

4570

OFFICIAL REPORT  
OF THE  
DEBATES  
OF THE  
HOUSE OF COMMONS  
OF THE  
DOMINION OF CANADA

---

FIFTH SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

---

63-64 VICTORIA, 1900

---

VOL. LIII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTH DAY OF JUNE TO THE EIGHTEENTH  
DAY OF JULY, INCLUSIVE



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

1900

# House of Commons Debates.

FIFTH SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, June 8, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### RETURNS, &c.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved :

That an order of the House do issue to the proper officer for a return showing what rails, rolling stock or other material, if any, have been sold or parted with by the Intercolonial Railway each year since the 1st day of July, 1896, to whom the same were sold or otherwise parted with, and whether the sale was made by public contract or tender.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg to lay on the Table a return in accordance with the motion just passed.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.). With the consent of the Prime Minister, I would like to move that the rules of the House be suspended, and that the return brought down last night by the acting Minister of the Interior, being a report of Mr. Ogilvie's, be printed forthwith. I want to call the attention of the acting minister to the fact that on the sheet for the receipts and disbursements, on page 83, the revenue and disbursements are not given. That table will have to be added to make it complete.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I would like to make a statement across the House to the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) with reference to a complaint which he made yesterday or the day before regarding a return from the Marine Department.

I could not, at the time, of course, have reference to the return which he spoke of ; but I was somewhat astonished, as I have taken very particular care that all the returns from my department were brought down promptly, and I thought I had a clean sheet. If I have not, I am prepared to supplement the return and give every information I can. But, I went, with the deputy, over the statement made by my hon. friend, and I asked him whether there was any information asked for between 1896 and 1897 which had not been given in the return. He told me that there was none, that there had been no dismissals for offensive partisanship on the report of any commission in that period. I asked him to make sure of it, and give me an official answer ; and he has given me the following memorandum :

(Memorandum for Minister.)

In examining the 'Hansard' for Wednesday, the 6th June, I find that the Hon. Mr. Foster, in commenting upon returns furnished by this department in regard to dismissals from office, refers to a return furnished on the 17th June, 1897, which forms Sessional Paper No. 73a of the House of Commons, and states that no name is given in the return of any official dismissed. I find by reference to the return called for that the names of dismissed officials are not called for.

The return furnished, however, in 1899, No. 103, gives information in regard to dismissed officials, stating both the names and post office addresses.

In regard to the statement of Mr. Foster that there is an important hiatus from August, 1896, to April, 1897, in which no information has been given, I may observe that there were no dismissals during the period referred from office on account of political partisanship as a result of investigations held by commissioners.

I think it will be found that the return furnished in 1897 and that furnished in 1899, together with the return supplied during the present session, will give very full information in regard to the inquiries of the hon. gentleman.

(Sgd.) JOHN HARDIE.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the hon. gentleman's reports which have been brought down include all the dismissals?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Include all the dismissals.

Mr. FOSTER. The statement is, that up to April, 1897, no dismissals were made as a sequel to these reports.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman was tardy in making his dismissals. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to call the attention of the acting Minister of the Interior to the fact that Mr. Ogilvie's report on the Yukon, referred to in the report of the Department of the Interior for 1899, and about which the hon. gentleman telegraphed in May to Mr. Ogilvie, has not yet been brought down. The report which the hon. gentleman laid on the Table does not seem to be that report, and it is necessary that that report should come down. Has the hon. gentleman yet received any answer to his telegram as to that?

Mr. JAS. SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). I have received no answer, and only this forenoon I wrote officially to Mr. Ogilvie asking for an explanation as to why the report was not sent, and why the three telegrams, which, I understand, were sent since this matter was referred to in the House, were not answered. I did, as my hon. friend knows, the very best I could. I have collected every possible information in the department with regard to the Yukon district which came from the commissioner.

Mr. FOSTER. I believe the acting minister has done everything he could to get the report; but I would call the attention of the government to what is rather a serious matter, that although Mr. Ogilvie has now been telegraphed to three times by the acting minister to forward that report, he has not even answered the telegrams, and now, in the last days of the session, the minister is reduced to sending an official communication to him asking for an explanation. Mr. Ogilvie has a great many absolute powers, but he ought not to have the absolute power of disregarding the orders of the acting minister.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think the hon. gentleman should be loth to say that he is disregarding the orders of the minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Three telegrams?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, but the Yukon is a very uncertain country. Mr. Ogilvie may be in the interior or absent somewhere else. I would not be disposed to assume that Mr. Ogilvie is acting in defiance of the order of the minister. Of course, we shall have an explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that another telegram be sent. Though we shall be here for some time yet, I am afraid we shall not be here long enough to get a letter to the Yukon and an answer by letter.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I felt very much the same as the hon. gentleman did about it, and I asked for an explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), has asked me to call to the attention of the hon. minister his request that Mr. Ryley's statements should be placed in his hands before he takes up that matter, so that Mr. Ryley's counter statements may be known.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I read over the remarks of the hon. member for Pictou with Mr. Ryley, and there were one or two references in them that neither of us could understand. I have been waiting the return of the hon. member so as to have an explanation from him, and I promise that we will then immediately have Mr. Ryley's explanation placed in his hands.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Pictou would like to know what answer Mr. Ryley has to make.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It would be difficult for Mr. Ryley to give a complete answer when he does not understand exactly what the hon. member for Pictou refers to.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know also when the papers promised, respecting the order of February 7, 1900, with reference to Dominion Creek, will be brought down?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have explained to the hon. member for Pictou privately, that there are no papers in the department, ex-

cept one or two, and I hope to lay them on the Table this afternoon. Any papers in the department will be laid on the Table this afternoon or to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have a statement of the work done by the registrar, Mr. Girouard, in the Yukon, as registrar, from the time he began his office work down to the latest date possible.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—HOISTING OF THE FLAG ON AMERICAN BANK NOTE COMPANY'S BUILDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I would crave the indulgence of the House with respect to a remark by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), on Wednesday last, regarding a matter which he considered important, though I did not. He said that the company which is manufacturing stamps and bank notes for the government had not exhibited the flag on the occasion of the celebration, so general in the city, of the occupation of Pretoria. While I do not attach any importance to the point as to whether they did or did not raise the flag, it is due to the company to say, that I received from its representative, Mr. Myers, a letter, in which he says: 'I personally raised the Dominion flag on Tuesday morning, the 6th instant, on learning the news from Pretoria.'

Mr. G. E. TAYLOR (South Leeds). In reply to the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance, I may say that when I made that statement in the House, the flag was not up, and had not been up that day. My hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie), drew my attention to it, and I went out at noon, and looked for myself, before making the statement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have made no statement of my personal knowledge, but have simply read the words which the manager, Mr. Myers, wrote me. He says that he personally raised the Dominion flag, on Tuesday morning, the 6th instant, on hearing the news from Pretoria and I know Mr. Myers to be a gentleman of good repute.

Mr. T. BEATTIE (London). If he hoisted the flag, he must have taken it down as soon as he raised it. Mr. Klopfer, Mr. Carscallen and myself, were around there and did not see it.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock), found out whether there was any sufficient reason given by the caretaker of the Bathurst post office, for not having raised the flag the other day, and for having refused to raise it on the day of the relief of Mafeking? The newspapers have called attention to this, and an injustice may have been done the caretaker.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The postmaster at Bathurst has his instructions as to the days on which to hoist the flag, and on that particular morning, he telegraphed to the department for instructions, and was instructed to hoist it, so that his hesitation was due to his waiting for instructions, and was not intentional on his part at all.

#### TRANSLATION OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. F. A. MARCOTTE (Champlain). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the House to an article which appeared recently in *Le Journal*. It is in connection with a letter from Mr. Larose, chief of the translating staff of the *Hansard*. The article runs as follows:—

The French 'Hansard.'

The chief of the translating staff, Mr. Larose, writes to the 'Journal' and informs us that his duties, as well as those of his colleagues, are not confined to translating the speeches of members from English into French. He says:

'It must not be lost sight of that as there are no other translators of the debates than those who are always called, I do not know why, French translators, it is also upon them that devolves the task of translating into English all the French speeches delivered in the House of Commons.'

That goes to show still more forcibly that there should be added to the staff three or four good French translators, in order that the French edition of 'Hansard' should not remain more than two or three days behind the English edition.

As to the translation of the French speeches into English, as this is quite a distinct work, it should be done by a separate staff.

There is not and there will never be found a translator with such a mastery of the genius of each language as to translate from French into English and from English into French with such a degree of perfection as is required from official translators. Parliament does not pay the official translators sufficient salaries to remunerate a man of so rare a merit.

As the translation of the Debates is in a backward state, I particularly call the atten-

tion of the Prime Minister to the opinion expressed by such an experienced man as the chief of the translating staff.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend will allow me to remind him that the matter to which he has just called the attention of the House does not come, properly speaking, within the province of the government. It should be referred to the *Debates* Committee, which is represented in this House.

Let me assure the hon. gentleman that any suggestion the committee may offer will always receive the best consideration at the hands of the government.

#### THE PILOTAGE ACT.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 11) to amend the Pilotage Act.—(Sir Louis Davies.)

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). This Bill has been reprinted in accordance with the amendments made in the committee, and I merely want to move it forward a stage. I move that the committee rise and report the Bill.

Bill reported.

#### THE SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Bill (No. 12) to amend the Act respecting the safety of ships (Sir Louis Davies), read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee thereon.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). This is merely, as I explained in introducing the Bill, to correct a clerical error made in the Bill of last session. There is no change in the law.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the clerical error?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hon. members will remember that the time for taking deck-loads was extended at the request of the shipping interest for twelve days, and that has been carried out by the Act and was a great boon. But the Bill in extending that time limited

Mr. MARCOTTE.

it to the end of the year, and it should read between March 16 and October 12.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

#### CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 156) to amend the Civil Service Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). Would my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) briefly explain this Bill; and particularly would he deal with the point as to whether under this Bill any change is made that affects the status of officers now in the service.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Bill does not affect the position of any officer now in the service, except as it may afford opportunity for promotion to some who would not otherwise have that opportunity. The chief object, as I explained at a previous stage of the Bill, is to provide for a grade of civil servants to occupy the place between the temporary clerks who may be employed at a minimum of \$400, and the second-class clerks who may be employed at a minimum of \$1,100. The view we take is that the difference between the two grades is too great. In former years, we had a junior second-class grade, which grade was afterwards abolished, and a third-class grade, which was also abolished, I think, when the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) was in office, no doubt, for good and sufficient reasons as they appeared at the time. We have found an embarrassment arising from the fact that there are occasions when we need to employ gentlemen in the civil service who can hardly be expected to enter the service at so low a salary as \$400, but to whom we do not wish to give, at the outset, so high a salary as \$1,100. Many cases could be cited in which the absence of such a grade has proved quite embarrassing. We propose to create a grade of junior second-class clerks. As the Bill stands the minimum salary for this grade is set at \$600; but when the Bill is in committee, I shall propose to amend that so that we may make a man a junior second-class clerk and give him the rank and thus start him on his way upwards without necessarily giving him so high a salary. Though he may not get much more at the

time of his appointment as second-class clerk than a temporary clerk, he will be in the way of promotion. Another proposal is that the maximum salary of packers and sorters in the Post Office Department shall be \$600 instead of \$500 as at present. I intend to propose to amend that by including also the messengers of the departments in Ottawa. Their maximum salary at present is \$500. There are cases of men who have been in the service a long time, men of special intelligence, and we think that for these men a maximum salary of \$500 is hardly reasonable. One difficulty we have in that relation is the dissimilarity of remuneration between the messengers in the departments and the messengers in the House of Commons and the Senate. We pay larger salaries to some messengers in the House of Commons and the Senate, though the service is only for a portion of the year, than we pay the messengers in the regular service who work during the whole year. We do not propose by this Bill to equalize them, but we think that \$500 is too small a maximum for the messengers in the regular service. Therefore, if the Committee of the Whole will agree, I will propose to amend the Bill which, in this respect applies only to packers and sorters in the Post Office Department, so as to apply to messengers in the inside service. Then there is a provision, in line with one in the Civil Service Act now, that if a man, in addition to the usual qualification, has passed in two out of three optional subjects—book-keeping, typewriting and stenography—he may be given an extra \$100 a year. We propose to extend that so that for special cause in the case of a graduate of the Royal Military College or of one of our universities, a man to whom you would wish to give more than the ordinary salary, you may start him at \$800. Then we propose to re-enact the clause of the Civil Service Act which was in force several years ago, but which expired in 1896, whereby persons who were already in the service when the Civil Service Act took effect may be promoted without having passed the regular examination. We propose to renew that for a period of two years. It will apply to those who were in the service in 1882, and have been continuously employed since. It simply provides that such persons shall be treated as qualified for promotion though they may not have passed the examination.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the Bill provide that a person may come immediately into the service, into the second class, if eligible, where the minimum is \$1,100 a year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, he could, if necessary, be placed in the second class directly, as at present. There is no change in that respect.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). In so far as temporary writers are concerned, it does away with the necessity for the experience which was found advantageous in those who were coming into the service before they were taken permanently on. I think the government will find the same difficulty as was found before, that men put directly into the service will be found very often not qualified for it, or for any special duties. They will be found lacking in that experience which they get in temporary employment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is nothing in this that prevents them being temporarily employed previously.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They may not necessarily be temporarily employed; they may be taken from the outside at once.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Quite so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And those who have been temporarily employed and who have had experience, may be passed over?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the case at present. You can make a man a second-class clerk without any previous temporary employment.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.). The proposal of the Minister of Finance is to do away with the legislation which, as he says, was introduced when I was Minister of Finance, after a good deal of careful consideration, and with a sincere desire to take away from the country a burden which it was thought was unnecessarily large, owing to the fact that you had a large proportion of clerks, who, in a grade, could go from \$400 to \$1,000, and in practice a large proportion of them got to the \$1,000 mark. Of these third-class clerks, nine-tenths of them did nothing more nor nothing better in service to the country than could be done by writers who could be employed for a salary of from \$300 to \$600. I do not think there was the least doubt about that being the state of things. The result was that we had a large number of clerks drawing \$1,000 when they got to the maximum, and of somewhere between \$800 and \$1,000 after they had been in the service a little while, and they were practically doing merely clerical work that any bright young man or bright young woman with a good knowledge of the English language and some knowledge of routine business work, which is easily acquired, could perform with equal satisfaction and equal efficiency. And so the government then determined to do away for the future with the grade of third-class clerks, allowing, of course, those who were

already in the service to work themselves to the other gradations. Then in the course of time we would have the writers' class, which did simply clerical work and which was a class getting salaries from \$300 up to \$600, a large class in the service of any government, and which would have been a large class in the service of this government, taking in many grades of ability, out of which it would not have been difficult for the government to pick the brighter and better minds and transfer them, if such became necessary, to vacancies that occurred in the second-class clerkships. But there was also another source of supply. It is a grievance to a great many in the service that those included in the third class who have got up to their maximum of \$1,000, have very little chance of preferment, because the vacancies that occur in the upper grades are few in comparison to the number that occur in the third class. Consequently they have little chance for preferment. Now, when you made the writers' class and had no appointments to the third class from the time of that legislation onward, what happened was this, that all that number of third-class clerks were eligible, in so far as their ability and experience made them able to do the work, for promotion to vacancies that occurred in the second-class grade. There is an abundant supply in the third class of good, honest and capable workers who are now up near the maximum, or at the maximum, and some of them have been at the maximum for years; there is abundant material there to supply any vacancies that take place in the second class, in what we may call the ordinary third class clerkships. It always will happen that every once in a while, in the upper grades, you will want a special clerk, and you may not be able to find one with just the qualifications required in any of the grades below. It is always then open for the minister who has charge of that department to come down to parliament and explain the necessities of the case, and by an enactment in the estimates and Supply Bill to appoint the necessarily qualified clerk to that position. But that is a very different thing from making a class, and consequently getting in the course of time a class filled up with high grade clerks, a large number of whom are doing just exactly what we have previously been doing by taking on bright young men or young women who have a fair knowledge of things and are abundantly able to do the work. Now, the hon. gentleman is going to do away with that legislation, which I am perfectly certain was a salutary piece of legislation. Gradually we would come to have a good class of writers, and that lightened the financial burden, because at that time we had a superannuation system and the privileges of superannuation did not accrue to that class. Consequently, we

were gradually getting rid of a whole class that entailed the burden of superannuation. Under the present legislation the superannuation business is done away with in one grade, and it is kept up with reference to insurance superannuation, which is also to a certain extent a burden upon the country, inasmuch as the country gives a larger rate of interest to the deposit which comes from contributions of all these clerks to the superannuation fund. It was found from the experience of Great Britain, where it has been tried for many years, that this class of writers do the work effectually and well and at a minimum of cost. Now, the hon. gentleman is going to do away with that. It will not be admitted, I think, by the common sense of the House, that it is not possible by one or two methods always to get the right person for a vacancy that may occur in the second class—that is all you have to provide for; a vacancy that takes place in the first class can be made up by promotion from the second class. I should be sorry to think that any vacancy could occur in the second class where you could not get out of the third class some person who would be quite able to take that vacancy and fulfil the duties. Therefore, all you have to provide for would be an occasional clerk in the second class whom you could not find in the whole range of the third-class clerks, or in the range of writers of more or less experience in the service. Is it reasonable to think that many cases would arise in which, if a second-class vacancy occurs, you could not find in the whole range of the third-class clerks or in the still wider range of the writers—who have had now some six years' experience, and who are gaining experience from year to year—that you could not find any one of all those clerks to fill a vacancy in a second-class grade? Granted that it would occur now and then; but instead of establishing the high class grades of junior second-class or third-class clerks, the easiest way to meet special cases would be the appointment of a special man that you could not get from the other two classes. Select him from the outside, and bring down an estimate for that person, explaining the reasons, and if the reasons are satisfactory, the person could be appointed, as is done every session. You have done it this year. Where is Mr. Marchand? You have taken a man who never was in the service, who had no experience of the service, whose life was foreign to it in every respect, who knew nothing about the routine of work in the Department of the Interior, and it is largely a routine department, you have transplanted him out of an atmosphere foreign to it, put him in at a salary of \$1,100 a year, and left five or six clerks in the second class who are engaged in the revenue work, in the accounting, and who are as capable as men could be, sitting there without pro-

Mr. FOSTER.

motion, and you have introduced this man over their heads. You do not need any junior second-class grade in order to do that. You did it, you gave what excuse you had for it, you got your vote through, your followers supported you, and the House voted the money. I protest with all the earnestness possible against establishing an expensive grade of clerks or making the way for it. The moment you do it there is no limit, you will find that you will have to submit to the pressure of your followers, and before we know it we will have a large junior second-class grade built up. Where is all this talk that we heard so often about the burdens of the civil service? Where are those promises that told us in the good old days that the civil service burden could be reduced to one-third of what it was upon the hill of Ottawa? It was an absolute step in the way of diminishing the burden of the civil service when we substituted a grade that began with \$300 and worked up to \$600, for a grade that went from \$500 to \$1,000, and did just as efficient work. That is working itself out, and in the course of a dozen years from to-day you will find few third-class clerks, but you will have a class of writers, men and women who are doing the work at from \$300 to \$600 a year, and doing it just as well as it was done by a class of clerks getting from \$600 to \$1,000 a year. The new grade which you are creating will be filled up inevitably. Open up a junior second-class grade, and in the course of eight or ten years you will have it filled up with men and women who are doing the work of writers, and at a high class of salaries when you can get plenty of people who will do the work neatly and well for a much less salary. Where are all these protestations against the weight and burden of the civil service? Where is this consuming idea of lessening the burden and getting the people's work done for a fairly reasonable amount? There are Liberals, there is the present Finance Minister, there are gentlemen who sit behind him, there is my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) who, whether for good or ill, first put that notion of the writer class into my head by remarks which he himself made more than once as to the English system, and why we did not adopt it in this House. It was adopted and has worked well, and I must appeal to the hon. gentleman to come to my rescue now against his expensive and extravagant colleague the Minister of Finance and help me. He and I together! What a stroke of work we could do! By the way, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has not yet notified me if these envelopes are ready for our joint addresses to go out. I accepted the offer; I notify my hon. friend that I am ready now. I am ready to have my speech placed in the envelope alongside of his and circulated with it. It saves

handling and expense in the post office, and as both of our speeches will go they might as well go together as apart. I appeal to the House to pause before it puts an expensive, a useless and an unnecessary grade of civil servants upon the finances of the country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has pointed out a good many things with which I quite agree in regard to the second-class clerkships which can be filled up. The hon. gentlemen, however, I think, has entirely missed the point and object of this Bill. He has pointed out that under his own direction the government of which he was a member did away with any further additions to the third-class clerkships, and substituted a class of writers, or temporary clerks, who are engaged from time to time, and who, although they have passed the civil service examination do not belong to the permanent civil service. It is for the purpose of enabling those who have shown aptitude and extraordinary diligence in their work to become members of the civil service and to reap the benefits of being in the permanent service, and to keep these people in the service rather than have them leave the service which we are finding is our experience, that this measure is proposed. The class of writers that the hon. gentleman brought into existence commence their service at \$400 a year. They are allowed a statutory increase of \$30 a year until they reach the maximum of \$600 a year. There are bright young men and women who will not enter the public service at all at \$400 a year, and if they do they will not stay in the public service after they have gained a few years' experience at only \$430, or \$460, or \$490 a year, as, by the terms of the class which the hon. gentleman created, they are only able to stay. They will not stay even for \$600 a year, and the result is that we are face to face with the dilemma that we either have to let those who are specially qualified for their work leave the service altogether or else make them second-class clerks at \$1,100 a year. My hon. friend would not, for a moment, suggest that it would be a proper thing to take young men or women who are at the head of the class of writers getting \$600 a year, and at one jump, and without any graduation at all, make them second-class clerks at \$1,100 a year. I am not speaking of where a vacancy occurs amongst the second-class clerks which has to be filled, but I am speaking of the case of a temporary clerk who is getting even \$600 a year, whose services are efficient, but who will not stay in the service at that rate of remuneration, and whom we cannot blame for that feeling, because such people are efficient, intelligent and capable enough to deserve a greater remuneration than \$600 a year.

They can get it elsewhere, and they are tempted to leave the service, as in many instances they have done. Under these circumstances the government have thought it best that they should bring back again that class of third-class clerks who are called junior second-class clerks under this Bill. Practically it is a renewal of the third-class clerkships in order that we may be able to retain the services of young men and women who are best equipped for the public service, best fitted to do the work efficiently, and who could not expect to be given second-class clerkships at \$1,100 a year. There is a wide difference between \$600 and \$1,100 a year, and there is abundant room for the adequate payment of efficient men and women in the service between these figures. My hon. friend has asked: Where are these protestations of the desire to make the public service less expensive which we expressed when we were in opposition? My hon. friend received an answer to a very considerable extent, when, a few weeks ago, an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, asked a comparison in certain departments of the public service of the expenditure upon these departments to-day and the expenditure before we came into office. The answers to these questions show, that in three or four departments, although the service is much larger and more onerous than in 1896, the actual expenditure on civil government is less than it was in 1896. That is the way we try to fulfil the promises we made when in opposition. I do not think that it would be wise to adopt the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), to appoint more second-class clerks, so as to give them the promotion they may fairly expect.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not advocate that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If you did not advocate that, do you mean to say that all these writers should be kept for ever as writers, and only be promoted as there is a vacancy in the second class?

Mr. FOSTER. What else do you want to promote them for?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. So as to keep them in the service.

Mr. FOSTER. You know it is very easy to keep your service sufficiently filled up.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are doing that, but efficient men will not stay in the service at \$600.

Mr. FOSTER. Let them go elsewhere.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And you would lose the best men you have.

Mr. FOSTER. No, you would not, you always have plenty.

Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. You will have plenty of an inefficient character.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all. How many have left?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One left in my own department last year.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very large proportion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are a large number of these temporary clerks, who have told me that unless some such inducement is held out to them they will not stay in the service.

Mr. FOSTER. Let them go.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, and the result would be that you would have nobody in the service that would be thoroughly efficient. If we are to retain the best men in the service we must give them promotion, and if we do not do that we will be driven to create more second-class clerks. Since I have been in the department I have been more and more convinced that the repeal of the Act in 1895 was a mistake. I believe the government were actuated with very proper motives at the time, but it certainly did not make the improvement that was expected.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What does the present law prevent the minister doing, except appointing a lot of raw men permanently in the service. If you have a special reason you can make a second-class clerk now, and if there is a vacancy you can promote a man. The Bill of 1895 was to prevent the appointment of inexperienced men permanently in the service, and this Bill will enable you to do that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And the hon. gentleman suggests that in order to prevent the best men leaving the service we should create more second-class clerkships?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not at all. Will the minister tell me how many of all the civil servants have left during the last three years?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say exactly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, that is very important, because the hon. gentleman founds his argument upon it. Who was the man who had left in his department?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was one of the assistant patent examiners whom I appointed, and I gave him \$600 but I could not keep him.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where did he go?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He went to the States and got a higher salary.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Quite so, but you are not suffering because he is gone.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was obliged to create three more second-class clerkships, and give them \$1,100. I was willing to do that in that particular instance, but in most instances it would be too great a payment for the services rendered. If we carry out the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) and make more second-class clerks, we will create more expense to the country than if we passed this law.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When we were discussing the estimates, the minister said these new men were worth \$1,100.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why did you not pay that to the man who left?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because I had not a second-class clerkship to give him, but I had to do it since in order to get the men.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is a new experience.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I repeat that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues made a mistake when they did away with the third-class clerkships, and we are now remedying that mistake, and will make the service more efficient than it is to-day.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is a serious step, and must have been under the consideration of the government. How many cases are in view in which these junior second-class clerks are to be created?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is a matter we must know.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Votes will have to be brought down in every case.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, but there must have been some basis for framing the Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This Bill will not appoint any one.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We cannot get young gentlemen to come from outlying portions of the Dominion to Ottawa to take a position in the service at \$400. It is not fair to offer a graduate of a college or of an academy that salary. But to offer him \$1,100 is, we think, too much. We think that a

reasonable sum would be \$600, if we re-established the third-class clerkships.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the minister any difficulty in getting men?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. We cannot get these young gentlemen to stay unless you pay them extra by a special vote of the House every year, as has been done. That is one of the principal reasons why you have in your estimates every year 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.' It is said that this is done for favouritism, but it is nothing of the kind. You cannot get good men to enter the civil service at \$400. They cannot live on it. \$1,100 is too high, and we think that \$600 is a reasonable sum to start on. Many of those clerks who were appointed at \$400, and receive a special vote every year, might be recommended for this new class. When I came into my department I found two or three clerks who had to get extra pay in one way or another. Would it not be much better to appoint these men to a class where they would receive a fair remuneration, and I do not think that \$600 is extreme. I remember the case of Mr. Brophy, stenographer to Mr. Venning, who got \$700 a year, but he would not remain. He went off to the States where he has been getting \$1,000 ever since.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You got another one, though?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. McNEILL. What was the salary of the former third-class clerk?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He started at \$500 and went up to \$1,000.

Mr. McNEILL. You are starting with \$600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. Practically, it is the third-class clerk over again, as the Minister of Agriculture has stated.

Mr. JAS. CLANCY (Bothwell). I have listened with some interest to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries point out that for this work gentlemen of exceptional training were required.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, no; not exceptional training.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, the hon. gentleman said: We cannot get gentlemen who are graduates of academies or colleges to come. I was not aware before that selections might not be made from among the bright young men of this country, who are not getting such salaries elsewhere. I am not saying that they are too well paid, but there

are thousands of young men who would be glad to come to Ottawa and take their chances of rising on their intrinsic merit.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There is no promotion for a temporary man.

Mr. **CLANCY**. There is nothing to prevent the hon. gentleman promoting any young man who shows that he has intelligence and industry enough to go forward. The law does not promote him, but he may be promoted.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The leap is too great.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The leap was not too great for Mr. Keyes.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. He could not get it under this Bill.

Mr. **FOSTER**. You can get over anything when you want to.

Mr. **CLANCY**. If it were shown that the class of men required for that work could not be obtained under other circumstances, that would be some reason for this measure; but this class is being created in order that permanent appointments may be made, leading to all the consequences which the hon. member for York pointed out as having obtained in the past. Surely we should profit by the experience of the past, and hon. gentlemen have not made the shadow of a case for the change. A young man who has a fair English education can do any part of that work. The experience of the past was, that the service was being constantly filled up with political appointments. It may be said that young men are unwilling to come to Ottawa at the salaries given. That was not the experience of the past. It may be said that they cannot live well on those salaries. The country is not obliged to tell the young men how well they are to get along. The experience of the past is that you cannot keep a young man back if he is industrious; he is bound to rise in the service, unless he is unfairly treated by one or other of the great political parties.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee thereon.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. **G. E. FOSTER**, (York, N.B.) I am opposed to amending the Act, and I propose to give my reasons why. One thing that has been urged is that you are at a loss to find men to put into the second-class vacancies. Let us see how much there is in that. In the Privy Council you have eight men who are third-class clerks. Every one of these is eligible to promotion to any vacancy that may occur in the second class. I will ask any gentleman in this House if he

does not think there is quite sufficient material there for promotion, without making a new class. Will the Prime Minister himself say that these third-class clerks are so dull, so incapable for the execution of clerical work, as to be not fit to take any places which may become vacant in the second class? He will not say that.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). Nor does the Act say so, nor is it intended to have that effect, nor will it have that effect.

Mr. **FOSTER**. There are only two reasons for this Act. One is that given by the Minister of Agriculture, that his heart bleeds and his eyes weep because he sees young men and women whom he would like to promote and cannot. The other is that you cannot get material with which to fill up your second-class vacancies when they occur. In the Privy Council there is material enough to go upon for many and many a year without creating another class. In the Department of Justice, while there are not so many third-class clerks, there are still some who are available. However, that is a somewhat technical department, where a different grade of clerk is sometimes necessary from what is required in most of the other departments; he must have a knowledge of law in order to perform his duties. Coming to the Department of the Interior, you find a whole host of third-class clerks, some of them up to their maximum, and others in all grades of the service, from \$600 to \$1,000. There is evidently abundant material in that department from which to make promotions to any vacancies in the second class which may occur. The Department of Inland Revenue is the same.

The **MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE**. Only two.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Very well, I would exhaust the two before forming another class. In the Department of Customs, there are names of third-class clerks whom I know very well, who have not reached their maximum to-day, and are well able to fill second-class positions if any vacancies occur. So, I might go through the whole service from one end to the other. Take the Post Office Department, it has some four pages of a list of third-class clerks, running from \$1,000 down to as low as \$600 or \$700.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. There is not the slightest intention of passing them over.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Then, when you want to fill vacancies in second-class clerkships, that is where you ought to go for your material, and there is no necessity to form another class for the kind of work which is done by the clerks in the second and higher grades. My whole contention is based upon this fact, that the kind of work which is

done by the third-class clerks is not the highest grade of work; that it can be so arranged, if it is not now, that all the work which was formerly done by the third-class division can be done by the writers' class, running in salaries from \$300 to \$600 a year. You may talk as you like about what is to be done. I have been in the department, and I know what is done. I know that the vast majority of the work is simply clerical routine work. Here is a paper that requires to be copied, here is an account that requires to be run up, here is a piece of mechanical work that requires tabulation. Any one who thinks for a moment knows what all that class of work is. You do not want a man at a salary of \$1,100 or \$1,400 to do that class of work when you can have bright young men and women, who will do it quickly, neatly and well, and who are in the writers' class. Oh, but, says the Minister of Agriculture, those bright young men, the time comes when they do not want to stay any longer at a salary of \$600. If they do not, and there is no place to which they can be translated in the regions above, they entered the writers' class knowing the conditions, and if they can better themselves outside, I would advise them in heaven's name to do so. For if there is any class into which a bright ambitious young man or woman should not remain it is the lower grades of the civil service. Just come to the common-sense view of it, without any high faluting as to the great work that is to be done, and any one with practical experience knows that the vast majority of the work done in all the departments is simply this routine, mechanical, clerical work, which does not require any higher class of men or women than are getting from \$300 to \$500 per year. Suppose you come across a difficulty, suppose you want a special class of work done, and you cannot find, in all the unused remainder of the third class, one who is able to do it, and when you cannot find any one in those that fill the writers' class, at from \$300 to \$600 per year, fit to do it, what would you do? A special case can be specially provided for. It is much cheaper to provide for a special case now and then, when it occurs, than to establish a class, which you will be always tempted and urged to fill up more and more and keep filled up with men and women at a high salary. I do not think any good reason has been given why we should form another class of highly paid men and women to do what is really third-class work. But you say there is some high-class work to be done that you cannot get done by any of the third-class clerks. There is an easy solution of that. The ministers, looking over the departments, will find that some of the second-class work done by men who are paid second-class salaries, is a kind of work which could be just as well done by the

writers' class, so that by shifting that class of work to the writers' class, by weeding it gradually out from your higher grades, there will be less to be done in the second or first class, and you will not need to add to your force. The great merit of having the writers' class is to keep all that kind of work, which is simply clerical, down to that class, and the high grade work is none too highly paid for. I suppose my hon. friend is determined to push his Bill through, but I venture to hope he may see differently. These gentlemen are going to make some friends in the meantime by doing this. They are going to fill up this class during the short period of political life which remains to them, but when their political life ends, as it will soon, we will have an elephant on our hands—an expensive piece of machinery that we will be obliged to continue or take the onus and trouble of getting rid of it. If there is no other feeling dominant in these gentlemen's hearts, let them have a little pity for us who are soon to succeed them, and let this thing lay over a year or two, and I venture to say that when we attain office, we will do the service of the country with the writers' class at present existing just as well as it is now done, or as it will be done under this new Bill, notwithstanding the opinion to the contrary of the hon. Minister of Customs.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I can understand the course taken by the hon. gentleman, who was one of those who established the writers' class, which, in my opinion, was not a change in the best interests of the service. The committee will agree in this opinion if they look at the matter in a broad light. You have the option now of bringing a man into the inside public service at \$400 per year, or \$1,100 per year. The mere mention of that fact ought to carry a great deal of weight, and it is that which carries weight to my mind with reference to this Bill. I think that the difference is altogether too great. It ought not to be necessary that we should give as high as \$1,100 to a person on entering the service to do a certain kind of work, but you must either do that or secure the services of one who values his services at only \$400. The distinction is too great, and the object of this Bill is to put ministers, when they require additional help, in the position of obtaining that help without having to pay \$1,100 per year at the start off or else employ some one who values his own services only at \$400. But, taking that \$400, the most he can look for under the law, is an advance of \$30 per annum; and when his salary reaches \$600 the increases absolutely cease—there is no further promotion for him. That is the difficulty that weighs with me. I do not know that there is the desire to create any large class. The object is to attain efficiency in the public service, and I think that under

the plan proposed, that object will be attained, together with economy. It has been stated that you can fill your second-class clerkships from those who are remaining in the old third class, as it was before the law was amended. That is true, and as a rule, I fancy that is what would be done. But if vacancies occur in the second class through death or resignation, or the necessity for extra help, and you promote a third-class clerk to the vacant position, you create a vacancy in the third class.

**Mr. FOSTER.** That is the intention of the enactment.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** Quite so. As the law stands, one of the temporary employees, whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) calls writers, cannot be put into that class, for if he is put in as a temporary clerk to do the work, he still gets only \$600 and with no chance of advancement. Why should there not be an intermediate grade, to which one of your temporary writers, who has obtained the maximum of \$600, may pass, and so be given an opportunity to work his way up? The ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), and other hon. gentlemen opposite, have found fault with the government, because they have withheld the statutory increases, which, they say, should mechanically raise the salaries of the civil servants by \$50 per annum; and yet these same hon. gentlemen object to this opportunity for advancement and increase of salary on the part of officers in the civil service. It does seem to me that it is more unjust to promote a man to a place made vacant by the death of one who was receiving \$1,000, and still pay him only \$600, with no chance of an increase. Let me illustrate the point by a case in my own department. Two years ago, a first-class clerk in the employ of the Customs Department, died. He was engaged in the work in which the ex-Finance Minister has referred—largely clerical work. He had gone on year after year, getting his advance, until, at the time of his death, he was in receipt of \$1,700 or \$1,750. His death took place after the estimate for his salary had been voted in the Committee of the Whole. But before the estimates were finally passed, I moved to reduce them by \$1,750, and, in the supplementary estimates, I placed a vote for \$1,750, with the words, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary.' My idea in doing that was this: I found I could get what I considered two capable men, one of whom would take the place of the man who had died, while the other would be of use, as the department was short-handed. And so I got the two men, paying no more than had been paid before. But this was done under special legislation, and every year—this year—I have to come to parliament and propose these votes 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary.' Hon.

**Mr. PATERSON.**

gentlemen opposite will see that if we had a class of the kind proposed, there would not be the necessity for this special legislation, but that when a salary lapsed through the death of the man to whom it was paid, the government should be free to put in a man at a much lower salary, and with the prospect of promotion. The ex-Finance Minister would tell me, I suppose, that when a first-class clerk dies, I should fill his place with a man from the second class, and fill his place with a man from the third class. But the vacant place in the third class could only be filled by giving the work to one of the writers who had obtained the maximum of \$600, but who could not be promoted stage by stage with the others, though doing his full share of the work with men in receipt of from \$700 to \$1,000. Though I have no doubt that the law now in force was adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite with the best intention, I must say it struck me from the moment I got a grasp of the working of the department, that there was this difficulty in the case. The third class no longer exists under the law, but this will have the effect of bringing back that class.

**Mr. CLANCY.** There is no necessity that we should keep the third class as full as it is now. The object was that this class should finally pass out altogether.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** That means that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is in favour of those who are to-day doing the higher class of work, being paid \$1,100 from the start. While it is true that there is a class of work which faithful men can perform, and are ready to perform at comparatively low salaries, there is a certain class of duties that we cannot find men to perform, paying them only a maximum of \$600 a year. I say again, in conclusion, that the broad fact struck me that for the government to be shut up, either to give a person \$1,100 or be content to fill any vacancy that may occur, with persons who are willing to give their services for \$400, is a position that we should not be confined to. It does not work in the interest of the public service, and I believe the creation of this class will result in economy.

**Mr. McNEILL.** At the present time, I understand, there is no possibility of promoting a deserving man from the writer class.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** Except to the second class, which is \$1,100.

**Mr. McNEILL.** He can be promoted now to that class?

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** Yes, to \$1,100.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** But I thought my hon. friend was arguing that he could not do that.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** No, I was arguing that it was not desirable to be

forced. If you wanted to put one in that position, to give him \$1,100, that there should be an intermediate class in which he might start at \$800, or something higher if he had special qualifications, and in which he could gradually work up. From \$800 to \$1,100 is too great a difference to start with.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has made unto himself graven images, and he bows down and worships them. He worships class, he is struck with a great reverence for first class, second class and third class clerkships.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is the law.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems to be the pivot around which the hon. gentleman moves when he discusses this question. I am not looking at class at all, I am looking at grades of work. He says it is an unfair thing when a vacancy occurs in a second-class clerkship to take a third-class clerk at \$1,000 and move him up to fill that vacancy, and then to take a man at \$600, and put him into that place to do what the \$1,000 man was doing. That is the hon. gentleman's argument. I say that what you are to look at is the grade of work. When you take your third-class clerk out at \$1,000 and promote him to do a grade of work worth \$1,100 in the second-class clerkship, then you have a vacancy in the third-class clerkship, and a portion of the inferior work which was being done in the third class drops down to its proper level amongst the writer class, and is just as effectually done by the man or woman who is doing work in that writer class. The point of view from which the legislation started was this, that your third-class clerk was engaged largely upon work which was not of a sufficiently high grade to make it proper that salaries should be paid ranging up to from \$800 to \$1,000. We are just working that off, and in proportion as you promote a man into the higher class he is put into higher class work, and you are simply drawing down the work which was done by the better paid clerk to its own level where it is just as efficiently done by a writer for \$400 to \$600. The gravamen of the charge against the whole service was that you had hundreds and hundreds of clerks who were getting from \$600 to \$1,000 for doing work which was not of a quality and character which made such high pay necessary. The fact was that it could be done by what you may call a cheaper class of men, by the writers class. In a commercial establishment all the mere routine work is done by a low class of labour, and that class which requires responsibility and initiative is the class that the merchant puts at a higher grade, and pays higher salaries. Is there a grievance to a bright young man who comes into the writers' class? I think as a matter of course that you will have two classes

in that writers' class. You will have a class who are willing to go in for life at \$600 a year; you will have another class who will go in and do their best work, and pass that pilgrimage as a stepping stone to help themselves to something better in the outside world. You say those do not make the best class of clerks. I believe they make the best class for that kind of work.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. To give them that promotion you have to give them the \$1,100.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the Minister of Customs see that it is not simply the grade which makes the salary but it is the work, and if the work done in the second class is of that kind which is worth \$1,100, the leap is a proper leap. But if my hon. friend does not want to leap, he need not for the term of his natural existence. In the third-class clerkships in the service taking them all through, there are hundreds of men who are willing to be promoted to the higher class work. You can promote them, you need not make the leap.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman speaks of what business men would do. I venture to think that any business man having clerks in his employ at \$400 per annum and rising to \$500 or \$600, if he found that he could not recognize their merit by regulations that had been made, perhaps, by his partners, without jumping them up to \$1,100, he would feel that that was a very unfair condition. He would say: Here is a bright young man whom I would like to advance. I do not think he is worth \$1,100, I am willing to give him \$600 or \$700, but here is a regulation made by my partners which prevents me from promoting him unless he jumps up to \$1,100.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman reasons in that way, let him follow out his argument to its conclusion. Let him simply resolve the service into a business matter, abolish all classes, and let each minister pay each clerk what he thinks he is worth.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is proposing something which is absurd and which he knows cannot be done. There is, however, one portion of the hon. gentleman's argument with which I sympathize a little. He seems to be anxious to draw a wide distinction between those who are of the class of writers and the class who compose the permanent staff. He did not wish them to consider that they had a right to promotion, as their work is clerical and temporary in its character. To some extent, I sympathize with that view. I do not want the idea to get abroad that a man who has the rank of a temporary clerk has a good and just claim to promotion, unless under exceptional circumstances. But, let us see the effects of the hon. gentle-

man's view. I think we are all agreed that we want a permanent civil service in this country. I think we will admit that the service in Canada is getting better than it was, although we are still a very long way from the English system. We have heard about these bright young men whom we want to enter the service and to give their life to it. Suppose you have one of these bright young men, you propose to put him into this writer class, and if he is a bright young man he will ask himself: What is going to happen to me in this writer class? I will only get \$400 a year to start with; I do not mind that, because I am just out of college, but what is going to happen to me in two or three years? Even if I get \$600 I have no chance of promotion, unless some minister will take me out of the \$600 class, and at one step place me in a position to receive \$1,100. My chances are so poor that I will leave the service when something better offers. Such young men have no hope of being appointed to a permanent class. Four hundred dollars is not very much, \$600 is not very much, and if a young man, such as I have spoken of, is fit for anything, he will not stay in the service for more than a few months. He will not use it as a stepping stone to something better in the service, but to something else outside. Should we not be able to hold out to some of these bright young men an inducement to go into the service of the country with the expectation of a reasonable promotion in their class, and ultimately into another class? As the law stands to-day your bright young man, if he is fit for anything, will not go into the writer class with any intention of remaining there.

Mr. CLANCY. One of the arguments of the hon. gentleman is that it is difficult to get this class filled, and another argument is, as presented by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that it was unfair to jump these clerks from \$600 to \$1,100. If the first class can be filled, the service will not suffer. Let us bear in mind that these are all political appointments. I will venture to say that you can get many efficient men in the third class who are better than some of the men in the second class. It would be a strange thing, under our system, if that were not the case. Now, then, if that be true, I want to ask my hon. friend where that grade of work is between \$600 and \$1,100? There is absolutely no grade of work, and the first permanent clerkship is a second-class clerkship beginning at \$1,000 at least. If the hon. gentleman can point out that there is a middle grade of work for which you must supply a middle grade class, there is a case, but there is no middle grade of work. The clerk is on trial as a writer until a vacancy occurs in what is the first clerkship that is permanent, namely, a second clerkship at \$1,000 a year and the writer steps into the class of work that be-

Mr. FIELDING.

longs to a second-class clerk. He may look forward to this \$1,100, or \$1,000, and he has a perfect right to do so. Let us recognize, first, that a permanent clerk has to be a second-class clerk, and let us recognize that there is no medium between a writer and a second-class clerk. If there never had been third-class clerks established under our system, the hon. gentleman would be without a shadow of excuse in urging that there should be a junior second class. Until the hon. gentleman can point out that there is a class of work standing between the writer and the second-class clerk, there is not a shadow of excuse for creating a class of clerks for which there is no work corresponding to a graduating salary going upwards. It is all very well to say that this does not look businesslike, but we cannot put the service on an entirely business basis. We cannot pay all the clerks according to their merit under our system, but we can come as near that as possible. We have adopted a system of employing a class of temporary writers, and there is no difficulty in getting any number of persons to take these positions. While I think we are all anxious that the condition of the service should be improved, it does not seem that such a backward step as is proposed will accomplish that end. The few years' experience that we have had since the abolition of the grade of third-class clerks has shown that the change was a wise one. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) says: We will do away with the third-class clerks. I would like to have the hon. gentleman point out what there is specially about that class to which he referred as such. What is the nature of the work that belongs to it? This work has been referred to as being of a clerical kind which belongs to the writers. The work which was done by the third class was writers' work. If that is done let it be done by the writers, and the moment you come to a higher grade, if you require a higher class of work, pay for it without any hesitation.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will just give the illustration that I gave before. The hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) is not reasoning fairly, because he knows that he has to consider the Bill in connection with the existing law of the land, because we have to deal with the law as it exists now. If a minister had some means of getting so conversant with the work that he could arrange the work, classify it, and say such work is worth so much, that might be different, but that is not the way it is in the public service. You have now under the law these classes, and this Bill is in reference to these classes. The work comes by classes. It does not come in the way the hon. gentleman says. Although the work of the first class being done in my department, the position having become vacant, I took the promotion which I would be able

to do under this Bill without having recourse to special legislation; I dropped the vote for the \$1,750, and took that amount to be expended, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, in the employment of two men. One man I put to discharge the duty of the man who died, and I had another man to engage in other necessary work. I do not know how the ex-Minister of Finance arranged in the Finance Department, but it is my experience—and I think my predecessor (Mr. Wallace) will agree with me—that sometimes the duty of third-class clerks are as responsible, perhaps, as the duties of second-class clerks, or even first-class clerks, in some branches.

Mr. FOSTER. What is your inference from that?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That under the system of civil service promotion and mechanical advances of salary that prevailed under the old law, this has gone on whether the class of work required it or not until you have these high salaries being paid. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will find that what he lays down theoretically will not work out in practice.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not the argument of the minister, that occasionally you find first-class clerks who are doing third-class work?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot call it third rate work, but you will get some bright young men at \$700 or \$800, who are competent to do good work if they have a prospect of advancement. The contention of the government in this Bill is that we will get them at less than \$1,100 provided they may have a chance of being advanced gradually.

Mr. FOSTER. When the service was first started, the basic idea was not that you should nominate a certain number of men as first-class clerks, a certain number as chief clerks, and a certain number as second and third-class clerks, and then that you should apportion the work amongst them. When the service was started, the grades of work was first divided and the men were then appointed and classed because of the kind of work they could do. If we get to any other position, great injury will be done to the civil service. What the Minister of Customs said was plain proof that in his first-class division he had a lot of third-class work being done.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. When this man died, that was getting \$1,750 a year, he found he could get a man to do it for \$1,000 and that he could appoint another man at \$750. That was because it was low grade work.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is not so.

Mr. FOSTER. I presume you will find that in some of the departments first-class clerks are doing nothing more than clerical work.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What did you do with that?

Mr. FOSTER. I would put that kind of work where it belongs, in the writers' class, and keep the first-class clerks for first-class work. I see that the Prime Minister is impatient. Does he want this Bill to be rushed through without discussion?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is altogether wrong. What reason has he for saying that?

Mr. FOSTER. Here you are with a grade of third-class clerks running from \$500 to \$1,000, and you put right alongside of them *pari passu* what you call junior second-class clerks at the same salary. What under heaven's name do you want with two grades of clerkships which are exactly the same? Every time you make another class, when it comes to make the promotion you multiply the trouble and the heart-burning in each department. If you are going to do this at all you had better reenact the old third-class clerkships and not have two grades exactly the same.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I admit that practically this new class is the same as the third-class clerkship called by another name. I have no doubt that if you were now constituting a new civil service for the first time, you could with your experience of thirty years frame a much better system than we have. I dare say that you would provide that one man should not step from one class to another without undergoing a very rigid examination for the higher class. But now you are dealing with a state of facts that you find at your hand, and are you going to shut the door to many young men throughout this country who may have a proper ambition and desire to enter the civil service? It is absolutely essential for the future good government of this country that a proportion of the best young men of the country should enter the civil service. It is all very fine to have ministers at the head of the department carrying out a certain policy and altering it from time to time, but to have effective government you must have first-class civil servants and you cannot have them unless you are supplied with a good stream from the bottom. There is not an inducement to a clever young man to enter the service to-day. If a vacancy occurs in the second class now, you have to go to the remnants of the third class, or very rarely you can bring in a man at \$1,100, but practically there is no hope of entering the service at a higher salary than \$400, and then merely as a temporary clerk without any permanency assured to him.

Mr. McNEILL. I have listened very carefully to this discussion, but I have not heard my hon. friend answer the question of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster): Why establish this new class? Why not establish the third class?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend stopped me in the middle of what I thought was a strong argument. I say you must offer inducements in order to get a portion of the best-educated young men in this country to come into the service and make their future in it. What inducements do you offer to-day? I say absolutely none. You do not offer a permanency nor any hope of promotion; you only offer \$400 a year to begin with and an increase of \$30 a year up to \$600 and then stop. Will any educated young man accept an offer of that kind? He will not.

Mr. McNEILL. Can you not put him in at \$1,100?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. member for York says you cannot bring a man from the outside at \$1,100, because the third-class clerks are waiting for any vacancies that may occur. So that you are excluding from the civil service of this country the very class that you should attract to it. I do not say that \$600 is much to offer them, but you offer that with the prospect of rising to \$1,000, and a fair hope of rising to the higher positions afterwards.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman has not answered the question I asked: Why establish this new class?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is only a difference of name. The third class was abolished, and we are reviving it by calling it the junior second class. The rights of the third-class clerks now in the service were retained at the time the third class was abolished.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman not paying a larger sum than the country has a right to pay for clerical work?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. From my experience of my own department, I tell the hon. gentleman that I am not paying one man in my department more than I think I ought to pay him.

Mr. CLANCY. But if the hon. gentleman introduces this system, he will pay more for the work than he is paying now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not necessarily. I have appointed four clerks in my department, and in each case I had to get a special Act providing, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, before I could give him an increase of salary. There they are, fixed

without a permanency at \$600, three of them graduates of colleges.

Mr. HENRY CARGILL (East Bruce). Does the hon. gentleman find any difficulty in getting a sufficient number of clerks at varying salaries from \$1,100 upwards to do the work connected with the different departments? Is there a lack of men at the present time? Does he find any difficulty in getting a sufficient number of men to fill the positions?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, no.

Mr. CARGILL. Does he find any difficulty in getting a sufficient number of men to enter the service at \$400 per annum, with the prospect of an increase to \$600?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, we find very great difficulty in getting men to come in at \$400, with the prospect of rising to \$600.

Mr. FOSTER. You could get a thousand to-morrow if you wanted them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not of the right kind.

Mr. FOSTER. Of the right kind.

Mr. CARGILL. I have been in parliament a great many years, and I have made frequent attempts to get several very efficient young men into the civil service in Ottawa, but up to the present time I have failed. I have never been able to get a single young man into any of the departments in Ottawa, even when my colleagues were in power. Now, I can supply any number of young men from East Bruce, and I will obtain from a good guarantee company of the province of Ontario a guarantee for them. I will guarantee these young men to have the necessary qualifications to discharge the duties required of young men who are paid salaries of from \$400 to \$600. If that be the case, why create offices for men to whom you propose to pay between \$600 and \$1,100? I cannot see the necessity of it. I was very much taken with the suggestion made by the Minister of Finance that the present government are proposing to conduct the business of this country on business principles. If there were more of that done by the government, it would be a grand improvement. Business men, when they employ a man for their office, know what the minimum salary is and what the maximum salary is. They take him into the office, and promote him according to merit. As soon as he reaches the maximum salary, if he says he can do better elsewhere, his employer says: 'Go, we are quite satisfied we can get plenty of men to take your place at that salary.' That is the way the business men of the country conduct their business, and I cannot for the

life of me see the necessity of this change. If it is possible to get a sufficient number of young men, who are anxious to get into the civil service at \$400 to start with, with the prospect of that being increased to \$600, and you have plenty of men to do the more technical work at salaries varying from \$1,100 to \$2,000, why create offices for men to whom you propose to pay \$700, \$800 or \$900 when you can get the same work done for \$600 ?

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). I think I can point out to the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill) the necessity for this Bill, and I am glad to see the government introducing it, because to my mind it is a confession of weakness. They see their coming doom; they know that they have every corridor and every room packed with writers; they know the course they pursued when they came in of dismissing officials; and they know that these officials, if without permanent appointments, will be dismissed. They want this Bill put through simply for the purpose of giving these clerks, who are on the temporary list, permanent appointments, so that when these hon. gentlemen opposite go out, as they will in a few months, and we come in, these new appointees will expect to be kept on permanently, having been appointed by order in council. That is the only necessity for this measure.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). I cannot at all agree with the spirit in which the discussion has been approached by some hon. members opposite. I do not think it is at all fair to say to a clerk in the civil service, who has done his work for years faithfully, and who desires an increase: We can get somebody else to do the work at the same price and will not give you any increase. That, I am sure, is not what the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill) does in his own business. We all employ people and give them increases of salaries, not because they are doing different work, but because they have been doing their work for a number of years. I have a book-keeper in my office who does the same work as he did ten years ago, but his salary has been increased regularly since and so has every clerk in my office, and I am sure that business men generally follow the same practice. It is not fair to say to a writer who has done his work faithfully for a number of years: You can go adrift, if you are not satisfied, because we can get some one to do the work at the same salary.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Under the present Bill they get an increase.

Mr. BELCOURT. Up to \$600.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is that too little for a man who simply does copying ?

Mr. BELCOURT. They are not restricted to copying. They are often called on to do other work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What other work ?

Mr. BELCOURT. Making compilations, for instance.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Perhaps the hon. the Minister of Marine can tell us ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It depends on the department they are in.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not care what kind of work they are called on to do, when a man has been doing work for a number of years, that entitles him to an increase of salary.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Up to a certain limit.

Mr. BELCOURT. Of course I would not pay \$2,000 to a man who does work that is well paid for at \$1,000, but people cannot live in a city like this and bring up families on \$600. It is all very well for members of rural constituencies, where living is much cheaper, to talk about the salaries paid in the civil service.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Our rural constituencies do not get \$60,000 per year each to do their own local improvements.

Mr. WALLACE. Nor do they get into the Yukon jobs.

Mr. CARGILL. You must not class the rural business men of Ontario with the lawyers of this country. They have not the same facilities for making money.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am not going to notice interruptions of this kind. I think that these comparisons are very invidious.

Mr. FOSTER. As a humble member of a rural constituency, I protest against the slur cast upon us by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not mean any offence, I am only stating what is the case, that year after year we have gentlemen in this House who represent rural constituencies—and I am not saying that they are not entitled to as much consideration as others—making attacks on the civil service.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a great deal of breezy common sense among the rural constituencies.

Mr. BELCOURT. I say that the civil service has been made the legitimate prey of these gentlemen. There are abuses, no doubt, which ought to be remedied in the service, but I do not think it deserves to be made the butt of such attacks as it is from year to year in this House.

Mr. CARGILL. When did I make any attack on the civil service ?

Mr. BELCOURT. My hon. friend—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Your rural friend.

Mr. BELCOURT—has had his opportunity of addressing the House, and I would ask him to have a little patience.

Mr. CARGILL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put him a question? When did I make any attack on the civil service?

Mr. BELCOURT. What I meant by attack was that hon. gentlemen from year to year get up in this House and say that the Ottawa civil servants receive too big salaries.

Mr. CARGILL. I never said so.

Mr. FOSTER. It was the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who said that.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am not singling out any side in particular. I say that these attacks have been made by hon. gentlemen on both sides, and let him whom the cap fits put it on. At the moment it certainly fits many gentlemen on the opposition benches. I appeal to every hon. member whether it is businesslike to have clerks getting from \$400 to \$600 per year, and who cannot get any promotion except you jump their salaries to \$1,100 per year. That is a state of things that cannot commend itself to any business man.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We all appreciate the high and mighty airs of the hon. member for Ottawa, but with all due respect to him, rural members have just as much right to speak on matters of administration as those gentlemen who represent urban constituencies, and have just as much knowledge of the civil service. The hon. gentleman has, no doubt, behind him a great force who are anxious to come into the civil service, who see him morning, noon and night, and who want to get as much as they possibly can. No attack has been made on the service from this side by any gentleman to whom I have listened, but we say that a class of work which can be done by writers whose ability demand no more than \$500 or \$600 per year, should not be paid \$800 or \$1,000 per year. No doubt there are technical branches in the service which require special men, and the government have every opportunity for appointing those men and paying them salaries commensurate with their ability and the duties they are called on to perform. I am opposed to this Bill for two reasons. First, it will load up the permanent service. The object of the former Bill was to employ men temporarily and make them serve a period of apprenticeship in which they would have an incentive to secure the good opinion of those above them, on whose good opinion they would have to rely in their struggle to obtain permanent positions. But the object of the government is to enlarge the permanent civil service of the country for political purposes. It has not been shown

Mr. BELCOURT.

that in the practical working out of the present law any injury to the public service has been done. The government have had good service. Occasionally they have to come here with a special clause in a vote: 'Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act,' but it is better to do that than appoint men permanently who are not specially fitted for their positions, and who are consequently fastened on to the public service without special qualifications. While a great majority of the civil service are very excellent people and do their work well, and earn their money, I know instances of men who were put in the permanent service as third-class clerks who have gone on year after year, partly by political pull and partly by friendship pull, up to the maximum, and to-day are getting \$1,000 a year—and they are not doing work worth \$300.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who are they?

Mr. WOOD. How long have they been in the service?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Long enough to get their promotion to the maximum of their class.

Mr. WOOD. Who appointed them?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not care who appointed them or who they are. I know lots of such cases, and any gentleman who has had anything to do with the departments knows of such cases.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That occurs under the statutory system.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is quite true. Men were dumped into third-class clerkships and made permanent officers without qualifications. And they are getting more to-day as officers of the government than they would get in any other business place in Canada for twice the amount of work. Mind, I say these are exceptional cases; I am not attacking the civil service, for the civil service is, on the whole, a body of able, intelligent hard-working men. But, it was to guard the public service against the drone in it that the existing law was introduced in 1895. And, if carried out, it would have that effect. We have heard a great deal of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) with regard to what business men pay their employees. I know something of what business men pay; I know something of what banks pay in this country. Let any hon. gentleman go to-morrow and ask to have one of his sons put in the Bank of Montreal, one of the strongest institutions in this country or in the world, and what will the lad get? He will get \$200 a year.

Mr. PUTTEE. Is that enough?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I rely to some extent, at any rate, on the judgment of financial institutions being as good as that of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee).

The **PRIME MINISTER**. At what age are men paid that amount ?

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. A clerk goes in at 16. He gets a certain amount of increase every year. He does not get in permanently.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes, it is a permanent institution.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Yes, but let him not do his work—

Mr. **GIBSON**. It is the same here.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. No, that is just the difference between the Bill we introduced, and the Bill hon. gentlemen opposite have introduced. We would employ these people as temporary writers. We proposed to test them as to their energy, ability and industry. And if we found them up to the mark in this respect, we made them permanent clerks. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) proposes, under this Bill, to make them permanent clerks at once, and that is the reason I am making these objections today.

Mr. **CAMPBELL**. I think the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) are very unfair to the civil servants. He said there were men in the departments who were getting \$1,000 who were not doing \$300 worth of work. Now, I do not believe that there are any such men in the departments, and if he knows of any such men, he ought to be man enough to name them, and not cast a slur upon the whole civil service of this Dominion.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). I desire to point out, from the standpoint of my own department, the necessity of this clause. There are in the inside service of the Post Office Department, at the present time, fifty-eight temporary employees whose maximum salary cannot exceed \$600. There are also a number of clerks in the inside service, some sixty of whom are receiving less than \$1,000, while many of them are at the maximum. I should like to have the temporary writers feel that there was some prize open to them that was reasonably within their reach, that there would be a fair opportunity for them to be drawn upon for promotion into the junior second class, whereas, the long step to the second class, with \$1,100 as a minimum, must be almost impossible. I am satisfied, therefore, so far as the Post Office Department is concerned, that the adoption of this clause will be a great advantage to the service. In order to leave no doubt as to the efficiency of the staff, I would say that, after careful attention to the staff of the Post Office Department, I am not aware of any one who is drawing \$1,000 who is not entitled to his money. We have an excellent staff; and, whatever views might be held by those who have no practical acquaintance with the

work of the staff, I can say that, while there are degrees of merit, while some may have been promoted a little beyond what they were entitled to, and some may not be in receipt of as much as they are entitled to for their services, yet there are many in the lower grades who might, with great advantage, be drafted into the higher positions of the service to the improvement of the service—if the system is not abused, as I do not think it will be. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) suggested that this was practically a restoration of the third class. Not so. It is very much easier to go on by annual increments of \$30 or \$40 a year from \$400 to \$1,000 than to go from \$400 to \$1,000 when there are two distinct classes. Therefore, in the division of what was formerly the third class into temporary writers and junior second class—if you choose to consider these two together as making a third class—I think the provision of the Bill makes a wholesome check against an unwise increase of salary, and, at the same time, offers a fair incentive to those in the lower class to look forward to promotion on their merits. I make these remarks because the hon. member for York appeared, in the earlier part of his argument, to intimate that in establishing this class it was designed to pass over all who were in the service that it was a way of bringing in outside people; and so, he proceeds to go through the list of third-class clerks, and asks why this one or that one has not been promoted to the second class, suggesting that it is intended to pass them over. I do not so regard it. He argued from an entirely false premise in suggesting that that was the scope of the Bill. Those in the lower grades will be as likely to receive promotion as before, and scope is offered for the meritorious in the lowest grade to rise.

Mr. **CARGILL**. Is not the object of this proposal to enable the departments to give from \$700 to \$1,000 for work that they are now getting done for \$600 ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No. At the utmost, the highest salary at which, under the Bill, one can commence will be \$800. The object of the Bill is to provide that if an additional officer is to be appointed, you can get him for from \$600 to \$800 instead of being obliged, as without the Bill, to pay \$1,100.

Mr. **CARGILL**. I understand the intention of the minister is to select a few men and give them an increase of \$800, and then let them work on up to a higher salary.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I believe this Bill will not add one to the list of persons employed in the civil service. But we cannot do what my hon. friend says without coming down to parliament and taking special votes for them. But if we attempted to take any large number of persons who

are now doing work at \$600 and give them rank and promotion, that would be a fair subject for criticism. In that case we would have to come before the House and explain what we were doing.

Mr. CARGILL. At present the third-class clerks are doing work at a maximum salary of \$600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman means the temporary writers.

Mr. CARGILL. Now, the mere technical work commands a salary of from \$1,100 up. I understand that the object of this Bill is to enable the government to pay the men who are at present receiving a maximum salary of \$600, to pay them \$800 for doing the same kind of work that they are doing at present for \$600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, that is hardly a correct statement of the case. It does not necessarily follow that one single man of the temporary service must be appointed to these grades at all, but they may be. This temporary class is still to be continued for what might be called the ordinary office work, such as copying, &c., you will still have the writer class for this work. But if there is in any class a bright young man who has been a temporary clerk and who is capable of better work and we wish to select him for promotion, we can do so. But I do not anticipate that any such general use of the Bill will be made in that way.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not see why the civil servants of this country should not be treated on business principles in the same manner as a business man treats his own clerks. If I were to engage a man and tell him that I would start him at \$400, and that for all time to come he need not expect to get any more than \$400 or \$600, I would find great difficulty in getting men. I do not think the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Cargill) treats his own men in that way. He says that he has never been fortunate enough to get any individual appointed in the service. I may tell him frankly that he is a very lucky man, because the moment he got one of his friends appointed he would be immediately beset by that person and by his friends to procure for him a raise of salary. This Bill is a step in the right direction, because it gives the government power to increase the salaries of men who are really deserving of an increase, owing to the nature of the work that they are performing. Because a man has been in a certain class eight or ten years, it does not necessarily follow that he is more able to do the work after all that period than he was when he entered. But there may be a man who has been in that class for ten years, and who performs his duties more efficiently than when he entered the service at \$400, and for all time to come must that man remain at the salary at which he en-

Mr. FIELDING.

tered the service, that is, if he merits an increase, unless he has a political pull by which he can rise to \$600? I think this Bill commends itself to every member of the House. When men in the service know that they have an opportunity of promotion by reason of faithful service, they are going to do better work. The promotion is not to be by leaps and bounds. As has been pointed out by the Postmaster General, he has 58 men in his employ, and he cannot pay one of them more than \$600, he cannot advance any one of those men into another class unless he gives him \$500 of an increase at one step. We must admit that \$500 is a very large increase to give any man unless it is given for very special service. I say that the government is wise in taking this power without having to come down to parliament and appeal specially for any man in the service. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) advanced the idea that the government was going to be defeated and they wanted to put their friends into the permanent service before the Conservative government came into power. Now, we can understand exactly what his idea of politics is. His idea is that the knife is going to be brought into play by the Conservatives the moment they get into power. What was all this squealing about the first session of this parliament when the Conservatives were imploring the Liberals not to remove some Conservatives from office? In 1878, after the Mackenzie government was defeated, there was not a man in the service that had been appointed by that government, who was not dismissed within 24 hours after the Conservative government took office unless he was tied down by order in council. So it appears that the same thing is going to be repeated when the Conservatives get into power. Let me tell my hon. friend that he will not be in the House when the Conservative party gets into power. I say the government ought to be supported in this measure, by which they take power to promote efficient men in the service and not be obliged, as the member for Hacklmand (Mr. Montague) says, to retain men in the service at large salaries who are not worth \$300 a year. I say that the minister would be derelict in his duty if he had not brought in a Bill to relieve the government from the necessity of paying men more than they are worth.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When I was a member of the government I began the cleaning out process from the moment I started, and I was attacked very bitterly for it. It appears to me that the courtly gentleman from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) made his statement under a little excitement. I see in the press to-day something which throws a little light upon the question of government patronage. I see by the *Toronto Mail* that a delegation of French Canadian Liberals

waited on Messrs. Belcourt and Hutchison, the members for Ottawa, and presented to them the protest of about a thousand French Canadian Liberals against the way the government patronage is distributed in Ottawa. Messrs. Belcourt and Hutchison said that they would bring the matter to the attention of the proper authorities. Whether they have done so or not I do not know, but the government is anxious, apparently, to put through this Bill; and if the passing of this Bill will relieve my hon. friends, the junior and senior members for Ottawa, from the pressure of these 1,000 Liberals, then, I say for heaven's sake let us pass it.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to have a little information about this matter on one point that I have not been able to understand as yet. Why is it that the government are pursuing the course that they have pursued in regard to this measure? I presume that they are going to carry this clause. As I understood the Minister of Finance, his object is to secure men to do technical work at a lower rate than the government are now compelled to pay.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not necessarily technical work, but good work.

Mr. McNEILL. What has been called technical work in the course of this debate, second-class work. I presume they are going to carry this clause. But I have not yet been able to understand why it is that they introduced this new clause, and why they do not abide by the old divisions into second and third class clerkships. I want to make one other remark. I think the member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) scarcely intended to be so severe on rural members like myself, as some of my friends on this side of the House thought he did. I did not understand that he meant to say anything very offensive to poor, ignorant rural representatives like myself in this House. But, I think I have heard hon. members, like the hon. member who spoke a moment ago, speak as though members on this side of the House were attacking the civil service. This is one of the most extraordinary statements that I have ever heard, although I have been a member of this House for eighteen years, and I have heard some very curious things said. If there is one thing we have been accustomed to more than another it has been the most violent attacks from the hon. members who are now occupying the Treasury benches upon the salaries paid to the civil servants of this country. We have, upon this side, been defending the civil service. I quite agree with what the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) said a moment ago, and I think it is a matter that ought always to be kept in view in discussing the civil service, as to the necessity of endeavouring to induce men to remain in the service. I am not quite sure if

that point of view has been as strongly insisted upon as it might have been in this discussion. I do say to the hon. gentleman that when he puts that position before the House as strongly as he did to-day, I wish he would go as far as the hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) asked him to go, and asked the government to go, and let us have the decision of the courts so that we may know whether the members of the civil service are not being robbed, at present by this government, of their statutory increase. I do not say that the government is doing so deliberately, but I say that it is deliberately withholding a statement as to the condition of the law from the civil servants which the civil servants are entitled to have. These men entered the service with the understanding that they were to have their statutory increase. I believe, and it is the opinion of many of the best lawyers in the House, that they are entitled to have their statutory increase. The hon. leader of the opposition has asked the government to have a case laid before the courts so that we may know whether they are by law entitled to this increase, and up to this time the government have refused to do the civil service the common justice of doing this. So that I think it ill-becomes hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to twit hon. gentlemen upon this side of the House with any desire to do an injustice, either by word or deed, to the civil service.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I wish to say a word in regard to one point. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that there is nothing in the name itself. I would say that what was the third class, under the former system, and the junior second class, will be practically the same, and call for the same salary. So that, whether you call them by one name or another, it can have nothing to do with the merits of this Bill. I think there is a convenience in distinguishing between them, because third-class clerks under the former law come under the Superannuation Act, so that there is a convenience of distinguishing between those who are officers, who came under that law, and officers that do not.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend can hardly carry that out. Is a gentleman put into a second-class clerkship, by the legislation you are passing through now, eligible for superannuation?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Under the new system, yes. The superannuation system that he would come in under is different from the other. We have, strictly speaking, no superannuation now. We have a savings fund. These gentlemen will come in under what I may call the new savings fund system, but they will not be under the old superannuation system.

Mr. TAYLOR. I just want to say a word in reply to the hon. member for Ottawa

(Mr. Belcourt). He made the statement that no person could live in Ottawa on \$600 a year. There are 312 working days in the year, and \$1.50 a day would be \$468. There are plenty of people living in Ottawa to-day on \$1.50 a day.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

### AFTER RECESS.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 120) to incorporate the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. Frost.)

#### SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 172) respecting the Canada Mining and Metallurgical Company (Limited).—(Mr. Casey.)

#### CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 156) to amend the Civil Service Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Is there any objection to put the word 'only' in there, so as to make it read 'and only after.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). It does not strengthen the meaning of it. It cannot be done before.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is done before, and you will need all the stiffening you can.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). There is no objection to that.

On section 7,

Mr. JAS. CLANCY (Bothwell). I would like to ask the minister why a graduate of the military college should be given a preference over others having the full qualifications to do the work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It applies not merely to graduates of the military college, but to graduates of any university. The idea is that in special circumstances we may give a little recognition to a man who has taken the trouble to qualify himself by a college education. If a man has spent years taking a course of instruction at one of our higher institutions of learning, it is not a fault that we should give special recognition to that fact.

Mr. CLANCY. I deny that such a distinction should be made in the civil service of Canada, which belongs to men who, in many cases, are unable, owing to their position in

Mr. TAYLOR.

life, to secure a college education, while well able to perform the duties required in the service. A university degree does not give a man any special advantages for those duties. I will venture to say that, generally speaking, there is not a particle of work done in the service that might not be done efficiently by persons unable to take such a degree. There is no doubt about that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is much doubt about it.

Mr. CLANCY. While university graduates should be encouraged to come into the service, I do not see why a preference should be given to them, thus placing at a disadvantage other young men who may be quite as bright, if not more capable. The fact that a man has passed through and taken a degree in any of our universities is no measure of his qualification to be a good accountant.

Mr. MONTAGUE. A good many of them do not know anything about accounts.

Mr. CLANCY. As my hon. friend says, a good many of them do not know anything about accounts. I say it is unfair to give them a preference over other men who can do the work as efficiently and, in some cases, more efficiently. The special training is no argument that the work will be better done.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that we may safely lay it down as a rule, that even if a man is to be a hod carrier, a college education will make him a better hod carrier. I speak feelingly on this subject as one who has not enjoyed all the advantages of that higher education. I do not hesitate to say that in any walk of life a man may be engaged, he is all the better for having enjoyed a university training. That training does not belong exclusively to the sons of wealthy men. Our educational institutions in every province are, fortunately, in such a condition that they can afford to the sons of poor men the advantage of university training almost equally with the children of wealthy men. When the hon. gentleman says that this is unfair to some one else, I may say it is unfair to the son of a poor man, who has struggled hard to obtain a university education, that in the public service of Canada there should be no recognition of that struggle.

Mr. FOSTER. Like the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) I may be taking the unpopular side, but I do not believe a word of what the Finance Minister has said. It sounds well, but I do not believe it can stand the test, and I am speaking now in the face of one of our university men from the maritime provinces. Take two men who have commenced the struggle of life at the same time. The circumstances of the one have enabled him to take a collegiate course, but the other has had to content

himself with a business course, and after finishing his superior school education he goes to a business college and thoroughly fits himself for business. He will probably be better fitted for the work of the departments than the man who comes out of a university, and has got his degree, and who, in nine cases out of ten, has to learn the special work which he is called on to do after he gets through his college course.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. He starts with a trained mind.

Mr. **FOSTER**. It all depends on circumstances. Other things being equal, the university course gives him the advantage, but it is only when other things are equal, and your hod carrier might turn out a much better hod carrier if he had never seen the inside of a college. I think the hon. member for Bothwell has the right idea. If you have a special kind of work, which requires a higher grade of training, you look to a university man, but you ought to show that you have that kind of work to be done. When that is shown, you can start this man at \$800. The Auditor General is very partial to university men. He has always held that, other things being equal, he would rather take a university man and start him at \$800 or \$900 than one without university training at a less amount. But what ought to be shown is that there is a grade of work to be done which requires that kind of man. But take a young chap who struggles just as hard, and in nine cases out of ten much harder and for a longer time probably, to fit himself for work than one who was fortunate enough to have friends to put him through a university, I do not think you ought to give a premium to the more fortunate one who has been able to get a university training and who is not more fitted for the class of work you require to be done than the one who did not have that advantage. This clause provides that the Governor in Council may, for special cause shown, appoint a graduate of the Royal Military College or of any university in Canada. What is that special cause? This section would be interpreted to mean that the special cause was the fact that the person applying is a graduate of a university, and on that ground alone he would start at \$800, although he had no special training for the special work of the department.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The special cause would be special qualifications for a particular work. It does not follow from the section that because a man is a college graduate, he must get \$800. There must be special cause shown.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Consisting in what?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I have been trying for three years to get a graduate of the Royal Military College in my department as a draughtsman. Parliament fixed the salary at \$600 and I cannot get a man at that price. I tried to get one by raising the salary, but Colonel Kitson told me that even now the salary is too low, and these men with special qualifications will not accept that figure.

Mr. **W. H. MONTAGUE** (Haldimand). What does the hon. gentleman say with regard to business colleges? They are taking a very high stand now in the province of Ontario, they have confederated among themselves, and have a regular standard of examinations which their graduates have to pass. These graduates are much more specially fitted for the work of the department than university men. They are taught practical work, such as banking and stenography and book-keeping, and when our leading firms want book-keepers they apply to a business college. They are specialists to a much higher degree for the business required to be done in the department than university men. I regret, with the Minister of Finance, that I had not a university education. But it is a fact that cannot be denied that men come out of our universities, particularly pass men from our universities, without any qualifications for business whatever. In many cases, the very fact of their having spent four years in this work of the university, in my judgment, sometimes actually unfits them for business. But, putting that aside, if we give this advantage to the university men, I think we ought to give it to the commercial college men.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I do not say that I agree with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) in all that he has said; but, I may point out, that his view is met, to some extent, by the provision in regard to the optional subjects. A gentleman who has gained a certificate in the commercial college can pass in the optional subjects, and thus begin at \$700.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. And you will not examine him?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes, he will have to pass an examination in two subjects.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Why should he?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. To get the extra \$100.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. But, why should he be examined when the university man is not examined?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The degrees of the universities are recognized throughout Canada. I do not think we

could use the general expression 'commercial college,' and treat every holder of a certificate of a so-called commercial college as being equal to the graduate of a university. I do not think the hon. gentleman would wish to push his argument so far as that. There are commercial colleges and commercial colleges.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That does not apply to Ontario.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But, this is a law for the whole Dominion. The commercial colleges are doing good work, but I do not think there is a standard of commercial college education that would justify us in treating their certificates in the same way as a university degree.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Montague) knows that the existing Civil Service Act discriminates between a university course and other forms of education, because the holder of a commercial college certificate must pass the civil service examination the same as anybody else. We simply follow the rule in this case, except that we provide that on passing in two subjects of a commercial college course, the candidate can get an additional \$100.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would point out further, that some of the best men for the civil service in Canada are school teachers. Why should we allow the university men to get in without an examination, while compelling the school teachers to submit to it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the present law, and I only have not proposed to depart from it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But, I think it should be departed from. A man may be a teacher of a school in a large town, a man of the highest qualifications—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is he not usually a university man?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But, if he is principal of a school?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) knows nothing about it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is so with us.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With us, the principal of a large school is usually a university graduate.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am afraid the universities in the east do not maintain such a high standard as do ours in Ontario. It is much easier to get a degree there, I am afraid—

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, these hon. gentlemen can discuss the matter with their colleague the Postmaster General (Mr. Mullock).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) would keep quiet—he knows nothing about this part of the matter. The principals of our public schools are not, in one case in a hundred, university men.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, dear!

Mr. MONTAGUE. I appeal to my hon. friends from Ontario on both sides of the House. There is not a gentleman in the House who will say I am wrong if I say not one in two hundred, but they are thoroughly educated men, men of the very highest qualifications. Principals of our high schools are all graduates, but the principals of our public schools have very few graduates among them. I venture to say that there are not two men at the head of big public schools in Toronto who are graduates of universities. Why not admit the holders of these positions to the civil service without compelling them to undergo an examination?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The same standard does not apply throughout the Dominion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is unfortunate.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). Speaking for my own province, I do not know a principal of a school who is not a graduate of a university.

Mr. POWELL. High school?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). All our high schools and public academies. We would not think of having it otherwise. That is the reason why our education is of a much higher character than that in Ontario. The argument the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) uses itself shows the wisdom of this. He says that teachers would be good men for the civil service. With us, almost every graduate is a teacher. He has to teach between times—that is the way the majority of them get their education. And I can tell the hon. gentleman that these graduates know as much about general business and matters relating to book-keeping and so on, as most of the young men I have seen who have passed through the commercial colleges. They have to teach all branches of mathematics and they are perfectly competent to do it. Let me tell the hon. gentlemen that I have known men

plucked in our universities to go up to the large universities in the upper provinces and pass with a great deal of credit. History everywhere shows that the smaller the country the better the colleges. Go to Aberdeen and Edinburgh, and where do you find better colleges? They may not have the fame of Oxford and Cambridge, but that is because they have not the population about them, but they have sent out as well-trained and as highly educated men as any colleges in the world. I would not have referred to this matter had not the hon. gentleman suggested that our colleges did not amount to anything. While it is true that some self-made men are better than college graduates—for instance, Elihu Burritt was a man of marvellous learning, though self taught—no man will say but that the college graduate is a better man in every respect and can do his work better than if he had not the advantage of a college training. If you allow teachers and many more in, there is no use in the civil service examination. You must draw the line somewhere; and, in my opinion, there is no better way than to say that a graduate of any university in Canada may be admitted without examination, and that those who have special qualifications shall be given advantages on demonstrating that they have those qualifications. It is only another way of saying that the passing of a college course is in itself evidence of the possession of due qualifications which other men must show they possess by passing an examination.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest an amendment to this section so as to make it read:

The Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the head of the department, setting forth that the person to be appointed has special qualifications for the duties to be performed, and concurred in by the Treasury Board, appoint, and so of—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would not like to accept that off-hand. But, let the clause go as it is now, and before the Bill finally gets out of committee, I will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) an answer. I quite see the purpose of the amendment—it must be for special reasons with regard to the man and the duty.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and that is the work of the deputy.

On section 9,

Mr. FOSTER. I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to a point which I think is worth consideration. The government seem to be agreed that this is going to rehabilitate the third-class section. To my mind you are doing this: The third-class clerks exist, there are a large number of them, they are in the service, and many of them have been for a considerable length of time. They will be known as third-class clerks. You are superimposing upon

those a junior second class. That junior second class will by its very name take precedence of the third class; so that whenever you come to promotions into the second class and so on, it will be the junior second class division from which these promotions will come.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not necessarily.

Mr. FOSTER. It would naturally be so, as the hon. gentleman will acknowledge. Now, that would be an injustice. If you were now to make a class and put it over the old third class in which there are so many deserving men, it would be an injustice. I think something like this should go in to remedy that:

After the passing of this Act all third-class clerks now in the service shall be styled and known as junior second-class clerks.

There are two things you do by that. You certainly place the third-class clerks where they ought to be, and you get rid of having two classes when one class is quite sufficient.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will make the same answer to that as I did in regard to the other amendment. I will take it into consideration. So far as their substantial position is concerned, there is really no difference between these two classes. I do not attach the utmost importance to the names. I do not think there would be that discrimination. But if the hon. gentleman will allow that amendment to stand, before the Bill finally leaves the committee we will consider that. Now, I would like to call attention to the amendment which I announced in my introductory remarks. Section 10 now reads:

The salary of a packer or sorter, employed either permanently or temporarily in the first or inside division of the Post Office Department, may be increased to a maximum of \$600.

I propose to enlarge that so that it shall apply to messengers also. Instead of applying it strictly to the post office staff, it will apply to the civil service generally and include messengers.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was going to suggest that it shall apply to the Customs branch. I think the most underpaid men in the whole service are the men who do the manual labour.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Section 10 will now read:

The salary of a packer, messenger, sorter or porter, employed either permanently or temporarily in the civil service may be increased to a maximum of \$600 per annum, by amounts not exceeding \$30 in any one year, such increase to be granted only upon an order in council passed on report of the deputy head, and concurred in by the head of the department, that such messenger, porter, sorter or packer is eligible for such increase and is deserving thereof.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does that apply only to the inside service? Why should a packer or sorter in the city of Ottawa, in the inside service, get more than one in the city of Toronto? If the hon. gentleman passes that it must apply to all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think in the Post Office Department the salary of messengers in the outside service is already \$600.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is not in the Customs.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On page 195 of the Civil Service List you will see, letter carriers, sorters, stampers, messengers, box collectors and porters get salaries from \$360 to \$600. When that clause was drafted it was not necessary to extend \$600 to the outside service, because they already get \$600.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think in the Customs branch, where men work very hard, the salary of messengers and porters is \$500.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the Customs it is \$200 and \$500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps we should make it clear that it shall apply to messengers generally.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Minister of Finance had better make a little revision of that whole matter. He will find that goes a long distance, and if it is fair for one outside man who works so many hours at manual labour to go up to \$600, it is equally fair for another outside man who works at manual labour for an equal number of hours.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Suppose we take the clause in its amended form to apply to messengers, packers and sorters, and I will look into it and see what other classes there are.

On section 11, subsection 3,

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. Minister of Finance know how many of them are eligible?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I could not give my hon. friend the information.

Mr. FOSTER. Why say 1901?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The idea is not to make it a permanency.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thought the supply had become exhausted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are one or two yet, I think.

On section 12,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In regard to section 12, I want to make a slight change in the phraseology. In the fourth and fifth lines, instead of saying, 'under the provision of the Civil Service Act,' I propose

Mr. FIELDING.

to say 'than the minimum salary of the class.' I beg to move that the section be amended in this way.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose that the Bill be allowed to remain in committee, and that it be not reported at present, that we may give it further consideration.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### SUPPLY—THE PACIFIC CABLE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I want to bring to the notice of the House, and of the government, a matter which I deem to be of considerable importance. My justification for doing so is the information contained in certain despatches which I shall read in a moment. I feel further justified in trespassing upon the time of the House, because I have been asked by the Board of Trade of Ottawa, a body which displays a good deal of intelligent zeal in the public interest in dealing with questions of importance, to lay before the House a series of resolutions passed by this board of trade some months ago, and which I have had in my possession for some time. The series of resolutions refer to the scheme for the construction of the Pacific cable. The resolutions read as follows:

Resolution No. 1.—That while the proposed Pacific cable would foster trade and intercolonial intercourse, it would at the same time constitute the initial link in a system of cables to all British possessions around the globe, that such a system would form a new bond of Imperial unity of inestimable value.

1. That this board regards it of vital importance that the Pacific cable should be completed as a state undertaking, without delay.

2. That in view of the great object to be attained, this board is strongly of the opinion that it would be wise policy to make full provision for ultimate state ownership in any arrangements hereafter made to lay cables by private companies between British possessions in any part of the globe.

3. That this board recommends that the principle of state ownership be especially provided for in the cable proposed to be laid by a private company between South Africa and Australia.

Resolution No. 2.—That this board attaches so much importance to the resolution respecting the Pacific cable, that it especially requests the members for the city of Ottawa to bring the subject before the government and parliament.

Resolution No. 3.—That a copy of the resolution respecting the Pacific cable be transmitted to the principal chambers of commerce in the United Kingdom, with the request that they will move the home government to reserve the right to Her Majesty to assume possession of the cable in any arrangement for laying a cable by a private company between South Africa and Australia.

I do not propose to take up the time of the House in going over the details of the agreement entered into about a year ago between the Australian colonies, the Imperial government and the Canadian government, for the construction of the Pacific cable. That the cable should be constructed, is a matter upon which, I think, every member of the House is agreed. I only want to remind the House that the principle which was sanctioned, when the scheme was entered into, was the principle of state ownership, in reference to a certain portion of the cable, and I think, looking also to state ownership ultimately in reference to all cables laid between British possessions. Since that agreement was entered into a great many delays have occurred, and a great many obstacles have been thrown in the way of completing the scheme. These obstacles have been occasioned largely through the opposition of a monopoly called the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company. It would seem that matters are now getting to a serious pass, so far as the principle of the state ownership of this cable is concerned. The success of the project is seriously impaired, if not imperilled, by certain negotiations that are now going on between the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company and certain Australian colonies. I want to read to the House an article which appears in the *Nhill Mail*, of the date of May 5, a paper published in Australia. It is as follows :

We desire to specially call our readers' attention to an appeal 'To the British People in the Australasian Colonies,' sent by the last Canadian mail by the eminent engineer, Sir Sandford Fleming, to our worthy townsman, Mr. J. C. Lockley, with a request that the same should be made public. The appeal, which is published in another column, should go so straight to the heart of every true Britisher that anything further urged in its favour hardly requires to be put forth. The British people own one flag and should have all interests in common, and in furtherance of this most noble sentiment, which we know the people of Australia most heartily reciprocate, the Canadians have asked us to join with them and with Great Britain in a practical connection by telegraph cables which will bring all together, and within a few hours' speech of one another. To assure such being an integral part of the flag somewhat in the same way as the British navy is, and, in fact, to act in conjunction with the navy, it was proposed to make these telegraph cables, with their stations, British in every sense of the word—that is to say, to be owned and controlled by the self-governing British states of the empire. The adoption of the first part of such a laudable project, the Pacific cable, was agreed to by Great Britain, Canada, and nearly the whole of the Australian colonies, inclusive of New Zealand. This work should have been accomplished to-day, and we have no hesitation in saying would have been accomplished had it not been for outside influence of a most powerful nature permeating in every direction in which such influence has been of use to the monopolists who control the greater portion of the world's submarine telegraph cables. The monopolists do not like the idea of any state-owned cables. In such a case their large dividends would disappear, for they know only too well

that the self-governing states of the British Empire, with Great Britain, can obtain capital at a very low interest, and since these cables would be laid for the good of the British people in the development of commerce and its protection, a low tariff would only be required to assure a sufficient revenue for payment of interest, sinking funds and maintenance, and this is fully proved by the postscript to Sir Sandford Fleming's appeal. To nip such a project in the bud the cable monopolists have agreed to forego a subsidy of £32,000 per annum for twenty years, which they at first required, and to lay a cable via the Cape of Good Hope, provided the Australian governments will give them certain concessions, viz., permit them to open their own offices in the Australian capitals. Prior to the proposal of a state-owned Pacific cable, they did not ask for such a concession, and it is doubtful if they would have accepted the same had it been offered to them by the governments. On the face of it, the concession seems very innocent, but it empowers its holders to make secret contracts with clients for a term of years, allowing rebates on published prices.

The only fair way to deal with this problem is for the governments to fix a tariff, to collect all messages as at present, and to leave the question of route entirely with the sender of a message, and any objection to such a system can only mean that the objectors are to be looked at askance. Again, for such a concession given to the present monopolists the Australian colonies were given to understand they would obtain a new all-British cable via the Cape and the islands of St. Helena and Ascension. Did they receive it, or are they likely to do so? From published reports, we are informed that the cable actually laid goes to the island of St. Vincent, which is Portuguese territory. This certainly does not convince us that the new cable will be all-British. Certainly there is a West African costal cable which may be called all-British, but if we are correct this was submerged and in operation long before the promise of a new all-British line via St. Helena and Ascension was made in return for the concessions asked. In conclusion, we would most strongly urge all true British people in the Australasian colonies to see that they are not put off by any compromises with private companies that would tend to even delay the practical realization of the Pacific cable as the first link in a system of all-British state-owned cables connecting all the larger British possessions in the world into one great Imperial whole.

I find that the *Melbourne Argus* in its issue of the 5th of May contains a despatch which must necessarily give alarm to those who are anxious to see the construction of the Pacific cable at the earliest possible date. I wish to point out that Victoria and New South Wales are two of the colonies which are parties to the agreement entered into about a year ago for the construction of the cable. It will be apparent from the following quotation, that these colonies have entered into negotiations with the Eastern Telegraph Company to grant that company concessions which cannot be exercised if state ownership is to be preserved.

#### The Cable Schemes.

When the Postmasters General of Victoria and New South Wales completed their conference in respect to the Cape cable scheme of the Eastern

Extension Telegraph Company on Thursay afternoon, Mr. Crick had to leave for Sydney before a clean copy of the amended and proposed new clauses had been made. Yesterday Mr. Watt forwarded to Mr. Crick a full copy of these, and Mr. W. Warren, manager in Australasia for the company, who is at present in Adelaide, has also been supplied with the result of the conference's deliberations. It is understood that Mr. Warren has referred the amended and new clauses suggested by Mr. Crick and Mr. Watt to his directors in London for their consideration. From Adelaide Mr. Warren will proceed to Freemantle, but his absence from Victoria will not hinder the conduct of negotiations, which will be continued by telegraph if necessary.

Adelaide, Friday.

The alterations in the proposals of the Eastern Extension Company for laying a cable from the Cape to Glenelg, as suggested by Mr. Crick and Mr. Watt, have been submitted to Mr. Warren, the Australasian manager of the company. The ministers mentioned telegraphed to Mr. Warren, inquiring whether the company would insert in the agreement a purchase clause, to be read in conjunction with the arbitration clause. Mr. Warren replied that the arbitration clause had been cancelled, and that the purchase clause would depend upon its conditions, and upon whether it was approved by the contracting colonies before he submitted it to his board in London. He added: 'The agreement having been completed with the three colonies of South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania, cannot be altered, and will be strictly adhered to.'

The last extract with which I will trouble the House is this: On the 23rd of May the *Times* published the following in its report of the proceedings of the Imperial House of Commons. I would point out that the despatch was read in the Imperial House of Commons by the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The Eastern Telegraph Company.

In reply to Sir C. Dilke (Gloucester, Forest of Dean),

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. Hicks-Beach) said.—Arrangements have been made with the Eastern Telegraph Company by which landing rights will be given for the cable to St. Vincent, one of the conditions of which is the laying of a cable from Ascension to Sierra Leone. The Eastern Telegraph Company has entered into an agreement with the colonies of West and South Australia and Tasmania to construct with all convenient speed the line from Durban to Mauritius, Rodrigues, Cocos and Freemantle in West Australia, and thence to Glenelg, South Australia, as soon as landing rights have been granted. Landing rights have been granted in Natal and in West and South Australia, and the company has been informed that Her Majesty's government are prepared to approve the granting of landing rights at Mauritius, Rodrigues and Cocos, and will issue licenses as soon as the general form of license now under consideration has been settled.

If the information contained in these despatches is reliable, it is quite evident that the object which Canada was so anxious to have realized, namely, the ownership by the different colonies and the home government of the cable, will be utterly impaired if not imperilled. It may be said that some of the points referred to in these despatches

Mr. BELCOURT.

do not cover the matters provided for in the agreement entered into between the different colonies and the home government, but my object in bringing the matter before the House is to ask not only that the Canadian government shall make such representations to the Imperial government as will insure the ownership of this cable by the different governments, but also that all cables which shall in future be laid between British possessions shall be laid under a provision looking to state ownership in the future. In these days when we hear so many plans for promoting Imperial unity and prosperity, it seems to me that we should give our attention and our efforts principally to these projects which are practical and business-like, and which, to my mind, will bring about Imperial unity and prosperity far surer than a great many of the sentimental and hysterical schemes that are propounded. No scheme will tend to promote more efficaciously the strength, unity and prosperity of the British Empire than an all British line of cable uniting the British possessions, and encircling the globe. I ask that the government shall make such representations to the Imperial authorities, if they have not already been made, as will prevent the granting of concessions to this huge monopoly, the Eastern Telegraph Company; concessions which must in the future render it impossible to have state ownership in the cables now contemplated, and in other cables which in the future it may be desirable to lay between British possessions. I think, Sir, that in recent times, Canada has shown such an interest in Imperial matters that we can with very good grace; in fact, that we have the right to make representations of this sort, in a matter in which not only the Dominion, but the empire is deeply interested. I trust that if the Canadian government has not already made the representations to which I have alluded they will lose no time in bringing them to the attention of the Imperial authorities.

Mr. GEORGE CASEY (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has again brought this important subject to the notice of the House. The hon. gentleman has done so in a most practical way, he having done so at the request of the board of trade of this city, a body whose opinions on such a matter cannot be lightly overlooked. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) in urging upon the government the necessity for immediately representing in the strongest manner to the Imperial authorities, that in any agreement allowing the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company to land its cable at Mauritius or Cocos, or at any other point on British territory on which it must land, there should be a clause providing for government purchase. This House and the government have strongly held, ever since the bargain was

made between the mother country, Canada and the leading Australasian colonies, that any action tending to endanger the success of the Pacific cable would be a breach of good faith on the part of those concerned. It happens, however, that there are certain colonies not included in that arrangement whose action may give rise to a similar state of things to that which we have been objecting to, namely, the establishment of dangerous competition with the government cable. Also, the proposals made by the Eastern Extension Company to some colonies which were in the bargain, appeared on their face tempting, and not unfair to the colonies concerned. It has apparently become impossible, then, to secure the prohibition of cable construction by the Eastern Extension Company to those colonies. The solution now proposed, that of a purchase clause in any of the agreements made by any colonial government, or by the Imperial government, with that company, seems to be the only way out of the deadlock. If such a clause be included in any arrangements made, the construction of the cables referred to, by the Eastern Extension Company, will not be so dangerous. It is true, they institute competition with what is intended to be a government cable; but if that competition can be removed by government expropriation and purchase at any time, the objection becomes less. I have great pleasure, then, in supporting the proposition that we should approach the British government with strong urgency to secure the adoption of such an understanding.

Let me speak for a few moments in general terms about the claims of these two enterprises—the extension of existing cables by the Eastern Extension Company, and the building of a government cable. Judging by extracts which I have seen from Australian papers, the editors of these papers have not got a clear idea of what it is proposed to do. They speak of the proposed Pacific cable as being controlled by a company. They do not see why any one company should have a monopoly of the cable business between those colonies and the rest of the empire. Now, it cannot be made too clear that the proposed Pacific cable is not to be built or controlled by any company. It is not a private enterprise. Nobody stands to make anything out of it. It is to be built and managed throughout by a trust representing the British government, the government of Canada, and the governments of the other colonies which come into the bargain. It is no more of the nature of a private enterprise than the postal system which pervades the empire. There is no more reason in urging that there should be competition with this government cable in order to secure the lowest possible rates for the populations concerned, than there is for urging that there should be competition with the government postal system throughout the empire. We all know that governments in all

ages, since post offices have been introduced, have agreed to prevent competition with that postal service. It is illegal to compete with the post office in the carriage of mails in any civilized country, and it should be so. It is one of the services which a government can do cheaper than any private corporation. It is of the nature of a monopoly, and it should be controlled by the people for the benefit of the people and not for the benefit of private investors or speculators. Sir Sandford Fleming, in a letter to the people of the Australasian colonies, calls attention to some very notable considerations in this connection. He says:

If in the United Kingdom charges on messages have been lowered in some cases to one-twelfth what they were when the telegraph lines were in private hands, are we not warranted in the conclusion that in the larger field like results would follow a like cause. If the application of the principle of state-control in the United Kingdom has lowered charges on messages to one halfpenny per word for all distances, under the same conditions may we not look forward in the near future to the charge on ocean telegrams throughout the empire being reduced to one shilling per word, or even less? This, I conceive, is by no means too sanguine a view to take; I have given the matter much consideration, and I am perfectly satisfied that if at this juncture the Australasian colonies follow a wise course they will be instrumental in conferring on the British people throughout the world the inestimable blessing of a state-owned cable system, by which eventually the very lowest tariff on messages will be obtainable. I much hesitate to express my full and deliberate views on this point lest I be regarded as a visionary. If, happily, the present difficulty be overcome, the Pacific cable proceeded with, and the larger scheme followed up, I am satisfied that one of the chief objects to look forward to in a few years will be a uniform six-penny tariff the world over for ocean cables; precisely on the principle of Imperial penny postage.

Sir Sandford Fleming has sometimes been called a visionary: but it is a remarkable thing that most of the schemes, for the promotion of which he has been called a visionary, have been realized, have come into practical effect, and have been beneficial to the public and the empire at large. I think there is every reason for believing that in this connection he is right. The illustration of the Imperial penny postage is exactly apposite. No private concern could pretend to carry the mails at the rates at which they are carried by the postal services of the different countries concerned in the penny postage scheme. In the same manner no private enterprise could possibly send telegrams at as low a rate as a government telegraphic service. If the one system is good, the other system is good; the two go exactly *pari passu*, and the arguments which experience has produced in favour of the one are convincing in regard to the other.

So much for the merits of the case. Let me say again, a few words as to our right to speak on this matter. In the first place, the government of Canada was amongst the

first to take up this scheme of Imperial telegraphic communication. The government of Canada was the first to bring it to what may be called a practical stage, by assisting the governments of the Australasian colonies in pressing the matter upon the Imperial government.

In the second place, it is a matter which concerns the whole commonwealth of the British nations—not merely the British islands, nor merely any one colony. And, Sir, it cannot be denied, that in fact, although not in form, the commonwealth of British nations has become a unity to-day. It is a united commonwealth. We have had discussions for many years as to how this commonwealth of nations could be united, whether by confederation, or representation in the House of Lords—whether by this scheme or that—but now spontaneously that union has become a fact. There is no constitution yet for this great commonwealth, except that which has been written on the sands of Africa in the blood of brave men—men of all the colonies, men of the empire—but the fact remains that the British nations are to-day one great unity. Any one member of that unity has a right to speak on any matter concerning the interests of the whole body, and above all, Canada, the leading member of that unity, has a right to speak on a matter of this kind. I think we have proven, not only our right to interfere in matters of this kind, but our sense and judgment and foresight in connection with such matters. Let the establishment of Imperial penny postage itself speak on that point. Surely if ever there was an Imperial measure, drawing its principal support and assistance from Canada, that is one. It has been accepted enthusiastically by the greater part of the empire, and recognized as a complete success. Let us then come forward boldly and firmly and strongly, and impress upon the Imperial government that this thing ought to be done, and that the crisis now puts the responsibility upon their shoulders. If the Imperial government had been as anxious to see this great Imperial scheme carried out, as we are, that cable would have been laid and carrying messages to-day. It has been delayed and postponed from time to time, and given the cold shoulder, for reasons into which this is perhaps not the occasion to inquire and which perhaps we would be unable to get at. At all events the Imperial government has been slow to move when the colonies have been ready. Now is the time for the Imperial government to take action, which will prevent the establishment of a fatal competition with the Imperial scheme of cables between the different colonies, for if these cables are now established, without such an expropriation clause as has been suggested, the chances for the Pacific cable of the empire will be very poor indeed. I must say that the government have been

active and urgent in the past, and have accomplished a great deal. They have kept the matter before the British government, and the discussions of this House have had their effect, and are having their effect in Australia, as we see by the extracts which were read to us by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt). The idea of an expropriation clause has been accepted there, and is pressed on the Eastern Extension Company. With all this to encourage us, I hope to hear from the government that some active steps have been taken to carry out the views which I think are unanimously those of this House, on the subject.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I unfortunately was not present, Mr. Speaker, when this subject was brought to the notice of the House, and perhaps it would be more convenient for the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), if I were to make a few observations before the government say anything on the subject. The subject was put very clearly and succinctly before the House by my hon. friend the Postmaster General, when he brought up for the action of this House this important question of the Pacific cable, and I think we all agree that not only commercially, but from a strategic point of view, the construction of the Pacific cable from Vancouver or Victoria to Australia, is a matter of deep moment. It is impossible, in my judgment, to overrate its importance to Australia. It is also commercially and in every other way, a matter of great importance to Canada, and of still greater importance to the United Kingdom. It is quite possible that, under the existing condition of things, the whole position of Australia may be imperilled. It is known that the Eastern Extension Company's lines are liable to be interrupted, and that communication between London, the heart of the empire, and Australia could be easily cut off, and a long period elapse before any intercommunication could take place. In the case of war between a European power and England, the communication with Australia could be easily cut off, and a great deal of damage done by the enemy, before it became known. Canada is not so directly interested, but Canada is a component part of the empire, and as such deeply interested in everything that tends to a closer commercial intercommunication between the various parts of the empire. Anything that will make Canada the highway of communication between Australia and Great Britain, anything that would help the section of the empire exposed to very serious assault and damage, cannot be too seriously considered. After the discussions that have taken place in this House on this question, it does not require a word to enhance the great importance to England, Australia and Canada, of cable intercommunication. Everything that Canada could be asked to do, she has done, and it would

be greatly to be deplored, if any action should be taken by any one of the parties concerned, without the absolute consent and approval of the others. Not having been here when the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), brought up the subject, and not having heard the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Casey), who has just taken his seat, I do not know whether the attention of the House has been drawn to what took place in the House of Commons on May 22. But I hold in my hand the *Times* report of the proceedings in parliament of that day, and, in my judgment, they are of a character to attract the very serious attention of any person who takes an interest in this very important question. In answer to a question regarding the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company, asked by Sir Charles Dilke, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, said:

Arrangements have been made with the Eastern Telegraph Company, by which landing rights will be given for the cable to St. Vincent, one of the conditions of which is the laying of a cable from Ascension to Sierra Leone. The Eastern Telegraph Company has entered into an agreement with the colonies of West and South Australia and Tasmania to construct, with all convenient speed, the line from Durban to Mauritius, Rodrigues, Cocos and Freemantle, in West Australia, and thence to Glenelg, South Australia, as soon as landing rights have been granted. Landing rights have been granted in Natal and in West and South Australia, and the company has been informed that Her Majesty's government are prepared to approve the granting of landing rights at Mauritius, Rodrigues and Cocos, and will issue licenses as soon as the general form of license now under consideration has been settled.

Having given this subject a good deal of attention, I regard that action as absolutely fatal to the Pacific cable from Canada to Australia ever being constructed unless one of the conditions made in granting the licenses in these various places by Her Majesty's government is that the Imperial government may at any time, under equitable conditions, come into ownership and possession of those cables. I have no doubt the attention of the government has been drawn to this subject and that they are quite apprised of the real condition, and that, as this question is one of almost vital importance to the empire and of great importance to Canada, they will take every measure possible to prevent any action being taken that will destroy our hopes in connection with this great undertaking.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The question which has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) is of sufficient importance to justify even at this late stage of the session, our giving a little time to the consideration of the present situation in regard to it. The

House has been taken fully into the confidence of the government both as to the views of the government and the attitude of the government in regard to this threatened danger to the successful accomplishment of the scheme. Nothing official has transpired since I last made an announcement to the House that goes to show any further development of the proposed concession of rights to the Eastern Extension Cable Company. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has read an extract from the *London Times* intimating that an agreement had been made with West Australia, South Australia and Tasmania to allow landing powers in all or one of these colonies, and that the Imperial government, in return, was prepared to grant landing rights at intermediate points on British territory between South Africa and Australia. And it has been suggested by my hon. friend the senior member for Ottawa and other hon. gentlemen who have spoken, that this government should make representations to the Imperial government to preserve the rights of expropriating the cable as a condition of granting these concessions. The government has no intimation that either on the part of the Australian colonies that were partners in the Canadian Pacific scheme, in regard to which we legislated last year, or of any of her other Australian colonies, or of the Imperial government, has any change in the situation taken place. We have read in the press and probably have had communications of an informal character announcing that concessions would be made to the Eastern Extension Cable Company which this government regard as threatening the success of the Canadian Pacific cable, but otherwise we have no further information. I can perhaps go this far without being pressed to produce documents—so far as we know, the negotiations are being carried on by the Pacific Cable Commission in England with a view to carrying out the scheme on the lines of our legislation. I believe the commission is actively proceeding with a view to putting the cable under contract at an early day. It would seem strange if the commission should proceed with the Hsblity endorsement of the Canadian parliament and people if such an arrangement, as has been referred to has been in contemplation or had been made and no official communication made with the Canadian government. I cannot conceive therefore that there is any real foundation for this rumour and the Imperial government not take the Canadian government into its confidence. I agree with the leader of the opposition that the failure of this scheme would be a national calamity. Perhaps he is right in saying that it chiefly concerns Australia. When I took up this subject, I was of that opinion and had difficulty in discerning the Canadian interest in it. But, as I studied it,

I came to the conclusion that we were common partners in the scheme, and, without nicely weighing the relative interest of the different parts of the empire in it, it is a scheme that so concerns the empire that, whether Canada is more or less concerned in it, if we are to take an interest in what concerns the empire, we should give this scheme our unqualified allegiance. I concur with the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) that if anything should interfere with this scheme, it would be both a commercial and political calamity to the empire. And believing that other parts of the empire are quite as much alive to the interest of the whole empire as Canada is, the Canadian government and the Canadian people may safely assume that no party to the scheme will permit an enterprise such as the construction of a cable from South Africa to Australia to be carried out under such conditions as will imperil the cable scheme. It would be a great accomplishment to the empire to girdle the earth with a cable touching only British soil in its circle of the globe. It may be realized sooner than we expect to-day. Once this cable to Australia is completed, we practically have then a British cable from Australia to Great Britain, and but a small portion remains to be done to complete a British state-owned cable around the globe. I think we may confidently look forward to such a result. Whether the government, under the circumstances, having no official intimation of the concessions that are supposed to be granted, would feel warranted in making representations to the Imperial government as to what they should or should not do, is a matter that the government will seriously consider. It might be regarded as an unfriendly act by the Australian colony. It is to be borne in mind that the three colonies referred to are not parties to the Pacific cable scheme. There are four colonies which joined with Canada and Great Britain in that scheme, Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales and New Zealand. With them there are obligations that are perhaps not binding upon other parts of Australasia. It might be by them regarded as an unfriendly act on the part of Canada were we to interfere with a purpose they regard as of supreme importance to themselves. Therefore, we should approach that subject with great caution. Perhaps it would do more harm than good, and even defeat instead of advancing the object we all have in view, if we were to approach the subject in an unskilful way. However, I can tell the House that the views presented here to-day will be carefully considered by the government, and the government will continue, until the scheme is either successfully launched or defeated, to take a lively and active interest in its advancement.

Mr. MULOCK.

## CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) I know that hon. gentlemen are anxious to get into supply, but I must claim the indulgence of the House for a few moments to make some remarks with regard to what I consider is a most important matter, in fact one of the most important matters before the Canadian House of Commons to-day, I refer to the immigration of Chinese and Japanese into this country. The hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell), when he brought up the same question on a previous occasion, said that members of parliament had many disagreeable duties to perform. It is a disagreeable duty for me to perform to have to get up every year in this House and bring this matter before hon. members; but I do so in common with all the other members from British Columbia, because we feel so strongly on the subject, and we know our constituents look upon it as a burning question. Last session when I was speaking on this subject I was constantly interrupted by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and I believe by one or two on this side, asking me to stop, as they were tired of hearing it. Well, Mr. Speaker, if they are tired of hearing about it now, they would be still more tired if they had the same influx of Chinese and Japanese as we have in British Columbia to-day. I cannot find words properly to express the intense feeling that there is on this subject, especially among the working classes of British Columbia. As hon. gentlemen know, it is on the Pacific coast that all these undesirable immigrants land, and it is the working classes of British Columbia who are brought into competition with them in the various lines of industry they undertake. I may say that the people of British Columbia have a right to expect that the government should take some stand in this matter to try and stop the influx of these men; they have a right to expect it, because the right hon. gentleman who leads the government has promised that action would be taken. I remember very well when, just before the election of 1896, a telegram was sent, of which I have a copy here, from Vancouver. It was as follows:

Vancouver, May 23, 1896.

Hon. Wilfrid Laurier,  
Windsor Hotel, Montreal.

Do you favour restriction of Chinese immigration and reserving Canada for Canadians, and not the Mongolian race?

(Sgd.) J. C. McLAGAN,  
Editor Vancouver 'World.'

The answer came back as follows:

Montreal, May 25, 1896.

J. C. McLagan, Vancouver, B.C.

Chinese immigration restriction not a question in the east. Views of the Liberals in the west will prevail with me.

(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that seems to me about as strong a promise as any hon. gentleman could make to an elector. This telegram was read with the greatest glee by all Liberals from one end of British Columbia to the other, and I may say that it was the means of gaining to the right hon. gentleman and his supporters hundreds of votes. The workmen were like hungry trout with their mouths open for some promise, and this telegram was the worm that dropped into them. I may tell the House that so long a period has elapsed without this promise being fulfilled that they are more hungry now than ever. The right hon. gentleman says that Chinese immigration restriction is not a question in the east. Well, Sir, it is a long time since he made that statement, but I must differ with him. It is only a question of time when it will be as great a question with the people of the east as it is now with the people of the west. I also remember that at a public meeting held at Vancouver in December, 1898, on a question being asked by Mr. G. Bartley as to what prospects there were of an anti-Chinese Bill being pushed through the House at the next session, the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) stated:

After his first speech in the House, he had felt its pulse on the question, and found that a good deal of lobbying and personal talk with the members was needed; also a good deal of 'drumming' the question into them. Premier Laurier had, when speaking of the subject, privately said: 'If you want it you will have to get it, but it would be best to leave the matter till another session.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was in the year 1898. The people of British Columbia have waited one year, two years, three years, four years, for the government to do something, but as yet they have done nothing but disallow the legislation that the provincial government had passed with the view of stopping this influx of yellow men. It is now late in the session of 1900, and I was led to believe by the right hon. gentleman himself, who has twice so stated to the House this session, that the government intend to bring in some legislation. But as I said, it is getting on so near the end of the session, at least we hope so, that I feel it my duty to bring this matter up in the House and to find out whether the government intend to do anything.

I am not going to enter into details to show why this immigration is so detrimental to all classes of labour in British Columbia. I went into it fully last year and the year before, and on several occasions all the members from British Columbia have expounded their reasons why the people of British Columbia are so antagonistic to this immigration; and anybody who wishes to see those reasons and to study the question can find them all in the *Hansard*. I do not think that at this hour of the session I am called upon to go into

the details. These Chinese and Japanese are still coming into British Columbia by the thousands, ship load after ship load. A large number of them pass through into the States, but still a great many of them make their permanent abode in that province. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) some time ago brought down the figures of that immigration, and I think they showed that during the present year something like 9,000 had come into British Columbia. Hon. gentlemen will understand that every Chinaman and every Japanese that comes into the country makes competition with white labour more severe. As every one knows, they are willing to work for a very much less wage than any white man can do. They can live on one-tenth of what a white man, especially if he has a wife and family to support, can do under the most advantageous possible circumstances. I would take this opportunity of warning hon. gentlemen in this House of what will occur if the influx is not stopped. One of the papers in British Columbia, I think, the *Victoria Colonist*, stated that the representatives of British Columbia in parliament could do far more than they have done in training the minds of the people in the east to look upon this question in a proper manner. I contend that they have done everything that possibly could be done, both inside and outside of the House, but, there seems to be a feeling amongst the people in the east that the danger is very small to those who live in the east. I would once again say that every gentleman who has the welfare of Canada at heart ought to study the question, and see whither we are drifting. I saw in a paper the other day that in the city of Montreal over 200 Chinamen, the owners of wash-houses, or the employees of wash-houses, had been summoned for not paying the tax imposed by the municipality. You can see them every day in Ottawa and Toronto in increasing numbers. It is only a question of time when these men, every one of whom is hard-working, frugal and industrious, will drive white men and women out of some employment. I would like to bring to the attention of the House what I consider to be the best object lesson that has occurred in Canada since the first Chinaman landed. That is afforded by the action that has been taken by Mr. Dunsmuir, the large colliery owner of British Columbia, a gentleman who has been employing Chinese and Japanese in his mines. He is a man of great wealth, employing thousands of men, and there has been a keen fight between himself, or his colliery company, and the provincial government as to whether he had the right to employ these men or not. Restrictive legislation has been passed by the provincial legislature, which Mr. Dunsmuir has constantly fought, from the provincial courts to the Privy Council in England. He has won his suit at last. It was declared that the legislation was ultra vires, and he is

enabled to employ all the Chinamen he likes above or below ground, but, a few days ago I was very glad to see that that gentleman made the public statement that now that he had vindicated his own opinion, and had shown that he was going to run his business as he thought fit and right, he would voluntarily give up what he had been contending for, and he has given orders to his foremen to discontinue the employment of Chinese underground. He says that after years of experience he has come to the conclusion that the employment of Chinese is a detriment to the country, and he has made up his mind that he will not employ them underground any longer, but that he will fill their places with white men as quickly as he can get them, and as soon as other people give up employment of Chinese above ground he will do the same. I think it is a striking lesson that a man of his experience, who has employed so many Chinamen, and who will lose thousands and thousands of dollars a year by paying higher wages to whitemen, should give up the employment of Chinamen. He must feel very strongly upon the subject, because it touches his pocket very severely. The only way to stop that influx is for the Dominion government to largely increase the tax of \$50 per head. I heard it rumoured, I heard it from one gentleman who was lately a member from British Columbia, and who went home disgusted and disgruntled, that the best the government could possibly think of doing was to increase the tax by \$50 per head, making it \$100 per head. I will tell the right hon. the leader of the government that if he only intends to increase the head tax by \$50 it is worse than worthless. If you put on a tax of \$500, as the Australian colonies did, you may keep them out, but nothing short of that will have any effect whatever. These men do not come in of their own volition. They are brought in as slaves, by Chinese contractors, who farm them out just as slaves and serfs would be treated. They see nothing of any contract that may be made for them. If a large railway or mining company wants a thousand Chinamen it simply comes to the Chinese boss and says so, and these men are driven out to work like so many cattle. If the tax is only \$50 a head they can pay it, or they can pay \$100 per head, but they will not be able to pay it if it is raised to \$500. I feel convinced that the raising of the head tax to \$500 is the only means of stopping this undesirable influx of Chinamen into British Columbia. The Japanese are looked upon by a majority of the working classes, at all events, in British Columbia, as almost as detrimental to the interests of the country as the Chinese, but, I must confess, that, owing to Imperial interests, as we heard it so well explained by the right hon. leader of the government last session, we must give up all thought of trying to restrict them in this manner. The

Mr. PRIOR.

interests of Great Britain demand that the Japanese nation should be treated with friendship, and I am well aware that the government look upon any scheme for keeping them out by taxing them as an unfriendly act. But, there is another way in which these Japanese can be kept out, and it is by bringing into force the Natal Act, which the members of the government know perfectly well is now in force in other portions of the empire, and has had, I think, a most desirable effect, so far as I can hear.

At all events, it seems to be the wish of the majority of the people in British Columbia that the government should bring in the Natal Act and put it in force so as to restrict the influx of Japanese.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How does the Natal Act restrict them?

Mr. PRIOR. By making them pass an examination when they come in showing that they are able to read and write, and to answer questions in some European language. I believe that is the principal clause in it.

The PRIME MINISTER. That would apply to all Asiatics, not only to Japanese.

Mr. PRIOR. I confess that it would; it would apply to all nationalities as well as Japanese, but if it were brought into force it would apply to Japanese, and these are the people in British Columbia that we wish to prevent coming in. At the present time, I may say the gentleman who is now Premier of British Columbia is stating that if he gets into power he will bring in legislation that will stop this Chinese and Japanese influx. Everybody who has watched legislation in this House must know that any legislation like that is only humbug. It is not in the power of any province to pass such legislation, and if it is passed, it will be immediately disallowed here. I only make that remark so that the people of British Columbia may see how foolish it is to believe that any legislation of any use upon this question can be passed by any legislature except this House. I would, in conclusion, press upon the government my strong opinion that it is their duty, not only to the people of British Columbia, but to the people, especially the workingmen, of Canada, that they should immediately bring in a Bill putting a \$500 tax per head on Chinamen coming into the country, and that they should also bring the Natal Act into force so that the influx of Japanese might be stopped.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have just one word to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) and that is that on Monday a Bill will be placed on the Order paper, to be introduced as soon thereafter as the rules of the House will permit, upon this question.

Mr. PRIOR. I am very glad to hear it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say at once to my hon. friend, that I fail to see exactly the position which he takes on this question. The hon. gentleman seems to be of the opinion that so far as the Chinese are concerned, that the most effective way of dealing with them would be to increase the capitation tax from \$50 to \$500, and that in the case of the Japanese, the most effective way would be to introduce the Natal Act. Well, if the Natal Act were introduced I do not see what necessity there would be for the increase of the capitation tax, or, in fact any tax at all. If the Natal Act were introduced the provisions would be all Asiatics landing at any port in Canada would be subjected to an examination and if it were found that they could not speak and write any of the European languages, then they could not have admission to the country at all. If that Act were put in practice here, neither Japanese nor Chinese, nor indeed any Asiatics whatever—except, of course, a few of the better classes who would come in as merchants or professional people or the like of that—would be admitted. I might remind my hon. friend of the words I used in the House last year when I said we could not treat the Japanese as we could the Chinese. In view of the possible complications which may arise in the Orient, we should not do anything that would imperil the friendship of the Japanese government. We could not, therefore, apply the Natal Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a matter which we must treat very delicately. I would direct the attention of the hon. gentleman and of the House to the fact that Great Britain, being engaged in war at the present time, and in view of the possible complications which may arise in China at any moment, it would be unwise for us to do anything which would in any way jeopardize the friendship of the Japanese government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a question which will require a good deal of consideration, and I am not prepared now to say what will be the provisions of the Bill we will introduce. I can only repeat that on Monday the Bill will be put on the Order paper to be proceeded with as soon as the rules of the House will admit.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Dominion Lands ..... \$110,932

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.). What is the increase of \$4,200 for?

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). There is \$500 increase for the salary of E. F. Stephenson, Crown timber and land agent and inspector, and \$2,500 for extra clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these clerks to be appointed, and what is the salary of each appointee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The deputy informs me that the salaries depend upon the duties they are asked to perform.

Mr. FOSTER. But you cannot make an estimate like this unless you know where the clerks are to be appointed, and what they are going to be paid.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am informed by the deputy minister that these extra clerks are generally paid about \$75 a month.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are they to be appointed?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is only one man at present in the Yorkton office, and he will require an assistant at \$75 a month. The agent at Alameda will require an extra clerk at the same salary. One will be required at Lethbridge at about the same salary. There are no other officers at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. What are these clerks doing at Yorkton?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is only the land agent there at present. It is represented that he requires assistance.

Mr. FOSTER. You are doubling the amount of clerical work there. Has the labour doubled?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. More than doubled, owing to settlers coming in.

Mr. FOSTER. Whom is it proposed to appoint?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No appointment has been made, and there is no person in view at present.

Mr. JAS. CLANCY (Bothwell). I understand that this work to which the hon. gentleman made reference is paid out of the Immigration Department.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The duties of the land office are quite different, and the work there is the greatest when the settlers are making entries of land.

Mr. CLANCY. According to Mr. Stephenson's report, there were last year less than 6,000 entries and some 2,200 cancellations. That is not a vast increase over the work of the previous year. What extra work is to be done at the Lethbridge office to require an additional clerk?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Application has been made for assistance, and it is expected

that the work will be very considerably increased during the present year.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is an odd comment on that. At page H-74 of the Auditor General's Report I find that the Dominion lands revenue at Lethbridge was \$17,000 odd in 1897-8, and \$8,000 odd in 1898-9, a decrease of \$8,891. If the land revenue has fallen off more than 50 per cent in the last year, the increased work which you base doubling the clerical staff is hardly borne out. In the revenue from timber agencies at Lethbridge there has been a decrease of about 30 per cent. What is the minister's explanation of that?

Mr. CLANCY. Has Mr. Stephenson made a request for the appointment of those clerks for which the hon. gentleman is now making provision?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is no doubt that the report of the inspector with regard to these matters would influence the department altogether. He would be the one who would advise us whether extra assistance was required or not.

Mr. CLANCY. I find the following paragraph in his report:

There have been few changes in the personnel of the staff of the respective agencies. Owing to the death of Mr. W. J. Scott, agent at Battleford, a vacancy occurred which was filled by the appointment of Mr. R. F. Chisholm. The other changes were few and of minor importance.

Did Mr. Stephenson bring pressure on the department to have these extra clerks appointed? There seems to be nothing in his report to suggest that they are required.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly, the necessity has been pointed out to the department, or else this would not be in the estimates at all.

Mr. FOSTER. We have not had any explanation of why you are going to double the clerical service when the revenues have fallen off more than 50 per cent. Does it not show that the work is not so great as it was?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Because there was a large payment of money received it does not follow that the work was not greater.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has not shown that it was. That is only a supposition. I do not want to be insistent; but we are asked to give \$900 for an extra clerk at Lethbridge, and when we ask the reason why we get the statement, that it is because there is more work to be done. It would be utterly foolish to ask for an extra clerk and add 100 per cent to the working force unless you backed up your request by the statement that there was more work to do. But look at the actual results. The land revenue and timber revenue have fallen off more than 50 per cent, and it is a

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

fair supposition that the work of the office has fallen off in proportion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I quite admit that that is a fair supposition, but I am informed that the difference between the two years may be accounted for by some large payments of money. There is no clerk at present in that office, and the land agent is asking for assistance.

Mr. FOSTER. He got along without one before. And now that only half the revenue is coming in, I cannot see the reason for giving an extra man.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The former agent was unable to do the work, and applied for assistance, and a man who was thought more capable, was put in his place, and he too finds he cannot do the work alone.

Mr. FOSTER. The explanation is not satisfactory, but I do not want to keep discussing this item all night.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will furnish the hon. gentleman any more details I can obtain on another occasion. There has been an addition to the agent's salary at Calgary of \$200, which makes his salary \$1,400. There has been the appointment of another homestead inspector for Prince Albert district. His name is James McArthur, and salary \$1,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of adding \$500 to the salary of the first officer there, Mr. Stephenson? He is now getting \$2,500.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He has been a long time in the office, and his duties have increased very largely. I have made careful inquiries, and find that he is a very efficient officer, and deserves this increase.

Mr. CLANCY. He made but seventy homestead entries during the last year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will bring down a comparative statement, showing how his duties have increased.

Mr. CLANCY. The agent at Calgary had 208 homestead entries, and the agent at Yorkton only 261. Both together would be scarcely a man's work.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have explained that there will be a very large increase in the number of settlers going into that particular district referred to. At Yorkton there will perhaps be over 1,000 entries this year. If those entries are not to be made, a clerk will not be appointed. The information in the possession of the department, leads us to expect a large number of settlers, and it would be very poor policy not to provide for assistance, so as to meet the wants of the settlers as promptly as possible.

Mr. CLANCY. How many clerks in the Dawson office?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Only two, the agent and the clerk.

Mr. CLANCY. How many at Edmonton?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There are three at Edmonton.

Inspector's expenses, travelling expenses of commissioner, superintendent of mines and homestead inspectors, contingencies of Dominion lands and Crown timber agents; and at head office, removal expenses, stationery, printing and expenses connected with forestry protection ..... \$31,000

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose that includes the salary of the forestry inspector, Mr. Stewart?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The item of salaries does.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman intend to carry out Mr. Stewart's recommendation with regard to enlarging the service for what is called timber protection?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Stewart has shown great enthusiasm in his work. His recommendations will be carefully considered and, if deemed in the interest of the country, will be carried out.

Mr. CLANCY. Whatever his enthusiasm, he seems unable to give much information in his report or otherwise. Whatever the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) may contemplate, I fancy the House will want much better information than Mr. Stewart seems to be in possession of before voting money for this service.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. After Mr. Stewart has had an opportunity to visit the different sections of the country, I have no doubt his reports will become more valuable. But, if not, of course his recommendations will not be acted upon.

Mr. FOSTER. In the meantime, he will have had a nice visit.

Salaries of extra clerks at head office, advertising, &c. .... \$7,000

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion of that is spent in advertising?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is estimated that \$5,957.50 will be paid for salaries, leaving \$1,042.50 for miscellaneous advertising. This in connection with licenses to cut timber and so on.

Mr. CLANCY. I believe that Mr. Jerome was in the department before he resigned to run for the local legislature, and my information is that he is still in the employ of the department. Is that the case?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not find his name on the list, so he cannot be employed permanently. But the deputy informs me that he has been employed at different times temporarily as homestead inspector

and Crown timber inspector, and when so employed he would receive \$4 a day.

Mr. CLANCY. How many days was he so employed last year?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have not that information at hand, but I will ascertain the facts.

Mr. CLANCY. Is Mr. Jerome employed by the department now?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Dominion Lands chargeable to capital—  
To provide for the amount required for surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, and including \$10,000 for irrigation surveys, &c. (Salaries of temporary officers and clerks may be paid out of this vote at rates exceeding \$400 per annum, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$200,000

Mr. FOSTER. What surveys are to be carried out this year?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This information is furnished by the surveyor general: Survey of townships, southern Manitoba, one party, estimated to cost \$6,000; Swan River district, four parties, \$24,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What part of the Swan River is that?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. A new district, one that has not been surveyed. Prince Albert Canadian Pacific Railway reserve, two parties, \$12,000; Edmonton, one party, \$6,000. Then, there is what the surveyor general calls the Finnlander's reserve in the Red Deer district, two parties, \$12,000; Crow's Nest and Southern Alberta, one party, \$6,000; Southern Alberta, one party, \$6,000; railway belt, two parties, \$12,000. Then there is the Swan River belt, subdivision work where surveys have already been held, three parties, \$15,000; Edmonton, two parties, \$10,000; Finnlander's reserve, three parties, \$15,000. Then the exploration of Chesterfield inlet, one party, \$8,000; irrigation surveys, \$10,000; and Yukon survey, \$20,000. Head office expenditure, \$31,000, and miscellaneous, \$7,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be done with that \$20,000 as regards Dominion lands in the Yukon chargeable to capital?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I thought I had a report here in detail as to what surveys were to be carried on, but I find I am mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the minister had better let that item stand. There is one matter he might explain. In the last year's accounts of the Auditor General, Dominion lands chargeable to capital, there was an item of \$349.77 for expenditure on account of Doukhobor immigration, Mr. Hubbell and his party. That clearly is an item of

expenditure on immigration, and how does it come to be chargeable to capital account?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The deputy informs me they sent Mr. Hubbell up with the Doukhobors to show them the lines of the various townships, and to point out to the settlers where the land was that was allotted to them. That accounts for the expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. But how can you charge to Dominion lands an expenditure for taking immigrants out and showing them where they are going to settle?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not see any objections to that, that when settlers go in there they should be shown the lines. It is to fix the points in the various townships of the lands to be located by the immigrants. Mr. Hubbell, the surveyor, was sent up to define these lines and fix the division between the various townships where the Doukhobors were to settle.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman say these lands were never surveyed before?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Some part of them were never surveyed. Very little land in that district had been surveyed, and this was on account of new surveys.

Mr. CLANCY. How many surveyors are employed for the purpose of doing this work?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think there are 21; there is a surveyor in charge of each party.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it done by contract?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. For the men who are on permanently the pay is fixed by the regulations of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Is any of it done by contract? That is, does a surveyor take a contract for doing so much and furnish his own party?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am informed that the department had let several by contract this year. But several of the surveyors are permanent officers of the department. In that case the government fits out the expedition and hires the men.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another item, H-49, locating the Doukhobors, John Francis, \$482.70. Please take a note of that, because it would seem that some of this money which is voted on capital account is used for surveys. The only thing that you can use capital for is to expend money for the survey and the original laying out of the townships. We have often debated in this House as to whether there should be any such thing as capital, whether it should not always come out of revenue. However, the two different classes, partly revenue and

Mr. FOSTER.

partly capital have been kept, and the charge to capital is for the original survey of unsurveyed ground. When you come to locating Doukhobors on lands, that does not seem to be a charge to capital. I would like the hon. gentleman to give me an explanation of that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the wording is unfortunate. I would agree with him, though not saying anything, on the spur of the moment, as to whether this should be charged to capital. But I agree that if it was used for the purpose indicated by that language it would be wrong. But I am satisfied it was not used for that purpose at all. I will be glad to get a memorandum of the work that was done.

The CHAIRMAN. Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we cannot pass that item until we get an explanation about the Yukon surveys.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In regard to this \$20,000 for surveying in that country, it would be almost impossible to give any detailed information. I can give the hon. gentleman an idea of what was done last year.

Mr. FOSTER. What was done in Yukon surveys last year? I do not quite understand the nature of the survey in the Yukon. There is not much arable land to survey.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mainly mining claims. There is a great deal of surveying to do. There is advertised for sale up there next month, over 2,000 claims.

Mr. FOSTER. Mining claims?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mining claims.

Mr. FOSTER. Are we sending expeditions up there to survey mining claims?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Districts have to be surveyed. For the want of surveys a great deal of trouble has arisen about claims. Disputes have arisen by reason of locating or staking claims before the surveys are made. In the report of the work done last year, I see that Mr. Gibbon made a survey, under the instructions of the commissioner, of West Dawson, and that Mr. Cautley made a survey of part of the town site of Selkirk.

Mr. FOSTER. That is intelligible where you survey a town site for Dominion purposes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There are many to be attended to yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any part of this \$20,000 for town site surveying?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is almost altogether for that sort of work.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are you surveying town sites?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I said to the hon. gentleman, it will be impossible for me to

give the details without having a report from the Yukon, as to what are the surveys that the commissioner would ask to have done there during the present year. But, I was going on to give the hon. gentleman an account of the work that has been done.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you made an estimate for \$20,000 for surveys for next year, and have you not had Mr. Ogilvie's report and his request upon which to make up your estimates? Are these estimates made up without any basis from Mr. Ogilvie, as to what he thinks is required?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, I think these surveys are pretty clearly set forth in Mr. Ogilvie's report. He starts by giving, as I was giving it to the committee, an idea of the work that was done there by the surveyors last year. I will follow up those that I gave before. Mr. R. J. Jephson made a survey of a division of Dawson, on the top of the hill. The returns and plans of this have just been completed, and are now being examined before confirmation. Mr. Gibbon completed a survey of Bonanza Creek, from No. 60 below Discovery, to the mouth, and he has also made a survey of Hunker Creek. Mr. Cautley made a survey of Sulphur Creek and part of Dominion and Gold Run Creeks. Mr. Dumais arrived in August, and he was instructed to make a survey of the town site at the Canyon, and one at White Horse. Mr. Coté was instructed to make a survey of Indian River, commencing at the mouth and tying his work on to that of Mr. Gibbon or Mr. Cautley. It is also necessary to make a survey of Quartz Creek. Mr. Dumais has just completed, and is now engaged in the preparation of the returns of a survey of the system of roads from Dawson to several creeks. Mr. Ogilvie says:

When his returns are in it will enable us to tie the surveys on both the Klondike and Indian River mining divisions on to Dawson, and thus accurately connect them with the Yukon River.

In addition to the above official work of a professional character, Mr. Thibodeau made a very hurried reconnaissance survey of Stewart River, which has proved to agree very closely with that made by Mr. McArthur, though Mr. Thibodeau did not know that Mr. McArthur had made a survey.

Mr. FOSTER. What was done last year?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Part of it was completed last year, and the work will have to be carried on this year.

Mr. Thibodeau also made a reconnaissance survey of the Klondike River and its several branches, and has furnished us with much more reliable information of that stream and the adjacent country than anything hitherto given.

Instructions were also issued for the survey of coal lands near Cliff Creek; also on Kentucky Creek, a branch of Chandindu River; also on Sock Creek, known here as Rock Creek.

Instructions have been given for the survey of hydraulic concessions in the Forty-Mile district, on Clinton Creek; on Australia Creek; on Indian River; on Quartz Creek; on the Klondike River; on Ten-Mile Creek; and several supposed ancient bed of Stewart River.

My hon. friend will see from the work to be carried out, that they have hardly made a reasonable beginning in the required surveys, and I do not think the sum we are asking for, will be considered too large.

Mr. FOSTER. That is according to what you are going to do.

Mr. CLANCY. It would seem by the reports, that the work of locating the Doukhobors was done last year. Mr. Coté and Mr. Woods make reference to it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have promised my hon. friend that the deputy will bring down a statement, showing what was done last year in regard to these people.

To provide for the cost of investigations and demarcations, and other astronomical work of the Department of the Interior. Salaries of temporary officers and clerks may be paid out of this vote at rates exceeding \$400 per annum, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$15,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the work to be done for the coming year?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In regard to the boundary survey, there is one clerk with a salary of \$840, one draughtsman, \$1,200, one photographer, \$780, one carpenter, \$750, one extra computer, \$730, and one surveyor, \$1,700, making \$6,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the same as last year?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes. Books, stationery and contingencies of office generally, \$800, observatory contingencies, \$200, determination of latitudes and longitudes, \$1,000, travelling expenses, \$500, boundary surveys, examinations, &c., including delimitation of provisional boundary about the head of Lynn Canal, \$6,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a party up there now?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is at the head of it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. King himself went up at the head of the party this year.

Expenses and salaries connected with the commission appointed to inquire into half-breed claims in North-west Territories, out of which payment may be made to J. A. Coté as half-breed commissioner, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$5,000

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to change Mr. Coté's initials in the item. It should be 'N. O. Coté.'

Mr. FOSTER. Who are those commissioners?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. McKenna and Mr. Walker, and Mr. Coté and Mr. McLeod.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Are they the same as last year?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It was the brother of Mr. Côté who was out there last year. They are both in the department.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Yes, I know, but the others are the same as acted last year?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. How is it the government did not see their way to appoint one of the leading half-breeds to act on that commission, as has been the practice heretofore? In former years, Mr. Roger Goulet was a member of that commission, and, in fact, the soul of that commission. I understand that his health did not allow him to act on the commission this year, but Mr. Pierre Deschambault was very strongly recommended by some friends of the Liberal party. He was not appointed, however, although last year he acted in an unofficial capacity. He certainly should have formed part of the commission. He is a man who has been born and bred in that district where the commissioners are going to exercise jurisdiction, and he was the best qualified man that could have been selected. He is a man against whom the Department of the Interior could not say anything, even politically.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not aware that there was any reason, even politically, in the appointment. One of the half-breeds has been appointed in the same position this year, a man who lives in the district and knows the people well. Mr. Charles Fisher has been appointed as secretary to the commission, and he is familiar with all these matters.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Is that the same gentleman who is now a member of the legislature in the North-west Territories?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think he is the same gentleman.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Well, I may say that he is perfectly qualified to act as secretary, but I think he ought to have been appointed a commissioner. The fact of the matter is, that the vast majority of these half-breeds are of French origin, and with the exception of Mr. Côté, who was sent from Ottawa—and he is a good appointment, I believe—there is not another gentleman on the commission who can speak French. Mr. Côté, I repeat, is, I believe, a good appointment.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. LaRiviere) is mistaken. Mr. Fisher is a French half-breed.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I mentioned the commissioners; Mr. Fisher is only the secretary.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is an important appointment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I know Mr. Fisher, and he is a good appointment, but he ought to be appointed to a higher place as one of the commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the details of the expenditure last year?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have not the details of last year's expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. The department should not have allowed the hon. gentleman to come down here without having a detailed statement. He should take all the wool off the top of the head of some of his officers for not having furnished him with more information.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know that it has been customary in the past to give details of such an item.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg pardon. Whatever faults the present Minister of the Interior may have, when he was here last year he gave the fullest explanation that ever was given by any minister in this House—I will not except any—of his departmental estimates. He was told it would be expected and as *Hansard* will show, he gave most full and explicit statements in reference to every question that was asked as to expenditure. The department ought to have been even more careful to have this information for the acting minister than for the minister himself.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will give my hon. friend a statement, which I think ought to be satisfactory, of the use to which the whole of the money is put for this year and next year, amounting altogether to \$18,000. It is estimated that there will be six months' services of two commissioners at \$10 a day, \$3,600; six months' services of two commissioners at \$5 a day, \$1,800; one head clerk at \$5 a day, \$900; three clerks at \$100 a month each, \$1,800, making \$8,100 on account of salaries; transport, contingencies, camp outfit, wages of cooks, boatmen, &c., \$7,000; supplies and living expenses of commissioners, clerks, interpreters, cooks, boatmen, teamsters and other persons it may be found necessary to employ, \$3,000; making the total amount for the present year and next year, of \$18,100.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are the commissioners?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. McKenna and Mr. Walker. Mr. McKenna is an officer of the Indian Department.

Mr. FOSTER. What is his pay?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He receives \$6 a day in addition to his salary. Mr. Walker is not an officer of the department. He lives at Calgary. He was, I believe, at one time superintendent of the mounted police,

and is considered well acquainted with western life. He receives \$10 a day.

Mr. FOSTER. On what principle do you take a salaried officer of the department and give him the pay of a commissioner in addition to his regular pay? Is not his whole time at the disposal of the department? There has been instances this year in which officials have been placed on commissions and simply paid their salaries, with of course, their expenses. What is the reason a different plan is adopted in this case from what is adopted in other departments?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it has been customary, in taking officials from a department for duties for which they are particularly well qualified, to give them an extra allowance.

Mr. FOSTER. No, they have been given their extra expenses.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not prepared to dispute the hon. gentleman's statement in regard to any particular case; but in my experience as a member of this House we have repeatedly voted to different officers extra allowances for extra duties. It was thought that in this case an officer of the department ought to be one of the commissioners, that his knowledge of the official working of matters in the department would enable him to protect the government very much. One would naturally suppose that local commissioners might be influenced by the surroundings and the people more than an officer of the department. I am inclined to think that parliament would be quite willing to allow an officer with the qualifications for such an important and responsible duty, where thousands of dollars are involved, a small allowance in addition to his salary.

Mr. FOSTER. What salary does he get?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. \$1,400.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Coté, one of the officials of this commission last year and this year, was also one of the officials of the commission which settled the half-breed claims in 1885, and I think he was treated then just as Mr. McKenna is treated to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. McKenna a private secretary as well?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He also acts as private secretary of the Indian Department, I think. I must have been mistaken in stating that he received \$6 a day, for the estimate is made up at the rate of \$5 a day.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. McKenna is receiving his salary of \$1,400 as clerk, his allowance of \$600 as private secretary, and in addition this extra amount of \$5 or \$6 a day as commissioner?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. He is paid as private secretary without doing the work, he is paid his salary for his work as a clerk, none of which he is doing, and outside of that he is paid \$5 or \$6 a day, and all his expenses on this commission. I think that is a very fat little office for Mr. McKenna. An officer of the department who is as well paid as he is might very well do this outside work for the department for his pay and extra expenses. Will the hon. gentleman now give us a general idea of what these men have to do?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Applications are made by the half-breeds for scrip. The commissioners have to investigate their claims and take evidence whether they are entitled to scrip or not, and their duties are very important.

Mr. CLANCY. How many claims are there supposed to be?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have answered that question in the House before, and I forget now the number but it is up in the thousands.

Mr. FOSTER. Over what territory are they travelling?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the principal number of the half-breeds are in Saskatchewan and Assiniboia. There are some at a very long distance. I remember in a conversation with Mr. Côté, before the commission went away, he said it was doubtful whether they could reach some of the outlying points before the winter season.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is doing the work of these clerks while these men are away?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The other officers of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. There is plenty to do the work when they are gone?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The work may accumulate, but at any rate there have been no complaints so far.

Mr. FOSTER. They give this scrip to the half-breeds, as they arrange the claims, while on their travels.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They give certificates on the spot, and each certificate entitles the bearer to an issue of scrip.

Mr. FOSTER. How do they get the scrip?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The certificates are sent on through the banks or post offices or storekeepers or other people in whom the parties have confidence. A great many of these certificates are transferred to others.

Mr. FOSTER. I find in a Toronto paper that this scrip is offered for sale at 80 cents on the dollar.

The PRIME MINISTER. You cannot avoid that.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman last year said he was going to correct the abuses that existed in the time of the preceding government, but his commissioners are simply paying out the scrip without any conditions attached to it at all. That shows what an immense farce the whole thing is. The idea was that in some way or other these half-breeds should be given lands or if they wished to go into stock or the ranching business they could be assisted to do so, but instead they have been given scrip payable to bearer. The half-breeds then part with the scrip for a song, and sometimes for worse than a song, to the speculators, who have followed on the track of these commissioners, and the result is that, in many cases, the half-breeds derive no benefit at all from this settlement. It does seem a pity that so much money should be spent to satisfy the just claims of the half-breeds and yet be spent in such a way that these people actually do not get the benefit. This plan of the right hon. gentleman, like many other plans of the government, was better in theory than in practice.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I may say that the commissioners have made every possible effort to induce the half-breeds to take land scrip and they report that a much larger proportion of the half-breeds are taking lands than formerly.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend, the ex-Finance Minister, forgets what took place last year. The commission started with instructions to pay out scrip that was not transferable, so that the half-breeds would invest it in the purchase of land and not sell it to speculators. But, as was explained in the House last session, when the commissioners came to deal with the half-breeds—the commissioners were the Hon. Mr. Laird, a man of great prudence, Father Lacombe, a man who has been the friend of the half-breeds all his life,—I forget the names of the other members—the commissioners found that the half-breeds would take no other scrip but scrip similar to that which had been issued by the late government. They held meetings and notified the commission that they would not accept the scrip that was offered to them. They had been accustomed to have their scrip transferable and immediately convertible into money. The commissioners had to deliberate what they would do. They were ready to leave in the morning if their bills were not accepted. The Indians with whom we wanted to make a treaty were assembled, and the commissioners had to consider whether the Indians should be left to go back to their homes discontented or whether they should not meet their views and issue scrip as in former years. There is no man who

Mr. FOSTER.

has taken a stronger view than Father Lacombe against the excesses resulting from issuing scrip, or who saw less benefit in its results to the half-breeds. But, in view of the determined attitude of the half-breeds he issued a report to the government that he had advised that the old system should be resorted to, and the scrip in the usual form issued. That was not the best way to deal with the half-breeds—we all admit that. But, after all, the commissioners came to the conclusion that it was better that the half-breeds should be satisfied, even though they do not derive the same beneficial results which would accrue to them if the new form of non-transferable scrip had been issued.

Mr. FOSTER. Land scrip?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no other, then?

The PRIME MINISTER. It entitles the holder, as I understand it, to pay it for its face value as cash upon any payment for Crown land. This year, I understand, the half-breeds were making use of the scrip in larger proportion than formerly for the purchase of their land, and thus we may suppose the half-breeds will receive greater benefit from this new issue of scrip than from former issues. At any rate, we shall have satisfied the claim of these men. They have always been discontented, feeling that the government of the country had not settled with them, had not given them their due. If we have gained nothing else, it will have been worth all the money that it cost the country. In 1870, after the rebellion, we issued scrip to the half-breeds, which was squandered, every dollar of it, I believe. But we gained this at any rate—that there were no more claims against us. We cannot afford to have a large section of the population of the North-west or any other part of the country feeling discontented and asserting that the government of the country has not given them what is their due. We must give them what is their own. If they squander it, so much the worse for them; if they profit by it so much the better; but at least, we get them satisfied.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) did not understand me when I used the expression commonly used in the department 'money scrip.' There are two kinds of scrip; one kind is good for 240 acres of land. That is the kind that I said the House would be glad to know the half-breeds were taking more generally. The other kind is transferable, and can be applied on the payment of any Crown lands by the holder of the scrip.

Mr. FOSTER. It is all redeemable in land, but some is transferable and some is not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is hardly the distinction. One kind represents an actual quantity of land, and the other a money payment on the purchase of any quantity of land.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am sure the House will be pleased to know that many of the half-breeds are taking the scrip that represents the land. For the benefit of those who take the old form of scrip, an effort is made to keep the price as high as possible, so that they may get as much benefit out of it as possible.

Mr. CLANCY. It does not seem to me there is much difference in value whether it is transferable or not.

The PRIME MINISTER. The point is that sometimes the half-breeds sell the scrip for a mere song.

Mr. FOSTER. The question undoubtedly was a difficult one, and there is some force in the way the Premier puts it. The course taken, can only be palliated on the ground that every effort was made to cause the half-breeds to study their own interest and not throw their scrip away. We are not wholly free from responsibility unless our officers joined with such men as Father Lacombe, who is on the ground and who has great influence with the half-breeds and others whom they trust to find a way by which they could be helped to help themselves. It certainly makes a difficulty when a man like Father Lacombe himself, after talking with them, finds that he cannot persuade them. How much of this scrip has been issued since this commission began? I suppose it is not issued to others than half-breeds?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not very familiar with the scrip business.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the hon. Minister of Finance to look into it and see if it is not time that the unauthorized issue of what are practically government bills should be taken out of the hands of the department. The Minister of the Interior himself has the power under the Act to issue scrip I think.

The PRIME MINISTER. I believe the scrip is about all issued.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is the expectation that every claim will soon be settled.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) speaks of unauthorized scrip, I suppose he has no special case in mind, but fears that it might be abused.

Mr. FOSTER. The issue of what is practically money is not generally left to the discretion of a minister.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It only affects the Department of the Interior, and only as respects lands.

Mr. FOSTER. But, so long as you have lands to sell and do sell them, this scrip partakes of the nature of a bank bill.

Mr. CLANCY. Are there certain localities for which the land is to be taken up for the scrip?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. A half-breed accepting scrip can take land wherever Dominion lands are to be granted; and if it is transferable scrip, it is accepted as payment on lands from any person who may owe the Crown.

Miscellaneous—Expenses of government in district of Keewatin ..... \$2,190

Mr. FOSTER. What is this spent for? Is it an appendage of the government of Manitoba?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What was spent last year, and what for?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Out of this appropriation, the secretary to the governor gets \$600 and the clerk \$480. The lieutenant-governor looks after this expenditure, it seems to be altogether under his jurisdiction.

Maintenance, construction of roads, bridges and other necessary works in connection with the Hot Springs reservation near Banff station, N.W.T. .... \$11,920

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be done with this money?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The salaries appear to be the same, \$2,420. Last year \$2,000 was voted for repairs to buildings, which is not necessary this year. Repairing roads, there is an increase of \$500, the whole amount to be expended is \$1,000. Last year we voted \$500 for new roads, nothing is required this year for that purpose. New buildings required this year, \$1,500. There is a new bridge over the Cascade River to cost \$500. The care of buffaloes and other animals is the same. There are twenty-one or twenty-two buffaloes. They were doing very well when I was there last year. An increase of two is reported this year. A man is employed to take care of them, who rides round on a pony. Then, there is required for heating apparatus this year, \$700; clearing land, \$500; contingencies, \$1,000. The superintendent at Banff is Mr. Douglas, formerly a resident of Calgary.

To provide for the survey of the boundary between the Yukon territory and British Columbia from Teslin Lake to the Alsek River ..... \$14,000

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The amount to be spent is divided as follows: Astronomical party, \$6,000; survey, \$8,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How near is this work to completion?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They made a few observations last year, and it is to be hoped it will be completed this year.

Mr. FOSTER. For this amount?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes. Mr. White-Fraser is the astronomer, and Mr. St. Cyr is the surveyor.

To provide for the relief of distressed persons in the North-west Territories. \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. I do not understand this vote. What was spent out of that vote last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). This is a new vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Last year there was a sum to recoup members of the North-west Mounted Police for relief given to destitute half-breeds. What is this for?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This has been put in upon the application of the Hudson Bay Company.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I will ask the hon. minister to let that stand until some of the North-west members are here.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. All right.

Expenses of relief party and furnishing provisions to distressed people on the Liard and Dease Rivers..... \$20,000

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The explanation of what has been done in this matter is in a letter from the Hudson Bay officer, which is as follows:

Hudson's Bay Company,  
Commissioner's Office,  
Winnipeg, Dec. 13, 1899.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of December 1, I beg to state the accounts for relief of destitute miners given by the Hudson's Bay Company on behalf of the Dominion government, have just been received, and are being prepared for your approval and will be sent forward without delay.

For your information, I have to state that in accordance with your telegraphic instructions of May 10 and subsequent communications, the company's steamer 'Strathcona,' which was then laid up at Port Simpson, was immediately put in commission, and a captain and crew were despatched from Victoria on May 15 to join the vessel.

The supplies which were considered necessary were at once shipped to Wrangel to meet the steamer 'Strathcona' upon her arrival there. The 'Strathcona' was promptly launched and prepared for service, and arrived at Wrangel on May 29.

In proceeding up the Stikine River on the first trip, the boat unfortunately met with an accident which necessitated her return to Wrangel for repairs. These were effected without unnecessary delay, and the boat left Wrangel for Glenora on June 10.

In the meantime, as it was impossible to find out what other animals, if any, were available at Glenora for the transportation inland of the supplies from that point to Dease Lake, a contract was entered into with Mr. Pike, of the Casca Trading Company, for the sending in of sufficient men and pack animals to enable the inland transport to be carried out.

Mr. FOSTER.

Upon the arrival of the 'Strathcona' at Glenora it was learned that the report of destitution had been considerably exaggerated, and it was not considered advisable to send in all the supplies which had been forwarded, and in the interest of the government the contract which had been entered into with Mr. Pike was cancelled. As, however, Mr. Pike had already incurred considerable expense, he requested compensation therefor, and this was settled by paying him the sum of \$1,500. The needed supplies were then sent forward by the Hudson's Bay Company's pack train at a cost of \$464.36, and as the total amount payable to Mr. Pike under the contract which had to be first made with him was \$4,800, there was a saving to the department by the cancellation of the contract of \$2,835.64.

On June 20 the government relief supplies left Glenora for Dease Lake in charge of the Hudson's Bay Company's officials, and all possible assistance was given to those needing relief.

The first of those in distress reached Glenora on June 18, and these parties had already been assisted by the Hudson's Bay Company at their inland posts. From time to time others arrived until September 4, when it was necessary for the 'Strathcona' to leave on her last trip to Wrangel on account of the low stage of water in the river. Altogether the 'Strathcona' made seven complete trips between Wrangel and Glenora, and brought out 155 men, to whom transportation, meals and accommodation were afforded. In addition to these, there were some thirty who worked for their passages, thus effecting a saving to the government. From those to whom relief was afforded certificates were taken that they were in destitution and had been given the assistance described.

The majority of those receiving assistance expressed their gratitude to the Hudson's Bay Company, as the agents of the Dominion government, in affording them relief, as well as for the treatment they had received at the company's posts which they had passed upon their long and arduous journey. There were some, however, who, disappointed by failure and hardship, were discontented, and were not so appreciative of the government's action and the efforts which had been made to relieve them.

Practically the last of the sick and destitute in that part of the country were brought down on the final trip of the 'Strathcona,' and it is hoped that the assistance which the Hudson's Bay Company has been enabled to afford, and which has only been carried out with much difficulty, may be considered by those who have been benefited as a generous and beneficent action on the part of the Dominion government.

It is possible that some small accounts may yet be received from some of the inland posts with which communication is difficult, but it is not anticipated that the amount of the present account, approximately \$29,500, will be much exceeded.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) C. C. CHIPMAN.

Mr. FOSTER. So that the amount was \$29,500?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The account is \$29,500, and the deputy informs me that in looking over it, they have reduced it some.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this vote of \$20,000 for this year?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They had a vote last year of \$25,000, and these accounts not

having been settled, it lapsed. They paid a little over \$12,000 on account of this \$30,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole account will be \$29,900 ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, but the deputy thinks it will be cut down some.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we have done a pretty good night's work.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If my hon. friend is willing to allow the item of \$10,000 for the relief of distressed persons in the North-west Territories to pass, we can take the discussion later.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not the right kind of way to pass estimates.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am sure that I will be willing to give every possible opportunity for discussion. This money was spent, and it had to be spent to relieve the destitution of people in the North-west. This will finish these items, if the hon. gentleman will agree.

Mr. FOSTER. They will not go to the Senate any quicker, or be available any sooner.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If there is any discussion, every opportunity will be given. I do not think there will be any objection.

Mr. FOSTER. No, we had better let that stand, and get the explanation at the same time.

Yukon—Mounted Police ..... \$500,000

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Prime Minister give us some information about this ?

The PRIME MINISTER. This vote is intended for a force of 250 men. There are 197 men there at present. We have withdrawn the military force from the Yukon and we estimate that we can do with a police force of 250 men. The officers are Supt. Perry, who took the place of Col. Steele, and Supts. Wood, Primrose, Scarth and Rutledge. There are two districts, the Dawson and the Tagish districts, and the men are distributed over a number of stations in these districts.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they boarding out, or have they accommodation for themselves at each station ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I speak under correction, but I think they all have stations for themselves. These stations are thirty miles apart, and we not only provide for the police, but for travellers, miners and so on.

Mr. FOSTER. If the travellers take provisions, do they pay for them ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The instructions are to take money for provisions supplied, but very often they have no money to give.

Mr. FOSTER. It ought not to be so much now.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not now, but everything has been of a very confused character until now, when things are becoming more systematized. When the police went there first they had to act as policemen, teamsters and mail carriers, and customs officers, and so on. We do no post office business now, but I believe we will continue to do some customs business, but not so much as in the past. Every one, I think, will agree that the force has been of great benefit to that country. They have built their stations themselves, and they have performed all the other duties that I have mentioned.

Mr. CLANCY. Are these emergency men at the different stations ?

The PRIME MINISTER. At Regina and Tagish and Dawson, the headquarters, we have a certain number of men always ready to do any kind of work they may be called upon to do.

Mr. FOSTER. Have there been any casualties amongst the force ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Very few.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they been met with force in any case ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Not that I have been informed.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the supplies bought outside, or do you buy them in Dawson ?

The PRIME MINISTER. About 80 per cent of the supplies are bought outside and 20 per cent in Dawson.

Mr. FOSTER. The rule is to buy by contract from outside ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I believe so, except small supplies that are bought on emergency.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Prime Minister give us an honest expression now ? Was not the taking in of the militia force to the Yukon a failure ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot say that. I am glad to say that the services of the militia were not required, but I believe that the presence of the force had a salutary effect. My hon. friend will remember that when we asked an appropriation for the force in the spring of 1898, there was no opposition to it from any quarter. We knew there would be a rush of a population of a rather rough character, and in anticipation of possible disturbances, we thought it advisable to send the force there. I believe, for my part, that it was the old maxim: If you want to have peace prepare for war. The presence of the militia, no doubt, had a deterrent effect. It is possible that if we doubled the number of mounted police the same result might have been attained.

Mr. FOSTER. Why was Col. Steele recalled ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I cannot give any information on that matter, because that portion of the force, though nominally under my supervision, was left to my colleague the Minister of the Interior, who had the organization of the Yukon.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That is just the point. If the Prime Minister will allow me to express the opinion, it does not seem to me that the Minister of the Interior ought to have anything at all to do with the disposition of the mounted police, except by way of advice to the First Minister. I think a serious mistake has been made in turning everything over to the Minister of the Interior, who has had, not only too much to do, but who has had, what he never should have had a control in other departments, and used it in a way which has not been good. I hope the First Minister, when he is the head of the mounted police, will be its head right through, no matter where the mounted police goes. I have confidence in the First Minister—in a guarded way, of course—and very great confidence in the efficient deputy who has charge of that body; and I should like to see it kept in charge of the First Minister and his deputy, and not turned over to any other minister. I believe it has been used by the other minister as it would not have been used by my hon. friend.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I must take exception to the too flattering remarks of which I feel very proud, from my hon. friend towards myself, and I must say that his criticisms of my colleague, the Minister of the Interior, are hardly fair. It was felt at the time that it would be better—and I am not prepared to give up my judgment on this point—to turn over the whole administration of the Yukon to one responsible minister. Different departments had to do with that administration; but the Yukon is so exceptionally situated, and is so far from all communication, that it has to be treated exceptionally, and I believe that the system we followed was, after all, the best we could follow under the circumstances. It would have been almost impossible to carry on the administration under another system. Now, I put another question to my hon. friend. He put a question to me a moment ago, which I answered calmly. Does he not think that, after all, the administration of the Yukon has come out more successfully than he anticipated at one time, and that on the whole it has been reasonably satisfactory?

Mr. **FOSTER**. I am quite ready to give my right hon. friend an answer according to my lights. They say that a drunken man escapes most wonderfully sometimes when he tumbles about, and the administration has got out of it a little better than at one time I feared they would. But I cannot say, and I do not believe in my heart, that the administration of the Yukon has redounded to the credit of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. **FOSTER**.

I do not think that under the surface, things have been as they ought to have been; and yet, the disposition here in Ottawa has been to close the ears and steel the mind against anything that was not complimentary towards the administration of affairs in that far-off country. The minister and the ministry would have done better if they had taken it a little more for granted that there were grievances, and if they had not steeled themselves against every representation of a grievance which came from there. I make up my mind largely from talking with friends who have passed months and some of them years in the Yukon, men whom I know, and in whom I have great confidence; and I am bound to say that I do not believe the Yukon has been administered by the Department of the Interior as successfully as it should have been, by a great deal. I am not going to say that the distance, and the very great difficulties of communication at first, are not to be taken into account; and we cannot expect any man to do superhuman things. Fair toleration must be allowed when we take these circumstances into account; but taking them into account, I cannot say very much for the administration of the Yukon. The government did not do what would satisfy the people of this country, and be a benefit all round, namely, have a fair and impartial investigation by a Royal Commission into the charges that were made. Then, if the charges were unfounded, the government would have had their own vindication. If they were well founded, the right hon. gentleman must acknowledge that it is the duty of the government to correct every grievance, and have every wrong righted. If that commission had been given, the clamour would have been stilled for one of two reasons—either that the charges would have been proved to have been false, or they would have been proved true to a certain extent, and the government must have remedied the grievances. But the Minister of the Interior seems to have gone on the assumption that every word or story of wrongdoing in the Yukon, was to be construed into an attack upon himself and his administration, and he steadily denied and resisted. The great mistake the government have made in connection with the Yukon, if they ask a candid opinion, is in not putting in there a commission of judges, a first-rate commission, who would have carried the confidence of the country through and through and letting them go to the bottom of the whole matter. That would have satisfied the country, and indicated the grievances, and affairs would have been much better managed than they have been. I hope if I have not satisfied my right hon. friend with the tenor of what I have said, I have satisfied him that I have given him my honest opinion.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. That is what I wanted to have. I suppose my hon. friend and myself might discuss this matter till

doomsday without coming to an agreement. I admit that in 1898, the condition of things in the Yukon were rather chaotic. They could hardly be otherwise. There was a rush of population into the country; Major Walsh could not reach his destination in the winter, and many imputations were made upon his conduct for which I hold him absolutely blameless. Major Walsh was succeeded by Mr. Ogilvie, who, whatever be his demerits, is beyond doubt, an honest and painstaking man. Gradually things have been improving, and I do not know that in the summer of 1899, or this year, there have been any very serious complaints, if there have been complaints at all.

Mr. CLANCY. All the time.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not very serious. Of course, you will always hear complaints from a distant country; but, no serious and well-founded complaints have been made against the administration. Suppose there were. There may be faults of administration, little delinquencies of one kind or another; but, on the whole, I submit that the administration has been reasonably satisfactory. Taking in view the construction of houses and roads and everything else, and the fact that the whole thing had to be done at a great distance from all communications, I think that the Minister of the Interior has done better than he has been given credit for.

Mr. FOSTER. We will require to have a discussion on the Yukon, and my colleague from Pictou has a word or two to say on the administration of that district, and I also have my own views to express as regards the council, which I hope to bring before the attention of the right hon. gentleman in a day or two. In the meantime, I would like to have back the return he borrowed from me.

Mr. CLANCY. While there may have been a change in the administration of the Yukon, I must say that the complaints have not ceased. I have many letters in my possession that have no political aspect whatever—letters written by parties to their friends, which were never supposed to be seen by any other persons, and which disclose the fact that these people are under the impression that it would be much better for them to remain quiet than to air their grievances. I feel quite sure that the hon. gentleman can hardly enjoy that peace of mind and consolation on which he congratulates himself as to the perfection that may exist up there.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perfection does not exist anywhere.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I was asked the other night to ascertain how it happened that a vote for schools in unorganized districts in the North-west we were able, on an appropriation of

\$2,000 to spend more than that amount. I could not explain it at the moment, but I find, on inquiry, that several years ago a clause was inserted in the Supply Bill by which this item was treated in an exceptional manner, and the balances passed from one year to the other instead of lapsing. For the present year, we will follow that rule, but, for the future I do not see any reason why we should not follow the general rule.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. (Saturday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, June 11, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### ELECTORAL FRAUDS—JUDICIAL INQUIRY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With reference to the promise made the other day to my hon. friend on his suggestion with regard to the commission of inquiry now issued, I told him that I would give him the opinion of the Minister of Justice upon the subject, as laying down the policy the government intends to follow. The House will be interested in being given communication of the grounds taken by the Minister of Justice upon the several propositions and suggestions made by the hon. leader of the opposition:

(Memorandum in Respect to the Proposed Commission.)

Office of the Minister of Justice,

Ottawa, June 11, 1900.

The undersigned learns from the speeches of the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Borden (Halifax) that they are of opinion that the scope of the commission under chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada and the amendments thereto, is not sufficiently broad to make the inquiry of the commission effective.

The undersigned is of opinion that this conclusion has been reached by overlooking the amendments made by 52 Victoria, chapter 33. The powers under this statute, as it now stands, enables the Governor in Council to appoint a commission to inquire into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada, to confer upon the parties appointed to make the inquiry, by their commission, the power of summoning before them witnesses, and to require such witnesses to give evidence on oath, and to produce such documents and things as such commissioners deem requisite to full investigation of the matters into which they are appointed to examine.

Such commissioners are clothed with the same power to enforce attendance of witnesses, and

to compel them to give evidence as is vested in any court of record in civil cases.

It is expressly provided in that statute that no witness examined before such commissioners shall be excused from answering any questions put to him on the ground that the answer thereto may criminate, or tend to criminate, him; but no evidence so taken shall be admissible against any such witness in any criminal proceedings, except in the case of a witness charged with having given false evidence at such inquiry, or having procured or attempted, or conspired, to procure the giving of such evidence. In the opinion of the undersigned, chapter 114, as it now stands amended, is sufficiently ample to meet the requirements of the investigation, as suggested by Mr. Borden (Halifax).

Sir Charles Tupper suggests that the commission should be enlarged by adding the following words: 'And any fraudulent practices, persons or means connected therewith.' The present commission authorizes the commissioners to inquire into the fraudulent conduct of any person in relation to the alleged wrong-doing in respect to the ballots, and so these words are, in the opinion of the undersigned, unnecessary.

Sir Charles Tupper suggests that, in the employment of counsel, the leader of the government (the Prime Minister) shall name one counsel, and he shall name the other. The undersigned is of opinion that it is better the appointment of counsel should rest with the commissioners, as they will be present for the purpose of aiding the commissioners in accomplishing the object had in view—the ascertainment of the facts in the constituencies in which it is found necessary to conduct an investigation.

As to the suggestion that the witness should be asked how he voted, the undersigned is of opinion that no attempt should be made by legislation to compel a witness to give evidence that it may have been the express intention of the law should not be given. Whether a witness shall be compelled to testify how he voted or not, is a question which the commissioners will undertake to decide in conformity with the law. The present Ballot Act was introduced into parliament by the late Chief Justice of the province of Quebec (Sir A. A. Dorion), at the time he was Minister of Justice. At that time, it was intended by him, on ground of public policy, to have parliament to so legislate that the ballot could not, under any circumstances, for the purpose of ascertaining by whom it was marked, be inquired into, in a court of justice. In this respect, the Ballot Act of Canada differs from the English law, and also from the law of Ontario, where, upon a scrutiny, the law provides that it may be ascertained from the ballot itself how each elector voted. The ballot being itself the primary evidence, it has been said that there is no other safe means than by its production, to show how a party voted, and it would certainly be very hazardous to permit a party to testify how he voted. The witness, were he to give false testimony in this regard, would do so without the slightest fear of detection, and without its being possible, except by the ballot, to establish that his evidence was wrong.

In the case of the Haldimand election, the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (Sir Henry Strong) held that to permit a voter to testify how he voted would be a direct violation of the Act—that secrecy is imposed as an absolute rule of public policy, and that it cannot be waived. The whole purview of the law is different from that of the English and of the Ontario Acts.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Some judges have held to a different opinion, but the commissioners, who are all judges of ability, may be safely left to interpret the law for themselves.

In the opinion of the undersigned, it would be extremely improper to permit the evidence taken before the committee in the West Huron case to be made evidence before a commission, as the importance that the commissioners may attach to the evidence of a party, and the impression made upon their minds may depend upon his demeanour in giving his evidence, it is most important that the parties should appear before the commission and testify in the ordinary way.

Sir Charles Tupper states that he was advised that it is impossible for the commissioners to compel the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to do what is required of him in this commission. In that view the undersigned cannot concur. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is an officer of the Crown, through whom the Crown issues the writs calling upon the parties to whom they are addressed to make a return of a member to the House of Commons within the time specified. He, as an officer of the Crown, is subject to the summons of the commissioner, as much so as any other witness whose attendance may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID MILLS,  
Minister of Justice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I am sorry that the government have arrived at the conclusion they have with reference to this matter, because I am sure it will prevent the accomplishment of what the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said was its object, and that was to have a thorough and complete examination of the subject. I took exception to the scope of the commission, and was anxious it should also embrace 'any fraudulent practice, persons or actions connected therewith.' What possible objection there could be to the addition of these words and to this addition to the scope of the commission, I am at a loss to conceive, if the government wishes a fair, full and complete investigation into this matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). What is the difference between 'fraudulent practices' and 'fraudulent conduct' which is to be inquired into?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Even supposing that my hon. friend (Mr. Blair), is right in saying that the point I desire is already covered, there could be no objection to adding the words 'fraudulent practices, persons or actions.' In the next place, the Act under which this commission is authorized is stated in the *Canada Gazette*—for I find that the commission has been gazetted in anticipation of any action by this House or any expression of opinion here—is chapter 114, and it is appointed to inquire into, investigate, and report upon certain election frauds. The English Act to which I drew attention, provides specifically that the commission shall inquire into the matters committed to them 'by all such lawful means as to them appear best.' It also provides:

For the more effectually prosecuting any inquiry under this Act, every person who has been engaged in any corrupt practice at or connected with any election of members or a member to serve in parliament for any county, division of a county, city, borough, university, or place to which any inquiry under this Act relates, and who is examined as a witness, and gives evidence touching such corrupt practice before the commissioners appointed under this Act to make such inquiry, and who upon such examination makes a true discovery to the best of his knowledge, touching all things to which he is so examined, shall be free from all penal actions, forfeitures, punishments, disabilities and incapacities, and all criminal prosecutions to which he may have been or may become liable or subject at the suit of Her Majesty.

This is 15-16 Victoria, chapter 57, and the language is adopted by chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes. In the case of this commission, such complete immunity is not provided as, I hold, is absolutely necessary, in order to reach the truth in this matter. If the object is, as my right hon. friend professes, to have a thorough and complete investigation, to probe these matters to the bottom, what possible objection there could be to the adoption of the language of the Imperial statute I cannot imagine. It is true that under the Act under which the commissioners are appointed, they would have power to undertake that any evidence given by a witness should not be used against him. But that does not cover the case. You must give him absolute indemnity as well as against his evidence being used to bring forward other persons, and thus give him every encouragement to disclose the truth and the whole truth. I think the suggestion I made was a reasonable one, and I do not think that any of the statements made just now by my right hon. friend at all covers the case or gives any sufficient ground why my suggestion should not have been adopted. Then I drew attention to the point concerning the payment of witnesses, and suggested that it would be impossible, that everybody knew it would be impossible, to have a complete investigation unless you provided for the payment of expenses of witnesses.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** We intend to ask an appropriation for that object.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** That is another thing. I think the commission should provide for that. It is the right of the parties to know what witnesses will be paid, and to have it in the Act, and not left to the judgment of the government or any person else as to that point. Under the Corrupt Practices Act, there is this power, and if it is not intended to cripple or defeat the object of this commission, I do not see why you should not give such an indemnity to the persons giving the evidence, as the Imperial statute give, nor do I see any reason why you should not provide, by law, for the payment of expenses of witnesses. The other suggestions that I made are matters to which I do not attach so great importance, though

important they certainly are. I see that the choice of counsel by the commissioners is limited to Queen's counsel, thus not leaving the judges free to appoint any counsel they please. They must appoint Queen's counsel. That being so, I do not see why the suggestion I made as to the choice of these counsel should not be adopted. I suggested that the commissioners should be advised to consult my right hon. friend as to one of the counsel to be named, and that the leader of the other party in this House, and this country, should be in a position to suggest the other. There could be no ground of objection, there could be no partiality in that. My right hon. friend has certainly offered no sufficient objection to what I proposed. But I went further and suggested that these counsel having been appointed, one at the suggestion of the leader of the government and the other at the suggestion of the leader of the opposition in this House, they should be authorized to obtain the assistance of other counsel. And for a very obvious reason. Every person knows that it is impossible for any counsel, however able and distinguished he may be to deal with a question of this kind, unless he is in a position to call to his aid other persons, and these persons would be required to be sent to investigate and to learn what evidence was to be forthcoming and what evidence could be brought. Why should it be thrown upon two counsel without any assistance whatever to deal with a question of this magnitude? It is utterly impossible, with any regard whatever to the time they should occupy in making this investigation, that it should be confined to two counsel. My right hon. friend has not seen proper to adopt my suggestion with reference to that point, to which I attach the greatest importance, because I think the greatest success of the investigation must inevitably depend largely upon the assistance that counsel are able to give; and if they are limited to their own exertions and cannot obtain aid and assistance from other solicitors in dealing with this question, one of two results follows: The time occupied in this investigation will be so lengthy as to deprive it of its utility, or it will be absolutely impossible to have that complete investigation to which my right hon. friend pledged himself so emphatically.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Speaking under correction, at this moment, I do not remember that when this matter was last before us my right hon. friend suggested there should be more than one counsel on each side.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I suggested there should be one counsel named by the right hon. gentleman and another named by the leader of the opposition, and that they should have authority to obtain such assistance as was absolutely necessary to secure a thorough investigation. My right hon. friend will find that suggestion in the

remarks I made if he will consult *Hansard*, which is generally very correct.

Then, as to the question of examining witnesses as to how they voted, I must express my great surprise at the decision arrived at in view of the evidence that we have before us, that the government have now in their possession. The gravamen of the charge in the Huron election rests upon the right of the electors to testify how they voted, and the right hon. gentleman, knowing that the whole case rests to a large extent upon that fact—I am surprised that there should be any hesitation in passing an Act that would enable the judges to ask the witness how he voted. The Committee on Privileges and Elections ruled that as the seat was not affected, and as it is not proposed to affect a seat by the decision of these judges, the case would be exactly in the same position as it was before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, on which my hon. friend has an absolute majority, and which ruled that in order to have any proper investigation it was absolutely necessary that witnesses should be permitted to state how they voted. Yet that is, for some reason best known to my hon. friend and to the government, refused, although it is the very first step towards getting a prompt and searching investigation, the very first step towards discovering the ground upon which frauds in the West Huron election to a large extent rest. My right hon. friend knows that in one case in which forty men voted for a Conservative candidate, there were only thirty ballots found in the ballot box, and it would be utterly impossible to reach that fraud unless these men tell how they voted, and unless they do this, it is absolutely impossible to expose the fraud, and you break down the whole machinery by which a pure election can be held. My right hon. friend knows that the testimony of at least forty men—and an hon. gentleman beside me says there were more than forty—had gone in before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, their sworn and solemn testimony confirmed on cross-examination; and I say that under these circumstances it would appear that one of the objects in removing this matter from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which had ruled that such questions should be asked, and given to a Royal Commission, is to get rid of that evidence, and prevent testimony being given that has been proved to be absolutely necessary in order to expose one of the most scandalous transactions that has taken place in the case of the West Huron election.

I am also surprised that any question should arise, in order to expedite this matter, as to the sworn testimony taken before the Committee on Privileges and Elections being utilized in the present case. Why should it not be utilized? Is there any reason why this testimony should not be used? Every person knows the immense

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

difficulty of bringing a hundred or more witnesses before a court; and when it is remembered that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) and the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) declared that the result of that investigation was not to establish anything that would materially affect the gentlemen on the other side of the House and the party with which they are connected, it is the more strange that the judges are not to be permitted to use that testimony which, at great public expense and enormous inconvenience to the public, had been procured. Their sworn testimony is on record, and why should it not be used as sworn testimony is used when it is transferred from a committee of one session of this House to a committee of another session? I must say that I am greatly disappointed to think that the extremely moderate and reasonable suggestions which I ventured to make to my hon. friend, have all been thrown over. It would seem that instead of my right hon. friend being anxious to implement the pledges that he gave to this House to promote a thorough and searching investigation, the object now appears to be to get rid of an investigation at all that will be of any value, and to cripple and confine the commissioners in such a way as to prevent witnesses from testifying in the same way they had testified in the first place, because they are not to receive the indemnity that the Imperial Act gives to witnesses under similar circumstances, and they are not permitted to give the testimony that, under the decision of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, they have already been allowed to give. Therefore, that is another reason. I suppose, why this investigation is to be crippled and hampered by restrictions that are calculated to prevent its having the effect that is desired.

Now, I drew my right hon. friend's attention to another thing, and that was the desirability of taking the Brockville and West Huron elections first. I did not catch what decision he has arrived at with reference to that matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not speak of that. I said the other day that upon this matter as well as others, the government did not feel justified in giving any instructions to the judges, but preferred to leave them to conduct the inquiry as they saw fit.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My right hon. friend seems to forget that the reason of this commission being issued is because one of the most frightful scandals has taken place, being an attempt to deprive the electors of this country of their independent franchise, and to substitute spurious members, returned by a gang of ruffians who invaded the constituency and tampered with ballot boxes, who switched ballots, stole ballots, substituted ballots; and this commis-

sion was appointed because this country became convulsed from one end to the other at the scandalous practices that were proved to have been carried on. My right hon. friend did not deny that. In his speech he agreed to submit this matter to an independent body of judges competent to investigate all that has taken place, and I want to know, if that be the case, whether this House and this country have not a right to know why the investigation into these two elections is not to be proceeded with, which are the cause of the issue of this commission, and in regard to which the right hon. gentleman said that a prima facie case had been made out sufficient to justify the submission of the case to the Committee on Privileges and Elections? He was prepared to have a thorough investigation and it was sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, with the result that one hundred witnesses came before the committee, whose evidence was so overwhelming and so alarming to hon. gentlemen opposite who had no doubt taken part in these elections, that my right hon. friend drew back from his position, changed front, declared as being an improper course that which the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) concurred in as a legal act, which the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) declared was all right, legal and proper a year ago, and, when this startling proof came out, when he found that his party were going to be overwhelmed with evidence of the most overwhelming rascality and corruption and fraud in connection with these elections, the right hon. gentleman, having got a legal opinion, suddenly changed front, when he found that the evidence that was presented was so grave, so serious and so strong of the disreputable means by which the independent electors of this country had been stricken down, when it was found that proofs were to be reported to this House of the machinations of a gang of scoundrels, sent from one constituency to another, and when he found that he would have to face the ordeal of public opinion in this House and this country, he declared that he would have a Royal Commission, that the Committee on Privileges and Elections was not sufficient to deal with the subject, and that he would have a Royal Commission to have a complete, a thorough and a searching investigation. We have now a refusal to adopt such suggestions as are copied from the Imperial statute, and instead of adopting the suggestions, the adoption of which is absolutely necessary in order to have a full, complete and thorough investigation, the Prime Minister insists upon issuing this commission under an Act that does not cover the case, an Act that does not provide power for an investigation of a searching character as the Imperial Act upon the same subject does. My right hon. friend recedes from the position

which he took, and says: We will refer the case to a committee of judges appointed under a law which will hamper them at every step; we will appoint a committee of judges under a commission that will hamper them at every step, and which does not give them the right to grant indemnity to witnesses or to provide for their payment, or to provide such assistants as counsel would absolutely require in order to have a searching investigation into this matter unless they intend to take two or three years to do it. In the face of the circumstances under which this Royal Commission was granted, you say that you are going to send this judicial commission back four years to commence their investigation and allow the difficulty which the year now elapsed has caused to intervene before this case shall be reached. If you will not do that which, on the face of it, the people of the whole country insist shall be done, unless this great case which has been so thoroughly established as to compel the issue of a Royal Commission is promptly taken up, unless you have a thorough and prompt investigation into the Huron and Brockville elections the country will hold you responsible. Let me say to my right hon. friend, and let me say it in all seriousness, that unless he insists upon securing a prompt investigation of the Brockville and Huron elections before there is an appeal to the people in order to give them a report upon that which lies at hand, and which is the gravamen of the whole charge, he might as well put a plea of guilty before the people of the country at once, and say that the reason that he changed his mind, that he changed the opinions of himself and of his friends behind him as to the propriety of referring this important question to the Committee on Privileges and Elections was for the purpose of preventing the electors from having that which they were entitled to have as to who had led and who had been behind these men who had led to such a perversion of justice in striking down the independent electors of this country. The right hon. gentleman has tried that on one or two occasions before. He has refused a judicial commission for the prompt investigation of matters brought before the House, but I can tell him that there is a higher court than even the hon. gentlemen who sit behind him, and that, as he stands to-day overwhelmed and condemned by a province that stood at his back a year ago, if he attempts to snatch a verdict from the electorate before the Huron and Brockville elections have been thoroughly examined into and reported upon by this commission, he will find himself in the same position and he will find that he has courted the same verdict from the independent electorate of the Dominion of Canada that he has received from the province of Manitoba in reference to his Minister of the Interior. I regret to be obliged to deal with this question with any heat, but, when you contrast the solemn

pledge given by the hon. gentleman, here, a short time ago, when he found that there was going to be a stampede of his followers who would not vote for the view of the hon. junior member for Halifax, when he declared in this House that there should be a prompt, a searching, a complete and a thorough investigation, with the position which he has taken to-day and with his refusal to conceive it to be his duty to bring in an Act to give these eminent judges power to control all these cases, it is evident that the Prime Minister misjudges the temper of the people if he thinks that any advantage can thus be secured for his party by thus postponing the evil day possibly until it may be too late to get the subject before the electorate. I regret more deeply than I can say, that the Prime Minister has turned a deaf ear to the moderate, reasonable suggestions that I made in order to implement the pledge which he himself gave to the House and without which that pledge is a mockery. I regret that my right hon. friend has taken such a course, and I say that it will fail, in my judgment, in securing any of the objects that he has in view. I said before, and I say now, that I have no objection to going back as far as by the commission is required. But here is a burning case, now alive, in which the whole country is interested, in regard to which a hundred witnesses have been examined, a case which has been practically established, and when you say that you will turn back several years in order that these facts upon which the country are feeling such a deep interest, I can tell my right hon. friend that he will entirely fail to secure the objects which he has in view. We hail with delight the appointment of this commission. If there is a man in the Liberal-Conservative party, I do not care what position he may occupy, against whom you can bring home such gigantic fraud and such scoundrelism as took place in the West Huron and Brockville elections, we want to see that man exposed and punished. I care not how far back you may go with your inquiry; you may go to the Greek Kalends if you like, but there never was a case where for the honour of the House of Commons of Canada, it is more necessary that the right hon. gentleman should, as he is in duty bound to do, have a prompt, thorough and complete investigation into these frauds that we know have taken place. We do not 'think' they have taken place, for we have the evidence before the House and the country that they have taken place, and I say that the perpetrators of these frauds—no matter how high the position they occupy, should be brought to condign punishment.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman conclude with a motion?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My right hon. friend can make a motion if he wishes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) while he was speaking, but I certainly would have done so if I thought he did not intend to conclude with a motion to adjourn the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Speaker, I will conclude with a motion if necessary. It is well, perhaps, that one or two observations should be made on what the leader of the opposition puts forward as defects in the composition of the commission, and in the powers which have been conferred upon it. If any evidence were wanting to satisfy the fair-minded members of this House that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has simply been indulging in political manoeuvring in this whole transaction, he has furnished that evidence to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. The hon. gentleman says that the professed object of the leader of the government is to pretend to make inquiry into these matters, but that he has so formed the instructions given to the commission that the commission must fail. The whole country knows that is not so. It is quite patent that the object of the leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has been to demand that some changes should be made in the language of the commission, so that in the event of these changes being accepted by the government, the hon. gentleman and his friends and his press could circulate broadcast throughout the country, that the government commission was defective in most important particulars and that it would have failed to make a proper inquiry were it not that the opposition forced the government to introduce the amending words.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Am I to understand that that is the ground on which they are refused?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is, undoubtedly, the object of the leader of the opposition in making these proposals. It is not that he believes there is anything of material importance in his suggestions; not that he believes there is any defect in the phraseology of the commission, or that its scope will be strengthened by these words, but that he might be able to say that he had compelled the government against their will to alter the commission and make it more perfect. Failing to do that, the hon. gentleman gets up in his place to say that the government has taken such a course that this inquiry will utterly fail in eliciting the facts and establishing the wrong-doing which he alleges to exist. Sir, the government is open to no charge in that direction. I can show, by a brief reference to the commission itself, and to the

law upon which it is framed, that there is no reason why this commission should be amended. If the government is convinced, as it is convinced, that every ground that it is proper and necessary to cover has been covered by this commission, and that every ground which fair-minded men think necessary has been covered; then, I want to know why we should yield to the request of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) to make some footy alterations, just to enable him to say that we have been compelled to make them at his demand.

After referring to the character of the inquiry that should be made, the commission goes on to say:

They may also inquire into 'any fraudulent conduct' in respect of the poll books, ballot boxes, or the lawful contents, or what should have been the lawful contents, of the ballot boxes.

Everything relating to the ballots, everything relating to the ballot boxes, everything relating to the poll books, and everything which it is necessary to inquire into for a full and thorough elucidation of all the facts, can be inquired into under these words. Do not the words 'fraudulent conduct of the parties' refer to fraudulent practices? If you use the word 'practices' a thousand times, would that word be any more expressive than fraudulent conduct? If you use the word 'means' would that be any? You have already got it, because the commission authorizes an inquiry into the fraudulent conduct, not of any one individual, but of all individuals. It is utterly ridiculous and absurd for the leader of the opposition to press any such contention before this parliament. He is addressing intelligent men; men who understand the meaning of the English language, and he ought to know, and he does know, that the very terms which the government have carefully framed in this commission are full and ample to cover everything he has suggested. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) asks: Why is there not some provision here with regard to the payment of witnesses? Let me tell him that there is every provision for that, when it is supplemented by an appropriation which the Prime Minister has assured the House and the hon. gentleman that he will ask parliament for. The money is to be voted for the purpose of paying the expenses of the commission, for the purpose of bringing the witnesses there and paying their expenses, and when it is voted it will be at the disposal of the commissioners, and can and will be applied towards paying the expenses of the witnesses on the one side as well as on the other. Is it not a frivolous pretense, is it not a hollow sham, to declare that unless there is something specially put in about paying the witnesses, the commissioners will not be warranted in doing so? You might as well say that the commissioners would not be warranted in paying counsel or officers of the court. When the appropriation is passed they will

have all the authority that is necessary to pay all the legitimate expenses that is necessary for carrying on the inquiry, and among the rest the paying of the witnesses. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) says also: You have limited the character of the counsel who may be employed, and you have perpetrated the outrage that you have compelled the commissioners to select Queen's counsel only. I do not know what are the conditions in Ontario—I suppose the lawyers will be from the Ontario bar—but, if the conditions in respect to the Ontario bar are the same as obtain in my own province, then you cannot get a lawyer of any eminence, you cannot get a gentleman whom you would employ for such a purpose who is not a Queen's counsel.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, my friend; I cannot afford the time, I have only got a moment. I would not admit that you could not find an able man in the Liberal party who is a Queen's counsel, and if you cannot find amongst the Conservatives a sufficiently astute and able lawyer among the Queen's counsel to efficiently discharge duties of this kind, then the bar must be in a very deplorable condition. However, I know better than that; I know it is not so. I know, too, that when you have the assurance that the lawyers chosen shall be Queen's counsel, you are giving a guarantee that the two most eminent men of the bar can be selected to discharge this duty.

The hon. gentleman tells us that proper provision has not been made for indemnifying the witnesses against prosecution. The hon. gentleman, or those who instructed him for his statement the other day, had not taken account of the Act, 52 Victoria, chapter 33, in amendment to chapter 114, reading in this way:

No witness examined before such commissioners shall be excused from answering any question put to him on the ground that the answer thereto may criminate or tend to criminate him; but no evidence so taken shall be admissible against any such witness in any criminal proceeding, except in the case of a witness charged with having given false evidence at any such inquiry, or with having procured, or attempted, or conspired, to procure the giving of such evidence.

That is as far as it would be proper for this commission to go, and as far as parliament authorizes it to go, in indemnifying a witness against any criminal prosecution for any evidence that he might give. It is there in the law, and why pass another law to the same effect? Would it not make the leader of this government ridiculous if he were to introduce a Bill to do what was already done several years ago? This amending Act of 52 Victoria, provides a full and ample indemnity to all persons who may give evidence before that commission. From a second remark which the hon. gentleman

made in this connection, I thought he expressed the opinion that we ought to go further and indemnify anybody from prosecution arising from evidence given before this commission. Did I so understand him?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman did not intend to go that far, which would be a most absurd and ridiculous length, he cannot go any further than to ask that the witness himself who gives evidence before the commission, shall be free from prosecution; and I do not think there is any lawyer on the other side of the House who will say that the words of this amending statute do not amply cover the ground.

My hon. friend says that these commissioners ought to use the evidence which has already been given before the committee of this House on Privileges and Elections, and draw all their deductions and conclusions from that evidence, and dispense with the necessity of bringing the same witnesses before the commission. There are very cogent reasons, which must be apparent to any gentleman who has had any experience in the trial of cases, why such a course of procedure would be exceedingly inexpedient, improper, and not attendant with the results which the hon. gentleman would have us believe he desires to accomplish. Such evidence would simply be read by the commissioners. That evidence contains all sorts of testimony—testimony which may have been legal or which may not have been legal, testimony which was proper, and testimony which was simply hearsay. It contains testimony which was admitted by the committee under circumstances which were not proper, favourable to the proper elucidation of the facts, or to the holding of a proper inquiry; and I will tell the House why I think so. When the question came before that committee as to whether certain witnesses should be compelled to state for whom they had voted, the question of the admissibility of that evidence was very properly raised by counsel. The result was that the newspapers of the opposition cried out that the committee were stifling inquiry; and the reason that evidence was admitted afterwards—I was present when a portion of the discussion took place, and also when the evidence was finally admitted—was not because in the opinion of the majority of the committee, it was proper or legal evidence, but because they felt that the whole object of the opposition and the opposition press, was to create the impression that the majority wished to suppress the evidence and stifle the inquiry, and, therefore, they felt that it would be better to allow of this violation of the law, rather than to put it in the power of hon. gentlemen opposite to represent to the country at large, who would not know the rights or the wrongs of the matter, that we

Mr. BLAIR.

had refused to permit everything to come out, or to allow the widest possible inquiry. My hon. friend says that it would be proper to allow this evidence to be used by the commission, and that we should pass a law for that purpose. I think he will search in vain throughout the whole legislation of this country or the mother country, to find an instance in which parliament undertook to pass *ex post facto* legislation for such a purpose. We would be taking away from electors the privilege of voting in secret, so that the way they cast their vote would not be known. We have no right to deprive them of that privilege. Therefore, the question with which the commission may properly deal, is a very simple one. If, under the law of the land it is proper to ask each witness, as he comes up, for whom he voted, and to do that in the absence of the ballots, and long after their destruction, then the commission will so judge; they will make their determination in accordance with the law, and not in violation of any principle or rule. You will be getting a solemn adjudication at the hands of gentlemen who are competent to make it, in accordance with the existing law of the land. If, on the other hand, this is not a question which may be properly asked, and answered, these commissioners will be able so to determine. But what the hon. gentleman asks us to do, is to introduce a law to have a retroactive operation, providing that the privilege which these men thought belonged to them when they cast their ballots, shall not continue to belong to them, but shall be taken from them, and that in this inquiry everybody will be compelled to state for whom he voted, whether he will or no. This would be unjust, and I think it might fairly be characterized as most iniquitous legislation. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman has no just reason to complain. The commission will be found amply to cover everything; and I hope the hon. gentleman and his friends, when they find how utterly futile and unreasonable have been the objections which he has made to this commission, and how fully it will cover all the ground, will be frank enough to acknowledge that these furious diatribes of his have been utterly unfounded. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Picton). The hon. gentleman who has just spoken introduced his speech with the remark that there was some manœuvring in this matter. The manœuvring, in my mind, is to sidetrack an investigation which had been begun under the auspices of this House, into the Brockville and West Huron elections. We were half way through the trial of those cases, when the government, for what reasons it is not now necessary to discuss, decided to stop without a conclusion of them; and public opinion was undoubtedly aroused to a very healthy condition, when it was learned that the government

did not intend to go further into matters, which, at any rate, looked serious enough to be sifted to the bottom, according to the pledge given by the Prime Minister last session. That subject came under discussion this year, and the government endeavoured to show the unfitness of the Committee on Privileges and Elections to deal with the cases of the West Huron and Brockville elections. The whole discussion was concerning those two elections. Some hon. gentlemen, supporting the government, endeavoured to use the tu quoque argument, and made counter charges which had never been sent to any committee, and were only thrown in as a last resort at a desperate stage of the debate, and finally, to the surprise of his followers, the right hon. the First Minister was forced to announce that these questions would go to a Royal Commission.

Why these other matters, to which I have referred, should have been imported into the commission at all I could never see, but the hon. the leader of the opposition and his supporters did not see fit to raise the slightest objection to the scope of the proposed commission going far beyond the West Huron and Brockville elections. And undoubtedly, the country will be amazed to learn that the government propose to break off the inquiry which parliament had begun, and take up matters of ancient history, comparatively, so that if the chronological order should suggest itself to the commission, they may think proper to begin at the beginning, and thus throw off from the public mind, for a long time, the consideration of the very matters that brought about the existence of the commission, and with which parliament was dealing last session, through one of its committees.

The hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) has made some statements which, coming from a lawyer, are of a very extraordinary character. He pretends that the statute chap. 33 of 52 Victoria could not have been read by the hon. the leader of the opposition or the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) when they pointed out in what respect the commission was defective. But, chap. 33 of 52 Victoria, when compared with the Imperial Act 15-16 Victoria, referred to by the leader of the opposition, and our own statute, chap. 10 of the Revised Statutes, will show that the Minister of Railways could not have given the attention and study to this subject which, being a lawyer, one would have expected him to do, and I am amazed that any Minister of Justice would have put his signature to the statement furnished by the present Minister of Justice. It is clear that if the minister read, as, no doubt, he did, 52 Victoria, chap. 33, he never read the Imperial Act to which the leader of the opposition referred or the clause in the Corrupt Practices Act which the leader of the opposition quoted.

We had 52 Victoria, chap. 33, before the House last year, and I then raised the same point with reference to the Ogilvie commis-

sion that my hon. friends have raised with reference to this commission. It was found in the Ogilvie matter, that the miners were handicapped and had to withdraw, because, in order to prove wrong-doing in the Yukon, they had to confess to being parties to it. Although it is provided in 52 Victoria, chap. 33, that if a man gave evidence it could not be used against him, that would not prevent an indictment being preferred against him for the offence he admitted having committed; and witnesses before the present commission will be in exactly the same position. Mr. Blake, who was a lawyer of equal standing at least to the Minister of Railways, saw that in connection with inquiries into corrupt practices, in which you are trying to ferret out crime, you must rely on criminals to a large extent, and use their evidence; and in order to obtain the fullest evidence the courts must have power, not merely to do as in ordinary cases of public inquiry, but to go further and absolutely pardon the witness, so that no indictment could be preferred or warrant proved against him. It is clear that this point was not considered by the Minister of Justice, when making out his written opinion; and when the Minister of Railways taunts the leader of the opposition with ignorance of the statutes, he has simply laid himself open to the charge of never having taken the trouble to read the Imperial statute to which the leader of the opposition referred, and which was followed by Mr. Blake in framing the Corrupt Practices Act. Take the clause in the statute referred to by the Minister of Railways, 52 Victoria, chap. 33:

No witness examined before such commissioners shall be excused from answering any question put to him on the ground that the answer thereto may criminate or tend to criminate him; but no evidence so taken shall be admissible against any such witness in any criminal proceeding, except in the case of a witness charged with having given false evidence at any such inquiry or with having procured, or attempted, or conspired, to procure the giving of such evidence.

Mr. Blake thoroughly understood that that did not go far enough, if you want it to get at the very bottom of corrupt practices. He understood that it is not sufficient to hold that bait out to a man who had been implicated in the fraud. You must put another power in the court, and that power was this, given in section 9, chap. 10 of the Revised Statutes, entitled 'an Act respecting Corrupt Practices at Elections':

Provided always, that when any witness answers every question relating to the matters aforesaid which he is required to answer, and the answer to which may criminate or tend to criminate him, shall be entitled to receive from the commissioners, under their hands, a certificate stating that he was, from this examination, required by them to answer one or more questions relating to the matters aforesaid, the answer or answers to which criminated or tended to criminate him, and had answered any such question; or if any information, indictment or penal action is at

any time thereafter pending in any court against such witness in respect of any corrupt practices committed by him previously to the time of his giving his evidence at any election concerning which he has been so examined, the court shall, on production and proof of such certificate, stay such proceedings, and may, in its discretion, award to him any costs to which he has been put; provided, that no statement made by any person in answer to any question put by the commissioners shall, except the case of an indictment for perjury, be admissible in evidence in any legal proceeding.

Now, any lawyer, or any layman for that matter, will see the difference between that clause, which empowers the court to grant a pardon on the spot as against criminal proceedings and the clause that stops short with prohibiting the evidence tending to incriminate being used against him, and leaves the man to be indicted and confronted with other evidence. And the start of the prosecution, the initiative, the detective work, may be the very evidence extracted from him on the stand. Consequently, as Mr. Blake says, if you are going to ferret into corrupt practices, you must go as far as the English Act has gone, and you must go a little farther in order to use the criminal whose evidence is so important. In 1876, Mr. Blake said :

We can see very clearly what the consequence of this may be. In the first place, it adds strength and vigour to his testimony, supposing he was guilty; in the second place, it proves the fact, morally, at any rate, that he is guilty, and is consequently some argument in favour of a more extensive indemnity clause. But whatever the argument may be, it is absolutely essential for this part of the investigation that there should be a clause to indemnify witnesses who attend and give evidence.

But not for witnesses who refuse to speak or who cannot claim a certificate of indemnity on other grounds. The case is one not of indemnity, but of privilege for the use of his evidence.

But not for witnesses who refuse to speak or who cannot claim a certificate of indemnity on other grounds,

So, it is clear that the Minister of Railways and Canals, who has spoken so positively, has never compared the legislation referred to by the leader of the opposition and has simply followed the very superficial—I say it with all respect,—opinion of the Minister of Justice on that point. Even in the case of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, which was not referred to by the Minister of Railways, but by the Prime Minister, I think, and also by the Minister of Justice. I have a word to say. There were very able lawyers in parliament when the Elections Act was put through this House, and the Prime Minister, I am sure, will remember, that, while there were no very positive opinions expressed as to what power a court would have over the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and over the parliamentary records and documents in his charge and custody, it was stated by eminent counsel, and it is the opinion of eminent

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

counsel to-day, that it might well be that an ordinary tribunal with the fullest power in connection with the trial causes would hesitate before dealing with a parliamentary officer and parliamentary documents; and, therefore to remove all doubts, to make it absolutely clear, there is, in a similar case, the trial of election petitions, express statutory provisions under which subpoenas run to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery; and by this legislation, all doubt is removed as to the power of the court to see that he obeys the subpoenas and produces these documents. So that, as was stated by the leader of the opposition, not that it was clear beyond all doubt that this commission would not have power to subpoena the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, but that it would be well, remembering the course that had been taken in the case of election petitions, to follow the precedent there set, and to pass an Act in this connection so as to remove all doubt and prevent these proceedings being wholly abortive. The suggestion put forward by the Minister of Railways and Canals to-day that, whether these suggestions of the leader of the opposition were good or bad, he, for one, as a member of the government, was afraid to adopt them, lest it should be said that he had been forced to do so by the leader of the opposition. A more humiliating statement never was made by a Minister of the Crown. I thought I could see a blush mantling the cheeks of his colleagues when such a reason was put forward. There is no other reason for not adopting these suggestions, for not following the former practice in these cases, for not removing all doubts and making the matter clear and certain. After parliament has been prorogued, if these doubts are well founded, the business of this commission may come to a very sudden end, and delay be caused for which, I am sure, the public will hold the government accountable.

Then, in connection with the pay of witnesses,—there is no other reason against it except the ridiculous reason given by the Minister of Railways and Canals. It is true that you may make provisions by an Act of Supply for the payment of any one, including witnesses; but what happened in the Ogilvie case? They had money galore; when money was wanted for any purpose whatever, in connection with the Yukon it was forthcoming one way or the other. But witnesses appealed to the commission, appealed to the legal officer representing the government sitting with him for their expenses and their fees, putting before them the great loss of money and time they were put to. Many witnesses could not be got because of the lack of money. And months and months elapsed after the commission had closed before a dollar was paid to any of the witnesses, and then it was only paid to those who had run the risk and attended. This is a point of the legislation that the government has overlooked, and the Minister

of Justice has overlooked. By the course that the government propose to follow, instead of the matter being left in the hands of the commission, it is left in the hands of the government. The Corrupt Practices Act contains provisions that the Supply Bill will not have. The provisions of the Supply Bill must be carried out by officers of this government; they must be put in force in accordance with the form and ceremonies of the Auditor General's office as in connection with all government expenditure. But, in the case of the Corrupt Practices Act, as pointed out by Mr. Blake, the court has statutory authority over all the procedure, including the payment of witnesses and paying for assistants in the way of witnesses. The Minister of Railways and Canals suggested that parliament would vote an amount that could be resorted to. No one suggested—certainly the leader of the opposition did not—that parliament would prorogue without making full provision for all expenses. The point is that in England and Canada this ample power for obtaining evidence was handed over to the commission. The First Minister says: We want to leave so much for the commission; we do not want to interfere. Why not, then, give them such power as such commissions usually have in the case of inquiries into corrupt practices, and not put the commissioners in the position of making requisitions to the government for the amount voted in supply, the government taking the responsibility, as would be necessary under the Supply Bill, as to how this money was to be expended. Then the Minister of Railways and Canals was driven to some extraordinary statements respecting the observations of the leader of the opposition as to counsel. Now the Prime Minister will, I am sure, do the leader of the opposition the justice to say that he never in the slightest manner questioned the propriety of naming Queen's counsel on the commission. The leader of the opposition, in his reference to Queen's counsel, had simply in view as he expressed it, another argument on another point, and that was that the government was not consistently following the idea suggested by the Prime Minister of not controlling this commission in any way; that because it named Queen's counsel it had undertaken to limit the authority of the judges, it would not give them in that regard unlimited discretion; and if they had limited their discretion, why did the government refuse his suggestion that a counsel named by the leader of the government on one side, and another named by the leader of the opposition on the other side should be employed by the commission? The Minister of Railways and Canals was so desperately driven that he misrepresents entirely the views of the opposition by saying that we had objected to Queen's counsel being employed. No one ever made such an absurd suggestion, and no one but the Minister of

Railways and Canals ever thought that any one could make it.

Then in regard to the use of evidence. Again the extraordinary confession is made that though the government had a parliamentary majority on the Privileges and Elections Committee when the Huron and Brockville elections cases were before them, and though they all entertained the strongest views in regard to the character of the evidence that should be produced there, they were afraid to advocate or carry out those views, and they bowed to public opinion; because the opposition press had lashed on public opinion and shown the cowardice of the government, therefore, the government did what was entirely wrong. But now, defying public opinion altogether, they propose to resort to this commission, and relying on the law as laid down in the Haldimand case, if it be applicable, that the judges, as buffers between them and the public, will prevent this evidence being given, the leader of the opposition contended that whatever the law might be in the courts this thorough probing, this full investigation, could not be made unless that evidence be given. Parliament undoubtedly has control and discretion to receive any evidence it pleases. But there is to be a nice question, if you please. This is shoved from the Election Committee of this House and given to a Royal Commission because of one reason only that is given here—it partakes of a partisan character. But we find in this debate that there are other reasons for referring it to that commission, and that commission is to be cribbed, cabined and confined, that commission is to be restricted, it is to be shorn of its powers in other respects, and instead of a wide tribunal, there is to be the narrowest possible tribunal, subject to all the technical rules of evidence. Is that what the public wish? Has any part of the public for a moment suggested or inferred that when this matter was relegated from a partisan tribunal to a non-partisan tribunal, there would not be given to that non-partisan tribunal the fullest powers that our own committee had for the ascertainment of the truth in regard to these charges? I think the public will be shocked when they find that not only is there to be a narrowing down of the scope of the inquiry, a limitation of the powers of that investigating tribunal as compared with our own, a deprivation of those advantages, and aids, and assistance which are usually given to tribunals appointed for the investigation of corrupt practices, but there is a suggestion from the Treasury benches that they are not to probe into this matter at all by means of the advantages of examining persons as to how they voted in connection with charges of switching ballots, and so forth.

Then the other objection mentioned by the Minister of Railways and Canals was

that this evidence was very bulky, that a great deal of it was irrelevant. Well, is it to be supposed that any importance could be given by this commission to such evidence? Does any one wish to give importance to irrelevant evidence? Will they not be able to sift that as well as the evidence that may be produced before them? And all this talk about bringing witnesses is met fully by machinery in the courts adopted every day in connection with the most important matters. Where, for instance, you have witnesses at a distance, witnesses who are dead, witnesses that cannot be got, you may by commission obtain all that evidence; and here is evidence obtained by a commission at great cost, ready at hand. At one time the argument of expenditure was dwelt on by the Minister of Railways and Canals. I think it was stated that this evidence had cost \$10,000. Now, we have a proposition that this evidence shall cost \$10,000 more, and that that money shall be absolutely wasted, that that evidence taken shall under no circumstances, be used by this commission. I think the public will see through that just about as quickly as this House. We certainly can see through it without much difficulty.

Now, the hon. gentleman referred to the scope of this commission, and if there be anything in it, there remains nothing but the extraordinary objection that they will not accept a suggestion in this matter from the opposition. Well, I hope the public will take note of that. We have got down to this condition of things, that the government are afraid to take a suggestion from the opposition lest it might be supposed that it was forced on them by the opposition. Now, what is the position of the government in regard to the suggestion by the leader of the opposition? The Minister of Railways and Canals endeavoured to show by a reference to two or three lines of that commission that it covered not merely the fact of a corrupt act—it undoubtedly does that. For instance, the stuffing of a ballot box is covered. But the point, if I understand the leader of the opposition, is this; It may be, from the language used as to that, that as soon as it is proved that a corrupt act has been committed and there has been a switching or stuffing of ballots by John B, you may not call the evidence to show that John C combined with John B to do this criminal and improper act, that you may not show that there was an organization, for instance, for carrying out a crime. And how can this commission report on what we desire to be investigated, so as to guard ourselves against the repetition of the methods of an organization which is corrupt and criminal? Is there any danger that by this language they will be confined and consider themselves confined to acts themselves and nothing else. Now, for instance, supposing the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), and the hon.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland), had undoubtedly conspired with these men to go into all these rascalities, had paid them for their wrong-doing, and actively engaged them in all these schemes, is there any language that would permit the judges, if it were established that wrong had been done, to go beyond merely that wrongful act?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Undoubtedly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think so, and I will give you my reasons.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Undoubtedly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) gave us two or three words, in which he argued that the language was sufficient, and he said that there was here power enough to cover the widest scope suggested by the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition, but he would not adopt it lest it should be said that the hon. leader of the opposition had forced this upon the government. The commission begins by reciting that in elections:

Frauds were committed by returning officers, deputy returning officers or other parties in several of the electoral districts either while the votes were being polled or thereafter by the spoiling of the ballots marked by the electors—

That is one case.

—or by the fraudulent substitution of other ballots for those so marked—

That is another case.

—or by other fraudulent conduct in respect of the ballots at any time before and up to the return of the writ.

That is another case. All this is the language read by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. These are the only cases in which the language is specific.

The PRIME MINISTER. Read on.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (reading):

And it being most desirable—

The PRIME MINISTER. No, that is not it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am reading the language of this commission, because I cannot follow the construction which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals put upon it:

And it being most desirable that all such alleged frauds should be investigated, and the recurrence thereof, if any, prevented—

That is where I would look primarily for the scope.

The PRIME MINISTER. But, my hon. friend did not read it all:

—or by reason of any fraudulent conduct—

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** I have read it.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** No, you did not read this :

—or by reason of any fraudulent conduct in respect of the poll books, ballot boxes or the lawful contents, or what should have been the lawful contents, of the ballot boxes.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** That is not in the first paragraph.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** It is in the commission.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** I am reading from the 'order in council appointing a commission to investigate election frauds.'

**The PRIME MINISTER.** You will find a copy of the commission at page 6569 of *Hansard*.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** That is not the copy I have. I am reading from the order in council printed for distribution amongst members. Let us begin at the beginning. This commission cannot go any farther than the order in council goes.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I have it here, and my hon. friend has left out that portion which I read.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** I will come to that. Whatever may be in the commission, it gets its force and strength from the order in council. There is no question that this is not correct, because it is a document printed by order of parliament.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding).** Does that profess to be the order in council or the commission ?

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** It is the order in council.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** That is what we have in *Hansard*, and it should be the same.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** I will read it again.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** That is the preamble you are reading from.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (reading) :**

On a memorandum, dated June 2, 1900, from the Minister of Justice, submitting that whereas allegations have been made that during and for several years prior and subsequent to the general elections of 1896 for the election of members to the House of Commons of Canada, frauds were committed by returning officers, deputy returning officers, or other parties—

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** Does not that include everybody ?

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (reading) :**

—in several of the electoral districts, either while the votes were being polled or thereafter,

by the spoiling of the ballots marked by the electors, or by the fraudulent substitution of other ballots for those so marked, or by other fraudulent conduct in respect of the ballots at any time before and up to the return of the writ, and it being most desirable that all such alleged frauds should be investigated, and the recurrence thereof, if any, prevented, to the end that the return may show the actual vote by the electors who vote in each electoral district:—

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** That is merely the preamble.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Read the enacting part.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (reading) :**

—to inquire into and investigate any alleged fraudulent alteration, defacing, marking, spoiling, substitution or tampering in respect of election ballots, or by reason of any fraudulent conduct in respect of the poll books, ballot boxes, or the lawful contents, or what should have been the lawful contents—

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Hear, hear.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (reading) :**

—of the ballot boxes, whether by way of fraudulent alteration, addition, withdrawal or otherwise, during and until the close of the election, and until the return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

I do not think it has been presented to this House at any time as a positive opinion, as positive as lawyers can be, that the government are wrong and that the opposition are right in the construction of this language, but the argument advanced from this side of the House was that it might possibly be, and it seems to me, and with abundant reason, that this particular language that I have now read confines the commission to those acts that are specified. I am not speaking even as positively as a lawyer might speak. I say that there is room for doubt. No one will say that it is clear, that it is beyond all cavil or question, that it covers what the language suggested by the hon. leader of the opposition covers, and, consequently, will the government stubbornly stand out and say: We all construe it as you do, we think it bears the interpretation you wish to put upon it, but we will not use your language lest it be said in the country that you had forced something upon us? That is not a creditable position for the government to take. If we are all one as to what we want investigated, why not accept the two or three words which have been suggested, which would remove all doubt and estop up from afterwards using the argument which we would be bound to use if this turns out as we say, that the government have not intended to allow these commissioners to go beyond actual acts committed by these different officers. They have power; there is no question about their power. Here is a case in which the government have power to act. I need not refer to the hon. member

for Halifax, a gentleman holding a responsible position in the profession, having suggested doubts. In that commission why not remove all doubts and throw away all reason for cavil or complaint in regard to a matter that concerns us all equally, and adopt the amendment proposed by the addition of these few words?

Mr. McNEILL. What are the words which it is proposed to add?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The exact words are very few. Coming after the last language I read, it is proposed to add 'and any fraudulent practices, persons or matters connected therewith.' That is what they do not want; at least, that is what the country will say. I was not proposing it in that spirit, but, undoubtedly, I shall come to that conclusion if their only reason for rejecting our suggestion is that it may be suggested that we forced it upon them. We certainly have the right to make suggestions in parliament, and the government is bound, in fair-play and honour, to adopt them unless the suggestions are wrong. Here the government profess to have in view what we have in view, and if this language would be satisfactory to our side of the House and there is no objection to it, why not use it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I regret the temper with which this question has been approached by the leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), and in a minor degree by my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). I do not think the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), was happy when he spoke of the judges as being buffers between the government and public opinion. The judges selected are of the highest character possible.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As to whether I showed any improper temper, that is a matter of criticism. None was intended. As to my reference to the judges, nothing was further from my thoughts than to use the slightest language directly or indirectly by way of insinuation or otherwise, that would suggest that I had any other opinion of them, than that they would do their duty. I used the word 'buffers,' as in no sense reflecting on them, but as to the language of this commission in hampering them in the discharge of their duties.

The PRIME MINISTER. I accept the explanation as fully as the hon. gentleman puts it, but I still think the expression was unfortunate as applied to the eminent men who compose the commission. Temper was uncalled for in this debate, because there is no disposition on the part of the government to do anything else than to have the fullest inquiry, applying to all parties—applying to accomplices as well as to prime factors, who have been actually guilty of fraud. Let us discuss, in a judicial way, the observations which have been made by the hon. the leader

of the opposition. First, as to the scope of the inquiry. The hon. gentleman suggests that we ought to add to the commission, the following few words. 'That the inquiry should extend to any corrupt practices, persons or means connected therewith.' I will not enter into a criticism of the verblage, but I will take the sense of the proposal. The sense of the hon. gentleman's suggestion is that the commission should be searching and should apply to all parties—to those who have been actually guilty, as well as to those who have been instrumental in procuring the guilt of others. I may say by way of preface, that I am sorry that I have to discuss this matter at all, because I would prefer to have it discussed by the legal officer of the government, and by gentlemen versed in the law on the other side. I call attention to the wording of the commission:

—be appointed commissioners under the said Act in respect of the election of members for the House of Commons of Canada, to inquire into and investigate any alleged fraudulent alteration, defacing, marking, spoiling, substitution or tampering in respect of election ballots, or by reason of any fraudulent conduct—

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). What does that 'by' mean: 'Or by reason of any fraudulent conduct.' What?—by reason of any fraudulent conduct.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think my hon. friend has exercised his ingenuity in constructing these words. However, that is a new criticism. The criticism of the leader of the opposition was that the commission was not wide enough to include accomplices:

—or by reason of any fraudulent conduct in respect of the poll books, ballot boxes, or the lawful contents, or what should have been the lawful contents, of the ballot boxes.

'What should have been the lawful contents of the ballot boxes,' is broad enough to include all categories of offenders. The moment you give power to the commissioners to investigate the conduct of those who may have been connected with what should have been the lawful contents of the ballot boxes, you bring in every one who in any way attempted to interfere with the lawful contents. The lawful contents of the ballot boxes are the honest votes of the electors, and you give the power to the commissioners to investigate the conduct of all persons, and of any person who attempted to remove what should have been the lawful contents of the ballot boxes. In other words, if there is any conspiracy whatever between the parties who committed the deed and the parties who instigated the deed, then, the language of the commission gives power to the commissioners to investigate the conduct of such persons. It seems to me that the words are just as broad as it is possible to make them. At all events, what I did to-day was merely to bring down the opinion of the Minister of Justice on the points that have been raised previously. Lawyers as doctors will

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

disagree, and an ingenious lawyer can very often drive a coach and four through any Act of parliament; but after all, common sense must be applied to the interpretations of our statutes, and if you apply the ordinary laws of common sense here, it seems to me that the opinion of the Minister of Justice is fully substantiated, and that the language of the commission embodies exactly the idea of the hon. the leader of the opposition.

Mr. POWELL. I really cannot understand; I am honest about the matter, and I do not think the Prime Minister himself can understand this clause. Is it meant to inquire into 'fraudulent practices respecting the poll-books, ballot boxes, or the lawful contents or what should have been the lawful contents of the ballot boxes?' Does the inquiry mean to go into that?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Mr. POWELL. Then what is the significance of the meaning of the words: 'Or by reason of any fraudulent conduct?'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). They appear to be surplusage.

Mr. POWELL. It is worse than surplusage. It is limiting the proceedings in some way. The words destroy the sense.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will not discuss that matter just now. My attention was called the other day to certain objections made by the leader of the opposition, which were referred for an opinion to the Minister of Justice, and my hon. friend (Mr. Powell), brings up a new objection now. That is a question for the Minister of Justice, and for the lawyers on the other side of the House. I am simply dealing now with the objections advanced the other day by the leader of the opposition. I failed to understand the argument of my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), as to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery which was to the effect that an ordinary court of justice might hesitate to issue an order of subpoena to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. There is no doubt that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is an officer of the Crown, and not an officer of parliament. And if he is an officer of the Crown, the moment the commission gave the power to the judges to summon him, the objection is met. He being an officer of the Crown, then the Crown can delegate to the judges the power to summon him, and he is bound to appear. Now as to the indemnity of the witnesses. That is not part of the commission, because I assume there can be no doubt whatever, that all the expenses connected with the commission—the payment of the commissioners, the registrar, the stenographer and the witnesses—must be provided for by this parliament; and the appropriation which we are to make must be ample to cover all the expenses, and must be placed at the disposal of the commission themselves, to be applied as they,

in their judgment, deem best. So that I do not see what can be the hon. gentleman's objection on this point.

Then, my hon. friend would have us introduce legislation to compel witnesses to divulge the secrecy of the ballot. This is a question which has been before the courts for several years, and the law on the point is not quite certain. Some judges have held that the secrecy of the ballot could not be broken; others have held the opposite. Under these circumstances, I think it would not be advisable for us to introduce ex post facto legislation, and have a new law to apply to facts which arose a few years ago. The witnesses called before this commission will have to testify to what took place under the law as it was when they were called upon to cast their ballots. Any ex post facto legislation is always dangerous. Parliament will not resort to it in matters of substance; we can perhaps do so in matters of procedure; but the Minister of Justice has come to the conclusion, in which I fully share, that we had better leave the eminent judges who compose the commission to apply the law as they deem it to be. Last year the Committee on Privileges and Elections determined that the law permitted them to force the witnesses to give evidence as to how they had voted. Their judgment on that point was either right or wrong; at all events, that was their judgment; and we may safely leave the eminent men who compose the commission to determine by their own judgment what the law is on that point. If they determine that they have power to compel witnesses to give evidence as to how they voted, they will compel them; but if they determine that under the law which existed in 1896, 1897, 1898 and 1899, no voter could be compelled under any circumstances to state how he voted, I think parliament should not pass a law to compel a voter to give evidence which, under the law which existed at the time he voted, he would not be compelled to give.

My hon. friend also objected that we do not compel the commission to take advantage of the evidence given before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I submit to my hon. friend, as a matter of justice, whether he thinks it is fair or right, when the judges themselves are empowered under this commission to investigate this matter, to require them to use the evidence of witnesses whom they have not had the opportunity of hearing and seeing. It is a principle of law which every one deems to be fair and useful, that the party who is to give the verdict in any case should see the witness for himself, so as to form an opinion as to his credibility by his demeanour in the box. I contend that this is one of the strongest elements of procedure for arriving at truth and justice; and therefore, I submit that the ends of justice would not be so well served by the procedure which my hon. friend wishes us to adopt as

they would by having the witnesses give their evidence in their own way before the commission.

My hon. friend has spoken very strongly in favour of the view that we should direct the commissioners how they are to proceed—that we are to tell them to proceed in one case before another. I repeat that in this matter we have thought it preferable to leave the judges absolutely untrammelled. They know the cases; they have become public property. All interested parties can go and lay complaints before them. They know the state of public opinion; they cannot be ignorant of what is current history; and we leave them without any instruction, from the government or the opposition or anybody else, to proceed in the way in which, in their own judgment and conscience, will be most conducive to the public interest. For this reason, I do not think it is advisable, notwithstanding the strong language used by my hon. friend, to give the commission any specific instructions, but to leave them absolutely free and untrammelled.

I would say the same thing as to the appointment of counsel. The hon. gentleman has suggested again to-day that he should be allowed to select a lawyer and I another. Does he not think that in this, as in everything else, we can safely leave the selection to the judges themselves. They know that there are two parties in this matter; they know that party spirit runs high in this country; but they also know that constitutional government cannot be carried on except by party; therefore we think it is better to leave them to select the counsel who, in their opinion will be best qualified to assist them in carrying on the investigation. The judges are all from the province of Ontario, because the offences which they will be charged to investigate chiefly occurred in the province of Ontario. They are perfectly familiar with the members of the bar of that province, and they know better than either my hon. friend or I can know, who will be the best counsel to advise them. The government therefore, do not think that it would be advisable to change the instructions which we have given to the judges, but they think it better to leave them absolutely free and untrammelled. With regard to the scope of the inquiry, the Minister of Justice has come to the conclusion that it is ample.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** The Prime Minister has not referred to the statement, which I think, was not unfairly made, that the Minister of Justice could not have made a comparison between those two statutes. He does not profess to have done so.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I am glad my hon. friend has called my attention to that. I never understood it as it was presented a moment ago by my hon. friend from Pictou, who says that the indemnity to wit-

**Sir WILFRID LAURIER.**

nesses, given by the Act 33 Victoria, chapter 32, of 1889, is not as ample as the indemnity given in cases of corrupt practices. That may be, and I will call the attention of the Minister of Justice to that point. But I have to say this at present to my hon. friend. The Act for the investigation of corrupt practices is an Act which dates from the year 1876. The Act relating to investigations by royal commissions is an old Act, which has been on the statute-book for many years. The last Act is chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes, which was consolidated in 1886. The other Act for the investigation into corrupt practices was passed in 1876, and also incorporated in the Consolidated Statutes of 1886. The two Acts were in the Statutes of 1889. Then the late Sir John Thompson, who was Minister of Justice at the time, thought it advisable to amend chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes providing for the investigations by royal commissions. He amended it in certain particulars so as to give greater latitude to witnesses. He amended it in this way:

No witness examined before such commissioners, or before any commissioners appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of any province of Canada to conduct an inquiry into and concerning the good government of such province, or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof, or the administration of justice therein, or in reference to any municipal matter, shall be excused from answering any question put to him on the ground that the answer thereto may criminate or tend to criminate him; but no evidence so taken shall be admissible against any such witness in any criminal proceeding, except in the case of a witness charged with having given false evidence at any such inquiry, or with having procured, or attempted, or conspired, to procure the giving of such evidence.

When Sir John Thompson introduced that amendment, he had before his eyes the Act for the investigation of corrupt practices, and did not think it advisable to extend the provisions of that Act into the amendment he was proposing to chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes, but rather limited that Act by his amendment which I have just read.

My hon. friend says that the law does not go far enough. He says that the Act of 1889 should have gone further. He says that chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes should have contained the same provisions as the Act for the investigation of corrupt practices. Well, that is a point upon which I am not prepared to give an opinion at this moment. The amendment of 1889 appeared sufficient to the Minister of Justice of that day, whose authority nobody will question, and in face of that I am not surprised that my hon. colleague, the Minister of Justice, thought it safe to follow the precedent set by Sir John Thompson. The point, however, is one which requires some consideration, and I will refer it to the Minister of Justice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. My right hon. friend has interpreted one part of my argument incorrectly. I did not quarrel with the amendment of 1889 as an amendment to the general Act, but I pointed out that this general Act refers to public inquiries in general, but that when we come down to specific acts of corruption, there is necessity for a provision such as Mr. Blake introduced into his Corrupt Practices Act, and which might not be necessary in an Act dealing with public inquiries generally.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). There is a strong impression in the country to-day, due to the result of the commission appointed by the provincial government in Ontario, that these commissions are issued for the purpose of preventing information coming out rather than eliciting it. As regards giving the commission greater scope, so long as that will not have the effect of preventing facts coming to light, which we desire to see ventilated, the public hail the suggestion with approval, but it is the bounden duty of the government to see that the widest possible scope is given this commission for the purpose of eliciting the facts. The enlargement of the commission, therefore, cannot be too great, and no doubt it will do its work better, if it is enlarged in every direction, than if it is circumscribed, as we believe the wording of the commission does circumscribe it to-day.

Then, the public will expect that the West Huron and Brockville elections should be the first inquired into. These are the two special elections in which the corrupt practices took place over which the country is so much exercised. There are two members representing these constituencies in this House to-day, although the information brought to us clearly indicates that they are sitting here by virtue of the most corrupt scandalous political practices ever perpetrated in Canada. It is therefore desirable, in order that the fullest light should be thrown upon these practices, and that all the facts should be in possession of the electorate before the next general election, that this commission should begin at once its work in these constituencies.

The desire has been expressed that the investigation should go back further. Well, we on this side have not the least objection to the commission going back any length of time or calling before them any witnesses, politicians or others, who have taken any part whatever in the elections, either before or since 1896. But I think it is of the most vital importance that the conduct of these two elections of West Huron and Brockville, which are the ones that really gave rise to this commission, shall be the first inquired into, and that the finding of the commission should be put before the people before they are called upon to give their verdict at the next general elections. Unless that is done, the con-

clusion will inevitably be reached by the public that the government desire to prevent the facts, which were partly investigated by a committee of this House last year, being made public until after they have gone before the people.

The hon. the Minister of Railways took the position, which I thought was rather a strange one for a lawyer to take, that the law of the land never contemplated that the secrecy of the ballot should be violated, and gave in support of his argument the ruling of the court in the Haldimand election, and he followed his argument up by an appeal to us to trust to the wisdom and judgment of the commissioners who are able judges, as to the interpretation of the law. But it is a matter of vital importance to the country whether the law ever contemplated that the secrecy of the ballot should be exposed or not, and if that be the intention of the Ballot Act, let me say that the secrecy of the ballot is of very small importance in the minds of the electorate compared with the ferreting out of the frauds committed during elections and the punishment of the guilty parties. And, if necessary, the Ballot Act should be so amended that there will be no hindrance to the bringing out of the evidence and the information the people desire should be brought to light. What the people want is to have the whole truth laid before them.

And even though it may never have been contemplated that the secrecy of the ballot should be infringed, I hold that that secrecy should not be held for one moment to prevent the commissioners going behind the ballot and asking every man how he voted and expecting him to answer, if it is necessary to bring out the information that is desirable in connection with these election frauds. The country wants this information brought out, and if the commissioners fail to bring it out by reason of the failure of the government to make the scope of the commission wide enough or to amend any law that may stand in the way, the public will hold the government responsible. Another question was to allow the commissioners to be charged with the responsibility for selecting their own counsel. We have had an example of this course in the commission that has been sitting lately in the province of Ontario. That commission, I venture to say, has been a perfect farce.

Mr. COWAN. How?

Mr. SPROULE. By reason of the very limited scope given to the commissioner, and because the different political parties were not allowed to select counsel who, if they had been selected, might have brought out information which it was desirable should be made public, but which is not now brought out. There are lawyers who have been connected with these matters for months and years, and have become experts, as it were, in that line. They are in possession of a great deal of information

which enables them to ferret out wrongdoing that could not be brought to light by others. Yet these are the men who, it is very likely, under this commission, would not be selected by the commissioners. The people will be justified in coming to the conclusion that the government, in not allowing each political party to appoint its own lawyer, desired rather to prevent information being brought out than to make the facts of the case public. The Minister of Railways and Canals says: Oh, if we accept suggestions from the opposition, it will be said that we had to accept suggestions from that source. Why, if the suggestions are good, what matter it where they come from? What will the country care who makes the suggestions, so long as the work is well done? It is desirable that all suggestions should be adopted that will better enable the commission to do efficiently the work with which they are charged. If the results are to bring out facts that the public should know and that would not otherwise be brought out, then, these suggestions should be acted upon. The excuse given by the Minister of Railways and Canals was the most flimsy answer ever made to an argument in this House, and it is one that will not satisfy the country nor will it satisfy the intelligent members of this House. The government should be willing to accept all suggestions and enlarge the scope of the commission in any useful direction. They cannot bring out too much information or lay bare too many of these nefarious transactions. I need hardly give my interpretation of the law, because, I suppose, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) would set little value upon it. But, I venture to say, and I have as good a right to say it as any member of the House, even any lawyer in this House, that if the commissioners were to act strictly under the language of the commission, they could not go beyond the conduct of the officials connected with the election. They would not be able to find out who gave the money to Pritchett and Macdonald, and who raised the money—they could not inquire where the conspiracy first originated, who outlined the plan and got others to carry it out, and, in carrying it out, to perpetrate these fraudulent and corrupt acts. It is believed, by the people, properly or improperly, that certain ministers of the Crown are indirectly connected with this and responsible for it. That is a matter of common conversation and common belief. Yet, acting under the scope of this commission, the commissioners could not go so far as to inquire into that matter. So long as the language thus circumscribed the powers of the commission the government will be held responsible for not enlarging the scope of the commission to the extent the leader of the opposition desires should be done.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). I would like to call the at-

Mr. SPROULE.

tention of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the wording of this commission. If he will look at it, I think he will see that my hon. and learned friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) was not supererogatory in calling attention to it. It is an extraordinary jumble of ungrammatical construction. It says:

—to inquire into and investigate any alleged fraudulent alteration, defacing, marking, spoiling, substitution or tampering in respect of election ballots, or by reason of any fraudulent conduct in respect of the poll books, ballot boxes, or the lawful contents, or what should have been the lawful contents, of the ballot boxes, whether by way of fraudulent alteration, addition, withdrawal or otherwise.

I think if he will call the attention of the gentleman who is responsible for the drafting of the commission to the jumble, that gentleman will see that the language requires to be recast. For instance, the form of expression is departed from in the first clause:

To inquire into and investigate any alleged fraudulent alteration, defacing, marking, spoiling—

There you are using the present participle. Then we come to—

—substitution—

And then we revert to the present participle—

—defacing, marking, spoiling or tampering in respect of election ballots—

—and so on. Now, let us analyse that clause. It runs thus—the judges are to inquire into and investigate any alleged fraudulent alterations in respect of election ballots, defacing in respect of election ballots, marking in respect of election ballots, spoiling in respect of election ballots, substitution in respect of election ballots or tampering in respect of election ballots. Then you come to:

—or by reason of any fraudulent conduct.

And so on. What do you connect 'or by reason of' with? 'By reason of,' if excised, will make the sentence better.

The PRIME MINISTER. It may make it better, possibly.

Mr. DAVIN. One word as to the scope of the commission. Surely the right hon. gentleman is not going to confine this inquiry, which the public and parliament thought would relate to fraudulent practices in elections, and to every kind of corruption that can mar the efficacy of our electoral system. Is it to be confined? You make your commission, and you are going to confine it merely to irregularities connected with the marking, or spoiling or substitution of ballots. It seems to me that is not what the public expects, and it is not what parliament expected; and surely it is not what is called for in the interest of the purifying of our electoral system. Nothing can be clearer than that our electoral system has been got hold of by conspirators against the freedom of the electorate. The public mind is deeply impressed with it, and it is not enough that

this commission has to inquire only into irregularities that may be perpetrated by those who are, after all, only the instruments of the worst criminals in these matters, only the persons that will be employed. For instance, Pritchett's conduct would come under the scope of this inquiry, and the ballot-slipper would come under its scope; but the men that set these criminals at work, I do not think this language would cover their conduct. I think it will be confined to such men as Pritchett and Cummings. The evidence all taken shows that these men are merely creatures of far worse criminals. Take, for instance, Preston—I do not see how this commission will be able to inquire into the achievements of Preston; and yet, unless the universal impression is altogether astray, Preston belongs to a class of men whom it is most desirable to strike. the large culprits, the heroes of all this infamy, these are the men it is desirable to strike. And here we are having three judges, two of them judges of the Superior Court and one of them a county court judge, assisted by counsel, who are going to inquire into the conduct of the minor villain, and the large culprits, the heroes of all this infamy, are to be let go. I should be very glad if the Prime Minister, or anybody on those benches, will be able to show that the conduct of these men will be inquired into.

To inquire into and investigate any alleged fraudulent alteration, defacing, marking, spoiling, substitution or tampering in respect of election ballots, or by reason of any fraudulent conduct in respect of the poll books, ballot boxes—

We are still confined to misconduct in respect of ballots, tampering with them in any way, interfering with them or the ballot box.

—or the lawful contents, or what should have been the lawful contents, of the ballot boxes, whether by way of fraudulent alteration, withdrawal or otherwise.

Still confined to manipulation. The conduct of the men, therefore, that would set the Pritchetts and the Cummings at work, would be entirely outside this commission, and therein the commission would be altogether too narrow.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). I should like just to make one remark before this discussion closes. I think we are now discussing, without any doubt, the most important question of domestic politics that can possibly engage the attention of this parliament; and I think that, under such circumstances, both sides of the House ought to join together to endeavour, if possible, to eliminate any chance of a complete breakdown of this investigation—or a miscarriage of justice, as an hon. member suggests. Now, my right hon. friend, I think, sees himself that there is, at least, a great deal of force in the arguments that have been brought forward on this side of the House to show that these words do not go as far as we would wish them to go, and as my

right hon. friend wishes them to go. Now, just take these words and read them, and I would ask my right hon. friend himself if he is prepared to say that they are without doubt,

To inquire into and investigate any alleged fraudulent alteration, defacing, marking, spoiling, substitution or tampering in respect of election ballots—

Let us suppose that the clause stops there.

The PRIME MINISTER. But it does not.

Mr. McNEILL. Let us suppose, in the first instance, that it does. Would my right hon. friend say that these words are devoid of doubt?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. McNEILL. Very well, now let us take the second part of the clause. That has not reference to the ballot,—dealing with the ballot itself; it has reference to dealing with the ballot box, or the contents of the ballot box.

The PRIME MINISTER. Or, what should have been the contents. That is broad enough to cover everything.

Mr. McNEILL. In that case, my right hon. friend implies that the first part of the clause is mere tautology, is not required at all. If this second part of the clause, 'the ballot box or the lawful contents,' covers the whole ground, then the first part is tautology. The judges will not hold that. I think it is clear the judges will hold that this has reference to the ballot box as distinguished from the action upon the ballot itself before it is placed in the box. It seems to me that it is, at all events, very doubtful, to say the least of it, whether these words will go as far as the House wishes them to go; and if there be any doubt, why in the world should we hesitate to put in words which will remove that doubt altogether? I do not pay the slightest attention to the suggestion that was made, that the opposition desired to show that they have forced the government to do something which the government were desirous of not doing. We all understand that in cases where Bills are brought forward, or any document is brought before the House, it is the duty of both sides to endeavour to have that Bill or document so framed that there shall be no misapprehension as to its meaning. Now, under the circumstances, why in the world should my right hon. friend insist upon having this clause so framed as that it shall be in a form which, at all events, many members of the House hold to be sufficient for the purpose it is intended to carry out. The other point which impresses me very much is in regard to the disclosure of the manner in which the ballot was marked. It is a question as to whether the judges may decide that the elector has the right or has not the right to disclose the way in which he marked his ballot. If it is decided that he has not the right there is an end

to the inquiry. The whole inquiry collapses if the elector cannot disclose how he has marked his ballot. Surely the right hon. gentleman does not want that. I think it is absolutely essential if we are going to deal with this matter intelligently and thoroughly, that we should arrange it so that the elector shall have the right even if he is not compelled to disclose how he has marked his ballot. It is useless to go into this inquiry without that. I think we had very much better simply say that we drop the whole matter and that the whole thing is of doubtful expediency. It is better that we should do that at once than leave it in doubt as to whether the elector can disclose how he has voted. The judges have no power in regard to this matter to go outside of what they deem to be the law in regard to it. We want to give them that power. We ought to say what we want done in regard to this matter. We want to provide what ought to be the practice before this commission. I do not want to take up the time of the House further, but I would ask the right hon. gentleman to consider these points.

Motion (Mr. Blair) to adjourn, negatived.

#### RIFLE CLUBS—INDIAN FAMINE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to draw the attention of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to two points. As he is no doubt aware there is a movement on foot to carry out a system suggested by the Marquis of Salisbury in regard to rifle clubs, and parties are taking a great deal of interest in the establishment of these clubs. A gentleman has offered prizes for those who start these organizations, and if it commends itself to the government, I would like to suggest that provision should be made for furnishing rifle clubs with free ammunition by the government under proper regulations and restrictions, in order that the parties forming these clubs should have an opportunity of perfecting themselves in rifle practice to as great an extent as possible. I would make that suggestion for the consideration of the right hon. gentleman and of the government.

There is another matter. I do not know whether the attention of the government has been called to it, but I see the statement going the rounds of the papers contained in a despatch to Washington that:

In the Senate to-day Mr. Perkins, of California, presented a petition from organizations and individuals in that state asking congress to make an appropriation for the relief of the famished people of India, and he asked that it should be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

My right hon. friend and the House are aware that the public in Canada have been called upon, in connection with the patriotic fund and in connection with the great fire

Mr. McNEILL.

that took place here, to make very great and unusual outlay from private sources, and, of course, that would very much interfere with initiating a famine fund such as was provided in Canada a few years ago. With the great distress there, it has occurred to me, that, under the circumstances, the government might be disposed to consider the propriety of bringing down an appropriation for those who are suffering by the famine in India.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) if he is prepared to lay on the Table those papers in regard to the emergency rations. He told us that he would bring them down the next day, and at this late time of the session it is important that we should get them as soon as possible. I would like also to remind him of those missing canteen papers that are very important.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). In regard to the emergency ration papers, I am now prepared to lay on the Table the papers which were read the other night, and some additional papers. I have been holding them expecting to get the originals of the affidavits which were made by the men upon the tests which were made at Kingston. It seems that they are in the hands of a notary in Montreal. They were promised to me, but I have not received them. I think perhaps it would be better that we should wait until to-morrow so that I may be able to lay them altogether on the Table of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. There would be no very great difference between to-day and to-morrow in that respect. I would ask for all the papers, not only those that were read, but all the papers.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. I would also remind the hon. gentleman of those missing canteen papers.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have not been able to find them. The papers are papers which had been sent to me privately and were kept amongst my private correspondence. I am looking over my private papers and trying to find them. They were never on the file in the department, but notwithstanding that I have no objection to bring them down. In fact, I want to bring them down because they were used in the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I would also like to mention the Yukon report of Mr. Ogilvie. That was ordered to be printed and to which was to be added a statement of the accounts and revenue.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have just received a copy, and I will put it into the printers' hands at once.

#### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. DAVIN.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. A paper published in the North-west Territories makes a statement about what took place in this House on the 30th of May, and it says that on the Grain Inspection Bill, that was then before the House, when it came to the 40th clause, Mr. Davin never spoke a word.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not believe that.

Mr. DAVIN. It says that on the clauses before and after I spoke, but when we came to that clause I never spoke a word. The curious thing is that in the *Tribune* a correspondent implies that the same thing was the case, the fact being that the moment the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) moved this clause in regard to section 40 I got up and opposed his motion and ultimately called for a division.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I am ready to give assent to my hon. friend (Mr. Davin).

Mr. DAVIN. When we went into committee the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) supported the clause, and I rose, and to the best of my ability combatted the reasons which were offered by the Prime Minister. I find five columns of *Hansard* with my speech combatting the right hon. Prime Minister. What happened? The Prime Minister then got up and took back his clause and proposed another which was virtually a repeal of the objectionable clause which I had opposed. So that the statement is palpably untrue.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR— TIMBER LICENSES.

Mr. GILLIES asked :

1. Was there not a large sum due the Department of the Interior by Edwards & Co. within the last month—even at the beginning of the present month of June

2. How much was that sum, when and how was it paid; whether in cash, by cheque, note, draft, or how?

3. How long was that sum or any part thereof due and payable?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There was an amount due by Edwards & Co. in connection with

timber licenses. The sum was \$2,727.97. The amount was paid in full with interest.

#### ELECTION LISTS—MONTMORENCY.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

From what municipalities in the county of Montmorency have the electoral lists been received, as stated in the answer of the right hon. the Premier to question No. 9 by Mr. Casgrain on the Order paper of the 16th of June instant?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The whole list for Montmorency had been received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on May 28 last. The list for the parish of St. Francois had to be returned for correction. It has now been received corrected. The whole of the list is now in.

#### MILITARY PARADE GROUND—ST. THOMAS, ONT.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Have the government purchased the military parade ground at St. Thomas, Ont.? If so, what was the price paid, and when was the payment made?

2. To whom did the property belong?

3. Did any officer of the Militia Department value the said property, and if so, what was his report?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Yes. The price paid was \$8,000, made up as follows: \$6,000 cash and the old site, where the old drill hall stood, accepted at \$2,000. Payment was made May 21, 1900. 2. The property belonged to Dr. J. H. Wilson, of St. Thomas. 3. No, but valuation was made by a real estate valuator, who placed a value of \$9,800 on the new site purchased by the department, and \$1,500 on the old site and building, transferred to Dr. Wilson. The property was examined by an officer of the Militia Department, as to its suitability, and was favourably reported upon.

#### THE MISPEC RIVER, ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. GANONG (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

Has the present government given permission to any person or persons to build a dam or other erection across the Mispec River, in the county of St. John, N.B.? If so, to whom was the concession granted? When was the concession made, and what was the nature of said concession? Was the permission given by order in council.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). So far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, no such permission has been given. Perhaps it belongs to some other department.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was permission given by order in council?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no knowledge of an order in council in reference to the subject.

### THE PLAINS OF ABRAHAM.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. Are the government aware that the last battle which took place in 1759 between Wolfe and Montcalm, was not fought on the ground which the government declare they are prepared to purchase at a reasonable price in order to make it a public park ?

2. When the government state that such purchase might be made in order to perpetuate the memory of a great historical event, to what historical event do they refer ? Is it the battle of the Plains of Abraham, which did not take place on the ground which certain private parties are interested in selling to the government, or does the reference apply to some other historical event, and what event ?

3. Is there any truth in the following statements published in 'Le Soleil,' of June 5, under the heading 'Les plaines d'Abraham' :

'We are credibly informed that, thanks to the efforts of His Honour Mayor Parent, an understanding is about to be reached.

'The price is to be some \$10,000—a reasonable figure—and the amount will, it is stated, appear in the estimates for this present session' ?

4. Have the government come to a decision in the matter, and if so, what decision ?

5. In case the government decide to purchase the property referred to, might they not at least refrain from saying that it is done to perpetuate the memory of a battle which certainly was not fought on the ground the said parties are striving to induce them to purchase ?

6. If the government entertain doubts in this matter, would it not be well to remove such doubts by suitable inquiry ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government are not aware that the last battle which took place in 1759, between Wolfe and Montcalm, was not fought on the ground which the government declared they were prepared to purchase ; but tradition says that the battle was fought on that ground. The government have not considered any other statement than the one which has just been made. *Le Soleil* was misinformed. The only exact information on the subject is the information which has several times been given to the House, that the government were prepared to buy the Plains of Abraham at any time if that property could be obtained at anything like a reasonable price.

### SEIZURE OF ILLICIT STILLS.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. Was Mr. V. A. Emond, of St. Roch de Quebec, condemned, on or about December 1, 1898, to pay a fine of \$200 for having in his possession a still, contrary to law ?

2. Did he pay the said fine ?

3. If not, why not ?

4. Who intervened in his behalf ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). 1. No. 2. No. The answers to the first two questions render it unnecessary to answer the last two questions.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. On or about December 19, 1898, was Mr. Edouard Lapointe, of Quebec, hotelkeeper, condemned to pay a fine of \$1,000 as proprietor of a still in the cellar of Mr. C. S. A. Langlois, of Quebec ?

2. Was Mr. Langlois condemned to pay any fine whatever for being found in possession of a still, contrary to law ?

3. Was he even prosecuted for such breach of the law ?

4. If not, why not ?

5. Who intervened in his behalf ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). 1. He was condemned for this offence to pay \$500. 2. No. 3. No. 4. The prosecution was taken against Lapointe, the owner and operator of the still, who was considered to be the principal offender. 5. I do not consider this a proper question.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. Whether on or about March 10, 1899, a still was seized on the premises of one Elzéar Savard, proprietor, or joint proprietor of a park in the immediate vicinity of Quebec ?

2. What was the capacity of the said still ?

3. Was it not the largest still seized by the officers of the district of Quebec in many years ?

4. Was the said Elzéar Savard condemned to pay any fine whatsoever ?

5. Was he so much as prosecuted for this breach of the law ?

6. Did the Department of Inland Revenue issue any instructions in this matter, and what instructions ?

7. To whom were they given ?

8. Who intervened to arrest or prevent the usual judicial prosecutions in like cases ?

9. Who are the partners of the said Elzéar Savard in the ownership and keeping of the said park, known as 'Parc Savard' ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). 1. Yes. 2. About 200 gallons. 3. I believe so. 4. No. 5. No. 6. Instructions were sent to proceed against Savard. The proceedings were subsequently stayed on receipt of a solemn declaration from Savard that he was the proprietor of the house where the still was seized, that he had rented it to a man named Rousseau, that he was not aware of the existence of the still on the premises until the seizure was made, that he was not in partnership with Rousseau, and that had he known of his illicit distilling he would have cancelled the lease. 7. To the Department of Justice. 8. I do not consider this a proper question. 9. I do not know.

### NEWMANVILLE-MERRICKVILLE MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. To whom was the contract given for carrying the mail from Newmanville to Merrickville, in the county of Leeds and Grenville, Ont. ? 2. What is the contract price ? 3. Were tenders called for, and was the contract given to the lowest tenderer ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). 1. To George E. Johnston. 2. \$48 a year. 3. Tenders were called for, and the contract was given to the lowest tenderer at the rate of his tender.

#### REGIMENTAL BANDS.

Mr. **CLARKE** asked :

1. Has the commanding officer of a militia regiment the authority, under the Militia Act, to order out the members of the regimental band to play music at any other than military functions?

2. If so ordered out, do the department hold that the members of such regimental bands are compelled to obey such orders?

3. In filling other than military engagements, by what authority are members of regimental bands permitted to wear their military uniforms?

4. Has the Minister of Militia received any correspondence as to the matter referred to in the above question? If so, from whom, and what answers have been given?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). 1. Not unless the members of the regimental band are at the time subject to military law, as specified in paragraph 82 of the Militia Act. 2. Yes, if at the time they were ordered out the members of such regimental band were subject to military law. 3. There is no authority for their so wearing them unless they are at the time subject to military law. 4. A petition and a few letters from the Toronto Musical Association *re* interpretation of the Militia Act as regards members who belong to military bands were received in the department in the months of April and May, 1900. The reply to the above was a quotation of paragraph 57 of the Militia Act.

#### THE MARCHMONT PROPERTY, QUEBEC.

Mr. **MARCOTTE** (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to acquire the Marchmont property?

2. For what purpose?

3. At what price?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Marchmont property was never offered to the government for sale, and they have never considered the advisability of purchasing it.

#### WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 110) to amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière).

(In the Committee.)

The **MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE**. The only question that remains for consideration is the last amendment, which refers to binder twine. This question was

considered in committee the other day by my hon. friends on both sides, and some changes have been suggested to the amendment introduced. I will give way to my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMullan, and my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who have studied the question carefully, and who can explain the changes which they consider ought to be made.

Mr. **JOHN McMILLAN** (South Huron). I think there should be put on the stamp the name of the importer or manufacturer of the binder twine. Then, I want struck out the number of pounds in such package, ball or parcel, for this reason, that a large quantity of twine is left over every year, and it will shrink in weight; but as long as the number of feet to the pound is retained, that will be sufficient, because the lighter the weight is the greater will be the length of binder twine to the pound. While I want to see the interests of the farmers secured, I do not want to see any injustice done to the manufacturer or importer, which I think would be the case if we required the weight of the package to be maintained. I would like also to strike out the words, 'agent or dealer,' and insert the word 'manufacturer' so as to limit the responsibility to the importer or manufacturer. I would like also to substitute ninety days for thirty days as the time for taking proceedings. The most of the farmers have their twine bought at the present time, but they cannot test it properly until they use it in harvest, which will reach to the end of August. That amendment would then be all that could be desired as far as I can see at present.

The **MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE**. I think the committee will agree to accept the clause with the following changes. The amendment of Mr. Frost reads as follows :

Said subsection 1 of the section substituted by section 2 of chapter 28 of the Statutes of 1899, as aforesaid, is hereby further amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

18a. Upon every package, ball or parcel containing binder twine offered for sale there shall be a stamp or a stamp shall be attached thereto stating the number of pounds in such package, ball or parcel, and the number of feet of twine per pound in such package, ball or parcel.

Every importer, agent or dealer who neglects to comply with the provisions of this section shall be liable to a penalty of not less than \$20 for each offence, to be recovered under the Summary Convictions Act, but no deficiency in the number of feet contained in any such package, ball or parcel shall be deemed a contravention of the above section unless such deficiency exceeds 5 per cent of the amount or length stated upon such stamp. Any proceedings under the above section shall be taken within thirty days from the sale of any such package, ball or parcel.

In paragraph 18a, I propose to add after the word 'parcel,' the following words: 'with the name of the manufacturer or importer.' And instead of the words: 'stating the num-

ber of pounds in such package, ball, or parcel, and the number of feet of twine per pound,' I would strike out the words 'the number of pounds in such package, ball, or parcel.' The paragraph will then read :

Upon every ball or parcel containing kinder twine offered for sale, there shall be a stamp, or a stamp shall be attached thereto, with the name of the manufacturer or importer, stating the number of feet of twine per pound in such package, ball or parcel.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not want to place any obstruction in the way of passing the Bill, but there may be some difficulty in working it properly. In order to ascertain the number of feet in a ball of twine, it will be necessary to unwind the ball, and once the ball is unwound, it is utterly useless.

Mr. McMULLEN. It would be sufficient to unwind one pound and not the whole ball.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then half the ball would be useless.

Mr. McMILLAN. You can take a ball of twine, weighing four and a half pounds, and measuring 600 feet, and unwind a quarter of that, say 150 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. How can you force the importer to put on the number of feet per pound? He has no personal knowledge. It is only the manufacturer who can tell that.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This Bill will only take effect after a certain time, so that the importers will have ample opportunity to make the manufacturers understand what they want. Some of the manufacturers live in a foreign country, and we cannot deal with them. We have to hold the importers responsible.

Mr. CARGILL. And the importer will have his recourse against the manufacturer.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When a man buys one of these balls of twine, he is not obliged to unravel the whole ball to find out whether he has been deceived or not. Should the farmer begin to suspect that he is not getting the proper length, he can easily ascertain, by unwinding part of a ball to the weight of a pound, and measuring the part thus weighed.

Mr. JAS. CLANCY (Bothwell). As I was not present at first, I hope the hon. minister will allow me to ask him a question. In case of the proper length not being given in a ball of twine, is it left with the purchaser to be the complainant, or does the government officer undertake that duty. I do not see any great difficulty with regard to the twine manufactured in Canada, but I do with regard to twine imported into Canada. The importer is sometimes not known, and even where he is known, it is impossible for the importer himself to know that the twine he is bringing in is up to the standard. There should be some inspection before it passes into the hands of the im-

porter, for instance at the custom office. Sufficient examination should be given at any rate to warn the manufacturers that they run risk in not giving full length.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Under the Bill, the importer becomes answerable, as he has put his name on each ball. In case of anything not being satisfactory, the farmer can at once refer to the importer. The importer will be in the same position as those who import any other goods. I think it will be very difficult to entrust to the customer the task of unwinding these balls to see if their contents are correct. The amendment calls upon the manufacturers to put their name on the balls, so that it will be possible for the farmer to know to whom to refer in case of anything unsatisfactory being found.

Mr. CLANCY. But the importer will not undertake to put his name on each ball. The twine comes in car lots or in ton lots, the balls being done up in sacks. The importer would not undertake to put his name on each ball or if he did, it would only be by getting an advance on the price to compensate him for his labour. But if it were provided that the manufacturer had to put his name and the number of feet to the pound in each ball that would overcome the difficulty. I call particular attention also to the point that if you leave this matter to the consumer to prosecute the importer, it will not be done. If it is left to the consumer, we might as well not pass the Bill, the imposition will go on the same as ever. But both these difficulties will be overcome—for there would be practically no need of a prosecution in that case—if twine were allowed to be imported only under stringent conditions on the lines I have indicated.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. But under the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Clancy's) suggestion, the Customs would be obliged to open all the parcels. I do not see why the importer should not open the parcels; he will have to do so sooner or later, and I cannot see great difficulty in his putting his name on each one of the balls. It is a great safeguard to compel him to do so.

Mr. CLANCY. Why should not the officers of the department, when they are going the rounds inspecting weights and measures, inspect such twine where they find it, and assume also the task of punishing the parties who deceive their customers the same as those who use false weight or measure? A very few lessons in the country will teach the persons who are committing this fraud—if I may use the word—to be more careful, and the cases of fraud will become very exceptional. That will overcome the difficulty. But if we leave it to the farmer to become the complainant and to prosecute, it will be a perfectly dead letter, because he will never undertake it.

Mr. JAS. McMULLEN (North Wellington). My hon. friend forgets one fact, it would not meet the purpose of this Act to compel the manufacturer, say, in the United States or Germany, to put on the weight of the ball and the number of feet to the pound, because he could not be held amenable to a law passed here calling for a forfeiture if the twine was not up to the standard marked on it. The only way we can reach him is by having the importer's name put upon it, and the weight and number of feet. The importer can be reached in Canada, and will be equally responsible to the agent or the farmer for the twine. But, if it is manufactured in the United States, and the manufacturer stamps on it the number of pounds and the number of feet, how are you going to fine the importer?

Mr. CLANCY. I would make a law that the importer who found that stamp on it would be liable.

Mr. McMULLEN. That twine may pass into the hands of several individuals, and when it reaches the farmer it has the name of the maker merely and not the name of the importer. How are you going to find that Brown was the importer of the twine unless you have the importer's name upon the tag fastened to the ball and that is passed and inspected; then you can prove he is the importer. We must reach the importer in Canada. This law will be still another restriction to the free importation of binder twine, and I am sure the hon. gentleman will concede that that of itself is still an assistance to the manufacturers of twine in Canada. It will certainly be some restriction to the importation of twine. A man importing twine will have to compel the manufacturer in the United States to comply with the conditions made in Canada, or else he will have to see that they are complied with himself, because he will forfeit the \$20 if he does not.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The suggestion made by the member for Bothwell exactly meets that. He desires to have the twine inspected where it is imported, at the custom-house, and it must be in some importer's name. But, the member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says that he cannot find the importer after it is sold. It stands in the importer's name then, and if the inspection is made then and there, why you have the responsible party to deal with. But, after it is retailed out through the country and gone through two or three hands, it is much more difficult to find who is the responsible party.

Mr. McMULLEN. The question with regard to the number of yards to the pound, and the number of yards to the ball, will never come up until it reaches the hands of the consumer. Then, when it reaches the hands of the consumer, if he finds it is not up to the requirements of the law, he would

have a claim against the man from whom he bought it, or against the importer, against the man whose name was on the ball as importer. Unless his name is on as the importer, it is going to be a difficult thing to trace it back. For instance, you buy twine from Brown, and a hundred others buy from Brown. He goes back to Grey and says he got it from him; Grey says he got it from White, who imported it. Now, if the name is not on the twine, how are you going to trace it back through all these different parties and satisfy any judge or jury that White is the man that should pay the penalty, if his name is not on it?

Mr. CLANCY. How is the farmer going to tell how many feet there are in a ball of twine?

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, was not in the House when the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) asked that question a moment ago. Suppose a ball of twine contains so many pounds, four and a half or five pounds, and in that there are so many feet. Now, it is not necessary that you should unwind the whole ball. The farmer knows how many feet there is to the pound, and if he cuts off what will weigh a pound, he can test the balance of the ball. If he unravels what will weigh a pound or half a pound he can test the weight of the balance of the ball.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think the hon. gentleman ever used any twine, or he would not make that statement. The ball unravels from the centre until there is nothing left. If it were wound on the outside it would not run, and as for using it on the binder, it would become entirely useless. Here is the difficulty. Supposing you unravel a ball of twine at the customs-house, there would have to be some provision made, where the twine was found to be all right, that there should be no loss to the importer or to the person who is quite innocent. Where the importer is not innocent, there would neither be sympathy for the party bringing it in or compensation. But, to have the test made involves some difficulty. I am sure the farmer could not attempt to do it, because he would throw away a ball of twine each time he made the attempt.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. CLANCY. I think that hon. gentleman has had no experience. I fancy there is not a farmer in this House who has ever seen twine wound upon the outside of the ball and used in a binder.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Take the inside and throw away half a pound.

Mr. CLANCY. That would be no test at all. Perhaps that twine does not always spin out at the same thickness.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Would you suggest unwinding the whole ball?

Mr. CLANCY. I suggest that the farmer should not be at expense or loss if the twine turns out to be short.

Mr. McMILLAN. After having handled hundreds of balls of twine, I can say that it is easy to take a ball of twine and take half a pound out of the centre. In spinning twine or yarn, any man knows that when you get a uniform article of raw material, you spin a uniform thread from beginning to end, and you can tell exactly by weighing half a pound how it will turn out in the whole ball.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I do not see how you can tell the length of the twine without unravelling the whole of the ball. I think the farmers are intelligent enough to find out whether they are fairly dealt with or not. I know that there have been good grounds of complaint, and hence the necessity of settling this matter.

Mr. G. E. TAYLOR (South Leeds). I am afraid the legislation of the hon. gentleman is putting through will have the effect of increasing the cost of twine to the farmer by a cent a pound. Twine, when imported from the United States or any foreign country, is put up in bales of eight balls to the bale. These balls are made by various manufacturers all over the United States and sold for export, and they are not branded and will not be branded. Where the law compels the importer to put this card on them, giving his name and the number of feet to the pound, the importer has got to open these sacks and brand each ball separately. It will cost an average of four or five cents a bale to do that. If the twine was all made in this country the manufacturer could comply with the law quite easily. The manufacturer can comply with the law quite easily, because he could have his tags, and he puts up each ball with a tag on it. But, you compel the importer to stamp it when he receives it, and if he has to open each bale to put a separate tag on each ball, it will increase the cost to the farmer by a cent a pound. The suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell, is the right one to adopt; let it be inspected at the port of entry, and there the importer will get a certificate from the producer that it runs so many feet to the pound, and if he fails in doing that, let it be confiscated, or let the penalty be enforced. You cannot do otherwise without increasing the cost of the twine, because, if the importer has to go as far as branding every ball, he must charge the cost of branding to the farmer, and the farmer has to pay for it. When we only had manufacturers of binder twine in this country, as we had a few years ago—

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman laughs, but, a few years ago, practically every pound

Mr. MCGREGOR.

of binder twine was made in this country, but now it is practically all imported in the country.

Mr. MCGREGOR. This is a growing time.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is a growing time for other countries. The legislation that you are forcing through the House will have the effect of increasing the cost of binder twine to farmers.

Mr. McMULLEN. I just wish to say in reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor), who has just taken his seat. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, if he has gone over the statistics in regard to the use of binder twine, that it has increased ten times over within the last ten years in Canada. He heard the hon. Solicitor General make a statement to the House a few days ago, pointing out the enormous increase in the use of binder twine. There are about eight thousand tons in use in Canada, and there are only about 500 tons manufactured in the Kingston penitentiary. The enormous increase in the use of this commodity, is the reason for the increased importation into Canada, but the hon. gentleman is prepared to advance any argument that will suit his purpose. He says that we should make an examination of imported twine at the port of entry. Suppose that an examination is made, that the consignment is entered; suppose that a loose entry is made, that a consignment, which is supposed to contain so many feet and so many pounds, does not contain that amount, and that it passes in, who will be held responsible for that? Will the Department of Inland Revenue be called upon to make it good, because one of its officers has not seen that the proper precautions have been taken? The hon. gentleman assumes that it is going to be quite a task to put the name of the importer on the tag. But the importer already has on each ball, the number of pounds and the number of feet to the pound, so that all the importer has to do, is to write his name on the tag. He and his manufacturer have an understanding, and he can make it plain to the manufacturer that if he infringes upon the law, he will be responsible for a fine of \$20. If you do not do that, leave it an open question. It is going to be a difficult thing for the farmer to get justice.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see how you are going to secure a conviction if you leave it to the farmer, because the farmer is not going to unwind and measure the ball of twine. If it is examined at the boundary, where the customs-house office is, how are you going to follow the importer, when it passes through two or three different hands, until it reaches the farmer? I do not think it can be done successfully, and if it is going to amount to anything, the inspection must be made at the customs-house by some responsible party when it is imported. In regard

to what is made in the country, there can be no difficulty, because the manufacturer, knowing this in advance, will certainly stamp all his twine.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Not to criticise the Bill any further, but for information, I would like to ask the hon. minister if he proposes the \$20 as being the penalty for each infraction of the law. Does he mean that a penalty of \$20 will be imposed for each package, or each ball of twine that is found short in the measurement or will \$20 apply to the whole car-load? In the event of its applying to a car-load, \$20 per ball would amount to about \$100,000 of a fine. I think it is quite indefinite as the Bill stands now, as to what the offence would be, whether a shortage of one ball will complete the offence, or whether each separate shortage will be treated as a separate offence.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Mr. Chairman, I must acknowledge that there is something in that. Balls of twine are pretty much of a certain size. I think a ball is generally considered to be 4½ or 5 pounds. Instead of leaving it in such a state of uncertainty, which might have deplorable results, I think it might be better to say what the fine will be per ball, and then, of course, it would be much more moderate than that. It might be 50 cents, or \$1, or 25 cents. I would like to have the opinion of some of my hon. friends who are familiar with the question on that point. I would say that we might place it at 25 cents per ball.

Mr. SPROULE. That will be so very small that I am afraid it will not have the effect.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I propose to make the penalty of 25 cents per ball, instead of \$20.

Mr. SPROULE. In the event of a complaint being laid, I suppose there would be one complaint in regard to a sack of eight balls. Would one prosecution suffice, and would the fine bear any proportion to the number of balls contained in the package?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think it is clear enough. These balls contain four or five pounds of twine, and the fine would be 25 cents for each ball. If there were a great many balls in the bale, they would have to bear the consequences. They would multiply the number of balls by 25 cents.

Mr. SPROULE. If that is done, it would seem to be a fair thing, because the ordinary sack has eight balls. Supposing a farmer bought two balls, would these be the basis of any indictment. If the fine were only 25 cents—

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I mean per ball.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose a farmer buys four balls, does the amendment permit him

to institute a prosecution to recover the penalty of one dollar?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If the farmer buys twine in March or April, he will not know it is too short until August or September, and therefore thirty days is too brief a period to allow him to institute a prosecution. It should be four months.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I have no knowledge whatever of the practical matter intended to be dealt with by this section, but it seems to me that the amendment might lead to difficulty in enforcing the section. In the first part of the section you use the words 'package, ball, or parcel,' but in the latter part of the section you simply use the word 'ball.' That may cause difficulty in enforcing the section. I would also suggest that the penalty of twenty-five cents a ball is not a very effective penalty. The penalty should be something that would be a deterrent to fraud. If you put in a provision that the person would be liable for a penalty of ten dollars, together with an additional penalty of twenty-five cents for each ball, it would be more effective.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I would move the last amendment namely: That this section only come into force, on November 1, next.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the minister making any provisions against a person removing the tag or stamp. There ought to be a penalty provided for that.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is very difficult to provide for everything, and I do not see how we can provide for that.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the Act will be practically unworkable, so far as it applies to the importation of twine. The importer will sell to the wholesale man, the wholesale man to the retail dealer, and the retail dealer to the farmer. To whom is the farmer going to look for redress when he finds that his twine is short? It is sold to him by the hardware merchant in his own village, but he has only the importer to look to. He will have no redress at all.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Surely the hardware merchant will know from whom he bought the twine. I do not see why there should be any more difficulty in obtaining redress in connection with binder twine than there is in connection with anything else.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose an importer at Halifax imports a lot of twine, and sells it to Wood, Vallance & Co., of Hamilton, or to Bate & Co., of Ottawa, and they sell it to a wholesale man in Toronto, who supplies a hardware man in the county of Grey, from whom the farmer gets his supply. Suppose the farmer finds that this binder

twine is short; how is he to find the importer in Halifax in order to get redress? Is the farmer in Grey likely to proceed against the importer in Halifax?

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). The seller in his own interest will follow up the man from whom he purchased. You can safely leave that difficulty to be disposed of between the merchant and the importer.

Mr. D. D. ROGERS (Frontenac). In this as in many other matters it is difficult to frame a law to meet every case. If the farmer finds that any particular brand of twine is not satisfactory or is short, he will not buy any more of that twine, and it will be sufficient punishment to the manufacturer or the importer to find his twine getting a bad name. The very fact of having a law on the statute-book to compel manufacturers or importers to stamp the twine will be a sufficient safeguard to the farmers. You will find that it will hardly be necessary to put the law into effect; but I think it will be very satisfactory to the farmers.

On the preamble,

Mr. J. V. ELLIS (St. John). I would like the minister to hold the Bill and not put it through its final stages this evening, for this reason, that I understand it was not known that there was to be legislation of this character with regard to salt, and some of the largest importers of salt in the city of St. John are opposed to it, and have telegraphed to me to that effect, adding that they are writing. Therefore, I would like the minister to hold the Bill until the objections of these importers may reach me, and I may be able to state them to the committee. I am not aware myself what they are.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I had fondly hoped to get the Bill through this evening, but it is very difficult not to grant the short delay my hon. friend asks for, on the ground stated. Under these circumstances, I will ask that the Bill be reported, but that it stand for its third reading until another day.

Bill reported.

#### DOMINION OF CANADA RIFLE ASSOCIATION.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden) moved the second reading of Bill (169) to incorporate the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association. He said: This association is a very old and useful one and is perhaps doing more useful work this season than ever before. I have been asked by its president and executive to introduce this Bill the object of which is to enable the association, which after many years has acquired property in different

Mr. SPROULE.

parts of the Dominion, to hold this property and transact business relating to it.

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

#### SUPPLY—ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). I have to bring up, Mr. Speaker, another case relating to the maladministration of the affairs in the Yukon. We have had Mr. Wade's connection with several transactions referred to this session as well as last. There was the case of the *John C. Barr*, in which this gentleman, by means of his position in the government service and his connection with the collector of customs, enabled that vessel to drive through the laws for the protection of shipping; and there was the steamship *Yukoner* in which this gentleman, employed against the ship, was able to serve his clients by having the laws again ignored by the collector of customs, and the greatest injustice done to the vessel. There is also the case of the water front, which was referred to in the debate of last year to some extent, and included in the charges I made from my place in this House, and in which Mr. Wade again figured, his connection with that transaction, being, to say the least, of a most suspicious character. But that is not all. In connection with the so-called leasing of this public property at Dawson, every rule that should guide the government officers was set at naught and an extraordinary favour done to protect Mr. Wade's clients.

Mr. Wade at the time held a number of offices. He was connected with the Dominion lands as general registrar, he was clerk of the court; he was Crown prosecutor, and he filled various other important positions. This man was undoubtedly, as far as I can see in the record and as I am informed, in the pay of two men who wished to make a large sum of money; and if the information and the evidence be correct, these men did make a very good thing and were able to pay Mr. Wade, out of their profits, a very large sum. In short by paying \$30,000 to the government, and about \$10,000 to Mr. Wade, to induce him to violate the laws of the land and become a criminal subject to indictment, they made \$120,000 or thereabouts. And in connection with this matter the government are content, as in other matters, to stand by, to see a farce enacted by one of their officers, Mr. Ogilvie, a mockery of justice, and treat with contempt his report upon the evidence. I have taken some trouble to dissect the evidence given in the presence of Mr. Ogilvie, and how he ever came to the conclusion that he did in

this matter respecting Mr. Wade, is more than I can understand, unless he ignored most of the evidence given before him. But there is more evidence than was taken by him, because that examination partook of an ex parte character. Mr. Wade, and his counsel appeared, but there was no one representing the government, and no cross-examination of either Mr. Wade himself or the witnesses who were examined by his counsel, and even Mr. Ogilvie, when he began to inquire into the matter, apart from counsel, allowed himself to be stopped by Mr. Wade's own interference.

The charges which I made last year were that Mr. Wade had been appointed to all these official positions I mentioned, and referring to the Land Titles Act, which contained a provision to prevent his transacting business within the Land Titles Act other than his duties as an officer or clerk. I went on to charge that he practised his profession of law in this district while holding these various positions. And, as the acting Dominion lands agent and so on, he had accepted retainer, fees or remunerations for procuring or promising to procure titles to or possession of Dominion lands; while holding these positions he was individually and personally interested in the disposal of lands known as the water front. These are serious charges, charges of offences against the Criminal Act, and not merely of irregularities in performance of his duties. The government's defence, through the Minister of the Interior, partook of this character, so far as the water front is concerned—you will remember, I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that it was a plausible defence if it was supported by evidence from any source—that Mr. Wade in connection with the leasing of the water front, called for tenders on certain conditions, and the reasons he had not advertised was that there were no newspapers in the district and the highest tenderer had obtained this public property. There might be some show of truth in that statement. But it so happened that in the investigation before Mr. Ogilvie Mr. Wade destroys the whole of that statement by his own evidence. There was not a word of truth in that statement. According to my own recollection, the Minister of the Interior informed the House that he had received this information from Mr. Wade. But Mr. Wade explained that nothing of the kind had happened. There was no such regularity in the proceeding. The returns brought down to this House this session, coupled with Mr. Wade's testimony before Mr. Ogilvie, show a most extraordinary state of affairs and wholly apart from any charge of my own, or any evidence I might bring forward to show his corrupt connection with this transaction, because these papers disclose that Mr. Wade undertook, without holding these positions I have mentioned, without instructions from any superior officer, without any authority

invested in him under the law or instructions brought down to parliament to enter into correspondence with various gentlemen in regard to this property. He never submitted any proposition of any kind. The different letters are brought down, but not all from Mr. Wade in reply to them. These letters to Mr. Wade are in the nature of offers. They came from one and another. They were addressed to Mr. Wade as Crown counsel; they were addressed to Mr. Wade as registrar of lands; they were addressed to Mr. Wade as Dominion lands agent, and so on. And Mr. Wade writes back that he has recorded these applications made to him, and he is of opinion that leases might be given for a certain period, and so on. But in no place is it pretended, nor does Mr. Wade pretend in his evidence that he ever said to two men or any body of men, in order to serve the public interest: These are the conditions on which that lease will be granted; what do you offer? There was no public notice. That is admitted by the Minister of the Interior, and the reasons he suggests was that there were no newspapers. But his other statement was that Mr. Wade—or I think it was Mr. Fawcett, he said—offered this lease under certain conditions to certain responsible parties. That statement also is erroneous. Referring to the return of the papers before the House, I observe particularly the tender of Alexander McDonald. He puts in a tender on the 26th of March in the form of a letter. Other tenders were made. The whole thing bears on its face some evidence of this—that as soon as an offer would come in that was not from McDonald or Morrison, Mr. Wade would acquaint Mr. McDonald with that fact. Because, on the 28th of March we find a higher offer from McDonald & Morrison, and that offer was ultimately accepted, accepted early in April. And Dunsmore & Spencer and some one else, on the 29th of March, offer a large amount. But no conditions are stated. Mr. Wade writes a letter of acceptance, giving certain conditions never put before or communicated to any of the different parties who seemed willing to make a deal. Now, it is of importance, in considering a matter of this kind, to notice the defence, or excuse or justification that was subsequently attempted. When Mr. Wade was put on his oath to explain this transaction, he seemed to think it a great justification—that his clients—I call them his clients for reasons that will appear—accepted what he called a very precarious lease. He went on to explain that these men had accepted a lease under which the government or the land agent could terminate it at a month's notice, while still holding them for the \$30,000 rental. And this was a lease for a year. In the bargain that was made—for there was no formal lease, though they talk of a lease constantly—in the letter there was no authority for them to sublet. It was a

most precarious lease, and having regard to these facts, I say it was a lease that no sane man would have entered into, unless he was absolutely sure of the powers that be, that is, unless he knew that Mr. Wade would stand by him and at least would enable him to enjoy that property. Otherwise, it would be ridiculous for him to accept the terms, because, as Mr. Wade points out in illustrating the precarious state of this lease, not only could the government take it out of the hands of these men at any time they choose, but these men were bound, without indemnification from the government to make certain improvements on the water front. Not referring to the reservation of streets and so on, they were to construct sidewalks and certain buildings which are particularized, while, without any provision of subletting—which is what they contemplated, because it was by subleasing they got the huge profits from the property—they threw themselves on the mercy of Mr. Wade. And these arrangements and conditions are drawn up between these parties, no other parties having an opportunity to tender upon them at all. Consequently, I say with full confidence that that is strong evidence of the fraudulent and improper relations between Mr. Wade and these men. From the facts I shall refer to—not at great length—I think that is a fair one. In fact, Mr. Wade admits, under oath, that these men who got this valuable property, were his clients. He acted for the Crown in these capacities he had undertaken to control Mr. Fawcett, as Mr. Fawcett's evidence shows, as gold commissioner. But his point was that they were not his clients when the lease was made. But his point is this: They were not my clients at the time that lease was made. I have no doubt my information is correct that they were his clients, and I think there is considerable evidence produced by him that points in that direction. But I would not commit myself absolutely to an opinion of that kind, and therefore, I do not ask the House, in the resolution I propose, to come to any conclusion as to the guilt of Mr. Wade, for it is a crime that has been charged against him. I only ask the House to join me in pressing and insisting upon a full and satisfactory inquiry into this matter. It cannot be said that the present inquiry is satisfactory, because it does not even give us the information that some returns give. You cannot deal with the history of this matter by referring to Mr. Ogilvie's report, strange to say. There is evidence in possession of the government, there is evidence now in possession of parliament which existed when Mr. Ogilvie was supposed to be inquiring into this. None of it is produced by Mr. Ogilvie, and he makes the astounding confession that he knew so little of the importance of his duties as royal commissioner that he himself, outside of court, *ex parte*, secretly,

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.**

made an inquiry from a certain Grotshier in regard to a very important matter, and he reports that he found his evidence did not amount to anything, and so this man is not produced. But he, knowing as I say, so little of his duty and the responsibility of his position, admits that he had made an inquiry, the result of which he gives, whereas his duty to the government was to report the evidence. But the evidence he leaves out.

There is another important thing in connection with this statement. Mr. Ogilvie had reported in a letter to the minister in February, that this commission, under which all this evidence was given had broken down, and the man who had made the charges had retired. It was after that that Mr. Wade comes there with counsel; he, a lawyer himself, comes with counsel before Mr. Ogilvie, and is examined, not cross-examined. He is there with counsel to examine Mr. Morrison and Mr. McDonald; they are cross-examined, no counsel representing the Crown, no counsel representing the public interest; but these men go there and make this statement off-hand. And yet it is from this statement that the suspicion is again suggested; and without following the matter with prejudiced mind, I myself have come to the conclusion that the information which was given to me is not only capable of proof, but has to a large measure, been sustained by the evidence that has been produced. Although I would not ask, as I say, an absolute conclusion to be made from that; I would, if Mr. Wade resisted a proper inquiry, I think that would be evidence of his guilt. If the government resisted pressure for a proper and regular inquiry after this mockery gone through by Mr. Ogilvie, I think that would be evidence from which a very unfavourable impression would be drawn regarding every one concerned. I have mentioned, for instance, that there was no provision as to subletting, and that was a most important thing, for the reasons that I have given. The information as to the value of this property given to me by a reliable man, and in my possession last session when I made this charge, was to this effect:

When Ogilvie surveyed out the site for Dawson, he reserved a strip of land on the water front as government property for the purpose of landing supplies, &c. He then marked out the streets parallel to the water front. The river at Dawson has a rapid current, some six or seven miles an hour, but right at Dawson there is a curve in the river which enables boats to swing in and out of the current, and therefore able to land. These lots were bought by parties who have built on them—some to the value of \$40,000 and \$50,000, with the understanding that nothing should be between them and the water front. Alexander McDonald got a lease of this land from Fawcett. Wade got \$15,000 as lawyer, and also \$15,000 from the Yukon Sawmill Company. He turns round now and says it was for drawing up the papers.

And this is the important part of this information :

McDonald subdivided it into lots, and is renting it out for \$120,000 to \$130,000 a year.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). What page are you reading from ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not reading from any evidence that has been published. I say that last session, among other testimony I had in my possession, was a statement from a reliable man whose evidence was as follows :

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). What was his name ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not give his name then, and would not give his name now. It is no use producing these names unless a tribunal is appointed, and I undertook last session to produce not only the names, but the witnesses :

A man who went in with me is paying \$12 a day for a five foot front for a saloon and the whole front is taken up in that way with little slab huts and is a great damage to the people who have built on the town site, and the front is all taken up, so that there is no accommodation for landing.

That was a part of the information, but as to the particulars you will see what his statement was. These men were obtaining a handsome profit. They carried out this deal with a man who undoubtedly at the same time was their lawyer, under a heavy salary, as he himself admits, whom I charge as their lawyer at this time, and that the moving consideration with Mr. Wade was the consideration in cash that he got from these men to violate his duty as a public officer. And, Mr. Speaker, in that connection it must not be forgotten that the report to the Labour Bureau at Washington by officers of the United States at Dawson, corroborated this statement as to the huge profit that was made by McDonald & Morrison, and I have referred to that in the resolution. There is a statement which the member for Guysborough can see, and I do not suppose that the fact that he was an American official will destroy the value of his evidence. This whole business struck the government, I think, as a most extraordinary matter. It was always difficult to get from the minister what ideas the government had about this thing. The minister always spoke to Mr. Fawcett granting this lease. Then we discovered no formal lease had been granted. There was an informal correspondence, then we discovered the correspondence was not with Mr. Fawcett, but was with Mr. Wade. Then, we discovered that the government had never formally approved of this transaction, that Major Walsh had approved of it, but that the government as a government had never approved of it. Now, the disposition

of all this property was put into the hands of the Minister of the Interior by parliament. It was not in Mr. Wade, nor in Mr. Fawcett, nor in Major Walsh, under any legal authority. To this day there is no positive straight statement that the Minister of the Interior approved of his transaction, ratified it and confirmed it, and was ready to stand by it. But in regard to that there is a shifting of responsibility. Mr. Fawcett attempts to show that he had nothing to do with it except to sign the documents under Mr. Wade's direction. Mr. Wade says that Mr. Fawcett was the man with authority, and there they come into collision and contradict each other in important particulars.

Now, on the question of the character of the lease, I have to ask the House to follow this statement. I have made the statement, from reading the letters, that no reasonable man, unless he had some monetary relations or some influence over the government official with whom he was dealing, would put himself in the position these men put themselves in. That idea struck Mr. Wade, but he refers to it for a different purpose. I only refer to it in order to show that the character of the transaction was suspicious ; Mr. Wade refers to it in order to show how carefully he guarded the public interest. This is what he says on page 17 of the small book :

Then McDonald & Morrison were put in this position: they were bound to take that lease for a year. The government was not only bound for a month, and could terminate the lease at any time. It was, therefore, in the interests of the government of Canada and not in the interests of Morrison & McDonald. They were to keep the streets open necessary to go to the river; they were to establish public sanitary conveniences, and to build sidewalks, and so on.

Now, I say that the excuse put forward is a most suspicious thing. To suggest that reason as a reason why he ought to be considered guiltless is to me an additional reason for saying that McDonald & Morrison had no plan in regard to the building, going to expense, or the termination of their lease. As a matter of fact they were the clients of this officer of the government, and the only difference is as to whether they became clients before the letter of acceptance was received or not. Morrison omits to say whether they paid him before or after the signing of the lease. Morrison swears that Wade told him that he had paid \$15, or \$25, or \$50 for drawing up the lease, because he did not want to draw it up himself, being an officer of the government. He was selling his position as an officer of the government. But, it was not a lease regularly drawn up at all. The documents that were referred to as the lease in the Department of the Interior did not amount to a lease at all. The lease is represented by two letters. That is beyond dispute ; the hon. Minister of the Interior admits it and every one admits it. These

documents are the only documents that Morrison is referring to, and for drawing them Wade paid \$15 or \$50—he does not know which. Wade told him that he had these documents drawn. During the inquiry the commissioner seemed to pause, but only for a second or two, to sift statements that were being made by Alex. McDonald and Morrison, and he attempted to cross-examine in regard to these statements when he was stopped by Wade. Though Wade had his counsel there, Wade rushed in, and when a very important point was reached stopped the inquiry. At page 10 of the further report, Mr. Wade tells us what occurs. Mr. Morrison is being examined, and the commissioner says :

His government position here—

That is, Wade's.

—did not enter into the consideration at all.

A. Well, his government position here and his business—those were two different positions.

The Commissioner—I wanted you to say if you had that in your mind.

Wade interrupts with this remark :

I am not responsible for what he had on his mind.

Then, I mentioned that the commission had fallen through before this inquiry was taken up. Months before, Wade, Morrison and McDonald are examined, and in a further report on February 20, 1899, Mr. Ogilvie wrote to the Minister of the Interior :

I regret to inform you that this Royal Commission for the investigation of charges against officials has, to an extent, fallen through.

He goes on to explain that the parties who were pressing the charges, I think very wisely, had withdrawn owing to the ruling that the commission was not as extensive as the order in council. The order in council did not direct that a limited commission should issue, limited to the charges or facts up to August 25. There was no such limitation whatever in the order in council, but the commission itself did contain words of limitation, and according to the ruling the commission was restricted to such charges or facts as had occurred before that date. I believe it was after this that this commission was taken up in a cursory manner. I refer to the fact that the commissioner had gone outside of his duties and position to inquire into this matter, and had made private inquiries without giving the evidence to the House. That was referred to at page 225 of the evidence. We find that Mr. Ogilvie went out and made a private and ex parte examination of witnesses upon the matter in question. At page 225, this is what occurred. The commissioner says :

The Commissioner—I heard this statement of Mr. Grotshier, and I went to see him about it. I came to the conclusion he knew nothing. Alex. McDonald made certain statements to him in a

loose way, and I wanted him to make his declaration, but I found nothing in it. I was going to have the parties that he implicated examined, but I found it was simply hearsay, and it was no use taking the declaration of a man on what he had heard.

That might have been very proper, but it is not what this gentleman was asked to do, to go out on the street, outside of the court room, and make an inquiry without giving the public and parliament any of the facts he discovered, but giving his conclusion upon these matters. I think, in a hurried way. I have gone over the important points in the evidence, I have put them together for convenience. I think, from a sense of fair-play, and they lead up to the conclusion I ask the House to come to upon the facts in the evidence. It is not unimportant that I myself made serious charges of this character, prior to the time that this evidence was before the House, that there was a convincing case before the House, and that the evidence of Wade, Morrison and McDonald is corroborative of the statements I made. It must not be forgotten that I stated last year, and it has never yet been contradicted in this House or out of it by Major Walsh, that Major Walsh had informed a member of this House that Wade had made \$10,000 out of this transaction, and for the purpose of corroborating this statement I have read from the witnesses whose evidence I read on a previous occasion, and whose statements I, for the first time, read on this occasion. Bearing these facts in mind, I ask the House to conclude :

That it is not in the public interest that officers having authority to alien any part of the public domain, should be permitted to accept or receive retainers from or to be or remain in the employment of persons applying for grants or leases of such public domain.

That in the interest of the public and of the public service the matter of the leasing of the water front and the connection of Mr. F. C. Wade therewith, and his relations with the successful tenderers, Messrs. Morrison & McDonald require a prompt, thorough and searching investigation under oath.

I will read the resolution, because in it I put succinctly the references to the evidence and the documents from which I ask the House to draw a conclusion, and not an unreasonable conclusion, but, to stamp these men as undoubtedly guilty, to say that the investigation that has gone into the matter has not been thorough, that the result of which is not such as to entitle Wade or any one connected with that matter to the conclusion that Mr. Ogilvie drew. The resolution is as follows :

That all the words after the word 'That' be left out, and the following added instead thereof :—

'On June 28, 1899, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, a member of this House, stated from his place in parliament, that he was credibly informed and believed that with the same co-operation (and through the supervision of the Department of Justice) as was given by the government of

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.**

Canada to the Hon. Clifford Sifton in the case of the Manitoba election frauds (so-called) he could establish before a commission comprised of eminent judges and clothed with proper powers the following among other facts and charges:—

That Mr. F. C. Wade was appointed Crown prosecutor, clerk of the court, and registrar and acting Dominion lands agent for the district of the Yukon on August 26, 1897.

That section 31 of the Land Titles Act, 1894, provided that no registrar or clerk in any land titles office should advise for any fee or reward or otherwise upon titles to land, nor practice as a conveyancer, nor should he carry on or transact within the land titles office any business or occupation whatever other than duties as such registrar or clerk.

That Mr. Wade actively practiced his profession of the law in the said district while holding the official positions aforesaid, and appeared before the court of the district, the gold commissioner and other officials as the paid advocate of private parties having business transactions with the various departments of the government.

That the acting Dominion lands agent, registrar, clerk of the court and Crown prosecutor has accepted retainers, fees or remuneration to procure or for procuring, or attempting or promising to procure grants or title or possession of Dominion lands.

That Mr. Wade while holding the position of registrar of lands, clerk of the court, and Crown attorney, was financially and personally interested in the disposal of lands known as the water front.

That subsequent to the statement of said charges a copy of a further report of William Ogilvie, Esq., and of the evidence accompanying the same, were laid before parliament, and further and other papers respecting the so-called water front lease were brought down during the present session.

That from the reports and papers now before parliament it appears:

That in 1897 (prior to Mr. Wade's arrival in the Yukon district) Mr. Fawcett, the gold commissioner refused to allow buildings on the water front. 'There were a large number of buildings there, and he would not like to have them removed; he thought it would be inflicting a great hardship on them.'

(Page 225, evidence before Ogilvie commission.)

That the present commissioner of the Yukon district, Mr. Ogilvie, reported on April 14, 1899, to the Minister of the Interior, as follows: 'My impression with all due respect to the past officials, was that it was a very impolitic act to have leased it at all.'

That 'lots in the government addition of the town of Dawson' were ordered by Major Walsh, when commissioner, to be 'properly valued and public notice posted so that the lots might be sold in accordance therewith.'

(Report of Major J. M. Walsh, Interior Report, 1898.)

That this procedure did not obtain in the case of the water front (so-called) lots.

(Major Walsh's report above.)

That without securing a proper or other valuation and without issuing public notices, Mr. F. C. Wade entered into negotiations and carried on a correspondence with certain individuals respecting the leasing of the said water front, as in the case of one William Rourke, to whom Mr. Wade wrote with respect thereto that his application 'was duly recorded by me.' . . . 'I do not think it advisable that such a lease

should be given for a longer period than one month at a time, to be renewed from time to time if thought advisable.'

That on March 26, 1898, Alexander McDonald (one of the firm of McDonald & Morrison, hereinafter mentioned) submitted to Mr. Wade a tender for a lease of the water front at \$1,500 a month on special conditions.

That on March 28, 1898, Messrs. Morrison & McDonald offered Mr. Wade a rental of \$2,500 a month for the said water front.

That on March 29, 1898, Densmore, Spencer & McPhee submitted a tender to Mr. Wade offering a rental of \$25,000 for a year's lease of the said water front, to be paid monthly.

That on April 9, 1898, Thomas Fawcett, gold commissioner, and F. C. Wade, Dominion lands agent, formally accepted the offer of Messrs. Morrison & McDonald of March 28, 1898, subject to certain conditions, among others the following: 'With power to the Dominion government, the gold commissioner or the Dominion lands agent to terminate it on giving one month's notice to the lessees.'

That on April 14, 1898, Messrs. Morrison & McDonald accepted the said terms, with one exception, adding: 'You will, of course, see that the front is cleared off.'

That officers of the United States government officially reported that the said water front yielded to the lessees thereof about \$10,000 a month.

(Bulletin, Department of Labour, November, 1898, Washington government printing office.)

That touching the responsibility for this transaction, the evidence taken before Mr. Ogilvie was unsatisfactory and contradictory.

That Mr. Wade testified under oath:

'I came with instructions from the Minister of the Interior not to act as Dominion lands agent exactly, but to take over what is called the land application book.'

(Page 15, further report, Ogilvie Commission.)

That there is no record in the Department of the Interior of these instructions.

(Return to order of House of Commons, February 7, 1900.)

That Mr. Wade testified under oath that his action was approved of by the department at Ottawa.

(Page 19, further report, Ogilvie Commission.)

That when asked in this House, 'Has the government approved or confirmed the action taken by the officials in Dawson respecting the so-called 'leasing' of this property to Morrison & McDonald,' the hon. Minister of the Interior replied: 'The government has taken no action respecting the lease referred to.'

That there is no record in the Department of the Interior of any note or memorandum of approval of the department at Ottawa, referred to on page 19 of the said further report of Mr. Ogilvie, where it appears that Mr. Wade testified as aforesaid.

(Return to order of House of Commons, February 7, 1900.)

That the following question and answer were stated in this House:

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

'1. Under what statutory authority, if any, were Messrs. Morrison & McDonald put in or allowed to take possession of or enjoy the control of the land known as the water front in Dawson?

(a) Has the government approved of or confirmed the action taken by the officials in Dawson respecting the so-called 'leasing' of this property to Morrison & McDonald?'

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Under section 4 of chapter 22, Revised Statutes of Canada, the Minister of the Interior has the control of all Crown lands except those under the control of other departments mentioned in this section. The public lands in the Yukon territory are under his control, and Mr. Thomas Fawcett was authorized by the Governor in Council to act for the Minister of the Interior in matters relating to the administration of the Yukon territory. The question whether Mr. Fawcett's action regarding the water front was within his powers, has never been formally determined.'

That Mr. Fawcett, with respect to the leasing of the said water front and the negotiations and correspondence relating thereto, has given the following evidence:

'Mr. Wade, as Dominion lands agent, attended to all terms of this letter, and for the minister I signed it.'—(Page 220, Ogilvie Commission.)

'I heard that there were other tenders, but did not know what they were.'—(Page 221, Ogilvie Commission.)

'That Mr. Wade had powers over Dominion land.'—(Page 221, Ogilvie Commission.)

'That his (Mr. Fawcett's) duty was to sign on Mr. Wade's advice.'—(Page 223, Ogilvie Commission.)

'All I had to do was to put my name to the document.'—(Page 230, Ogilvie Commission.)

That Mr. Wade, respecting the same matter, has testified under oath as follows:

'I went to work and leased that front.'—(Page 15, further report of Mr. Ogilvie.)

That the hon. Minister of the Interior informed this House on April 4, 1899:

'Mr. Wade and Mr. Fawcett called for tenders for a lease of this water front upon certain conditions. There were no newspapers at the time.'

That Mr. Fawcett testified under oath that he took no part except signing the lease.—(Page 221, Ogilvie Commission.)

That Mr. Wade testified under oath: 'I consulted with him (Fawcett) as to the question of inviting tenders by public notice. We both agreed that was not advisable for this reason:

'At the time we were under the impression that the lessee, whoever he might be, would have to go to work and build their buildings to accommodate the sub-lessees, whoever they might be. In fact, we were going to require that the lessee should put up substantial buildings and build sidewalks and put in sanitary conveniences, and so on. It was therefore necessary to deal with a responsible party; for that reason it was agreed not advisable to call for public tenders.'—(Page 16, further report of Mr. Ogilvie.)

That there is no evidence that the absence of newspapers had anything to do with the course adopted by Mr. Wade.

That it appears that neither Mr. Wade nor Mr. Fawcett, in calling for tenders, prescribed or specified any conditions, although the Minister of the Interior informed the House on April 4, 1899, that Mr. Wade and Mr. Fawcett called for tenders for a lease of this water front upon certain conditions.

That the evidence of Mr. Wade and Mr. Fawcett is in other respects unsatisfactory and irreconcilable and contradictory.

That Mr. Wade testified under oath:

'I got the offer of Densmore, Spencer & McPhee of \$25,000. . . . I was on the point of closing the tenders, when McDonald & Morrison sent in a letter . . . in which they offered \$30,000. . . . The figures had gone clean

beyond anything that Mr. Fawcett had anticipated; he thought it was getting too high. I consulted with Judge McGuire. . . . he thought it was very exorbitant.'—(Further report, Mr. Ogilvie.)

That Mr. Justice McGuire notified Mr. Wade he was prepared to make an offer.—(Return to order of House of Commons, February 7, 1900.)

That the returns before this House show that the letter of Messrs. Morrison & McDonald is dated on the 28th day of March, 1898, one day before that of Densmore & McPhee.

That Mr. Fawcett was examined as follows:

'Q. There was an appearance of tender and you gave it to McDonald & Morrison without saying anything about the other tenders?—A. I heard that there were other tenders, but I did not know what they were.'—(Page 221, Ogilvie Commission.)

That evidence has been given tending to establish that Mr. Wade while holding the official positions above recited and while conducting or completing the negotiations aforesaid on behalf of the government was the paid and retained solicitor of Messrs. McDonald and Morrison.

That the agreement between Mr. Wade and Messrs. Morrison and McDonald for a lease of the water front was 'extremely precarious' according to Mr. Wade's evidence.—(Page 17, further report of Mr. Ogilvie.)

That the agreement to lease was of a character that any ordinary citizen having no monetary relation with the officer of the government in charge would be most unlikely to accept, in that the government was at liberty to cancel it on a month's notice but the lessees were bound for a year; it contained no provision for sub-letting and the lessees were required to construct a board sidewalk, public privies with pits, to the satisfaction of the gold commissioner.—(Return to order of the House of Commons, February 7, 1900.)

Mr. Wade's explanation on oath is as follows: That 'McDonald & Morrison were put in this position: they were bound to take that lease for a year. The government was only bound for a month, and could terminate that lease at any time. It was, therefore, in the interest of the government of Canada and not in the interest of Morrison & McDonald. They were to keep the streets open necessary to go to the river; they were to establish public sanitary conveniences, and to build sidewalks, and so on.'—(Mr. Wade's evidence, page 17, further report of Mr. Ogilvie.)

That a member of this House has stated to Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, upon the authority of Major Walsh, that Mr. Wade received \$10,000 for granting this lease to Messrs. McDonald & Morrison.

That the foregoing fact was communicated to this House by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper on the 28th day of June, 1899.

That Mr. Wade told Mr. George that 'he had immediately after his decision, which gave Morrison & McDonald the water front, been retained by Alex. McDonald for his attorney for one year, and had been given a handsome bonus as a retainer fee. . . . My information was that it was \$10,000.'—(Page 228, Ogilvie Commission.)

That this evidence has not been expressly contradicted by Mr. Wade, although he had an opportunity of doing so, and was examined after the evidence had been given.

That Mr. Morrison (of Morrison & McDonald, the lessees) testified under oath that Mr. Wade told him 'he would get some one else to draw up the papers, or words to that effect.'—(Page 10, further report of Mr. Ogilvie.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

'He said he paid \$25 or \$50 for making the lease.'

That no formal lease outside of the correspondence above referred to was ever drawn up.

That Mr. Morrison was unable to say whether Mr. Wade was retained before or after the water front lease.—(Page 10, further report of Mr. Ogilvie.)

That the following incident occurred during Mr. Morrison's examination: 'Q. His government position here did not enter into consideration at all?—A. Well, his government position here and his business—those were two different positions.'

'The Commissioner—I want you to say if you had that in your mind.'

'Mr. Wade—I am not responsible for what he had on his mind.'—(Page 12, further report of Mr. Ogilvie.)

That Mr. Alex. McDonald testified:

'Q. To your knowledge did Mr. Wade profit in any way by the water front lease?—A. Not from me. What money I gave Mr. Wade it was for his other services.'—(Page 14, further report of Mr. Ogilvie.)

That Mr. Wade testified: 'The retainer was purely for my legal services.'—(Page 17, further report of Mr. Ogilvie.)

That the evidence of Messrs. McDonald, Morrison and Wade was given after the following statement was written by Mr. Ogilvie to the Minister of the Interior:

'Feb. 20, 1899.—Sir,—I regret to inform you that this royal commission for the investigation of charges against officials has, to an extent, fallen through.'

That none of the witnesses were cross-examined by counsel for the government.

That the commissioner, Mr. Ogilvie, did not call for the production of books, documents or other papers by any of the said witnesses touching the date of the said retainer or of fees paid by the said McDonald & Morrison to the said Wade.

That no counsel attended before Mr. Ogilvie to represent the government, the only counsel attending represented Mr. Wade and the commissioner, and did not attempt a searching inquiry into the statements of Mr. Wade or of his clients, Messrs. McDonald & Morrison.

That Mr. Ogilvie, a commissioner under royal commission, made a private and ex parte examination of a witness touching the matter in question.—(Page 225, evidence, Ogilvie Commission.)

That notwithstanding the foregoing facts and the ex parte character of the inquiry, Mr. Ogilvie reported: 'Mr. Wade is entirely acquitted of all charges made against him in connection with the leasing of the water front to Morrison & McDonald.'—(Page 1, further report, Mr. Ogilvie.)

That Mr. Wade still holds the important position of Crown prosecutor in the district of the Yukon.

That the Prime Minister stated in this House on June 29, 1899: 'We must probe the Yukon delinquencies, so-called, to the bottom. No officer of the government must be allowed to rest under any suspicion.'

That it is not in the public interest that officers having authority to alien any part of the public domain should be permitted to accept or receive retainers from or to be or remain in the employment of persons applying for grants or leases of such public domain.

That in the interest of the public and of the public service, the matter of the leasing of the water front and the connection of Mr. F. C.

Wade therewith and his relations with the successful tenderers, Messrs Morrison & McDonald require a prompt, thorough and searching investigation under oath.

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to occupy the time of the House very long in reply to the hon. gentleman. I had fully expected that in bringing this matter again before the House, he would by this time have produced some new evidence. The hon. gentleman, by special pleadings, which clever lawyers are able to make, and by insinuations against the commissioner and the commission, and against the officers of the Crown and the gentlemen with whom they had dealings, has endeavoured to make it appear that there was something wrong in the leasing of the water front. I hardly think my hon. friend has made out a case to justify an expensive investigation such as he asks for. When parliament is called upon to take such a step, there ought to be at least some substantial evidence to show that there are good grounds for such an investigation. My hon. friend expressed a lot of opinions; but these matters do not appear to other people as they do to him. He laid great stress on the statement made by Mr. Ogilvie that the commission had fallen through, and he tried, not by a direct statement, but by some kind of innuendo, to make out that it fell through, because the commissioner had not full power and was not willing to undertake a full investigation. Now, I think the facts do not bear that out. On the contrary, the complaints and the wild statements that have been made in this House and out of it, and in the press of the country, with regard to the conduct of affairs in the Yukon, concerning which the investigation was asked for, were about transactions which took place prior to August 25. The commission was granted, and if the commission fell through it was because the parties who made these grave charges were unable to get evidence to substantiate them. I do not think there can be any doubt about that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was relying on Mr. Ogilvie's own statement.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Ogilvie's statement is that the commission fell through because these people were unable to furnish any evidence.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think the hon. gentleman has read it. This is what he said—

Mr. MCGREGOR. You had your chance.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman need not interrupt. He is interested very closely in this matter. He might very well cease his interruptions when he has a relative who is associated in these transactions,

Mr. MCGREGOR. I can take care of myself.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. So can your brother take care of himself. Mr. Ogilvie says :

I regret to inform you that the Royal Commission for the investigation of charges against officials has, to an extent, fallen through. Mr. Armstrong, chairman of the miners' committee, who drew up the memorial which led to the issuance of the commission, and Dr. McDougall, the secretary of the committee, withdrew from the investigation when they learned that the scope of the commission only included what occurred previous to August 25, the date of the memorial.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Perfectly true, and the offences with which they were charged, had all occurred previous to that time. Surely if you had any evidence at all against the officials or any one else for malfeasance of office—and in their petition to the government they stated that these things had occurred previous to that date—why should they have made the flimsy excuse they did for withdrawing from the commission. Their conduct was utterly dishonest and disingenuous. They retired because, as Mr. Ogilvie says, they were unable to sustain, even to the slightest extent, any of the charges they had made. However, I do not propose to take up the time of the House in discussing these charges. The people of this country have heard so much about this matter that they are tired of it, and they thoroughly understand that the parties who got up these charges were irresponsible, miserable vagabonds. All of them, I understand, without exception, have left the country, and are afraid to return, lest they should be prosecuted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Dr. McDougall is in Dawson now.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He was not one of those who were active in making the charges, or if he was, he was made a dupe of by the editor of the *Nugget*, and those men who came to this city and consulted him, in order to try and make out a case. They are well known to be characters of the worst description.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You are the first man who ever said it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is not the case. What I have said is proved in the Canadian courts of justice. These men had to leave the country.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I deny that, and you cannot produce evidence of it. The hon. gentleman says that the evidence is in records of the department.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, but I said it was in the records of the courts of justice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I defy you to prove that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. These people had to leave the country to avoid being arrested and imprisoned, and every one of them is known to the people of the Yukon, as being a man of the worst type of character.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman include Dr. McDougall in that description?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, I do not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He was one of the men prominent in the commission.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Any man who makes insinuations and serious charges against respectable citizens, without having any evidence, when the time comes to produce it, is a dishonourable citizen, whether Dr. McDougall is to be included or not, or any one else in this House, or out of it. No more dishonourable and disreputable conduct can a man be guilty of, than to make serious charges against a fellow-citizen, without having any evidence to back it up. And whatever irregularities may have occurred, the great majority of all these statements and charges consisted of nothing but gossip from the lowest kind of characters. The hon. gentleman has given no new evidence on which to base a demand for an investigation. He had insinuated, to a great extent, that this transaction of the leasing of a water front was a very irregular one. I am not so sure that business is not done even in the older parts of the country, in a much less regular way; and we must not lose sight of the condition of affairs which existed in that part of the country at the time. It was a new country. Thousands of miles from communication, with a large number of people of all kinds, under the excitement of gold finds, rushing to the country, and with no government, municipal, or otherwise. Two or three gentlemen were sent up to represent the government, and they had to take hold of matters affecting this large influx of population and deal with them as best they could. What do we find in the evidence? We find that it was thought well to rent this water front, and we find further, that instead of tenders not being had tenders were received by Messrs Wade and Fawcett. Before the terms of the lease were settled with Messrs. Morrison & McDonald, tenders for the water front had been made to Messrs Wade and Fawcett. Mr. W. Rourke had offered to pay quarterly a rent of \$3,000 per annum; Mr. D. Keizer had offered an annual rent of \$7,500 for the whole front, or one of \$120 for each lot of 25 feet; Messrs. Dunsmore, Spencer and McPhee had offered an annual rental of \$25,000, payable monthly, in advance; Mr. John Cameron had offered a monthly rental of \$2,050, and Messrs. Morrison & McDonald had offered one of \$2,500 per month, or \$30,000 per annum. A part of the tract, about 100 feet frontage, which it was pro-

posed to reserve as a site for government offices, and all the front which extends from a point fifty feet to the north of Third Street to the Smith addition to Dawson, being all that afforded sufficient water for steamboat landing purposes, were excepted from the land covered by the lease. Evidently, therefore, the matter must have been pretty well known, since so many persons sent in tenders. My hon. friend states that Morrison & McDonald made a very large amount out of this transaction, but in support of that statement, he has furnished none but hearsay evidence. Well, on the other hand, I have heard it stated very frequently by people who have been in that country, that Morrison & McDonald complained very bitterly that during the excitement, they paid too much for the lease and lost money on it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.  
Hear, hear.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. However, that may be, it is only a matter of hearsay. It seems to me, at any rate, that they paid a very heavy rent, and I am sure much heavier than could be obtained from the property now, under the regular system of leasing water fronts, and they were entitled, if they made a fair lease, to any profit they could make.

My hon. friend again asked for an investigation. But to investigate what? What evidence has he produced? Morrison & McDonald, who were both on oath, swore that all the statements made with regard to this transaction were untrue. Then he attacked Mr. Wade. My hon. friend seems to have no confidence in the legal profession. He seems to think that if a man once acts for an individual firm or corporation, he must necessarily be corrupt, and that any action he takes in the discharge of his professional duties, must be influenced by some corrupt motive. I was not aware that the legal profession was quite so bad as that. We find that Mr. Wade, on oath, flatly contradicts these charges, made on the evidence of parties who, no doubt, had reasons of their own for imputing improper conduct to Mr. Wade. Mr. Wade, under oath, said:

As to the other questions, whether I received a dollar out of the water front lease, I want to be most explicit and emphatic. A long time has elapsed before I had the opportunity of doing this. I have been industriously slandered throughout eastern Canada for a large portion of the year. Every dirty political pen and every mean pen that could be used to do me harm has been used. This is the first opportunity I have had of stating the facts under oath, and I say now that neither previous to the granting of the lease nor at the time nor since have I ever had any arrangement to receive a dollar from anybody, or did I ever receive a dollar for the leasing of the water front. This is the first opportunity I have had for saying so under oath.

As against the hearsay evidence of men of well-known bad reputation, men who have being proven since, in the courts of justice

of Canada, to be men of bad repute, we have the sworn statement of a member of the legal profession to which the hon. gentleman belongs,—a man well known in Canada; of good standing in his profession, of very considerable talent, and always looked upon as an open, frank, outspoken, honourable man—and yet the hon. gentleman will give the preference to his hearsay evidence. As to the merits of the transaction, the hon. gentleman had to do a great deal of special pleading and hairsplitting to point out that it looked as if there was something suspicious. I am inclined to think that, whatever may have been the result as to McDonald or Morrison having made or lost money, this was a very fair arrangement and a very fair rental. The fact seems to have been that the interest of the public was carefully guarded. Mr. Wade, as a professional man and a man of some experience, realized that the conditions there might change and that others might soon be there to represent the government, with authority, while he was only acting as assistant, as it were, to Mr. Fawcett, the gold commissioner, who was overcrowded with the duties he had to perform, owing to the unexpected influx of population. Mr. Wade made the lease on the part of the government so that it was liable to be cancelled by the government within thirty days. I do not see that there is in this any ground for suspicion of his conduct; but, on the contrary, it is proof that it was not intended, as hon. gentlemen opposite have insinuated, as a job that they could make a lot of money out of. If that had been the object, they would have made the lease for a length of time. How could these men promise to pay Mr. Wade a large amount of money, when they did not know but that within thirty days they would have to leave the property.

Mr. CLANCY. They were pretty certain that they would have it for some time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They had no reason to be certain. The commissioner was soon coming in, and, so far as they knew, might cancel their lease at thirty days' notice. That was what they had a better right to expect. Mr. Wade knew, because he had accompanied him part of the way, that the commissioner was coming in. Instead of this very indirect insinuation that because Mr. Wade, acting for the government, took this precaution, I think it is a proof of the honesty of the transaction that it was made only a temporary and easily terminable lease, as the commissioner with authority, was coming in. In view of the sworn testimony of all the parties interested that there is not a word of truth in the charges made, I do not think that the House would be justified in spending a large sum of money, probably more than we receive from the lease, to investigate the case. We have a right to be influenced by the sworn testi-

mony of Mr. Wade, who showed that he was only too anxious to make known the facts, who went before the commissioner and gave his evidence with regard to this subject. For myself, and I think I may say for the government, we should be most anxious to investigate if there was any reasonable evidence at all that the matter was one that ought to be investigated. But it is a long time since the event referred to took place, and, in view of this and of the fact that no new evidence has been brought out and of the sworn testimony of all the parties interested, voluntarily given, that there is no truth in these charges, it seems to me that there is no reason why a further investigation should take place at the present time.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Of all the lame excuses ever presented to this House, I think that we have just listened to is the lamest. It would not do credit to a twelve-year-old schoolboy, to say nothing of a minister of the Crown. Charges are made about as serious as any that could be brought against any man. Here is an officer of the government sent up to the Yukon with authority as clerk of the Crown, Crown prosecutor, and land commissioner. And we have it plainly charged that this man accepted a fee to represent a client in relation to a matter in which he was representing the government on the other side. In this bargain, he is the go-between of the two parties—he virtually makes the contract with himself. He lays down conditions that safeguard the public interest and then he takes a retainer from the party on the other side—whether he took it before or afterwards does not affect the case in reality—to represent their interests. He has been on oath and has not denied the fact, that he got \$10,000 from his client for services done or to be done.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Surely, the hon. gentleman has not read the evidence.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I quoted that, and gave the page.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) quoted somebody else as saying that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Two statements have become confused. Last June, I stated that a member of parliament, on the authority of Major Walsh had stated that Mr. Wade had received \$10,000 out of this water front matter. The statement referred to by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is that given in the motion, the page of the evidence being quoted, that a witness swore before Mr. Ogilvie that Mr. Wade had told the witness that he had got a large amount from McDonald & Morrison after this lease, and the amount, he thought, was \$10,000.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). It was not for this transaction. Read the evidence.

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. SPROULE. The question is not whether the money was paid immediately before or immediately after—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, but whether it had any relation to this transaction.

Mr. SPROULE. There was no other transaction mentioned between these people and Mr. Wade.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the contrary, Mr. Wade positively swears that he got his money for professional services after that.

Mr. SPROULE. He admits that he was retained for a year.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Where is that?

Mr. SPROULE. It appears in the resolution, quoted from the evidence.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will allow me, I will give the page where it is stated that Mr. Wade got this money.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is what somebody else stated.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But Mr. Wade told him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That all took place after the lease.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On page 227.

Mr. George being called and sworn, testified as follows:

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Who is Mr. George?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not know that that is explained.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was he not one of the proprietors of the *Nugget*?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). And he had to leave the country.

Mr. FOSTER. His oath is just as good as another man's.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As to his having left the country, I do not know anything about that. My point has nothing to do with this man's credibility or otherwise. I say that after this man specifically swore to a statement made by Mr. Wade, and Mr. Wade being on the stand in the hands of counsel representing him, it is a singular thing that he did not contradict this statement in the sense that lawyers mean.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. A man could not do it in more explicit language.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (reading):

Q. Will you be good enough to tell us what you know about the water front; you are conversant with everything. Tell the court all

you know. I think that is the best way?—A. I should judge that any information at my disposal which you would be interested in, would be that regarding an interview I had with Mr. Wade regarding the water front. He was very frank in a great many matters, and, as is my wont, I put many impertinent questions. I remember one question distinctly: 'Mr. Wade, what part of this money did you get of this water front?' He said: 'I got no share of it.' I waited a while and repeated the question again: 'Is there any of this money coming to you?' He replied (by the way, I would like to preface my remarks by saying that this was a public interview; it was for the press; I had my note-book and pencil in my hand at the time). He replied, none, unless a certain fee he had received from Mr. Alexander McDonald could be considered in that light of a division of the profits. I got him to make me a statement of what that fee consisted. He said he had immediately after his decision, which gave Morrison & McDonald the water front, he had been retained by Alex. McDonald for his attorney for one year, and had been given a handsome bonus as a retainer fee. I asked him what the amount of the retainer fee was, but he didn't tell me; I asked him if it was \$10,000, and while he didn't say (I don't recollect whether he said yes or no), he left the impression on my mind that that amount was the retainer fee.

The Commissioner—The amount can be ascertained.

It never occurred to the commissioner to ask that question of Mr. Wade.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is anything clearer than that, I do not know where to find it. Here is a transaction that takes place between an officer of the government and a firm who desires to get a very valuable water front. The officer of the government has it in his power to negotiate a bargain on behalf of the government, and he also has it in his power to negotiate a bargain on behalf of his clients, and he succeeds in doing it to the satisfaction of both. Immediately thereafter his services are retained for a year—I presume that is merely a pretext—and he gets for that a very large amount of money. Whether it is \$10,000 or more is a matter of very little importance. The transaction is so shady in its nature that I say there is scarcely an honest man in Canada who could come to any other conclusion than that that money was given to him for the consideration that he in turn was giving to his clients. Yet the acting Minister of the Interior says that the government would be only too anxious and willing to investigate if there was anything to investigate. They are always anxious and willing to investigate, but when it comes to be done, no matter how shady the transaction is, they do not investigate. The acting Minister of the Interior says that the people of the country thoroughly understand this. Yes, I can tell him that they thoroughly understand that the whole management of the Yukon from first to last is rotten, there is no doubt whatever about that. There is not a man who has lived in that country, there is not a man who has been there and returned, unless he be

a government official, but who speaks of it in exactly the same way. From every quarter of the country comes the same information, that the officials are rotten, that the whole management out there is rotten, that there is not an official in that country that cannot be bought up, and many of them are bought up over and over again. There is scarcely an official belonging to the government who has remained there any length of time but what comes back loaded with money. They have made immense wealth in a short time, not out of their salary, because their salary is not so large as to enrich them. They come back with large amounts of money, and they boast of it. Every person seems to know it except the government, and they plead ignorance or innocence. Now, the hon. gentleman says there has been no charge made and no fresh evidence. Here is evidence:

That the acting Dominion lands agent, registrar, clerk of the court and Crown prosecutor has accepted retainers, fees or remuneration for procuring or attempting or promising to procure grants or title or possession of Dominion lands.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Does the hon. gentleman call that evidence?

Mr. SPROULE. I call it an allegation, a charge upon which an ex-minister of the Crown is asking the House to grant an inquiry. And it is supported by a good deal of sworn evidence that cannot be refuted, no attempt is made to refute it:

That Mr. Wade, while holding the position of registrar of lands, clerk of the court and Crown attorney, was financially and personally interested in the disposal of lands known as water fronts.

That is the charge made by a responsible member of this House in his place in parliament, and yet the Minister of the Interior says there is no charge, that only flimsy allegations are set forth, unsupported by evidence from responsible parties. Yet an ex-minister of the Crown makes this statement, and stakes his reputation upon it, and is prepared to prove his allegations if only the government will afford him an opportunity:

That lots in the government addition of the town of Dawson were ordered by Major Walsh, when commissioner, to be properly valued and public notice posted so that the lots might be sold in accordance therewith.

But when they come to sell the water fronts there is no valuation put upon them, no conditions attached to the notice when asking for tenders. What is the nature of the tenders asked for? What information has been given to the public who are asked to tender? Why, the whole transaction bears on its face the features of jobbery from first to last. These lots were not valued, there were no conditions attached to the notices that were given out asking for tenders. Mr. F. C. Wade, the Crown prosecutor, the land commissioner, and clerk of

the court, the man of all lines out there, entered into negotiations with certain individuals :

That without securing a proper or other valuation, and without issuing public notices, Mr. F. C. Wade entered into negotiations and carried on correspondence with certain individuals respecting the leasing of the said water front as in the case of one William Rourke, to whom Mr. Wade wrote with respect thereto that his application ' was duly recorded by me.'

Showing that he was carrying on negotiations on behalf of the government and doing it on behalf of his clients as well.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Will the hon. gentleman permit me to read one line ?

In fact we were going to require that the lessee should put up substantial buildings and have a sidewalk put in, with sanitary conveniences, and so forth.

Mr. SPROULE. Did they ever require that to be done ? Did the lease show that that provision was in it ? There was no lease whatever, nothing to show that the sidewalk was to be put in. And if it be a fact that the requirements of the lease demanded that they should make this outlay for public improvements, do you think any company would make that upon a month's lease, that they would make that outlay if there was not an understanding that they would retain it for more than a month, and that the lease would not be cancelled at the option of either one of these individuals at the end of the month's time ? The thing is so absurd that there is not a man who is capable of carrying on any financial or business transaction who would entertain the idea for one moment that such an arrangement did exist or could exist between the parties. I say that the very fact that the representative of the government, the land commissioner there, who was charged with authority and power to lease that land was acting with this firm and endeavouring to lease it, that he was leasing it to the firm with himself representing both sides of the transaction, shows that it is one calling for investigation. Wade testified under oath that his action was approved by the department at Ottawa. Then, we have the statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior, that it was never approved of. Who is telling the truth, the head of the department or his official ? Either one or the other must be saying what is not true, and we are not able to ascertain who is telling the truth. The hon. the acting Minister of the Interior says that there is nothing worth while inquiring into. He says that these allegations are not supported by evidence coming from a reliable source when the very reverse is the case. These are allegations made by a responsible member of parliament, and supported by sworn evidence that the hon. gentleman did not refute. Will the government allow an inquiry to be made ? The hon. gentleman

Mr. SPROULE.

informed the House that Wade had called for tenders, and that he had leased the water front on certain conditions. This is entirely inaccurate. There is no knowledge or record of any such conditions. If such conditions were laid down why were they not presented to the House as they should have been when the return was asked for ? We should have been in possession of them here to-day. The hon. gentleman does not say a word about that. He only refers to the conditions, but he does not say what record there is of them. What record have we that there are conditions attached to any proposition that we should receive tenders for the water front ? Then, we have the fact that, so far as the evidence discloses, and we believe it to be reliable, these men who leased the water front received over \$120,000 a year for it, while all they paid the government was \$30,000 a year. They could well afford to give away \$10,000. It was a mere bagatelle, a mere trifle, a small percentage of the transaction, not even the percentage that a lawyer would claim who carried out a transaction of such importance. You may call it a retainer for his services, or a bonus, or a gift, or what you like. But it was a payment made to him for the purpose of controlling him in the discharge of his duty as an official of the government. All these allegations are made, and they are supported by evidence that this official has been doing other than his duty, that he has been guilty of acts for which he might be languishing in a penitentiary if properly prosecuted. Notwithstanding these charges made by a responsible member of the House, and upon his responsibility, the government come to the conclusion that there is nothing to inquire into, and therefore, they will not grant a commission. There is a day of retribution coming when the people will pass judgment upon them for their action in connection with this matter. They cannot hoodwink the electors of this country. The hon. gentlemen have a majority behind them to vote down and prevent an inquiry, as they did vote down an inquiry into the Yukon last year, but there is coming a time when public opinion will speak out in condemnation of their course. If the government will not take warning in time I can only tell them that the day is coming when they will wish they had granted this commission, or something to inquire into these charges, because they are charges of the most scandalous and corrupt work by an official of the government, and I believe that they are susceptible of proof if a proper tribunal is constituted and proper provision made to inquire into them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before the resolution is put, I would like to say a word or two in regard to it. The hon. acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) has taken the

ground that everything in connection with this transaction, which has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), is perfectly regular. He has made a defence by using harsh language in regard to men who made certain charges which were investigated to a certain extent by Mr. Ogilvie. He has called them blackguards, he has said that they were guilty of crime, and that they have left the country. When challenged by the hon. member for Pictou to state whether he made that charge in respect to Mr. Armstrong, the Chairman of the Miners' Committee, and in respect to Dr. McDougall, who is a highly respected gentleman, now living in the Yukon, he did not venture to repeat his assertion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was Dr. McDougall examined?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Dr. McDougall was secretary of the Miners' Committee which made these charges.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did he swear to them?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) said that the men who had made these charges were blackguards, that they were guilty of crime, and that not one of them remained in the country. That is his attitude to-day in regard to this matter, that is the defence which he makes to a case of this kind, that these men are blackguards and scoundrels, and that they have left the country. That is why the charge against Wade was not investigated. That is the answer of the government to the motion which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has brought before the House. Now, he has ventured to join issue with my hon. friend, and he has told the House that tenders were called for and that specifications were stated. I would like some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House to show in any of the records, in any of the evidence on this question, that is available to the House, in any information which has been brought before the House, what these specifications were, and how tenders were called for. There is not one syllable of evidence to be found to support the hon. gentleman in the defence that this was a perfectly fair and regular transaction, a transaction in the public interest. He takes a position that would justify the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in removing him from his office as acting Minister of the Interior. He says that it is perfectly and regular thing for Wade, having given the so-called lease to McDonald & Morrison in this irregular manner, a lease which was subject to termination at the will of Mr. Wade himself, to accept a retainer or bonus of \$10,000 from these very men. Let me put

to the right hon. gentleman what the position taken by the hon. acting Minister of the Interior involves. Mr. Wade was an officer of the government, having charge of this matter at the time, subject to the control of the government, a control which they have never seen fit to exercise, because the hon. acting Minister of the Interior has stated that the government have not yet determined whether that lease was regularly granted by Wade or not. It is certainly a matter which in the public interest they should determine. Mr. Wade has seen fit to grant a lease from which it appears that Messrs. Morrison & McDonald made a profit of many thousands of dollars. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) stated here last year that the government had not yet come to a conclusion as to whether that lease was regular or not? Is it not high time that the government should come to some determination on the regularity of that lease; a lease from which, according to a return sent to the United States government, Messrs. McDonald & Morrison made a profit of \$7,500 a month, or \$90,000 for the twelve months. Yet, we have not the slightest information from the government as to whether that lease was regularly granted or not. Mr. Wade was acting for the government in respect to that. He was acting for the government exactly in the same way in which Mr. Sifton would be acting for the government if he were dealing with the matter at Ottawa. Suppose Mr. Sifton had granted to Messrs. McDonald & Morrison at Ottawa, a lease determinable at his will, for \$2,500 a month, out of which they made a profit of \$7,500 a month, and suppose that Mr. Sifton the next day took from the same Messrs. McDonald & Morrison a retainer of \$10,000 to secure his legal services, would that be regarded as a proper style of administration in this country? Let us rest this case a little further. Suppose the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) was granting a contract to some person for a supply of engines and cars for the Intercolonial Railway; suppose Mr. Blair granted the contract, as Mr. Wade did in this case, subject to his determination at the end of one month, or two months, or any number of months; suppose that was a contract out of which the contractors could make a profit of \$7,500 a month; would it be regarded as an administration of the affairs of this country in the public interest that Mr. Blair should take a retainer of \$10,000 the next day from the men to whom he had given the contract? Suppose Sir Louis Davies, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, were to grant a profitable contract in the way Mr. Wade did. Suppose Sir Louis Davies, who is an eminent lawyer, should have his services retained by these very contractors with a fee of \$10,000, would that be a matter into which it would be desirable to have an investigation or not?

The acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) has taken a most extraordinary position with regard to this matter. It makes not the slightest difference whether this retainer was given before or after, when we consider the peculiar terms of the lease; because if it were given before, surely no one would say it was a proper thing for Mr. Wade with one hand to be granting a lease to Messrs. Morrison & McDonald out of which they made a profit of \$90,000 a year, and with the other hand for Mr. Wade to take a retainer from the \$10,000 for legal services. If it were given after, then he accepts a retainer from persons whose title to a profitable lease depends on his will. Mark you, although Mr. Wade went into the witness box, we have not the slightest suggestion from him as to what were the legal services which he rendered to Messrs. Morrison & McDonald. Is it not desirable in the public interest that we should have some intimation as to what the legal services were, particularly in view of the statute which forbids any registrar or clerk employed in the land department of this country from engaging in any other business whatever. That statute was violated when Mr. Wade undertook to go outside of his duties as an officer of the government and to practise as a lawyer. The whole difficulty originated there. The Minister of the Interior was guilty of a very great fault when he undertook to give Mr. Wade any such permission as that. If Mr. Wade were to act as a representative of this government in parting with the public domain in the Yukon, it was not a proper thing that he should have received instructions from the Minister of the Interior that he could practise his profession, because that led to the very abuse which is complained of here. That an officer who is dealing with the public domain should take a retainer from the very people with whom he is dealing as a representative of the government, is certainly not conducive to honest and fair administration in Canada. I have stated that, in my opinion, it makes not the slightest difference so far as the necessity for the investigation arises, whether or not this \$10,000 was paid to Mr. Wade before or after, and I will tell you why. If it was paid before it certainly was an improper thing that Mr. Wade, acting as a representative of the government, should be dealing with men who had given him so astounding a retainer as the sum of \$10,000—or, to use his own language, 'a retainer which would be regarded as very high in the east.' If the money was paid to him afterwards, the position of Mr. Wade with respect to this matter is worse. The position, then, would be, that Messrs. Morrison & McDonald have a lease from Mr. Wade as the representative of this government which can be terminated at any time upon the will of Mr. Wade; and they secure Mr. Wade's goodwill, it might be thought—his determination

not to act adversely to their interests, by the next day retaining him as their paid solicitor, and paying him \$10,000 for services, as to which he has not seen fit to give us any information whatever. Therefore, it seems to me, that when the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) stands up in this House and uses harsh language with regard to the man who made charges which are not now in question, and then undertakes to say that this is a perfectly regular transaction, he takes a position which I should think the right hon. gentleman who leads the government would find it a little difficult to support.

It has been suggested by the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) that this matter has already been investigated before Mr. Ogilvie. Now, what kind of an investigation did we have before Mr. Ogilvie? We had Mr. Ogilvie sitting there as a commissioner, a gentleman without any legal training, a gentleman with no idea of what was evidence and what was not evidence, a gentleman without any practice in extracting the truth from witnesses. We had the government, so far as any question between Mr. Wade and the government is concerned, acting absolutely without counsel and depending upon Mr. Ogilvie. Any gentleman who examines this evidence can see with what degree of thoroughness Mr. Ogilvie inquired into the conduct of Mr. Wade in this matter. Mr. Wade, however, was represented by counsel. Not only was he represented by counsel in respect to this inquiry, but he took part in the investigation himself, and whenever the commissioner was getting on dangerous ground, Mr. Wade intervened and stopped any further inquiry. The very first thing that a counsel acting for the government in this investigation would have done would be to inquire of Mr. Wade as to the exact date of his retainer, as to the exact amount of his retainer, as to the exact services which he rendered to Messrs. McDonald & Morrison for that retainer. Not a word about that do we find in the investigation before Mr. Ogilvie. In fact, so far as any charge against Mr. Wade is concerned, the investigation from beginning to end is little more than a farce. The government, therefore, stands in this position, that this questionable conduct of Mr. Wade has not been investigated in any proper sense of the term. Mr. Wade, the representative of the government, did deal with Messrs. Morrison & McDonald, and did deal with them to their benefit, so that they made a very large sum out of this water front. He did that, being retained either at the time or immediately afterwards, by the very men who, through him, made that profit, and who, according to his own sworn statement, gave him a very large retainer. It is true that Mr. Wade says the \$10,000 had no relation whatever to the water front, but was given in consideration of legal services. The exact point, then, comes up for

inquiry as to what the legal services were, and why it happened that Messrs. Morrison & McDonald, at that particular time, saw fit to retain this particular person with respect to some particular matter which demanded so large a retainer as that. Now, I do not wish to weary the House, but I do think the administration of affairs of that kind, whether in the Yukon or anywhere else, demands inquiry. My hon. friend the acting Minister of the Interior based his case to some extent on the fact that the Yukon was a distant country, that it required a long time to communicate with officials there, and that you could not possibly expect as regular a course of dealing there as you could elsewhere. Mr. Speaker, I join issue with my hon. friend in that respect. I say because the Yukon was far away, because it was difficult to communicate with officials there, the officials who were sent to the Yukon should have had instructions which would ensure, so far as instructions could ensure, a course of dealing which would have prevented abuses of this kind arising. The fact that the Yukon was distant and that it was difficult to communicate with officials or with opportunities such as these was a reason in the first place why his instructions should have prevented him engaging in such a transaction as this, which, to say the least, in the absence of an investigation on the part of the government other than that held by Mr. Ogilvie, will tend to raise suspicion in the minds of the public, and will tend not only to the discredit of the government, but to the discredit of Mr. Wade as well.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, before the House is called upon to pass judgment upon the motion, which has been introduced by my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), I would ask both sides of the House to consider very seriously and dispassionately the character of the accusation which is brought to-day by my hon. friend, and which we are asked again to investigate by judicial inquiry. The whole character of the accusation of my hon. friend rests upon one fact, and one fact alone. It rests upon the fact that Mr. Wade, acting at that time in his capacity as the land agent of the government, rented a certain property known as the water front of the Yukon River, to the firm of Morrison & McDonald. Having stated that fact, I ask the House to look at the conclusion of the motion of my hon. friend. It is in these words :

That in the interest of the public and of the public service, the matter of the leasing of the water front, and the connection of Mr. F. C. Wade therewith, and his relation with the successful tenderers, Messrs. Morrison & McDonald, require a prompt, thorough and impartial investigation under oath.

You would imagine, from the fact that we are asked to investigate the transaction

which took place between Mr. Wade and Morrison & McDonald and the circumstances connected therewith, that the government had suffered from the action of Mr. Wade; you would imagine that Mr. Wade had sacrificed the interest of the country for the benefit of the firm of Morrison & McDonald, who were said to be his clients. If the transaction of which complaint is made really bore the character which I now describe, if it were contended and could be shown by any statement which has been made by my hon. friend, or by any fact which we have before us, that Mr. Wade, acting as land agent, had forgotten the duties he owed to the government whose agent he was, and had made a bargain by which the interests of the country had been sacrificed for the benefit of the party with whom the transaction took place, then I could understand that there would be something to investigate; but the transaction which is brought to the attention of the House does not at all bear that character. Taken by itself it is a very honourable transaction; there is nothing wrong in it; the interest of the government never suffered in any way at all. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen, on the other side especially, to the evidence which we have on this subject. I read from the report of Major Walsh, who, upon the facts, does not seem to be contradicted. This is what he said in his report :

I also found on my arrival at Dawson, that Mr. Wade and Mr. Fawcett, as the representatives of the Dominion government, had leased to Messrs. R. Morrison and A. McDonald, for \$20,000 per annum part of the water front of Dawson. Before the terms of the lease were settled with Messrs. Morrison & McDonald, tenders for the water front had been made to Messrs. Wade and Fawcett. Mr. W. Bourke had offered to pay quarterly a rent of \$3,000 per annum; Mr. D. Keizer had offered an annual rental of \$7,500 for the whole front, or one of \$120 for each lot of twenty-five feet; Messrs. Dunsmore, Spencer and McPhee had offered an annual rental of \$25,000, payable monthly in advance; Mr. John Cameron had offered a monthly rental of \$2,050, and Messrs. Morrison & McDonald had offered one of \$1,250 per month, or \$30,000 per annum. A part of the tract, about 100 feet frontage, which it was proposed to reserve as a site for government offices, and all of the front which extends from a point fifty feet to the north of Third Street to the Smith addition to Dawson, being all that afforded sufficient water for steamboat landing purposes, were excepted from the land covered by the lease. It was granted for but one year, and even this short term may be terminated by one month's notice from the government.

The transaction being one which I considered to be most satisfactory from every standpoint, I at once gave it my approval.

Now, Sir, what does this evidence disclose? It discloses the fact that a number of tenders were received for the lease of that property, that the highest tender was accepted, and that the price was \$30,000 a year. But the charge of my hon. friend is supported by a second argument; the rent,

though high, could have been made much higher. The rent, though high, did not really represent the value of the property, and for all we know it might have been \$100,000 a year. Therefore, my hon. friend says if Mr. Wade could have obtained a much higher rent than he did obtain, high though it was, there must be some presumption of fraud in that respect. But, Sir, there is a conclusive answer to that assertion, and it is this: That the lease was made only for one year. The lessees were bound for one year; they had to pay the rent for that length of time, whether they found the transaction profitable or not. But—and this is a circumstance not to be forgotten—it was within the power of the government to terminate it at the end of one month. What greater precaution could have been taken than this? I ask any man in this House, who knows the confused condition of things that existed at that time in the Yukon, where rents were liable to great fluctuation, if that was not a most proper precaution on the part of Mr. Wade. Suppose it to be true that the government could have leased that property for \$100,000 a year, as the hon. gentleman states Morrison & McDonald did afterwards get, this fact seems to be conclusive to my judgment that there could not have been on the part of Mr. Wade any desire to give any advantage to Messrs. Morrison & McDonald. He could not do that because it is stipulated that if the government found the price was too low, or if the government found it more advantageous to keep the property in their own hands, they could cancel the lease at any moment. Under the circumstances, is it not simply common sense to come to the conclusion that Mr. Wade could not have acted more in the interest of the government than he did. But even supposing, for the sake of argument, that he did wrong in leasing the property, he must have thought at the time that he was acting in the best interests of the government; and not willing to bind the government, keeping in mind that the values were likely to fluctuate, he put in a stipulation that if the government were not satisfied, they could terminate the lease on a month's notice. I do not see how he could possibly have exercised his judgment better.

But the hon. member for Halifax anticipating this argument, said this stipulation amounted to nothing because it was in the power of Mr. Wade himself to cancel or not to cancel the lease. I do not read the contract in this way. Mr. Wade did not keep in his own hands the power to put an end to the lease but reserved that to the government. Naturally what was in his mind was to forward the lease to the government at Ottawa, and then let the government, if they chose, put an end to it. That being the case, the contention of my hon. friend from Halifax, falls to the ground, that Mr. Wade kept this sword over the head of Morrison &

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

McDonald, to make them do just what suited him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Referring to the portion of the letter which I had in mind, I find that the lease gives power to the Dominion government, the gold commissioner or the Dominion lands agent to terminate it on giving one month's notice.

The PRIME MINISTER. But Mr. Wade was but temporarily land agent. It was never intended that he should be permanent, and shortly afterwards another man was appointed in his place, so that, not being the land agent, he could not cancel the lease himself. He was replaced by another official.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have not the date, but I know that another agent was appointed long ago. Mr. Wade was land agent at the time no doubt, but he had gone in as Crown prosecutor, and as things were very much confused, he had been instructed to act as temporary land agent and was replaced shortly afterwards. So that when he put that power into the lease, he was not stipulating for himself because he was only there temporarily.

But my hon. friend says that the firm of Morrison & McDonald were the clients of Mr. Wade, and therefore we must read the lease in connection with that circumstance. If it were shown that Mr. Wade had sacrificed the interests of the country in favour of Morrison & McDonald, there might be something in the position taken by my hon. friend. You might say: No wonder, because Wade was the attorney of these men and there was personal interest between him and them. But if it be true that in that lease there is no advantage in favour of that firm as against the government, it matters not whether McDonald & Morrison were clients of Mr. Wade or not.

Moreover it is stated that Mr. Wade received \$10,000 from the firm of McDonald & Morrison out of that transaction. What evidence is there of that? All the evidence which the hon. member for Pictou could discover was that of the man George, the proprietor of the *Nugget*. What does that evidence amount to? It simply amounts to this, that this man, who was a journalist by profession, was seeking an interview with Mr. Wade, and strange to say one of the questions he intended putting to Mr. Wade was whether or not he had not received money out of this particular transaction, or, in other words, whether he had not been paid unduly moneys by that firm. It appears to me that that was a very strange question for a journalist to put to a man from whom he was seeking an interview, but at all events Mr. George must have had a peculiar way of his own of managing these matters, for he said he put the question to Mr. Wade. Mr. Wade did not admit having received any

money, but he gave an evasive answer, which Mr. George interpreted as an admission that he had received the sum of \$10,000. That is all the evidence we have on this point.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** That evidence is corroborated by Mr. Wade himself. Mr. Wade said that so far as George's statement as to the amount was concerned, he did not mention \$10,000, but said that he had received a large retainer from these people at that time for his services.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** Well, we have the evidence of Mr. Wade himself, who declared that he never received one cent out of that lease. If my hon. friend has the evidence of George, which purports to be an admission of Mr. Wade, is not the evidence of Wade just as good; and when Mr. Wade says, I did not receive a dollar, is not that as good, if not better evidence, than that which my hon. friend has submitted.

But that was investigated into by Mr. Ogilvie. Mr. Ogilvie is not a man learned in the law, but everybody admits that he is a man of very exceptional character and intelligence, and anxious to do right, and would not shield anybody who did wrong. The ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) now says that this investigation took place, but practically was broken down. But how did it break down? Simply because the parties who had made the charges against Mr. Wade and other Yukon officials virtually withdrew from the prosecution, and refused to appear before the commissioner. That is, after they had made the charge and when they were brought face to face with the accused parties and with their own allegations, instead of prosecuting these charges, instead of offering evidence, they practically withdrew from the prosecution and would not give evidence. But Mr. Wade, as an honest man, did not want to have this charge resting on his name, even though not prosecuted, and insisted on giving his evidence and upon having the facts brought out. And the result was that Mr. Ogilvie came to the conclusion that, from the evidence submitted that Mr. Wade was entirely free from the accusation with regard to the lease of the water front made to Morrison & McDonald. I submit to the intelligence and fairness of the House, I submit to the impartial judgment of the House, whether, when it has been shown that Mr. Wade made a transaction which was eminently satisfactory, in which there was nothing wrong, it would not be simply an act of persecution to have a further investigation into this matter? It seems to me that everybody will come to the conclusion that the matter should be considered finally closed, not to be reopened.

**Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell).** I do not intend to detain the House more than

five minutes, but I am just going to state the case as it appears to my mind as a layman, and as, I am sure, it will appear to the people of this country. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), if I understand him, based the whole case upon this—that the country lost nothing by the action of Mr. Wade, and that the whole case is closed.

**The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).** That is not exactly how I put it.

**Mr. CLANCY.** That was the strong point.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** No. My point is that this transaction which is made a reproach to Mr. Wade is one which, on the face of it, is absolutely fair and honest.

**Mr. CLANCY.** It might have that appearance, looked at in one way, but there is precisely the opposite side to the argument which the right hon. gentleman presented. The right hon. gentleman's contention was that Mr. Wade had guarded the public interest. And by what means? By means of retaining as a condition of the lease that it might be terminated at the end of one month. But looked at from the other side, what does that mean? It looks as though Mr. Wade exacted such conditions that nobody but one who was a party to a job would undertake it. The conditions were such that no sane man would undertake them unless he had protection—

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** Several other people offered nearly as much.

**Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).** One offered \$24,600.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Very true, but I say that these conditions were such that no sane man would invest his money in an undertaking of this kind. They were obliged to build sidewalks, to undertake sanitary improvements and also to put up such buildings as would be suitable and substantial for those who wanted to occupy them. And yet, in the face of that—without provisions for damages in case of it being terminated, the lease might be terminated within a single month, or they might be compelled to keep it for a year. I ask if that is a transaction any one but an insane man would undertake?

**Mr. BRITTON.** People are taking leases from this government every day on just such 'insane' conditions.

**Mr. CLANCY.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) is a lawyer, which I am not. Every one knows that the Crown has a reserve power to terminate a lease. I am judging from common sense, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) should judge from common sense as well as from the knowledge gained in that profession of which he is a distinguished member. In the cases he speaks of, the Crown would not take away the lessee's right without compensating him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Whether in the lease or not.

Mr. CLANCY. That would not make any difference.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Quite so, and the same in this case; and everybody knew that.

Mr. CLANCY. I will take that as meaning that if the government had terminated this lease of Morrison & McDonald they would have compensated them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Or anybody else—that is what you are proving.

Mr. CLANCY. But, if that is the case, where is the protection to the public interest? The hon. gentleman must take one side or the other. Mr. Rourke was told, when he put in his tender that such conditions would be exacted. Did he put in another tender? He knew that it would be idle to do that. What complexion does all this bear except that of wrong-doing? Mr. Wade was a lawyer and knew there was a prohibition in the Land Titles Act by which he could not enter upon the practice of his profession without violating the conditions of his office. Is it denied that Mr. Wade disregarded every part of the Land Titles Act? Was Mr. Wade blind to the wisdom and necessity of putting such conditions in the Act? Not at all. But Mr. Wade did violate all these conditions from the start. And, having gone that far, what length could the government say he would or would not go? The moment he entered upon that course, in violation of the position he held as guardian of the interests of the people, he might fairly be suspected, and an investigation should have taken place. It is no use to say that the country did not suffer by this transaction, for it is not Mr. Wade's fault if the country did not suffer. But we are left to infer that Mr. Wade's receiving \$10,000 in the way he did, was not a crime so long as the rental was paid under this lease. I think the country will take the view that in these transactions no man can serve two masters, and that a man cannot occupy such a position as that of Mr. Wade and represent private interests at the same time. He had one duty to perform, and he should have performed that duty or he should have resigned his office.

The government had winked at it, they had winked at that investigation. Everything has been conducted in a very slipshod manner, the investigation was of a very loose character, the people were not represented in any sense, but Mr. Wade was represented. Then, we take the conduct of the acting Minister of the Interior. Why, the whole transaction in his office is of so hazy a character that he knows nothing about it. He cannot tell what the condition of affairs

Mr. CLANCY.

is, whether Mr. Wade acted within his powers or not. All I can say is, that if Mr. Wade intended to pillage this country every opportunity was given him for doing so. If a great wrong has not come out of it, it is not because of want of opportunity to commit the wrong. Mr. Wade has been restrained in no way. He violated the law from the moment he put his foot in that country. He started out in a course of conduct in which it was impossible for him to act honestly. It would be almost impossible for any man to act honestly when he pursued such a course of conduct as Mr. Wade did. I have only this to say in conclusion, that the people of this country are convinced that there is every reason for suspecting wrong-doing on a great scale in the Yukon. If there has not been wrong-doing, it is a miracle. But the government refuse an investigation on the ground that it will cost something. Why, Sir, they could select no lower ground for refusing to investigate the grave charges that have been made over and over again into the administration of that country. The people of this country are quite willing to spend money in an investigation if it will act only as a check to prevent wrong-doing in the future. I say no lower ground could be selected than that the people cannot afford to pay the cost of investigating these charges. What is needed is to lay down a rule of conduct for our officers that will check them to a large extent and prevent similar scandals occurring there in future. The vast expanse of the country, the distance from the seat of government, the defective machinery—all this is an invitation to officials there to go wrong. Instead of the hon. gentleman pleading the cost as an excuse for not endeavouring to improve the administration, it is a reason for taking the precisely opposite course. Sir, I never more heartily supported a resolution in this House than I do this resolution of the hon. member for Pictou that the government should undertake to investigate these charges, for unless something is done, charges of a still graver character are likely to come before this House.

House divided on amendment (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bell (Pictou),  
Borden (Halifax),  
Broder,  
Cargill,  
Clancy,  
Clarke,  
Davin,  
Foster,  
Gillies,  
Henderson,  
Hodgins,  
Kaulbach,  
McAllister,  
McDougall,

McLennan (Glengarry),  
Martin,  
McIntague,  
Moore,  
Morin,  
Powell,  
Prier,  
Rcche,  
Sproule,  
Taylor,  
Tupper (Sir Charles),  
Hibbert), and  
Wilson.—26,

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Beith,	Landerkin,
Bethune,	Lang,
Borden (King's),	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Britton,	Legris,
Brodeur,	Lemieux,
Brown,	Logan,
Bruneau,	Mackie,
Burnett,	McGregor,
Calvert,	McGugan,
Casey,	McLennan (Inverness),
Copp,	McMillan,
Cowan,	McMullen,
Domville,	Malouin,
Douglas,	Melgs,
Ellis,	Morrison,
Ethier,	Parmalee,
Fielding,	Pettet,
Fisher,	Proulx,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Puttee,
Gauvreau,	Rogers,
Gould,	Russell,
Graham,	Semple,
Hutchison,	Stenson,
Johnston,	Sutherland,
Joly de Lotbinière	Tolmie, and
(Sir Henri),	Tucker.—51.

## PAIRS :

## Ministerial.

## Opposition.

Christie,	Roddick,
Gibson,	Corby,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles)
MacPherson,	Rosamond,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Featherston,	Carscallen,
Fitzpatrick,	Casgrain,
Snetsinger,	Reid,
Davis,	Hale,
Scriver,	Blanchard,
Bell (Prince),	Earle,
Wood,	Gilmour,
Paterson,	Ganong,
Lewis,	Poupore,
Mulock,	Haggart,
Rutherford,	LaRivière,
McIsaac,	Kloepfer,
Dobell,	Wallace,
Joly de Lotbinière	Caron (Sir Adolphe),
(Sir Henri),	
Davies (Sir Louis),	McK,
Sifton,	McInerney,
Edwards,	Gillet,
Godbout,	Dugas,
Talbot,	Bergeron,
Lavergne,	Marcotte,
Tarte,	Hughes,
Blair,	Pope,
Flint,	Mills,
Somerville,	Maclean,
Campbell,	McNeill,
Macdonald (Huron),	Macdonald (King),
Livingston,	Cochrane,
Harwood,	Quinn,
Erb,	Tyrwhitt,
Préfontaine,	McIntosh,
Belcourt,	Chauvin,
Hutchison,	MacLaren,
Frost,	Osler,
Domville,	McCleary,
Hurley,	Craig,
Penny,	Robinson,
McCarthy,	Bell (Addington),
Stubbs,	Kendry,
Costigan,	Ferguson,
Fraser (Lambton),	Robertson,
Lang,	Beattie,

## Ministerial.

## Opposition.

Dyment,  
Ratz,  
Heyd,  
Holmes,  
Comstock,

McCormick,  
Ingram,  
Bennett,  
Seagram,  
Klock.

Amendment (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Organized Districts—Tuberculosis ..... \$17,850

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) We must have an explanation of that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The item under discussion comprises \$12,850 for organized districts of quarantine, and \$5,000 for the further amount required for tuberculosis. These two items should not have been grouped together, as the quarantine relates to human quarantine and the other is for tuberculosis in cattle. The reason of this increased vote for quarantine this year is to provide for the increased expenditure at Williams Head, B.C., to provide quarantine as against Oriental traffic. We have had to do more there, as we have constantly to examine and fumigate all Orientals who come into the country, in consequence of the danger from bubonic plague. The staff has been increased, and a large amount of extra provisions have to be obtained for people coming in through the quarantine. Besides that we have had to add to the staff of Grosse Isle, Dr. Montizambert having said that it is absolutely necessary to provide a fumigating apparatus, to be able to fumigate the holds of any ships that might arrive with disease on board. No such ship has arrived yet, but we were obliged to engage another steamer, and get some more men who would be able to handle her. This has added \$1,750 and \$1,000, making \$2,750. The extra arrangements at Williams Head have involved an outlay of between \$4,000 and \$5,000. Then, besides the preparations to keep out bubonic plague, we have had lately to spend considerable money in guarding against the introduction of small-pox from the United States. We have had to appoint a number of physicians all over the frontier, and I see an item here of about \$3,000 for that.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). Who are the physicians appointed?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not certain that I have a complete list of them here. They have been appointed just recently. There are five or six in British Columbia, two or three in Manitoba, seven or eight in Ontario, and we have appointed an extra one in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Is that for small-pox?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. It is to guard against the danger of bringing small-pox in from the United States. I was in hopes at one time of the provincial authorities undertaking this, as being partly a matter for local boards of health, but the Department of Justice advised us that it is our duty, as a quarantine department, to deal with it.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. This is the first time.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. No, the same thing was done in the latter part of the eighties.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. I think by the local authorities then.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. No, by the government at Ottawa. Physicians were then appointed at salaries of \$100 a month all along the whole frontier.

Mr. **T. S. SPROULE** (East Grey). What do these men do?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. They board trains and inspect everybody who comes from a district where they receive reports from the United States authorities that small-pox prevails. They are examined for vaccination.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I noticed that there was a case at Windsor. Did the government look after that?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. No, these physicians were not appointed then. It was partly in consequence of that case that these men were appointed.

Mr. **PRIOR**. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he is quarantining all Chinese and Japanese that come to British Columbia? I see by the papers that six Chinamen have died in San Francisco, from what the press says is bubonic plague, and that Chinatown in San Francisco is strictly quarantined. There are vessels running all the time from San Francisco to Victoria and Vancouver, and they must pass the Williams' Head station. Are all Chinese and Japanese coming from San Francisco, Honolulu, China and Japan, quarantined for fourteen days?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. No, they are all fumigated, disinfected, bathed, and examined. Vessels coming from such a distance as Oriental ports, Dr. Montizambert does not consider it necessary to detain, if no disease is found on them. So far no vessel has arrived with any disease upon it.

Mr. **PRIOR**. Does not the hon. minister think that it would be a safe thing to quarantine all Japanese and Chinese coming from San Francisco?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. I discussed that question with Dr. Montizambert, who, having received a report of the precautions which are being taken at San

Francisco, where Chinatown has been quarantined, thought these precautions were sufficient not to require that we should detain these people.

Mr. **PRIOR**. I cannot help thinking that it would be a safe precaution to make them go into quarantine for a fortnight, because we do not want to bring that plague among our people if we can help it. They thought they would keep it out of San Francisco, but it has got in there, and there has been a fresh outbreak in Honolulu. In Vancouver and Victoria, there is quite a number of Chinese residents, and there may be danger of bringing it into Canada.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. I will discuss it further with Dr. Montizambert. We are desirous of taking every precaution.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I understand the hon. minister to say that these physicians were appointed to prevent the importation of small-pox on board the trains. Is there a physician at every point where a train comes from the United States?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Not absolutely, I think. In Ontario they have been appointed at different ports, so as to intercept people coming from Michigan. I do not think there has been any person appointed at Windsor. I am speaking from memory, as I cannot state positively.

Mr. **SPROULE**. What is to prevent small-pox from being imported every day, unless there is some arrangement made at the different points where the railways cross, Niagara Falls, Windsor and the Tunnel. We might as well appoint none, as appoint a few, and allow intercourse to continue at places where railways cross the frontier.

Mr. **PRIOR**. Has the minister seen the report of Dr. Fagan, secretary of the provincial board of health in British Columbia. It is well worth reading. He gives a very good account of the bubonic plague. I have shown it to a good many medical men and they say it is a splendid report. It would be well if the Minister of Agriculture were to ask the province of British Columbia to send him a few hundred copies for distribution.

Mr. **SPROULE**. What are the names of the gentlemen appointed by the minister, and the localities in which they are appointed.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. They have been appointed within the last week or two and I have not the names here, but speaking from memory there is one at Fort William, one at Port Arthur, one at Sault Ste. Marie, one at Owen Sound or Collingwood or perhaps both, and one at Parry Sound.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Is there none at Windsor or at the Bridge?

Mr. **PRIOR**.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.**  
No.

Mr. **SPROULE.** What information has the minister about the tuberculosis test?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** This vote is necessary in consequence of the very large demand for the testing of cattle for tuberculosis for the current year. I only asked \$15,000 last year instead of \$20,000 as the demand for testing was not so great the previous year and the vote was not expended, but this year, the demand has increased and the \$5,000 is to pay outstanding accounts and to carry on the work.

Mr. **SPROULE.** If the cattle are found diseased, are they slaughtered?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** They are quarantined and the owner can slaughter them or not as he chooses, but he cannot sell the animals or their products.

Mr. **SPROULE.** Does the government pay compensation if the animals are slaughtered?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** No. The owner sends a written request to have the test made, and one of the conditions is that he shall not expect or receive compensation.

Mr. **PRIOR.** In British Columbia there is a veterinary surgeon appointed by the province who travels around testing the cattle throughout the province.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. I had a conversation with Mr. Anderson, Deputy Minister of Agriculture in British Columbia, last fall, and he never told me about that.

Mr. **PRIOR.** I know very well about it, because I have a farm rented to a man and they destroyed forty of his cattle.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** That was probably on demand of the municipality that the cattle of the man supplying milk were diseased.

Mr. **PRIOR.** There is a Mr. Roper there who is paid by the provincial government, and he goes around making his inspection all over the province.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I did not know about that.

Arts, agriculture, &c., Paris Exhibition	\$30,000 00
Printing of Patent Record .....	4,500 00
Maintenance of experimental farms....	8,000 00
Drainage at Agassiz .....	754 93
Classification of patents .....	300 00
Purchase of books and publications for patent library, \$527.02 of the amount to be paid T. McCabe—revote.....	673 89
Fumigation stations for nursery stock imported under amendment to San José Scale Act....	1,600 00
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$45,828 82</b>

Mr. **FOSTER.** Do you want all this?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** You cannot separate the item. The particular item we desire is for the Paris exposition; and if it is necessary, any portion of the vote can be reserved for future discussion.

Mr. **FOSTER.** What is this money wanted for?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** We got a vote of \$175,000 for this year, and that vote was exhausted a week or two ago. The estimates supplied me from Paris show that on the 30th of June, we will require about \$30,000 more to cover the expenditure up to date. I ought to explain that out of the amount of money voted we have been obliged to pay about \$115,000 for space and buildings. It is the largest claim that has ever been made for accommodation at an exhibition. Not unfrequently the authorities have supplied the general buildings at a universal exhibition, but in Paris they have charged for the space granted to each particular country.

Mr. **FOSTER.** Was that known when the minister started out?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** It was not known at the time we accepted the invitation, but it came out very soon afterwards. The result is that we will have spent \$115,000 on the space and buildings when they are paid for.

Mr. **FOSTER.** Will that cover all?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I am speaking from memory of the estimate, but it will not be very much more, if any.

Mr. **DAVIN.** Does Mr. Tarte administer this money in Paris?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** No. The money is sent to the order of the commission in Paris, but Mr. Tarte has nothing whatever to do with the space. That was all arranged before Mr. Tarte was appointed.

Mr. **FOSTER.** What does Mr. Tarte do?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** He represents Canada at the exhibition.

Mr. **FOSTER.** Tell us what he does.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** He acts as chairman of the commission there and looks after the work generally.

Mr. **FOSTER.** Has he charge of the whole matter?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** He has charge of the matter in Paris now.

Mr. **FOSTER.** To what extent? Is he absolutely in charge?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** Yes, I think I may say absolutely in charge since he has been there. While the pre-

parations were being made on this side of the Atlantic in collecting the exhibits and making arrangements for the exhibits I acted as chairman of the board of commissioners. Mr. Perrault, one of the commissioners, was sent over rather early, and Messrs. Jardine and Scott were sent after. Mr. Tarte occupies the position of chairman of the commission in Paris in the same way as I did here in the early part of the work.

Mr. FOSTER. So that you have three commissioners there, and Mr. Tarte?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Do these commissioners act as a board, with the majority ruling?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not known them to have any vote or discussion as to that. Mr. Tarte being chairman, I suppose that if any difference arose his opinion would rule.

Mr. FOSTER. The business is not managed by the commission, but by Mr. Tarte?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By Mr. Tarte, with the advice of the commission, acting as chairman of the board.

Mr. SPROULE. We did not imagine, before we had this late statement, that we would have to pay so much for space.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That statement was made last year; but, I did not know that it was going to be so much.

Mr. SPROULE. When the minister found that it was going to cost anything like this, it would have been quite in place for the government to have withdrawn from the exhibition entirely. It is, in my opinion, a means of spending money for no good end. The minister says that Mr. Tarte is the chairman of the commission. I find by the press that he takes the responsibility of declaring that he will close up the exhibition if certain things are not done. That indicates that it is not the board that controls it, but Mr. Tarte, at his own sweet will. He seems to be credited with doing in Paris with the exhibition what he was doing here with the government. The minister says that by June 30 we shall have spent \$205,000 on this exhibition, and I expect that it will be double that before we have done with it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, no.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister shakes his head, but the expenditure has gone so far beyond his expectation already that it is likely to cost a great deal more than we anticipate at the present time; and I do not think the country is getting any good return for this expenditure. I imagine there have been sent over to Paris a number of

Mr. FISHER.

ornamental commissioners or heads of branches whose capability for spending money has no parallel in this country. A man who was at the exhibition in Philadelphia in 1876, Mr. Perrault, whose accounts have been scrutinized many times by the people of Canada, and which disclose such discreditable and extravagant expenditure of money as was never known before in connection with an exhibition, is sent to Paris to do practically the same work and exercise the same powers; and he has a man at his head with spending proclivities even greater than his own. This exhibition seems to be a means to enable certain gentlemen to go to Paris and have a good time there, go all over Europe and make speeches, and keep out of this House when it would be inconvenient for them to be here when inquiries are going on before the Public Accounts Committee, and when their estimates are going through this House. I am afraid that when we get to the end of this business, and come to look over the accounts, we shall have a very sorry exhibition of the expenditure of the country's money in a most extravagant and needless way.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been spent up to date?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. \$175,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the large items besides \$115,000 for space?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have had the commissioners working a little over a year and a half—four commissioners. I ought to have said that in addition to the four commissioners specially appointed, there are four on the board who are public officials—Prof. Saunders, of the Experimental Farm; Dr. Dawson, of the Geological Survey; Prof. Robertson and Major Gourdeau. Major Gourdeau is in Paris at present, though he is coming back very soon. Prof. Robertson returned here yesterday, but I have not seen him since his return. The Hon. Mr. Gillmor was the fourth of the outside commissioners, but he was appointed to the Senate, and then ceased to be a commissioner. These commissioners were paid at the rate of \$2,500 a year from the time they commenced their work, I think about February or the latter part of January of last year, and their travelling expenses when travelling in Canada at the usual civil service rates—actual travelling expenses and \$3.50 a day living allowance in Canada and \$5 a day while abroad. None of the officials who are commissioners draw any salary as commissioners. They get their expenses, but no additional salary.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the staff that Mr. Tarte has around him? He took over a number of ladies, I understand?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When Mr. Tarte went over, there were at that time in Paris Mr. Perrault, Mr. Jardine, Mr. Scott and Mr. Gourdeau. Madame Dandurand was appointed as a representative of the women of Canada. She went over at the same time that Mr. Tarte did.

Mr. DAVIN. What is her salary ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. She receives no salary, but she receives an allowance for living and travelling expenses. Another lady went over to take charge of the ladies room there, and to do official work under Madame Dandurand in connection with the meetings of women at Paris. Her name is Mademoiselle Barry, of Montreal. She is known in the newspaper world as 'Francoise.'

Mr. DAVIN. Is she connected with the *Star*.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. She wrote for the *Star*. I may say that there is another Miss Barry on the staff of the *Star*, who has gone to Paris as a representative of that paper.

Mr. DAVIN. Are they sisters ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. Then, there are two gentlemen from the Geological Survey, who are in charge of the mineral exhibit—Mr. Wilmot and Mr. Faribault. Mr. James Macoun, also of the Geological Survey staff, has charge of the forestry exhibit. These gentlemen receive no salary besides their regular salaries; they just receive their travelling expenses and living allowances. Mr. Cusson, of Montreal, is secretary of the commission; he receives \$1,600 a year and expenses. Mr. Halkett went over with Major Gourdeau to help set up the fishery exhibit, and is in charge of it; he belongs to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Mr. Hay, of the Experimental Farm, who has been managing the exhibits of the Experimental Farm for several years back, went over to set up the agricultural exhibit. He is on his return now, having accomplished his work. Robert Hamilton, of Grenville, in the province of Quebec, went over in charge of the fruit exhibit.

Mr. DAVIN. What is his salary ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. \$6 a day, covering salary and living allowance in Paris. Actual travelling expenses from here to Paris and back are paid him. Mr. McKinnon took charge of Professor Robertson's cold storage and fruit products exhibits.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the cold storage arrangement ever found ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was arranged for satisfactorily.

Mr. FOSTER. It was lost for a while ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, but there was an unfortunate mistake. What is called the colonial building was for the accommodation of the British colonies. Canada has much the larger portion, but as it was not entirely given to Canada, what was called the colonial committee of the Imperial British Commission took charge of the building, and said we had no control of it in any shape. They informed us what it was going to cost us. The authorities of the Paris exhibition made a good deal of trouble as to the design, and insisted that the design should be submitted to them and accepted by them. When our commissioners went over, they were very much disappointed with the building, and Mr. Tarte has informed me that the building is not up to the specifications and plans accepted by us, and he has actually refused to make some payments on it. That is a matter still under discussion.

Mr. DAVIN. Who was the builder ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know his name. He was a contractor in Paris. The Imperial Colonial Commission made the contract with him according to plans which they sent to us, and which we accepted. We did not quite approve of them, but accepted them because we could not help ourselves.

Mr. DAVIN. Give us the names of all the officers over there.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is Mr. Turcotte, who has charge of the caretakers and cleaners in the exhibition, a gentleman from Quebec. He gets \$6 a day, covering salary and living expenses. There is Mr. Hamilton and Mr. McKinnon, and H. C. Knowlton, and Mr. Como and Mr. Stewart, all getting the same rate. Mr. Como is a gentleman from Nova Scotia, and Mr. Stewart is from British Columbia. I have tried, as much as possible, to get representatives of the different parts of the country, so that questions on the part of foreigners regarding Canada might be answered by people who knew the different parts of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you administer the financial portion ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The board of commissioners was given a list of salaries, and the payments are made on the signature of two commissioners. An amount is put to the credit of the commissioners in Paris.

Mr. FOSTER. What latitude has Mr. Tarte as to expenses ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are a number of incidental expenses of all kinds, and these have been left largely in the hands of Mr. Tarte and the board of commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. Without any restrictions ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They knew what the vote was when they went over there.

Mr. FOSTER. They did not know that the hon. gentleman was going to ask for another \$30,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A statement of the probable expenses was supplied me by Mr. Tarte and the commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. He has fixed the expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In one sense. The buildings was not by any means up to the specifications, and the interior was very bald and ugly. Mr. Tarte cabled me that he found it absolutely necessary to do something in the way of decoration. He and the members of the board had gone over and discussed it, and made up their minds that they would have to spend the sum of \$3,000 or \$4,000 on the interior of the building in the way of decoration and improvements.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that authorized ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. It was stated in the newspapers that Mr. Tarte said that unless so and so were done, he would close the exhibition ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not like to believe the newspaper report.

Mr. FOSTER. Nor I. But I think the minister should have informed himself.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not think it worth while to cable over about the matter.

Mr. U. WILSON (Lennox). Why was Mr. Tarte sent to Paris at this particular time when he ought to be here answering for his department. I find that a most extraordinary proceeding. If he is able to discharge his duties there as commissioner, he ought to be able to discharge his duties here as Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is pretty well known that Mr. Tarte was in Paris last year, and submitted to a surgical operation of a very difficult character, from which he suffered a good deal. He returned, unfortunately before his recovery was complete, and went on with his work here as long as he could, until finally his physician recommended him to go back to Paris and put himself under the care of a physician and surgeon there. He was going to Paris in any case on account of his health, and we believed that he was quite able to do the work as commissioner of Can-

Mr. FISHER.

ada, notwithstanding the somewhat failure of his health.

Mr. WILSON. I understand that Mr. Tarte not only performs his mission as chairman of the commission, but has been running frequently between London and Paris on other business. I understand that the hon. gentleman is not only directing this commission as chairman, but he has been running from Paris to London on other business ; he is not only doing the business assigned to him, but other business as well ; and we constantly see in the newspapers, reports of statements he has made. He can hardly be in such a very bad state of health as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher), says, or he would confine himself to the work that is absolutely necessary. In fact, if he is so sick a man, as has been stated, I do not see why he should go into this work at all. The country is quite willing to pay a minister who has faithfully discharged his duties, even should he be laid aside for a time. I think it gives greater reason for our complaints that the minister is not here to answer necessary questions in supply, when we find him in London and Paris making these unfortunate speeches.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). This message is the most extraordinary one we have ever had. I do not think that we have had such experience in regard to any other exhibition. My hon. friend (Mr. Fisher), may shake his head. There is a vast difference between the World's Fair at Chicago, or the Indian and Colonial at London, so far as their actual value to this country is concerned, and the Paris exhibition of the present year. My opinion is that if \$25,000 were spent on behalf of the Canadian people for the Paris Exposition of this year, that would be enough. This large expenditure, is money almost wasted. I would like the minister to say what return the Canadian people may expect for these two or three hundred thousand dollars that will be spent ? I think it is an outrage. As the hon. minister knows, I am not one of those who make charges off-hand, with regard to the public service ; but I think it is simply an attempt to afford this man and that man passage to Paris at the expense of the government of Canada. I am not making any invidious distinction between the parties, but I think the government are simply acting in this matter without check or hindrance, and that there is a wasteful scattering of the public funds which will bring practically no return to Canada. The extravagance of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), is well known. His liberal ideas when he is seeking public money, we all recognize. I think that the Minister of Agriculture is acting very unwisely in giving to that colleague the power to spend public money there, or he is acting unwisely in spending it on that colleague's advice. We understand that a gentleman of

Mr. Tarte's proclivity for popularity, is exceedingly anxious to cut a swell figure in Paris during this exhibition, and he does not care a rap—I say that advisedly—what it costs the people of Canada; nor does he care whether we get any return for that expenditure or not. There are ways in which money can be spent in the older lands which would be a very great advantage to Canada, but in my judgment, this is not one of the ways; and I believe that, when the hon. minister (Mr. Fisher), comes to submit the details of these accounts to parliament, he will find that extravagance of the very worst type has been indulged in by the people he has sent there, people who practically have the management of affairs in their own hands. The original vote was a sufficient vote, and the government should have tied the commissioners down to that. There does not seem to have been any order or proper arrangement or organization of the men in the beginning. We had this man going to Paris, and that man returning, and a general flight across the ocean of people connected with the government; and all the while Mr. Tarte is over there, and sending requisitions for more money. I do not want to utter any insinuations, but it appears to me, that nine-tenths of the money that is being spent will not bring a dollar of return to the Canadian people.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I realize that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague), is speaking as he considers, very moderately in regard to this matter; and I know he is not disposed to cavil at expenditures. But I think he is putting an unfair statement before the House in regard to this matter. In the first place, I do believe most sincerely, though I regret to differ with the hon. gentleman—that a large expenditure to make Canada cut a good figure at the Paris exhibition was a most justifiable thing on the part of this country. I am satisfied that the Paris exhibition this year will attract the greatest crowds of people ever gathered together on earth. I understand from those who have written from there, and also from one or two gentlemen who have been there, in a private capacity, that this is the case. They said that Paris was crowded in an extraordinary degree with people from the ends of the earth. It would have been a great pity had Canada not been adequately represented. I am glad to say, from statements made to me, by those who have seen it and also from reports from our own staff, that our exhibits are fine in quality, and are now exposed in such a way as to make a most excellent display. I understand that our exhibit of agricultural products is the finest thing of its kind at the exposition, and has attracted universal attention and admiration. Our mineral exhibit, while not on the grand scale of some of the United States, is still spoken of as of the highest quality, and as showing in a very marked de-

gree the varied resources of this country. And so with many others of our exhibits. I may say also that the people of Canada showed a disposition and desire to exhibit at Paris. True, some of the manufacturers found themselves so busy that they were unable to prepare an exhibit, while some others did not send as much as they intended—not from any lack of a desire to do so, but because their factories were working overtime, and they were so busy they could not undertake to get up an exhibit. Notwithstanding that, however, we have what I venture to think is the finest exhibit of manufactured articles that has ever been sent out of Canada, without any exception. I think the Canadian exhibit will attract attention, not only from the people of France, but from a large number of people from other countries who are there, people from our own empire, people from all the countries of Europe, as well as our own rivals from the United States, and from Australia, who are in the habit of sending food products to the same markets that we do. With regard to what the hon. gentleman has said about the comparison of expenditure between this and other exhibitions, I have not under my hand at the moment the expenditure at the Chicago exhibition, or at the Indian and Colonial. But I may say that the expenditure at the Chicago exhibition, speaking from memory, was vastly greater than that which has been incurred or will be incurred for the Paris exhibition; and that, notwithstanding the fact that Chicago was at our own doors, while Paris is 3,000 miles away. As regards the officials, the hon. gentleman thinks that they are extravagant, but I can assure him that the commissioners have not been so at all. The arrangements that we made with our employees there were somewhat different from those made at other exhibitions. They are paid so much a day to cover both salary and living allowances, and in that way the payments made may compare favourably with those that were made at the Indian and Colonial exhibition, or at the Chicago and former Paris exhibitions. There is not that extravagance which the hon. gentleman believes to exist. It is true that the Minister of Public Works, who has been given, as was proper to a gentleman in his position, and occupying the post he occupies there a somewhat free hand. But I do not think the hon. gentleman need be afraid of what the Minister of Public Works will do, although I grant he wishes to see Canada worthily represented there and to make a good showing. Still, he has a regard for the way in which the money is spent, so I am not at all prepared to accept the strictures which the hon. gentleman has made against my colleague in that respect. I acknowledge that I regret the great expenditure in connection with space. At Chicago we did not have to pay for space, at the Indian and Colonial I do not

think that we paid for space, at least not nearly so much. I am quite willing to admit that is a heavy expenditure at Paris, and one which I hardly think is proper in this sense, that I do not think the Paris authorities ought to have charged for space when they were inviting people to go to their exhibition. But still that was a rule of the exhibition which was laid down, and we either had to accept it or not go at all. But, believing, as I do, that Canada will reap a great benefit from this exhibition, I would have felt that we could hardly withdraw. I venture to say that the exhibition will redound greatly to the credit of Canada. I am glad to be able to say that I have received a couple of letters from exhibitors, which have just come in, one from the Massey-Harris Company, and one from Mr. Burton, an exhibitor of manufactured articles, both of whom express themselves as extremely pleased with the way in which they have been treated by the commissioners and the way in which the exhibits have been cared for. The Massey-Harris people are especially enthusiastic in praise of the management of the Canadian exhibit as a whole. I am glad also to be able to say that although there was at first some delay, and the exhibition was not ready at the date it was opened, as no part of it was ready then, or is quite ready yet, our Canadian exhibit was one of the most forward and ready of any exhibit in Paris.

Mr. DAVIN. What does this enormous staff find to do ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The staff are there to give explanations and information in regard to Canada, to look after the exhibits and see that they are properly installed; and having been installed, and set up, and properly prepared, they are there to watch over them and to give explanations in regard to them, in regard to Canada, and the way these things are produced in Canada, and to give such information as commissioners usually do at exhibitions.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the minister should tell us just how much money has been spent up to date, and how it has been spent.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can give the hon. gentleman the amount in a rough form.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think we should have it in a detailed form, because to my mind this money is being absolutely wasted, thrown away entirely, and if we spent it in establishing our reputation for food products in British markets instead of throwing it away in Paris on what I see one of the American papers calls an aggregation of fakes, it would be a good deal better for Canada. In my judgment, when the government found out that it was a money-

Mr. FISHER.

making speculation and that a large amount was being charged for space, they would have been justified in retiring at once, and I think they ought to have retired. As to the advantage that is going to come from it to Canada, that is largely a myth. In my judgment nine-tenths of the money will be wasted. Before we vote any more I think the minister ought to tell us just how the money has been spent, and what it has been spent for.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As I have already mentioned in answer to the hon. member for York, N. B., \$175,000 has been spent.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How has that been spent ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The items are here. Placed to the credit of the High Commissioner in London, \$88,573. That was spent for the building. Below that another item, \$16,800—

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much did the building at Chicago cost ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the Canadian building cost us about \$40,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. More like \$4,000. I happen to know.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I know, too. I am speaking from memory, but it was certainly nearer \$40,000 than \$4,000. But I want to point out this which the hon. gentleman knows very well, that the Canadian building at Chicago was not for Canadian exhibits at all; it was simply used as a reception room for visitors and that kind of thing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We paid for no space in that building.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I grant that.

Mr. BERGERON. It did not cost \$40,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It certainly did not go to \$10,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will bring the item down. The whole cost of the Chicago exhibition was something like \$360,000. Then Mr. Perrault, when he went over to Paris, was given a credit of £1,000 for commencing the work and installing the exhibits.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How was that spent ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got the details of that expenditure.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We ought to have these accounts in by this time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Perrault went over there to receive the

exhibits as they were shipped from here. Somebody had to receive them there, to see that they were placed, and to pay freights and charges on them. We could only pay the charges here on the ship, and Mr. Perreault had to pay the charges from Antwerp to Paris, the charges of bringing them to the exhibition building in Paris, and storing them there until the building was ready. The government paid the expense of carrying the exhibits to Paris from Canada and setting them up, as has been done in every other exhibition.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it true that when Mr. Tarte arrived there he found things in a very unsatisfactory condition?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not like to use that word, but it was found that our building was not by any means ready and the exhibits were not placed. That is not the fault of our commissioners, but because the contractors, whose contract was with the colonial commission of the Imperial commission, had not lived up to their contract. That is the money we paid under contract.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What was the amount of the contract?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not tell you off-hand. This payment amounted to \$88,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is Mr. Perreault going to account for all the moneys he received, and show how he spent them?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe that Mr. Perreault has been sending in accounts periodically.

Mr. BERGERON. Could not we have his accounts here?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will give the items of them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Perrault's items were very interesting in 1875.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These are on a different scale, and under different management.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is he the same gentleman?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but working differently. The system of accounts is entirely different. These gentlemen are given an allowance for living. In Philadelphia the Canadian commission engaged a house and got living expenses in that house.

Mr. BERGERON. How are they in Paris?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are paid so much a day, and allowed to do as they like.

Mr. BERGERON. Where does Mr. Perreault board?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know and do not care.

Mr. BERGERON. Does not the hon. Minister of Public Works keep house there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand the hon. Minister of Public Works keeps house there, and that it is paid out of the money furnished him by the government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No; if he does keep house he does it at his own expense.

Mr. DAVIN. Is there any limit as to what the hon. minister spends?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not fixed any per diem allowance.

Mr. DAVIN. He spends what he likes.

Mr. BERGERON. I have heard it rumoured in Montreal that the hon. Minister of Public Works keeps house in Paris, and that it is being paid for at the public expense.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. His wife has engaged a house there at her own private expense.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman says that the Minister of Public Works has a free hand. We know what the hon. Minister of Public Works is, and with his chauvinism in the most exalted state, we can easily understand how the money will go.

The PRIME MINISTER. They are very thrifty in Paris.

Mr. DAVIN. Thrifty some are, but, not the high kickers with whom the hon. Minister of Public Works associates.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They are very spendthrift.

Mr. DAVIN. The Minister of Agriculture represents the vast portion of the people of Canada, and it is a most important portion. We have not yet heard it explained to us in what way the agricultural population of Canada will be benefited by this exposition. We have an army of officials, an army of ladies and gentlemen taken over—some twenty-four in all. I spent two months at the Philadelphia exhibition, and I observed Mr. Perreault when he was a younger man than he is now. Twenty-four persons are going in connection with this exhibition. The hon. gentleman said that there was no jobbery. We have Mr. Gillmor, Mr. Jardine, Mr. Scott, Mr. Perreault and Mr. Tarte. What Scott is that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. W. D. Scott of Winnipeg.

Mr. BERGERON. What Gillmor is that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Gillmor is now Senator. He has resigned his position.

Mr. BERGERON. Who has replaced him?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He has not been replaced.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Gillmor is a Senator. We are glad that there will be so much political economy in the Upper House. I have no doubt that it will be a great advantage, but on the face of it, can it be supposed that that was not a job? Mr. Gillmor was not needed. This has been proven because he was not replaced. As the representative of an agricultural district I want to know how their interests are to be subserved by this exposition, in which a building will cost us at least \$115,000. When the exposition is over, will it be in any way an asset to the people of Canada?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The implement building near Vincennes will be sold for our benefit.

Mr. DAVIN. Fancy \$115,000 for a temporary building.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Part is for space, and part for the building.

Mr. DAVIN. The whole thing is a monstrous use of that extravagance and recklessness which touches everything that the hon. Minister of Public Works is connected with from the first hour that his fatal malignant hand has laid its touch upon the ministerial life of Canada up to this.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the names of the ladies who are there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is Madame Dandurand and Mademoiselle Barry.

Mr. DAVIN. Are there any other ladies there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is Miss Galbraith and Miss Leboutilier, who are acting as typewriters.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the work of these ladies?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mde. Dandurand represents Canada at various conventions of ladies' organizations which are going to meet in Paris. The World's Women's Council will meet in Paris this summer. There is a large number of congresses going on during the period of the exposition.

Mr. BERGERON. Has anything of the kind taken place yet?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think any great congress has taken place, but there are meetings of ladies who are engaged in various branches of women's work.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. BERGERON. What advantage is that to Canada?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All countries are represented.

Mr. BERGERON. Madame Dandurand and Mlle. Barry are the lady commissioners?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Madame Dandurand is the commissioner, Miss Barry is an assistant.

Mr. BERGERON. And I suppose the correspondence which she sends to *La Patrie* is paid for by the country?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I stipulated with Miss Barry that she should send reports regularly to the papers.

Mr. BERGERON. And she sends only to *La Patrie*?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And to *La Presse*.

Mr. BERGERON. No.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. She sends to *La Presse*, but they may not publish them.

Mr. BERGERON. What do those other two ladies, Miss Gailbraith and Miss Bouthellier, do?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a ladies room where the ladies rest, and meet and gather and talk over things, and one of these young ladies is there all the time. They have their typewriters there, and they do the correspondence of the exhibition.

Mr. BERGERON. They are Madame Dandurand's typewriters?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No; they do the typewriting work for the whole commission.

Mr. BERGERON. Are there no other ladies there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Is not Mrs. Turcotte there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. She is in the Public Works Department and acts for the minister.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Surely the Minister of Public Works does not want his secretary and an extra typewriter on the other side of the Atlantic?

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Tarte has his secretary there—Mr. Haines—and Mrs. Turcotte is his typewriter as well.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was not aware that the secretary was there. He is not on the Paris staff.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What are we coming to? The minister goes away for his health, and he takes his secretary and his typewriter. Is there any place where the men gather and meet and rest and take something?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a reception room in charge of Mr. Cusson, the secretary of the commission.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Tarte has his secretary there, and I suppose he pays him out of this \$50,000 vote?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know anything about his secretary. If he has a secretary he is not paid out of the vote for the Paris exposition.

Mr. BERGERON. What does Mrs. Turcotte do?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know. She is not connected with the exhibition.

Mr. BERGERON. She is connected with the master of the exhibition.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That may be, but she is not paid out of this vote.

Mr. BERGERON. How does the minister know how these people are paid when he does not know any of the details.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Tarte informed me that he was going to take a typewriter, whether Mrs. Turcotte or not I do not know, but she was not to be paid out of the Paris vote. He said he might take his secretary, but I do not think he did. I am not speaking from absolute knowledge about that, but it is not to be paid out of the Paris vote.

Mr. BERGERON. The minister gave Mr. Tarte \$50,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not.

Mr. BERGERON. Where did he get it?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know.

Mr. BERGERON. It has been said here and never denied, that Mr. Tarte was given a credit of \$50,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. Who said it?

Mr. BERGERON. I think the Prime Minister did.

The PRIME MINISTER. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. BERGERON. My right hon. friend has been sleeping for the last hour and he forgets.

The PRIME MINISTER. I remember what I said.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, what amount of money was given the Minister of Public Works when he left?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Three thousand dollars.

Mr. BERGERON. At an expensive time like this in Paris, where does the Minister of Public Works get the money needed to keep up the life he is living, and to keep up all this suite, with secretaries, &c.?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know.

Mr. BERGERON. Where did this \$175,000 go to, then?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. \$88,573 went to the High Commissioner in London, \$4,866 to Mr. Perreault—

Mr. BERGERON. Did Mr. Perreault get that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, and more too.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think Mr. Perreault had the expenditure of the amount sent to Paris, except what was sent to the High Commissioner. There was \$3,800 sent to Mr. Hector Fabre for bills that had accrued there before the commissioners arrived, and there is a departmental item of \$40,000, which, I suppose, means salaries and expenditure in preparation of the exhibition before the commissioners went over.

Mr. BERGERON. To whom was that \$40,000 paid?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The accountant of the Department of Agriculture has the details.

Mr. BERGERON. Cannot we see them?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose so, but it is not usual to lay the departmental accounts before the House.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, we should remember that we are voting the money of the people here. I am convinced that a great deal of money is spent for nothing. It is the best thing that the government could do to give us details, because then we would be in a position to defend the government over this.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very likely.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is an item of \$15,000 for printing maps, &c.

Mr. BERGERON. Who was that paid to?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the details here.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, we should not allow this vote to pass until we get the de-

tails. Here is \$175,000 spent here, and the minister does not know how a cent of it was spent. Has Mr. Tarte the disposal of all this money?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, how is it spent?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is paid out on the signature of two of the commissioners.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it true that Mr. Tarte has been authorized to go to Brussels and deliver lectures to Galicians and Doukhobors to invite them to come to Canada?

The PRIME MINISTER. Do you believe all that?

Mr. BERGERON. I am telling the government what I believe. I believe a lot of things that are bad for the government. I saw a letter of Father Lacombe's stating that he is going to Brussels with Mr. Tarte to see the Galicians and invite them to settle in the North-west, and that he is going to Austria to ask the Emperor of Austria to help the Catholics who are in the North-west. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if the government have authorized Mr. Tarte to do that?

The PRIME MINISTER. If Mr. Tarte were to go to Brussels I would not be surprised at all; but if he were to go to Vienna or to Galicia, I would be surprised.

Mr. BERGERON. That is no answer. Has the government or the right hon. gentleman authorized him to do so?

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Tarte has been authorized to go to Paris as commissioner. If he takes a holiday to go to Brussels. I do not think he needs anybody's permission.

Mr. BERGERON. I am asking the right hon. gentleman a fair question. Is Mr. Tarte authorized to go and give lectures or conferences at Brussels or in Austria, and invite any one to come to Canada? If Mr. Tarte is not authorized, how does he dare to go and travel at the expense of Canada?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not suppose that Mr. Tarte has to go to Austria to lecture to the Doukhobors; but if Mr. Tarte found time to go to Brussels to lecture on Canada, I would quite approve of his doing so, and he would not require the authorization of the government. I think it is quite within his duties.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think so. We all know that Mr. Tarte has been the master of the administration in Canada for years. But he could not be here during the session; he went across because he was supposed to be sick, which I do not believe, because a man doing the work he is doing there must be one of the strongest men in

Mr. BERGERON.

this country. I do not think he should be there and have a free hand in the expenditure of the money of this country, for we know the man, and we know that he is not scrupulous in the expenditure of money that belongs to the people.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order.

Mr. BERGERON. I am perfectly in order.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman is not in order when he says that the Minister of Public Works is not scrupulous in expending public money.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order. The expression he has used is too harsh to be used in debate.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the rule? I am here as a representative of the people, and I have rights.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has been called to order for using an expression which should not be used according to the ordinary rules of debate.

Mr. BERGERON. I contend that it is not against the rules. I think I know the rules a little, and I have a right to use the word unscrupulous, and to say that a minister of the Crown is not scrupulous.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. If the word unscrupulous were used alone, I would not say that it was quite a polite expression to be used in debate, but the hon. member used it in such a way as to insinuate some charge against the minister.

Mr. BERGERON. I said that the Minister of Public Works was not scrupulous when he spent public money, and that is not against the rules. We have the proof of that. He has increased the expenditure in every part of his department; that means that he is not scrupulous. He has given contracts without tender; that shows that he is unscrupulous. I have used a word which I find in the dictionary. The Minister of Public Works is a spendthrift and an extravagant man. Will that do?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no use of discussing that question. I understand that the hon. member does not want to charge the minister with doing anything that is contrary to morals.

Mr. BERGERON. As far as morals are concerned, I will leave him in the hands of Almighty God. I am not talking about morals—I will leave that to his own conscience.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I mean anything dishonest.

Mr. BERGERON. I will not use the word dishonest. I mean it, but I do not use the word. I want to get every possible detail of the public money that will go through

the hands of the Minister of Public Works. If my right hon. friend were in Paris at the head of that commission, I would not ask for the details of one dollar's expenditure, for I have confidence that he would not spend one cent that was not necessary. I have not that confidence in the Minister of Public Works, judging by his conduct since he has been a minister over his department. I have confidence also in my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher); but I want every possible detail of the money spent at Paris by Mr. Perreault and Mr. Tarte. Before we vote this item I would like to get from my right hon. friend to whom the money has been paid, how it has been spent, and the vouchers. I know it has been said that the Minister of Public Works went across there because he was sick; but he could not be doing the work he is doing there if he were sick.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is close to his physician.

Mr. BERGERON. He will very likely bury every one of us. When I asked the right hon. gentleman whether he had authorized Mr. Tarte, who is in Paris as commissioner of the exhibition, to go around from one country to the other, and ask for immigration, the hon. gentleman said he had not asked Mr. Tarte to do so, but if Mr. Tarte did so, he would be ready to say he did right.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. gentleman unbounded confidence in Messrs. Tarte and Perreault in the matter of economy?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe they are doing things as economically as they can.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What evidence have you?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My knowledge of the men.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend will lose my confidence, if he goes on talking like that.

Mr. SPROULE. What is likely to be the whole cost of the exhibition?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have asked in the estimates for next year, \$50,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is safe to say the exhibition will cost \$350,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should hope not more than \$300,000.

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to the statement of the hon. minister that he pays no attention to newspaper reports, we see a report of the doings of Mr. Tarte, which was published, I think, in *La Patrie*, and which stated that he had refused to allow the representative of the British Empire to include Canada as a portion of that empire, and absolutely insisted on Canada being re-

cognized entirely independent of Great Britain. He even went so far as to threaten that if President Loubet would not treat Canada as such, he would close the Canadian exhibition. That statement was published in many papers, and yet the hon. minister would not take any cognizance of it. It appears to me Mr. Tarte's conduct was too high-handed and significant to allow it to pass without comment. This indignity and insult to the British Empire is entirely incompatible with his duties and responsibilities.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman puts a different complexion on a newspaper rumour than from what I have gathered from any paragraph I have seen. I did see a paragraph to the effect that some question had arisen between Colonel Jekyll, the secretary of the Colonial Commission of the Imperial Commission, as to the precedence of the Canadian commissioners at the visit of President Loubet to the colonial building. I did not see any statement or suggestion that Mr. Tarte wished to divorce Canada from the empire in any way whatever.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what the papers say.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is absurd. Mr. Tarte did not dream of such a thing. As to the exact particulars, I have no official information, but no doubt will get particulars in letters from Paris, and will be glad to give them to the House.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman took no trouble to get any information?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not think it worth while cabling about it.

Mr. SPROULE. If the statement is correct, it was a very high-handed and uncalled for proceeding on the part of Mr. Tarte, and quite out of keeping with his duties in the position he holds. It shows a great deal of carelessness and indifference on the part of the Prime Minister, as well as the Minister of Agriculture, not to take steps to ascertain whether the report was correct or not.

The PRIME MINISTER. I should deem it my duty to investigate any charge which would have some foundation, but when my hon. friend appears to think seriously that Mr. Tarte attempted to separate Canada from the British Empire, the charge is so absurd that if he is prepared to believe it, I am not. But if Mr. Tarte insisted that Canada should be considered separately by President Loubet as being a self-governing colony, having its own autonomy, I cannot blame Mr. Tarte for that. That would be quite consistent with our position in the empire. We are part of the empire, and are proud of it, and the British flag floats over our building. But if Mr. Tarte in-

sisted that Canada should be given recognition as a self-governing autonomist colony, I do not think my hon. friend will find fault with that.

Mr. SPROULE. The statement was absolutely made that when it was contemplated giving President Loubet a reception in the building belonging to the British Empire, Mr. Loubet was to be received by Colonel Jekyll, as representing the British Empire, but Mr. Tarte emphatically objected, and said in effect that Canada was an independent country, and the reception should be made in the Canadian pavilion, or he would close the exhibition. In the first place I would like to ask what authority he had to close the Canadian exhibition. If as chairman of the board of commissioners, he was acting without consultation or advice with them, his proceeding was a high-handed one. And for him to entirely ignore the relationship of Canada in regard to the exhibition with the British Empire in a building belonging to the empire, was still worse.

Patent Record ..... \$4,500

Mr. FOSTER. We will let these items go through with the understanding that on the main estimates we may have any questions answered.

Immigration ..... \$75,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this large sum?

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). I suppose if this whole question is to be discussed when the main estimates come down, all I need give is the items, as follows: To recoup for quarantine, \$15,000; additional bonuses, \$20,000; additional printing and stationery, \$20,000; locating immigrants, \$10,000; collection of exhibits, \$5,000; miscellaneous expense, \$5,000; \$75,000. It will be seen that a large proportion of this is to pay for additional bonuses. Another cause of expense was the sickness which broke out, especially among the children of the immigrants while they were at Winnipeg. Measles and scarlet fever broke out, and there was a large and unexpected expenditure because of that.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). We are within eighteen days of the end of the financial year, and I can hardly understand why the minister should want so large an amount at this time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is all spent.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister has spent the money then, and merely comes to us for our endorsement of what has been done. A warning was given with regard to this last year. If this kind of thing goes on, we shall be obliged to move that the item be struck out. The minister has no right to

spend a dollar of this without the consent of parliament, and should not have done so. I warn the minister he had better not repeat it, otherwise the House will have to take action, and his supporters will be compelled to give a vote that they will not care very much about giving. The money having been spent, I suppose it will have to go. But I hope that the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland), from whom we expect much more than from the minister himself, will put a check on that sort of thing, and that we shall not be called upon to give another such vote as we are called upon to give to-night.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the amount expended over the appropriation could not be satisfactorily accounted for, the criticism would be all right. But, when we come to discuss the matter, I think these items can be shown to have been in the best interest of the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. Whether the money is spent well or ill, matters very little so far as the country is concerned—it is gone. I hope in future the acting minister will exercise healthy control over the expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems rather amusing to say that the money is spent, and the House must vote it, but we can give a satisfactory explanation later on, not now. The satisfactory explanation would be more satisfactory if it were given before the money was spent, because it is on the explanation that we judge whether it should be voted or not. I do not wonder at this expenditure, when I remember that there is an army of agents all over the country to spend it. I think there are 250 agents employed in the United States; and, if we had correct information as to the number of immigrants they bring in to the country, I believe it would be found they bring in an average of one or two each. We have no reliable information on that point. But we know that the government have succeeded in placing every political friend of theirs who was instrumental in securing the support of the patrons.

Mr. COWAN. Not all of them.

Mr. SPROULE. There may be a few like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan), but no doubt all hope to be brought in. There is Mr. Curry, Mr. Rogers, Mr. Green, Mr. Davies, the brother of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Holmes, the brother of the hon. member for West Huron, and the rest of the list. These men draw immense salaries, and considering the small return, it is no wonder that we object to this extravagant expenditure, and no wonder that the minister is obliged to come and ask for an additional amount of \$75,000. I remember that a few years ago, hon. gentlemen opposite said that \$75,000 was too much to spend on immigration altogether.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), will see that the items themselves show results. There is a vote for additional bonuses. The department last year spent \$60,000 in extra bonuses, and this money would not be spent had not the immigrants come in. Then there was the unexpected sickness among the immigrants. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, does not object to that expenditure—he would not allow disease to spread through the country.

Mr. BERGERON. Where did he get the authority to spend the money?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. We owe it.

Mr. BERGERON. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland), said it was all spent.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is spent, but not paid.

Mr. WILSON. Is this \$75,000 in addition to the \$360,000 appropriated last year? I think there are two or three ways in which bonuses are paid, and the minister ought to be familiar with that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I appeal to the hon. gentlemen that in view of the arrangement which was made with the leader of the House, it would be better to defer this discussion until the item in the main estimates comes up.

Mr. WILSON. Will he be prepared to give us then all the explanations about how the bonuses are paid, and in what condition the bonuses are?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly. My hon. friend is entitled to every reasonable information and he must have it.

Militia and Defence—Annual drill—Further amount required for June camps. . . \$125,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). This is to pay for the annual drill prior to July 1. Every year there is a similar vote to this. The vote in the main estimates was \$300,000 which, with this, is estimated as the cost of drilling the whole militia in any one year. We propose to drill about 35,000, of these 20,220 are going into camps now. The first artillery goes into camp on June 5; the second artillery on June 19, the first division, London, camp on June 5, the 2nd division, Niagara, on June 12; the 3rd division, Kingston, on June 19; the 4th division, Laprairie, on June 26; the 5th division, Lévis, on June 26. The 1st artillery brigade number 400; the 2nd, 400; the 3rd 400. The London camp will number 3,850; the Niagara camp, 3,800; the Kingston camp, 3,670; the Laprairie camp, 4,000; the Lévis camp, 3,700. I have here a detailed statement of how this vote will be spent. The pay of the men will amount to \$104,500, that is the pay to men and officers. Rations will cost about \$15,000, that is an estimate

of sixteen cents per man per day, all furnished by tender. I have all the prices here. 1,000 horses at twenty-five cents a day. All these sums total \$122,250, and we are asking for \$125,000. The transportation is not estimated for, because the bills will not come in until considerably later, and there is money enough in the main estimates to pay for that.

Mr. HENDERSON. When the estimate of the same character was before us last year, I drew the attention of the minister to the question of increased pay to the volunteers attending camp, and possibly he may have given that matter some consideration. I think there is a widespread opinion that the men ought not to be asked to leave employments where they earn \$1.25 a day, and go out to camp for fifty cents. It seems to me they ought to be allowed some better compensation than that. I do not think the country should expect the services of these men even for the purpose of drill in such a way as to entail a loss upon them. I think a more fair and reasonable remuneration should be given them. It may be said that these men do not enter this service for the sake of money; but we must make them feel comfortable in the position, and I think that something better should be done for them.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I remember distinctly the discussion we had upon this question last year. I am not able to say, however, that I can recommend any change. The present system has worked very well for many years. So far as I know, there is no complaint generally among the volunteer militia as to the rate of pay. In the first place the service is voluntary, men need not go into it unless they choose; in the second place, the men who go into that sort of thing usually do it from choice, they like it, they are fond of it, it is an outing, and gives them an opportunity to engage in something which they have a special fondness for. I think all they require is to receive enough to cover their actual outlays, to be indemnified for any personal loss. The hon. gentleman knows that the government supplies the food, clothing and transportation, and in addition 50 cents a day. It seems to me we are hardly called upon to make any change now.

Experimental Farm, Ottawa—Balances due contractors for construction of laboratory and root house, and for other works urgently needed in connection with buildings, fittings, fencing, &c. . . . . \$4,100

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The laboratory was foreseen last year, but the root-house was found to be completely rotted, and we had to rebuild, and in rebuilding we had to put in a stone wall underneath rather than the wooden structure that there was before. That cost more than

we could pay out of the ordinary vote for repairs. In building it we built a wagon shed. There has not been a wagon shed or a shelter for wagons and vehicles at the Experimental Farm.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.15 a.m. (Tuesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, June 12, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### YUKON TELEGRAPH LINE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to a motion that I will make, if he consents. Perhaps it would be better to state the nature of it, and unless the Prime Minister says that I should move it to-day leave it as a notice of my intention to move. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), early in the session, put a series of questions connected with the telegraph construction under Mr. Charleson; and being asked by the minister representing that department to make a motion for papers, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) gave notice of that motion on February 14. When this notice of motion was called on several occasions when the unopposed motions were taken, a request was made that it should be allowed to stand. And the hon. gentleman saw fit to drop the motion from the paper, in order that he might not be debarred, when this portion of the estimates was reached, from discussing the substance of that notice of motion. I have received information from one of the employees under Mr. Charleson which corresponds closely with the points suggested by these questions. I received yesterday also a communication from another party, not, as I believe, connected with the work, but a man who lived in the district while the working was going on; and the information in these two communications tallies so closely, and both the writers profess their readiness to

Mr. FISHER.

attend before a committee or any formal body to testify to what they say, that, in order that the matter can be properly ventilated and discussed when the estimates of that department are reached, I desire to move that the papers on the point be brought down. Of course, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will see the reason for my pressing for his favourable consideration of such a motion. I will not weary the House by going over the various points touched by the questions, and which are covered by the heads of the motion, but, I may state the main one substantially, not being held too closely to accuracy in my statement: In connection with the construction of the telegraph line contracts for different divisions were made by Mr. Charleson with different parties for the necessary poles, at very good prices. But, instead of using these poles, for instance, on the first section, the greater number of them were simply disposed along the shore of the river or lake next which the line took its course, and then the contractors utilized the trees growing along the route for swinging the wires, leaving the poles about ten feet above high water mark to rot. This went on for more than one section of the line, but I think it was on the third section that Mr. Charleson stopped this business.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Does the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) say that these are the facts?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has not followed me. I say that this is the information I get from a man employed under Mr. Charleson at the time and still employed, a man whom I know personally and whom I know to be reliable. He is perfectly ready to testify to this, either before a committee of the House or before any tribunal that may look into the matter. Then, weeks or months afterwards, a man who is not in the employ, but who states that he was in the district when this was going on, says he is willing to testify to these facts. Other points are that A. Boyer, assistant to J. B. Charleson in the construction, was to receive \$150 a month, according to the statement of the Prime Minister on the floor of the House; but, as a matter of fact, Charleson pays Boyer \$225 a month, or \$75 a month more than the government engaged him for at Ottawa. It is further charged that Charleson filled the places on the telegraph system with foreigners; that he places his orders in Vancouver with merchants who agree to pay his nephew, Percy W. Charleson, 5 per cent commission, which he has received, Percy W. Charleson being at this time J. B. Charleson's agent here; that he paid his son \$350 for expenses to Ottawa when he was not an employee of the government; that he awards contracts to his foreman, whom he brought into the country at the

government's expense, without calling for tenders. These are a few of the points on which this man is ready to give information. I have not troubled the House with the letters. I give notice of motion in order that the Prime Minister may look into the matter and see whether he will not agree to have the papers covered by the motion I have referred to brought down forthwith; because, undoubtedly, this matter will be subjected to examination in the Committee of the Whole here, and I think much time will be saved if we have such papers as are on record in regard to the matter referred to. It will save putting a large number of questions.

The PRIME MINISTER. What papers?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The papers mentioned in the notice of motion of February 14:

1. Date of Mr. Charleson's return from Dawson.
2. Report on the telegraph construction work, full and complete accounts for the same.
3. Date when last in Ottawa; date he left Ottawa, and destination.
4. The names of the men employed by him from Bennett to Dawson, and nationality of each man.
5. Wages and allowances given to the men per day.
6. Time they were employed.
7. Date the men struck for further pay; when, and result.
8. Name of party or parties who supplied the poles for the wire; price; terms.
9. Number of standing trees en route used for stringing the wires; distance, approximately, in comparison with the distance where poles were used.
10. Amount the government paid for poles distributed along the route and not used. Number of poles not used paid for by the government.
11. Whether the linemen employed at Dawson, Ogilvie, Selwyn, Selkirk, Five Fingers, Lower Labarge and Tagish, British subjects, and to what nationality do they belong.
12. Whether the following men were employed: William McNamara, Oly Martinson, Carter, Laurity Oleson, Brown and S. E. Chambers; at what wages, and in what capacity.
13. Number of linemen employed.
14. The name of the contractor for the supply of poles; name of the sub-contractor.
15. Residence of the sub-contractor.
16. Whether the government chartered the ss. 'W. S. Stratton'; from whom, and on what terms.
17. Tonnage of the 'W. S. Stratton.'
18. The name of her master; whether a British subject when engaged or acting as master.
19. Price paid for the use of this boat.
20. Use made of the 'W. S. Stratton.'
21. Number of scows, if any, used for supplies.
22. Number of boats other than scows used for supplies.
23. Number of scows used, and on what terms.
24. Amount of money charged or paid for transportation by water other than by the steamer 'Stratton.'
25. Length of time during construction that Mr. Charleson was actually present with the construction party.

26. Whether the government bought or chartered the 'Lillie C.' above White Horse; from whom and on what terms; disposition of this boat, whether sold or disposed of; on what terms, and to whom.

27. Nature of arrangements made for supplies to the men.

28. Whether the government is aware of the price charged the men for boots, tobacco, pipes, linens, underwear, overalls, &c. Whether middlemen acted in this regard, or the government directly dealt with the men. In case middlemen were acting, nature of arrangement made by the government, if any, to protect the men from imposition.

29. Arrangement, if any, made with the men engaged at Bennett respecting pay for their time when returning from Dawson.

30. Amount of money already paid for the telegraph line under Mr. Charleson's charge, and amount now due, as per accounts rendered and certified.

This is the notice of motion that was given by the hon. member for Beauharnois, and I desire also the additional papers that I have referred to. I do not suppose it will be necessary, if the government consents to the order passing, to add to that, because the information would be as full, I suppose, as the government could make it. If there is no objection, I will move it now.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I suppose that a good deal of the information mentioned by the hon. gentleman, and to which I can see no objection will be brought down. There are some statements the need of which I question, but I will say nothing of these at the present time. But I must express my regret at some of the strictures made by the hon. gentleman upon Mr. Charleson, and which I would hesitate very much to believe, unless he becomes responsible for them, because I have known Mr. Charleson for at least twenty-five years, and have always known him to be a perfectly honest man.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). When this question was put on the Order paper by myself in the month of February, I have every reason to believe that nearly every question could be answered, but at the request of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), I had to give a notice of motion, and every time it was called the government asked that it should stand. I believe my right hon. friend could get answers to every one of these questions, unless he is unwilling to give them.

#### ACCOUNTS OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Has the Prime Minister looked over the report brought down yesterday?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yes. Does the hon. gentleman insist upon having it printed?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. It is very bulky, and unless the hon. member has some special object to gain, which I do not understand, I cannot see why it should be printed.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I do not like to use the word 'insist,' but I think I shall have to. I, therefore, move that the rules of the House be suspended, and the third report of the Standing Committee, with reference to the Post Office Department, be printed.

Motion agreed to.

#### LETTER FROM LT.-COL HUGHES.

Mr. **B. M. BRITTON** (Kingston). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to mention that I saw in the *Globe* recently a letter which purports to be addressed by Lt.-Col. Hughes, to the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden). It seems to me strange that it should appear in a newspaper, and I desire to ask the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence, if he received that letter?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). I understand the hon. gentleman refers to a letter which recently appeared in the Toronto newspapers, written by Lt.-Col. Sam. Hughes, and addressed to myself. I understand the hon. gentleman to ask whether that letter appeared in the newspapers with my consent or authority. I have no hesitation in answering him at once, and saying that I did receive a letter which I presume to be the same letter which appeared in the Toronto newspapers, though I have not compared them. I received it about the date of this publication. As a matter of fact, I had not read the letter, and had not opened it until the very day in which it appeared in the Toronto papers. I did not authorize anybody to publish that letter, and I know nothing more about it than the fact that it was published without my authority, given to Lt.-Col. Hughes, or anybody else. I did not receive the original letter until the date at which this letter was published.

#### YUKON—INCOMPLETE RETURNS.

Mr. **G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the acting Minister of the Interior to the fact that in the return he brought down the other day, which in other respects is very satisfactory, one of the most satisfactory returns that I have received—there are four points missing which I will mention. The amount paid in permits issued at Ottawa, from August 30, and subsequently, in thirty-eight cases. These should have been returned from the Yukon so that they could be in possession of the department, and I suppose they have been. Also, the amount paid on the permits in class B. Then Mr. McGregor's report

Mr. **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**.

mentioned on page 37 of the papers brought down; and Mr. Bliss's report mentioned in Mr. Ogilvie's letters of November 1 and 2, 1899. If the hon. gentleman will supply those, I would like to have them.

#### VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. **W. H. MONTAGUE** (Haldimand). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to repeat my question to the Prime Minister, with regard to the voters' lists. This session we are asked for a vote to pay for their printing, and we have no information as to how the Printing Bureau is getting on with the printing of the lists.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend shows a wise diligence at all events. I cannot satisfy his curiosity at this moment, but I will inquire into it.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. The right hon. gentleman forgets to tell me after he has inquired.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Then the hon. gentleman will not forget to inquire again.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—THE EMERGENCY FOOD RATION.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). I move for leave to lay on the Table papers and correspondence relating to the emergency ration supplied to the troops in South Africa. These papers are those which were laid on the Table a few evenings ago, and include some additional papers. But they are not yet complete; I have not yet received the certified copy of the affidavits made by the men upon whom the test was made at Kingston. I propose to ask for a supplementary order to complete these papers at a later date. There are also certain analyses of the food which was used at Kingston, and the food that was sent to South Africa, which are not yet complete; that is to say, some of them are complete, but they are not wholly complete; and I propose to lay the whole of these on the Table, probably within a few days. I mean that in addition to the papers that I am laying on the Table now, there will be affidavits of the Kingston men and the analysis of the two kinds of food.

Mr. **NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN** (West Assiniboia). Have these analyses been made subsequent to the debate?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Both before and subsequent.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Now, Sir, the Minister of Militia and Defence has taken a course that leaves him in a very bad position, unless he at once refers this question to a committee to inquire into all the facts. The fact that he has had an analysis made since the debate, proves that in his own mind there

was a case to be inquired into, proves that in his own mind a prima facie case had been made by the hon. gentleman who brought this matter before the House, that the public mind would, therefore, be alarmed, and it was necessary to do something to appease the public mind. The fact that he has practically gone into an inquiry himself, makes it incumbent that we should have a full and thorough inquiry. I understand from what he has said that affidavits have been made, and analyses have been made. If so, are we only to have the affidavits?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interpose and say that the affidavits to which I refer, are the affidavits which were discussed here when this matter was first brought up, the affidavits of the soldiers at Kingston, who lived upon the emergency food for thirty days. These, as I explained to the House yesterday, were made three months ago. I explained yesterday to the House that the originals of these affidavits are not in the department, they are in the hands of a notary in the city of Montreal. I have been promised certified copies of the originals, and I propose to lay these on the Table as soon as I get them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The minister made another statement, he spoke of analyses made both before and after the debate.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand my hon. friend, in his interruption, to deal merely with the affidavits. But even sending for these affidavits made two or three months ago, is a course which places new material before the judgment of this House.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIN. Then the hon. gentleman will not deny that the fact of his having had an analysis subsequent to that debate, is taking a step to lay new material before the judgment of this House.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. DAVIN. If it is not what does it mean? What is the analysis for? The analysis must be of some food, either of 'Vitaline' or of 'Protose.' Whichever it is, it is intended that the result of the analysis should be placed before the House, and if the placing of the results of the analysis before the House is not the placing of new material before the judgment of the House, I do not know the meaning of language.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will explain, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), will allow me, again. The food which was used at Kingston in the test referred to in this House was analysed. The food which was sent to South Africa was analysed by the same chemist.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Some time ago,

Mr. MONTAGUE. When?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot give the exact date. It was before the debate and after the time that the food was sent to South Africa.

Mr. BERGERON. By whom?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Dr. Neilson has in his possession some of the food which was used at Kingston. He has also samples of the food sent to South Africa taken out of the original packages in transit at Halifax. It is now proposed in addition to the test which we have already made in the department, to submit to a first-class analyst, or chemist, samples of each of these foods, and have them tested.

Mr. DAVIN. That is exactly what I said.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, certainly, it is what I said. I said that he was going to place before the judgment of the House the result of a fresh analysis, and he tells us that he is going to make that analysis by a skilled analyst. Surely if he is going to make it he is going to make it for the purpose of placing the result before the judgment of the House, and what is the object of doing it unless there is a position in which he finds himself placed that wants to be righted? What is the object unless there is a doubt in regard to this transaction in the public mind as there is a doubt in regard to the transaction in the mind of parliament. If everything is satisfactory, if there is no reason for any suspicion, why make this analysis? As the hon. gentleman has gone so far he must, in order to clear himself before the people of Canada go further and give us a committee. He must enable us to examine Dr. Devlin, he must enable us to learn from Dr. Devlin where he got this food, how he made it up, how he got it into his cans and everything connected with the transaction. Nay, Sir, I will tell you what we want to know; we want to know what transactions the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden), himself, has had with Hatch & Co. We want to know what transactions he has had with Dr. Devlin, we want to know who negotiated with Dr. Devlin, we want to get at, whether it was the hon. Minister of Militia or an officer of his department who dealt with Dr. Devlin, and we cannot get at it without a committee.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Make a charge.

Mr. DAVIN. Fancy that kind of a chorus: Make a charge. That comes from the cavernous bosom of that gentleman who is ready to take for himself and his family all that he can get from this government.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. If cavernous bosom is unparliamentary, I will substitute capacious for it. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter that can be bluffed or fobbed by any attempt to gloss it over, by laughter, or by a sense of amusement. The Minister of Militia knows well that it is a transaction in which there is no amusement. The minister knows well that we are face to face with something wrong in regard to his department. It may be that we shall find some officer who, in dealing with Dr. Devlin, has been guilty of something wrong, but anyway there is the fact that the same food has not gone out to South Africa that was analysed at Kingston. That is an admitted fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIN. It is another food. Hon. gentlemen say no. Why not let us inquire and sift it to the bottom? If it can be shown irrefutably by these gentlemen in the Militia Department that it was the same food which was tested at Kingston which went to South Africa why not have a committee? and if it is patent to the public that it is the same food why have this subsequent analysis? I am afraid the hon. gentleman is uneasy in his mind; the public is uneasy in its mind, and it cannot be set at rest by an inquiry of the sort that is described by himself as having been undertaken. This parliament shall not rise until we have got to the bottom of this transaction, for, Mr. Speaker, there is something rotten in the state of Denmark.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I might call the attention of the House to the fact that there is no occasion at all for going into hysterics in regard to this thing. The hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) is complying with the promise he made the other day to the House that he would bring down the papers, and he has brought them down. Moreover, I will remind the House, that, at the close of the debate, upon the inquiry of the hon. member for York, N. B. (Mr. Foster) I stated that if it was the desire, if it was the request of any hon. member that we should have an inquiry into the matter he would have an inquiry, and since the papers have been brought down, if there is still anything obscure in the mind of any hon. gentleman, if the papers do not clear everything that may be obscure, I hope he will feel it to be quite within his option to

Mr. DAVIN.

ask for an inquiry, and there is no objection to it.

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I may say in reference to this matter that what the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has stated in his reply to my inquiry across the House is true. The only statement he made was that if the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) would make the charge that he believed fraud had been committed in this matter, he should have his committee. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier who has been absent for a day or two, is now present. He will be prepared, in the course of a few hours, anyway, within a day or two, or less, to make his charge, and we have the additional information to-day from what the right hon. gentleman has stated that a committee will be given.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I do not wish to detain the House, because I have prepared a motion embodying the charge which I intend to make, as requested by the right hon. the Prime Minister. But I would ask the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), since he has stated that much of this food in the original packages had remained in Canada, will he bring down those packages along with the papers, so that this House may see these packages.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If any are available.

Mr. MONK. Very well. Then there is another question which I wish to ask. Will the Minister of Militia, in bringing down the papers, place upon the Table of this House the order which was given from his department or from any other of the departments, permitting the free entry into Canada of the stuff which has been sent over to South Africa. Will he lay upon the Table of the House the order freeing that substance from the payment of duty.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not aware that there is any such order.

Mr. MONK. Does the minister say that no such order was given?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as I know.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). That would not be in the Militia Department.

Mr. MONK. I am addressing myself to the government generally. Will that order be brought down amongst the papers which the Minister of Militia has moved for permission to lay on the Table of the House?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The present motion is to allow

the minister to lay certain papers on the Table of this House. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will have every opportunity to make his motion to have his committee of inquiry, and every possible information he can have he shall have.

Mr. MONK. My right hon. friend is not quite fair to me. The Minister of Militia announces that he will lay certain papers on the Table of this House, and is it not competent for me to ask for a document which is of great importance, and which shows that this stuff was brought from the United States, and that it obtained free entry here from the Canadian government.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Minister of Militia cannot make such a promise because if such an order were given it would not be in his department. I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is going to make a charge within a few hours, and as soon as he makes the charge he shall have his committee, and the committee will have every information possible that may be in the hands of the government.

Mr. MONK. I am not going to take up the time of the House arguing the point with the Prime Minister, but I do not think that his answer is in any way satisfactory. I am aware that if I make the charge I will have the committee; I am secure about that now; and is it not competent for me to ask that the government shall bring down the order showing the free entry into Canada of the stuff that was sent into South Africa, showing that it came from the United States?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not aware of any such order.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If there is any such, will it be brought down?

Mr. MONK. The Minister of Customs is in the House and he can answer. Surely this incident must have struck him. This stuff came from the United States, and it was allowed to enter Canada free of duty, because it was destined to be for the use of the government. Now, will that order—

Mr. SPEAKER. The First Minister has stated the position of the government, and I think it is only fair that the House should accept his statement. Every one who knows parliamentary practice knows that each minister has control of his own department, and this matter does not belong to the Militia Department.

Mr. FOSTER. But the Minister of Customs ought have no hesitation in saying that if there is any such paper in his department it will be brought down.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I have no remembrance at all of what the hon. gentleman mentions.

Mr. FOSTER. We did not expect the Minister of Customs would have, but cannot the Minister of Customs say that if there is any such paper it will be brought down.

Mr. MONK. I want to ask another question of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), and that is the name of the analyst who analysed the substance which was sent to South Africa. We know who analysed the 'protose' which was tested in Kingston, but who is the analyst who examined the substance which was sent to South Africa?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have stated, Mr. Speaker, that I would lay these analyses on the Table when they are complete, and I will do so.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I happened to be absent the other day when this matter was brought to the attention of this House, but I have heard a great deal of this question since, and I want to state for the benefit of the House a few facts about it. This gentleman, Mr. Hatch, the inventor of this food, left the city of Buda-Pesth in Austria, and went to England to test it in a laboratory there, which was considered to be one of the best in the world. He could not obtain in England a laboratory complete enough to test his invention, and so he went to Paris. In Paris he was informed that he could not carry on his experiment unless it were for a French product to be used in France. He then returned to England and asked where he would go, and he was told there that the only place he could test his invention satisfactorily would be at the McGill University in Montreal. This it will be seen was a great compliment to Canada and to McGill University. Mr. Hatch, who is a chemist, came to Canada and he found at McGill what he considers, is perhaps, the most complete laboratory in the whole world. He was a stranger, and he got into partnership with a gentleman from Montreal, and the rest of the story is pretty well known. He was granted permission to make experiments on the men of 'A' Battery at Kingston, and these experiments proved satisfactory. Mr. Hatch has perfected his invention, and he is in a position to prove that there is 85 per cent nutritious food in his emergency rations. He had some difficulty with his partner, and they separated, and he learned a little while afterwards that his partner was fabricating or producing some such stuff as they were manufacturing in partnership. When he learned later on that the government of Canada had bought some of this other stuff his

curiosity was aroused and he had it analysed. He not only analysed it himself, but he went to the chemist who analysed his own food, and he found out that there was only 15 per cent of muscle-forming food in the preparation that was sent to South Africa by this government.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not want to call my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) to order, but I appeal to him, if the statement he is now making is not prejudging the case. The motion now before the House is simply to be allowed to lay papers on the Table, and the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) are not germane to the subject.

Mr. BERGERON. My remarks will, I think, help the investigation which is to be granted, because these gentlemen will be called as witnesses. I thought it would not be a bad thing for the country to know that we have in Montreal the best chemical laboratory to be found in the world.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorancy). I congratulate the Premier on the statement he made a moment ago. If I understood his words aright, they were these, that when the papers are tabled, if any member on this side of the House had any doubts left in his mind as to the transaction that had taken place or as to the regularity of the proceedings, a committee would be appointed if it were asked for. This statement was made before the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had mentioned that he was in a short time to make a charge and ask for a committee. I was not here the other evening, but I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon having found out at last that there was great unrest and anxiety in the public mind in relation to this matter, and he has again given evidence of the fact that the opposition is sometimes right. The other evening, if I can take *Hansard* as a correct report of what he said—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is proceeding to discuss the question.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am only discussing the question of bringing down the papers. I wish to say that not only the papers now before the House should be produced, but others, and I think I have the right to show that the other evening the right hon. gentleman said that if a charge of fraud were made, a committee would be granted. Now, the hon. gentleman does not say that; but he says that if anybody, after seeing the papers which are brought down, has any anxiety regarding the transaction, let him say so and he will get a committee at once. I simply want to point out the difference between what my right hon. friend said the other night and what he says now, and

Mr. BERGERON.

to say that the papers before the House are not sufficient to enlighten us. We want to be satisfied by the papers which have been brought down, and if not by them, by an inquiry, that there is an identity between the food—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, instead of dealing with the motion before the House, is proceeding to discuss the question on its merits.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am not at all doing that. I am only saying that the papers which have been brought down are not sufficient, and that we must have more papers to show that there was identity between the food which was analysed and the food which was subsequently analysed and sent to South Africa.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B. C.) I would like to ask the Minister of Militia whether he or any other member of the government has cabled to South Africa in respect to this food, and if so, what has been the nature of the cable.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PRIOR. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the hon. gentleman takes his seat I will go on. Mr. Speaker, there is a motion before the Chair, and until that motion is disposed of, the hon. gentleman has no right to put a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The minister may answer any question he sees fit.

Mr. PRIOR. I have asked a plain question, Mr. Speaker, and I would like the hon. minister to give an answer. Does the hon. gentleman refuse to give an answer?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have no objection to saying that I communicated with two officers in South Africa; but I do not think it is desirable in any interest at this moment to disclose exactly the nature of those communications.

Mr. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). I would like to ask the minister if I misunderstood him the other evening when, in answer to me, I understood him to say that the director general should report as to the second emergency food; that is, the food that was sent, of which there had been no chemical analysis.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I did not say there had not been.

Mr. TISDALE. To-day I understood the hon. minister to say that there had been.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, both foods.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). I want to inquire, Mr. Speaker, whether the papers which are to be brought down with reference to analysis, show that any analysis of the food was made before it went to South Africa and after it was supplied to the department. I refer to this 'Vitaline' food.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the date, but it was about the time the food was sent to South Africa. When the papers are brought down, that fact will be disclosed.

Mr. MONK. May I ask the hon. gentleman one question?

The PRIME MINISTER. Spoken.

Mr. MONK. Do I understand the Prime Minister to refuse me the privilege of asking a question?

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has been three times on his feet already.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I would like to ask the Minister of Militia where the food was delivered and who received it?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The food was delivered at Halifax. The papers which I have laid on the Table to-day show who received it. I do not remember the name, but I think the surgeon at Halifax, Dr. Jones, is one of the gentlemen whose names appear there as having certified to the food having been received.

Mr. WALLACE. Where did the analysis take place?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have given all the information I propose to give. In a day or two the papers will be on the Table.

Mr. WALLACE. The minister can either answer the question or refuse to answer. He says that the goods were delivered from the producers at the city of Halifax, but he cannot tell to whom they were delivered.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The papers contain the names of the people to whom they were delivered.

Mr. WALLACE. But the hon. minister does not know. If he does not know, we are asking for information.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The papers laid on the Table show.

Mr. WALLACE. Matters have come to a curious stage when members of the House of Commons are to be denied information which they are entitled to receive. There

has been pretty good evidence of an enormous piece of rascality, in which the monetary point of view fades into insignificance entirely compared with the lives of brave men that are at stake. If the food which was supposed to contain 85 per cent—

Mr. SPEAKER. My hon. friend is drifting into a discussion of the merits of the question, and I must call him to order.

Mr. WALLACE. I asked the Minister of Militia a question relating to the papers that he laid on the Table. I asked him if they contained certain information, and I asked the hon. minister to give certain information which was vital to the question. He has refused. He says the papers will disclose it. I say it is too serious a matter to be dismissed in the flippant style proposed by the hon. member for North Wellington or the Minister of Militia, who is on his defence. Why, the whole practice of parliament in England and in Canada has been that when a minister or his department has been in the slightest degree charged with wrong-doing, they should not only be willing but desirous and anxious to produce every information—

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Does the hon. gentleman charge me with wrong-doing? He says, when a minister is charged with wrong-doing. Does he make a charge?

Mr. WALLACE. You may depend, Sir, that that transparent game of bluff will not do.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would again remind the hon. gentleman that he is drifting into a discussion which is out of order.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister of Militia interrupted me, contrary to the rules of parliament. If anybody was out of order, it was the hon. Minister of Militia and not I. I was discussing the question when he interrupted me, and I gave his answer—

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WALLACE—and he will get up again and be out of order.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman is now—

Mr. WALLACE. I have the floor.

Mr. SPEAKER. I shall be obliged to call you both to order. I am in the judgment of the House. I think that my hon. friend from West York made some very strong statements respecting the administration of the Department of Militia. Perhaps he does not recollect them at the moment, but I think they were stronger than, perhaps, he intended.

Mr. WALLACE. Not half as strong as they will be.

Mr. SPEAKER. Reserve that discussion for the merits of the question. You must not discuss the question on its merits now.

Mr. WALLACE. We are on the threshold of the question and discussing the motion before the Chair. I have been continuing that discussion and will not be let off by any side issue raised by the hon. member for North Wellington or the Minister of Militia and Defence. There have been serious charges; these papers have been brought down in response to these serious charges. These papers are incomplete. Why should we have papers of the most important character demanded by parliament coming down in dribblets, incomplete, every day, so that the opposition are denied the opportunity which they are entitled to, under the laws of the land, of thoroughly examining the question with all the documents before them. The hon. minister tells us himself that the papers are incomplete. He tells us that the goods were delivered in Halifax. I asked him the question, where was the analysis made and where was the sample got from which this analysis was made. Was it got in Halifax or Montreal? And what certificate have we that that sample was a proper and correct sample of those goods? We want to know those things right away. We are not going to stand on ceremony. The lives of men are at stake in this matter, which the Minister of Militia thinks is a flippant matter and a good joke, but he is not going to prevent its being investigated. That investigation has started and is going on, and if any wrong-doing has been done—and there appears every indication of a scheme of the vilest rascality—the people of Canada will know it, and the whole thing will be exposed from top to bottom.

Mr. SPROULE. It was rumoured that these goods were paid for before delivery.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not think so; I have no reason to believe they were; I am quite sure they were not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the papers show whether the boxes were opened, in which this food was shipped to the government and certain samples taken out, and if so, who took them out?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The papers will not show that, but I will have a paper laid on the Table which will show that the boxes were opened in Halifax and samples taken from them, and that the sample which was tested here was one sent from Halifax, as I was informed.

Mr. WALLACE. Why did you not tell me that when I asked the question?

Mr. SPEAKER.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Because you never asked for anything as a gentleman should ask another.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. I call for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. Recalling the hon. member's own statements, we had better drop that point of order.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose we are permitted to ask for a ruling? The Minister of Militia was out of order in two respects. First, he did not address you, Sir, but a member of the House; and, secondly, he addressed a member of the House in offensive terms.

Mr. SPEAKER. What were the terms?

Mr. WALLACE. He said that I never asked a question as one gentleman should ask another.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not recall that. But I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is right in saying that instead of addressing the Chair, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, King's) spoke across the House.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I apologize for addressing the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace.)

Mr. WALLACE. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, King's) will apologize for his want of gentlemanliness—but, of course, that is too much to expect.

Motion (Mr. Borden, King's) agreed to.

#### SUPPLY BILL.

Resolutions 304, 305, 306, 307, 333, 336 and 371, reported from Committee of Supply, read the second time and agreed to.

House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding \$271,278.82 be granted to Her Majesty out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada for the financial year ending June 30, 1900.

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

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 179) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th of June, 1900.

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

**THE CITY AND DISTRICTS SAVINGS BANKS, AND LA CAISSE D'ECONOMIE DE QUEBEC.**

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 177), to amend chapter 32 of the Statutes of 1890, intituled: 'An Act respecting certain savings banks in the province of Quebec.'

He said: I intend to propose, after the second reading, that this Bill be referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

**SUPPLY—TIMBER LICENSES IN MANITOBA.**

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. **NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN** (West Assinibola). On the 28th of March, a return was brought down, in obedience to an order of the House for which I moved, and I have refrained from calling attention to the facts disclosed by that return because of the absence of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). I hoped from day to day, and from week to week, that there would be some prospect of his returning so that he might be in the House when I called attention to the facts disclosed, and moved the motion which I now intend to move. The Dauphin railway was being built through a wooded country in Manitoba, and it seems to have occurred—you cannot avoid that conclusion on reading the documents which are now on the Table of the House—it seems to have occurred to the Minister of the Interior that an amendment might be made in the order of council governing the issuing of permits and licenses respecting the cutting of timber, in a way that would redound to the advantage of certain parties. Sir, the Conservative government which had been in power for some eighteen years, had, after they had been some years in office, made regulations governing the issuing of permits and licenses to cut timber so as to avoid the abuses which experience had told them were very likely to attend the administration of the forestry of the country. On the 17th of September, 1889, an order in council was passed governing the granting of licenses and permits to cut timber, which provided amongst other things:

That licenses to cut timber should be disposed of by public competition; that parties tendering should be required to state the sum or bonus per square mile which they would pay in addition to the ground rent and royalty, and that each tender should be forwarded in a sealed envelope and be accompanied by the cash or accepted cheque of a chartered bank, payable to the order of the Deputy Minister of the In-

terior for the amount of such bonus; that the limit should be awarded to the party offering the highest bonus therefor, that the licensee should pay an equal ground rent of \$5 per square mile except for lands west of Eagle Pass, B.C.; that the licensee should pay a royalty of 5 per cent of the amount of sales of all products of the berth, and that saw-logs and other timber taken from the berth should be manufactured at the saw-mill of the licensee, to be operated in connection with the berth; that the licensee should furnish the Crown timber agent with returns accounting for sawn lumber and other products of timber manufactured and sold or otherwise disposed of, and pay Crown dues.

&c. Now, it will be seen that this order in council guarded the public interest, secured against favouritism, secured also, by holding up limits to competition, that there should be the largest amount paid into the treasury. There was an order in council passed on the 20th of January, 1892, amending the previous order in council, and which provided that:

A licensee should be required to construct a mill and commence the manufacture of the lumber from the timber on the tract covered by his license within one year from the date when he was notified by the proper officer of the Department of the Interior that the Minister of the Interior regarded such a step as necessary and expedient in the public interest.

Now, on the 28th of February, 1898, an order in council was passed providing that in the Yukon a license might be granted to any person who was the first applicant; that it might be acquired by competition as the Minister of the Interior might direct, and the bonus should not be less than \$250 per square mile. The reason I call attention to that order in council is this: It will be seen that even with the present government the idea was deep and strong that there should be a bonus commensurate with the value of the franchises acquired. Well, Sir, on the 1st of July, 1898, an order in council was passed ordering and directing that certain annexed regulations should be substituted in lieu of the regulations issued under authority of an order in council dated September 17, 1889, and subsequently amended, and which I have recited. Now, here is the order in council, which will be found in the volume of Orders in Council of Canada, 1899. I have before me the order in council that was passed on the 1st of July, 1898, and by a comparison of the regulations of the order in council passed in 1898, repealing the orders in council of the 17th of September, 1889, and the 20th of January, 1892, you find that the regulations that were repealed are practically the same as the regulations enacted with one exception. Now, what is that exception? The exception is found in a section that will henceforth, I think, be known to fame as section 17, and which provided as follows:

In the discretion of the Minister of the Interior permits may be granted in Manitoba and in the North-west Territories to saw-mill owners to cut over a definitely described tract of land,

not exceeding fifty square miles in extent, on payment of Crown dues at the rate of 50 cents per thousand feet of sawn lumber, and the further sum of 50 cents per thousand feet in lieu of bonus and ground rent; all other products of manufacture to be paid at the rate set forth in section 11, clause (a).

It will be seen that this puts in the discretion of the Minister of the Interior the power to get rid of the bonus, the power to get rid of the ground rent, the power to get rid of the Crown dues on certain conditions. First, that the beneficiary to whom the Minister of the Interior, in his discretion would give advantages out of this clause, should be a saw-mill owner; and he should cut over a definitely defined tract not exceeding fifty square miles, and he was to pay Crown dues at the rate of 50 cents per thousand feet on sawn lumber, and a further sum of 50 cents per thousand feet in lieu of bonus and ground rent. Now, these are the conditions. Well, Sir, when you come to the correspondence which is here you will find that according to the opinion of the department that clause was not intended to apply, according to statements made officially, to any saw-mill owners that were not in need of timber. I have the answer before me of the hon. acting Minister of the Interior, and it is very instructive. I asked the hon. gentleman on the 7th of May, 1900, a question, and in the course of the answer he gave to that question, he said:

The new regulations made the same provision as the old regulations with reference to the acquisition of timber limits, namely, that they should be acquired at public competition, but in view of a recommendation made by the Crown timber agent at Winnipeg, a provision was inserted that in the discretion of the Minister of the Interior, permits might be granted in Manitoba and the North-west Territories to saw-mill owners to cut over a definite described tract of land, not exceeding fifty square miles in extent, on payment of Crown dues at the rate of 50 cents per thousand feet on sawn lumber, and a further sum of 50 cents per thousand feet in lieu of a bonus and ground rent. The intention was that saw-mill owners might obtain timber to be manufactured at their saw-mills without competing with the public. Prior to 1885, timber berths could be acquired without public competition. The law was changed so that any person who desired to acquire a timber berth was compelled to compete for the same—

The law was changed in 1889, by the Conservative government.

—and the consequence was that in the case of millowners it proved a hardship when an expenditure had been made by them in exploring a timber limit, it was granted to an outsider who offered a larger bonus therefor, thus depriving the millowner of the timber he required for his saw-mill, and compelling him, in many cases, to pay the holder of the berth a considerable sum in advance of the amount which he had paid for the berth.

Later on, in response to my query:

Why was it repealed?

The hon. minister said:

Mr. DAVIN.

It was felt that while it could be fairly claimed as reasonable that saw-mill owners holding limits should, in order to provide timber for their mills, have the privilege of acquiring other timber by paying practically double dues under the suggested arrangement contained in section 17, yet demands might be made upon the department with regard to it which would have the effect of practically annulling the general policy of the department.

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the hon. acting minister in giving that answer intended to have a blow at the minister in whose place he is, because the concluding words there strike at the minister as breaking and evading the regulations which he made. It will be seen that we have it authoritatively that the object of the clause was to meet the necessities of saw-mill owners and their saw-mills. I cannot avoid the conclusion, and I will state it now, that section 17, looking at the way in which it was administered, was constructed for two purposes; first, to enable the hon. Minister of the Interior to give an advantage to his brother-in-law, Mr. Burrows, and then to enable him to go to council, and to use a colloquial phrase, pull the wool over the eyes of his colleagues, and when they said to him: Why do you want to repeal the old timber regulations? Are they not working well? To make the argument that for the behoof of certain saw-mill owners it was necessary to make certain changes. The changes were contained in section 17. How would it help his brother-in-law? His brother-in-law could only be defined as a saw-mill owner by a pun upon the word. He had no saw-mill on the tract of country over which he wanted to cut timber. He had no saw-mill contiguous to it, but he was the owner of a small saw-mill at Dauphin, forty miles away which has the effect of allowing that word to convey a false meaning, and to represent that Mr. Burrows could be held to belong to the category contemplated by the section.

On January 13, 1899, an order in council was passed which, having recited section 17, said that 'whereas it has been ascertained that the provisions of the regulations hereinabove referred to' (i.e., the aforesaid section 17) 'are not working satisfactorily,' rescinded section 17 aforesaid.

The order in council of July 1, 1898, did not come into force until August 13, 1898. Before section 17 of the order in council of July 1, 1898, was rescinded several applicants for permits under section 17 were refused permits thereunder. And why? Because they had not fulfilled the conditions of the law and the spirit of that law. For instance, on September 16, 1892, Hooker & Co., of Selkirk, wrote to Foley, inspector of Crown timber limits, asking for permit under section 17. On September 22, Foley, assistant Crown timber agent, wrote to the secretary of the Department of the Interior, advising that the permit under section 17 be granted. On October

25, the assistant secretary of the Department of the Interior wrote to the Crown timber agent asking whether it would be in the interest of the school land fund to invite competition for a permit to cut timber on a certain section of land numbered 11. On September 4, 1898, Stephenson, Crown timber agent, wrote to the secretary of the Interior that it would be in the interest of the school land fund to invite tenders and giving reasons why Hooker & Co. might be expected to pay a larger price at that time. Accordingly no permit under section 17 was issued to that firm, because, in the opinion of the Crown timber agent in Winnipeg, if competition was called for Hooker & Co. might be expected to pay more. So that, you see, it is in the mind of the department, in administering this very section 17 that it should not be acted upon if it was probable that the department would gain more by calling for competition.

On July 30, 1898, Jefferson Caverly wrote Stephenson *re* his application for permit on Swan River. On August 6, 1898, Stephenson wrote to Mr. Smart, Deputy Minister of the Interior, inclosing Caverly's letter. Amongst other things, he said: 'Under the present regulations a berth can only be acquired after public competition has been invited. Under the new regulations which will be shortly in force the minister has discretionary power which would enable him to comply with Mr. Caverly's request.' On August 20, 1898, Pereira, assistant secretary of the Interior Department, by direction, wrote Stephenson, Crown timber agent, a reply in which he said:

It is noticed that you stated that under the present regulations a berth can only be acquired after public competition has been invited, and that under the new regulations the minister has discretionary power which would enable him to comply with Mr. Caverly's request. It is thought that you refer to the issue of a permit without the same having to be acquired by public competition. If this is the case, I have to draw your attention to the fact that the regulations provide that the minister may issue a permit without competition to saw-mill owners, and, therefore, unless Mr. Caverly has a saw-mill in operation, the provision of the regulations referred to will not apply in the case.

I ask the House to bear that in mind, because it would seem to be very important as bearing upon the palpable favouritism I am going to demonstrate has been shown by the present Minister of the Interior. On November 2, 1898, Mr. Pereira, assistant secretary of the Department of the Interior, by direction, wrote to Mr. Caverly as follows:

Impossible to comply with your request until you furnish the department with a definite description of the land.

I ask that to be borne in mind, because I think the inference is a fair one that Burrows got all the privileges he desired before he had furnished any definite description of

the land. No request could be granted until he furnished the definite description of the land, and unless the applicant was a saw-mill owner with a saw-mill in operation on, or contiguous to the tract of land covered by the permit. On September 30, 1898, Pereira, assistant secretary of the Interior, by direction wrote to the Crown timber agent in respect to another case where a Mr. Robinson had applied for a permit, he being a saw-mill owner, and a person coming within the category, that taking clause 7 as *bona fide*, might be contemplated by it.

In reply, I have to say that, as Capt. Robinson is a millowner, you may issue a permit in his favour to cut timber in a certain prescribed area, not exceeding fifty miles, in accordance with the regulations.

On December 26, McArthur wrote to Stephenson, the Crown timber agent, applying for permit under section 17, on Red Deer Point, and after some correspondence that permit was refused to McArthur, presumably because, regarding the clause as *bona fide*, that its conditions were not filled by him. Now comes a very striking case as bearing upon one of the points at issue. On October 17, 1898, James Drake wrote to the Hon. Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior, applying for permission, under section 17, to cut sawlogs, and stating he had not sufficient timber on his berth. On the 11th of November, Taylor, acting Crown timber agent at Winnipeg, wrote the secretary of the Department of the Interior as follows:

I beg now to report that having ascertained that Mr. James Drake is the owner of a saw-mill, there would appear to be no objection to granting his request for a permit under section 17, aforesaid.

On November 17, 1898, Pereira, assistant secretary of the Department of the Interior, by direction wrote to Drake, saying that section 17 of the regulations:

—was intended to apply only to mill-owners who have exhausted their sources of supply and who have no more timber with which to keep their mills going. Please say whether this is your case, and whether you require the timber on the above tract to prevent the closing down of your mill.

If that means anything it means that the department could not properly, under section 17, give a permission unless the man was a saw-mill owner; unless his timber was exhausted and he needed it to keep his mill going. On November 22, 1898, James Drake wrote the secretary of the Department of the Interior, saying:

I do require the permit asked for to procure a supply of timber to keep the mill going. The timber berth on which my men are now working will only supply a part of the cut required for the coming season.

On the 2nd of December, 1898, Stephenson, Crown timber agent, wrote to the secretary of the Department of the Interior, saying:

Drake will be able to get sufficient timber on his new berth, No. 815, to keep his mill going for this winter. If later it should be found otherwise, he might then renew his application under section 17.

He goes on to say that Drake had commenced operations on berth No. 815, although the required survey had not yet been made nor license issued. This was contrary to instructions. He goes on to say, that Drake was written to and instructed to stop, and to advise the department of the quantity already cut, and Stephenson advises against considering his application under section 17. On the 29th of September, 1898, Pereira, assistant secretary of the Department of the Interior, wrote to Drake refusing permit. Why? Drake was a saw-mill owner. Drake had made the statement himself that he was destitute of timber. This is the reason given:

As it appears that you will be able to obtain sufficient timber on berth 815 to supply your saw-mill for the present—

He goes on to say, that it had been reported that Drake had commenced operations on berth No. 815 prior to the required survey and the issue of the license, which is contrary to the regulations.

On December 7, 1898, the firm of Shaw Bros. wrote from Dauphin, Manitoba, applying for a permit, under section 17. On January 4, 1899, Pereira, assistant secretary of the Department of the Interior, wrote by direction to Shaw Bros.:

That it has been decided not to issue any more permits unless they are acquired by public competition.

I want the House to bear in mind that on the 4th of January it had been decided not to issue any more permits. Well, Sir, on December 5, 1898, the Dauphin Lumber Company, millowners, applied for permits under section 17. On January 4, 1899, Pereira, assistant secretary of the Department of the Interior, wrote by direction to the Dauphin Lumber Company, as follows:

It has been decided not to issue any more permits to cut timber for barter or sale, without public competition.

William Irwin, on January 12, forwarded through Stephenson, Crown timber agent, application for permit, under section 17. Stephenson, writing to Smart, Deputy Minister of the Interior, said he had:

—explained to Irwin that clause 17, fixing the dues at \$1 per thousand to millowners, applied only to these mill men who are operating stationary mills, and who have an established business.

Operating stationary mills where? Why, on the track or contiguous to it covered by the permit.

Immediately after the order in council of the first of July, 1898, came into operation in Manitoba, namely, on the 13th of August, Theodore A. Burrows, a brother-

Mr. DAVIN.

in-law of the Hon. Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior, writing on the 21st of August, 1898, to the deputy minister eulogizes the new arrangement provided for by section 17 of the order in council of the 1st of July, 1898, which has just come into operation, and he applies for a permit under the same to cut timber on township 30, R. 22, W. 31, 32, and 33, R. 23 West, and 31 range 21 west. He says:

I cannot define by sections the timber I want.

I want to draw the attention of the House to this:

I cannot define by sections the timber I want. Where I made the mistake was in not including a larger area in the block which I was to choose, Berth 814. Now, Mr. Smart, I want this permit, and owning, as I do, Berth 814, I am entitled to first right of permit. Kindly have permit sent me. I intend cutting ties on it this winter. Sorry I did not see you when I was last in Ottawa.

Yours very truly,

THEODORE A. BURROWS.

I call attention to this fact that this gentleman, applying for the permit, evidently refers to some previous communication, because he says:

I intend cutting the ties on it this winter.

What ties? It must have been the ties they had spoken of in some communication that is not before us, or viva voce. Here is an extraordinary thing. He says:

I intend cutting the ties this winter.

Why, Sir, the clause is a clause not for tie cutting, ties or pole cutting; the clause is a clause that in its body and soul looks to the timber cut being manufactured in a mill. On September 3, 1898, Lyndwode Pereira, assistant secretary of the Department of the Interior, by direction, wrote to the Crown timber agent at Winnipeg, instructing him that even if the aforesaid Burrows should not be able to comply with the conditions of section 17, nevertheless, a permit might be issued under it, and another permit issued later on. I will read his words, and then you will see whether I overstate the case:

You will notice that the regulations provide that the tract of land to be covered by the permit must be definitely described. If Mr. Burrows is not in a position at the present time to furnish you with a definite description of the tract in townships 30, 31 and 32, range 23 west, and he wishes to obtain a permit to cut timber on the sections which he has described, there is no objection to a permit being issued, and another permit being issued later on to cover the remainder of the tract, not exceeding fifty square miles. Mr. Burrows has been asked to communicate with you in reference to his application.

Now, I have proved that one of the conditions was that there should be a definite description. He is told by the officer of the department that he can ignore one of these

conditions. On September 6, 1898, James A. Smart, Deputy Minister of the Interior, telegraphed Burrows that his description was 'too indefinite. Am writing.' This letter, whatever it was, is not in the return brought down. The Crown timber agent at Winnipeg, on September 15, wrote to F. K. Herchmer, Esq., Crown timber agent at Dauphin, Man., inclosing the letter of September 3, and telling the Crown timber agent that Burrows had secured the right to a permit to cut timber under section 17 of the new regulations, and that 'the timber to be cut is for the Dauphin Railway and Canal Company, and will not be manufactured at a saw-mill, although Mr. Burrows is a saw-mill owner.' You see, this reads like a joke. It was as if the Crown timber agent said: 'Give him a permit; he is not going to manufacture the timber at all, although he is a saw-mill owner.' Not until January 17, 1899, was a permit issued to Burrows. Burrows never received a permit until four days after the order in council under which he got the permit had been rescinded, and he had cut a large quantity of timber illegally, out of which he manufactured ties and piles for the Dauphin Railway. He did this, as appears from the letter of the agent of Dominion lands at Dauphin, dated January 10, 1899, 'at a time when no survey of the lands had been made, and when it was not possible to give a description.' So that, every regulation, every principle, every idea and motive which could apply to that section 17 is violated by the Department of the Interior to put this great privilege in the hands of this gentleman, the brother-in-law of the Minister of the Interior, so that he might have an advantage above everybody else, and everybody else might be shut out. Is not this patent, Sir? Here is a railway running through a wooded country. If competition had been called for to cut timber for ties, is it possible that the lumbermen of that district would not have been glad to pay down \$5,000 as a bonus for the privilege of cutting it? On January 18, 1899, five days after the date of the order in council rescinding section 17 of the order in council of July, 1898, Mr. Lyndwode Pereira, by direction, wrote the agent of Crown lands at Dauphin, saying:

There is no objection to a permit being issued to Mr. Burrows under section 17 of the regulations, to cut timber on the lands described by him, with the exception of those situated in township 32, range 22.

On February 8, 1899, Theodore A. Burrows wrote to the secretary of the Department of the Interior, saying he had mistakenly thought certain lands in township 32, range 22, were within the boundaries of the fifty square miles he had selected, and he says:

I beg, therefore, to ask that the lands I have defined in township 32, range 22, be included in the tract to be covered by my permit. On the 13th of February, Lyndwode Pereira, assistant secretary, wrote to the agent

of Crown lands, Dauphin, telling him that it had been decided to allow the sections of land in township 32, range 22, west of the first meridian, to be included in his permit. On May 7 last, I asked the acting Minister of the Interior: How much timber did Burrows cut? And this is the answer he gave me: 1,523 fence posts; 1,730 cords of wood; 2,318 telegraph poles; 4,786 feet of piling, and 98,372 railway ties. The ties there are worth, I am told, 25 cents each, which would make them alone worth \$24,593. I will now ask the attention of the House while I again read section 17:

In the discretion of the Minister of the Interior, permits may be granted in Manitoba and the North-west Territories to cut over a definitely described tract of land, not exceeding fifty square miles in extent, on payment of Crown dues at the rate of 50c. per thousand feet on sawn lumber, and a further sum of 50c. per thousand feet in lieu of bonus and ground rent.

So, that you see, Mr. Burrows got clear of a bonus, which would probably be \$5,000; he got clear of the ground rent, and he never paid the 50 cents per thousand feet on sawn lumber in lieu of ground rent, because he never cut any. Among the many slick transactions accomplished by the present Minister of the Interior, this is the slickest of them all. Now, Sir, I have not painted in lines of sufficient shade the portrait of the Minister of the Interior in the light of this transaction; because, Sir, what is the fact? At the time when Mr. Burrows' complaisant brother-in-law passed that clause 17 in these regulations, who was he? He was the land commissioner for the builders of the Dauphin Railway, who, I may say, were Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. So that you see, it is a beautiful transaction, a family compact all the way through. The land commissioner says to his brother-in-law: 'Here is fine timber; I want to cut ties; if you put it up for competition, I will probably have to put down three or four or five thousand dollars as a bonus, and I will have to pay so much per square mile as ground rent. Could you not, clever fellow that you are, manage in such a way, that we shall get rid of competition? If you put it up to competition, I might not get it, and I am the land agent for this railway, but I want to buy for myself, I want a nice little arrangement, could you manage it for me? Then the astute Minister of the Interior ponders, and what does he do? He draws a lot of regulations, practically the regulations he is ostensibly about to repeal, and puts in this clause 17, which will enable him to go before the council. The Prime Minister says: Why make these changes—he begins to be a little suspicious. The astute minister replies: You see, my Premier, here are mill-owners, numbers of them destitute of timber, and it is a pity, when they are destitute of timber, that you should ask them to compete with others. We will arrange

that they shall be able to get the timber, but they must pay double dues. Then the Minister of the Interior declares Mr. Burrows, a millowner, and gives him this valuable franchise. Not a solitary condition is ever fulfilled, and the amount of dues paid by Burrows, as stated by the acting Minister of the Interior, would exactly correspond with the scale of dues, under another clause, so that it is proved to demonstration, that not a cent was paid in lieu of bonuses, or in lieu of ground rent.

Here are the figures: The railway ties, for which Burrows would have got \$24,593.25, he paid for at 3 cents, under section 11, clause 'A.' That would give \$2,952.16. He paid 5 cents for telegraph poles, which amounted to \$115. He paid 1 cent for fence posts, or \$15.23; and 25 cents for cordwood, \$432.50; piling, \$117.50. Total \$3,632.29. So that the position is this: Supposing Mr. Burrows had been a saw-mill owner, supposing he had a saw-mill contiguous to the track, and supposing he cut the timber in his mill and paid the 50 cents per 1,000 feet for sawn lumber, and the 50 cents extra in lieu of the bonus and ground rent, still it would be impossible to avoid the conclusion that we were face to face with a piece of nepotism. But when he fulfilled none of the conditions, when he had no saw-mill, when he did not saw one inch of this lumber, when, therefore, he did not fulfil a single condition, not only are we face to face with nepotism, but with something very like rascality. We have the Minister of the Interior, who makes a regulation to suit his own family, and who, in order to help a member of his family, defies the conditions of that regulation. I say that discloses a very bad state of things. I beg to move, therefore:

That all the words after the word 'That' be left out, and the following added instead thereof:—'an order in council was passed on July 1, 1898, which, while in the main re-enacting the former regulations contained section 17 which placed the granting of permits to cut timber under certain conditions in the discretion of the Minister of the Interior.

That the aforesaid section 17 was rescinded by order in council of January 13, 1899.

That Theodore A. Burrows, a brother-in-law of the Hon. Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior, received a permit under section 17 of the order in council of July 1, 1898, aforesaid, on January 17, 1899, four days after it had been rescinded.

That the facts disclosed in the return respecting permits and applications for permits to cut timber under the order in council of July 1, 1898, indicate that the aforesaid Theodore A. Burrows had no mill on or contiguous to the tract of land covered by his permit, and that during the year 1898 he had cut large quantities of timber illegally.

That he did this as appears from the letter of the agent of Dominion lands at Dauphin, dated January 10, 1899, 'at a time when no surveys of the lands had been made and when it was not possible to give a description.'

That the timber cut by him was not manufactured at any mill, but was disposed of wholly

or in the main to the Dauphin Railway, in the shape of ties, poles, &c.

That the said Theodore A. Burrows, though he did not intend to manufacture the lumber at any mill and though this was known to the department, was nevertheless granted a permit under section 17 aforesaid. That he never paid the Crown dues provided by the section 17 aforesaid to be paid in lieu of bonus and ground rent.

That as a fact he cut 1,523 fence posts, 1,730 cords of wood, 2,318 telegraph poles, 4,786 feet of piling, 98,372 railway ties, the ties alone being worth \$24,593, and all he paid the government in dues was \$3,632.

That the provisions of section 17 were intended as stated in official documents to be available only for saw-mill owners with mills in operation, and who stood in need of lumber to keep their mills going. That only a saw-mill owner who manufactured the lumber could pay the dues contemplated by the section 17 aforesaid to stand in lieu of bonus and ground rent.

That millowners who applied for permit under the provisions of section 17 aforesaid for the purpose of manufacturing lumber were in some cases refused.

That in granting Theodore A. Burrows a permit under section 17 aforesaid, the provisions of the said section were violated; that he could be held qualified to receive a permit under it only by a play upon words; that he never fulfilled its conditions.

That the facts recited aforesaid indicate that partiality has been shown by the Hon. Clifford Sifton, the Minister of the Interior, to Theodore A. Burrows, his brother-in-law, and call for immediate attention and investigation.'

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). I have followed the statement of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), very carefully, to find out how the public interest has been prejudicially affected by any action taken under the regulations, to find out if the hon. gentleman had any charge to make against the Minister of the Interior, supported by any facts or borne out by any reasonable statement that would appeal to one's better judgment. But I have come to the conclusion that this is one more evidence of a deliberate policy on the part of certain gentlemen in the opposition, having no real substantial criticism of the department to offer, to resort to personal attacks—to mere mud-throwing. The minister must be attacked because he happens to have as a brother-in-law a gentleman engaged in what I believe to be a perfectly legitimate business, and a well-known and highly-respected citizen in the district in which he lives. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is not situated, I suppose, like most other people, as he has no relatives in this country. He thinks that all that is necessary is to show to the House and the country that a person occupying some position or engaged in some business is connected with some minister, and that implies fraud; and, without the slightest proof, he goes on to frame a resolution, the statements in which, I am free to say, are untrue.

Mr. DAVIN. I give the facts—here is your own return.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But there are other facts. The railway was being built in this district, development was going on at a very rapid pace and a large number of settlers were going in. It was represented to the department by the Crown timber agent, Mr. E. S. Stephenson—and, by the way, it is a wonder the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) did not say there was collusion between the minister and the Crown timber agent—

Mr. DAVIN. That is too thin—going behind an official.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is uneasy. He sees that this dirt-throwing, this policy of personal attacks on the character of respectable citizens, is not countenanced even by his own friends in this House and in the country; and when the facts are pointed out, he grows uneasy—though I must say that I do not think he is very sensitive about things of that kind. But I was trying to show what was actually done by the department. Mr. Stephenson, the Crown timber agent, made a report to the department that in this district it was desirable to give saw-mill owners an opportunity to get some timber adjoining the limits that they might have, where they had not enough timber to carry on their business and supply the needs of the community. The hon. gentleman seems to think it a terrible charge to make in this House, that the minister allowed certain parties to have permits to cut the timber to supply the railway. But the railway required the timber, and surely it was a proper thing to give that timber under the regulations.

Mr. DAVIN. Without competition, and in defiance of section 17?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It was not in defiance of section 17. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) finds that he has made statements not strictly in accordance with the facts. As I was pointing out, on this recommendation the clause in the regulations was adopted which the hon. gentleman referred to. And how very different that is from the policy supported by the hon. gentleman himself for years while he was in this House, and while his friends were in power. They granted timber limits without competition, without any conditions whatever. All it required, during that time, was to be a favourite—

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) says that was changed in 1885.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That policy, I am glad to say, was changed. But the only modification was not to grant to favourites, as had been done by his friends before that.

Mr. DAVIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) to say that the state of the law required the change made by the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and that under the former govern-

ment it was always the rule to give timber limits without competition?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I did say that for a great many years, during which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) supported the Conservative party, they granted these timber limits without competition and without conditions. I did say that that was changed, as I am informed, in 1885. The hon. gentleman says it was not changed until 1889.

Mr. DAVIN. I quoted the order in council of 1889; but I believe the change was made in 1885.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have been informed by the department the change was made in 1885. And what is the clause that the hon. minister adopted in the regulation? It is as follows:

In the discretion of the Minister of the Interior, permits may be granted in Manitoba and the North-west Territories to saw-mill owners to cut over a definitely described tract of land, not exceeding fifty square miles in extent, on payment of Crown dues at the rate of 50 cents per thousand feet on sawn lumber, and a further sum of 50 cents per thousand feet in lieu of bonus and ground rent; all other products of manufacture to be paid for at the rates set forth in section 11, clause (a).

What is the effect of that change in the regulation? Timber was required in that district by the settlers and by the railway. The payment of double fees on lumber would be more, as is well known to the officers of the department, than any bonus that had been received for the limits that were put up at competition.

Mr. DAVIN. He did not pay these double fees.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) will wait a moment he will be told the facts. He finds that he has made a statement that he cannot substantiate, and he is ashamed of it. He tried to make another point because one of the saw-mill owners, he said—and I have no doubt it is true—is a brother-in-law of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). The hon. gentleman says that this was done for his special benefit. But I find that there were others who got permits under this regulation. I find there were H. B. Mitchell, Capt. William Robinson, K. Finnsson, J. A. Christie, Alfred A. Wells, M. McKinley, L. E. Benz, Walter Humberstone and J. Caverly.

Mr. DAVIN. Every one of them fulfilled the conditions of the clause, but J. M. Burrows did not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Burrows did. That is where the hon. gentleman makes a statement that is not correct, in order to show that this man was treated differently from the others. Speculators and others were anxious to come in under this clause, but because the department was particular in seeing that the conditions were fulfilled

before any grant was made, my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) accused them of favouritism. He has stated in his resolution that Mr. Burrows had not a saw-mill. I am informed on unquestionable authority—

Mr. DAVIN. What I stated was that Burrows had a saw-mill forty miles away and could not fulfil the conditions, and that, no matter where he had a saw-mill, he sawed no lumber.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The general impression that the hon. gentleman conveyed by his resolution and his speech was that Mr. Burrows had not a saw-mill and was not in the business.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me? I have again and again used the word, that he could only be held to be a saw-mill owner under section 17, by punning on the word 'saw-mill,' because he palpably was not a saw-mill owner to saw lumber.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not want to be unfair to any person, but the impression I received from his whole speech, and the terms of his resolution, was that he was trying to give the people in this country to understand, by insinuation at all events, that Mr. Burrows was not a saw-mill owner, and did not own one; whereas the fact is he was a saw-mill owner, and came strictly under these regulations in that respect. Now, the public did not lose anything in respect to the dues or otherwise, under these regulations, because as I have pointed out, they gave the actual and legitimate saw-mill owner an opportunity of cutting an extended timber limit up to fifty square miles, if he required it in connection with his business, and the double dues would fully recompense the public treasury for the amount of bonus that was remitted.

Mr. CLANCY. Did he pay these dues?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly. Mr. Burrows does not appear to have benefited from any favouritism in that country. I have been looking over the list of limits given under competition, and I find that Mr. Burrows pays the highest amount per square mile for his limit, of any man in that district. The lowest I find to be \$3.33 per square mile, and one of the very highest is \$79.16. Now, Mr. Burrows, for the limit he received, pays \$100 per square mile.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What regulates the price per mile?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is put up for public competition. What I want to show is, that the regulation is based upon experience in that district, and while it gave this privilege to those legitimately engaged in the business of the sawing and cutting of timber for the use of settlers in that district, the public treasury received as much under that regulation as it could receive

M. SUTHERLAND.

under a system of competition. As has been frankly stated, it was found that under that clause men who were not legitimately in the business, endeavoured to take advantage of the regulations to get timber limits, and it was thought better to repeal that clause and return to the previous system, under which the policy of the department would be public competition. Now, I do not think the hon. gentleman has made anything out of these two points: First, that the public interest has suffered in any way; and secondly, that the Minister of the Interior showed any favouritism to his brother-in-law, or has granted him any privilege not granted to any other person who applied under that clause, and complied with the regulations.

Mr. CLANCY. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes. If it occurs to the hon. gentleman that there was any irregularity or impropriety in this transaction, I would like him to point it out.

Mr. CLANCY. Did Mr. Burrows manufacture this identical lumber now in question at a saw-mill within the meaning of the spirit of the Act, requiring saw-mill owners to supply settlers, &c.?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have not the particulars here, but I have not the slightest doubt that for any lumber cut under this regulation, he would have to pay the double dues, and that everything he took off the land, ties, telegraph poles, and everything else, were fully accounted for, and he paid dues for them according to regulation 17, which I have just read.

Mr. CLANCY. That would affect the Crown under the circumstances, because the license was refused unless certain conditions were complied with.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is no doubt these regulations can be abused. The reason we put up these limits to public competition was to avoid favouritism, to avoid granting valuable lands to people without the public having every opportunity to bid on them. You will easily see that the saw-mill owners often have, in timbered sections such as that, a great grievance. A man has invested a large amount of money in a saw-mill, timber is scarce on his limits, and when he prospects, and surveys, and prepares a plan for application, he finds that people who have not spent a cent on it, bid against him and run up the price. I say that Mr. Stephenson, the Crown lands agent there, made representations to the department that it would be well to give these people an opportunity, that it was only fair to them and in the interest of the settlers, to make the grants under certain conditions, and that is the reason the change was made. But like many other good laws, it was found that this regulation could be abused,

that here was an effort made by speculators and others, as agents of manufacturers and dealers in lumber, to take advantage of this clause. That is the reason it was repealed, and not for any such reason as the hon. gentleman insinuates. I have pointed out clearly that Mr. Burrows did not get any advantage under this clause, that was not granted to other saw-mill owners in the district, who complied with the regulations. If any hon. gentleman could bring forward anything to show that any individual, whether he was a relation of the Minister of the Interior or not, had received any undue advantage, the department would be liable to criticism and censure. But on the contrary, I think it has been clearly proven that the arrangement was in the interest of the settlers of that district, it was in the interest of the legitimate saw-mill owners, and the treasury has not suffered in the least. I find that the hon. gentleman from West Assiniboia, when he supported the Conservative government, took a very different view with regard to this matter. While he was speaking, I have been looking over some papers that I have, and I find that the Conservative government granted over 500 berths, 50 square miles, without competition, aggregating thousands of square miles of territory; and I find that the hon. gentleman himself was an applicant, and was granted fifty square miles. I suppose he had a saw-mill, I suppose he was a lumber dealer. He has read off the amount of money paid to the department by Mr. Burrows, but I find on referring to the return, that he never paid even the rent of this fifty square miles that was granted to him. So I think it ill becomes the hon. gentleman, without some better grounds than he has shown yet, to bring this matter up in the way he has done, and try to throw dirt—that is the only way I can characterize his language—against the Minister of the Interior, because, amongst these applicants to whom a limit was granted under this clause in the Act, after fulfilling all the conditions, happened to be a relative of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Would the minister lay on the Table of the House the return that he has just quoted from, showing that a timber limit was granted to the hon. member for West Assiniboia?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have the statement in my hand, which the hon. gentleman may see. The returns are all accessible in the department.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not see what led the hon. member for Assiniboia to bring this question before the House. If he thought he was going to make any political capital out of it—and he could not have brought it up for any other reason—I think he has made a mistake. I do not see that he has brought it before the House for any other reason. As the

hon. acting Minister of the Interior has just pointed out he has not shown that the public interest has suffered in any way by this timber limit being granted to Mr. Burrows, but, evidently, he wants to stir up a noise so as to impress the public mind with the idea that there is something wrong, simply because Mr. Burrows is a relative of the hon. Minister of the Interior. What are the facts of the case? The regulations were changed. On whose recommendation? On the recommendation of Mr. Stephenson, the Crown timber agent in the city of Winnipeg, and if the hon. gentleman is going to make political capital out of it, I may tell him for his benefit, that Mr. Stephenson is a son of Mr. Rufus Stephenson, the late Conservative member for Kent. Therefore, I do not think there would be any collusion between Mr. Stephenson and the hon. Minister of the Interior. Evidently Mr. Stephenson, in following out his duty as a public officer, and I think he is a first-class official, has made this recommendation in the interest, not only of the mill-owners, but in the interest of the people of Manitoba generally. After an individual, or a company has gone into a place and built a mill at an enormous expense it is not a fair proposition that, after having invested all their capital in the erection of the mill in making surveys and exploring tracts of timber, some speculator should be allowed to crop up, put in a bid against them, not with the intention of putting up a mill, but of mulcting the millowners. If Mr. Burrows is a brother-in-law of the Minister of the Interior, I do not think that alters the situation at all. Is Mr. Burrows to be deprived of his rights as a citizen simply because he happens to be a relative of the hon. Minister of the Interior for the time being? I do not think that is a fair proposition. In Dauphin last autumn during the elections in Manitoba this question was made a live issue. The opponents of Mr. Burrows issued a special edition of a newspaper published in that town containing an article headed 'Great Timber Steal.' The people of Dauphin, by reason of their being upon the ground, understand the facts of the case. Mr. Burrows received a majority of almost 500 votes, the largest majority received by any candidate in the provincial elections of the province of Manitoba. If there had been anything wrong, if there had been any crookedness of this kind is it reasonable to suppose that the people of Dauphin would have returned Mr. Burrows, after the charges made during that election, by that enormous majority? Of course, the hon. member for York said that there was something wrong with the lists, and that they had been stuffed at certain places. I want to point out to the hon. gentleman and to others, that, in Dauphin, where hon. gentlemen will admit there was no stuffing of the lists, and where the peo-

ple knew what the facts were, this large majority was given to Mr. Burrows. I think it is only fair to conclude that the hon. member for Western Assiniboia brought this question before the House to try to make a little political capital for his party out of it, and I can assure the House that as far as the hon. gentleman himself is concerned he needs a great deal of political capital. If he expects to get back to this House he will have to do something far weightier than make the charges which he has made against the hon. Minister of the Interior to-day. What do I find in this return which the hon. acting Minister of the Interior alluded to a little while ago? It shows that during the Conservative regime, during the eighteen years that they were in power they granted timber berths to the extent of 26,000 square miles, that they actually gave away to their political friends, not to bona fide millowners, not to gentlemen who intended to go in and establish mills in the interest of the people, but to political heelers and friends, as the returns will show. There is hardly a leading Conservative in Ottawa, or in other parts of the Dominion, who is not represented here as having gobbled up fifty or sixty miles of timber limits in the North-west Territories. My hon. friend from Western Assiniboia had fifty miles secured before anybody else was able to get in. Fifty miles! He did not go to the breezy plains of Western Assiniboia to get timber, because there is no timber to be had there larger than would make a walking stick for him, but he came to the district of Saskatchewan and gobbled up fifty miles. Did he ever pay a cent for it? No. He never paid a cent of bonus or rent or anything, and it has not been shown that he ever owned a saw-mill. I do not think it has been shown that the hon. gentleman ever owned anything more than a buck-saw. Now, what does 26,000 square miles of timber represent? It represents, and I wish hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to pay attention to this, 16,000,000 acres of the timber lands of Manitoba and North-west Territories granted to the political friends and heelers of hon. gentlemen opposite without one cent being paid for it, without any competition or anything else. Now they get up and tell us that the hon. Minister of the Interior granted fifty acres of timber to his brother-in-law, and that there is something wrong in doing this. I do not want to take up the time of the House by reading this list of names. I see the hon. member for York is evidently afraid that his name is in it. I see the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), and several Conservative senators figure largely in this return. We have quite a number of Conservative members in the list.

An hon. MEMBER. Read the names.

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS. The list is too long. I see the power-house of the Conservative party, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is looking this way. We have here the names of D. W. Cummings, Sherman & Pratt, Donald Gunn, A. Cameron, R. McIntosh, J. S. Armitage, E. Roberts, A. Hudson & Co., William Hardy, R. L. Rogers, Wm. Stubbs. I do not think the last named is the hon. gentleman who sits at my right. I see the names of Shields, Haggart, MacLaren. Evidently one of these gentlemen is the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, who is referred to, and another is one of our leading senators. They figure here as having got a large grant of timber in the North-west Territories. Chas. Whitehead, Howlew & Muirhead, Armitage & McCullough, Williams & Harrison, John McBeth, A. Watts, D. McFadden, and Shields, Haggart, MacLaren and Nicol. I suppose Nicol had a bigger pull than these other gentlemen, and he was able to scoop in a larger limit than they were. I am not going to give the whole of the list, because there are hundreds and hundreds of names in it. I see here the Cochrane Ranch Company. There is a gentleman in the Senate of the name of Cochrane. Then the list continues, Turner & Co., Hiram Robinson, J. A. Hughes, Drake & Rutherford, Fergus & O'Connor, Amos Rowe. I have heard that gentleman's name mentioned here before, and I see that he is down for a large tract. Then, there is another gentleman who figured in this House some years ago—John Adams. I suppose hon. gentlemen will remember Mr. Adams in connection with the Rykert business. D. McMillan is slated for fifty miles of timber in the North-west Territories.

An hon. MEMBER. He is a judge.

Mr. DAVIS. He was a good judge of timber at that time. Then there are Shorheed and Laidlaw, and Moore & Macdowall. This company of Moore & Macdowall figures very largely in these transactions. Mr. Macdowall, who was my predecessor from Saskatchewan in this House, managed to get a considerable amount of timber limits during the time he occupied a seat here, like the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), when he formed that famous joint stock company, and got \$10 stock put into it so that he might dodge the Independence of Parliament Act and get government printing. Mr. Macdowall formed himself and another into a company so as to enable him to grab a number of timber limits in the North Saskatchewan. What little money he paid for them did not amount to a hill of beans, but during the eight years he was in this House, he managed to get enough timber limits to enable him to hypothecate them to the Bank of Ottawa for \$80,000. That is the way the Conservative party handled the timber limits of the Ter-

ritories. And yet, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) talks about timber limits being granted without competition. Here is the name of a gentleman well known in the city of Ottawa, Mr. McLeod Stewart, who got fifty miles without paying a cent. Here are some more names in which a Mr. Haggart appears.

Mr. COWAN. What Haggart is that?

Mr. DAVIS. I fancy it must be the ex-Minister of Railways. They are down for timber limits here, and they got them without competition and without price. Again, we have Mr. Dickenson, who was a member of parliament here, and Jacob Erratt, I do not know who he is, but he got a good slice. He must have stood high in the councils of the Conservative party, because he got a larger slice than some of the others.

Mr. MACKIE. He is an ex-mayor of Ottawa.

Mr. DAVIS. Oh, that accounts for it; he had a political pull. Now, I hope the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) will not deny this, but, I would call his attention to timber berth No. 130, for he may have forgotten the number, and I find here from this return that one N. F. Davin got fifty square miles on the Saskatchewan River.

Mr. GIBSON. Did he pay anything for it?

Mr. DAVIS. He got it without money and without price.

Mr. McMULLEN. What did he pay for it?

Mr. DAVIS. He paid nothing at all, and there was no competition. It was handed over holus bolus to the hon. member (Mr. Davin), and I suppose nobody ever thought of asking him if he could build a mill.

Mr. GIBSON. Is it run by wind or by water?

Mr. DAVIS. It is a windmill of course.

Mr. COWAN. A windmill run by water.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, a windmill run by water, and something stronger at times. Here are some more who got these timber limits. There was C. C. Colby. I do not know who he is.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. A member of the Conservative government.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, they were not satisfied with giving it to the small fish, but here we find that members of the government actually got timber limits. Among others who got limits were Mr. Alex. Fraser, Mr. Skead, Moore & Macdowall again, Wm. Stubbs again, and Senator Sanford, who has, unfortunately, passed away. Then, there was P. MacLaren. He is one of those old gentlemen up in the Senate. It is no wonder

the Conservatives could go to the Senate when they got fifty miles of timber limits without paying anything for it.

Mr. HAGGART. Did Mr. MacLaren get his timber limits without paying anything for them?

Mr. DAVIS. There was no competition.

Mr. HAGGART. Just read what he paid for them.

Mr. DAVIS. Five dollars a square mile. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) can have this return when I am done with it. He will find there the parties who paid a certain amount of ground rent, and the parties who paid none, and the parties who gave a bonus. I am reading the names of those who paid no bonus, and the hon. member from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) paid no bonus.

Mr. TAYLOR. And get no limit.

Mr. DAVIS. This is a very long return, and it comprises a vast number of names of Conservatives who got grants of timber lands from the Conservative government, without any competition and without giving any consideration whatever for it.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair before six o'clock, I was alluding to the number of timber berths in the Northwest Territories that had been granted by the late government to their political friends between the years 1878 and 1896. I must again apologize to the House for taking up its time on this question, because, with the session drawing to a close, the proper business of the House should be proceeded with, and questions of this kind should not be brought up. But hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have for the last week or more been bringing up various questions with the evident intention of making some cheap political capital for themselves. We have had the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) treating us on several days with a rehash of his Yukon charges of last year; we have had another gentleman bringing up the question of food supplied to the volunteers; and, last but not least, we have now the hon. member for Western Assiniboia retelling this ancient history about the timber limit which he says was granted to the brother-in-law of the Minister of the Interior. If these hon. gentlemen wish to go into matters of that kind, I suppose it is only fair and right that we should give them an answer to show what they themselves did in the eighteen years that they were in power. Now, I submit that the hon. gentleman who brought this matter up made no case at all. He argued the matter to a conclusion in his

own mind; he said the inference was this, the facts led people to believe that, and so forth; just as the hon. member for Pictou picked up the gossip of the streets and said, Tom Brown said this and John Jones said that. If I were to take up all the gossip I have heard outside of this House, I could tell about having heard of some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House making fortunes out of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract and other contracts. Now, by the list which has been handed to me by the acting Minister of the Interior, I find that no less than 537 timber berths in the North-west Territories were granted to hon. gentlemen opposite between 1878 and 1896 without competition, and without a bonus or a dollar of any sort being paid for them. If timber berths had been given to people who would put their capital into the country for the purpose of developing it and opening it up, there would be no ground of complaint; but shortly after the North-west Territories were opened up we find that a whole horde of hungry followers of hon. gentlemen opposite invaded that country and gobbled up all the timber limits they could get from the boundaries of Manitoba to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. They did not confine their scope to one province or to one district, but gobbled up everything in sight from the Cypress Hills to the Saskatchewan River. They gobbled up no less than 16,000,000 acres of the timber lands of the North-west; and they were not millowners, but merely speculators, and amongst these people I find the names of a great many of the leading members on the other side of the House. It would be well for hon. gentlemen opposite to see that their own backyards are clean before they look into the backyards of their neighbours. I may say first that when I stated that Senator MacLaren had obtained timber limits in the North-west Territories, the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) said that he had paid his rent. He may have paid two or three years' rent; but he received those timber limits without competition and without paying any bonus—I suppose because he was a political supporter of the party then in power. There were 178 timber berths granted on which from one to two years' rent was paid, but no bonus. Three hundred and fifty-two timber berths were granted by hon. gentlemen opposite to their political friends without competition, on which no ground rent whatever was paid and no bonus given. As I said before, amongst the men who were feeding at the public trough in that way, I find the names of very prominent gentlemen on the other side of the House; and I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite will like to listen to this, because their old sins are coming up and staring them in the face, and I am sure it will make very good reading. Now, in this list, which was furnished

Mr. DAVIS.

to me by the acting Minister of the Interior, I find the name of D. Tisdale, M.P. for South Norfolk, who received a timber limit. I find the name of R. S. White, M.P. for Cardwell, who received a timber limit. I find the name of R. C. McCuaig, M.P. for Prince Edward County, who received a timber limit. I find the name of C. C. Colby, M. P. for Stanstead, who received a timber limit. An hon. gentleman tells me that he was Minister of Agriculture, which makes the matter worse. Not satisfied with his followers gobbling up these timber lands, here is a minister of the Crown participating in this onslaught on the public domain. T. Kenny, M.P. for Halifax, received a timber limit. It was not confined to Ontario and Quebec, but from the shores of the Atlantic Ocean men came to gobble up the lands of the North-west Territories. I find the name of another gentleman who occupies a very prominent position in this House, a gentleman whom I see sitting day in and day out in front of the hon member for Western Assiniboia—J. G. H. Bergeron, M.P.; he was feeding at the public trough in this way. I find the name of L. H. Massue, M.P., George H. Howland, senator, I believe, John White, M.P., J. M. Farrow and Asher Farrow, sons of the M.P., who gobbled up some hundreds of miles of timber limits. I find a gentleman who was appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite to a very important position in the service of the country, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, W. B. Scarth. He also was in the business of gobbling up timber limits. I find the name of David Blain, William Richardson, M.P., H. A. Ward, Montplaisir, M.P., H. H. Smith, commissioner of Crown lands, who of all men should not be implicated in a matter of this kind. What would hon. gentlemen opposite say if the present commissioner of Crown lands had got hold of fifty or one hundred square miles of timber limits? You would then hear the breezy voice of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) reading the government a lecture on the evils of the Grit party. We find another gentleman, who occupies not a very small position in this House, the hon. Dr. Montague, ex-minister of the Crown. He figured very largely in this promenade over the North-west Territories, at a time when they were gobbling up timber limits. I also find the name of my illustrious and poetical friend from the plains, N. F. Davin. He got fifty square miles. These gentlemen would not take acres, nothing but miles would do them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How much did he pay?

Mr. DAVIS. He paid nothing at all. If the hon. gentleman had stuck to the breezy plains of West Assiniboia, I would not have so much of a grievance, but looking around those beautiful plains and not finding suffi-

cient timber there to make telegraph poles and cord wood and fence posts, he went to the Saskatchewan and located fifty miles of timber. I find W. E. Sanford's name and John Haggart, M.P., the latter was connected with the company of McLaren, Haggart, Nichol and somebody else. I will give credit to the hon. member for West Assiniboia, that he was very modest in his demands. He only asked for fifty miles. I find the name of the ex-Minister of Agriculture figuring in two or three places in this book.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). Then the hon. gentleman finds what is incorrect.

Mr. DAVIS. I will give the hon. gentleman the references and the numbers of the berths, because his memory may not be very good. So many of those things pass through his fertile brain, that no doubt he cannot remember them all. I understand that the name of the hon. member for East Grey appears in this book too.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey.) I want the hon. gentleman to understand that my name does not appear in that or any other account for timber limits, nor does it appear for any other lands in the North-west.

Mr. DAVIS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, and will withdraw the statement, but I find the name of Sproule. It may be the hon. gentleman's brother, and does not make any difference.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to set him right—unless he desires to create a false impression—I might give him this information. I put in sixteen or seventeen or eighteen applications for timber berths for men whom I never saw. I put in also an application for two of my brothers, who then contemplated going into the milling business, and who were living in Winnipeg. Of all the applications I put in, there never was one granted, and not a stick of timber cut. As for myself I have never, directly or indirectly, had any interest in any timber or grazing or other lands in the North-west, except such lands as I bought from private individuals and paid for.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You got no subsidy for the applications?

Mr. SPROULE. No, I am not in the habit of doing that sort of business as the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is.

Mr. DAVIS. I am very glad to have the explanation of the hon. gentleman, and am very much pleased he did not get any timber limits. But he has acknowledged the corn. He has admitted that he put in applications for sixteen.

Mr. SPROULE. Fifteen out of the sixteen were Reformers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No wonder they did not get anything.

Mr. DAVIS. I am quite satisfied, if that was the case, but it must have been near election time. He has not given us the information whether those gentlemen ever got the timber limits.

Mr. SPROULE. I tell the hon. gentleman that the applications were sent me from all over the country, and so far as I know not one of the applicants got a timber limit.

Mr. DAVIS. That does not mend matters. The hon. gentleman says he put in applications from sixteen parties all over the country, whom he did not know. That appears to me to make matters worse.

Mr. SPROULE. They came from your own country.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman should not have put in those applications unless he knew the applicants were from bona fide millowners. But apparently he never asked a question.

Mr. BRITTON. Perhaps it would be in order for the gentleman to tell us whether he put in those applications as a land agent or as a politician.

Mr. SPROULE. Neither. I got them from a gentleman who was living in Bertram, and who is in the timber business. He had a mill out there. He sent these applications, and I sent the letters on, and never saw one of the fourteen or fifteen in my life except one man who happened to be from my riding, and who was a strong Reformer and voted against me.

Mr. DAVIS. I was sorry to hear the hon. gentleman make the statement he did, because I have a great deal of respect for him. But the idea of his standing up here and telling us that he put in sixteen applications—which I must call bogus applications—from parties all over, asking for from fifty to 100 miles of timber limits each, in the North-west Territories, without finding out whether there was a mill to be erected or people to be served or anything else—

Mr. SPROULE. I sent those parties copies of the regulations under which they were to act. I got their letters asking me to apply and sent their letters to the department, and sent them copies of the regulations under which timber limits could be granted. Any hon. gentleman would have done the same for those who sent in applications or have been guilty of discourtesy.

Mr. DAVIS. In cases of that kind, generally speaking, from my district, when a party wants to put in an application for timber limits, he sends it to the department and asks me if I will go to the department and interest myself in trying to get the thing carried out. As I have been informed

on credible authority, these applications sent by the hon. member for East Grey were sent just before the general elections.

Mr. SPORULE. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIS. Sixteen applications handed in to the hon. gentleman from parties all over whom he did not know, and each of whom wanted fifty to 100 miles of timber limits in the North-west Territories. Things must have come dear in the good old days in this country.

An hon. MEMBER. Was there any money paid?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not know, it seemed to me a go-as-you-please matter. The ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) said that his name did not appear in the list. The list is so long I cannot go through it at the moment, but I can refer the return to him, and he will find his name there.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) is quite right now. He said my name appeared there several times. It appears there once.

Mr. DAVIS. It is only in degree, then, that I am wrong?

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) will permit me—perhaps he will explain what there was wrong in that transaction, or if there was anything wrong. If he can do that, he will have some cause of complaint. Perhaps a name similar to mine does appear there. My brother was a saw-mill man in Manitoba, one of the first there; and when his saw-mill in Manitoba was burnt, he went westward looking for timber and took up timber limits. But, if he took them up, he took them up under the regulations. I see the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) smiles. I may say I never promoted railways in this House and made money out of them. I never made a red cent out of my public life, either through timber limits, grass lands or otherwise.

Mr. DAVIS. I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) has acknowledged the corn. He wants to know what harm it was. I think there was a great deal of harm. The idea of a member of this House—

Mr. MONTAGUE. That was many years before I became a member of this House.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) tells us something about a man going west. The whole Conservative party about that time seems to have taken Horace Greeley's advice and gone west. They found plenty of timber limits and fertile lands, and they all seemed to be attracted. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) only got fifty miles; I am rather sorry he did not get more. What harm was there in the transaction, he wants to know. Well, what harm is there in the case the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) is trying to

Mr. DAVIS.

make political capital out of? Here is a mill-owner, one of the largest property owners in that country—

Mr. MONTAGUE. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) did not say I ever got a timber limit. A formal application was put in for me. I never owned an acre or received a dollar for it in my life.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, perhaps there was not enough to go round. But, like the Irishman who fired at his landlord and missed, I am sure the hon. gentleman did his best, and no man could do more. But, I was giving the names of prominent Conservatives in this return. There was Mr. McMillan, then a member of this House from Middlesex—

Mr. COWAN. No, a judge in Haldimand.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, he seems to have been a judge then—a judge of timber. Then, there is Mr. MacLaren, a senator. Now, I skip the name of the hon. gentleman from Haldimand (Mr. Montague), but it is there all right. Then, I find the name of Mr. Boyle, then member of parliament for Wellingland. And here is another name illustrious in the Conservative party—T. Mayne Daly. He was Minister of the Interior under the late government. As such he received a training, no doubt, which will assist him in picking out timber limits and coal mines in British Columbia. Then, there is Adam Brown, ex-member of parliament. I find here also the name of Mr. Caron—another minister of the Crown, I think. And here is another friend of ours who sits on the other side—Mr. W. J. Poupore, the representative of Pontiac. Hon. Mr. Hardisty, a senator, figures for fifty miles. I find the name of Dr. Orton, then member of parliament for Central Wellington, who is down for fifty miles. They do not seem to have arranged very well as to the quantity. It seems to me that a minister of the Crown in that government should have had a hundred miles, a member of parliament fifty miles, the deputy ministers and commissioners of Crown lands twenty-five miles, and then let the small fry have ten, five or two miles.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Davin got fifty miles.

Mr. DAVIS. I am not sorry, because I think he needed it. Then, I find the name of Mr. Macdowall, my predecessor in the representation of Saskatchewan. He did not confine his operation as the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin) seems to have done. I wonder that those who supported the Conservative government in that House should allow this quiet, mild-mannered man to scoop in so much.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How much did he get?

Mr. DAVIS. I cannot stop now to figure out the total number of square miles; but he was able to hypothecate it in the Bank of Ottawa for \$80,000. He was here for

only two terms, eight years. So, he got \$10,000 a year. The ordinary member of parliament puts in his time here for five months for \$1,000. Another name in this list is that of George H. Bradbury. I have met him in the campaigns in the west, and I wondered why he was so energetic. His interest in the Conservative party may be accounted for by the fact that his name figures so largely in this return. I do not propose to take up the time of the House in reading the list of those occupying prominent positions on the other side who have figured on this timber lands return.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That would take a week.

Mr. DAVIS. It would take altogether too long. Why, Mr. Speaker, look at the size of the list. I can hardly count the pages—filled with names of prominent Conservatives, not only in Ottawa, but all over the country.

Mr. GIBSON. Does the name of Bergeron appear there?

Mr. DAVIS. Certainly he figures here. The firewood was scarce, I suppose, in the town where he lives, and he wanted to get some timber limits. I think he is down for fifty miles.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Where do you find that?

Mr. DAVIS. In the return brought down by the minister.

Mr. BERGERON. Did I ever apply for it?

Mr. DAVIS. I am not in a position to say.

Mr. BERGERON. Exactly—the hon. gentleman does not now what he is talking about.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said that he received applications from Tom, Dick and Harry, and put them in. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is Tom, Dick or Harry.

Mr. BERGERON. If the rest of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Davis') speech is like this part, he had better sit down, because there is not a word of truth in what he says.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) will find his name in the return.

Mr. BERGERON. I know what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) refers to. It is an old story and has been denied twenty times. It was exploded long before he ever thought of coming here.

Mr. DAVIS. I tell the hon. gentleman that he made the application on the 15th of February, 1882, and again on the 15th of February, 1883. If the hon. gentleman will brush up his memory a little he will come to the conclusion that I am right.

Mr. BERGERON. Not a word of truth in it.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, there is the record. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not get 100 miles. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not going through all the names. The hon. gentleman from Beauharnois has seen fit to challenge my statement. I find here is the number of the file—'File 22,662, number of timber berth, 169, J. H. G. Bergeron, 50 miles on Lake Winnipegosis.' Given without competition. I am sorry the hon. member for Beauharnois did not get 100 miles, because he is a very good fellow, and he might have been a seignior up at Lake Winnipegosis. It is a great country for fish. The hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, when they were in power, made a great many lords, a great many earls, by giving them public lands in the North-west Territories, and now we might make a few more out of timber. Now, the hon. member for Beauharnois, we might call him the Count of Lake Winnipegosis. The hon. member for Western Assiniboia would shine as the Duke of the Pile o' Bones. The hon. member the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague), we might call him the Earl of Medicine Hat. Then we have the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), the ex-Minister of Justice, he might be called the Earl of Yukon. That would be a very good name for that hon. gentleman. We have lots of nice names in the North-west Territories that we can furnish to all the lords and dukes and earls hon. gentlemen opposite wish to make.

But I was going on to say that this is a very serious consideration for the people of the eastern provinces. What are they going to think of the fact that 16,000,000 acres of timber land, the finest timber lands in that country, have been given away to political friends and supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, without one cent being paid into the public treasury? Why, Mr. Speaker, 16,000,000 acres is an immense extent of territory. If we had a belt of timber two miles wide and a railroad running through the centre of it, that road would run for 13,000 miles through solid timber, or half way round the globe. Or if you take a belt of timber 100 miles wide, it would extend all the way from here to the city of Toronto. When the people of the eastern provinces think over this enormous amount of timber that hon. gentlemen opposite gave away to their political friends, they will come to the conclusion that it is no wonder we had a rebellion in the North-west Territories in 1885. But that is not all that hon. gentlemen opposite did. They gave away 66,000,000 acres of the choicest and most fertile land in the North-west Territories to railway corporations, out of which public rumor says that a great many hon. gentlemen who occupied seats in this House made a great deal of money. That is what public opinion says, I am giving it

for what it is worth, and it is worth just as much as the statements made by the hon. member for Pictou, about the Yukon and just as much as the statements made by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia. I say that the people of the North-west have a right to feel alarmed when they know that 66,000,000 acres of the choicest and most fertile land was given away for practically nothing to supposed railway corporations. The land was given away but the railroads were not built, the charters were only on paper. Then they come down and give away 16,000,000 acres of the choicest timber land of the country. Yet, in the face of all this, we find the member for West Assiniboia getting up and taking exception to the fact that a certain gentleman, whom he claimed is a brother-in-law of the Minister of the Interior, got a small belt of timber down in the Dauphin country on which he has paid up to the present time \$5,000 or \$6,000 in cash; and it has been shown by the acting Minister of the Interior that he paid more for it than any other person paid for a similar berth. I say that, in the face of such a record of the Conservative party for the last eighteen years, it ill-becomes the member for West Assiniboia or any other hon. gentleman opposite to get up and make a statement of that kind. What are the facts of the case? The facts are that the Crown timber agent in the city of Winnipeg, Mr. Stephenson, a most highly respectable man, one of the best officials that we have in this country, a man not appointed by this government but by the late government, whose father was a Conservative member for the county of Kent—this gentleman recommended that the regulations be changed in such a way as to allow bona fide millowners to get a certain amount of timber in the locality in which they lived, without competition. I think that was a perfectly correct regulation. I think when a millowner goes in there or any other person, and invests his capital for the purpose of opening up the country, the government is in duty bound to protect him. I would not grumble at hon. gentlemen opposite giving away all these timber limits if they had given them to persons who were going to open up the country. But here was a millowner in the Dauphin country that wanted a small piece of timber. He was not the only one, the regulation was not made for his benefit, although the member for West Assiniboia tries to show that the regulation was changed because Mr. Burrows was a brother-in-law of the Minister of the Interior. I do not think that the hon. gentleman will get many members in this House, or many people in this country, to believe that Mr. Stephenson, the Crown timber agent at Winnipeg, would commit such an offence as to publish bogus reports for the purpose of allowing any one to get timber limits. Mr. Burrows was not the

Mr. DAVIS.

only man that got limits. Mr. Stephenson in good faith recommended that the regulation be changed in such a way as to protect the bona fide millowners, because, as I have said, when this timber is put up for competition there are often speculators, some of them, perhaps, living in the city of Ottawa, who will put in tenders, not with the intention of operating a mill or of benefiting that country, but with the intention of hanging up the millowner and mulcting him in \$2,000 or \$3,000 in order to get a timber limit afterwards. I say the member for West Assiniboia has not been able to show that there was anything irregular about that. He says it looks bad. Well, some other things look bad. Let me point him to the fact that if he goes down to the province of Nova Scotia he will find that the hon. gentleman who is leading the opposition in this House has a great many of his relatives occupying positions in the public service, and there is no one who says very much about it.

But I want to say again that this question is ancient history in the west; and if the hon. member for West Assiniboia or any other hon. member on the other side imagines for a moment that they are going to make any political capital out of it, they are greatly mistaken. They will make just about as much political capital out of it as the hon. member for Pictou has made out of the Yukon charges that he has been talking about in this House for the last two or three years, and they have fallen flat. I pointed to the fact that during the election in Manitoba last autumn this question was made an issue on the platform. The people of the district of Dauphin, living on the spot, understand the circumstances of the case, as they have had an opportunity of judging the merits. The local Conservative paper that was edited, I understand, by a gentleman sent from the *Star* office, in Montreal, for the purpose, tried to throw dirt on Mr. Burrows, by saying that he had been implicated in a timber steal. Mr. Burrows denied the charge upon the platform, and he got a majority of 425 votes in the district of Dauphin, or double the majority that the whole Conservative party got in Manitoba. He polled two votes to one right in Dauphin where he is known. I think my hon. friend who is returned from Marquette (Mr. Roche), will give the people of Dauphin credit for being intelligent, that they know what they are voting upon, and when they vote, how they are voting, and if there had been anything crooked about this transaction, they would not have voted as they did. I have nothing more to say. I am glad that some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have repented of their sins, and given up some of the timber limits they got in the good old days. I am sorry that my hon. friend, whom I alluded to as the power-house of the Conservative party, the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), had not any share in

this. I do not see his name in the list that I have read over.

Mr. WILLIAM J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House has been edified by the cultured gentleman who has just addressed a few remarks to the House, and that hon. members have been captured, not only by his style, but by his elegant language, and by the so-called defence that he has put up on this question that we are supposed to be discussing this evening. The hon. acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland), spoke this afternoon about the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), being engaged in mud-slinging, but, I think, if there has been any mud-slinging indulged in, it has been from his own side of the House, and what the hon. acting minister has not seen fit to indulge in himself, he has relegated to the most appropriate person who has done full justice to himself in that role, the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). It is not my intention to follow the hon. gentleman through his devious meanderings, covering the last eighteen years, introducing a lot of irrelevant matter into the discussion which has nothing to do with the question before us, nor is it my intention to correct the many misstatements which he has made here to-night, in his own peculiarly offensive style, because the House has become so well accustomed to the hon. gentleman's style of argument, if such it can be called, as to know how much reliance can be placed on anything emanating from the hon. gentleman's lips. It shows the very great stress that hon. gentlemen opposite are driven to, and especially the hon. acting Minister of the Interior, when he goes to the trouble of preparing a long list of some hundreds of names of gentlemen who, during the eighteen years that the Conservative party were in power, obtained what he claims were special privileges, by getting these timber berths from the government, many of whom, he declares, got them for nothing, which is not true, and trying to leave the impression on the House that they were Conservatives, when, as a matter of fact, many of these names that have been read, I am personally aware, are those of Liberals, whereas, a great many of the names that have been suppressed by the hon. gentleman are those of Liberals, and, therefore, his whole argument falls to the ground. He spoke of these gentlemen, and he mentioned the hon. member for Western Assiniboia, amongst others, as having secured special privileges, by getting these berths for nothing, when they did not do anything of the kind. It is true that a number of gentlemen applied for timber berths, but, they did not comply with the law, they did not erect mills, according to the Act, and, therefore, these berths reverted to the Crown, and the country lost not a single dollar, nor did the

gentlemen reap one single dollar of benefit from them. The hon. gentleman has entirely misrepresented the facts, and he has read a long list of names, trying to convey the impression that those who obtained timber berths benefited financially from their reception. The case brought forward by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is one, in my opinion, of very great importance, involving, as it does, the disposal of our valuable timber limits and particularly in this case, it would appear, that there is ground for suspicion that they have been disposed of by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), in the interest of his political friends and near relatives, because, we find that this Mr. Burrows is the local member for the constituency of Dauphin, that he is the brother-in-law of the hon. Minister of the Interior, and but a nominal millowner, who did not live up to clause 17, which enables millowners to obtain these privileges. We all recognize the value of our timber limits, and especially those of us who live in the west, where, at the present time, in many districts, that commodity has become a very scarce article. It is necessary that the government should dispose of them in the interest of the settlers, and not in the interest of their own political friends, and private individuals, who may amass huge fortunes at the expense of the public domain. It would appear that up to July, 1898, the old law disposed of these timber limits by public competition, by offering every one of them in the open market, by charging \$5 per square mile as ground rent, and asking a bonus. It would appear that the hon. Minister of the Interior, when he came into power, undertook to reverse all this, and it seems a strange coincidence that while this order in council was passed, changing these regulations, on July 1, 1898, it did not come into effect until August 13, 1898, and within eight days thereafter, the first applicant was Mr. Burrows, brother-in-law of the Minister of the Interior, who applied for fifty miles, the utmost limit that the law will permit. Mr. Burrows was informed in a letter from the Department of the Interior, that he would have to specify definitely the land he desired to secure. Mr. Burrows replied that he was unable to do so, because the land was unsurveyed. However, this did not prevent brother-in-law Burrows from going on and cutting on that land without a license, without the permission of the government, without having a survey made, although that privilege was refused to other applicants, and thus we find that there was discrimination in favour of Mr. Burrows. As to this clause 17, it is in the hands of a designing Minister of the Interior to do a very great deal in the interest of his political friends and relatives, as was done at least in this particular instance to the detriment of the country at

large. It is true that Mr. Burrows, was part owner of a mill in Dauphin, but the mill is forty miles away from his limits, so that it is an evasion of the provision of the law, which says that the mill shall be contiguous to the territory applied for. Then, it was intended that he should be charged 50 cents per thousand in lieu of the bonus, and 50 cents extra per thousand in lieu of the ground rent, per foot, board measure, for every foot sawn in the mill. Mr. Burrows absolutely did not comply with this regulation at all. According to the correspondence which has been read here by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia, he did not manufacture one single foot of lumber, and how could he pay a dollar a thousand for this lumber? On the other hand, he acted in the capacity of a speculator, and I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Burrows, when he was making his application, shortly after August 13, when this clause was put into the regulations, wrote a letter to the Department of the Interior, congratulating them upon the change in the law, as well he might, seeing that he was such a great beneficiary therefrom. He pointed out that when millowners had to face competition in the open market, the bona fide millowner was subjected to unfair competition at the hand of the speculator, who ran prices up. Did the country suffer by that running up of the price? Not at all. The acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) stated this afternoon that far from favouritism having been shown to Mr. Burrows in the past, he had paid as high as \$100 per square mile. Well, that is exactly why the Act was changed and this clause 17 introduced. Mr. Burrows did not wish to be subjected to this unfair competition and to have to pay that \$100, and the law was changed so that he could get that fifty square miles of valuable timber limits without paying a cent of bonus, without paying \$1 of ground rent, without being subject to any competition, and without having to pay the cost of survey, which he also stated was a grievance and which the millowner had to pay in the past, or send a man to spy out the land. Did Mr. Burrows avail himself of the privilege to manufacture that timber into lumber. Not at all. He acted as a speculator. He occupied the position of land commissioner to the Canadian Northern Railway, Mann & Mackenzie's line; a position which, no doubt, he secured through the influence of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who is so very closely connected with Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie, the proprietors of this road. Mr. Burrows acted as land commissioner for that road, and he had special facilities in that capacity for spying out the very best timber land in that northern country. He utilized that position, to act as a speculator to obtain fifty square miles, not to manufacture the timber into lumber, and not on the ground of being

Mr. ROCHE.

a millowner, but to sell it for railway ties, telegraph poles, and so on. He did not manufacture one single foot which was cut off that valuable timber limit into lumber. It has been said that other gentlemen obtained this same privilege. That is true, but these other gentlemen were bona fide millowners and did comply with the law. Take for instance H. B. Mitchell, who was quoted this afternoon. He cut 578,122 feet board measure, but he manufactured that into lumber, and he paid \$578.12 dues. He complied with the conditions of the law. If Mr. Burrows had received this privilege alone, and if all others were refused, then the thing would be too transparent, and those in power sought to avoid that. Captain Robinson of Selkirk was a bona fide millowner, and he manufactured the timber into lumber. He cut 2,031,500 feet, and paid dues amounting to \$2,031.50. Those gentlemen who have been named here this afternoon were all bona fide millowners, and they complied with the clause 17, but what we accuse the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) of is in allowing Mr. Burrows to go without complying with that clause, and that is where the favouritism comes in. Mr. Burrows cut 1,523 fence posts, and he paid for them one cent each, they being 7 feet long and 5 inches at the small end. He cut 1,730 cords of wood, paying 25 cents a cord. I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is not a farmer in that district who has not to pay tribute for every cord of wood he cuts to Mr. Burrows, during the time that regulation was in force. Mr. Burrows cut 2,318 telegraph poles, 22 feet long and he paid 5 cents each for them, and one cent per foot for each foot over that. He cut 4,786 feet of piling. He cut 98,372 railway ties at 3 cents each, 8 feet long. Upon all this he paid the nominal sum of \$3,632.29, and notwithstanding the fact that the Minister of the Interior states that is more than the bonus would be, I have to differ with him in that. If this system was so very beneficial to the revenues of the country over and above the old system, why did the minister rescind that order; why did he not keep it in operation; why did he not desire to obtain all the revenue possible for the country and stick to this system which he says brought in more revenue than the old bonus system. Why, Sir, the bonus alone would be more than Mr. Burrows had to pay. Anyway it is not a question of the revenue, so much as it is the special privilege that was granted to Mr. Burrows by allowing him to get this without competition, without tender, without paying his ground rent and a bonus as in the past. Mr. Burrows, as I said, made application, eight days after the order was put into effect by letter, on the 21st of August, in which he congratulated the government on their change in the regulations. He telegraphed on the 26th August for permit. But the strange thing about it is that

while other gentlemen made applications for timber lands they were refused. Take for instance the case of Mr. Drake. Mr. Drake was recommended by the Crown timber inspector as a person qualified under the law to receive this privilege of getting a permit to cut over fifty square miles. Did Mr. Drake obtain this privilege? Not at all. Why was he refused? He was refused in the first place on the ground that the regulation only was intended for saw-mill owners who had exhausted their supplies and had no lumber to keep their mill running. Was this condition required of Mr. Burrows? No. No question whatever was asked Mr. Burrows as to whether or not he had run out of lumber. Mr. Drake was handicapped by the statement made against him that he had sufficient timber to keep his mill running. Even then, Mr. Drake met that objection by presenting evidence, backed as he was by the Crown timber inspector, that he only had sufficient lumber to run his mill for half the winter. But still he was refused this privilege, a privilege that was given to Mr. Burrows without a question being asked him as to whether or not he had timber enough to keep his mill running. I wish to point out that Mr. Drake, having been recommended by the Crown timber inspector, commenced operations without receiving his license and without having his land surveyed. He was immediately called down by the Minister of the Interior and castigated by him for doing something which was contrary to the regulations. But Mr. Burrows cut on un-surveyed land, and he cut without a license, and yet the Minister of the Interior never raised a question about that. Why, this discrimination again in the interests of Mr. Burrows. Mr. McArthur was refused the privilege, although he applied some weeks before this clause was rescinded. The clause was rescinded on the 13th January, and Mr. McArthur applied on the 26th December previously, but yet he was not allowed the privilege that was accorded to Mr. Burrows. Again there was a Mr. Caverley. He received a letter from the department that his application could not be entertained unless a definite description was given of the land which he had applied for. Mr. Burrows did not submit this definite description. The application of Mr. Burrows was allowed without a definite description, but the application of Mr. Caverley was refused because he could not give a definite description. Then the application of Hooker & Co., was refused on the ground that there was no competition in the matter of the disposal of the timber. That objection was equally as valid at the time Mr. Burrows received his privilege as it was then. Hooker & Co. were recommended by Foley, the Crown timber inspector. Then there was the application of Shaw Bros., of Dauphin, the rivals in

trade of Mr. Burrows. However, they happened to be strong Conservatives, and they were refused the privilege, although they applied some time before the clause was rescinded. It is very strange indeed that Mr. Burrows was not accorded a license until after the clause was rescinded. No license was issued to Burrows before January 18th, and the clause was rescinded on the 13th January. Mr. Shaw was refused early in January, although he had applied early in December. Mr. Shaw was refused although he was a bona fide millowner; and although he was manufacturing his lumber, but he was a rival in trade of Mr. Burrows, and would not be accorded the same privileges by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). The acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) attempted to give a certificate of character to Mr. Burrows this afternoon, stating that he was a most estimable gentleman, and that nothing could be said against him. The members on this side of the House have introduced no question of private character into this debate. We are not accusing Mr. Burrows of anything. He simply obtained a business advantage over his rivals, but who we are accusing is the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) for having allowed this special favouritism to his own brother-in-law and for having allowed his own brother-in-law these privileges which he refused to other applicants, although they complied with the conditions of the law which Mr. Burrows did not. I can substantiate everything the acting minister has said with reference to the character of Mr. Burrows, but that has nothing whatever to do with this debate. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) stated as a valid defence for Mr. Burrows obtaining these privileges, that Mr. Burrows had such a large majority in the recent provincial elections. It is true that this was made use of against Mr. Burrows on the platform; but the action was issued not so much against Mr. Burrows as against the Minister of the Interior. Mr. Burrows was not accused of doing anything illegal; but the Minister of the Interior was accused of showing the greatest favouritism to Mr. Burrows. The hon. gentleman states that Mr. Burrows got some 450 majority, but he does not tell the House how he got that majority. One-half of it was got in a district where this timber limit is not situated at all, and in a constituency which is noted for the disgraceful manner in which the voters' list was stuffed. In four polling subdivisions there were 603 names, although there were not fifty inhabitants residing in those polling divisions; and the best evidence of the fact of the lists being stuffed is, that the local government abolished the old list, and in that list, out of 3,300 names, 893 names were struck off and some 600 new ones added in the preparation of the new one. This shows that Mr. Burrows got his majority by one-half of the people of the constituency

being disfranchised. That is no defence for this timber transaction, and the hon. member for Saskatchewan knows it very well.

Now, I might just summarize, Mr. Speaker, the reasons why I intend to support the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia. Because I think it has been amply demonstrated beyond a doubt that Mr. Burrows had no mill within forty miles of his limit, although the law contemplated that he should have one contiguous to the limit. Then, he did not so cut the timber as to keep his mill running, as was demanded of his competitors. He did not define his timber limit, as the other applicants were required to do. He did not hand in until January 10, 1899, a statement of the sections which he had selected, and he then handed in some thirty-eight out of fifty, just three days prior to the time the order was rescinded; and his license was not issued until some days after the order had been rescinded on January 18. Mr. Burrows had gone on cutting timber before the land was surveyed. He cut timber in township 32, which was not within the limits of the timber sections which he applied for at all, and then he applied for the right to cut in that township too. Was he refused? Not at all. What was the use of having a brother-in-law if you could not make use of him? So, the Minister of the Interior came to his rescue, and on February 13 he included township 32, which was outside of his fifty-mile limit, although other gentlemen had been refused the privilege of cutting timber long prior to this date. Mr. Burrows did not manufacture a foot of lumber out of the timber. There again he did not comply with the law, while the other gentlemen did comply with the law in that respect. Mr. Burrows acted as a speculator, as the land commissioner of the Canadian Northern Railway; and the cutting of railway ties, piles, fence posts, and so on, did not benefit the settler one farthing. For these reasons, I intend to support the motion of the hon. member for Western Assiniboia, and any hon. gentleman giving this matter his attention cannot fail to see that the grossest favouritism was exercised in favour of Mr. Burrows by the Minister of the Interior, and merits the condemnation of the House.

Mr. PETER MACDONALD (East Huron). Mr. Speaker, I think that our hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) made a mistake this afternoon in the interest of his party in bringing before this House the question of timber limits. If there is any one thing blacker than another upon the escutcheon of the Liberal-Conservative party of this country, it is the timber policy which they adopted early in their regime and carried out for a number of years, until the property which they undertook to dispose of was taken out of their hands. I say this knowing whereof I speak. Knowing the

Mr. ROOHE.

history of that period, I cannot refrain from placing before the House a few facts which, I think, the electorate of this country should know. I do not know very much about the merits of the case immediately under discussion. I take for granted that the acting Minister of the Interior has given a very good answer to the charges brought against the Minister of the Interior, and, therefore, I will not deal with them, but will rather show the methods with which the Conservative party dealt with the public domain of Canada from about the year 1881 to the year 1888. I have before me a return which was brought before parliament some years ago, showing that a large portion of our public domain, which was at that time in dispute between the Dominion government and the government of Ontario, was given out to a large number of members of the Conservative party during those years—so much so that out of 150 applicants who received timber limits, there were only about ten Reformers, and a number of those ten were persons who had weakened on the Reform side and went over to the Conservative party because they thought there was more money on that side than there was on this. No less than 50,000,000 acres of land situated in the province of Ontario and the North-west Territories and Manitoba were applied for by twenty-six members of parliament and their friends; and although they did not all get timber limits, it was because in the first place there were not timber limits for each, and, in the second place, before the matter was settled, many of the timber limits they were disposing of passed into the hands of the Ontario government by the action of that government. The late government gave to Charles Rykert fifty square miles, in the Cypress Hills, in Manitoba, for the small sum of \$5 per square mile—\$250 all told. There was no bonus, but the \$5 was rent which had to be paid each year. At the same time, the government could not help knowing that the value of that land went up almost to the hundreds of thousands, for Mr. Rykert shortly afterwards united himself with a Mr. Adams, in the city of Winnipeg, and sold that very timber limit to a Mr. Sands, of Michigan, for no less than \$200,000, and pocketed that sum, less the \$250. In the face of that action of a few years ago, these very men place a resolution before the House to-day to condemn the Liberal party for giving a license to a man in Manitoba to cut timber for the use of the settlers. But, Sir, is that all? My hon. friend the whip of the Liberal-Conservative party will remember that in 1884, I think it was, they gave to the St. Catharines Milling and Lumber Company the right to cut logs upon a large territory, and the transaction was only stopped by the Hon. Oliver Mowat obtaining a mandamus from the courts to prevent the removal of logs from that territory, which was in dispute at the time. And what did the Conservative

government here do? They actually supplied the funds with which to defend the case of the St. Catharines Lumber Company before the Privy Council of England, and sent Dalton McCarthy there as solicitor. It not only cost this government \$8,000 for the fees of the solicitor, but, all told, nearly \$80,000 was spent by the province of Ontario in defending its territory.

This lumber company had no mills, this company was on paper, there was no solidarity about it, it was a combination that came together for the purpose of doing this country out of that large territory. At the head of the combination was the president of the Liberal-Conservative party of Ontario. Yet, in the face of all these facts, these hon. gentlemen are seeking to impress the people with the idea that we are giving away without compensation the timber of the Dominion of Canada.

Look at what they did with regard to Hunter's Island. That is a large island in Lake Superior and was in the disputed territory. The late government sold the timber on that island for \$7,500, and the company which bought it sold it to a Chicago syndicate for \$650,000. Here was \$643,000 to be taken out of the public domain and put into the hands of a foreign syndicate. How was this scheme prevented? The Hon. Oliver Mowat, ever true to the interests of Ontario, had a mandamus issued to prevent this property passing into the hands of the Chicago syndicate until the question of the boundary was settled, and when that question was settled, Hunter's Island came into the province of Ontario, and the transfer was never made. But the Liberal-Conservative party did all they could to have that transfer made and that same party in the Ontario legislature did their best to have this land transferred to a foreign syndicate, and if that land was saved to the country it was thanks to the efforts of the Liberal party.

But that is not all. There were some lands, a few years ago, given to Mr. Macdowall, who sat in this House a number of years. That land was situated in the Saskatchewan. Mr. Macdowall had to pledge it to a considerable degree in order to get money to establish a plant for the purpose of converting the timber into sawn lumber. He did not pay anything for the land but the ordinary \$5 per square mile of ground rent. A bank in the city of Ottawa became possessed of a claim upon that land, and there is a gentleman in this House who went to that bank and offered as an option \$200,000 for that property, but the bank would not accept the offer. And this Macdowall, mind you, was a member of this House and got this land for \$5 per square mile while he was sitting in this House. If you think this is not true, I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman who offered to pay \$200,000 as an option will corroborate my statement. I refer to my hon. friend, Mr. Mackie, who offered \$200,

000 of an option for the land that Mr. Macdowall got for nothing, only a few years ago.

Mr. MACKIE. Six months ago.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). And we are told, in the face of those facts, that the Liberal party are those who are seeking to give away the public domain.

But there is another case I want to bring before you and that is the Robillard case. Mr. Robillard, formerly a member of this House from the city of Ottawa, who sat here many years, got a limit, in 1887 I think it was, from this government in the Whitefish Indian reserve, for which he paid \$316. He united with him a man by the name of Riopel and another whose name I do not remember. Would you believe it, that land, which he got for \$316, he sold six months afterwards for \$50,000. I have this from the mouth of Mr. Riopel, who was one of the partners. Mr. Robillard received one-third for his trouble in getting the limits from the Conservatives who were then in power, and when he was a member of the House. Two years later, after a considerable portion of timber had been taken off the limit, it was sold for \$100,000, and two years after that, when the limit had been worked to a considerable extent, it was resold for \$200,000. And the original price paid by the Tory member to a Tory government was \$316. One is surprised at the effrontery of these hon. gentlemen.

Thus I might go on step by step to show you how the public domain was parcelled out by the late government to this one and the other of their friends. Just on the eve of the elections of 1882, a large number of timber limits were given in order to strengthen the influence of the party and run the elections. That was the time when the hon. member for East Grey made applications for limits for himself and his friends.

Mr. SPROULE. I have already stated, in the presence of the hon. gentleman, that I never made an application for timber limits for myself and my friends, and he must accept my word.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The return says—

Mr. SPROULE. I call on you, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must accept the statement. The denial of an hon. member is always accepted.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron.). But my statement was this—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask my hon. friend to accept the statement of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). But I have not made a statement.

Mr. SPROULE. He said that I had applied for timber limits for myself and my friends. I deny the charge and demand its withdrawal.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I said this—  
Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Just allow me to make the statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to this point as to whether or not, Mr. Speaker, you are going to enforce your ruling.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I simply made this statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. Allow the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), to explain.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the hon. gentleman explains, I just wish to state my point. The point is that he made a statement—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). No, he did not.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope I may be allowed to make my statement—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Make a correct one, then.

Mr. FOSTER. I am to be the judge of the correctness of my statement and not the Postmaster General. He had better keep his mouth shut while I am speaking, or I will have to call your attention to him, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). This was the statement I made—

Mr. SPEAKER. I shall have to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), to sit down. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) raises a point of order, and there is no getting over that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). You sit down, and shut your mouth.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Speaker is going to allow any hon. gentleman to rise in his place and tell me to shut my mouth, I would like to know what this House is coming to, and, if it is allowed to go on, the fault lies at the Speaker's door.

Mr. McMULLEN. I rise to a point of order—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). If the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) is permitted a word, I think he will explain. He was referring to a document, and was not permitted to finish what he was saying. I think if he is permitted to finish, there will be no difficulty between him and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. MILLS. He (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), was making a statement that was denied.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member who leads the opposition (Mr. Foster), has the floor.

Mr. FOSTER. I have it for the purpose of asking whether a member is to be allowed, without reproof, by the Chair, instead of addressing me through the Chair, to address me direct, and tell me to shut my mouth?

Mr. McMULLEN. That is not the point of order that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) took the floor to raise.

Mr. FOSTER. But, surely, that must be settled. I think I have a right to ask the protection of the Chair. I must insist on this.

Mr. GIBSON. What did you say to the Postmaster General? You were the first to use that language.

Mr. SPEAKER. All I can say is, that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), used a phrase of that kind, he was out of order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I withdraw what I said about the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) shutting his mouth.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I raise my point of order—

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker, is he (Mr. Foster), to have the floor all the time?

Mr. SPEAKER. He must be allowed to state his point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald (Huron) made a statement with reference to my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule). The hon. member for Grey rose and denied it point-blank. You ruled, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), must accept the denial. He has not accepted it; he has not stated that he will accept it. And yet he goes on with his speech. My point of order is, that before any discussion goes on, the hon. gentleman from Huron must accept the word of the hon. member for Grey.

Mr. McMULLEN. Now, Mr. Speaker—  
Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am speaking to the point of order. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), rose and interfered with the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), before he had finished his sentence. If he had waited until the hon. gentleman concluded his sentence, he might then fairly ask him to retract what he says.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) said distinctly the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) had applied for timber limits for himself and his friends. I denied it. The statement

was complete, and did not require any additional words in explanation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My statement was this—

Mr. FOSTER. Before any discussion goes on, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I have the right—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. I only desire to ask—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), should allow the hon. member for East Huron to say a word in his own defence. The House is not afraid that that would be a breach of decorum.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The whole matter can be settled in a moment. If the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), had not broken in in the middle of my sentence—

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. I ask that the decision of the Chair, having gone forth, shall be enforced before any other business is taken up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Chair has permitted the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Huron), to finish his sentence.

Mr. SPEAKER. I simply ask the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), to take his seat, and, in common justice, to allow the hon. member for East Huron to make what statement he wishes. There is nothing unfair in that.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My statement was this—

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, order.

Mr. FOSTER. My point of order simply stated is this—that once the Chair has given his decision—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, sit down.

Mr. FOSTER—no discussion or anything else is in order until the decision of the Chair is carried out.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to say—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The House will please come to order. We cannot transact business with the House in this confusion.

Mr. FOSTER. I insist upon my point of order—

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already said that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is out of order. I ask the House to allow the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), to complete his statement. The House need not be apprehensive as to the questions

between the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald); I am sure the hon. member for East Grey does not feel that he will be injured by an explanation being made.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). This is the statement I intended making in the beginning—

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have already raised the point of order—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not following up this matter because—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. I want order before I state my point of order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My statement that I commenced to make was in this wise—

Mr. SPEAKER. I confess that I understood the words as claimed by the member for Grey.

Mr. FOSTER. I press my point of order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I could not have made such a statement. I was broken off in the middle of a sentence and did not finish it.

Mr. FOSTER. I press my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. My recollection is—

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). If you are going to cut a sentence off in the middle—

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member for Huron please sit down?

Mr. FOSTER. I never knew in this House of Commons before that it was ever ruled by a Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER. I want to say to the hon. member for Huron that my recollection of the statement is as the hon. member for Grey says. I must say I caught the words just as he presented them. Now, I think these words are unparliamentary.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I will not withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER. Let me ask the hon. member one question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I did not make that statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. If he denies making the statement—

Mr. FOSTER. It does not matter what the statement was, I raise my point of order independent of it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) please sit down and raise the point of order afterwards?

Mr. FOSTER. I will not sit down. I will stand here for my rights if I have to stand all night.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Have you no respect for the Chair when the Chair asks you to sit down?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh; order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the House come to order?

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CHARLTON. May I be allowed to make a suggestion?

Mr. FOSTER. I want to state my point of order and have a decision.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a suggestion. I would suggest, Sir—

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am standing on my right to state my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman will not accept the judgment of the Chair, but insists on taking his own way, why, of course, there is no alternative.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you allow me to ask you one question, Mr. Speaker? Is it the right of any member of this House to rise to speak to a point of order or is it not?

Mr. CHARLTON. Clearly, Sir, your authority as Speaker in this House has been defied, and I hold it is high time that the authority—

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CHARLTON. The dignity of the Chair should be vindicated, and if we have authority vested in you—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair, order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think there is any use prolonging the discussion. Will the hon. member for Huron take his seat?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). Will the hon. member for York, N.B., take his seat also?

Mr. FOSTER. When there is order I will speak. If the Speaker cannot get order for me I will stay here until he does.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair; order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the House come to order. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will sit down for one moment.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the House come to order. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will sit down for one moment. Will the House come to order? It is utterly impossible to do any business. The moment the House reflect on the position they have put them-

Mr. SPEAKER.

elves in, I feel satisfied they will feel ashamed. Will the House allow the hon. gentleman to state—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am not asking you to allow me to state the point of order, I am appealing to the Speaker to give me my right to speak to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member for Huron take his seat? May I ask the House for one moment calmly to come to order? The House is not losing any of its rights in allowing the hon. member for York—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. The House is not losing any right.

Mr. FOSTER. I object to losing my rights.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). What is the point of order?

Mr. FOSTER. My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is this, that when an hon. gentleman, speaking on either side of the House, makes a statement which is denied by an hon. gentleman who rises in his place, being the one of whom the statement is made, and when the Speaker rules that the statement must be taken as made by the last mentioned hon. gentleman, my point of order is, that nothing can be discussed except the point of order until Mr. Speaker gives his ruling, and that when the Speaker has given his ruling nothing can be discussed until the decision of the Chair is obeyed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a point of order. I have the same right as he has.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think he has a right to discuss the point of order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). When a speaker is in the middle of a sentence and is broken off, a portion of the sentence not being uttered, is he not to be allowed to finish his sentence? That is just my position to-night. All I claim at the hands of my hon. friends on both sides of the House is liberty to make the statement that I desired to make, then, if it is not in order I will obey the Chair and withdraw it.

Mr. SPROULE. The question I understand to be this, and I ask whether it is not a fact: When a point of order is raised and the Speaker has given his ruling on that point, can there be any further discussion on it except an appeal is made from the Speaker to the House? The hon. member did not appeal to the House, but he endeavoured to go on and discuss it afterwards. That is the objection I raised on this

point, and I would like to have the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The Speaker cannot rule unless he knows the sentence upon which he is asked to rule.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). He has not the complete sentence.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must say to the House that my recollection of the sentence that the hon. member for Huron used is exactly as the hon. member for East Grey states it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Now, let me finish the sentence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order. Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. Perhaps the House will allow the hon. gentleman—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think this House wants to be unfair to anybody, and if the hon. member for Huron has cast an aspersion upon the hon. member for East Grey I am sure that the House will see that he takes it back.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). That is the statement of the hon. member for East Grey. Now, I—

Mr. FOSTER. I desire—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to have a ruling on my point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair. Sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. I simply want a ruling on my point of order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. member for East Grey—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I want a ruling on my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Huron claims that he was in the middle of his sentence and that it was unfair to cut his sentence in two.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. I will restate my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is unnecessary.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not seem unnecessary, because you have misapprehended it. The Speaker does not apprehend my point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. I simply ask for the ruling of the Chair on my point of order. If the Speaker wants me to repeat my point of order, I will do so. If the Speaker does not wish my point of order repeated, then I ask for a decision upon it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. Have I a right to a decision by the Speaker on the point of order that I raised?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, it is impossible in the confusion to understand what is the question, therefore, the House would be glad to have your ruling, and to abide by it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would say simply this to the right hon. leader of the House—

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for East Grey took exception to a sentence when the hon. member for Huron was in the act of making a statement. He said that the hon. member for East Grey, for himself, and his friends, had made application for certain timber berths—

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). That is right so far.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member for East Grey got up and stated that he had distinctly made the statement that he had made no application on his own behalf whatever. That is the question of order that was raised, if I remember.

Mr. BERGERON. You decided that he should withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Huron pleaded that he was interrupted in the middle of a sentence, and that when he completed his sentence it would be found that he cast no imputation on the hon. member for East Grey.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) insisted that he should take back that half of the sentence without any further explanation. The hon. member for Huron asked to be allowed to finish his sentence to show that it had been misinterpreted. As my recollection is that he used words that he had no right to use he should withdraw them.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I do not deny it, but allow me to state—

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be better if the hon. member would withdraw the

statement in regard to the hon. member for East Grey personally, and then he can proceed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My sentence was this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Sit down.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I do not—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. MACLEAN. Withdraw and make a new statement, if you like.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I did not finish my sentence.

Mr. BERGERON. Withdraw.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I insist upon—

Mr. SPEAKER. If there is any dispute as to the actual words perhaps the reporter would give us the precise phrase.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). There is no dispute about the words. This sentence was not concluded.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. MACDONALD. Let me conclude the sentence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw, withdraw.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am in the right.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). However, I accept the ruling of the Chair. Now, allow me to give you the sentence, and it will be seen by every one that what I said from the beginning—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). He has done so.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I accept the ruling of the Chair, but I am not going to be put in a false position that is not fair to me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, please.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). They do not want to hear it. The hon. member for East Grey made an application for timber limits for self and friends as stated in an official report brought down to this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I would appeal to the Speaker—

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am not out of order now. Then, if the hon. gentleman did not make an application for self it is between himself and the official report of his own party brought down in this House a few years ago. Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. In fairness I think you should allow the hon. member for East Huron to make an explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Now, Mr. Speaker, had I been allowed to finish that sentence, as I said I had not finished it, if it had not been broken off in the middle by these interruptions, would I not be in perfect order? All this fuss has been made because interruption from the opposite side of the House will break a man up in the middle of a sentence, and forsooth, he is put into a position into which he should not have been put, called to order and made to withdraw when he has no right to withdraw. If I had been permitted to complete the sentence which I had a right to complete, I would not have been put in this position. I will say this, that it is impossible for the Speaker to decide upon a point of order unless the exact paragraph or sentence, the complete words of any man are before him, and it is not enough for the hon. acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Foster) to take up part of a sentence and appeal to the Speaker to decide upon it. He is an old parliamentarian, he should know better, and hon. gentlemen sitting behind him should know better. Every one in this House from the Speaker down to the humblest member in this House, should know better than that. Every man has a right in this House, to complete a sentence or paragraph, or what he wishes to place before the House before he is called to order, and I say that under the circumstances it is not surprising that I should feel the indignation which I do at the way I have been interrupted by hon. members on the other side of the House. Now, I have gained the victory in the end.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). These hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House appear to be aroused this afternoon because this correspondence has been brought up. But they were the beginners of this agitation to-night. It reminds me of the story of the Irishman who was going through a field and met a bull, which bellowed at him and threatened to attack. The Irishman had a club in his hand and when the bull made a spring at him he caught the bull by the tail and brought the club down on the bull's back until the animal cried with pain. So it is to-night. We have brought

down our clubs on the backs of the Conservatives yonder, until they have groaned with pain; but in the words of the Irishman to the bull we may say: Take it you brute, you were the one that began it.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Were it not for some remarks made by the member for Alberta (Mr. Davis), followed up by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), and by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), I would not have spoken in this debate. Let me explain what really was done by members of parliament in connection with these North-west timber limits. There was a statement read purporting to be a statement made by the government, which I have not been able to look carefully over, but if it is an official statement of the government then the following heading is incorrect: 'List of timber berths authorized to be licensed upon the applicants complying with the provisions of regulations, &c.' That heading is not a true description of the contents. At the time these applications were made, regulations had been drafted by the government, in view of the scarcity of lumber in Manitoba and the Territories, that any parties who went into that country and erected a mill could get a timber berth of fifty square miles by paying \$5 a square mile for it. A number of people applied for timber limits as was anticipated, and almost every member of parliament had letters sent to him from persons who did not understand in what shape the application should be made. I got a number of applications from a gentleman then living in Birtle, an acquaintance of mine who had previously lived in East Grey. So far as my memory serves me, he wrote that he did not know the regular form of application, but asking me to apply on behalf of so and so for certain berths, specifying as near as he could the localities. I did so, as I have no doubt any member of parliament would do it for a person writing to him under the circumstances. I sent him a copy of the regulations and I put in the applications. I afterwards got other applications from him in a second letter and I sent them to the department, requesting the department to enter the applications, and giving the particulars as near as I could from his letter. I got letters from other parties in the same way and I sent them as I did these. I received an acknowledgment of these letters and I sent these acknowledgments to the parties as far as I could learn their post office addresses. That is all I had to do with it. So far as my memory serves me, I never got a reply, saying whether or not the government had granted the application of any one of these men. Some of the parties went up there, looked over the situation, and as they considered it would not pay them to build saw-mills they gave no more attention to it. I had letters from these parties whom I had never seen,

asking if the berths had been granted. I inquired in the department and found nothing had been done and I wrote to them to that effect. That is the sum and substance of all I had to do with this matter. The statement when first made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Davis), that I had applied for a timber berth was at once denied by me.

Mr. McMULLEN. You got up and said you had applied on behalf of your brothers but not for yourself.

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking with regard to myself personally, and the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) knows it or ought to know it. He need not be so crazy over it. When the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald) repeated this statement, I denied it, and he said that he had it in an official document. I have never seen that official document, I do not believe it is in existence, and I do not believe the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) could show it. I denied his statement, and the hon. gentleman was bound to accept my denial, and when he refused I asked the ruling of the Chair to compel him to do so. The hon. gentleman from Kingston (Mr. Britton) made an interruption which was uncalled for. I trust he is in the House now because I want to tell him something. When I said that I had made application as I had been requested to do so by parties whether I was acquainted with them or not, and as I presume every other member of parliament had done; when I made that statement the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) asked: Did I do it as a political agent or as a commercial agent. He implied that I got a consideration for it, but I can tell him that I never got one dollar nor one cent for any work I ever did in this parliament, from any one inside or outside of parliament. My name does not appear on the public accounts of this country, as a man who fed at the public crib, like the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), to the extent of \$3,000 for doing his work, not as a member of parliament but as a commercial agent or something else. I say that my name does not appear in the public accounts as does the name of the member for Kingston, and it comes with bad grace from him to throw out such an insinuation. Now, Mr. Speaker, you would think from the statement by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), that he was a man of such immaculate purity that it was impossible for him to be found in any way connected with public business that would affect his position. I will not say anything about that, but I will give one other circumstance to the House, and I will let the House judge whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) has any right to lecture members of parliament and to insinuate that they received compensation or consideration on account of what they do for their friends. In the case of the application for the timber

limit I should have remarked that some of the applicants were my political opponents. Let me tell the House, that at the present time there is a public work going on at Owen Sound, and the dredge 'No. 9,' has been doing certain work there. It has been doing it for the last three years to the tune of \$80 a day. Now, who are the owners of that dredge? I have the names here: E. H. Horsey, physician, of Owen Sound, a son-in-law of the hon. member for East Huron; Lelai A. Horsey, daughter of the hon. member for East Huron; Maggie Macdonald, spinster, of Wingham, an unmarried daughter of the hon. member for East Huron; and A. G. McKay, Crown attorney of Owen Sound. Will any hon. gentleman, who knows the family, tell me that the hon. member for East Huron, ever gave to his daughters a dollar to invest in anything of the kind? The hon. gentleman is, I believe, profiting to-day by the work done there under government authority, and is only evading the Independence of Parliament Act, by using the name of his daughter. Under these circumstances has the hon. gentleman a right to get up and insinuate that any member of parliament receives money because he does what any member of parliament is bound to do, in courtesy for any man who writes to him? He is the last man to say anything on this subject, just as the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), is the last man to throw across the House the insinuations which he made. I would not have referred to this matter, if I had not been insulted by such remarks—remarks which either of these hon. gentlemen dare not make outside this House, because if they did, I would knock them down as quickly as I could reach them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to say anything on the merits of the case before the House. I have listened carefully to the statement made by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia, and I came to the conclusion that there was something wrong in that transaction between the Minister of the Interior and his brother-in-law, Mr. Burrows. I came to the conclusion that either the regulations were changed for the purpose of enabling Mr. Burrows to secure the advantage he did, or the regulations were winked at, and instructions were given to accept his application, although he did not comply with those regulations. It is a shady transaction, which requires more investigation to bring to the knowledge of this House and the country the information which is required to enable them to judge whether the transaction was right or wrong. It is said that timber limits were given by the late government, without competition; but that government followed exactly the same regulations that were made by the Mackenzie government with this exception. When that government granted a timber limit, they allowed the person to whom it was granted to pick any portion or portions

Mr. SPROULE.

of the fifty miles, anywhere in the country. For instance, Mr. H. H. Cook had the right to select any portion of his fifty miles anywhere from Manitoba to the Rocky Mountains. But the new regulations adopted by the Conservative government, provided that the fifty miles must be all in one place. They adopted those new regulations in order to enable the settlers to get their lumber at a lower price than they formerly had to pay, which was about \$50 a thousand. Under the new regulations made afterwards by the Conservative government, the timber limits were to be put to competition. That rule was continued until the Conservative government changed the regulations, in order to sell the timber limits without competition to their friends, and their own friends have benefited. If so much money was received for the timber in the past, surely there is stronger ground for supposing that if the timber limits were put up to public competition to-day, when settlement is increasing, when timber is getting scarcer, and when there is a greater demand for it in the country, even better results would be secured.

The hon. member for Saskatchewan said that the Conservatives gobbled up 16,000,000 acres. Does the hon. gentleman desire to be accurate, or to say what is true? I hold the return which I think the hon. gentleman had, and it does not say so. Applications were made for timber limits in a territory, which perhaps would aggregate 16,000,000 acres; but not one out of twenty applications was granted. How could they gobble up 16,000,000 acres? They had no interest in the land; they had only the right to take timber off the land, and they gobbled up no timber, except what they took under the regulations, which were open to the world. When they complied with those regulations and built a mill, and went on and cut timber, they received simply the usual benefit which every man received, who took out a license to cut timber.

The hon. member for East Huron stated that Mr. Charles Rykert got a timber limit for a very small consideration, and that he sold it for over \$200,000 and pocketed that money. The hon. gentleman ought to know better, because that matter was discussed in this House. If the hon. gentleman knew the facts, and yet made that statement, it is discreditable to him. Mr. Charles Rykert is alive to-day, and the hon. gentleman dare not make that statement outside of the House, or Mr. Rykert would take him into court as quickly as he could do so.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What did Rykert resign his seat for?

Mr. SPROULE. That is another thing altogether. I am not defending what Mr. Charles Rykert did. I am criticising the incorrect statement made by the hon. member for East Huron, a statement which he dare not make, except when he shelters

himself behind the privileges of parliament. There are some gentlemen sitting in this House who know the explanation that was made of that transaction. While Mr. Rykert did what I will not defend, and what was not creditable to him, he did not do what the hon. member for East Huron alleged; he did not pocket any such amount of money at all. Therefore, I would give the hon. member for East Huron the same advice that I gave to the hon. member for Saskatchewan, to be a little more accurate and keep closer to the facts when he makes statements in this House, because he is making them in the presence of men who know the facts of these transactions a great deal better than he does.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). I understand the hon. member for East Grey to have said that I had received \$3,000 a year from the Ontario government for doing nothing?

Mr. SPROULE. No, what I said was, that it did not come with very good grace from the hon. member for Kingston to throw insinuations across the floor against me, because I had never received a dollar in my life from the government for any services, whereas the hon. gentleman could not say the same, since he appeared in the public accounts of Ontario as having received \$3,000 for services in connection with the ditches and watercourses.

Mr. BRITTON. The hon. gentleman evidently knows nothing about it at all. In the first place, I never had anything to do with ditches and watercourses. In the second place, I did hold a position under the Ontario government for some years, and to that position a salary was attached, but I believe I did the work faithfully and well.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. BRITTON. And received the salary attached to the office.

Mr. SPROULE. That is all I said.

Mr. BRITTON. But, the time came when the people of Kingston wanted me to run as their candidate, and, perhaps, unfortunately for myself, so far as money is concerned, I accepted the candidature and resigned the office. I have never received anything for nothing that I am aware of, and I am not aware that any fault has been found with the way in which I carried out the duties of the office I once held. I may say now, that the office was not sought for by me. The records of the Department of Justice of Ontario will show that it was offered to me without any application of mine or in my behalf. At that time, I held the office of county attorney, which was as good as the office I accepted under the Ontario government. The office which I held under the Ontario government was that of drainage referee, which had nothing to do with

ditches and watercourses, and in order to hold that office I had to give up practice.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the difference between a ditch and a drain?

Mr. BRITTON. It is a matter of law. Ditches and drains come under the jurisdiction of the county, and as drainage referee, I had nothing to do with them. If the hon. gentleman will look at the law or consult some one who knows it, he will find that I am perfectly correct.

The debate we have just had furnishes a very apt illustration of the truth of the axiom that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. The mover of the resolution seems to have been one of those who live in glass houses, and some stones have been thrown at him, and apparently with considerable effect. As far as the charge is concerned, there is no evidence before the House of any intention on the part of the Minister of the Interior to benefit his brother-in-law, or any other individual, by the change he made in the regulations. The statement of the acting Minister of the Interior shows that the change was in the public interest. This resolution asks us to declare that the change was fraudulent, or that it was a play upon words, and that the spirit of the resolution, if not the letter, was violated. I submit that even if the spirit of the resolution was violated and not the letter, before this House can fairly be asked to investigate a charge of this kind and condemn the Minister of the Interior, some harm ought to be shown as having resulted. But none has been shown. It was all very well to state how many telegraph poles, and railway ties, and cords of wood, and fence posts were got out, and the comparatively small sums paid to the government for the stuff got out, but hon. gentlemen must bear in mind that the amount paid was fixed by regulations of which nobody complained. The complaint is, that one of the regulations, section 17, was altered. Well, the others were not altered, and there is no complaint about them, and, therefore, they must be right. Yet, every penny that was chargeable under the regulations was paid. There was no loss or fraud shown; and in the absence of fraud, even if the spirit of the regulations was violated, there is no need of taking up the time of this House discussing a change by which no harm was done. These gentlemen who brought this matter up had not the slightest desire to have an investigation, but were just taking this opportunity of trying to cast suspicion on the conduct of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what pane of glass in my house was broken?

Mr. BRITTON. If the hon. gentleman cannot understand the pretty plain language which was used this afternoon, it is impossible for me to enlighten him.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). We have been witnesses this evening of a most disgraceful scene. We could pardon the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) in throwing out his accusations right and left, because he can say anything he likes. He does not amount to very much in any case, and he was not here when all these charges were brought up in parliament before and refuted. But, I am astonished to find the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), who was here years ago, getting up and making imputations against members in connection with timber limits, when he knows that these were all explained before. In 1886-7-8-9, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) brought up all these old charges, and read the names on this list, but when the hon. members, whose names were on the list, explained the whole matter, the hon. member for North Norfolk accepted their explanation. And now it is all coming up again, and why? Because the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) spoke this afternoon about the regulations having been changed by the Minister of the Interior. And the government, I suppose, having no answer, and hon. gentlemen behind the government wishing to show zeal, think they are doing something grand by use of the *tu quoque* argument and virtually saying. It is true that the Minister of the Interior has done something he should not have done, but look at the timber limits that have been taken by Conservative members years ago. It is a childish answer; and what we witnessed a few minutes ago was a disgrace to the House of Commons. I hope, for the honour of parliament, we shall see no more of it. Hon. members who sit here can go back to *Hansard* of ten years ago and get the answer to all that has been said by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald), and the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), who, as I said, is accustomed to bring accusations which he cannot prove.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the vote is taken, Mr. Speaker, will you allow me a word of personal explanation with reference to what has been said concerning myself. The way it was put was that members of parliament and myself had applied for timber limits. I never applied for timber limits since I became a member of parliament. I did apply years before. But what had to be done in order to acquire those limits? You had to go to the expense of surveying the land, and then you could not get it without fulfilling certain conditions. In the present case the expenditure was made by the applicant; but the mill was never put up.

Mr. POWELL. How long ago was that?

Mr. DAVIN. In 1882.

Mr. BRITTON.

Mr. POWELL. How long before you became a member of parliament?

Mr. DAVIN. Five years.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Davin).

YEAS :

Messieurs :

Beattie,  
Bell (Addington),  
Bergeron,  
Borden (Halifax),  
Cargill,  
Carscallen,  
Clancy,  
Clarke,  
Cochrane,  
Corby,  
Craig,  
Davin,  
Dugas,  
Foster,  
Gillies,  
Gilmour,  
Gullett,  
Henderson,  
Ingram,

Kloepfer,  
Macdonald (King's),  
MacLaren,  
McDougall,  
McLennan (Glengarry),  
Marcotte,  
Martin,  
Monk,  
Moore,  
Morin,  
Pope,  
Powell,  
Prior,  
Roche,  
Sproule,  
Taylor,  
Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert), and  
Wilson.—37.

NAYS :

Messieurs :

Archambault,  
Bazinet,  
Beith,  
Belcourt,  
Bernier,  
Bethune,  
Bourbonnais,  
Brodeur,  
Brown,  
Burnett,  
Campbell,  
Casey,  
Champagne,  
Copp,  
Cowan,  
Demers,  
Domville,  
Douglas,  
Dupré,  
Edwards,  
Ellis,  
Erb,  
Featherston,  
Fielding,  
Fisher,  
Fortier,  
Fraser (Guysborough),  
Gauvreau,  
Geoffrion,  
Gibson,  
Gould,  
Harwood,  
Heyd,  
Holmes,  
Hurley,  
Hutchison.

Joly de Lotbinière  
(Sir Henri),  
Landerkin,  
Lang,  
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),  
Legris,  
Lenjoux,  
Livingston,  
Macdonald (Huron),  
Mackie,  
McGregor,  
McGugan,  
McHugh,  
McIsaac,  
McLennan (Inverness),  
McMillan,  
McMullen,  
Madore,  
Malouin,  
Marcil,  
Maxwell,  
Meigs,  
Mignault,  
Monet,  
Morrison,  
Mulock,  
Parmelee,  
Paterson,  
Fettet,  
Proulx,  
Rogers,  
Ross,  
Savard,  
Semple,  
Somerville,  
Sutherland, and  
Tucker.—72.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.

Christie,  
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),  
MacPherson,  
Charlton,  
Snetsinger.

Opposition.

Roddick,  
Tupper (Sir Charles),  
Rosamond,  
Tisdale,  
Reid,

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Davis,	Hale,
Scriver,	Blanchard,
Bell (Prince),	Earle,
Wood,	Gilmour,
Lewis,	Poupore,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Wallace,
Tarte,	Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Sifton,	Haggart,
Godbout,	Macleam,
Talbot,	McNeill,
Lavergne,	Hodgins,
Fitzpatrick,	Casgrain,
Rutherford,	LaRivière,
Turcot,	Hughes,
Ethier,	Chauvin,
Calvert,	Bennett,
Fraser (Lambton),	Kaulbach,
Frost,	McInerney,
Dobell,	McAlister,
Tolmie,	Montague,
Flint,	Mills,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Fortin,	Quinn,
Russell,	Tyrwhitt,
Britton,	Osler,
Johnston,	McCleary,
Logan,	Robinson,
Penny,	Bell (Pictou),
McCarthy,	Ferguson,
Bostock,	Kendry,
Macdonell,	Broder,
McClure,	Klock,
Bethune,	Seagram,
Copp,	Ganong,
Oliver,	McIntosh,
Borden (King's),	Robertson,

Amendment (Mr. Davin) negatived.

Motion agreed to, House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Civil Government—Department of Indian Affairs ..... \$47,530

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). There is an increase here of \$830, which is made up of sixteen statutory increases of \$50 each and one of \$30.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). As we are discussing Indian affairs, I would like to call the attention of the acting minister (Mr. Sutherland) to some trouble that arose last year at St. Regis, in the province of Quebec.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. May I suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) that it would be better to take that up when we are on the vote for expenses in connection with that branch?

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to have an opportunity to discuss the matter. Will the item to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) refers come up to-night?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I hope so.

Department of Indian Affairs—Ontario and Quebec ..... \$76,711

Mr. BERGERON. What is the meaning of this?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The distribution of seed grain is made during the early spring to these Indians, who endeavour to maintain their families by the cultivation of farms on small plots of ground.

Schools—Ontario, Quebec and maritime provinces ..... \$38,765

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond). I desire to ask the Minister of the Interior how many schools there are in the lower provinces, what amount is paid on account of the schools, and what system is followed in the classification of teachers.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In Nova Scotia there are eleven day schools; aggregate number of children on the roll, 230; average attendance, 96. In New Brunswick there are six day schools; aggregate number of children on the roll, 142; average attendance, 74. There is one school in Prince Edward Island. I am informed the teachers require the ordinary provincial certificate, and they are under the provincial inspector.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). Is attendance compulsory at these schools?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No. An effort is made to have the children attend schools, but they are not forced.

Mr. POWELL. If they are wards of the government there is no object in providing an education unless attendance is made compulsory.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The attendance is fairly good. But it is a debatable question as to how far you can force these people. You have to handle them rather carefully.

Mr. GILLIES. The minister says the schools are subject to the local inspection, and that the teachers are subject to examination as they are in white schools. If that is so, are these Indian teachers engaged by a board of trustees, and are the different Indian schools under a board of trustees the same as white schools?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They are engaged by the department, and have to present their certificate to show that they are qualified to teach. They are subject to the usual semi-annual inspection.

Salaries of chiefs, Cape Croker and Gibson, and agent at St. Regis..... \$150

Mr. BERGERON. Has the hon. gentleman heard that there is a state of war at St. Regis on account of the election of chiefs?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There has been no report made to the department of a state of war down there.

Mr. BERGERON. I am surprised the department has not heard of it. They may hear of it too late when they will have to

shoot somebody. There is friction just now at St. Regis on account of the new rules and regulations made by the department. There is a good deal of disturbance, according to the reports in the newspapers, which I think are pretty accurate, because there are reporters on the ground. It seems that the American Indians have crossed over to St. Regis to stand by the Canadian Indians in trying to raise trouble.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is no doubt that these matters are very much exaggerated in the newspapers. The Indians object to the lock-up that was ordered to be built, and after consultation with the member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), who made representations to me, I gave orders in the meantime that the building should be stopped, and the matter investigated. I am in hope that after the investigation the difficulty will be ended.

Mr. BERGERON. It is not altogether in consequence of the lock-up that there is friction at St. Regis, but it is about the election of their chief. I presume I may take this opportunity, while we are on this item, of calling the attention of the department to another matter. There have been some new regulations put into force by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) regarding the election of their chief. They are no longer allowed to elect their chief, and the government want to establish there some kind of municipal law. The government appointed some councillors and the Indians did not like it. I do not say whether the Indians are right or wrong, but I call attention to the fact that there is dissatisfaction. There was dissatisfaction last year for the same reason, and the department were informed of it, and the difficulty proceeded to a climax, and a man was killed by the chief of the Dominion Police, though acting, I believe, in the line of his duty. However, the incident has left on the reserve a very bad impression, and trouble has been brewing since that time. Now, we are voting money for the Indians and we call that money the Indian fund. When that trouble took place last year, although we have a Solicitor General who is supposed to do the legal work for the government, some lawyers were employed in order to give them patronage. That is the great weakness of this government, they desire to give all the patronage they can to their friends while they are in power, because they expect soon to return to opposition and to remain there for a long time. Consequently last year two lawyers were employed when they were not needed, as the Solicitor General could have done the work himself. The two lawyers were Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Brossoit, of Beauharnois, and for the edification of the Minister of Finance, I propose to give him the accounts of these gentlemen, these two country lawyers. They would become very wealthy if

Mr. BERGERON.

all their clients paid them as well as the government. This document, which was recorded in the Auditor General's Report, is published in the *Huntingdon Gleaner*, one of the most reliable papers in Quebec. It is criticising this government very much because the proprietor, Mr. Sellers, is a very honest man.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think this discussion does not properly come under the item now under consideration. We are called upon to vote :

Salaries of chiefs, Cape Croker and Gibson,  
and agent at St. Regis ..... \$150

I do not think this discussion has any connection at all with that item.

Mr. BERGERON. I will explain to the Chairman, if he does not see it, why, I think, this discussion is in order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not see what connection there is.

Mr. BERGERON. If the hon. gentleman allows me, I will show him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. The discussion so far has been in regard to the expenses of the Department of Justice. The discussion would come up properly under another item.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is an item to provide for the erection of a lock-up at St. Regis, and it may come up under that.

Mr. BERGERON. I have no objection to waiting until we reach the lock-up item, if the hon. gentleman does not drop it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will not drop it.

Removal of Lake of Two Mountains Indians  
from Oka to Gibson ..... \$200

Mr. BERGERON. Why are we called upon to vote any more money for that? We have been called upon for eighteen years, since the government decided to transfer the Indians from Oka to Gibson to vote money, and we should not be called upon to pay \$200 because, I understand, they have been all transferred to Gibson.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend will see that the same vote was granted last year, but no money was spent. I am informed that the department have put the vote in so that if any family wishes to move this vote will be available. The Indians look upon it as an evidence of good faith. If any occasion should arise for a removal it is here provided for.

Mr. BERGERON. Good faith with whom? I do not understand the meaning of saying that it is to keep good faith.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is under an old arrangement for the removal of the Indians. It was not spent last year.

Mr. BERGERON. How much has this country paid for the removal of the Indians

from Oka to Gibson, purely and simply as a matter of caprice.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The official has not got the figures with him. If the hon. gentleman would like a statement I will be pleased to have a statement made out and brought down.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to have it, because I know it is a very large amount of money.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). This item has been in the estimates every year. I think, since I came to the House, about twenty-one years ago.

Mr. BERGERON. It commenced in 1881.

Mr. SPROULE. There has been an item for this purpose year after year, and the information has been given to us each year that it was thought the vote proposed would complete the removal of the Indians. But, still, we have that item every year. I do not think it lapses, although it may have lapsed last year. There ought to be an end to this transaction, and not allow it to run on for a quarter or half a century. The department is not proceeding with the work, or somebody is making a pension out of it while doing nothing. If it is not intended to use it, why put it here, and if it is intended to use it, why not say so?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is the policy of the government to remove the Indians from Oka to the Gibson settlement, and if any families decide to move they know that we have this fund to pay their expenses. There may be or may not be any removal this year, but the Indians are desirous that we should have this fund if any removal takes place, and we want this small vote to provide for that.

Mr. SPROULE. Every one is aware of the fact that the Indians do not intend to move, and there is no use of putting in that vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend will see that if there is no removal there is no expense.

Mr. SPROULE. What I object to is the voting of money without there is an intention to use it, and without it is clear that it will be needed during the current year.

To provide for the Indian Land Management Fund ..... \$14,000

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to have some explanation of that item. It seems to me a large amount for managing land of that kind.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it always the same amount?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will give the explanation furnished to me by the department. It is as follows:

Ontario and Quebec—Indian Land Management Fund.

1899-1900. 1900-1901.

Provision for the Indian Land Management Fund..... \$14,000 \$14,000

This item provides for the amount of the grant to assist the Indian Land Management Fund under the terms of order in council of July 1, 1898.

The grant for the year 1898-9 was distributed as follows:

Province of Quebec Fund.....	\$ 700
Indian Land Management Fund.....	13,000
Lapsed .....	300
	<u>\$14,000</u>

When the plan for the gradual restitution of these funds was put into operation, the capital of each stood as follows (July 1, 1892):

Indian Land Management Fund .....	\$ 72,788 88
Province of Quebec Fund .....	12,526 01
Indian School Fund .....	97,317 31
	<u>\$182,632 20</u>

On July 1, 1899, the capital of the funds stood thus:

Indian Land Management Fund .....	\$152,865 65
Province of Quebec Fund .....	73,465 73
	<u>\$226,270 38</u>

During the seven years from July 1, 1892, to July 1, 1899, the capital funds have been increased as follows:

Indian Land Management Fund.....	\$36,075 77
Province of Quebec Fund .....	2,799 72
Indian School Fund to June 30, 1898..	4,762 69
	<u>\$43,638 18</u>

Precis of the new arrangement for the replenishment of Indian Land Management Fund and Province of Quebec Fund, under authority of order in council of July 1, 1898.

The Indian School Fund has been closed by a transfer of the amount standing at the credit of capital to the credit of Indian Land Management Fund and Province of Quebec Fund, \$102,030.

This sum was, in 1876, transferred to Indian School Fund to meet payment of salaries to missionaries and teachers, which had been charged to Management Fund and Province of Quebec Fund. All these payments have disappeared from School Fund, now being paid either by the fund of the band interested in the school or by a parliamentary appropriation, the original capital has been retransferred to the credits of the funds from which it was taken. The whole original capital of School Fund having been expended for purposes of Indian education, the account is closed.

Province of Quebec Fund, with annual revenue from invested capital of \$3,083.60, can bear an annual expenditure of \$1,000 and create a sinking fund, which will in about fifteen years restore the capital to its original power, and produce an annual revenue of \$1,162.08, which can be spent each for the purchase of supplies for the poor and destitute in the province of Quebec, and for other purposes.

The Indian Land Management Fund will be restored in probably twenty years, with the assistance afforded by the grant of \$14,000, to its original position, when the grant will be at once diminished.

Mr. WILSON. What is the total amount of the fund now?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. \$226,270.38.

To provide for the erection of a lock-up at  
St. Regis ..... \$500

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman said that at the suggestion of the hon. member for Huntington (Mr. Scriver), he had given the order to stop the building of that lock-up. Let me say that the strongest criticism of the government, in this matter, comes from their own friends. In this case whether the prosecutor or the defendant wins, the cost comes out of the same pocket. All this difficulty has arisen out of the Indian Improvement Act, which was passed two years ago by the Minister of the Interior, and which was intended to supplant the old tribal customs of the Indians, by new municipal organizations. The Indians were opposed to that, and there was a collision.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What Act was passed two years ago in connection with this matter?

Mr. BERGERON. The Indian Improvement Act. It was passed for Caughnawaga, as well as for St. Regis, and if there has been no trouble at Caughnawaga, it is because good advice prevailed. I have been consulted by the Caughnawaga Indians, assisted by their lawyer, Mr. White, of Montreal, and I have advised them to stand by the law until they can make their case prevail before another man than the present Minister of the Interior, who has declared that he would not hear them under any circumstances. The Indian Improvement Act may have been passed with a good object, but it was not acceptable to the Indians, and my impression is that we will have considerable trouble on account of the cast-iron rules laid down by the government. Here is an account of what took place:

The difficulty between a few government officials and the St. Regis Indians is again in evidence. It arose, as our readers will recall, in the Indian Improvement Act, intended to break up the old tribal custom and organize among the bands a modified municipal system. The St. Regis Indians opposed the enforcement of the new law from the start. Whether the Indians elected their chiefs for a term of three years or for life really concerned nobody but themselves—in fact, it did not matter whether they had chiefs at all, for the custom of having them is a survival of circumstances and conditions that have long disappeared, so that the position is almost a nominal one, little better than the honorary bestowal of the title of colonel among white men. The difficulty, however, was a welcome one to officials anxious to show their authority, and to the lawyers. Had Mr. Sifton acted as he ought to have done, he would have winked at the resistance of the Indians to the change in their method of choosing chiefs, but no, he fell in with the advice of the agent at Cornwall and sent a posse of Dominion police under Col. Sherwood to arrest those Indians against whom warrants had been issued. The

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

events that followed are of so recent date that the reader's memory needs only to be refreshed by recalling the chief of them. Sherwood and his men embarked on a tug at Valleyfield and arrived early in the morning at St. Regis. Going to the house of Mr. Long, a messenger was sent to the cabins of the Indians wanted to tell them to come to the office of the Indian agency, where men were in waiting to arrange with them for stone to rebuild the collapsed piers of the Cornwall bridge. Two or three, unsuspecting any plot, hurried to the office, where they were seized and promptly manacled by the police. A squaw saw them throw down one poor fellow and put handcuffs upon him, and hurried to tell his brother. Furious at the intelligence, Jake Ice burst into the office and flew to release his brother. Col. Sherwood intercepted him and a struggle ensued, during which Col. Sherwood, stronger and younger than Ice, drew a revolver and shot him twice, the second shot being fatal. The police, with their prisoners, marched to the tug and left unmolested, although the whole tribe was gathered on the wharf and could have overwhelmed them, had they not been what they really are, a quiet and inoffensive people. Sherwood came to Huntington and surrendered himself. The inquest held on the body of Jake Ice resulted in a verdict of justifiable homicide, which cleared him of all danger of prosecution. Meanwhile, warrants for more Indians were sworn out, and, on learning of this, seven of them voluntarily went to Beauharnois to answer the charges against them. The government, however, by this time had come to understand how matters stood, and did not want to prosecute the Indians. They knew that before a jury such ugly facts would come out as that Jake Ice was unarmed, had not even a stick, that as a member of the tribe he had entered an office to which he had a legal right of entry during daylight, that there were three big policemen in the room, besides Sherwood and agent Long, and that there was no necessity for using firearms. There was no riot and the police were in no danger. The government saw it would be the police and not the Indians who would be on trial, and wanted the affair hushed up, so the Indians were let go on nominal bail.

Like many another outrage perpetrated on the Indian, the matter would ere this have been forgotten had it not been that the department insisted on paying all the law costs and expenses out of the funds in its hands belonging to the St. Regis band. Of the nature and extent of these accounts, the reader can judge by the two we print in another column. To read the items in those two accounts it would be concluded the prosecution was an arduous and exacting one, requiring the attention of lawyers day and night. As a matter of fact, the legal proceedings were of an elementary character, requiring no research. The charges never came up for hearing, no evidence was taken. Three times the magistrate opened the court, and three times the learned prosecutor asked for an adjournment, which was agreed to, the whole proceedings lasting only a few minutes. The fourth time the Indians were committed for trial without hearing, as they waived examination. The proceedings in court were brief and formal, yet for his attendance on these four occasions Mr. Mitchell charged \$100. There are other items even more astonishing, winding up with his actually charging the country for making out his own bill. Mr. Mitchell charges \$5 an hour for his services after dark; Mr. Brossoit lumps his evenings at \$20 each, and impartially charges for Sunday and Saturday. More remarkable still, he charges

\$40 for the two days he was at Ottawa, and again, in the two last items, charges \$40 each for the same two days, so that he got \$120 for them, \$12 more for his expenses, and \$2.50 for visiting the Indians in jail, \$134.50 in all. If this is a specimen of how Mr. Newcombe taxes bills, the sooner his services are dispensed with the better for the public interests.

The extraordinary feature in the government's conduct in the affair is that the bills of both lawyers are charged to the Indians, who are thus compelled to do what is expected of no white man, to pay for their own prosecution. Nay, more, they are charged with the expenses of the inquest, which was not held in their interest, for they did not shed the blood of the dead man, but was conducted to protect the police from prosecution.

All the accounts are not yet published; judging from those that have been, it looks as if they would amount to \$1,500. The Indians object to this being taken out of their fund, and they are in the right. Supposing, for instance, a dozen men broke the law in this village, would the ratepayers submit if the government attempted to collect from them all the bills which lawyers and others put in for disposing of the twelve?

Now, the point which I wanted to make is that not only is that money all taken from the Indian fund, but it seems that the whole thing has been done to enable two country lawyers to make money, simply because they are friends of the government. From all parts of the country we hear the same thing. It is a disease. I am going to read the accounts to show to what a level we have fallen in this country, when men who are lawyers will come down to any petty way of trying to get money from the government, and when the government is too weak to refuse, and allows itself to be robbed. Here is Mr. Mitchell's account:

Huntingdon, May 18, 1899.

Dr., the Government of Canada, Department of the Interior.

To A. E. Mitchell, Esq., advocate, in the three cases of No. 98, the Queen vs. Jake Fire et al., riot, No. 101; the Queen vs. Louis Thomas, assault upon an officer, and No. 102, the Queen vs. Louis Sunday, assault upon an officer; of the records of the magistrate's court, Beauharnois, W. S. Maclaren, J.P.

There is a whole page of an account which amounts to \$463.21; and there is this certificate at the bottom:

May 26, 1899.—I hereby certify that I have examined this account and taxed the same at \$408.21 (four hundred and eight dollars and twenty-one cents).

E. NEWCOMBE,  
Deputy Minister of Justice.

I am told that Mr. Mitchell is very angry because Mr. Newcombe reduced the account. Here is the other account:

Dept. of Justice to Thomas Brossoit, Q.C.—

I do not want to read the items, but it is a sad sight.

Mr. SPROULE. Read the items.

Mr. BERGERON (reading):

Department of Justice to Thos. Brossoit, Q.C.	
May 2, 8, 16—Despatches and telephones to Indians .....	\$ 2 70
May 4—Instructions by telephone to Louis Thomas and Louis Sunday .....	5 00
May 5—Appearance before the magistrate, W. S. Maclaren, J.P., at Beauharnois, for Jacob Fire, Angus Papineau and Louis David, examining complaints and warrants and proceedings had in Huntingdon before the magistrate's court there on May 2, 1899, and postponement of case to May 12.....	25 00
May 8—From Beauharnois to Ottawa to receive instructions from hon. Solicitor General vs. Indians, two days.....	40 00
To travelling expenses and hotel bills...	12 00
May 8, 15—To letter to hon. Solicitor General and Mr. Macrae re Indians....	6 00
May 16—Attendance at court-house in Beauharnois at the request of C. Loupret, district magistrate, and the Indians; conference with the magistrate and appearance before the court; attending to proceedings re Indians; examining records and despatch to Indian, John Angus .....	27 00
May 17—Attendance in court for Indians before C. Loupret, article 766, 774, 775, Criminal Code, advising Indians, and argument before the magistrate .....	20 00
Drawing and presenting petition to Hon. Judge Bélanger to bail Indians and argument .....	30 00
Attendance to bail bond .....	5 00
May 5, 12, 17—To the jail four times at Indians' request .....	10 00
May 17—To magistrate's clerk and officer of court (vouchers) 29, '90; absence from my office, May 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, attending to Indians' case, Cornwall St. Regis, Hogansburg and Dundee, seven days .....	140 00
To night work do., May 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, seven nights .....	140 00
	<hr/>
	\$492 67

Mr. Newcombe struck off \$31, and certified the account for \$461.67. Now, the right hon. gentleman knows this man, and knows that he does not make \$20 a day. These Indians gave themselves up and did not want to get out on bail; but they were let out on bail by the judge, who said there was nothing against them. They were not guilty; they had not killed anybody; but the judge let them out on bail because he said it was better than to set them at liberty, so as to give them the idea that they could be brought back again. This Mr. Brossoit was the lawyer on both sides, and was probably paid by both sides. He was the Crown prosecutor at Beauharnois the last term. These men were brought down and defended by some members of the Crown prosecutor's family. There was nothing against them at all, but the trial lasted a few days and he was paid \$20 a day. This was a case I wanted to bring to the attention of the hon. gentleman who was in charge of the department. If he thinks that these people will stand the squandering of their money in that way,

he is greatly mistaken. More than that, those Indians are a very intelligent class. They read the papers and know what is going on, and they know that we vote money for them here. Is it any inducement to them to keep the peace when they find out that some people are making money out of their own funds?

I believe it is a most injudicious action on the part of this government to build a lock-up at that place. The Indians look upon it as an insult. They are very respectable men and care a great deal about maintaining that respectable reputation, and they look upon the building of a jail there as a very serious reflection on them. I may tell my hon. friend that there is trouble breeding, and this is the cause. I would advise him not to go on with the building of that jail, and there is one not far off which he can utilize if necessary.

These men who were tried gave themselves up last year, and were declared not guilty by the criminal court.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have been informed that this trouble is not of recent origin. For some ten or twelve years back, there has been more or less trouble. No doubt what the hon. gentleman says with regard to the character of the majority of the Indian population is true, but he must admit that there is a small element, at least, of pretty rough characters. This matter came under my notice, and on consultation with the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), who seemed to be familiar with the character of the Indians, I did stop this work, although I was not familiar with the cause that led up to it. All I can say is, that the officials of the department are in communication with some of the chiefs, and if it is found that different treatment will bring about greater peace and harmony, I will advise that a different course be pursued. At the same time, the hon. gentleman must admit that where there is a disorderly population, whether white or Indians, the law must be enforced. He is mistaken when he says that this action was taken under a law passed by the present government. On the contrary, the department is simply trying to enforce the old regulations. I do hope that after careful consideration of the whole matter, and consultation with those people, we may be able to come to an amicable arrangement.

As to the charges made against the Justice Department, that will come up for consideration again, and will be explained by the Solicitor General. I find myself in a pretty hard place, between the Indians and the lawyers.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may say, in addition, that I am, to some extent, familiar with the causes of the trouble which, not recently, but for a great many years, have existed at the St.

Mr. BERGERON.

Regis reserve. I have had in my office, during the last two years, delegations of the Indians, and from questions I have put to them, I can form a pretty accurate judgment as to the causes. The causes are due, not to any recent legislation, because there has been none.

Mr. BERGERON. It has been put in force, then.

The PRIME MINISTER. All this has arisen out of the election of one or two chiefs.

Mr. BERGERON. I am afraid the right hon. gentleman is making a mistake.

The PRIME MINISTER. The reserve of St. Regis is on the boundary of the state of New York, and that boundary is purely conventional. There is not even a brook or picket to show it, and while we have a reserve in the province of Quebec, there is another Indian reserve in the state of New York of the same tribe, so that we have the American and the Canadian Indians practically on the same reserve, the boundary between them being purely conventional. The fact that the American agents come on our reserve is a prolific cause of disorder. Last year, after the trouble took place at one of the elections for chief, warrants had to be served upon some of the Indians. The chief of police, who is a discreet man, Colonel Sherwood, was sent to execute these warrants. He was assaulted and had to defend himself. He was carrying the writ of Her Majesty and had to execute it, and in so doing shot a man. He was brought before a magistrate and released immediately, as it was shown he had acted in the legitimate exercise of his duty. When an assault was committed on an officer of the law, it would be unpardonable weakness if the government had not asserted the majesty of the law.

Mr. BERGERON. How was it asserted?

The PRIME MINISTER. By arresting these men. They were locked up and taken to Beauharnois. After conference with the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), we came to the conclusion that it was better not to prosecute them but to release them on bail. We decided it was better to do nothing more than assert the law. In this we had to employ lawyers. My hon. friend takes exception to the account filed by the lawyers. The Minister of Justice did not pay the account as it was presented; but the bill was taxed, and paid as it had been taxed. Could anything else be done? If my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) remembers Max O'Rell, he will remember that charges were made by some British barristers that would put this account to shame. I remember that one of these gentlemen charged his client for dreaming of his case.

Mr. BERGERON. But this man had no time to dream; he was working day and night.

The PRIME MINISTER. In that case, my hon. friend should not find fault.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not accept the idea that the services of Messrs. Mitchell and Brossolt were required at all. The Solicitor General of Canada could have done the whole thing himself. The right hon. gentleman has made no defence for taking this money from the Indian fund. As to these Indians being neighbours of the United States Indians, what the right hon. gentleman says is quite true. But, is not that another reason why we should have no cast iron rules concerning these Indians? Why should we not treat them as the American government treat those on their reserve, which would avoid friction? It may be true that the law which was put in force two years ago by the present Minister of the Interior, is an old law. But that only shows that the late government showed greater discretion in not putting it in force. These Indians do not want the municipal system; they want to continue their old institutions, and to be treated in the same way as in former times. The Caughnawaga Indians are asking the same thing. Why not treat them that way, if it does nobody any harm, and will avoid friction, as in the case we have spoken of? Before this item passes, I would like to ask the acting minister if he has received a memorandum—and I would apply the same question to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—from the Abenaki Indians of St. François du Lac, from M. de Gonzague, missionary there, for \$500 or \$1,000 to assist the tribe in building a wigwam for the missionary? And, if such a memorandum has been received, what answer has been given, and what does the government intend to do about it?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have received several communications from Mr. de Gonzague but I do not recollect having received one of the nature referred to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no present recollection of having heard of such a communication; but I will make a memorandum of it, and if there is correspondence of such a character, I will get the information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Referring to the newspaper extract read by my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron), I may say that, so far as it refers to the conduct of Col. Sherwood, my understanding of the facts are not as they are stated in that newspaper. I remember that I gave attention to the facts at the time, and my distinct recollection is that Col. Sherwood used his weapon only as a last resort and in self-defence, and for the purpose of preventing greater loss of life. Having had personal acquaintance with him, and knowing something of his record, knowing something of the pluck and coolness and

courage that have always characterized him, I would require very little evidence to assure me that this was the case; and I think the same would be said by any one who knows that gentleman. The newspaper extract having been read, I think, that in justice to Mr. Sherwood, this statement should be made.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I desire to say a few words with regard to this account that has been read. We have such accounts coming in from different parts of the country for work done by lawyers, who are supporters of the government. All are of the same extravagant character. It seems to me that this is growing to be not only an abuse, but a disgrace to the country. I have looked over a few of the bills, and the payments seem to be made on no principle, except to strike off a few dollars, and pay the balance, no matter how extravagant the charges may be, the slight reduction being supposed to satisfy everybody. There are two objectionable features of this bill that has been read here. The first is that the bill is enormously large and no adequate services were given for the money paid. And in the second place, the money is taken from the Indian fund, and to that extent, the Indians are impoverished, and their money is paid extravagantly to men who have done little to earn it. These Indians are wards of the government; the government is trustee of their funds, and should not squander them.

Mr. J. D. REID (South Grenville). I would like to ask the minister if there is a lock-up on this St. Regis reserve and a magistrate to deal with any one who commits a wrong?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The magistrate is the Indian agent on the reserve. There is no lock-up at present on the reserve.

Mr. REID. Is he a duly appointed magistrate?

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid) knows that St. Regis is in the district of Beauharnois. It is not far from the jail of Beauharnois which is large enough to hold all the Indians who are guilty of wrong-doing.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The question was whether he was a magistrate, and I understand that he is ex-officio a magistrate under the Indian Act.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no special magistrate, it is the same one who sits in Beauharnois. He does not live in the town, but comes to Beauharnois to hold sittings of his court. I repeat that it would be wise not to build the jail there.

Department of Indian Affairs—Nova Scotia  
—Medical attendance ..... \$3,000

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). There is an increase of \$700. Why is that?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is not exactly an increase. For some time a supplementary vote of \$700 has been asked for every year; and it was thought better to put the whole in one item in the main estimates.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it not due to the fact that there is greater license in the way medical men are allowed to make their charges?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No. The explanation is as I have given it. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) wishes, I can give him the expenditures in detail.

Purchase of twenty-five acres of land as an addition to the Indian reserve at Millbrook, Colchester County ..... \$250

Mr. McDOUGALL. Would the hon. minister explain that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The reasons are set forth in a letter from Mr. Thomas Smith, Indian agent, Truro, N.S., to the secretary of the department. There are at present twenty-five acres on the reserve on which there are eighteen houses, and this is found to be insufficient. Mr. Smith applies for funds to purchase twenty-five acres of land of Geo. Benhall, at \$10 an acre, this land being on the north side of the Millbrooke reserve.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is the land in wood or is it cultivated?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is some wood on it.

New Brunswick—Medical attendance and medicine for Indians ..... \$1,740

Mr. POWELL. I would take this opportunity of asking the minister why it was that Dr. White was dismissed as Indian officer for the county of King's?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The department thought that a more economical arrangement could be made, as the medical service was costing about \$400 per annum. There is but a small number of Indians, and we have put on a man at an annual allowance of \$200. I have not got the name of the man who was substituted for Dr. White, but I will give the name to-morrow.

Mr. POWELL. Had he up to that time been a resident physician in Sussex?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no information with regard to that.

Manitoba and North-west Territories—  
Annuities and commutations ..... \$141,745

Mr. DAVIN. What is the cause of this increase of \$5,900?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is on account of the new treaty known to the department as treaty No. 8. It covers the Peace River and Lesser Slave Lake.

Mr. McDOUGALL.

Triennial clothing ..... \$5,918

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) There is a large increase here, what is the meaning of it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In addition to what we had before, we have seven chiefs and twenty-three headmen under treaty No. 8, which accounts for \$1,200 additional. Then every third year a suit of clothing is provided for each chief and headman, and this happens to be the third year.

Day, boarding and industrial schools.... \$280,912

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). On this item, I desire to draw the attention of the acting minister to a matter that I have brought forward by way of questions both last session and the present session. I refer to the printing plant that was purchased by the government for the Indian industrial school at the town of Elkhorn, for the purpose of teaching the printing trade to the Indian pupils. The hon. gentleman will recollect that in the fall of 1893 it was decided by the government to teach the pupils the printing trade in connection with other trades, and for that purpose a plant was purchased and put into this school. Mr. W. J. Thompson was employed as instructor to teach the pupils and to manage and edit a paper. The paper was called the *Elkhorn Advocate*. It was a non-political paper, and it built up quite a little business; it was liberally patronized by the advertising community, and had a considerable circulation. It was a weekly paper, and was continued until the 1st of April, 1898, when, I believe, it was decided to cease teaching printing in connection with the teaching of other trades at this school. Mr. Thompson, having entered into contracts with advertisers, having accepted money for subscriptions in advance, and being desirous of continuing the publication of the paper there, made a visit to the city of Winnipeg, and had an interview with Mr. Forget, the Indian commissioner, the result of which was that an agreement was entered into between Mr. Forget, representing the department, and Mr. Thompson, by which Mr. Thompson was to continue the publication of this paper. He was to receive all moneys due for subscriptions and advertising rates and, until the termination of the subscriptions, he was to supply the paper. The provision was also inserted in the agreement that the agreement could be annulled by either party giving six months' notice. The Indian commissioner informed Mr. Thompson that undoubtedly he would be allowed to retain possession of this plant until such time as the department might again take up the teaching of these trades. But, little more than two months had elapsed after this agreement had been made when Mr. Thompson received his six months' notice. He was taken considerably by surprise, espec-

ially in view of the assurance given to Mr. Thompson that the plant would remain in his possession. No reason was given for the annulling of the contract other than that stated by the Indian commissioner, that it was done upon the authority of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), and in that connection I desire to draw the attention of the hon. acting minister (Mr. Sutherland) to the discrepancy between the reason given by the commissioner and the reason given by the hon. Minister of the Interior in reply to a question asked during the last session of parliament. Upon making inquiries, Mr. Thompson learned that they were giving this plant to a fellow Liberal, the editor of a Liberal paper called the *Virden Advance*, and it was given upon much the same conditions as Mr. Thompson had it. Mr. Thompson did not like to be treated in this harsh manner; he saw that the object was to squeeze him out and start the publication of a Liberal newspaper. It was in the constituency of the hon. Minister of the Interior, and no doubt being desirous of utilizing the plant, not being used there for the purpose of printing a paper in the government interest, the object of the minister was to squeeze out Mr. Thompson, in order that he might hand this plant over to Mr. Garrison, who would publish a Liberal paper, and no doubt publish these reports sent out by the puffery bureau from Ottawa and Winnipeg laudatory of the Minister of the Interior. There was no Liberal paper there before. This paper that Mr. Thompson published was not run as a political paper, it contained no articles condemnatory of the government or of any minister, and he therefore resented this treatment. But, anticipating the action that was to be taken, before six months had expired he purchased a plant of his own and continued the publication of his own paper, setting aside the government plant. Last session, on May 15, I placed upon the Order paper the following question:

Did the government lease the printing plant in Indian school, Elkhorn, to Mr. W. J. Thompson, of Elkhorn?

To which the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) answered 'Yes.' Question 2 was:

If so, was lease cancelled, and for what reason?

Answer. The lease to Mr. Thompson was cancelled by the Indian commissioner, the reason for the action not being given.

You will see that the Minister of the Interior places the full responsibility for the cancellation of the contract upon the shoulders of the Indian commissioner. That seems a rather peculiar statement of a gentleman who came down here stating that he was going to run his own department, and not allow it to be run as his predecessors had, he said, by his subordinates. And it seems strange to me that the commissioner should

be allowed to cancel the contract without specifying to his superior officer the reason why he did this. The only reason the Indian commissioner gave Mr. Thompson for cancelling the contract was that he was authorized to do so by the Minister of the Interior, while the Minister of the Interior shoulders the responsibility upon the Indian commissioner. This is a discrepancy I would like to hear explained by the hon. acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland).

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Was there not a question in regard to this matter this session?

Mr. ROCHE. Yes, I am going to refer to that. The third question which I asked was as follows:

Who holds the plant now? Has it been leased or purchased, and for what sum?

Answer. E. H. Garrison. Negotiations for the sale to Mr. Garrison are now pending.

They gave Mr. Thompson six months' notice that this agreement with him would be annulled, and at the same time they did not complete any arrangement with anybody else. If they were desirous of deriving a revenue from this plant why not sell it to Mr. Thompson. He would have purchased it, as he was anxious to purchase it. He purchased a new plant anyway. But that was not the object of the hon. Minister of the Interior, and he therefore had this contract with Mr. Thompson annulled while he states that negotiations were pending for the sale of the plant to Mr. Garrison in the neighbouring town of Virden. After the expiration of another year, and thinking that these negotiations which had been pending from last session would surely have come to a focus by this time, I put a series of question on the Order paper, to which the hon. acting Minister of the Interior gave the following replies:

1. Did the government lease or sell the printing plant formerly in Indian school, Elkhorn, since the Thompson lease was cancelled? Answer. No.

2. If so, to whom? Answered by No. 1.

3. Is the government aware that this plant is now used for the printing of a paper supporting the government in Griswold, Brandon constituency? Answer. No.

That seems very strange, because here is the *Griswold Ledger*, which is edited by a gentleman named Wildman, and it is a paper which is printed on the plant formerly owned by the government, and which was used in the Industrial school at Elkhorn. The acting minister does not know anything about it, and possibly his officers do not know anything about it, but if the answer had been given by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) it could not have been accepted as a truthful answer. I am bound to say that the hon. minister knows that within a few miles of his town of Brandon there exists a paper printed upon

the plant that was used in the Industrial school at Elkhorn, and that it could not be printed unless he was cognizant of it. If these answers I received to the questions in the House this year are correct, the Department of the Interior should take proceedings against Mr. Garrison in the interests of justice, because he certainly has left himself open to a charge of larceny, for Mr. Garrison has disposed of the plant. Whether he purchased it from the government or not I cannot say, but it is stated that he sold it to Mr. Wildman. I cannot understand the answers that were given to me this session, but the information I am in possession of, is that Mr. Garrison sold the plant to Mr. Wildman for \$350. My information is that the plant had cost the government \$800. The minister stated that negotiations were pending a year ago for the sale of the plant to Mr. Garrison, and the hon. acting Minister of the Interior has stated this session that it has not been disposed of to him. Still, Mr. Garrison has sold that plant to Mr. Wildman, the present editor, for \$350. These were the terms. He got \$75 cash; two notes for \$75 each, two notes for \$50 each, and he wiped out a contra account he had against Mr. Garrison for \$25, making in all, \$350. The \$75 cash was turned in by Mr. Garrison to the establishment of the *Virden Advance*, of which he was part proprietor. One note for \$75 as transferred to the Toronto Type Foundry Company to wipe out a debt which the *Virden Advance* owed. That note has since been met and paid. Before these facts came out, Mr. Wildman had heard that Mr. Garrison was not authorized to sell the plant, and that he did not own it, and I am credibly informed that he wrote to Ottawa, presumably to the Minister of the Interior, and his answer was that it was all right. He went on and paid some few of these notes. I believe that fully one-half the purchase price of that plant has been paid by Mr. Wildman to Mr. Garrison up to the present. I desire to bring these matters to the attention of the acting minister, feeling sure that if he has not this information already in his possession, and if these are the facts, they are certainly worthy of investigation. If it is true that this plant has been sold by Mr. Garrison without having been purchased from the government, then Mr. Garrison has laid himself open to a charge of larceny. Mr. Garrison is a strong party man in the constituency of the Minister of the Interior, and so is this other gentleman, Mr. Wildman, and they are both supporters of the Liberal party. I can hardly believe that Mr. Garrison would take a printing plant that does not belong to him and sell it to another gentleman, and pocket the proceeds, and do all this behind the back of the Minister of the Interior, without his knowing anything about it.

Mr. SPROULE. What became of the Indian money that was paid for the plant in the first place?

Mr. ROCHE.

Mr. ROCHE. I know nothing about that, but if the plant has not been sold to Mr. Garrison, I would ask who is in possession of the plant to-day, and why was the agreement cancelled with Mr. Thompson, when, if the government wished to sell the plant, it could just as well be disposed of to Mr. Thompson.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) has, no doubt, made a statement that requires investigation. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no information with regard to it. I spoke to the officials about it, and they at once communicated with the Indian commissioner, Mr. Laird, making inquiry with regard to this matter. So far as the officers in the department are concerned, I am satisfied that their answers were perfectly honest. All we can do, in view of the statement of my hon. friend, is to have an investigation into the whole matter, and have a full explanation given to the House. It may be possible that that has been done by the Indian agent, and the report has not yet come. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) say it occurred last year?

Mr. ROCHE. It was in April, 1898, that the contract with Mr. Thompson was cancelled, and negotiations were then pending with Mr. Garrison.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I certainly shall give instructions to have a full investigation made with regard to this matter.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assinibola). I am glad that the acting minister has decided to have a full inquiry into this whole matter, because those who have unofficially inquired into it have come to the conclusion that, undoubtedly, the funds that belong to the Indians, the wards of the nation, have been put to a use not contemplated by parliament in voting that money. It would really seem that what was purchased by these funds was diverted from its original intention in the interests of party politics. I am very glad that the acting minister has decided to inquire into it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think the minister (Mr. Sifton) could have had any knowledge of anything of the kind being done.

Mr. ROCHE. I did not say that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As to the statement made, it is a matter that must be inquired into.

Mr. SPROULE. All this shows that the minister at the head of the department should be here discharging his duty. When a question like this comes up, we are told it was done by the minister, and as the department knows nothing about it, the House can get no information. Cannot the acting minister tell us if this plant has been sold, and if so, what has been done with the money?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is no information in the department as to the sale having taken place, and there is no correspondence in regard to it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member (Mr. Roche) has given us information which certainly seems to be correct. It is not likely that he is mistaken in the statement that he has made. We find that this money was used to start a Reform newspaper, although it belonged to the Indian fund, and if the paper has been sold, it is not known whether the money has gone back to the Indian fund or not.

Now, with regard to these industrial schools, I would like to have some information. How many are there in the Territories?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. First, there is Rupert's Land school with 120 pupils. The next is St. Boniface, with 100 pupils, at \$110. Then there is Elkhorn, with 100 pupils, at \$120; Brandon, with 100 pupils, at \$120; Qu'Appelle, with 225 pupils, at \$125; Battleford, with 120 pupils, at \$150; Red Deer, with 80 pupils, at \$140; St. Joseph's, with 120 pupils, at \$140; Calgary, with 50 pupils, at \$130. Those are all the schools.

Mr. SPROULE. Under whose authority are these schools conducted? Is there a qualified teacher appointed by the government to take charge of them?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am informed that the different denominations that manage these schools nominate the teachers, although they are appointed nominally by the department.

Mr. SPROULE. At places where there are two or three denominational schools kept up, how is the distribution of money made?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That would be a different class of schools. These schools are industrial boarding schools.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they taken charge of by any particular denomination?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In one district only one denomination has a school. Any children whose parents, for any reason did not wish them to attend the schools of their particular district, would have to go to the school of some other district.

Mr. SPROULE. My information is that in a certain locality, I think in the Prince Albert district, there was a school carried on for a length of time by the English Church, and there was one started later by the Roman Catholic denomination which gets all the money, though it was started later and has a smaller number of pupils. The authorities of the other school applied for an appropriation, but they were refused, because there was another school in the locality which gets the grant. I

wrote to the department asking them on what principle the distribution was made, and if the school in question could not get any support. The answer was that the department could not assist any schools except those in operation at the present time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think we could very well give a grant to two schools in the one place; there would not be sufficient to do that. If my hon. friend will give me the name of the school, I shall be glad to get the information for him. I know there is a good deal of difficulty in trying to please the different denominations in the districts.

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot tell the name of the school or the exact locality where it is, as I have not the letter which I received on the subject. My object in asking was to ascertain on what principle these schools were assisted.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know that there is any principle. In opening up the country, where a denomination has made missionary efforts, and makes application, it seems that where they were thought worthy the grant was made.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, it may be assumed that the institution to which I refer was not thought worthy of the grant.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, no; but two schools are not assisted in the same locality.

Indians, British Columbia—Salaries..... \$20,560

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) What is the increase of \$720 for?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. For another clerk in the office of the superintendent, who represents that the work has increased.

Indians, British Columbia—Medical attendance and medicines ..... \$3,500

Mr. PRIOR. On what system does the minister call in the doctors? I notice a great change in the personnel of the doctors who have been attending the Indians in British Columbia.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I understand that that is controlled almost altogether by the Indian agent.

Mr. PRIOR. Are the Indian agencies instructed as to what medical men they are to require?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

British Columbia Surveys and Reserve Commission ..... \$7,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is not that work all done?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The sum asked for is for the purpose of having reserves already laid off surveyed and completed, as much confusion and inconvenience often arises in

connection with unfinished reserves, especially when they have been seven or eight years in that condition. In addition, there are several localities not yet visited by the commissioners, where reserves have to be made for the Aborigines. It is likely that next year will see the work finished.

Mr. PRIOR. I would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the Songhees Indian reserve opposite Victoria. I would ask him to see if he cannot come to some arrangement to have the Indians moved elsewhere. Mr. McKenna was sent up there, and the last I can find out from the correspondence, is that, on behalf of the Indians, the government made an offer to the provincial government, which the latter would not accept, and there the matter stands.

J. A. Macrae, Inspector of Indian agencies and reserves, British Columbia ..... \$1,800

Mr. FOSTER. Why is this increase of \$200 ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Macrae has been in the service many years. He began at Edmonton, and was brought to Ottawa in 1893, and then appointed to the position of inspector of Indian agencies and reserves. He has a great deal of travelling to do, and is a very competent officer, and has not had an increase for some years.

Mr. SPROULE. It looks very bad to give one man an increase of \$200 in one year, and allow a number of others, equally deserving and industrious, to go on from year to year without their statutory increase of \$50.

Department of the Geological Survey .... \$53,800

Mr. FOSTER. Why this increase of \$500 ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is due to increases in the salaries of the different officials, made on the recommendation of the director of the Geological Survey, Dr. Dawson.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—ADDRESS TO HER MAJESTY.

A Message was received from the Senate acquainting this House,

That their Honours have agreed to the address of the Commons to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, congratulating Her upon the approaching termination of the war in South Africa, as foreshadowed by the recent successes, culminating in the fall of Pretoria, which have attended the British arms, by filling up the blank with the words 'Senate and.'

Also,—That they have passed an address to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to transmit the joint address of both Houses to Her Most Gracious Majesty, congratulating Her on the approaching termination of the war in South Africa, as foreshadowed by the recent successes, culminating in the fall of Pretoria, which have

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

attended the British arms, in such manner as His Excellency may see fit, in order that the same may be laid at the foot of the Throne, and requesting the House of Commons to unite with them in the said address.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the address to His Excellency the Governor General be concurred in by filling up the blank therein with the word 'Commons,' and a Message was ordered to be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What estimates will be taken up to-morrow when we go into supply ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has been called away on business, but I expect him to-morrow. If he is present we shall go on with the Election Bill. If not, we will go immediately into supply and take up the militia estimates.

#### QUARANTINE AT VICTORIA, B.C.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I would like to correct the statement I made last night in reply to the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior). I said that I did not think Oriental people coming into Victoria from San Francisco were quarantined. I find, on consulting Mr. Montzambert, that they are quarantined for the full term of the disease. I think that this fact should be made known to the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. (Wednesday.)

### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, June 13, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

#### PRIVILEGE—MR. BERGERON.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beaubarnois). Before the motions are called, I desire to rise to a question of privilege. In this morning's *Ottawa Citizen*, there is an account of yesterday's proceedings in which I read these lines :

On the item of \$500 to provide a lock-up for the St. Regis Indian reserve, Mr. Bergeron criticised

at some length and with considerable severity the action of Lieut.-Col. Sherwood in connection with the suppression of the disturbances on the reserve last year.

I merely wish to say that that is an error of the reporter. I only stated what I saw in a newspaper, the *Huntingdon Gleaner*. I did not give my own opinion unfavourable to Colonel Sherwood, whom I hold in very high esteem.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—THE EMERGENCY RATION.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege in connection with the statement I made yesterday, following which it was understood that I would make a charge. I now desire to read to the House the statement upon which I will base a motion, as soon as I have communicated the statement to the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend will pardon me. It is usual, and I expected from the hon. gentleman, that before taking any step to formulate his charge, he would notify me of it. I have received no notice at all.

Mr. MONK. I notified the right hon. gentleman yesterday, that within a few hours I would make that statement to the House and base a charge upon it.

The PRIME MINISTER. But I expected that the hon. gentleman would give me notice of the motion that he intends to make.

Mr. MONK. The motion is the usual motion, and refers to the charge which I intend to make before a committee.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not the usual motion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The promise of a committee was given, if he would make a charge.

The PRIME MINISTER. I appeal to the sense of fairness of the hon. member, if it is not proper that when a motion is to be made, the terms of the motion should be communicated to the leader of the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Picton). Will the right hon. gentleman allow me to explain my interruption? That would be a perfectly fair position if the government had reserved its discretion as to whether the committee would go or not. But after having heard the hon. gentleman who has this matter in hand, the Prime Minister did say yesterday that if the hon. gentleman would take the responsibility of making a charge, the committee would be given at once. There was not, therefore, the reason that ordinarily obtains for submitting the terms of the statement to the leader of the House, because the Prime Minister said in advance that if my hon. friend would make

a formal charge, the committee would be given.

The PRIME MINISTER. I stated that if the hon. gentleman would become responsible for a charge, the committee would go. Still, I submit that as a matter of convenience and of courtesy between one side of the House and the other, and in order to maintain the orderly procedure of the House, the terms of the motion to be made should be submitted to the leader of the House. I am not taking exception to the general idea or to the terms of the motion; I only say I would like to see it, before I pronounce upon it.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Yesterday, in discussing this question, I remember to have stated—it will be found in the *Hansard*—that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), would be prepared, in a few hours, to make his charge, I said certainly not later than to-morrow, meaning to-day. Last night I crossed the House, and in conversation with my right hon. friend, he will remember I told him that the member for Jacques Cartier intended to make his charge and motion to-day. The right hon. gentleman will remember that between us we discussed the granting of the committee, and the number of the committee; and as the motion was simply to refer the charges made to a select committee of the House, I took it for granted that that was quite sufficient notice, and I think I so stated in conversation to the right hon. gentleman. I told him that the charge would be made according to the terms stated by my right hon. friend the other day, when he told the House that if the hon. member for Jacques Cartier would make his charge, he should have a committee—if he charged fraud or wrong practice. My hon. friend does charge that, and his motion requires no very great scanning, because it is simply a motion to refer to a select committee of the House. But if my right hon. friend chooses to ask that this shall be made a notice of motion for to-morrow, and that it be spread upon the records of the House, I suppose that technically it is within his right to do so, but it keeps us back one day.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will say, in answer to my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), that I did discuss the matter with him informally. I do not care to have a formal notice, but I anticipated all along that in this matter the terms of the motion would be submitted to me in advance of the motion. I insist upon that, I think it is only right. I do not want a formal notice, but I want the terms of the motion to be submitted to me.

Mr. MONK. I do not desire that there should be any misunderstanding. I understood from the right hon. gentleman yesterday, that I was expected to make a charge

within a very few hours, and it was stated here in the House that, at the latest, I would make that charge to-day; and I have put myself to some inconvenience to reduce my charge to writing. But the right hon. gentleman, I think, is mistaken in one point. So far as I understand the procedure usually adopted in such cases, there can be no objection whatever to a member of the House rising on a question of privilege and making a charge without giving any notice in advance, not even such notice as was given here. But the consideration of the motion upon which the charge is based, may very properly be put off to another day. But in rising to a question of privilege, in order to make that charge, there can be no necessity for any postponement. I feel, in justice to myself, after what took place in the House yesterday, that there should be no delay whatever in my making this charge, but I have no objection to the consideration of the motion containing the charge being postponed to any day that will suit the right hon. gentleman. This is my statement:

That I am credibly informed and believe that I can establish by satisfactory evidence:

1. That in October, 1898, Surgeon Lieut.-Col. Neilson, director general medical staff of the Canadian militia, wrote to Henri Hatch, of Montreal, a manufacturer of concentrated foods, and the registered owner of 'Hatch's Protose,' a well-known food produced in Montreal by the Hatch Protose Company, and in use in hospitals throughout the country, informing the said Hatch that the Minister of Militia, the Hon. Frederick William Borden, was interested in Hatch's protein food, and impressed by the favourable results reported by the hospitals, and in consequence that the minister had instructed him (Neilson) to ask immediately for samples of the powder, and that, from the laboratory of the Hatch Protose Company, in Montreal, two samples of 80 per cent and 50 per cent proteid-strength were, without delay, sent by Hatch to the minister.

2. That in February, 1899, the Minister of Militia, the said Hon. Frederick William Borden, then, as now, a member of this House, promising Hatch a first trial order for the mounted police in the Yukon, asked him if at any time a sufficient quantity could be had of the powder on short notice, in order to avoid delay in delivery in view of the difficulties in communication, so that depots might be established where 'Hatch's Protose' might be stocked for any emergency, to which the said Hatch answered that he had all the necessary machinery in his laboratory, and would keep ready for the department from half a ton to one ton of powder over 60 per cent proteid-strength, as per the average of the samples sent to Lieut.-Col. Neilson.

3. In March, 1899, the said Hatch employed and charged one Dr. Devlin, of Montreal, to solicit the permission from the department to make a military test of the said food, known as 'Hatch's Protose,' as an exclusive diet, in order to ascertain if soldiers on active service could live on it in perfect health, whereupon it was decided that the test would be applied to five soldiers of 'A' Battery, R.C.A., at Kingston, Ont., subject to stringent conditions imposed by the said Minister of Militia, namely:

(a) that the soldiers subjected to the test should answer satisfactorily a certain series of approved questions;

(b) that the test should last for one month;

(c) that the test should have to be stopped at once if any one of the five soldiers suffered uneasiness;

(d) that the test should be controlled by Lieut.-Colonels Neilson and Drury at Kingston, Ont.

4. That it resulted from the said test so made at Kingston upon five soldiers of 'A' Battery, R.C.A., that the food furnished for the experiment by the Hatch Protose Company, of Montreal, and controlled as above, was an eminently suitable food to serve as an emergency ration, and it was so reported by the Minister of Militia to Mr. Hatch himself.

5. When the first contingent of Canadian troops were preparing for departure for South Africa, Mr. Hatch, proprietor of the food tested in Kingston, as above, wrote to the Minister of Militia in reference to the supply of emergency rations to the said contingent, in the shape of food such as tested in Kingston, to which the minister replied, thanking Mr. Hatch, and expressing regret that under arrangements made with the home government, all supplies for the said contingent of Canadian troops were to be furnished by the War Office in England.

6. That the Minister of Militia had several interviews, principally in Montreal, but also elsewhere, with the said Henri Hatch, whom he knew to be the sole manufacturer of the food tested at Kingston.

7. That nevertheless, by a tender made on the 4th day of January last, and accepted on the same day, an agreement was arrived at between the Minister of Militia and the said Dr. Devlin (hereinabove mentioned) at Ottawa, by which the latter undertook to supply the Department of Militia and Defence with 2,333 pounds of vegetable proteid powder, in 7,000 tins, for the sum of \$4,660.

8. That upon information received by him that the said agreement was being executed under circumstances calculated to excite grave suspicions, the said Henri Hatch, on the 25th day of January, 1900, wrote the Minister of Militia a letter, which was by him duly registered, in the following terms:

Your Excellency,—I just happen to hear of a large purchase of 'Proteid food' from Messrs. Devlin & Lyons, of this city, for the Canadian contingent. If such is the case, I consider it to be my right and my duty to inform you that such a supply can only rest upon a poor and fraudulent adulteration of my 'Protose,' as it is done without my knowledge, and has nothing in common with the product tested in Kingston last spring. This will be easily detected by analysis of the food supplied, to which end I intend to take the necessary steps in order to protect my interests. A sample of mine could, of course, have easily been obtained from any druggist, but the articles, if already supplied, are not mine, and cannot be identical with those used at the military test.

This I thought it advisable to bring to Your Excellency's knowledge, for any emergency.

Your humble servant,

H. HATCH.

9. That the Minister of Militia and Defence failed to acknowledge receipt of this letter, and did not promptly communicate with the troops of the Canadian contingent, or take any steps to verify the truth of the information conveyed to him by the letter above referred to of January 25, 1900, received from the person whose food he had, as above stated, caused to be tested at Kingston.

10. That as a matter of fact, the food or emergency ration supplied to the Canadian troops was

not identical with the food tested at Kingston, known as 'Hatch's Protose,' but was a totally different article, of very inferior quality, containing scarcely 17 per cent of nutriment, whereas the food tested contained over 60 per cent of nutritive substance.

11. The said food, so supplied under said agreement, was never made in Canada at all, but was brought on from New York or some place in the United States of America, by the parties interested, packed in a certain number of large Saratoga trunks, containing each two large rough bags filled with a substance closely resembling broken biscuits; it was then ground in Montreal by ordinary milling process to a fine powder, and placed hurriedly in small tins, neither sterilized nor hermetically sealed, and must have deteriorated even if it had been suitable food, which it was not.

12. That the said tins bore a label indicating that the emergency ration contained in them were the product of the Vitalline Company, corner Craig and Bleury streets, Montreal, said company having no legal existence, and being irresponsible, and having neither manufactory nor known office in the said city of Montreal.

13. That the value of the said food, so brought on from the United States, does not exceed \$500.

14. That a sample of the said food, so packed in the tins aforesaid, was obtained from the drug store where it had been packed, and was subsequently tested by Milton L. Hersey, M.A., Sc. (McGill), of Montreal, and found to contain only 17 per cent of nutritive substance, and said analysis was confirmed elsewhere.

15. Said tins were shipped to Halifax in large wooden cases bearing a large label, stating that upon the food contained in them Canadian soldiers had lived thirty days in perfect health.

16. The usual precautions as to inspection were not adopted by the Militia Department in regard to this shipment of emergency rations.

17. The substance brought in from the United States, as above stated, in Saratoga trunks, was detained by the customs officers for duty thereon, but under direction of the government it was allowed to pass without payment of customs dues.

18. The amount due under the agreement of the 4th of January, 1900, that is, \$4,660, was paid to the contractor before the goods were actually delivered.

19. That under all the circumstances above set forth, the Minister of Militia and Defence, the said Hon. Frederick William Borden, was guilty of gross and culpable negligence: (a) in making, with undue haste, the agreement hereinabove referred to of the 4th of January, 1900, for the supply of emergency rations to the Canadian troops in South Africa with irresponsible parties; (b) in not having the preparation of said rations controlled by competent men, and the supply furnished to the troops carefully and rigidly inspected and tested; (c) in neglecting, after he had received said letter of January 25 last, to take the steps commanded by the ordinary rules of prudence to ensure the protection of the troops; and (d) in paying the amount of the said contract, \$4,660, in a case where he must have known that any recovery of the same was impossible, and without any investigation.

That, Sir, is my statement upon which I base the following motion, which is seconded by Mr. Prior:

That Frederick D. Monk, the member for the electoral district of Jacques Cartier in this House, having stated from his place in this House that he is credibly informed and believes that he can establish by satisfactory evidence:

Then follow the charges which I have just read. The motion concludes as follows:—

That the above statements be referred to a select committee of this House to inquire fully into the said allegations, with power to send for persons, papers, records and such articles as may be necessary for such investigation, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and that the committee do report in full the evidence taken before them and all their proceedings on the reference and the result of their inquiries.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion, in my humble opinion, this is not at all a case of privilege, which has been disclosed upon the facts stated by the hon. gentleman. Speaking at the first blush, upon hearing the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk), I do not see that anything has been charged against the privileges of the House, and I doubt if it can be treated as a matter of privilege. But, as I stated a moment ago, it would be better to let the matter stand until to-morrow.

Mr. BERGERON. Put the motion anyway.

The PRIME MINISTER. I raise the point now that the motion cannot be put as a matter of privilege.

Mr. MONK. I assume that this is a question of privilege because it affects a member of this House, and as far as I have been able to ascertain motions of this sort are considered motions of privilege. It is on that ground I made it a matter of privilege, and also upon the urgency which exists, as shown by what the right hon. gentleman said himself. I ask that the motion be put.

The PRIME MINISTER. I stated yesterday that if my hon. friend made a charge of fraud, we would waive all other considerations and have the investigation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has not chosen to act on my suggestion, but has taken his own course and brought it up as a matter of privilege. I make the point at present that the motion is not one of privilege, and I suggest that the matter shall stand until to-morrow as a notice of motion.

YUKON TELEGRAPH—MR. J. B. CHARLESON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). Referring to the matter to which I gave informal notice yesterday, I beg to move for:

Order of the House for a return showing when Mr. Charleson last left Ottawa for the West, a copy of all reports made by him respecting telegraph construction work formerly and now under his charge; showing also the names of the men employed last season and this season between Bennett and Dawson and the nationality of each so far as possible; the wages and allowances for each man so employed, particulars as to any strikes on the part of the men for higher wages; the names of parties who

supplied the poles for the telegraph wire, the price and terms for the same; whether standing trees 'en route' have been used for stringing wires, for what distance approximately, in comparison with the distance where poles were used; how many poles were paid for, how many of these paid for were not used; whether the linemen employed at Dawson, Ogilvie, Selwyn, Selkirk, Five Fingers, Lower LaBarge and Tagish are British subjects, and if not, the nationality of each; the names of sub-contractors for the supply of poles and the residence of each sub-contractor; the terms of charter of ss. 'W. S. Stratton' and the charterer's name; the name of her master and acting master and the nationality; the terms of the charter-party; the use made of this steamer; whether scows were used for supplies and what boats other than scows were so used; how many scows were used and on what terms; the amount charged or paid for transportation by water outside of the ss. 'Stratton'; the length of time during construction Mr. Charleson was actually present with the construction party; the particulars as to purchase of 'Lillie C.' the purchase, disposal or sale or transfer of his boat and the terms thereof respectively; the arrangements for supplies made and with whom; the arrangement made at Bennett respecting pay for men's time returning from Dawson; the amount already paid for the line under Mr. Charleson's charge. Copies of accounts rendered and of accounts paid in connection with this work, the rate of pay first and now allowed A. Boyer, assistant to Mr. Charleson; also a statement showing where Mr. Charleson places his orders in Vancouver in this connection and on what terms, and what commissions, if any, are paid to on these supplies and to whom; the name of Mr. Charleson's agent at Vancouver in this connection; the quantity of supplies in this connection obtained by Mr. Charleson from the United States; whether Mr. Charleson's son was paid \$350, or other amount or amounts for expenses of a trip to Ottawa or otherwise, and whether he is or was there an employee of the government; whether Mr. Charleson awards contracts to his foreman, and whether the foreman's expenses were paid into the locality of operations at government expense, and whether tenders are asked for in this connection?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I did not understand that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was going to move this motion to-day. I undertook to find in the department all the information we could get, intending to bring it down without a motion. I do not care to raise any objection, but I think the hon. gentleman will consult his own interests just as well if he will allow us to bring down all the information we have at the earliest possible moment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am quite willing to let the motion stand. Yesterday I thought I had sufficiently conveyed to the Prime Minister what I wished to move. I stated very fully the points of the motion, and I sent across the House at the request of the Prime Minister the paper from which I spoke, and which was an old notice of motion given by Mr. Bergeron as early as the 12th February last. I thought it was agreeable to the Prime Minister that I should move in the matter to-day. As

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

this is a matter for inquiry when the Public Works estimates are before the House, it would save a great deal of time if instead of putting questions to the minister, and he asking time to obtain the information, I should adopt this course. I understand the Prime Minister now wishes this to stand.

The PRIME MINISTER. We are endeavouring to meet the hon. gentleman's views and will bring down all the information we have at the earliest possible moment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If there is going to be any objection on the part of the government, then I will take the responsibility of moving, and the government, if they choose, can vote it down. If the right hon. gentleman wishes to let it stand I will let it stand, but from what the Prime Minister says now it is not proposed that the motion should be allowed to pass at any time.

The PRIME MINISTER. What I said was that orders had been given to bring down everything we have in the department.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the government is ready to bring down all they can, surely they can have no objection to the motion passing.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not see why the hon. gentleman should bring a motion, when we told him we were going to do it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. An order of the House is the proper proceeding. This is not a matter of courtesy at all. I have no doubt of the good faith of the Prime Minister, but at the same time, I am bound to take the regular course.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). This is not the regular course.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If it is objected to I am helpless, because the government has a majority. But I have the right to move—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). You cannot move without notice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I gave notice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was not put on the paper.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am certain the Prime Minister will not make that objection, because yesterday when I mentioned the reason for proceeding in this way, all the Prime Minister asked was that I would give him notice which I did, and sent him across the floor an outline of this motion. I take the responsibility of moving, and the government can take the responsibility of objecting.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend misunderstood me. I asked him to send a list of the papers which he wanted, so as to send it at once to the Department of Public Works to have the papers prepared.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was a misunderstanding because my language is recorded in *Hansard*, and it was, that unless the Prime Minister objected I would move on the spot, and I abstained from moving—

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman knows that he could not have moved on the spot. There seems to be a threat in that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no threat about it. I make the motion.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then I ask that the hon. gentleman abide by the rules of the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If I am driven to the rules of the House, that means that this goes among the notices of motion. At this stage of the session the right hon. gentleman knows that I would be the greatest fool under heaven to put that on the Notice paper because then I could not refer to the subject until it was called and it never would be called. If the right hon. gentleman drives me to the rules of the House to put this on the motion paper, it is practically asking me to drop the matter. I will not drop it; I will not put it on the Notice paper. I am ready to give the hon. gentleman a day's notice of this informal character, or two days' notice—anything fair; but I want the hon. gentleman to say whether he is going to take advantage of the rules and ask to have it ruled out of order, or vote it down. That will drive me to this. I shall have to obey the Chair if the Chair rules it out of order. If the Chair rules it in order, it will probably be voted down. That would drive me to avail myself of the privilege of any hon. member to put these questions in Committee of Supply, in order to obtain the information piece by piece and bit by bit.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not understand the fuss the hon. gentleman makes, if he will permit me to say so. When he sent me the paper yesterday, I took the precaution to have his wishes carried out, and to have all the papers that he mentioned brought down at the earliest moment. That ought to satisfy my hon. friend.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then, I will move my motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. In the face of the objection which has been taken, the hon. member cannot put his motion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I ask that the motion be put from the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. Without notice the motion is not before the House, because the First Minister took the objection that it required the ordinary formal notice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman takes advantage of the rule—

The PRIME MINISTER. I do, because I am trying at this moment to comply with the wishes of the hon. gentleman.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will get all the information before you get the supplies.

### GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE.

Mr. TALBOT asked :

1. How much value does the hon. Minister of Agriculture place upon the taking on board and pulling back on shore of the disinfecting apparatus in connection with the Grosse Isle Quarantine?

2. Has the hon. minister any reason to believe that the same number of men on board of steamer 'Contest' could have performed the same service as is now being done by the steamer 'Kathleen'?

3. Has not the steamer 'Contest' been reported by competent authority as good a boat as the 'Kathleen,' and offering more cabin room for passengers?

4. Can the hon. minister state why he is paying \$1,000 more for the steamer 'Kathleen' than he would have paid for the steamer 'Contest'?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). 1. From \$270 to \$300. 2. No. The minister believes more men would have been required. 3. Both the *Contest* and the *Kathleen* were reported suitable for the work. The *Contest* offered more cabin room for passengers; the *Kathleen* better accommodation for the disinfecting appliances. 4. The *Contest* has double engines, and the *Kathleen* a single one. The *Contest* would therefore require more coal and a larger engine room staff. The *Kathleen*, while having less cabin accommodation, has much better accommodation for the disinfecting appliances. Indeed there would have been some difficulty in placing these in the *Contest*. The putting on board and taking back of the disinfecting apparatus was included in the offer of the *Kathleen*. For these reasons the minister accepted the *Kathleen*, although the price asked for her was nominally \$1,000 more than that asked for the *Contest*.

### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PURCHASE OF HAY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

How many tons of hay were purchased by the Department of Agriculture, or by its instructions, as acting for the British government, from Mr. McCain, of Carleton County, New Brunswick; at what price, and where delivered? How many tons from D. J. Purdy, M.P.P., St. John,

New Brunswick; at what price, and where delivered? How many tons from Lieut.-Governor McLellan, of New Brunswick; at what price, and where delivered?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). Hay was purchased from H. H. McCain, 1,450 tons at \$9 a ton f.o.b. at Florenceville, Bath, and other points in Carleton County; D. J. Purdy, 100 tons, at \$9 per ton, at St. John; W. E. Reid, 100 tons, at \$9 a ton, f.o.b., who, I am informed, is employed by the local government at Salisbury.

#### IMPORTS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. **CHARLTON** asked :

1. What is the total amount of imports from the United States for the ten months ending May 1, 1900?
2. What is the total amount of imports from the United States entered for consumption for the ten months ending May 1, 1900?
3. What is the amount of dutiable goods imported from the United States and entered for consumption for the ten months ending May 1, 1900?
4. What is the amount of free goods imported from the United States and entered for consumption for the ten months ending May 1, 1900?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). As the monthly returns of the department do not supply this information by countries, the answers given are in each case for the month ended 31st March, the latest date to which the department has such information. 1. \$84,290,434. 2. \$78,983,803. 3. Imported, \$42,869,565; entered for consumption, \$37,463,214. 4. Imported, \$41,420,869; entered for consumption, \$41,520,589.

#### DREDGING LEASES.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER** asked :

In what issues of the 'Royal Gazette' was the order in council, January 18, 1898, respecting dredging leases, published?

Mr. **SUTHERLAND**. The order in council of the 18th of January, 1898, respecting dredging leases, was published in four consecutive issues of the *Canada Gazette*, namely, the issues of the 12th, 19th, and 26th of February, and the 5th of March, 1898.

#### POINTE AUX OUTARDES AND GODBOUT CABLE.

Mr. **CASGRAIN** asked :

1. Are the government aware that a cable connecting a telegraph line on the north shore, between a point near Pointe aux Outardes and Godbout, is broken and interrupted?
2. That the said cable is broken by the ice nearly every spring, and that the service in such case is performed by a boat?
3. Is it the intention of the government to continue the use of the cable, or to carry the line through by land between the two points aforesaid?

Mr. **FOSTER**.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). 1. Yes. 2. No. The cable laid seventeen years ago has been interrupted three times, and only once by ice. 3. The present cable has been tolerably free of trouble, and will be continued. Sixty miles of land line which would be required to replace 26 miles of cable would not be as free from interruption as the present cable.

#### YUKON TELEGRAPH LINE.

Mr. **DOMVILLE** (by Mr. Gibson) asked :

What date was the telegraph line from Lake Bennett, British Columbia, to Dawson City, Yukon territory, in operation?

What has been the earnings per month since that date to May 1, 1900?

What number of messages have passed over the line in the same period?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). 1. September 28, 1899. 2. June, 1899, \$46.40; July, \$465.45; August, \$1,060.69; September, \$3,787.87; October, \$7,552.90; November, \$5,014; December, \$3,788; January, \$6,752; February, \$5,366; March, \$7,878; April, \$7,345; total to 1st of May, \$49,056.31. 3. Messages sent: June, 1899, 45; July, 452; August, 800; September, 2,024; October, 3,150; November, 1,505; December, 1,269; January, 1900, 1,831. No complete report has been received since January.

#### WOODSTOCK, N.B., COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. **FOSTER** asked :

1. Is the government aware that F. H. J. Dibblee, collector of customs at Woodstock, New Brunswick, is a paid official of the town in the fire department thereof?

2. Has he been notified that he must either resign that position or give up his office on the ground that his whole time is required for the duties of his office?

3. What is the policy of the government in such cases?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). 1. The government has been informed that Mr. F. H. J. Dibblee, collector of customs at Woodstock, N.B., is chief of the fire department of Woodstock, for which he receives \$100 per annum. 2. Mr. Dibblee has been advised to resign such position in the fire department.

#### THE CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. **A. W. PUTTEE** (Winnipeg). I desire to call the attention of the right hon. the First Minister to a promise he made to this House last week. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) brought up, on Friday afternoon, the question of Chinese immigration, and the right hon. gentleman replied that on Monday a Bill would be placed on the Order paper to be introduced as soon as the rules of the House will permit.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In answer to my hon. friend, I have to say that I have put a notice on the Order paper for the introduction of this Bill to-morrow.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—EMERGENCY RATIONS.

**Mr. A. McNEILL** (North Bruce). I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Militia when he expects to lay on the Table the additional papers referred to yesterday with regard to the emergency rations.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). Dr. Neilson, the director general, had to go away to camp and I expect him back to-day or to-morrow, and will then immediately have the papers ready. In his absence we cannot have them ready.

**Mr. McNEILL**. Are there any additional papers which the hon. gentleman can lay on the Table?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. None.

**Mr. McNEILL**. Will the hon. the Minister of Customs say whether he has made any inquiry with regard to the order to admit the material imported from the United States free of duty.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. I made inquiries and so far have not been able to find any orders or correspondence.

**Mr. McNEILL**. The hon. gentleman has not been able to get any information?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. Not so far.

#### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

**Mr. G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.). I would like to call the attention of the different departments to the fact that no returns have been brought down showing the dismissals. Papers have been brought down as regards the commissions and the amounts paid, but as to the dismissals, none. I want to ask the hon. Minister of Marine one question anent the hiatus in the return from the 1st of July, 1896, to April, 1897. The statement read by him goes to show that no dismissals had taken place in that time as a result of the investigations made by the commission. I want to ask him whether or not there were dismissals for partisan reasons outside of that. Under the wording of the statement, the return would be perfectly clear if it did not bring down those that were made by the minister on representations of members or candidates.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Has the hon. gentleman the return there?

**Mr. FOSTER**. I have referred the right hon. gentleman to this so often—

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman made the general statement that there were no returns brought down. The returns from my department are down. With respect to the question, I will make inquiries, but think the return follows strictly the lines of his motion.

**Mr. FOSTER**. It might be so construed. I meant to say any additional returns brought down since I referred the matter to the right hon. gentleman. I would like to ask the acting Minister of the Interior if he has any answer yet to his telegrams to Mr. Ogilvie for that supplementary report, for which he asked on three different occasions by telegram without getting any answer from the commissioner.

**Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND** (North Oxford). I have received no answer to the telegrams, and as I said will have inquiries made.

**Mr. FOSTER**. It is useless to correspond with Mr. Ogilvie now so as to get the information before the House rises. What I want is that the telegraph for which we have paid a very large amount, chiefly on the ground that public business would be facilitated by it, should be used to get the information or know the reason why.

I want to call the attention of the hon. minister to another fact, the fact that permits which were granted by Ogilvie from December 1898, up to April 13, 1899, and for which the department have repeatedly asked him, have not been sent down nor has Mr. Ogilvie answered the requisitions made to him for those returns. Those two things put together show a state of affairs which is intolerable and the minister's duty is to inquire into it instantly and by telegraph.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND**. As far as I am personally concerned I am not here to apologize for the conduct of any officer. I have explained to the House several times that it is inexplicable why those telegrams at least should not have been received by him and answered. I have done everything in the power of a minister to do under the circumstances. At once, after not receiving the reply, I asked for an explanation, and I am as much disappointed as the hon. gentleman. And as to the return he asked for, it may be that Mr. Ogilvie will have some explanation—whether satisfactory or not—to offer; and every man is entitled to be heard. We must see what explanation he has to offer for not having furnished the information before now. There was no desire on the part of the department or the government to hold back any information. On the contrary, I did what I think was unusual—I went out of my way to have the information that the

department had received from Mr. Ogilvie collected, and it has been brought down and ordered to be printed. That information, perhaps, will be much fuller in its details than anything that would be published in the annual report. I have made every possible effort to meet inquiries promptly and to bring down the information that the department had. Personally, I have put myself to a good deal of inconvenience to urge and hasten the bringing down of all possible information with regard to these matters.

Mr. FOSTER. If Mr. Speaker will allow me, I may say that I have not tried to imply any censure upon the acting minister (Mr. Sutherland)—quite the contrary. But, I call the attention of the First Minister to the extraordinary position of things, and I would ask that the government should, by a free use of the telegraph, find out why this information has not been sent. I would keep a pressing telegram on file until Mr. Ogilvie either answered it or came out.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I had intended to say that I ordered a formal and official letter to be written to Mr. Ogilvie; and I might make a note of the matter and wire him again.

#### BRITISH COLUMBIA ELECTIONS— POSITION OF THE LIEUTENANT- GOVERNOR.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) I wish to draw the attention of the leader of the government to the fact that the elections have taken place in British Columbia, and, according to the reports, the present government have suffered an overwhelming defeat. I would ask the right hon. gentleman whether he has sent any instructions to the lieutenant-governor as to the manner in which he shall proceed at the present time, so that the uncertainty that now reigns in the province and that is doing a great deal of harm to all business there, may be put a stop to at the earliest possible moment.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may inform my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) that the government does not propose to issue any instructions to the lieutenant-governor of the province of British Columbia. The lieutenant-governor has chosen to appeal to the people of the province and the answer is in their hands.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) evidently forgets the statement he made some time ago to this House. That statement was—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) cannot make an argument at this stage.

Mr. WALLACE. I was going to ask a question of the right hon. First Minister.

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

In the statement to which I referred, the Prime Minister said the lieutenant-governor of British Columbia had assumed a serious responsibility—that the provincial elections would be held, and then the governor would be called to account. Now, the elections have been held and the decision has been given, by a very decisive majority, against the Prime Minister of the province and against the lieutenant-governor; and we would like to know, in view of the course foreshadowed by the Prime Minister as to what would happen if the provincial Premier and the lieutenant-governor were not sustained, whether it is the intention to recall the lieutenant-governor, or what is to be done in the matter. The Prime Minister, in his previous statements, indicated, in plain terms, that if the majority went against the provincial Premier and the lieutenant-governor—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) must not make any argument.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not making an argument, but I am asking a question, and I would like a reply.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) knows that this is too grave a question to be treated with levity. It is a matter which concerns the people of British Columbia. The elections took place last Saturday. It is impossible, so far as I know, to know what the returns are. If action is to be taken by the government, it is not to be taken on mere newspaper reports. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) will not be surprised if I tell him that before we consider the question at all, we must have something official before us.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Lord Aberdeen did not have anything official before him.

The PRIME MINISTER. He had the statement of the Prime Minister of the day.

Mr. PRIOR. I hope the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) does not accuse me of treating this matter with levity?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

#### AMERICAN VESSELS AND THE COAST- ING TRADE.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the Prime Minister if any applications have been received recently from American vessel-owners, praying that the privileges given them last season to engage in the Canadian coasting trade might be renewed during the present season. And, if so, what is the intention of the government with regard to that application?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No such application has been received.

**Mr. W. H. BENNETT** (East Simcoe). In the same connection, I would ask the Premier if an application has been made on behalf of certain owners of American tugs for the privilege of towing logs between Canadian ports on Georgian Bay. The rumour is current that such an application has been made. If it has been made, is it the intention of the government to accede to the wishes of the American tug owners?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. At this moment, I am not aware that any such application has been made, but I will inquire into the matter.

#### ABENAKIS INDIANS OF ST. FRANCIS.

**Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON** (Beauharnois). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the acting Minister of the Interior (**Mr. Sutherland**) if he can give me an answer to the question I put to him last night—has **Rev. Mr. Degonzague** applied to the Department of the Interior for the sum of \$500 or \$1,000 to build a wigwam for the missionary at St. Francois du Lac on the Abenakis reserve?

**Mr. SUTHERLAND**. I am informed by the officers of the department that no request has been received from the **Rev. Father Degonzague**, a missionary at the Abenakis of St. Francis, for the grant of \$500 to assist in building a house for the missionary at St. Francois du Lac.

#### SALARIES OF JUDGES.

**Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN** (West Assiniboia). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Solicitor General (**Mr. Fitzpatrick**), as he has dropped the motion of which he had given notice relating to the salaries of judges, whether he intends to introduce any resolution respecting the salary of the chief justice of the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (**Mr. Fitzpatrick**). When the resolution was called, I said 'dropped.' It is dropped with the intention of substituting another resolution, because the last paragraph of this resolution was improperly drawn.

**Mr. A. MARTIN** (East Queen's, P.E.I.) I also desire to ask the Solicitor General a question in regard to this resolution which he said was to be dropped. In his amended resolution does he propose to increase the salaries of judges in Prince Edward Island, who, I think, are the least paid of any judges in Canada?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. The hon. gentleman has not given notice of his ques-

tion. I may say, however, that the present resolution is defective in the last paragraph, which is not drawn to meet the necessities in the province of Quebec.

#### ELECTION ACT—AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 133) to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members of the House of Commons.

On section 80,

**Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN** (Montmorency). Before taking up this section, I wish to propose the amendment of which I have given notice, and which the hon. gentleman will find on page 562 of the Votes and Proceedings. It is an amendment which is to be found in the Revised Statutes of Ontario, and also in the Quebec Election Act, and is in the following terms:

79a. In case, through accident or irresistible force, riot, removal of documents or other cause of a similar nature, the nomination could not be held, or the voting could not commence at the hour fixed or was interrupted by similar causes before being closed, the returning officer and the deputy returning officer, in so far as it concerns either, shall adjourn to the following day, to recommence the operation, and day by day if necessary, until the nomination of candidates may be fully held; and in case of the polling, it is resumed by commencing at the hour fixed by sections \_\_\_\_\_ until it has lasted eight hours or ten hours, as the case may be, so that all the electors who wish to vote may have had the opportunity of so doing.

There is already a clause in the Bill to a similar effect, but it only relates to the nomination, and not to the polling. So far as I can see there is no machinery which could be put into operation to have a poll, in case the polling was interrupted by riot or otherwise. The hon. gentleman will remember a case in Quebec West, where the polling was interrupted by a riot; and I think a clause of this kind, which already exists in the Acts of several of the provinces, could properly be introduced here.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (**Mr. Fitzpatrick**). I think the best way, would be to go through the whole Bill, and adopt such clauses as do not require amendment; then we will take up the Bill again, and go over those clauses which have been left aside for amendment. I have gone carefully over these amendments of which the hon. gentleman has given notice, and I have practically decided to adopt almost the whole of them. But I want to have them incorporated in the Bill in their proper places.

**Mr. CASGRAIN**. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for his statement. I suppose he will not object, as we go along, to my pointing out to the committee the amendments that I propose to suggest?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We may discuss the amendments as we go along, and after we have agreed upon them. I suggest that they be redrafted in conjunction with the whole Bill, for final consideration.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I want to suggest a change in the phraseology of this clause. In line 36, instead of the words 'votes given,' it would be better to say 'ballot papers cast.' Many votes are given for a candidate which are not counted, which have to be thrown aside for some reason. The intention of the clause is to count only those ballots which are good, and which have been cast for a candidate. Also, in the second paragraph, instead of saying 'in counting the votes,' I would suggest an alteration to specify counting those we have just mentioned, that is, to reject all those which have not been supplied.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This law has been in existence for many years past, and the words in this Statute Bill have been adopted from the statute we have had in force for a number of years. I do not really see that there is any good reason for a change in the phraseology.

Mr. BERGERON. Although it has been like that for many years, it is never too late to make an improvement. I acknowledge that the hon. gentleman is better acquainted with the English language than I am, but I think the object of the clause would be better served if this change were made.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If I come to the conclusion that it is an improvement, it will be done, but I do not like to make a verbal change in a section which we have had for so many years without some good reason being shown.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend can take a note of it, and if he considers it, I think he may come to the same conclusion.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). This is one of the most important sections of the Bill. All of those gentlemen who read the evidence taken in the investigation in the West Huron election, and are familiar with the Brockville case, will bear me out when I say that at the counting of the ballots upon the closing of the polls was where the greatest difficulties and frauds occurred. The hon. Solicitor General has said that this section is copied from the old Act, and as the same has been in existence for years, I intend to move an amendment to repeal that section and to substitute another instead of it. My object in doing so is to frame the section in such a way that no frauds can be committed by the deputy returning officer or the poll clerk at a polling subdivision. Section 80 is not capable of preventing frauds such as occurred in Brockville, West Huron and other constitu-

Mr. CASGRAIN.

encies. I wish to give notice that I intend to move an amendment to strike out that section and to substitute another.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Why not move it on the third reading?

Mr. INGRAM. I may be shut out on the third reading.

Mr. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). If the hon. gentleman has a clause which he states will end the trouble that has occurred in the past it is altogether too important a matter not to be able to discuss in committee. Section 80 is capable of several interpretations, and we want to make the law as plain as it should be.

Mr. INGRAM. This is the amendment that I propose:

Immediately after the close of the poll, the deputy returning officer shall, in the presence of the poll clerk and the candidates or their agents—and if any of the candidates is neither present nor represented by an agent, then in the presence of such candidates and agents, if any, as are present, and of such electors, not exceeding three, as are at or around the polling station and willing to attend—proceed to examine the state of the ballot papers and count the votes in the manner following: He shall, before opening the ballot box, ascertain how many persons have voted and how many ballot papers should be in the ballot box, and shall carefully count the number of unused ballot papers and of spoiled ballot papers, and shall afford opportunity to the persons present to ascertain whether all the ballot papers are properly accounted for; after having so done, and not before, he shall open the ballot box and examine the ballot papers to ascertain that they are the ballot papers which he supplied, examining his initials on the backs, and shall count the whole number of ballot papers in the box to see that the number corresponds with the number of persons who voted, doing all this as far as possible without opening out the face of any of the ballot papers or discovering or disclosing for whom any ballot paper is marked; and should the number of ballot papers found in the box exceed the number of persons who voted, he shall, if possible, ascertain and reject such as were not supplied by him. After having so done, he shall open and examine both sides of the ballot papers and count the number of votes given for each candidate, exposing to the view of those allowed to be present the face of each ballot paper, and, when so requested, affording them opportunity for thorough inspection of any ballot paper; and in so counting he shall reject all ballot papers which have not been supplied by the deputy returning officer, all those by which votes have been given for more candidates than are to be elected, all those which are not marked with a black lead pencil in the white circular space opposite the name or names of the candidate or candidates, all those upon the face of which there is any cross elsewhere than in the said white circular space or spaces, all those upon any part of which the voter has intentionally placed any mark with anything other than a black lead pencil, and all those upon which there is any writing or mark by which the voter could be identified, other than the numbering by the deputy returning officer in the cases hereinbefore provided for.

This is on the line that we shall still continue to use the disc ballot, and to my mind the disc ballot is the only ballot in existence that is a safe ballot. That is the reason why I incorporate in the amendment provision for the disc ballot. I know that deputy returning officers, in the last few elections, have taken on themselves entire control of the polling booth. They have violated the law in every way imaginable, and carried on very high-handed proceedings, and so, I say that the only means by which these frauds can be prevented is not to leave the law open to inference, but to give plain and candid directions to these officers.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would like time to consider the amendment suggested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram). Certainly, listening to it being read, I do not think it is possible to accept the amendment in its present form. But, as we have to consider some other sections which we have left over, I am willing to allow this section to stand that I may consider the amendment.

Mr. INGRAM. The reason it is so lengthy is that it embraces certain sections following No. 80.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that this clause is to stand over. I believe that properly speaking, sections 96 and 97 should come before this one. This Bill seems to have been framed in a great hurry, and as my hon. friend is going to write his name on the back of it, I want to have the Bill as complete as possible. I believe that sections 96 and 97 should precede section 80. Clause 96 refers to what is going to take place in the morning before the vote is taken. Clause 97 is to prevent anybody saying for whom he has voted. That is during the day. Clause 80 deals with the work that should be done after the poll is closed, and therefore, I think clauses 96 and 97 should have precedence. I do not understand why they have been put in further on because there is no sense in it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the reason is quite apparent. Secrecy of voting is made applicable to all that takes place whether previous to the time the ballots are counted or afterwards.

Mr. BERGERON. But has my hon. friend seen clause 96?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. That deals with everything that should be done before the voting commences in the morning, and clause 80 speaks about work that is done at the close of the poll at night.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Read paragraph 7 of section 96:

Every officer, clerk and agent in attendance at the counting of the votes shall maintain and

aid in maintaining the secrecy of the voting; and no such officer, clerk or agent shall attempt to obtain at such counting any information or communicate any information obtained at such counting as to the candidate for whom any vote is given in any particular ballot paper.

Mr. BERGERON. These are all the things which should be known before the poll is opened. I suggest that to the hon. gentleman anyway.

On section 82,

Mr. MARTIN. According to the notice I have given the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), I propose to amend subsection 2, line 19, by striking out the words 'in counting the ballots' and inserting the following after the word 'Act' at the end of the subsection. 'Such ballot papers being counted for the candidates for whom respectively they have been cast.' The reason I propose the amendment is that some returning officers might come to the conclusion that the objected ballots should not be counted at all; and it is necessary that the Act should be clear on that point.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let it stand.

Mr. McNEILL. It would be a good thing then if in this section there was incorporated the idea that the agent of either candidate should be at liberty to seal the envelope on behalf of the person he represents.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That seems to be a reasonable suggestion. After it is sealed by the returning officer I can see no objection to the agents of the respective candidates adding their seals for additional security.

Mr. INGRAM. I would move that the words be inserted 'such agents also affixing their seals if they desire.'

Mr. SPROULE. In some cases there are no agents present, and you should then make a provision that any elector might do this.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, perhaps that suggestion could be adopted.

Mr. McNEILL. If a candidate chooses to provide a seal for his representative, then, his representative should be at liberty to place that seal on the envelope. If the candidate does not provide a seal there is an end to the matter.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Perhaps you should say 'it shall be sealed or marked.'

Mr. McNEILL. You had better say 'sealed and marked.' I do not think you can take too much precaution. I could supply my agent with a seal peculiar to myself, and I could then easily discover if it had been tampered with.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). The word 'shall' is a dangerous word to use. Why not put in 'may be sealed and marked'? It is all right to say that 'shall' is permissive in matters of procedure but that is a disputed point.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will have to get that amendment properly drafted. Let the clause stand.

On section 83,

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that the ballot boxes are often of such a character that the sealing of the box is of no use whatever. In the case of tin ballot boxes, when they are being carried about after they are sealed, the springing of the tin breaks the seal. Some precaution ought to be taken for making this provision really capable of being enforced. I remember very well in an election of my own, that when we came to the declaration we found that the seals of the ballot boxes were almost all broken.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The way to seal a ballot box is the same as to seal a cash box.

Mr. McNEILL. All I wish to call my hon. friend's attention to is, that as matters are now, the ballot box is so sealed that the sealing is really useless. I think some consideration ought to be given to that fact.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Has my hon. friend in mind any practical suggestion?

Mr. McNEILL. No, I have not. I simply wanted to direct my hon. friend's attention to the fact.

Mr. A. C. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I would suggest that a good strong tape, put both ways across the ballot box and sealed on the top, would be effective. The tape which I have seen used is usually too light.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to draw attention to another matter. This section provides that the ballot box shall be locked and sealed with the seal of the deputy returning officer, and shall be forthwith delivered by the deputy returning officer to the returning officer or to the election clerk. What is understood by 'forthwith delivered'?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Within a reasonable time. That is a relative term, the meaning of which would vary according to distances and circumstances.

Mr. SPROULE. In many outlying districts ballot boxes are sometimes kept over night, sometimes for two days or three days, and sometimes a week in stormy weather. I think there should be some limited time within which they should be returned.

Mr. McNEILL.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If there is a suggestion that would remedy that difficulty, I would be glad to accept it; but the term 'forthwith' is an elastic expression which ought to meet every case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think you can improve on the word 'forthwith.' If an officer delays in delivering the ballot box for two or three days, he is violating the law, and should be punished. But, as the Solicitor General says, I do not think we can improve on the term 'forthwith,' because it puts the deputy returning officer to the utmost diligence to which any word could put him.

Mr. INGRAM. There are a great many cases in which the law has been violated in this respect, and I know of no case in which the person violating it has been called to account. In towns and cities there is nothing to hinder the deputy returning officers returning the ballot boxes on the night of the elections; and with that view I placed this provision in the Bill which I introduced last year and this year:

If the said ballot box has been used within twelve miles of the office of the returning officer, or of the election clerk, it shall be returned within five hours after the return of the poll.

In every city of the Dominion I think there ought to be a specified time within which every ballot box must be returned to the returning officer, so as to prevent them being tampered with. In my own county, in the last election, a competent deputy returning officer who acted during the day, went to Toronto and stayed three or four days, without returning the ballot box. I am satisfied that he had no dishonest intent, but was simply careless or negligent.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If there is negligence, as my hon. friend says, there is a remedy under the statute.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). In many ridings in the province of Ontario, there are three or four towns of no inconsiderable size, and the postmaster in such a town has a position of emolument which he is desirous of keeping. How would it do to provide that in all towns of which the returning officer is not a resident, each deputy returning officer shall, on the evening of the polling day, deliver to the postmaster the ballot box?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Does my hon. friend think that would add any security? I think it would be as well to trust our own returning officer as a postmaster with the custody of the boxes.

Mr. BENNETT. It is alleged that the deputy returning officers have left the boxes where they are accessible to other persons. If they were delivered to the postmaster of an incorporated town, which would be a town of over 2,000 population, or an incorporated village, which would be a village of

over 700 population, the postmaster, knowing that his reputation, and, perhaps, his position as postmaster, was at stake, would be very careful of them.

Mr. McNEILL. I would again call the attention of my hon. friend to the matter I spoke of a moment ago. It is very important, as I am sure my hon. friend sees, that the ballot box should not be tampered with; and it is to secure it against that tampering that the provision for sealing is made. If the letter of the law can be complied with and the sealing be of no value whatever, certainly there is something wrong; and I would ask my hon. friend if he would turn the matter over in his mind, and see if some words could not be introduced descriptive of the manner of sealing, that would provide means against trouble of the kind to which I have referred.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the suggestion of the hon. member for East Simcoe would do at all. It would multiply the number of officials, and very much complicating the matter in the event of an attempt being made to ascertain whether the ballot box was tampered with or not. You had better leave it to the official who is appointed for that purpose, and who is sworn to do his duty.

Mr. INGRAM. In the case of an election in Ottawa, does the Solicitor General mean to say that the ballot boxes cannot be returned on the same evening? The poll closes at five o'clock, and in all probability the ballots are counted before six. Surely it is possible to return the boxes to the returning officer in a couple of hours, and I propose to state that they shall be returned in so many hours.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). That is not as good as 'forthwith.'

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, because 'forthwith' is violated all over the country. Take the British Columbia elections, some of the ballot boxes are not yet returned, and they do not know where they are.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not think the suggestion of my hon. friend could be carried out in the rural districts. In my county 'forthwith' suits very well. If you start from St. Tite des Caps, forty miles away from the chief place in the county, I do not know how many hours you would have to fix, and then it would depend on the season. In the winter, sometimes it takes a day or two to get back from there. No doubt, however, there is a good deal in the objection of my hon. friend. I remember a case in which the deputy returning officer took time to take out all the ballots from the box and count them with his wife on the bed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is hard to fix any time because after all there are some polling booths in which the agents of

the candidates are much more difficult to deal with in a recount than in others. In some polling booths, the counting up is disposed of in a very few hours, but in others, because of the characteristics of the representatives, it takes very much longer. I do not think we can improve on the word 'forthwith.'

Mr. BERGERON. In line 24, of section 83, the words 'counting of the votes' are used. I would suggest that 'counting of the ballot papers' be substituted. A vote is only a ballot paper after the cross has been made upon it and it has been counted as good. Before that it is simply a ballot paper.

On line 27, the words 'shall make out a statement' are used, but it is not said of what the statement is to be. I would suggest to add the words 'of the poll.' That will show what kind of a statement the deputy returning officer is to make.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Form Z gives that.

Mr. BERGERON. There will be no harm in adding those words. On line 31, of the same section, I find 'a special envelope supplied for the purpose.' I propose to add the words 'and addressed to the returning officer.' The statement is to be made out in triplicate—one attached to the poll-book; one retained by the deputy returning officer; and the third kept inclosed in a special envelope supplied for the purpose. I would add 'addressed to the returning officer.'

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Why?

Mr. BERGERON. It has to be addressed to him.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, the returning officer does not touch these envelopes in the counting up.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It is put in the box and goes back to the returning officer.

Mr. McNEILL. With regard to the special envelope supplied for the purpose, supposing by accident no special envelope was supplied to the deputy in an out of the way part of the country, what then?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He will put it in any envelope of course. The intention is that stationery shall be supplied to carry out the Act; but if a special envelope is missing, the ballots will have to be put in another envelope.

Mr. BERGERON. I would suggest that in line 37, instead of the words 'votes given for each candidate' these words should be used: 'ballot papers cast and accepted for each candidate.'

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would not like to leave the deputy returning officer to decide what votes should be accepted.

Mr. BERGERON. They are already counted, and accepted.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are accepted by the returning officer, but on a recount they may be thrown out.

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond). Subsection 4, of section 83, provides that after the ballot box is locked and sealed it shall be delivered to the returning officer or the election clerk or to one or more persons specially appointed for that purpose by the returning officer. I think there is too much latitude given here for tampering with the ballot boxes. The more parties you may appoint to receive these boxes, the more danger there is of their being tampered with. I would propose that the words 'or to one or more persons specially appointed for that purpose by the returning officer' be struck out.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The law was amended in 1891, by the addition of those words 'one or more persons specially appointed,' etc., because it was found necessary to add to the number of persons who might be appointed for the purpose of receiving the boxes, and I do not know that any inconvenience has resulted from the operation of the law since then.

Mr. SPROULE. A good many deputy returning officers do not know whether it is their duty to deliver the boxes or wait until the election clerk comes round to receive them, and the boxes remain with the deputy returning officers until called for.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman's statement does not show that any inconvenience has resulted.

Mr. SPROULE. It multiplies the opportunities for fraud. Because, if you send men in pairs to gather up the ballot boxes, as is often done—two to the east, two to the west, two to the north, and two to the south—they gather up the boxes, and, in their travels stop at one hotel after another to get food for themselves and to feed their horses, and perhaps even to stay over night. There must be opportunities under these circumstances for parties to tamper with the ballot boxes which would not be offered if the deputy returning officer was obliged to deliver his ballot box over to the returning officer or to some one appointed in a certain locality to receive it.

Mr. McNEILL. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) is a good one, and that we should confine the responsibility to as few persons as possible.

Mr. LAGRAM. Take the case of a very close election, and there is grave danger of returning the wrong man, if proper provision is not made for preventing any person from tampering with the ballot box.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

In my own county, we had one case where a ballot box was not returned on the night of the election. The election was a very close one, and when the recount took place, it was found that a number of the ballots in this box had been spoiled—tampered with. The contention of the Liberals was that those ballots were spoiled when they were put in the box, while, on behalf of the Conservative candidate, it was contended that the ballots were not in the shape in which they were left. By keeping that box over night and tampering with the ballots, they elected the wrong man. So, I say, something ought to be done to compel the delivery of these boxes on the night of the election.

Mr. E. COCHRANE (East Northumberland). Would it not remedy this evil to a large extent if the deputy returning officer were compelled to return the ballot boxes to the returning officer in each case, instead of having the returning officer and clerk, travelling hundreds of miles through the constituency to gather them up? You would then have only two parties entrusted with the ballot boxes. I would suggest also that the ballot box should be bound with tape and sealed at the crosses.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand the Solicitor General, he objected to the proposition that in incorporated towns and villages ballot boxes should be delivered within three hours after polling to the postmaster, on the ground that the postmasters are not amenable under the Election Act. But that could be got over by making these persons responsible under some clause in the Act. Take for instance the riding of East Simcoe—we have there four large towns, Penetanguishene, Midland, Orillia and Gravenhurst. Of the postmasters of those towns, two are Liberals; but I would much prefer that the three or four ballot boxes in each of those towns should be in the hands of the postmaster after polling, rather than in the hands of the several deputy returning officers. The postmaster is in receipt of a salary of from \$1,500 to \$2,500, which would make him feel it incumbent upon him that every regard should be paid to the safekeeping of the ballot boxes committed to his care. An hon. friend asks me how about the ballot boxes in country districts. It might be extended to postmasters resident elsewhere than in incorporated towns or villages. I certainly think that there should be a positive enactment in the law that, within three hours after the closing of the polls in cities, the ballot boxes should be delivered to the returning officer. I remember an election in the city of Toronto in which it was in doubt on the night of polling which candidate was elected, and a great deal more in doubt where the ballot boxes were, though they might all have been delivered that night at the city hall to the returning officer.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not know whether it would be possible practically to carry it out or not, but if it could be arranged for, I think that the ballot boxes should be sealed by the representatives of the candidates, just as the envelopes are.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no reason why the same principle should not apply. I think we shall have to allow that section to stand over. But I would ask my hon. friends, in the meantime, to consider means of practically meeting the difficulties that have been pointed out. We see the difficulties, but what we need is some solution that can be incorporated in the law and made workable. With reference to the sealing, there is a way to remedy that. Of all the difficulties suggested that is the only one that I can see my way at present to cope with. However, when the others are considered, I may be able to adopt some of the suggestions made or give satisfactory reasons why they should not be adopted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the reasons for the amendment made in 1891, for the delivery of the ballot boxes to others than the returning officers?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot give any reason except one that has been given by the Auditor General. He has taken the ground that if persons were appointed by the returning officers to collect the ballot boxes, it would save considerable expense. I can see no other reason.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as safety is concerned, it seems plain that it would be better to have the ballot boxes delivered direct to the returning officers, because the more you multiply the people who handle the ballot boxes, the more you increase the danger. Still, I can see that in a large constituency there would be reasons why some person should go round and collect the ballot boxes. In my own constituency, there are some polling places more than one hundred miles from Halifax, where the returning officer resides. One person collecting these boxes makes one journey to the city of Halifax; whereas, if each deputy returning officer had to journey to Halifax to deliver his ballot box, the expense would be much greater.

Mr. COCHRANE. The proposition is, I understand, that instead of travelling over a large riding, a returning officer should be empowered to announce the fact, that at a certain day he would be in a central town or village in the riding to receive the ballot boxes. I suppose there is no riding in Canada in which a deputy returning officer could not travel, in four or five hours, or half a day, from where the poll was held to the place named by the returning officer, to receive the ballot boxes. Human nature is

about the same everywhere. Here is a man that starts from the office of the returning officer with a driver; he drives round a large constituency, and gathers up the ballot boxes, and arrives at night in the village with fifteen or twenty boxes in his sleigh. Would they be as safe in his custody as they would be with the deputy returning officer, to keep them until the day named for the deputy returning officer to deliver them up to the returning officer at a certain place?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman who spoke last is perfectly correct, that it would be a dangerous innovation if you were to multiply persons responsible for the custody of the ballots. If anything is to be done in that direction, I would suggest to the Solicitor General that the only way we can effectually deal with it is by affixing, if that were necessary, still severer penalties against any deputy returning officer who may improperly tamper or part with the control of the ballot boxes committed to him. But I am bound to say, and I speak with a good deal of experience of elections under various conditions and different laws, that I would prefer to trust the deputy returning officers and the returning officer rather than interpose anybody between them. Hon. gentlemen must recollect that a great many of our elections, from the necessity of the case, may be run at periods when daylight is long past before the ballots are counted and finally sealed. I think it a risky experiment to send anybody round to collect ten, twelve or twenty ballot boxes at a comparatively late hour of the night. It appears to me that whatever the difficulties and inconveniences of the present system may be, you must be content to trust your deputy returning officers and your returning officer, punishing anybody who tampers with the ballot as severely as you please, and I for my part, as a member of the government, and as a private member of the House will do my best to forward anything that will contribute to the safety of the ballot. But I doubt very much whether you can do it by interfering between the deputy and the returning officer.

Mr. H. CARGILL (East Bruce). The more I listen to this discussion the more I am convinced of the necessity of appointing the highest class of men to the position of returning officer and deputy returning officer. The other night I pointed out that certain individuals throughout the country are precluded from acting as returning officers and deputies. Any one listening to this discussion must come to the conclusion that what is called chiefly in question, is the reputation or character of the men who are appointed to these positions. Reflection has been very frequently passed upon them. I submit that throughout this country the very

men spoken of here, and who are precluded from occupying positions of this kind, are the men who should be appointed to those positions, that is, the clergy and judges of the country. We know they are non-partisan, as a rule they remain neutral in elections, at least that is my experience. They are deserving individuals. If there are a few dollars to be spent, I do not know of any individuals more worthy to receive it. In all seriousness, I submit that these individuals should be appointed returning officers and deputy returning officers in the different ridings. If such were done, I am quite satisfied there would be much less tampering with the ballot. These are gentlemen in whom every representative in the country has implicit confidence. I have always had confidence in the clergy of this country, as I hope every representative here has. I suggest that the Solicitor General seriously consider this matter, and I hope that in making his improvements, he will introduce an amendment of this character.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Would the hon. gentleman limit the appointments to the class he refers, or only give them preference?

Mr. CARGILL. No, I would give them the preference, irrespective of denomination. There are in every riding a sufficient number of clergymen to fill these positions. As there are usually several denominations in each riding, there should be no discrimination in the appointments.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the idea is a very novel one. I would not trust every preacher in the country to be an election agent. Besides, I am afraid the denominations would be jealous of each other, one denomination would probably claim that it was discriminated against in favour of another in the appointments.

On section 84,

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest the addition after 'deputy returning officer,' of the words 'or of any other person whose seal is affixed thereto' because there is provision made that others may affix their seal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It would be necessary to amend the section as we have amended the preceding section.

Mr. McNEILL. There should be a special instruction to the person having charge of the ballot box that he shall preserve the seal unbroken.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is provided for in section 84.

Mr. McNEILL. That applies to the returning officer.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It says:

And this he shall do without effacing or covering the seal of the deputy returning officer.

Mr. CARGILL.

Mr. McNEILL. I may be harking back on the last section. I do not think there is much fear of the returning officer's seal being broken, but the deputy returning officer's seal is liable to be broken in carrying the box from one place to another.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is in connection with the previous section.

Mr. McNEILL. Yes.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We might allow that section to go through with the understanding that we will consider this amendment in reference to the seal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suggest that we make it read as follows: 'And this he shall do without effacing or covering the seals thereto affixed.'

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, that will cover it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is moved to amend section 84, to read in this way:

And this he shall do without effacing or covering the seal of the deputy returning officer.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. Referring again to section 83, I would make a suggestion to the hon. Solicitor General. Subsection 3, of section 83, reads as follows:

The poll book, the envelopes containing the ballot papers, the envelope containing the voters' lists, and all other documents which served at the election shall then be placed in the large envelope supplied for the purpose, and this large envelope shall then be sealed and placed in the ballot box.

I think besides the seal of the returning officer the envelope should also have the seals of the agents.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That would come in when we take up the other amendment.

On section 85,

Mr. GILLIES. Is section 84 passed?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, everything is open; we are discussing the whole thing.

Mr. GILLIES. Section 84 says:

The returning officer, upon the receipt by him of each of the ballot boxes, shall take every precaution for its safe-keeping and for preventing any person other than himself and his election clerk from having access thereto.

Why these words, 'and his election clerk?' The ballot box is confided to the care and custody of the returning officer. Why then should the election clerk have access to it? I would suggest to the hon. Solicitor General that the words 'and his election clerk' be stricken out.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Maybe the returning officer has died in the in-

terval, or something has occurred that would prevent him taking part in the addition, under which circumstances the election clerk takes his place.

Mr. GILLIES. In the event of such a contingency provision should be made for it. I submit that the fewer who have access to the ballot box the better.

Mr. INGRAM. There are many cases where the ballot boxes are placed in the election clerk's office for safe-keeping.

Mr. F. FORTIN (Laval). Section 85 would be hard to work out. It says :

The returning officer, at the place, day and hour appointed by his proclamation, and after having received all the ballot boxes, shall proceed to open them—

And so forth. In the first place it might happen that the day and hour appointed by the proclamation would come before all the ballot boxes had been received.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is provided for in section 87.

Mr. POWELL. He can adjourn in that case under section 87.

Mr. FORTIN. Well, there is another point I want to mention to the committee. I would suggest that it be made to read that the opening of these boxes and the addition of the votes shall take place only after due notice has been given to the member elected and the opposition candidate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is issued in the proclamation.

Mr. FORTIN. At the time the proclamation is issued, but the candidates should get notice after the voting day. I remember that the law required such notice to be given. I make the suggestion, but I would not insist upon its adoption. It seems to me that an opportunity should be given to the candidates to be present.

Mr. POWELL. The best test in these matters is as to how they practically work out. I do not think that any trouble has arisen under the old law, which was exactly as it is here. They always got the declaration in some way or other.

Mr. BERGERON. Before we leave section 85, I believe it does not read very well, and I would suggest a change in the latter part of the clause. In line 16, you find :

From the statements contained in the several ballot boxes returned by the deputy returning officers of the ballot papers counted by them.

Those last words, I think, are not very plain. I would suggest that after the word 'candidate' in line 16, all the words following be struck out and that these words be substituted : 'As shown by the statement of the poll prepared by each respective deputy returning officer and contained in an envelope specially labelled for the purpose to

be then deposited in each ballot box.' The only object I have in view is to improve the language of the section.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I fear there is a little too much of circumstance attached to the clause as suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron). He defines the votes that are to be counted as those contained in a statement, which is to be found in an envelope of a particular description. It might be that they could not count the votes unless they happened to be in that envelope; whereas the provision in regard to putting the votes in an envelope is plainly directory.

Mr. SPROULE. I have known it to happen that these statements were put loose in the ballot boxes when the ballots were put in an envelope and tied up with a string. The law now enables the deputy returning officer to count them as long as they are found within the ballot box. If you say that the returning officer shall count what he finds in an envelope and he finds nothing in the envelope how can he count then.

Mr. BERGERON. In future the deputy returning officer will have to put them in an envelope that is all. Now, I will suggest an amendment to paragraph 2. The law now provides that where there is an equality of votes, the returning officer shall vote and then declare the man for whom he votes elected. Now, suppose one of the candidates should ask for a recount, and that the result of that recount was that the votes were again equal. Who, then, would decide the election ?

Mr. TALBOT. If you take one from one man and give it to the other there would not be an equality.

Mr. BERGERON. If there is an equality of votes, when the boxes are opened the returning officer votes for one or the other of the candidates. Then, suppose on a recount before a judge, the man for whom the returning officer voted lost one vote. There would be an equality of votes again. I would replace paragraph 2 by this :

The result of the final addition of the votes shall be made public there and then by the returning officer, and the candidate who is found to have a majority of the votes shall be declared elected on the expiration of the six days' delay provided by section 92 ; or in case of a recount, so soon as the judge has handed his certificate of the result of such recount or final addition to the returning officer.

Under this, instead of counting the votes and declaring the man elected immediately, he would wait until the six days for a recount had elapsed, and then if there is still an equality of votes the returning officer preserves his right to vote for one or the other.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is provided for already. The first proceeding is to go before the returning officer, who makes an addition of the votes according

to the statements placed in the ballot boxes by the deputy returning officers. In the event of an equality, then the returning officer casts his vote for one or the other. Then on the recount, the judge deals with the ballots and not with the statement in the box. He deals with the ballots exclusively. If he finds that there is an equality he then makes a return and the returning officer casts his vote.

Mr. BERGERON. Then the returning officer will vote twice.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. By two different processes. That is the law, and I do not think we can improve on that.

Mr. BERGERON. There is an anomaly. The first day the returning officer may vote for one man, and then when the judge makes his recount, he could vote for the other one if he liked.

Mr. TALBOT. He might be open to conviction.

Mr. BERGERON. There is that danger.

Mr. POWELL. The returning officer does not in any proper use of the term vote twice. The first time he does not place a ballot in the box at all, and so it is not taken into account by the judge on a recount.

Mr. BERGERON. What proof have you of that?

Mr. POWELL. The recount is a recount of the ballots put into the envelopes by the deputy returning officer.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Does not the returning officer put his ballot in the box?

Mr. POWELL. No; he takes the returns, and if the returns show a tie, he declares one of the candidates elected.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In practice, as far as I have seen it, the returning officer always casts a ballot. He cannot vote in any other way than by marking a ballot according to law.

Mr. POWELL. That does not mean that he deposits a ballot. The time for depositing ballots has gone by. With reference to the criticism of the hon. member for Beauharnois, it strikes me as a little too critical. If the section is amended as he suggests, the harmony of two or three other sections will be destroyed. The hon. gentleman is entirely in error as to the function of the sealed envelope. The sealed envelope he is referring to is an envelope put into the box and returned to the returning officer to be by him forwarded to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The statement which the returning officer takes as the basis of his count on declaration day is not that sealed envelope at all; it is the statement annexed to the polling book. I would suggest that as the election law has worked well in the

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

past, it is not desirable now to alter three or four sections.

Mr. BERGERON. The light which has been thrown on the subject by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) does not make it any clearer to me. I still persist in saying that unless we make a change in the law, the returning officer will have two votes; but, if the proposition I make is adopted, he will only have one vote, like every one else. The proposition is, that he should not vote until the six days for the recount are past. If nobody asks for the recount, he will give his casting vote, and declare one of the candidates elected. But, if a recount is asked for, the court may find some bad ballots on both sides, and may still come to the conclusion that there is a tie; then, the returning officer will give his casting vote. That would prevent his voting twice. Anything that can be done to avoid the necessity of the returning officer casting his vote should be done. I remember in the local election in my county, in 1892, there was a tie, and the returning officer was called on to give his casting vote; and it was a sad sight, because the man was an employee of the government.

Mr. INGRAM. Let us look at this for a moment in a practical way. There are two candidates in an election, and there happens to be a tie. It is quite natural that the returning officer should cast his ballot in favour of the government candidate. As sections 85, 86, 87 and 88 all work in harmony as they are now, I cannot see any use of amending them; and the penalty provided in section 88 is much more severe than it was before.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not quite understand what the proposition of my hon. friend from Beauharnois is. I want to understand whether he wishes that the returning officer shall not declare any candidate elected until the expiration of the six days, whether or not there be a tie?

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, no; only in case of a tie.

Mr. McNEILL. I must say I think my hon. friend has made out a pretty strong case. Whatever the technicality may be, the broad fact is that the returning officer has voted. Whether you say he has deposited a ballot or not, the Act says he has voted. For many a long day we voted without a ballot. However, we have the ballot now, and the law says the returning officer can vote, whether he deposits a ballot or not. My hon. friend who has just spoken says that he cannot imagine the case of a returning officer voting against the government candidate, because the returning officer is appointed by the government. If the returning officer in my last election had voted, I think he would have voted against me; therefore, I do not think that argument of my hon. friend will altogether hold water.

I do not say whether we should alter the law or not ; but, the hon. member for Beauharnois has made out a very good case to show that the returning officer may vote, and afterwards may vote again.

Mr. WOOD. The vote only counts once.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman has not followed the discussion, I think. He can vote once at the time of the declaration, and he can vote again after the recount.

Mr. WOOD. But, his vote is not considered in the recount at all.

Mr. McNEILL. We have discussed that. The law says it is a vote. It counts as much as any vote can possibly count. It elects the man.

Mr. SPROULE. It is quite clear that the returning officer never uses a ballot at all, because the ballots are all sealed up. It is only when he counts up the statements of the deputy returning officers and finds that there is a tie that he gives the casting vote. When the judge deals with the question on a recount, he only deals with the ballots ; he has nothing to do with what the returning officer does ; and if, as the result of the recount, there is an equality of votes, the returning officer is called on, in the language of the Act, to give the casting vote the same as before.

Mr. McNEILL. All I am speaking of is the anomalous condition of things by which the returning officer may vote one way at one time, and the other way at the other time.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

## AFTER RECESS.

### SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 176) to incorporate the South Shore Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Flint.)

### ELECTION ACT—AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 133) to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

On section 88,

Mr. SPROULE. There ought to be some provision made, if the ballots are there and the statement is missing, authorizing the returning officer to open the packages and count the ballots.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would not like to have that. Paragraph 2 makes provision that in the event of a statement being absent from the box, the returning officer shall use all reasonable efforts to ascertain the exact number of votes given for each candidate.

Mr. SPROULE. But very often the statements are not made, and there ought to be some means of counting the votes.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) to look at the beginning of section 83, where, I think, by the amendment we have practically met the difficulty that he points out :

The deputy returning officer and the poll clerk, immediately after the completion of the counting of the votes, shall take and subscribe respectively the oaths in Forms 'X' and 'V,' which shall remain attached to the poll books; after which the deputy returning officer shall make out a statement in triplicate—

And so on. Then, at the beginning of section 80 :

Immediately after the closing of the polls, the deputy returning officer shall count the number of voters whose names appear on the poll books, and make an entry thereof on a line immediately below the name of the voter who voted last.

The difficulty pointed out by the hon. gentleman is a real difficulty, but I think it has been met in this way.

Mr. BENNETT. How many of the clauses of section 88 are new ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The whole of the last part, which is taken from the Bill of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram).

Mr. BENNETT. That is, paragraph 4 is the only new one ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

On section 90,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would move to strike out the words on the 50th and 51st line, 'Or in the North-west Territories to a judge of the Supreme Court.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There might be a case where the deputy returning officer had improperly counted or improperly rejected no ballots, and yet the statement returned by him would be wrong. I remember one case mentioned by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery last year, a case where A had 100 votes and B 50 at a particular polling section. The deputy, in making up the statement, reversed the numbers and gave B 100 and A 50, and B was returned and sat throughout the succeeding sessions of that parliament. The mistake was not discovered until long after it had occurred. Would that case be included in the expression 'improperly counted?' Would it not be better to add something to cover a case where the statement of the deputy returning officer is incorrect ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the section at present would cover that case.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to call attention to subsection 5 relating to the packages that may be opened to see if the contents are in the several packages; first, the unused ballot papers; second, those rejected; and third despoiled ballot papers. In section 8 the judge has the powers of a returning officer as to the papers that may not be returned. I have in mind a case that may have been an accident or it may have been designed. Suppose a deputy returning officer puts in ballot papers in the spoiled ballot envelope, that might be counted afterwards by the judge for one of the candidates. When the judge opens that package he has no power to call witnesses, with respect to the contents of that package. His court is not a court of inquiry further than it would relate to the powers of a returning officer, and he could not act, even if it was known as a fact that the rejected ballots were put in the same envelope with the spoiled ballots. A designing deputy could defeat a candidate by putting them in the wrong envelope, and nothing but an election petition would give relief. I know a place where that took place. As a layman I am unable to suggest a remedy, but the hon. gentleman will see that that might be the means of turning the result of an election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. But after the poll is closed the deputy returning officer is obliged to make a package of the ballots that he counted, then he makes a package of ballots that were rejected, and another package of ballots that he looked upon as spoiled. So you have got all the ballots in those three packages, and on a recount these would all be opened.

Mr. CLANCY. The spoiled ballots would be put in an envelope by themselves, but when the ballots are being counted it is found there are several other ballots marked in the same way. In the judgment of the deputy returning officer those ballots were improperly marked and would be rejected ballots. Now, by mistake or by design he puts those ballots marked in the same way in the spoiled ballot envelope, and the judge has no power to call witnesses to show whether that was done by mistake or by design.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the safeguard we have put around the counting of ballots will be sufficient to cover such cases.

Mr. CLANCY. But the rejected ballots are put in with the spoiled ballots.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I beg your pardon.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand me. I say that the deputy returning officer may put, either by mistake or design, before the envelopes are sealed up, ballots that he rejected, into the

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

envelope into which they are not intended to go at all, namely, into the envelope for spoiled ballots. If they go in there once there is no means of determining their value, whether put in by design or mistake. If they once go in there they remain as spoiled ballots. Although the fact is known to many persons that by mistake they were put in there, or by design, you cannot touch them afterwards. There should be some means of inquiring into that where a case arises.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). I see the point that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) wishes to make. It is this: The deputy returning officer, coming across ballots that he believes are improperly marked, will put them into the rejected envelope instead of the spoiled envelope, or rather, in the spoiled envelope instead of the rejected envelope.

Mr. CLANCY. No, he puts them into the envelope for spoiled ballots.

Mr. PUTTEE. According to the law they are not spoiled, they are only rejected, and that can be done either through design or ignorance. As a matter of fact you will find that the deputy is often in doubt, and anything which is not properly marked he is very apt to put into the spoiled envelope. At the recount before the judge in Winnipeg he saw that difficulty in this matter. He found spoiled and rejected ballots, and he found out by the poll book that ballots were marked spoiled ballots which were really only rejected ballots. There was in one case two which were so spoiled, and these were thrown out. There were enough ballots to alter the result that were put into the envelope for spoiled ballots which should have been put into the envelope for rejected ballots.

Mr. GEO. LANDERKIN (South Grey). There is a difficulty in this matter which arose in a recount in which I was concerned. It was found upon examining the ballots which had been counted and had been placed in the respective envelopes for each, and which had been certified to by the returning officer and the scrutineers at the polls in this election that was held in my own riding, that four ballots had been taken out of the envelopes in which the ballots marked for myself were placed and four substituted bearing the name of my opponent. When it came before the judge the judge was at a loss to know whether he could reject the forged ballots that had been placed in the envelope, and which were forged after the election and placed in these envelopes. The judge was quite conscious, and stated so, that he believed them to be fraudulent, yet he scarcely had the power to set them aside, and there is a difficulty. Further, in this case, although they had stolen twenty-four ballots and forged twenty-four more, making in all

forty-eight ballots, which was two more than my majority, we gained at the recount, and the result was not changed. Had it not been that there was a gain in the recount the forged ballots perhaps would have been counted, and the people would have been deprived of the majority candidate. So, there is a difficulty in that way, because the judge has not the power under the law to decide in reference to the validity, or invalidity, of these fraudulent ballots. These ballots were placed there after the election. There was no doubt of that, because the deputy returning officer and the two scrutineers, one upon either side, made a certificate as to the number of ballots that were placed in each envelope. There could have been no doubt about that, and there was no doubt about the ballots being fraudulent ballots. The judge was satisfied of that, and so expressed himself, yet he had not the power to set them aside, and he asked for an adjournment to see if the law would permit him to reject these fraudulent ballots and allow the majority candidate to be returned. Whether it is wise to open the door and allow the judge to call witnesses in such a case as this is a question to be considered. I agree with the hon. Solicitor General that it will scarcely be a wise thing to do, although we know that there are difficulties, and this is a case in which I saw the difficulty. The judge saw the difficulty, and it was only by the gains that we made in the recount that the will of the people was not set aside.

Mr. POWELL. While it is impossible to guard against error entirely, I would ask the hon. Solicitor General's attention to a suggestion which, I think, will help to cure or lessen the evil to a great extent. If he will direct his attention to section 80 of the Bill, he will see that it reads :

Immediately after the closing of the poll, the deputy returning officer shall—

Then insert the words : 'Put the spoiled ballots in envelopes to be provided for that purpose'; and then he writes underneath the poll book so that no name can be afterwards added, his name, and after that, in the order of sequence, he opens the ballot box. If you make it a condition precedent to the opening of the ballot box that the spoiled ballots should be put in the proper envelope and sealed, the deputy returning officer cannot possibly get the ballots mixed up. You cannot guard against stupidity entirely, but that would reduce it to a minimum.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That would also involve an amendment to section 82.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How would it meet the difficulty ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does not meet the difficulty entirely, but it renders it less likely that such a thing would occur.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As I understood it the point of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) was that the deputy returning officer, either wilfully or unconsciously, might take a certain number of ballots voted for Smith and put them into the spoiled ballot envelope, and thus when the spoiled ballot paper was opened the returning officer would have no power to count them because they were returned to him in a sealed paper as spoiled ballots. Then, if it appeared from the total of the count that there must have been some mistake made there is no means under the Act of enabling the returning officer to count these ballots.

Mr. POWELL. My suggestion goes upon the principle that prevention is better than cure. The difficulty is that the deputy returning officer gets them mixed up. He puts ballots into one package that should go into the other. But, if the only ballots he has are spoiled ballots he cannot get them into the other package, and if before he proceeds to count at all he puts them into an envelope labelled 'spoiled ballots,' there is no danger.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not think there is much danger of that arising with scrutineers on each side. They will see that spoiled ballots are put into the spoiled ballot envelope, and that the candidates' ballots are put into the candidates' envelope. I do not see how a case could arise unless there was collusion amongst them.

Mr. POWELL. No, it is not a case of collusion at all. In West Huron, where it was not a case of intentional fraud, they were mixed up together. You will see by the record that ballots which were rejected were actually included among those marked 'spoiled.' This suggestion I make will reduce the difficulty to a minimum.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In the North Bruce election ballots were all thrown loosely into the ballot box. I do not think that was done ignorantly; it must have been done wilfully, and the law should take cognizance of it and prevent recurrence of that kind of thing.

Mr. POWELL. You can only do it by punishing the offender.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was a worse case than the West Huron case, and it was very apparent why it was done. The ballots were thrown loosely into the ballot box, and the judge had the greatest difficulty in coming to a decision at all.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. On the true construction of the statute there cannot be any difficulty if you take the law as it is; but, at the same time, the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) would obviate the appearance of difficulty, and it should be adopted.

Mr. B. RUSSELL (Halifax). The spoiled ballot is a ballot which is brought by the voter to the deputy returning officer, because the voter has inadvertently put some mark on it which would make it ineffective. What is to hinder the deputy returning officer from so effectually spoiling that ballot paper that it cannot possibly be used again?

Mr. CLANCY. The suggestion made by the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland covers the whole case and should be adopted.

Mr. BENNETT. In a case where there is a senior county judge and a junior county judge, has the Solicitor General made any provision as to before which judge the recount shall be held?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I should think it would be a matter for arrangement between the two judges. In our province, where there are four or five judges sitting in one district, the judges arrange it among themselves.

Mr. BENNETT. In the province of Ontario there are constituencies which are made up in part of two different counties. After the general elections of 1896, there was one case which caused a good deal of comment. A riding was in part composed of two different counties. An appointment was made by one county court judge for a recount, and for reasons best known to himself, one of the candidates afterwards went to a judge who had jurisdiction over part of that riding, applying for and obtaining a recount, although an appointment for a recount had been made previously by another judge. It seems to me that the law should provide for some uniformity in this matter. I refer to the North Ontario case. Judge Mahaffy, in whose judicial district a large portion of the riding was situated, had issued an order appointing a hearing for a recount, and then Judge Dartnell, who was judge of a county, part of which went into the riding, made another appointment under which the recount was held. I would ask the Solicitor General whether he has considered a contingency like that arising?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Those who wish a recount should have it before whatever judge they see fit. Both judges are supposed to do what is right, and I do not see that it makes much difference. The junior judge gets a smaller salary, and I do not see why he should be debarred.

Mr. BERGERON. That is not the point.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the junior judge is qualified, I do not see why he should not act as well as the senior judge. The recount in which I was concerned was held before the junior judge, and no objection could be urged against him. He was equally as able and as honest and as straightforward as the other judge. If you are going to lay down a rule like that, you would discriminate

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

unfairly against the junior judges, and I think it would not be a proper thing for this parliament to do.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me point out the circumstances in the North Ontario case. The defeated candidate applied to Judge Mahaffy for a recount, and the order went out for a recount to be held. Then, the candidate who had been declared elected applied to the other judge for a recount and obtained his order. Such disgraceful proceedings as that should not be allowed. The result was that there was a conflict between the two judges as to which had the right. It degrades law and justice to have two judges conflicting on a point like that. Here was the defeated candidate going to a judge who had the largest portion of the riding in his judicial district, and getting an order for a recount; and although the other candidate had been declared elected, he applied for a recount to the other judge, and as the returning officer saw fit not to obey the order of Judge Mahaffy, he went before the judge who had granted the recount on the application of the elected candidate. This judge only counted part of the ballots and then declared the present member elected. The ballots were then brought down to Ottawa, and a further recount was defeated. I think it should be declared here, once for all, that the recount should be held before one particular judge of the district, and it should be granted only at the instance of the defeated candidate, not at the instance of the elected candidate.

Mr. McNEILL. We have passed away to some extent from the question of the spoiled ballots; but I think there is a good deal in what was suggested by my hon. friend from Halifax, if I caught his suggestion rightly; that is, that the spoiled ballots should be ear-marked, as it were, so that there should be no doubt about them. I should like to ask the Solicitor General: Does it not rest with the deputy returning officer to say whether a ballot is spoiled or not?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There cannot be any dispute about it, because it is a ballot that does not go into the box.

Mr. McNEILL. Then why should that ballot be left in a condition to be confounded with any other ballot? Why not let the deputy returning officer write 'spoiled' on it, or put a cross on it, or do something to the ballot itself which will make it impossible to have the ballot confounded with any other ballot afterwards? It is quite right, as my hon. friend from Westmoreland suggested, that the arrangement should be that before the ballot box is opened, the envelope should be sealed and disposed of; but suppose that should not be done. What then? I think it very strange that the judge should be prevented from dealing with that matter at all. Suppose bal-

lots which are not spoiled happen to be included in that envelope; suppose this is done by design; suppose there is fraud in the matter, it seems to me, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) said, to be an unfortunate condition of things that the judge should be prevented altogether from dealing with them.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think it possible, if the judge knows the exact number of spoiled ballots that ought to be in a package, that he can be precluded from counting any others which may be found in that packet. What is the packet opened for? If after he opens the packet, the judge comes to the conclusion that there are ballots there which are not spoiled, but which came there by mistake, what is he going to do with them? He must count them.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in regard to the practice. I can point to one case at least where the judge did not count the ballots in the envelope. He must leave the ballots as they are in the envelope unless he calls witnesses.

Mr. COCHRANE. I want to draw the attention of the Solicitor General to a case that happened in the riding which I have the honour to represent. I agree with him that there would be no use of the judge opening the envelope containing the spoiled ballots without seeing if there were any ballots in it which he could recognize as good ballots. In the case I speak of there was a recount, and with the spoiled ballots two ballots were included which the judge decided were not spoiled. They were considered spoiled by the deputy returning officer, but when the judge came to examine them he found that they had been marked by voters who wet the pencils more than they ought. They put the cross opposite the name of Mr. Mallory, my opponent, and when the papers were folded the cross made an impression on the opposite side. The judge found that they were marked properly for Mr. Mallory, and counted them for him.

Mr. McNEILL. I still think there can be no possible objection to having an arrangement by which the spoiled ballots would be ear-marked.

Mr. POWELL. If you get them out of the way, that will be sufficient.

Mr. McNEILL. Suppose you do not get them out of the way. If you provide that this envelope is not to be put into the ballot box at all, that is another matter; but it would be a double precaution to have the spoiled ballots ear-marked. May I refer to another matter while on my feet? Earlier in the day I asked my hon. friend a question with regard to a case where envelopes had not been provided and could not be obtained and where the ballots had to be put at the

bottom of the ballot box under the books. That was a case which occurred at a particular poll in my own election. I think it would be well to have some arrangement made which would relieve the judge from a great deal of responsibility in a case of that kind.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think the judge ought to have any trouble in such circumstances. If the ballots are there and properly marked for identification, he ought to be able to count them. If the committee are of opinion that there ought to be a double security with reference to the spoiled ballots, a verbal amendment to section 73 will provide for the spoiled ballots being defaced to such an extent that when they go into the receptacle they will be spoiled beyond redemption. I think myself that the suggestion of my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) might meet the difficulty.

Mr. BERGERON. Before we go any further, I do not know whether my hon. friend has had his attention called to this. I find that this Bill is different from the old law in this respect, that there were four grounds for application for a recount in the old law and there are only three now.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) drew my attention to that. There are two or three amendments I have to make. In section 90, in addition to the amendment I suggested on lines 50 and 51. I would like to amend the section on lines 5 and 6, page 23: 'Or with the clerk of the said Supreme Court.' I propose to strike out those words. They apply to the North-west Territories. In the North-west Territories, application for a recount has to be made to a judge of the Supreme Court, but if you eliminate the judge of the Supreme Court as one of the tribunals to which application is to be made, you have to eliminate the clerk of the court when you come to make your deposit.

Amendment agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. On line 13, I would move to strike out the figure 3 and substitute 2.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend has suggested that the difficulty to which I refer is covered by subsection 3, in line 1, of page 23, but that only deals with the case where the returning officer has improperly added up the votes. The point I made was, that subhead 1 and subhead 2 did not seem to meet the case where the deputy returning officer, although he had not improperly counted or rejected any ballot, may, nevertheless, have put the figures down wrong in his statement. What is meant by improper counting of ballot papers is counting ballot papers which are not properly marked within the meaning of the Act, and rejecting papers which are properly marked.

You do not include in that the case where he properly counts the ballot papers, but, nevertheless, in his statement puts down a wrong number to either candidate.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If my hon. friend will look at section 83, he will find that on the close of the poll the deputy returning officer and his poll clerk take oath and make out a statement in triplicate. That statement is put in the box. On a recount that statement is not dealt with, but what is dealt with is the ballots. Therefore, on a recount the ballots are counted and the statement is not referred to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That does not meet my point. We are dealing with the grounds on which you can demand a recount. In the case I have put, you cannot make an affidavit under this section, because you do not come within any part of it, and you cannot get your recount. Take the case I have suggested, where the ballots were properly counted and rejected, but, nevertheless, the statement was wrong.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Therein consists the improper count.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, the language is 'improperly counting any ballot papers,' and not 'the' ballot papers.

Mr. POWELL. There was a case actually occurred in New Brunswick in which the numbers were thirty for one candidate and fifty for the other. By a sheer clerical error, they were reversed, and that is a case we want to be covered. That was not improper counting, but was a clerical error in crediting the one candidate with the number of votes given to the other.

Mr. ELLIS. I think that was only in the newspapers.

Mr. POWELL. It actually took place.

Mr. CLANCY. One is an incorrect counting and the other an improper counting.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Where is the difference?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me there is a clear distinction between improperly counting ballot papers—that is, counting as good those which are bad—and properly counting ballot papers, but making an incorrect statement of the result.

Amendment to strike out the word '3' and insert the word '2' agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. On page 24, line 45, I move to strike out the following words: 'or in the North-west Territories to the Supreme Court.'

Mr. BERGERON. It seems to me the subsections are not put in regular order. What should be subsection No. 2 is subsection No. 3. The order of the judge to the returning officer is the first thing done after

the judge has granted the demand of the candidate for a recount. Subsection 3 should be subsection 10.

Subsection 3 instead of being the one on the Bill, should be subsection 10 in the Act, which provides, 'return not to be made until judge's certificate is received.' Subsection 4 should be subsection 5; subsection 5 should be subsection 6, and so on, so that everything will be in order. Of course, it does not change the law, but it would be more regular, and, to an outsider, would read better than the Bill as it is now.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It may be that there is something in this that I cannot see; but if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) will look at subsection 2, he will find it provided that notice is to be given to the candidate. The candidate is entitled to notice at as early a period as the returning officer. I do not know that it makes much difference whether subsection 2 is before subsection 3 or vice versa.

Mr. BERGERON. There are two things that come before that, first the order of the judge to the returning officer, and that the return cannot be made until the judge's certificate is received, and then the service of notice to the candidate. The other things are matters of procedure and should come in afterwards.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Under subsection 1 the judge appoints the time, after the recount is called for. Then comes the notice to the candidate, and then the order of the judge to the returning officer. It seems to be in order.

Mr. BERGERON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has not read the subsection. The first thing to be done is the order of the judge to the returning officer. To put it in any other way is like putting the plough before the horse. We are making a law which is to remain upon the statute-book, and it should be in proper form.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is an old law and has been on the statute-book a long time, and I never heard it criticised from this point of view before.

Mr. INGRAM. I agree with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that section 90 should be amended so as to specify which judge shall hold the recount.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That would lead to a great deal of trouble.

Mr. INGRAM. Before the absence of such a section caused a lot of trouble in North Ontario, and also in West Elgin in the local, each party trying to take advantage of the other by securing the services of the judge most favourable to them.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) has only pointed out one case in which this has occurred since

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

the law was first put in operation, many years ago. I do not think that is sufficient reason for an amendment. We must rely to some extent at least upon the sense of decency of the judges. For my part, I have never known a case of one judge trying to cut the ground from under the feet of another.

Mr. INGRAM. There was also the case in the local which I have mentioned. I think something should be put in the section after the opening words :

If, within four days after that within which the returning officer has made the addition of the votes for the purpose of declaring the candidate or candidates elected, it is made to appear, on the affidavit of a credible witness, to a judge of the county court—

—and so on, some such words as these :

After one application has been made, no second application may be made bearing on the same recount.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram). Before we leave this section, I would like to see if some form could not be agreed upon to cover the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden).

Mr. McNEILL. The difficulty seems to be that the word 'counted' is ambiguous. In one case it means 'allowed,' and in the second case, and in other cases, it means 'enumerated.' The words here are :

(1) Has improperly counted, or (2) has improperly rejected.

In this case 'counted' is evidently taken in the sense of 'allowed,' being balanced as against 'rejected.' As I understand my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden), there ought to be words covering the idea of improper enumeration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These are statements that must be made in order to give the judge jurisdiction. The mere statement that the returning officer has improperly counted gives that jurisdiction, and when the judge orders the recount he has the case before him, and takes the ballots and counts them up. It does not matter whether the man has or has not made an improper statement—the judge does not look at that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suggest that this clause 3 should be made 4, and that the words should be inserted :

—or (13) that the deputy returning officer has improperly added up the vote or incorrectly stated the result of such adding up—

And then go on with the present clause 3 as clause 4.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not object to the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax); but in practice, what is done is that the man who applies for the recount

takes the words of the statute and swears to these words. So, it seems to me that a great deal of this discussion is unnecessary.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He simply makes the statement that is necessary to give the judge jurisdiction.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax), and myself, are accustomed with dealing with men who think first whether they can truthfully swear to the language in the statute or not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But there might be a case in which the ballot had been improperly received instead of having been improperly rejected. Then how could you make the affidavit ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There must have been a false count.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That leads back to what we mean by improperly counting ballot papers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does not improper counting necessarily involve an improper statement of the counting ? Supposing there were twenty ballots for A, and through an improper count twenty-five were returned for A. I say in that case he has improperly counted those ballots.

Mr. MARTIN. I think some change requires to be made before this clause is applicable to Prince Edward Island. In this recount there are three grounds of application : First, improperly counted ballots ; second, improperly rejected ballots ; and third, if the returning officer has improperly added up the vote. By section 67 of the Act in Prince Edward Island where the qualification is decided at the polls, there being no voters' list, when there is any doubt about a vote being genuine it is marked objected and the ballot is initialled. I propose that at this recount the judge shall at the same time, that is if the candidate asks it, go into these objections concerning the initialled ballots, and I propose on page 23, after the figure 3, to insert the following words :

That in Prince Edward Island any person not qualified to vote in such electoral district shall state the name, designation and residence of such person, also the name and number of the polling division in which he has voted.

Otherwise, as regards a vote objected to, and the ballot to be initialled, you have no remedy unless you go to an expensive trial. But by adding this provision the county judge shall decide the validity of these initialled ballots. That change would necessitate another change in line 7. After the word 'dollars' insert the following words :

—or in Prince Edward Island \$300 if the application is made on the third ground.

That is, if the application is made on the third ground it would necessitate a larger deposit. In a recount on the first, second and fourth grounds it is \$100, and I propose to make \$300 when made under the amendments I propose. I propose also, in the same section, in line 13, to strike out the word 'three' and insert the word 'two' in lieu thereof. And in line 14, after the word 'application,' insert the following :

—or decide whether any person in Prince Edward Island not qualified to vote has voted, if the said application is made on the third ground of application.

I think these provisions are necessary in regard to Prince Edward Island. On page 23, in lines 19 and 20, section 90, I propose to make some further amendments. I propose, in subsection 2, to strike out the following words, 'or to make such final addition as the case may be,' and to insert 'as aforesaid and when the recount is demanded on the third ground of application the said notice shall include a copy of the affidavit aforesaid.' I propose to make the application on the ground that the applicant furnishes the judge with a list of the votes he is going to contest, and at the end of subsection 4 of section 90, I propose to insert the following subsection :

At the time and place appointed and before proceeding to recount the votes, the judge may receive an affidavit from the candidate or his agent, against whose return the affidavit mentioned in subsection 1 of this section has been directed, declaring that any other person not qualified to vote has voted, giving the name, designation and residence of such person, and also the name and number of the polling division in which he has voted, but the affidavit authorized by this subsection shall not be received by the judge, except where the recount has been demanded on the third ground of application.

I furnished the hon. Solicitor General with a copy of these amendments, and I hope he has given them attention, because these amendments are imperative in order to carry out the provisions of the Bill in regard to Prince Edward Island. Following on, at line 49, on the same page, after the word 'counted,' I propose to insert the following : 'Included in Prince Edward Island those numbered and initialled under section 67 of this Act.' The clause would then read :

At the time and place appointed, and in the presence of the said person, the judge shall proceed to make such final addition, in the manner prescribed by section 85, or to recount all the votes or ballot papers returned by the several deputy returning officers, as the case may be, and shall, in the latter case, open the sealed packets containing (1) the used ballot papers which have been counted, included in Prince Edward Island those numbered and initialled under section 67 of this Act; (2) the rejected ballot papers; (3) the spoiled ballot papers—and no other ballot papers.

Mr. MARTIN.

Then, turning to the next page and to subsection 7, leave out from the word 'in,' in line 8, to the word 'shall,' in line 9, and insert the following words :

Subsections 1 and 2 of section 81 of this Act, and in Prince Edward Island the judge, when recounting the votes, shall decide the qualifications of all voters whose ballot papers were numbered and initialled under section 67 of this Act as having been objected to on the ground of want of qualification, and who have been described in the affidavits provided for in this section, and for the purposes of such decision he shall hear the candidates or their agents, and may examine on oath the person whose vote has been objected to, or any other person. Both candidates may be represented by counsel, and the judge shall ascertain the facts, and may take such other evidence as he thinks necessary and is able to obtain, and may require the attendance of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence, and shall, for all purposes of such decision, have all the powers of a county court judge in Prince Edward Island, exercising his ordinary jurisdiction in civil cases.

Then, subsection a will be as follows :

(a) In determining the qualification of the voters aforesaid, the judge shall not identify nor allow to be identified, any ballot paper, until it has been decided that the person casting it was not legally entitled to vote, in which case he shall identify the said ballot paper, and deduct the vote or votes marked thereon from the total number of votes received by the candidate or candidates in whose favour it has been marked.

Then, going on to subsection b :

The judge—

And so forth, down to the end of the section. I propose that it shall read :

—shall verify or correct the ballot paper account and statement of the number of votes given for each candidate; and upon the completion of such recount, or as soon as he has so ascertained the result of the poll, he shall seal up all the said ballot papers in separate packets.

Unless we have these changes made in the Bill, the provision which the hon. Solicitor General has made in regard to the initialling of ballots, will be of no avail, and almost useless. These initialled ballots are all counted—though many of them will be bad. They are to be put into separate envelopes, and my amendment provides a simple way of deciding on their validity before a county judge, which otherwise would involve a very expensive trial before a superior court. I hope the hon. Solicitor General will see his way clear to adopt these amendments. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has had these amendments in his hands for some days, and I hope he will give his assistance in order to perfect this Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman's amendments are all in one direction, and that is to add to the powers of the county court judge. I know his object very well and I sympathize with his

motive. I have had an opportunity of going over these proposed amendments with the hon. Solicitor General. I do not know how it is possible to superadd to the power of the county judge of simply recounting the votes, the power to enter upon a scrutiny which the Superior Court has now under the Controverted Elections Act. The only possible mode of proceeding is under the Controverted Elections Act. I want to point out that if you proceed under the Controverted Elections Act, you will have thirty or forty days longer, and you will file a petition without having reference to fraud. You can confine your petition entirely to the qualification, and you can in that way simplify the proceeding by confining it to a scrutiny, and you can give ample notice to both sides as to what votes are going to be contested. I will tell you my doubts which justify me in opposing this amendment and how insuperable the difficulties appear to me. Here, you would have four days within which the recount must be applied for. In any ordinary rural county, such as I represent, and such as the hon. gentleman represents, it is utterly impossible for him, or for myself, to know at the end of four days how many votes have been challenged, whose votes have been challenged and whose have not. I cannot know within four days. If an election were to take place in November, or in the winter, when travelling is bad, I could not possibly know. I could not get any particulars of the different ballots which had been challenged, or the grounds upon which the voters had been challenged. Suppose I were the defeated candidate and I made an application to the county court judge to have a scrutiny as well as a recount, surely I would have to furnish particulars as to the names of the parties whose votes I intended to scrutinize. That would be an impossibility in the time left to me. On the other hand, suppose I were successful, and my hon. friend was attacking my seat, and he applied for a recount and a scrutiny, and I got notice on the fourth day, and wanted to make a counter petition, how am I going to get sixty or seventy names that voted for him and that I object to. I could not possibly formulate a counter-petition in the time.

Mr. McNEILL. How many days will it take?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In a large rural district, where there might be fifty or sixty polls, where you would have to go over the different votes objected to and carefully examine the evidence, it would take a couple of weeks, I suppose. You would have to have petition and counter-petition and particulars and counter-particulars delivered to each side, and allow a reasonable time for the parties to send out and get their witnesses. It would be a regular contest lasting for weeks, perhaps. Here we have a simple

provision for remedying the evil which might arise from an improper counting by the deputy returning officers, and to superadd cumbrous machinery to that would simply spoil the entire effect of it. Everything my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) seeks to obtain can be obtained by a simple petition under the Controverted Elections Act, limiting the petitions to a scrutiny, and you can file another petition for bribery and corruption afterwards if you chose. I appreciate and sympathize with the object of my hon. friend (Mr. Martin), for his object would necessarily be my object, namely, to have the improper votes determined to be improper at the earliest possible moment, but I do not think it can be done in the way he suggests. I think it can be done the other way although it might take a longer time, but no longer time than is essential to enable the parties to martial their witnesses. In bribery and corruption charges there is immense delay, because candidates have to be examined and particulars and counter-particulars have to be furnished, but such delays are not necessarily incident to a simple petition for a scrutiny. I take it, that a simple petition for a scrutiny could be got through with, with very much less delay than a petition for an election trial on the ground of ordinary bribery and corruption. If my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) can satisfy the Solicitor General that he has a feasible scheme that can be worked out, I have no objection to seeing it done, but I have not been able so far to satisfy my own mind that it is feasible.

Mr. MARTIN. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, but I do not think his objections are insuperable. The amendment does not propose to go into bribery and corruption at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand that.

Mr. MARTIN. If there is anything in the objection that the time is too short, it would be a very simple matter to extend the time, if necessary. I do not think there would be much difficulty in making up these lists of objected votes to be submitted to the judge at the recount, because on declaration day the ballot boxes are open, and besides that, a week before on the eve of election day, the poll-books are in the hands of the agents of both candidates, and every one of these names in the different polling divisions would be closely scrutinized. If there had been improper voting by those who had no votes, and whose ballots had been initialled, then, as soon as the election was over they would closely look over the poll-books in every division and get the names of the persons who were objected, and which is to be scrutinized before the county judge. The hon. gentleman knows that it is only these initialled ballots of persons whose names have been marked

'objected to' on the poll-book which would come in question before the county judge. In place of four days, the time might be extended when the application is made under this amendment.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. But, the candidate would not know anything about it until after the application was served.

Mr. **MARTIN**. As soon as the election is over, on the eve of the election, the candidates or their friends know exactly how many votes had been objected to at each polling division. If the vote has been close they can easily go over the number of votes objected to in the riding, and come to a conclusion as to how many of these they could strike off. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows the great expense and delay of proceeding under the Controverted Elections Act, and he knows that my proposal is a very simple and expeditious way of doing it. My only object is to make the Bill as satisfactory to Prince Edward Island as possible.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Hear, hear.

Mr. **MARTIN**. If the minister thinks that four days is too short a time, it can be made ten days if he likes. I think every one of the objections he has raised may be overcome. We find now that the Acts which we had in force some years ago, while suited to those times, do not suit the present time. There are new schemes now—the Ontario machine amongst them—which were not thought of years ago, and we must try to make this Bill as perfect as possible in order to meet these cases.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that we have had the Franchise Act, under which the voting for this House takes place, in operation for very many years in Prince Edward Island; but, nobody there has ever suggested that we should have in the local elections the machinery which we have here suggested. They have a Controverted Elections Act there as we have here, and if any votes are attacked on the ground of the qualifications being irregular or wanting, it must be done by an election petition. If you can see any way of simplifying the Controverted Elections Act, I will join hands with you. If the deputy returning officer counts votes wrongly, against me or against my hon. friend, we have a right to have the votes recounted before the judge at once; but to superadd to that an Act to provide for a scrutiny, appears to me to be impossible.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. So far as I understand the election law of Prince Edward Island, the manner in which the list is made there on election day is so different from the practice in any other province of the Dominion, that it seems to me some machinery should

Mr. **MARTIN**.

be provided to rectify the judgment of the returning officer as to the qualifications of the voters. I understand that in Prince Edward Island there are no electoral lists at all; but a man comes up to vote, and it is then that the question of his qualification is decided; and by whom is it decided? It is decided by the deputy returning officer.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. By the oath of the man himself.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. If he is questioned, he is bound to give certain answers upon oath, and then the deputy returning officer decides whether or not the man has a right to vote.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Then he votes. The returning officer cannot exclude his vote.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. However, the deputy returning officer is vested with certain judicial power and a certain discretion.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. My hon. friend is wrong there. He has no judicial discretion.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. Then, my information is wrong.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Three or four of us here have been through elections in Prince Edward Island for the last thirty years. There is no discretion on the part of the deputy returning officer. If a man comes up claiming an electoral qualification upon a piece of land and takes the oath prescribed by the statute, his vote has to be recorded.

Mr. **MARTIN**. It may be marked 'objected to.'

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. In most other provinces, before the day on which the voting takes place, interested parties have a right to contest a man's vote, and appeal to a judge from the decision of the municipal authorities, or those who make the list, and you have a judicial decision.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Not in the North-west.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. It is the case in all the other provinces, except the North-west. In Prince Edward Island you have no such remedy. Now, it seems to me that if you can remedy the decision of the returning officer as to ballots which have been improperly rejected, you should have some machinery by which you could also remedy the other abuse which exists in the fact that a man not qualified to vote has voted. Everybody knows that under the Controverted Elections Act the proceedings are very expensive and occupy a very long time. What I would suggest would be to substitute the scrutiny. My hon. friend says the practical difficulty would be the short time for the notice. Then, why not extend the time for Prince Edward Island? It would be

simply an appeal from the deputy returning officer, as in all the other provinces.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. My hon. friend is in error in thinking that the deputy returning officer in Prince Edward Island has discretion. It is not so. If a man comes and takes the oath, giving a description of the land which entitles him to vote, his vote must be recorded. Whatever theoretical difficulty may be suggested, there has been no practical difficulty in the matter. We have no more difficulties in Prince Edward Island than they have elsewhere. If anything can be suggested to simplify the matter, I should be very glad. We all desire to get at a simple means of testing whether there has been a bona fide and square election, and the question is, whether that can be achieved in a hap-hazard way by a rush, or whether or not due notice should be given to your opponent, you should file your particulars, have him file his particulars, and then try the issue. There must be ample time given to both sides. I have no prejudices one way or the other, but I have come to the conclusion that the proposition is workable.

Mr. McNEILL. It seems to me that in Prince Edward Island any one who chooses may come and cast a vote, if he is prepared to take the oath. When my hon. friend speaks so lightly of an election petition, he hardly realizes what it means. It means a deposit of \$1,000, and an infinitude of trouble and expenses.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Not if you confine it to a scrutiny.

Mr. McNEILL. I have been advised that a scrutiny is a most expensive thing in the case of a controverted election. But this is a different thing. It is simply allowing the county judge of Prince Edward Island to do what the county judge does with us—say whether this man was entitled to vote or not. The only difference is that with us the county judge does it before the election, and in Prince Edward Island he will do it after the election. It need not be any more expensive than it is in our case, and is very different from a scrutiny under the Controverted Elections Act.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I found that to work this out, you would have to draw a new Controverted Elections Act; and under that Act, you can do it as quickly as with any new machinery you can devise.

Mr. McNEILL. It does seem strange that we cannot get at a decision of this matter by a county judge after an election in Prince Edward Island, as easily as in Ontario before the elections. It is very dangerous as it is.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It has not been found so in fifty or sixty years.

Mr. McNEILL. But we are in a very discreditable position regarding elections at present—a condition that is almost appalling.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. That does not exist with us at all.

Mr. McNEILL. Better adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend and prevent its coming in.

Mr. RUSSELL (Halifax). This is merely a Bill regarding the manner of voting at elections. I quite understand the difficulties in Prince Edward Island owing to the special circumstances, but the object sought to be attained by hon. gentlemen now is really a scrutiny of the vote, and not a mere recount of the ballots. Those two things are entirely different. This Bill merely provides for the conduct of the election, and not for the determining whether right or wrong things have been done with respect to voting. If something is required between this recount and the expense of controverted elections in Prince Edward Island, it would be far better to have a special Bill introduced to provide a cheap and summary way of testing the question as to the rights of voters who have taken the oath and been challenged, rather than intermix with these provisions regarding a recount such provisions as would be adequate to meet the case put by my hon. friend.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The other evening the Solicitor General said he would probably amend the Controverted Elections Act after we had got through with the Bill, and he will probably consider some amendments by which a simple procedure could be devised that would rectify this abuse.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not see that the difficulty can be so great. The votes in question would not be larger and could not go beyond a certain number—that is the number of initialled ballots. Those in every poll would be very small in number, and the candidates would only select those which he knew to be bad, and the investigation would be limited to those under the amendments I propose. The candidate complaining would have to furnish a list of those names when he makes his application, and could not go beyond that list. If the opposing candidate wishes to scrutinize the objected votes, he must also furnish a list, and cannot possibly go beyond that list. I do not think that the labour would be very great. The hon. Minister of Marine made a reference to the Controverted Elections Act. He said that under that Act, you might have a scrutiny without going into

corrupt practices. But he knows that if you claim the seat in a trial under the Controverted Elections Act, your opponent has the right to go into corrupt practices. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) cannot pretend that there is a simple way provided at present. But he knows that if the candidates having the smaller number of votes proceeds, under the Controverted Elections Act, his opponent can enter into charges of bribery and corruption, which would necessitate a long and expensive trial. Of course, if the hon. gentleman does not accept the amendment I propose, he has a large enough majority to carry out his wishes, but if that is his position, I hope he will introduce a Bill amending the Controverted Elections Act to meet the case. He himself has said that a man can go to the poll, and if he takes the oath, his vote is accepted and counted, and there is no remedy. No remedy is provided in this Bill, and so I say it is incumbent on him, as representing that province in this House, to submit a Bill that will be applicable to Prince Edward Island. Under the Controverted Elections Act, a man must be prepared to bear the expense of a long trial, and also to put up \$1,000. The hon. gentleman being a lawyer, that may suit him very well, but I think it will not suit the people of Prince Edward Island. The onus is thrown upon him, if he opposes these amendments, to propose a Bill that will be workable.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) need not wax warm on this subject. We have had manhood suffrage in Prince Edward Island for fifty or sixty years, and there has been no such trouble there as he conjures up. Every man there, *prima facie*, is entitled to a vote, though we may exclude a vote on some technicality occasionally. Between 1873 and 1885 we had this same system of voting, and nobody ever heard of any of these difficulties. You had general elections, and by-elections, and no difficulty arose. So little are these difficulties feared that the legislature has never made provisions for the special trial that he suggests. However, I shall be glad to sit down with him and the Solicitor General, or anybody else, and see if there is any better mode of testing these election votes, than the one which the Controverted Elections Act provides. I am as much interested as anybody in having proper machinery for testing the votes. I want to have an honest vote, and effective means of testing the vote after the election. But as I am at present advised, the Controverted Elections Act meets that case as well as any other law that can be provided. If I am wrong, I am willing to assist the hon. gentleman in making an amendment to the Controverted Elections Act. But I would call his attention to the fact that though we have had manhood suffrage for fifty or sixty years, and have had this system of voting from

Mr. MARTIN.

1873 to 1885, nobody has claimed that there was any wrong to anybody, and fewer petitions have been filed in Prince Edward Island than in any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. MARTIN. If these are good reasons that the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) has given, we have wasted the whole night in trying to perfect this Bill. He says it worked well in Prince Edward Island in 1873 and 1874. What are we making changes for, then? It must be to meet altered circumstances.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MARTIN. But there are difficulties that arise in Prince Edward Island also. When he simply says that the Act was sufficient in years gone by, it seems to me that his argument can hardly be serious. However, I have done my duty. I have proposed these amendments, and I think I have met fairly every objection that he has raised. I have laid the case before the committee as clearly as I could. The hon. gentleman does not say that a remedy is not required, but he simply appears to think that we cannot find a remedy, and seems to think that what applies to other parts of the Dominion, will apply to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. INGRAM. With regard to the point raised by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), if he will look at section 92, subsection 5, I think he will find it meets the point. That section will provide for the return of the papers by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. BERGERON. No, that does not meet the case. That will be discussed when we get to that section.

Mr. INGRAM. I have an amendment that I desire to propose. I propose to move this amendment on the third reading:

That subsection 1 of section 90 is hereby amended by striking out after the word 'votes' in the second line on page 23 thereof the following words:

And if the applicant deposits within the said time with the clerk of the county or district court or with the prothonotary of the said Superior Court in the said judicial district, as the case may be, the sum of \$100 in legal tender or in the bills of any chartered bank doing business in Canada, as security for the costs in connection with the recount or final addition of the candidate appearing by the addition to be elected.

While the member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Martin) wishes to have the deposit increased to \$300, he has shown tonight by his explanation of the way in which they conduct a recount in Prince Edward Island, that their system is much on the same principle as that on which we conduct a recount in the province of Ontario. It is a very expensive operation. In Ontario no deposit is necessary in provincial elections. But in case of appeal

from the recount, as conducted by the county judge there is a provision made in subsection 6 of section 12, of the Revised Statutes of Ontario :

That in case of appeal to the Court of Appeal the judge of the Court of Appeal may direct by whom the cost of appeal shall be paid.

And the judge makes the order accordingly. But so far as the recount is concerned, no deposit is required. The only restriction with respect to a recount in Ontario is that in case the candidate has a majority of 50 or less, he can secure a recount, but if his majority exceeds that number no recount can be granted. I see no reason why we in Ontario should be called upon to deposit anything for a recount. If I wish to have a recount I secure the assistance of a lawyer and pay him for his services, the judge receives a salary for his services, and the returning officer receives payment for his services. No witnesses are required, and there is no cost attached to the proceeding at all. I see no reason therefore why we should be called upon to make a deposit. I have had a recount on a local provincial contest, but I was not called upon to put up a deposit. I fancy if I had been called upon to put up a deposit, very little of it would have been returned to me after the lawyers got through with it.

Mr. BERGERON. I again call the attention of the committee to subsection 9 of this section :

The judge shall forthwith certify the result of the recount or final addition to the returning officer, who shall then declare to be elected the candidate having the highest number of votes; and in case of an equality of votes, the returning officer shall give the casting vote.

This provision is in conflict with section 86 which we passed this afternoon, and which says that if there is an equality of votes the returning officer shall give his casting vote. Well, he has already given his casting vote in the first place, and here you allow him to give another vote. But you are prevented from doing that by section 77, which says that no person shall vote more than once in the same electoral district at the same election. Now, under this subsection the returning officer can vote twice. Why not make the law in such a way that we will not give a man two votes when he can have but one? Whether he votes by ballot or not makes no difference.

Mr. RUSSELL. His vote has only been counted as one vote in the final result.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I am unable to see the matter in the same light as the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). It seems to me that when a recount is asked for, the vote which the returning officer gave to break the tie is practically void and done away with, because the final determination of the election is to be decided by another tribunal. Then he gives his casting vote if necessary,

and the only vote which really counts. His first vote is absolutely void the moment a request is made for a recount.

Mr. BERGERON. But he has already voted.

Mr. HENDERSON. But when the recount is asked for, practically that vote is cancelled.

Mr. McNEILL. But suppose no recount was called for; in that case he had elected the candidate.

Mr. BERGERON. If there is no recount will that candidate remain elected, and if so by whose vote?

Mr. HENDERSON. I repeat that the moment the recount is asked for the first vote given by the returning officer is void by operation of the law, it ceases to have any force or effect whatever, because the final decision of that election is handed over to the judge. If the judge finds there is still an equality of votes without counting in the vote of the returning officer, he then refers it back to the returning officer to give his final vote. But certainly he does not vote twice.

Mr. INGRAM. Can any person point out why it is that the returning officer has not a vote during the election the same as any other elector. The object is, in the case of a tie, that he can give his casting vote.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) brought a point to the attention of the hon. Solicitor General which, although I do not agree with him in his contention, deserves some consideration on the part of the promoter of the Bill. It is in respect to judicial districts in which there may be more than one county court judge, or electoral districts which may be, in part, in different judicial districts. In view of that, I think it would be better that the word 'the' in the fourth line of the section should be changed to 'a.' And then, at the 13th section, it may be added, that in case an application be made to more than one judge, the judge to whom the application is first made shall be seized of jurisdiction to the exclusion of all the rest. The hon. Solicitor General evidently is of the opinion that the matter would work out on that principle. I think it is the common law of the country. A case was cited in Ontario in which one county court judge was first seized of jurisdiction, and another attempted to oust him and to take up a second application. The second judge, if he were aware that the first judge had had the application made to him was really violating, not the Criminal Code, but the criminal common law of the country. I shall call to the hon. Solicitor General's attention the case of Regina vs. Stainsbury 4 T. R. 456, and Regina vs. Great Marlow 2 East 244. These cases are summarized in the following language :

All the justices of each district are equal in authority; but, as it would be contrary to the public interest, as well as indecent, that there should be a contest between different justices, it is agreed that the jurisdiction in any particular case attaches in the first set of magistrates, duly authorized, who have possession and cognizance of the fact, to the exclusion of the separate jurisdiction of all others. So that the acts of any other, except in conjunction with the first, are not only void, but such a breach of the law as subjects them to indictment. It is rather not, however, necessary that the justice hearing the charge should be the same justice before whom the information was laid.

The Solicitor General may have been aware of the authorities when he took the ground, but, if not, this quotation from a very authoritative text-book he will be pleased to know is confirmatory of his opinion. It seems to me that it is desirable that subsection 13 should be added so as to state to whom application should be made.

Mr. BERGERON. On account of the complimentary remarks of the hon. member for Halton, I want to give notice that on the third reading of the Bill I will move that subsection 9 of clause 90 be struck out, because I contend that we would legally give the right to one man to vote twice.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before this clause is carried, I propose that it be amended by adding immediately before the word 'that,' on line 1 of page 23, the following words :

Has made an incorrect statement of the number of ballot papers cast for any candidate or (4)——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think we had better agree to allow this section to be carried, and I will bear in mind the suggestion of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), and endeavour to incorporate it in the Bill so as to make it absolutely clear when we come to consider the amendment later on, and also the amendment of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). I would be obliged to the hon. member for Westmoreland if he would draft that 13th clause which he thinks should be added to the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That will be perfectly satisfactory.

On section 91,

Mr. CASGRAIN. This is not new ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Except that the words 'court or' are inserted in the thirty-fifth line so as to make it read 'court or judge.' It occurred to me, in dealing with this subsection, that it is rather a strange provision. I find it has been the law that a judge in our province shall have jurisdiction to summarily deal with judges of the Superior Court. I think that is rather curious, but it has been the law, and I do not like to make a change.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. CASGRAIN. You can apply it in the province of Quebec, to the Court of Queen's Bench, where an order might be made that a judge of the Superior Court should comply with such a direction.

On section 94,

Mr. BERGERON. Before we proceed any further, I was writing a letter, and did not know that section 92 had been carried. At the end of the section I find subsection 5, which, I think, comes from the Bill of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram):

In the event of the returning officer making a return and report to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery not complying with the provisions of this section or section 90, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall return the said report and return to the returning officer on presentation of an order signed by any judge who has jurisdiction under the latter section.

I believe this conflicts with section 98. I presume that the hon. gentleman wants to prevent what happened in the Leeds and Grenville case. The county court judge was called upon to make a recount, but the returning officer had sent the ballots to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. According to the interpretation of the Act it is only a judge of the High Court of Justice who could compel the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to send back the ballot boxes, and therefore, the county court judge could not get them back. I would suggest the following amendment :

Provided, however, that in the event of the returning officer having made his return to the writ and sent the same to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, contrary to the provisions contained in sections 90 and 92 of this Act, and the ballot papers are required for the purpose of a recount under these sections; the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall either produce in person or deliver or send back the said returns, together with all the other documents and election papers in his possession relative thereto, to the returning officer, on the presentation or production by the latter of an order to that effect signed by any judge who has jurisdiction in the matter under section 90 of this Act, and such order shall be deemed sufficient proof to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that the return to the writ in question was wrongfully made, and such order shall be obeyed by him.

As the law stood before it was only a High Court judge who could make such an order, and that is why I suggest this amendment.

Mr. INGRAM. The only difference between this Bill and the old Act is that the words 'a recount' are added here. In the Leeds and Grenville case it was because section 98 did not mention 'a recount' that the difficulty arose.

Mr. BERGERON. Under this clause whether there is a recount or not, the order could not issue from a county court judge. Suppose a recount is asked before a county court judge which happens in ninety cases out of a hundred in Ontario, the applicant

goes before the court on the last day of the four days allowed. You commence proceedings before the county court judge and you find that the returning officer has already forwarded the ballots.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. He could not do that.

**Mr. BERGERON**. But that is what he did do in the Leeds and Grenville case. They found that the ballot boxes had been forwarded, and they asked the county court judge to give an order, but the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery would pay no attention to that. Then in such a case if you go before a High Court judge he will tell you that the time is too late, and so you have no remedy. The amendment which I have suggested is, I humbly submit, the only way to obviate this, and I therefore, ask that subsection 5 of clause 92 do not form part of the Bill.

**Mr. INGRAM**. My understanding of the Leeds and Grenville case is this. At the conclusion of the polling day the returning officer immediately forwarded the ballots to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery without waiting for the four days. When they applied for a recount they discovered that the papers and documents were in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and there was no law by which they could compel him to return these ballots for the purposes of a recount. My object in moving this amendment was to try and get over that difficulty. It is quite clear that the returning officer violated the law in that case, but there was no power to remedy it under the Act as it stood.

**Mr. BERGERON**. Even so, the only judge who would have jurisdiction is a judge of the High Court of Justice, and a county court judge would not have the right to make the order even if the amendment is passed.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. Subsection 5 of section 92 is intended to meet the difficulty that has arisen, and enables the judge who has charge of the recount to exercise his control over the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to oblige him to return all the documents connected with the election so as to enable a recount to be carried out. There may be some question as to whether subsection 5 goes far enough to include the ballot papers. I will have that section recast so as to give effect to our intention to include all the papers.

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)**. The first part of subsection 5 does not seem to be drawn in the most artistic manner, though the object is perfectly good.

On section 95,

**Mr. BERGERON**. In this section, why not strike out the words, 'subsection 5 of section 92,' and insert instead 'subsection

2 of section 98'? I am speaking as if the clause which I suggested as subsection 2 of section 98 were adopted.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. When my hon. friend reaches section 98, he can refer to that. I am always willing to have any clause reopened for discussion, whether it has been carried or not.

On section 96,

**Mr. CASGRAIN**. It sometimes happens that not only the officers, clerks and agents are in attendance at a polling place, but that the candidate is there also. I do not see why this section 96, which is intended to preserve the secrecy of voting, should not be extended so as to include the candidate in a polling place. I do not think a candidate should have any more right to go there than any one else. Then I would suggest that the following be added to subsection 4:

An elector who makes known the mark on his ballot loses his right to vote and to have his ballot deposited in the ballot box. Such ballot is placed among those to be rejected, and note thereof is taken in the poll book.

The reason of that is this, that sometimes an elector, for the purpose of showing how he votes, comes out of the polling place with his ballot paper held in such a way as designedly to show his mark on it to the agent of the candidate for whom he has voted. It seems to me that this is a means of doing away with the secrecy of the ballot. I also think that every person having anything to do with the polling booth, either as candidate or agent, should make an oath, and the one I suggest is taken from the Quebec Act, and reads as follows:

I, the undersigned, G. H., agent, by special authorization, for (or elector representing, as the case may be) J. K., one of the candidates at the election now pending for the electoral district of \_\_\_\_\_ solemnly swear (or, if one of the persons permitted by law to affirm in civil cases, solemnly affirm) that I will keep and assist in keeping and maintaining secret the names of the candidates for whom any of the voters at the poll in the voting subdivision of \_\_\_\_\_ marked his ballot in my presence, at this election, and that I shall impart no information, before the closing of the poll, respecting the names of any persons entered upon the list of electors who have or have not claimed their ballots at this poll, nor communicate at any time to any person any information obtained in the interior of this poll as to the name of the candidate for whom an elector intends to vote or has voted, &c.

It is well known that a practice has become prevalent, of people in the polling booth communicating news to those who are outside, which not only gives rise to disorder, but also, to a certain extent, interferes with the secrecy of the ballot, and permits the giving of spurious ballots for distribution to persons outside of the polling booth. If you guard as much as possible the secrecy of the polling booth, I think you will guard

against these frauds. I make these suggestions for consideration.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I quite agree that the provision of section 96 should extend to the candidate. I also agree to the suggestion with reference to the elector who makes known how he voted. But I shall have to consider the proposal to put upon a candidate an obligation to take an oath every time he enters a polling booth.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I wish to make a remark which appears to me to be pertinent here. My hon. friend sees that in section 3 provision is made that no elector is to show his ballot paper to any person, so as to allow the name of the candidate for whom he votes to be known, and if he does so, he is liable to a penalty of \$200. If he does show it, he is liable to a penalty of \$200. There is not any great evil existing at present. I have not known in any elections I have run, of any complaint that people, after marking their ballots, came out and showed them, and ran the risk of the penalty. My hon. friend will be giving the right to a deputy returning officer to reject a man's vote on the charge that he had shown his ballot.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think there is a great deal in what the hon. Minister of Marine says. The electors are not all familiar with the law, and a man might innocently declare his ballot, not knowing the consequences. In my experience, I can only recall one instance where a man actually displayed his vote, and it was a peculiar case. He had voted for me and wished to show that he was independent enough to do so.

On section 97,

Mr. SPROULE. This clause provides that no person who has voted at an election, shall, in any legal proceeding, questioning the election or return, be required to state for whom he voted. Would that protect him if he refused to declare for whom he voted before a special committee of this House?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The committee of the House of Commons last year decided that he was obliged to tell. This section is the same as in the old Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. I find that subsection 5 of section 96 provides that no officer, clerk or agent, or other person shall communicate the number on the back of the ballot paper given to any voter at the polling station, or attempt to ascertain, at the counting of the votes, the number on the back of any ballot paper. Surely it is not intended to have numbered ballots.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, but the objected ballots are numbered. This applies only after the ballots are cast, and

Mr. CASGRAIN.

an objection made at the time of the recount.

Mr. BERGERON. It seems to me that section 96 should come after clause 79 with the penal sections. It would be more in its place there than where it is. I would suggest that clause 98 should come after clause 95, because it runs on the same line.

Mr. QUINN. The Solicitor General says that this subsection 5 of section 96 applies to numbers on the ballots at the recount. But the subsection referred to any officer, clerk, agent or other person who was present at the polling. There is nothing in this Act which provides for putting numbers on the ballot papers while the polling is going on. There is only one number put on the ballot paper, and that is the number put on under section 81. There is a number on the counterfoil, but that does not go into the ballot box.

Mr. PUTTEE. If the deputy returning officer rejects any ballots, he must number those ballots. This is what this refers to.

Mr. QUINN. It is quite evident that it is not to that, that subsection 5 refers, because it says 'the number on the back of the ballot paper given to any voter.'

Mr. CLANCY. It cannot refer to a spoiled ballot, as that is returned—

Mr. PUTTEE. I said rejected ballots, not spoiled ballots.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This deals with a matter in which, evidently, it is thought secrecy is desirable. But, there does not seem to be any reason for that secrecy. So, I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) must be right in believing that it refers to the same subject as section 81.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no other section in which provisions are made respecting numbering.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It evidently is not well expressed. It might, as the hon. member for St. Ann's, Montreal (Mr. Quinn) says, refer to the counterfoil, using the word 'ballot,' though 'counterfoil' is intended.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would call attention to section 67, under which, in the province of Prince Edward Island, if the right of a person to vote is objected to, the ballot paper shall be numbered. This is for the purpose of enabling us to ascertain the way a man voted, and information must be given in court. So, I would ask the Solicitor General to consider if it would not be well that this should be recast.

Mr. BERGERON. In section 74, he will find the same thing.

Mr. QUINN. I think the object was to prevent any officer, clerk or agent giving information out to any of his friends outside the poll as to the number of votes polled, the persons who had voted, and so on. But, I think it is very badly expressed and ought to be recast.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The thing is first to find out what the object of it is.

Mr. BERGERON. I think I can help the hon. gentleman. I would suggest that it be made to read this way :

No officer, clerk, agent or other person shall communicate at any time to any person any information as to the number on the back of a ballot paper given to any voter at a polling station under the provisions of sections 67 and 74 of this Act, or attempt to ascertain at the counting of votes the number on the back of any such ballot papers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But, the law allows a number to be put on in the case of votes objected to in Prince Edward Island, with the very object that this information may be given at the proper time. It would hardly do by this section to prohibit those who have that information from giving it.

Mr. INGRAM. I think this is a half-brother to the Ontario section.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) will make that statement, I will drop the section at once.

Mr. INGRAM. I will read it, and you can judge for yourself :

No officer, clerk, agent or other person shall communicate at any time to any person any information obtained at a polling place as to the candidate for whom a voter at a polling place is about to vote or has voted, or as to the number on the back of the ballot paper given to a voter.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It looks like it. We had better consider this.

Mr. SPROULE. That is because the Ontario ballots are numbered on the back.

On section 98,

Mr. BERGERON. This section provides :

No person shall be allowed to inspect any ballot paper in the custody of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery except under the rule or order of a Superior Court judge thereof—

And so on. Now, this would prevent the carrying out of subsection 5 of section 92, and that is why I suggested, a few moments ago, that instead of adopting subsection 5 of section 92, we should add to this clause 98 :

Provided, however, that in the event of a returning officer having made his return of the writ and sent the same to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, contrary to the provisions contained in sections 90 and 92 of this Act, and the ballot papers are required for the purposes of a recount under these sections, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall either produce in person or

deliver or send back the said return, together with all the other election papers in his possession relative thereto, to the returning officer on the presentation or production by the latter of an order to that effect signed by any judge who has jurisdiction in the matter under section 90 of this Act; and such order shall be deemed sufficient proof to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that the return to the writ in question was wrongfully made, and such order shall be obeyed by him.

This makes an exception to this section 98, so as to allow the other to have effect.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Would it not do to have in the third line 'or judge thereof, or judge of the county court.' There does not seem to be a contradiction here, and some words should be introduced providing for the carrying out of subsection 5 of section 92.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Section 98 deals with one set of conditions, that is, where it is necessary to get inspection of the ballot paper to institute or maintain a prosecution or defence in relation to the ballot papers. Subsection 5 of section 92 is a provision for the purpose of enabling the person who is charged with the duty of making the recount to restore to the custody of the returning officer those papers of which he has dispossessed himself.

Mr. INGRAM. All he would have to do would be to strike out the word 'recount.'

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I move to change the phraseology of section 98, so as to make it read :

Except as provided by subsection 5 of section 92, no person shall be allowed to inspect any ballot paper.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 107,

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire now to call the attention of the committee to the amendments that I propose to add after this section, and which are found on page 562 of the Votes and Proceedings :

Section 107a. On the day of the polling in cities, and on the day of the polling and the previous day everywhere else, it is prohibited within the limits of an electoral district where an election is held, under penalty of either to sell for a price in money or in exchange for any article whatever, or lend or deliver or gratuitously supply any quantity of spirituous or fermented liquor ; the only exception to this provision, the burden of proof whereof is upon the accused, is established in favour of the sick, in which case the liquor can only be sold, lent, delivered or supplied upon the certificate of a priest or minister of some religious denomination or of a physician; and whoever shall give or deliver a false certificate in respect thereof shall be liable to a fine of dollars, and in default of payment to an imprisonment of month.

Section 107b. During the days mentioned in the next preceding section, and under the same penalties, but subject to the same exception in

case of sickness, it is forbidden to cause to be brought or carried, or to bring or carry, within the limits of the electoral district within which an election is held, or from one place to another within the said limits, any gratuity whatever or spirituous or fermented liquor.

This provision shall not affect the sale, carrying, delivery or purchase of spirituous or fermented liquor made in good faith and in the ordinary course of affairs by a merchant or trader; provided that the cases, casks, bottles or envelopes containing the said liquor be not opened, broken or unclosed during the days above mentioned.

Section 107c. During the days mentioned in the two next preceding sections and under the same limitation of time as to cities, whoever is found under the influence of liquor, and consequently disturbing public order in or on any street, lane, road, by-road or public square, or in any hotel, restaurant, tavern or place of public resort whatever, within the limits of an electoral district in which an election is held, is liable to a fine of \_\_\_\_\_ dollars, and in default of payment to an imprisonment of \_\_\_\_\_ days, or to both.

These clauses may appear to be rather severe; but I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that in a great many constituencies liquor plays a most important part, especially on the day of polling, and on the day preceding the polling. Now, I may say frankly, and it is something which many of my hon. friends who are now listening to me know to be the case, that on the day preceding polling, and after the speeches have been delivered and the public questions have been discussed for weeks, unscrupulous men bring liquor into the constituencies. They have meetings on the night preceding the election; they have parties, soirees, balls, at which liquor is distributed, and men are made to drink and become intoxicated, and the next day they are taken to the polls like so many sheep to vote. Men who do not understand what they are doing are made to vote in the morning when they are still under the influence of liquor. I know that this abuse exists, and other hon. gentlemen around me know that it exists, and it is to provide against this abuse that I suggest the adoption of these amendments. These sections are incorporated in the law of the province of Quebec, and I think that during the last election they deterred a great many people from a practice which has been prevalent in the past, and which has caused a great perversion of public morality in the province of Quebec, and I have no doubt the same thing has taken place in the other provinces. I also desire to add the following section:

Section 107d. It is prohibited to lease or let, as a place of assembly for an election committee or election meeting, any house or part of a house or place in which are retailed spirituous or fermented liquors, or in which food is ordinarily supplied for payment, or to make use of any such places for that purpose, under penalty of a fine of \_\_\_\_\_ dollars, and of an imprisonment of \_\_\_\_\_ months in default of payment.

Mr. CASGRAIN.

In certain districts people who run taverns insist upon a room being taken in the house in which the tavern is kept, for the purpose of holding committee meetings. Their object is simply to distribute liquor among those who attend the meeting of the committee, and it seems to me that this should be stopped too.

Mr. INGRAM. Does not the Act already provide that there shall be no treating by the candidates?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Of course.

Mr. INGRAM. There is no doubt that such a section would be a great hardship in some cases of country hotels. You are travelling around and meeting committees, and there is no place to meet committees except in hotels.

Mr. BERGERON. I think my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has the best of intentions in making these amendments. I think that most of these are in the Quebec Act passed by my hon. friend when he was Attorney General of Quebec. I have seen how they work out in practice. Of course, I may be told that the law is there; I do not know whether there is any arrangement amongst the parties themselves, but, in the local by-elections and in the local elections of 1897, which were held under this Act, bar-rooms were opened the day before the day of nomination and the day after, and a man could get whisky anywhere in the places that I have been in my own riding. Of course this does not mean that it would not be a good thing to put such a provision on the statute-book, but I can assure my hon. friend from East Elgin that there will be no danger of what he is speaking about happening, because the hotels are always open the day before, the day of nomination, and the day after. The question is whether it would be better to have such a law on the statute-book and allow it to remain a dead letter or to have it on the statute-book and enforce it. In practice it did not seem to make any difference in the last elections in our province.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It is no reason to say that the law has been violated. I take issue with my hon. friend on this point. In the district of Quebec I know perfectly well that every tavern, every place of entertainment and every saloon was shut up on election day. I know that such is the case at places I visited myself.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They cannot sell anything within the limits on election day.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No, but I am making the law more stringent.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You are making it so that one man cannot treat another on the day before or the day after.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The abuse is great, and I think the time has come to stop all this. The difficulty was that under the Controverted Elections Act it was not possible to adopt all the provisions of the English Act or to appoint a public prosecutor whose business it would be to attend trials and ex-officio prosecute anybody against whom proof had been made of having committed an offence against the Act. If you could introduce this into the Controverted Elections Act or make the Act so stringent that it would be impossible to saw off one offence against another offence committed by another party, then, we would attain the object I have in view.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Controverted Elections Act contains that provision now. You cannot do it legally.

Mr. CASGRAIN. People drive through the Controverted Elections Act very easily. I suggested the other evening certain amendments which I think should be made to the Controverted Elections Act by which it would be impossible to saw off these election protests. The only remedy is the remedy adopted in the English law, and that is to provide a public prosecutor who would attend the trials, and ex-officio, take the necessary proceedings. Everybody is interested in having pure elections. Aside from other considerations we are interested personally in that we should make elections as cheap as possible. Elections are becoming so expensive that it is almost ruinous to conduct an election, and if you succeed you have to spend four or five or six months in Ottawa, which is driving worthy men out of political life. We are all interested in having these elections as pure and cheap as possible, and we should take every means to accomplish that end.

Mr. INGRAM. Before the hon. gentleman takes his seat, I would like if he would explain the first line of section 107d :

It is prohibited to lease or let as a place of assembly for an election committee or an election meeting any house or part of a house, &c.

Does 'to let' mean to rent?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose I went into a hotel, met a few friends and proposed to hold a committee meeting, and we sat down, would the provision apply to that?

Mr. CASGRAIN. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Well, then I have no objection to it.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it to mean that, because this is a custom which prevails very largely, and a hotel is the only convenient place for the purpose. On election day all hotels are closed, and there is no liquor sold, so far as I know. But on other days hotels are largely used for committee rooms

when you do not want to go to the expense of renting permanently and keeping up a committee room where you must provide light and heat and a man to take care of the room. I do not think the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Montmorency will be practicable in Ontario. That part in regard to liquor, I think, would be very difficult to work out; still, in some respects, I think it might be made suitable. In regard to pairing off at elections—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not in this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to that I have always held for a great many years past that it is one of the most baneful things under our system. It tends more to demoralize political life than anything I know of.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is a regular blackmailing system.

Mr. SPROULE. I have fought against it for ten or fifteen years, and I regret to say that I have not got much countenance from men that I had a right to expect it from—men in public life in Canada. For many years past it has been not only a blackmailing system, but it has been a means devised to prevent frauds coming out that otherwise would come out. Men who take part in it and who assist in carrying it out are particeps criminis after the Act, just as much as one who stood by and looked at a crime being committed and took no part to prevent it. In my judgment it is one of the absolute necessities of the time, that we should put some law on the statute-book to prevent this as much as possible. The law which we have contemplates that when an election petition is filed it is filed upon certain allegations that are sworn to. They are either true or false, so far as the party making the affidavit knows. If they are true they should at least go into court and try to prove the allegations. If they are false the party who makes that affidavit should be sent to penitentiary.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know that all legislation of this character is found to be difficult in its operation, but that is not a reason why we should attempt to put such legislation on the statute-book and make an honest effort to enforce it. I sympathize with the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) in the views he has expressed and I trust that the hon. Solicitor General, while perhaps not adopting the amendments proposed in their entirety, will endeavour to accept them as far as possible if the law can be so amended as to meet the abuses which the hon. member has described. But, the conditions which the hon. gentleman has described are not confined to the province of Quebec, and there are no doubt abuses that we should deal with by legislation. Some hon. gentlemen may

say: 'What is the use of legislating unless you can make sure that people will not override the law?' Notwithstanding that this will be done to some extent, if we put a law upon the statute-book it will have an effect on the best class of people in the country. There are loose ideas in regard to the manner of conducting elections. Men who are honourable in every other relation of life have loose ideas as to how men should be expected to conduct elections. Many a man who in every other respect is a model citizen, will violate the election law in the most flagrant manner. It is our duty to do something, if possible, to instil in the mind of the average citizen a more correct appreciation of his duty in that respect. We know that the use of liquor in connection with elections is but too common. If we can do anything that will prevent that, and which will introduce a better system, we shall be doing a good work. Now, Sir, while the Controverted Election law is not immediately an issue here, I personally have somewhat radical views on that subject. I believe that the Controverted Election Act is not a very good piece of machinery. It seems to be designed largely to prevent inquiry into elections. We find that it requires a man to put up a deposit before he can go into court with a complaint, and no doubt that operates well at times, but all the same its tendency is to prevent inquiry into elections. I know the view which I am going to express is radical, and I wish to say that I am only speaking for myself, when I express the hope, that the time is not far distant, when instead of requiring a man to put up a deposit before he can have an election trial, that one of the first duties of the courts of the country, after an election, will be to inquire into these election matters voluntarily, and to hear every man who has a complaint to make, without waiting for the intervention of a private citizen. I do not know that our judiciary could be better employed for three months after an election, than in holding courts of inquiry into the manner in which an election has been conducted. That is a radical view, I admit, but if we are in earnest about this matter, we have to get away from the old-fashioned methods. Instead of putting obstacles in the way of a man going into the election court, let the doors be open so that the poorest citizen of Canada, if he believes there is wrong-doing in an election, shall be enabled to bring his complaint before a judicial tribunal. That view may be considered as advanced and radical, but at all events it is my view. Then as to the 'pairing-off' system; we all know that hon. members on that side, and hon. members on this side, while they are shouting for pure elections and for honest ballot, and so forth, will walk out behind the Speaker's chair, and agree to 'saw-off' their election petitions. I agree with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that we should

Mr. FIELDING.

have different methods in that respect. The man who puts in an election petition should not do so unless he has some bona fide cause of complaint, and then he should not be allowed to withdraw that petition under this system of pairing off.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman allow a person outside of the constituency who knows nothing about the facts to enter a petition?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If he could make an affidavit that he was possessed of certain knowledge, he ought to be allowed to enter a petition. But, if I had my way, I would not wait for a petition at all. I am speaking for myself, when I say that I would make it the duty of a judge of the higher court, within one month after the holding of an election, to hold open court for every one who wished to come and make a complaint about the conduct of that election. That is a very advanced and radical view, I admit.

Mr. BERGERON. But you could not until the allegations are made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would not wait for any allegations to be made. I would have the court held at a certain date, and I would allow any one to come forward to make his complaint—just as we are doing now in another case—without waiting for an allegation. If you want thorough investigation into the conduct of elections, you must encourage that investigation, and not put obstacles in the way of it, as the present law does.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), appears to be very serious in this matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am very serious.

Mr. BERGERON. I agree with a good deal that the hon. gentleman has said. I agree that elections should be carried out fairly, honestly and honourably, but when he looks forward to the day when the judges of the land will, for three months after an election, voluntarily invite people to come before them and tell what was done during the election, I think the hon. gentleman has forgotten a good deal about what occurs at elections.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have been through some elections.

Mr. BERGERON. So have I, but with all due respect to the judges, and notwithstanding all the confidence I have in them, I shall do everything in my power to prevent the realization of such a scheme as the Minister of Finance indicates. We know how election petitions are engineered today. We know that in almost every case an election petition is not gotten up honestly, but that it is blackmailing, pure and

simple. Who puts up the thousand dollars deposit? Is it the poor honest man in the county whose conscience is pricking him about the manner in which the election was conducted? Not at all. There is a committee to deposit the money, and they want to contest such and such an election. They get the thousand dollars, which is put in the hands of a lawyer—not in the hands of a country lawyer generally, because they are afraid he might keep it—but it is put in the hands of a lawyer from Montreal or some other city, who holds it closely in his pocket, delivers it to the prothonotary, takes a receipt and says to the prothonotary: Do not make a mistake, I want that thousand dollars to be given back to me, and not to Mr. So-and-so.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is hard on the Montreal lawyers.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is the way it is done.

Mr. BERGERON. I have been protested three or four times, and I know how it is done. What is the next step? Probably the last man in the county, a man that you would not trust with a dollar bill, a man without reputation or honour, he is secured to make the petition, and then you have three or four country lawyers who have been starving for four months, and who think there is something in it, and whether it is true or not, what the petitioner says, and even if the election was mostly honourably conducted; if there is a man in the county who has done anything wrong, or if one can be bribed to perjure himself for \$25, he is brought forward. That is what members of parliament are subjected to now. Political life is not such a beauty after all. It is not such a grand thing to be a politician. We are subjected to blackmailing every day as it is, and why should we draw down more blackmailing upon our heads. I have not that blind confidence in the judges of the land that would induce me to allow them, without any reason whatever, to examine my political conduct. Are we not the highest court in the land in this parliament? Can we not, and should we not protect ourselves here? Whenever there is a question of a judge before parliament, show me the man who will rise in his seat and say what he thinks about it. They are afraid. There are a number of lawyers here, and those who are not lawyers may be sultors, and they all know that judges are human, and so they are afraid. They are not any different kind of men from what we are. They are generally old politicians. Would the Minister of Finance, for whose judgment I have much respect, manacle and chain the member of parliament in the hands of these men. I approve of the sentiment which guided my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain), in making his amendments to the election law, but I tell him that law is

not enforced in the province of Quebec. It may be in force, in some cases, in the district of Quebec, but I have been in many counties at elections in 1897, and the law was not carried out. The law is too rigorous to be enforced. It provides that hotels shall be closed the day before an election, as well as the day of an election, but so far as I could see, the people did not seem to know there was such a law upon the statute-book. Not only were the hotels open the day before the election, but they were open on polling day as well, a thing which was strongly forbidden under the old statute. I was surprised that the legislature of Quebec should pass such a rigorous law, but whether they passed it or not, it has never been enforced. I repeat once more that we should legislate in this parliament, and do everything in our power to have elections conducted honestly and honourably, and cheaply. Good, but let us not make laws which would be so stringent that they could not be enforced. I ask my hon. friend to think of these observations, and not take such a radical step.

Mr. D. K. ERB (South Perth). I would like to ask the hon. member for Montmorency why he proposes by his amendment to make a distinction between cities and country districts in regard to the conduct of elections. As I understand, he proposes to prohibit the sale of liquor outside of cities on the day before polling, as well as on polling day, but to allow the sale of liquor in cities on the day before polling. My idea is that if it is an undesirable thing to have liquor sold in country places on the day preceding the election, it must be equally undesirable in cities. He contends that the sale of liquor on the day before the election in country districts is likely to cause electors to get into an intoxicated condition before the election, so that on election day they are led to the polls like sheep. Does not the same thing exist in cities, or are the people in cities more moral than the people in country districts?

Mr. CASGRAIN. The only reason I made this distinction was that in my experience the same abuses do not exist in cities as in country districts. At first I included cities, but on representations being made to me to that effect, I excluded cities. I have no objection to including cities as well as rural districts.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think the hon. gentleman's amendment goes far enough even then. The experience of almost every member of this House, if he has been any length of time in public life, must be that liquor is often a more potent influence in elections than money. For weeks before an election men have been debauched and kept in a state that was disgraceful. I think an effort should be made to stop the use of liquor during the whole time of an election

contest, if that could be done. I do not think you could go too far in this direction. Cases have come under my own observation that were perfectly disgraceful. Kegs of beer and whisky have been taken to houses, where there have been dances, and efforts of every kind made to debauch the electors for weeks before an election. I hope my hon. friend will be supported in an effort to do away with practices of this kind, which usually obtain secretly, because in country places these things are usually not brought under your notice. I can easily see how the evil would be much greater in rural districts than in cities, where it would be under the watchful eye of the police. I think this an opportune time for both sides of the House to join in any reasonable effort to suppress so great an evil.

Mr. INGRAM. If you close the hotels on election day and the day preceding, I do not see that there is anything to prevent the electors getting barrels of flour. With respect to the hotel men, I do not wish to stand up here for the purpose of defending them; but there are always two sides to a question. The hotel keepers of the province of Ontario as a rule pay very high licenses and are subject to very stringent rules under the license commissioners. They are, as a whole, a very good class of people; they try to carry on respectable hotels; and I think we ought to be careful about adopting a provision which will close up the places of business of these men for two days consecutively. Many of them feel that they have now a grievance in being compelled to close their hotels on election day. I think that is proper, but before making the radical change involved in this amendment, I think notice should be given to these gentlemen.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I want to call attention to some words in the proposed amendment with respect to the leasing or letting of a room in a house or place in which are retailed spirituous or fermented liquors, or in which food is ordinarily supplied for payment, or to make use of any such places for that purpose. Therefore, the question of the hon. member for East Elgin should be answered in the opposite way; he cannot have the use of any part of a hotel for a committee meeting under that section as it stands.

Mr. WILSON. Do you think that is desirable?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not saying whether it is desirable or not.

Mr. WILSON. I think a member of the government, knowing the difficulty of getting places in which to hold meetings in the country, should see that this clause ought

Mr. CLANCY.

to be changed. It is going to put the candidates in a very awkward position.

Mr. CASGRAIN. This is intended only for permanent committees. The clause may not be worded as it should be, but the intention is this, that nobody should be allowed to have a permanent committee which lasts probably during the time the election is being organized, in a hotel or a place where liquor is sold.

Mr. HOLMES. I think you run up against a difficulty there if that suggestion is acted upon, because in rural places it is very difficult to get committee rooms except in hotels. In my riding there are absolutely no committee rooms except in hotels. It does not follow that liquor is used in connection therewith.

Mr. ELLIS. My opinion is that the committee rooms may be very well dispensed with altogether. What is done at them?

On section 108,

Mr. CASGRAIN. Here is another amendment which I suggest:

Section 107e. Each candidate can have only one place paid for in each polling subdivision for his election committee, under penalty, &c.

The reason for that is that in certain cities and other places also, men will come to a candidate and insist on having rooms in their houses rented for committee rooms. I have seen as many as ten committee rooms on a short street. They are not needed at all; it is simply blackmail which certain persons in a constituency impose on a candidate. It is simply corruption. You rent these rooms, not for committee rooms at all. Probably three out of four are never used. It is simply a way of holding up a candidate and telling him, if you do not rent a room, you will not get my vote nor the votes of my friends. I want to do away with that.

On section 109,

Mr. HENDERSON. The last paragraph of this section reads as follows:

Provided always, that the actual personal expenses of any candidate, his expenses for actual professional services performed and bona fide payments for the fair cost of printing and advertising, shall be held to be expenses lawfully incurred, and the payment thereof shall not be a violation of this Act.

It might be presumed from that, that these were the only lawful expenses and that all others would be illegal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is not the intention. We had better assume that everything is done is legal except that which is prohibited.

Mr. HENDERSON. In that case strike out this proviso.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I propose to add another subsection, subsection i:

Every person who immediately previous to or during an election and by reason thereof, with a view of promoting and securing votes or of interfering with the freedom and sincerity of the electors or the electorate, causes temporary work to be performed by the electors whom he employs and pays;

Every elector who participates in such work becomes incapable ipso facto of voting at such election and incurs a penalty of \_\_\_\_\_ dollars and an imprisonment \_\_\_\_\_ months in default of payment.

In certain constituencies people are employed at temporary work to induce them to vote for one of the candidates. I remember an election in a constituency in which a railway ran, that was then leased by the government. A few days before the election a lot of men were employed on the road to shovel snow, at least 400, and the implied understanding was that only those favourable to the government candidate and who would vote for him would be so employed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Under this every man who took employment some days before an election would be understood to have taken it out of corrupt motives.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If it is proved that fifty men were so employed, and that, under the circumstances, the presumption is clearly made out that the work was given them in order to secure their votes, fifty votes would be taken from the number cast for the candidate elected.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They may have voted for the other candidate.

Mr. CASGRAIN. This is a provision which resembles a great many others. In the Act there are provisions declaring that if an offence is proved against a certain party, his vote is taken off.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Under this a man who innocently went to work would be punished although not guilty of any crime. You do not provide, in his case, as in the case of his employers, that there should be a corruptive motive. All the unlawful intention necessary, in the case of an employer, to make him guilty, is left out in the case of a workman.

Mr. INGRAM. Take the case of an old man who has a vote in a certain place. The young fellow undertakes to drive him to the polling booth, but, instead he drives him in the opposite direction, for the purpose of doing him out of his vote. Nothing can be done to him. If there is temporary employment given to induce those employed to vote for one of the candidates, that should be punished. There is no doubt about it; and I think something of this kind should be inserted to prevent it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the

disqualification for voting. I do not see how you could make it effective unless you had some means of challenging the voter at the polls. I do not see that it would do simply to cut off so many votes from a successful candidate, because these parties may not have voted for him. The corruption may have been on the losing side, and, with all their corruption, they may not have succeeded in electing their man. It seems to me you must devise some way of challenging the voter at the poll, thereby preventing him voting.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I see there are two clauses in the old law which are not inserted in this Bill. They relate to bribing a man to run or to prevent him from running. I would suggest that the clauses in the old law should be inserted in this Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How would that affect a man who helps his neighbour with his deposit?

Mr. CASGRAIN. It would not affect him, if it were not done with corrupt intent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We may have to borrow our deposits, and do not want to be punished for that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That clause is in the Bill already, and if the committee will go on with the other clauses, I will find it.

On section 110,

Mr. CASGRAIN. You punish the man who bribes, but not the man who is bribed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Your amendment provides for that.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My amendment is as follows:

Section 110a. Every elector who with a corrupt motive, accepts or takes any such meat, drinks, refreshments or provisions, is also guilty of the offence of treating, and is liable to a fine not exceeding \$50 and not less than \$10, and to an imprisonment of three months in default of payment.

On section 112,

Mr. INGRAM. This clause relates to undue influence, and that is one of the worst things we have to contend with. There is a great deal of intimidation on the part of some people, and it is not confined to one party more than another. Take the large employers of labour who wish their men to vote for a certain candidate. He instructs his foreman how to talk to these men and tell them that if they know their own interest, they will vote for the candidate favoured by the employer, and if they do not vote in that way means will be taken to injure them. This is too grave an offence to be dealt with by a fine alone.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is made an indictable offence.

Mr. INGRAM. What does that amount to?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The offenders can be sent to jail.

Mr. INGRAM. Why not specify the length of time right here in the section—say, imprisonment for twelve months. A money penalty is not enough. I give notice that on the third reading, I will move something of that kind.

On section 113,

Mr. R. HOLMES (West Huron). This refers to hiring rigs. Some amendment should be made here. While this has been the law for a number of years past, in our elections it has been absolutely necessary to hire rigs, and, practically, the law has been violated. It seems to me there should be a provision for hiring necessary conveyances on the day of election. That would not allow much latitude for bribery or wrong-doing.

Mr. WILSON. This section is openly violated.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Like all excessively stringent provisions—they are never observed.

Mr. HENDERSON. I scarcely share that opinion. So far as I know, this section of the law is fairly well observed. It may be that the county in which my elections are fought is smaller than most of constituencies, and that there is not the same necessity for conveyances. But, candidly, I do not see the necessity for conveyances to convey voters to the polls in a rural section. Almost every man has his own conveyance, and rarely has one to go more than three or four miles to the polling place. Besides, there is no difficulty in getting a ride with a neighbour who is going to poll his vote. I think this is an excellent thing for the candidates. It is a very serious matter to legalize the hiring of conveyances.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I know a constituency in which the first thing the candidate has to do when he presents himself is to plank down \$1,900 for carters, and I know other constituencies in which the same thing is done. It is done to evade the law. These people are hired a week or ten days before the election comes off, but with the understanding that they will drive on election day. I know that in the city of Montreal—and the members from the city of Montreal will confirm what I say—the first thing a candidate has to do is to hire half the carters in his constituency, or as many as he can find, and pay them an enormous sum of money. There should be a stop put to this. In these constituencies the elections cost \$10,000, \$15,000 or \$20,000 a side. The hon. gentleman says that these stringent provisions are not observed. Why? Because there is an understanding between

the parties to saw off contestations. In the amendments which I will propose later on as to the election expenses, I limit the expenditure in each constituency to a sum which is deemed to be sufficient for the organization of the election, and any money which is expended beyond that sum is an illegal payment. I go still further, and I say that we can only employ such persons, for instance, so many carters for so many polling divisions, so many secretaries, so many messengers, and these are the only men you can employ, and the employment of any man in any other capacity is a corrupt act. That is the way we are going to prevent all this. Now, there is another abuse regarding carters. In some constituencies every second farmer on election day becomes a carter to carry his neighbour to a meeting or to the poll, and gets paid for it.

Mr. U. WILSON (Lennox). I think the explanations just made are correct. I think it is better to make it legal to hire the necessary number of carriages on election day than to have the candidate bled for two or three weeks to pay two or three prices for every team they get. Besides, we ought not to make the law so stringent that men will have to do wrong to get over it. I am strongly in favour of allowing the hiring of certain number of cabs on election day.

Mr. A. SEMPLE (Centre Wellington). It seems to me the prohibition of the hiring of conveyances on election day is the best protection a candidate can have. If they were allowed to hire conveyances, people would be coming by the hundred to the candidate to be employed, and they would be willing to throw in their vote as well. That would furnish an excellent avenue for all kinds of bribery, and it would cost the candidates much more to carry on an election. So far as I know, very few men accept any consideration for driving their conveyances on election day. They are generally plucky. The Conservatives get all the voters out they can and the Liberals likewise, and they are agreed to take the law as it is, and it is found to work admirably. It is a good thing also that the candidates cannot treat, otherwise crowds of thirsty men would be following them from one place to another.

On section 121,

Mr. CASGRAIN. Under this clause you cannot sue upon a contract, but you can sue for the delivery or the value of the goods. I suggest that you should debar a person completely from having any action at all. I think that would be a good way to prevent many unlawful contracts for the supply of goods during an election. If a man, for instance, hires a rig for election day, or he hires a rig with a corrupt motive for a considerable sum of money and he does not pay, he cannot be sued upon this contract. The contract is nil. But he can

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

sue for the value of services, at least before our courts, and judgment has been rendered against candidates. Why not take away the action completely, either upon a contract or for the value of the goods delivered, or for services rendered?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Even for the payment of lawful expenses?

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. Yes.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Why should you do that?

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. To protect the candidates.

On section 123,

Mr. **HENDERSON**. Is that not an extraordinary section?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It has been there for years and years.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. Still, it is an extraordinary section, jeopardizing seats which may have been earned legally without the slightest corrupt act.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. It says a corrupt practice by your agent.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. Without your consent or knowledge. That agent may be a man who constitutes himself an agent of the candidate.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. The authority for his agency is something utterly beyond the control of the candidate.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No, the court must determine the agency.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. Certainly, but the candidate does not appoint the agent. A man who attends a committee meeting becomes an agent, and the candidate has no knowledge of it. It is entirely without his consent or knowledge, and yet such a man becomes an agent.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No.

Mr. **HOLMES**. It is so held in Ontario.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. The candidate is unseated on that kind of agency. I think it is strange on our part, sitting here as representatives of the people, to enact any such legislation. It is going too far altogether. We ought to protect ourselves as well as protect the electors. It seems to me to be foolishness on our part to give any man in the country such absolute control over a candidate who may have honestly secured the seat.

Mr. **WILSON**. I would like the hon. Solicitor General to tell us what constitutes agency.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I would have to read all the cases that have been decided in the last twenty years.

Mr. **WILSON**. But in a general way.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I would say that the case submitted by the hon. member for Halton does not constitute agency.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. I must beg to differ entirely from the hon. Solicitor General, because the judges in Ontario certainly hold that it does.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I am sorry to differ from the hon. gentleman, but I cannot accept it.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. The judges in Ontario interpret the law in that way.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I might go to your committee meeting for the purpose of making myself an agent and then disqualify you.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Unless you can connect the candidate with the organization of the committee, surely the courts will not call it agency.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. It is not necessary to connect the candidate with the organization of the committee as long as it is a committee for the purpose of promoting the election. Time after time judges have unseated candidates on that ground. When a candidate was in no way responsible for a man's agency he was held liable. I think it is most extreme legislation, and I think the clause ought to be carefully looked into, and some limitation made to this agency. Holding the view which the hon. Solicitor General does in regard to agency, I am not at all surprised that he approves of the section, but, if he takes the extreme view of the judges in Ontario he will see that the section is not fair.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I am afraid we make the judges of Ontario liable for a lot of holdings which they would not be willing to acknowledge.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. I have been unseated myself through the agency of a man over whom I had no control. He attended a committee meeting. I was in no way responsible for him whatever, and yet a simple act performed by him compelled me to give up my seat.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. That was a bad judgment.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. I am not going to say whether it was a good or bad judgment. I know that such agency was also held in another case because I have been unseated more than once. If you file a petition in Ontario you can depend upon it, unless you get a saw-off there is no chance of escaping. You condemn that practice of sawing off

protests, but it is the only possible means by which a man can hold his seat. If it goes to the court you can rest assured that he is going to be unseated. This is the rule unless there may be some underhand means taken of withholding the evidence, and pretending you are going to prosecute a case, whereas really you are not going to do it. But, if there is a fair trial there is no possibility of holding the seat under a clause like this. I think the hon. Solicitor General ought to modify this clause, and I hope he will inquire into the interpretation put upon it by the judges of Ontario. If he does I am sure he will modify it because I do not think he would desire that such a hardship should be imposed upon men who have personally conducted a fair election.

Mr. SPROULE. I can endorse what the hon. member for Halton says in regard to agency, because as soon as a trial takes place and a corrupt act is found out the first thing that is attempted is to connect the party who committed this act with some committee. If it can be proved to the satisfaction of the court that he has been an attendant at the committee the agency is established.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is an entirely different story.

Mr. SPROULE. But not that he has been appointed by the candidate.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. But if he has been an attendant at a committee for the purpose of organization, he is regarded as an agent. Unless they can connect him with committee work the agency is not established.

Mr. INGRAM. As far as agency is concerned they stretch the word agency very much. In my case, after three or four days spent in taking evidence they held a man to be an agent. I met him on the street, and I asked him if he was going to take any part in the election. He said: 'No, the last time I took part in an election I got into difficulty.' Meeting a gentleman upon the street a few days after he bluffed him on the election, and he put up quite a sum of money on me and went in to save his own money. He came once or twice to a committee meeting, but had nothing to do with the committee. He went out and bought a good Liberal for \$2 and a drink of whisky. In that case agency was established.

Mr. HOLMES. The local member for West Huron was unseated under similar circumstances. A young man went into a committee room; he was not known to have taken any part in the election, but he was seen in the committee room, and as a result the local member for West Huron is to-day unseated.

Mr. HENDERSON.

On section 125,

Mr. CASGRAIN. After this clause, I suggest that the following be inserted:

All placards, posters, publications and printed matter whatever, placarded, posted or distributed during an election, and having connection therewith or reference thereto, shall visibly bear upon the face thereof the name and address of the printer and publisher thereof; and whoever prints, publishes, posts or distributes them without such names and addresses as aforesaid, is, if a candidate or one of his agents, guilty of a corrupt practice, and if another person, incurs a penalty not exceeding \_\_\_\_\_ dollars and an imprisonment not exceeding \_\_\_\_\_ months in default of payment.

That is taken from the English law. It often happens that during an election placards are posted up or handbills are distributed in which there are libellous statements. They bear no name whatever. You cannot trace them to anybody. They are sometimes distributed during the night time, sometimes one or two days before the election takes place, and you have no recourse against the persons who distribute these posters or placards. If the name of the printer or publisher were printed on the face of these placards or posters, then, if any false or libellous statements were made, any statement which could injure a candidate personally, you could have the man arrested and brought before the court. This section is taken from the English law, and I think it should be adopted.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the hon. Solicitor General ought to be willing to adopt this section.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Which one is that; 125a?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. All right.

On section 132,

Mr. INGRAM. This is copied from the Ontario law, but the Ontario Act provides a penalty of \$200 against the returning officer if he does not carry it out, and here you seem to omit the penalty.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Under the general section 19 a penalty of \$500 is provided.

On section 142,

Mr. CASGRAIN. I intend moving a number of amendments here replacing sections 143, 144, 145 and 146. These amendments have been published in the Votes and Proceedings, and without any further notice I shall move them on the third reading of the Bill.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They will be taken up on the reconsideration of the whole Bill.

On section 145,

Mr. HENDERSON. Do I understand that under this section a candidate will be at liberty to pay legal expenses which have been overlooked, or an account which has not been rendered in the time prescribed by law?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then I think it is a very good provision. I have an account pending for four years which I was compelled not to pay, simply because I knew that a protest could be filed against me at any time if I did. I have been wondering how in the world the law would allow me to pay my honest debt, and I am glad the Solicitor General now has made a provision enabling me to do so.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I warn my hon. friend that this will only apply to the next election. The way to pay your last election account is to go to your solicitor and let him have the money.

Mr. HENDERSON. But I went to my solicitor and he advised me not to pay it.

On section 147,

Mr. INGRAM. Subsection 2 refers to the fees of returning officers.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are not paid half enough.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not object to what they are paid; it is to the way they are paid. It offers a premium to them to create a large number of subdivisions, many of which are not necessary at all, and thus increase the cost both to the candidates and to the public.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think it would be better to let that stand.

On schedule L,

Mr. INGRAM. I think in this should be included the form of the ballot and directions as to how the ballot should be marked.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Better let that stand.

Mr. HENDERSON. There ought to be another schedule giving the oath to be used in the case of an ordinary voter. I fail to find anything of that kind. The deputy returning officer will be unable to get it unless he hunts up the provincial statutes. It will be important to have the oath included in the Bill. Is it the intention of the Solicitor General to add a schedule giving the form of vote required in such a case?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are to receive a copy of the local elections Acts with the affidavits.

Mr. HENDERSON. There will have to be a change made from the oath used in the Ontario Act.

Schedule *u* allowed to stand.

Mr. INGRAM. I wish to give notice of a couple of amendments:

That section 34 is hereby amended by striking out all the words after the word 'paper' in the sixth line thereof, and also by repealing subsections 2 and 3 of the said section, and substituting the following therefor:

'2. Upon receiving a nomination paper, the returning officer shall give a receipt therefor, and such receipt shall in every case be sufficient evidence of the production or filing of such nomination paper and of the consent of the candidate.'

That section 38 of the said Act is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'time' in the first line thereof the words, 'within forty-eight hours,' and by striking out the words, 'and before the closing of the poll,' in line 2 thereof.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business is to be taken up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Probably some government Bills will be taken up first, and then Supply, if we have time.

Mr. WILSON. What estimates will be gone on with?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I think, probably, militia; but I cannot say with certainty, because my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) is not present.

Mr. WILSON. Will you not take up immigration?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think immigration is through. If not, we will take that up in preference.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.30 a.m. (Thursday.)

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, June 14, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received the following notice from the Governor General's Secretary, which I propose to read to the House:

Office of the  
Governor General's Secretary,  
Ottawa, June 13, 1900.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber on Thursday, the

14th instant, at four o'clock p.m., for the purpose of giving the royal assent to the Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

L. G. DRUMMOND, Major,  
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable

The Speaker of the House of Commons.

### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—EMERGENCY RATION.

Mr. FREDERICK D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I now present to the House the motion which, I believe, was deferred from yesterday, which is a motion that a select committee of this House be chosen to investigate the charge which I had the honour of reading in this House yesterday. I would like to say one word in regard to the character of privilege which I gave to the motion which I made yesterday. Let me, in the first place, state to the House in regard to this character of privilege—

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) will pardon me, I will just interrupt him for one moment. I observe that the printed notice given is for to-morrow, Friday.

Mr. MONK. There is an evident misprint. The House will remember that it was agreed yesterday that the motion should be taken into consideration to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER. All right.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend will look at the French version he will find that the notice was properly printed. The error evidently occurred at the Printing Bureau. As two days' notice is necessary for a motion of this kind, they evidently assumed that I had made a mistake, but, as the hon. gentleman will remember, we agreed to proceed to-day. As I was saying, there is, in our own parliament, in respect to motions having the character of motions of this kind, a greater latitude than that which exists in regard to similar motions in England. I find in the 'Parliamentary Procedure and Practice' of Sir John Bourinot, the following:

The precedents go to show that the Canadian House of Commons, in its desire to deal promptly with all questions affecting its members, has generally waived the strict rules which govern matters of privilege properly speaking, and given every possible facility for inquiry thereon. When a member proposes to make a motion touching another member, it is frequently found convenient that he should state his intentions in his place, and then give notice that he will move it when motions are called in due order on a subsequent day.

If the House takes into consideration the fact, which, I assume, is beyond doubt, that

Mr. SPEAKER

this statement which I made yesterday affects the position of a member of this House, not only in his capacity as a minister of the Crown, but also in his capacity as a member of this House, and if it furthermore recalls the preceding debate in which I was invited by the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in this House to formulate a charge, it will become evident that it was in order for me yesterday to place my statement before the House in order to safeguard my own position irrespective of any other procedure which should apply in a case of this kind. In regard to the motion itself, I have followed pretty strictly the procedure which was adopted by our late lamented Speaker, Sir James Edgar, in 1892, when he made a charge of a character somewhat analogous to this. The only difference is, that, in 1892, by his motion, Sir James Edgar asked that the reference be made to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It appears, however, if hon. gentlemen will refer to the debate upon that motion of his, that there was a general consensus of opinion that a question of that kind would only suffer delay by being referred to so large a committee, and there was a general consensus of opinion that upon a charge of this kind the reference could far more profitably be made to a select committee. There is, in the motion, as the House will observe, a request that all witnesses should give their evidence under oath. I am aware that under the statute of 1894 that is not absolutely necessary, but that the statute provides that any committee of this House may swear witnesses brought before it. It says it may swear them, but the general rule, I find from precedents in England, where a similar statute to that of 1894 has existed for some considerable time, is that the direction of the House has always been imperative on committees to swear witnesses. I thought it was better to incorporate that instruction in the reference. I have also added the word 'articles' to the customary words 'papers,' &c., which usually appear in motions of this kind, because it is possible that, in the present inquiry, apart from papers, statements, accounts, letters, &c., it may be necessary to order the production of certain articles before the committee. So much for the procedure; now, as to the substance of the charge itself. It seems to me that a member of this House, making a statement upon which is founded a charge for which he demands an investigation, should not prejudge the case. The statement is made; it is articulated carefully, and he should refrain from making a commentary upon evidence which has not been adduced. However, I think it is necessary to point out to the House some few of the particular points raised by the statement; in the first place, to show what was the motive which caused me to originate this procedure, and in the next place, in order that the House should be

fully instructed as to the basis of the statement which I made. In the first place, I will ask the House to observe that the gist of the whole charge is, that the food tested at Kingston was not the food which was forwarded to our troops in South Africa. That is the main point of the statement, and beyond that, strictly speaking, it was unnecessary to go. However, perhaps, from the fact of my long practice of my profession, and, perhaps, from the necessity which, I think, existed to articulate the grounds of my charge, I deemed it useful, if not absolutely essential, to give further details, and to give the circumstances which led me to make before this House the statement which I made. I articulated particularly the acquaintance of the hon. the Minister of Militia with Mr. Hatch, the sole manufacturer of the food which had been tested at Kingston. Upon that point I will pray the House to remember that the hon. the minister stated most formally in this House at the time of the first debate, and stated repeatedly, that he did not know Mr. Hatch. I confess that this statement so formally made by the Minister of Militia gave me considerable embarrassment because it seemed to me that we might with reason assume that if this gentleman had never met the Minister of Militia, it became difficult to tax him with not having communicated with him at the time that the necessity existed for provisioning our troops. But there was evidently a lapse of memory on the part of the hon. gentleman, because I took the trouble to make a most careful investigation, and no possible doubt can exist in the mind of anybody, that the minister on several occasions, long previously to the two circumstances which the statement refers to, had seen Mr. Hatch, had seen him on business, and on business connected with the very subject which is engaging the attention of the House. It is quite conceivable that in the hurry and bustle and occupation which became incumbent upon the Minister of Militia at the time of the sending out of the troops, this circumstances may have escaped his memory, but the fact is there, and I bring it to the attention of the House, because there is in my statement, a formal articulation of fact, that the minister had seen Mr. Hatch repeatedly, and had seen him on business in connection with this food, before the declaration of war. Besides I may state to the House, that very strong representations having been made to the hon. minister, that in this respect, at least, the statement he made to the House being absolutely incorrect, he must positively correct it; I believe the hon. minister in conformity to these strong representations acquitted himself of that task.

As the House will notice, I thought it necessary, partly for my own justification, partly for the guidance of the committee, to clearly point out that the stuff sent out

to South Africa, whatever be its character, had never been manufactured in Canada at all; because upon that fact, which I will prove without any possibility of doubt or cavil, rested the suspicion, and the very natural suspicion the House will admit, that there was something wrong, for be it remembered, that protose is an article which I believe is nowhere manufactured on this continent, except at No. 10 Richmond Square, Montreal, by the patentee of that food. If, therefore, the food was brought in from the United States, there was a very strong presumption that it certainly was not the food which had been tested at Kingston. I thought it, therefore, necessary to articulate that fact, and I will add that I deemed it essential as showing strong grounds for suspicion on my part that that food had been brought into this country in Saratoga trunks, and under other circumstances which were surely—I appeal to every member of this House, if I am not correct in saying—which were surely calculated to excite suspicion and grave distrust.

There is also, as the House will notice, particularly articulated in my statement the question of the packing. I have been informed, by most competent men, that emergency rations; food of the nature which we are discussing to-day, whatever may be its inherent value, loses all its qualities when that food has been allowed to be exposed to the air for a certain time. I have obtained one of the tin cans—one of the shipment of tin cans, which were sent out to South Africa; that is according to the very best information. I hold that tin can in my hand at the present moment. It is a can which is not hermetically sealed. The can has never been sterilized as it should be, as I am informed. The can is not even closed hermetically. A strong man holding the can, can open it, by squeezing his hand. Any person leaning strongly against this can will cause the cover to go off. So little is it hermetically sealed, that although but a small quantity of the contents remain—probably for the cause I have just indicated—if you turn the can over and shake it, you will find that it amounts to little more than a pepper-box, and that with a little patience the remnants that remain in the can will soon be expelled from it. I thought it necessary to particularly articulate that point, because, according to me, without doubt, there is there an element of carelessness and unpardonable neglect.

This House will observe also, that I referred to the nature of the company, and why did I do so? Upon this can you will find the address, presumably of the company that manufactured this substance contained in the can. It is the Vitaline Company, and upon the label is given the address of that company. What is that address? It is 'corner of Craig and Bleury streets, Montreal.' I presume there is no doubt that all the cans that went out to South Africa bore

the same label, and here is a point where suspicion very justifiably and very naturally arises. At the corner of Craig and Bleury streets, Montreal, you find at the south-east corner, the Clendenning Stove Company, and at the south-west corner, you have the office of the *Montreal Daily Witness*. On the north-east corner you find, I believe, a haberdashery or hatter's store.

An hon. MEMBER. Allan's store.

Mr. MONK. Yes, Allan's great haberdashery store, and on the north-west corner is a chemist's shop. Now, where would the House suppose that this Vitaline Company, giving its address as the 'corner of Craig and Bleury streets, Montreal,' would have its office? Would it be in the office of the *Montreal Daily Witness*, and is it conceivable that the food furnished to our troops in South Africa was fabricated in the office of that eminently respectable newspaper? I presume not. Would it be in the Clendenning Stove Company? That seems improbable. You possibly find many things in stove stores generally, but you do not usually find concentrated foods. Would it be in Allan's haberdashery store, where you see nothing but hats, shirts, cravats, &c.? Not probable. We are, therefore, when examining a case, as a lawyer or any sensible man would do, led to the very natural conclusion, that the remaining corner would be the place where you would find this Vitaline Company—the chemist's store. But here a great doubt is immediately created, because the owner of that store has taken the trouble to make a published statement. What does he say? From the letter which I am about to read to the House, if you take it in good faith—and we must assume *omnia rite esse acta*—it is evident that there is no office of the Vitaline Company there. This is what he says:

Sir,—In your issue of Thursday last my name is mentioned in the report of the parliamentary discussion of the 'emergency food' supplied to the government for the South African contingent as having been the manufacturer and having sold a certain food that was afterwards analysed and found to be almost worthless. If the statements made were allowed to go unchallenged by me, the public would be led to believe that I had been a party to or had committed a serious offence. Allow me to state, that as far as the allegations concern me, they are absolutely false. I have never manufactured any food for the government nor for Dr. Devlin. I am not nor never have been a partner of Dr. Devlin's, and any transactions he may have had with the government are entirely on his own account, and there is no reason why my name should have been mentioned in the matter, as it is one which does not concern me.

The address is given as being at that corner where we should naturally expect or presume that the Vitaline Company had its principal place of business; but from that corner we have an absolute denial. We have no denial from the other corners; but

Mr. MONK.

there is, as I said a moment ago, a strong presumption against them. Therefore, I think the House will admit that I had a right under the circumstances, as I did, to articulate that this company had no known address in the city of Montreal, unless you or I come to the conclusion that its office was in the air or under the street—an office which a man could reach only by a manhole or a trapdoor. I appeal to the members of this House whether there was not at any rate strong ground for suspicion.

The further information contained in the statement is to the effect that this stuff, imported from the United States, passed through the customs without paying duty. I cannot swear to it, but I received on that point information upon which I was bound to rely, and which also is articulated in the statement.

There remains another point which I desire to indicate to the House, because I wish to show—and presently the House will see why—that I did not proceed without consideration, imprudently or rashly. That is the question of payment. It is alleged in the statement which is about to be referred to a committee, that the payment was made before the goods were delivered. Upon that point I am not to that degree certain that I could take an oath; but a man making a charge in this House makes that charge upon reliable, respectable information conveyed to him—facts ascertained by him upon which he has reason to found a strong belief; and that belief which has existed in my mind and exists to-day, is to the effect that payment was made before the goods were delivered; in which case I think the House will admit that this, joined with the other circumstances, was calculated to arouse suspicion, because the parties who furnished this food are irresponsible parties, as alleged in the information which I have given to the House. Let the House notice that the last delivery of this food, according to the papers brought down by the Minister of Militia, was on the 25th of January last. If the payment was made after delivery, it was made after the 25th of January; and the House will bear in mind that there is a statement made, which can easily be proved, that on the 25th of January the Minister of Militia was informed by Mr. Hatch by letter that the food furnished to the contingent was not Hatch's Protose, as tested at Kingston previously. Therefore, if payment was not made before the goods were delivered, and the ultimate delivery was, on the 25th of January, it was made after that letter of warning was received; and in that case the government is equally guilty.

Now, Sir, having explained, in order to make it clear to the House, the nature of the charge, having explained those particular articulations which the charge contains, it remains for me to say to this House that, as is well known by all persons who have read, that transactions of this kind are un-

fortunately too frequent. We know that in the Spanish-American war a difficulty of this kind arose, a difficulty of a very grave nature, reflecting upon persons connected with the government of the United States and upon some of the military employees. In the Franco-Prussian war all who have read the history of that war know how much the poor French soldiers suffered from the acts of unscrupulous army contractors. If in that war a double proportion of misery fell on the defenders of France, it was due in large part to the acts of the army contractors; and I could give numberless instances. It would therefore not be surprising if, in our military expedition, something of this kind should have occurred; and, Sir, as a member of this House—and I repeat it, in spite of the taunts and jeers that some hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches launched against me—I believe I only acted in accordance with my duty in bringing this matter before the House. These men were simply volunteers, after all, among a vast number of applicants for military service, and they have been the admiration of the world. 2,500 men travelled over 7,000 miles to defend our flag; and the least those who were not able to follow them could do was to see that they secured adequate protection. Therefore, I think that these facts having come to my knowledge, I was perfectly justified—I would have been greatly, criminally, remiss in my duty if I had not brought these facts to the knowledge of the House. I have been attacked; I have been told that if I published a statement in the papers, I would be criminally prosecuted for libel. Vain attacks! Vain taunts! What I state to the House the newspapers of the country may publish, and I will take the consequences, although I never like a role of notoriety. It is not to the public press of this country that a man who has the honour of a seat in this House should go to discuss questions of this kind. He is sent here to perform a certain duty, and it is here, and not in the newspapers that he should perform that duty. Before I resume my seat, I should say that I was a little surprised at the manner in which the information which I thought it my duty to convey to the House was received. And why? Well, Mr. Speaker, a man rises in this House and he complains that a lighthouse is not in proper order. Immediately a member of the government gets up and says he did not know it and that he will see to it. My hon. friend to my left (Mr. Prior) has time and again called the attention of the government to evils resulting from Chinese immigration from the want of careful observation of the quarantine regulations. He is, generally met with a courteous answer; he is told that the matter has escaped the attention of the government, or something of that kind, and that it will receive attention. The

provisions of the alien labour law are sometimes relax and complaint is made, and the government seeks to justify itself and states that the proper officers will see to the enforcement of our law. But a man who has never, I think, unfairly thrust himself upon the attention of this House, hears of an army scandal, of a matter of the gravest nature which concerns the Department of Militia—the department which we should most jealously guard from all political influence—and he calls the attention of that department to this matter in connection with the furnishing, not of clothes or arms, important as they might be, but of the very food of our troops—and all the gentlemen on the Treasury benches proceed to jump upon him. I had the Prime Minister telling me that I was accusing a respectable member of the medical profession—absolutely in anger he was. I had the Minister of Finance chiding me for my zeal in this matter—a very pardonable zeal; and I had the Minister of Militia going so far as to tell me that I spoke like the paid advocate of Mr. Hatch.

Mr. Speaker, I never met Mr. Hatch with regard to the first information I gave this House. I would have taken with much distrust naturally information of that kind given to me by the very man who might be interested in this contract. But I got it, although it was public property in Montreal, at that time, from a respectable physician who has tested Hatch's protose; and that I can prove before a committee. And it was upon that information, conveyed to me in no uncertain way by a most respectable physician, who knew the value of this food tested in Kingston, that I brought the matter to the knowledge of the House.

Then, even my hon. friend the Solicitor General attacked me most vigorously. He said that I would not dare to repeat elsewhere what I have said here. He taxed me with insincerity. This was a reproach I little expected from the Solicitor General, I must confess. Had I been attacked by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) I believe I would have succumbed completely; I believe I would not have been able to bear up against his powerful invectives. But last, and perhaps least, the minister without portfolio—so gentle, so suave, so polite—got up in a fire of anger and said that my statement amounted to a cock and bull story.

Whatever may be the result of this investigation, my own mind and my sense of duty are perfectly at ease, because I feel that I have done simply what I ought to have done. I have done what any other man in my position would have done, and more, what any member of this House, I think, on whatever side he may sit, would have actively busied himself about, at any rate, if he had obtained that information. I will do that justice to the men, without

exception, with whom I have been sitting here for four years.

But the government made a great mistake, and that is admitted on all sides. Having given that information to the House, instead of these gentlemen jumping around me and attacking me—pardon the expression, Mr. Speaker—like a band of savages torturing a prisoner at the stake, they might have very well said that they were no party to such an infamous transaction as the one I brought to the notice of the House; that they would immediately have an investigation, and keep the House informed, and bring the guilty parties—if guilty parties there were—to the punishment which, in my estimation, they richly deserve. I beg to move:

That I am credibly informed and believe that I can establish by satisfactory evidence:

1. That in October, 1898, Surgeon Lieut.-Col. Neilson, director general medical staff of the Canadian militia, wrote to Henri Hatch, of Montreal, a manufacturer of concentrated foods, and the registered owner of 'Hatch's Protose,' a well-known food produced in Montreal by the Hatch Protose Company, and in use in hospitals throughout the country, informing the said Hatch that the Minister of Militia, the Hon. Frederick William Borden, was interested in Hatch's protein food, and impressed by the favourable results reported by the hospitals, and in consequence that the minister had instructed him (Neilson) to ask immediately for samples of the powder, and that, from the laboratory of the Hatch Protose Company, in Montreal, two samples of 80 per cent and 50 per cent proteid-strength were, without delay, sent by Hatch to the minister.

2. That in February, 1899, the Minister of Militia, the said Hon. Frederick William Borden, then, as now, a member of this House, promising Hatch a first trial order for the mounted police in the Yukon, asked him if at any time a sufficient quantity could be had of the powder on short notice, in order to avoid delay in delivery in view of the difficulties in communication, so that depots might be established where 'Hatch's Protose' might be stocked for any emergency, to which the said Hatch answered that he had all the necessary machinery in his laboratory, and would keep ready for the department from half a ton to one ton of powder over 60 per cent proteid-strength, as per the average of the samples sent to Lieut.-Col. Neilson.

3. In March, 1899, the said Hatch employed and charged one Dr. Devlin, of Montreal, to solicit the permission from the department to make a military test of the said food, known as 'Hatch's Protose,' as an exclusive diet, in order to ascertain if soldiers on active service could live on it in perfect health, whereupon it was decided that the test would be applied to five soldiers of 'A' Battery, R.C.A., at Kingston, Ont., subject to stringent conditions imposed by the said Minister of Militia, namely:

(a) that the soldiers subjected to the test should answer satisfactorily a certain series of approved questions;

(b) that the test should last for one month;

(c) that the test should have to be stopped at once if any one of the five soldiers suffered uneasiness;

(d) that the test should be controlled by Lieut.-Colonels Neilson and Drury at Kingston, Ont.

4. That it resulted from the said test so made at Kingston upon five soldiers of 'A' Battery,

Mr. MONK.

R.C.A., that the food furnished for the experiment by the Hatch Protose Company, of Montreal, and controlled as above, was an eminently suitable food to serve as an emergency ration, and it was so reported by the Minister of Militia to Mr. Hatch himself.

5. When the first contingent of Canadian troops were preparing for departure for South Africa, Mr. Hatch, proprietor of the food tested in Kingston, as above, wrote to the Minister of Militia in reference to the supply of emergency rations to the said contingent, in the shape of food such as tested in Kingston, to which the minister replied, thanking Mr. Hatch, and expressing regret that under arrangements made with the home government, all supplies for the said contingent of Canadian troops were to be furnished by the War Office in England.

6. That the Minister of Militia had several interviews, principally in Montreal, but also elsewhere, with the said Henri Hatch, whom he knew to be the sole manufacturer of the food tested at Kingston

7. That nevertheless, by a tender made on the 4th day of January last, and accepted on the same day, an agreement was arrived at between the Minister of Militia and the said Dr. Devlin (hereinafter mentioned) at Ottawa, by which the latter undertook to supply the Department of Militia and Defence with 2,333 pounds of vegetable proteid powder, in 7,000 tins, for the sum of \$4,660.

8. That upon information received by him that the said agreement was being executed under circumstances calculated to excite grave suspicions, the said Henri Hatch, on the 25th day of January, 1900, wrote the Minister of Militia a letter, which was by him duly registered, in the following terms:

Your Excellency,—I just happen to hear of a large purchase of 'Proteid food' from Messrs. Devlin & Lyons, of this city, for the Canadian contingent. If such is the case, I consider it to be my right and my duty to inform you that such a supply can only rest upon a poor and fraudulent adulteration of my 'Protose,' as it is done without my knowledge, and has nothing in common with the product tested in Kingston last spring. This will be easily detected by analysis of the food supplied, to which end I intend to take the necessary steps in order to protect my interests. A sample of mine could, of course, have easily been obtained from any druggist, but the articles, if already supplied, are not mine, and cannot be identical with those used at the military test.

This I thought it advisable to bring to Your Excellency's knowledge, for any emergency.

Your humble servant,

H. HATCH.

9. That the Minister of Militia and Defence failed to acknowledge receipt of this letter, and did not promptly communicate with the troops of the Canadian contingent, or take any steps to verify the truth of the information conveyed to him by the letter above referred to of January 25, 1900, received from the person whose food he had, as above stated, caused to be tested at Kingston.

10. That as a matter of fact, the food or emergency ration supplied to the Canadian troops was not identical with the food tested at Kingston, known as 'Hatch's Protose,' but was a totally different article, of very inferior quality, containing scarcely 17 per cent of nutriment, whereas the food tested contained over 60 per cent of nutritive substance.

11. The said food, so supplied under said agreement, was never made in Canada at all, but

was brought on from New York or some place in the United States of America, by the parties interested, packed in a certain number of large Saratoga trunks, containing each two large rough bags filled with a substance closely resembling broken biscuits; it was then ground in Montreal by ordinary milling process to a fine powder, and placed hurriedly in small tins, neither sterilized nor hermetically sealed, and must have deteriorated even if it had been suitable food, which it was not.

12. That the said tins bore a label indicating that the emergency ration contained in them were the product of the Vitalline Company, corner Craig and Bleury streets, Montreal, said company having no legal existence, and being irresponsible, and having neither manufactory nor known office in the said city of Montreal.

13. That the value of the said food, so brought on from the United States, does not exceed \$500.

14. That a sample of the said food, so packed in the tins aforesaid, was obtained from the drug store where it had been packed, and was subsequently tested by Milton L. Hersey, M.A., Sc. (McGill), of Montreal, and found to contain only 17 per cent of nutritive substance, and said analysis was confirmed elsewhere.

15. Said tins were shipped to Halifax in large wooden cases bearing a large label, stating that upon the food contained in them Canadian soldiers had lived thirty days in perfect health.

16. The usual precautions as to inspection were not adopted by the Militia Department in regard to this shipment of emergency rations.

17. The substance brought in from the United States, as above stated, in Saratoga trunks, was detained by the customs officers for duty thereon, but under direction of the government it was allowed to pass without payment of customs dues.

18. The amount due under the agreement of the 4th of January, 1900, that is, \$4,660, was paid to the contractor before the goods were actually delivered.

19. That under all the circumstances above set forth, the Minister of Militia and Defence, the said Hon. Frederick William Borden, was guilty of gross and culpable negligence: (a) in making, with undue haste, the agreement hereinabove referred to of the 4th of January, 1900, for the supply of emergency rations to the Canadian troops in South Africa with irresponsible parties; (b) in not having the preparation of said rations controlled by competent men, and the supply furnished to the troops carefully and rigidly inspected and tested; (c) in neglecting, after he had received said letter of January 25 last, to take the steps commanded by the ordinary rules of prudence to ensure the protection of the troops; and (d) in paying the amount of the said contract, \$4,660, in a case where he must have known that any recovery of the same was impossible, and without any investigation.

That the above statements be referred to a select committee of this House to inquire fully into the said allegations, with power to send for persons, papers, records and such articles as may be necessary for such investigation, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and that the committee do report in full the evidence taken before them and all their proceedings on the reference and the result of their inquiries.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). After having listened to the hon. gentleman, I am more than ever of the opinion which I expressed yesterday that this is not a question which can be termed a question of privilege. The hon. gentle-

man does not charge anybody with any fault which might be wantonly committed against the privileges of this House, but whilst I state this, I have no intention whatever of pressing the point. After consultation with my colleague, the Minister of Militia, a moment ago, we have come to the conclusion that he would waive all question of privilege and meet the question fairly and squarely. But at the same time, I must remind the House that there has been a misunderstanding. Upon the Votes and Proceedings issued this morning, the motion is set down to be taken into consideration to-morrow, and therefore, my hon. colleague, the Minister of Militia, who has a right to be heard before the motion is considered, has not ready the statement he desires to make, and the government have not had the time to give the consideration to the matter which it should before the motion is decided.

I move, therefore, that the debate do now adjourn, and be made the first order of the day to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

#### CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 180) concerning and restricting Chinese immigration. He said: The members of this House who have had the honour of occupying seats on the floor of parliament in the eighties remember very well that almost every session the question of restricting Chinese immigration—which at that time was as open as any other kind of immigration—came regularly before the House, and was annually brought to its attention by the gentlemen who then sat here from the province of British Columbia. It was represented that Chinese immigrants were of an undesirable character, that in fact they could hardly be styled immigrants at all, that they came here, not with the intention of settling in the country or making it their permanent abode, but simply to spend a few years earning their living at the expense of honest white labour, then returning to their country. It was represented, moreover, that if they had come here with the intention of becoming settlers and becoming permanent citizens, this would not be desirable, because they are of a character not suitable as immigrants for Canada. The complaints becoming more numerous, the government of that day thought it advisable to have the matter properly investigated. This subject, which so deeply affects our fellow-citizens residing in the province of British Columbia, is one that is not at all felt here. The other day I noticed that my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) stated that the time would come when the people of the east would suffer as much from Chinese immigration

as the people of the west do to-day. But, that time has not come, and the people of the east do not take the same interest in the question, the same passionate interest, I may say, as is taken in it by the people of British Columbia. In 1884, if I remember aright, the government issued a commission, which was presided over by the late Mr. Chapleau, to investigate the question and make a report upon it. The report expressed the conclusion that, in fact, the Chinese were not a desirable class of immigrants, that not only was it not advisable to encourage that class of immigration, but, it was advisable, in some measure, to restrict it.

Acting on the report, the government introduced a measure under which a poll tax of fifty dollars was imposed upon all Chinese immigrants. That Act came into force in 1886, and has been in force ever since. During the first years when it was in force, I believe it gave substantial and reasonable satisfaction to the people of British Columbia. I may say that whether it was the result of the Act or the result of other causes, Chinese immigration into British Columbia in the years immediately following 1886 was of a very restricted character. The statistics we have in the department show that those who paid the poll tax seldom exceeded 200 in a year. Of late years, the immigration has become much more considerable, and it is growing from year to year. So, an agitation has been carried on for some years past, asking that further restrictions be imposed upon this class of immigrants. We have no statistics as to the number of Chinese who leave this country, but there is reason to believe that the number is not inconsiderable. There was a provision in the Act which allowed a Chinaman to emigrate on what was called a leave of absence, or something of that kind—that is, he could take a ticket-of-leave, and, on returning and presenting his ticket he could re-enter the country without paying a second poll tax. There are still about five thousand of these tickets-of-leave which have been given out, the owners of which have not returned to this country. It is probable that a considerable number of others have gone out without such tickets-of-leave. Therefore, it may be said that the character of the immigration may be said to be essentially transient. Every Chinaman who comes to Canada to work comes, not with the intention of settling, but, invariably with the intention of returning to his own country. Under such circumstances, I think we may safely conclude that the Chinese population of British Columbia, though it may be a little larger, does not very much exceed that of 1886.

But the problem has been complicated by another feature that did not exist in 1884. In 1884, and previous years, complaints were made only of Chinese immigration. But, since that time, and particularly in recent years, similar complaints have been made

of Japanese immigration. I believe it is the fact that a certain number, perhaps a considerable number of men of Japanese origin, are coming to British Columbia. The question is, how are we to deal with this double problem? How are we to treat the Chinese immigrants and the Japanese immigrants? That something should be done we are all prepared to admit—at any rate, the government is prepared to admit it. To what extent we should go is the question. What are the steps to be taken is another question. It has been suggested that we ought to apply the Natal Act. The Natal Act applies to all Asiatics, and is absolutely prohibitive—not prohibitive in term, but prohibitive in fact. It would be a bar to all Asiatic immigration.

Mr. PRIOR. Yes, to all the uneducated classes.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is the only class to which objection would be made; we do not object to Chinese or Japanese merchants settling in the country. The gist of the Natal Act is, that no immigrant of Asiatic origin shall be permitted to settle in the country unless he can read and write one of the languages of Europe. This makes it, in effect, prohibitive. We have not thought it advisable to adopt the provisions of the Natal Act, because there are questions of Imperial policy connected with the question at this moment which the Canadian people are not prepared to ignore. Therefore, while we recognize that Japanese immigration is to be treated differently from Chinese immigration, at the same time, we want to have the matter properly investigated. The government has come to the conclusion that it would be wise at this moment to follow the course adopted by the government in 1884, and have the matter properly investigated—whether or not the Japanese should be treated as the Chinese were; whether or not the Japanese are of the same objectionable character as the Chinese; and whether or not, if they present the same objectionable character as the Chinese, they should be absolutely prohibited from coming into this country. We propose, therefore, to have a committee of investigation appointed, who will look into the question and report, so that the views of the people of British Columbia may be placed before the Imperial authorities. There is a question of Imperial policy involved; and I believe there is no man in this country at this moment who would be prepared to advise the Canadian government to put a restriction upon Japanese immigration. At all events, speaking on behalf of the Canadian government, I am prepared to say, that for reasons I have had occasion to explain more than once on the floor of parliament, we are not prepared to extend the same treatment to Japanese immigrants as to Chinese immigrants. We are not prepared to come in conflict with the Japanese

government, when, perhaps, there may be complications in the Orient which may involve England in a war, and when, possibly, the best ally she would have in the Orient might be put in jeopardy. For this reason, we are not prepared to treat the Japanese as we do the Chinese. But, while we take that course for the present time, we think it due to our fellow-citizens in British Columbia that they should have an opportunity to put their views on record, that this subject should be investigated by a proper commission, so that their views upon the question can be placed before the Imperial authorities for their consideration. There is, in that respect, ample justification for the course which I now suggest, that we should have this matter properly investigated.

### ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attention of your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Governor General had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :

An Act to incorporate the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer.

An Act to incorporate the Morris and Portage Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Cowichan Valley Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited).

An Act respecting the Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Thousand Islands Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Oshawa Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the St. Mary's River Railway Company.

An Act respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.

An Act respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.

An Act respecting the National Sanitarium Association.

An Act to incorporate the Holiness Movement Church in Canada.

An Act respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Crown Life Insurance Company.

An Act respecting the Merchants Bank of Halifax, and to change its name to 'The Royal Bank of Canada.'

An Act for the relief of Edwin James Cox.

An Act to amend the Gas Inspection Act.

An Act to amend the Loan Companies Act, Canada, 1894.

An Act to amend 'The Admiralty Act, 1891.'

An Act to incorporate the Colonial Investment and Loan Company.

An Act to amend the General Inspection Act so as to provide a grade for Flax Seed.

An Act respecting the Inspection of Foreign Grain.

An Act to make further provision respecting Grants of Land to members of the Militia Force on Active Service in the North-west.

An Act to amend the Experimental Farm Station Act.

An Act respecting the Restigouche and Western Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Dominion Cotton Mills Company (Limited).

An Act respecting the Yarmouth Steamship Company (Limited).

An Act respecting the Nova Scotia Steel Company (Limited).

An Act respecting the Quebec Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the St. Lawrence Terminal and Steamship Company.

An Act for the relief of Gustavus Adolphus Kobold.

An Act for the relief of Catherine Cecilia Lyons.

An Act respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Royal Marine Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Comox and Cape Scott Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act respecting Securities for Seed Grain Indebtedness.

An Act for the relief of Gertrude Bessie Paterson.

An Act respecting the Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company, and to change its name to the 'Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada.'

An Act respecting Inscribed Stock of Canada in the United Kingdom.

An Act to amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.

An Act respecting the incorporation of Live Stock Record Associations.

### CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With regard to the subject of Chinese immigration, I have observed that for some time past, as the number of Chinese immigrants has increased, there have been almost annual appeals to this parliament and government on the subject, from the people and legislature of British Columbia. In 1885, the legislature adopted the following resolution :

That an humble address be presented by this House to the Lieutenant Governor, praying him to again move the Dominion government to increase the per capita tax on Chinese coming into the Dominion to \$100 each; and at the same time expressing strongly the opinion of this House that three-fourths of all moneys received at British Columbia ports from the proposed higher tax, or (if such higher tax be not imposed) from the present tax of \$50, should be paid to this province, as the chief injury from the presence of these Chinamen is sustained by this province, and not by the Dominion.

Upon this resolution, the late Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives), made the following report :

The undersigned (Minister of Trade and Commerce) has the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Privy Council Reference No. 724 J, being a copy of a report of a committee of the Executive Council of the province of British Columbia having reference to a resolution of the legislative assembly of that province, passed during the present session, praying that the Dominion government may be moved to increase the per capita tax on Chinese entering the Dominion to \$100—such report having been transmitted through His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of the province under date of the 1st instant—and in reporting thereon, the minister would call attention to the report of his predecessor of date May 12, 1894, on similar resolutions, as per Privy Council Reference No. 1829 H, and in doing so would add that he sees no reason for changing in any way the substance of the report of May 12, above referred to.

I may just observe upon this resolution and report, that the resolution at that time adopted by the province of British Columbia, demanded that the increase of the personal poll tax on Chinese be raised from \$50 to \$100. Similar resolutions have been passed almost yearly. But I would call special attention to the last one, in which there is to be found a very important departure. In the year 1889, the legislature of British Columbia adopted a resolution which is embodied in a minute of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor to the Secretary of State. It is as follows :

Sir,—I have the honour to transmit herewith, for consideration of His Excellency the Governor General in Council, an approved minute of my Executive Council, dated the 2nd instant, embodying a resolution passed at the recent session of the Legislative Assembly of this province, expressive of the opinion and desire of that body that the federal government increase the per capita tax on Chinese immigrants to at least \$500.

Now, there has been in the minds of the people of British Columbia, upon that subject, a very serious movement indeed. In 1895, just five years ago, the people of British Columbia, as represented in their Legislative Assembly, demanded that the present poll tax of \$50, should be raised to \$100. To double a tax of that kind would be already a very serious step ; but in 1899, the same body passed a resolution asking that the tax should be raised from \$50 to \$500. There is in this fact a very grave suggestion, and one which everybody will admit requires serious consideration before it is adopted. In 1885 the parliament of Canada thought it advisable to impose a poll tax of \$50 ; and I may say that for several years this tax seemed to meet the object for which it was imposed. Of late years it also seems evident that this tax has become inadequate. Now, to what extent should it be increased ? I submit to the judgment of every man in this House, that to double it at once, would be to take a very considerable step ahead, but to increase it at one bound to \$500, would seem to be a proceeding which should be very carefully considered before it is adopted. The govern-

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

ment is not prepared to go that length, but the government thinks that at the present time, under the considerations I have stated to the House, we would be doing substantive justice to the people of that province, if we acted upon the suggestion they made a few years ago, and repeated several times and increased the tax from \$50 to \$100. The commission which I have spoken of, will have to investigate, not only the Chinese and Japanese questions, but also to consider whether it would be advisable further to increase the tax to \$500, as was proposed to us last year. The wisdom therefore, of appointing such a commission seems to be indicated to the consideration of the House. So far as Chinese immigration is concerned, we are prepared to go a good ways to meet the views of our fellow-citizens in the province of British Columbia. At the same time there are other interests to be considered, and we would not be prepared to sanction such a very wide departure as is involved in the proposition to raise the tax from \$50 to \$500. We think the people of British Columbia will be satisfied with the advanced step we are taking under this legislation, and will be prepared to await the result of the experiment of raising the tax to \$100, and see how it will work on the immigration of next year. The commission, therefore, will have to investigate that subject of Chinese immigration, and will have to determine whether the increase which we make this year is adequate or not to meet the views of our fellow-citizens in the province of British Columbia.

With regard to the Japanese question, I have to inform our friends from British Columbia, that in coming to the decision not to impose any tax whatever upon Japanese immigrants, it is possible that we may disappoint the people of that province ; but I feel almost certain, indeed I have an abiding faith, that when they realize the motives of the Imperial policy which guide us in denying them that wish, when we represent to them that at present England is not only engaged in war in South Africa, but that serious complications are arising in China, and it is not impossible that England, though we hope it will not come to pass, may find herself engaged in another war in the Orient, the people of British Columbia, I venture to think, will be prepared to put no obstacle in the way of an alliance between Japan and England ; and although it may call for a sacrifice on their part, they will be prepared to make that sacrifice for the sake of the mother country and for the sake of a united empire.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) I have listened to the special pleading of the right hon. leader of the government, very attentively. There is only one feeling that will permeate the people throughout British Columbia, as soon as the telegraph has flashed

this news to them, and that will be one of great disappointment. A few days ago, I brought to the notice of the House, a telegram that was sent to British Columbia in 1896 by the right hon. gentleman, in which he said: 'On this question, the views of the Liberals in the west will prevail with me.' Now, I would ask the right hon. gentleman, with which of the members from British Columbia, who support his government, do these views prevail? I think there is not a single gentleman representing a constituency of British Columbia who will say to-day that he is satisfied that this Chinese tax should be raised to only the small sum of \$100 per head. The right hon. gentleman says that he believes there are no more Chinese in British Columbia to-day, than there were in 1886. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman is a better authority than I am on that question, because he has all the statistics at hand, and perhaps has looked them up; but, I venture to say, there are many more thousands of Chinese in British Columbia to-day than there were in 1886. They are not, perhaps, so easily seen, because in that year the Canadian Pacific Railway had just finished building their road, and the many thousands of Chinamen that they had employed had not then distributed themselves but were concentrated in certain portions of British Columbia. They are now distributed all over the mining districts of British Columbia. In Cariboo you see almost three Chinamen to every white man that is mining and taking gold out of the ground. In regard to the Japanese I must say that I feel as strongly as the First Minister or any of his supporters, that we should do our best to strengthen the bonds between Great Britain and the empire of Japan, but we must look at home first, and, as I said the other day, I firmly believe that it would not have done any harm to these friendly feelings if the Prime Minister had seen fit to bring in the Natal Act. It is in force in other portions of the British Empire, and nothing is said against it. Why should not Canada put it in force as well? The people of British Columbia believe that they have a right to demand that, and I feel perfectly certain that nothing will satisfy them until some stringent measure is put in force to at least lessen the influx of Japanese, as well as of Chinese. This is the first reading of the Bill, so that I do not intend to make any lengthy remarks, but, I must say that I believe there will be an intense feeling of disappointment in British Columbia when they know what the government has seen fit to bring down to-day.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). Before the motion is put, I wish to say that I, too, am quite disappointed at the conclusion which the government have arrived at. In my opinion there is not much room for the Chinaman in Canada. He displaces a good Canadian, or, a good British subject.

As has been proved by the commission which was referred to by the right hon. First Minister in his speech, the Chinese come to Canada, live here for a few years, earn a lot of money, and save the largest portion of it. They say that they can live on a pound of rice a day, which costs them a good deal less than five cents a pound, and they leave the country, taking with them the money which they have obtained. The First Minister stated to the House, as I understood it, that there were 5,000 permits to leave the country issued to men who have gone out and who have not come back. That, I presume, is the class that has made some money and then returned to China. These Chinese have simply made use of this country, and have obtained employment which should have gone to good citizens of the country. I think that the increase of the tax from \$50 to \$100 will be totally inadequate. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) could easily tell us what are the figures as to the entrance of Chinamen in the country during the past fourteen years. I think it will be found to be very much larger than these 5,000, of whom we have a record as having gone back to China. If that be the case, one of two things must have occurred. Either the Chinese population of Canada has very much increased, or a number of Chinese have made use of Canada as a kind of underground railway to get into the United States. So far as that is concerned, I suppose we have no particular objection if the Chinese come here, pay the poll tax and go through to the United States. It is a matter of no particular concern to us, and we would have no objection to the Chinese leaving this country no matter whether it be by underground railway or any other means of exit. But, the population is increasing. It has been found now that not only are they monopolizing the laundry business and the growing of vegetables in British Columbia, but they are driving skilled miners out of employment in the coal mines. They are going into the mines as coal miners. There are many reasons for objecting to these men going into the coal mines. For instance, Canadian people have to work in these mines. It is the most perilous of all employments. They should be guarded and protected in every possible way that human ingenuity and civilized usage can devise for the protection of the lives of the people, but it has been found that the Chinese are not paying that attention to the protection of their lives that is necessary and desirable in the coal mines. Therefore, I contend, Mr. Speaker, that these men should be prohibited altogether from working in the coal mines of British Columbia, or anywhere else. It is not safe for the other miner who goes in there because he has to consort and associate with these men, making the risks which are inevitable in a coal mine, infinitely greater. For that reason, among many

others. Chinamen should be prohibited from working in the coal mines. More than that, I would say that the Chinaman is generally an undesirable immigrant. He does not do any good to the country. They say that he helps to build the railways and so on. There are plenty of other people to get that employment. There are plenty of people who, if they are employed, will make their homes in the country, who will assist in developing the country, who will perform the duties of Canadian citizens, who will help to build up the empire and perform the duties of good citizens, such as we are ready to welcome to this country. Fourteen years ago, as an experiment, it was decided to put a poll tax of \$50 per head on Chinese coming into the country. That tax was found then to be a success and to work satisfactorily. But experience has shown that it is not a sufficient restriction to impose to-day, that it does not keep out the Chinese, but that they are coming over in larger numbers than ever. The First Minister says he does not think the numbers are larger, but we would have been better satisfied if he had given us some more specific data which the Minister of Trade and Commerce would have furnished him with in order to fortify that opinion. He has just given a general opinion, but we would have been better satisfied if he had fortified that opinion with facts which must be in the hands of the government. So, I say, Mr. Speaker, that the statement made by the First Minister in regard to the Chinese will not be considered satisfactory throughout the country by those who have investigated this subject. In reference to the other portion of the proposal, in regard to the Japanese, I must say that it meets with my own cordial approval. I do not know how other hon. members of the House will view it, but I think I can cordially agree with the conclusion arrived at by the First Minister. I think it is not the time just now to disturb the relationships which exist between the Japanese Empire and any portion of the British Empire. I think that the First Minister, therefore, is quite justified in taking the position he does in regard to the Japanese, but, in regard to the Chinese it is a growing evil which calls for an immediate remedy. So, I say, that the proposal which is made by the government, in my opinion, will be entirely unsatisfactory.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### POSTMASTER OF CARNDUFF.

Mr. DAVIN (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. Has Mr. J. P. Carnduff been dismissed from the postmastership of Carnduff?
2. How long has he held this position?
3. Has Mr. J. H. Taylor been appointed in his stead?
4. Why was Mr. J. P. Carnduff dismissed?

Mr. WALLACE.

5. Has the Postmaster General received petitions from the people of the district protesting against Mr. Carnduff's dismissal?

6. Will the Postmaster General lay on the Table the correspondence, reports and petitions connected with the dismissal of Mr. Carnduff?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). 1. Mr. J. P. Carnduff has been dismissed from the postmastership of Carnduff, Assa. 2. He had been postmaster of Carnduff since 1st September, 1884. 3. Mr. J. H. Taylor has been appointed to the office in his stead. 4. Because certain mail matter which was mailed at Carnduff, and was liable for postage was, contrary to law, allowed to be transmitted through the mails free of postage. 5. A petition has been received. 6. No objection, if desired.

#### BALLAST GROUND AT ST. ELOI.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked .

Has the Department of Railways a ballast ground at St. Eloi, Temiscouata? If so, under what tenure does it hold the said ground; is it as proprietor or as lessee? In what year did the department acquire the said land from the farmers, what was the price agreed upon, and to whom was the money paid? Is it the intention of the department to work the said ballast ground this year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Department of Railways and Canals does own a ballast pit of an area of about ten acres, one and a half miles east of St. Eloi, together with fifty feet right of way thereto about one and a half mile in length. The government is the proprietor of the land. It was acquired at the time of construction of railway in 1873, at which time a plan was filed in the registry office, Fraserville. There are no deeds of it at Moncton. It is not proposed to work this ballast pit this year.

#### ROBERVAL WHARF.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. Whether the government have had any work done on the wharf at Roberval since March, 1900?

2. If so, how much money has been expended?
3. Why has not the sum of \$10,000, which Mr. Savard, M.P., at a public meeting at Roberval, in the autumn of 1899, declared to have been voted for that work, not been expended?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. Yes. 2. \$400. 3. This question purports to contain a statement of facts, and therefore, seems irregular. The department has no information in regard to such alleged declaration.

#### WHARF AT ST. GÉDEON.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked :

1. Whether the government is aware that Foreman Lavoie, in charge of the work on the wharf

at St. Gédéon, county of Chicoutimi, having refused to pay to Mr. S. Desjardins the price of certain pieces of timber and iron used in the said work, has been twice sued for the payment thereof?

2. Has the department been notified of the said actions at law?

3. Why has payment been refused to Mr. Desjardins?

4. What is the daily pay of Foreman Lavoie?

5. Does he receive, or has he received any allowance for travelling and board?

6. Is it true that his wages are paid even for days when it rains and no work is done?

7. Who recommended his appointment as foreman of the said work?

8. Why was not Mr. Elzéar Levesque, a master builder, entrusted with the building of the said wharf?

9. Is it true that Foreman Lavoie was sent from elsewhere to St. Gédéon simply to reward him for having changed his party in 1896, in consideration of promises made to him?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. It is known in the department that certain timber prepared by Mr. Desjardins, on his own responsibility, was refused by Mr. Lavoie, as it was not suitable for the work. 2. Not to the knowledge of the department that Mr. Lavoie was sued. 3. Was paid for all suitable timber and stone supplied. 4. \$2 a day. 5. No. 6. The foreman so far has only received one day's pay more than the workmen. 7. Mr. P. V. Savard, M.P. 8. Mr. Lavoie being appointed rendered it unnecessary to appoint an additional foreman. 9. The department has no information on this subject.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—EMERGENCY RATION.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Has the Militia Department had any analysis made by the Department of Inland Revenue of the 'emergency food' bought by the Militia Department for use of the troops in South Africa?

2. If so, how many samples were submitted, and on what dates?

3. Were these samples that were analysed, if any, the same food that was shipped to South Africa?

4. What were the results as reported by the Inland Revenue Department?

5. On what date was the emergency food shipped from Canada to South Africa?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). In answer to the first question: The Department of Militia sent to the Department of Inland Revenue on the 3rd February, 1900, two parcels of food for analysis; one taken from the packages of emergency food shipped to South Africa, the other from the food used in Kingston in March or April of a year ago. In answer to the second question: One sample of each was submitted on the 3rd February, 1900. In answer to the third question: One of the samples was of food shipped to South Africa, the other, as I have said, was a sample of the food used in Kingston. In answer to the fourth

question: I have already explained to the House that as thorough analyses are being made of these foods, I do not think it desirable now to make public the result of the analyses, except that I may say that they bear out literally the statement made to me in the letter which I read to this House from the Director General, that the foods are identical. In answer to the fifth question, I may say that I regret that I did not notice the reference to the date on which the food was to be delivered at Halifax, but it appears in the papers which I laid on the Table of the House. I think it is the 20th of January.

#### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. MACDONALD (HURON).

Mr. PETER MACDONALD (East Huron). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to rise to a question of privilege. There is in the *Ottawa Citizen* of this morning an article in which there is a quotation purporting to have been taken from a speech of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) on Tuesday evening, in which he charged me with having a direct interest in a dredge which he called 'No. 9' and therefore, that I was sitting in the House in direct contravention of the Independence of Parliament Act. Now, Sir, I wish to say that I have no interest directly or indirectly, remotely or approximately in any dredge in the world to-day. I therefore, think it wise on my own behalf and on behalf of those interested in me to make this statement, and to characterize the assertion of the hon. member for East Grey as literally and absolutely untrue.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I only wish to say this: That in the *Hansard* report, I noticed in correcting it that there was a mistake. Speaking of the circumstance of the owners of the property, I said 'I believed' that the member for Huron profits by the investment of his money in this way.

Mr. MACDONALD. Would you be kind enough to withdraw it?

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly. If the hon. member says he is not, I am certainly bound to withdraw the statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

#### PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN (East Queen's, P.E. I.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) for the reasons why work has been stopped on the contract for building a section of the railway in Prince Edward Island. The contract was entered into not very long ago, and the work was supposed to have been commenced, but I am now

informed that the work has been completely stopped. A few days ago I gave the minister notice that I would ask this question.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). The hon. gentleman alludes to the contract that was recently made for the building of eleven and a half miles of railway on the island—the grading and levelling of the road-bed from Charlotte-town to Murray Harbour. That work has been stopped for a reason which I think will commend itself to the hon. gentleman as sufficient. The contract, as the House has been informed already, was let to a Mr. McManus. Mr. McManus became mentally disqualified for doing any business or carrying on any work, and it was the desire of his friends, as well as his own desire, as far as he seemed to be able to express any desire, that the contract might be rescinded as respects himself; and upon looking into the matter we came to the conclusion, that in the interest of the work it was our duty to rescind the contract, and it has been rescinded. We are now in negotiation with the next tenderer, the amount of whose tender was very close to that of Mr. McManus, and I hope that before very long we shall be able to make such an arrangement that the work will be resumed. We have lost no time, I can assure the hon. gentleman, and I have given immediate attention to the matter. I am now in communication, through the officers of the department, with the next tenderer, Mr. Willard Kitchen.

Mr. **MARTIN**. I asked the hon. gentleman some time ago about the completion of the survey of the road, and he told me that it was to be proceeded with during this summer. The summer is now pretty well advanced, and I believe that no progress has been made in the completion of that survey. It was began as far back as the year 1897, during the progress of an election, and there has been nothing done since until 1899, during the progress of another election; and now, instead of it being proceeded with during the summer season, as the hon. gentleman told me it would be, nothing is being done.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have heard nothing, since furnishing the House with the information to which the hon. gentleman alludes, to make me doubt the correctness of the statement that the surveys are being prosecuted. That was the information given me at the time, and I still believe it to be correct.

Mr. **MARTIN**. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman another question. Some time ago I asked him whether the cross line starting at a point on the proposed Belfast line connecting with New Perth or Cardigan passing near Montague Bridge, in connection

Mr. **MARTIN**.

with this road had been surveyed, and he told me it was under the consideration of the government. I would like to know if he has come to any conclusion with regard to that matter?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think I shall have to ask my hon. friend to give me formal notice of that. I am not at the moment prepared to enlighten him.

#### ANALYSIS OF EMERGENCY FOOD.

Mr. **ALEX. McNEILL** (North Bruce). I should like to call the attention of the government to a statement made a few minutes ago by the Minister of Militia and Defence, who, I am sorry to see, has left the House. In reply to a question asked by my hon. friend from Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior) he said that an analysis had been made by the Inland Revenue Department of a portion of the emergency rations which were sent to South Africa, and he said he was not going to produce the report of that analysis at the present time. I must say I think that is scarcely—

Mr. **SPEAKER**. My hon. friend is entering into an argument.

Mr. **McNEILL**. I will, if necessary, conclude with a motion, Mr. Speaker, because I regard this to be a matter of the very gravest importance.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. There is just this difficulty, that in the absence of the minister I think it is hardly fair.

Mr. **McNEILL**. I will not in the absence of the minister, if so requested. But, I wish before sitting down, to call the attention of my right hon. friend to the matter, and ask him to be good enough to speak to his colleague in reference to it, and point out to him that it is considered by some members of this House that if there be in the Inland Revenue Department a report of that analysis, it should be laid on the Table of the House at the earliest possible moment.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In reply to my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill), I beg to say that the Minister of Militia stated a moment ago that the analysis of the food sent to Africa proved to be identical with the analysis of the food that had been experimented on before at Kingston. At any rate, I would remind my hon. friend that this matter is to come up to-morrow, when the minister will probably be able to give my hon. friend every satisfaction.

Mr. **McNEILL**. What I wished my hon. friend to do was to take care that the report of the analysis should be laid on the Table to-morrow.

### I. C. R.—TRAIN ACCOMMODATION.

Mr. M. J. F. QUINN (St. Ann's, Montreal). I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if it is the intention to put on another daily train between Montreal and the lower ports. The season when a very heavy traffic takes place on that line is approaching, and the demand is very great in Montreal on the part of those who occupy summer residences around Rivière du Loup and Metis for a daily train. The train which leaves Montreal in the morning reaches Metis and Rivière du Loup about midnight. This necessitates the loss of a day by men going to visit their families there, and brings them to their destination at a very inconvenient hour. In previous seasons a train has left Montreal about eleven o'clock at night—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). At 7.30 p.m.

Mr. QUINN. It left Bonaventure station, at all events, in the evening, and brought men from Montreal to their residences early in the morning in time for breakfast. This was a very great accommodation, and I know that the people of Montreal are very anxious that, at least, a tri-weekly service should be put on the Intercolonial Railway for their accommodation, and I would like to ask if it is the intention to give a service of that kind

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may say to my hon. friend that it is not the intention to increase the train service beyond that provided for. We think we have made ample arrangements for that traffic. It is, of course, in the interest of the Intercolonial Railway to furnish all the accommodation necessary to meet the demands of the public, and we believe we have done that. We are sending out an evening train every Friday, which will accommodate the business men, and it is the business men whom, I understand, my hon. friend has in his mind when he makes this request. To send a tri-weekly train in the evening would not be at all necessary, in my opinion, nor in the opinion of the traffic manager of the road.

### PORT MULGRAVE AND ST. PETER'S MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond). I desire to call the attention of the government to the fact, that the steamer plying between Port Mulgrave and St. Peter's and intermediate points, which is subsidized by this government, is not carrying the mails this year as formerly. The Postmaster General is absent from the House, but I would ask some member of the government to draw his attention to the fact that the steamer is not now carrying mails as formerly. This subjects the people to a very great inconvenience, inasmuch as the mails are

sent overland, and are not delivered until the following morning. I am sure that I need only draw the attention of the government to this matter to have the remedy applied at once.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I shall call the attention of the Postmaster General to the matter.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). There is great complaint in the town of Sydney and that neighbourhood, owing to the fact that the mails from Newfoundland arriving by the steamer *Bruce*, in the early morning, are not forwarded to Sydney, until late at night, and the mails are not delivered for twenty-four hours, although the distance is only five miles by steamer. I would ask the Minister of Railways, whether the report is well founded that a new time table is to come into operation on Monday next on the Intercolonial Railway, and if so, what are the hours of departure from Montreal to Sydney.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). If the hon. gentleman will give me until to-morrow, I will tell him the hours exactly. We leave Montreal for Sydney, by the express at about eleven o'clock, but the hour that we leave Sydney for Montreal, I cannot state at this moment.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. A. CAMPBELL (Kent). Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a statement going the rounds of the Tory press. I did not think it worth while to correct it at the time, but I see that it is reported in the *Daily Intelligencer*, of Belleville, and other papers. The statement is that when, after the resolution, moved by the First Minister, congratulating Her Majesty on the termination of the war, was voted, God Save the Queen was sung, I remained in my seat and kept my hat on. That is a downright falsehood, from beginning to end.

### WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) moved that the order for third reading of Bill (No. 110) to amend the Weights and Measures Act, be discharged, and the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, for further consideration.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The reason why I ask that the House go again into committee, is to add to the last subsection these words: 'and apply to all binder twine imported into Canada or manufactured in Canada after that date.' This is to prevent the Act having a retro-

active effect, and applying to binder twine now in store.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported; read the third time and passed.

#### INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved first reading of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 161) to amend the Act respecting interest. He said: This Bill reduces the general rate of interest from 6 per cent to 5 per cent. The Senate has added some words to put it beyond doubt that the change shall not affect liabilities existing at the time of the passing of the Act.

Amendments read the first and second time, and concurred in.

#### SUPPLY—BROCKVILLE AND WEST HURON ELECTIONS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to proceed with a motion of which I gave notice to the right hon. the leader of the House on Tuesday. As the matter has, to a very great extent, been debated and threshed out in the House, I will not find it necessary to deal with it at very great length. In the first place, I wish to say a word or two with respect to the memorandum from the Minister of Justice, which was read to the House on Monday, June 11, in answer to the suggestions which have been made to the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) by the leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper). Now, in the first place, the Minister of Justice is of opinion that the suggestion with reference to the indemnity of witnesses is covered by the statute 52 Vic., chap. 33, and he says that that statute was evidently overlooked by the leader of the opposition and myself in making the suggestions we did. It seems to me that it would rather appear that the Minister of Justice overlooked this statute, because he made not the slightest reference to it in the order in council upon which this commission is based. It is the usual course, where you rely upon a statute and an amending statute, to name not only the principal statute but the amending statute as well. This by the way. The statute of 52 Vic., chap. 33, does not meet the point brought forward by the leader of the opposition and myself. It merely contains a provision which is also found in the Canadian Evidence Act of 1891, to which I referred. The effect of this is that answers of witnesses which tend to incriminate them shall not be used in evidence against them. It does not contain the provision in the English Act,

Sir HENRI JOLY DE LOTBINIERE.

15-16 Vic., chap. 57, referred to by the leader of the opposition, nor does it contain the similar provision to be found in the ninth section of chap. 10 of the Revised Statutes, of Canada. The distinction, which the Minister of Justice does not seem to have dealt with, is perfectly plain. In the one case, in the statute which amends chap. 114, the provision is that you shall not use the witness' answer against him. But, in the Act respecting corrupt practices at elections and the English Act respecting inquiries of this kind, you have a provision that the witness shall not be prosecuted in respect of matters concerning which he gives evidence. In one case, you cannot use his own answers against him, but may prosecute him; in the other, he shall not be prosecuted if he answers fairly and to the satisfaction of the judges, and obtains a certificate. If he answers fairly, promptly and truthfully, and conducts himself properly, the judges or commissioners give him a certificate which prevents any prosecution against him in respect of the matter. I should have thought that the language of Mr. Blake with respect to that would have commended itself to the Minister of Justice. I do not desire to say a word which would detract from the well-known position and high reputation for ability of the Minister of Justice; still, we know that Mr. Blake is not only a man of very great learning and of exceptional ability—not inferior, perhaps, to the Minister of Justice—but he is a man of very much wider experience than the Minister of Justice. For that reason, I should have thought that his view with respect to the necessity of such a provision in investigations of this kind would have commended itself to the Minister of Justice. The language of Mr. Blake has already been quoted, but I think I might quote again a few words to good purpose:

The object one has in view in an inquiry of this description, where corrupt practices appear to have extensively prevailed, is to get at the proof, to search to the bottom, and ascertain how far corruption has prevailed in the constituency; and I think it is wise, under the circumstances, that a very liberal indemnity clause should be placed in the Bill.

So, he places in that Bill, which is dealing with an investigation of exactly the same character as that now proposed, the provision to which I have referred, which prevents any prosecution whatever being brought against any witness to whom the judge has given a certificate.

The next point to which I desire to direct attention is with respect to the scope of the commission. The hon. Minister of Justice has not seen fit to give effect to the suggestions of the leader of the opposition which would tend to enlarge the scope of the commission. He has held very strongly that the words which are to be found in the order in council, and, I presume, in the commission, are amply sufficient to effect the purpose intended. It

it impossible to know in advance how widely or how strictly these words will be construed. Taking them in their natural significance, it seems to me there might be a great deal of doubt whether they bear the wide construction the Minister of Justice puts on them. What do you aim at in an investigation of this kind? Do you desire merely to ascertain and report to the country the tool who has marked the ballot, or transferred the ballot, or altered the ballot, or stolen the ballot? I should not suppose that that was the intention of an investigation of this kind. I should suppose you would desire to inquire to any extent necessary in order to get at the real criminal, to go as far back as might be deemed necessary by the commissioners in the line of agency by which any such thing as that had been accomplished. For example, the agency may have been handed down through a dozen different hands, there may have been connivance or collusion, even where there was no positive direction. In regard to these matters, I should think it would be wise to grant to the commissioners power to be exercised by them in their discretion to enter into an inquiry of that kind, and not tie them down by any language found here.

—to inquire into and investigate any alleged fraudulent alteration, defacing, marking, spoiling, substitution or tampering in respect of election ballots, or by reason of—

These last words are meaningless, and, I believe, they are to be left out.

—any fraudulent conduct in respect of the poll books, ballot boxes, or the lawful contents, or what should have been the lawful contents, of the ballot boxes.

These words do not, in their natural signification, enable the judges to go back and deal with a person who is indirectly implicated who has helped to bring about the evil complained of, who has connived at the bringing of this about or who has colluded with the persons who have brought it about. That is a matter with respect to which there should be no possible objection on the part of the government to make the scope of the commission as wide as possible. We do not wish to have the time of the commission taken up in discussing the question of its scope, we do not desire that the money of this country should be spent in having counsel to argue before the commission and in having the commission consider whether the scope is sufficiently wide to embrace matters of that kind. Would it not be far better to make the scope so wide that there could be no possible justification on the part of the commissioners to hold, or on the part of counsel to contend that matters of that kind were not within the inquiry.

In the next place, the Minister of Justice has thought it unnecessary to make any change with respect to the appointment of counsel. Well, so far as the appointment of counsel is concerned, I do not propose to say anything.

It may be wise, as he thinks, that counsel should be appointed by the commission. But, one matter that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition dealt with has not been touched upon by the Minister of Justice, I think; and on that point I think I can appeal with a great deal of force to my hon. friend the Solicitor General. When you come to deal with the practical carrying out of an inquiry and investigation of this kind, there must be a previous investigation of the facts and inquiry into the evidence. There must be work that is usually done by solicitors. If you are to have your investigation, conducted by counsel before the commission, an effective one, you cannot expect those counsel to conduct a proper inquiry unless there is work done in the first place which is usually done by solicitors in an investigation before a judicial tribunal. Now, you appoint counsel of high standing. Do you expect that these counsel are to go into a constituency and drive around the country, interview witnesses, interview persons who are said to have knowledge of these matters, and do all the work which is usually done by a local solicitor? I should think you would probably be disappointed, and the resolution which I will read in a moment suggests that in respect matters of that kind some provision should be made for doing the work which is usually done by solicitors. I will not dwell on that because I desire to make my statement extremely brief.

Another point that the minister has dealt with, is the question whether witnesses before that commission should be permitted to testify as to how they marked their ballots, and the Minister of Justice has devoted a considerable portion of his memorandum to that matter. Now, the Minister of Justice has referred to the introduction of the present Ballot Act into parliament by the late chief justice of the province of Quebec, and he has said that at that time it was intended by him, on grounds of public policy, to have parliament so to legislate that the ballot could not under any circumstances, for the purpose of ascertaining by whom it was marked, be inquired into in a court of justice. Well, I am assuming, I do not know whether I am correct, that the Ballot Act in its present form is in the form in which it was then introduced. At all events, that it is material for us to consider, not the form in which it was introduced, but the form in which it exists at present; and the form in which it exists at present does not seem to carry out the suggestion of the Minister of Justice. It is not in every case that you are not to investigate, but only in certain cases:

No person who has voted at an election shall in any legal proceeding questioning the election or return, be required to state for whom he voted.

But the Minister of Justice says that the the policy of the Act is that he 'could

not be so required under any circumstances.' Well, I do not so understand the Act. This matter, as was mentioned by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the other evening, was to some extent argued out by lawyers on both sides before the Committee on Privileges and Elections last year; and the Manitoba cases and the Haldimand case, both dealing with this matter, were referred to, and the committee eventually decided to admit evidence of how the voter marked his ballot, because in that case there was not any legal proceeding questioning an election or return. Of course, it may be suggested to me if that is the law, why do you desire any provision made with respect to this matter? I say that I desire provision made because this is a very important matter, upon which doubts have been raised by eminent lawyers, and it is one upon which there should be no doubt.

It is quite true that the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, in a proceeding questioning an election and return, has dealt with this matter in the manner referred to by the Minister of Justice, but the opinion stated by the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada in deciding the particular case before him was a mere dictum with respect to the matter we are now considering, would not be binding on any other court. He was dealing with the right of ascertaining how an elector voted in a proceeding questioning an election and return, and not with such a case as will arise before this commission.

Then, on the other hand, you have the Manitoba cases which were referred to also before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, you have the Manitoba case of Regina vs. Saunders. That was a case stated for the opinion of the court, a Crown case reserved, which is reported in 11 Manitoba Reports, page 559. It was held in that case that notwithstanding section 71 of the Election Act, to which I have just referred, voters may be required, upon the trial of an indictment for offences against the Election Act, to state for whom they have marked their ballots. I refer to the judgment of Hon. Mr. Justice Killam, pages 564 and 565, setting forth the reasons which led him to that conclusion:

It is true that in the Haldimand election case, 15 S.C.R., 495, Strong and Taschereau, J.J., expressed opinions upon the general policy of the Act which, at first sight, may seem opposed to this view, but they were dealing with an election petition, and the construction of the clause forbidding that, on such a proceeding, a person who has voted shall be required to state how he has voted. The circumstance that the prohibition is limited to proceedings questioning the election or return is some indication that parliament did not intend it to extend to other proceedings. It seems unnecessary to refer in detail to the English and Irish cases cited, which my learned brother has already reviewed.

I may say, in passing, that the Minister of Justice seems to think that there is some

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

difficulty as to whether such evidence is the best evidence. Well, that seems to me a suggestion much more fanciful than practical. Here you have a hundred ballots, and none of them would be good if they bore any identifying mark, and how can you, by the production of those ballots, say that you are assisting in producing the best evidence? It is also a fanciful objection because there is no difficulty about producing the ballots. If the ballots are to be of any assistance in getting the best evidence, have been produced, but still let the witness give evidence. And Mr. Justice Killam uses that very argument. He says:

The general rule is that the best evidence obtainable must be given, and, naturally, the best evidence of the contents of a written instrument—and a ballot paper, with the marks upon it is certainly a written instrument—is the original instrument. But the rule requiring its production and identification yields to circumstances, as in the well-known cases of lost documents, documents which the opposite party will not produce, inscriptions or documents affixed to walls, documents held by a solicitor claiming a lien upon them, public documents in official custody, documents held by parties abroad who refuse to part with them, &c.

Then the Minister of Justice makes another suggestion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The court held there that the evidence could be given.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Quite so. I trust the Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not misunderstand me. What I desire to have made plain in this case is that the evidence may be given. There has been some supposed conflict of judicial authority. For myself, I do not think that there is any conflict of judicial authority. Gentlemen for whose opinion I entertain very much more respect than I do for my own, have held the contrary view. For that reason I suggest that this question should be made plain, for the reason that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries holds a very strong opinion of mine on this question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So far from holding an opinion in opposition to that of the hon. gentleman, I hold an opinion in unison with him, and so declared, as did every other lawyer on the Election Committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I recollect the hon. gentleman did express that opinion before that committee; but if I am not mistaken he rather came around to the opposite opinion in dealing with this matter in the present session.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I never did.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. But I think my hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Russell) did entertain a very strong view in opposition to mine, and I think the mere fact that my hon. colleague from Halifax entertained a strong view on a question of that kind is sufficient justification—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He says that he accepted my views.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that even to the last, before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, my hon. friend adhered to his view, and said that although he had deferred to the views of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in respect to that, nevertheless he had a pretty strong idea that he was right on that subject, and it is for the reason that he held that opinion up to the last that I suggest that this matter be made clear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think it is fair to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that when the matter was brought up in the Committee on Privileges and Elections it was argued, and I think, at my own request, it stood over until next day, that we might look into the authorities, and next day several of us expressed the opinion very strongly, and that opinion was put before the committee and carried without a dissenting voice; the hon. member (Mr. Borden) voting for it. The expediency of it was another thing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is quite clear that upon that investigation my hon. friend and colleague (Mr. Russell), adhered to the opinion which had been expressed by two judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, that a voter not only should not be compelled, but should not be permitted, to testify as to how he marked his ballot in any proceeding questioning an election or a return. And, further, he thought that the policy of the Act created a similar state of things in any proceedings. As to the policy of this, it is another question. The reasons which have been given by the hon. Minister of Justice do not seem to be adequate reasons. What are these reasons? He says, in the first place, that the policy of the Act is, that you shall not disclose or permit to be disclosed, how any one voted. You cannot prevent it being disclosed how any one voted. Every one of the voters in any polling district can go out and state how he voted. Every one of these voters may make a solemn declaration stating how he voted. How then can you say that there is anything in the policy of the Act to prevent it being disclosed, except in one proceeding referred to, that any witness voted in any particular way? If the Act was intended to prevent anything of that kind, all I can

say is that the Act is most inadequately framed, because it is perfectly within the competence of every voter to make a statement, or a solemn declaration, stating precisely for whom he has voted. A solemn declaration so made has all the sanction of an oath. The hon. Minister of Justice has made another suggestion. He says that it would be a great temptation to perjury because, he says, you have no check upon the witness. It seems to me that this objection is also a very fanciful one. Years ago when a witness was not allowed to testify if he had the slightest interest in the result, one hundred years before we permitted criminals to testify in their own behalf, some importance might have been attached to a suggestion of that kind. But, will you say that a person giving evidence as to how he marked his ballot is any more interested or biased or is more likely to commit perjury than a criminal who goes upon the stand and testifies in his own behalf, over whom there is no check? Take the case of a man who is accused of murder, a case where no one was present when the crime was committed, except the man murdered and the man charged with the murder. That man can go upon the stand and testify. There is no more check upon him than upon any one of these persons who is giving evidence respecting how he marked his ballot, and the interest to commit perjury is infinitely greater. When you permit evidence of that kind to be given, surely you will not say that there is anything in this fanciful suggestion made by the hon. Minister of Justice, that because you have no check upon the witness you will not permit him to testify. Dozens of cases will occur to every practising lawyer in this House where witnesses give evidence in court in respect to which there is no possible check except that of cross-examination.

Another matter which was dealt with by the hon. Minister of Justice, was the propriety of permitting the commission to use the evidence taken in the West Huron investigation. I would suggest that the principle which the right hon. leader of the government laid down respecting the employment of counsel would be a very good principle in respect to this. My right hon. friend said that it would be best to leave matters of that kind, as certain other matters in connection with this commission, to the judgment and discretion of the commission. I would suggest that the use of the evidence taken in the West Huron election investigation might very well be left to the judgment and discretion of the commissioners. The hon. Minister of Justice seems to attach importance to the fact that the commissioners will not have seen the witnesses. That is a matter for the judges themselves and not for the hon. Minister of Justice. But, as a matter of fact, it is an every-day practice for judges

to pass upon evidence without ever having seen the witnesses. For hundreds of years in England, courts of equity determined all issues that came before these courts, without the judges seeing the witnesses at all. The evidence was taken in the master's office, or by affidavit. In my own province they did the same thing; evidence was taken before the master in equity cases. In Admiralty cases adjudication was pronounced upon evidence taken before the registrar and the judge did not see the witnesses at all. These are matters upon which the judges and not the hon. Minister of Justice should pronounce. Two of these very commissioners, when sitting in the courts of Ontario, have many times had occasion to pass upon evidence without having seen the witnesses.

Then, the hon. Minister of Justice also thinks that there is nothing in our suggestion about the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I think there may be a very grave question about that. In the first place, so far as the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is an officer of this House, I should doubt very much whether or not these commissioners would have jurisdiction over him and over the documents in his custody. In so far as the ballot papers and other documents are in the custody of this House, or of its officer, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, there seems to be very much doubt as to whether or not they should be produced by him. The hon. Minister of Justice has apparently overlooked the provisions of section 72 of the Elections Act. That section reads as follows:

No person shall be allowed to inspect any ballot paper in the custody of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, except under the rule or order of a Superior Court Judge or a judge thereof—which rule or order may be granted by such court or judge on being satisfied by evidence on oath that the inspection or production of such ballot papers is required for the purpose of instituting or maintaining a prosecution for an offence in relation to ballot papers, or for the purpose of a petition which has been filed questioning an election or return; and any such rule or order for the inspection or production of ballot papers may be made subject to conditions as to persons, time, place and mode of inspection or production, as the court or judge making the same thinks expedient, and shall be obeyed by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

That provision has a most important bearing on this particular case, and of course it is most important that the ballot papers should be produced. It is not only important that the ballot papers should be produced when you proceed to examine witnesses in this case, but it is also important that the ballot papers should be produced for the purpose of examination by counsel and experts before the proceedings in court begin, and you cannot accomplish that in view of the provisions of this section except by legislation in this House giving necessary powers to this commission.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was managed last year by the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why, of course, because the House directed the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to attend at the Bar of the House and produce all these documents. They were laid on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps I misunderstand the hon. gentleman's argument. I rather thought he quoted the statute to show that except in two particular cases mentioned no such ballot papers were to be subject to examination at all. I understood my hon. friend to be relying upon that section as offering a bar to the production of these documents before the commission. If that argument is good now, it was equally good last year against their being produced before the Privileges and Elections Committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am afraid I have not made myself plain. I would not regard section 72 as having the slightest relation to the proceedings of this House, or to its control over the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery who holds the ballots and other documents, as an officer of this House, and is completely under the control of this House. We are not dealing with a case of that kind.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is not an officer of this House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My contention is, that he is an officer of the House in respect to the custody of these ballot papers. The matter seems to be very plain to me. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is subject to the direction of this House with respect to the production of any document relating to the election of any member of this House; and necessarily so, because the House, although it has abdicated to the courts its functions with respect to elections, in some measure, at least, has not abdicated its control over these documents and has not abdicated its control over its officers—as I established to this House, as the leader of this House admitted, and as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) admitted, in the debate which took place in reference to the West Huron and Brockville elections last year. As respects these matters, I see no conflict between section 72 and the powers which this House could undoubtedly have exercised, if section 72 had never been passed. At all events, all I am asking in respect to this matter is that it be made perfectly plain. If you refer to section 114 of the Elections Act, you see

that the same matter is dealt with, and weight is lent to the argument which I am making. It is there provided :

The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery may deliver certified copies of any writ, list of voters, poll books, returns, reports and other documents in his possession relating to any election, except ballot papers; and such copies so certified shall be received as prima facie evidence before any election judge or court, and before any court of justice in Canada.

You are entitled to use in evidence, and he is entitled to give a certificate respecting any document except ballot papers, but as to those, he is not permitted, nor is he permitted to deal with them at all, except, as I understand, by direction of a judge in virtue of section 72, or by virtue of a resolution of this House. Now, it is absolutely essential that the ballot papers should be produced. The evidence given before the Committee on Privileges and Elections last year may be referred to. Some at least of the members of that committee were of opinion that a very great fraud had been committed in respect to ballot papers at poll No. 4, Colborne. I leave it to the judgment of any member of that committee, who heard that investigation, as to whether or not it could have been possible to get at that fraud, unless we had the ballot papers. I say unhesitatingly, that it would have been absolutely impossible to discover what I think was a fraud committed by some one in respect to those ballot papers, unless we had the ballot papers and were able to trace the dissimilarity, in the paper, in the colour, in the size, and in other particulars, between some of these ballot papers which were found in the box and the stubs from which they were supposed to have been taken. It does not seem to me that the House should hesitate, for a moment, to make a matter of this kind perfectly plain.

I suggest also that it is important—I will not dwell upon the point—that the provisions of section 11, of chapter 10, of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the maintenance and expense of witnesses, should be made applicable to this commission. At present there is no such provision applicable to this commission. It is a provision which is necessary for the purpose of giving the commissioners power to remunerate witnesses for their attendance. Apart from that, it will be necessary for the witnesses to depend upon a vote to this House, and to be subject to all the delay and formality which will be incident to having these payments made through the Auditor General, or with the sanction of the Auditor General. There is no need of that, because matters of this kind could be very much better dealt with by the commissioners—who are accustomed every day to deal with questions of this kind—than by the Auditor General, or by any other officer of this House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where would the objection be, or the difficulty in the Auditor General approving, and the commissioners exercising power to pay the witnesses, if in the Appropriation Act there should be a sum granted to be placed at the disposal of the commissioners for the express purpose of paying the expenses consequent upon the commission, as stated by the Prime Minister the other day. What legal difficulty does my hon. friend contemplate may arise, if that course is pursued ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), means to enact legislation equivalent to section 11, by means of putting it in the Appropriation Act, I admit at once that it will cover the case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend surely has heard the assurance given by the Prime Minister, that parliament would be asked to vote a sum of money expressly for the purpose of paying the expenses of this commission. I stated the other day, with the authority of my colleagues, that that would be made to cover the expenses of the officers and the payment of counsel—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not stated that it would be under the control of the commission.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will read for the benefit of the hon. minister, the section to which I refer :

The commissioners may, if they deem fit, award any witness summoned to appear before them a reasonable sum for travelling expenses and maintenance according to the scale which shall be fixed by the Governor in Council; and they shall certify to the Minister of Justice the name of any such witness and the sum awarded.

If any provision the same, or substantially the same, as that is passed in any way, whether by means of the Appropriation Bill or otherwise, we will be perfectly satisfied.

Another matter which I would like to suggest is this: The Brockville and West Huron cases were cases which I brought to the attention of the House last year. I made certain statements, and produced certain evidence in support of my charges, and I produced certain further declarations and statements this year. The facts of the West Huron case are, at least in part, fairly well known. The circumstances of the Brockville case have been disclosed through the statements which I made to the House, and also through affidavits which have been read by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). Now, as these affidavits have been brought to the attention of the House and the public; as these cases have led to the appointment of this commission; I suggest to the government that it is proper that

these cases should be promptly dealt with, that the commission should in the first instance, with all convenient speed, deal with these cases, and while these cases are being dealt with—the witnesses can be summoned at once—the witnesses in other cases could be ascertained by counsel or solicitors, employed by the commissioners, so that there need be no delay whatever on the part of the commission in proceeding with this investigation.

There is only one other matter which I would like to suggest, and that is this: I think it would be proper that persons who desire to make charges, or to bring to the attention of the commissioners, alleged fraudulent acts committed in any election, should have the right to come before these commissioners and be heard by their own counsel, and produce witnesses, and examine and cross-examine.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is a matter entirely in the discretion of the commissioners.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). I do not so understand it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They can regulate the whole procedure.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). I do not so understand it. It is well known that in the province of Ontario, a commission was issued and two counsel were appointed. It is well known that certain persons went before that commission and desired to produce witnesses, and to adduce evidence with respect to certain fraudulent acts which were alleged to have taken place in the election of a member to the provincial legislature for the riding of West Elgin. It is equally well known that the commissioners held—limited as they were by the scope of the commission which appointed them—that they could not hear these parties at all. The result was that that investigation conducted by that commission has not been of so searching or thorough character as it would have been, if the commissioners could have permitted this to be done. My hon. friend, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), says this can be done. The commissioners in the case to which I refer held that it could not be done. Does the hon. gentleman say that the scope of this commission is greater than that of the commission in the West Elgin case? I would not be so sure of that as my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals. This commission provides that the commissioners shall be assisted by two counsel. Where you have an express provision of that kind, it might very well be held by the commissioners that those were the only counsel by whom they could be assisted. Where a counsel appears before a court, although he acts for a particular party, he

is there for the purpose of assisting the court. If the commissioners have their two counsel to assist them, may they not say, as was said in the case of the West Elgin commission, that they are not able, by reason of the limited scope of their commission, to have any other counsel to assist them? Is it not right, at all events, that that matter should be made plain? Should not any man who says that he knows that fraudulent practices have been committed at any election, have the right to choose his own counsel to bring out the facts? Is it not the duty of the government, if they desire to make this investigation searching and thorough, as they say they do, to see that there shall be no mistake and no quibbling about that? Persons who brought forward these allegations in the first instance should be allowed to occupy a position analagous to that which they occupied before the Committee on Privileges and Elections? There they brought forward their witnesses. It is true, they did not appear by counsel, but they had their representative present, and they had witnesses who were examined before the committee at the instance of the persons who produced them. That is a different case from the case in which you have two counsel appointed by the commissioners, to whom everything must be referred, and through whom everything must be brought forward. We cannot count upon the prejudices of these people beforehand. There might be people who desire to make a case before that commission, who might think, without the slightest foundation to support their thoughts, that if they tried to make their case through the particular counsel appointed by that commission, they would not have the evidence brought out in the way they would like. Can there be any possible objection to those people having their own counsel?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Not the slightest.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). If there is not the slightest objection, then I say let us carefully guard against this commission putting itself in the position in which the West Elgin commission has been put. Let this investigation be searching and thorough, no matter whether gentlemen on this side of the House or on the other side happen to be touched by the finding of the commission.

There is only one other matter to which I wish to refer. The question has been raised as to whether or not this commission is authorized under chapter 114. For this suggestion which I bring to the attention of the House I am indebted to my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). He will no doubt deal with the matter; but I state the point now simply that it may be brought to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite. Chapter 114 begins in this way:

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax).

Whenever the Governor in Council deems it expedient to cause inquiry to be made into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada, or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof, and such inquiry is not regulated by any special law, the Governor in Council may, by the commission in the case confer upon the commissioners—

It has been suggested, and it seems to me there is a great deal in the point, that inasmuch as parliament, at least with respect to returning officers and deputy returning officers, would, apart from any statute of this kind, have the sole right to investigate and inquire into charges arising out of a controverted election respecting any member of this House, you may well inquire whether or not the general provisions of chapter 114 were intended to apply to a case of that kind. For such a purpose you would require express provisions. The language of chapter 114 is broad: 'Concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada'; but is that language sufficiently definite to cover a case which, apart from the statute, could only be investigated by the House or by a committee of the House? Could you by language of that kind confer the right to investigate a controverted election if there was no Controverted Election Act in force in Canada? This is the question dealt with in the latter part of my resolution, and which I have thought it worth while, on the suggestion of my hon. friend from Westmoreland, to bring to the attention of the House. I therefore move:

That all the words after the word 'That' be left out, and the following added instead thereof:

'this House is of opinion that the powers and jurisdiction conferred upon the Hon. Sir John Alexander Boyd, Chancellor of the province of Ontario; the Hon. Mr. Justice Falconbridge, and His Honour Judge MacTavish, under the provisions of the order in council passed on the 4th day of June, 1900, and of the statutes therein referred to are not sufficiently wide and comprehensive to enable the commissioners to make a thorough, complete and searching investigation and inquiry into the frauds which are alleged to have taken place at or in connection with the election of members of the House of Commons of Canada.

That the scope of the commission should be so widened that the commissioners shall be expressly empowered to inquire into and investigate all fraudulent practices and devices by means of which any such frauds have been accomplished, as well as the conduct and proceedings of any persons who indirectly, or by means of others, or by any collusion or connivance, have aided, abetted or countenanced the commission of or the attempt to commit any such fraud.

That for the purpose of indemnifying witnesses who may be required to answer, and who may answer questions, the answers to which may criminate, or tend to criminate them, the provisions of section 9 of chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled 'An Act respecting members as to corrupt practices at Elections of Members of the House of Commons,' should be made applicable to the proceedings of the said commissioners and to the witnesses examined by or before them.

That the provisions of section 11 of the last mentioned Act respecting the travelling fees and maintenance of witnesses should also be made applicable to the proceedings of the commissioners.

That provision should be made for such preliminary investigation of facts and inquiry into evidence as are usually incident to the conduct of proceedings before a judicial tribunal.

That such provision should be made as will place beyond doubt—

(a) That it is the power and duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to produce before the commissioners all poll books, voters' lists, ballot papers and other documents in connection with any election which may be called for by the commissioners.

(b) That any witness before such commissioners is competent to testify how he voted at any election concerning the proceedings at which the commissioners may make any inquiry or investigation.

(c) That notwithstanding the appointment of counsel by the commissioners, any person making charges that fraudulent acts within the scope of the inquiry have been committed at any election, may appear and may be represented by counsel, and may examine and cross-examine witnesses before the commissioners upon any inquiry respecting fraudulent practices at such election.

That power should be conferred upon the commissioners to receive in evidence, if they deem it expedient so to do, the whole or any portion of the testimony or proceedings taken or had before the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections during the session of 1899, respecting certain frauds alleged to have been committed at the last election of a member of the House of Commons for the electoral district of the west riding of the county of Huron.

That the commissioners should, in the first instance, proceed to inquire into and investigate with all convenient speed the alleged frauds at the last election for the electoral district of Brockville and at the last election for the electoral district of the west riding of the county of Huron, which have already been brought to the attention of this House, and which were referred to and in part investigated by the said Committee on Privileges and Elections, and which have led to the appointment of the said commission.

That this House is also of opinion that such legislation should be enacted as will place beyond doubt as well the power of the Governor General in Council to pass the said order in council of the 4th June, 1900, as the jurisdiction of the said commissioners by virtue of the commission issued thereunder to inquire into and investigate the alleged frauds.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

## AFTER RECESS.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I followed the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax), who made this motion this afternoon, and I think it is only fair to say that I think he presented his argument in support of the motion very fairly. But I did not discover that he advanced any stronger reasons than had been previously stated to the House in support of this proposition, or that what he urged upon the House tended at all to establish

the statements in the resolution—that the House is of opinion that the powers, jurisdiction and so on, conferred upon the commissioners are not sufficiently wide and comprehensive to enable the commissioners to make a thorough, complete and searching investigation and inquiry into the frauds which are alleged to have taken place in connection with the elections of members to the House of Commons. I am quite willing to give my hon. friend and those who are acting with him the credit of desiring that this investigation shall be thorough and complete in every particular; and while I do that, I claim on behalf of the government and its supporters in the House an equal anxiety, and as keen a desire for a thorough and complete investigation. I take it that it is in the interest of both parties in this country that we should take means to ascertain, if possible, the extent to which these practices have occurred, and to ascertain, if possible, what means may be efficiently taken in order to prevent their repetition in the future. I think there can be nobody bold enough to affirm that these practices had their origin in any recent election: that, if they existed in relation to the election in West Huron, that was by any means the first time, nor was that the first year in which recourse was had to these means which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) wishes to see put down. And I say that this government not only has no desire to frustrate a thorough investigation, but it has no interest in preventing a thorough exposure of all parties in all elections in which it may be shown that acts of this kind have been committed. There can be no reason assigned by hon. gentlemen opposite why this government should be moved by any such disposition. I do not charge it against hon. gentlemen opposite that they would be unwilling to have the elections which took place when they were in power and when the officers were appointed by them included in the inquiry: I do not charge against them that they have any reason for so desiring. But, while I state that, I affirm, as strongly as my own knowledge and belief will enable me to do, that there is no reason under the sun why this government should not earnestly and ardently desire that the investigation should disclose anything and everything that may tend to show where these practices have existed with a view to preventing them in the future.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax), I take it, has failed in convincing the members of this House that the inquiry cannot be thorough, complete and searching under the commission which is issued. The government has made every effort to so frame the commission, to use such terms, as will enable the commissioners to explore all the ground and to get to the bottom of these matters; and I think we have not

failed in employing language which is adequate for that purpose. I think my hon. friend has some doubts himself, at all events he had not a very strong opinion, that the first portion of the resolution was well sustained—that the scope of the inquiry would be widened by his proposal, and that, in the absence of this amendment, the commission would fail of its object. He looked at, and I think he read, the terms of the commission in this regard; and he concluded his argument in this way—that, while he seemed to think the language was strong enough and clear enough, yet there might be a doubt, and to remove doubts, it would be well that this amendment should be made. Now, Sir, that is a matter of opinion. The opinion on this side of the House, supported and sustained by the law officers of the Crown, is that the language of the commission is amply broad enough to inquire not only into the conduct of the returning officers, deputy returning officers and other officers, if there are any, but into the conduct of all persons in relation to the alleged frauds in the elections. Therefore, there is no reason why we should amend our own commission, when we firmly believe and are convinced (and my hon. friend who moves this resolution has only some doubt on the subject), that it does not require amendment, that it is sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. CLANCY. Suppose they are wrong?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But we are assured they are not wrong; and I think we are entitled to entertain that opinion, and, entertaining it, to act upon it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will permit me, I endeavoured to state, so far as was consistent with becoming modesty on my part, that I thought the scope of the commission was not sufficiently wide for the purpose. Of course, I had every respect for the opinion of gentlemen who differed from me. Therefore, I did not see fit to make a positive statement, as I knew there were gentlemen, such as my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, who seemed inclined to hold a contrary opinion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not attribute my hon. friend's hesitancy to modesty; but, since he affirms that was the reason of it, I am bound to accept his statement. But I think I shall be justified in expressing some surprise that his modesty carried him as far as it did; and I do not acknowledge that the language of this clause was open to the doubt which he expressed in this resolution. Now, let me call attention to the actual language of the commission, and, in the first place, to the preamble. The preamble

Mr. BLAIR.

would necessarily throw a great deal of light on what was the purpose and intent of the commission, and it would help to remove the doubts of my hon. friend as to whether any other persons were referred to than returning officers and deputy returning officers. If he will look at that commission he will see that the object is thus set forth :

It is alleged that frauds were committed by returning officers, deputy returning officers or other parties, in several of the electoral districts.

You see that the commission at the very outset sets forth that frauds were alleged to have been committed, not merely by returning officers and deputy returning officers, but also by 'other parties, and that this commission should be empowered to institute an inquiry into the conduct :

Of all persons as respects any alleged fraudulent alteration, defacing, marking, spoiling, substitution or tampering in respect of election ballots, or by reason of any fraudulent conduct in respect of the poll books, ballot boxes or the lawful contents, or what should have been the lawful contents, of the ballot boxes.

Now, my hon. friend does not say that this inquiry should, in the terms, specify anything more than the poll books, ballot boxes and contents thereof, which would mean of course, the ballots. He does not say that it is defective as to the persons by whom these frauds may have been committed; it is not as to the particular frauds committed—that is sufficiently alleged—but as to the persons who may have been concerned in committing those frauds. Now he will fail to find any limitation as to persons whatever. The inquiry is into the conduct of A, B, and C. But you cannot inquire into the conduct itself, unless you inquire into the acts of persons whose conduct is complained of, or whose fraudulent acts are alleged—necessarily all persons. You observe the empowering portion of the commission was framed with the view of being as strong and as broad as possible, so clear and so broad, that no person could possibly take any exception to it. It is not limited in the empowering portion of it; in the instructions to the commissioners it is not limited to individuals or officers, but it is made broad enough to include all parties, and it does include all parties, and all fraudulent conduct of the character referred to here. Now having that strong conviction, having carefully framed the commission so that it would not be open to criticism upon this question, we do not feel justified in yielding to the hon. gentleman's request to amend this commission. There is no reason for amending it; it is made completely clear that the commission covers the whole ground.

My hon. friend then turns to another weakness which he alleges to exist in this commission. He does not state this pro-

position in the order in which I am mentioning it, but it is suggested to him, I think, by one of the members of the House, that there is, in the chapter under which this commission has been issued, inadequate language to justify the issue of the commission, and he calls attention to it with, I think, a great deal of hesitation himself, but still with the expression of opinion that there may be a great deal in it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No hesitation at all. I referred to my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), because he had first brought the matter to my attention.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend then did not express any hesitation, so I must have been in error. Doubt arises on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, or certain of them, in respect to this language. In the Act respecting Inquiries Concerning Public Matters, the first clause says :

Whenever the Governor in Council deems it expedient to cause inquiry to be made into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada—

And so on, he may issue a commission. Now, what language would my hon. friend use of a general character, what words would he employ more plainly, meaning everything connected with the government of the Dominion, than the words that are employed here—'any matter connected with the good government of Canada'? Is there a doubt in my hon. friend's mind that this is a question connected with the good government of Canada? I think he will say no. Now, supposing that language was not adequate upon which to found an objection that the commissioners could not exercise these functions that have been conferred upon them by this commission, because the general Act, chapter 114, was not broad enough, and it was not a matter affecting the good government of Canada, what argument would my hon. friend make? I have a great deal of confidence in his legal knowledge, and in his acumen and astuteness, but I think with all his capability, he would absolutely fail in making any argument having the slightest weight with any tribunal, in support of the contention that this was not a question affecting the good government of Canada, and, therefore, did not come within the statute. I think if he does think there is anything in this, he is rather hypercritical. We, at all events, have no doubt whatever upon it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not fully apprehend my point. I desire to make it very clear. Suppose we have parliament in this position, that it has the right and sole right to deal with matters respecting controverted elections; and no doubt it has the sole right,

apart from the statute. Let us say that you have conferred upon it jurisdiction to deal in the most general terms with all matters affecting civil rights, or some equally broad expression; my suggestion is that inasmuch as general language of that kind would not take away from parliament the right to deal with questions concerning controverted elections, so a general expression of this kind, 'the good government of Canada,' would not interfere with the sole right of parliament to investigate and inquire into the conduct of its returning and deputy returning officers. That was the point I intended to convey. So my hon. friend, perhaps, will see that there was something in it that he has not yet touched. So far as controverted elections are concerned, he will remember that we have a statute which deals with that subject in the most express terms, not by any general language. What I suggested might be the construction of chapter 114 was that general language of that kind would not deal with the matters so intimately connected with the rights and privileges of the House as this matter does, and that he would require an enactment quite as expressed as the provisions of the Controverted Elections Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not say that if we were dealing with a question which parliament had specifically delegated to another tribunal it would not be well for us to say that there had been a specific provision in the Act varying the jurisdiction, or creating another tribunal to make sure that parliament's intention was to confer a new jurisdiction upon it. I am referring to the case where it had already set up a special and distinct tribunal for hearing such a case, as, for instance, the case of a controverted election. I would not assume that under such circumstances parliament could be presumed to have given power under chapter 114 of dealing with the case of a controverted election, under a commission issued under the authority of that Act, but it is clear that the argument that the hon. gentleman makes would fail as parliament has set up no special tribunal outside of itself for the purpose of dealing with questions relating to the administration of the government of the country, or relating to the good government of the country. It has set up no special jurisdiction for hearing charges or complaints, or investigating matters of that kind. Therefore, the argument which might perhaps forcibly be made, if we were presuming to refer to a commission under chapter 114, a question relating to a controverted election would not apply in the present case at all. It is not a matter which arises out of, or is connected with, controverted elections in any way. It is not a matter which affects the seat of any member of this House, it is not a matter which would deal with the correctness of the return in any election.

Mr. BLAIR.

It is simply an inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining whether, having regard to the good government of Canada, the officers, and not the officers only, but the persons who had to do with these elections, were guilty of any fraudulent practices. That inquiry is made with the view, in the first place, I presume, of ascertaining if we could, how these acts and this conduct of these men could be prevented by further legislation, and in the second place, by taking steps for the punishment of the people who have been guilty of these acts. It seems to me, and it so seems to the Department of Justice, that the statute is abundantly broad to cover such a commission as we have here issued, that the commission does relate to an inquiry connected with the good government of Canada, and that it does not undertake to deal with a subject that parliament has delegated to another tribunal. It is equally true that parliament has the right, and parliament, under ordinary circumstances, alone, exercises the right to inquire into the conduct, if it desires to do so, of any department of the government, any act of administration by the government as a whole, or any minister of the government. Does any person say that a commission could not properly issue under chapter 114, for the purpose of investigating, inquiring into, and ascertaining the facts in regard to it, under this chapter, and could it be urged as a reason, as the hon. gentleman is urging, that no commission could exercise any such jurisdiction, that it would not have any such authority, because parliament could appoint a committee in the usual and constitutional course, for such a purpose? I think there would be no force in such an argument. I think it was manifestly the intention of parliament, when it passed chapter 114, to supplement the ordinary jurisdiction of parliament, by and through the government of the day, which it controls, that a commission outside and independent of parliament should be appointed for the purpose of holding such inquiries, of which this is one. Let me then proceed to the next clause. The hon. gentleman states in this resolution:

That for the purpose of indemnifying witnesses who may be required to answer, and who may have answered questions, the answers to which may criminate or tend to criminate them, the provisions of section 9, of chapter 10, of the Revised Statutes of Canada entitled 'An Act respecting inquiries as to corrupt practices at elections of members of the House of Commons,' should be made applicable to the proceedings of the said commissioners and to the witnesses examined by or before them.

I understand my hon. friend to contend that the powers contained in the Act which was introduced into this House and known, I think, as the Blake Act, should have been embodied in the present commission, or rather, that legislation should have been

introduced for the purpose. I take it that it would be necessary that legislation should be had for such a purpose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may say that in so far as commissions of that kind are concerned, I intended that there should be legislation. The Governor in Council could not do that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I quite understand my hon. friend to mean that. The hon. gentleman proposes that chapter 114 should be amended so as not only to afford protection to the witness from the testimony which he, himself, may give upon such an inquiry, but that every person by reason of the fact that he has come forward and given that evidence, should be entitled to a certificate, and that that should free him from any prosecution in respect of any act which he may be proved to have committed of this character as to which the evidence may refer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not so much dealing with chapter 114, as I was dealing with the suggestion that this investigation, which is of the same character, or somewhat of the same character, as that provided for by chapter 10, should be accompanied with the same instance in that respect; in other words, that so far as this investigation is concerned we should make applicable the provisions of the ninth section and the eleventh section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand the hon. gentleman's contention in that regard. I take it that it is a mere matter of opinion. The hon. gentleman's opinion is that it would be desirable to do that. The opinion of the government upon it is that it would not be desirable. The hon. gentleman thinks that it would tend materially to more freedom in the giving of testimony, if such a course were adopted. That opinion is not shared by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, so far as I know. It is an opinion, at all events, that is not entertained by the government. It is entirely a matter of opinion. The opinion which I entertain is that such a departure from what is the usual and ordinary privilege which is conferred upon the individual who gives evidence which may, if it were used against him, tend to incriminate him, is going far enough. We do not see that any benefit would accrue at all from extending it beyond the phrase that we have embodied in our commission. We do not think any benefit would accrue from it. The hon. gentleman thinks there would; we think there would not. I may point out to my hon. friend that it does not carry the argument any further, as it strikes me, to say that one member of this House at one time contended that such an addition to the ordinary privilege would be an ad-

vantage. It bears no other weight than can be attached to it as the opinion of a prominent member of this House; which apparently is shared in by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden).

Mr. POWELL. And by the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The majority of the House at that time did agree in it. But what effect will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) attach to the equally cogent fact (which no doubt is present in his mind although he did not mention it), that when the Act of 1889 was being passed, it was introduced by no less a person than Sir John Thompson. Sir John Thompson had Mr. Blake's clause and the English Act, and this Act before him. He no doubt weighed and considered all these, but yet he came to the conclusion that in any inquiry which should take place by commissioners, covering the whole sphere of any matters involving the good government of Canada; he came to the conclusion that it was not desirable to extend that clause beyond what is embodied in this Act. He rejected Mr. Blake's clause as not being, in his opinion, wise or proper legislation. Of course, any hon. gentleman who thinks that Mr. Blake's opinion is very much more valuable than the opinion of Sir John Thompson will perhaps agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Borden), but those who entertain the view, that Sir John Thompson's opinion on a question of this kind was equally valuable with the opinion of Mr. Blake, will not follow the reasoning of the hon. member (Mr. Borden). You have Sir John Thompson upon the one side and Mr. Blake upon the other, the one neutralizing the other and leaving us just where we commenced.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I follow both.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend will pardon me for saying that he does not follow both.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I follow both, because I think that Sir John Thompson did not intend that section 114 would apply to any such proceeding as this at all. I follow both Mr. Blake and Sir John Thompson, if my theory is right as to what this Act means.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a mere matter of conjecture on the part of the hon. gentleman, and conjecture is not very valuable in support of such a proposition as he asks the House to adopt. The fact is that Sir John Thompson asked parliament to amend the law in so far-reaching a manner as to regulate all inquiries into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada; and, having present to his mind that the evidence which a person might be called

upon to give might tend to criminate that person and that legal prosecutions might follow, and, not believing that it would stimulate the witness to give better testimony if there was incorporated Mr. Blake's clause, Sir John Thompson distinctly rejected that clause and amended the law as we find it in the Act of 1889. I say that the absence of that additional clause from the Act of 1889, which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) seeks to insert to-day, is the best evidence in the world that Sir John Thompson's opinion was against the insertion of that clause. I am not a little surprised that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) should now attach such very great importance to the opinion of Mr. Blake as against the opinion of Sir John Thompson on this question. We are at all events of the opinion that it would not conduce to any more freedom on the part of witnesses in giving their evidence or in stating the facts. I can very well imagine—and it might possibly have been in the mind of Sir John Thompson when he rejected that clause. I can very well imagine that were such a clause inserted, and my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) were conducting that inquiry, and if he had an interest in saving any particular person, A, B, C, or D, who had been guilty of these alleged practices, and a number of witnesses had been put on the stand whose testimony pointed to the guilt of A, B, or C, my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) would be on the alert to have A, B, C, or D called as a witness, and he would advise him: Now, you are in a hole; the evidence clearly shows your guilt, go on the stand as quickly as possible and make a clean breast of it, and you will escape entirely a prosecution if you do that. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) would no doubt bend his energies in that direction, and if you had many such people so inculcated you would have them marching up in battalions to the court, hurrying to give their testimony so that they would be exempt from prosecution, although the evidence outside of their own confession was ample to establish their guilt and secure a conviction.

My hon. friend next spoke of the payment of the maintenance and travelling expenses of the witnesses before the commission, but I think the hon. gentleman was satisfied with the suggestion made to him across the floor, that there could be no object in amending this commission in that direction at this stage. The commission, I think, has actually issued—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.  
It is gazetted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it would be desirable to amend the commission for this reason alone, unless some stronger arguments can be given than have been given in favour of it. It was declared not only this after-

Mr. BLAIR.

noon, but it was declared at a very early period of this discussion, that it was the intention of the government to ask parliament for a vote and to make the vote in such terms that it should be at the disposal of the commissioners for the purpose of covering these expenses. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) must not think that it was in the mind of the government at any time to ask parliament for a vote which they did not intend should be used for that purpose, or to ask for it in such a way that it could not properly be used for that purpose. Nothing could possibly be gained by that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) might at least acknowledge that the government of this country are not entirely destitute of common sense. Even if we had no higher motive, we would not propose to start an inquiry which we did not intend should be equipped in every necessary way, in order if possible to get at the facts which we want to reach and to expose to the fullest extent. That is our interest, and hon. gentlemen opposite do not, I think, do themselves justice if they assume that the government could be moved by any want of earnestness or sincerity in this matter, or could feel that we had any credit to gain or could justify ourselves to the public at large by issuing a commission which is faulty and defective, and which must fail by reason of the form in which we had issued it.

The next clause the hon. gentleman proposes is that:

Provision should be made for such preliminary investigation of facts and inquiry into evidence as are usually incident to the conduct of proceedings before a judicial tribunal.

In this connection my hon. friend pointed out that it would be unreasonable to expect the two counsel who would be named by the commission, to take up the preliminary or initiative stages of these matters, and that it ought to be possible for persons who might be interested in pursuing an investigation into any of these charges, to retain counsel who would be authorized to appear before the commission. I do not see any reason why my hon. friend should feel alarmed on that score. There is nothing in this commission which would prevent the commissioners from allowing any counsel who might appear in the interest of any complainant, to state his case, present his witnesses, and, if he would, examine them before the tribunal. On the contrary, the very terms of this commission show that the government, in framing it, have been alive to the importance of making every possible provision for the judges to make the inquiry thorough and effective. We confer upon them in terms the power to make such rules and regulations governing the practice and procedure as seem to them proper for the initiation,—the very point my hon. friend seems to be alarmed about—the

conduct and the prosecution of such inquiries and investigations. What we have had in our minds in using the language which we have used here, and in framing the commission generally, is that the commissioners may be free to take up the subject in such a way as they deem best. What will probably take place will be this. As soon as the commissioners are ready to enter upon their duties, I apprehend that they will notify parties that they will open their court at a date named, and will hear suggestions from persons who are interested pro or con in respect to the subjects of inquiry; and, if necessary, they will frame rules and regulations in order that everything may be done, and well done, that is necessary to make the investigation thorough. If it fails to be thorough, if any difficulty arises of the kind my hon. friend anticipates, it will not be the fault of the commission. I cannot imagine that anything can be clearer than that they may make rules under which persons interested in the matters to be inquired into may appear by their solicitors or counsel and be heard. That is one of the rules that they would make, and I am sure they would not refuse to make it when it is suggested to them; and I doubt if it would be necessary to suggest to them anything so plain and clear as likely to be necessary for the proper conduct of the inquiry.

My hon. friend proposed that parliament should be asked to pass a law to the effect that every witness in this inquiry may be asked how he voted at any of these elections. Now, my hon. friend either is of opinion that a change in the law is necessary in order that such a question may properly be asked and the answer to it enforced, or he entertains a different view. If he entertains the opinion that the law as it stands to-day would not warrant such an inquiry, and that a witness who is summoned would not be compelled to answer, then my hon. friend wants to change the law of the land as it is at this moment and as it was when the votes were cast. I think that is a very serious proposition. He says he wants to make it clear. He is of opinion that in this inquiry a witness can be asked how he voted and can be compelled to answer. If he is right, there is no necessity of changing the law. If he is wrong, I cannot believe that this parliament would say that it would be a proper thing to change the law. We have done the best that could be done under the circumstances. We are not going to change the conditions under which men voted when they cast their ballots at any election which has taken place up to this date. We are not going to say that a man who may have voted in the belief that his ballot was secret and that he could not be compelled to declare how he voted, shall now be placed, in respect to the secrecy of the ballot, in any different position from that which he occupied under the law two,

three, eight or ten years ago. I do not think there can be any purpose or any good public interest served by going to the length of changing the law of the land in this regard. My hon. friend says this is not a controverted election trial or an inquiry in which the seat of any member is involved or can be prejudiced. If he is so confident that he is right in that opinion, why seriously propose to this parliament what may be, if he is wrong, a change in the law? If my hon. friend is right, there is no need of changing the law; if he is wrong, it would be wrong, in my opinion, to change the law. I am sure that this parliament and the country are willing to take the law on this question as it stands to-day and act upon it, and take the consequences. The country will be willing to leave it to the men who have been chosen upon this commission to determine what the law of the land is in that regard.

My hon. friend says that it would be proper for us to take the evidence given before the Privileges and Elections Committee of this House, to hand it over to the commission, and ask the commission to make what use they please of it. Is not that a somewhat novel proposition? Does my hon. friend remember any inquiry involving serious consequence, it may be, to those whose acts and conduct are being investigated, being determined upon testimony given before another tribunal and given when the rights of those who appeared before that other tribunal were not considered at all. The controlling consideration before the Committee on Privileges and Elections was not what are the strict rules of evidence, nor what is the law regulating the admission and rejection of testimony, that was not at all the controlling consideration either on the one side or the other. My hon. friends opposite pressed for the admission of evidence that they knew would never for a moment have been considered admissible by any court of justice. And why? Because they thought that the great majority of the people, who do not know anything of legal rules, would assume that when such evidence was objected to, it was because those objecting to it were trying to exclude it for some improper purpose or because they were afraid of the consequence. Such a disposition was manifested on both sides, and always will be in those inquiries before parliamentary committees, involving political questions. Those who think that such evidence is not admissible are afraid to oppose its admission because they feel that such opposition would prejudice them in the eyes of the people, who, knowing nothing of the rules of evidence, would see only in it a desire to prevent discovery of the facts. That idea was no doubt what moved the committee to allow the admission of a great deal of the evidence received. I have sat upon those committees my-

self in other places and I know, and those gentlemen who have sat on similar committees will be frank enough to acknowledge—if they wish to acknowledge what they believe—that this is the moving influence on both sides. The party in opposition always feel that they have everything to gain by pressing the most unreasonable and improper questions, and the party in power, on the other hand, feel that they have everything to lose by objecting to such questions. Yet my hon. friend coolly asks that testimony of such a character and admitted under such circumstances should be handed over bodily to this commission, and this commission be asked to come to a conclusion upon it. To ask that the judicial commission should take cognizance of such testimony, taken by a completely distinct body, and a great deal of it hearsay and utterly inadmissible and valueless, is to my mind a request which requires only to be stated to be refused. What is the object which my hon. friend thinks can be served by such a departure from all rule and precedent? My hon. friend has not enlightened us. I have not heard any reason advanced, except the matter of expense, and that question of expense is not one which will weigh very much with hon. gentlemen opposite. They will not feel much concerned on that score, and it is not a consideration that will weigh with anybody. We have selected gentlemen in whom the people have confidence as commissioners, and we want these gentlemen to give their best mind and thought to the investigation. We want them to get at the facts, but we do not want them to be loaded up, at the very outset, with hearsay statements, because you can get hearsay statements which will incriminate any one. We want them to come to a conclusion upon legal and proper evidence, taken in a legal and proper way. In civil cases, in which the character, freedom and reputation of men are not affected, but which simply involve dollars and cents or some question of legal controversy—in such cases evidence is sometimes taken by the consent of the parties elsewhere than in the presence of the judge, who will read it and give what weight to it he chooses. But that class of cases is entirely different from the one before us. In this case the parties are all liable to suffer the consequences if they are shown guilty of the acts charged against them. While this commission is not a trial, it is leading up to a prosecution in those cases in which the charges may be established, and therefore, such charges ought to be investigated in a proper manner and only such evidence admitted as can properly and legally be admitted, without doing any injustice or unfairness to any person concerned.

As to the expense, I do not believe that a dollar would be saved by following the course advised by my hon. friend, because either one side or the other will be

Mr. BLAIR.

desirous of having every individual witness, who gave evidence before the committee, summoned and examined again.

The suggestion is one that does not commend itself to the government, and we cannot except it.

Next we had something with regard to the power or authority of this commission to compel the attendance of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery with the ballot papers and poll books and other documents in his possession. My hon. friend referred to the Election Act in this connection, and suggested that there was some argument to be drawn from it. I think he bases his contention very largely upon the proposition that the officer is an officer of this House. If I am correct in that, I think that the basis upon which he urged this contention of his is not well founded, because I think it must be clear that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is an officer of the Crown, and not an officer of the House of Commons. He is appointed by the Crown, not by this House; he is paid by the Crown and not paid in the ordinary way of officers of this House. He is assuredly an officer of the Crown.

Mr. POWELL. Might he not be both?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He might possibly be both. But, I take it that as a Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, he is an officer of the government. He is made custodian of certain documents relating to the return of member to this House—

Mr. POWELL. And to that extent, he is an officer of this House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I take it not. I do not think you will find in any statute which governs him or his duty that he is declared, *quo ad* the receipt of returns of elections and the filing of them, an officer of this House. It is not so stated in any statute so far as my memory serves me. As an officer of the Crown, he must be subject to the control of the Crown; and the Crown has stated in this connection that he shall attend upon the request of the commission, and produce these documents. Perhaps, if the House were to pass an order that these documents and papers should not be taken by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and exhibited before or handed over to the custody of this court, that might be sufficient to prevent them being taken. I am not going to argue that question, because that question is not likely to arise. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is required, in express terms by this commission, to attend and produce these documents. So my hon. friend will see that we were prepared against any possible contingency, against any possible contention that might be made that our

commission was faulty in any particular. The hon. gentleman referred to a clause contained in the election law from which he gathered, as a matter of inference, that the statute forbids this officer to allow any person to inspect these ballots or poll-books, or whatever may be the prohibited documents, other than to the courts excepted under the Act. If there is doubt upon the subject at all there is a very simple and easy way by which you can remove that doubt. We have no desire to have this investigation baulked through any defect of that kind, I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite,—that is furthest from our thoughts and wishes. But, instead of passing through this House an Act to amend chapter 114, or instead of changing the commission in any regard—though I presume that would not be adequate if my hon. friend's reading the law is correct—we might meet the case by a very simple amendment to the Bill relating to elections which is now before the House. If any hon. gentleman thinks it a matter of sufficient doubt, and will suggest the words to be added to one of the clauses which will remove that doubt, there will be no objection on the part of the government to amending that clause. Section 98 of the Bill is one identical with the section in the existing law; and the addition of few words will make it clear that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall attend this commission, so that there will be no necessity for the introduction of a separate Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it will be decidedly necessary, because the Governor General in Council has no power to make an order with respect to returns which I think, are in the custody of this House through their officer the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. RUSSELL. How do you make it out that he is an officer of this House?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) doubt that the returns of members to this House are in the control of this House? My idea about it is that the return of members to this House are in the possession of this House and under the control of this House, although they are, by the terms of the statute, in the actual possession of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Holding possession of these returns, he holds them as an officer of this House and is subject to the control of this House in that respect. In other words, the House has complete control over these returns, and also over ballot papers and other documents relating to the return of members to this House. And, as is pointed out to me by my hon. friend the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), in Sir John Bourinot's book, page 225, on this point, he quotes Hatsell, a well known authority:

He is also an officer of the House of Commons, though appointed by the Crown and in attendance on the Lords on certain occasions.

That is exactly what I thought the law was, though I never had my attention attracted to that authority before. I should think it abundantly plain that the Governor General in Council, in the absence of a statute expressly giving authority for that purpose, would have no control over the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in respect of these documents. That is why I suggested that it was necessary, and why I still think it is necessary, to make the change. I think an amendment of the Election Act will effect the object desired.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not necessary to waste time discussing the question now, because it is a purely academic question. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) desires that an amendment of that kind be introduced in the Bill relating to elections, that Bill will be before the Committee of the Whole again, and there will be no objection on the part of the government to the adoption of the amendment. We wish to place no obstacle in the way of the inquiry; and it would be extremely inconvenient if any doubts arose in the minds of the commissioners as to whether the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery could be compelled to produce these documents before the commission. We desire to have them there; and while I do not think that any question would arise, while I do not think that there is any room for doubt under the terms of the commission, as to the obligation on the part of this officer to attend on the subpoena from these commissioners, yet, there can be no possible objection to a few words being added to the clause of the Election Act to which I have referred.

Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) makes further complaint with regard to the commission, and says that we ought, in express terms in that commission, to direct that the commissioners should inquire, first and foremost, into the West Huron and Brockville election cases. He has not favoured us with any particular reason why either of these cases should be first taken up, except that one of them was taken up and has already been practically exhausted, so far as the taking of evidence is concerned, before the Committee on Privileges and Elections of this House. If that were a good reason, a cogent reason, why the West Huron case should be taken up, it would not be any reason why the Brockville case should be taken up out of its order, because there has not been even the shadow of a prima facie case stated in this House for the Brockville inquiry. But, whether there is any particular urgency for the hearing of one case first rather than another, does the hon. gentleman imagine that public interest will be exhausted as soon as one

case is heard, or does he think that the hearing of one case is going to exhaust the whole time at the disposal of the commissioners, and that they cannot go into other cases? If he imagines that, I trust it will turn out that he is entirely in error, as I would hope the inquiry might be concluded inside the vacation season in all the ridings in which cases for an inquiry may be suggested. But, the hon. gentleman ignores this fact, that if any reason can be urged why the West Huron case should be taken up first, the commissioners would be very happy to hear the argument of the hon. gentleman, I have no doubt. They are not going to stop their ears to any reasons alleged as to why an inquiry into one riding should take place first. I am well assured that he will find that the commissioners, who cannot be charged with any partisan interest or party prejudice, will be disposed to give all weight to any reason the hon. gentleman may assign as to why the West Huron case should be taken up in priority to the others. Let him go there and present his reasons. But, I think it would distinctly militate against the character of this commission if we were to give instructions to the commissioners first to take up the West Huron case. Is the government going to express its opinion that the West Huron case is the only case, or the chief case of consequence, in which it is necessary that the inquiry should take place, that it is the most important case in which practices of this character are alleged to have occurred? Nobody can subscribe to that. Why, Sir, there is not a man in this country who does not believe, there are many men who, from information which they have received from reliable sources, know that fraudulent practices of this kind have obtained in election after election in this country. And to suppose that the government, in issuing a commission, are going to give the West Huron case prominence, as if it were the worst of all cases, is a proposition which I think is rather unreasonable and has nothing to support it. What we propose to do by this commission is to leave everything of a controversial character, everything that is not plain and free from question, to be dealt with by the commissioners themselves. The order of procedure they are most competent to determine upon. The time, the place, when and how, are all questions which, I think, the people, if they have faith in their competency, in their fitness, and in their impartiality, can afford to leave to them. The commissioners themselves must be competent to determine what locality, concerning which charges are made, should first be investigated. Therefore, the government has declined, and will continue to decline, to give any instructions to the commission as to which case they shall take up first. Let them hear what may be alleged, let them hear what arguments may be advanced as to the procedure and order in which the in-

Mr. BLAIR.

quiry should take place, and let them determine as in their judgment shall seem best; and their determination, I am sure, will be accepted by the country at large as a determination which is influenced by no improper motive, interest or consideration whatever. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House will not think proper to subscribe to my hon. friend's proposition, that the commission is not sufficiently wide and not sufficiently comprehensive to enable the commissioners to make a thorough and searching investigation. I think the House is satisfied that the intentions of the government, as declared to this House, have been fully carried out. There is a bona fide and sincere desire upon the part of the government that this inquiry shall not fall from any want of scope in the commission, and, under such circumstances, I am sure the House will not accept the proposition of my hon. friend.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). Few hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will dispute that superior knowledge which the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) seems to claim as to the prevalence of frauds in other elections and other electoral districts. The hon. gentleman apparently has knowledge which would have been useful to parliament in connection with inquiries of this kind. He says that the West Huron election was not the first in which fraudulent practices have occurred. I want to remind him and to remind his colleagues, that it was the first election in which a demand for investigation into fraud was made by a member of this House, at any rate, for many long years past; it was the first investigation that was begun under the auspices of this House by one of its regular committees, and it is the first that, having been begun, was stopped midway by the action of the government. It is unique, therefore, in that respect. The cases of West Huron and Brockville, which I should have coupled together, are not only unique in that respect, but, as I said on another occasion, these cases, and the acts brought to light by the work of the committee last session, undoubtedly brought the government to its present position, and undoubtedly forced the government to change their front as to whether an inquiry should go on, and compelled them finally to decide to issue a Royal Commission. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, if this commission is to be considered a parliamentary delegation, and not a delegation of a party, or simply of one side of the House, I think the suggestions that are made, without heat, that were made by men of the legal profession on this side of the House, should have been received in a different spirit by the gentlemen who happen to be for the moment in possession of the Treasury benches. I was glad to-night, in listening to the Minister of Railways and Canals, to find

that he did not venture that extraordinary, that almost appalling reason that he gave the other day for not taking suggestions on this subject from this side of the House, when, as he will remember, he stated that these suggestions, while they did not amount to much, as they were practically covered by the order in council out of which the commission comes, still they might be accepted by the government were it not that the opposition and their press would say that we had forced the hands of the government on the subject.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman profess to be quoting what I said?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not quoting verbatim, but I think I am doing the hon. gentleman justice, and I think he said even worse than that. Still, as I understood him, that was one of his strongest arguments on the last occasion when this subject was discussed for not accepting suggestions from this side of the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume that the hon. gentleman will not object to me setting him right. I do not attach very much importance to the hon. gentleman's reference, but it might be assumed, that if I allowed him to make it without protest, he was correctly stating the effect of what I said. What I did say was this: I said distinctly, in answer to the hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), who made a most vituperative attack on the government, attributing all sorts of motives, in answer to the motives which he attributed, that he would justify the inference that his whole object, in asking that these provisions be put in was that he might be in a position to say if we accept them, that we were forced to do it by the other side, and if we did not accept them to cry out to the country that we tried to suppress the inquiry.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Here it is verbatim et literatim:

It is quite patent that the object of the leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has been to demand that some changes should be made in the language of the commission, so that in the event of these changes being accepted by the government, the hon. gentleman and his friends and his press could circulate broadcast throughout the country that the government commission was defective in most important particulars and that it would have failed to make a proper inquiry were it not that the opposition forced the government to introduce the amending words.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is just what I say.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Sir Charles Tupper then says:

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Am I to understand that that is the ground on which they are refused?

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) does not give as direct an answer as one would suppose from what he states this evening. He says:

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is, undoubtedly, the object of the leader of the opposition in making these proposals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say that that was the reason for refusing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is my appreciation and recollection of his language, so that I do not think there is a very great difference. But, it is clear enough, it is beyond reasonable argument, that there is now a broad line between the policy of the opposition and the policy of the government in reference to this commission and the scope of this commission. I feel confident that any one, referring to the language used by the right hon. leader of the government at the close of the debate when the Prime Minister stated to this House and to the country that a commission would issue in response to the suggestions having come from this side of the House, must admit that the utterances of hon. members on this side of the House since that are more in keeping with the promises and statements of the Prime Minister as to the scope of the commission than the technical and narrow arguments used by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals this evening, because the hon. gentleman, eminent lawyer though he is, has to admit the strength of the arguments advanced by the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). He could not brush them away as idle, he could not term them captious. The hon. gentleman several times referred to the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice. They have a responsibility, and it is not for the opposition to dictate to them in matters where there are legal questions involved, and they are perfectly within their rights if they stand on the opinion of the law officers of the Crown. But, in a matter where, as it seems to me, the case is for parliamentary action and not for government action merely, where something is being done under the auspices of parliament, in parliament assembled, and not under the auspices of the government, I think that the views of different gentlemen, at any rate, those learned in the law, should be entitled to more consideration than they have received to-night. The criticism was made in regard to the opinion of the hon. Minister of Justice, made without offence, that it bore upon its face signs of haste, signs that it had not been considered. When it was read in the House the Prime

Minister confessed to parliament that one point in connection with an important matter with which the hon. Minister of Justice had dealt had not occurred to the mind of the government, and that the comparison we had with chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes relating to corrupt practices, as copied from the Imperial Act, with 33 Victoria, chapter 52, had not been made. He went on to suggest the only possible answer, which I will consider in a moment, the one made by the Minister of Railways and Canals to-night, when he endeavoured to make out that the opinions of Sir John Thompson and Mr. Blake were at variance on a question of policy of that kind. We cannot attach to an opinion of that kind the importance we would ordinarily attach to it, and I mention it by way of brushing it aside so far as having any final authority with this House in the consideration of this matter is concerned. Here then we stand, proposing, on this side of the House, that every doubt be removed, that a thorough investigation be made, not merely into the practices, as the hon. gentleman said to-night, that prevailed, not merely into the acts that occurred, the actual tampering with the ballots, but, in the line of the pledge that the Prime Minister gave after formal debate at the time to which I refer, into everything connected with these practices, into all the surrounding circumstances, in order to draw aside the veil from the men who used the criminals, who made the criminals, who aided and abetted them. No one pretends that when you prove that one man or another actually tampered with the ballots, switched them, or committed any crime at the election, the investigation ought to end. The men that were behind the criminals prompting these crimes, these frauds, and the system under which the frauds were organized, are the men that the country wishes to know about. That is what we want to know in this House, so that when the inquiry is over we may, by legislation or otherwise, take steps to prevent a recurrence of these frauds, the existence of such corrupt organizations and of such a system in this country. With that object in view, is it reasonable that the government should maintain stubbornly their opposition, and while professing that the language of the commission covers all the points that we desire to be covered, is it a reasonable position for them to take to say that they will not change a word, that they will not change a sentence in regard to the scope of the inquiry? I submit that their action will not be considered in that light by the country, that they are taking upon themselves a huge and tremendous responsibility before the country. We upon this side of the House, venture no positive opinion as to the absolute accuracy of the views we have put forward. The commission may not entertain them, it may proceed upon the line that the Minister

**SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.**

of Railways and Canals has laid down in his argument, as it might widen the commission, as we all desire it should be widened, so that everything should be taken in. But if the inquiry becomes a farce as other inquiries under commissions issued under this government have become a farce, the responsibility on the shoulders of the government will be great indeed. I have referred to this point of the scope of the commission, and I do not wish to deal more fully with that, because I do not think I will add much to that which has already been said by the hon. senior member for Halifax. The difference between the hon. senior member for Halifax and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, let me just say as to the question of the scope of the commission, is that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals constantly refers to the ample language and the proper language empowering this commission to investigate into the practices which prevailed, and the hon. member for Halifax asks that he should go much further than that and that there should be no doubt as to the power and duty of the commission to inquire into the circumstances surrounding these practices, and how these practices came to prevail.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The commissioners have power to investigate into any fraudulent conduct in respect to these acts. You could not get anything wider than that. Would it not be fraudulent conduct if there were outsiders conspiring together?

**SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** It might be held from the language of the commission that it referred simply to corrupt and fraudulent practices in connection with the perpetration of the act. For instance, after it had been proven what took place in the booth, the evidence might inculpate people outside the constituency who had sent in a gang of men to perpetrate these acts in the booth, and it is just possible that the judges might rule that the acts of those parties outside was not within the scope of the commission.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Would not the persons who sent them be just as liable as the persons who went, and would not their conduct be fraudulent?

**SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** The Minister of Railways will understand how dangerous it is to pick out a few words in order to test a question of this kind, and therefore, I shall read the language of the commission. The empowering language of this commission says:

To inquire into and investigate any alleged fraudulent alterations—

That is one thing.

—defacing, marking, spoiling, substitution or tampering in respect of election ballots, or by reason of any fraudulent conduct in respect to the poll books—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is it; go on.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is limited to poll-books:

—ballot boxes, or the lawful contents—

Having named these things in regard to which the fraudulent practices may be, it goes on:

—or what should have been the lawful contents of the ballot boxes, whether by way of fraudulent alteration, addition, withdrawal or otherwise.

That being the language it seems to me to be a direction to inquire into fraudulent practices, being the acts perpetrated, and not into conspiracies organized outside, and from which these fraudulent practices emanated. If there is room for any doubt, what objection can there be to amplifying it and making it clear as we are seeking to do. It is done every day in the case of an ordinary Bill. I have heard the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ask the advice of members and suggestions from them on important questions which he has submitted to this House. I have seen the Solicitor General yield his own opinion to the opinion of others, and when it was advocated that language should be inserted in a section, I have heard him state that although he did not think that was necessary yet as it carried out the object he had in view, he would accept it. If this language which we advocate should be inserted, simply makes the thing clear, why not insert it? Sir, the position of the Minister of Railways forces me to the conclusion that the government is not sincere in desiring that the scope of this commission should be as broad as the language of the ministers would lead one to believe they desire. Otherwise there is no reason why we should quibble over a matter like this, especially considering the very few words that are suggested from this side of the House. Let the House remember the language used by the Prime Minister when he was making his promise that this commission should issue. Let us see whether the actual language of this commission is as consistent with the words he used then, as is the language which we ask that the commission should be couched in. The Prime Minister said on that occasion:

Some investigation must take place—deep, searching, complete, penetrating everywhere, so as to ferret out the evil, to search out the criminals, and if legislation be necessary to punish them, and to punish them adequately . . .

We must have, at an early date, immediately, a tribunal composed of the best judges of the

land, so as to have the fullest, the most complete, the most searching inquiry into all that we know, into all that has come to the attention of the House, of the press and of the courts, and into what also has not yet come to the attention of the public; to ferret out that system and expose it, and to eradicate it for ever from this land of ours.

There is the strong and emphatic language of the Prime Minister and here in the commission is the narrow and dangerous language of the half-hearted attempt at performance. I again call the attention of the House to the fact that the words 'any fraudulent conduct' seem to be qualified by the words following in the context, but I think, however, the hon. gentleman will understand that that was my argument. The argument of the Minister of Railways regarding these different statutes was to my mind an extraordinary one. I would not profess for a moment to reflect on the hon. gentleman's legal ability or on his ability to interpret the spirit of a statute, but I say that when he came to deal with the indemnity clause his argument was not the argument of a lawyer but was the argument of a politician—the argument of a man who was destitute of any argument that a lawyer or a statesman could use in reply to the contention of the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). I am not referring to the chaff (for it must have been chaff) in regard to the alleged contrary opinions of Sir John Thompson and Mr. Blake. But, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) dealt with the suggestion of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) as to whether there is jurisdiction in His Excellency in Council to commission these judges to inquire into these frauds under that statute respecting inquiries into any matter relative to good government; surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) could have used other arguments than he did. However, we must deal with the arguments that he did use. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) follows his argument to its logical conclusion, then parliament wasted time in passing the Act relating to controverted elections, and the Act relating to corrupt practices, because if all these things relate to the good government of Canada, then all that would be necessary would be to issue inquiries into matters relating to controverted elections and corrupt practices at elections. The hon. gentleman will see that his argument would apply to the cases of controverted elections, and to corrupt practices, as well as to this case. I venture to think that the Minister of Railways never took time to consider, why it is that upon the statute-book side by side, we have one statute relating to corrupt practices, and another passed in order that under a certain state of affairs a commission of judges could do the very thing that you are attempting to empower these judges to do here, namely, to inquire into, to probe, and to ascertain to what extent corrupt practices

prevail, and of what character they were. And for that purpose Mr. Blake introduced in 1876, that elaborate Act, chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, copied from the elaborate provisions made for the same purpose in England, and there never was a man, Sir John Thompson, or any other eminent man in this House, who was charged with these matters, who ventured the suggestions that have fallen from the lips of the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Railways in regard to this matter. There never was a suggestion in anything which Sir John Thompson said touching this amendment in 1889, of a totally different Act passed for a totally different purpose, that would warrant the observation made by the Minister of Railways, that he had considered that the Blake Act was unnecessary, and that with regard to the indemnity provisions it had gone so far. There was nothing said, and for a good reason; these two statutes deal with entirely different subjects. This is the first case which the hon. gentleman can call to mind in which it was ever attempted to clothe a commission with authority to inquire into the prevalence of corrupt practices and fraud and crime and rascality relating to elections or anything else. The other is the machinery devised for that purpose by the able men who prepared that legislation in England. The other is the result of the study of Mr. Blake, made in 1876, when he copied the legislation with certain improvements; and, as I say, it was never pretended by any one on either side of this House, before we had at hand that little Act relating to public inquiries into matters relating to good government, that would make that machinery and all those provisions in the other Act wholly unnecessary.

Touching, too, this question as to jurisdiction, I would like the hon. gentleman to remember the peculiar jurisdiction respecting this matter of elections and all relating to them. In May it is laid down:

Another important power peculiar to the Commons is that of determining all matters touching the election of their own members.

And he goes into the history of this interesting subject, showing how the courts had attempted to deal with these matters, but how in the contest the will and claim of parliament had prevailed, as of course it would prevail. So that when we find parliament delegating to the courts, and by Act of Parliament, of course, only a portion of its jurisdiction, and that relating simply to controverted elections, and then in regard to corrupt practices prevailing at elections, it does seem to me to afford more than a doubt as to whether this general legislation can be said to have taken the rest of the jurisdiction away, or to have been so expressed that it would have been interpreted, after argument, to mean that under that the Governor in Council could deal with the

rest of a matter, otherwise within the exclusive jurisdiction of this House; and that is a question which may come up, if the hon. gentleman's position be right in regard to another matter, that counsel, other than the two named by the commissioners, shall have access to that tribunal. If the parties interested may attend by counsel, one of the very first questions that will come up will be that; and if the hon. gentlemen are anxious that this commission shall proceed speedily, and shall not be disturbed, why should not that doubt—though the hon. gentleman does not share it—be put aside by the use of apt language? What possible reason is there for resisting the suggestion that all doubts as to the jurisdiction of parliament should be removed? I would put it to any reasonable member of this House, who has studied the question at all, when you are dealing with a question like the Huron and Brockville cases, and other similar questions, which is the Act most suitable to copy? Which are the provisions most adequate on their face? Those in the Act relating to corrupt practices, or those found in the Act respecting inquiries into any matters relating to good government? So, in 1889, Sir John Thompson, recognizing the difference, not only in the language, but in the application of those two statutes—one expressly dealing with corrupt practices and crimes, the other dealing with inquiries into the improvement of the civil service, with regard to the conduct of officers in the service, with regard to matters suggesting legislation, matters in connection with the grain trade, and other matters of that character—might well say that the provision was unnecessary, which found its way into the Corrupt Practices Act, simply on the ground on which Mr. Blake put it, that you have to depend on criminals for some of the most important evidence, and you cannot hope to get that evidence, or get to the bottom of a crime, where the crime has extensively prevailed, unless you go further than the Act of 1889 does, and give complete indemnity, and allow the commission to grant absolute pardon to the criminal who makes a full confession, and properly conducts himself before the commission. So the reasons have not been met by the Minister of Railways, and the reasons, I think, were clear to the mind of Sir John Thompson, when he amended an Act intended to deal with a totally different matter.

As to the payment of witnesses, the hon. gentleman says that we do not do ourselves justice in assuming that the government do not intend to make ample provision for the witnesses. I do not know about other members on this side of this House, but I will tell the hon. gentleman why I have considerable doubt. I will admit that the statement of the Minister of Railways to-day, and the statement of the Prime Minister before him, on that head, are ample to satisfy me, that is, the express promise, as I

understand it, to include in the Supply Bill such provision as will clothe the commission with the powers in this matter proposed by the senior member for Halifax. That is satisfactory. But touching the hon. gentleman's observation as to our not doing justice to ourselves in assuming that that provision would not be made, I refer to the Ogilvie Commission. That commission was issued under this statute. What happened to the witnesses? There was money at hand under the command of the government; did they pay the witnesses? If they did, when did they do it? The men who had the conduct of the charges came before the commissioner appointed under the same Act under which these commissioners are appointed, and told the commissioner that they depended on the evidence of men who were up the creeks on their claims, and who could not be got there, unless they were paid, and were maintained while attending the commission; and Mr. Ogilvie, as the report shows, admitted his inability to pay a farthing to any one of the witnesses who were required in court. And all he could do, was to promise that he would communicate with the government and endeavour to have some arrangement made. What happened? That commission became abortive, owing largely, to the inability to obtain witnesses and pay them their proper fees. The labours of the commission closed in May, 1899, and the witnesses who were paid by the government were paid in November, 1899. With a case of that kind before parliament, I do not think that the hon. Minister of Railways need be surprised that we should take care to see that no such accident shall happen with regard to this commission.

The hon. gentleman says, touching other counsel than the two named, that there is no difficulty about that, as the commission have authority to allow other counsel to appear. But he hardly made that point good. He did not meet the argument that, as the commission can appoint two counsel, it will be going very far to say that either by rules or orders, under the general language to which the hon. minister refers, there will be other counsel than the two named by the commission.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Not paid by the commission.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** No, but the language of the commission is that they shall appoint two counsel, and certainly it is not a violent presumption to say that those were to be the only counsel. But the hon. gentleman did not meet the other point, namely, that we are unable to say what view the commission will take, and the case of the Ontario commission is before us, which refused to allow other counsel to appear and ruled them out. The same thing consequently might happen in this case; and the government do not take the responsibility of saying that they have

so arranged that commission that they do not intend that other counsel shall appear except these two.

Then again as to asking how the witnesses voted, I think the Minister of Railways found himself skating on rather thin ice. I forget whether he was in the House this afternoon when a very interesting discussion took place across the floor. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) was dealing with the Haldimand case, when the hon. the Minister of Marine interrupted him to explain that there need not be any trouble about this matter at all, because he did not hold that the Haldimand case settled the question and that witnesses could not be asked how they voted, but he agreed with the hon. member for Halifax, that that question was not an open one, but one which had been decided. He agreed with the hon. member for Halifax that the Manitoba case had decided the point that witnesses could be examined as to how they had voted, when the limit for filing an election protest was over and the result of the election could not be affected. To-night, however, the hon. Minister of Railways leaned strongly the other way. His view was that such evidence will not be allowed. So that we have at least a case of doubt, a case in which there is difference of opinion in the cabinet. You have the Minister of Marine a lawyer, and the Minister of Railways, also a lawyer, both expressing different opinions on that head. The Minister of Railways gave this House to understand that the only reason why the Committee on Privileges and Elections last year permitted witnesses to be asked how they had voted was that public opinion would be prejudiced against those who objected to such evidence. So that I may not do the hon. gentleman an injustice, I will quote his language:

It contains testimony which was admitted by the committee under circumstances which were not proper, favourable to the proper elucidation of the facts, or to the holding of a proper inquiry; and I will tell the House why I think so. When the question came before that committee as to whether certain witnesses should be compelled to state for whom they had voted, the question of the admissibility of that evidence was very properly raised by counsel. The result was that the newspapers of the opposition cried out that the committee were stifling inquiry; and the reason that evidence was admitted afterwards—I was present when a portion of the discussion took place, and also when the evidence was finally admitted—was not because, in the opinion of the majority of the committee, it was proper or legal evidence, but because they felt that the whole object of the opposition press was to create the impression that the majority wished to suppress the evidence and stifle the inquiry, and, therefore, they felt that it would be better to allow this violation of the law rather than to put it in the power of hon. gentlemen opposite to represent to the country at large, who would not know the rights or the wrongs of the matter, that we had refused to permit everything to come out, or to allow the widest possible inquiry.

But the Minister of Marine took particular pains to explain that the reason which actuated the committee was wholly different; and the reason was that the committee took the view taken by the bench in Manitoba in the case of the Queen vs. Sanders.

These things make us somewhat suspicious. We find one minister telling us: the law is as you say; and then we have another minister, who happened to be out when his colleague spoke, coming in a few hours afterwards, and telling us that the law is exactly the opposite.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I was present when the Minister of Marine made the statement referred to. Therefore any statement I make subsequently was made with the full knowledge of what my colleague had said. In the next place, I did not express this evening any opinion on the question as to whether the evidence was admissible or not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman did not listen to the quotation I gave from his own speech. He can go a great distance, but he is not going to tell this House that the language I have just quoted does not show that the hon. minister's opinion was that the admission of such evidence was improper and illegal, and that the Committee on Privileges and Elections admitted it simply because of the row created by the opposition press. What condition of things have we come to when, in face of his own language, the minister can say that he never entertained that opinion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not said anything of the kind. I have said that I did not express—whether it was important for me to express an opinion or not is beside the question—an opinion this evening. The hon. gentleman has been endeavouring to put in my mouth an opinion which he says I expressed this evening upon the question of the admissibility of this evidence. I say that I have expressed no opinion on the admissibility of the evidence.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman cannot get away in that manner. He either heard or did not hear, and if he did not, I will read to him again the language he used on June 11, in this House, when he distinctly said that the evidence was improperly admitted. He distinctly says that the evidence should not have been admitted, that it was evidence improperly admitted and that it was admitted because of the force of public opinion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will allow me, I

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

am not saying that the statement of mine on June 11 that he read was not a correct statement of what I said. But, the hon. gentleman is referring to what I said the other day and professing to say what I said tonight. He said that I came in, and, not hearing the opinion expressed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) this afternoon, had expressed an opinion directly contrary to him. I expressed no opinion on that subject this afternoon; and if I had expressed any, it must have been when the matter came up a few days ago.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That explanation I do not think very satisfactory. I take back at once and stand corrected in regard to the immaterial point as to whether the minister (Mr. Blair) was present or absent when his colleague expressed diametrically opposite opinions. But the question was as to the admissibility of this evidence; and it was on that that the opinion was expressed on June 11 by the minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What was it?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What I have read.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Was that an expression of my opinion on the question?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. So far as the English language could convey an opinion. The hon. gentleman puts it very strongly. He could not have followed me, but I would refer him to his opinion as expressed in the language I have already read. We had the very opposite view expressed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries this afternoon. Now, can there be a clearer reason for this House to set doubts at rest? There are two different views held by two eminent legal gentlemen in the cabinet; and we ask that the proceedings of that commission shall not be disturbed, but that we shall take the responsibility here and now of saying what the instructions shall be. If hon. gentlemen opposite wish to treat us fairly, let them as a party, let them as a government—because they are taking charge of this commission as a party and a government and not as a parliament—say that they do not wish the commission to have the right, clear and beyond doubt, to obtain from witnesses information as to how they voted, and let us decide on that. Let them be frank with us. If that is their view, let them express that view; but let us make clear the will of parliament on that important matter. There never was a case requiring to be decided more definitely than the case now under notice; and let us deal fairly with ourselves and with the commission, and remove what, at any rate, may be

the cause of great embarrassment through the consumption of time or in frustrating the efforts of the commission to probe these frauds to the very bottom. Then, in regard to the use of the evidence, I have only to say in reference to the minister's observation, that he did not, it seems to me, seize the idea conveyed in this resolution. It is not to force the acceptance of legal evidence, that is, evidence to be inquired into in a court of law, but to provide that the commission shall be free to use such parts or the whole of such evidence if they think proper.

Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) discussed the action of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Has he forgotten—certainly the House has not forgotten, those who have read the evidence knew—that so far from that committee being controlled by the prejudices or caprices of the opposition, so far from the opposition being given full latitude, as he suggested, the whole control of the investigation was taken out of the hands of those who had any responsibility in connection with it. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) took the responsibility upon himself of making serious charges. So serious were they that reference to a committee was granted. Other hon. gentlemen undertook the responsibility of assisting him in producing the evidence to substantiate these charges. But, to the surprise of most reasonable people, it was found that the majority of that committee, the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, took the whole charge of the conduct of the proceedings, to such an extent as to compel the gentleman who had made the charges and those who had undertaken to prove them to put on the stand first the alleged criminal, disturbing the order of calling the witnesses, not only the way in which these gentlemen intended to call them, but the reasonable order in which they should have been called. I pass by the reflections that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has cast on the committees of this House—that they are incapable, practically, of acting as reasonable men, which is the inference from the observations made by the Minister of Railways and Canals. It is not a great compliment, I may say, to the party—his own party—who have control of every one of these committees at the present time. I think this is the first time such strong language in regard to them has fallen from the lips of a minister of the Crown.

Then, on the question of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, I think the quotation of Sir John Bourinot's book and the reference to Hatsell pretty well took the wind out of the minister's sails. At any rate, after that authority was read, we did not hear any longer the argument that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was not an officer of the House. Perhaps I am doing the Minister of Railways and Canals an injustice in arguing this point, because he conceded a doubt

about the jurisdiction of the commission to force the attendance of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery before them with the documents that are in his custody. And, if I understand the hon. minister right, he has suggested that this question could be dealt with in the Election Bill, and all doubts on that subject put at rest. I have this to say—that it certainly cannot be said to be clear that any commission could compel the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to produce our documents before it, unless some statutory authority could be shown. It is in virtue of a statute that he appears with those documents now in the different courts of law, not under subpoena, but after obtaining an order. In 1886, in the case of North or South Leeds, I think it was held that unless the provision of the statute was exactly followed, and the case came within the provision made for compelling the production of those documents, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery need not obey the order in court, let alone the subpoena.

Then the hon. gentleman suggested, in regard to the order of hearing these different cases, that there was no particular urgency for taking up one case first more than another. Well, is that a fair view? I submit it is a most unfair view to take, although what would be unfair in one sense as we consider it, might appear to the court in a different sense altogether. They must utterly ignore, so far as they can, all that has happened in this House; they must separate themselves in so far as they can from the controversies that have been waged on these different questions; and therefore, with nothing to guide them, unable to resort to the arguments we used, it might possibly occur to them that they should begin at the beginning as these matters go. As we understand them, the beginning is not in 1896, the beginning as we understand it here, is where those cases did begin. Taking a fair view of it, one case has already been begun and the investigation stopped, and it was not intended it should go on. Pressure was brought to bear, and finally the government had to yield, and a promise was made that the inquiry should be resumed, and it was an after-thought that neither case should be inquired into. But the first matter for investigation was undoubtedly the case of the West Huron and Brockville elections; consequently I think in all reason, direction should be given to this commission to begin the investigation where it left off, and that was in the cases of the West Huron and Brockville elections, and then to proceed as they saw fit in regard to the others, which have not even been suggested by the government as proper cases to inquire into.

Then we had the hon. gentleman's assertion all through of the desire of the government to purify and to observe as far as they can the sanctity of the ballot in political elections. Now, all of these pro-

fessions we may doubt, we may not give the hon. gentlemen credit for sincerity; but I believe the position of the government of this country would be far better and far stronger in the land if, in regard to these reasonable suggestions, their position was this: We do not entertain the same views as you do in regard to these amendments, we think them absolutely unnecessary; but being offered in good faith—as they are in this case—and they have not challenged the faith in which they have been offered—seeking to promote as they do the objects we have in view, we will accept those suggestions in the spirit in which they are offered, and then that commission will start under the best auspices, and with the confidence of both sides of the House that it was intended it should do its duty thoroughly, and that no possible difficulty should be put in its way. I think that would be a splendid position for this government to take. Unfortunately our appeals are made to empty benches. The government is not here to-night. It has been on nearly every important occasion this session remarkable for its empty benches, and if it continues to treat parliament in this way, and to treat the wishes of the country in the way suggested in this debate, I fancy they will leave those benches altogether.

Mr. B. RUSSELL (Halifax). I have been rather struck in listening to my hon. and learned friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and my hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Borden), with a sense of the great lack of enterprise on the part of our Liberal newspapers. I am quite sure that if the newspapers and journals on the other side of the House had had the same opportunities presented to them that have been presented by our hon. friends opposite to the journals supporting the government, they would have made a very much better use of those opportunities than our journals are doing. Supposing that our friends on the other side of the House being in control of the government had issued a commission for the purpose of inquiring into electoral corruption or into electoral irregularities, into frauds and evil practices, as ample and as generous, as large and as full, as the commission which has been issued by the Governor in Council in this case, and supposing that having issued that commission, their opponents, instead of acquiescing in it, instead of hastening it into operation, instead of allowing the commission to be organized and to go on with its work, had obstructed the organization of that commission with all sorts of trivial objections, with all sorts of technical quibbles, with all sorts of wire-drawn arguments, such as have been presented to the House by our hon. friends opposite, I am quite sure what would have been said by all the Conservative journals under those circumstances: I am quite sure they

would have said that there was obstruction being placed in the way; that while the government were ready to go on with the inquiry into these evil practices, here they found a factious opposition, here they found an obstructive opposition, unwilling that this thing should go forward, and anxious to obstruct the good measures of the government. I say that our journals are not as enterprising as the journals which support the hon. gentlemen opposite, or they would have improved the opportunity offered to them in such a case, as I am sure their adversaries would have done if they had been placed in similar circumstances.

I do not intend to weary the House at this late hour, and after the protracted discussion that we have had upon this subject, not only to-day, but on previous occasions in this House, with any lengthened argument as to the legal questions that have been raised, the extremely ingenious, I must confess, and somewhat plausible legal arguments that have been presented to the House by way of criticising this commission which has been placed before us. My hon. friend attacked the commission on one ground, because of the competency of the Governor in Council to appoint the commission at all for this purpose, under the provision which is contained in chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals pointed out that the language of that statute is certainly sufficient to enable them to institute an inquiry like this. It enables them to conduct an inquiry into any matter connected with the good government of Canada. Surely nobody questions that,—it ought to be common ground between us that that language is large enough to include the issuing of the commission that has been issued in this case. But then, if I understand the argument that has been made use of by hon. gentlemen opposite, one branch of it, at all events, is that it has to be assumed that this particular inquiry does not come within the purview of that statute in respect to the constitution of commissions for general inquiries of that character in matters effecting the good government of Canada, because, if I understood the argument, there is a special statute which gives the right to appoint a special kind of commission to inquire into corrupt practices. I am not sure whether that is one branch of the argument or not, but I understood that to be argued. Well, if this is the contention, I am not quite sure that these particular practices that we are seeking to have an inquiry into by this commission are corrupt practices within the sense of the word as used in the Controverted Elections Act, and as such could be inquired into by a tribunal organized for the purposes of inquiring into corrupt practices. Whether they are corrupt practices or not, I think, without having had an opportunity of having read this statute

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

as carefully as one would like to before giving an opinion upon the question, it will be found that there is no procedure by which, under these circumstances, a commission could be organized for the purpose of inquiring into these particular practices which are now in controversy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has apprehended my argument correctly, or if he has apprehended the whole of it. The first branch of it that I would bring to his attention is that if you had not a Controverted Elections Act, for example, would it be competent to issue a commission, under chapter 114, for the purpose of investigating into a controverted election?

Mr. RUSSELL. We know that there is a very long history connected with that. We know that the House of Commons would imprison anybody who would pretend to start such an inquiry, and that is quite possible that the courts would arrest and put into prison a serjeant-at-arms who would obey the behest of the House of Commons in the same connection. We know there was a very great question of doubt as to the right of any tribunal other than the House of Commons to test the propriety of any person professing to be a member of the House holding his seat, and we know that the House has claimed exclusive jurisdiction in such matters. But we are not inquiring into that question at all. I think it is admitted that we are not inquiring into the question of the tenure upon which any member of this House holds his seat, but we are inquiring into a system of fraud and of evil practices which is alleged to have been going on and into matters of that kind. This is not particularly the kind of subject that the House of Commons has exclusive jurisdiction in, but whether it has or not that is not the question that I am now considering. I was referring to a different branch of the argument. I was going on to show the reasons why I thought this chapter in respect to the inquiry into corrupt practices in the election of members of the House of Commons could not be invoked in this case because in the case of a commission of this kind it requires that certain antecedent conditions should be complied with before there can be any such commission issued. The first condition is the report of a judge on an election trial that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed, or that there is reason to believe that they have extensively prevailed, or if that condition is not present in the case, then that a petition has been presented within sixty days after the receipt of the writ by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. These are the only two cases in which you have the conditions laid down for the constitution of a commission under chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes for the purpose of inquiring into the prevalence

of corrupt practices at elections. There may be others, because, as I said before, I am not dogmatizing about the matter at all. If there is any general or unlimited power given by the statute it is there for the purpose of making inquiries into corrupt practices. All I say is that I doubt if these practices which we are inquiring into are corrupt practices. I would almost go further and say that I think you will find that these particular practices that we are now considering are not corrupt practices within the meaning or terms of the election law. But, whether they are or are not, there is no possibility of bringing chapter 10 into operation in this case, and we would be utterly helpless in respect to the constitution of a commission to make any inquiry into this matter unless we have the power under the statute to constitute a commission as it has been constituted by the order in council which has been laid on the Table of the House. Now, I do not think it is a pleasant conclusion to come to, that the state of our law is so entirely inefficient,—that it has been left, after thirty years of legislation, so absolutely imperfect that when glaring wrongs, such as are alleged to have been committed in 1899, and such as were proved to have been committed in 1896, are brought to the attention of the House and when it is shown by the vote and the experience of this House that the Privileges and Elections Committee is an absolutely unsatisfactory tribunal for trying such questions, we have actually to resort to legislation which may never be passed or which may only pass after considerable obstruction, to make an inquiry into these evils. It is not a pleasant conclusion to arrive at, but, it is the conclusion that has been embodied in the last paragraph of my hon. friend's resolution, that the matter is so doubtful that he is not certain if the Governor in Council has the power to constitute a commission for the purpose of inquiring into these particular matters. Now, then, suppose we carried that argument to its logical conclusion, it would seem to amount to this, that this general provision which is made in chapter 114 for the constitution of a commission to inquire into any matter affecting the good government of Canada must practically be almost inoperative, that there could hardly be any case in which you could bring it up into operation, because I am quite certain that so amply has the whole field of legislation been covered by this House that you will not find one single thing that you would desire to bring within the purview of that section which has not been covered by legislation, and for which tribunals for inquiring into such matters have not been provided. The whole field of legislation has been occupied by statutes of one sort and another, and if you are going to carry that argument to its logical conclusion you will have to cut down the broad and ample terms of the statute

to almost nothing at all, because wherever you find that the subject of inquiry is already provided for before the courts a commission organized under that statute will not have jurisdiction, seeing that there is some other way by which the same result may be arrived at. The criticism is also made that the terms of the commission are not large enough—but that has been gone over so frequently and by so many speakers that I do not wish to occupy any of the time of the House in discussing it at all. It is really a question of grammar. It is a question of the grammatical analysis of the sentence in which the powers of the commissioners are stated. I do not profess to be an expert on that subject, but when you find in the commission that it refers to frauds that have been committed by returning officers, deputy returning officers and other parties. I think you have the basis laid for a very generous and liberal construction of the operative part of the commission. Then, when you read in the operative part of the commission itself that they are to inquire into any fraudulent conduct, that is to say, into the various things that have happened by reason of any fraudulent conduct in respect to the ballot books, the ballot boxes, or their lawful contents, or what should have been their lawful contents, you get an exceedingly ample charge for this commission to inquire into, everything that by any possibility could be brought within the scope of the subject which they are to investigate. I do not intend to analyse these sentences any further, because I believe that anybody reading them fairly must see that they cover all that it is necessary this commission should inquire into.

Now, it is quite clear that any question that can be raised as to the indemnity of the witnesses cannot possibly have any relevancy to the question as to the fulness of the inquiry. The commission is to be as full and as ample one way as the other, as ample the way the commission stands as the way my hon. friends opposite propose that it should be read. All the witnesses are bound to answer any questions, whether the answers criminate them or do not criminate them. The question is not as to the obligation of the witness to answer every question, but it is as to what is going to happen the witness after he has answered the question. So far as I am concerned it strikes me that the policy of the commission as issued, is much more wise and sensible than it would be if the suggestions of hon. gentlemen opposite were accepted. The witnesses have all the protection that is requisite and just, given to them. The protection that is given to them is exactly equivalent to the privilege that is taken away from them. The privilege that is taken away from them is that contrary to their privilege under the common law, they can be called upon to answer any question which

would have a tendency to criminate them. You deprive them of the privilege of refusing to answer questions which may criminate them, but you give them a corresponding advantage when you say that their answers shall not be used against them in any criminal trial. To go further than that would bring about the result, that you might have proved your case conclusively against a most notorious criminal who ought be tried and put in the penitentiary for some flagrant violation of the law, but the first thing any one would do who had an interest in him, would be to hustle him into court to get him examined as a witness and have him whitewashed. By that process you might whitewash all the scoundrels in Canada who have been connected with this business. I therefore think that the protection given to these witnesses is all that can be fairly asked for. I again point out, that the question at issue between the two sides of the House in this regard, is not as to the fulness of the inquiry, is not as to the nature of the questions that can be asked, is not as to the power of the commission to get all the knowledge that is in the breasts of the witnesses, but it is simply as to what shall be or what shall not be the extent of the immunity accorded to the witnesses.

In regard to the right to question the voter as to how he voted, I will have to confess that I had a rather strong feeling in favour of the protection of the secrecy of the ballot when we were discussing this matter in another place some twelve months ago. However, I was disposed to acquiesce in the view that was taken by the learned Chief Justice Killam, of Manitoba, that there might be a distinction drawn in the policy of the law, and therefore the propriety of asking or not asking the question, between a case where the seat of the member was in question; and a case where the seat of the member was not concerned. The only point was this: That if you are going to consult considerations of policy, it did not then and it does not now occur to my mind, why the policy of the law should be any different in the one case from that which it is in the other case. Be that as it may, however, the distinction has been made and it has been upheld by the chief justice of Manitoba, and I would be inclined to predict that the judges who constitute this commission would be governed by the decision in the Manitoba case, and which is not necessarily in conflict with the dictum that was adopted by Chief Justice Strong and Judge Taschereau, of the Supreme Court of Canada. But, whether they adopt that view or the opposite view is to my mind a thing which is entirely immaterial. I would think it highly improper to interfere with their judgment about that. I believe that whatever decision they come to in respect of that will be in accordance with the policy of the law up to this date, and I fail to see that

any circumstances which have arisen should induce this parliament to change the policy of the law in respect to the secrecy of the ballot, and as to whether a witness may or may not be asked whether he voted for any particular person. Whatever the policy of the law is in connection with that, it should be considered as settled now for the cases that are coming as well for the cases that have gone by. Whatever may loom up in the eyes of my hon. friends opposite, I do not believe that any occasion has arisen why we should change whatever policy of law we did adopt as to the secrecy of a vote given by ballot. Whatever the court shall adjudicate as having been in the breast of this parliament as the policy of the law in respect to that subject, I for one am willing to be bound by it, and I feel confident that the conclusion of the court will be as sage a conclusion as any we can come to here. I shall not detain the House at much greater length, but I wish to observe that there do seem to be two subjects upon which hon. gentlemen opposite are particularly alarmed in respect to the issue of this commission. One of these is: The anxiety on the part of gentlemen opposite as to the witnesses who have been examined in the West Huron case. Holding the view I do, I can well understand why hon. gentlemen opposite should be very reluctant to have these same witnesses go again before a tribunal to be dragged through the same ordeal as they experienced twelve months ago. I can understand why it would be a much pleasanter prospect to them to have the printed book containing the evidence placed before the commission, than to have these thirty or forty witnesses, including the ten or twelve who in my theory were not stating the truth in respect to their votes; it would be much pleasanter I say to have the book of evidence submitted than to have these witnesses confronted with the statements in that book and cross-examined as I have no doubt they would be. It is not a prospect which any hon. member who sympathizes with these witnesses can contemplate with any feeling of great comfort. I can understand that with a witness who is telling the truth he need not have much alarm how often he is called upon to testify, or at how long an interval of time he may be called upon, but in the case of a witness who has fabricated his story, I can quite understand that he would not be specially anxious not to have to fabricate it again, after the lapse of twelve months when he may have forgotten some of the particulars of his story. The hon. gentlemen on the other side are no doubt extremely solicitous that the book of evidence which is dead print should be produced in court, and not the living witnesses. There is another matter in reference to which I notice considerable anxiety on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that is as to the order in which

the investigations into these matters shall be conducted. The government so far as I understand have not made the slightest or remotest hint or suggestion to this commission as to the order in which they shall take up the various subjects of inquiry. They may take up the West Huron and Brockville cases first, or they may decide that the more proper way is to proceed in historical order. If they are permitted to go back to 1896, they may think that the more proper and suitable way is to begin with the origin of the matter, if the origin of it can be found, or to go as far back towards the origin of the matter as their commission permits them to go. I can see why our hon. friends opposite may be very apprehensive in regard to that. The whole horizon has been clouded to their minds in the last twelve months with the West Huron and Brockville matters; they have been able to see nothing else in the sky. Anything of the same kind that took place in previous years, as far back as 1896, is altogether shrouded from their view; and I can understand how tenderly the hon. member for Pictou relegated all those events to the domain of ancient history, as he calls it. That is quite natural; but the judges may not regard them as ancient history at all. They may regard them as modern history; they may consider that those things happened since the flood. They will, undoubtedly, go into those matters which occurred in 1896, and on other occasions when hon. gentlemen opposite were on the griddle, or should have been, and inquire into the election frauds which occurred then as well as into matters of more recent occurrence. As I have said, the government have not given the faintest hint or suggestion to the commissioners, and I am sure would not think of doing so, as to the way in which these investigations should be taken up. But, if the judges do see fit to proceed in the chronological order, and take the events of 1896 before they take those of 1900, which would not be unnatural, then, I can understand that our hon. friends opposite would lose a great deal of the interest in this thing which they had in the beginning. To gentlemen on this side of the House, it is a matter of indifference where the judges begin the inquiry. Whether they begin at the end or at the beginning or in the middle, is a matter of sublime indifference to gentlemen on this side of the House. All they ask is that there shall be a full, fair and exhaustive investigation into all this kind of fraud and rascality that has been perpetrated, whether by the friends of one party or the friends of the other party, unhampered by any conditions, and with the large and full charter which has been given to these judges by the commission which has been laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat indulged in some criticism, not of a very serious nature, respecting the utterances of the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), and the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). He characterized their arguments as hair-splitting, as small, as paltry, and by other terms which may be parliamentary, but certainly do not dignify discussion on the floors of parliament. I may say, however, that although he has applied these terms, which I might call vituperative, to these hon. gentlemen, he has also by necessary implication if not expressly applied somewhat similar terms to the Hon. Edward Blake and to the English parliament. Considering the fact that the two hon. gentlemen on this side of the House stand in such very good company, probably they can afford to ignore the criticisms made upon them by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell). In discussing the matter before the House, he has referred to the question which forms one of the prominent features of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Halifax, that is, respecting the former witnesses and the testimony given by those witnesses before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. In the first place, I may say that I have always felt a great deal of pride in the sincerity of the hon. gentleman, inasmuch as we were both educated at the same college and subjected to somewhat similar moral influences; and I am astonished that he should discuss this matter in the way he has. He says the hon. member for Halifax is trying to force upon the commission the evidence that was taken before the committee of inquiry of this House. The hon. gentleman knows, as every other hon. gentleman on the floor of this House knows, that the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Halifax is permissive and not imperative, as respects the use of that evidence. The commissioners may use it or may not use it; it is entirely a matter in their own discretion. I was also astonished when the hon. gentleman proceeded to give the reason why he thought the members on this side of the House might desire that testimony to be taken into account by the commission. His argument was based upon either one or two positions; in the first place, that hon. gentlemen opposite desired to get an advantage by shutting out this testimony inasmuch as the witnesses, if called before the commissioners, might forget part of their story, and the whole truth would not get out; or, in the second place, that the witnesses before the Committee on Privileges and Elections committed deliberate perjury. Now, I do not think it is a very nice insinuation to make, unless there is something on the face of the papers themselves that shows it conclusively, that a man has committed perjury. If he has placed himself in such a position that no

other inference can possibly be drawn, then, of course, it is a legitimate subject of comment, and one cannot be accused of cowardice in standing behind his privilege as a member of the House of Commons and making that charge; otherwise, I think it is just as well for a gentleman of honour to avoid any such reflections and insinuations.

Mr. RUSSELL. Somebody must have committed perjury.

Mr. POWELL. I know one gentleman, who, out of his own mouth, is convicted of perjury, and who cannot, by any process of excuse, which even the astute mind of the hon. junior member for Halifax can form, be excused, and that is one of the gentleman who presided at one of the polls in West Huron.

Now, to proceed with the discussion of the main matter before the House. I may say that chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes is not definitive of jurisdiction at all. I think—I submit it with all deference to the House—that the view of this matter taken by both the hon. Minister of Railways and the hon. junior member for Halifax is entirely wrong. That Act does not confer jurisdiction; it assumes that the Governor has power in certain matters to issue a commission, as every one knows that from time immemorial the Crown has been in the habit of issuing Royal Commissions, and it says, with respect to certain Royal Commissions which the Crown has the right to issue, certain powers not previously possessed shall be henceforth possessed. I read it:

Whenever the Governor in Council deems it expedient to cause inquiry to be made into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada, or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof, and such inquiry is not regulated by any special law, the Governor in Council may by the commission in the case—

It does not define the jurisdiction. It refers to the jurisdiction the Governor in Council has, and within that jurisdiction he may insert in the commission, and thereby confer upon the commissioners or persons by whom such inquiry is to be conducted, the power of summoning before them any witnesses, and of requiring them to give evidence on oath, orally, or in writing, or on solemn affirmation, if they are persons entitled to affirm in civil matters, and to produce such documents and things as such commissioners deem requisite to the full investigation of the matters into which they are appointed to examine.

Then, it goes on:

Such commissioner or commissioners shall have the power to enforce the attendance of such witnesses and to compel them to give evidence, as is invested in any Superior Court of record in civil cases; but no such witness shall be compelled to answer any question by his answer

Mr. RUSSELL.

to which he might render himself liable to criminal prosecution.

The latter part of that clause is amended. That Act is simply an enabling Act, to enable the commissioners appointed by Royal Commission to do things which, without the Act, they could not do. A Royal Commissioner, appointed by the Crown, under commission, has no jurisdiction to summon witnesses, but this Act enables him to do it, in respect of those matters to which it applies. He otherwise would have no jurisdiction to compel the attendance of witnesses, but this enables him to do it in the same manner as if he were a court of record.

That being the case, it becomes necessary to consider the question whether or not at common law—including in that term, parliamentary law—there existed at the time of the passing of this statute and still exists, any right in the Crown to inquire into election matters by Royal Commission. I say to inquire into election matters, because all these matters, such as are complained of, are incidental to and grew out of an election, and a general jurisdiction to make inquiry into an election would include them, as they are inseparable from it, and are appurtenant and incidental to it. Does there exist any such right in the Crown? Originally and up to the reign of Richard II., the King did inquire into elections. There is no question about that. In the reign of Richard II. parliament began to object to the King exercising this power, and a conflict ensued. The House of Commons asserted its supposed right; the King asserted his. Finally the matter was recognized as being one within the exclusive jurisdiction of the House of Commons, and the Court of Exchequer, in the year 1374, so decided. In the year 1680 and in the year 1702, the House of Lords approved of the decision of the Exchequer Court.

An hon. MEMBER. B. C. ?

Mr. POWELL. I think that the hon. gentleman who interjected that interruption, not only lived B. C., but, from his intelligent remark, I think he must have lived before Ante Adam. By the Act of parliament, 7 William III., chapter 7, it was finally settled that the House of Commons alone had the exclusive jurisdiction to inquire into these election matters.

Even after that, the conflict waged over subsidiary matters. We had mentioned by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), the case of *Ashby vs. White*. This is a well known case. In it the House of Commons came directly into conflict with the civil courts of the country. The matter grew out of the right of an elector to deposit his vote. The returning officer had refused him the right to give his vote, and he sued the returning officer in a court of law. The House of Commons asserted that it was a matter of parliamentary law, entirely with-

in its jurisdiction, that the civil courts had no right to entertain the suit. The matter never came to a decision in a final court of appeal, but so far as the authority went it was in favour of the contention that an action did lie. This distinction was drawn, that an action lay simply because the plaintiff in the case had been denied a right which he enjoyed by common law, namely, his right to vote. The court conceded all the claims put forward on behalf of parliament, namely, that so far as it was a matter of parliamentary procedure, it was in the exclusive jurisdiction of the House of Commons, but inasmuch as the act of the returning officer had deprived the party of a civil right, he had the right to sue for damages for violation of that right.

Then came the *Hansard* case, in which a dispute between the courts and the House grew out of the publication of defamatory matter by the reporter of the House. That case came before the courts and was finally disposed of by an Act of parliament. Then we had later the procedure in election trials. Election courts were constituted for the trial of election petitions, and it was urged that the House had denuded itself of jurisdiction to try them. Mark you, notwithstanding the fact that jurisdiction was conferred upon the tribunal for the trial of election petitions and notwithstanding it was almost expressed in exclusive terms, the opinion of the best parliamentarians in this country and England has been that that does not oust the jurisdiction of this House, that the courts are only the officers, so to speak, of the House, and only exercise jurisdiction of the House, and that the House has the right to exercise its jurisdiction and try an election petition if it sees fit. But, as a matter of policy, it is universally conceded, that such matters are relegated to the courts for all purposes. Neither political party has, under ordinary circumstances, ever expressed a desire to depart from the general course of procedure.

Another matter came up to show you how these matters are exclusively within the jurisdiction of parliament. In Ontario, a few years ago, in an election case, a judge was not doing his duty, and application was made to a higher court for a prohibition to restrain the judge below from doing certain acts complained of as illegal. If this were an ordinary matter and not within the exclusive jurisdiction of the House of Commons, what would ensue? As an exercise of jurisdiction inherent in the highest court of record, the prohibition should have gone. But what action did the court take? It refused the prohibition. In the 24th Ontario Appeals, 1897, *McLeod vs. Noble*, the case I speak of, is reported. The judgment of Osler, one of the judges of the court of appeal, is as follows:

Then, upon the main question argued, I wish to express my entire concurrence with the prin-

eiple on which the case in re Centre Wellington, 44, U.C.R., 132, was decided, namely, that the recount by a county court judge of votes at a parliamentary election is a matter belonging to parliament alone, and the proceedings before him are not cognizable by the High Court except in so far as parliament has by legislation conferred jurisdiction. This case is quoted with approval in *Ellis vs. The Queen*, 22 S.C.R. 1, by Mr. Justice Fournier; and see R.S.C., chap. 8, sec. 64; 54-55 Vict., chap. 19, sec. 11 (d).

I agree with what is said by Merewith, J., in re North Perth, *Hessin vs. Lloyd*, 22 O.R., 538, 545, that by the Act just referred to, parliament has recognized the Centre Wellington case as a true exposition of the law. He speaks of it as legislation which seems, by expressly giving jurisdiction to this court, under the circumstances, and for the purposes under consideration in that case, to more plainly indicate that, where jurisdiction is not expressly conferred, it was not intended that this court should exercise any of the rights or powers of the high court of parliament in any proceedings under the Acts respecting the representation of the people in parliament.

So far, we see that matters of the nature of those to be inquired into by the commission are not cognizable by the courts of the country, except in the assertion of a civil right. Elections and matters incidental thereto are exclusively for the House of Commons to deal with, so far as the courts of the country are concerned, except matters of civil rights which may have been violated. It would follow as a necessary corollary to that, that they could not form the subject of a Royal Commission because the Crown would be interfering with the special and sacred privileges of the House of Commons which have been recognized for so long a time.

Furthermore, chapter 10, of the Revised Statutes, is based upon the supposition that chapter 114 does not apply to such cases as this. This view was put by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). This is a very important point, it is almost decisive of the question, these statutes, chapter 114 and chapter 10, must be read together, and in construing chapter 114, we must refer to what parliament did at the same session in chapter 10. I shall dwell upon these points for a few moments. Chapter 10 refers to corrupt practices at elections, and it authorizes the appointment of a Royal Commission under certain circumstances. Now, if chapter 114 could apply to these matters, there would be no necessity for chapter 10. The mere fact that chapter 10 is passed, however, pushes it, as a matter of construction, a step further, and shows that parliament did not intend these matters of election frauds and election errors to come within the general provisions of chapter 114. Having made special legislation with respect to these in chapter 10, that special legislation must prevail as against the general provision of chapter 114.

We will suppose now that chapter 114, instead of being merely procedure in a juris-

Mr. POWELL.

diction recognized by it, does actually confer jurisdiction—what then? It is a general Act. General legislation cannot control the privileges of the House. I lay that down as a general proposition. Some hon. gentlemen on the opposite side may be disposed to dispute that. I might cite many authorities, and adduce many instances of the recognition of the rule. Time and time again, in the province of New Brunswick, in the province of Nova Scotia, in the province of Ontario—in every British colony, almost, in the empire—legislatures have enacted laws governing the procedure of courts; and, in these colonies, the courts have held that, notwithstanding general words in the enactments relating to procedure, the special privileges of members of parliament were not touched, but remained intact. The language used was sufficiently general to cover the privileges, but the courts held it did not, showing that in constructing a general statute, the privileges of this House stand exactly on the same basis as if they were enacted in a special statute. The legislature does not override the House's privileges without express words. Further, let us suppose, for a moment, that the general words of this Act, chapter 114, are sufficient to include and actually do include, matters proposed in the commission. If that be the case, chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes and amending Acts thereto, do not apply. Let us look at chapter 10, to which I have referred. It is in these words:

Whenever the House of Commons, by address, represents to the Governor General that petition has been, within sixty days after the publication in the 'Canada Gazette' of the receipt of the return to a writ of election, by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery—

And so on—

—presented to the House of Commons, signed by any twenty-five or more electors of the district, stating that no petition charging the existence of corrupt practices has been presented—

—then, it says—

—the Governor General may appoint one or more of such judges or such person or persons, as the case may be, to be a commissioner or commissioners for the purpose of making inquiry into such corrupt practices.

Here is a special Act providing for inquiry into corrupt infractions of the election law. Let us now go back to chapter 114. I have already read it, but I will read part of it again:

Whenever the Governor in Council deems it expedient to cause inquiry to be made into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada, or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof—

Now, mark these words—

—and such inquiry is not regulated by any special law—

—then, and then only, does this Act apply. Every matter of corrupt practices, is regulated, so far as inquiry by Royal Commission is concerned, by chapter 10. This subject of regulation in chapter 10 is excluded by the terms of the Act from chapter 114. In other words chapter 114 does not apply. Then, Sir, none of the powers pretended to be conferred upon the commission are conferred, and the commission is simply a body without power to summon witnesses or do any of the acts authorized by this chapter.

Furthermore, I call the attention of the House to this fact. In taking up election frauds, or corrupt acts at elections, chapter 10 provides a great many precautions. In the first place twenty-five electors have to apply, and, in addition, there must be this resolution passed by the House. All this preliminary procedure has to be taken, showing how carefully this right of inquiry into matters which are privileges of the House are guarded by the House. In this case before us the government propose under the words of chapter 114 to issue a commission, ignoring entirely these safeguards—really ignoring chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes.

Some one has made the suggestion that the limitation of time affects the case, and the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) made use of the further argument that chapter 10 is cumbrous. I make this reply: That if parliament has laid down a certain mode of procedure that procedure has to be followed, and any limitation of time is as much an enactment relating to procedure as anything else; and, if acts are beyond the scope of the Election Act through lapse of time or other non-observance of the law, neither that nor the fact that the procedure may be cumbrous interferes with the principle and the Act (chapter 10) must certainly prevail.

A good deal of talk has been indulged in by the Minister of Railways and Canals and by the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) respecting the right to examine people on oath as to how they voted at the election. Let us see how this matter stands. In the first place, we have the judgment of Chief Justice Killam of the Manitoba court, who says the Act does not apply. We have the obiter dictum of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada to the effect that it does apply. There is somewhat of a conflict of judicial authority. Let us look at the Act itself. The Election Act confines the disability simply to cases in which the election is being contested. On the face of it the Act would not apply. But the Chief Justice of Canada says that the Act applies because the compelling witnesses to tell how they voted would be contrary to public policy. Eminent a jurist as Chief of the Supreme Court of Canada is, I would suggest that public policy means what is recognized by the common law of this coun-

try as public policy, and with all deference to that eminent jurist, I think that he is entirely in error as to what the public policy of England has been. The public policy of England down to the enactment of our election laws has been open voting where every man could know how every other man voted. That has been the public policy of the British Empire. The proceeding we now have is an interference with the old public policy, and the substitution of a statutory provision for the general principle of public policy that heretofore prevailed. A construction based upon considerations of supposed public policy or policy of the statute itself, if that construction be not an exploded one, that is contrary to the public statute cannot prevail against an expressed provision, or a necessary implication from the words of the Act itself.

Such being the case, with the conflict of judicial authority before us, what does the member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) propose to do? He suggests to the government that they should pass an Act conferring upon this commission power to compel witnesses to tell how they voted at an election. Well, what objection is urged to this? The only objection that has been urged by any gentleman who has spoken on the other side of the House, is that such is the present law, and this provision is entirely unnecessary, inasmuch as such would be the law applicable to the commission as it is proposed to be issued. I think that contention comes with bad grace from hon. gentlemen opposite. Those of us who took part in the proceedings before the Committee on Privileges and Elections last year know that the hon. the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) argued most strenuously, and he was supported, if I mistake not, by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), he was supported by almost every legal gentleman in that committee who sits on the other side of the House, in his contention that no question could be put to a witness as to how he voted at an election. Then they abandoned that position. Do they say they abandoned it because they were in error? No. What do the records show? The Minister of Railways and Canals, on the floor of this House, has on two or three occasions said that they abandoned that position because the press of the country had been raising such a howl—and not because they had changed their opinion. If the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) has weakened in his opinion, he has weakened since last session, because at the very last sitting of that committee when we examined witnesses, he expressed the opinion that an entirely illegal and improper course had been pursued with respect to allowing witnesses to state how they had voted. Now then, if these gentlemen were honest in

their opinion then, may not these judges, who are not infallible, take the same view of this matter that an astute intellect like that of the junior member for Halifax took of it, that almost every Liberal in the House then took of it? They must either confess that they were dishonest then, and were asserting before that committee an opinion that they did not entertain, or else they must concede that on this matter there may be a legitimate difference of opinion, and that intelligent men may take either side. All doubt ought, therefore, to be removed. This is simply the suggestion that my hon. friend from Halifax has incorporated in the resolution before us.

Again, the junior member for Halifax states that the immunity from prosecution of witnesses has already been provided for. On this the changes have been rung by quite a number of gentlemen opposite. They seem to fail to recognize the distinction that is drawn by my hon. friend with respect to what the law already provides in one case and what it provides in another, and what he proposes to guide the commission in their conduct. Under this Act a man is simply granted immunity from having the testimony he has given brought up in evidence against him, that is all. But, he is not granted immunity from prosecution, and the very evidence he gives, the very statements that he makes, may afford a clue for his conviction, may start a train of investigation outside of himself entirely, and the testimony of people that he has thus suggested may lead to his conviction in nine cases out of ten. What does my hon. friend from Halifax propose to do? He says: We will grant them a greater immunity. His reason for doing that is to protect culprits from those results that the law attaches to the acts that have been committed, not that he desires to protect evil-doers, but to elicit the truth. His view is simply this: Inasmuch as their liability to be convicted depends entirely upon the investigation, therefore, he asks to have them put in about the same position as they would be in were this inquiry not made at all. And for what purpose? If that is done a man will be free to give testimony without the slightest likelihood of his testimony convicting him. He will not give evidence, as it were, under fear, but will state the truth fully and completely; he will not endeavour to evade service. But on the other hand, if by giving testimony he is likely to put himself in jeopardy, he will evade service and escape giving testimony, or will, if called as a witness, disclose as little as possible.

For what reason does the government refuse to incorporate this provision, which is a wholesome provision, a provision that was urged by the Hon. Edward Blake, and was adopted by this House in the Corrupt Practices Act, a provision adopted by the English parliament, and incorporated in their Corrupt Practices Act? Why do these hon.

Mr. POWELL.

gentlemen opposite object to that being introduced here? They simply say it is unnecessary, and urge no other ground of opposition. Unnecessary—we think it is very necessary. We think it will lead to a more complete inquiry by affording a guarantee that witnesses will be on hand to give testimony instead of fleeing to the United States as they have been doing in case of the commission that has been sitting in the province of Ontario. But these hon. gentlemen evidently do not want a full inquiry; they are anxious that these witnesses should not come to court. No man can assert that the government have alleged any good reason so far why this provision should not be incorporated. My hon. friend has not raised this matter factiously. He is advocating the provision which was the calm, deliberate considerate policy of Edward Blake; the calm, deliberate policy of the British parliament. It is not something new and unheard of that he is proposing. He is simply asking that the precedent of the British parliament and the opinion of the Hon. Edward Blake, both of which should weigh with every man in this House, should prevail, and a provision be incorporated in a statute, and in pursuance thereof incorporated in the commission which is issued to these judges. For these reasons I do not see how any gentleman who desires a full and complete investigation into these election frauds, which have disgraced our country, can refuse to support the resolution of my hon. friend. Those hon. gentlemen who take a different course must risk at the hands of the electorate the condemnation which will undoubtedly be meted out to people who attempt by the subterfuge of a sham investigation to cover up the corruption and illegality which unfortunately prevail, and which public opinion demands should be exposed. If hon. gentlemen opposite oppose this motion they must bear, at the hands of the electorate, the condemnation which will undoubtedly be meted out to them if they attempt to burk this investigation, or have a sham investigation.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Borden (Halifax).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	Hedgins,
Bennett,	Kloepfer,
Bergeron,	LaRivière,
Borden (Halifax),	Macdonald (King's),
Casgrain,	McAllister,
Clancy,	McDougall,
Clarke,	Marcotte,
Cochrane,	Martin,
Corby,	Monk,
Davin,	Moore,
Dugas,	Morin,
Foster,	Powell,
Gillies,	Prior,
Gilmour,	Quinn,
Guillet,	Sproule, and
Henderson,	Taylor.—32.

**NAYS :**

**Messieurs**

- |                        |                       |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Archambault,           | Lemieux,              |
| Bazinet,               | Macdonell,            |
| Blair,                 | McGregor,             |
| Brodeur,               | McGugan,              |
| Bruneau,               | McHugh,               |
| Burnott,               | McIsaac,              |
| Calvert,               | McLennan (Inverness), |
| Campbell,              | McMillan,             |
| Casey,                 | McMullen,             |
| Copp,                  | Malouin,              |
| Demers,                | Mignault,             |
| Dupré,                 | Paterson,             |
| Edwards,               | Pettet,               |
| Erb,                   | Proulx,               |
| Fielding,              | Puttee,               |
| Fitzpatrick,           | Rogers,               |
| Fortier,               | Ross,                 |
| Fraser (Lambton),      | Russell,              |
| Gauvreau,              | Rutherford,           |
| Geoffrion,             | Savard,               |
| Gibson,                | Semple,               |
| Joly de Lotbinière,    | Somerville,           |
| (Sir Henri),           | Sutherland,           |
| Lang,                  | Talbot, and           |
| Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), | Tucker.—50.           |
| Lavergne,              |                       |

**PAIRS :**

**Ministerial.**

**Opposition.**

- |                          |                                  |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Christie,                | Roddick,                         |
| Cartwright (Sir Rich'd), | Tupper (Sir Charles),            |
| MacPherson,              | Rosamond,                        |
| Charlton,                | Tisdale,                         |
| Snetsinger,              | Reid,                            |
| Davis,                   | Hale,                            |
| Scriven,                 | Blanchard,                       |
| Bell (Prince),           | Earle,                           |
| Lewis,                   | Poupore,                         |
| Toimie,                  | Montague,                        |
| Featherston,             | Carscallen,                      |
| Fitzpatrick,             | Casgrain,                        |
| Richardson,              | Ganong,                          |
| Mulock,                  | Haggart,                         |
| Johnston,                | Broder,                          |
| Landerkin,               | Kendry,                          |
| Beith,                   | Maclean,                         |
| Brown,                   | Seagram,                         |
| Turcot,                  | Robertson,                       |
| Ratz,                    | McIntosh,                        |
| Ethier,                  | Osler,                           |
| Logan,                   | MacLaren,                        |
| Dobell,                  | Caron (Sir Adolphe),             |
| Ellis,                   | Roche,                           |
| Mackie,                  | Ferguson,                        |
| Wood,                    | Wilson,                          |
| Oliver,                  | Ingram,                          |
| Borden (King's),         | McNeill,                         |
| Fisher,                  | Pope,                            |
| Cowan,                   | Tyrwhitt,                        |
| Holmes,                  | Beattie,                         |
| Tarte,                   | McInerney,                       |
| Sifton,                  | Hughes,                          |
| Davies (Sir Louis),      | Tupper (Sir Charles<br>Hibbert), |
| Livingston,              | McLennan (Glengarry),            |
| Fraser (Guysborough),    | Bell (Pictou),                   |
| Graham,                  | Wallace,                         |
| Fortin,                  | Chauvin,                         |
| Flint,                   | Mills,                           |
| Britton,                 | Cargill,                         |
| Hurley,                  | Craig,                           |
| Stenson,                 | Kaulbach,                        |
| Joly de Lotbinière       | McCleary,                        |
| (Sir Henri),             |                                  |
| Dymont,                  | McCormick,                       |
| Parmalee,                | Klock,                           |

Amendment (Mr. Borden, Halifax) negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To provide for the relief of distressed persons in the North-west Territories ..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is to cover the expenses connected with the relief which was ordered to be sent forward to the suffering half-breeds on Birch River in Cumberland district, Saskatchewan, their property having been lost through the flood. Word was received at the department that the people were in a destitute condition, and instructions were forwarded to the Hudson's Bay Company asking them to have relief furnished to the persons who suffered loss by reason of this flood. They were to be assisted by the mounted police. Mr. Chipman, commissioner of the Hudson's Bay Company, instructed the Hudson's Bay officer to send a person to the relief of these people at Birch River. The Hudson's Bay Company also reported that there were persons in distress farther down the river. In connection with this I may say that no accounts have been rendered, and after consultation with the officers of the department and with the men who know something of the people who were affected by the flood, I have come to the conclusion that it will only require half of this amount. I think it would be just as well to reduce the vote to \$5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is Birch River ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Three hundred miles north of Prince Albert.

Mr. DAVIS. It is three hundred miles down the Saskatchewan River from Prince Albert. There is a settlement of half-breeds. There was very high water in the Saskatchewan last summer and it covered the place where they had their houses, their property and their crops. It destroyed all their crops and they lost everything. Missionaries wrote to me stating that they were in a destitute condition. I wired to the department asking that relief should be sent to these people, and this is the outcome of it.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no satisfactory explanation given for this vote, either by the hon. minister, or the hon. gentleman who tried to make the explanation for him. There has been no statement as to the extent of the damage. There has been no statement as to whether the North-west council were approached. It is their duty to attend to cases of distress under their own government, and we cannot give an amount of money for a purpose of this kind unless we have some statement as to the actual damage and as to the amount of distress.

This is an unusual vote to give, and being an unusual vote, we ought to have a better explanation than that which has been given. So far as I can see it means that somebody applied to the sitting member; the sitting member can be able to strengthen his case if he can distribute a sum of money, and it has been granted. That seems to be all we have to it so far. Maybe there has been a good case for the interference of the government, but no such case has been made out here, and the fact that it is cut down from \$10,000 to \$5,000 shows that there must have been looseness in the department, and leaves it open to suspicion. When was this relief given?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. On December 28 last.

Mr. DAVIS. The people were in a state of starvation as the result of the fall floods.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the evidence of that?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It has been the custom to provide relief for sufferers who are in distant parts of the Territories.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not wrong at all. I am not in the habit of stating things that are wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is in the habit of stating things that are wrong. He got a vote through the other night for a civil servant, on the statement to me that the salary of the servant had not been recently increased, but on inquiry I found that the salary of that servant had been increased only the year before. My hon. friend is not infallible.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is perfectly true that I can make a mistake, as well as any one else, but whatever information I give to the House I give it honestly, and I obtain it from the best sources that I can. If I stated that that servant's salary had not been increased, I was so informed. I would like to know who that civil servant is. What I state with regard to this vote, is that I am informed by the department, that with regard to Indians, there has been a standing arrangement for many years, that where distress occurs, the Hudson's Bay Company should grant relief, and the same way with the North-west Mounted Police force. In this particular case representations were made to the department (Mr. Chipman refers to it in his correspondence), that owing to the high floods that had taken place in September these people were in want of something to eat. I appeal to the committee that if there were any settlers in any part of Canada who were suffering for the necessities of life, would it not be the duty of the government to help them? I do not think it is the policy of Canada to let people starve.

Mr. FOSTER

It was represented to the department on the best authority, that these people, 300 miles from Prince Albert, were in actual distress, and the government adopted the usual custom. The government sent the following message to the Hudson's Bay Company:

It has been represented they are in need of immediate relief owing to property being flooded by high water. Please arrange at once through your post at Cumberland to supply what is necessary. Police will assist.

I inquired carefully for details, and I find that no accounts have yet been rendered. There have been transactions of this kind in the past, and it seems that the officers of the department put in this estimate of \$10,000 to meet the accounts. I was informed that from 150 to 200 people were suffering, and after consultation, it was my personal opinion that probably for the present \$5,000 would be sufficient. There is no reason to suppose that it was done for any other object than to relieve those people who were in distress. The accounts will not be paid unless they are found to be all right. The well known character of the Hudson's Bay Company, with whom the government have been dealing in matters of this kind, for many years, is some guarantee that no impropriety will be committed. I do not think Mr. Chairman, that there is any reason for an attack upon the department. The department simply acted in a humane way. I do not believe that any member of this House would be unwilling to take the best action to furnish relief, if representations were made that a number of our fellow-countrymen were in destitute circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. That shows exactly the view the hon. gentleman has of ministerial responsibility, and the duties of the government. He says that it has been the custom to do it, and when asked for an example, he says that if the Indians were in destitute circumstances anywhere, the government would come to their relief. Why not? The Indians of the North-west are the wards of this government. The cases are not parallel at all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What I did say, anyway what I intended to say was, that we proceeded in the proper way, because we went to the Hudson's Bay Company, which was our intermediary in these matters with the Indians.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister takes the broad ground that if any one in this country is in need, he does not think the House would object to a vote to relieve them.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is straining it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what the hon. gentleman stated, and that is what this vote is. If people in any section of New Brunswick or British Columbia or Quebec or Ontario, or anywhere else, are in want from failure of crops or the like of that, the hon.

gentleman thinks it is the duty of the Dominion government to immediately put a vote through the House, and if any one objects he is to be accused of being wanting in humane motives. The hon. gentleman knows that that is not the duty of this government. Fires take place and they sweep away a village, and the hon. gentleman knows that the government does not take the money of the Dominion to help these people. It is only when some great overshadowing calamity occurs that this House makes a special vote. The white people of the North-west Territories are under the government of the North-west Territories, who have their appropriations, and charities are looked after by them, or by the municipalities, but it requires a case different from a mere local misfortune of some kind, to justify the minister in putting in a vote for \$10,000, and immediately ordering some one to go and dispense it. What were the representations made to the government? We do not know whether it was an overwhelming calamity, or the amount of loss, or anything of the kind. There is nothing to show that the North-west government was communicated with, but on the mere statement of a gentleman who wants to run an election in the constituency, this department, and this minister, who is not now present, where he should be goes to work, and in his generosity says to the Hudson's Bay Company: Go on and spend, and I will put \$10,000 in the estimates; and the hon. gentleman thinks he has done his whole duty by saying that he does not think the Hudson's Bay Company would do anything dishonourable. It is not dishonourable for them to sell all the goods they can to this government; their business is to sell goods. Neither is it a good reason why the expenditure should be made, that they spent this money on the order of the minister. The hon. gentleman has shown the utmost laxity in the department. The \$10,000 must have been put in on consultation with somebody; and yet when the minister comes to look into it, the reason for it is so poor that on the first prick of the pin the bubble collapses, and he comes to the conclusion that \$5,000 is enough. What were the representations on which the telegram of instructions to the Hudson's Bay Company was sent?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman in his remarks insinuated that this was not a proper transaction.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not insinuate it; I stated it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Hudson's Bay Company was the only company in a position to do this service for the department, with the assistance of the mounted police. There was no other company or person to whom they could apply, and I referred to the standing of that company as a justifica-

tion for applying to it. Then the hon. gentleman proceeds to put some arguments into my mouth which I did not use, to the effect that if somebody was hard-up in Ontario or Quebec, I would at once ask this House to vote relief. The circumstances are different, although I believe that when the hon. gentleman was in the government, and it was represented to parliament that there was distress among the fishermen, we voted a sum of money to relieve that distress. Though I cannot recall the instances now, I believe parliament on other occasions, when proper representations were made, has voted money to relieve distress. These people were not in Ontario or Quebec or New Brunswick, where their own government or the municipal authorities could attend to them; but it was a matter which the Dominion government had to deal with. I do not think any charge is to be made against the department or against myself for looking into the matter and endeavouring to keep the vote as low as possible. The estimate was at first put at \$10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. On what ground was it estimated at that figure?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. These estimates were put in before I came into the department. It does not necessarily follow that the officers of the department were dishonest.

Mr. FOSTER. Who said they were dishonest? Do not be looking for charges.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Probably they were governed by their experience in the department in the past.

Mr. FOSTER. What experience? What cases have they had before?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have already stated cases in which the government relieved distress. I do not think the hon. gentlemen has a right to attribute to me recklessness or a desire to help any person in this matter. The hon. gentleman seems to think that no act can be done without some ulterior object, such as helping an election. There was nothing of the kind in this matter. When I discussed with the officials the number of people or families affected, I thought that as the accounts had not come in, \$5,000 ought to be sufficient to meet them. If they do not come to that amount, the money will not be paid; if they come to more, parliament will have to be asked to make it up. But I am satisfied that the necessity was there and that it was a proper expenditure and will be honestly accounted for.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the representations?

Mr. DAVIS. For the information of the hon. gentleman I might state that it has been customary for years in the North-west, not only under this government but under

the late government, for the mounted police to go and give help to destitute half-breeds.

Mr. FOSTER. These are not half-breeds.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, all of them are half-breeds. They are situated on the Birch River and around Cedar Lake. They are not on reserves, but are living in settlements along the river. As to the representations, I might tell the hon. gentleman that I had a letter from the Rev. Mr. Hynes, who is in charge of the Church of England missions in that part of the country, and also from Rev. Mr. Settee, another Church of England clergyman, as well as from several school teachers, drawing my attention to the fact that these people were starving, that their crops had been destroyed and washed away by the flood, and that if relief was not furnished, numbers of them would die for want of something to eat. I communicated with the department, who communicated, I suppose, with the Hudson's Bay Company. I did not suggest the Hudson's Bay Company. If I remember rightly, I suggested the police; but as the police were not in that part of the country, the department communicated with the Hudson's Bay Company, the only people who could afford relief. It was impossible at that time of the year to send goods in from the outside, as navigation was closed, and there is no way of getting goods in except by the river. From my knowledge of the Hudson's Bay Company, I do not think that for the sake of selling a few dollars' worth of goods they would do what was not right or would give any more relief than was necessary.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can the minister give to the House any part of the correspondence that has led to this grant? The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) has spoken of having received letters from some clergymen of the district. I think these should be produced.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I stated that the member for the district had telegraphed the circumstances to the department. He has given the House the authority on which he made the representations to the department, and I have read the only correspondence that we have.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. member to say that this relief had been given for years. I have here the estimates of 1898-9, and do not see anything in them for that purpose.

Mr. DAVIS. The mounted police have been giving relief to the half-breeds for years.

Mr. FOSTER. To what extent?

Mr. DAVIS. Quite a large extent. The Indian Department have been giving relief to half-breeds to a very large extent in some cases.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. minister to say that this was an item run-

Mr. DAVIS.

ning from year to year, but in the estimates of 1898-9, I can see no such item. Therefore, it must be an exceptional one. Who spends the money?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I believe the Hudson's Bay Company furnish the relief, under the direction or with the assistance of the mounted police.

Mr. CLANCY. There must be some principle observed in giving these grants, or you will open the door to a mere slipshod way of giving them without knowing how they are applied. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the damages took place in December.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The floods took place in September, and the assistance was asked and granted at the end of December.

Mr. CLANCY. In September the crops are harvested, and that is not the time that crops are destroyed. There is no information to warrant our giving \$10,000. The hon. the minister cannot say how many families required relief.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I said that the estimate was for some 150 to 200. I read the letter of the department.

The PRIME MINISTER. I listened with some attention to the remarks which fell from the lips of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), and taking them upon a broad basis they are unimpeachable. This government is not a charitable institution, and cannot be called on to look after the welfare of individuals. But if a flood or fire takes place in any one of the older provinces, private charity and the municipal authorities will come to the rescue of the sufferers; whereas in a settlement, hundreds of miles away from any neighbours, it is absolutely impossible for private charity to cope with the distress. For years we have had an appropriation granted by parliament for the relief of half-breeds in distress—\$300 to \$500 every year. It is a matter of notoriety that last year three floods of a most destructive character took place in the North-west Territories, and we have voted \$92,000 to repair the damages caused by these floods. It appears that they destroyed, not only public works but the crops of some of the poorer settlers on the Birch River. My hon. friend from Bothwell says that the crops are over in the month of September, but he forgot that these people live very far north, and the crops were still on the ground when the flood took place. The clergy and missionaries made representations that the people were left destitute. Under the circumstances, these people could only apply to the Hudson's Bay Company, and that company is under no obligation to give anything to these men.

Mr. KAULBACH. What about the North-west council?

The PRIME MINISTER. The North-west council has very little means. It has only what is supplied by this government, and probably had not a cent available. The government of the North-west Territories have received this year from this government \$90,000 to replace the public works destroyed by this flood. Under these circumstances the clergymen applied to the Minister of the Interior, and he thought it advisable to authorize the Hudson's Bay Company not to let these people starve. This condition of things ought to appeal to the manhood and to the justice of our people. We cannot allow any portion of our fellowmen to starve in this country. This country is too rich for that.

Mr. MONK. To whom will this money be paid?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. To the Hudson's Bay Company.

Mr. MONK. For my part, I have the greatest objection to this manner of doing things. I do not object to the principle of relief, but I think that in these cases we ought to proceed with great caution, and that the money should be paid to certain indicated persons. I do not mind saying that they ought to be indicated in the vote. Because, the committee will see that if we vote a certain amount to relieve distress in a district, large discretion is left to the minister. The degree of want should be ascertained exactly, and how the relief is organized, and to whom the money is to be paid. I would like to avail myself of this item to ask the Prime Minister if he has come to any decision in regard to the application made to him some time ago in connection with the disaster at Pointe Claire?

Mr. GIBSON. To whom should that be paid?

Mr. MONK. That is an instance in point. The moment the disaster occurred a regular relief committee was organized, which adopted a constitution and passed resolutions. No money could be paid, except upon the authorization of the president and the secretary-treasurer. Here you have somebody to look to, you can get vouchers for all moneys.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The inquiry of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is not, I must say, germane to this question. I have no objection, however, to tell him that the government has come to no conclusion upon the matter. But, before this discussion ends, I would ask my hon. friend to ponder upon the words of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). He had a case in point. If a fire sweeps away a village, the government is not called upon to contribute anything, except where the fire causes such great distress as to be beyond the powers of relief of the neighbours and the municipal institutions.

Mr. MONK. I admit—

The PRIME MINISTER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) admits that, he will probably have no difficulty in working out an answer to his own objection.

Mr. MONK. The right hon. gentleman is mistaken. I admit that principle; but, in the case of Pointe Claire, there were special circumstances. We alleged in our claim that the disaster had occurred so near, in point of time, to the calamity at Ottawa, that we have been deprived of a very large measure of relief on account of the very considerable contribution we had made to the sufferers in Ottawa. We did not invoke a new principle, but contended that the government should give us relief under the special circumstances.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This case is not exactly the same. No one would suppose that the government must come to the relief of the distressed under all circumstances. As to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Monk's) objection to the form, there would not be the slightest objection to have it enacted that this money is to be paid to the Hudson's Bay Company and to no one else. I confess, I was surprised at the criticism. We have already had quite a discussion on this matter. As a result of these floods, we had granted, I think \$92,000 to repair the damages to public works. The hon. member for West Assinibioia (Mr. Davin) did not think that was enough.

Mr. DAVIN. I said the general vote was not enough, not that this \$92,000 was not enough for the purpose. I never endorsed the statement of the purpose, because I never heard of any of the destruction that was predicated as having taken place in consequence of these floods, to bridges, and so on. I have travelled over the North-west Territories a good deal, and I have seen bridges decayed and injured, and therefore easily swept away by flood.

The PRIME MINISTER. Is it too much?

Mr. DAVIN. I think the general vote is not enough.

The PRIME MINISTER. But the special item?

Mr. DAVIN. I may tell the right hon. gentleman what I think of the form of that special item. I thought it was put in that form by the government so as not to commit the government to the amount annually, whereas that and more should be voted annually for public works. I thought it was factitious.

The PRIME MINISTER. You will have to discuss that with Mr. Haultain.

Mr. DAVIN. I will say here that I doubt very much if either Mr. Haultain or Mr. Ross is responsible for the form of that vote. I have read what their demand was, when they asked for over \$500,000, and I do not think they put that item in that form.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I must apologize to my hon. friend (Mr. Davin), as it seems I misunderstood his remark. But, he is mistaken when he says that the special vote referred to was not made on representation. Mr. Haultain and Mr. Ross both signed an estimate giving in detail every work damaged and the amount which would probably be required to repair it; and I referred to that at the time. It was on their representation on behalf of the people of the North-west Territories that the vote was made. The House also granted this session \$20,000 for the relief of the distress on the Liard and Peace Rivers. Some difficulty is made about these people, no doubt, because it is supposed that they have votes. As to what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says, there would be no objection to amending the vote so as to provide that the money be paid over to the Hudson's Bay Company. If there is any person here who would suggest a better method that might be adopted when similar cases arise than the one adopted by the department, I shall be glad to learn of it. At that season of the year, with people at least 300 miles from telegraph or railroad, and represented by responsible people to be suffering and in distress—I do not think that the case calls for criticism. There is no other method that I can think of. I was personally concerned in looking into the case carefully and suggesting means to make the vote the lowest amount possible. And the money will not be paid out unless properly certified bills are presented.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has found fault with the method and not with the basis. This parliament is amenable to the calls of suffering and has a charitable heart. But we cannot do these things without reference to the precedents established and to the general principles that ought to govern the distribution of Dominion moneys. There is no parallel between such a sum as this and such amounts as have been used by the mounted police in relieving individual cases of distress. The police are scattered all over the North-west and there are cases of great distress that come before their view; and they have always been allowed a reasonable amount to administer relief to these cases. But, as my hon. friend said, they never went over a few hundred dollars a year. This is altogether a different vote. There was a vote given for relief of distress in the North-west Territories a few years ago, when I was a member of the late government. But we gave the vote and administered it through the North-west council, and after investigation made by the North-west council. The difficulty here is that you make the precedent, without any reference to the local government, of granting relief for local distress in large amounts; and my right hon. friend knows to what an extent

Mr. DAVIN.

that can be carried, and what an abuse can be made of it. As to the method of distribution, once the distribution is agreed upon, it could not be better. No one finds fault with giving this into the hands of the Hudson's Bay Company, there was no other way that it could be done as well or as quickly. But the whole matter seems to have been rushed into hastily.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It has to be, when there is distress.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a good deal of difference between September last year and this present time, and the minister has not got over the matter of haste yet, because knowing that this vote was to come on, he has not prepared himself with information.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What information does the hon. gentleman want?

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Minister of the Interior could authorize his department to put in \$10,000 for a vote for local distress on Birch River, he must have had some information upon which to go. When brother-in-law Burrows wanted to get a timber limit to which he had no right, he telegraphed or wrote to Mr. Smart that he wanted it, and it came. And when Mr. Sifton wanted an excuse for putting in a vote for \$10,000 for distress the extent of which he does not seem to have known anything about, he had a representation from a member of parliament who represents that constituency. How much representation, and how much information was given?

Mr. DAVIS. How does he think I could give any more information than what I received?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not like to undertake the impossible task of pointing out how the hon. gentleman is going to get all the information he needs. What information has he given the acting minister? He said he had a letter from a school teacher or two, a letter from a reverend gentleman, and a letter from another reverend gentleman. To what extent did these letters carry the minister in authorizing the hon. gentleman to put a vote of \$10,000 into the estimates? We do not know. Now, if there was any information upon which that vote was based that information should be in the department. If it was in the department the minister should have it for this House when he comes to ask the House to give him the vote. How much information has he given to the House? He has not a scrap of a letter, he has not an estimate of damage. We are not finding fault that the Hudson's Bay Company should distribute a charity when once a charity is determined on. I think the government should have communicated with the North-west Territories. The North-west Territories have in their

assembly a representative from that district, I imagine. It is an organized district is it not?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it is.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, if in any part of the province of Quebec, a calamity falls and a local charity is necessary, they appeal to the local government, and the same in any other province or organized district. Now, the representative in the local House ought to have been just as much interested as the representative in the Dominion House, and the application should have gone to him. It seems to me that local help should have been asked from the local authorities, and that the local representative should have something to say about it as well. If the application was made there, does any one doubt that Mr. Haultain would not have lent an ear to the people under his own administration? But there was no consultation. The man who represents that constituency saw a splendid opportunity, presumably, of making himself solid, and he telegraphs or writes to the minister, and \$10,000 is put in. Remark how the vote is worded. It is \$10,000 put in for the relief of distressed persons in the North-west. It is not localized, you can use it in any constituency you choose. It is given to be used for any distress that may be, in the judgment of the administering authority, eligible for relief anywhere throughout the North-west Territories. I think we ought to wait until the accounts come in, and then we will see how they have been incurred. The Hudson's Bay Company, under that authority might go to any extent. They do not seem to be limited, they may spend it for other purposes than relief in food.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It was limited to the purposes mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER. I think when we see the accounts, the minister can have them completed, and then we can vote them.

The PRIME MINISTER. All the accounts may not have come in yet. That is a very distant section of country. The minister, after having looked over the matter, as the deputy informs me, thought the amount should be reduced to \$5,000, and he has asked the amount to be reduced accordingly. There are from 150 to 200 families who were left destitute and had to be provided for, and having talked over the matter with the deputy we thought that \$5,000 would cover all the legitimate advances that could have been made by the Hudson's Bay Company.

My hon. friend says that the vote is too general. Perhaps there is something in that. My hon. friend the acting Minister of the Interior has said that he had no objection to limiting the vote, and particularising the items, saying that the money should be paid to recoup the Hudson's Bay Company, and

that it should be for this particular district. There is no intention to have a blanket vote, covering all parts of the North-west Territories. The hon. gentleman confuses the matter when he says that we should have applied to the local authorities. My hon. friend forgets that the people of the North-west Territories have not yet the same degree of self-government that has been reached in other sections of the country. If a calamity of this nature should happen in any of the older sections of Canada, we would have to apply to the local government. But when it happens in the North-west Territories, the first thing that the people think of doing, is to apply to the Dominion government. There is no municipal organization, and the local government have too limited a power at the present moment. The Dominion government are everywhere in that country, having the mounted police in all parts of the country, so that it was natural that the people should apply to the Dominion authorities more than to the local authorities. Under the circumstances, I think that the hon. gentleman will agree that the minister acted properly in authorizing the Hudson's Bay Company to see that these people were not left to starve. The hon. gentleman says that the Hudson's Bay Company should have been notified that they could go to a certain extent and no more, but the Hudson's Bay Company are the most particular people. Their agents are a very superior class. They want to sell their goods, but the hon. gentleman knows that it is not their intention to take advantage either of the government, or of anybody. They are very fair dealers.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right; I admit that.

The PRIME MINISTER. When the minister said: See that these people do not starve, the instructions were well understood by the Hudson's Bay Company, and there is no necessity of going further than that.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the acting minister read the telegram or letter of instructions again?

Mr. SUTHERLAND (reading):

Settlement of half-breeds at Birch River, Cumberland district, are in need of immediate relief owing to property having been lost from high water. Will you please arrange at once with your post at Cumberland to supply what is necessary. Police will assist.

That was sent to Mr. Chipman, at Winnipeg.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that followed by a letter of instructions?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, the only letter is the one we had in reply, where Mr. Chipman refers to the report of the agent, that further down the river there were some others in distress, and that is why the of-

officials explained to me they thought the distress was greater than it was.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is there any acknowledgment of that order?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, I have read the letter twice, and there is also the statement of Mr. Chipman in reference to the report of their officer in charge there.

Mr. CLANCY. How many are now being taken care of?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think there are any being taken care of.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, being assisted. I think when I ask a civil question, the hon. gentleman should give a civil answer.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Did I not give a civil answer?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman gave it in a sneering tone.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, I apologize. I was not aware that I had done so.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Have any bills come in for the goods supplied?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, they will arrive in a short time. I think in regard to the statements and insinuations made, that I may say that there was no desire to use the money for any improper purpose, as has been shown, not only by my own action in asking to reduce the vote, but in stating that I understood that the accounts will not amount to the sum originally asked for. If they are more, we will have to ask for another vote, when the accounts will be produced. When these accounts arrive the committee must see that this money has been properly expended. There is no way in which this money could be improperly paid out, except by fraud.

Mr. CLANCY. Do the Hudson's Bay Company look into particular cases themselves there, or do they pay the money to reputable people there to distribute it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The officer of the company, if there are no police at that point, would assume the responsibility himself.

Mr. FOSTER. There are no police as a matter of fact.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Sometimes the police are in that district.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Would it not be better to have this item stand over until the hon. gentleman gets the information?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is no further information; I have made every inquiry.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There ought to be further information. The North-west Territories are not so far away that we should not in a few weeks, or a few days, be able to get a report of what was done. It is six

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

months since that order was given, and there is no information as to what was done up to this time. What necessity is there for this parliament undertaking to provide for work, when they have no knowledge whether it was done or not?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I read the letter of the manager of the company, stating that he had given instructions to the agent there, to relieve the distress that had occurred. My hon. friend will see that if there are no accounts rendered, there will be none paid. The transaction is perfectly regular, and not a dollar will be paid unless it is shown that the money has been properly paid out.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I object to doing things in an improper way. The order was given last September, and all the information we have after the expiration of six months, is that this money is to provide for the relief of distressed persons in the North-west Territories. How are we to know from that, what parties the money has been paid to? There is no information that one single dollar's worth of goods has been given to these people.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Nothing will be paid then.

Mr. McDOUGALL. How are we to know? The department acted upon the sole representation of the hon. member (Mr. Davis) when they had their mounted police and their own officers and the North-west council to consult. This was neither right nor proper. I understand the Hudson's Bay Company are themselves in the habit of giving relief of this kind and that being the case the action of the government may be to relieve the Hudson's Bay Company from one of their customs.

Mr. GIBSON. If the company is charitable enough to give goods voluntarily, surely they will not charge the government for goods they do not give at all.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Here we are six months after the order was given by the department, and we have not a detail before us of this expenditure. We should not provide money until the accounts are in. I would move that this item stand until we get some information.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am informed that the Hudson's Bay Company only send the accounts half-yearly, and the hon. gentleman will see that the honour and credit of the country are pledged to pay this amount.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the Hudson's Bay Company were a less powerful company they would have sent in their accounts long ago. We have to deal with the North-west Territories somewhat differently from the older territories. When the announcement came that there was distress what more could be done than to give the

order to the Hudson's Bay Company, who are the best qualified to arrange a matter of this kind. The transaction is fair, regular and reasonable.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is very irregular. If this item were put in the proper way it would tell where the relief was distributed and how it was distributed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The acting Minister of the Interior has offered to designate the Hudson's Bay Company, and the Birch River in the item. The Hudson's Bay Company is an old and honoured institution, and you could not have a better organization to do the work.

Mr. FOSTER. The Finance Minister is responsible for having the estimates brought down properly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item is all right.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not in proper form, and the Prime Minister has acknowledged that it is not in proper form.

The PRIME MINISTER. I offered to amend it to suit the fastidiousness of my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. It is apparent that we cannot get any more information about this item. The acting minister has been good enough to improve 50 per cent on the real minister and to reduce it \$5,000. I would suggest that the item should read in this way:

To provide for relief dispensed to distressed half-breeds in the Birch River district, Northwest Territories.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would rather have it in that way and we will change it to read in those words.

Mr. FOSTER. That means the payment to the Hudson's Bay Company as well. The Hudson's Bay Company got the order and they acted in good faith.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would ask my hon. friend could anything else be done?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, what I outlined would have been better.

Mr. GILLIES. I wish to enter my protest against the voting of money in any such way as this. The vote may be meritorious enough in itself and I am not objecting to the principle of giving relief, but I do object to this wholesale voting of money without a particle of information being furnished to the House. The acting minister says that the only information that he had of any relief being necessary was a telegram being sent to the department by the sitting member. That telegram has not been produced. We do not know what the distress was or how many people were suffering, if any at all, and yet the Minister of Finance makes the extraordinary statement here to-night that the vote is re-

gular in every respect. I protest against this system of transacting the public business of the country.

Governor General's Secretary's office ..... \$9,250

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). One officer has retired effecting a reduction of \$1,800, and on the other side of the account there are two statutory increases of \$50 each.

Mr. FOSTER. What officer has retired?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. W. Campbell, owing to ill health. Mr. Walker and Mr. Sladen each get the statutory increase of \$50.

Department of the Secretary of State.... \$36,300

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In this case there are thirteen eligible for the statutory increase, of whom seven receive it. A messenger has been dropped. So that the saving there more than balances the increases.

Office of the Auditor General ..... \$23,100

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Twelve receive the statutory increase out of eighteen who are eligible.

Mr. FOSTER. Who do not get the increase?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hayes, Stevenson, Gross, Hudson, Reid and Kearns.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason these do not get it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is the rule not to give it to all.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the Auditor General recommend more?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He did not, but he is quite ready to.

Mr. FOSTER. He did not, because of a little consultation beforehand, I suppose.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Quite so.

Mr. CLANCY. What classes of clerks are receiving the statutory increase?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Three chief clerks, and the others third-class clerks. The chief clerks who receive the increase now received no increase in the previous year.

'Canada Gazette' ..... \$6,000

Mr. DAVIN. Does this pay? I suppose the advertising adds to the income?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is considered to be self-sustaining.

Plant for Printing Bureau ..... \$5,000

Mr. PUTTEE. It strikes me that it is very poor policy to starve the Printing Bureau. No business concern would attempt to run an institution like that with \$5,000 to replace plant. I have taken a

great deal of interest in that Bureau for some years past, especially since I have been down here. It is an institution which is a credit to this parliament, to the people who founded it, and to the people who manage it. Last year there was a vote of \$38,000, and the principal item to which that was devoted is a fine new press which is to be put in, and which will be the best press on this continent; but to put it in it will be necessary to upset the arrangements of a very fine press room, as everything else has to be shifted to make room for it. What the Bureau wants is a large increase of floor space, by the erection of a new wing on one side. The Queen's Printer has considered the matter very fully, and he considers that the bindery should be put downstairs. There have been complaints this session that the business of the country has been kept back owing to the Bureau being blocked with work, and it will continue to be blocked until more accommodation is provided and more material is furnished with which to do the work. As a business proposition, the Printing Bureau is probably the very best thing that is being operated by any public body. Anybody who goes through the various items and sees the savings being effected there will, I am sure, agree that it is very poor economy to starve the Bureau. The plant is ten years old, one of the oldest in the country, with less new material than can be got along with properly. It is my opinion that the Bureau should be liberally dealt with, so that it may have a fair chance to do its best work, that in future there may be no complaint that it is in any way hindering the business of this parliament or the country.

Office of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, including R. Boudreau, chief clerk, at \$1,800, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act..... \$30,320

The PRIME MINISTER. I may explain that the expenditure of the Privy Council is increased by \$480—\$30 of an increase to the messenger, Henry Potter, and the other nine clerks at \$50 each. The jump to my private secretary, Mr. Boudreau, is due to special qualifications. He has been with me several years and is a very valuable English and French stenographer and worthy of an increase. He is getting \$1,100 now. I do not propose to give him the whole \$600 available for that purpose. I have two private secretaries, and require the services of another.

Mr. FOSTER. What, three private secretaries!

The PRIME MINISTER. I have a great deal of French correspondence to attend to. I have two French secretaries, and require a third. I do not propose to expend a cent more than the \$600. Mr. Boudreau and Mr. Lelièvre are my two secretaries.

Mr. PUTTEE.

Mr. Boudreau gets \$1,100 and \$600, and Mr. Lelièvre \$1,600. The third one I have not appointed yet. I do not propose to increase the expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has now two private secretaries and intends taking a third. That does not mean that he is simply distributing the \$600 among them, but he is taking the services of two very high class clerks—one at \$1,600 and the other at \$1,100—whom he proposes to increase. It has not been the rule to take the private secretaries of ministers from the high class clerks.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not propose that the private secretaries will cost one cent more than at present.

Mr. FOSTER. But you are taking away these men from their proper service in the department.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think so. I propose to give a rise to Mr. Boudreau, who is a very superior officer. There is a vacancy in the office. Mr. Lamothe, who was assistant secretary, has been promoted to the office of Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I propose to make Mr. Boudreau a superior class officer, so as to be able to draw despatches, state papers and things of that kind. I have no officer of that kind in my department. I propose to take a junior man to do the purely clerical work of a private secretary. But, I insist that it does not matter much how the work is divided, so long as it costs nothing more to the country; and that is what I intend to do.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you give Mr. Boudreau such a boost as that? Are not you afraid you will make the young man dizzy?

The PRIME MINISTER. No; I think his head is quite level.

Mr. FOSTER. You are going to give him \$2,000 altogether?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not want to disparage anybody in my department, for they are all good men, but there are men who are exceptionally good. My hon. friend knows that, in the Privy Council, Mr. Pope was taken from the position of private secretary, and was made assistant clerk of the council, which was a proper thing to do. He knows that Mr. Burgess was raised from an inferior position and—quite properly—in a short time made deputy head of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. That took a long time.

The PRIME MINISTER. No; he was taken in in 1876 and was made a deputy head in 1882 or 1883, I think. When you find a man of superior ability, it is quite right to advance him.

**Mr. FOSTER.** When did Mr. Boudreau enter the service ?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** He came in with me in 1896. He has been my private secretary for ten years.

**Mr. FOSTER.** This is very rapid advance. In four years this young man advances so that he receives the \$1,800 of a chief clerk and also an allowance as private secretary. What are the tremendous powers and capabilities of Mr. Boudreau that he should be passed over the heads of older officers and made a chief clerk, a grade in which he may advance to a salary of \$2,400?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Mr. Boudreau has been my private secretary for ten years. When I came into office I brought him with me. He is not only a French stenographer, but an English stenographer.

**Mr. FOSTER.** But that is merely mechanical.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** These are important accomplishments and it is very seldom that you find them united in one man. I have found Mr. Boudreau reliable in every particular and always equal to any work that I have entrusted to him. I do not want to be unfair or unjust to any member of the establishment over which I preside, but I have not amongst my employees of my department one who has been so faithful a servant to myself personally or who has shown himself more assiduous in the performance of his duties as an official of the government. I do not see why I should not be privileged to give him the position which I think suitable to his abilities, when that position is vacant and the change does not cost the country a cent.

**Mr. FOSTER.** It is not that.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Well, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says that I put Mr. Boudreau over the heads of other men. I do not wish to do injustice, but I do not think there is any in the service equally well qualified for the position.

**Mr. FOSTER.** These are excellent reasons why Mr. Boudreau would make a splendid private secretary for the right hon. gentleman, particularly as he has been with him long enough to have that intimate acquaintance with him which is one of the qualifications for good secretarial work. His being an English and French stenographer is also an excellent qualification for a private secretary. But, these are not the qualifications for a chief clerk in a department, a man who would be left there next to the deputy head when the right hon. gentleman goes out of office, as he soon will, and will be left without much work for his stenographical abilities. Whilst the right hon. gentleman has a strong personal feeling in favour of Mr. Boudreau, there is another

point to be considered, and that is, that the public service is for the public benefit, and must not be used simply to reward a political or private friend inordinately. Mr. Boudreau will be advanced over the heads of men who have been for years in the department and are perfectly well acquainted with the routine of the work—and the work in that department is peculiar. The right hon. gentleman may reward his private secretary, but I think he is straining the matter too far and going beyond justice in what he is doing.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** It may be true that Mr. Boudreau is placed over the heads of older employees.

**Mr. DAVIN.** What is his age ?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Thirty-two or thirty-three. I say this to my hon. friend, he knows that this is not without precedent, and I do not say that because I want to shelter myself behind a precedent. But from the nature of things, there are circumstances in which a man in the position of Mr. Boudreau is frequently shoved up above others. Take the case of Mr. Pope, an admittedly valuable officer, and who was private secretary for a long time to Sir John A. Macdonald. He was placed in the position of assistant clerk of the Privy Council, and passed over the heads of several others. I will say more. My hon. friend knows that the duties of a Prime Minister are of a very multiple character. Does he not think that a Prime Minister is entitled to the services of a private secretary, capable of rendering assistance above that usually rendered by private secretaries, such as receiving letters from dictation, filing letters, and so on ? A Prime Minister needs the assistance of a man who is able to draw up papers, and to perform a superior class of work.

**Mr. FOSTER.** He has a right to the best man he can get.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** That is the kind of a man I want, a superior class of secretary. I do not think any Prime Minister so far, has had the assistance of a man such as I speak of. But I say that he is entitled to the services of a secretary above the rank of private secretaries generally.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I have made my objection, and I am not going to push it any further.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The **PRIME MINISTER** moved the adjournment of the House.

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

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Minor items on the paper, and then the Postmaster General's Department, and Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.55 a.m. (Friday.)

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, June 15, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

## PRAYERS.

Bill (No. 181)—from the Senate—for the relief of William Henry Featherstonhaugh.—(Mr. Bennett.)

## PARIS EXHIBITION—SPEECHES OF HON. MR. TARTE.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before the Orders of the Day are called. I think it would not be improper to bring to the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister a matter which has been going the rounds of the press, stated to be taken from the *St. James Gazette*, London, Eng., in which, under the heading 'Notes of the Empire,' the *St. James Gazette* says:

London, June 14.—The 'St. James's Gazette' to-day, under 'Notes of the Empire,' says that after ex-Premier Schreiner, of Cape Colony, the figure of the week in colonial circles has been Hon. J. I. Tarte, the Canadian Minister of Public Works, now sojourning at Paris in connection with the Dominion's contribution to the great exposition, and adds:

'It is really difficult to know what to make of this gentleman, but we are sure Sir Wilfrid Laurier would be well advised if he were to call his errant colleague to Ottawa, where his speeches would give less offence and give rise to fewer conceptions than they do in Paris.'

This following on a number of rumours in the papers with regard to the erratic conduct of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) as representative of the Dominion in Paris, calls for an explicit statement by the Prime Minister. Of course, we must not always attach too much importance to rumours, but this is repeated so often, and in the same sense by responsible newspapers, that in order to calm us in this country, it may be necessary that we should have a reassuring statement from the right hon. gentleman who leads the government.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I am able to inform my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) and the House as well, that Mr. Tarte himself has written to me upon the subject of his various speeches. He has complained to me that several of the speeches which he has made in Paris have not been faithfully translated and have not been faithfully represented to the public. I answered this communication from him, and I may say that the correspondence between Mr. Tarte and me is now going on. Under such circumstances, the House will agree, I am sure, that the matter ought not to be further dealt with at the present time. The gentleman whose conduct is incriminated, if incriminated it be, at all events, whose conduct is commented on, has himself drawn attention to the fact that the report of his speeches are not fair

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

and correct and do not convey a proper interpretation of his thought, and, under such circumstances, before condemning him, or before passing judgment upon him, it is only fair that we should have the full text of his remarks before us.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I say, in connection with that, that it would be wise to have Mr. Tarte send exactly what he did say, as it appears in the French press, which, I understand, is very correct in its reports of statements of public men.

## AMERICAN TUGS TOWING LOGS.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Some days ago the Premier stated that he would inform the House whether applications had been made by the owners of American tugs for the privilege of towing logs in Canadian waters. I wish to ask if such application has been made, and, if so, is it the intention of the government to concede the wishes of the parties making the application?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I referred this matter to the Minister of Customs, and I have not received his answer yet. The minister (Mr. Paterson) will be in the House in a few minutes, and I will try to get the information from him.

## SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—EMERGENCY RATION.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). I wish to refer to the matter which I brought to the attention of the House yesterday, and if it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, I would ask to have your ruling upon the point of order. I ask to have the analysis which has been made in the Department of Inland Revenue of the foodstuff sent to South Africa laid upon the Table of the House. I think it is very important that we should have this done before we proceed to a discussion of the question. I could not very well hear what the minister said from where I was sitting, but my right hon. friend said that the minister had stated what the result of that analysis proved. Under those circumstances, the document having been quoted from and the contents having been stated, we are entitled, under your ruling, Mr. Speaker, to have it laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is anticipating what is before the House in the form of a resolution, and it is the first order for to-day.

Mr. McNEILL. I understand—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman had better not ask my ruling on that matter to-day.

Mr. McNEILL. I defer to your suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

## I. C. R. TIME TABLE.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) promised me yesterday that he would give certain information with regard to the new time table of the Intercolonial Railway which would go into effect this week.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have sent for the time table, and I expect a copy of it by the first mail possible.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.). I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if the return moved for by Mr. Hale, of Carleton County, N.B., with regard to the hay contracts, is ready to be brought down?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). It is not ready, and if the whole correspondence is to be dealt with, it will take a very considerable time before it can be ready. If Mr. Hale, or my hon. friend, will indicate what particular letters are wanted, I will have those copied first, and bring them down. The order of the House simply mentions all the correspondence with regard to the hay contract. I have no idea of what the hon. gentleman wants, and it will take a month before all the correspondence can be copied.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no question of a month. The resources of this government are surely equal to copying the correspondence in that small matter. The hon. gentleman's estimates cannot go through until that correspondence is laid before the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only tell my hon. friend that the officers of my department say that it would take one clerk six months to do the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Put six clerks at it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Then it would take a month.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has had five weeks in which to get this return ready, and now he comes before the House, and cries for mercy, and says it will take another month.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not crying for mercy at all. If the hon. gentleman indicates what letters he wants, I will have them copied and brought down as soon as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. The order of the House, I think, fairly indicates what is required, and it is the duty of the Minister of Agriculture to obey the order of the House.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Some days ago I asked the right hon. leader of the government whether any correspondence had taken place between him and the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia, with refer-

ence to the latter's resignation. The right hon. gentleman said that he did not remember any correspondence, but that he would look and see, and if there was any, he would lay it on the Table. Has he found any correspondence of that nature?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no correspondence on the subject.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Picton). I would like to ask the acting Minister of Public Works what progress has been made in preparing the papers which he promised, touching the telegraph work supervised by Mr. Charleson?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). After the request of the hon. gentleman on Wednesday, on arriving at the department on Thursday morning, I called the deputy, but he was not in the department. As soon as he came, he came to my room, and I asked him to get all the information he could. He told me that he had already had a similar request from the Premier, and that every means would be taken to furnish the hon. gentleman at the earliest moment, with every bit of information in the possession of the department.

## SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—EMERGENCY RATION.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Monk, for the appointment of a Select Committee to make inquiry on the subject of certain emergency rations supplied to the Canadian troops in South Africa.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I am exceedingly sorry to have to inform the House that the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), cannot be present to-day to make the statement which he would otherwise have been glad to make, being detained at his House by very serious sickness in his family. But though my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, cannot be present to-day to give to the House the information which he would be entitled to give for his own protection, still the government do not think it advisable to delay this matter, but prefer to dispose of it, reserving to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, the opportunity, as soon as the unfortunate circumstances which now prevent his presence in the House, will permit him again to be here, to make the statement which he expected to make to-day. As I stated on a previous occasion, if frauds are charged against any member of the government, the government will not resist any motion for an inquiry, but, on the contrary, will be prepared at once to give and to court investigation. The hon. gentleman who has brought this motion, has not charged fraud, but he has charged a certain number of things, which, in his opinion, constitute culpable negligence on the part of the minister. The information laid down by the hon. member

for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is contained in eighteen paragraphs of the motion which he has laid before the House. The nineteenth paragraph contains no statement of facts, but merely deductions which the hon. gentleman draws from the facts which he has stated in the other eighteen paragraphs. I submit to the House—and I believe I can appeal to the sense of fairness of every man on either side of the House—that it is hardly fair for the House to draw in advance any conclusions as to the statement of facts which have been laid before it. Paragraph 19, reads as follows :

That under all the circumstances above set forth, the Minister of Militia and Defence, the said Hon. Frederick William Borden, was guilty of gross and culpable negligence (a) in making, with undue haste, the agreement hereinabove referred to of January 4, 1900, for the supply of emergency rations to the Canadian troops in South Africa with irresponsible parties; (b) in not having the preparation of said rations controlled by competent men, and the supply furnished to the troops carefully and rigidly inspected and tested; (c) in neglecting, after he had received said letter of January 25 last, to take the steps commended by the ordinary rules of prudence to ensure the protection of the troops; and (d) in paying the amount of the said contract, \$4,660, in a case where he must have known that any recovery of the same was impossible, and without any investigation.

As the House will see, in this paragraph there is no statement of fact whatever, but only the conclusions which my hon. friend, who has made this motion, has drawn from the facts as laid down in the previous eighteen paragraphs. Then the motion goes on, and concludes in this way :

That the above statements be referred to a select committee of this House to inquire fully into the said allegations, with power to send for persons, papers, records and such articles as may be necessary for such investigation, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and that the committee do report in full the evidence taken before them and all their proceedings on the reference, and the result of their inquiries.

I may say at once that the government are quite prepared to grant a committee of investigation, and have the statement of facts properly investigated; but I submit that it would not be fair or just to the hon. Minister of Militia to pronounce in advance, that he has been guilty of negligence. It shall be the duty of the committee to investigate all the facts in the eighteen statements which are found in this motion. Then the committee will report the facts, or pass judgment, or do as they please. The House, when it has before it the report of the committee and all the facts, will be in a position to pronounce on the subject, and declare whether the minister has been guilty or not guilty of negligence. Therefore, I propose to move :

That paragraph 19 in the said motion be struck off from the same.

When this is agreed to, the rest of the motion will be accepted by the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. GEORGE E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I certainly was not prepared for any move of this kind on the part of the government, and especially on the part of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who leads it. During the last few days I have had conversations with hon. members on this side of the House, and must confess to having taken occasion, in every one of these conversations, to rather chide the gentlemen who were speaking with me. I have to confess my fault before this House to-day. The gentleman who spoke with me, amongst whom was the mover of the motion, canvassed seriously with me the probability of the Prime Minister not allowing a full investigation into this charge which he had preferred, and stated to me once or twice that he was of opinion, that he suspected, that he strongly suspected, that the government would not dare and did not intend to allow a full and complete investigation. I dissented from my hon. friend's view, because I believed I had sufficient ground for dissenting from him, not only in the urgency and plainness of the case itself, but from what the right hon. gentleman himself had stated to this House, from what the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) had stated in this House, and from what, if I remember, one or two of the other members of the government had stated in this House with regard to their complete readiness and their complete willingness to have this matter investigated the moment my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) or any other member of the House should make the statement that he desired an investigation. Particularly strong was the statement made by the right hon. gentleman himself; and I think it would not be out of the way for me to recall to the House what he did say. On the 6th of June, after the first debate on this matter, at the conclusion, I took occasion—subsequent to the statement which had been made by himself and by the Minister of Militia and Defence—to ask him :

Whether he proposes to carry out what was promised, I think, by the Minister of Militia and by the member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), or whether he will say to-night that he will take the matter into consideration, and let us know at an early day whether a suitable and adequate committee will be granted for the probing and investigation of this matter.

To that the right hon. gentleman replied :

If the hon. gentleman remembered the remark I made this afternoon, he would not take the useless trouble of putting to me the question he has done, because I answered this question in the closing remarks I addressed to the House. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier makes a statement upon his own responsibility that he has reason to believe that a fraud has been committed, he shall have his remedy.

Now, I do not think that any statement could be more full, more complete and more definite than that. And the Minister of Militia himself went to the extent of say-

ing. in the course of his remarks on the question, that if the hon. member for Jacques Cartier would make a charge, he should have his committee inside of five minutes. So satisfied was the Minister of Militia, and so willing was he that the full light of day should be let in on this matter as ventilated by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, that he very positively stated that, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) would make his charge in reference to this matter, he should have a committee inside of five minutes. Well, Sir, what did the Prime Minister say? On the 12th of June, he stated in this House:

I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is going to make a charge within a few hours, and as soon as he makes the charge he shall have his committee, and the committee will have every information possible that may be in the hands of the government.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would draw my hon. friend's (Mr. Foster's) attention to the inadvisability of quoting from previous debates. Of course, I do not wish to restrict a member's privilege of discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you, Mr. Speaker, rule that this is not all one debate?

Mr. SPEAKER. I would simply ask my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) not to prolong the quotation.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not do that. So convinced was I that the right hon. gentleman intended to give a committee and make no cavil about it, that I stated in the House on the 13th of June, that, the evening before, I had some conversation with my right hon. friend, in which conversation, I told him that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier would move his motion on the succeeding day; and I spoke to him as to whether the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier should name his committee or whether it would be the province of the government to name the committee. And, of course, the right hon. gentleman stated that the government should name the committee. We also spoke as to the number—five and seven were canvassed—and he said he thought the committee ought to be seven. In bringing that to his notice on the 13th of June, he said: 'I did discuss the wording with him'—meaning myself—'informally.'

I do not care to have a formal notice, but I anticipated all along that in this matter the terms of the motion would be submitted to me in advance of the motion. I insist upon that, I think it is only right. I do not want a formal notice, but I want the terms of the motion to be submitted to me.

That was in exactly the same line as the other. The right hon. gentleman took his stand upon his rights to have a formal notice of the motion brought before him.

Then, later in the same debate, the Prime Minister said:

I stated yesterday that if my hon. friend made a charge of fraud, we would waive all other considerations, and have the investigation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has not chosen to act on my suggestion, but has taken his own course and brought it up as a matter of privilege. I make the point at present that the motion is not one of privilege, and I suggest that the matter shall stand until to-morrow as a notice of motion.

Now, these positive statements and the inference to be drawn from the other statements went to convince me, and, I think, went to convince this House—that portion of it that was not suspicious of all promises made by my right hon. friend—that the government had made up its mind to grant a full and complete inquiry into this matter; on the charge being made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier on his own responsibility as a member of this House. Well, Sir, yesterday, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) made his formal motion; after it had gone over for one day to give required notice he made charges such as have been laid before the House. No member of this House can say that these charges lack in particularity, no member can say that they do not go to the very extreme of indicating specific particulars of the charge which the hon. gentleman proposes to prove and to substantiate. Not a single line of that charge can be said to lack in particularity, or that it is too general and that it does not come to the point. The fact is that the hon. gentleman made his charge down to the minutest particulars, which he need not have made but which he did spread on the face of his charge in order that the House and the committee and the country might know the exact particulars which he proposed to prove and upon which he based his concluding motion. Now, Sir, not even yesterday did the Prime Minister take any objection to the terms of the motion. He had it laid over until to-day on the excuse that the hon. Minister of Militia was not ready to make his statement. That excuse did not seem to this side of the House to be a very valid one. The hon. Minister of Militia seemed fully prepared three or four or five days ago to make his statement of the case. He did make his statement of the case and he made it with such emphasis and such an apparent belief in its sufficiency that it laid the hon. gentleman open, in the view of hon. members on this side of the House, to the suspicion of being overbearing and defiant in the way in which he met the charge preferred by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. It was not until matters developed and until the members of the government began to have a little time to think it over and a little time possibly to question the hon. Minister of Militia that it began to dawn upon this House that the hon. gen-

tleman had been entirely wrong in some of most important particulars of this case. He denied upon the first day that the charge was made that he knew Mr. Hatch, that he had ever met Mr. Hatch, but he has had to go into the public prints and state that he was mistaken in that respect. It was a very strong point that the hon. minister made when he was able to stand up before the House and declare that he did not know Mr. Hatch, that he had never seen Mr. Hatch, and that he had no dealings with him. That has fallen to the ground. Since then there has been a chance for the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to have a talk with the Prime Minister. There has been a chance for a comparison of notes between the hon. Minister of Militia and other members of the government, and the government have come to the conclusion that they will give another example to this country of the utter repudiation of solemn promises given to this House. The Prime Minister, last summer, on the hustings of this country, stated it with great power, with great force and with great pride, that: They charge us with wrong-doing, they charge us with corruption, they charge us with malpractice in office. Let the people understand that we have one answer and one answer alone, to that. What is the answer? If they make these charges we grant them an investigation. That is our answer. Well, Sir, the charge has been made particularly, and I do not go beyond the book when I state that no more grave charge could be made in this House than the subject-matter involved within the charge which has been made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. It is not necessary for me to go over that. The hon. gentleman himself has placed that motion admirably before the House. Every man in this House knows just what is involved in the commission of a fraud of that kind with reference to soldiers in the field, with reference to emergency food upon which life absolutely depends, in reference to their confidence in the efficacy of it when they trusted themselves to the food without other rations with the entire confidence that it was sufficient to sustain life for a number of days consecutively. No one can read the statement made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, without coming to the conclusion that there had been fraud somewhere in this transaction. Wherever it lies, if there is any truth in the charge at all, if the evidence that the hon. gentleman is going to bring forward substantiates this charge fairly well it is apparent that fraud has been attempted against the lives of the soldiers of the Queen on the field of battle, or on the march. I was the last one to harbour even the shadow of a suspicion that if a charge of that kind, even, though it might happen to have not been made with the particularity with which this charge has been made, came before the House from the

lips of a member of this House, the government would have been only too glad to have placed all the sources of their information and all the resources of this House of Commons at the command of that member in order to investigate this charge and in order that the truth might be shown. Why not? Will the Prime Minister give any one sufficient reason why a Minister of Militia and a government of which he is a member, having nothing to fear, should not court the fullest light upon a charge made here by a member of the House that fraud has been committed in substituting a worthless food upon which the lives of the soldiers on the march and in the field absolutely depended for the time they were away from the base of the commissariat and of supplies? What reason is there? Is the minister guiltless? Has every precaution been taken that could have been taken? Is it not absolutely necessary for the good of the administration, is it not for the good of public life in this country and the feeling which ought to exist in the electorate of confidence in the executive, which for the time being manage the affairs of the country, that such a surmise, if it were only a surmise that such a charge made with particularity should at once be inquired into and inquired into with all the resources at the command of the government, and of this House? What reason is there that it should not be? The Prime Minister laughs. The Prime Minister was not a soldier in the field. The Prime Minister is an honorary colonel. He fights in his dreams; he does battle in his hours of slumber. He enjoys all the glitter and glamour of an honorary colonelcy, but these men, with sword in hand, on the march and in the field of South Africa with their emergency food upon which their lives depend—these are the men whose lives are at stake. Hon. gentlemen laugh. Their lives are not in danger. It is not a laughing matter; it is a most serious matter and laughing at this moment on the Treasury benches is the best proof that this government are what I called them the other day—a devil-may-care government. What care they what happens so long as they keep their offices? What care they what happens so long as they can shield themselves from an investigation? What care they what happens so long as a minister who to say the least, on the face of these charges, was grossly and culpably negligent in not taking the precautions that he ought to have taken in reference to this emergency food can escape investigation? What matters it to them so long as they can shield such a one from the consequences of his culpable negligence and carelessness. What does the Prime Minister propose to do? He proposes to cut out section 19. I have no hesitation in saying that the most important part of the charge is that which charges the substitution of a worthless for a good food, a fraud of some kind by which worthless was

substituted for what was valuable, valuable on a sufficient test made by the department under its departmental officers themselves. That is one part of the charge, that is the basis of the whole charge.

But, Sir, in proportion as that charge is grave, so also and very little less serious than that is the charge which is brought against the responsible head of the department that he did not take the precautions which lay in his power, and which a man ought to have taken in order to ensure that the food which was placed on the vessel for the service of these soldiers was the food which was tested by the director general, or under his orders, at Kingston, in April, 1899. That is the only food which was tested thoroughly, and with reference to which we have the results from the government. The statement has not been substantiated in this House that any other food was tested by a test of that kind; the statement cannot be made in this House that the vitaline or any other food but Hatch's protose was tested by a test such as Hatch's protose was put through at Kingston in 1899. Well, there is the responsible minister who has before him the identical food which was tested in April, 1899, by a month's test upon five members of the militia force in Kingston, and which was pronounced analytically, and by observation of his own officers, and by the observation of the condition and feelings of the men, as being an absolutely sufficient and reliable food. That is what he had before him. What else had he before him on the 4th of January? He had the fact that Mr. Hatch himself, under his own letter, also in verbal interview, and on an inquiry made of him, had informed the minister that whenever he wanted food of that kind which he himself had tested, either for the North-west or for the troops, he could get it from Hatch's company, which kept in store from one-half to a ton of this food, and would so keep it in store. The minister, on the 4th of January, when urgency compelled him to give that contract, knew that the food had been tested nearly nine months before, knew that that food was in store. He had more than that, he had the recommendation of Col. Neilson, director general of medical stores, and that recommendation in plain English is this: I recommend the food which was tested at Kingston, and which test proved the food satisfactory as a sufficient and reliable ration for the troops in South Africa. He paid no respect at all to the test at Kingston, he brushed aside the statement of the only company that manufactured that food, that they had it in store, and that he could be provided with it at any moment. He brushed aside, again, the recommendation of Col. Neilson that this protose was tested in Kingston and was found to be an absolutely sufficient and reliable emergency ration. He brushed all this aside, and in

his urgency, on the 4th of January, he closeted himself with Dr. Devlin. Dr. Devlin wrote him a letter and said to the minister: I tender to supply to the contingent so many rations according to the sample that I hold in my hand. From the beginning of his tender to the end of it there is no allusion in any shape or form to the protose food which was absolutely and thoroughly tested about a year beforehand at Kingston. The Minister of Militia and Defence, on the same 4th day of January, turns round and says to Mr. Devlin, who has his sample package in his hands: I will agree to give you an order for so many cases as per that sample. The order was given, and the food was sent away to Montreal, delivered at Halifax, and the minister and the government have failed to this day to show that they took representative samples of the mass of food that was shipped from Montreal according to that contract, that they took one single sample of that food and had it then analysed in order to show that it was Hatch's protose, or if not, that it was food equally as good.

Now, I take this ground, that the minister's plain duty was to take no other food, on that short notice, but Hatch's protose. That is the only food that Col. Neilson recommended him to give to the troops, that is the only food about which he had knowledge, analytical or practical. The food that was sent, if it was not Hatch's protose, was a food which the minister had no right, so far as the recommendation of any officer or any test warranted, to send to the soldiers in the field as an emergency ration. Now, is there the shadow of a doubt that the minister did not take the precautions which I have mentioned? Will the right hon. gentleman deny that he did not take the precautions? Will the right hon. gentleman, having studied the case, declare that the Minister of Militia and Defence did take these necessary precautions? He cannot. Neither in the papers nor in the minister's speech, and especially in anything which has been brought down of a reliable character, has it been shown that the minister took any precaution to see that it was Hatch's food that was sent and no other. Now, I press that point, and I do it at the expense of repeating myself. The only food that had been tested was Hatch's protose, the only food that was recommended by Col. Neilson was Hatch's protose, that was the only food that had been thoroughly tested. The food that was sent out by the minister, there is not a shadow of evidence to show had ever been tested, that there was any chemical analysis of it. It is not shown, and I here to-day deny, from all the proof that has been laid before the House, that the minister took the ordinary precaution that a man would have taken in buying wheat flour, or potatoes, or butter for him-

self or the troops, or in a commercial transaction, namely, to make certain that the food which was actually delivered was the food according to sample and equally good. That can only be done by taking portions of the goods actually transferred and having them submitted to a sufficient test. What is a sufficient test? That the two foods look alike? That is not a test at all; everybody will admit that. What other possible test was there, then? Two only, a chemical analysis to show the ingredients of the food; and the other and only sufficient one, the test of actual experience upon the soldiers who lived upon that food, and who were watched during the process when the test was made. There was no such test as that made of vitaline. Then, the charge against the Minister of Militia is a grave and serious charge. If that condition of things be exposed, as I believe it will be in the evidence, then no amount of whitewashing or attempt at whitewashing will keep the people of this country from believing that the Minister of Militia is guilty of gross and culpable negligence.

Mr. McMULLEN. Get the evidence first.

Mr. FOSTER. The evidence first! When a charge is made the person who puts forth his charge states what he proposes to prove. He states after that the evidence upon which he proposes to prove it, but is the criminal, so far as the charge is concerned, let loose until all the evidence is given, or is he kept where he can be tried just as the evidence goes on which is in fact his trial. You cannot separate culpable negligence on the part of the minister from the basis of this charge, and one is just about as grave as the other. Analyse the defence made by the Minister of Militia and its two essentially weak points are these: That he could not state that the food he sent was ever tested by a practical test, or, that it was tested at the time it was being delivered and by chemical analysis even, was shown to have nutritious qualities to a certain percentage, equal or nearly equal to Hatch's protose. As long as that is not done, the negligence is there, the culpable negligence. My right hon. friend has no right to ask that the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) shall eliminate that, which is inseparable from the other. If the other parts of the charge are substantiated that one cannot possibly fall to the ground. There is a sequence between the two under the circumstances as they appear to this House, and the minister has had plenty of time to put all these papers before this House which would place his conduct in its best light. From all that mass of evidence there is nothing to show this House or the country, that the Minister of Militia took this absolutely reasonable precaution which it was his duty to take. Now, Sir, I am not going to spend more

Mr. FOSTER.

time in discussing this question. I protest against this attempt to burk inquiry. It is of a piece with the conduct of this government from the time they have undertaken the administration of public affairs. It is of a piece with their arbitrary doings with reference to executive acts, usurping the power of parliament and placing this parliament in the secondary and inferior position of merely registering their will. It is on a par with their administration of the Yukon, out of which for the last three years there has been coming to this country and to every civilized country complaints of wrong-doing, and charges of corrupt dealings, and all that story of maladministration, without calling from the government a searching and thorough investigation. Not only did the government not investigate on their own account as they should have done, but when charges were made on the responsibility of a member of this House, a former minister, the government after having through one of its ministers declared that the moment a charge was made a commission will be granted, immediately revoked that, and said they would not give a commission. Then they started a sort of departmental inquiry by a paid officer of their own. This is exactly on a par with the other conduct of the government. What answer will the right hon. gentleman make to the people of this country. Does he wish to have a clean and pure administration in the departments of his government. There never was a graver charge brought against one of them than this. The moment the matter was intimated the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues said: Make your charge and within five minutes you shall have your committee; make your charge of fraud and the committee shall be granted without delay. The charges are made, and now the right hon. gentleman comes down and undertakes by virtue of his majority in this House—if his majority see fit to follow him as they have followed him before—the right hon. gentleman undertakes by virtue of the majority at his back to cut out from these charges one of the two salient points of the whole accusation. The right hon. gentleman will have to answer this House for that conduct and he will have to answer this country too, and he will find it far easier to answer his majority in this House, than to answer the electorate of Canada.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will not experience the slightest difficulty whatever either in convincing the majority of this House or the majority of the electors of this country, that he has done his simple and plain duty in refusing to condemn a colleague unheard. If there is one principle of law, equity or common sense, which commends itself to the general temper of the people more than another it is, that

first of all charges shall be investigated, the accused party shall be heard in defence, and then and not till then shall the verdict be pronounced. What do these gentlemen opposite propose to ask? They propose to ask that we should declare:

That under all the circumstances above set forth, the Minister of Militia and Defence, the Hon. Frederick William Borden was guilty of gross and culpable negligence.

They ask us to condemn our colleague and our friend before one single solitary fact against him is established by these hon. gentlemen. I call attention to the remarkable contrast between the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and the hon. member (Mr. Foster) who has just addressed the House. The hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier comes to us and says: I am credibly informed and believe that I can establish certain facts if you will give me a committee before whom I can appear and produce these facts, but the other hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) takes it upon himself without hearing one witness, without having the opportunity of testing the truth of one single statement, to call on us to condemn our colleague for being guilty of gross and culpable negligence. Why does the hon. gentleman suppose that my right hon. friend asked for the motion. He asked for the motion in order that he might see that no such injustice as that might be perpetrated on his colleague. We are prepared to give the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) the fullest opportunity that any man can desire to prove each and every one of the allegations he has made, but we will not consent—I would be ashamed of my right hon. friend if he consented for one moment to declare beforehand that our colleague is guilty without his being heard. The speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) appears to have been prepared under a very different impression. It is a speech which might have been in point, I grant you, if the Prime Minister had refused to grant any investigation at all, but it is a speech which is utterly uncalled for under the circumstances, and I may remark that in view of existing conditions, it is as indecent and it was ungenerous when the party accused is prevented by circumstances which every man in this House must deplore from being present in his seat to answer in detail the accusation which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has not scrupled to hurl against him, when he knew that the Minister of Militia could not by any possibility be here to reply. The hon. gentleman says that the excuse we made yesterday was that the minister was not ready. That was not the excuse, or the reason, my hon. friend gave. The reason was, that we were informed, on looking at the Orders of the Day, that the motion was to be made to-day; and, under that circumstance, the hon. Minister of Militia very naturally had not prepared himself

for a detailed statement. Now, Sir, I never heard before that in granting a committee of investigation, the House was asked to declare, as it is asked in this clause 19 to declare, that the party accused was guilty. What object, what purpose, what use, is there, under such circumstances, of granting a committee of investigation at all? The hon. gentleman opposite, without hearing one word of testimony, without examining a single witness, has condemned the Minister of Militia beforehand. It is quite evident that no evidence is required to convince that hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, on behalf of the House, on behalf of the government, on behalf of my hon. friend, I wholly deny that the First Minister has repudiated any promise whatever. The First Minister promised to grant an investigation. He is prepared, and the government are prepared, to grant an investigation, and to grant it at once. Every single point of importance has been fully and elaborately stated in the eighteen paragraphs preceding the nineteenth paragraph; and all those the hon. member for Jacques Cartier shall have the fullest opportunity of proving, if he can, before a committee of this House. What more has he or have the opposition a right to ask? Do they pretend to tell the people of this country that they have likewise the right to call upon us, in advance of hearing the testimony, to declare that the Minister of Militia was guilty of gross and culpable negligence? I do not think that, outside of the hon. gentleman and, perhaps, a very small number of his followers, there will be any men found to say either that the course of this investigation is going to be prejudiced in the slightest degree by striking out paragraph 19, or that any principle of justice calls upon us to condemn a man before he is heard in his own defence. And here let me remark, that when my hon. friend spoke of granting a committee in case of fraud being alleged, he most assuredly referred to fraud being alleged against the minister. That was evident from the context of my hon. friend's remarks. Now, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has taken exceedingly good care not to comply with the terms laid down by my hon. friend. He has not charged fraud against the Minister of Militia. He has, no doubt, charged that some parties, whose names he gives, may have imposed upon the minister, may have substituted an inferior food at a much higher cost for what the department supposed it was getting; and I can tell the hon. gentleman that if he can prove that, he need not be afraid that the government will, in the slightest degree, screen the guilty party. Sir, I take as much interest in the welfare of the forces in South Africa as any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House; and I may remind the House that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, like myself, has the strongest possible ground for desiring, at any rate, that everything should be

done to promote the health and comfort of the troops.

Now, Sir, I am sorry that so fair and reasonable a proposition as my right hon. friend has made should not have been at once accepted by the hon. gentlemen opposite. They ask for an investigation. They shall have an investigation; and if they can prove their statements, they need have no fear but that due punishment will be meted out to those who have in any shape or way attempted to impose upon the government or attempted to supply our forces in the field with improper food. But, I do protest, in the name of common sense and common fair-play, against the attempts that are being made to prejudice this cause; and such a speech as the hon. gentleman has made is obviously for the purpose of going to the country, and obviously for the purpose of prejudicing the Minister of Militia before he has an opportunity of delivering his defence, and under circumstances which might well have called for a little moderation and a little forbearance on the part of any man with a heart in his bosom.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). It must be evident, Mr. Speaker, to the members of this House, that, so far as I am concerned, I am not prepared to accept the amendment proposed by the right hon. leader of this House. Were I looking for purely personal gratification in this matter, I do not think I could have had more satisfaction than that afforded me by the step taken by the right hon. First Minister, because the amendment which he proposes, having for its object to carefully exclude from this investigation the only party whom we have to blame in this matter, amounts to an absolute backdown on the part of the government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONK. Of course it does. We are left with the right to make an investigation against the Vitaline Company, which has no office and no legal existence whatever. We are left with the right to make an investigation against the army contractor; but, when I rose in this House and told the Minister of Militia that he was to blame for this state of things, what did he say? 'Have the courage to get up on your feet and make a charge of any nature whatever against me, and it will be investigated.' I took the trouble, at the suggestion of the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches, to lay a formal charge against the Minister of Militia, and we are told that we shall have a full opportunity to investigate and find out things which all of us on both sides of the House know already. But, when I ask an opportunity of tracing the real guilty party in the matter, I am not allowed to go any further. There is scarcely any more *raison d'être* for proceeding. The whole object which I had in view

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

was to find out who the really guilty parties in this matter were, whereas, if we accept this amendment, we shall be left with the mere privilege of investigating the conduct of parties with whom this House has nothing to do whatever. I was surprised to hear the reasons given by the right hon. Prime Minister, and by such an old parliamentarian as the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. What have we from the right hon. Prime Minister? He tells us that he wishes completely to exclude from the subject-matter of our investigation the Minister of Militia, because the House will appreciate his conduct. But, how can the House appreciate his conduct, if the investigation committee has no right to investigate facts tending to show him guilty of the charge I make against him? What will the House have to go upon? And what does the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), tell us? So far as I can see, he has completely misunderstood the nature of the motion I made. In that motion, the House is not asked to declare that the Minister of Militia is guilty. On the contrary, the motion merely recites my charge, and the House is asked to order an investigation on that charge. Surely, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce cannot be serious, when he says that the purport of this motion is to declare that the Minister of Militia is guilty of the charge.

THE MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is your intent.

Mr. MONK. If these are the reasons on which we are asked to exclude from our investigation the real party against whom I charged the act of gross neglect, they are very poor reasons indeed. They remind me of a circus proprietor of whom I once heard. Arriving in a town, and desirous of drawing as many people as possible to his show, he announced that he had an elephant that could play an air upon the piano. This had the effect of bringing an enormous crowd to the tent—for there are people other than children, who like to see a circus and hear an elephant play upon the piano. The elephant was brought into the arena, and put one foot upon the stool and the other upon the keys; but the moment the piano emitted a sound, the elephant fled from the tent with a snort of fear and horror. The people were, naturally, very much disappointed. But the circus manager was equal to the occasion. He said: Ladies and gentlemen. I am perfectly persuaded that when you hear the reason why this elephant has not performed on the piano, you will sympathize with him and with me, and will excuse him; the fact is, he recognized in the ivory keys of the piano the tusks of his mother-in-law who was killed in Africa some years ago. The people did not appreciate the reasons—and I question whether the people of Canada will appreciate the reasons put forward by the government to-day.

Now let me point out that this contract of January 4, 1900, was entered into upon the recommendation of Lieutenant-Colonel Surgeon Neilson. And what does he say :

I recommend that the troops of the second contingent be provided with five days' rations of protein vegetable food, as tendered for by Mr. F. E. Devlin. This substance has been the sample tested on five members of 'A' Battery during one month of last year in Kingston.

Therefore, the sample which he had in his hand, and which Mr. Devlin had in his hand, was a sample of that food which had been provided for the test in Kingston—there could be no doubt about that. And Mr. Devlin in his tender, refers to the same sample. And the order given on that same January 4, in the Department of Militia, also refers to the same sample. There can be no doubt whatever, therefore, in the mind of any man, that the food which it was intended to provide was the food tested in Kingston. And that food was Hatch's protose. Once you have that fact in your mind, there remains the question, where the food was procured, that was sent to South Africa—was it this kind of food or another? I say that the investigation loses a great deal of the character which we desire it to bear, if our research is going to be confined to that point. For, unless there is so much perjury at this investigating committee, that we shall be able to light our pipes in the atmosphere of the room, without matches, we shall find out from the very first witnesses, that the food sent to South Africa was a totally different food. But that is not the real point; that is not the real difficulty. The real difficulty, and that which we have the right to inquire into is: Who is to blame for this substitution? I say that the object these gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches have in view, knowing and feeling convinced, as we all feel convinced, is to exempt the Minister of Militia from this investigation; so that when the investigation shall have taken place, we shall be able to say to the country, each and all of us, that there was a gross fraud perpetrated upon the department, and that somebody was guilty of what amounts to a heinous crime—but the government had nothing to do with it.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I feel quite satisfied that if a stranger had happened to enter this House of Commons this afternoon, and had listened to the two speeches we have heard from the opposition benches, he would have come to the conclusion that the government had refused to grant the investigation which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has asked into the charges he has preferred in his resolution. I never was so taken by surprise in my life, as when I heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), forgetting his usual tact, delivering a speech which he had prepared under the impres-

sion that the government was going to reject the motion, and persisting in making that speech, after the government had accepted the motion. After the fact dawned upon me, I ventured to laugh at the ridiculous position in which the hon. gentleman places himself; and he administered a lecture to me for this manifestation of amusement. Why, there never was a more ridiculous exhibition. Here was the hon. gentleman lashing himself into a fury, denouncing the government, condemning everybody in advance, assuming the truth of every statement of fact which was to be referred to the committee to be investigated; and pronouncing judgment and calling upon every faithful follower to join with him in that judgment. And this, after the government had formally declared that they wanted this matter formally inquired into, that they would not even take advantage of the serious illness which detains the Minister of Militia from this House, to postpone the reference to the committee for a single day, that they were willing to grant the committee this very day—and grant it, mark you, Mr. Speaker, not in the manner in which committees have been granted in previous parliaments, after the charge had been emasculated by the government of the day, after the sting had been taken out of them, but grant a committee upon the precise charges, in the very words in which they are preferred by the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. gentleman made his own indictment, he framed every paragraph. We did not seek to alter or change one letter, to undot one 'i' or uncross one 't.' We agreed to refer every charge as he made it to the committee to investigate, for the purpose of ascertaining whether any and which of these charges were true; and if any were true, who was to blame, and what measure of condemnation was to be meted out to him. And the hon. gentleman, instead of accepting the frank, honourable, manly course, which the government propose to take, asks his followers to assume guilt, to pronounce judgment before he knows whether any one of these facts can be proven.

Now, Sir, there is only one thing required to make this a perfect farce. Everybody who has been through matters of this kind before knows why the hon. gentleman creates this dust to-day, knows why he was backed up so vigorously by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, knows why this wild appeal was made to the country and to his followers to condemn the Minister of Militia and Defence in advance—it was done because he fears he cannot prove his charges. Does any human being suppose that if these gentlemen believed they could prove the charges they would ask to have judgment pronounced in advance? Why, Sir, we ought to have the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) put on as two members of that committee, perfectly fair, dis-

interested and open-minded men, who would approach the consideration of the question as judges in an impartial manner. Didn't you hear them judicially pronounce judgment to-day in advance, before they had examined one of these packages of food to see whether it is the same or not, before they had the slightest knowledge whether there has been a fraud committed or not? These are men who would form an ideal committee.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Have you pronounced judgment in the other sense?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not pronounced any judgment as yet. I do not suppose, as a colleague of the hon. gentleman who is charged, that I would have the indecency to go on the committee, the hon. gentlemen opposite will do me the justice to say that. But I was remarking what a splendid spectacle it would be to have this committee composed of such men as the hon. member for York. I will not do him the injustice of assuming that after the indecent spectacle that he presented this afternoon, he would accept that position, I think he is too fair a man for that. I do not think he would descend to go on the committee now, his judgment has been pronounced beforehand, he does not want to hear any evidence. But what did he do? He turns round to those with whom he has influence and he says: Now, mark you, some of you must go on the committee. I want to tell you with all the authority which I possess as a leader that these charges are true, that the Minister of Militia and Defence is guilty, and if you go on the committee you must find it so. That is the advice the hon. gentleman gave, that is the spectacle he presented to-day, and it was an indecent spectacle, as the hon. gentleman to my left pronounced it a little while ago. The only object, says the member for Jacques Cartier, that I have, is to find out the guilty parties. Is that so? Can it be so? If that is the only object, why did the hon. gentleman state the deduction he has drawn in his 19th paragraph, that he has already found out the guilty parties? He charges guilt specifically. Why did he do that? If his only object was to find out the guilty parties by inquiring into the facts which he alleges in the eighteen preceding articles, why didn't he stop, after the allegation of the facts, and refer those facts to a committee? He must find out the guilty party and then pronounce judgment, but instead of doing that, the hon. gentleman hastens to tell the country, I pronounce judgment now, I have found the guilty party. I am willing to condemn him from my place in the House.

Now, I ask the hon. gentleman, what did he mean by saying that the omission of the 19th article would exclude the conduct of the Minister of Militia and Defence from investigation. What ground could he

have for such a statement? He has charged in several of these articles, previous to the 19th, that the Minister of Militia and Defence was guilty of conduct which, if true, would render him liable to censure. Those facts are to be examined into, and if they are found true, I admit the conclusion may be drawn. But in the meantime is he going to draw it? Can he reconcile the position he has taken in his resolution with the state of mind he is in when he says that he only desires to investigate? Why, Sir, the thing will not bear examination for a moment.

The hon. gentleman said the other day, that he had spent a great deal of time examining the precedents in this case? Has he found a precedent for the form of his resolution here? Sir, the records of this House teem with charges which for years back have been brought from time to time by members on their responsibility against their opponents. Can the hon. gentleman cite one precedent where condemnation was attempted to be pronounced by the person making the charge before the reference? Go back to the famous one in 1891, when this country rang with charges of fraud made against the government of the day and the then Minister of Public Works in the McGreevy and Connolly scandals. Did the hon. gentleman turn up that precedent? No doubt, he did and went over that carefully. What did he find? He found that when the facts recited in paragraphs, as up to the end of the 18th paragraph he has recited them in his charge, that then, without drawing a conclusion, the person making the charges prayed that they might be referred for examination to a committee that the facts might be sifted and judgment pronounced after the facts were found. I have here the record of the precedent of 1891, here are the charges made by a member of this House, covering several columns of the *Hansard* of the day.

Mr. BERGERON. Not against the minister.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Against no one, but reciting certain facts which he alleges to be true, and when they are proved to be true he will ask certain deductions to be made, but not asking the House foolishly and wickedly to pronounce judgment before any one is proved guilty. Now then, we had other charges. We had the charges preferred in 1892 by the late Speaker of this House against a member of the then administration. Those charges were made by the late Sir James Edgar, and after he had made them he asked that they be referred for examination to a committee—without drawing the conclusions which he might have drawn from the alleged statement he made in the preceding paragraphs. He did not draw any conclusion condemning any particular individual. What did he say:

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

That the said sums of money hereinbefore mentioned in paragraphs 6 and 9, as paid and contributed for election purposes, were so used, together with other sums contributed by public contractors with the Dominion government, and were controlled and distributed by the direct authority and with the knowledge of the said Sir A. P. Caron, in lavish and illegal amounts.

That the above statements be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to inquire fully into the said allegations, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and that the committee do report in full the evidence taken before them, and all their proceedings on the reference, and the result of their inquiries.

Now, the hon. gentleman did not wind up in his resolution by saying that from the foregoing statement of facts he concludes that anybody is guilty. What are the statements here? The hon. member for Jacques Cartier reiterates in eighteen paragraphs certain facts which he says he is able to prove. Whether he is, I do not know, we will see after we get the evidence. Then he goes on to say that under the circumstances above cited the Minister of Militia and Defence, the said Frederick William Borden, was guilty of gross and culpable negligence. There was never anything more plain or specific.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me one word?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, I will be more courteous than you were to me.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman was in my debt before. I take it from the argument of the hon. gentleman, that when reading section 19, he leaves out the preamble of these charges. I will read section 19, as I think it ought to be read:

That I am credibly informed and believe that I can establish by satisfactory evidence that, under all the circumstances above set forth, the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence—

And so forth. He winds up with a motion in the ipsissima verba of the resolution read by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), has too acute a mind not to see that a conclusion drawn from facts is an essentially different thing from the facts themselves. The hon. gentleman stated in the preamble that he was credibly informed and believed that he could prove certain facts.

Mr. FOSTER. And section 19 is one of them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not a question of fact at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He went on in eighteen paragraphs to set forth the facts which he said

he was credibly informed and believed he could prove, and when he had finished in the eighteenth paragraph he set out to draw his own conclusion from these facts. How did he do it? He says:

That under all the circumstances above set forth, the Minister of Militia and Defence, the said Hon. Frederick William Borden, was guilty of gross and culpable negligence.

There is no fact about that. It is the conclusion which the hon. gentleman himself draws, and he asks this House to assent to it. He asks the colleagues of the hon. gentleman who believe that Dr. Borden is an upright and honourable man—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He asks his colleagues and his friends who sit behind, at this peculiarly unfortunate time, when the hon. Dr. Borden is standing beside the sick bed of a loved one, when he dare not leave his own house—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not right.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are asked to say that that man was guilty of corrupt and dishonourable conduct.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not right.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. More than that, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has taken, for the first time in parliament, the course of asking this House to pronounce in this way. It is entirely without precedent. He cannot find a precedent anywhere to justify him in asking this House to commit itself to a conclusion before there has been the slightest investigation of the charge. I have reason, from the statements I have heard made on this side of the House, to believe that many of the hon. gentleman's statements made in these charges will be found to be untrue.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies), allow me? He is doing an injustice that I am sure he would not intentionally do to my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I am a witness to this, that this afternoon, before the right hon. Prime Minister rose to his feet at all, I asked the hon. member for Jacques Cartier if this matter was coming up, and he told me 'no,' because of illness in the family of the hon. Minister of Militia. Had not the Prime Minister introduced the matter, it would have passed over altogether, so that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not say that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier precipitated this debate.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The reason that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made the state-

ment he did, was because of a remark which I regretted deeply to hear from the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster), wherein he said, that although the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had made these statements on his responsibility, the hon. Minister of Militia had had plenty of time to put in his answer.

Mr. FOSTER. I did say that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I know that Dr. Borden has had no time to put in his answer. On the Orders of the Day there appeared public notice, that, not yesterday, but on Friday, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier would move his motion. The hon. Minister of Militia did not make his statement then because he was officially notified that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier would not introduce his motion until to-day, and to-day he was notified by the Prime Minister, that Dr. Borden was standing at the bedside of a dear friend, who is dangerously ill.

Mr. MILLS. Why did you not allow the matter to stand?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because we know that there are men small enough on the other side of the House, who, if it were to stand for one hour, would say that we were seeking to prevent this matter going before the committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because we are bound to have this matter sifted to the bottom, because we will screen nobody, if anybody has been guilty of fraud, because we are determined and have been determined from the first that if responsible charges are made by responsible men, to have them referred at the first moment to a committee for investigation. I ask the House to mark the distinction there is between the conduct of this government and the preceding government in similar matters. What took place when charges were made? Were they accepted? No charges were accepted as we have accepted these. Have we tried to modify, or alter, or emasculate these charges? No Sir. But they altered ours, they modified ours, they emasculated ours, and when they had totally changed the charges, they referred them, not to a committee of the House, but referred them to a chosen Royal Commission, appointed by themselves. We have done nothing of the kind. We say: Make your charges, and when they are made, they will be referred promptly to a committee; we will give you every latitude, without conditions, but we decline to pronounce judgment upon one of our colleagues and to say that he is guilty, when we believe him to be thoroughly innocent.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a personal explanation. After what has fallen from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), I feel bound to say that before the House met this afternoon, a person came to me, I presume, from the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), and asked me if I would have any objection to this matter going over on account of illness in his family, to which I answered, that, unquestionably, I would offer no objection, and I went around and notified my friends of the fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. Under these circumstances, the language of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is altogether unjustifiable.

Mr. M. J. F. QUINN (Ste. Ann's, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, it is really difficult to understand how three such eminent gentlemen as the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), and that great legal luminary, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), could attempt to argue, before a number of lawyers in this House, and before the House of Commons of Canada, that section 19 is a conclusion instead of a statement of fact. I appeal even to the least learned man in the law in this House, to listen while I read the beginning of the statement of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and read section 19, as part of that statement:

That Frederick D. Monk, the member representing the electoral district of Jacques Cartier in this House, having stated from his place in this House that he is credibly informed and believes that he can establish by satisfactory evidence—

What? Nineteen different statements of fact. There is no difference between the first and the second as regards the fact. Each one of the nineteen statements which he makes, is a statement of fact, and the nineteenth is as much a statement of fact as the first one. Each stands separate and alone, and the nineteenth section must be read as if it were immediately preceded by the words:

That he can establish by satisfactory evidence—

Nineteen:

—that under all the circumstances above set forth the Minister of Militia and Defence, the said Hon. Frederick William Borden, was guilty of gross and culpable negligence.

That is what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier stated. He stated that he could establish, by satisfactory evidence that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence was guilty of gross and culpable negligence. He stated that he would prove this, because the hon. minister had been guilty of allowing certain food to be substituted for

food which had already been tried. He was guilty of this negligence because he had been properly warned that the food which was going to be supplied was not the food that had been tested in Kingston. Let me point out that section 19 is not the conclusion of the motion. Section 19 is a statement of facts and the conclusion of the motion is, that all the statements including section 19 be referred to a Select Committee to be inquired fully into. The conclusion of that motion calls every one of the nineteen charges, questions of fact, and then says:

To inquire fully into the said allegations—

That is into the said nineteen allegations.

—with power to send for persons, papers, records and such other articles as may be necessary for such investigation, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and that the committee do report in full the evidence taken before them, and all their proceedings on the reference, and the result of their inquiry.

Now, if this were not the interpretation of the Act given by the right hon. gentleman, why was it that he forced the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) to be so formal as to make the statements in the motion before the House. When the charge was first made the right hon. gentleman said to my hon. friend (Mr. Monk): If you will assume the responsibility of making a charge against some member of this House, you shall have the committee at once. Believing that the hon. member (Mr. Monk) would not assume the responsibility of making the charge, the Prime Minister was courageous, but when he found that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) was sufficiently brave, and was backed up by facts sufficiently strong to make the charge, then the Prime Minister retreated from that position as much as he possibly could, and he said: We will only give you a committee if you charge fraud against a minister or a member of the House. Has this House only the right to inquire when fraud is charged directly against a member or against a minister? Is it possible that there cannot be negligence on the part of a minister which may be equal to fraud? In the most formal manner the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has said that the Minister of Militia is guilty of gross and culpable negligence, and could there be a more serious charge against a minister, unless it be indeed that fraud was included in that gross negligence. But, Sir, the committee may find from circumstances, that not only was it a case of gross and culpable negligence, but unfortunately that there was also fraud in the transaction. The government ask the House to be satisfied with investigating eighteen of the charges, and, what an illogical position it is for them to take. The other day they told us that it was absolutely necessary to charge some offence against a member before a

committee would be appointed, but to-day the government tells us that it is perfectly within our powers to investigate eighteen charges which do not compromise a member or a minister at all, but which relate to the acts of ordinary citizens of this country. I say that the position of the government in this matter is most illogical, and I further say that a committee appointed under the circumstances suggested by the Prime Minister, must result in nothing that can be of benefit at all to this House and to the country, whatever may be the outcome of the investigation of these eighteen charges. After all, Sir, the great object of this investigation is not so much to find out whether an imperfect food had been sold to the Department of Militia, or whether some person was guilty of a very clever fraud on the department, but it is to find out if the department of the government is conducted in such an efficient manner as to safeguard the lives of our soldiers in South Africa.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You think that is a proper subject to refer to a committee of this House.

Mr. QUINN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then you do not know much about parliamentary usage.

Mr. QUINN. That remark of the minister (Mr. Blair) is on a par with the remark of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). It is in effect: You do not know anything about it, but we know all about it. Well, on this side of the House we may not know much about it, but I venture to say that we take the same view of it as the ordinary elector of Canada will take, and it will not do for the Minister of Railways to tell the ordinary elector that he does not know anything about parliamentary procedure, when that elector charges him with having been a party to supplying trash instead of nutritious food to the soldiers in South Africa. The government asks us to investigate eighteen charges against certain individuals outside this House, but when it comes to the one charge which we have the right to investigate, and from the investigation of which good results may flow to the country, the government step in and say that we shall not investigate that. The government do not say: The Minister of Militia and Defence was not guilty of gross and culpable negligence, but they say: You must not investigate the charge, because instead of making it a statement of fact, you have concluded from the evidence in your possession that he is guilty. There certainly is no logic in that position. The Prime Minister might have said to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier: Well, Mr. Monk, I think that your motion as regards section

19 ought to be amended for the honour of my government, for the honour of the Minister of Militia, for the good name which the government of this country wants to hold, and Mr. Monk in my judgment you clause 19 is a conclusion rather than a statement of fact, and if you want to have that investigated, amend it by withdrawing these words and make it a clear cut statement of fact. If that had been said by the Prime Minister my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier would, no doubt, have dropped from that section 19 any words that the Prime Minister would have suggested in order to make it, even to their minds, a perfect statement of fact, but had they done so, would their conduct be such as to lead the people of this country to believe that they wanted an investigation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. QUINN. Sir, the conduct of the government is such as to convince the people of Canada that it is not an investigation they wish, but that what they want is to cloak everybody in authority, and to find guilty some poor devil outside who has, perhaps, been made a victim of their own fraud and misconduct. There is one more phase of the discussion to which I wish to refer. That is the very regrettable circumstance of the illness in the family of the Minister of Militia. I think it a most unfair, and if I were not in the House of Commons, I would say a most unmanly thing to impute to any member of this House a desire to press a charge against a minister when he is afflicted in any way. The matter has been fully explained by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier; but I do not think it can be too much emphasized by any member on this side of the House who speaks on this question. I would hate to think there is a man on the Conservative benches in the House of Commons who would stoop so low as to attack or take an unfair advantage of any member of the government during a time of illness or trial; but I do not think such a thing has been done in this case; and even if the conditions exist, which I believe do exist at the moment, and are likely to continue for some time, I do not think an investigation of this kind should be stopped on that account. We must all deplore anything of the kind occurring in the family of any member of the government or any member of this House; but we must all be prepared for these things. They are visitations which may come to any one of us; and though they are unfortunate, I do not think the public affairs of this country should stop because a visitation of that kind happens to come to a member of the government or a member of this House. The explanation which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has given must, I think, be satisfactory to anybody, and must speak

Mr. QUINN.

to the heart of anybody who looks at the matter fairly, and who knows the nature of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, which is one of perfect honour, and of a man who would be incapable of even the thought of attacking another in an unfair or unmanly manner.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker—

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order; I think this is as good a time as any other to raise it. I do not purpose speaking on this question in the absence of the Minister of Militia; but I want to have your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether we are to have laid on the Table of the House the analysis of the vitaline, which has been made by the Department of Inland Revenue, and the contents of which the Minister of Militia and the Prime Minister alluded to yesterday. I think it is very inconvenient to discuss this question without having that analysis on the Table of the House, and I take it that in your ruling the other day you held that when a minister dealt with the contents of a public document, he was bound to lay that public document on the Table of the House with all despatch. There can be no difficulty about his laying this document on the Table, because it can be had in the department at any moment.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know what my hon. friend refers to when he says I spoke of an analysis. The Minister of Militia and Defence spoke of an analysis; but I submit that there is no point of order in that fact.

Mr. McNEILL. I know that my right hon. friend has no desire in any way to misrepresent the fact or myself; but, in justification of what I said, I would remind my right hon. friend that in dealing with a suggestion which I made, he referred to what the Minister of Militia said was the result of that analysis. The point of order I raise is that this is a most important discussion in reference to a most important matter, and it is vital to this discussion to know what is the result of that analysis which we now know has been made. Under the circumstances we ought to have the document laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. With all due respect to my hon. friend, I cannot see a point of order in what he has just now said. Perhaps I am obtuse. The position, as I apprehend it, is this. The minister stated that there were certain processes in progress, and that there were certain papers not in his possession which he pledged himself to present to the House as soon as he could do so.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you allow me—

Mr. SPEAKER. No, I cannot allow you till I close. Under these circumstances, I really see no point of order in what my hon. friend has said, because we have the word of the minister that at the earliest moment at which those papers can be brought to the House, they will be brought.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, will the Speaker allow me to raise a point of order? I wish to say that I am afraid the Speaker did not catch the exact point of order raised by my hon. friend; so I will raise it again, as my hon. friend has taken his seat. The point of order is this, that an analysis was made of certain food on the 3rd of February by the Department of Inland Revenue, and that analysis was referred to by the Minister of Militia, who contended that it favoured his argument. He was asked to bring down the results of that analysis; but he stated that though the results of the analysis were favourable to his contention, he did not propose to lay the actual figures before the House. Now, the point is: if in the course of a discussion a minister gives the results of an actually performed analysis, and states that these favour his contention, whether he is not obliged to place those figures before every member of the House so that each can have the same source of information as himself?

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in the discussion of a motion for a committee of inquiry, and we are all agreed that the inquiry is to be granted. The immediate question before the House is whether a certain paragraph in the charges of the hon. gentleman who has made the motion is to be included in the reference to be sent to the committee; that is all. The point cannot be elucidated by anything that has taken place previous to this debate.

Mr. McNEILL. It is vital to this debate.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, the vital question in this debate is whether paragraph 19 is to be submitted to the committee or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has not, to my mind, raised any fresh point of order which has not already been decided in answer to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill).

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, then I rise to a point of order. On this very matter, the Prime Minister himself said yesterday:

I beg to say that the Minister of Militia stated a moment ago that the analysis of the food sent to South Africa proved to be identical with the analysis of the food which had been experimented on before at Kingston.

I ask whether, after the Prime Minister has made that reference, we should not have the analysis here.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have simply to say to my hon. friend that we are discussing at the present moment whether clause 19

shall form a portion of the resolution of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and the point of order raised by my hon. friend has no bearing on that question at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to say a word with respect to certain remarks—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has not the floor.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) desires to make an explanation, and I am willing he should make it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that reference was made by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, when I was not in the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No; the reference I made was to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), and in reply to a statement which I thought was highly improper.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier had been reflected upon in some way on account of his supposed desire to proceed with the matter when he knew that there was illness in the family of the Minister of Militia.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire merely to state to the House, with regard to that, that I understood about two o'clock to-day, from the Minister of Militia, that there was serious illness in his family; and I took it upon myself, believing it to be his desire that I should do so, to mention the matter to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. The moment I mentioned the fact the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) said in the most generous manner, and without the slightest hesitation, that this discussion should stand over until Monday; that it would suit his convenience very well, because he would be glad to get away this afternoon, to Montreal. I mention this in justice to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. Knowing the Minister of Militia as I do, I feel that under the circumstances he would be the last person to desire that reflection should be cast on my hon. friend in any manner. When my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) rose in the House and said that the motion would be proceeded with, I mentioned to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier that I trusted that he was not misled, that I understood it was the desire of the Minister of Militia to let the matter stand over, and I thought some slight misunderstanding or misapprehension had arisen concerning the matter. He said it made no difference; that he was not misled; that it was all right as far as he was

concerned. I do not intend to speak on the motion; I merely make these remarks in justice to my hon. friend; because I know that the Minister of Militia himself, if he were present, would corroborate what I have said, and would desire that no reflection whatever should be made upon my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). I am sure that this House was edified by the speech of my hon. friend from St. Ann's, Montreal (Mr. Quinn). It was an exhibition. It was dramatic, erratic and profane—three characteristics which you do not often find in one speech. He said that the least learned in the law could understand the matter. Why, a layman can understand it. I was surprised that the hon. gentleman from Montreal did not devote a little attention to what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said with reference to the precedents. Lawyers are bound by precedents. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) tried to show, and I think the attempt was made even by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to treat the nineteenth clause of the resolution as on the same basis as the other eighteen. Let us examine this, sticking to the resolution itself, for these frantic appeals, these decisions made as quick as lightning that everything is wrong, I submit, do not become a parliament like this. I draw attention to the fact that the precedents in such inquiries as this are against the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and that under these precedents, the resolution should end with section 18. The eighteen sections refer specifically to certain acts of wrong committed. Then, section 19 says:

That, under all the circumstances above set forth, the Minister of Militia and Defence, the Hon. Frederick William Borden, was guilty of gross and culpable negligence—

—not, you will observe, because he did these things set out in this section 19, but because he did the things set out in the eighteen sections preceding. Now, if this section 19 is a statement of facts, and not an inference, what is the meaning of that language?

Mr. MONK. I may tell my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough), that I am ready to do that.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Yes; finding himself in a hole, the hon. gentleman is ready for anything. But, he very ingeniously and with malice aforethought—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Well, I take it back. I meant it playfully.

Mr. MONK. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I had not reference to any malice in the heart of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk)—

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Mr. MONK. My point of order relates to another matter. I would like to know what the objection of the government is.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) surely does not pretend that that is a point of order. He is treating the matter in a playful way. No one could tell the story he told and try to make it applicable to this case without treating the whole matter with levity. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is laughing now, and so are his friends on that side of the House. They laugh to keep their courage up, knowing that they are not going to succeed. Returning to the legal argument, I say that very judiciously, and very cunningly the hon. gentleman seeks to commit the House to a conclusion before it has heard the evidence. If this resolution were carried, and the evidence proved the minister not guilty, the question would arise: How can you declare he is not guilty when the House has already come to the conclusion expressed in this 19th section. In the case of the ex-Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron), when charges were made against him, nobody ever thought of putting in a clause inferring, from the charges already made, that he had been guilty of gross and culpable negligence. Nobody ever thought of such a course in the case of Sir Hector Langevin. If section 19 is a statement of fact and not a deduction—and I wish to call special attention to this—every one of these eighteen statements, except the first, might begin as the nineteenth does, that under all the circumstances above set forth 2 is true, 3 is true, 4 is true, 5 is true. It would be just as proper to say that in all the preceding sections except the 1st as in section 19. But more than that. There is not a statement of fact in the whole of the indictment, and hence paragraph 19 was very cunningly drawn. One thing the hon. gentleman says in his prologue to this indictment is this: I am credibly informed. Is that a statement of fact? How can that be introduced into paragraph 19 as a statement of fact, I would like to know—that a member has been credibly informed of a thing and then he states it to be a fact. He might have said that under all the circumstances above set forth, supposing them to be true, the minister was guilty, then I could understand it.

Mr. DAVIN. But he says—I believe.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Because he is informed of certain things by others, therefore, he says they are facts, it is true. And that is logic. I understand that a man has the right to take the word of another man if he believes him to be a reputable man, he has a perfect right to say—I believe that. But that is his belief in the statement of another man, it is only a hearsay remark made to him. You will notice

that paragraph 19 is made up altogether of evidence that would come in under the eighteen preceding paragraphs; therefore, 19, if it means anything, means that under the eighteen preceding paragraphs—and they are epitomized in 19—that the minister is guilty, that is the way it stands. Now, in reason, is that fair to the minister or to anybody else? Hon. gentlemen may think that it is easy to bandy words, they may think that it is a small matter. But I submit that no member of this House or of any government would for a moment consent to declare a colleague guilty before the case was sent to a committee—because there is nothing less than that in paragraph 19. It says that under all these circumstances he was guilty of gross and culpable negligence. Well, indictments are all right, they are in definite form. But there is a preliminary inquiry even in an indictment. There must be evidence before a grand jury before an indictment is found. The member for Jacques Cartier, without giving any evidence at all, wants an indictment, and he wants us to find that indictment. Nay, more, he wants us to bring in the Minister of Militia and Defence guilty before we hear any evidence. That is a new form of justice. The question before us is not the question of sending bad food to the soldiers, but it is a question of whether the Minister of Militia and Defence has done certain things. Let us not pass judgment upon the belief of the member for Jacques Cartier, as we are asked to do, before we go on with the investigation. We ought to approach the question in a different spirit from that. I am not going so far as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and say that the member for York or any other member would not approach this question without bias; but I am bound to say he has shown a very bad preparation for sitting on that committee when he gives judgment before hearing the evidence. I know he is broad enough, when the evidence is given, to do justice according to the evidence, but there would always be a suspicion that, having given judgment without evidence, he would not be as willing to give a different judgment on the evidence.

I was struck with what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said with respect to precedents. Is there an hon. gentleman on the other side who can find a precedent for this? Was there ever in this House such an indictment as that brought up, closing as paragraph 19 does? I say we may change the laws of this country, we may act in a different way from our predecessors; but I submit that if, in the wisdom of parliament, they have gone in a certain direction all these years, there must be a strong case made up before we change their form of procedure to the extent of finding a man guilty before we try him. Let us keep to the words, of the resolution, let us keep away altogether from talk about the food being bad. That has nothing to do with the

matter before us; we have simply to decide whether that clause 19 ought to go in. Even if the soldiers were being poisoned, that would have nothing to do with the question before us. I agree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in believing that this discussion on the other side has all been got up because they did not expect there would be such a ready reply given by the government. But I submit that only one answer can be made as to the disposition we should make of paragraph 19.

Mr. McNEILL. Having listened very attentively to the statements made by the government and by their supporters, I think the best thing the House could do is to endeavour to arrive at some arrangement which will be satisfactory to both parties. The government allege that they are most anxious to have a thorough investigation of this matter. It is unfortunate that the proposal of the government is one which amounts to this, that we can investigate everything except the conduct of the government or any member of the government. That is how it appears to this side of the House. There are certain words in the last paragraph of the indictment, if I may so call it, of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, which are thought by the government to be irregular. I do not at all agree with the arguments that have been put forward on the government side in support of that contention. It seems to me that what has been alleged is absolutely correct in form and that you must read the clause in this way: I am credibly informed and believe that I can establish so and so by satisfactory evidence. But, as it is not accepted by the government, I propose, under the circumstances, with the approval of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who wishes to do nothing unfair in regard to this matter, who wishes to ask the House to arrive at no conclusion which is not a fair conclusion, but who wishes to ask for the inquiry which he has specified here, and not to call for the condemnation by the House, in advance, of any man, I propose to move as an amendment to the amendment, that clause 19 shall stand with the exception of the words:

Under all the circumstances above set forth.

The clause will then read:

19. That the Minister of Militia and Defence, the said Hon. Frederick William Borden, was guilty of gross and culpable negligence (a) in making, with undue haste, the agreement hereinabove referred to of January 4, 1900, for the supply of emergency rations to the Canadian troops in South Africa with irresponsible parties; (b) in not having the preparation of said rations controlled by competent men, and the supply furnished to the troops carefully and rigidly inspected and tested; (c) in neglecting, after he had received said letter of January 25 last, to take the steps commended by the ordinary rules of prudence to ensure the protection of the troops; and (d) in paying the amount of the said contract, \$4,660, in a case where he

must have known that any recovery of the same was impossible, and without any investigation.

The striking out of these words, I think, absolutely removes all the difficulties and all the objections which have been urged by my right hon. friend the leader of the government, and by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to this clause. It is now impossible, I think, for the most ingenious intellect to frame a suggestion that this clause is any more than a statement that my hon. friend believes that he can establish this charge. There is no inference in the clause now at all, and if my right hon. friend is prepared to do, as he says he is, to have a full and thorough investigation of this matter, I submit that there will be no objection to it as it will stand. I confess that I was very much surprised at the statement which was made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I did not expect that he would make the charge that he did make against the hon. member for Jacques Cartier in regard to this matter.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I did not make a charge; I replied to the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster).

Mr. **McNEILL**. We all understood, at this side of the House, that there was a charge of that kind made, and I think it was a very ungenerous thing to make such a charge, in view of the fact that this discussion has been brought up by the government.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I merely replied to the statement of the hon. member for York, N.B.

Mr. **McNEILL**. The discussion has been brought forward by the government, and the House has been entirely taken by surprise. We understood that there was to be no discussion to-day, and when the discussion was brought up by the government themselves, in this House, to charge an hon. gentleman with some want of delicacy of feeling because we went on with the discussion under the painful circumstances of the illness of a member of the family of the hon. Minister of Militia is very unfair. I think it is a very inconvenient thing to have the discussion in the absence of the Minister of Militia.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. My hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) knows that, under the rules of the House, he cannot be present at the discussion.

Mr. **McNEILL**. I think he could very well be present during the discussion.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No.

Mr. **McNEILL**. Well, then, in that case I am mistaken. I have always understood, that, during the discussion, the person charged could be present, but he takes no part in the discussion, or in the division, and

Mr. **McNEILL**.

I am still inclined to hold to that view. Of course, in view of the fact that the government were desirous of striking out the only clause that preferred a charge against the hon. minister, it is questionable whether the minister could not have been here during the discussion. If they are prepared to do that, he might be present as well as any one else. I want to call attention to another matter in connection with this discussion, which, I think, is very germane to it. The charge brought against the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence is, that he has been guilty of culpable negligence in regard to this matter. We charge that he has not, in any degree, taken the precaution which his duty to the country and to the force which he has under his control called upon him to take in reference to this supply of emergency ration. We have had an analysis of this 'Vitaline' made here in Ottawa, according to the statement of the hon. minister. That analysis has been made by one of the departments of the government. We have had the statement made that it has proved a certain fact of vital importance to the discussion.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) is getting outside of the amendment.

Mr. **McNEILL**. With the greatest possible submission, I am now discussing clause 19 and the allegations of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk). That clause asserts negligence on the part of the minister, and I say that it is most important that it shall remain a portion of the charge. The government propose to strike out that clause.

Mr. **SPEAKER**. I have already ruled that it was not within the purview of this debate. I ask the hon. gentleman to respect that ruling.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Order, order.

Mr. **McNEILL**. I understand you to rule in regard to a point of order I raised some time ago, that it was not a point of order, but surely I am not to be precluded from dealing with this question? Am I to understand you to rule that I am not to deal with a question of fact, that I am to be precluded from dealing with this question?

Mr. **SPEAKER**. The motion before the House is, that clause 19 be dropped from the original motion. Your amendment simply modifies that. I have already ruled that the discussion is not germane to the motion before the House.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Order, order.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I beg leave to say what I have to say. Do I understand Mr. Speaker to rule my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) out of order in this debate because he chooses to discuss a fact which he knows, and which has been used in this House, that there was

an analysis made of this food by a department of government, and to press upon the attention of the House the fact that the analysis has not been brought down? If so, I propose to appeal to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is my impression. I may be wrong; I am open to an appeal to the House, but I do feel that, under the circumstances, it is not germane to the subject whether we shall retain or drop clause 19. My judgment, of course, is subject to an appeal to the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would not press the point. By consent of the House, so as to abridge time, I would have my hon. friend go on.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that we are on such ground that we should know where we stand. There are certain rights of discussion in this House that we have enjoyed since this was a parliament.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman appeal from the ruling?

Mr. FOSTER. I propose to appeal, but I think that a word or two might save the necessity for appealing. I am sorry to have to appeal in this case, and I do not want to appeal unless it is absolutely necessary. But there are certain rights of discussion this House has enjoyed ever since it was a House, and they must be preserved. I think a ruling of this kind, which would be fatal to the right of discussion, is of such importance, that we should know at once where the House is with reference to it. If my right hon. friend would give his views upon the matter perhaps it might obviate the difficulty.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not like to question the decision of the Chair, but I am quite willing for my part not to press the point, and to allow my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) to proceed with his remarks. I would be sorry any one should think that he had not the right of discussion.

Mr. McNEILL. I would be the last person, Mr. Speaker, to wish to call in question your ruling, but there is no doubt, I think, that in this case it would be more convenient—

Mr. SPEAKER. If the consent of the House is that the hon. gentleman should go on I shall raise no question. I am in the judgment of the House in any case.

Mr. McNEILL. Very well, Mr. Speaker. I was about saying that it was of essential importance in the discussion of this case, that we should have laid on the Table of the House the analysis which has been made of this vitaline. That analysis we were told has been made in a department of the government. We were told by the Minister of Militia yesterday, that it was made so long ago as the 3rd of February, and you yourself,

Sir, have ruled that the minister shall bring down all the papers in connection with this matter. The result of that analysis is one of the first papers that should have been brought down, and that document has not yet been laid on the Table of the House, although it is essential to this discussion that it should be so laid on the Table. On the face of it, that is a circumstance which should call for comment and disapproval on the part of members on both sides of the House. Surely to goodness we can sometimes deal with public questions without being tied down to mere party issues. For my part, I much dislike dealing with what are called scandals. I regard the ferreting out of scandals with regard to public men, as very much the scavenger work of politics. It is a thing that I personally dislike dealing with. But what I say is: That when we have certain facts affecting the public interest brought to our notice, it is the duty of the members of this House, however disagreeable it may be, to probe those matters to the bottom, even though the result should be to bring discredit on a public man, either in his administrative capacity, or, what is infinitely worse, in reference to personal honour. I may say in my own behalf, that I did not hesitate in the House when my own party were in power, and when I fancied the government of the day was endeavouring to avoid an investigation into the conduct of a colleague of my own; I did not hesitate to get up and oppose the government I was supporting under those painful circumstances in this House, and I certainly do not intend to be prevented from doing so now, by the taunts of the Minister of Railways, who accused me of unfairness, or by the Minister of Militia (whom we all regret is unable to be present), who accused me of want of courtesy. I shall endeavour to do my duty in regard to this matter, and I say it is absolutely essential in my judgment that we shall have such a charge as this 19th clause included in the investigation. I have suggested the modification of that clause in such a way as if my right hon. friend thinks it desirable to investigate the conduct of a colleague of his at all, he cannot have objection to it. The modification I have suggested removes the objection that has been made to the clause, and I would appeal to the right hon. gentleman under all the circumstances to accept it as an amendment to his amendment, and to allow this clause to go to the committee along with the others. Otherwise, most assuredly, this side of the House and the country will believe that this 19th clause is being excluded, simply because it is a clause that brings the investigation to bear immediately upon the conduct of a member of the ministry. I say that the circumstances connected with this case are such as to call for a most rigid examination, in reference to the very

charges made in this particular clause. We have the fact established here, that the Minister of Militia has, in reference to this matter, over and over again risen in his place in this House and declared in the most absolute manner, and indeed with some degree of heat: that this vitaline, this stuff which he purchased from Dr. Devlin, was identically the same substance which had been tested at Kingston. I say that the Minister of Militia made that statement without any facts being in his possession to justify it. On what evidence did he make that statement? He made the statement on the evidence of three witnesses. One portion of that testimony is so trivial that it is not worth discussion at all. It is the evidence of a man who used some of this vitaline food for some time, and afterwards declared it was the same food he had used before. To bring such a statement as that before the House is very little short of an affront to the intelligence of hon. gentlemen. No human being could tell, by simply tasting the food, that it was the same food he used before, but curiously enough the soldier who used this food says it did not produce quite the same effect as the other food, because he had not a disagreeable taste in his mouth after using it as he had when he used the other.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman is now sitting in judgment.

Mr. McNEILL. I am dealing with the matter that is before the House. I am dealing with what is contained in the papers that have been laid on the Table of the House.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Do you not think you had better leave it to the committee?

Mr. McNEILL. I think I have the right to discuss the statement made by the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) in the House, and I think I have the right to show—without being accused of prejudging the case—that the Minister of Militia did not have facts before him when he made that statement justifying the statement. Then, again, there is the evidence of the director general of medical stores. If you take the letter of that gentleman, you will find that he does not give any proof whatever that the two substances are identical. Then you have the evidence of Dr. Devlin, and as every one knows—however, he may be able to clear himself from the suspicion, when the matter is brought before the committee—Dr. Devlin in the meantime is under the suspicion of having been connected with a fraud, and it is absurd to suggest that his evidence should be taken as of any weight in connection with this matter. I want to know where the evidence exists, upon which the Minister of Militia got up time after time in his place in parliament, and declared that the two

Mr. McNEILL.

foods are identical. There is, so far as I can see, no evidence worthy of consideration for a moment which justified the minister in making any such solemn declaration to the House. From that point of view alone, if from no other, he has been blame-worthy.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

## AFTER RECESS.

### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the Timagami Railway Company.—(Mr. McHugh.)

Bill (No. 124) to incorporate the Lake Superior and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Dymont.)

### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—EMERGENCY RATION.

Mr. McNEILL. When you left the Chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was discussing the propriety of the clause contained in the charge of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) which alleges that the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) has been guilty of negligence in regard to this transaction. At that time I had just stated that the minister, again and again during the discussion, had asserted in the most positive manner—and if he were present I think I would perhaps use a little stronger language—that the food that he had sent to South Africa was identical with the food which had been tested at Kingston and had proved so eminently satisfactory. I pointed out that his allegation rested upon a very shaky foundation. I pointed out that there were three persons whose evidence he was able to call in support of the statements he had made. One of these persons was a soldier who had used the food, and who, from simply having used it a short time, ventured the assertion that it was exactly the same as the other food;—which seems to me very much as though one of us were to allege that the brown loaf he had for breakfast this morning was composed of exactly the same material as the brown loaf he had had for breakfast nine or ten months ago. The next evidence was that of the director of medical stores, who did not allege that he had tested the material, but merely said he had examined it. And the other evidence was that of Mr. Devlin, one of the parties who is under suspicion in connection with this transaction. I say that the assertion which the minister has so frequently made, so definitely made and so strongly made, that this was exactly the same substance as that which had been tested at Kingston, rests upon no solid foundation whatever, was a statement which he ought not to have made with such assurance. It is exceedingly difficult and exceedingly disagreeable to have to discuss this question

in the absence of the hon. minister; but we cannot help ourselves.

Now, this that I have spoken of is the evidence adduced to show that the food was the same. The evidence that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) adduces was of a very different nature. In the first place, on the face of it, we have reason to assume that this is not the same food. The protose is a patented food, and no one can manufacture the same food in this country without violating that patent. Therefore, any one coming to the Minister of Militia stating that he was manufacturing this same food was subject to suspicion immediately, because he was admitting that he was violating the law. He had no right to manufacture any such food, and, on the face of it, the minister ought to have been warned that the food was not the same. In the next place we have a food of a different name. It is not called by the same name, and it is not manufactured by the same company. That again was a warning to the minister. But in addition to all that, we have the fact that on January 25, the manufacturer of that food, which the minister had approved, which he said had been recommended to him by medical men of the highest standing in Canada, writes to him a solemn letter, telling him that this food is not the same food as that which it was represented to be, telling him that it is a fraudulent and valueless imitation of that food, and calling his attention to the fact that this can all be proved by analysis. Now it was perfectly competent to the minister, and to any one who supports the minister, to say that that was merely a statement by a rival firm—there is no rival firm, because there is no Vitaline company at all—that it was a statement by a rival manufacturer, some one who wanted a contract; and that because it was a statement made by a person who was rival to the person supplying the food, it was subject to a certain amount of suspicion, and he had discounted it to a certain extent. That is a perfectly fair criticism of the letter, but that is no sufficient reason for the minister ignoring the letter, more especially as the writer of the letter showed his bona fides by offering to subject his statements to an infallible test. He tells the minister: I make this statement, you can test that easily by chemical analysis and decide whether my statement is right. Nothing could be stronger evidence of the bona fides of the writer than that offer. He himself suggested that this food be subjected to an analytical test. He says further: Not only can you do so, but I will do so for my own protection, I intend to do so. Then we have the fact alleged by my hon. friend who brings the accusation, the fact that he sent it to Mr. Moore, and that the analysis was made.

However, that is something the minister was not then aware of. But the

minister was aware of all the facts to which I have called attention. He received the warning on January 26, it was written on the 25th, and was registered, and was no doubt received by the minister on January 26. Now, he had ample time from the receipt of that letter, to have this food tested before it was shipped to South Africa. I understand it is alleged that there was not time to make this test. There was some statement of that kind made in the House, I think, during the debate the other day. But the minister himself says that this food was not shipped until February, and in point of fact, the vessel which carried the food, did not sail until February 21. My information, which I obtained to-day, is that the second contingent left Canada on three ships: the first, on January 20, the *Laurentian*; second, the *Pomeranian*, on January 27; and the *Milwaukee* on February 21. Now, the minister, in the course of the discussion, stated that the food was shipped in February, so that if the food was shipped in February it was shipped by the *Milwaukee*, which did not leave until February 21. So the minister had nearly four weeks from the time that he received this letter of warning, before the food left the country, during which time he could have taken those precautions which my hon. friend refers to in his statement, and have had this food analysed, as was suggested in the letter written to him by Mr. Hatch himself, the manufacturer of the food.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear enough that my hon. friend is fully justified in having made the charge he has made, namely, that the minister has been guilty of culpable negligence in allowing this food to be shipped after the warnings he had received, and in taking no steps whatsoever to have determined the nature of the food. I call my right hon. friend's attention again to the fact, that while the minister has declined to say that he had the food analysed, while we have a right to assume that he has not had the food analysed himself, he has admitted that on February 3, there was an analysis of that food made here in Ottawa. Now, I say again that it is not treating this House fairly to withhold the report of that analysis. I say we have a right to have that analysis on the Table of the House, and to see what the result was. The minister says that he is going to have some other analysis. What has that got to do with it? We do not care what analysis he may have hereafter, we want to know what was the result of that analysis that was made in the Department of Inland Revenue. The minister has said that it bears out his contention, and my right hon. friend has repeated that statement. We want to have that document laid upon the Table so that we ourselves may have an opportunity of judging whether these hon. gentlemen have drawn

a proper conclusion from the statements contained in that analysis. I confess that I am astonished at the government hesitating for one moment to lay that analysis on the Table. I think that the ruling that has been given by the Chair on a former occasion, ought to be sufficient to convince the government that all the documents that have been referred to in the course of this discussion, ought to be laid on the Table without a moment's unnecessary delay. But here we are face to face with the fact that this most important document is deliberately being withheld. I say that the government cannot blame us if we regard this as a most suspicious circumstance. When the government are acting in this manner, we are bound, as reasonable men, to suppose that there is some cause why this document is withheld from us. Why do they withhold it? It is a most suspicious circumstance on the face of it, that this document is not laid on the Table of the House. We naturally conclude that if it were laid on the Table of the House, it would show something which has not yet been developed, and we claim to have the right to have it laid on the Table of the House. Now, I do not wish to prolong the discussion further, and I will read to the House the amendment which I beg to move. I propose to move, in order to meet the objection of my right hon. friend :

That all the words after 'That' in the amendment be struck out, and the following words inserted instead thereof: 'the 19th paragraph of the main motion be amended by striking out after 19 the words 'That under the circumstances above set forth,' and inserting the words, 'and the said Frederick D. Monk also believes that he can establish by satisfactory evidence that.'

The clause now reads in this way :

That under all the circumstances above set forth, the Minister of Militia and Defence, the said Hon. Frederick William Borden, was guilty of gross and culpable negligence, &c.

The government object to that on the ground that if the House accepts it the House will have prejudged the case and decided that the minister has been guilty of negligence. For my part, I must confess that I am utterly unable to agree to that statement. I think that the clause is simply, as all the other clauses are, governed by the preamble in which the hon. gentleman for Jacques Cartier says that he :

—is credibly informed and believes that he can establish by satisfactory evidence—

So and so. But, in order to meet the views of the government, I make the suggestion that these objectionable words be struck out and the clause will then be the mere statement of the belief of my hon. friend, that he can establish the fact that the hon. Minister of Militia has been guilty of gross and culpable negligence. Clause 19 will then read in this way :

That the said Frederick D. Monk also believes that he can establish by satisfactory evidence that the Minister of Militia and Defence, the

Mr McNEILL.

said Hon. Frederick William Borden, was guilty of gross and culpable negligence (a) in making, with undue haste, the agreement hereinabove referred to of January 4, 1900, for the supply of emergency rations to the Canadian troops in South Africa with irresponsible parties; (b) in not having the preparation of said rations controlled by competent men, and the supply furnished to the troops carefully and rigidly inspected and tested; (c) in neglecting, after he had received said letter of January 25 last, to take the steps commended by the ordinary rules of prudence to ensure the protection of the troops; and (d) in paying the amount of the said contract, \$4,660, in a case where he must have known that any recovery of the same was impossible, and without any investigation.

That is the amendment that I propose, with the approval of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who has already stated on the floor of the House that had the government made a suggestion to him of this kind he would have been most happy to have complied with it, so as to remove all possibility of ambiguity, although I do not think there is any. The statement now is, that he says that he believes that he can establish by satisfactory evidence the facts stated in clause 19, and I hope the government, under the circumstances, will agree to the amendment I propose and allow the nineteenth clause to be incorporated in the statement and to go to the committee.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I may be pardoned if I state to the House that I am deeply surprised indeed that the proceedings in this matter have not been understood better than they have been. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier made a statement the other day to the House upon which he has moved a motion. The statement was, that he believed he could establish certain facts, to the number of eighteen, which, in his opinion, if proved, would establish that the hon. Minister of Militia had been guilty of gross and culpable negligence.

Mr. FOSTER. He did not limit it to eighteen.

The PRIME MINISTER. He did. My hon. friend, in his statement, enumerated eighteen different charges which, if established, would prove, in his judgment, that the Minister of Militia had been guilty of culpable negligence. Now, I submit to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill), who has just moved his amendment, I submit to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and I submit to the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster), who has spoken in this debate also, that, as has been stated already by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), there has never been yet a case, of the many cases where similar charges have been made against a member of the House, in which deductions were sought to be made from the charges laid down. In no other case has this been done, from the time that, in 1873, Mr. Huntingdon made his charges. You will find that in

every one of these cases the statement simply contained the charges and the facts, as alleged, leaving it to the committee to investigate into them and report the result of their inquiry. If you take the precedent which was established in this House in 1891, when Mr. Tarte moved his celebrated committee of inquiry, you will find that Mr. Tarte then and there made a statement of the facts and did not presume to deduce any inferences from it, but, thereupon, asked that a committee should be empowered to investigate these facts and report its conclusion. So it was when a charge of a similar nature was made against the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron). In that case, Mr. Edgar laid down certain facts. He made certain charges against the then Postmaster General, and having made these charges he deducted no conclusion whatever, he did not venture to say that he would establish such and such a thing against Sir Adolphe Caron, but he simply asked that the matter be referred to a committee, then and there to be investigated and to be reported upon by the committee. In this case the hon. member for Jacques Cartier lays down eighteen facts stated in eighteen different paragraphs, whereby he deduces the conclusion that the Minister of Militia and Defence has been guilty of culpable negligence. Take, for instance, the charge which you find in paragraph No. 6. Before I go on to offer to the House the remarks which I have to offer upon this point, I would beg to call the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), to this fact. They stated that if paragraph 19 were to be eliminated from the reference which is to be made to the committee, the conduct of the Minister of Militia could not be investigated. Well, if such were the case, indeed, if the elimination of paragraph 19 were to make it impossible for the committee which is to be appointed to investigate the conduct of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, the point would be well taken.

But if section No. 19 is eliminated, the committee will have to investigate the charges which are laid in the preceding paragraph against the Minister of Militia. Take paragraph 6 :

That the Minister of Militia had several interviews, principally in Montreal, but also elsewhere with the said Henry Hatch whom he knew to be the sole manufacturer of the food tested at Kingston.

That is one of the circumstances laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), from which he deducts the culpable negligence which he charges later on against the minister. The preceding paragraph charges that the Minister of Militia had been warned by Mr. Hatch that the food he bought was not proper food, and so we have paragraph 9 :

That the Minister of Militia and Defence failed to acknowledge receipt of this letter ; and did not promptly communicate with the troops of the Canadian contingent or take any steps to verify the truth of the information conveyed to him by the letter above referred to.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk), charges that, first of all, the minister knew Mr. Hatch to be the manufacturer, that he received a letter from Mr. Hatch that the food purchased from Mr. Devlin was not proper food, and that having been so warned, he took no precaution to ascertain whether the food he bought was the true food or not. That is the culpable negligence which is charged by the hon. member (Mr. Monk) against the minister. But that is not all. Take paragraph 16 :

The usual precautions as to inspection were not adopted by the Militia Department in regard to the shipment of emergency rations.

That is another circumstance, which in the opinion of the hon. member (Mr. Monk) establishes, when proved, the culpable negligence which he charges against the minister. Well, Sir, these are to be referred to the committee for investigation. They are true or they are not true. If they are not true, of course the minister is absolutely exonerated. If they are true, then, it will be for the committee to determine whether or not they constitute that culpable negligence which is now charged by the hon. member (Mr. Monk) against the Minister of Militia. It is absurd to argue that if you eliminate paragraph 19, that the conduct of the minister will not be investigated. Take away No. 19, and amongst other things the committee will have to inquire, whether Dr. Borden received a letter of admonition, whether he acted upon it, or whether he should have acted upon it, whether it be true that the usual precautions as to inspection were not adopted by the Minister of Militia. These facts and others have to be investigated, and if they are found to be true, then, of course, the committee will have to report upon the case. The order of reference is this :

That the above statements be referred to a select committee of this House to inquire fully into the said allegations, with power to send for persons, papers and records and such articles as may be necessary for such investigation, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and that the committee do report in full the evidence taken before them and all their proceedings on the reference and the result of their inquiries.

That is to say, the committee will have to report to the House whether or not the charges in paragraph 7, in paragraph 8, paragraph 9, in paragraph 16, are true or not true, and if true, whether or not there are exculpating circumstances, and whether or not they constitute the culpable negligence which is charged in the last paragraph. Under such circumstances, what becomes of

the argument of my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill), whose candour I always admire? Can he still contend that if paragraph 19 is eliminated from the reference, it will not be possible for the committee to investigate whether or not Dr. Borden has been guilty of culpable negligence. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) overlooked these things when he made the statement that paragraph 19 was essential to bring home guilt to Dr. Borden, if guilt there is. Let us look at the origin at paragraph 19. In the mind of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), paragraph 19 is simply the result of preceding paragraphs. The hon. gentleman thinks he can establish by successful evidence that Dr. Borden received a letter of warning from Mr. Hatch; that the food bought from Dr. Devlin was not the food that had been tested before; he thinks he can establish by successful evidence that the Minister of Militia took no notice of that letter; he thinks he can establish by successful evidence that the minister failed to take the ordinary precautions that should have been taken; and believing that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) comes to the conclusion that the Minister of Militia has been guilty of culpable negligence. If paragraph 19 is eliminated, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) will still be at liberty to prove these facts, which are alleged to be incriminating circumstances against the Minister of Militia, and the result of which, will, in the opinion of the hon. member, establish culpable negligence. The mind of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), is perfectly clear, simply from the reading of his motion, that:

19. That under all the circumstances above set forth, the Minister of Militia and Defence, the said Hon. Frederick William Borden, was guilty of gross and culpable negligence (a) in making, with undue haste, the agreement herein above referred to of the 4th of January, 1900, for the supply of emergency rations to the Canadian troops in South Africa with irresponsible parties; (b) in not having the preparation of said rations controlled by competent men, and the supply furnished to the troops carefully and rigidly inspected and tested; (c) in neglecting, after he had received said letter of the 25th January last, to take the steps commended by the ordinary rules of prudence to ensure the protection of the troops; and (d) in paying the amount of the said contract, \$4,660, in a case where he must have known that any recovery of the same was impossible, and without any investigation.

It is plain to the House that the allegations in this paragraph are a resume of the charges made in the previous paragraphs. Again I appeal to the sense of justice of the House, is it fair-play, is it substantial justice that we should pronounce in advance upon these allegations; or that you should even draw a conclusion in advance? This point is so strong that my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) tried to avoid it, and he avoids it by pointing to the words:

That under all the circumstances above set forth.

But, if you withdraw these words, the charge No. 19 remains just the same. It is not a statement of fact; it is simply an inference drawn by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, that he can establish that the Minister of Militia has been guilty of gross and culpable negligence. How can he establish that? He cannot establish that except by facts; and what are the facts which makes the Minister of Militia guilty of that charge? They are all these charges made in the previous eighteen paragraphs. It is impossible for the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to proceed to establish the charges made in the amended motion unless he first proceeds to prove the eighteen charges previously made, because they are the gist of the whole offence, and the rest is simply consequence. Again I say it is not fair to the Minister of Militia under such circumstances to attempt to prejudge the case by saying that this or that proves him guilty. These are the facts to be investigated by the committee and upon which the committee will report their finding to the House. Now, this motion is based on what? It is based on a solemn declaration made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. No motion of this kind is ever made in the House unless a member raises in his place and declares that he has reason to believe that he can establish such and such facts. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier made a statement in the House, which is to be found in *Hansard*, that he had reason to believe that he could establish by evidence this and that; and after he has based a motion upon that declaration, my hon. friend from Bruce, undertakes to amend that motion and substitute for it a new motion based upon a statement of fact which was not made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier.

Mr. FOSTER. No, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, it is so. I do not believe under such circumstances that you can amend the motion; but I do not press that point very much, though it is a point of procedure which might be very seriously taken. All I want to do at this moment is to appeal to the fairness and justice of the House. Suppose paragraph 19 is eliminated, and suppose the committee make a report, as they must; and suppose they find, for instance, that Dr. Borden, the Minister of Militia received a letter from Mr. Hatch, that he took no notice of that letter, that he knew Mr. Hatch was the manufacturer of that food, that he paid Dr. Devlin after he had been warned; suppose especially that it be proved under paragraph 16, that the usual precautions as to inspection were not adopted by the Department of Militia; would not the committee have absolute liberty, under the reference

made to them, to say under such circumstances that they find that the minister is guilty or is not guilty of culpable negligence? Would not that be the deduction in their judgment drawn from the facts proved before them? Would not the committee have the same power that they have to-day to say, we find that the Minister of Militia acted with negligence or did not take due precautions, and so on? Undoubtedly they would; and if the amendment does not take away one iota from the powers with which the committee are invested, I want to know, in the name of common sense once more, in the name of fairness and justice once more, in the name of everything that is sacred once more, why you should brand the Minister of Militia as having been guilty of gross and culpable negligence? The facts alleged may all be true without constituting guilt on the part of the Minister of Militia. But it is not for the House at this moment, I submit in all earnestness, it would be unfair to the Minister of Militia at this moment, when there has been no investigation, to declare in advance what verdict may be pronounced upon him by the committee.

Mr. McNEILL. Will my right hon. friend allow me to call his attention to the fact that when he says we are asking the House to prejudge the case, that the amendment which, with the approval of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, I have moved to the amendment of my right hon. friend states:

And the said Frederick D. Monk also believes he can establish by satisfactory evidence—

If the House votes that this shall stand a part of the indictment, does my right hon. friend really say that these words imply that we prejudge the case and decide that the Minister of Militia is guilty? Will my right hon. friend allow me to remind him that when my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier first brought this matter to the notice of the House, the hon. Minister of Militia rose in his place, and in the most impassioned manner called upon my hon. friend, if he dared, to prefer a charge against him personally; and this is the charge which my hon. friend has preferred against the minister personally, and he believes he can establish the charge.

The PRIME MINISTER. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has made his charge against the Minister of Militia; in the statements to be found in paragraphs 6, 8, 9, 16. You will search in vain for any similar motion to the one proposed; but there has been a tendency on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite this afternoon to prejudge the case. The hon. member for North Bruce, the hon. member for York, and every other hon. member who spoke from that side of the House has discussed the merits of the case, saying that the Minister of Militia did this and did

that, that he purchased the food, that he did not take the proper precautions, that he paid the money, and so on, when they should have refrained from making any such comments, because these are the very questions to be investigated by the committee.

Mr. McNEILL. Surely my right hon. friend will allow us to deal with the statements made in the House and the documents laid on the Table.

The PRIME MINISTER. I say this to my hon. friend: When the matter is referred to a committee to be investigated, it is most important to make no comment on the facts to be investigated. It is not fair to the Minister of Militia to say that he has done this or done that. All these things are to be investigated, and when the committee make their report, that will be the time to make comments and to be as severe as my hon. friend desires. But there has not been in this matter on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite a disposition to give the Minister of Militia that measure of fair-play to which he is entitled. Even this afternoon, my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) treated the Minister of Militia as a criminal, though he has not yet been tried. I have only to say that, under such circumstances, it is not possible to accept the motion of my hon. friend.

Mr. QUINN. Will the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) allow me to ask him a question?

The PRIME MINISTER. What is the question?

Mr. QUINN. If section 19 were eliminated, would it be possible for the committee to declare that the Minister of Militia had been guilty of gross and culpable negligence or that he was innocent in that respect?

The PRIME MINISTER. Most undoubtedly.

Mr. QUINN. I understand the right hon. First Minister to say that the committee can declare that the Minister of Militia was guilty of negligence or innocent of it?

The PRIME MINISTER. If the committee find, as a result of their investigation, that the minister was guilty of negligence, they have the power to say so.

Mr. QUINN. Even if section 19 be eliminated?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I have been in parliament for quite a while, and I have never listened to special pleading such as that we have just heard from the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Why, Sir, it was hardly worthy of the name. I was surprised that the First Minister should resort to such subterfuges.

To my mind, it shows the straits the government are reduced to in refusing to meet the charges that are made so specifically by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). With regard to the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), for my part, I do not think it was necessary at all, but that the case as it stood was sufficiently strong. But, with that amendment, every objection that the First Minister could possibly make has been swept away. The First Minister tells us that the other charges are specific enough against the Minister of Militia, and he does not want any more. But these are charges of wrong-doing, charges of maladministration, charges of rascality, of robbery and of the basest of crimes—for, Sir, this is a case in which the money consideration is but secondary. A contractor may rob the government of \$50,000 or \$500,000; but, this robbery of \$5,000 transcends them all in importance, for the effect of it is to put in jeopardy the lives of the soldiers. Such a crime is not to be measured by a money test. Take, for instance, the tenth charge:

That, as a matter of fact, the food or emergency ration supplied to the Canadian troops was not identical with the food tested at Kingston—

and so on. That does not make a specific charge against the Minister of Militia. Or this:

That the value of the said food, so brought on from the United States, does not exceed \$500.

But, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier comes down and takes the responsibility, as a member of parliament, knowing what that responsibility means, of saying specifically: I charge these things against an individual who sits on the other side of the House, the man in charge of the Militia Department, the man responsible to parliament and the people of Canada; that is my charge, and it is contained in section 19, which declares that the Minister of Militia has been guilty of gross and culpable negligence. He charges the whole series of wrong-doings to the Minister of Militia himself—and that is the thing that hon. gentlemen opposite object to. The First Minister told us this afternoon, and he virtually repeats it to-night, that he objects to charges being made against the Minister of Militia. Why, Mr. Speaker, do we not know that the history of the past four years has been a bluff game by these hon. gentlemen? When charges are made in this House, they say: Make your charges specific, or we will refuse to listen to them. The hon. senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) had to make his charges on the Yukon more specific. To-night the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) virtually tells us: You have no right to make such specific charges against the minister. But, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier takes that responsibility; he does not beat around

the bush, he does not make charges against the minister's subordinates; but he makes his charges against the man who is responsible to us and to the people. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) told us that we asked the House to assume guilt and to pronounce judgment before investigation. But, then, on the other hand, he said the hon. member for Jacques Cartier could not prove his charges. Let the hon. gentleman wait, and he will see whether the charges will be proved or not. The House is not asked to assume the guilt of the minister. If the hon. gentleman will look at the charges he will see that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier begins by saying:

That he is credibly informed and believes that he can establish by satisfactory evidence—

all these nineteen charges. And then, after formulating his charges, his resolution goes on:

That the above statements be referred to a select committee of this House to inquire fully into the said allegations—

and so on. That is the customary form to be followed by a member of this House when he makes a charge against another member of the House. But the government are refusing the opportunity to prove these charges; all they will consent to is that an investigation be held. From the experience of the past, we know what kind of an investigation will be held, if the government have their own way in the matter. But, Sir, we are not going to permit that. The government have been compelled to back down on many occasions this session, and we will make them back down again, and will make them permit an investigation into these charges, which are of too serious a nature for the government to successfully burk inquiry concerning them. There are other features of the case to which I refer. In clause 17 of these resolutions we find:

The substance brought in from the United States, as above stated, in Saratoga trunks was detained by the customs officers for duty thereon, but under direction of the government it was allowed to pass without payment of customs dues.

Where is the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to-day? We have been looking for him. Some one said that he flitted in and flitted out again, while some member on that side was speaking, taking good care not to be in when any one on this side was speaking. There is a charge against the Minister of Customs. He was asked in this House as to the truth of that charge, and he shirked an answer. This is an insult to this House. We are entitled to an answer; we must have an answer. It will not do for the Minister of Customs to tell us, as he did, he has not been able to find out anything. He has the evidence in his own department. The entry was made about the 4th, 5th or 6th of January. The contract was signed on January

4, and these goods came in with lightning speed. They were there on the 5th or 6th of January. He could have the investigation made in his own department.

Mr. BERGERON. He could do it in a week.

Mr. WALLACE. His officers could furnish him the facts in half an hour. He could telephone or telegraph to Montreal, to the customs there and have the customs entry and invoice sent here. The entry was sent up; he could have the invoice sent up as well. The charge is made that under the direction of the government it was allowed to pass without payment of customs dues. Who had authority to give that instruction? Who had authority to violate the law? The Minister of Customs had no more right than any member of this House to violate the law which governs him as well as every other citizen of this country. But where is the minister to-night? He is out. We want him here. It is the usual custom in this House that when ministers are wanted they are away. All the important investigations have been burked, to a certain extent, and hindered by the ministers who were implicated in wrong-doing absenting themselves. Then the First Minister gets up and makes an apology for the minister not being here. There are two ministers away in the old country who are shirking their duty in the House of Commons, who ought to be here to answer the charges which they are afraid to meet. So it is with the Minister of Customs. He is not here to-night. One of these charges is against him and his department; he should be here to meet it. The other minister, we are told, is ill, and that is the reason he is not here. At any rate the Minister of Customs cannot make that excuse. He should be here to make an answer to that charge, and I ask the right hon. the First Minister to send for him forthwith and have him produced here. 'Call in the ministers.'

Now, there is another matter. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us to-night that the Minister of Militia and Defence was an honourable man, as honourable as any man in this House. For my part, I object to be classified in any way with the Minister of Militia and Defence. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries may put himself alongside of him as regards respectability, but I will not. I have never been charged with things that are floating around the corridors and all over this country with regard to the Minister of Militia and Defence. There are scandals attached to his name which I think should demand an investigation at the hands of the First Minister who, if he knows of these things, is responsible for his retention in this cabinet, if not his retention in this House. For my part, I object to the challenge thrown out by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the uncalled for and unnecessary challenge,

under the circumstances, as to the eminent respectability and propriety of the Minister of Militia and Defence. The facts are known to the ministers, they have been called to the attention of the ministers, and particularly the right hon. the First Minister, who is the guardian at any rate of the honour of the members of his cabinet, and to a degree of the members of the House. For my part, I openly repudiate a comparison between any hon. member of this House and the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Now, there is another matter which also refers to the Minister of Customs. These goods were not made in Canada, they were made in the United States. The Minister of Militia and Defence knew that Hatch's protose was made in Canada, that it was not made anywhere else, that Mr. Hatch had a patent under which he was manufacturing it in this country. The correspondence previously shows that these goods were manufactured only in Canada. And yet the very fact, if it be a fact, that is stated here—and it is not contradicted, there is nobody to contradict it, no Minister of Militia and Defence and no Minister of Customs—that these goods were manufactured in the United States, is evident proof that they were not the goods that were supposed to be manufactured in Canada and only in Canada. Now, I would like to ask another question. There was great haste on the 4th of January, but these goods, according to the statement of the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) were not shipped until the 21st of February, all that time after the 4th of January, when he made that hurried bargain with Dr. Devlin, or with whomsoever the bargain was made. I would like to know why, when these men were sent away, the government did not send some of that emergency food with them. The minister had made the preliminary arrangements in the matter; he had arranged with Mr. Hatch with regard to the Yukon to have a large quantity on hand so that at a day's notice they could supply emergency rations, presumably at that time for the Yukon. Knowing that this firm had it on hand and were ready to supply it, why did the government not send it out with the first contingent on the 21st of February, instead of making an inquiry sixty-six days later. I would like to have an answer to that question, but there is nobody here to answer it. The ministers are absent, and we have to wait for an answer until some time in the future. But we will have an investigation, we will have witnesses to prove all the charges that have been made, we will not permit all these things to be burked. I say that the minister was blamable, when he had investigated the qualities of this emergency ration a long time beforehand, when the Yukon expedition was looming up, when they supposed they would need food of that kind—I say there was palpable negligence in that the minister, knowing of these facts,

did not send out some of that food, because he could have got it at a day's notice in Montreal.

Now, there is another feature. At the battle of Paardeberg, and for twelve or fifteen days afterwards, some of the Canadian troops were going on half rations, they were suffering all sorts of hardship. It would have been a blessing if they had had that protose, that emergency ration. It would have saved the lives of many a poor boy who is down with fever contracted through the hardships and starvation that they had to undergo. If this emergency ration had been supplied to these troops, it would have saved many a Canadian boy's life. That is another charge that the minister was guilty of culpable, and, in my opinion, of criminal negligence in not providing this food when he had full information that it was ready. For my part, I did not know anything about this emergency ration, I did not know the minister had been making investigations a year before he found out the excellent qualities of this food in saving life, and that a soldier could carry it so easily with him. All these things the minister himself, knew. He did not utilize his knowledge, he did not provide for the safety of the volunteers he sent out there as in many other cases in which he has been utterly negligent of their interests. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Militia has to answer these questions. The hon. Minister of Customs has to satisfy this House and the country in regard to the charges of illegal action by the Department of Customs, and the country will not be satisfied for the First Minister to get up and by quibbles, by what he calls arguments, although I would not dignify them by the name of arguments, pretend to lead the public away from the charges. They will not be led away. There never was, in the parliament of Canada, charges more specifically and definitely made of wrong-doing, in every instance detailing the facts and charging the minister with being a party directly and straightly responsible for this wrong-doing. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier says: I am prepared to bring the evidence right down and prove my case up to the hilt. Why do I not get an opportunity without taking up the time of the House, without quibbling and without proposing amendments? You cannot prevent the people saying that this is a proper clause to have there. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier assumes responsibility in making that statement, and when he makes it what right have the government to say: You shall not prefer charges, you shall not be definite in your charges, you must not charge a minister with wrong-doing. Hon. gentlemen went all over the country, bluffing the country and saying: Why do they not make specific charges and we will be ready to meet them in five min-

Mr. WALLACE.

utes? When, here, a definite charge is made, when a positive statement is made, such as is contained in clause 19, they are afraid to meet the issue, but they will have to meet the issue, and the country will be the judge upon this occasion.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that there is not a man in this House who has listened to the speech which has just been delivered by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) on this very important subject that is at all surprised at the irritated manner in which he has undertaken to deal with this very grave question. For my part, I am exceedingly anxious that a thorough and exhaustive investigation of this whole matter should be held, and I am quite sure that when hon. gentlemen opposite enter upon the discharge of that duty, from their standpoint, the government will give them every facility to prove every one of the seventeen charges they have made. I have sat in this House many years with the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden). I am unwilling, and I positively decline to cast my vote to declare that he is guilty, before the evidence is heard, before any evidence is taken, before any of the charges that have been presented to the House by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier have been investigated.

Mr. MILLS. No one asks you to.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is the intention of the declaration. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace), challenges the right of the government to alter, or in any way to interfere with the charges that have been made. He thinks that the government should have just accepted the charges as they were laid on the Table of the House and not dare to lay a finger or a pen upon them. My hon. friend has a very short memory. If you go back to 1892, when hon. gentlemen were on this side of the House, and when Mr. Edgar made his charges against the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), who now sits beside the hon. member for West York, the question presents itself to you: Were those charges accepted by the government of that day? Did they ever lay finger or pen upon them? What are the facts? There were some ten or eleven charges made. Did they strike out one, or two or three? They actually struck out six charges out of the ten or eleven. Who was a party to it? Who was the party who made the motion, and who was the party who seconded it. The motion was moved by Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who is now a Senator. He made the motion, but who seconded it? The hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) was the seconder of the resolution, not to strike out one clause or amend one clause, but they actually amended every one but three of the entire num-

ber of charges. They took the whole of the charges out of Mr. Edgar's hands, they formed and moulded them to suit themselves, and then they said: Come on.

Mr. MILLS. You are not going to follow such a rascally example?

Mr. McMULLEN. They tied Mr. Edgar's hands behind his back, and challenged him to a duel.

Mr. CASGRAIN. But, you would not follow such a bad example.

Mr. McMULLEN. In regard to the charges that the hon. member for West York has made as to the absence of ministers from this House, we can also go back to a period when, this House met for two weeks and every day we had the report that the strikers were not present, that the government had not adjusted their differences. The House had the pleasure of meeting, looking at the Speaker in the Chair, and then adjourning from day to day until such time as the ministers of that day would make up their family quarrel and come back to the House. Yet, the hon. member for West York has the brass to get up in the House and charge the hon. members of this government with not being present every time that he would like to see them. Ministers of the Crown no doubt have a great deal of responsibility, and have a great deal to do. The hon. gentleman has made some discourteous remarks in regard to ministers of the Crown who are not here, but who are out of Ottawa. I do not think that my hon. friend would make these charges were these ministers here. One of the ministers is attending to his duty in Paris, which, I think, he is quite capable to discharge. Another minister is discharging a personal duty, which, I think, he has a perfect right to discharge, and while they are away from this House there are plenty here to take their places and plenty to justify the policy of the government. All I have to say to hon. gentlemen opposite is, in place of quibbling in regard to this question, let us have a committee, let the hon. member for Jacques Cartier prove every charge he has made or a percentage of them. He will find that if there has been any culpable negligence, if any member of the government has done what is wrong, no member on this side of the House will have any hesitation in pronouncing in that direction. But, I think the hon. Minister of Militia is entitled to the benefit of the doubt until such time as he has been found guilty. What are we in this House? We are the grand jury virtually sitting before the case is sent to the judge and the petit jury. Who are the petit jury? The committee. I would like to know if, in the presentment of a case by the grand jury it was ever declared: We find this gentleman guilty of malfeasance of office, or

guilty of gross negligence in the discharge of his duty, or guilty of anything else? The word guilty is not in the presentment, and it should not be there. It should be removed from this motion, and it should not be placed there until the committee to which the charge is referred has so declared. We should hesitate to pronounce the Minister of Militia guilty until such time as these charges are proven. If he is guilty, he will have to be responsible for that guilt, but to declare him guilty now, before we know whether he is or not, would be unfair and unjust. I have no doubt that it would be a nice thing to gentlemen opposite if they could get up on the stump throughout the country and produce this charge No. 19, and say: Here is the expression of the House of Commons in regard to Dr. Borden; here is a declaration by the House that he was guilty of gross negligence in the discharge of his duty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Not at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, these gentlemen opposite are ready to take any port in a storm, and they would be unfair enough to take advantage of this clause, to say that the Minister of Militia was condemned, but they will not get the chance. We will give a committee to hon. gentlemen opposite and we will give every opportunity to them to prove their charges, and if when the investigation is completed and the report made, Dr. Borden is found to be guilty, he must abide by it, but I for one will not be unfair enough to pronounce the minister guilty until I see what evidence there is to be brought forward.

House divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. McNeill):

YEAS :

Messieurs

Beattie,  
Bell (Pictou),  
Bennett,  
Bergeron,  
Caron (Sir Adolphe),  
Casgrain,  
Clancy,  
Clarke,  
Cochrane,  
Davin,  
Foster,  
Gilmour,  
Guillet,  
Haggart,  
LaRivière,  
Macdonald (King's),

McAllister,  
McCleary,  
McDougall,  
McNeill,  
Merk,  
Morin,  
Powell,  
Prior,  
Puttee,  
Quinn,  
Sproule,  
Taylor,  
Tupper (Sir Charles  
Hibbert), and  
Wallace.—30.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,  
Basinet,  
Belcourt,  
Blair,  
Brodeur,

Graham,  
Holmes,  
Hutchison,  
Joly de Lotbinière  
(Sir Henri),

Calvert,  
Campbell,  
Casey,  
Copp,  
Costigan,  
Cowan,  
Davies (Sir Louis),  
Dobell,  
Dupré,  
Ellis,  
Erb,  
Fielding,  
Fisher,  
Fitzpatrick,  
Fortier,  
Fraser (Guysborough),  
Fraser (Lambton),  
Geoffrion,  
Gould,

Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),  
Lavergne,  
Lemieux,  
Macdonald (Huron),  
McGregor,  
McHugh,  
McIsaac,  
McLennan (Inverness),  
McMillan,  
McMullen,  
Mulock,  
Paterson,  
Proulx,  
Semple,  
Sutherland,  
Talbot,  
Tucker, and  
Wood.—46.

## PAIRS :

Ministerial.

Opposition.

## Messieurs

Scriver,  
Davis,  
Tolmie,  
Snetsinger,  
Christie,  
Featherston,  
Cartwright,  
Gibson,  
Charlton,  
Lewis,  
Edwards,  
Tarte,  
Sifton,  
Livingston,  
Carroll,  
Maxwell,  
Bethune,  
Parmelee,  
Frost,  
Rutherford,  
Penny,  
McCarthy,  
Burnett,  
Bruneau,  
Lang,  
Somerville,  
Johnston,  
Landerkin,  
Beith,  
Brown,  
Turcot,  
Ratz,  
Ethier,  
Logan,  
Bell (Prince),  
McGugan,  
Richardson,  
Semple,  
Russell,  
Flint,  
Fortin,  
Britton,  
Hurley,  
McPherson,  
Mackie,  
Dyment,

Blanchard,  
Hale,  
Montague,  
Reid,  
Roddick,  
Carscallen,  
Tupper (Sir Charles),  
Corby,  
Tisdale,  
Poupore,  
McLennan (Glengarry),  
Hughes,  
McInerney,  
Kaulback,  
Ingram,  
Tyrwhitt,  
Pope,  
Clarke,  
Klock,  
Roach,  
Ganong,  
Robertson (J. Ross),  
Bell (Addington),  
Henderson,  
Kloepfer,  
Broder,  
Wilson,  
Kendry,  
McLean,  
Seagram,  
Robertson,  
McIntosh,  
Osler,  
McLaren,  
Earle,  
Martin,  
Hodgins,  
Chauvin,  
Borden (Hallfax),  
Mills,  
Dugas,  
Cargill,  
Craig,  
Rosamond,  
Ferguson,  
McCormack,

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

House divided on the amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier):

Mr. McMULLEN.

## YEAS :

## Messieurs

Angers,  
Bazinet,  
Belcourt,  
Blair,  
Brodeur,  
Calvert,  
Campbell,  
Casey,  
Copp,  
Costigan,  
Cowan,  
Davies (Sir Louis),  
Dobell,  
Dupré,  
Ellis,  
Erb,  
Fielding,  
Fisher,  
Fitzpatrick,  
Fortier,  
Fraser (Guysborough),  
Fraser (Lambton),  
Geoffrion,  
Godbout,

Graham,  
Holmes,  
Hutchison,  
Joly de Lotbinière  
(Sir Henri),  
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),  
Lavergne,  
Lemieux,  
Macdonald (Huron),  
McGregor,  
McHugh,  
McIsaac,  
McLennan (Inverness),  
McMillan,  
McMullen,  
Mulock,  
Paterson,  
Proulx,  
Puttee,  
Semple,  
Sutherland,  
Talbot,  
Tucker, and  
Wood.—47.

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Beattie,  
Bell (Pictou),  
Bennett,  
Bergeron,  
Caron (Sir Adolphe),  
Casgrain,  
Clancy,  
Cochrane,  
Davin,  
Foster,  
Gillies,  
Gilmour,  
Gillet,  
Haggart,  
LaRivière,  
Macdonald (King's),

McAlister,  
McCleary,  
McDougall,  
McNeill,  
Marcotte,  
Monk,  
Morin,  
Powell,  
Prior,  
Quinn,  
Sproule,  
Taylor,  
Tupper (Sir Charles  
Hibbert), and  
Wallace.—30.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion (Mr. Monk) as amended, agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER. I propose to my hon. friend on the other side of the House, that the committee to which this matter be referred be composed of seven members, and if my hon. friend is ready, I would like him to select the members from his own side, or if he is not ready to-night, I will make the motion on Monday.

Mr. FOSTER. I am ready at the present time to give the names—I suppose three?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. I propose that the matter be referred to a committee consisting of Messrs. Russell, Britton, Costigan, Belcourt—

Mr. FOSTER. And Messrs. Monk, Casgrain and Clarke.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That the charges brought this day by Mr. Monk, member for Jacques Cartier, be referred to a select committee, to be composed of Messrs. Russell, Britton, Costigan, Belcourt, Monk, Casgrain and Clarke.

Motion agreed to.

**SUPPLY—GASPE ELECTION—INTER-FERENCE OF AN OFFICIAL.**

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

**Mr. G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, as I gave notice to the Minister of Customs, I desire to bring up a matter which has been lingering before the House for more than two years, and I propose the second time to make a statement and a few criticisms as to the course of the government in reference to the matter. In August, 1899—I think it was on August 11, just before the close of the session—I brought the matter to the attention of the government, and was answered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who at that time was leading the government, to the effect that the matter would be taken under advisement, and would be looked into. Since then the papers have been brought down, and I have now the complete papers, which have been laid upon the Table of the House. The matter consists of a charge which was brought against an official of the Customs Department, by the late Dr. Ennis, who ran in the Liberal-Conservative interest in the district of Gaspé. The charge was brought by Dr. Ennis, in a letter written to the Customs Department, which runs as follows :

Grand River, Gaspé Co., P.Q.,  
February 16, 1898.

Hon. Wm. Paterson, M.P.,  
Department of Customs,  
Ottawa.

Hon. Sir,—As the government has made known during the last session of parliament their desire to give civil servants an occasion 'to gratify their ambitions' by relieving them of further duty when they would have manifested an inclination to hold any other than a neutral position between the political parties seeking the approval of the electors of this country, I beg to hereby call your attention to the following statement:

'I hereby solemnly charge Mr. H. A. Lemieux, formerly an employee of the Montreal customs office, and now assistant inspector of customs under Mr. O'Meara of Quebec, with having taken an active part in the electoral campaign of June, 1896.

I further declare specifically that the said Mr. H. A. Lemieux spent a part of the month of June, 1896, in Magdalen Islands, canvassing and working in the interests of his son, now member of the House of Commons for Gaspé County.

I further declare that the above-mentioned Mr. H. A. Lemieux represented Mr. Rodolphe Lemieux, M.P., at polling station No. 41, Basin, on Magdalen Islands, as the sworn representative or agent of his son, then a candidate for election to parliament, on June 23, 1896;

I further declare, again, that during his stay on the islands aforesaid, Mr. H. A. Lemieux made himself known and acted under the assumed name of H. A. Lamirande or de Lamirande, and that his oath as representative at the poll was taken under this false name, subscribed to by this false appellation;

I hereby further state Mr. H. A. Lemieux has, since committing this offence against the

spirit of the civil service law, been promoted in the service, whilst other officials—guilty in a much lighter degree—have been punished and dismissed for "political partisanship."

On the strength of the above, I ask an inquiry into the conduct of Mr. Lemieux during the month of June, 1896, and beg that a copy of my accusation be sent him with the name of his accuser. I will produce sworn testimony to the above effect.

I have the honour to be, hon. sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) THOMAS ENNIS.

Without taking any time over the matter, I may say, that Dr. Ennis, who was the representative of the Liberal-Conservatives in Gaspé in 1896, from all I can learn, was an eminently respectable and straightforward gentleman. He makes these charges on his own responsibility. He prefers them in detail, and he states to the minister, that he would like the accused to have a copy of these charges, and to have an investigation ordered, and he would be prepared with sworn testimony, to prove his allegations.

Now, Sir, I think that a statement like that ought to have been sufficient to at least enlist the attention of the Minister of Customs; not only on account of the first charge, that of gross and active political partisanship and neglect of his duty in being absent from his place of duty and engaged in the active work of an election contest, but—what is much more serious—the allegation that Mr. Lemieux represented the opposing candidate at one of the polls and acted in other parts of the constituency under the assumed name of H. A. Lamirande, taking his responsibility as a representative in the poll under that name. Well, what is the action of the Minister of Customs, who ought to be jealous first for the vindication of the principle that people in the public service ought not to engage in active and open political party strife? The question was brought to the hon. gentleman's attention by this letter of February 16, 1898. The only result was a letter from the minister promising attention to it. On March 10, the letter was acknowledged for consideration. On March 21, the hon. senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) brought the matter again to the attention of the Minister of Customs, sending him, I believe a copy of the charges which had been made by Dr. Ennis, and asking him what action he proposed to take upon it. On May 13, having received no answer, the hon. senior member for Pictou again wrote to the Minister of Customs, sending him a copy of the charges. Still no answer. On July 24, the hon. senior member for Pictou again wrote to the Minister of Customs. It was only on August 9 of that year the Minister of Customs at last got so far as to reply. And one of the main sentences in his letter was that, in view of the lapse of time between 1896 and this date, he did not deem it advisable to investigate alleged partisan action. It will be seen

that, while Dr. Ennis preferred the charge of political partisanship, he preferred also the charge of misrepresentation, the misrepresentation of giving the name of another person, and, under an assumed name, taking part in a public and political duty, in one of the polling places, which would come, I should think, very close to personation, and which, if the charge was true, was conduct which certainly ought not to be allowed in any employee in the service of this country.

Mr. MILLS. It is second cousin to the machine.

Mr. FOSTER. Whatever relation it be, it certainly looks as if there was blood between them. In his answer of August 9, the minister conveniently loses sight of the main charge. On August 17, the hon. senior member for Pictou again calls the attention of the minister to the fact that he has not yet taken action, and especially that he had overlooked the most serious of the charges, namely, the one to which I have just adverted. On August 23, a letter was sent by Dr. Ennis asking again for an opportunity to prove his charges. On August 28, there was an answer from the private secretary of the minister to the hon. senior member for Pictou, saying that the minister was away on his holidays. Nothing more was done, until August 11, 1899, when I brought the matter to the attention of the House and the government, and received the assurance of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) that attention would be given the matter. But, Dr. Ennis did not rest simply with trying to get an investigation from the Minister of Customs. Finding that he was not successful in that, on September 29, 1898, or about that time, he wrote to the Minister of Justice and informed the minister that he had preferred these charges to the Minister of Customs, that he had not had an opportunity of proving them, and that no investigation had been ordered, and he asked the Minister of Justice to interfere, either by himself or through his colleague, to the end that an investigation might be had. The Minister of Justice took no action on this matter, except to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to it, and to inform Dr. Ennis that the matter did not lie in his department, but was a subject in which the Minister of Customs alone had authority to act.

Now, Sir, that charge was made in February, 1898; and there is one peculiar circumstance with regard to it—it has never been denied by the Minister of Customs himself. One would think that, a grave charge of that kind with reference to an officer in his department having been preferred, the minister would have gone so far as to make some investigation into it at least to convince himself that it was not well-founded; and, if it were not well-found-

ed, in justice to his department and in justice to the officer, he would be ready to make a denial, and so clear his officer and himself. Up to the present time the Minister of Customs nor any one in his behalf, has denied this charge. An official of the government charged with an offence of that kind, and knowing that he was charged with it, if he were not guilty of it, it would seem, would be the first to make a statement clearing himself with reference to the charge. But up to the present moment, I have never seen or read or heard of the official implicated making any statement with regard to his innocence or rebutting the charge in any way. More than that, and, I think, even stronger is that after the matter was brought to the attention of the government and became public to the whole country—known to the Prime Minister—action promised in some way by the Minister of Trade and Commerce—by no member of the government has any attempt been made, to clear the official or to clear the department of the charge of keeping in their employ an official who had been guilty of such conduct.

There is another peculiar circumstance with reference to this. While the Minister of Customs was neither able to deny the charge, nor to investigate the charge, nor to give any information with reference to it, he was able to take that same employee and raise him in office, and raise him in salary, and to make him, as I understand, an assistant inspector, with a largely increased salary. So that it stands in this way, that one of the gravest charges that could be made was made against an official of the Customs Department, namely, that he had under an assumed name personated and represented himself in a polling booth to be a person whom he was not—and there has never been any attempt to clear up his record in this House by the government, or any official of the government, or by himself. But the Minister of Customs in this way has put his approval upon such conduct, and denoted his utter contempt and defiance of the charge that was made, and of the public opinion, which I was sure would ask that such a charge should be investigated; he has in open day and before the whole country publicly promoted this officer and made him a responsible officer of the higher grade in the Customs Department. This is, I think, a fair and temperate statement of facts. What does the government propose to do about it?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The hon. gentleman has made, as he says, a temperate statement in reference to the matter that has been brought under my notice, as he states. I did not follow all the dates he has mentioned, but I think they are correct; I have them under my hand here. The facts with reference

Mr. FOSTER.

to the matter are, as he states, that on the 16th of February, Dr. Ennis, who was the Conservative candidate in Gaspé at the last election, wrote a letter which was forwarded to me by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) on the 28th of February, 1898, and was received by me, as my memorandum shows, on the 2nd of March of that year. The member for Pictou wrote to me once or twice with reference to the matter, and when he pressed me for an answer, I told him at first it was for consideration, and when he asked me the second time, I replied in the letter which the hon. member for York has read, and which was addressed to the member for Pictou on the 9th of August, in which I said :

In reply to your letter of the 24th ulto. respecting the charges preferred by Dr. Ennis some time ago against Mr. H. A. Lemieux, assistant inspector of customs, I beg to state that I do not deem it advisable to issue a commission to investigate the charges in view of the great lapse of time between the time of the alleged partisan acts said to be committed, and the time at which the charges were preferred.

I can say to the hon. gentleman that that was not dealing in an exceptional manner with this case. Before this time the Department of Customs had decided that it was inadvisable to receive charges or to go to the expense of investigating charges of political partisanship that were preferred so long after the event occurred. I am told that there may have been, so far as my department is concerned, one or two cases that were entered upon subsequently to this one being considered. But the conclusion had been arrived at in our department that it was inadvisable to go to the expense of appointing commissions to inquire into charges of political partisanship preferred so long after the time. I am speaking now from a memorandum given to me with reference to the way other cases were treated. I say there may have been two or three cases that were dealt with after that time. But before that date it had been announced on more than one occasion, to more than one person, that we deemed it inadvisable to appoint commissions to go into cases that had transpired so long previously. Remember this was a year and eight months after the alleged partisanship was committed. When Dr. Ennis sent this statement he did not send it as a sworn declaration, but merely as a letter in which he preferred those charges. The Department of Customs took the view that if there had been anything seriously wrong it would have been brought to the notice of the department at an earlier date. Gaspé was a long way off, the commissions that had been sitting had entailed quite an expense, and it would have entailed a large expense to institute an investigation there. The answer that I gave in reference to this case was the same that I gave in other

cases in which charges were made by friends of the government against officials who were opposed to the party now in power, as having been active political partisans during that contest. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) blames me, not alone for having failed to investigate the charges, but for having promoted Mr. Lemieux in defiance of these charges, as I understood him to say, to a higher position in the customs service.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). The hon. gentleman has until now been referring to the charge of political partisanship only. Does he seriously express the view that this was the only charge made against him ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There was a charge that he had acted as scrutineer at the polls for his son, under this name, it was part of the political partisanship. He was not a deputy returning officer, he was an agent of his son, I suppose a scrutineer at the poll, but was not officially connected with the election.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That seems to be a point upon which we should have a definite statement. When an officer, or any person, assumes a false name, and acts under a false name as an agent, takes an oath under a false name, or, let us leave that out, when he enters a polling booth and assumes to be a person other than he is and takes part in that capacity, does the hon. Minister of Customs seriously say, that, in his opinion, it is simply an act of political partisanship on the part of the officer, and nothing more, supposing it to be proven ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not a legal agent, and I do not profess to go into that. All I can say is, it seemed to me that it was a very decided mark of acting on behalf of a candidate, and I mentioned the matter to gentlemen who are competent to judge. This matter was brought to the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and to the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills), as the hon. gentleman himself has said. If the hon. gentleman wants me to give him a legal opinion as to that question, I will leave the right hon. Prime Minister to speak in reference to that point.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has no opinion upon that himself.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The charge is that political partisanship was manifested by this gentleman, and it is alleged that this is proved by the part that he took in the contest. I was proceeding to say when the hon. gentleman interrupted me, that the hon. member for York, N.E., (Mr.

Foster) had stated that in defiance of this charge which was made, I had promoted him in the service, instead of dismissing him, as, I suppose, he would say he should have been dismissed. It is true that Mr. Lemieux was promoted. When I came into the service I found that it was desirable, in the interest of the revenue and in the interest of the service, that the inspector's branch should be strengthened. Two assistant inspectors were appointed for Ontario, and we had only one inspector in the province of Quebec. I appointed Mr. Lemieux as assistant inspector. He had previously been receiving \$1,000 a year in the Montreal customs-house. He was one of the very best officers there, and he had an experience of twenty-three years. I considered him one of the most thoroughly qualified officers in the customs-house at Montreal, and seeking to strengthen the inspectors branch, and not going outside of the department at all, I took this gentleman, who, from his long experience and from his ability, I had formed the opinion, would be a gentleman who would strengthen that branch of the service. That being the case, I appointed him as assistant inspector. I may mention to the hon. gentleman that this change was not made in defiance of the charge preferred against this gentleman at all. When I did that I had no word, not the slightest hint, that he had been a political partisan, or had taken part in any election or in anything connected with elections. There was nothing before me in that respect. It was a year and eight months after this occurrence before Dr. Ennis wrote his letter at all. The first information reached me through Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper from Dr. Ennis, on March 2, 1898, so that was the first intimation I had from Dr. Ennis in reference to this matter. Mr. Lemieux was promoted from his position of clerk in the customs-house at Montreal to the position of assistant inspector of customs for the province of Quebec on July 12, 1897. Hon. gentlemen opposite will see that, so far as there is any charge of negligence upon my part in reference to this matter, months and months had elapsed after the change had taken place before any charge against Mr. Lemieux was brought to my attention at all. Of course, it bore upon the face of it the case of a father interested in the success of a son, in a son's election. He engaged in active election work, according to the charges that were made, a course which is to be condemned, which was condemned by the hon. gentleman who spoke, and which is condemned from this side as well. I regret the circumstances very much, but I felt, after all, when the charge had gone so long, that Dr. Ennis himself, at a subsequent date, did not view it as a very serious matter when he wrote to the hon. Minister of Justice, because he says in the letter that :

Had it not been that so many officers were unjustly, to my mind, dismissed in Gaspé County at Mr. Rodolphe Lemieux, M.P.'s, suggestion, I

Mr. PATERSON.

would not have felt bound to press this charge further.

So that, he did not, himself, consider the case as a very strong one against Mr. Lemieux. But, he felt bound to press this, that this gentleman should be dealt with as others had been dealt with.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister had better sit down as soon as possible.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have given the statement of the case as it occurred. I have given the facts of the case. They are not contradicted; they will not be contradicted by hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Lemieux is in the service; he was promoted, not as the hon. gentleman suggests, in defiance of the charge, but months before this charge was brought before the notice of the government or of the department at all. All I can say is, that this matter seemed to me serious enough to mention to the Prime Minister. I mentioned the matter to him, and had his view and opinion in reference to it. That being the case, he was more competent to judge as to the feature that the gentleman insists upon than I was myself, and, therefore, it was that no investigation was entered upon. The facts are as I have stated them. It was a case of the father promoting the election, or engaging in the election of the son, and he was not an officer under this government at that time; he was an officer under hon. gentlemen opposite, and all I can say is, that if there is any partisanship displayed by any officers under the present government it is without any desire or without any consent from the head of the department. This took place in the election of 1896, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and as I said, Mr. Lemieux was not an official in the election at all. He was an officer, of course, of Her Majesty's customs, and as such he should not have taken a political part, and yet there were many who took an active part on the side of hon. gentlemen opposite and who have not been dismissed from the service. That I can say as far as the Department of Customs is concerned, and I believe it is true also of other departments of the public service.

Mr. CLANCY. I can tell the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) that there were many men who never took part in the election at all, and the minister dismissed them without even a shadow of a trial.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I owe it to an old and faithful employee of the government to present what I believe is a very fair defence. I owe it to him all the more, and I believe the defence will be accepted all the more readily from the fact, that Mr. Lemieux, whose conduct is impugned, is the father of a much respected member of this House. To my knowledge Mr. Lemieux has been an

employee of the government in the city of Montreal for nearly forty years. Mr. Lemieux has been residing in the city of Montreal discharging his duty as a customs officer, and I believe every citizen of Montreal will bear witness that in that city Mr. Lemieux never was charged with any political partisanship, never was an offensive partisan and never took any part in an election. If Mr. Lemieux had been charged with having taken an undue part in the election in the city of Montreal, he would certainly come within the definition which we understand by the term offensive partisan. Both sides of the House will agree that officers of the government should not take part in politics. There is something repugnant to fair-play when we see an officer of the government paid with public money, using his position amongst his friends and neighbours, where his connection may give him influence, for the purpose of favouring one political party. If Mr. Lemieux was charged with taking part in an election in the city of Montreal where he was discharging his duties and where his position might have given him influence, the charge would have been different from what it is. Mr. Lemieux is not charged with having taken any political action in Montreal, but in an election in the county of Gaspé, some 600 miles from that city, and where he was unknown. He is even charged with acting there under an assumed name. Mr. Lemieux, in the summer of 1896, took his holidays as he had a right to, and he went to the Magdalen Islands, and because his son was a candidate he would not take his own name. Mr. Lemieux is charged with having personated somebody, but Mr. Lemieux personated no one.

Mr. FOSTER. Why?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know why, but he did not personate anybody.

Mr. FOSTER. How?

The PRIME MINISTER. Because he did not take anybody's name.

Mr. FOSTER. He did not?

The PRIME MINISTER. He did not.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. No. Personating is taking the name of another party with a view of exercising the rights of another party, but Mr. Lemieux did not personate anybody pretending to be a voter. He did not attempt to take the name of any one who was a voter in the county of Gaspé, or to personate anybody according to what we understand by personation. He was under an assumed name as though he was travelling incognito; just as we know the Prince of Wales travels sometimes incognito.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, and Mr. Lemieux in doing that was not committing any breach of law, nor committing any offence I venture to say. Judging from the persistency with which Dr. Ennis and some other gentlemen friends of Dr. Ennis's, pursued Mr. Lemieux in this matter, if Mr. Lemieux had committed any offence against the law, they would probably have brought him before the courts of the country. No one so far has undertaken to bring Mr. Lemieux before the courts, and if the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is true, and if the view he takes be correct, Mr. Lemieux would have committed an offence against the law. I venture to say that Mr. Lemieux has violated no law. He may have committed an indiscreet act; he may have committed an act which perhaps was far from wise, but no one will pretend that he has violated any law, and if he did, I dare say he would have been prosecuted before now. I admit frankly that Mr. Lemieux was indiscreet and that he did an unwise thing. What Dr. Ennis charges against Mr. Lemieux is that he went to the county of Gaspé under the assumed name of Lamirande and there took part in the election. If Mr. Lemieux went to the county of Gaspé and perhaps imprudently, perhaps exasperated, or perhaps simply from the very natural feeling to see a gentleman in whom he was much interested, win; if he forgot himself and went too far, and then took an active part in the election, I dare say there is not a man in this House who will not admit that if the action was indiscreet it is an action which at all events we can look upon with some feeling of leniency. Remembering the feeling which prompted him, remembering the cause in which he was engaged, I dare say that if Mr. Lemieux had been a wise man he would not have gone so near the fire; he would not have gone to the Magdalen Islands where he must have known a contest was going on. I do not presume he went there with any intention of taking part in the elections, but he was no doubt attracted by the contest, gradually taking one step after another, until finally he represented his son at the polls. Mr. Lemieux, when he did that committed a very indiscreet action to say the least of it, but he certainly committed no crime. I will go to the extent of admitting the charge against Mr. Lemieux, that he went into the county of Gaspé and represented his son at the poll, acting as scrutineer for him in the name of Lamirande. For my part, I accept the statement of Dr. Ennis as correct. Would it have been wise or proper to have had an investigation into the matter? Suppose an investigation had proved every statement made by Dr. Ennis, it would have proved that he had done a thing that was wrong, a thing which I cannot encourage and which I would not defend, but which after all was not a violation of the law.

Mr. DAVIN. Is the right hon. gentleman aware that Mr. Chapleau, Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, wrote a letter in which he stated that Mr. Lemieux as H. A. Lamirande, took an oath as the representative of one of the candidates on June 23, 1896? If he took an oath under an assumed name, it was a very serious offence.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Chapleau does not say anything of the kind. Mr. Chapleau simply says that one H. A. Lamirande appeared as scrutineer.

Mr. DAVIN. No, that is not what he says. I will read his letter.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order. I can read the letter just as well as the hon. gentleman, and this is what Mr. Chapleau says:

A. Beaudry, Esq., Percé, Que.

Sir,—In answer to your letter of the 9th instant, I must say that H. A. Lamirande appears to have taken his oath as the representative of one of the candidates at the election of June 23, 1896, at polling booth No. 41.

If the inference to be drawn from this interruption of my hon. friend is that Mr. Lemieux took a false oath, I have only to refer my hon. friend to the oath which is taken by a scrutineer. It simply is that he will act as scrutineer, and discharge the duties faithfully. What I said a moment ago, I have only to repeat, that if Mr. Lemieux in doing what he did, violated any law, he is amenable to the law. In my estimation he violated no law. But let us assume that all the charges made in the statement of Dr. Ennis are true; let us assume that Mr. Lemieux represented his son at the poll, as scrutineer, and that he took the oath, you have the fact, as I have said, that Mr. Lemieux acted in a very indiscreet manner, in a manner which I admit cannot be defended, but which, after all, is not to be looked upon except with some degree of leniency.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman may say no, but I say yes. I say that when a charge of this kind is brought against a man, who has been all his life an honourable officer, who has discharged the duties of his office in a worthy manner, who has been an honourable and respectable citizen up to that time, for nearly forty years, but who has been carried away by the feeling of affection which every father has in his heart for his son—carried away to the extent of being imprudent—if under the circumstances he has committed an imprudent and indiscreet action, I say, for my part, it is something which ought to be viewed with some leniency. After all, we are all human; and there is not a man in this House, especially if he has children—I am not of those—who does not feel some sentiment of sympathy for a father who, at a moment when he thought the fate of his

son, in whom he took a legitimate pride, depended upon his going to the poll, in order to see that justice should be done to him, acted as Mr. Lemieux did. Under the circumstances, I say that, for my part, I view an offence of that kind with some leniency. If Mr. Lemieux had been an offensive partisan, going about the country, exerting his authority, and trying to use his position to influence votes, that would have been a very different matter; but Mr. Lemieux was not of that character. He was not a man to make himself offensive to his fellow-men, or to abuse his position or his authority. But finding his son in a contest, fearing he might lose the election, and thinking that he could help him, he was carried beyond the limits of prudence, and did a thing which certainly cannot be defended in itself, but which, after all, was not a very great offence—a thing which, I, for my part, feel inclined to forgive, and which I hope the House also will forgive. That is all I have to say for Mr. Lemieux. I am not here to defend his action. He was indiscreet, he was unwise, but he was a father, and I think for that reason, that his offence can be overlooked.

Mr. WM. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), is also to be sympathized with to-day. All afternoon he has been excluded from the Chamber, for fear something might come out in regard to the importation of certain goods in the matter under discussion, as to which, if they had not been imported, he would have so stated. But this evening he is in the House under circumstances of not very great pleasure to himself. However, he was judicious in this, that he at once divested himself of all responsibility in the matter, and thrust it on the Premier.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). If the hon. gentleman said that I was kept out of the Chamber to-day because of something that transpired, he said what was absolutely incorrect.

Mr. BENNETT. I say that the company of the Minister of Customs this afternoon would have been most desirable, at least to this side of the House, because, I am sure he would have been plied with a great many questions in reference to the matter then under discussion. The minister has done very well this evening, because he has divested himself of all responsibility in this matter, and washed his hands of it. It is true, he tried to excuse himself on the ground that under the procedure in his department, he never took upon himself the responsibility of decapitating any customs officers, especially if any time elapsed between the making of the charge and the action. The minister's memory is very much at fault. Does he remember a case that happened at Parry Sound, when nearly a year and a half after the election of 1896,

a charge was preferred against the collector at that port? Does he remember the case of Mr. Hogg, that occurred in Collingwood shortly after the election? And does he consider the circumstances under which these cases were conducted? He sent a legal gentleman, a supporter of his own, who held a star chamber investigation on the cases, and this fair-minded Minister of Customs, who poses as the embodiment of fairness, after he had decapitated these two officials, absolutely refused to show the report under which Mr. Galna had been dismissed from office; and to this day, Mr. Galna has been unable to get the report, although he was led to believe by the commissioner when he left that there was nothing in the case. The Minister of Customs went further than that. In that case, he not only used the evidence of persons in the riding, but the evidence of Mr. Pedley, one of the officers in the Immigration Department in Ottawa. That had to be brought in to bring about the dismissal of that official; and that gentleman, who was dismissed, has been refused by the Minister of Customs even the report on the finding of the commissioner. The Minister of Customs has sought to excuse himself for the course he has taken in this case on the plea that the offence was not complained of in good time. Does the hon. gentleman stand here to argue that if a crime is found out a considerable length of time after it was committed, it must go unpunished? That is a most startling proposition. But when he found he had floundered in that, he said he was only a layman. I hope for the sake of all honest laymen—

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not say, and never did, that it was a crime for any person to be guilty of political partisanship.

Mr. BENNETT. It certainly is to be hoped that men shall be punished when their crime or wrong-doing is exposed. The Minister of Customs, then, as I said, turned the matter entirely over to the Prime Minister to make the best of what apparently is a bad case. But the people will not lose sight of the fact that the Minister of Customs has the two sets of political morality. He lays down the principle that in Ontario, after a prosecution—because it was a prosecution in the case of Mr. Galna, and not an investigation—he will dismiss the official; but, in the province of Quebec, where political interest has to be consulted, all other interests will be set aside and he will be guided by the advice of the Prime Minister, as he frankly said.

Now, coming to what the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said, he pleaded that it was natural for the father to take an interest in his son's election. Everybody, I think, would have been ready on that ground to excuse Mr. Lemieux, so far as one charge is concerned. But the most serious aspect

of the case is the part he played in this contest. Now, as charged by Dr. Ennis, Mr. Lemieux was acting as scrutineer under the name of Lamirande, and his oath as the candidate's representative was taken under this false name. Of course, I do not know the particulars of this contest, but I understand that there was a man of that name who voted in that constituency.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, there was no one.

Mr. BENNETT. I have not before me a list of the electors of Gaspé; but, why should Mr. Lemieux have taken that name unless there was an elector of that name, because he would not be entitled to be an agent of the candidate unless he was an elector? Was Lamirande the name of a deceased man or of some man who lived in a distant part of the riding? The serious part of the case is that this gentlemen represented himself as Lamirande, and, according to the form of vote, he practically swore that that was his name. And yet it is laid down, practically, that the end justifies the means. The contention put forward by the government, if it were accepted, would be an evidence that political morality must be at a low ebb indeed. Now, what did the minister of Customs do? He knew, at the time of the promotion and increase of salary that was given to Mr. Lemieux, that this offence had been charged.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. BENNETT. No, I am wrong in that. But the Minister of Customs is in worse position than ever. This promotion was made on the 12th July, 1897, and the complaint does not come in until February, 1898. The minister knew that he had made the promotion and advancement of this officer against whom these charges were made. Was that not the time to investigate the case, and, if the charges were found to be true, to revoke what had been done in the way of advancing this official? Does the Minister of Customs lay it down as one of the working rules of the department, according to the Prime Minister's rule, that if he finds a collector of customs who for years has been a good, faithful servant, but afterwards finds him derelict, his failing is to be condoned, because, for years he was a good man? Men do not grow bad all at once. There must be a starting point in every case. But the Minister of Customs has been heard, and he washes his hands of the whole matter by saying that he would not have done what he did but for the Prime Minister.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I did not say that.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. minister (Mr. Paterson) will refer to-morrow to *Hansard*, and I think he will find that in the closing

part of his remarks, he made the statement that the Prime Minister was consulted with, and, at his advice, the matter stood where it was.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, I said that.

Mr. BENNETT. On that statement of facts, I think the Minister of Customs should have our sympathy, for by that he virtually admits that he is not strong enough to manage his department, that when a serious case like this arises he endeavours to divest himself of all authority and hand it over to the leader of the government. But, the offence is all the worse coming from the higher place. People will wonder now how we are to reconcile the Premier's words of to-night with the statement he made some three or four sessions ago, that when the government found any official who desired to participate in political contests they would let him indulge his wishes to his heart's content and would deprive him of his office. Here is an official who took part in an election and who, in doing so, committed an offence which, if it is held up to be commended, must argue a low state of morality in the whole country.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). I do not wish the House to assume from anything that I am about to say that I am one of those who are ready to condone the participation of public officials in elections. I hold strong views on that subject, all the stronger because I have had in my experience, an opportunity of seeing a good deal of that kind of thing. It seems to me that in this case Mr. Lemieux acted with considerable indiscretion; but I think it is a case upon which the House ought to look with leniency for the reasons given by the Prime Minister. The tie between father and son, I think, constitutes a reason for leniency in this case, but the long term of faithful public service of Mr. Lemieux entitles him especially to lenient consideration. I rose particularly in reply to my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). He stated that though a man has been in the service for a very long time, say thirty or forty years, the fact that he has been for so long a faithful servant constitutes no ground for leniency in case he should offend. I entirely disagree with him in that respect. I assert, and I think that the House will agree with me, that a civil servant who has faithfully performed his duty to the country for thirty or thirty-five years, and who, toward the end of his career commits what everybody must say, as in this case, was an indiscretion, he is entitled to some leniency. I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if a great number of civil servants in the city of Ottawa had been refused the leniency which hon. gentlemen are not willing to extend to Mr. Lemieux, many of

those civil servants in this city would have been dismissed for partisanship. I have seen, in election after election, civil servants take the most prominent and offensive part in this very city. Yet they are in their places to-day, and so far as I am concerned, and so far as my colleague (Mr. Hutchinson) is concerned, they shall remain. I think I can say with positive assurance that I know of only one civil servant in Ottawa who has been dismissed for partisanship; yet I could name dozens, possibly hundreds of civil servants who would have been richly entitled to dismissal had they been treated with as much severity as hon. gentlemen opposite wish to extend to Mr. Lemieux. I agree that it was an indiscretion on the part of Mr. Lemieux to do as he has done, but I cannot see that he committed any criminal offence. The name he used does not appear to have been the name of anybody else, it is not so charged; and if Mr. Lemieux took any fancy name, or any name that did not belong to anybody else, that is certainly not personation, it is not perjury. The charge is not that he did anything else but represent his son at the polls. It seems to me that this is certainly a case calling for leniency, and that in view of the fact that Mr. Lemieux has served his country faithfully for thirty-five years, it would be a harsh thing to turn him out upon the streets for the indiscretion committed under these circumstances.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). This case seems to be very much graver than it has been presented, either from the ministerial benches or from this side. I think, to hear the speeches which we have heard here to-night from two ministers of the Crown, and one of them a Prime Minister, is one of the most painful things that could occur in the history of a great British colony. Let me say at once that I do not think it was fair, in either the Minister of Customs, or the Prime Minister, or the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Belcourt), to appeal to us as brother members of the member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). I do not think it is fair, because it introduces an element into the discussion of this question that should not be introduced; and it was not fair because it does not lie with hon. gentlemen on these benches to make an appeal of that sort. For what have we seen in this House? We have seen hon. gentlemen—because we must call them hon. gentlemen—rise up in their places and without a shadow of foundation traduce the names of men against whose fair fame it was impossible to raise a blot; and the Prime Minister of Canada, who poses as such a perfect gentleman in these matters, sat there and gave it the sanction of his silence, or smiled the approval of semi-cowardice on the lie. Sir, it did not rest with those gentlemen to make that appeal.

Mr. BENNETT.

Now, let me state what occurred. A gentleman in the employ of this government goes down to Gaspé in 1896, he enters a polling booth, and he acts there as the agent of a candidate. Let me say en passant that he could not act as the agent of that candidate without having a power of attorney from him, and a power of attorney in the name under which he takes the oath and swears that that undersigned name is his name. We have then an hon. gentleman who stands high in all the churches, and who at one time expounded from a more elevated desk than that at which he now sits, who tells us that it was a small fault, it was a little thing; and he says that even if it was a serious thing and he condoned it, he was not his own master, the Prime Minister was the keeper of his conscience. The Prime Minister the keeper of his conscience! What a precious keeper of his conscience, and what a precious spiritual adviser that Prime Minister is; the right hon. gentleman, who is now known not merely in Canada but throughout the length and breadth from moral colour blindness, who does not see the distinction between right and wrong, in any case where politics are concerned. We saw the spectacle of the Prime Minister pleading like an advocate for a criminal in the dock, and telling us: I have no defence, but look at the relatives. We know what happens when an experienced advocate wants to plead for a criminal for whom there is no defence; he brings in the mother, or the wife, or the children, and he turns away the minds of the jury and the mind of the judge from the criminal and says: Look at these dear children, look at that dear wife, look at that happy household that will be left desolate if you convict this man. Fancy an appeal like that coming from the leader of a great party, a man who is at the head of this country at this moment, the keeper of its honour. I am not surprised, because we have had now for four years such recurring exhibitions of what I call moral colour blindness on the part of the right hon. gentleman that we need not be surprised at anything. But there is this consolation. Did any man ever see such a picture of a defeated and moribund government as was manifested by the Minister of Customs and subsequently by the Prime Minister? I said some years ago that the colour of death was in the face of that government. It is now in an acute moribund condition; and there is point in what an old Irish lady said a few days ago in the corridor of this building when we saw the portrait of the Prime Minister hung up on the wall with lights burning above. The daughter of the old lady said: 'Come and see Sir Wilfrid Laurier.' 'No, I won't go there' says the old lady, 'surely it is his political wake.' But, Sir, the colours on the face of the occupants of the Treasury benches here to-night are no less suggestive

of a political wake than these lights above the portrait, which suggested the burning candles that are in certain parts incidental to a sad departure.

Now, Sir, we must not be governed by mere sentiments, we must not be too much impressed by the fact that a brilliant man who happens to be a member of this House, is related to this wrong-doer. What was the plea made for him by the Minister of Customs? He said: After such a length of time, our hearts are so delicate that we could not think of punishing him for anything that was done in 1896. About a year and eight months had elapsed and how could my sensitive heart punish him? Why, Sir, this government has done something equally atrocious. Let me give an illustration. A month or so ago I brought up here the case of a dismissal at the bidding of one of the colleagues of the hon. gentleman who has been galavanting on the banks of the Danube, and who is now coming home with the Minister of Public Works. It is a curious thing, Sir, to observe the special charge that providence takes of things connected with this government. Providence and physicians arrange that two gentleman shall get ill when it is most convenient that their places should be vacant in this House, and get well when they can return with safety, and the session is near its end, and there is no danger of parliamentary warrants. Now, they are spreading their wings across the Atlantic, and are about to reappear. At the bidding of one of these gentlemen, Mr. Gass, of Moosejaw, was dismissed a couple of months ago, four years after he was said to have been guilty of offensive partisanship. And the colleague of the Minister of Customs, the Postmaster General, with that kind of Ursa Major oleaginousness that characterizes him when he means to be peculiarly effective, declared that Mr. Gass was dismissed for offensive partisanship committed four years previously. But, a year and eight months after was too long time when the conduct of a man had to be taken in account who had been guilty of wrongdoing in their favour.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was Gass's offence?

Mr. DAVIN. Gass's offence was, or the allegation was, that he had attended a political meeting, and that he was supposed—it was about that—to sympathize with me. Mr. Speaker, I think when we have two ministers of the Crown, especially the right hon. Prime Minister, getting up here and declaring that this is a small thing, perjury and personation, we have a right to be astonished. The Prime Minister seems to think that if Lamirande was a fictitious name it would not be personation. Let me give the meaning of personation:

Personate: to assume the character of; to represent by a fictitious appearance.

Thus, it is personation, even if you assume a fictitious name. But, whether that gentleman assumed a fictitious name or whether he represented a defunct elector, or an absent elector named Lamirande, it is a trifle compared with the character of the act that he went there with authority from the candidate to commit when he took the oath under that name. It does not matter whether there was another man by the name of Lamirande or not. You have a criminal act, and we have the spectacle of the Prime Minister of Canada standing up and saying that this is only a venial thing that should be treated with leniency, and that we should not be too hard, that our feeling towards a colleague should make us look the thing over. How are we to know that in other matters he will have more moral backbone? In fact, we know that he has not got it. There is no moral backbone there. The right hon. gentleman, so quickly has this fatal weakness grown upon him, does not feel that reprobation when wicked things are done by his colleagues that he once professed, and now the misconduct of his colleagues has risen so high that it is overwhelming him and his government. The hon. Minister of Public Works had hardly got into office when he showed what he was, and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was not warm in his place when he showed what he was. I have recently, from this desk, shown how he has behaved. If, at the beginning, the Prime Minister had adopted the maxim 'obsta principiis' we should not have had the spectacle that we see, of a government that four years ago were so unbrageous in their boundless confidence, believing that they would be in power for twenty years, and crowing violently in their confident anticipation of long-lasting power, like cockerels in the early dawn, and now they are like seventeen roosters in a shower, heads down and tails half-mast.

**Mr. JOSEPH A. GILLIES (Richmond).** Mr. Speaker, it must certainly have been refreshing to hon. members of this House to hear the tones of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), at such a late hour at night, more particularly, after having been in cold storage this afternoon, carefully keeping himself aloof from the debate that took place here, a debate in which he would have been called upon to give information to this House.

**The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS.** I must deny that statement of the hon. gentleman.

**Mr. GILLIES.** Then, I understand that the hon. gentleman was not in cold storage. I am very glad to hear it. The hon. minister, at all events, will not deny that when a matter was up this afternoon of very considerable importance, and that when the motion was pending before the House for several hours, preferred by the hon. mem-

ber for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) against one of his colleagues, charging that colleague with grave negligence, and with having received goods of a certain spurious character, which were entered free of duty in this country by the order of his department, he was conveniently absent. The hon. minister will remember that in one particular paragraph in the charges framed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier there was this one specifically set forth. Charge 17 is as follows:—

The substance brought in from the United States, as above stated, in Saratoga trunks, was detained by the customs officers for duty thereon, but under direction of the government it was allowed to pass without payment of customs dues.

The hon. minister knew that the debate was coming on this afternoon, and he religiously kept himself out of the House, knowing that questions would be put to him, and that information would be expected from him upon this point. But, we find him coming in at this late hour and showing a phase of political morality that I find difficult to reconcile with what I am told has been his past conduct as a local preacher in the district in which he lives. I do hope that the hon. gentleman, in the constituency that he represents, and in the particular territory in which he is supposed to be a powerful evangelist, will strictly avoid laying down as true doctrine the code upon political morality that he laid down here this evening. As far as I was able to gather his argument, it resolves itself into this: That the charge made by Dr. Ennis could not be entertained for two reasons: first, because Gaspé was far away and it would cost a good deal to have an investigation, and, secondly, because the charge was not made until after the expiry of eighteen months from the time that the deed was committed. I have yet to learn that there is any statute of limitation operating against the punishment of a crime. Mr. Lemieux was charged substantially by Dr. Ennis with having adopted the name of Mr. Lamirande while representing his son in the Magdalen Islands in the election held on June 23, 1896. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) must have known, and the hon. Minister of Customs must have known, that before Lemieux could be the agent or representative of the candidate in the poll, he had to have the written authority of the candidate appointing him, and he could not be sworn in as the agent or representative of that candidate until he had filed that authority with the deputy returning officer. If these charges are true—and we must assume they are, because there is nothing to contradict them in the slightest degree—then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) who represents Gaspé drew up the document appointing his father under an assumed name, or else the father took the name of his own accord and put in a false authority

**Mr. DAVIN.**

purporting to be signed by his son. There is no escape from one or either of these positions. That is a very serious offence in itself, and when we consider that the oath had to be taken by that man that his name was Lamirande, it becomes more serious, and then that man by that very fact was guilty of perjury. The very moment that was brought to the notice of the Minister of Customs it was his bounden duty to have investigated the charge. But the minister tells us that Gaspé was far away, and that it would be very expensive to hold an investigation. Well, Sir, I wish that distance had been a barrier to the rapacity of the Minister of Customs in that regard. I will call to his mind a case in my own county, the case of Mr. Rémi Benoit, collector of customs at the port of Arichat. A gentleman who for twenty years filled acceptably the position of collector of customs at the port of Arichat. A charge of partisanship was laid against that gentleman in 1897, not for any partisanship practised by him in the election of 1896, but for partisanship in the elections of 1891, and in the by-elections of 1892. And, Mr. Speaker, will it be believed, that upon charges preferred as having occurred in these two elections, Mr. Rémi Benoit's conduct was investigated by an officer sent by the Minister of Customs from here to Gaspé, some 600 miles further away than Arichat, and Mr. Benoit was dismissed from office, and himself and his helpless family thrown on the world, and poor Mr. Benoit had to leave the country.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GILLIES. No, I am not mistaken; I know all about it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am speaking with reference to the year. I think there must have been charges with reference to the election of 1896.

Mr. GILLIES. There were no charges in 1896, and none in reference to that year were investigated, and if you look at the report of your officer you will find that the charges were for alleged partisanship committed in 1891 and 1892. That case will show how unsubstantial are the reasons given by the minister for not having investigated the charges against Lemieux. Arichat is 600 miles further away than Gaspé, so distance in that case was not a barrier to my friend Mr. Benoit being dismissed from office. In the Lemieux case eighteen months elapsed before it came to the notice of the minister what Lemieux had done, and the minister tells us that the time which had elapsed was so long that it prevented an investigation, but in the case of Mr. Benoit, six years had elapsed and Mr. Benoit was dismissed.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken in that.

Mr. GILLIES. No, sir.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, I think so.

Mr. GILLIES. I am perfectly correct and the minister knows it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. My recollection of it is, and I speak subject to correction, that the gentleman himself admitted partisanship in 1896. I will not be positive, but I will look it up.

Mr. GILLIES. The minister's memory is at fault. I will modify the statement that I made that he knows it, and I will say that if he does not know it he ought to know it. The fact is that Mr. Benoit was dismissed for partisanship acknowledged by him to be committed in 1891 and 1892, six years before the investigation took place, but that remote time was no barrier to his dismissal, whereas in the Lemieux case eighteen months was a barrier to investigation. I was sorry to hear the statement and the manner of defence of the Prime Minister to-night. Since I came to this parliament I made it a point to look upon a Prime Minister as a gentleman who should guide this House in every way and more particularly in inculcating ideas of political morality. I cannot for the life of me understand his defence of the conduct of Lemieux. He stated in effect, that Lemieux had a son whom he loved very much running an election in Gaspé, and that Lemieux was justified in changing his name and swearing that his name was Lamirande. I regret to find that the Prime Minister should have adopted such a role. It is indefensible. Now, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that this House cannot in any way condone the offence committed by that man Lemieux. To do so would be to countenance rascality of the worst kind. To do so would be to connive at the act of every rascal who would go to a poll and assume the name of any person and swear to it. To do so would be for us to go a step further than the machine which we are trying to suppress in the province of Ontario. We are all, I hope, anxious to put down corruption in its ugliest forms, and we have been this session endeavouring to pass a law that will suppress to some extent the frauds which have prevailed in elections in some parts of the Dominion, and would it not, therefore, be inconsistent for us to condone the offence of Lemieux and to endorse the action of the government in that regard? Now, Mr. Speaker, we would record our abhorrence of corruption in its most dangerous form, and trusting that I express the views of the House in that regard, I beg to submit the following motion, seconded by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper:

That all the words after the word 'That' be left out, and the following added instead thereof:—'on the 16th day of February, 1898, Dr. Ennis, of Grand River, Gaspé County, Quebec, by

letter addressed to the Minister of Customs, made the following charges against Mr. H. A. Lemieux, then an employee and now an officer of Her Majesty's Customs, to wit :

I hereby solemnly charge Mr. H. A. Lemieux, formerly an employee of the Montreal customs office, and now assistant inspector of customs, under Mr. O'Meara, of Quebec, with having taken an active part in the electoral campaign of 1896 ;

I further declare specifically that the said Mr. H. A. Lemieux spent a part of the month of June, 1896, in Magdalen Islands, canvassing and working in the interests of his son, now member of the House of Commons for Gaspé County ;

I further declare that the above mentioned Mr. H. A. Lemieux, represented Mr. Rodolph Lemieux, M.P., at polling station No. 41, Basin, on Magdalen Islands, as the sworn representative or agent of his son, then a candidate for election to parliament, on the 23rd June, 1896 ;

I further declare again that during his stay on the islands aforesaid, Mr. H. A. Lemieux made himself known and acted under the assumed name of H. A. Lamirande or de Lamirande, and that his oath as representative at the poll was taken under this false name and subscribed to by this false appellation ;

I hereby further state that Mr. H. A. Lemieux has, since committing this offence against the spirit of the Civil Service Law, been promoted in the service, whilst other officials—guilty in a much lighter degree—have been punished and dismissed for 'political partisanship.'

Mr. Ennis in said letter declared that he was ready to produce sworn testimony to prove his charges, and then and thereafter repeatedly asked that an opportunity be granted him to substantiate the same.

That on various pretexts the Minister of Customs delayed decision until on August 9, 1898, he refused an investigation, alleging as his reason the great lapse of time between the alleged partisan's acts were said to have been committed and the time when the charges were preferred.

That so far from investigating the charges and punishing the wrong-doer, the Minister has continued the above mentioned H. A. Lemieux to be an Assistant Inspector of Customs, and has materially increased his salary.

That such action on the part of the Government tends to degrade the public service, and demoralize and corrupt the administration of public affairs.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker. I am not going to take up any length of time in further discussion of the matter. There is just one point that I want to emphasize. The position of the Minister of Customs, which was a painful one, and the position taken by the Prime Minister, which for Canada was a most humiliating one, have been most admirably set forth by my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). No language that I could use could more effectually, more truly, or more picturesquely portray the situation, and I will not attempt by any words of mine to add to the gravity of the situation as shown by him. But there is one point I want to emphasize—the lesson that this government has to-night taught to the public of Canada, the lesson that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Customs have taught to the civil service of this country. I am sorry that they have taught it. No more de-

Mr. GILLIES.

grading, no more demoralizing position could have been taken by these two gentlemen considering the public service, and the honesty that it should form the basis of that service than these gentlemen have taken to-night. I am speaking earnestly ; I am speaking what I believe. And I cannot see how any honest man can stand up for that action. We are not simply doing our own private business here ; we are not simply employing a gardner, each one for his own private work. We are dealing with the public service of this country ; we are dealing with a service at the base of which perfect honesty must be required, whether perfect honesty can always be entirely and absolutely secured or not. And when a minister loses sight of the gravity of the question as concerning the public service of this country and makes his little childish plea that the father for his son, committed an indiscretion—I tell you again, Mr. Speaker, that it is not only wrong, but it is humiliating that it should be spoken by the Prime Minister of a country like this. I want to tell the Minister of Customs ; I tell it to him honestly ; I tell him because I believe it—that I have no confidence from this time forward in his administration of the Customs Department of this country. He has delivered himself, his conscience, his sense of right—all that should be the defence of the chief of a department for the honour of his service, into the hands of a subservient Prime Minister. Subservient to what ? A Prime Minister subservient to the call of sentiment, subservient to the feeling of party friendship, subservient to a sentiment (laudable enough in itself) which a man may have for his friends, but forgetful of the fact that he is the head of a government, and that his words teach a lesson to the public of this country, and to the civil servants of this country. Now, if the Minister of Customs can justify his retention of a man who is absolutely, in essence, a perjurer and a personator, in an office of responsibility, he can take that ground—he can go to the people with it—he can go to his conscience with it ; but I hold that no more harmful stroke could be administered to the integrity and health of the civil service of this country than that which the hon. gentleman has administered to-night. There may be other cases. If a man can do these things for his son, he can do them for another—he can do them for a friend. If a man will certify that his name is so and so when it is not, will go into a polling booth and make that declaration, and, at the end of it say 'So help me God.' and does it because he does not want it to be known who he really is—when a man will do that, he is not a man who ought to be a trusted officer of the Department of Customs. And the minister who can stand up in the face of to-day and can laugh and make light of that action in one of his officials ought not to be trusted at the head

of a department like the Department of Customs of this country.

Sir, some will say this is harsh, and will say I am speaking as if I had no faults. I am not. Whether I have faults or not, whether the Minister of Customs has faults or not, we are dealing with the public service of this country, and we must act as judges, we must hew to the line. Now, what are the members who sit in this House on both sides of this House, going to do in the utterance of their opinion on this vote? Are they going to say to their electors and the people of this country: There is no such thing as honour required, no such thing as truth required in the public service; provided you have a twinge of sentiment, provided there is party advantage to be gained, you can play fast and loose with anything like honourable straightforwardness in official life in this country. If a man will do that to forward the interest of a friend, may he not do the same for his own more selfish interest, may he not do it in the execution of other duties which do not require him to use a false name, and make a false oath? Yet, this is the man who is kept in high position; this is the man who, the Minister of Customs says has committed only a venial indiscretion. And to every man in the employ of the government, from one end of Canada to the other, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Customs has read this lesson; go on, be corrupt; if only you can get on the warm side of the minister's heart, you will not be punished. Now, that is the simple fact. And what petty poor pleading was made by the Minister of Customs! He did not think it was right to punish a man because a year and three months had passed after the commission of the crime before it was brought to his attention. The hypocrisy of such a plea as that by a government that every day within the last year have been dismissing men from the service for partisan actions committed or partisans leanings shown in the election of 1896. The utter, disgusting hypocrisy! Aye, and worse the morality of it! Here is a question which has to be settled by each individual conscience for himself—are the members on either side of this House going to subscribe to that kind of civil service morality? If they are, let them vote one way; if they are not, let them vote the other. For my part, I think it is a crisis in the history of the public service of this country, and that this vote will have a far-reaching effect.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have just one word to say. It is most refreshing to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) preaching virtue and morality. The hon. gentleman, at last, has found his congenial role, that of the great apostle of morality—at least in words.

Mr. FOSTER. What does my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) mean?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, what does my hon. friend mean? He has made an imputation against me, and I propose now to fight it out in this House with him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. His imputation is that I am immoral. Let him say it, if he dare. Let him be a man and not a coward. Let him make his statement and not a base insinuation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I am in earnest, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. So am I, and I ask the hon. member to respect the rules of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman tells us that he is in earnest, and we must accept his statement, as otherwise nobody would believe it. Well, I give him credit for being in earnest. He poses as an apostle of morality. Let us go back to no more than two or three years ago, when we took the position in this House that political partisanship should not be tolerated in civil servants, the hon. gentleman was the first to find fault with us. It was not to be tolerated, he said, that a man should be prosecuted for his political actions. But, the hon. gentleman poses as the apostle of morality to-day, he chides us at this time, and denounces us because, forsooth, we have not dismissed a political partisan. After having laid down the principle that we should not make dismissals for political partisanship, that we should grant absolute immunity to civil servants for their political acts, the hon. gentleman tells us that we should in every case dismiss a man for political partisanship, that there should be no exception, that the arm of the law should fall without any remission of the penalty. Now, the position which I take in this matter is this: Mr. Lemieux has been guilty of an indiscretion, let us say that he has been guilty of an offence. Let us say that he has been guilty of an act, which I am not here to defend, which on the contrary, I deplore as much as this apostle of virtue deplores it—perhaps not quite as much, because I cannot claim that superior virtue which the hon. gentleman claims; but I deplore it to the extent of my limited virtue. If Mr. Lemieux committed an offence, we thought that the circumstances were such that we could forgive him, because he had been an honest man all his life, because he is an honest man still, as I am not aware that a single reproach has ever been made against him, either in his private or official capacity. And if a man has committed an offence prompted by the feelings of a father, may we not condone it? Well, if we have ourselves been guilty

of a crime in this instance, I for my part am willing to take the consequences. If, under the circumstances, instead of acting with the utmost rigour, instead of having bowels of compassion, we were to forget that, perhaps, a father may be tempted and prompted to do things which another man would not do, the hon. gentleman says that is an offence against morality, and he poses as a virtuous man. Well, Sir, I have nothing more to say. I am quite willing that this case should be laid before the people. I believe that the people have bowels of compassion. I believe that they will make some distinction between offences. The hon. gentleman says: Oh, you have no guarantee that this man who committed an offence on behalf of his son, would not commit it on behalf of a friend. What logic that is. A man does for a son something which may be reprehensible, and, therefore, he may do the same thing for another man. That is the logic of the virtuous man that we have before us. I say that this offence of Mr. Lemieux on behalf of his son is the only black mark there is against him, and for my part, at all events, I do not think that act should weigh against the whole conduct of a lifetime.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The resolution that is in your hands, recites that subsequently to this act of partisanship on the part of Mr. Lemieux, he had been promoted in the service. The hon. member heard the explanation, he has the documents before him, he knew the facts to be that that promotion was given to Mr. Lemieux months and months before the department had the first intimation that he was to be charged with anything of that kind. The hon. gentleman suppresses that fact. The hon. gentleman also sought to be offensive, he alluded to my religious views, to the positions that he said I took in church.

Mr. GILLIES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me one word. I ask the hon. gentleman, as a good and religious man, which I believe him to be, to reconcile his conduct in this case with the doctrine of political morality he has laid before the House today.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In the matter of religious views, I think the members of the House ought to recognize the right of any individual to hold such views as he conceives to be correct; and while I am cognizant of my own faults and shortcomings, and profess to be no better than any one else, I do not claim to be in the position of a local preacher as the hon. gentleman said. I do not claim to be impeccable. If I do speak in the religious body to which I belong, on occasions, to those who are connected with the same body, that is something, I think, which is not to be brought up in discussion in the halls of parliament. It is a small body to which I be-

long. We have our views, and they may differ in some respects from views held by others, but every one in that body holds that the utmost charity should be exercised towards every one. I recognize the rights of every man to follow his conscience in matters religious, without being dragged before the public or before parliament. If these hon. gentlemen think that in this matter I have done anything to bring discredit upon the profession I make, I am not cognizant of having done so.

When I answered that letter which was sent to me by the hon. member for Pictou, I stated that so far as the Customs Department was concerned, we had decided not to take cognizance of an offence alleged to have taken place a year and eight months previously. I did not speak for other departments; I believe my hon. colleague, the Minister of Inland Revenue, took the view that at the end of six months he would not entertain charges. The Customs Department took the view that charges that were not made up to that time should not be investigated. I said there might have been one or two that we proceeded with after that date, but they had been connected with others that had been going on already. That letter sent to the hon. member for Pictou was not singular, as other cases and other applications had been dealt with in the same way. Yet the hon. gentleman tries to make out that I was treating this case differently from others, and that the length of time that had elapsed, I was urging as an excuse for taking no action. With reference to the other charge which the hon. gentleman made, I have already stated that I consulted my colleagues about it, and they did not see any crime in it, taking the same position as myself. I was the more inclined to take that view, believing that if it were a crime, the court was open to the aggrieved party, and he could have prosecuted Mr. Lemieux, but he did not do it, and for one year and eight months, he did not even make a complaint. In his letter he says that were it not that others had been dismissed through the instrumentality of Mr. Rudolphe Lemieux, he would not have pressed this case further. I did not look upon the act as one of political partisanship, but rather as the act of a father on behalf of his son. If it were all as represented there it was partisanship; it was the partisanship of a father for a son more than political partisanship. It was not exercised in the city of Montreal, as has been pointed out, but there is the natural feeling of the father towards his son. And I can understand him, as the Prime Minister said, going down there on his holidays. His holidays were not given to him by me. I was not at the head of the department, I was not in the government, but I can understand him going down there under the circumstances and taking an interest in the election so that he was

led into it taking a part in it. I do not think that it was inconsistent with the principles to which the hon. gentleman has alluded, in dealing with this question, while you could not approve of it, while I have not approved of it, and while you regret that it should have taken place to take the action which has been taken in regard to this case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, the views that have been expressed from this side of the House I share in their entirety, and deplorable as was the position of the government before the hon. member for York. N.B., (Mr. Foster) spoke, the anger and sneers of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), I think, are more deplorable still. Here, we have an admitted case of fraud, of dishonesty, of deception and of misconduct on the part of an officer wholly outside and apart from any question of offensive partisanship at all. Putting that aside altogether we have this man, holding a very responsible position in the public service, and when this question excited comment and indignation from this side of the House the result is nothing but excuses for the culprit, nothing but palliation for the wrongdoer, confessing, as his defenders do, the wrongs, and then abuse, sneers and insinuations thrown at those men who dare to stand up and say that the public will not tolerate such things. I think the condition of affairs is most critical. We have had charges in this House, and we believe that in some parts of the public service there is a fearful state of rottenness. But how are these wrongs to be righted when we find that the Prime Minister of this country has only abuse for those people who desire to reprehend men whom he confesses have done those things which can only be characterized as dishonest acts, and when they are retained in positions of trust? The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) felt the odium and weakness of his position. He never could hold his pen long enough to cover the charges which were made against this man. He stopped at the words political partisanship and endeavoured to overlook altogether the dishonesty that is admitted. But, when he was brought face to face with the public on this matter he threw the whole thing upon the Prime Minister. He put the whole load of responsibility on him. He knew that the man has no right to be a civil servant, has no right to hold a position of trust in the service of this country, that it is disgraceful to the service to retain him in that position, and knowing that, he concluded his observations, by saying that he had taken the record to the Prime Minister and left him to deal with all outside of the question of political partisanship. As to the other matter he was informed that no crime had been committed. A man has to be indicted and prosecuted, has to be put behind bars

before an offence in the public service can be considered as committed! Therefore, a man will understand from the hon. Minister of Customs and from this incident, here, to-night, that so long as he does not come within the lines of the Criminal Code, so long as he is not arrested and shut behind the doors of the penitentiary, he may lie and cheat and defraud, he may do all that is dishonest and disgraceful and hold his position and expect to be promoted and advanced. The hon. Minister of Customs said once or twice that the promotion of this man took place anterior to his reception of this charge. What difference does that make? Did he interfere with this man's position after he got the charge? Did he reconsider the question whether this man should be promoted in the public service? It would not have made a particle of difference, from the defence which we heard here to-night, whether the charge was made before or after the promotion was made. So, we stand face to face with a government that countenances dishonesty in the public service, that has nothing but abuse for those men who endeavour to prevent it and root it out. Perhaps it is a waste of time to bring forward charges in connection with the administration of the Yukon. These men have encouragement to do everything that is dishonest, tricky and deceitful because they find that men doing these things holding high, responsible fiduciary positions are rewarded by the government and defended upon the plea that the culprit, in this case, was a father. It is a waste of time really to say more in commentary upon this flimsy, disgraceful defence which has been offered by the Treasury benches.

House divided on the amendment (Mr. Gillies).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Beattie,	Macdonald (King's),
Bennett,	McCleary,
Bergerson,	McDougall,
Casgrain,	Marcotte,
Clancy,	Martin,
Davin,	Morin,
Foster,	Prior,
Gillies,	Quinn,
Haggart,	Taylor, and
Kaulbach,	Tupper (Sir Charles
LaRivière,	Hibbert.—21.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Razinet,	Hutchison,
Belcourt,	Joly de Lotbinière
Bourassa,	(Sir Henri),
Brodeur,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Copp,	Lavergne,
Costigan,	McGugan,
Cowan,	McHugh,
Davies (Sir Louis),	McIsaac,
Dupré,	McLennan (Inverness),
Erb,	McMillan,
Fielding,	McMullen,
Fisher,	Mu'ock,

Fitzpatrick,  
Fortier,  
Fraser (Guysborough),  
Geoffrion,  
Heyd,  
Holmes,

Paterson,  
Proulx,  
Puttee,  
Sutherland, and  
Talbot.—34.

## PAIRS :

## Ministerial.

## Opposition.

## Messieurs

Scriver,	Blanchard,
Davis,	Hale,
Tolmie,	Montague,
Snetsinger,	Reid,
Christie,	Roddick,
Featherston,	Carscallen,
Cartwright,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Gibson,	Corby,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Lewis,	Poupore,
Edwards,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Tarte,	Hughes,
Sifton,	McInerney,
Livingston,	Wallace,
Carroll,	Ingram,
Maxwell,	Tyrwhitt,
Calvert,	Pope,
Parmelee,	Clarke,
Frost,	Klock,
Rutherford,	Roach,
Penny,	Ganong,
McCarthy,	Robertson (J. Ross),
Burnett,	Bell (Addington),
Bruneau,	Henderson,
Lang,	Kloepfer,
Somerville,	Broder,
Johnston,	Wilson,
Landerkin,	Kendry,
Beith,	McLean,
Brown,	Seagram,
Turoct,	Robertson,
Ratz,	McIntosh,
Ethier,	Osier,
Logan,	McLaren,
Bell (Prince),	Earle,
McGugan,	Sproule,
Richardson,	Hodgins,
Semple,	Chauvin,
Russell,	Borden (Halifax),
Flint,	Mills,
Savard,	Dugas,
Britton,	Cargill,
Hurley,	Craig,
MacPherson,	Rosamond,
Mackie,	Ferguson,
Dyment,	McCormack,
Gould,	Powell,
Tucker,	McAlister,
Casey,	Cochrane,
Ellis,	Monk,
Champagne,	McNeill,
Dechene,	Caron,
Demers,	Gillet,
Comstock,	Moore,
Fortin,	Gilmour.

Amendment negatived.

### FREIGHT RATES ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. H. F. McDougall (Cape Breton). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring a matter to the attention of the House that I consider of sufficient importance to justify me in presenting to the notice of hon. gentlemen, even at this very Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

late hour. I should like very much to see the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) in his seat; he was there a few minutes ago. I wish to refer to a matter connected with the management of the Intercolonial Railway. About last August, I approached the management of the Intercolonial Railway for rates on certain material which I was about tendering for supplying to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, at Sydney, who had advertised for a quantity of material for putting in the foundation of the great work they are now establishing at the town of Sydney. As I thought it was my right to do, like any other man, I went to the management of the railway and asked for rates on several thousand car-loads of this material, consisting of stone, sand and gravel. After some correspondence with the general manager and with the general freight agent, I was given a rate, and on that rate I tendered for the supply of a quantity of material, to be continued during the progress of the work. In order to enable me to place that material on the government railway, I was obliged to build sidings and spurs from the point where the material was, to the railway and connecting with the railway. It is usual for the Intercolonial Railway management to build sidings for the convenience of shippers by that road, as is the custom. I understand, on all railways, but, when I applied for the building of these sidings, and guaranteed that I was to furnish the road with the carrying of a large quantity of this material, I was given to understand that I would have to put these sidings in at my own expense, that is, the grading and the supplying of the ties necessary. I was informed that I would be given the rails by the Intercolonial Railway, provided I made a deposit equal to the value of those rails with the Receiver General. I consented to these conditions, and I proceeded with the building of these sidings at my own expense, and deposited the money equal to the value of the rails as was required. A great portion of this work of putting in sidings, and so on, was done during the winter, and just as I was called upon by the company to whom I was furnishing the material, the necessity arose, from time to time, for putting in additional sidings and so on, and the same rule was continued. I put in some six or seven sidings at a cost of about \$2,500 for grading and ties, and at a cost of \$1,540 for rails, previous to the 1st of May last. In the month of February, I made application for the privilege of putting a siding in at a particular point, where I wanted to load about a thousand car-loads of sand. I waited and pressed for a reply from the department or from the management week after week, the material, in the meantime, being urgently called for by the people with whom I was under contract to supply it. I was not getting an answer. I was told that one reason why I was not getting an answer was, that the management did not have rails at their

disposal to enable me to put the siding in. I secured a car-load of new rails in another place, and I communicated to the general manager that I had them at my disposal, and asked him for authority to allow me to connect my siding with the government railway, stating that I would relieve them of the necessity of supplying the rails. I was refused that privilege, and it took me from February until May 1 to get a decided answer from the general manager, and that answer was to the effect that they would not allow me to put my own rails in, but that I would have to deposit \$470 with the Receiver General before they would allow me to put a track down. I made a deposit, and while it would not take more than three or four days to do the work the government had to do in connecting the siding of the railway, it took a month before that work was done. But that was not all. The rates at which I undertook to carry out my contract last fall were changed, I understand, a few days ago. I had a telegram here the day before yesterday from one of the gentlemen to whom I was shipping my material, saying that without receiving any notice from the railway, in one case he was asked to pay a 50 per cent higher rate on the material, and in another case an 80 per cent higher rate than he was paying before. I telegraphed the general manager at Moncton and I received his reply. He called my attention to a telegram he had sent me when I was requested to make the deposit of \$470 in payment of rails, stating that it was understood then that the rates were to be increased, and that the Department of Railways at Ottawa would not consent to put any more sidings in unless a certain rate was charged at least; but there was no limit the other way. The rate that is charged on the material I am shipping over the railway to-day is from 50 to 80 per cent higher than the rate agreed upon, when I undertook to do this business over the road. From the time I began shipping over the road up to the present, I shipped about 2,500 car-loads, and the railway earned something over \$15,000 in freight at those rates. What I complain of is, that these rates should be unreasonably increased. They are out of proportion to the rates that are imposed on all other business, and more than that, the influence of the government and the friends of the government was exercised with the company to whom I was delivering the most of this material, to get them to discontinue buying material from me. Having leased one of the quarries, from which I was operating myself, having leased that quarry from me with the understanding that it was to be worked until the completion of the foundations that required material, the company went to a great deal of expense to enable them to work that quarry and to ship a large quantity of stone from the quarry, but the interference of the friends of the government, with the knowledge of some

one connected with the management of the railway, was to the effect that the company were given to understand that if they concentrated their work of drawing material at some other points than those points from which I was operating, that they would give them a more satisfactory railway service. During the whole time from last September up to the present I have been unable to get half the car service I required, and instead of shipping 2,500 car-loads or thereabouts, and instead of the railway earning about \$15,000, it should have carried twice the quantity and earned twice the amount. While I admit that there were cases in which the railway management could not have given me the service as promptly and fully as I required it, there were circumstances in which incidents of the weather and accidents interfered. There were cases in which I know that those who had to do with the management of the Intercolonial Railway tried to hamper the business in which I was engaged and prevent it being carried on. Day after day I was waiting at considerable expense for the service which they could have given and which it would not have put them out to give. It may be contended, possibly, on behalf of the government by the hon. Minister of Finance, who took a hand in this matter from the beginning, who had made protests against the Intercolonial Railway management giving me such facilities over the road which would enable me to do this business—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What does the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I say that the hand of the Minister of Finance was active in finding fault with the management of the Intercolonial Railway because certain alleged concessions were given to me to do this business.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not what the hon. gentleman said. He said I had interfered and protested against the railway authorities giving him any facilities for doing business. I want to say that there is absolutely no foundation for the statement.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am glad to get the hon. gentleman on record. One of the contentions made against me was that I was getting too low a rate. Is it not a fact that the minister complained of that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it not a fact that he and his friends approached the management of the railway and found fault with them because they had allowed me to do business over the railway under such favourable conditions.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. I heard complaints made that other people could not get rates on the railway as favour-

able as those granted to the hon. gentleman ; but I made no complaint of the rates he got at all, and I do not know at the present moment whether they were fair and reasonable or not. I never heard anything about the matter except that the people complained that the railway authorities were giving the hon. gentleman favours.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that so far from giving me favours—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not say they gave them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. While they compelled me, in order to do my business, to expend from \$3,000 to \$5,000 in building sidings, they went in the last three months—and I can understand they did it on the recommendation of the hon. gentleman—and put in a siding at the request of James Macdonald, M.P.P. for Inverness, at a point known as River Dennis, without Macdonald paying anything for grading or ties or rails, while within a quarter of a mile I put in a siding at an expense of \$5,000 at a point where I have a saw-mill, and was made to pay every dollar of the cost of the siding out of my own pocket.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a question for the minister.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Just a few days ago, when I was putting in a siding at a cost of nearly \$1,000 at a place where I was assured by the management of the railway they would have put in that siding promptly the men who were doing the work were taken off the ground. I was obliged to put men on the work, although I was paying for the grading, the ties and the rails, but they delayed the work from time to time until they could put their own men on to join the siding to the government railway. They took those men away to build a siding for one of their political friends who was not paying a cent for rails or ties, but for whom the work was done at the expense of this country. While I required from ten to fifteen cars a day, I do not think two cars would be shipped from the other siding in a month. Does discrimination like that receive the support of the Minister of Finance? I want to show the hon gentlemen the rates I got when I began my work last fall. Although I call it my work, it was a work in which the community were interested. I employed from 100 to 200 men along the line of railway. It was a work in which every man in Canada was interested, because I was affording business for the railway. There is no man in Canada who has not a right to do business over that railway, and there is no man in Canada against whom the management should discriminate, even though he sits on this side of the House and votes against the minister. Any man, no matter if he is an Indian, has a right to get

Mr. FIELDING.

fair-play from the management of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, the rates ran from \$4 a car up to \$8. The distances were short—twenty miles in one instance, twenty-five in another, thirty in another, and forty-five miles was the longest distance over which a car of this material was hauled. Frequently I made calculations of the money earned by the road, and I could not come to any other conclusion than that the road was making a good business out of it, and I have the opinion of others to back me up in that. The lowest rates given to me—not the rates imposed now—was \$4 a car, and up to \$8 or \$9, according to weight of car. If I were getting the same rate as the Intercolonial Railway is charging on coal from Spring Hill to Montreal, I would only have to pay \$1.20. If I got the same rate as is charged from Sydney to Feronia in the county of Pictou, I would only have to pay \$1.70 instead of \$4. If I were getting the same rate that the railway is charging from Spring Hill to Montreal, I would only have to pay \$1.53. If I got the same rate as is charged from Sydney to Pictou, I would have to pay \$3.57.

Everybody who knows about the classification of freight on a railway, knows that it is based largely upon the value of the material carried. When we deal with common field stone, broken stone, sand or gravel, we get a class of freight than which nothing can be much cheaper. Coal is an article of greater value. If, in transit, a car of coal is damaged or lost, the railway becomes liable for the damage of it—say \$50 for the car. A large quantity of this stone was worth, loaded on the car, 17½ cents a ton, and for this the government was getting 30 cents a ton for a haul for a short distance—and, remember, the sidings and facilities for shipping were provided at the expense of the shipper, and the class of cars used is the common flat cars, not special cars such as are required for the transport of coal. Now, take the article of flour, which is a valuable class of freight. For the hauling of a car of flour from Montreal to Halifax, Sydney or North Sydney, the railway charges \$52 to \$55. But, if they applied the same rate to this coal as is applied to the stone to which I have referred, instead of charging \$52 a car-load, they would charge \$216 to \$240 per car. And the value of the stone to be replaced by the railway if it lost, is \$4 or \$5, while the value of the flour is \$500. I know that it will be said that reduced rates must be given for the long haul. But is not the discrepancy too great, particularly when you consider the difference in value? Now, I could occupy the time of the House for a much longer time detailing the discriminating treatment given me by the railway authorities, but I do not wish to do so at this late hour of the night. But I am charging the management of the railway now with having discriminated against the business I was giving to the

road, first, in not giving the ordinary facilities for connecting with the road; then, in not giving me a proper service, then, in overcharging me in freight rates; and, lastly, in taking unfair advantage of me in the middle of my business—with the result of loss of business by the railway, loss of business by myself, and loss of employment by from 100 to 200 men—employment at a point convenient to their homes. And all this for political reasons and to meet political ends. That is my charge, and I am able to prove it out of the mouths of a number of people who are personally conversant with the game that was played. And I have no redress; the management do as they please, they charge as they like. I had a telegram day before yesterday from one of my customers to the effect that the man for whom the material was shipped could not take it because of the advanced rates. I had a telegram about the 6th of April, while I was here in Ottawa, from the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, the company that had rented the quarries to which I referred a moment ago, saying that owing to the inefficiency of the railway service they were obliged to discontinue operations at the quarry where they had gone to the expense of providing means of loading from 25 to 30 cars per day, which would have furnished excellent business for the railway carrying this material to Sydney. All this business is destroyed by the management. And when I speak of the management, I speak of the management from Ottawa. This is where the harm is done. This is where the instructions come from, to please the demands of party heelers—I cannot give them any better name—who are to-day running the Intercolonial Railway. The orders of these people, it seems, must be obeyed. In order to facilitate carrying on my work during the winter between different points, one eight miles distant and one two miles distant from a railway station, I decided to build a telephone line. I put up the posts and made arrangements with the telephone company for the wires and necessary instruments. This improvement would have been a convenience to the railway as well as to myself. But what was done? I went to the station master, who knew that I was putting up the telephone posts, and spoke to him about where the instrument should be put in the station. He said: I do not think I would care to allow you to put an instrument in the station without getting the permission of the general manager. I wrote to the general manager and got a reply to the effect that he could not give me permission without communicating with Ottawa. If he communicated with Ottawa, I am yet without the use of the telephone and without any reply from the Ottawa authorities, though I have already undergone practically all the expense of providing it. Imagine, Mr.

Speaker, this treatment of a man who was giving that business to the railway, and proposed to furnish an improvement which would be a convenience to the railway as well as to himself. Now, I would like my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to get up and give some reason for this conduct on the part of the government, because I bring it right home to the government. They have got their petty officials and their higher officials. I do not know who controls the management of the railway, but I know that it is at the wish of the party heelers not connected with the railways at all that this is being done.

But I must not forget to speak of my operations in September of last fall. When I had shipped about 300 car-loads I found that over 200 car-loads were overcharged. I made a claim to the general management for a refund of the money. I got part of it and the other part it still unpaid. But hon. gentlemen will be surprised to hear what I have to say, and which took place only a few days ago, before a final settlement of this claim could be brought about. The management of the branch of the service at Moncton which has charge of investigating claims of this kind, wrote me through the station agent on the Intercolonial Railway, asking me to strike off a certain car numbered so and so, alleged to have been shipped on such a day, because they had no record of it. Why, Sir, I have a record of it, and my consignees returned the car to me and paid for it. I made a claim against the railway management for the overcharge on that car, along with the 200 other cars, and I am without a settlement to this day. That is the way the business of the railway is conducted. I have still to adjust charges on 400 or 500 cars with the management of the railway at the present date, some of these charges running since last September. On some of my first shipments made last September, the freight charges to the town of Sydney were more than the value of the material delivered in Sydney. This was due to the indifference and carelessness of the staff doing business on behalf of the railway at Sydney. When I spoke to the station agent I was put off month after month, all on account of the mistakes of the agent and the managers generally. When I went for a settlement with my consignees and found the returns that they had for the material I was delivering, when I found that cars that contained thirty tons were returned by the railway at only twenty—and I can produce their own handwriting admitting that a mistake was made; and when I found fault that the station agent was careless in doing his business, his plea was: Well, anybody will make a mistake. In the presence of the superintendent I told that young man, whose wages the people were paying, that if he was in the employ of any business man who had any care for the reputation of

his business, he would kick him out of his office as quickly as he would a bundle of straw, he would not allow him to have anything to do with his business—I made that statement in the presence of the superintendent and not a word of reprimand was uttered to this agent, nor apology to me. He has been allowed to go on with his misconduct to the present day. Some time afterwards a change took place and another man was put in charge, which brought about considerable improvement, but this young man of the mistakes is there yet, and the mistakes are still going on. I cannot get a return of the weights without asking several times for them. They charge me with the weights, and I have to fight with the management before I can get a return of the weights or charges. That is my complaint to the House, and I hope the House will pardon me for making it, because it is a matter that concerns myself. But it does not concern myself alone, it concerns this House and this country who have an interest in this railway that is used for this nefarious purpose by the party heelers throughout the country. I make this complaint in the interest of the people who were getting the employment that my business was giving to them; I make it in the interest of the work that was being delayed for want of the material I was under contract to supply. I complain of the treatment that is being accorded to me and that is destroying my business by an arbitrary, and unreasonable rate, a discriminating rate, a prohibitive rate. I say now that the charges made for carrying material is more than I was getting for the material delivered after paying freight last season.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). With about nine-tenths of what the hon. gentleman says I am not acquainted. I know absolutely nothing about it, I am not supposed to know anything about it, it does not relate to my department, and that being the case I do not propose to discuss it. But, I am bound to tell the hon. gentleman that I am hardly able to assume that there is much foundation for what he says, because in so far as I do know about what he has been talking of, I know that he has been guilty of a flagrant misstatement of facts as affecting myself; and I argue, not unreasonably, that if in a matter in which I do know something the hon. gentleman has made a gross misstatement, then I may reasonably assume that he has not been more particular in dealing with other things of which I know nothing.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that any statements I have made are not in accordance with the facts? I make my statements on the responsibility of my position as a member of this House, and I will swear to them, and I know hundreds that will swear to them.

Mr. McDOUGALL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend might be willing to swear to them. I prefer to hope that he would not, because that would be a reflection on his character which I would be unwilling to make. The hon. gentleman made a statement almost in the beginning of his speech in reference to myself to which I immediately took exception, a statement which will be found on the *Hansard*; he made the statement that he was able to show that I had interfered with the railway officials to prevent him obtaining ordinary facilities for carrying on his business. I interrupted him and said the statement was unfounded. I challenge him now to maintain that statement. I challenge him if he has a shadow of foundation for the statement, to make it known. I ask the hon. gentleman to give the authority upon which he made that statement, because he ought not to have made it in this House unless he had the authority. I have a right to ask him now to tell me the source of his information. I tell the hon. gentleman that I never heard of those transactions except in the way to which I have already alluded, namely, that I heard a complaint in a public place, among a lot of people, against the railway management, that they were showing the hon. gentleman undue favour and that other people could not get the same privileges that were given to him. I said at once I did not believe it. I said I believed the railway officials were doing what was fair and just by all. I told the parties who complained that I thought they were unjust to the railway officials; and while I knew nothing whatever of the transactions of the hon. gentleman with the railway, I took the ground, as I was bound to do, that the railway officials were managing their business in a businesslike way, and that whatever they gave the hon. gentleman they gave it in a fair businesslike way. Therefore, I declined to fall in with the general complaint against the railway officials.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Did the hon. gentleman take any steps to ascertain whether those complaints were founded?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I never believed they had any foundation, therefore it was not necessary for me to go any further. I stated to the parties at once that I did not believe it, and I do not believe it now. I take it for granted that the railway authorities dealt with the hon. gentleman in a businesslike way, and I take it for granted that the other people who were complaining would also be dealt with in a businesslike way. Wherever there are two or three people dealing with the railway authorities there is always a disposition on the part of A to say that B is being granted favours. I cannot myself say what foundation there is for the hon. gentleman's statement in regard to one man getting a siding for nothing,

and another man getting a siding for which he has to pay. I take it for granted that whatever rules are laid down by the Railway Department as to the terms upon which sidings are granted at one point and another are enforced in a business way and equally to all. I do not intend to go into this matter, but the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will be able to meet the arraignment of the hon. gentleman, and I have no doubt that if the hon. gentleman had given him notice that he was going to bring up this case the hon. minister would have remained and would have been able to deal with the question. I do not attempt to deal with it now, as I confess I have no knowledge of the facts of the case. I am perfectly satisfied that it will be found upon investigation that the statement of the hon. gentleman is not well-founded. We know that in railway rates there are mysteries, and that we get one rate for one section and another rate for another section simply to meet some special condition that may exist, but when you come to look into the matter there will be found good reasons for these rates. I have no doubt it will be found upon investigation that whatever has been done by the Department of Railways and Canals has been done in the interest of business, and in the absence of information to the contrary, I would be prepared to assume that the statement which the hon. gentleman makes is wrong. The hon. gentleman will have another opportunity to bring this matter up again, when the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will be able to give the hon. gentleman an answer to his statement.

#### YUKON—10 PER CENT ROYALTY ON GOLD OUTPUT.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to bring a matter before the House, but, as it is now nearly half-past one, if the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) thinks it is time to adjourn, I will be very glad to take another opportunity. If, however, the right hon. gentleman wishes to go on, I will be glad to go on. About a week ago I sent notice to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that at the first opportunity on going into supply I wished to bring to his attention and the attention of the government a matter connected with the Yukon. I refer to the 10 per cent royalty which is now collected on gold mined in that country. There is a general feeling amongst business men in British Columbia and amongst mine owners and miners in the Yukon territory that the 10 per cent royalty which is now obtained by the government in order to get a revenue out of that country works most unsatisfactorily, and that another arrangement might be made which would be much fairer than the 10 per cent royalty which is now collected.

The matter was brought before the Vancouver Board of Trade some time ago by Mr. R. P. McLennan, a gentleman who has large business interests in Vancouver and in the Yukon territory, and who is au fait with all the conditions now prevailing in that country. Instead of explaining the matter, I think that I could not do better than read what he said in addressing the Vancouver Board of Trade on the 25th of April last. He said:

Mr. President,—In moving the resolution asking for the abolition of the royalty of 10 per cent as at present levied on the output of gold in the Yukon, and in lieu thereof establishing a government assay office in Dawson for the purchase of gold dust, and making liable to confiscation any gold being taken out of the country without the appointed fees being paid thereon, I wish to call your attention to a few points in connection therewith. At the beginning of the Klondike gold fever, the merchants of Seattle, with commendable shrewdness and foresight, petitioned their government at Washington to establish an assay office at Seattle for the purchase of gold as it came from the Yukon. Their government was prepared to give the merchants credit for knowing what would benefit their country, and not only granted their request, but made the assay office certificates payable either in Seattle or at other cities in the United States, as desired, without any charge for exchange. The results have exceeded their expectations, for Seattle, particularly, has been, and is now, being built up by the immense trade resulting from the millions of dollars' worth of gold which annually passes us by on its way to the United States assay office there, where it is exchanged for money, which in turn is exchanged for goods in that city, carried past us again in American steamers to Skagway en route to Dawson. As the Yukon produces nothing but gold, and is an immense consumer, and as over 90 per cent of the goods used there are brought to this coast from the east, the farmers, merchants and manufacturers of eastern Canada may have some idea of the millions of dollars which are lost to them at present. A year ago the provincial government endeavoured to aid in diverting this trade by guaranteeing the assay certificates of an office established in this city and one in Victoria. Owing to necessary charges for exportation of the gold and exchange, these certificates are at a disadvantage compared with Seattle assay values. But even were our assay offices on a par with Seattle, we then would not get the gold and consequent trade, because fully 75 per cent of those coming out with gold dust are Americans who hail from Seattle, and make it their headquarters. These men, when coming down from Dawson, will wait at Skagway two or three days longer for an American boat sailing direct to Seattle, in preference to taking a British boat for a British Columbia port.

Gold dust can be sold in Dawson, but at such a discount from its real value, that the expense of taking a trip out to the coast is paid for by the difference obtained by selling it to the Seattle assay office. The Seattle merchant owes the Canadian government a debt of gratitude in policing the Yukon River so thoroughly that the risk from loss in taking gold out is reduced to the vanishing point. Where the dust is exchanged there the money is spent for the Yukon miner or trader does not trouble looking around for low prices. Were an assay office established by our government in Dawson where

gold dust could be exchanged for currency, there would be no inducement for the miner or trader to leave Dawson. Our commercial travellers would then find the merchant in Dawson, and easily wrest the trade from the Seattle jobbing-houses, as we have already done in the Kootenay country.

Now, to refer to the royalty of 10 per cent which the government has placed upon the gold output of the Klondike, there may have been some justification for so doing. According to early reports of persons from that district it appeared that all that was necessary was a shovel to dig the gold out with, and enough buckets to carry it away in, and no one would object to paying 10 per cent for the privilege of and protection in so doing. And as the government were going to an unknown expense in governing and protecting the people—nine-tenths of whom were foreigners—they would have laid themselves open to censure had they fallen short in their receipts and been compelled to tax the people of the Dominion for their mistake.

Notwithstanding the crude, unfair and unjust manner in which this tax is levied, and by which the whole amount of the royalty is obtained from a comparatively few miners, yet the Yukon has more than paid for itself, and has \$200,000 to its credit at Ottawa. Such being the case, it is time a change was made, the tax reduced and levied equitably. The government announces that the output of gold for 1899 in the Yukon was \$16,900,000. These returns were obtained, not from the official records, but from statistics furnished by the Seattle and San Francisco assay offices. We can easily account for another million in amounts that were taken to other countries for assay, manufactured into jewellery, and remaining in circulation in Dawson. That is \$17,000,000. The exemption of \$5,000 on claims producing over that amount would not amount to \$2,000,000, so that the government should have collected 10 per cent of \$15,000,000, which is \$1,500,000. They collected \$730,000, or less than 50 per cent. Now, who paid this \$730,000? It was, first, the honest man from conscientious motives; secondly, the stock companies who make a point of complying with the laws of the land; thirdly, the mine-owner who may be in the hands of the bank, and is not allowed to take any chance of confiscation of property. The balance pay little or much, as they please—mostly little—for we see that over 50 per cent of the gold escapes paying royalty. No inspector in this world can go up the creeks and tell by the look of a man's mine or dump how much gold he has taken or will take out. How absurd, then, to follow such a practice and impose such a tax, which results in engendering hatred amongst the people of the Yukon for everything Canadian, and places a premium of 10 per cent upon rascality and perjury. I have myself seen \$4,000 washed up from a few yards of dirt, and who could tell the difference? A mining man of repute told me he knew a man who washed up \$250,000, and swore to \$9,000. And unless the government placed an army of men equal to the Canadian South African contingent, they could not prevent it.

Bear in mind, Mr. President, that it is not every one who is mining that can wash \$4,000 out of a few yards of dirt. The Klondike gold-fields are the richest in the world. Marvelously rich though they are, they are similar to every other field yet discovered in that it costs from \$5 to \$10 for every dollar mined. The expense of finding the paystreak, the exorbitant cost of supplies of all kinds, transportation, labour, fuel, &c., and the trying circum-

stances under which the work has to be carried on, accounts for the estimate that where five men out of one hundred make either a competency or a fortune, the remaining 95 do not quit even, or lose their entire capital. Yet the wealth of the world is increased at their expense. Who then gets the gold that these miners dig out? It is the bankers, brokers, the lawyers, the merchants, traders, transportation companies, packers, saloon-keepers, gamblers and the Ottawa treasury. The miner leads a hard life, and is entitled to every cent he gets. Is it any wonder then that he becomes discouraged and disgruntled with a country and a people who not only make him liable for his pound of flesh, but insist upon payment of it unless he prefers to perjure himself and risk having his claim confiscated? Tax the miner sufficiently, and he will soon quit, and with him goes the royalty and revenue of every kind, leaving the country a howling wilderness. Encourage and make it pleasant for him and the country will develop and trade and revenue increase.

One thing that would do more than any other to bring this about—one that would establish a better feeling toward Canadians, promote trade and obtain the necessary revenue for the administration, would be to tax the gold as it leaves the country instead of the miner who digs for it.

I have shown you, I trust satisfactorily, that the gold leaves the Yukon by a beaten path to the United States assay offices at Seattle and San Francisco, and is spent there largely by the people so bringing it, depriving us of millions of dollars' worth of trade belonging to us. Also that the present royalty tax in the Yukon is unfair and distasteful to the miner and prejudicial to Canadian trade interests. It is the duty of the government to encourage the miner in developing the country, and assist the merchants, manufacturers and farmers of the Dominion in obtaining full control of the trade of a country which is our own. This can be done at the present time with satisfaction to all concerned and complete recompense to the government for their outlay. How? Simply by abolishing the present 10 per cent royalty, establishing an assay office at Dawson—the fountain-head—buying all the gold presented thereat, paying for the same with Canadian bank notes and deducting sufficient to pay royalty, maintenance, transportation and insurance on the gold.

If any one wished to take his gold out, he would have to get it sealed at the assay office, and pay the charges just the same. The result would be that every one with gold would sell it in Dawson, and on coming outside would have no inducements to pass the British Columbia cities, but having Canadian notes and drafts would be drawn to Canadian ports, where their money would be received at par. It would incidentally leave the Seattle and San Francisco mints with a freer hand to cope with the Cape Nome output. Such an act would have the effect of putting gold dust out of circulation as a medium of exchange in Dawson, for the loss in handling dust as such is estimated at all the way from 5 to 15 per cent. Such being the case, instead of a miner feeling the tax a burden, he would take his gold from the mine to the assay office, and receiving currency for the same would be saving a percentage in using it in purchasing goods in place of using gold dust for that purpose. Now that the government officials and others are established in Dawson, the cost of maintaining them must be very much less from now on than formerly. Perhaps a revenue of half a million from the gold would be sufficient. It is estimated that on account,

chiefly, of improved methods of working, the output of gold this year will amount to \$25,000,000. Two per cent of that would yield the half million required for revenue. I understand one-half of 1 per cent was paid last year on a large shipment of dust from Dawson to Seattle to cover transportation and insurance. Another half per cent would more than cover all charges for assay equipment and maintenance. Thus, 3 per cent, if collected equitably, would do as much as the 10 per cent now sought to be levied but evaded. The whole charge should certainly not exceed 5 per cent, and if that amount is charged, then in addition to exchanging the gold dust for currency at full value, it should be optional with the owner of the gold whether he receives the currency in Dawson or have it made payable, say in four or five of the principal cities in Canada, without any extra charge whatever. This latter might be arranged between the government and the banks now in Dawson without doing the latter any injustice. It would largely tend to bring the owners of these drafts or certificates to Canadian cities to get the same cashed. The merchants of the coast in British Columbia have overcome great obstacles in obtaining the trade we now have with the Yukon, and a great deal of it has been done at very little profit. We are prepared to make strenuous efforts to get the whole of it if placed on an equal footing with our competitors as indicated, but not only should the merchant be assisted, but the prospector and miner be relieved of his burdens, and be encouraged and aided at every point and in every respect.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the able report that was presented to the Vancouver Board of Trade by Mr. McLennan, and it so impressed the Board of Trade of Vancouver, that they passed the following resolution, which I believe has been forwarded to the government :

1. That the 10 per cent royalty at present levied by the government on the gold of the Yukon is distasteful to the miners and unsatisfactory in its operation, and does not produce the revenue to the government which is due on the output.

2. The present mode of collection induces deceit on the part of the miners and incidentally causes perjury to be committed in respect to the returns sworn to.

3. That in consequence a large amount of gold is taken out of the country, thus depriving Canada of business which would be done here if the gold were purchased in Dawson and paid for in Dominion currency.

4. That it is eminently desirable that as much as possible of the business to be derived from the mining industry shall be conserved to the people of Canada and a fair revenue be secured by the government in a manner alike agreeable to the miners and the government.

5. That in order to best attain these desirable results it is respectfully submitted that the present tax of 10 per cent be abolished, and in lieu thereof that an assay office be opened in Dawson, to which all gold produced there shall be taken for Dominion currency. A charge of not exceeding 5 per cent being made for assay and all taxes upon said gold.

6. That notice be given that all gold must be assayed in the government assay office and duty paid there, and that any person found attempting to take out gold without a proper certificate from the assay office stating the correct quantity and value of gold so being taken out, such gold shall be seized and forfeited by the

party found in possession of the same or owners thereof, or such other penalty as shall be deemed desirable by the government.

The British Columbia Board of Trade of Victoria, after discussing the same subject, passed the following resolution :

That the recommendations of the Vancouver Board of Trade be approved, and that this board desires to urge most strongly upon the government the necessity in the interest of Canadian trade of establishing a government assay office in Dawson, at which full value in Canadian currency will be given for gold.

Now, Sir, I think what I have read fully explains what are the wishes of at least a large majority of the business men in British Columbia, and also of the miners of the Yukon Territory. You will see that instead of having the 10 per cent royalty, which now the officials of the government try to collect, but which they are very unsuccessful in doing, there would be not more than a 5 per cent royalty charge, or in other words, instead of collecting 10 per cent from a few of the miners, who are honest enough to tell the truth about what they get, every miner, whether getting out a large or small quantity of gold, will be called upon to pay 5 per cent. The government will, I think, get more revenue in that way, and they would get it in a legitimate manner, not discriminating against any one. In regard to the penalty to be attached to any miner taking the gold out without taking it to the assay office, I leave that to gentlemen more learned in the law than I am myself, but there is no question about it, that it would be no hardship. All of us have to pay customs duties, and we do not consider that a hardship. There is no reason why the miner who takes the gold out of the ground of the Yukon should not be called upon to pay his fair quota to the government for the benefit he derives and the protection he gets. If this scheme of the Board of Trade of British Columbia is carried out, I feel convinced that it would be of immense advantage to the whole country, and that it would enable the merchants of British Columbia, and the rest of Canada to supply the people of the Yukon Territory with thousands and thousands of dollars worth of goods which now are bought in the American States. The Yukon is our own country, and the merchants of Canada have a right to obtain all the benefits that can possibly be got out of it. I hope that the government will take the matter into their careful consideration, to see if they cannot manage to give the wishes of the British Columbia boards of trade that consideration, which I feel is their due. I feel convinced that if they do, that they will have less trouble to collect the revenue, and it will be a great benefit to the country, as a whole.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, having already spoken on the motion now before the House, would not feel justified in going at any

length into the argument this evening ; but, at some other day he will answer the question.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

For cold storage on steamship, railways, at warehouses and creameries, and for expenses in connection with trial shipments of products, and for securing improvement and recognition of the quality of Canadian farm products ..... \$70,000

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). The Minister of Customs promised to give the committee a statement of the number of ships in which we have cold storage arrangements, and the character of the cold storage in each case.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). For this season we expect to have : To Liverpool, five ships, from the Allans ; to London, six ships, from the Thomson Line ; to Glasgow, six ships, half from the Allans and half from the Donaldson Line ; to the West Indies, one ship, from Pickford & Black ; to Manchester, three ships, from the Manchester Line ; to London, three ships, from Furness, Withy & Co. These are all under contract for the present season. In addition to these, there are five ships of the Elder-Dempster Line, which have been under contract till this year. Some of these ships are now engaged in carrying troops and provisions to South Africa ; but I am informed by the manager of the line that they will be put on the Canadian route as soon as they get through the charters from the Imperial government. They expect about the end of this month to have the same service to Bristol that there has been in the three years past. These vessels are all fitted with mechanical cold storage, some of them with a capacity of 20,000 cubic feet each, and some with a capacity of 10,000 cubic feet. The five ships of the Elder-Dempster Line have each a capacity of 20,000 cubic feet ; the five ships to Liverpool, 20,000 ; the ships to London, three of 10,000 and three of 20,000 ; the ships to Glasgow, 20,000 ; the Manchester liners, 10,000 ; Furness, Withy & Co.'s ships, 10,000 ; and the one to the West Indies, 3,000 or 4,000.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) What rates is the hon. gentleman paying ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The department does not pay any rates at all. Under the new contract to Liverpool, London and Glasgow, the rate will be 15 shillings per ton of seventy cubic feet. Under the old contract, which has not expired, the rate to the West Indies, to Manchester and to London is 10 shillings.

Mr. FOSTER. How long does the old contract run ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The contract with the Manchester liners has

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

one year to run, and the contract with Furness, Withy & Co. has a year and a half.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) How many ships have you under contract ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. (Translation.) We have twenty-four ships under contract for the present season. In addition to these ships, there are five ships of the Elder Dempster line, which are not yet under contract this year.

Mr. FOSTER. The new contracts are at 15 shillings a ton ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, to Liverpool, London and Glasgow.

Mr. FOSTER. That is seventeen ships ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the government pay to these vessels ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On the Allan Line to Liverpool, there are two ships on which we pay nothing. Contracts for these ships are expired, but by the arrangement for the three new ships, the old ones are continued on the contract. We pay half the cost of installation in two annual instalments. On the line to London there are six ships, for three of which we pay nothing and for three we pay at the same rates as to Glasgow. On the Allan & Donaldson Line to Glasgow, there were three vessels, and now there are six. For three of them we pay nothing, and for the remainder we pay half the cost of installation.

Mr. FOSTER. There are seventeen new vessels, and the total cost will be \$28,000 for this year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be multiplied by two annual payments ?

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, about \$57,000 altogether. There is one ship to the West Indies, which speaking from memory—I cannot lay my hand on the memorandum at the moment—is \$800. There is a payment to three of the Manchester liners, which will be in the neighbourhood of \$4,000 a piece—a total of \$12,000 for this year. And for the Furness, Withy Company there is about the same payment on three ships.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a payment of \$12,000 to the Furness or \$28,000 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Twelve thousand.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be \$24,000 the minister is paying for these two services ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it is about \$7,500 for the three Manchester

liners, and about the same for the Furness—about \$15,000 for these two services.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Elder-Dempster?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are not paying anything to them.

Mr. FOSTER. And the six Glasgow ones?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The six London, and the five Liverpool come to \$28,000.

Mr. FOSTER. So that altogether the minister is paying—

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. About \$43,000 besides the \$800 to the West Indies.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Manchester and Furness vessels have 20,000 or 10,000 cubic feet?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Ten thousand.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not this an abnormally high price?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. If it seems higher than our former payments, it is because we have to pay our share of the cost of installation in two annual payments instead of in three.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the equipment in one of these vessels?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. An insulated chamber affording the space arranged for, ten thousand or twenty thousand cubic feet as the case may be, provided with partitions, so that a different temperature can be maintained in different portions of the chamber. There is, in addition, a mechanical refrigerating plant, which is generally operated by a small engine, though it can be operated by steam from the engines of the ship. The mechanism compresses ammonia to an extreme degree, making it liquid. When this ammonia is allowed to escape from the vessel in which it has been compressed into the pipes who go into the cold storage chamber, the sudden expansion of the ammonia absorbs so much heat from the air in which the pipes are that it cools the air, and the result is to cool the chamber. This is commonly called the ammonia process of mechanical cold storage. It is called mechanical, because it is a mechanism which compresses the ammonia. Sometimes, it is called chemical, but that name is better applied to an apparatus which cools by a chemical combination instead of by compression and subsequent expansion.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you get at the cost?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The shipowners do the work and submit their vouchers, and we pay half the actual cost.

Mr. FOSTER. What obligation is there on these ships for which you pay half the cost, to continue cold storage arrangements after the contracts run out?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no obligation. We could not get them to make any obligation for the future.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you propose to keep it up?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We do not propose to keep it up. I hoped that when the first three years of the original contracts had expired the system would be so well established that it would go on of itself. Last year the Dominion Line, the Elder Dempster Line and the Allans all had put cold storage into vessels, not under contract at all, but finding the trade demanded it. It was really only in consequence of the shortness of shipping this year that I was obliged to enter into these new contracts.

Mr. FOSTER. Would there not be a larger supply for fewer ships?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but the people have more favourable offers for their ships elsewhere, and they said they would not bring them here under a contract and be bound to stay here, unless we made a contract with them. While the contract exists these vessels are bound to go on our trade, but the owners said that unless we made a new contract they would not feel bound to remain any longer, they would be able to take them off whenever they liked. We have never paid a subsidy to any vessel which was once fitted up with cold storage. If we had sufficient vessels on the route fitted up to perform the service, there would be no object in any further payment. The usual thing is for vessels to stay on the trade, and we fully expected they would. The contracts of the Elder Dempster have expired. It is true their vessels have gone off now in consequence of being chartered for the South African service, but the manager of the line tells me that they will be on again, and that he intends to keep it up. Some of the vessels of the Dominion Line are running to-day, and these new vessels that are coming to our ports are some of them being fitted up for cold storage, but not under contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister give us statements of the quantities carried on each trip on these vessels last year?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got a statement of the total number of packages carried on each trip. I have a statement about the fruit. The butter, which is the largest amount, is not given here. Practically all the butter that went from Montreal last year went in the cold storage. I may say that in the earlier part of the season, until about the 1st of

July, very little butter is shipped as a rule. The space is not altogether occupied. After about the 1st of July the cold storage, I may say in a general way, has been full during the last season on all the ships. In the fall of the year when butter becomes more plentiful, cheese is not shipped in cold storage. In extremely hot weather in the summer ships do take some cheese in cold storage. Poultry, meat, etc., have been shipped, and eggs have been shipped to a certain extent. Some of the shippers consider that eggs go just as well without cold storage, and do not care to pay the extra price. The fruit shipped last season showed a marked improvement over what had been shipped before. Fruit shipped in cold storage went in very good order as a general rule. We have been shipping now for three seasons some fruit experimentally. The first season was rather disastrous. The people who shipped it did not understand packing it, we did not understand it perhaps, ourselves, and a great many shipments did not turn out well. The second season a good deal turned out well, but some did not; but this last season we had men specially qualified to attend to the packing of fruit at Grimsby and to its selection, and the result was that nearly all that went this last season succeeded very well.

Mr. FOSTER. What species of fruit are shipped?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. First there are the more delicate kinds of apples, of which a considerable quantity has been sent, early apples. A large quantity of pears were shipped this last season with the greatest success, fruit which had never been sent to any extent before.

Mr. FOSTER. What profit would this bring to the shipper?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have no returns on that point. But pears have been very profitable, they have realized fully double what the same fruit would have realized at the point of shipment in this country after paying all expenses. The net profits have been fully double what they would have realized at Grimsby. Of grapes we sent over a considerable quantity the first season, but our manager in England reported that the English public do not eat them, not liking the peculiar taste of our grapes. The hon. gentleman perhaps knows that a great many of our Canadian grapes are what are called pulpy fruit. The seed is embedded like a strong pulp, and when it comes out in one piece in the mouth if it is separated it is found to have a stringent taste. Our first shipments were nearly all of that character of fruit. But we have, however, since been sending some other varieties, not so strong in that characteristic, and this last season some shipments were made, fewer in number and smaller

Mr. FISHER.

in quantities, but the success of these shipments was much greater.

Mr. FOSTER. Those, I suppose, were simply sample shipments?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were more than that. In one case we sent over one hundred cases, sufficient to make an appearance on the market. It was so successful that if a careful choice is made, our grapes may make a fair entry into the British market, and be sold at a profit. These sold this last year, which were of a better quality, at prices sufficient to make a profit.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the other fruits?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We sent shipments of peaches and tomatoes. The tomatoes were not successful on the whole, and this last season no tomatoes were sent. We had more success, in a partial way with peaches. I have here a statement of the shipment of the Alberta peach, which was praised very highly and which arrived there in very good condition. But, there seems to be a good deal of difficulty in getting the packers to pick them at the right stage of ripeness. If they are too ripe they hurt on the voyage, and though they may be all right when they get there, they go to pieces once they are taken out of cold storage. If they are not quite ripe when picked, they arrive in good order, and stand sufficiently long to sell at retail prices, and reap a good profit. I have here some statements of English critics, who have examined our peaches, and they say that if we can send them over in good condition, we would find a ready market for them, and they specially mentioned the Alberta peach.

Mr. FOSTER. That then, practically exhausts the fruits you sent over.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, I do not think there were any others.

Mr. FOSTER. Is anything done in the way of sending poultry?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, last fall and the fall before, we sent over a considerable quantity of dressed poultry. We paid the cost, and the department arranged for the fattening of some poultry.

Mr. FOSTER. They were chickens, I suppose.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, chickens.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that done by a patent process?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, they were crammed.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a humane proceeding?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think perfectly so.

Mr. FOSTER. Do the chickens never protest?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I have seen it done myself frequently. I have watched the operation, and I can say that the chickens do not seem to object to it at all. They certainly gain in flesh and quality in a most remarkable manner. The flesh of the chicken treated in this way is quite different from that of ordinary chickens we buy on the market here.

Mr. FOSTER. Whiter flesh?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Whiter and more delicate.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you cram them with?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A mixture of ground oats, sometimes corn-meal, mixed up with milk and a little beef tallow. It has to be ground into a fine mixture, so that the bird can digest it, and it has to be put into the bird with a pipe or tube.

Mr. FOSTER. Through the throat?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, right down into the crop. The operator takes the chicken under his arm, the tube is put down into its throat, and the appliance is worked with a foot-treadle.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a machine?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it might be operated by electricity.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not tried that. The profits to be made are such as to make it worth while to feed poultry for shipment to Great Britain. The British market and the large cities in England are largely supplied by people who follow that system, and they get extraordinary prices for their poultry. I am glad to say that the chickens we sent over, have brought such prices that I may say in a general way, we have doubled our money.

Mr. FOSTER. Are people going into these cramming institutes?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are a few, but there are not many. There is a gentleman in the neighbourhood of Ottawa, who has been for two or three years supplying the market here. There were three private individuals fattening chickens last year and shipping under our direction, to the English market. There were six or seven who did it for the department as an experimental work. I think there were about ten altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you any process of circulating information about this or teaching the farmers how to do it?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have advertised it, we have sent it out in our bulletins, and we have had it taken up at the institute meetings.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of a crammer?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think about \$20.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it is out of the reach of anybody but a professional?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think the ordinary farmer would go into the fattening of chickens for the market. The practice of the old country is that somebody sets up a poultry fattening establishment, buys chickens from the farmers, and by reason of his profits, he is able to give them better prices than could otherwise be paid.

Mr. FOSTER. How long does it take a professional to cram a chicken?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The actual cramming process only goes on for ten days, but they are generally prepared by a feeding process of about ten days before. It takes about three weeks from the time the chicken is started to fatten, until it is killed.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose you would not go on too long, because it would kill the chicken.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it would probably hurt the chicken.

Mr. FOSTER. Can you use that process on turkeys too?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have done so.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the result?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The same.

Mr. FOSTER. Goslings and ducks?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. We did not do anything with these at all.

Mr. CLANCY. How many of these vessels that were fitted up with cold storage, have electrical fans?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman exactly how many vessels fitted with cold storage have electrical fans. Professor Robertson and I have been urging on the vessel owners to improve the arrangements in the common holds, for the carrying of cheese and apples which do not go into cold storage. The ordinary holds are often ill ventilated, and apples, heating as they do slightly in the barrels, make the place so hot that it injures the fruit. I have the assurance of the vessel owners that a large number of the vessels last season were fitted up with elec-

trical fans and specially ventilating shafts. They are in no way under contract with us to do this, but I am still urging the ship owners to it. The same remark would apply to cheese as to apples put into the ordinary holds. I have asked Professor Robertson to ascertain what ships are fitted in this way so that we could inform the shippers.

Mr. BENNETT. Has there been any export of beef in cold storage ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think some small quantities of beef were shipped from Canada, but I have no knowledge of any export worth considering. Some of the vessels which are not under contract with us take Chicago beef at the present from Canada to England.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister give us an idea of what he is doing on the railways, and how much of this \$70,000 will be expended on that branch of the service.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have arranged with the railway companies to run a refrigerator car once a week or fortnight, according to the demands of the traffic. We guarantee to them that two-thirds of the capacity of these cars will be paid for. If the goods put in them do not come up to two-thirds of the capacity of the car, we make up the deficiency. They are obliged to give what is called less than car-load rates. Some of the routes are self-sustaining, and we do not have to contribute. We get the way-bills from the railways as to the cost to us. We have this arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway. We regulate the number of months during which they run these cars on the different lines, because in some places the production of butter and cheese only lasts four months in the year, whereas in other places it lasts five or six months.

Mr. CLANCY. Are there certain points at which these cars are loaded ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are put on the way-freights and are available at all the stations.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose that for the first one hundred miles the two-thirds capacity is not filled, but for the remainder of the distance it is thoroughly filled, what do you do then ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We pay for what is not filled.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you must almost always pay at the beginning of the journey ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, we take the two-thirds of the whole run. If the car is full the extra one-third counts for another trip so far as mileage is concerned. The whole capacity of the car for the season is reckoned up.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. FOSTER. How much money did you pay last year to each of these railways ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. \$6,000 is the amount Prof. Robertson has put in for this year for all the railways. I have no details to show how it is distributed. I think about the same amount was spent last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the trade not growing ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but the number of cars on which we have to pay is lessening. We get cars on which no payment has to be made as the trade grows, and the consequence is that we are able to take up other routes which we did not formerly have without any more charge on our payments. Last year, if I remember rightly, we paid about \$2,000 each to the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. You treat the Intercolonial the same as you do a railway which is not connected with the government ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Just the same.

Mr. FOSTER. How about warehouses ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The only warehouse which has taken up our offer is the one at Quebec. We offered a bonus of 5 per cent interest for three years on an investment of \$40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the total cost of the warehouse ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No ; the total cost is a good deal more than that.

Mr. FOSTER. On what rule do you make the payments ? On one-half or two-thirds of the cost ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. We estimated that a warehouse costing \$40,000 would be sufficient for the trade at that point, and we agreed to give a guarantee of 5 per cent on that amount for three years. If the people who undertook to do the work chose to put in a larger warehouse, they did it at their own risk. Quebec is the only place that has taken advantage of our offer.

Mr. FOSTER. After the three years have expired, what obligation are the owners of the warehouse under to continue to carry on the business.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is then established, and if they do not continue to carry on the business, the investment is a loss. In Halifax and St. John great efforts have been made to establish warehouses, but nobody has succeeded in doing so, and I am still approached and asked to offer greater inducements at those two points.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose after the three years at Quebec were up and the people said: 'We cannot carry on the business unless you do the same for us.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not do it.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did you start it?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because we believed the business was in the nature of an experiment. When this arrangement was made cold storage warehouses were comparatively unknown in the country, and people could not be assured of any returns for their investment; but, we believed they would be encouraged by that help for three years to put their money into the investment, and having done so, at the end of the three years they would find it advantageous enough to carry on the business afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been the experience?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At Quebec the warehouse has been built and the business has been going on this year.

Mr. FOSTER. To what extent was it used?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the figures. It was used considerably, but not to the extent that was expected. The position of Quebec is peculiar. For instance, the trade in butter is almost entirely in the hands of Montreal merchants and exporters, who, although they frequently buy butter in the neighbourhood of Quebec, bring it from Montreal to place it in warehouses there and hold it for export. The result is that butter which would naturally be expected to be placed in cold storage at Quebec has been brought up to Montreal and placed in cold storage there.

Mr. FOSTER. On what principle do you make the selection as to who shall have the bonus?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no question of selection. The Quebec warehouse is the only one in the country that has taken advantage of the bonus.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose that at the same point two or three would want it?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot suppose that. We made the proposition in the first place knowing well that it would be difficult to get people to take it up. I should say that in Charlottetown a gentleman has a cold storage warehouse for his own business, and we made an arrangement with him by which he agreed to place a chamber in it at the public service in return for a small subvention of \$600 a year for two years, being the interest on the cost of the chamber.

Mr. FOSTER. What are you doing in the creameries?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We wish to encourage the owners of creameries to put in a cold storage chamber, so that the butter manufactured there can be immediately placed in cold storage until sufficient accumulates to ship. For that reason we issued a circular to all the creamery owners in Canada stating that we would give a bonus of \$50 in the first year after the chamber was built, \$25 the next year and \$25 the next, making a total of \$100 for three years, the payments to cease at the end of that time. Here again it was hoped that after they would run for three years they would find it advantageous to continue. As a matter of fact, there are fifty-eight creameries on which which we now have to make the third payment, 114 on which we have to pay the second, and 104 on which we expect to pay the first time this year.

Mr. FOSTER. Being in all, how much?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In all, \$9,450 for this year.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these creameries well distributed over the country?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The creamery business is carried on more largely in Quebec than any other province of the Dominion. Ontario has gone largely into cheese factories, while Quebec seems to have taken more to the butter industry.

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion of this money is for the province of Quebec?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should say fully one-half, and the rest is distributed mainly in Ontario and Manitoba, with a few creameries in the maritime provinces.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is the hon. minister building creameries in Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are not building creameries anywhere. We give this bonus to people who build creameries, to induce them to have a cold storage room in connection with the creamery, so that they can put the butter in cold storage as soon as it is made.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is not a creamery being built in the county of Inverness?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. The government of Nova Scotia have made an arrangement by which they gave assistance to the establishment of a creamery in a county where there was no creamery; and on behalf of the Department of Agriculture here, in pursuance of the policy that was carried out in Prince Edward Island some years ago, we agree to maintain the creameries which were established in that way. There was one creamery established this spring, I think, in the county of

Inverness, in Mabou. I understand that the building was put up by the people of the neighbourhood, and the local government of Nova Scotia gave them a subsidy to equip it. We undertake to run it for a year, to put it on its feet. That is done out of the dairying vote.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Does the hon. minister remember any objection to the building of that creamery on account of the vested interests of people engaged in a similar industry in the locality?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understood that there was a good deal of discussion as to the location of the creamery. That was a matter for the people of the locality and one into which we did not enter.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Did not the hon. minister give assurance that the vested interests I had alluded to would not be interfered with by the expenditure of that grant?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. I had nothing to do with that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have here some correspondence with reference to that point. I have here a letter written by Mr. Archibald, in the county of Inverness, who owns a number of creameries in the eastern part of Nova Scotia, and two cheese factories in the county of Inverness, at Mabou. I will read the correspondence to remind the Minister of Agriculture what took place, as it seems he has forgotten:

Antigonish, N.S., Jan. 22, 1898.

Prof. J. W. Robertson, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Mr. Robertson, of the Nappan Experimental Farm, and Mr. Hopkins have been here and held two very instructive meetings, but unfortunately a snowstorm prevented many getting in from the country districts. In the spring, when the weather and roads are more to be depended on, I feel satisfied a repetition of these meetings either in town or outlying districts would bear good results.

These gentlemen informed me that Mr. Macfarlane, a dairyman in the employ of the Dominion government, is expected to spend about ten days in Cape Breton holding meetings among the farmers, and will commence in about a week or ten days. I surmise one of these meetings will be held at or near Mabou, where I have two cheese factories established, one started in 1890, and the other last spring, the former near the town and the other on east side of harbour, about four miles distant. I beg to inclose a letter from Mr. McKeen which explains itself. Both Messrs. Robertson and Hopkins assure me there must be some mistake about Dr. McLellan's offer, as the best offer known to them made by the government is the one carried out in Prince Edward Island, and in no case is it being carried out in a district where it could possibly interfere with an established creamery and cheese factory. They strongly urged me to write you and the Minister of Agriculture re the matter before it is too late, and to make a proposition that might be to the mutual advantage of all concerned. I feel satisfied, if

Mr. FISHER.

this scheme is carried out, many of my patrons will, even at great inconvenience to themselves, leave me and patronize a government establishment, principally because it is government, regardless of consequences. The locality referred to is only about three miles from my Mabou Bridge factory, and I fail to see where the milk is coming from to support it, unless from my districts.

As the government's object, of course, is to benefit the greatest number, I would suggest, if this scheme is to be carried out, my bridge factory, which is most central and the only locality at all, for years at least, suitable for carrying on winter dairying, be taken and fitted up as a creamery, then for a season or two, to satisfy farmers whether or not they would be warranted in investing their money, making it a permanent business.

If you can satisfy the farmers to continue the business, I know of no better locality in Nova Scotia for milk, as last season I got as high as 16,000 pounds of milk per day at the two factories; and one season, a few years ago, turned out over forty tons of cheese in four and one-half months from bridge factory, and output this season was about equal to each factory—twenty-five tons in a little over four months.

I might say just here re disappointment of patrons referred to by Mr. McKeen, that I only advanced 50 cents instead of 60 cents for June milk. The patrons asked, as a great favour, for their money before it was due, and not having possession of all the cheese to hypothecate it, bank was unable to advance any more. As an offset to this, however, I had more than an equivalent amount to collect from them for cans, and which is still outstanding. My agent was to advance 60 cents for the first three months and balance when cheese season was closed, and all cheese sold, and I regret to say I still have on hand about 1,300 boxes, and am advised by cable to-day to sell on this side, and not to ship. Cheese belong to this county and Mabou factories.

You can readily understand how we are situated re marketing our cheese; once our local market is lilled up (and it has been glutted for years) we have no alternative but ship to England, so what can we do when advised by our friends not to ship.

With the past few years' experience, no doubt the farmers in all my districts would hail with delight the advent of the government coming in to manufacture and market their cheese and butter, and care little whether I am compelled to close up or not.

The past season I only ran six of my ten factories, and am already advised by parties of two of these districts that I must move the factories three or four miles or close up next season. I trust you will think favourably of my proposition and carry it out. No doubt, we can easily come to terms of some kind for leasing or otherwise.

I might, in this connection, say there seems to be a growing demand for a creamery or two in this county, and now is the time to secure before the local government bonus is discontinued. This county is still entitled to the three. My Union Centre factory would be the most central for one, excepting where we expect to put in a butter plant with our condensing factory. Will you kindly bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, as I presume all these matters must come through you.

Waiting an early and favourable reply,

Yours very respectfully,

L. C. ARCHIBALD.

Here is a letter from Professor Robertson :

Ottawa, January 21, 1898.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 22nd inst. I inclose herewith the letter from Mr. McKeen. Mr. Robertson, of the Nappan farm, and Mr Peter McFarlane are to attend a number of meetings in Cape Breton, beginning this week. I did not obtain a list of the places at which the meetings were to be held, as these were to be arranged for by Mr. Chipman, Secretary of Agriculture, Halifax.

I have brought the matters which you refer to to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, and he directs me to say that it has been decided that our department will not take charge of any creameries and cheese factories in Cape Breton the coming season of 1898, and if our department should take charge of a few creameries to get this business well established in Cape Breton some time later on, you may be sure that these creameries, assisted in this way by the government, will not be placed where they will do any injury to existing cheese factories or creameries, or any injustice to those who had the enterprise to put their money into them. Our department was quite anxious to start a winter creamery or two in Antigonish County several years ago; but that being rendered impracticable, the Dominion turned that matter over to the local government in the various provinces.

Yours truly,

J. W. ROBERTSON,  
Commissioner.

This gentleman who invested his money in the county of Inverness in two cheese factories was assured by the officers of the minister, after consultation with the minister that his enterprise would not be interfered with by the expenditure of any money at the disposal of the department. Instead of complying with that promise, the minister is now constructing a creamery at a point between these two factories of Mr. Archibald at a cost of \$3,000. Mr. Archibald, having found these creameries would interfere with his cheese business, made a proposition to sell his buildings at a low price or to rent them at a reasonable price, but the minister has refused to do that. Mr. Archibald complains that a great injustice is done to his business and to his investment. I would like the minister to give some further information as to how he was led to take this step.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My explanation is very simple. I had no voice in the matter of the establishment of these creameries. The people of the locality decided to put up the building, the local government gave a bonus to equip the building. Before I knew where the building was going to be I had agreed to run the factory so built and equipped. When the one at Mabou had fulfilled these conditions I simply undertook to see to the running of it. The letters which the hon. gentleman has read were written some two or more years ago, and dealt with the condition of affairs at that time. I was then being asked to contribute to the establishment of creameries in Cape Breton, but I found I

was not able to do that. But afterwards the people of the neighbourhood and the local government brought about a condition of affairs in which I was able to contribute to the running of the creamery.

Mr. McDUGALL. The site was selected by the officers of the hon. gentleman's department.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. The site was arranged for by the local regulations of the local government. The local government gave a bonus to any county in which there was no creamery established, provided the people in the neighbourhood would put up a building suitable for a creamery. They then gave a bonus, and I made an agreement with the government of Nova Scotia that if they did that I would run a creamery for a year or two, to put it on its feet.

Mr. McDUGALL. Is not the Department of Agriculture paying for the cost of the construction of the building?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not one cent. The people there are paying for it themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. \$60,800 has been accounted for in this vote of \$70,000. What is the other \$9,000 for?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are office expenses, and the expenses of our agents and inspectors. We have a man, in Montreal, who looks after the cold storage there and the same man goes down to St. John in the winter. We have a man in England for six months. He looks after the arrivals of fruit and poultry shipments there and watches their passage through the English market. We have also a man at Grimsby who supervises the starting of the fruit shipments from there.

Mr. FOSTER. That makes up the \$9,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not sure of the exact details. The old vote was not spent during this current year.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been spent?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say positively, but Prof. Robertson told me this morning that he thought we might have, up to the present time, about \$10,000 left.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you expect to spend more next year than last year?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, the payments to some of these ships will be larger next year than they have been this year. In addition to that I hope to have a larger staff to receive the fruit shipments in England. I had a number of urgent representations this spring from the fruit growers and shippers asking that particular care should be taken in regard to the

examination into the way in which their fruit was handled on its arrival in England, and while going through the British markets. I have promised that I would have a man in London, Liverpool, Glasgow and Bristol to specially watch all our fruit shipments.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will remember that he promised to give me a statement in regard to North-west creameries. The arrangement is in regard to the creameries in the North-west Territories for three years and it has now expired. The information I have is that most of the creameries are a good deal behind and do not appear able to meet the terms of their contract.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have a statement here which I will give to the hon. gentleman. He asked me for a statement of the gross amount of what we advanced to the creameries, and what they have paid back. It is as follows:

Creamery.

Calgary and two outlying stations.	\$3,333	\$3,239
Cardston.....	277	250
Church Bridge.....	2,236	613
Grenfell.....	2,513	1,926
Innisfail.....	6,000	2,000
Maple Creek.....	1,600	400
Mcsejaw.....	1,700	1,600
Moosomin.....	2,000	700
Prince Albert.....	3,100	187
Qu'Appelle.....	2,100	700
Red Deer.....	700	51
Regina.....	1,174	1,001
Saltcoats.....	600	150
Edmonton, with outlying creamery stations .....	5,600	600
Wetaskiwin.....	3,200	900
Whitewood.....	2,700	2,000
Wolsely.....	3,000	600
Yorkton.....	3,000	2,000
Tindastoll.....	150	50

Mr. CLANCY. Some of these places seem to be pretty far behind.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but lately at some places payments have been pretty fair. I am sorry to say, however, that that has not been the case all over. Some of these creameries have been patronized to such a small extent that the payments have been very small. During the last two years wheat has been so satisfactory a crop, in Assiniboia that creameries have been neglected. That is not the case in Alberta where the creameries have been doing a good business.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman able to give the whole sum that they are now in arrears.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. They are \$25,000 in arrears.

Mr. FOSTER. With what prospects of getting it?

Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am afraid that in regard to some of them they will not return it for some time. Others are making good progress. Since wheat has come to be such a good crop creameries are neglected.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman still extending the aid in that country?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. CLANCY. How many are there now altogether?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think sixteen creameries and seventeen skimming stations. The results otherwise have been most gratifying. The people who have taken their milk to these creameries are extremely satisfied, and the neighbourhoods where these creameries are established are attracting immigrants. The trade in butter also has been quite satisfactory. We have sold a large quantity in British Columbia, and a considerable quantity has been sent regularly to Japan and to the Klondike. We are establishing a trade in Japan which I am quite sure will increase.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that agriculture has made great progress since the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) presides over that department. Every one of us is doing his best to promote the interests of the farming community, the more so as it is the branch of business which is the great wealth-producing industry of the country. I quite realize all the advantages accruing to us from the establishment of the cold storage system, for which some people give the credit to the hon. minister. but I think it is open to doubt whether the hon. gentleman can fairly claim that credit. But at this stage of the debate, I am not going to enter into the merits of that question.

I only wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that under the new contracts, we are paying higher rates than we did last year. That is due to the want of foresight of the hon. minister, in not renewing his contracts last year. Under the critical circumstances with which we were confronted last year, it would have been an easy thing for the minister to foresee that in the event of war breaking out in South Africa, a large number of ships would be diverted from the ordinary course of business, and engaged in carrying troops and provisions to South Africa; and if he had made those cold storage arrangements last year, it would have been far better both for the government and the shippers, and for the farmers as well.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I must say that I cannot answer the hon. gentleman in French.

Mr. F. A. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman speaks very good

French, and as there are now in the House a great many French-speaking members, they would be delighted to hear the hon. gentleman explaining himself in that language.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. (Translation.) The friends of the hon. gentleman understand English just as well as I do.

Mr. FOSTER. (Translation.) No, but understand French just as well.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcotte) has rehearsed the old story in regard to my lack of experience in not foreseeing the war in South Africa. I am in good company in that, because not even the Imperial government did foresee it, as is evidenced by the statements made by Lord Salisbury, Lord Lansdowne and others. The difficulties which have arisen in regard to our transportation are entirely due to the fact that such a large number of vessels have been diverted from the ordinary course of business. I would point out that the price of cold storage accommodation has not increased nearly so much from Canadian ports as from United States ports. It is 300 per cent more to-day from the United States than from Canada. What our people have to pay 15 shillings per ton for, the people of the United States are paying 40 to 50 shillings per ton for, so that our rivals in this trade are paying a great deal more than we are. I venture to say that the cold storage accommodation from Canada is probably to-day the best there is in the world. I say that, not from my own knowledge, although I have carefully compared it with that of other countries, but I say it as the deliberate statement and opinion of disinterested critics. I have in my hand a statement from a well-known journal called *Ice and Cold Storage*, published at Bridge Street, London, England, in which there is an article which contains the following:

When the history of Canada's agricultural interests comes to be written up, its progress, of a truth must date from the year 1896. . . . By these means a great improvement in the nature of Canadian butter was at once manifested, and it immediately began to advance in price and reputation. It has, we are glad to say, continued so ever since. From being 10s. to 12s. per hundred pounds below Australian butter, in 1895, at the end of 1899 it had risen to 8s. per hundred above that class of goods, and in the self-same market. We have it on the best authority that the price obtained by the Canadian farmer last year was one penny per pound more than realized, in 1895, and Great Britain as we have already pointed out in a previous article in 'Ice and Cold Storage' took 1,000,000 pounds worth of butter during last year. . . .

It will thus be clear to the meanest form of intelligence that the Dominion farmers have, during the past four years, thanks to cold storage, received some 1,227,400 pounds more for their butter, which, had it not been for cold storage they would never have had. There are

very few people who will not agree that the Minister of Agriculture has done something at least to qualify his office and benefit the Canadian farmers. The farmers themselves certainly will.

Mr. CLANCY. That sounds like a production of the Minister of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is not my production. It is the production of an independent journal in England.

Mr. CLANCY. I venture to say it is an inspiration from the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not at all. I never knew even of the existence of that journal until it was sent to me. Here is a statement which comes from Mr. Samson Morgan, who is the agricultural critic of the *London Times*:

I duly received the sample cases of Canadian apples and pears, and a box of peaches, which you sent me, and as your representative for the distribution of the fruit in this country informed me that you would be pleased to have my opinion on same, I herewith send you a report which is disinterested, and can therefore be depended upon with the utmost confidence. I am in a position to speak authoritatively upon this subject, as an expert from a market point of view, being the only fruit trade journalist who has, for just upon a quarter of a century, made choice fruit production, packing and distribution a special study, that is, in the United Kingdom.

The apples were snows, and when opened, the fruits were found to be in prime condition. Not one was unsound. They were wrapped separately in paper, and had been packed in layers and in rows. A better style for good fruit could not possibly be conceived. The fruits were medium in size. Possibly we want a larger sample on our markets, though the quality was excellent, and I was very much struck with them altogether.

Then as to the pears. They had been put up in the same size of box as the apples and each fruit had been wrapped in a small square of paper. They were absolutely sound, and in grand condition. I kept some of these pears for two weeks, and when fully ripened the flavour was delicious. They were *Beurre D'Anjou*. From these samples, it is clear that Canadian exporters can easily put high quality pears upon the English markets, and at the right time, too. I am satisfied that for quality, size, clearness of skin and condition that they will readily compare with the best Californian and French fruits. A better pear than these *d'Anjou* never entered the English markets, and I am confident that a big future lies before the Canadian pear trade in the United Kingdom. I was immensely pleased with these fruits, and the prices realized justifies the commendation I give them. With care in grading they would prove a very serious competitor to the French fruits, as the sample cases under notice were put up in better style, and the fruits were certainly cleaner skinned and much more dainty as eaters, than the foreign ones referred to.

Here the specimens were in fairly good condition, but not what could be termed perfect, the flesh of some being a little discoloured. All in the box I had were, however, eatable, of excellent size, and like the apples and pears, had been well and evenly graded, an important feature in the fruit trade here. The colour was

good, but the flesh was too fit, if I may expressively put it thus, that is, they needed to be sold in a day or two at least, not being in keeping condition. They were not so juicy as our forced peaches, but the flesh was firmer, and as an advocate of fruit eating, I claim that these Canadian Elberta peaches are magnificent, and I should like to be able to live on them without anything else for a month. They are very delicious, possess a nutritious flesh, and should prove a great boon to the consumers in all of our cities and towns.

My report will be found most encouraging to those on your side who have taken a great interest in the development of the Canadian fruit industry, though the praise given to the packages and their contents is due to merit, and well deserved. The Canadian fruit-growers are to be congratulated upon having the fruit export trade, including packing, shipment and distribution, dealt with in such an admirable manner by the officials of the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa.

The hon. gentleman the other day informed this House that our Canadian goods were being sold in England as American goods; but we find this condition of affairs to-day, that a large firm in Liverpool advertises for 20,000 boxes of Canadian eggs for delivery during October, November and December of last year. Here is another thing which some years ago we never saw in England, but which is now quite common—an advertisement of Canadian grapes, with the statement that they are grown on British soil, and that the people of England have waked up to the fact that they can get these food products in Canada. They are proud of the fact, and are glad to state that they are grown on British soil and are an inducement to the people of England to come to a country which was the first to give a preference in its markets to British goods; and they are glad to come here and trade with us in a way that they never did before.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have been criticising a good deal this cold storage, they have been saying how very small and unimportant a thing it is, and how it is only a continuation of their own policy. I would like to read a word or two from the statements of Prof. Robertson of a few years ago when discussing this matter. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), I think, stated that they had paid nothing for cold storage accommodation before my coming into office. I find, however, that \$6,600 was paid by him for the fitting up of cold storage ice compartments on steamships, and that there was a guaranteed payment on space of \$3,400. This is a statement of Prof. Robertson made before the committee on Agriculture in 1897:

To show the very rapid gain in the export butter trade, with such imperfect cold storage on the steamships only as could be obtained.

That had reference to the cold storage in 1896, of which hon. gentlemen opposite boast, and which they say was so good; but since that time we have brought mechanical cold storage into existence, and

have continued it until we have reaped the advantages which I have just been pointing out. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that with the cold storage of that day they had perfect success; but in Prof. Robertson's statement of 1896, speaking of the cold storage arrangements of 1895, he says, in regard to a trial shipment of perishable fruits—and I find in the Auditor General's Report that the minister of that day paid for that fruit:

The shipment was made on September 7, 1895, per steamship 'Mongolian.' The fruit, such as grapes and others of like perishable character, arrived in a damaged and almost worthless condition. It appears the fruit became heated in the refrigerator car during the journey from the initial point of shipment to Montreal. As there was no mechanical refrigerating plant on the steamship, the cases could not be cooled, and it is doubtful whether the fruit could have been preserved after the process of decay had actively begun, even if it had been chilled as soon as put on board the steamship.

The hon. gentleman stated that they had no losses with their ice cold storage, and that the losses had only occurred with the mechanical cold storage; but this statement of Prof. Robertson shows that the statement of the hon. gentleman was not accurate, to say the least of it, for they lost the whole shipment. But I have an authority here which I do not think the hon. gentleman will dispute for a moment. In the first place, it comes from the *Montreal Gazette*, the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, and in the second place it is the statement of a unanimous resolution of the Butter and Cheese Association:

That the thanks of this association are hereby tendered to the Department of Agriculture for arranging for excellent cold storage service on the steamships from Canadian ports, and also for regular refrigerator car service on railways, and for assistance to owners of creameries in providing cold storage at creameries.

The president of that association is Mr. Arthur Hodgson, who was in the chair, a well known Conservative of the city of Montreal, and a number of other gentlemen were present who are Conservatives. However, they do not carry their politics into their business; but when they understand that something is being done to help their business, they are willing to sink their party feelings, and give the credit where credit is due. I think it only right that these things should be put before the committee so as to show that the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to this cold storage are not founded on independent or unbiassed opinions, and that as a matter of fact those who know about the business are satisfied with what has been done. Under these circumstances, I feel that I can safely ask the House to grant me this vote, and, if necessary, more, to continue to provide the cold storage transportation which has worked such great benefit to the farmers.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not propose to let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) to go through the little farce he has gone through for the last half hour unchallenged. He has made the old statement that we have the best cold storage system in the world. He quotes extracts from one journal in the United Kingdom, to which he sent a batch of fruit, and the least the editor could do was to give the hon. gentleman a puff. The hon. gentleman declared that they were first class, and the best in the world. Yet the sound had scarcely left his lips, when, in answer to my hon. friend's (Mr. Foster's) question about pears, he said they were too small and were not in favour in England. Thus he made statements diametrically opposed to one another. The same about grapes they were not liked in England. And this gentleman whom he tells us is an authority says—

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He did not mention grapes; and I told the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) that those of last year were very much better than those of the year before.

Mr. CLANCY. And what about the pears?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The pears were excellent, though some of them were small.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman said that the pears were not in favour, that they were too small. The fact is the hon. gentleman made two statements that were contrary in substance and in fact. And everyone knows who has read Prof. Robertson's reports and who have heard his statements before the Committee on Agriculture, that the cold storage is far from being a success. Resolutions may have been passed in the Montreal board of trade, probably engineered by some gentlemen who knew little about the matter. But in Prof. Robertson's own reports, up to this hour, you will find the statement that cold storage is on trial, and the impression will be gained from these reports that much is expected of it that will not be realized. With regard to the butter the hon. gentleman took last year, it will be found that it was received badly—apples in the same way—cheese in the same way. While I do not want to bore the House as long as the hon. gentleman did, I venture to say that the statement he made to-night was hardly worthy of his position. It seems to me he was talking for victory and not for facts.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Victory is coming too.

Mr. CLANCY. It is coming in the statement more than in the fact. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the statement he has made to-night is hardly worthy of the great department over which he temporarily presides.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this the last item the Minister of Finance intends to take up to-night?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, we have an item in the Customs.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this the last item in the Agriculture?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. We were to have an explanation in regard to the census?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I thought I gave that. We expect to carry out the census on the same lines as before.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the hon. minister catch what the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said just now?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I was listening too intently to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. It is too good to lose. The hon. member for North Wellington said the Minister of Agriculture had shown very little sense to-night. What is the principle upon which the census is to be taken?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It has always been taken on what is known as the de jure plan. I suppose that the next census will be taken on the same plan. For purposes of comparison, it is well that the same plan should be pursued.

Mr. FOSTER. The government has come to that conclusion, has it?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Will about the same schedules be taken as last time?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not gone into the details of the schedules. A number of representations have been made to me on that subject. I thought I would wait until I got this vote, and, practically, till this session was over before I went into that matter.

Mr. FOSTER. When does the census begin?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1901. The time of the year is not fixed yet. It usually begins in April. That will depend upon the organization of the work, which I have not yet discussed with my officers or my colleagues.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any other item coming down for the Paris Exposition?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is an item in the supplementary estimates for next year. I do not know how much.

Mr. FOSTER. That item being passed, I think we have done all we should be asked to do to-night.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not propose to stay here and work at near four o'clock in the morning. We have been doing proper work, and I do not imagine we shall be called upon by the Finance Minister to stay after this. So far as I am concerned, I intend to protest against it, and to enforce that protest as far as I can. To ask us to stay here longer, is utterly unreasonable.

Mr. McMULLEN. You have sat here all night and done nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member (Mr. McMullen) has not charge of this committee, and he will find it is not the wisest thing to undertake to force matters. It was well understood that the criticism of the Department of Agriculture was to be taken up on the votes that have just been passed. I was not in favour of going on at the time we got in the estimates at half-past one. But we sat longer and did good work. It was forced on us; and we have been kept here, and kept with perfect good-humour.

Mr. McMULLEN. You have kept us here all night.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) seems to have come to a silly season. Does he mean to say that we have not a right to have the estimates explained to us?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I would like now to take up item 265.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to know from the Minister of Finance whether we are supposed to go on any further with these estimates at this hour of the morning, if so, I propose to protest against it with all the force I have left. Flesh and blood cannot stand everything. We are treated as human beings ought not to be treated.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no motion before the Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I move that the committee rise. I do not want to move that motion, I would rather the Minister of Finance moved it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think we had better try to get through this item. Really we have made very little progress to-day.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman has made a motion that the committee rise, without reporting progress, and asking leave to sit again, therefore, undoing all that we have done during the session. With reference to this item 265, it was left over at the request of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), who stated that the hon. member for York was not in his place at that time, and that he wanted to bring up a certain matter, that matter being the Lemieux matter, though the hon. gentleman did not mention it. To-morrow the hon. member for York has

Mr. McMULLEN.

brought up that matter on motion to go into supply. He has spoken upon it twice, and said that he had nothing more to say upon it. That being the case, I see no reason why we should not go on and pass this item.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will remember that all these items went through practically without criticism, but one was allowed to stand with the understanding that when that one came up there could be a general discussion on all the others.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The items did not go through without discussion, I gave full explanations on them all. I was prepared to go on with the Yukon item to-night, and I would like to put it through. I do not think it is unreasonable to ask the committee to pass this item now. It cannot be supposed that every member of the House and every member of the government who has a good deal of work to do can be in the House at all times. I think it is rather an unreasonable request to ask that this item should stand.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think I witnessed anything more unreasonable in my parliamentary experience than the attitude of the hon. gentleman. The hon. Minister of Customs has items totalling up beyond \$1,000,000, which money goes all over the country. There is not a department that has more varying interests than this. The hon. gentleman's estimates were not critically discussed and he got them through very easily. He gave his explanations, but the hon. gentleman knows that explanations are not all that is to be taken up in passing estimates. I had several matters that I wanted to discuss on these votes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace) was here while these items were being considered.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be, but every man has rights in this House. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) could not have said, and I do not believe he did, that I wanted this to be left over, to discuss the Lemieux matter. That was not in my mind.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the hon. minister will not say that I assigned any reason at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I intended to discuss the Lemieux matter upon going into supply when a motion could be moved and voted upon. The hon. gentleman has no right to confine me to the discussion of his estimates and in the discussion of the Lemieux matter.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I only alluded to the fact that the hon. gentleman told me that he proposed to go on with that one night. He said: I do not propose to go into this now, because I intend to

bring up the Lemieux matter when the Customs estimates are reached. That is the reason I made the statement.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Does the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) think it is right to ask me to go into the discussion of several matters in reference to these votes at this early hour in the morning?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** If this were the last opportunity that the hon. gentleman would have for the discussion of the Customs vote I would be inclined to think that perhaps his position would be fair, but as we have items coming under which the whole question can be raised I do not think he should be such a stickler for the opportunity to discuss these things. These items were pretty fully discussed, and the matter was held over so that it could be dealt with generally. I do not think we have had a very busy day's work, but we have had a long discussion by a few hon. gentlemen, and I had hoped that we might have done some of the real work of the House to-night. If the hon. gentleman will allow these items to pass he will have every opportunity to discuss these questions and I think that is a fair proposition.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I do not think it is a fair proposition.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** We may remain here for two or three hours making no progress, and I propose taking the responsibility of moving that the motion be withdrawn, and that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to and committee rose and reported progress.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

**Mr. FOSTER.** What estimates will be taken up on Monday?

**The MINISTER OF FINANCE.** There are still some items in the Interior Department, and if the Customs items are not to be proceeded with, the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), with his own estimates, or with those of the Public Works Department, will continue.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** There is one item that the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) requested to stand that he may wish to go on with on Monday.

**Mr. FOSTER.** That is the Ryley question?

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4 a.m. (Saturday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, June 18, 1900.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### EMERGENCY RATIONS COMMITTEE.

**Mr. N. A. BELCOURT** (Ottawa) presented the first report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the purchase of emergency rations for the use of the Canadian troops in South Africa.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER** (Cape Breton). I draw the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that it is necessary that the permission of the House should be obtained in order to enable the committee to report from time to time; and I would suggest that my hon. friend move that the committee be so authorized in order to put this report in order.

**Mr. BELCOURT.** That is what the report recommends—that the committee have leave to report from time to time.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** The difficulty is that you must have the authority of the House to make the first report.

**The PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If this report is adopted, surely the committee will have leave to report from time to time afterwards?

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** I understand that it is not competent for the committee to make this report until they have first obtained leave of the House to report from time to time; and I suggest, therefore, that my hon. friend should move that the committee have power to report from time to time, and then this report will be in order.

**Mr. B. RUSSELL** (Halifax). It seems to me that by adopting the report we shall have leave to report from time to time. That is the advice the chairman got from the clerk upstairs.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** The difficulty, I understand, is that the committee cannot make this report until the House gives it leave to do so.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** For my part, I cannot see the point. At all events, if it is there, I am quite willing to accept it. Therefore, if the Clerk of the House will write a motion, we shall be quite willing to adopt it.

**Mr. BELCOURT** moved:

That the committee appointed on Friday last do report from time to time.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. BELCOURT** moved:

That the first report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the purchase of emer-

gency rations for the use of the Canadian troops in South Africa be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

#### CHARLOTTETOWN AND MURRAY HARBOUR RAILWAY.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 182) respecting the construction of a branch railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour. He said: The Bill contains only one clause and a schedule, which is the agreement entered into between the government of the Dominion and the government of the Island of Prince Edward.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### INQUIRIES FOR PAPERS.

**Mr. G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask again for a report of the work of Mr. J. E. Girouard, as registrar, from the time of his appointment up to the latest date at which it can be obtained. I wish also to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that he has not yet brought down the report upon which was based the action on the coasting arrangements on the lakes. The Minister of Finance said he would bring it down.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). What I did tell the hon. gentleman was that the order in council would be brought down. It is an echo of the report.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I would like also to call the attention of the members of the government to the fact that no further returns have been brought down as regards the dismissals for partisan purposes, of officials in the employ of the government from July, 1896.

**Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND** (North Oxford). May I ask the hon. gentleman if the report he refers to with regard to Mr. Girouard is the information he asked for during the consideration of the estimates?

**Mr. FOSTER.** Yes.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** I brought it down the next day.

**Mr. FOSTER.** By the way, has the minister heard anything yet from the autocrat of the Yukon?

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** Nothing.

#### REPRESENTATION OF THE YUKON.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER** (Cape Breton). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), to a petition which was sent from a mass meeting of the inhabitants of Dawson in regard to the question of representation. As I understand it,

**Mr. BELCOURT.**

my right hon. friend stated to the House that it was not the intention of the government to take up the question of representation in the Yukon, or to deal with it, until the general census had been taken. I wish, therefore, to give notice that, on going into supply on a future occasion, I propose to move the following resolution:

That this House is of opinion that the time has come when provision should be made for an advisory council, partly elective partly nominative by the Crown, as in the case of the Northwest Territories up to the year 1888, for the administration of affairs now dealt with by the executive of the Yukon district. That this House is further of opinion that immediate provision should be made for the representation of the said district in the parliament of Canada.

If the House will permit me, I would say that this motion is made in no spirit of hostility to the government or its policy; but I am really in hopes that I shall be able to make such a strong case for immediate action, that I shall convince my right hon. friend that the government can properly accept my motion, and act under it.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) knows that I am always open to conviction, if good reasons are given to me. I await, with some anxiety, the reasons which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) will have to give us; but I may remind him that on a recent occasion, I informed the House that the government intended to have the Yukon represented in the territorial council. That is our policy—to issue a proclamation to put in force the provision of an Act passed last session, which authorized representation in the Yukon. And, as to representation of the Yukon territory upon the floor of parliament, previous to the census that is to be taken next year—that is a point, which for my part, I have not yet seen the opportunity of doing so; but I shall be glad, on a future occasion, to hear the views of my hon. friend.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Perhaps I may be permitted to ask whether it is the intention of the government—because, if so, it will cover that part of the question—to take steps immediately to have representation by elected members in the executive in council?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Yes.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** And the government have already power to deal with that question?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Yes.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Then I will eliminate that portion of my resolution. I was not present when the right hon. gentleman made that announcement. I shall confine my efforts to endeavouring to induce my right hon. friend to go a little farther, and grant immediate representation to the Yukon in the House of Commons.

### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—EMERGENCY RATION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I ask the indulgence of the House for a moment. On Friday last, my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan), informed me that he would be obliged to leave Ottawa to-morrow, and be away part of this week, and that, therefore, he preferred not to have his name upon this committee upon which he was appointed, because he could not be a regular attendant. In view of this fact, I beg to move :

That Mr. Costigan be excused from serving on the select committee appointed to inquire into the purchase of emergency ration, and that Mr. Campbell be substituted in his place on the said committee.

Motion agreed to.

### THE PARIS EXPOSITION.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). I should like to call the attention of the government to a matter in which the Department of Agriculture is particularly interested. The House knows that we passed a vote for the Paris Exposition, with only a very short discussion. An enormous expenditure is taking place on this service, and, as yet, we have had no details. We are to have another vote in the supplementary estimates to carry on that work. I may say to the government, that statements are being made in the country, and they have been made to me by people who say they know, that these expenditures are far greater than they should be. For instance, take one item—that of the building. That building cost \$115,000 or \$120,000, but, I am told, it should not have cost \$20,000. Before we are asked to vote any more money for the Paris Exposition, I think it is the duty of the minister, to bring all the details with regard to the expenditures which have been made in this connection, in order that the committee may understand them. Further, Professor Robertson has recently visited the exposition, at the instance, I have no doubt, of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). Professor Robertson has now returned, and, I think, we should have his report as to the condition in which he found things. But I think that neither the Minister of Agriculture nor the government can ask us to pass any more estimates until we have had a detailed statement of the expenditure that has already been made. I am perfectly positive, in my own mind, that that money will be shown to have been largely wasted. However, that will be for the committee to judge. But what I want to impress upon the minister is that, to avoid a very long discussion, he ought to have all these details before the committee when he asks for his vote.

### YUKON TELEGRAPH LINE—MR. J. B. CHARLESON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Picou). I would call the attention of the acting

Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock), to the serious state of the Charleson matter. I made statements on this matter, subject to official information, which I was very anxious to have brought down at an early date, that having been prevented from being ordered by the House, owing to objection taken to my motion by the Prime Minister. I would like to ask the acting Minister of Public Works, what progress has been made with the return on that subject? I have no desire, personally, to have the statements, which I made on information, which I stated to the House, standing in the shape they have been standing in, with no official answer or explanation. As far back as February, the whole subject was covered by a notice of motion; but the notice was not allowed to pass as an unopposed motion, and consequently the House was kept in the dark. And then I came forward and asked the consent of the government to have the official information ordered, and, to show the urgency, I mentioned very serious statements which reflected on the honour and character of Mr. Charleson. But the Prime Minister saw fit to prevent that by invoking the rules of the House. I bowed to those rules. But the statement was made that the government would, of its own motion, have certain papers prepared. Not merely in justice to myself, but in justice to all parties concerned, I would urge greater celerity in the preparation of the returns. The acting Minister of Public Works told me last week that he had given instructions to have these papers collected as quickly as possible. I desire to ask when we may expect those papers to be brought before the House?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I may say that on Friday, I think it was, I spoke to my deputy again, and he told me he had collected the papers and was getting them copied. My hon. friend may rely upon it that there will be no disposition whatever to delay the production of all the information that is in the department.

### AMERICAN TUGS TOWING LOGS.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I would like to ask if it is correct that certain parties have asked for the privilege of towing logs on Georgian Bay between Canadian points, in other words, doing coasting; and if it is the intention of the government to comply with their request?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). In reply to the hon. gentleman I would say, that I regret that I was not in my place when he asked this question on Friday. The hon. gentleman knows that ministers can hardly be in the House all the time, they have departmental work that crowds upon them. I noticed that the hon. gentleman had asked the question, and I made inquiry. There has been no such general application of tug owners so far as

I can ascertain. There was an application made on behalf of the Hall Company, I think, that are erecting a large mill at Sarnia, and who said it was their intention to have one of their tugs brought over to Canada and rebuilt in order to obtain a Canadian register and to be used in doing their work in Canadian waters. In the meantime they said it was a matter of very great importance to them that they should be permitted to bring one raft from some port on the Georgian Bay to Sarnia, and representations were made that it was impossible for them to secure a Canadian tug to do it. Under the circumstances it was deemed by the department to be in the interest of the country that they should be granted permission to do so.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it the intention of the government to permit others to follow in the same line?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Only on special application such as this, and after the department has taken the whole matter into consideration and assured themselves that no public or private interest will suffer. It is only under such special circumstances as these that permission has been granted, nor is it the intention of the department to grant others.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York N.B.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden), if he has yet hunted up those canteen papers?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). No, I am sorry to say that I cannot find them.

Mr. FOSTER. Are those papers absolutely gone so that they cannot be had?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My private secretary has been looking among my private papers, after the hon. gentleman asked me the question the last time, and he told me he had not been able to find them. I told him to look again, and he has not found them yet.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems rather hard that papers, the substance of which has been asked in the House, should not be at the call of the House when they are required. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to lay on the Table of the House the actual results of the analyses of the emergency food taken on February 3, and the other affidavits that he was supposed to be able to get within a day or two?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The matter has been referred to a committee, and I presume these are to go to the committee now.

Mr. FOSTER. But, I understood from the hon. gentleman, and from the Prime

Mr. PATERSON.

Minister as well, before the committee was appointed, that these should form part of the papers that have already been placed upon the Table of the House, even though the committee has been appointed in the meantime.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What I said was that certain analyses were being made now and that certain analyses had already been made, and that when those which are being made now were completed all the papers would be laid on the Table of the House. I presume that the proper place for them to go now would be before the committee. But when those are completed, which are not yet complete, I see no objection to laying them on the Table of the House. But, I supposed that that matter had been transferred from this House to the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I should think the proper way would be to bring down as promised the full papers before the House, and then they can be referred to that committee if the committee wants them.

Mr. CASGRAIN. We do not want to wait until they are brought down here.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 175) respecting the Ottawa and Hull Fire Relief Fund.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

#### SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 181), for the relief of William Henry Featherstonhaugh.—(Mr. Gibson).—(on division.)

#### YUKON TERRITORY—LEASE OF DAWSON WATER FRONT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked:

Having reference to the examination of the agent of Morrison & McDonald (Yukon evidence, 216, 217, 218) and return to this House as follows:

Mr. Grotschier, called and sworn (page 216).

By Dr. Bourke:

Q. Mr. Grotschier, I believe you have been the agent for Morrison & McDonald?—A. Yes.

Q. Collected rents?—A. Yes.

By the Commissioner (page 217):

Q. The question is, he wants to know to whom you paid the rents?—A. I paid Morrison until he left, and since then I have paid Finlayson, of the Bank of British North America. I think, E. O. Finlayson.

By Dr. Bourke:

Q. Did you pay over the sum of \$2,500 several months to the government?—A. Until a certain time—until you fellows commenced to kick and wouldn't pay your rent.

Dr. Bourke.—Everybody knows that.

Mr. Grotschier.—I wasn't going to advance it out of my own pocket.

Dr. Bourke.—About this money you speak of, it appears that McDonald must have come to

you, and you had known that McGregor had the \$2,000.

Mr. Grottschier.—I believe every one in court understood it. I told you that I told Mr. McDonald I hadn't any more money on hand. I had paid \$2,500 to Bliss, who is in charge of the office there at present, and I had no more money on hand. Hadn't collected any more money. When Morrison came in a few days after, I had deals with him.

By Dr. Bourke (page 218) :

Mr. Grottschier.—He asked me why I had two sets of solicitors. I thought Burritt & McKay very slow in getting these things in shape, and came to the conclusion to hurry the matter up; and so it was done.

By Mr. Tabor :

Q. Who were the other solicitors?—A. Clement, Pattullo & Ridley.

Q. You hadn't any other motive?—A. That's all; I had to hurry up and get done. If it stood until the 1st of May everything would be taken away, and we would be responsible to the government for the amount.

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, March 24, 1900.

(Memorandum.)

Messrs. Clement & Pattullo collected on account of rental from the Dawson water front tenants the sum of..... \$5,555 25

Out of the above revenue they made the following payments:

1899.

May 8.—J. H. Rust, bailiff.....	\$ 15
June 30.—Sheriff's account .....	196
(1) Bourke vs. Ogilvie ..	150
(2) " " " " ..	150
Costs in ejecting tenants.	300
	811 00

Amount deposited to credit of loca. revenue, as per Auditor General's Report, page H—107 .....

Statement of rents collected by Clement, Pattullo & Ridley, and of account in connection with removal of tenants and buildings from the Dawson water front.

1899.

April 28.—G. L. Fish .....	\$ 288 00
May 1.—Ed. Pierson .....	108 00
2.—Vernon & Storry .....	300 00
S. Archibald .....	598 25
3.—Geo. Brewitt .....	180 00
11.—Harrison King .....	225 00
12.—P. Galvin .....	126 00
13.—Kelly & Co. ....	168 00
A. W. Hall .....	120 00
C. Solid .....	144 00
Colsky & Steinfield .....	135 00
Bond, Halla & Co.....	108 00
W. J. Stoddart .....	48 00
J. L. Bates .....	126 00
Lynch & Hosher .....	192 00
J. M. Ellison .....	72 00
Hen. Spyns .....	60 00
A. L. Miller .....	90 00
David Ripstein .....	90 00
Chaffey & Hales .....	168 00
Max Weisfield .....	60 00
Allan & Scharff .....	156 00
Fike & Maynard .....	144 00
J. S. Barron .....	72 00
15.—Frank Granstron .....	72 00
John Macdonald .....	126 00
Wm. Greenlief .....	60 00
C. T. Dunbar .....	420 00

May 16.—Levy & King .....	\$ 72 00
Jas. Rosenberger .....	108 00
D. A. Shindler .....	126 00
John Keane .....	60 00
F. Golden, purchase of building .....	60 00
15.—Summerfield .....	45 00
Isaac Colsky .....	162 00
17.—Hamilton & Bodeman, purchase of building.....	60 00
Palmer Bros. ....	240 00
20.—Mrs. Carrie Lichenstadter....	30 00
Foley, H. B., purchase of building .....	40 00
23.—Vernon & Storry .....	96 00

\$5,555 25

Contra Account.

May 8.—Paid J. H. Rust, bailiff .....	\$ 15 90
29.—J. T. Lithgow .....	\$4,000 00
June 30.—Sheriff's account .....	196 00
Bourke vs. Ogilvie, No. 1....	150 00
" " " " No. 2....	150 00
Costs in ejecting tenants ....	300 00
Cheque therewith, balance...	744 25

\$5,555 25

1. On what dates, respectively, did Morrison & McDonald, the lessees of the water front, so-called, pay the monthly rental of \$2,500?

2. For what months, if any, were the lessees in default?

3. Who instructed Messrs. Clement, Pattullo & Ridley to collect the above rent?

4. Whose tenants were the parties above named from whom rent was collected?

5. What explanation has the government respecting Mr. Grottschier's evidence and this return, if any?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. 1. \$2,500, June 27, 1898; \$2,500, June 27, 1898; \$2,500, July 4, 1898; \$2,500, August 2, 1898; \$2,500, September 2, 1898; \$2,500, October 4, 1898; \$2,500, November 3, 1898; \$5,000, April 11, 1899; \$2,500, May 10, 1899; \$4,000, July 6, 1899; \$1,000, July 7, 1899. 2. The full amount of the rental for the term of the lease has been paid, as shown in reply to question 1. 3. The records of the Department of the Interior do not show who instructed Messrs. Clement, Pattullo & Ridley to collect the above rent, but the report of the collections made by that firm was addressed to the comptroller at Dawson. 4. The tenants of the Crown. 5. Mr. Grottschier's evidence relates to collections made by him as agent for Morrison & McLeod, while the statement above quoted relates to the rental for the period from the expiry of the lease to Morrison & McDonald, 30th of April, 1899, to the date of the removal of the tenants, the date fixed as the limit for removal being the 15th of June, 1899.

### IMPORTS FROM UNITED KINGDOM AND UNITED STATES.

Mr. GILLIES asked :

1. What is the total amount of imports into Canada from the United Kingdom for ten months ending May 1, 1900?

2. What is the total amount of imports from the United Kingdom entered for consumption for the last ten months ending May 1, 1900?

3. What is the amount of dutiable goods imported from the United Kingdom and entered for consumption for the ten months ending May 1, 1900?

4. What is the amount of free goods imported from the United Kingdom and entered for consumption for the ten months ending May 1, 1900?

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). Information is asked in the above questions as to the value of imports from the United Kingdom into Canada during the ten months ended 1st of May, but as the monthly returns of the department do not supply information by countries, the answers given below are in each case for the nine months ended 31st of March—the latest date to which the department has such information. 1. For the nine months, \$34,436,439. 2. For the nine months, \$34,106,556. 3. For the nine months, \$25,059,260, imports; \$24,766,636, consumption. 4. For the nine months, \$9,377,179, imports; \$9,339,920, consumption.

#### SEIZURE OF ILLICIT STILL.

Mr. **MARCOTTE** (by Mr. Monk) asked :

1. Whether, on or about December 1, 1898, or at any other time, a still was seized on the premises of one G. A. Emard, of St. Roch de Quebec?

2. What instructions did the Department of Inland Revenue Issue in relation thereto, and to whom were they given?

The **MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE** (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). 1. The seizure of a still was made on that day on V. A. Emond, and not G. A. Emard. 2. The Department of Inland Revenue sent instructions to the Department of Justice to take proceedings, but stopped them afterwards in order to further investigate the case.

Mr. **MARCOTTE** (by Mr. Monk) asked :

1. Whether the still owned by Mr. Lapointe, and in relation to which he was prosecuted, was seized on the premises of Mr. C. S. O. Langlois, on or about December 19, 1898?

2. Does the law allow the Crown to distinguish between the owner of a still and the person on whose premises it was seized, in prosecuting for the fines imposed?

3. Why was not Mr. C. S. O. Langlois prosecuted?

The **MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE** (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). 1. Yes. 2. I think that the minister has the right to decide of the expediency of instituting a prosecution under certain circumstances. 3. After consultation with the law agents of the Crown, I considered that the ends of justice might be more surely attained by prosecuting only Lapointe, the owner and operator of the still.

Mr. **GILLIES**.

#### FISH HATCHERY AT DUNK RIVER, P.E.I.

Mr. **McLELLAN** asked :

Is it the intention of the government to rebuild the fish hatchery burnt down some years ago at Dunk River, Prince Edward Island?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). No decision has yet been reached. The subject is under the consideration of the government.

#### GOVERNMENT WHARF AT SALMON RIVER, HALIFAX COUNTY, N.S.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax) asked :

1. What is the total cost to date of the government wharf at Salmon River, Halifax County, Nova Scotia?

2. What is the total cost to date of the shed constructed upon the said wharf?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). 1. \$1,646.89 for wharf. 2. The shed is being built, but the accounts have not yet been received.

#### YUKON TELEGRAPH LINE—MR. J. B. CHARLESON.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). In answer to the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), I may say that I have spoken to the deputy minister in reference to the matter that he called to my attention, and he tells me that a considerable portion of the Charleson papers have been copied and the balance will be ready for presentation to the House in two or three days.

#### BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 163) to amend the Bank Act be read a second time and agreed to.

He said : The Senate has passed the Bill to amend the Bank Act almost exactly as it left this House, but for a verbal change in section 21, by inserting the words 'so far as known.' It has relation to the returns of unpaid drafts.

Motion agreed to.

#### CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 156) to amend the Civil Service Act.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). Some clauses in this Bill were held over for further consideration. We had a discussion on section 7, which provided for the appointment of junior second-class clerks under certain conditions at a salary of \$800,

the special qualification being that the appointee should be a graduate of the Royal Military College, or of one of our universities. I propose to adopt that clause, with a proviso, which, I think, meets the views of gentlemen on both sides :

Provided that an appointment shall only be made under this section in one of the following cases :

(a) Where the junior second-class clerk to be appointed is to take the place of a clerk of the second class or of a higher class.

That is, if a vacancy should occur in a second-class clerkship where the minimum salary is \$1,100, there is nothing in the present statute to prevent a gentleman being appointed directly to that office, but, in such case, we propose that we shall not be prohibited from appointing one at \$800 instead of \$1,100, thus saving \$300.

(b) Where the deputy head of the department reports that, owing to the special character of the work to be performed, an appointment under this section is desirable.

I think this will meet the criticisms that were offered.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) The recommendation of the deputy head is satisfactory, but the Minister of Finance has not met the objection that he is superimposing a class between the third-class clerks and the second-class clerks.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will deal with that. I propose to insert the following amendment :

After the passing of this Act, all third-class clerks in the first or inside departmental division of the civil service shall be junior second-class clerks under this Act at their then salaries. Then, following clause 13, I propose a provision, that where an officer is transferred from one class to another, which is of some advantage to him, there are cases in which the salary he is now enjoying is larger than the salary he will obtain in the new position, though ultimately, of course, he will have a chance to advance. We have a section to provide that in that case he shall not suffer any decrease of salary. The point has been taken that this section may not cover the temporary clerks, and I propose to insert the word 'temporary' before 'employee' so as to make it read :

Clerk or temporary employee.

And in like manner, where the word salary is used, I would insert the word 'emolument,' making it 'salary or emolument.'

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. After the hurried way in which we have amended this Bill, do we really know exactly how it all chimes in ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection to have the Bill printed, as amended, before the third reading.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be well.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). Has the government made up its mind as to when a case will be presented for the decision of the courts in reference to the matter of statutory increases ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course this Bill does not touch on the question one way or the other, but the matter has not engaged our special attention since my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) referred to it.

Bill reported.

#### SUPPLY—ROYALTIES IN THE YUKON.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I have a matter to bring to its attention in connection with the royalties in the Yukon district, and some matters arising out of the evidence that was produced before Mr. Ogilvie when he acted as commissioner to investigate certain irregularities which had been charged. I do not propose to animadvert upon the wholly irregular way in which that most unsatisfactory commission proceeded to deal with many of the subjects brought before it, except to say that after Mr. Ogilvie had reported—privately, in the sense of the Minister of the Interior—but, so far as the document produced in this House is concerned, most formally and fully: That at the very outset the commission broke down. In connection with that, he did receive information touching a most extraordinary, and up to this time, not satisfactorily explained incident in which, so far as we can see from the record, the owner of the largest and most valuable claims in the Yukon district, the man known as the Bonanza King, the King of the Klondike, was the only individual in all that territory who received an extraordinary and illegal indulgence; and that arrangement was made—and there is no contradiction of the statement I am now making, so far as the reports of Mr. Ogilvie or the records in possession of the government go—by private and confidential correspondence between the Commissioner, Mr. Walsh, and Mr. Alexander McDonald, of which there has only been obtained one side, that is to say, the confidential instructions of Mr. Walsh to Mr. Fawcett; but, so far as the papers disclose, there has been no effort made to obtain the confidential letter written by Mr. McDonald to Mr. Walsh, though its existence is undoubted, because Mr. Walsh refers to it as the moving reason. Outside of the confidential letter which, from the evidence given before Mr. Ogilvie, seems to have been obtained by accident, and produced before the commission by accident, there is no explanation of any kind or nature as to why the gen-

tleman who was the least dependent on the government for concessions, the man who was reaping the most benefit and profit out of the mining operations, was the only individual to obtain an extraordinary indulgence at the hands of the government.

Now, to make this story clear, I should first refer to the position of the law, which was binding upon Major Walsh as it was upon the humblest individual who went into the Yukon. That is found in the regulations promulgated by an order in council of January 18, 1898; and the House will see when I read from these regulations, what little latitude there was for any such irregularity, to use a mild term, as happened in this connection, if the laws had been properly and honestly administered. Sections 30 and 31 are as follows:

30. A royalty of 10 per cent on the gold mined shall be levied and collected on the gross output of each claim. The royalty may be paid at banking offices to be established under the auspices of the government of Canada, or to the gold commissioner, or to any mining recorder authorized by him. The sum of \$5,000 shall be deducted from the gross annual output of a claim when estimating the amount upon which royalty is to be calculated, but this exemption shall not be allowed unless the royalty is paid at a banking office or to the gold commissioner or mining recorder. When the royalty is paid monthly or at longer periods, the deduction shall be made ratable on the basis of \$5,000 per annum for the claim. If not paid to the bank, the gold commissioner or the mining recorder, it shall be collected by the customs officials or police officers when the miner passes the posts established at the boundary of a district. Such royalty is to form part of the consolidated revenue, and to be accounted for by the officers who collect the same in due course. The time and manner in which such royalty shall be collected shall be provided for by regulations to be made by the gold commissioner.

31. Default in payment of such royalty, if continued for ten days after notice has been posted on the claim in respect of which it is demanded, or in the vicinity of such claim, by the gold commissioner or his agent, shall be followed by cancellation of the claim. Any attempt to defraud the Crown by withholding any part of the revenue thus provided for, by making false statements of the amount taken out, shall be punished by cancellation of the claim in respect of which fraud or false statements have been committed or made. In respect to the facts as to such fraud or false statements or non-payment of royalty, the decision of the gold commissioner shall be final.

Now, I would just stop to comment on one or two features of these regulations. In the first place, the gold commissioner is the only officer charged with anything like responsibility for the collection of the royalty; and the regulation very wisely requires a great responsibility to be assumed by the worker or owner of a claim. There are affidavits to be made, and his statements must be made honestly at his peril. Any dishonest statement made by the owner of a claim in regard to the amount mined by him, involves the risk of the loss of his whole claim. And yet, as we go on, we shall see,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

so far as the government are concerned—for all the papers in regard to this have been ordered to be produced before this House, and I have examined them carefully—that up to this time Mr. Alexander McDonald has not, in that regard even been compelled to comply with the law. There is no statement by Alexander McDonald of the amount of gold he has mined on his different claims, which would not only have assisted the government in auditing his account, but which is absolutely required by law, if the law is to be anything more than a mere matter of fancy. Now, if you turn to the report of Major Walsh, you will find how little he appreciated, in connection with this matter, the responsibilities of his office, or the binding effect of the laws of this country, when he reached the Yukon district; but, you will find that he recognized the powers that he might exercise if not held to his responsibility. He says:

On arrival at Dawson I found a great many questions awaiting solution which could only be disposed of by the authority of the commissioner. For instance, the question of royalty, over which there had been considerable discussion, appeared to be somewhat mixed. I immediately announced that the royalty would be collected on all claims the leases of which were renewed subsequent to the date when the law came into force. Nearly all the leaseholders of the larger prospected claims showed a disposition to respect the collection of royalty. Others, however, were not so tractable, their principal objection being that their leases were granted for one year, and that once being granted subsequent restrictions could not be placed upon them.

I may say that in reading this report, and reading, as I propose to do, dispassionately from the records and papers produced, I am most anxious to have the attention of the Prime Minister. In the motion which I propose to put into your hands, I do not think the Prime Minister will find so direct an attack upon the government or such an attitude assumed by me in this connection, that it would be necessary for the government, out of self-respect, to resist the motion. I think the facts I am going to mention, in regard to the property and the laws and the rights of this country, are so serious, that the conclusion I would ask the House to come to is one which, even at this day, the Prime Minister might agree is wholly proper; and, although I do not ordinarily urge that the Prime Minister should give attention to what I say, I would be very much obliged to him if he would follow me, at any rate, while I am referring to the records. Major Walsh goes on to say in this report:

I pointed out to the leaseholders that collection of royalty was necessary for the maintenance of courts of justice, for police protection, mail communication, and for public services. While acknowledging the force of most of this reasoning, they submitted that a more thorough examination of the real cost of outputting the gold would convince the government that the royalty was a severe tax, and express a hope that next year would see it removed. Royalty

was not collected from any claims which had not got into good working order or which could not show a profit after paying royalty, and this would represent a large sum. Again, more than half the leases were exempted from royalty on account of having been renewed previous to the date of the law requiring the payment of royalty coming into force. The collection of royalty will amount to about half a million dollars.

Let me call attention to this, that I do not think can be successfully contradicted. Major Walsh's report, at the end of his regime, on the royalty question, is all he says about claims for exemption, and those who will follow me will see exactly what he said with regard to such claims. He was instructed by the order in council appointing him and by his commission, to report monthly to the government of Canada, and it is significant that at no place did Major Walsh ever report to the government—to the Minister of the Interior or any one—outside of the mere instructions of a confidential character which he gave Mr. Fawcett, that he had undertaken to make an exception in the case of Alexander McDonald. Therefore, I think it is all the more extraordinary and significant that by accident, as it were, in Mr. Ogilvie's examination, during the time of his commission, there came out this confidential correspondence, extracted I believe—I am not now speaking exactly by the book, but from memory—by Dr. Bourke, through his having been allowed access to certain files in the gold commissioner's office, when he came across these confidential documents and a part of that correspondence. The letter missing is the letter of Mr. McDonald to Major Walsh, but although this transaction took place in July, 1898, and this report to the Minister of the Interior is made after Major Walsh came out of the territory, there is not any full official report yet on record in the Department of the Interior, and it was discovered in the way I have mentioned in the gold commissioner's office.

To give an idea of the value of these claims, the correspondence will show to some extent what a large territory Mr. McDonald is operating in these various creeks, and there is a paper the *Dawson Weekly News*, which, in its issue of the 25th of May, 1900, gives the various clean-ups of the different creeks. It gives the number of claims and the names of the owners and the number of men employed, the amount of tons on the dump, the value per ton, and the value of each clean-up. Looking over that, we find some interesting facts:

The clean-up of Dominion Creek is enormous. It looms up as one of the most prosperous of all the creeks.

Then we come to the Hunter Creek:

Claim No. 3, Alexander McDonald et al., twelve men employed; tons on the dump, 450,000; value of the clean-up, \$30,000.

No. 4, Hunter Creek, value of clean-up, \$30,000.

No. 3, value of the clean-up, \$10,000.

On Dominion Creek, Alexander McDonald, claim No. 7, value of the clean-up, \$24,000.

Dominion Creek below Discovery, the claim No. 6, McDonald, value of the clean-up, \$9,000.

Then we come to Silver Creek, No. 7, value of the clean-up, \$9,500; No. 8, value of the clean-up, \$24,000; No. 10, \$24,000; No. 11, \$45,000; No. 13, \$25,000; No. 14, \$19,520; No. 32, \$30,000; No. 33, \$17,500.

And again on Bonanza Creek, claim No. 20, \$8,400.

I do not know how many Mr. McDonald is interested in, but, at any rate, this confirms the general statement, which no one hitherto has denied, and the correspondence between Mr. Ogilvie and Major Walsh, in July, 1898, goes to show that Mr. McDonald was one of the largest proprietors in the district.

I have referred to chapter 6. Statutes of 1899, the constitutional arrangement for that district, and we will see, by the statement of the Auditor General to the Public Accounts Committee this year, that we have had this extraordinarily rich territory administered by officers appointed by this government, absolutely without any independent audit. The Auditor General has practically nothing to do with the accounts relating to the revenue or the expenditure in that country, and he was in no sense in a position to assist the Public Accounts Committee. This in itself is an extraordinary condition, and it is necessary to refer to it in connection with these matters that have occurred and with the investigation—if the thing can be called an investigation at all—that has taken place into the subject.

When this matter came up almost by accident before the commissioner, we find what was said, and Mr. Ogilvie's position in this connection is most unsatisfactory, to my mind, based on the information that I shall put before parliament. Whether my conclusion be reasonable or not, it is at any rate based on information that I shall put in the possession of the House. In the evidence that was given, we find, turning to the report of Mr. Ogilvie, some questions of this character. When Mr. Fawcett was being examined, he was asked—see page 210 of the evidence:

Q. You know this letter from Major Walsh to you, and you know that Alexander McDonald got time—I suppose there is no other case like this?—A. No, not that I know of.

Q. No other case of extension?—A. I do not know; this is the only case that came under my notice.

The House will remember what the law of the land was. It put Mr. Fawcett, the gold commissioner in charge, but you will find that Major Walsh stepped in and took charge of the gold commissioner absolutely by means of this confidential correspondence. When pressed, Mr. Fawcett said:

I think there is a letter some place that I have from Major Walsh asking me to give the mining inspectors full instructions with reference to the collection of royalty. These instructions were

given in writing, and rules were posted up. They were subsequently changed by Major Walsh after he arrived from Bennett.

Major Walsh did not get into Dawson, I think, until February, 1898. He did not get into that city in 1897, when he went up. The regulations refer entirely to the gold commissioner and the rules the gold commissioner was to post. These were posted by the commissioner, and, as Mr. Fawcett explained under oath, they were changed by Major Walsh when he arrived. Then, at page 211, the commissioner said :

The matter has been reported long ago to Ottawa to find out how much royalty he owes, as we can't find out.

Now, here is the statement of Commissioner Ogilvie, who was speaking, no doubt, not only as commissioner presiding over the examination, but as commissioner for the Canadian government in the Yukon; and who, as we shall see, had reported to the Minister of the Interior before the investigation that there is a serious matter in default. And the commissioner, having given the matter investigation with all the officers at his disposal, yet he makes the statement as commissioner that he cannot find any statement of account between McDonald and the government. And though there is the report—which I will refer to later on—of Mr. Lithgow, who is an officer of the government, professing to be an audit in regard to this account, the slightest examination will show that it is not only not an audit of the account from the beginning, but it does not profess to be more than a settlement, and lacks the material that ought to be before the House or at least in possession of the government—that is, the original statement made by McDonald as mine owner under the regulation, as to what he claimed he had mined, and the reports of the various officers paid for by this country, such men as McGregor, Norwood, Bliss, and all these various officers of the government, who were paid for watching and inspecting and checking over all these reports. We shall find that in the so-called settlement that Mr. Lithgow reports, there is not a syllable to suggest that they have ever had from any of these officers any official statement, or even a statement from the man interested. And, at page 211 of this evidence Mr. Ogilvie makes mention of the fact that, at that day, in his position there in the Yukon with all these records before him, he could not find out how the matter stood. Then, Dr. Bourke goes on to say :

As far as you are concerned, I am sure that everything has been done properly, but in this case what the public are interested in is in knowing who allowed these things to be done in this way ?

Evidently the commissioner answers this :

A. You see Major Walsh had power to amend the mining regulations, and you heard Mr.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Fawcett's statement that Major Walsh took the power out of his hands and ordered these matters.

I only stop to say that I am sure no lawyer in the cabinet will agree that Major Walsh had such power; and the government could not give him the power. And, in the second place, there is not a particle of evidence to show that Major Walsh attempted to exercise such power, except by the confidential letter written at the request of McDonald, who wrote to him a confidential letter on the subject. The record then goes on :

Dr. Bourke.—I want this to go on record, and ask that this letter in which Major Walsh hurriedly referred to McDonald's difficulties to meet his engagements. I want the government to know McDonald's position as a practical speculator; a man who holds government royalty to speculate with while a poor man who cannot pay for his sluice-boxes is locked up.

The commissioner then makes this extraordinary observation :

The government knows that months ago.

Again, on the same page, referring to the difficulties surrounding this matter, the commissioner says :

We can collect it; it is a simple matter if you know the amount.

Remember, this is in regard to the amount of work done by McDonald long anterior to the time when the commissioner was speaking. He is speaking in February, 1899; the royalty is a matter of 1897-8. And, the commissioner states at that time, that he is absolutely powerless in regard to how the accounts stand. And then come these letters. Here is a letter marked 'confidential' and dated 20th July, 1898, a letter written to McDonald by Major Walsh as commissioner of the Yukon. He acknowledges in that letter a letter which has never been produced, a letter that no effort has been made to secure. So far as the returns are concerned, and so far as the answers across the floor of the House show—and I would call the attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to this fact—that there has not been even a request sent to Major Walsh to produce the letter that brought about this extraordinary and exceptional treatment of Alexander McDonald, namely the private letter from Major Walsh. In his letter to McDonald, Major Walsh said :

Dear Sir,—I have just received your letter of to-day with regard to the royalty and the manner in which it would affect your interests if collected at once.

He then goes on to say that he realizes all that this man has done for the country and the extraordinary work and enterprise that he, Alexander McDonald, has shown. None of that I dispute; I am not attacking McDonald in the slightest respect. My point is that this matter has been treated in the most extraordinary manner—we do not know under what inducements—and also that it should not be allowed to remain in

this unsatisfactory position. Major Walsh says he would not like to do anything that would seriously interfere with McDonald, and then he goes on to say :

I do not see anything unreasonable in your proposition to pay one-half the royalty in September next, and the other half in May, 1899.

And, so far as the papers before this House are concerned, there is nothing to show that even that bargain was kept. I must say again—it can hardly be said too often—that there is nothing to show that at this time Major Walsh knew the value of the indulgence he was giving to Alexander McDonald; but everything goes to show that no statement had been had from McDonald as to how much gold he had mined under the regulations. Major Walsh concludes his letter by saying he will instruct the gold commissioner. Then he writes the gold commissioner a letter—and I call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that he writes him a confidential letter, not an open and official letter, under date of July 22, in which he says :

I inclose a copy of a letter I am forwarding to Mr. Alexander McDonald, in reply to a communication from him applying for an extension of time for the payment of royalties due by him this season.

And then he goes on to say :

You will please be guided in accordance therewith.

Which means: You will grant this concession. Then the gold commissioner writes that he has noted these instructions and will govern himself accordingly. This is the only open and official letter. The letters from McDonald to Walsh, and Walsh to Fawcett were confidential. Now then Llewellyn was sworn, and he is apparently called to show that this was exceptional treatment. He says here :

At any rate there were certain steps taken against you by the government regarding the payment of royalty, and as a result of those steps you had to appear here, in Dawson; and as a result of matters here you were discharged.

He swears, that it was on December 2, he paid the royalty. He was followed up in regard to this matter by Dr. Bourke, attempting to show that this was an exceptional indulgence, which was most material evidence it seems to me, and the commissioner seems to have shown a desire, as on many other occasions, to shield the officers of the government from full inquiry. He says :

You must give notice, Doctor, you must not spring things on us in this way.

Then at page 227, referring to evidence on this subject again, Mr. Fawcett asks :

Q. Do you know that Alex. McDonald's royalty was laid over for a time; the payments of it?—

A. I have no positive knowledge.

Q. Do you believe it was laid over?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you any knowledge of any other persons royalty being laid over?—A. No, I have

not. The only question of laying over this royalty was this letter.

Q. You have no knowledge of any other case?

—A. No, none whatever.

Mr. Fawcett.—That is all.

There is the gold commissioner examining Mr. Calder, apparently one of the officers in the office, and he makes that point. Now that evidence on its face is bad enough, but it is only a sample of many others showing that there is not any attempt on the part of Mr. Ogilvie—I defy any one who has examined the evidence to discover it—to probe this matter to the bottom. He does not make the slightest effort to obtain even Alex. McDonald's letter, though McDonald was examined on one other subject in regard to what happened between him and Major Walsh to bring about this extraordinary statement. He does not ask McDonald how much he owed, and how much this illegal indulgence was worth to him. The whole matter stops short where Dr. Bourke, who seems to have had access to the file and ferretted out those letters, at the remarks made by Fawcett, bringing out the very important fact that that was the only case of such an indulgence shown.

Then there is an extraordinary thing reflecting, I think—I say so openly—very seriously on Mr. Ogilvie, as commissioner. With all that before him, he writes a letter to the Minister of the Interior, dated February 20, in that very year, while that inquiry was before him. He says :

This matter is a very serious one. Under ordinary circumstances McDonald would lose all his claim in connection with this.

Undoubtedly that was the law of the land, but he goes on to point out that it would be a terrible thing to punish McDonald, and so it would be, for the acts of the commissioner reflecting on the government of the country. Now then the treatment of that letter seems to me suspicious. Am I unreasonably suspicious, Mr. Speaker? Let me give the government the grounds of my suspicion. There is a letter written containing that serious statement among others to the Minister of the Interior, on February 20, 1899. The Minister of the Interior got that letter on April 3, 1899, as is shown by an answer across this House, the formal answer from the acting Minister of the Interior. On April 4, the day after he got that letter, he informed me, in answer to a formal question, that he had no communication from Mr. Ogilvie on the subject of that commission other than a letter that was so involved with private and official matters that he would not lay it on the Table of the House. In answer to an order of the House this year for a return of all documents of this character, whether by accident or design, this document came down, the document the minister refused last year to lay on the Table of the House as being a private letter. But when it is inspected it is found to be of a most formal character.

It is addressed by Mr. Ogilvie to the Minister of the Interior, addressing him as 'Dear Sir,' signed in the nature of an official letter by 'your obedient and humble servant, Wm. Ogilvie.' There is not a line of it that partakes of a private character except it be this reference to the serious character of this matter he would have to investigate, and also containing clauses that, had they been before the House, neither the Minister of the Interior nor the Prime Minister would have made the statements that were made in debate last year when they said they had no word from Mr. Ogilvie in regard to this commission, but that if the information was not at all full, there would be a further commission. There was a letter withheld directly last session, so there followed an argument that could not be made if it were laid on the Table of the House. There is a letter brought down this year that shows that this man appreciated that the McDonald royalty question was a serious one, and that if the law of the land was carried out McDonald would have forfeited all his claims had he not been granted this indulgence, whether legally or otherwise, by Major Walsh. There is no explanation except that contained in the confidential correspondence, that as he had been a pioneer, as he had done great things for the development of the country, and incidentally no doubt for himself, as the subsequent returns show, he was to be granted an indulgence not contemplated by the regulations, and not proposed in regard to any other miner. The absence of that indulgence has been the ruin of many a poor miner, and has kept many a poor man from working in that country altogether. These are matters wholly apart from the complaints that arise in that country that do require probing, that do require the attention that they have not yet received. For instance, we must have some effort put forward to find the letter that McDonald wrote to Major Walsh. Surely that in any event ought to have been obtained, or some reason given for its not being brought down. The royalty would have embarrassed McDonald, is that a reason for not enforcing it? Cries have come up from all parts of that country that it is embarrassing in general, that it has driven the ordinary individual miner to the wall, and has put the whole, or a large part, of that rich country in the hands of rings and corporations, of men who are able to do what the ordinary developer of a mining country has never been able to do.

Now, in order that we may appreciate how worthless Mr. Ogilvie's report is, I think the House will be surprised to learn that these are observations that Mr. Ogilvie felt warranted in making. It is clear he did not know when he made his report that his letter, the letter that the minister for a time treated as private and confidential, would come down ultimately. This is what he says in his report :

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

You will also see that some inquiry was made into the laying over of Alexander McDonald's royalty and an explanation furnished for the same.

All the evidence submitted in this connection was that furnished in the letters between Major Walsh, Mr. McDonald and Mr. Fawcett. There appears to have been no wrong-doing in this—

The House will judge. There are simply these confidential letters that he is basing his report on, and there is the additional statement that no other man got this indulgence.

—at least none was made manifest, Major Walsh taking the view that it would be impolitic to exact Mr. McDonald's royalty, as it would put him to considerable hardship if he was compelled to pay it, and later on, his paying it would benefit the country as much as if he had paid it last spring.

Will it be believed that a commission that is supposed to be a satisfactory commission, that is supposed to have done away with the necessity of investigating the charges I took the responsibility of making, had not before it and did not attempt to obtain the information that I mention and that should have suggested itself to Mr. Ogilvie's mind as information that ought to have been obtained. They had not the information that the Department of the Interior had. They had not the ordinary official information, and when that information is examined which has been laid on the Table of this House, we will see that there is a great deal more in this matter to investigate than Mr. Ogilvie, at any rate, thought. Let us see how disturbing this question admittedly was in the minds of the officials of the department. Let us see whether this confidential information was ever sent to the Department of the Interior or whether it was obtained accidentally when Dr. Bourke and the other gentleman who appeared in this manner before Mr. Ogilvie. To show that I am not unreasonable in this matter, I will begin with the correspondence and continue it down, and we will see how this matter stands. I will show what the department itself thought about this, and it shows the carelessness of the department in regard to another matter where Wade figures. We will find that Major Walsh was advised in this matter by McDonald's solicitor, Wade. Major Walsh no doubt assumed that Wade was an officer of the government, and as a member of his informal council, he consulted him in this matter. Wade had the audacity and was unprincipled enough to interfere in regard to McDonald's case, when he was the paid solicitor of McDonald. We have had the water front matter under consideration, and the right hon. Prime Minister knows what loop-hole there was, if any, for Wade to escape from criticism in that matter. But, here, we find that Wade admits and that he swears that McDonald was his client, and at that time he was advising the Crown in regard to an indulgence as to his client's royalty. We also find that

McGregor, Norwood and these men who have been employed by this government as inspectors showed how much information that would give to the Department of the Interior in regard to one of the largest operators in the Yukon gold fields. Here is the correspondence :

(Commissioner Walsh to the Hon. Clifford Sifton.)

Commissioner's Office, Yukon River,  
Sixty miles S.E. Selkirk,  
February 14, 1898.

(En route north.)

This is the latter part of it only which is brought down, but it is the part relating to the royalty. There are stars which show omissions in the first part :

Sir,—

Fawcett has reported that but little royalty could be collected this year owing to the best large paying claims being renewed under the old regulations, and that the mines that are being worked under the new regulations will be unable to pay royalty. This being the case, and Fawcett understanding mining matters better than I, I considered it safer to leave the matter entirely in his hands for this season. . . . .

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) J. M. WALSH,  
Commissioner of the Yukon.

To the Hon. Clifford Sifton,  
Minister of the Interior,  
Ottawa.

Now, then, we have Major Walsh starting out with the intention of leaving this matter in Fawcett's hands for this season. The regulations leave it in Fawcett's hands all the time. The gold commissioner is the man, and not the commissioner of the Yukon territory at all. Strangely enough, there is no explanation to show why he ever took it out of Mr. Fawcett's hands except it be that while he was ostensibly and officially leaving Fawcett to be the scapegoat, leaving Fawcett to stand between the public and the department, and the department and McDonald, he, behind the scenes, was peremptorily ordering Fawcett to exercise a certain discretion in letters marked 'confidential.' a course he was advised to take by Wade, ostensibly a member of his irregular council, but really the solicitor for McDonald. On December 10, 1898, we find from Mr. Ogilvie this letter. This is before the examination to which I have referred :

Dawson, Dec. 10, 1898.

Hon. Clifford Sifton,  
Minister of the Interior,  
Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg to call your attention to the inclosed documents, which show that the royalty due the government by Alexander McDonald, of this city, was for a term remitted by instructions of the late commissioner, J. M. Walsh.

I do not wish to be understood as making a complaint regarding this action, but consider it irregular, and would like to know if there are any documents among Major Walsh's papers that would go to show how much royalty Mr. McDonald paid on account of this privilege, and how much is still due by him.

It appears the gold commissioner cannot say what the exact standing of the matter is.

It may transpire that some documents will turn up after exhaustive search which will throw light on the matter, but at present we are completely in the dark as to how much royalty Mr. McDonald paid in September last, and how much is due in May.

There is a statement of that private bargain between these two men showing the condition of affairs in a public office in this country bearing out what I say that this official had not only allowed this man to ignore the regulations which required that he should make a statement as to how much gold he had taken out of his claims, but that this officer had failed to make a report as to how much was due by McDonald to the Crown :

We should also like to know what means, if any, were taken to ascertain the output of Mr. McDonald's operations, as it is well known that he has a large number of claims here.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) WM. OGILVIE,  
Commissioner.

There is a question I want answered, and there is a question the government have not answered. There is a question that parliament ought to have answered, and therein lies a mystery, and it will remain a mystery until the government probe, as they should have probed, this extraordinary state of things to the bottom. What followed after that letter? A telegram from the Department of the Interior, dated February 15, 1899, to J. D. McGregor, Esq., Brandon, Man., an officer under pay as an inspector of this very subject up in the Yukon district, an officer who was found generally, and certainly during the last elections in Manitoba some thousands of miles away from the Yukon, working there as a political heeler. McGregor is wired by the hon. Minister of the Interior for a little information, for a little value for the money paid to him as an inspector, as follows :

(Telegram.)

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, Feb. 15, 1899.

J. D. McGregor, Esq., Brandon, Man.

It appears Alex. McDonald's royalty was not collected last summer. Records not clear. What information can you give about it. Wire reply.

CLIFFORD SIFTON.

Let us see how extraordinary this matter becomes the minute it is stirred up, whether it be by Dr. Bourke before Mr. Ogilvie, or whether it be by the officers of the department at Ottawa, or elsewhere. Mr. McGregor had been at Brandon, but he goes to Winnipeg, and he wires the hon. Minister of the Interior from Winnipeg, Man., on the 15th of February, 1899, as follows :

Winnipeg, Man., Feb. 15, 1899.

To the Hon. C. Sifton, Ottawa.

McDonald represented in writing to Walsh that it would embarrass him if the whole was collect-

ed. It was decided to let part of it lay over till this year. He was partner in all his working properties; who paid their share. Walsh will have his letter.

(Sgd.) J. D. MCGREGOR.

Mr. McGregor knew nothing about it, except what we have already ascertained from this confidential communication. He was inspector, knew nothing whatever, except that a confidential letter was written by McDonald to Walsh, and Walsh granted the indulgence. But he sees the importance of McDonald's letter, and yet parliament is not in possession of that letter, and apparently from the return—I speak subject to correction—no effort has been made to obtain the letter from Major Walsh. On February 17, 1899, the assistant secretary of the Department of the Interior writes to Mr. Ogilvie, as follows :

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, Feb. 17, 1899.

Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of December 10 last in relation to the royalty due to the government by Mr. Alex. McDonald, of Dawson, and asking what means, if any, were taken to ascertain the output of Mr. McDonald's operations.

In reply, I am to say that in a return received here from Inspector Norwood it is shown that on August 26, 1898, he collected from Alex. McDonald the sum of \$2,000, being royalty on the output of claim 35, above Discovery, on Bonanza Creek, but there is nothing on record here to show what action was taken to ascertain the output of Mr. McDonald's operations.

Here is the department telling Mr. Ogilvie away back in the Yukon that there was nothing on record to show what action was taken to ascertain the output of Mr. McDonald's operations.

Mr. J. D. McGregor, in reply to an inquiry from him as to what information he could give about the matter, stated that Mr. McDonald represented in writing to Major Walsh that it would embarrass him if the whole amount due for royalty were collected, that it was decided to let part of it lie over until this year, and that he has partners in all his working properties who paid their share.

It is thought that Inspector Norwood may be able to furnish you with some information as to Mr. McDonald's operations. Mr. McGregor leaves for Dawson in a few days, and you may also obtain further information from him.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) LYN. PEREIRA,  
Assistant Secretary.

Wm. Ogilvie, Esq.,  
Commissioner,  
Dawson, Y.T.,

Mr. McGregor shows he knew nothing about it, except that it was arranged in that confidential manner. In the return there is a document which does not seem to be a copy of a whole letter, for it neither begins nor ends, and yet we ought to be thankful for small mercies, for the House will remember how many were the letters passing between the Department of the Interior and the Yukon territory, that I was refused last year, because the minister told me they were

private, and could not be laid on the Table. However, this document is dated February 16, 1899, and has the following heading :

Copy of a letter received by the minister from Mr. J. M. Walsh, dated February 16, 1899, in relation to the royalty due by Mr. McDonald on gold mined by him in the Yukon territory.

I quote from the paper :

Fawcett, who received the returns of royalty collected from the mines by the inspectors, should be able to give Mr. Ogilvie a statement showing the sum due by McDonald at the close of the wash-up.

That is the first statement of this gentleman who granted the indulgence by a peremptory order to Fawcett, and Fawcett has sworn that Walsh took the matter out of his hands, and Fawcett explained that he could not give any explanation, and Major Walsh is referred to. He has never been called before the commissioner in any way, or his evidence taken under oath. Major Walsh goes on to say :

When McDonald appealed to me for time, saying that the sum he had during the spring and was still compelled to put into improvements to work his claims to advantage, made it impossible for him to pay the royalty then due and demanded; that he had already paid a large sum of royalty, and would continue to pay all he could as long as the wash-up lasted, the balance, if any was due, to be paid in the spring.

I discussed the matter with McGregor and Wade—

I ask the House to remember the name of 'Wade' in this connection. There is no doubt whatever from Wade's sworn testimony that at this period he was the paid solicitor of Mr. McDonald, that he had received a retainer, that would look large in the east, from Mr. McDonald, and now we find him in all these various matters, cropping up as the adviser of some one else—this man who was advising the Crown.

I discussed the matter with McGregor and Wade, and we decided that to close down on McDonald would not only interrupt our collection of royalty, but would seriously affect the whole mining interest of the Klondike.

McDonald's improvements were good security for the sum due, about \$30,000 or \$40,000.

I extended McDonald's time for full payment until the spring of 1899.

Before leaving Dawson (August 4), Norwood informed me that the sum then due by McDonald was about \$16,000. Fawcett should know if this sum was correct, and if there was an accumulation after my departure, for he directed the inspectors in their work, and received their reports.

Fawcett, of course, in the examination, showed that he did not know and that no one under his control knew. That was on February 16, 1899, while this helpless inquiry was being made in the Yukon territory. Now then, on February 28, 1899, the commissioner, Mr. Ogilvie, writes with regard, undoubtedly, to all the records in that department, and to his conversation with the officer. This is a so-called 'private' letter that was 'private' last session, and not

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

brought down to the House, but is brought down to the House this session, and which is, on the face of it, an official document from beginning to end. This is what Mr. Ogilvie reported to the Minister of the Interior :

The question of the withholding of McDonald's royalty has been brought up, and we will have to investigate it at the same time. This matter is a serious one. McDonald presumably owed the government some \$70,000 for royalty dues, out of which only about \$2,000 was paid.

You will note that Major Walsh said it was \$30,000 or \$40,000, instead of \$70,000.

Under ordinary circumstances, the man would lose all his claims, but, as this was authorized by the late commissioner, of course McDonald could not be made to suffer for his act; but it will have a very bad effect on the minds of the public when it becomes known that such was done.

On March 1, 1899, the secretary of the Department of the Interior, writes to Mr. Ogilvie, the commissioner.

On April 18, 1899, Mr. Ogilvie says, writing to the secretary of the Department of the Interior :

Commissioner's Office,  
Dawson, Y.T., April 18, 1899.

To the Secretary,  
Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—Yours of the 17th February re the question of Mr. McDonald's royalty arrived by last mail. In reply, I beg to submit that we knew that about \$2,000 of McDonald's royalty had been paid, but to what extent the balance has been paid, we don't know.

We know the terms of Major Walsh's letter laying over the balance of his royalty, which provided that one-half of the balance should be paid on the 1st of September last and the other half on the 1st of May next; we do not know what the one-half in either case amounts to; inquiries have been made, but so far without avail.

Mr. Norwood arrived quite recently, and the Comptroller will learn from him all he knows in that direction.

Mr. McDonald and his partner, Mr. Morrison, are here, and it is possible that we may be able to arrive at some definite conclusion in the matter before long.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
WM. OGILVIE,  
Commissioner.

Now, if there ever was a subject that required to be probed to the bottom by an independent commission, after all that occurred, it was that; and the very absence of an authoritative and satisfactory investigation is enough to give credence to any rumour that may be stated in regard to the irregularities that have occurred in connection with the Yukon administration. But what do we find? I asked on the 14th of May, 1900, a certain question in regard to this royalty, and I was told by the acting minister that the comptroller, Mr. Lithgow, not an independent officer in the same sense as the Auditor General of Canada, but an

officer of this government, had made an investigation and report on the subject of Mr. McDonald's royalty. I asked on May 30 whether this report had been brought down to the House, and if not, whether it would be brought down. The acting Minister of the Interior was good enough to bring down that report; and this is the report, which is the conclusion of all that I have read :

Dawson, Y. T., June 23, 1899.

James A. Smart, Esq.,  
Deputy Minister of the Interior,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—I have the honour to inclose a statement of royalty paid by Alex. McDonald on account of 1898, amounting to \$34,028.13, together with receipts and draft No. 347, deposited to the credit of the Receiver General.

It will be remembered that Major Walsh allowed Mr. McDonald an extension of time on the payment of his royalty, and the inclosed statement represents a full settlement, having been gone into most carefully by the gold commissioner and myself. This will appear in the gold commissioner's statement for June.

I have the honour to remain, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) J. T. LITHGOW,

Comptroller.

The gold commissioner is Mr. Senkler, and the comptroller is Mr. Lithgow; and not a particle of my case is based on any insinuation against the honour or integrity of either of these men; but they do not pretend that they have audited the account of Mr. McDonald with the Crown. They honestly state just what I have read, that this represents a settlement; and the House and the country, with all that investigation and correspondence, which I have read, before them, are unable to suppose that there has been anything like an audit of the accounts. No one pretends to say what was due when Mr. Walsh, undoubtedly illegally, remitted the payments and made an exception of probably the richest man in the Klondike, in granting him indulgence as to the time for payment. No one pretends to say that Mr. McDonald was ever asked to make an affidavit of what was due, as required by the regulations. There is no statement that Mr. McDonald was put under oath, having first made the statement which, by the regulations, he was required to make; and there is no statement to show that this account was checked over. Then we have appended to that letter something more unsatisfactory still. Mr. Lithgow said this represented a settlement in 1898; but it was not for the year 1898 only. The indulgence ran up to the wash-up in May, 1899, and there was no settlement up to that time. Here is the report of the royalties collected by Mr. Lithgow up to some time in May, showing that the agreement had not been lived up to in regard to the payment of the royalty. This is dated the 20th of June, 1899, and shows the date, the number of receipt, which is given, the name, the number of the claim, and that appears; the total gold production,

and that appears—\$347,781.30; the royalty paid, opposite each claim, the total being \$34,028.13, and the remarks. So that Mr. Lithgow is not bound to prove more, in order to show that he has not made a misleading statement, than that is a settlement, arrived at we know not how, between Mr. McDonald and the Crown. And the gold commissioner certifies this:

The above is a statement of the royalty paid by Alexander McDonald, being the balance due on gold mined by him during 1898.

E. C. SENKLER,  
Gold Commissioner.

Examined.—J. T. Lithgow, Comptroller.

Neither of these gentleman had anything to do with this man, or anything to do with the subject-matter of those claims during the period in question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What was the reduction made?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No one knows. This is a settlement of the account. We do not know what the Crown or any of the officers claim, and we have no statement under affidavit by any of these people of what was owed. So that in no respect can that document be considered as supplying to us anything in the shape of an audit. There has been no audit, certainly no independent audit, of these accounts. Let us look at a return to the House of Commons, dated the 7th of February, 1900, containing memoranda and reports of Corporal Wilson and other officers respecting inspection of mines and collection of royalties. There are one or two references there which are not unimportant. Here, for instance, we have Mr. Lithgow, on October 3, 1899, reporting generally on royalty affidavits:

It is possible that some of last year's are missing, but we have sent copies of all that could be found.

Indicating that so lax was the administration of affairs in that district under Major Walsh that the officers, when examined in connection with this or any other business matter, showed a condition of helpless confusion. On July 18, 1899, we find this comptroller, Mr. J. T. Lithgow, writing to the secretary of the Department of the Interior, acknowledging the receipt of an official letter re an amount of \$1,301, which was reported by Mr. Fawcett as having been received for a payment of royalty that was paid at the court:

I made inquiries at the court-house yesterday, and asked the clerk of the court to give me any information on the subject he could find, but he has been unable to find out anything about it, as there is no name, or number of the claim, to identify it. When I made out this statement for Mr. Fawcett in January last, we had agreed upon a balance of \$2,321.26, and it was not until some time after that Mr. Fawcett discovered in the back of his memorandum book an item of \$1,301.24, which he informed me was royalty paid into court. He had no other record of it, and was unable to give me any other information.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

If I am asked why I mention this correspondence, I do so to strengthen the statement that I have made, based on an examination of the papers before the House, that this period was one of confusion, for which Major Walsh was directly responsible. At the time when this illegal extension was granted, no precautions were taken to protect the interests of the Crown, and nothing which has occurred since has shown that there was anything like careful accounting, upon which to base a correct audit of the affairs between Mr. McDonald and the Crown. We find in another letter from Mr. Norwood, dated August 17, 1899, an idea of how little he could be relied on in these matters:

Regarding the money collected by me from the sale of free miners' certificates and the collection of royalties while stationed at Grand Forks, Yukon territory, during the summer of 1898, I will call attention to the fact that it was impossible for me to keep the money separate, as would have been done under ordinary circumstances, owing to the difficulties with which I had to contend, viz., no proper place to do business, nor books to keep accounts in, and having to send money to Dawson whenever I had a chance, as I had no safe place to keep gold dust where I was.

There is a reason given why the Minister of the Interior could not obtain, in the usual manner, from his officers any statement whatever, with regard to the affairs between Mr. McDonald and the government.

In this return again, there is a memorandum from Mr. Fawcett, dated Ottawa, June 13:

Those who paid royalty at the bank filled out and made affidavits to the return at the office, took it to the bank; these would be filed away at the bank. I do not know what the inspectors did with the affidavits taken by them.

Yet there is a set of regulations of the utmost importance, requiring an affidavit from every party interested.

Captain Bliss, who was accountant at that time—

He evidently preceded Mr. Lithgow.

—kept the account of the royalty, and did not prepare a return for the gold commissioner's office. The commissioner (Commissioner Walsh) himself superintended, to a great extent, the collection of royalties.

Why should not this gentleman, Captain Bliss, be called on to make a more explicit and exact statement than he has made with regard to this extraordinary transaction which was conducted secretly with Mr. McDonald, and with reference to which he gave such peremptory and secret instruction to the gold commissioner.

On January 30, 1899, there is a letter from Mr. Lithgow, the comptroller, in which he says:

He informs me that he had nothing to do with the royalty, as it was handled by Mr. H. A. Bliss, and the only amounts he received were \$1,403.50 from J. B. McGregor, already referred to.

Does any one pretend to tell me that the public mind would be at all satisfied until we have had Major Bliss and Mr. Wade examined. Major Bliss was not even asked for a statement. Major Bliss, who was the financial man under Major Walsh, was not asked to put his pen to a syllable to explain what became of this money, and how the account stood. Nor was Mr. Wade, who was the solicitor of this interested party, and the officer of the government, asked to give a statement as to how these matters stand.

In the Auditor General's Report, there is further evidence to be found, under the heading of the Department of the Interior, of the unsatisfactory condition of this question. He makes this remark, for instance :

I have seen no evidence that royalty was paid in every case where it should have been paid, or that the amount that was paid was the amount that should have been paid.

This is from parliament's auditor, and the secretary of the department writing on June 23, says :

Mr. Thomas Fawcett, who was gold commissioner at the time the last collection of royalty was made, has lately furnished this department with a report showing the method adopted last year to collect the royalty, and a copy of the same is inclosed herewith for your information. The department is not aware what system is being adopted by the present gold commissioner, but he is being asked to report to the department in regard to this, and a copy of your communication will also be sent to him.

Then inclosed is the statement as to the collection of royalties, during the summer of 1898. At the bottom he says :

The collection of royalties this year is in the hands of the North-west Mounted Police, and I think they can be depended upon to see that none are missed.

That that is a reflection on the conditions that existed, no one can doubt. But there is further proof on page 120, in a note from Mr. Senkler, written in the gold commissioner's office :

The three counterfoils, Nos. 3, 17 and 2255, are beyond explanation.

That does not reveal a satisfactory condition of things, at any rate, up to the time the present commissioner took charge. I am not going into the broader question as to how it is there is no provision for giving the Auditor General more independent control and supervision over the expenditure and receipts in connection with this huge revenue-producing country. I have shown that the government are solely responsible, and it is no answer to say that Mr. Lithgow is an honest man. I do not dispute his honesty. Among all the various complaints I have heard, nothing has ever reached me to impeach his character, which I knew once to be good, or the character of the present gold commissioner, Mr. Senkler, of whom I have heard, has been to his credit as a barrister and a gentleman. But the point is, that the Department of the Interior has

shown its helplessness in this matter, and that the commissioner, Mr. Ogilvie, has shown his helplessness, and that at the bottom of all the trouble and difficulty is a confidential correspondence, only part of which has come to light, and that with regards to this singular and extraordinary indulgence shown Mr. McDonald, Mr. Wade's name again is involved, who occupied the dual position of a paid government officer, depended on by Major Walsh for advice, and who at the time, was the paid counsel and solicitor for parties dealing with Major Walsh, the representative of the government. I, therefore, beg to move :

That all the words after the word 'That' be left out, and the following added instead thereof : 'on the 28th June, 1899, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper stated from his place in this House that he was credibly informed and believed that with the same co-operation through the supervision of the Department of Justice as was given by the government of Canada to the Hon. Clifford Sifton in the case of the Manitoba election frauds (so called) he could establish before a commission comprised of eminent judges clothed with suitable powers the following facts and charges amongst others :

That Major Walsh whilst acting as chief executive officer of the Canadian government in the Yukon was guilty of crime and misbehaviour in office.

That Major Walsh was guilty of doing acts directly contrary to the design of his office as chief executive officer of the Dominion government.

That Major Walsh did not send by each and every mail a full report in writing to the Minister of the Interior, as commanded by His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, or as required by the order in council purporting to appoint him to his office as commissioner for the Yukon district.

That the regulations were not regularly enforced, but certain of them (as for instance those relating to royalties on mines and mining claims) were allowed by Major Walsh to be violated.

That Major Walsh illegally exempted individuals from the law and regulations respecting the payment of royalties.

That officials in the employment of the Canadian government in the Yukon territory have been guilty of directly and indirectly accepting or receiving gifts, compensation and considerations for assisting or favouring certain individuals in the transaction of business with the government, contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Code.

That officials in the employment of the Canadian government in the Yukon district have been guilty of frauds and breaches of trust affecting the public, contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Code.

That from the reports and papers now on the Table of the House it appears Major Walsh, commissioner for Yukon district, without ascertaining the amount due, illegally and by confidential instructions to the gold commissioner, in 1898, extended the time allowed by law for the payment of royalty on the gold mined by one Alexander McDonald.

That the present commissioner for Yukon district reported to the Minister of the Interior on 10th December, 1898, as follows :

Dawson, December 10, 1898.

Hon. Clifford Sifton,  
Minister of the Interior.  
Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg to call your attention to the inclosed documents which show that the royalty due the government by Alex. McDonald, of this city, was for a term remitted by instructions of the late Commissioner J. M. Walsh.

I do not wish to be understood as making a complaint regarding this action but consider it irregular and would like to know if there are any documents among Major Walsh's papers that would go to show how much royalty Mr. McDonald paid on account of this privilege, and how much is still due by him.

It appears the gold commissioner cannot say what the exact standing of the matter is.

It may transpire that some document will turn up after exhaustive search which will throw light on the matter, but at present we are completely in the dark as to how much royalty Mr. McDonald paid in September last and how much is due in May.

We should also like to know what means, if any, were taken to ascertain the output of Mr. McDonald's operation, as it is well known that he has a large number of claims here.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) Wm. OGILVIE,  
Commissioner.

And again on the 28th February, 1898, as follows:

The question of the withholding of McDonald's royalty has been brought up, and we will have to investigate it at the same time. This matter is a serious one. McDonald presumably owed the government some \$70,000 for royalty dues, out of which only about \$2,000 was paid. Under ordinary circumstances the man would lose all his claims, but as this was authorized by the late commissioner, of course McDonald could not be made to suffer for this act; but it will have a very bad effect on the minds of the public when it becomes known that such was done.

That the following papers were brought down to parliament in 1899:

(Telegram.)

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, February 15, 1899.

J. D. McGregor, Esq.,  
Brandon, Man.

It appears Alex. McDonald's royalty was not collected last summer. Records not clear. What information can you give about it? Wire reply.  
CLIFFORD SIFTON.

Charge Interior.

(Telegram.)

Winnipeg, Man, February 15, 1899.

The Hon. C. Sifton,  
Ottawa.

McDonald represented in writing to Walsh that it would embarrass him if the whole was collected. It was decided to let part of it lay over till this year. He has partners in all his working properties who paid their share. Walsh will have his letter.

(Sgd.) J. D. MCGREGOR.

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, February 17, 1899.

Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 10th December last in relation to the royalty due to the government by Mr. Alex. McDonald, of Dawson, and asking what

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

means, if any were taken to ascertain the output of Mr. McDonald's operations.

In reply I am to say that in a return received here from Inspector Norwood it is shown that on the 26th August, 1898, he collected from Alex. McDonald the sum of \$2,100 being royalty on the output of claim 35 above Discovery on Bonanza Creek, but there is nothing on record here to show what action was taken to ascertain the output of Mr. McDonald's operations. M. J. D. McGregor, in reply to an inquiry from him as to what information he could give about the matter, stated that Mr. McDonald represented in writing to Major Walsh that it would embarrass him if the whole amount due for royalty were collected, that it was decided to let part of it lie over until this year and that he has partners in all his working properties who paid their share.

It is thought that Inspector Norwood may be able to furnish you with some information as to McDonald's operations. Mr. McGregor leaves for Dawson in a few days and you may also obtain further information from him.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) L. PEREIRA,  
Assistant Secretary.

William Ogilvie, Esq.,  
Commissioner,  
Dawson, Y.T.

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, March 1, 1899.

Sir,—Referring to the departmental letter to you of the 17th ultimo in relation to the royalty due to the government by Mr. Alex. McDonald, of Dawson, I am directed to inclose herewith a copy of a letter from Major Walsh upon the subject.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) L. PEREIRA,  
Assistant Secretary.

William Ogilvie, Esq.,  
Commissioner,  
Dawson, Y.T.

Copy of a letter received by the minister from Mr. J. M. Walsh, dated 16th February, 1899, in relation to the royalty due by Mr. McDonald on gold mined by him in the Yukon territory.

Fawcett who received the returns of royalty collected from the mines by the inspectors, should be able to give Mr. Ogilvie a statement showing the sum due by McDonald at the close of the wash-up.

When McDonald appealed to me for time, saying that the sum he had during the spring and was still compelled to put into improvements to work his claim to advantage, made it impossible for him to pay the royalty then due and demanded, that he had already paid a large sum of royalty and would continue to pay all he could as long as the wash-up lasted, the balance, if any was due, to be paid in the spring.

I discussed the matter with McGregor and Wade, and we decided that to close down on McDonald would not only interrupt our collection of royalty, but would seriously affect the whole mining interest of the Klondike.

McDonald's improvements were good security for the sum due, about \$30,000 or \$40,000.

I extended McDonald's time for full payment until the spring of 1899.

Before leaving Dawson (4th August) Norwood informed me that the sum then due by McDonald was about \$16,000. Fawcett should know if this is correct and if there was an accumulation after my departure for he directed the inspectors in their work and received their reports.

Commissioner's Office,  
Dawson, Y.T., April 18, 1899.

To the Secretary,  
The Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—Yours of the 17th February re the question of Mr. McDonald's royalty arrived by last mail. In reply I beg to submit that we knew that about \$2,000 of McDonald's royalty had been paid, but to what extent the balance has been paid we don't know.

We know the terms of Major Walsh's letter laying over the balance of his royalty, which provided that one-half of the balance should be paid on the first of September last and the other half on the first of May; we do not know what the one-half in either case amounts to; inquiries have been made, but so far without avail.

Mr. Norwood arrived quite recently, and the comptroller will learn from him all he knows in that direction. Mr. McDonald and his partner, Mr. Morrison, are here, and it is possible that we may be able to arrive at some definite conclusion in the matter before long.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) WM. OGILVIE.

Commissioner.

That it does not appear that Alex. McDonald in this connection was at any time required to make a statement of the amount of gold taken out as contemplated by the regulations under order in council.

That Mr. Wade, a government official, and one of the so-called council who advised Major Walsh, the commissioner, respecting the indulgence extended to Alexander McDonald, was the retained counsel and solicitor of Alexander McDonald.

That no audit of Alexander McDonald's account has been made by the Auditor General for Canada, or by any independent auditor.

That in the opinion of this House there should be an independent and complete audit of the account of Alexander McDonald touching royalties due by him to the government of Canada, and a prompt, thorough and searching inquiry under oath should be directed into all the facts and circumstances connected with the indulgence shown to him and the connection of Major Walsh and Mr. F. C. Wade or other officers of the government therewith.

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). In my humble opinion the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made last session a very long and foolish speech, he made I may say, a wicked speech, when he made his attack upon the officials of the government in the Yukon. At that time he found that even his own friends did not approve of the course he had taken. He has now endeavoured to excuse that speech by supplementing it with instalments made up of fragments of letters and reports, paragraphs of hearsay evidence from newspapers, by involved statements in this House, and by long resolutions setting forth little scraps of this that and the other thing. At present he attacks Major Walsh for having, as he says, at least technically violated the law. That may or may not be true. I am of the opinion that the people of this country will hold that owing to the condition of affairs in the

Yukon at that time, a country some four or five thousand miles distant from the capital, and fifteen or sixteen hundred miles from the nearest point of communication, it was necessary to give a great deal of discretion to the commissioner or whoever was appointed to have complete control there. We had to depend a great deal upon the discretion of the commissioner and the officers sent into that country to administer affairs. Now, Sir, this whole resolution is based upon the proposition that in granting an extension of time, or an indulgence as he calls it, to Mr. McDonald for the payment of a large amount of royalty, he violated the Act of Parliament under which he was appointed. I am not going to discuss now whether that is technically correct or not. As I say, Major Walsh was appointed commissioner under the peculiar circumstances with which the country and the House are well acquainted, and consequently we had to give him a great deal of discretion. Representations were made to him by Mr. McDonald, asking for time in which to pay the royalty, and Major Walsh thought it would be in the public interest to grant him the delay asked for. The payments were all made in September, 1898, and May, 1899. What the people are more interested in is the fact that McDonald did pay his royalty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.  
How do you know?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have not the slightest doubt about it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Nobody knew anything about it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. When my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was speaking I did not interrupt him by interposing questions that I do not think are pertinent to this subject. In my humble opinion, there is the very best of evidence for saying that Major Walsh acted in the public interest, that he acted honestly, and that the other officers acted honestly. If they had not acted honestly would we be able to say that McDonald had paid about \$41,000 in royalty? Twenty-one hundred dollars was paid on one claim, and afterwards his account was made out for the full amount; \$34,028.13 was paid. The hon. gentleman says that there is no evidence that he paid his royalty. There is no evidence, I confess, that any man pays what he owes except as shown by the account. There is not the slightest evidence furnished by the hon. gentleman that McDonald did not pay his royalty in full to the cent. If there were any evidence put forward that McDonald had not paid his royalty, then the question would be one worthy of investigation. But, there is not a tittle of evidence to show that he did not pay in full his royalty. My hon. friend cannot understand the conditions that existed in the Yukon at that time. When he was administering the Department of Justice, he

was unable to collect right here in Ottawa very nearly this amount of money for binder twine, and he allowed an extension of time to be made to his friends. This was when he was right here in Ottawa with a staff of officials under his direction, and still the hon. gentleman was unable to collect the money due to the country. He is finding a great deal of fault with the accounts and reports of Mr. Fawcett and Mr. Lithgow, because their reports are not tied up in red tape, are not folded just so, are not sealed just so, and all that sort of thing. He complains of the manner in which these statements are prepared, and says they are not audited, and so on. As a matter of fact, he knows as well as any person that these officials did not even have paper upon which to record these accounts, but that they had to keep these accounts on pieces of chips, wrapping paper boards and anything of that kind.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.  
Chips ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. What colour ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They had them all colours. The hon. gentleman shows how unfair he can be when he attacks these officials because their books were not kept in the state in which they might be kept in the Auditor General's office, and because their reports and letters were not filed as they would be in a first-class office at headquarters. The hon. gentleman knows that right here in Ottawa where we have a large staff of clerks and every facility for doing things properly and methodically, it is sometimes difficult to find papers and reports and other documents, an experience which he himself has had, and it is not surprising that these difficulties should be experienced under the conditions prevailing in the Yukon. It should be remembered that the hon. gentleman himself prophesied that the government would not be able to collect a dollar of royalty there. He knew that there were great difficulties, almost insurmountable difficulties, with an inrush of from 15,000 to 20,000 into that country, and he felt sure that Major Walsh and the officials would not be able to collect the royalty. The returns show that during the very first season they collected nearly \$300,000 of royalty, a statement which will satisfy almost every person that this amount would represent the full royalty on the gold taken out. My hon. friend says that McDonald did not pay his royalty. If we are to judge by what has taken place, I am inclined to think that McDonald paid royalty on his output during that season. He had an output of \$347,781.30, and as there was an exemption of \$7,500, under the law, he paid on \$340,228.30, or, in other words, \$34,028.13 of royalty at that time. That Major Walsh displayed good judgment and wise discretion in making

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

that arrangement with McDonald I think, has been proven by the results. There was a great rush of foreigners into that country, it was probable that they could raise a disturbance and cause trouble, as the hon. gentleman knows, but, the extracts, some of which he has read to-day, have made known to the House the fact that the people there have been law-abiding, and that for this season they have paid their royalty to the officers without giving trouble.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.  
Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him for one moment ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.  
The hon. gentleman does not apprehend my position exactly. Instead of making assertions of abuse and vilification, I am pressing this resolution for an inquiry, and consequently not prejudging the case. But, does the hon. acting minister believe that Alexander McDonald ever produced, what every other man has to produce under the law, an affidavit showing exactly the gross output from the different claims he held in 1898 ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have not the slightest doubt but that he did.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.  
The hon. gentleman has no evidence to show that he did.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no evidence to show it, but I have not the slightest doubt about that, because Mr. Lithgow, after an examination of this account, made the statement that McDonald complied with the law. I have not the slightest doubt about it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.  
I ask you about the fact.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend asks me about the audit. He knows that the Auditor General sent an auditor up there, Mr. Reid, and that the Interior Department sent up Mr. Stephenson.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.  
He never examined his accounts and never pretended to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend wants these men to be condemned on the exaggerated statements that he makes in this House, on newspaper trash, and on statements made by unreliable people. I simply appeal to the common sense of the country to say whether or not, under all the circumstances and conditions, there is the slightest suspicion to be attached to the conduct of Major Walsh or other officers in this matter.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

### AFTER RECESS.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I had stated that I believed there was very little foundation for the statement of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), that affidavits had not been required in this case as well as in the others. To sustain me in that belief I shall read the letter forwarding the statement, which will go to show that my opinion is correct. The following is a letter from Mr. Lithgow, the comptroller, to Mr. Smart, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, dated June 23, 1899 :

I have the honour to inclose statement of royalty paid by Alex. McDonald on account of 1898, amounting to \$34,028.13, together with the receipts and draft No. 347, deposited to the credit of the Receiver General. It will be remembered that Major Walsh allowed Mr. McDonald an extension of time in the payment of his royalty, and the inclosed statement represents a full settlement, having been gone into most carefully by the gold commissioner and myself. This will appear in the gold commissioner's statement for June.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,

J. T. LITHGOW.

Now, the hon. member for Pictou, gives to Mr. Lithgow, the comptroller, a certificate of character, and also to Mr. Senkler the gold commissioner, as being men of superior knowledge and character, and when the comptroller states in a letter that they had gone into the statement fully there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that they required the affidavits and everything else provided for in the Act in reference to this matter. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is a reasonable inference. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) then complained of the books and papers and reports and letters not being in every way as regular and concise as they might have been, and he said that Major Walsh should be censured because when he was appealed to—I think after he came out—to know what amount of royalty Mr. McDonald owed. Major Walsh did not know, when he ought to have known. I submit that it is a very unreasonable thing to ask that the commissioner should have knowledge of these accounts. He did not pretend to keep the accounts; he had no access to the accounts, except to the extent that the commissioner might have to the books of the gentleman who kept the accounts.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** It is just as well to be exact as to what I stated, and I did not say more than this upon that point: That when in July, I think, Mr. McDonald wrote to Major Walsh, and Major Walsh replied stating that this indulgence would be granted and that part of the royalty should be paid at one time and part at another; it did not appear that Mr. McDonald had been required to make

a statement formally or otherwise as to what was then due; or, that Major Walsh had taken any pains to ascertain what was then due. So far as the record goes it only states that it was simply said to McDonald: Whatever you owe may be paid in two instalments.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** I am very glad to hear the explanation, because in my opinion there is nothing meaner than for one hon. gentleman to attribute to another language he did not use. As I understood the argument of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), it was, that he censured Major Walsh for not having been able to mention the amount that was due by McDonald, but of course the explanation puts it in a different light. It would probably be more reasonable to say that the amount should have been fixed at the time Major Walsh was giving this indulgence, and the only excuse or reason for not doing so was probably the peculiar condition of affairs in the country then. I have already stated that in my opinion, considerable allowance ought to be made, in view of the circumstances in which the officials were placed. They had no regular forms of affidavits, nor books in which to keep accounts. After listening very carefully to the hon. gentleman's remarks, I believe he has not given any reason why this vote of censure should be passed. On the contrary, under the conditions that existed in that country during the season of 1897-8, the officers whom the hon. gentleman charges with negligence and carelessness, if not with fraud, collected pro rata on the output fully as much as they have done in the last two years, with a greater staff of officials, with books and other facilities. To a common-sense man, all the evidence goes to prove that on the whole these men, notwithstanding the unfavourable conditions in which they were placed, did their duty well and honestly. Now, as I have asked for a memorandum of the department in regard to this matter, I think it is only fair, before I sit down, that I should give the explanations of the department on the subject.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** Who writes this memorandum?

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** The deputy minister. It is really a memorandum of the facts as the department look at them, and it differs very little from the position which I have taken, and which I think the majority of people will arrive at, who are willing to look at the matter fairly, and not from the technical standpoint, which my hon. friend takes. I think my hon. friend has been unfortunate in his persecution of the gentlemen who happen to hold official positions in the Yukon territory. A considerable length of time has passed since he made these charges; yet with all the opportunities he has had, and the desire of a great many

people to find fault, and to furnish evidence, if there was any evidence to be found, he has not been able to show any good reason for the extreme manner in which he is pursuing Major Walsh and some others. This is the memorandum :

It appears that Major Walsh, the commissioner at that time of the Yukon, in July, 1898, received from Mr. McDonald a letter which explained that his interest would be very materially affected if the government insisted upon his paying immediately the large amount of royalty then due, and asking that an extension be granted to him for the payment of this money.

It would appear that the reasons for the commissioner so deciding to grant an extension were that Mr. McDonald was a very large operator in the development of claims, and that all the proceeds of the mines were being reinvested in the territory, and from the plans that he had made with regard to the expenditure of very large amounts in improvements, costing some \$30,000 or \$40,000, and that to close down on him would not only interrupt the collection of royalty, but would seriously affect the whole mining industry of the Klondike.

In view of this, Major Walsh decided to grant an extension of time for the payment of the royalty of 1898, one-half to be paid in September, 1898, and the other half in May, 1899. The commissioner held at the time that the improvements that McDonald was making would be perfect security for the royalty due.

The matter was reported to the department, and explanation asked, after which it was decided to instruct Mr. Ogilvie to take the necessary action to collect immediately the amount due to the Crown. This was in May, 1899. On June 3, Mr. Lithgow, the comptroller, wrote inclosing a statement of the royalty paid by Alexander McDonald for 1898, amounting to \$34,028.13, and stating that the amount had been deposited to the credit of the Receiver General. The statement sent represented a full settlement.

Mr. Lithgow stated that both the gold commissioner and himself had gone most carefully into the matter, and they found that the total output of gold by Mr. McDonald in 1898 amounted to \$347,781.30, less the exemption of \$7,500, the balance being \$340,281.30, on which the royalty, amounting to \$34,028.13, was paid. The report bears the certificates of E. C. Senkler, gold commissioner, and J. T. Lithgow, comptroller.

It might be added that \$2,100 had formerly been paid by Mr. McDonald on account of royalty.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** What is the date of the deputy's memorandum which the hon. gentleman is reading ?

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** June 12. As there has been so much discussion and so much insinuation in regard to the actions of the minister and the department and the officials, I think it is only fair when a matter of this kind is brought up, that a statement of how matters stand in the department should be given.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** All the documents in the possession of the government were ordered by the House, so that no advantage could be taken.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.**

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** My hon. friend will see that the papers were all brought down, and they will show that this is a fair and honest synopsis of the case. So far as the department is concerned, there was no favouritism, no neglect of duty, and no desire to cover up anything.

**Mr. CLANCY.** I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there was a letter that has not yet been brought down. What letter is that and the date of it ?

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** July 3, 1899.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Whose letter was it ?

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** Mr. Ogilvie's.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** Why was not that letter brought down before ? The order of the House made on February 7, 1900, was for all the papers.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** I thought it was brought down. Now, the hon. gentleman bases his complaint against Major Walsh, on the ground that he exceeded his power. All I can say is, whether he did or did not, the country will feel that in exercising his discretion in this matter, he did what was perfectly right ; and the results have proven that having regard to the condition of affairs in that country at the time, he acted with good sense and in the public interest. Now, I do not think there is a tittle of evidence to show that Mr. McDonald has not paid the full amount of royalty due by him. Instead of any of the officials, against whom my hon. friend is always making general statements and insinuations, having acted improperly or been careless in their business dealings, everything points to the fact that they have been industriously and energetically discharging their duties and have managed matters admirably in the interests of the country. The only reason by which we can account for the hon. gentleman making the speech he did is that he felt he was not justified in moving the wild statements he did last session and has tried to buttress up the position he then took by some additional reasons. But the more we know about this matter, the more we have to conclude that Major Walsh fills his position faithfully and honestly, and that there is no ground at all for the bitter attacks made on him. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that the more the people have an opportunity of finding out the true facts, the more disposed they will be to conclude that the hon. gentleman was not warranted in bringing the charges he did. Why, even in the unsettled and unsatisfactory condition of affairs that existed in 1897 and 1898, the officers, of whom the hon. gentleman speaks so disrespectfully, collected royalties equal pro rata to the amount they collected since then, with the aid of the North-west Mounted Police and with the advantage of all the better arrangements they have been able to make. Therefore, I do

not see any reason why we should adopt this motion.

**Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax).** The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, started out with some extraordinary remarks respecting my hon. friend from Pictou. He pointed out that the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) had made a very long and foolish speech last year and that during the present session he had taken up the time of the House with little scraps of this and the other thing which had no particular relevance to the subject in hand. It seems to me that if the hon. gentleman would refer to his own speech and observe to how slight an extent it was an answer to the argument of my hon. friend from Pictou, he might be somewhat inclined to apply those adjectives to himself. What is the position my hon. friend from Pictou has taken? In the first place, he says that Major Walsh had no authority in the law for remitting the payment of this royalty for any term whatever, and that undoubtedly is the case. My hon. friend, the acting Minister of the Interior, has not undertaken to controvert that statement, but he ventured to say that this was what he calls a technical violation of the law. He did not make it very clear just what he meant by that expression. I suppose that a man who breaks into a house and steals \$1,000 might be said to have committed a technical violation of the law, and I suppose that Major Walsh, taking claims in his own name, when the law forbade his doing so, would be committing a technical violation of the law.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** Did he do it?

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).** I did not say that he did it. I said that would be the case, I suppose, if he did it.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS.** You implied it.

**Mr. COWAN.** You said it all right.

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).** I will tell you what I do say, and my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan) will no doubt draw a very fine distinction between the two cases—

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** I did not admit that it was legal if Major Walsh did it, but I do not know what he did, and I said it was open for discussion; but, as I look at it, it might be a technical violation of the law.

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).** What has been admitted with regard to this matter and proved by evidence, is that Major Walsh compelled employees under him, liable to dismissal at his will, to take claims and assign them to his brother; and I suppose my hon. friend from Essex will regard that as perfectly proper, and no doubt draw a very fine distinction between that and the case I put for illustration. He is welcome to any nice distinction of that kind. The acting Minister of the Interior thinks it is a magni-

ficent answer to make that he does not know whether this was lawful or not. Does he not think that he or his deputy or some one should know whether or not it was lawful for Major Walsh to remit this penalty? The legality of this act has been challenged by my hon. friend from Pictou, who has quoted the regulations and challenged the acting Minister of the Interior to show any authority under the regulations, for the action of Major Walsh. But the answer of the acting minister is that he does not know. He may regard that as very satisfactory, but I should not suppose it will be so considered by this House.

If it was the duty of Major Walsh in the Yukon—as undoubtedly it was—to enforce the law, and this was a violation of the law, surely the acting Minister of the Interior ought to have some better answer to the motion for inquiry and investigation than the statement that he and his department do not know what the law is with regard to this matter.

My hon. friend the acting Minister of the Interior, seems to regard this as a motion of want of confidence and he spoke of some vituperative attack by my hon. friend from Pictou. There was no attack of the kind that I heard, and I was here all the time my hon. friend was addressing the House. What my hon. friend did was to make a calm, moderate statement of fact, and he substantiated everything by reference to public documents.

He asked for an investigation on two grounds. One, that payment of the royalty had been extended by Major Walsh without authority; and the other, that no statement had been made by Mr. McDonald at all of the amount of the royalty; and I did not exactly catch from the acting Minister of the Interior just now what the explanation is in a memo. prepared by the Deputy Minister of the Interior with respect to the discrepancy between \$34,000, the amount actually paid, and \$41,000 the amount claimed.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** What I brought that out for was this. I do not know whether the letter my hon. friend referred to contains the same passage, but in his letter Mr. Lithgow referred to the amount of \$41,000 as being the amount due by Mr. McDonald. The department at once asked for an explanation and ordered an investigation to ascertain why this difference existed in the statement submitted by Mr. Lithgow. My own idea, in looking at it, was that it is the amount of exemption between the amount paid and the amount that would be due, and I pointed out that the department had taken action at once to have the matter investigated.

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).** But my hon. friend will, of course, recognize that if the law had been carried out, then, under the regulations, which are before me, Mr. McDonald, as every person carrying on mining in the Yukon, would have been obliged to

make a statement under oath from time to time of the amount of royalty actually due. That was one of the strongest points made by my hon. friend from Pictou—that, though he has moved for all public documents relating to these claims of the Crown against Alexander McDonald, not one single statement of that kind, which should be in the files of the department, has been produced. The law being so clear, is it not an extraordinary thing that the department has not been able to produce these statements? Does not the acting Minister of the Interior as an administrator think it calls for an inquiry of some kind? In the province of Nova Scotia, we have a law exactly of this kind, that persons operating claims are required to make out—at the end of each month, I think—a sworn return; and it is an unheard of thing in that province for a return of that kind to be neglected. The mines would otherwise be forfeited, as this man's mine would be under the law. If Mr. McDonald was not able to pay, if it would embarrass him to pay, and if that was sufficient ground for the violation of the law, surely it would not embarrass him, and will not embarrass him to make a return showing what he should pay. And yet, my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) has taken his seat without giving us the slightest information as to whether Major Walsh not only remitted for the time being payment of the royalty to this man, but absolutely remitted also the necessity of making the return according to the law.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). That is only a presumption.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) says that is only a presumption. It seems to me it is presumption on his part to make that remark. We have asked for every public document relating to the amount due from Alexander McDonald for royalties, the House has ordered the return, and the papers have been brought down in answer to that order—and neither in the documents that have been brought down nor in the speech made by the acting Minister of the Interior is there any trace of Mr. McDonald having made these statements and affidavits which he should have made under the law. Under these circumstances, I do not see why the Minister of Railways and Canals should feel called upon to intervene with any remark of that kind.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. These affidavits are not forwarded to the department here, as a usual thing, at all.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). They should be forwarded to the department, if a return of this kind is to be brought down to the House as evidence of what the amount due actually is. The return was ordered by the House in February last. The government

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax).

was then aware that a criticism was to be made with respect to the amount due from Mr. McDonald, and with respect to its non-payment. During the intervening time, it would have been competent for the acting minister, even if the documents are kept in the commissioner's office in the Yukon, to have called for those documents; but from that time to the present, the acting Minister of the Interior has not been able to get such information as will enable him to say whether such documents are in existence or not. He stands up here and says that, in his humble opinion, they exist; he says that he has no doubt they exist. But the public interests of this country are not to be dealt with on the humble opinion of my hon. friend the acting Minister of the Interior, nor on his belief, when it is competent for him to produce the actual documents, if they actually exist. What reason has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) advanced against an inquiry into this matter? He says that my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Herbert Tupper) was abusive. He has also given the reason which he always gives in these cases which he might almost have set up in type to be printed in these speeches of his—that the Yukon is four or five thousand miles away, and communication is difficult, and that discretion must be given to these officers. It may be that discretion must be given to them; but that does not mean that discretion it to be taken by them. This was not a case of discretion given to Major Walsh; it was discretion taken by him in violation of the law. If the Yukon is four or five thousand miles away and you find it necessary to send a dictator, you must give him discretion to act while he is there—but give it to him by law. It is not for the acting Minister of the Interior to stand up and say that the commissioner must have discretion, when the law does not give it to him. If he is entitled to discretion, the law should give it to him; and if the law does not give it to him, he has no right to exercise it. Now, the documents which have been referred to by my hon. friend from Pictou indicate a very curious state of affairs with regard to this thing. We have Major Walsh, in one letter, written after he ceased to be commissioner, stating that the amount due by Mr. McDonald was about \$30,000, or about \$40,000. Then, we have the statement from Mr. Ogilvie, that Mr. McDonald owed the government about \$70,000. Is it not a legitimate subject for this House to inquire into, whether Major Walsh remitted for the time to Mr. McDonald, \$70,000 or about \$30,000 or \$40,000? How is it that these gentlemen are so far apart in their statements in regard to this matter? And here is another circumstance that impressed me very much. How is it that Major Walsh, dealing with the question of not less than \$30,000, according to his own statement, or \$70,000 according to Mr. Ogilvie, left not a single line of

record in his department with regard to the agreement he made with Mr. McDonald? Are the public affairs of this country to be administered in such a way that the Minister of the Interior must be telegraphing to Winnipeg or New Brunswick and all over the country to find out what the state of affairs is with regard to the royalty due by Mr. McDonald, while Major Walsh, the commissioner who made the statement, has not sufficient interest in carrying out his duty of this country to leave one single line on record in his department with regard to an agreement by which he remitted this large amount of royalty? Does the acting Minister of the Interior, as an administrator, think that a commendable thing on the part of the gentleman whose praise he sounded so loudly? If Mr. McDonald's embarrassment was a proper reason for violating the law, one would think that the commissioner would, at least, have had Mr. McDonald make a statement under oath of what the royalty was, having the amount stated in black and white, and he would have taken some security from McDonald for payment. One would suppose that any businesslike man would have done that. But, as a matter of fact, he does not leave a single line in his department or write a single report or letter to the department with regard to the remission of that amount of from \$30,000 to \$70,000. My hon. friend the acting Minister of the Interior is quite facetious; he thinks it remarkable that my hon. friend from Pictou should have said anything about this matter. He thinks it strange that we should expect Major Walsh to step aside from his work of instructing his employees to stake claims for his brother's and devote a few minutes of his valuable time in order to put this matter, involving at least \$30,000 of the country's money, on a satisfactory basis. The acting Minister of the Interior almost waxes humorous about the extreme ideas of my hon. friend from Pictou with regard to this matter. Now, Sir, that may be one way of looking at it. The acting Minister of the Interior may think, so long as Mr. Wade, the protégé of the Minister of the Interior, gets very good retainers of \$10,000 at a time, that really a trifling matter of this kind will not be much regarded by the country. He may consider possibly that so long as Mr. Philp holds good claims out there, small matters of this kind, \$30,000, or \$40,000, or \$70,000 of the country's money, are of small importance; but if I may quote the hon. gentleman's own language, possibly the people of the country may take another view with regard to matters of this kind, and may not quite coincide with the hon. gentleman's view.

Now, it is an extraordinary circumstance that Mr. F. C. Wade should turn up again here. We have had Mr. F. C. Wade turning up in every one of these matters, and now at last, if not least, we have him turn-

ing up here. In what way? We find that Major Walsh, in dealing with this remission, consulted Mr. F. C. Wade, the gentleman who had got the large retainer from this very Mr. McDonald for services which he has not seen fit to specify either to the department or to the House. Mr. F. C. Wade, the gentleman retained by Mr. McDonald in 1898, this very same year, receiving a retainer which Mr. Wade says would be regarded as large in the east, and which one witness says Mr. Wade admitted to be \$10,000—he advises Major Walsh that under the circumstances it would not be a proper thing to press Mr. McDonald for that. Well, I suppose my hon. friend the acting Minister of the Interior thinks it is an extraordinary thing that any criticism should be made on a circumstance of that kind. But I would rather be inclined to think that if the Minister of the Interior, for instance, or the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), should take a \$10,000 retainer from some person who was seeking a favour from his department, a favour that could only be granted in violation of law, possibly some legitimate criticism of the transaction might be made because of that circumstance. And is it different with regard to Mr. Wade? Not at all different, because Mr. Wade, the retained solicitor of this gentleman, is the man who is consulted as to the expediency of granting the remission to Mr. McDonald in violation of law. Yet my hon. friend the acting Minister of the Interior is almost moved to mirth at the idea of any one making any criticism upon such a mode of administration as that.

Now, another extraordinary statement in these papers is that one of the officers says that the documents relating to this matter may turn up after an exhaustive search, but that up to the present time no documents whatever have turned up. Here are \$30,000, or \$40,000, or \$70,000, as you please, of the country's money remitted for a time to Mr. McDonald, and the documents, we are told, may turn up after an exhaustive search. And that is good administration according to my hon. friend the acting Minister of the Interior. When my hon. friend from Pictou mildly and moderately suggests there should be some inquiry into these things, the acting Minister of the Interior says it is a vote of censure when a motion is made for inquiry into administration of that kind.

Now, there is one other thing to which I may direct the attention of the House. It appears that the Department of the Interior has been playing rather a curious game upon this House. Last year we had an order of the House, and we had a reference to a certain letter from Mr. Ogilvie to the Minister of the Interior. That letter was required to be brought down and laid upon the Table of the House, and the Minister of the Interior told us that it was a private

letter, or, at least, that private matters were so mixed up with it that it could not be brought down. It is brought down now and laid upon the Table of the House, and we find that there are no private matters, at least so far as we can discover, but that it is an official letter in the strictest sense of the term. Now, is that a proper way for the Department of the Interior to deal with this House? I do not think it is. It is true that possibly the Minister of the Interior has some precedent for that, because we remember that on one occasion his leader sent a certain telegram around the press of this country, and afterwards promised to bring down and lay upon the Table of the House the telegram to which it was an answer, relating to one Mr. Hamilton Smythe. But the next day, after making that promise to the House, he comes down and says that though the answer was public, the telegram to which it was a reply was private. But he did not go quite as far as the Minister of the Interior did in this case, because the minister here is dealing with the very document itself. Now, upon the facts that have been brought before the House by the member for Pictou I think the motion he has made is a very moderate and a very fair motion, and one which the government, not only in the interest of the country, but in the interest of their officials, and in their own interest, ought to accept and grant at once.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). This is the fourth canter we have had from the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) on the Yukon so far. It will be noticed that the motions of the hon. member for Pictou strike at men not at things. He brought up the case of the *John C. Barr* to strike at Mr. Davis and Mr. Wade; and it was only a question as to whether Mr. Davis was right in keeping \$5,000 to pay the crew; and there was a motion of censure. It will be noticed also that each time he brings up a motion he calls upon the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) to get up and strengthen him. He looks as solemn as if he was in earnest, and speaks as learnedly as if he knew something about it, and wishes the House to believe that actually he has made of it a great study, and this is a matter of intense importance. The next was the case of the *Foukoner*, and that was the occasion of a blow again at both Mr. Wade and Mr. Davis, because Mr. Davis said the ship was not worth as much as she should be. Then he brought up the matter of the water front, and that was a blow at Wade and McDonald. Now he brings up the question of this royalty, and attempts to strike a blow at Major Walsh and Wade and McDonald. It will be noticed that Mr. Wade comes in every time. I would really like to suggest to the member for Pictou the position in which he finds himself today. The audience, or rather his own

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

friends behind him, on the other occasions were a little stronger, but to-day they range from eleven to sixteen, and no more, and the spectacle was presented of three ex-Privy Councillors asleep at the time he was speaking, his honoured father, and the member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), and the member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), and they slept soundly, I tell you. The music of his voice sent them to sleep in a way that would charm anybody. Not a mother holding her infant in her arms, the sweetest singer in the land, could have put them to sleep as easily as he did. It was charming to see them. Two of them almost fell out of their seats, they went to sleep so soundly. Now, does the hon. member not see that when there is no more interest than that taken in his speeches really he is running the thing to seed? Does he not see it was a waste of time to take four days in discussing the question whether Mr. Davis was right or wrong in keeping \$5,000 to pay the crew of a ship; whether Mr. Davis should be dismissed from office and the government censured for not dismissing them because he valued the ship at \$10,000 when she was worth \$25,000; whether the government ought not to be censured for collecting \$30,000 a year of rent from water fronts when others offered, some of them, as low as \$2,500; and that now, because Major Walsh thought fit to say he would permit a man to pay a royalty of 1898 in 1899, therefore, we must have an investigation? I was surprised when the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) asked: Why are not the papers here? You might as well call for every affidavit made at every port in Nova Scotia about shipping. Let me explain how it is done. A man has a mine; he mines all winter. The wash-up is in the spring, and when the wash-up is made he brings his gold down. There are two things he can do with the gold. If he is dishonest enough he does not come into the city, but he strikes a trail, takes the boat somewhere else, takes his bag of gold out, and there is no remedy at all. You cannot guard against that; there are smugglers in the Yukon just as well as there are in other parts of Canada, but that is the exception. A man comes down to Dawson City with his gold and hands it over to the official. The officials know pretty well how much gold should come in, because the inspectors up in the creeks know fairly well how much gold comes out of each mine day by day in the winter, and when the clean-up comes, every day they go around and see how much gold is taken out. I can very well understand that a mistake might be made. One man might say that McDonald ought to pay about \$40,000 this year, and another man might say that he ought to pay about \$70,000. I can understand that letter of Mr. Ogilvie, because he did not see it, and knew nothing about it. Each individual comes to the official bringing his gold.

He is not required to swear how much gold he has, because the official attends to that, but he must swear that that is all and that he has accounted for every ounce that comes out of his mine. That affidavit is filed and it is in Dawson City now. Every affidavit that is made is there and can be found there. I remember wanting to know something about it and being in Mr. Lithgow's office, when a man came in I read over the affidavit. The affidavit is quite a long one, and I cannot undertake to reproduce it, but the affidavit is to the effect that he has a mine, that it is at such a place, that he has brought in all that he has mined, that no more has come out of that mine, and that that mine is the only mine he has worked. That affidavit is filed and it will meet him if he has made a mistake or he has perjured himself.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) allow me to correct a misstatement he has made, and a very important misstatement. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the affidavits in regard to the McDonald case are on file at Dawson. The hon. acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) stated no such thing. There was an order of the House, dated 7th of February, calling for a return of copies of papers and reports, and the papers brought down afford strong evidence to show that no such affidavits were ever in existence. This is a document, dated the 3rd of October, 1899, in which Mr. Lithgow, in a letter to the secretary of the Department of the Interior, states:

I beg to inform you that certified copies of all royalty affidavits to August 31, 1899, have been forwarded to the department in a special mail bag addressed to you.

The royalty returns were made to me since September, 1898, as it was not convenient to have them handled at the gold commissioner's office.

It is possible that some of last year's are missing, but we have sent copies of all that could be found.

In future, either duplicates or certified copies will be sent with the monthly statement.

There is incontrovertible evidence that no such affidavits ever existed. In the first place, no one in the Department of the Interior could state what was the royalty that the McDonald claim should have paid. On the other hand, Mr. Ogilvie writes that there is nothing to show, and that they have nothing in Dawson of any kind except the confidential correspondence that I have read. McGregor is helpless when asked for information, and then a reference to Captain Bliss is made, saying that he had charge, and there is no report from Captain Bliss. If the hon. gentleman bears in mind that condition of facts as before parliament he will not question the statement that McDonald never made any affidavit as to the amount of royalty due.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I am sure he did.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Give the evidence.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Give the evidence—Mr. Lithgow.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Read it.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Read it?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). All I have to say is that Mr. Lithgow understands his business. He told me: I saw the man make it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He told the hon. gentleman?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I am not to take the evidence of an official as against the assertion of the hon. gentleman. That is to say, that the hon. gentleman assumes that the affidavit was not made when an officer like Mr. Lithgow says that in every case like that the affidavit is made. But, that is nothing, my assertion is worth more than that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; Mr. Lithgow, according to the returns, never made any such statements, and if the hon. gentleman disagrees he will do me the courtesy to read the document upon which he is basing his statement.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Lithgow does not say that McDonald did not make it. I know that Mr. Lithgow does take an affidavit in every case; it is the law of the territory, and every man, except he takes his gold out of the country, has to make it. I did not see the affidavit, but Mr. Lithgow does not say, and he will not say, that in McDonald's case, he did not make the regular affidavit. Mr. Lithgow went into the thing carefully, and it must be remembered that in the office where Mr. Lithgow is, as I said, every one of these affidavits is kept on file—every one of them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). And when the payment was made the affidavit would be made. The whole charge is that McDonald got a year to pay the arrears of 1898. Does the law designate the particular day when the royalty shall be paid? Not at all. Where was there a violation of the law in saying to a man who has mined so much gold: You can pay it at a future date? Where is there anything wrong in that, if the return be made at the time the payment is made? I would like to know where there is anything wrong in that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman hear Mr. Ogilvie's report, that under the law, in consequence of the non-payment of the royalty by McDonald when it was due, he would forfeit his claims, but as Major Walsh had permitted this McDonald should not suffer.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). When it suits the hon. gentleman to bring Mr. Ogilvie as a judge to decide the law, he will do it, but when he wants to speak of it contemptuously, he will do it. I do not take Mr. Ogilvie's statement as deciding the matter by any means. What are the facts of this case? McDonald, with others, had gone to the Yukon early in the rush. The hon. gentleman undertakes to say, but he cannot find any evidence of it, that the country is in the hands of combines. There is no mining district in the world where there are so many individuals who own gold mines as the Yukon. There are less companies at work in the Yukon than in any other country in the world where the mining of gold is taken up. It is a remarkable thing. Of course, there are individuals who have made large fortunes, but they did not do it by the organization of combinations. There is a man on Eldorado Creek who has taken a million and a half out of his mine, but it was not done by a company. I know a young man named Calder, who went out there from Cape Breton three years ago, and who is now worth between \$600,000 and \$700,000. There are no large companies. McDonald went out there a poor man when it cost from \$300 to \$400 a ton to take everything into that country, and he went at once to mining. He got some good mining properties, but he wanted every dollar to pay his debts, and to get other properties, and he explained that to Major Walsh. Was it not reasonable that under such circumstances, Major Walsh would say to a man like Alex. McDonald: I will give you until next year to pay the amount that was due. How was the country going to lose anything by it? Forty thousand dollars was only 10 per cent of the amount he took out of the mine, and Mr. Ogilvie gives his opinion that if he did not pay the royalty, the property would come back to the government, and we know that the mine was showing better the next year than it had the previous year. Will any man, in his senses, say that there was any danger of the country losing a dollar by that? Major Walsh knew that Alex. McDonald was doing more for the Yukon than any man who ever went in there. There were a lot of Americans in the territory whose only idea was to get the gold and take it away; but here was Alex. McDonald, a good Canadian, a Canadian who came to stay there, to build up the district, and to grow in prosperity with the district. Was it not a wise thing for Major Walsh to do, to give a man like that a little assistance, when the coun-

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

try did not risk one dollar by his doing so? If Mr. McDonald had never been asked to pay, there might be ground for complaint. I want to say here that Alex. McDonald has done more for the Yukon than all the men in this parliament ever did or ever will do. I can tell the hon. gentleman from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), that all he can say will not affect Alex. McDonald's standing in that country amongst those who know him. He went in there as a pioneer, and made a lot of money, and now he is beautifying the streets of Dawson, building hotels and doing all in his power to make it a prosperous city. When Alex. McDonald went in there, every ton of food used by his men, cost \$300 or \$400 in freight alone from Vancouver, and \$40,000 was quite an item to him, so that I cannot help commending the wisdom of Major Walsh in helping him over that year. There is not a first-class business man in Canada, but who, when he sees a man who is worthy and deserving of encouragement, will not assist him in his payments. I forget how much is due for binder twine, and it may have been a wise thing for the government to let it be due, because I can understand that it may be prudent for the government, as well as for an individual, to let a thing like that go, in order to reach a greater result. Alex. McDonald was there to stay in the country, and no man ever lost a dollar by him, and no man will ever lose a dollar by him. It may have been that the wash-up was not complete, but whether or not every one who knows Alex. McDonald well knows that he will state exactly the amount of gold he takes out of a claim. Major Walsh was in a new country where they are not tied up with red tape every day in the year, and in that country they have to give and take, and one man has to depend on another. Indeed the wonderful thing to me is that we have collected the amount of royalty we have collected in that country. We must remember that 90 per cent of the people were foreigners, determined that they should pay nothing to the hated Britisher, and it is a marvel that we collected the royalty. McDonald was a Canadian born in Nova Scotia, born of the best race in the world, an honest, good Highlander, and he went out there to make his fortune, and every one knew that he was an honest man. I have no doubt that Major Walsh knew him, and had confidence in him as had everybody else. When it is remembered that Mr. McGregor and other officials walked up into these creeks where there was 90 per cent Americans and foreigners, and collected the same royalty in 1898, in proportion to the amount mined, as they did in 1899, it is one of the most marvellous things that ever happened in Canada. These Yankees did not want to pay one dollar. They were almost in mutiny stating that the country was theirs, because they were there first, but nevertheless the royalty was collected. Is it not a surprising

thing that the only complaint that is made about this royalty business should be made in the case of a Canadian who went up there as a hardy pioneer to develop the country, and then the only complaint that can be made is that Major Walsh gave this honest Canadian an extension of one year's time in which to pay this royalty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Let me ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser), on what information he reiterates the statement that we collected all the royalty? The Auditor General says he has nothing before him to show that the royalty, which was due, was collected.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I have the statement of Mr. Lithgow.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He does not say that.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). He says it was settled for. If the hon. gentleman denies that there is no use arguing with him, and I will be content to let it go on record.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Lithgow does not say that he collected all the royalty due.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). He says he collected the royalty from Mr. McDonald.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. My remark was not as to Mr. McDonald's royalty. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser), stated over and over again that it was a wonderful thing that with all these Americans and foreigners, the officers of the Canadian government had been able to collect all the royalty. In view of the statement of the Auditor General that he has no information to show that the royalty due had been collected, I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser) on what information he makes that statement?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Well, I suppose that royalty due, would refer to royalty that we know is due. We all are aware that there are lots of people who did not pay their royalty. It is quite clear that on each Yukon motion, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is getting more and more involved, and more difficult to understand. I admit that there were numbers in that country who did not pay, and I believe there will be numbers who will not pay their royalty. There are numbers of people in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and everywhere else, who are wearing clothes that did not pay duty, and if goods are imported into well settled districts without paying duty, is it to be wondered at, that in a country like that, without roads or anything else, some gold will be taken out without paying a royalty? I believe there was gold taken out without paying a royalty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The hon. gentleman says 'hear, hear,' but does the hon. gentleman wish it to be understood that when a man takes out three or four thousand dollars worth of gold dust in the year, and all he has to do is to strike a trail across the mountain and clear out; does he mean that it is possible to collect every dollar of royalty? We know that men pay a royalty at Dawson, and we know that if they have only a certain amount of dust that they carry it out. They make from one to three dollars an ounce on the gold they bring out to Seattle, and thus save the bank charges, and so quite a large amount of gold comes out in that way, and I have no doubt that quite a lot of it does not pay a cent of royalty. That is to be expected. In regard to the Auditor General, I have not seen that statement. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell me where I shall find that?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On page H-118.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). In the first place, there were no papers at all before the Auditor General. How would he have the papers? There is not a statement presented to him as to the number of men who mined or the amount they took out. He has simply a statement made to him of the amount of royalty collected.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the whole point.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). How does he know where it came from? How can he talk about anything due?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No one can.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Then, what is the point?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The point is simply this, that the hon. gentleman made a statement which I challenged and asked his reason for making; that was, that the royalty was collected, and that it was wonderful that it was collected.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). So well collected.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the statement is qualified, I have nothing to say.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Lots of it came out of the country, and was never collected at all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A vast amount.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). No, I would not say a vast amount. Even last year I saw men coming out with some gold, and, of course, it would be impossible to say whether that gold paid duty or not; but,

you never saw a fond lover cling to a maiden as they did to that gold, from the time they left Dawson till they got to Seattle. They did not leave it for a moment, because at any moment the gold might be taken by somebody else. And here I might say for myself, that I do not know but it would be a very good thing, in order to get every cent of the royalty, that no gold should be permitted to be taken out of the Yukon at all. I do not know but we shall have to come to that, that the government must insist that every ounce of gold mined in the country must be taken to them. I know the difficulty; it is the difficulty of the corporations; but, it is really the very best way of seeing that every dollar that is mined pays the royalty. Of course, the banks make a large margin; that is their business, no doubt. What I said was that, in view of the insufficient mode the officials had of collecting the revenue, and the few men there was to look after the miners, it was to me a marvel that the royalty was so well collected. I am satisfied that with the number of men there, the work could not have been better performed. Mr. Lithgow himself is an officer of the highest and best standing. He attends to the business of the country there as well as any man I ever saw. The ease with which the work is done makes it a matter that it not, perhaps, plain to those who have not seen it. The men who dig the gold and pay the royalty do not have to pay it after the manner of customs. A man comes with a bag containing, say, \$10,000 worth of gold, and lays it down. He makes an affidavit that that is the full amount he has mined that year. The officer takes the gold and weighs it, and finds it to be worth just \$10,000. He then takes 10 per cent out of it, and keeps it; or he hands the bag to the bank and the bank takes the 10 per cent and credits the official with it. I know that during 1897 and 1898 there was not the means of getting at every man who was mining. I know it was almost impossible to find the location and the amount. You must remember that at that time the officials had scarcely any office. They were there without a map or anything to indicate where men were working, except the stakes which were put down and a piece of paper put in stating that this man had that claim and that man the other. Fancy a handful of men among thousands of people, getting the business done as regularly as if it was typewritten. I know there was wrongs committed; there were men who were passed over and men who got clear, and there were times when the full amount of revenue was not collected; yet, the marvel to me is that there were so few cases of that kind. All I have to say to the hon. member for Pictou is, that if he went there, while he would see much that was not done as it would be done in this country, he would marvel that the officials did their work so faithfully and so

honestly. Sixty per cent of the foreigners there did not want to pay the royalty, and only for the mounted police they would never have paid a dollar. There was an armed mob of wild men there at one time who had no idea of law and order, and who were willing to strike against paying anything. With regard to this man Alexander McDonald, I say that Major Walsh did right in the interest of the Yukon and of the whole country in giving him that year to pay. If Alexander McDonald had been harassed at that time and had not got the use of that \$40,000 for that year, and had been lost to the Yukon, there are not a hundred of the best men in the Yukon who would take his place or do so much good for the country. So that, the whole thing comes down to this, that Major Walsh, being on the ground and understanding the position of Alexander McDonald as well as anybody else, decided to grant him that extension, and the money was paid the next year. What was the effect? He not only paid the \$34,000 in 1899 that was due, but you must remember that the other partners did pay. There were partners with Alexander McDonald, but they had not the large projects that he had on hand, and were able to pay. Mr. McDonald paid in 1899, the \$34,000 for 1898, and within a small fraction of \$80,000 besides. Not only did he pay in 1899 the debt of 1898, but he paid more than double that amount to the government for the year 1899. In that year he paid over \$100,000 to the government on an output of \$1,000,000. Was it not worth while to allow that man an extension of time from 1898 to 1899? Is it not a small thing to bring up in this House, that Major Walsh—who was on the ground and knew how things were—should have permitted a man like that—who was there not only to make wealth for himself, but to develop that country—to get an extension of credit from 1898 to 1899? I am sure that if the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), had reflected a moment, he would not have attempted to tarnish the fair fame of a man belonging to his province, and who had not done anything wrong, but simply went to the officer, and said: I owe a certain amount, will you give me time till next year, as I want to utilize the money for the development of the country? The hon. gentleman's attack will not hurt Mr. McDonald in that country, because he is too well known there, and too highly respected. The hon. member for Pictou might be engaged in better work. He might be engaged in trying to find out something that was really a grievous wrong, rather than attempt to censure the government for having allowed a year's delay to a man who had spent the best part of his life in building up that country. Besides the country did not lose a dollar by the transaction. If it had, the hon. gentleman might have had something to say. The country got from McDonald the amount he owed for 1898,

and, no doubt, this extension of time was in the interests of that section of the country and of the government itself, as well as of Mr. McDonald.

I cannot see any ground whatever, for bringing forward this motion. As I have said, this is No. 4, and I would strongly advise my hon. friend not to bring up No. 5, or No. 6, and No. 7, because, judging by the ratio at which his auditors decrease on each successive motion, he will find after a while, that he will have no one to listen to him at all, and he will turn this House, for the time being, into a veritable chamber of death, save for the dreary, confused wail of a solitary murmur.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I fancy, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. gentleman would reflect a moment, he will hardly think it necessary for any one to make any reply to his remarks, he has replied so completely to himself. It might be worthy of a small boy, but not one quite so large as the hon. gentleman is, to make the argument he did. What was the pith of his argument? That Mr. McDonald was born of a very honest family, that he had honest parents, that he went out to the Yukon a poor man, that he could not spare the \$40,000, and yet at the same moment, the hon. gentleman had in his possession what Mr. Ogilvie had said, over his own hand, that the extension given to McDonald by Major Walsh was absolutely demoralizing the whole condition of affairs in that country. The hon. gentleman says it is a wonder the royalties were collected. Every one who has listened to his speech will agree that it was a wonder, in the face of McDonald being permitted to pay his royalty when he chose, and pay such an amount as he chose. There is no record in the department of how much this man owed. The auditor does not know to-day whether he owed \$40,000 or \$70,000, and I challenge the hon. minister to produce one scrap of evidence to show how much Mr. McDonald owed.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Will you make the statement in this House that Alex. McDonald owes a dollar he did not pay?

Mr. CLANCY. So far as the records of the department are concerned, they all point to the conclusion that Mr. McDonald owed much more. If he did not, how does the hon. gentleman account for Mr. Ogilvie saying that he owed \$70,000?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). That was a statement merely made as an estimate, just as you would say a man was worth \$10,000, and another would say he was worth \$20,000.

Mr. CLANCY. That is splendidly indefinite. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that Mr. Ogilvie did not know? Is he a better authority than Mr. Ogilvie? Mr. Ogilvie should have known. It was the business

of the officials in the department to have a record and to have known in what amount Mr. McDonald was indebted. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that Mr. McDonald is a very honest man, but there was a confusion in the administration of the department that amounted to criminality. It is no excuse to say that the means for keeping the records are very poor. That may be a mistake; but if it was possible to keep the records with regard to other miners, it was possible to keep them in the case of Mr. McDonald.

Mr. McDonald was given an extension of time illegally. No one pretends to say that such was not the case, but the indications are that nobody knew how much Mr. McDonald owed. Nobody can tell whether he did not owe \$100,000. The hon. gentleman says we cannot prove that Mr. McDonald did not pay all he owed. But I say, it rests with the government to show how much he owed. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot escape the responsibility of coming down to this House, and through their officials, saying how much Mr. McDonald owed. If they fail to do that, they lie under the serious charge of either having winked at the dereliction of duty and allowed their officials to share in the plunder. What would be the object of hiding the amount that Mr. McDonald owed? The object could only be that somebody might participate in the fraud. Oh, but hon. gentlemen say, you are speaking of the officials, you should not speak ill of these gentlemen. When these hon. gentlemen are charged with serious misconduct, when they are charged with having failed in their duty, they reply, you must not abuse our officials.

These hon. gentlemen may think that the people are forgetting these charges, but they are just as fresh in the peoples' minds as the day my hon. friend from Pictou first brought them up. What is the position of the government? They simply reply: These officials are really honest men, and although they have given no account, everything is all right. Now, Sir, that bears wrong-doing on the face of it; and it was the duty of the government to have granted an investigation to clear or convict these men whom they are now defending. If this were a matter that happened in the city of Ottawa, no man would dare to face the people who refused a full and free investigation, because public indignation would be so strong that no man could possibly resist it. But because this is in the Yukon a long distance away, they could not grant an investigation. But is this the first charge of wrong-doing in the Yukon? They have been repeated and repeated; and now you would have to bring something more shocking as all the others are before hon. gentlemen opposite would take notice if it. They say: These are the old charges. I have to tell the acting Minister of the Interior, to whom I listened with

great interest, that I had expected that he would be able fairly to account for these things; but he hardly did himself credit when he said that these charges had been repeated from year to year. Was that an answer? He is not so bold as the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). An hon. friend behind me suggested that he has a little more common sense. The acting Minister of the Interior has lots of common sense; and I am going to ask him how he accounts for Mr. Ogilvie's two statements—that there are no records by which he can determine how much Mr. McDonald owes, and there are no means of knowing how much Mr. McDonald has paid. I am not willing to condemn the hon. gentleman and his department off-hand, but I would like to know from him how he accounts for these things?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I told my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) that, as soon as it was known that Mr. Ogilvie had heard that there was a different amount than that returned by Mr. Lithgow, he was at once asked for an explanation and told to investigate. That is all the department could do under the circumstances. And, when the answer comes, of course, we shall know what explanation is to be given.

Mr. CLANCY. Now, what does Mr. Lithgow say? He said it was all settled. Was the amount settled whether Mr. McDonald owed \$30,000 of \$70,000? There was no statement read.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If my hon. friend will allow me—I read Mr. Lithgow's official letter in which he said he and Mr. Senkler had gone into the thing thoroughly, going over every account and getting a full settlement.

Mr. CLANCY. There is no such thing in the statement as that they went into all that was taken out, unless my memory very much deceives me—and I wish to be set right if I am wrong. He said they went carefully into the whole thing and settled it. What have they settled? Not the point that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has charged—namely, that no record was kept upon which to make a settlement.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) will allow me, I will read it. This letter is dated June 23, 1899.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Was that after payment had been received from Mr. McDonald?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, and he informed the department that the amount was placed to the credit of the Receiver General. He says: 'The inclosed statement represents the full settlement.' That statement, as I understand it, showed every claim and the amount taken out. He adds: 'They

Mr. CLANCY.

have been gone into most carefully by the gold commissioner and myself.' That is Mr. Lithgow's statement.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) has left us in the dark as much as ever. There is no evidence to show that Mr. McDonald had ever made a statement. He was a sort of spoiled child up there: he did as he liked. But, so far the departmental records show—and I wish to press that point—he never made a statement under oath of what he did. He kept his own accounts and was allowed to pay when he chose.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has asked me a question. Now, I would like to ask him one if he will permit me. Is it not reasonable to suppose that Mr. Lithgow, who is a professional accountant, in making a statement of that kind, if he had found anything irregular, would have said so?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) comes down with what he calls a reasonable supposition. He ought, let me tell him, to come down with absolute information. For him to put an interpretation which seems favourable to himself and the government, instead of giving us the information and leaving us to judge for ourselves, is rather too thin. I am not going to charge Mr. Lithgow with having made a false statement—no doubt it is true, so far as he knows. But the hon. gentleman does not give information which would warrant the House in concluding that Mr. McDonald had ever conformed to the regulation which require the mine owners to make out a statement under affidavit. Mr. Ogilvie was in a better position than Mr. Lithgow to know the state of the case. Yet, the matter stands without being cleared up in any way. The pith and kernel of the whole thing is that there seems to be a set of officials in the Yukon who, if we may judge from surface appearances, if we are to put their acts side by side, are there for no other purpose than to pillage and plunder the country. And, if hon. gentlemen think that statement too strong, they have the remedy in their own hands—to grant the investigation that has been asked for over and over again in this House. If hon. gentlemen opposite wish to shelter their officials, they are taking the proper way to do it by refusing this investigation. I would ask the acting Minister of the Interior if it would not have been a more reasonable thing, in the face of all these statements, and of the collateral evidence, for the government to have granted this investigation? Would it not be more reasonable to grant it now in the interest of that country which, metaphorically speaking, is damned by having officials who are said to plunder every great interest there. We have it openly stated that Mr. Wade, who has been there

as an officer of the department there, has been receiving retainers, and he advised Walsh that he should not collect that sum from McDonald in the meantime. If there were only one case, it would justify an investigation. But such cases have been brought forward in every department that if the government felt that their officials were clear, and that they themselves were clear, they would not dare deny such an investigation.

Mr. GEORGE E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I had supposed that before the indictment made by my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was allowed to go to the House, some responsible member of the government would have thought it worth while to answer that indictment and to endeavour to clear up, for the officials, and for the government, the statements that have been made, and that so far, have been made without being successfully contradicted. I do not suppose that a serious and solid member of the government would for a single moment suppose that the acting Minister of the Interior put in a valid defence against a charge brought now on the 18th day of June, 1900, by replying that last session the member for Pictou had made a long and wicked speech. Now, that may be a satisfactory answer, thoroughly conclusive, to the statements which have been made to-day; but I can scarcely conceive that a solid and responsible member of the cabinet would so consider it. We have had a little improvement to-night on the lesson that was taught here last Friday night. Then we had the lesson solemnly put forth by the right hon. gentleman who leads the government that what would have been a crime if committed in the city of Montreal was only an indiscretion when it was committed six hundred miles away in the county of Gaspé. The acting Minister of the Interior is an apt pupil in that respect at least; and now what would have been a crime if committed in Montreal, but would have been an indiscretion if committed 600 miles away, when it is committed two or three thousand miles away, fades into the reminiscence even of an indiscretion, nay, better than that, becomes a positive virtue in the opinion, especially, of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). Well, Sir, that will hardly be considered, I think, a valid defence, ingenious though it is. The government appear to be laying it before the country as a valid defence. They surely must have thought that it was a defence which will bear them up in the trying times that are to come. Is it a valid defence? Let the people of this country ask themselves if that is the best the government can do against the charge which has been brought here to-day.

Another defence the acting minister put up is this: Oh, well, you often find debts unpaid, even here in Ontario, and close to

the seat of government. Some times you lose what is due to the government. Granted. Is that a valid excuse, a valid defence? When it is charged here that an officer high in the government of the country, having in fact great powers in the Yukon, but yet having no single power which made him superior to the law, actually made himself superior to the law, violated or broke it; and the only defence that is put up is: Oh, well, things are often done here as bad as that; you have not lost any money by this, therefore, the country is not out. Or did they consider that the defence put up by the member for Guysborough was a valid one? Did the Minister of Finance think for a moment to what end the argument of the member for Guysborough was tending? Did the member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), when he applauded that speech made by the member for Guysborough, did he set his sign manual to the logical outcome of the argument of the member for Guysborough? For what was the argument of the member for Guysborough? Simply this, that the government must not be foolish. The government has laws and regulations, but if in any case it thinks it may be a benefit to an individual, and ultimately a benefit to the country, that these laws and regulations should be openly broken and defied, it is perfectly proper to do it. Here was a law; here was a gentleman who owed a debt under the law, and here was an administrator who said: Yes, he owes the debt, he is able to pay it, but it would embarrass him to pay it, therefore, I will break the law, I will not collect it, and I will give him a year in which to pay it.

Then the member for Guysborough said triumphantly: Has the country lost anything? No, and Mr. McDonald has become more rich and still more rich, and now he is in a position to give the country still greater revenues from the output of his rapidly growing mines. Let the Minister of Finance apply that argument in older Canada. Here is a wholesale importer who is bringing in a large supply of spring goods or of winter goods. He brings them to the port of debarkation here, he brings them up to the customs-house, and he says to the customs officer, or to the Minister of Customs, if he happens to be there: It will embarrass me to pay these duties now. You just allow me a year to pay them, in two equal instalments; you will not lose anything, and I will be put in such a position by having the use of this money by that time, that I will be able to do a bigger business next year, and consequently be able to pay you larger customs dues on my larger importations. Is that going to be the argument which will weigh with the Minister of Finance? I believe the member for Guysborough has had ministerial aspirations. Suppose that he had a seat in the government and his peculiar philosophy were to rule with the members of the gov-

ernment; what would become of the great collecting departments of this country, when everything would go by favour or by whim, and when the law and regulations would be set aside? Does not everybody see that in matters of revenue collection you have to have a law, and you have your regulations under the law, and you have to apply them impartially and rigidly, and that it will not do to give way to one or another? It would lead to inextricable confusion and to all sorts of corruption.

Now, what are the facts of the case? The first charge made by my hon. friend from Pictou was that Mr. Walsh, not having authority and discretion given him by law, absolutely broke the law; for under the law, and under the regulations it is the gold commissioner alone who has power to collect these royalties, and whose duty it is to collect them under the law and under the regulations. Well, there were well defined and well set out regulations under which the gold commissioner was to act at that very time. What happens? Mr. Walsh, who had no power in that respect, that power being vested in the gold commissioner by the law and under the regulations, overrode the law and the regulations. Now, if Mr. Walsh had power to override the law and the regulations, why did he go about it secretly? The acting Minister of the Interior has not answered that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, I said he had power under the regulations to amend and change the regulations.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman point out where he has authority to do that?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The order in council says:

He may vary, alter or amend any mining regulation issued under authority of the Governor General in Council governing the granting of mining claims where such may, in his opinion, be necessary in the public interest.

I think under that he had the power.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the acting minister point out any ordinance, or any official document appointing that gentleman, by which he had authority to amend the regulations secretly and individually, without regular and published proclamation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, I have stated from time to time that lawyers may differ as to these various fine points. But I do think that under that authority he had power to vary that regulation to the extent that he did vary it, and to say to this man: Although you do not pay on a certain day fixed by the regulations, I will extend the time, and your claim will not be forfeited. I think he had the right to do that, I think he did it for many others.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the hon. gentleman can get back to his position, that, granted

Mr. FOSTER.

the order in council gave to Major Walsh the power to alter or to amend, was that alteration, or amendment, to be done secretly and in individual cases? If there was that power of alteration and amendment, it should be published, it should be made known to everybody and applied impartially to everybody. That is the point. Well, Sir, if he had had the power to alter or amend would he have gone secretly about the business? If he had had the power to alter it, and to alter it in that one way, why did he not publish this alteration so that everybody would know of it and point out why he did it? The very fact that he went secretly about it, that he did it simply in the case of McDonald and said: I will destroy the regulations as far as you are concerned, but do not say anything to anybody about it, and then wrote a letter to the gold commissioner, not an open, above-board letter, but a letter marked 'private and confidential,' overriding the regulations and powers of the commissioner, the regulations under which the gold commissioner was acting, shows that he had not the right to do it. The very statement that the hon. acting minister has made just now lands him in a difficulty, whereas, if he had said nothing he would almost have been in a better position, because he buoyed himself up on the fact that he was not a lawyer and did not undertake to argue that question. The statement made by the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) is a statement which is pertinent. The Department of the Interior has no right to exist and administer unless it has somewhere about it legal opinion and advice to know what the law is and to see that information can be given in reference to its legal powers. The fact of the hon. acting minister coming down here and saying that he and the department did not know that it was the law and did not know that the law had been violated, that he was not in a position to express an opinion, is not only putting contempt upon the department, but it is a reflection upon the government. If there was no one in the Department of the Interior who knew what the law was, the Minister of Justice is there as an adviser for very department that needs his services. Now, what were the regulations? There was a fair, open way in which this was done. What was it? The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), and I want the ministry to notice that, because the hon. gentleman has given their defence, and I want to know whether the ministry believe in the defence or not—defended them on this ground: Granted that it was not paid when it was due, there is nothing in the regulations that says when it must be paid; consequently, if it went on for a year it was perfectly legal. By the same reasoning, if it went for two years, it was perfectly legal, and if it went on for three years, it would be perfectly legal. There is nothing in the single point of time, and if it can go

over for one year it can go over for an indefinite period. But, the hon. gentleman was wrong in that. Here are the regulations. The regulations made it necessary that these payments should be made on the 1st and 15th of each month :

Notices were posted at intervals all along these creeks, through which claim-owners were informed that the royalty should be paid on the 1st and 15th of each month to the mining inspectors at the Forks of Eldorado, or at the Bank of Commerce in Dawson City.

This was in reference to a certain number of creeks.

On Hunker Creek the miners were notified to report at the commissioner's office, Dawson, on the 1st of each month. These reports were required whether royalty was paid or not. On Bonanza and Eldorado the mining inspectors examined the claims to ascertain if all who were working had reported.

And so on. Here is the modus operandi :

In each case the miner reporting made an affidavit or statutory declaration, which contained the number or description of the claim, the time covered in the return, viz., date of beginning and ending, the total output in ounces, and the amount of royalty; also a certificate as to the accuracy of the return.

That is what every miner had to do under the regulations that were made by the gold commissioner in pursuance of section 30.

Those who paid royalty at the bank filled out and made affidavit to the return at the office, and took it to the bank; these would be filed away at the bank. I do not know what the inspectors did with the affidavits taken by them—Capt. Bliss, who was accountant at that time, kept the account of the royalty and did not prepare a return for the gold commissioner's office.

That shows that the return to the gold commissioner's office was not prepared by Capt. Bliss.

The commissioner (Commissioner Walsh) himself superintended, to a great extent, the collection of royalty.

The affidavits above-mentioned would contain all the information asked for in the Auditor General's letter.

The Auditor General audits these revenue accounts; the Auditor General knows that to audit them properly you have to have the basis of them, and the basis is the affidavit of the miner, or the worker in the mine. It is the only check you have upon him. The Auditor General knew that, of course, and he demanded that in his letter. Now, what folly it is to say that Mr. Lithgow, who was brought up in the accountant's business and who knew well the mind of the Auditor General, did not know all this. If a definite statement had gone to Mr. Lithgow saying: We want to ferret this thing out, the first thing Mr. Lithgow would have done would have been to ferret out the affidavits. And when he returned his statement to the department he would have based it on the affidavits which he himself had seen, even whether he had returned them or not to the Auditor General. He

does not do that, and the fact is presumptive evidence that he returned no affidavits, and he certainly would have done so if there had been any. That he does not do so is proof positive to me that what they did do, after the lapse of time, was to do the best they could to settle the matter, that they came to an agreement and reported this settlement down here to the department at Ottawa. That seems to me a fair conclusion, and Mr. Lithgow and Mr. Senkler embodied it in the statement which they sent down. Has there been time to get these affidavits? I have read the regulations. Every miner and every mine-owner has, in some cases, on the 1st and 15th of the month, at stated times, to give an affidavit of the time he has been at work, of the amount he has taken out, of the value, and number of ounces, and he has to swear to it. That is the basis of the whole collection of the revenue. Not only have these regulations been in force, not only were they in force, but what has elapsed since then? One year and more has elapsed from the time that the department here began to get anxious that the matter should be settled and settled satisfactorily. What was the humiliating position of the department? Mr. Ogilvie lit upon the statement during an examination before him in another matter, and he found that one McDonald had not yet paid his royalty, which possibly amounted to \$70,000, according to Mr. Ogilvie. Mr. Ogilvie was the appointed man by the Minister of the Interior, he was that cool and level-headed man which they themselves declared, but Mr. Ogilvie got excited when he learned that, and he immediately wrote to the Minister of the Interior and said: This is a very serious matter; I find that in one case the royalty amounting to possibly \$70,000 has been remitted by Mr. Walsh, and that ought to be investigated. Mr. Ogilvie discovered the fact, but could not get the data and he rushed that fact off to the Minister of the Interior. The minister begins to feel that something is wrong. Here was the law set at naught by the commissioner, Major Walsh set it at naught by a secret and confidential letter, and the letter upon which his action was based, we have not been able to have produced in this parliament. If a secret and confidential letter can alter the law and the regulations with reference to the royalty, why does not the department get the letter upon which that was based, namely, the letter from Mr. McDonald in which he made his plea to Mr. Walsh, the commissioner. That letter has been the cause of breaking the law and the regulations, and it has no claim to be kept secret. The government should have secured it from Major Walsh so that parliament could have seen both sides of that agreement. However, the Minister of the Interior immediately sets himself to find out about this thing. He telegraphed first to Mr. Mc-

Gregor, the mining inspector, who was at Brandon, and Mr. McGregor answers back that he has not any information about it, but he knows that he and Mr. Walsh consulted together and that Mr. Walsh wrote a letter to remit the payment of the duty in the case of Mr. McDonald, and so the minister does not get the information from his mining inspector. He writes to Mr. Ogilvie: McGregor is going in, see him, see Norwood, see Fawcett; and Mr. Ogilvie sees them, and Fawcett says he knows nothing about it, and Norwood knows nothing about it but that he got \$2,100 at a certain time. There are no records, and in no place in the Yukon district can they find any affidavits or any records in reference to the matter. As I have said, Mr. Ogilvie lit upon this when he was conducting another investigation, and if it was so grave a matter, and with McDonald and the officers before him, why did he not probe it, as he had power to do? When it was discovered and when the government here knew that Captain Bliss had been taking in these royalties and did not return any of the affidavits, why was not Captain Bliss asked to make a return? He was not asked. The matter went back again to Mr. Ogilvie and it has been bandied backwards and forwards and a year has elapsed, and to-day the Department of the Interior comes before this House and cannot show a single affidavit made by McDonald as a basis upon which this claim should have been settled. That is not business. The fact that Dawson is 3,000 miles away, is no bar to these affidavits having been kept; the fact that communication with Dawson was difficult is no excuse for these officials not keeping their accounts in black and white, and not keeping the affidavits which the law requires to be made by the miners themselves. 'Oh,' says the acting Minister of the Interior, 'I know that McDonald paid everything because he paid so much.' Surely, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) will not contend that because a debtor has paid a certain amount that therefore it is proof positive that the debtor has paid everything due by him. The minister would never settle an account in that way. He would want to know the amount due and the amount that was paid. No department of government would proceed on the plan that the acting Minister of the Interior announces in this respect. The Customs Department must have the invoices, the bill of the goods, the rate of the duties, and these are the bases upon which the demand is made for payment and the payment made. In no other way can business be transacted. Take this thing from top to bottom, and it means simply this: In the first place your commissioner broke the law; he over-rode the powers of the gold commissioner; he did it secretly; he did it in one case alone; he did it without any memorandum that the government or any officer of the government has as to the

Mr. FOSTER.

amount that was due when he made the remission into two payments of six months each, or as to the amount he remitted. You have here set out in the government blue-book regulations stating that affidavits are absolutely necessary, and that they should be filed, and yet in this McDonald case the government cannot show one single affidavit as to the amount of gold he took out upon which to base the amount of the royalty he should have paid. More than that, as I was informed by the deputy minister, and as the acting minister admitted here: This is the sole and only case in which a remission has been made. Why should it have been made in one case and not in another? It is because it was made secretly. That is the reason. Let the acting minister (Mr. Sutherland) not run away with so poor an idea of himself and of the country, as to think that he has answered the charge brought against the department, when he accused the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) of following up certain civil servants and insinuating things against employees of the government. You cannot follow up a charge of this kind without seeing what was done by the employees of the government, and consequently you have to bring into it the employees of the government that were engaged in the transaction. But here you have a plain case of the breaking of the law, of the breaking of the law secretly, of the breaking of the law for one man and one man alone. Here you have the case of the remission of royalty without knowing what royalty was due at the time, and without one single affidavit being in the hands of the government to present to this House more than a year after the transaction began to be vigorously inquired into, which was about the month of May, 1899. And still the government from its archives in the Yukon territory have not been able to bring one single affidavit made by Mr. McDonald, of all the claims on which he worked and on which his royalty was to have been paid. That is not businesslike. I certainly think the hon. member for Pictou has very reasonably made his indictment to-day. He has certainly made out a case that ought to be inquired into. Where shall we be in the administration of public affairs, if a man administering in the Yukon shall make himself superior to the law and to the regulations, and do it proving adequately at the same time that he felt he was doing wrong, because he undertook to do what he did under cover of a secret and confidential communication to the man whose authority he usurped and whose regulations he overruled.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, although the hon. member for Pictou delivered a somewhat lengthy address and moved a remarkably lengthy resolution, my own judgment is that all the

facts of this case may be compressed within a very short space. Let me first call attention to the fact that in all the references which the hon. member has repeatedly made to Major Walsh, he has been attacking a person who has ceased to be in the employ of the government of Canada and is therefore beyond the ordinary reach of that punishment which a government is at liberty to mete out to an official who has been guilty of misconduct. I think this point is of importance, unless the hon. gentleman has in contemplation some remarkable proceeding, such as the hanging of Major Walsh or something of the sort. In the ordinary process of government all we can do in regard to an official whose conduct has displeased the authorities is to remove him. Assuming that Major Walsh was as inefficient and unfaithful an officer as the hon. gentleman has repeatedly charged, what, after all, could the government of Canada have done? Because at the time the hon. gentleman brought forward these charges Major Walsh had retired from the service of the government, and therefore it was not in the power of the government to administer punishment in the form of dismissal, if, in their judgment, such punishment was due; and I do not see what other proceeding the hon. gentleman could have contemplated in his attacks upon him. We have never assumed for one moment that the government are bound to defend the acts of every public official in the Yukon district. I have said elsewhere, and I repeat, that the marvel is not that there were here and there small irregularities, but that in the face of the many difficulties connected with the opening up and administration of that country the government's task was carried out so successfully and with such great freedom from any just cause of complaint. But it is not necessary for us to assume that perfection of government was reached out there. We do not even get perfection of government in the city of Ottawa or in any of the great cities of Canada. But I do say that so far as complaints have been made against the administration of the Yukon, in nineteen cases out of twenty when they have been investigated, they have practically been dispelled; or where there seemed to be any misconduct established, it was of such a trifling character as to be unworthy of the great attention which my hon. friend from Pictou has bestowed upon it. Let us see what his complaint is to-day. He has brought forward two charges, one of which is old, and the other is new, or, if not new, has been emphasized much more than before. The old charge is that Major Walsh granted an extension of time for the payment of the royalty to Mr. McDonald. That certainly is not new; we have had it before. The other charge is, that not only was an extension of time granted, but that

in the end the money which Mr. McDonald owed was not fully and faithfully paid. I think I am correct in stating that if the hon. gentleman has not presented this for the first time to-day, he has presented it in a more emphatic form than before. Let us take the first question, that of the extension. The hon. gentleman in his resolution has been careful not to speak of the extension. He has used words in his resolution which, even according to his own statements, are not justified. He has charged that Major Walsh was guilty of crime and misbehaviour in office. If Major Walsh was guilty of any crime, there are many ways in which the hon. gentleman could see that he was punished, even if there was any disposition on the part of the present government to unfairly defend him, which there is not. The hon. gentleman says further that Major Walsh illegally exempted individuals from regulations with respect to the payment of royalties. The hon. gentleman has not to-day attempted to sustain that statement. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has taken the same view, and emphasized it again and again by the word remission. That is the charge. The hon. member for Pictou says that Major Walsh, as a favour, has exempted Mr. McDonald from the payment of royalty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I thought the hon. gentleman complained of the length of my speech; but I could have given him the evidence in support of that. I thought I gave the hon. gentleman enough.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman makes statements with regard to an extension of time. Does he mean to say that an extension of time and an exemption from payment of royalties are one and the same thing?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I read to the hon. gentleman the evidence in support of that, on page 7 of Major Walsh's report.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman will not now pretend to say that Major Walsh granted exemption from the payment of royalty to Mr. McDonald. All he claims is that he was allowed to carry over the account from one year to another.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I read to the House part of the evidence on which that charge is based. It is on page 7 of Major Walsh's report, where he said he did exempt individuals.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman used the word exempted in relation to the McDonald case, he used it unfairly, because he does not pretend through the whole tenor of his argument to-day, and in the face of the receipt in the public documents for the payment of the money, that exemption was granted.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me explain that Major Walsh granted that exemption to poor miners who complained that their expenses were greater than the royalty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He had no power to do that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the exemption is an exemption of poor miners, and not Mr. McDonald, the hon. gentleman and I are talking of different things. The point of the hon. gentleman's argument was that Major Walsh would show no favour to the poor struggling miner, but would only favour this wealthy Bonanza king.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put the House in possession of my position, which he does not understand? The first part of that resolution is a recital of the charges which I preferred last year on my responsibility as a member of the House of Commons, and which related to the particular matter mentioned in this case, the McDonald royalty; but incidentally I referred to the charge of Major Walsh having illegally exempted claims—not the claim of McDonald; and in support of that I read to-day on page 7 of Major Walsh's report, where he states himself: 'I pointed out to the leaseholders that the collection of the royalty was necessary,' and so on.

Royalty was not collected from any claims which had not got into good working order or which could show a profit after paying royalty, and this reach a large sum.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let it be clearly understood that this reference to the exemption has no connection with the McDonald case and my hon. friend and I have a better understanding; but in taking that view, he destroys his own argument, that a great and exceptional favour was being extended to McDonald, and none of the other miners could get any concession whatever.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I quoted Mr. Fawcett's sworn statement that he did not know, nor did his colleague know, of a case where such indulgence had been granted as was granted McDonald.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the case of McDonald, the commissioner only granted an extension of time, but in the case of somebody else he granted a remission. Therefore, instead of any great favour being done the Bonanza king, he was granted less privileges than somebody else.

But the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) waxed eloquent about the secrecy of this arrangement, and then we were told that Major Walsh had no power to grant this extension. Well, the commission to Major Walsh provided that he should have full power and authority over every official in the district, and, therefore, if the gold commissioner had no desire—which is not ap-

Mr. FIELDING.

parent—to grant that extension to McDonald, the chief executive officer, by the terms of his commission, had undoubtedly power to grant that privilege.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You will not get that opinion endorsed by Mr. Mills.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall not discuss that point, because it does not happen to be one of very much importance. Let us come now to the substantial rather than the technical point. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) waxed eloquent over the secrecy of this thing. Imagine, he said, a collector of customs or the Minister of Customs making an arrangement whereby he would grant extension to one man and not to another. But that is not a fair comparison. I will give my hon. friend a fair comparison, with the help of his hon. friend from Halifax, who gave us an illustration from the mining laws of Nova Scotia. He said we had a law which provides that returns shall be made at certain time and certain conditions observed, and that if these conditions are not complied with, the property may be forfeited. That is true, but my hon. friend from Halifax knows that the occasions on which property is forfeited for failures of that kind are very rare. I think I can safely say that such forfeitures hardly occur at all. I can show my hon. friend that what Major Walsh did in the Yukon district is frequently done in Nova Scotia, under the mining laws of that province, as he must be perfectly aware. Did he ever hear of the Block House mine? He was professionally engaged in a case connected with that mine and must know all about it. The mining laws of Nova Scotia, which are excellent laws, require royalty to be paid at a certain time under penalty of the forfeiture of the property, just as in the mining district of the Yukon. But, the hon. gentleman knows that again and again privileges are granted to mining companies in Nova Scotia; and when mining becomes embarrassed, when times are not very prosperous, and a mining company is not prepared to pay promptly its royalty, consideration is shown on that account. In the particular case I have just cited—and I mention it because my hon. friend was associated in it—I had an interview with my hon. friend, when he asked for a compromise on behalf of the people interested in that property who had owed their royalties for many years. I cite that case merely to show that under the royalty laws of Nova Scotia, it was not an uncommon thing to grant an extension of time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far from an extension of time having been given that company, the government went on the spot and sold all the personal property for the purpose of realizing the royalty and closed up the mine.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My hon. friend is comparatively young, and came into that case very late. He says that the government did not grant an extension, but sold the property. But the government did not do that until the company had had years of extension, and it was only in the last resort, after the lapse of years, that the government sold the property.

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)**. I understand by extension one thing and my hon. friend another. It is true that the government did not sell the mine as early as they might have done, but so far as telling the company that they need not pay on time, I venture to say that the hon. gentleman will not find any such extension on record.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. What I understand by an extension of time is this. Where money is due and you allow the debtor to go on for months and years without enforcing the claim, you are granting an extension of time. I need not state that case only, but I mention it simply because my hon. friend was professionally associated with it. But, many cases have occurred in Nova Scotia where mining companies have come to the commissioner of mines and said: Business is bad and you should not be hard on us, and we ask you for an extension of time. I have agreed to such extensions repeatedly, in my capacity of Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, through the instrumentality of the commissioner of mines. I could mention the names of gentlemen known to every member from Nova Scotia to whom such an extension was given, and it will be generally admitted that it was a fair and reasonable arrangement. And it was equally fair and reasonable in the case of the Yukon district, where in the circumstances mentioned to-night, an extension of a few months was granted this man. Oh, but, said the hon. member for York, it was done secretly. Well, when we in Nova Scotia grant an extension of a few months to one of our debtors, do you suppose we go on the market place and advertise the fact to all the others and invite them not to pay?

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Would you mark the report 'confidential'?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No, but I would do my best to see that those who are able to pay did not know anything about it, and I would collect every dollar of the royalty from them before letting them know. And so I say, in the actual experience of the mining law my hon. friend has quoted, you will find ample precedent for granting an extension of time, provided the public interest is not in any way prejudiced.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Perhaps the Minister of Customs is doing that same thing now?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I do not think he is; but, if I were to give the names of the people to whom these concessions were granted in Nova Scotia, the leader of

the opposition would say that it was fair and reasonable to grant these extensions under the circumstances.

We have disposed of the contention as regards the extension, and have shown that it was an exercise of discretion on the part of the officers in the Yukon district, either the gold commissioner, who is technically the officer who should have granted it, or the officer who had control over all the affairs of the district. I think it was a fair exercise of discretion. But that is a matter of opinion. It is not necessary that we should all agree, but it is a fair matter of opinion.

The other question is whether or not the government of Canada obtained all the money due. That is an important question. The hon. member for Pictou has not a shadow of evidence to show that this money was not honestly paid, but he has a number of inferences and presumptions. He does not happen to have found any affidavit made by Mr. McDonald, and, therefore, presumes that there was none; but, it is quite possible that the affidavit exists and could not be found at the moment in any of the documents referred to by the hon. member for Pictou. We have a memorandum dated Ottawa, June 13, from Mr. Fawcett, the former gold commissioner, dealing with this question of the affidavit. Among other things he said:

Those who paid the royalty at the bank filled out and made affidavit to the return of the office and took it to the bank, these would be led away at the bank. I do not know what the inspectors did with the affidavits taken by them. Captain Bliss, who was accountant at that time, kept the account of the royalty and did not prepare a return for the gold commissioner's office. The commissioner (Commissioner Walsh) himself superintended to a great extent, the collection of the royalty.

The affidavits above mentioned would contain all the information asked for in the Auditor General's letter, and, if required, they would probably be obtainable.

I believe my hon. friend opposite read this and stopped here. But I read on:

The bank might not be willing to give up those on file there, as they show the authority for the transactions which took place through the bank in re collection of royalty.

It is possible, though I do not profess knowledge of the subject, that these affidavits were of the class referred to in the memorandum—

**Mr. FOSTER**. Were they?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I do not know. And that is where I differ from my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). In the things that he does not know he gives all the inferences and assumptions against the officials. I hardly think that fair.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) allow me to ask him a question? Suppose they were in the bank and the bank, for its own protection, did not care to give up those papers, would they

have the least objection to giving copies of them, or to allowing Mr. Lithgow or Mr. Senkler to see them to get information for the department?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a proper question, and one that may be looked into. But it would not justify such an inquiry as is contemplated by the resolution here. The Auditor General said in a letter:

I have seen no evidence that the royalty was paid in every case where it should have been paid, or that the amount paid was the amount that should have been paid.

That is in a letter from the Auditor General to the department on June 7. It is on that passage that Mr. Fawcett has made his memorandum. It is fair to state that the Auditor General does not claim to have evidence to show that the money was not paid. He simply says that the evidence was not adduced to him in detail as to the payment. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) takes the inference to be against the officials; the Auditor General does not. He states the information he has, but does not assume that the information he has not is not in existence. But, I will tell what the Auditor General did. It was suggested—I believe by the Auditor General himself—that he should send out an official to that country and make an investigation. Provision was made in the estimates for an additional sum to be placed at the service of the Auditor General to enable him to do that. He sent out an officer to audit the accounts. I think that if his assistant had found anything wrong in the Yukon accounts, I am satisfied, from what we all know of our friend the Auditor General, that he would not have been slow in bringing it before the public. But he has not pretended that he has found anything wrong. According to this memorandum he thought that the evidence of the payment was not entirely before him. But though after that statement was made, he sent out his officer, I am not aware that any statement has emanated from the Auditor General's office implying that, in his judgment, there is another wrong. If, however, there is any doubt, we can have before the Committee on Public Accounts the officer of the Auditor General's department who went to Dawson and inquired into affairs there. I imagine from what I have heard, that the officer gave his attention to a general review of the system of accounts rather than to an examination of particular items. However, that is a question on which we could have the officer before the Committee on Public Accounts; and if he has any additional information we can get it. But, my hon. friend says that these affidavits do not happen to be on file before us, therefore, he presumes they do not exist. I think that is a very unwarranted presumption, and I think we can establish that very fairly. In the

Mr. FOSTER.

memorandum of Mr. Fawcett, dated June 13, 1899, from which I have quoted, he says:

In each case the miner reporting made an affidavit or statutory declaration which contained the number or description of the claim, the time covered in the return, viz., date of beginning and ending, the total output in ounces, and the amount of royalty; also a certificate as to the accuracy of the return.

This is a statement of the practice, and he said it was followed 'in each case.' Therefore, unless we have something to contradict that, we have a right to conclude that the practice was followed in this particular case of McDonald.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) allow me to ask him a question? What he gives is supposition, and, of course, we cannot deny that it is possible. But, will the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) instruct his officers to telegraph Mr. Lithgow and ask him the simple question, whether or not that settlement has been made on affidavits which exist and which he has seen? That would be a good thing for the satisfaction of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we are going to have anything from Mr. Lithgow, I think I would rather have a full statement from him. I would not like to put a mere catch question to him. I would like to have him here and examined. He was an officer of my own department, and has been personally known to me for many years as a gentleman of the highest character and standing. I think it only fair to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to say, that when he was organizing affairs in the Yukon district, he came to me and said he desired to have a gentleman out there who would be controller or manager of their financial affairs to a large extent, and he wanted one with whom I had acquaintance and one whom I could cordially recommend. After thinking the matter over I recommended Mr. Lithgow, and he was sent there. He was transferred to the Department of the Interior and reports to that department. I am glad to hear gentlemen on both sides of the House bear testimony to the character of Mr. Lithgow. It shows that the judgment I formed of his qualities was not a mistaken one. He was in the employ of the Finance Department long before I entered it; but I had not known him as a fellow-citizen of Halifax for many years, and felt sure that he would do his duty fairly and impartially. Here is his letter of June 23. It has been read by my hon. friend the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland), but it will bear reading again. It is addressed to the Deputy Minister of the Interior and says:

I have the honour to inclose statement of royalty paid by Alexander McDonald on account of 1898, amounting to \$34,028.13, together with the receipts and draft No. 347, deposited to the credit of the Receiver General. It will be remembered

that Major Walsh allowed Mr. McDonald an extension of time on the payment of his royalty, and inclosed statement represents a full settlement, having been gone into most carefully by the gold commissioner and myself. This will appear in the gold commissioner's statement for June.

Your obedient servant,  
**J. T. LITHGOW,**  
 Comptroller.

He does not say he guesses at it; he does not say he had any trouble with it; but he says he has gone into the matter most carefully with the gold commissioner, and he puts his signature to the statement that the account is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. A single telegram to Mr. Lithgow would set that right.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not want a telegram to set at rest that which is sufficiently explained in the letter. Now, Mr. Lithgow, having made the statement that this would appear in the gold commissioner's statement for June, I desire to refer to that statement. I have in my hand that report. It is made up to June, 1899, and it gives each of the claims and the total gold production, royalty paid and the exemptions. It closes with the following statement:

The above is a statement of the royalty paid by Alexander McDonald, being the balance due on gold mined by him during 1898.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I suggest that my hon. friend read the items here, as showing how it was made upon each mine.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (reading):

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That does not go any further than the letter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hon. gentlemen opposite argue that there were affidavits, but I say that the presumptions are the other way, not only are the presumptions the other way, but the testimony of this return is the other way. Here is the letter addressed by Mr. Senkler to the Department of the Interior in July last, after the attention of the department had been drawn to the matter by the Auditor General. Mr. Senkler addressed the letter on July 24 to the department explaining the methods in which these accounts were made up, explaining why it was difficult to send the affidavits to Ottawa. He pointed out that it might be important to keep these affidavits in Dawson, and this letter of Mr. Senkler makes this statement—it is one of great importance, and I ask the hon. gentleman to read Mr. Lithgow's letter first and the certificate of Mr. Lithgow and Mr. Senkler—read them both in the light of this statement which I take now from the letter of Mr. Senkler to the department in answer to the criticism of the Auditor General. It is dated May 24, 1899:

Affidavits are all examined very carefully by the comptroller, who compares them with the report of the inspector, and with the counterfoil in each case before he certifies to the correctness of the report.

Now here is the statement of Mr. Senkler that before the controller certifies to the correctness of the report he examines the

Date.	Number of Receipt.	Name.	Number of Claim.	Total Gold Production.	Royalty Paid.	Remarks.
1899.				\$ cts.	\$ cts.	
June 20.	220	Alex. McDonald.	Buza. 2 ab. Disc.	8,400 00	840 00	
	221	"	Buza. 6 bel. Disc.	43,000 00	4,300 00	
	222	"	Hunker 6 bel. Disc.	1,370 00	130 00	
	223	"	Buza. 2 bel. Disc.	25,000 00	2,500 00	
	224	"	Hunker 3 bel. Disc.	16,000 00	1,600 00	
	225	"	19 Eldorado.	9,000 00	900 00	
	226	"	36 " "	15,000 00	1,500 00	
	227	"	22 " "	42,000 00	4,200 00	
	228	"	27 " "	31,000 00	3,100 00	
	229	"	Buza. 2 ab. Disc.	84,000 00	8,400 00	
	230	"	Buza 6 bel. Disc.	21,562 50	1,906 25	Exemption \$2,500.
	231	"	Eld. 36 and 37.	33,658 80	3,365 88	
	232	"	Hunker 6 bel. Disc.	2,860 00	286 00	
	233	"	1 and 2 Shookum.	15,000 00	1,000 00	Exemption 2 claims, \$5,000
				347,781 30	34,028 13	
		Less exemption.....		7,500 00		
				340,281 30		

The above is a statement of the royalty paid by Alexander McDonald, being the balance due on gold mined by him during 1898.

Examined,  
 (Sgd.) **J. T. LITHGOW,**  
 Comptroller.

(Sgd.) **F. N. SENKLER,**  
 Gold Commissioner

affidavits carefully and compares them with the inspector's report. Therefore, the presumptions which the hon. gentleman has turned against the existence of the affidavits are entirely the other way. Whether every form and phase of the regulation has been carried out is not the question. The great question the people of Canada will be interested in having solved is: Did this man pay his royalty fairly and honestly? I say every bit of evidence that we have before us goes to show that he did. But there are one or two statements which may need inquiry. The hon. member has called attention to the fact that Mr. Ogilvie has referred to the sum of \$70,000 due, and in another part of his letter has referred to \$41,000 being due; and then there follows the fact that only \$34,000 was paid. Well, I admit that is a discrepancy which needs explanation from Mr. Ogilvie and his officials; and the acting Minister of the Interior read from his memorandum a statement that Mr. Ogilvie had been called upon to explain that discrepancy, and his reply is not yet received. I have no doubt he will do so. If there is any difficulty, if there is any failure, I am sure the department can be trusted to look into the matter and to see that Mr. Ogilvie affords satisfactory explanation, and with the assistance of Mr. Lithgow, I am quite sure that if there is a shadow of doubt as to Alexander McDonald having been obliged to pay every cent that was due, that doubt can be removed by the ordinary machinery of the department without the necessity of the procedure referred to by the hon. gentleman.

House divided on amendment (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper):

## YEAS:

## Messieurs

Beattie,	Hodgins.
Bell (Addington),	Kaulbach.
Bell (Pictou),	Klock.
Bennett,	LaRivière.
Borden (Halifax),	Macdonald (King's),
Cargill,	MacLaren,
Casgrain,	McCleary,
Clancy,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Clarke,	McNeill,
Cochrane,	Martin,
Craig,	Mills.
Dugas,	Moore,
Foster,	Prior.
Ganong,	Roche,
Gillies,	Taylor, and
Gilmour,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Henderson,	Hibbert).—33.

## NAYS:

## Messieurs

Angers,	Heyd,
Bazinet,	Holmes,
Beith,	Haley,
Blair,	Hutchison,
Borden (King's),	Lang,
Brodeur,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Brown,	Lavergne,
Bruneau,	Legris,

Mr. FIELDING.

Burnett,  
Calvert,  
Casey,  
Champagne,  
Comstock,  
Copp,  
Cowan,  
Davies (Sir Louis),  
Dechene,  
Demers,  
Edwards,  
Erb,  
Fielding,  
Fisher,  
Fitzpatrick,  
Flint,  
Fortier,  
Fraser (Guysborough),  
Frost,  
Geoffrion,  
Gould,  
Guité,  
Harwood,

Logan,  
Macdonell (Selkirk),  
McGugan,  
McHugh,  
McIsaac,  
McLennan (Inverness),  
McMillan,  
McMullen,  
Madore,  
Meigs,  
Mignault,  
Morrison,  
Mulock,  
Parmalee,  
Paterson,  
Prculx,  
Rogers,  
Ross,  
Russell,  
Rutherford.  
Savard,  
Sutherland, and  
Tucker.—63.

## PAIRS:

## Ministerial.

## Opposition.

## Messieurs

Scriver,	Blanchard,
Davis,	Hale,
Telmie,	Montague,
Snetsinger,	Reid,
Christie,	Roddick,
Featherston,	Carscallen,
Cartwright,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Gibson,	Corby,
Charlton,	Tisdale
Talbot,	Bergeron,
Turcot,	Robertson, Ross,
Ratz,	McIntosh,
Ethier,	Osler
Costigan,	Caron,
Stenson,	Davin,
Macdonald (Huron),	Monk.
Wood,	McAlister,
McGregor,	Kendry,
Marcel,	Pope.
Graham,	Kloepfer.
Semple,	Sproule,
Ellis,	McDougall,
Fraser (Lambton),	Broder,
Mackie,	Ferguson.
Monet,	Wallace,
Bernier,	McLean,
Bostock,	Ingram.
Tarte,	Hughes.
Sifton,	Haggart.
Préfontaine.	Chauvin.
Desmarais,	McInerney,
Bell (Prince),	Powell,
McLellan (P.E.I.),	Earle,
Leduc,	Seagram,
Godbout,	Morin.
Archambault,	Tyrwhitt,
Gauthier,	Poupore,
Campbell,	Guillet.
McClure,	Quinn,
McCarthy,	Robinson.
Dyment,	McCormack.
Maxwell,	Moore,
MacPherson,	Rosamond,

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, before you declare the amendment lost, I would like to call your attention to the fact that the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) rose a moment ago to have his name struck off as he voted in mistake.

Mr. SPEAKER. His name is struck off.

Mr. DUGAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the fact that the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Dechene) is paired with the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte), and that he has voted.

Mr. DECHENE. I am not paired. The whip informed me that he had not paired me at all.

Mr. DUGAS. I understood the hon. member for L'Islet to be paired with the hon. member for Champlain. I have the list here.

Amendment (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) negatived.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Department of the Interior, including  
\$2,400 to T. G. Rothwell and P. G. Keyes, \$2,200 to G. U. Ryley, and \$1,800 to J. White, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act..... \$102,524

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. (Pictou). That item stood, I think, until Mr. Ryley had time to prepare a statement. The hon. acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) has been good enough to allow me to have a copy of the statement which Mr. Ryley prepared, and it is only fair, before anything further is said by me that the committee should have before it Mr. Ryley's statement, as I have already made mine.

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). In regard to this matter the only thing that is necessary is to read the statement made by Mr. Ryley in reply to the charges made by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) on a previous occasion. Referring to the statements made by the hon. gentleman, he says :

Two charges are made against me; first, that I had prepared a memorandum to the minister upon which he made a statement that Mr. A. E. Philp had not obtained a lease at all; that I suppressed the fact that he had received an option, which he considered was tantamount to a lease; and that from the return sent thereon to the House it can be shown that I not only deceived parliament, but deceived my minister, who, on the strength of my memorandum, made a positive statement to the House, which was proved to be wholly inaccurate by the returns of the department.

With reference to this, I may say that Sir Charles, in his speech, delivered in June, 1899, stated that it appeared by the return 83 that certain persons, including A. E. Philp, of Brandon, had obtained leases to dredge portions of certain streams. The minister instructed me to report whether this statement was correct. Upon referring to the return, I found it showed that no lease had been issued and reported accordingly. I stated that A. E. Philp applied for a lease on Bonanza Creek, but it was not granted, as would be seen by referring to page 4 of the said return.

At the time I made the report it was entirely in connection with the information given in the return, and I can truthfully state that I had no

intention of concealing any action taken by the department with reference to these applications. Moreover, at that date the minister and parliament were aware that the so-called options were given, as a copy of the departmental letter of January 22, 1898, informing Mr. Philp that a lease would be issued in his favour upon receipt here on or before the 15th of the following month of the fee for a free miner's certificate, and the payment of the first year's rental, was on the Table of the House. This letter was included in return Ref. 466,594, which was sent to the House of Commons on April 19, 1899.

I may add that the so-called options were never recognized by me as tantamount to a lease as the tract applied for was not shown on the plan open to the public as having been granted until a lease had been actually issued.

Sir Charles stated that the granting of options came into force for the first time under my supervision of the timber and mines department.

I may say that this system has been in operation ever since I have been in the department.

Sir Charles said that the options given to persons who applied for dredging leases were referred to time and again in the department as leases; that they were negotiated as leases; that they were as much leases, for instance, as in the case of the water front, where no formal document was drawn up, still the party had all the rights and interests and negotiated them.

I am unable to find where the department referred to these options as leases until the first year's rent was paid. The difference between the water front referred to and the option for a dredging lease, is that in the former the rent was paid, but in the case of the options the rental was not paid.

The persons who received options, no doubt, did negotiate with persons to become interested with them in the undertaking, and I remember the department did state to several persons who made a request to that effect that upon payment of the rent and the issue of the lease to the applicant, an assignment thereof would be accepted and registered in the department.

The second charge made by Sir Charles is that in my memorandum to the minister I stated in effect that I had full control of matters appertaining to my branch; and that the minister also stated he had practically delegated to me the authority and discretion to administer the affairs of the branch. Sir Charles stated he had found from personal experience that this was not the case. He cited an instance where he applied to me for the name of prior applicants for a timber berth in the Yukon territory, for which he had filed an application on behalf of a client, and stated that I referred him to the minister for authority to furnish the information.

With reference to this, I may say that Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, in the course of his speech, made in June, 1899, stated that the minister had been guilty of favouritism and partiality in the administration of the laws and regulations applicable to the district of the Yukon in the North-west Territories. The day after this speech was made the minister instructed me to prepare a memorandum setting forth the method of procedure adopted by the department in dealing with these applications, and also what instructions I had received from him in relation thereto. In reply I informed the minister that so soon as the regulations for the disposal of leases to dredge for minerals in the beds of rivers were promulgated, I personally asked the Minister of the Interior whether he desired each application should be submitted to him for his instructions; that in reply he

instructed me that all the applications should be dealt with strictly in accordance with the provisions of the regulations in that behalf, and according to their priority of date of filing in the department; that none of the applications need be submitted to him; that these instructions were fully carried out; and that the first applicant, irrespective of who he was, obtained a lease, provided he paid the rental within a given period.

It will be noticed that the instructions given to me by the minister only empowered me to deal with the applications made for leases to dredge for minerals in the beds of the rivers and gave me no authority whatever to furnish information beyond what the department usually supplied. The minister, in his speech upon this point, stated as follows:

When an application comes in for a mining concession of any kind, it goes to Mr. Ryley, the chief clerk of the branch, and it never comes to me unless it is a case in which Mr. Ryley has to ask for instructions, as he cannot deal with it under the regulations, or in which there is some confusion, or some doubt concerning which he thinks he ought to have the direction of the minister. If it is a matter for which there is no regulation, then I may consider whether special action shall be taken in regard to it or not; that the applications for mining and dredging concessions in the Yukon, which were referred to by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, he absolutely knew nothing of, or any one of them, and absolutely had nothing whatever to do with them; that he framed regulations after consultation with Mr. Ryley, and then said to him: 'I don't want to know the name of a single man making application for a lease; I want you to take these papers and deal with them according to the regulations, each on its merit and according to their priority, as each man is entitled to them under the regulations.'

This appears to me to be conclusive evidence that I had received no authority from the minister to deal with any applications beyond those filed for leases of portions of rivers for dredging purposes. I may here say that when I was first placed in charge of the branch I was informed by the deputy minister, Mr. Russell, not to furnish the names of applicants unless I was authorized to do so by the deputy head or the minister, and as far as I am concerned this rule has been carried out.

Respectfully submitted,

G. U. RYLEY.

I gave the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) a copy of that. Since that Mr. Ryley has filed a further statement with regard to the use of the word 'option,' and perhaps it is just as well it should go on record:

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, June 6, 1900.

(Memorandum.)

In reply to your inquiry, I beg to say that the word 'option' in connection with a reservation for a certain period was never used by the department until it appeared in certain questions asked this session by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.

The following is a copy of the departmental letter which was sent to Mr. A. E. Philp, reserving for a short period the tract on Bonanza Creek he applied for:

'Referring to your application for permission to dredge for minerals in a portion of the sub-Mr. SUTHERLAND.

merged bed of the Bonanza Creek, I am now directed to inclose herewith a copy of the dredging regulations for the provisional district of Yukon, from which you will see that it will be necessary for you, before a lease can be issued, to obtain a free miner's certificate, and to pay the rental for one year at the rate of \$100 per mile, for the stretch of river applied for, which, however, must not exceed thirty miles.

'A lease in your favour for a term of twenty years from the date thereof, to dredge in the portion of the stream applied for, will be issued upon receipt here on or before the 15th day of February next of the fee for a free miner's certificate, amounting to \$10 in the case of an individual and \$50 or \$100 in the case of a joint stock company, and the rental for the first year at the rate of \$100 per mile.

'If the amount of the fee and rental is not received here within the prescribed period, your applications will be cancelled without further notice, and the stretch of river applied for by you will be leased to any person who may make application therefor and comply with the provisions of the regulations.'

You asked me to explain what Sir Charles meant when he made the following statement:

'In the case of Philp, as the returns brought down this session show, he had the exclusive right of obtaining a formal lease covering various periods, extended from time to time, from January 12, 1898, down until he offered to drop the thing altogether for a fee of a considerable amount.'

I find by referring to the records, that Mr. A. E. Philp applied, on January 12, 1898, for a lease to dredge a portion of Bonanza Creek; that on the 22nd of the same month he was informed that a lease would be issued in his favour upon receipt of the rental on or before the 15th of the following month. The letter was cancelled on January 31, nine days after it was written, as it was found necessary to obtain a report from the gold commissioner.

I do not understand what Sir Charles refers to when he made use of the following words, 'until he offered to drop the thing altogether for a fee of a considerable amount.' There is nothing in the records, so far as I can ascertain, to show that Mr. Philp made such an offer. None of the persons, on whose behalf Mr. Philp filed applications, and referred to by Sir Charles in his speech of June, 1899, were given more than fifty days to pay the rent, and only one of those who received leases, assigned it, namely, W. L. Parrish. The assignment was made after the date of the lease. In none of the cases referred to did the department consent to a lease being accepted and assigned before the rental was paid. In all of the cases the leases referred to were issued in favour of the original applicants.

The annexed memorandum from the two recording clerks in my branch corroborates what I said in my memorandum to you, that the portions of rivers reserved for applicants for a certain period, were not shown on any of our plans as tracts leased, or referred to as leaseholds.

Respectfully submitted,

G. U. RYLEY.

Hon. James Sutherland,  
Acting Minister of the Interior.

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, June 7, 1900.

Mr. Ryley,—In reply to your inquiries, we beg to state that in the recording of applications for leases to dredge the beds of rivers in the Yukon territory for minerals, we kept a plan

on which the applications were plotted, and the reference number placed thereon, but not the names of the applicants. We also kept another plan on which the portions leased were plotted, with the number of the lease placed on each, but no plan was kept showing the portions of rivers reserved for applicants for a certain period. These plans were open to the public.

JAS. H. REIFFENSTEIN.  
SAMUEL M. GENEST.

I do not know if my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) lays any importance on the Dominion Creek matter, but I asked Mr. Ryley for a memorandum with regard to that, and if necessary, I will read it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.  
I propose to challenge his statement on that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then I had better read what he says on that also :

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, June 11, 1900.

(Memorandum re closing of Dominion Creek.)

The Solicitor General, on page 6570 of 'Hansard,' in reply to a question asked by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, stated that I informed him that on November 15, 1897, Dominion Creek was closed by the gold commissioner, Thomas Fawcett. With respect to this, I may say that on the morning of the 31st ultimo, the Solicitor General's private secretary asked me verbally who closed Dominion Creek and at what date, and in reply I informed him that it had been closed on November 15, 1897, by Thomas Fawcett, the late gold commissioner. The same afternoon, in order to make sure whether I was right in what I had stated, I looked up the question and answers in connection with the case which was before the department with reference to a claim applied for on Dominion Creek, as I had examined Mr. Fawcett particularly as to the closing of this creek. I understood from Mr. Fawcett that in closing the creek no entries were to be granted for creek, bench or hill claims. I submitted to you the statement made by Mr. Fawcett, which showed that he had closed the creek on November 15, 1897. I did not know at the time I made the statement to the Solicitor General, and also showed you the statement made by Mr. Fawcett, that the discussion particularly referred to the bench and hill claims, but was under the impression that the whole question hinged on the question as to the date the creek was closed. I find, however, on perusing 'Hansard' for the first time to-day that Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, on page 6574, acknowledged that Mr. Fawcett did, as a matter of fact, undoubtedly close the creek claims of Dominion Creek, but he contended that the bench and hill claims were not closed until instructions to that effect were issued by Major Walsh, and he referred to the evidence which had been taken before Commissioner Ogilvie upon this question. I have referred to the evidence, and after carefully reading it I am now of the opinion that the impression I had from what Mr. Fawcett informed me and from the statement he made, that I was under a misapprehension as to the hillside claims. I must confess that this is the first time I have read over the evidence carefully upon this question.

I notice on page 87 of the printed report of the evidence taken before the commissioner, that the answer given by Mr. Fawcett to a certain question makes it appear that the hill sides on

Dominion Creek were not closed. The question is, when they began operations people began to apply to hill side claims? Mr. Fawcett's answer was, 'I think some had been prospecting, and inquired of me if the hillsides were closed before that—in the spring—and of course they were answered in the negative.' In the previous answer of Mr. Fawcett, he stated that the surveyors commenced to survey the creek about the middle of April. It would, therefore, appear from this answer that the hillsides were not reserved prior to the middle of April. I notice, also, on page 88 of the report, that Mr. Fawcett stated that the privilege stopped on the hillsides on May 30, 1898.

In again reading over Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper's speech of June 1, in which he makes certain charges against me, I think the memorandum he referred to on page 6693 of the 'Hansard' as having been prepared for you, is the one I have above referred to which was handed to you the evening of the date that the Solicitor General stated that I had furnished him with information that the creek was closed on November 15, 1897, and which statement you made use of in your remarks during the evening. I may add that if I had known at the time I showed you Mr. Fawcett's statement about the closing of the creek, that Sir Charles had stated that he was satisfied Mr. Fawcett closed the creek on November 15, 1897, as far as the creek claims were concerned, I would have looked further into the matter before submitting the said statement to you.

Respectfully submitted,

G. U. RYLEY.

Hon. James Sutherland.

Acting Minister of the Interior.

I think these explanations given by Mr. Ryley ought to be very satisfactory to my hon. friend and the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am very sorry indeed that I cannot accept those explanations from Mr. Ryley as satisfactory at all, and I move that instead of passing this proposed item, which involves an increase in the salary of Mr. Ryley, the item be struck out altogether, and that no provision be made for Mr. Ryley. I do it on these grounds: It is seldom in this parliament that a minister of the Crown endeavours to bolster up his case or defend the policy of his department or his action by dragging before the House the names of his officers. According to the practice of our own parliament as well as that of the mother country such a course is most reprehensible. Lord Beaconsfield, when Mr. Disraeli, and Mr. Gladstone, as leaders of the Conservative and Liberal parties, both deprecated in the severest terms such a practice, the evils of which are present in this very case. These gentlemen went so far as to say that it ought not to be permitted to bring forward officers' names in a debate—that the ministers have ample remedies for all official acts. If they have not sufficient, they get sufficient; if officers do not do their duty properly, they are dismissed. If, on the other hand, the ministers do not dismiss them, they are responsible for all acts done by their officers, and they must stand between the House and their officers on all

occasions. In this case the Minister of the Interior was unable to defend himself from an attack made by me, and he made use of an officer for that purpose. I have read Mr. Ryley's statement most carefully, that is, the first and longest one. The minister did not show me the other two.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I received those afterwards, and I really intended to show them to the hon. gentleman, but I forgot.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I know it was an oversight, and no great harm was done, for I easily grasped the point that was made. Mr. Ryley lent himself to the minister for the minister's purpose, and the minister used him to such an extent that he gave me the lie across the floor of the House. The Prime Minister adopted the same view of the transaction. The Postmaster General also adopted a very extreme view in regard to himself, and the statement I made based on a memorandum of Mr. Ryley, which, while not absolutely false, was so inaccurate and misleading that it is the only defence these gentlemen have for using the language they used in regard to me in this House. Mr. Ryley put into the hands of his minister a document which I will refer to later on; and on that document a very important part of the defence of the minister rested. Let me remind the House what was up, and they will see how important this statement was, and how necessary it was for the minister to use Mr. Ryley, and how willingly and improperly Mr. Ryley lent himself to the minister for that purpose. I made a charge. I was careful not to make a direct charge against the minister, which seemed to give the minister some comfort, and enabled him to spend a considerable time on the matter. I think I have rather stronger and better evidence than he had in regard to the so-called frauds in Manitoba when he undertook to obtain and did obtain the co-operation of the Prime Minister and the expenditure of a large amount of public money for the purpose of assuming the responsibility of the charge and employing detectives in order to fasten on the people he suspected the responsibility for the crime which he thought had been committed. I have no doubt that if I had been given a similar opportunity of employing detectives, the minister's position would have been very different from what it was. But here was the point. It did not matter whether Mr. Philp had obtained a lease in a particular river, or a lot of the leases mentioned in the return to which I referred later on—a misleading return used in an incorrect manner by the aid of this misleading memorandum. It did not matter a particle how many of these he obtained; having obtained these leases, one of which would be enough, the charge was that he wrote a letter to a gentleman in Vancouver stating that he wanted this gentleman to join with

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

him in this dredging venture, that he had obtained a lease with Mr. Sifton and Major Walsh who were interested with him in that lease, but that their names could not appear for obvious reasons. Now, consider the parties who knew of this correspondence; consider the relation of Mr. Philp to the minister; the fact that from that day to the time I was speaking he enjoyed that man's confidence; that he was his former partner; that he was allowed to exploit the department in an extraordinary manner in regard to the so-called options and the applications for leases; that in the name of all sorts of individuals, relatives and friends he had been able to obtain these quasi rights over these various properties, though the policy of the law and the regulations of the department forbade one person becoming interested in these different properties. With evidence of that character. I made a serious charge. It was not direct, for the reason I have given; but if there had been nothing beneath it, if there had been no suspicious circumstance against it, there is not a minister on the Treasury benches whom I see now in front of me who, if I had dared to make that charge concerning them, would have failed to insist on having it referred promptly to a commission of any choosing, so long as it was of a judicial character, giving me that advantage, if it be an advantage, and the opportunity of making good the statements I had made, or giving them the opportunity to remove the very serious ground for suspicion that existed. But what alarms me is that, as in the case of Mr. Ryley, who was the main support of the minister in all his contradictions of my statements, in order to enable him to use that elegant language that he would choke my statements down my throat, he causes all these men on whose statements he relied to appear in the estimates or in the Auditor General's Report this session. For instance, we find that Mr. Ogilvie was paid \$5,000 as commissioner of the Yukon territory, and after the commission of inquiry ended he was granted \$8,000 salary, with house rent at \$250 per month, and housekeeper at \$60 per month, amounting in all to \$11,720 a year. We find that Mr. Clement, who assisted him on that commission, was receiving \$2,500; and he is receiving now, with living expenses and salary, no less a sum than \$6,200. And Mr. Treadgold, the one independent man on whom he relied appears according to the statement of the acting Minister of the Interior, as receiving \$332.50 to pay for the pamphlet that the hon. minister quoted in his report. That was paid November 16, 1899. In the case of Mr. Ryley, we find that he is to be rewarded by the sum of \$400 to be added to his salary from year to year.

Touching this stickler for accuracy in statement, it is interesting to note the numerous inaccurate and contradictory statements made by members of gov-

ernment with the assistance of their officers. Take the statement made by the Minister of the Interior that the instructions to Major Walsh when he went in were verbal. On another occasion he stated that no instructions were given him except those in his commission. One of those must be inaccurate. The Prime Minister stated that Major Walsh's appointment was for a specific time, and the Secretary of State said that he was distinctly appointed until order was restored, whereas Major Walsh, in his official report to the Minister of the Interior, says he was appointed for a year. Those are official statements across the floor, and now that I see how these things are done, I fancy that they are made to satisfy any particular emergency that may be pressing.

Then we have these erroneous statements, and it would be interesting to find whether Mr. Ryley had any connection with them. The Minister of the Interior last session referred to a preliminary note from Mr. Ogilvie, produced in sessional papers 63a, as a private note, and we have this statement in the House:

That is the course which the government took in connection with the investigation. I have no report as yet of the result.

That was on the 4th April, 1899. This session, in answer to my question on the floor, the acting minister was obliged to state that the letter of February 20, to which reference is made in that return, and to which the minister referred in the extract I have made of his speech, was received at Ottawa April 3, and this session when that letter was produced we find that it would have had a very material effect on the debate. In that letter, Mr. Ogilvie said:

I regret to inform you that the Royal Commission for the investigation of the charges against officials has to an extent fallen through.

Then he goes on to state that he was of opinion that the commission should be extended, and referred to the difficulty with regard to the limitation in such a manner that he could not possibly have known the extent of the law. Otherwise he would never make the statement with regard to the government giving fullest scope to Mr. Ogilvie, and undertaking that if the investigation was not satisfactory the government would adopt means to have a more thorough investigation.

The acting Minister of the Interior, when confronted with this letter, and asked: To whom is the document set out, whom addressed? Was it marked private or personal? replied: No. No argument can be suggested that that letter was unofficial in its character. It deals with a matter in which Mr. Ogilvie was acting in an official capacity and no other. It is a formal report addressed to the head of the department, and signed in a most formal manner. In connection with these important points

there have been contradictory statements, in answer to the formal questions put in this House, emanating from the Department of the Interior. Therefore, I am the more suspicious of the work this officer is doing when I find these statements which are incorrect and unfair.

Take, for instance, the language of the Minister of the Interior when talking of the Philp leases:

Sir, I have choked down his throat several of them to-day. One of the statements which the hon. gentleman has risked his political reputation and his chance of political preferment, if he does not prove, was the statement that these Philps got the mining permits and mining leases which he recites in that resolution. Is he going to prove that?

There is no use quibbling about the word leases or options or permits. The Minister of the Interior, advised by Mr. Ryley, went so far as to say that the Philps had not received a lease or a permit, and of course, his position was very plausible. If that statement had been borne out by the facts, as it has not been, my statement would have been flatly contradicted. What rubbish it was to take up time investigating into the writing of a letter from Mr. Philp, in which he said he had obtained a lease, and that the minister and Major Walsh were interested. The minister was able to take that position. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) thought that he made his position good. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) supposed that he had established it. Now, I put it to the Postmaster General. I put it to the colleagues of the Minister of the Interior: Would they have felt that my charge had completely broken down, that I had shown to have made a serious and material error if, that evening, it had been admitted by Mr. Ryley, who had been appealed to, in the memorandum, or by the Minister of the Interior, that while there had been no lease signed, sealed and delivered, to Mr. Philp, he had been permitted to hawk options, so-called, for leases under various names, including his own, over this continent, as far west as Vancouver, and had financed some of them, putting in the name of some party for whom he was acting in this transaction and, in others, obtaining extensions and obtaining at the hands of the Department of the Interior, the most extraordinary favouritism, as shown by the returns we have? We have documents that were withheld from parliament last session, that were not laid on the Table, in the face of which such statements would not have been made as were made last session. It is not for me to say where the blame was, where the inaccuracy was—that is between the Minister of the Interior and Mr. Ryley. The Minister of the Interior was basing all his statements on these documents prepared by Mr. Ryley, and meeting a serious charge, and meeting it in a manner in which he could not possibly meet it now, because

we find not only that Mr. Philp wrote a letter about leases, but that he had obtained leases, and that he had obtained them in his own name and in the name of others as well. There was the Parrish lease in which he figured all through. I have furnished the committee some of the evidence on which I prepared that charge, and there is also an interesting reference to the courts of law—and some of the gentlemen on the Treasury benches could assist me in showing how they got the suit settled. Taking all the references to the word 'lease,' were hon. gentlemen always as particular as Mr. Ryley was last session in his memorandum, in using the word according to its technical meaning? We have had discussion on the subject of the water front of Dawson. A lease was referred to as having been made on certain terms. But when we asked for the lease and requested that it should be laid on the Table, we found there is no lease whatever. There was correspondence. And so in connection with the Anderson lease. The order in council was passed authorizing the lease to be granted to Mr. Anderson on certain terms. The Department of the Interior, in which Mr. Ryley is found, considered that Mr. Anderson had a lease. There was authority for that. He had the right to it, and they were not so exacting, and so particular as to the technicality. He had the authority for a lease; he had a document for signing the transfer, of which he got, according to the returns before us, five thousand pounds sterling, the formal lease being taken out afterwards. But the departments referred to that as a lease long before the formal lease was in existence.

Mr. COWAN. You do not call an option for a lease, a lease, do you?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) will follow me, he will find that it was equivalent to a lease.

Mr. COWAN. Not at all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) says, 'not at all,' but he is not going to settle this question. I may not be able to get him to agree with me; but he cannot judge my position until I am through. But I may say for his information, that he may judge whether I am right or wrong, when I say that the option was so much a lease that he could negotiate, and did negotiate for cash, for the transfer. It was exclusive—not merely he did a certain thing in a certain time, but he had the exclusive right to the lease. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan), as he belongs to the same profession as I do, knows that there is great distinction technically, but he knows that this was tantamount to a lease, and in the case of Anderson, it was called a lease.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Mr. COWAN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), to blame Mr. Ryley for not calling an option a lease?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan), will understand me when I get through. Mr. Philp also telegraphed to Mr. Ryley or sent telegrams, which were under Mr. Ryley's notice. If you look at pages 24, 25 and 71, of the printed return, you will find that Mr. Philp telegraphed in regard to these options as leases. He treated them as leases. That was the understanding between Mr. Philp and the department. They knew, when he asked for extension of time for the payment of his leases, that he referred to these options, and I have been pointing out that they were as good as leases, they were better, because they cost him nothing. He had the exclusive right to the lease, and did not put up one brass farthing. He wires to Mr. Ryley or to the department, about leases, though he had nothing but this exclusive option. And he gets the extension he asks. Some of them ran out in February, and some later on. I have a schedule of them here. He gets all the extensions he wishes, and if he runs over it does not matter. He wires to the department from Brandon not to cancel his leases and he will remit the money next day. But he did not do it. He went to Chicago and he wires from there, that he is remitting \$4,000 for the leases. You will find a letter from Mr. Parrish dated November 12, 1898, in which he speaks of these options as leases, and the department and Mr. Ryley understood perfectly what they were driving at. In the same way with regard to the permits. When I referred to a permit, the Minister of the Interior professed, backed by this statement of Mr. Ryley, that there was no permit. He spoke of it as a letter. But we find that it was a permit, as shown by the telegram of Mr. Philp:

June 12, 1898.

Re permit issued to me 30th May, wire as follows: Permit issued May 13 to A. E. Philp, includes liquors. Despatch will oblige.

(Sgd.) A. E. PHILP.

There was no misunderstanding in regard to that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You are not finding fault with Mr. Ryley with reference to a liquor permit?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am dealing with far more than Mr. Ryley; I am endeavouring to make my position clear as to how important this interference of Mr. Ryley became. Mr. Sifton insisted that no permit had been issued to Mr. Philp, and technically he may have been right, but the thing was worked just the same.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What was Mr. Sifton's answer?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman knows it was that he declined to give any such instructions, that it included liquor.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Showing that he did not recognize it to be a permit.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not in that sense at all, but the permit issued was undoubtedly a permission for Mr. Philp to take in such liquors to the Yukon as he wished.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The minister said that he did not understand that to include liquor.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Although the minister wired that he could not do anything of the kind, that he must make his application in the regular way, we find this gentleman writing a letter dated March, 1898:

My dear Sifton,—I hear reports have been circulated doubtless with the desire to injure me to the effect that I have been interested in the whiskey business in the Klondike or had taken or been interested in a shipment of liquor to the Klondike and I wish you to know that I am not in that business and never have been interested in it directly or indirectly. I never had a permit to take liquor to the Klondike or was interested in one in any way and never took any liquor there or was interested in any that was taken there.

I remain,

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) A. E. PHILP.

My point in making these general references to leases, permits, letters and options, is to show that nothing appeared in connection with the charge I was making turning on any technical permission. It was a question whether a man had some right that he could sell, and whether, in regard to that right that he gets by virtue of the position of the Minister of the Interior, he offered to sell it again to some one else with the statement that the Minister of the Interior and Major Walsh were interested with him in that thing, no matter whether it was a lease, a permit, or an option. Now, Mr. Ryley certainly understood, and could not have misunderstood, that that was the purport of that charge, and to give the minister a little temporary comfort, there was a memorandum put into the minister's hands that was so misleading that he concealed from the House that, though the lease had not actually issued, options had been granted, and that options were being dealt with as property by Mr. Philp, and that Mr. Philp had been let into that department long before the proper time, that he being here in Ottawa, as this return discloses, this former partner of Mr. Sifton being here in Ottawa in December, before those regulations were framed, was rooting about in

that department, had access to the books, according to the statement of the acting Minister of the Interior across the floor of the House.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No more than anybody else.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We are not dealing with anybody else. Very few people got such favours as he got, as this return shows. Then when the regulations are framed the department is in a great hurry to inform him that up to a certain time he is to have the exclusive option. These regulations were not law, when this gentleman was selling rights under letters from the Minister of the Interior. The haste shown in the whole thing by Mr. Ryley for the minister acting under his authority, the haste in connection with that man Philp, was such that he was actually selling these rights under certain regulations that did not exist under the law, because while they were passed on the 18th of January they did not become law until some time in March. The law required that those regulations should be published so many consecutive weeks in the *Royal Gazette* before becoming law. So that Philp, instead of knowing anything about that country before going out there and taking his chances, rushed down here and was in Ottawa with his old partner, and with Mr. Ryley, while these regulations were being prepared; and so impatient was he to get to work to get all the favours, that he could not wait until the regulations became law, but went about trading on these options. Now, what was that return No. 83? I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding that memorandum, how it was he made the misleading statement in this House in the debate of last year. Whether it was I or whether it was the Minister of the Interior, misled possibly by Mr. Ryley, that is the only excuse I can show for him.

Mr. COWAN. What evidence have you that Mr. Ryley misled?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am now referring to return 83 that is prepared, no doubt, by Mr. Ryley, who is the gentleman that has to do with this subject. He prepared, too, I have no doubt, that timber limit statement the other night that the acting Minister of the Interior would not use himself but passed over to the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) to use in attempting to mislead a lot of hon gentlemen in this House. But at any rate, whoever prepared this return, this is the document which I followed. You will remember that the Minister of the Interior said that any one looking at the return would see that the leases all charged as having been granted were stated by return No. 83 as not having been granted. There is the return 83 in print, just as it was in print last session, and the Minister of the In-

terior, after reading Mr. Ryley's memorandum, who makes the same statement, says that that return shows on its face that the statements I made as to Mr. Philp's having these leases was wholly inaccurate. If you look at that return you will see, under the different headings, Mr. Philp's name, and above it the number of miles leased. 'None.' That was the word used time and again. Now let us look at that return. It was a return to an address of the House of Commons to His Excellency the Governor General and so forth, containing :

A list of all permits, licenses or leases granted, containing names of the grantees and extent of the territory given and conditions attached to each ; amount paid and to be paid therefor in respect of gold and placer mining or gold dredging areas in the North-west Territories and the Yukon district.

This is the description of the document : It was to show leases, permits and licenses granted. Then it says :

The leases for dredging portions of rivers in the Yukon district were issued under the authority of an order in council dated January 18, 1898, and the leases for portions of rivers in the North-west Territories under authority of an order in council dated July 29, 1897, and under this order as granted. Copies of said orders are annexed, also forms of leases.

This is on the front sheet. There was a statement that the return showed that where no miles are stated in the claim, no leases have been granted. There is no statement in any claim as read by the Minister of the Interior, in this language :

A. E. Philp, number of miles leased, none.  
Lindsay, number of miles leased, none.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). As a matter for information, I want to know does the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) pretend to state to this House, that although, that return showed there was no lease granted for the area mentioned in the return, at that time there was an option for that identical piece.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** Yes, in every case.

**Mr. SUTHERLAND.** They are shown on the return, are they not ?

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** No, they are not ; that is my point. They were concealed from the House. The right hon. Prime Minister was out a moment ago. I say that neither the Prime Minister, nor the hon. Postmaster General would have undertaken to have backed up the hon. Minister of the Interior in the language he used to me, that he would choke my statements down my throat, if they had known in connection with the Philp charges that though there was no lease granted there was an exclusive option, and that he was selling it for cash. Whether they would have done it

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.**

or not is one thing, but I do not think any impartial man would have deduced or that it would have been deduced that very reckless statements had been made by me. I was coming to the other part of the case. I was dealing with the return made by Mr. Ryley. If you take the return you find there the different names and opposite you find the number of miles leased, blank. And if you turn up *Hansard* you will see that instead of a blank the word 'none' is used, as though it were printed. That is the way in which the return was entered. It begins by purporting to be a list of the leases granted, it gives the blank form of the lease, and it purports to show the leases granted. And there the hon. Minister of the Interior attempted to make the House believe that there was the statement 'none' in the column for the number of miles leased, but you will find 30, 25, 15, 5, 2½ and 1. They come down numerically as low as to one in different leases. Opposite these various names that I referred to, Philp, Cameron, Burnett, Lindsay and Parrish you will find, for instance, A. E. Philp, B. Salmon, that is Big Salmon, then blank under the number of miles leased. The hon. minister said that the return showed that no miles had been granted, but when under one mile, where there was a blank. I suppose, that would be less than one mile, which would be a very valuable lease. But setting that aside, and endeavouring to point out, as the minister did, that the returns did not support the statements which I had made. I accepted the statement in good faith that there had been an inaccuracy in that regard, and that the return had been prepared to show that by these blank spaces no leases had been granted to Mr. Philp, but, I knew of letters, and I knew of correspondence that showed that this man had something to sell in regard to these dredging properties, and I then came to the conclusion that the one I had accidentally omitted in my formal resolution, the case of Philp on the Klondike River, and the number of miles that he got in his lease is shown, was the lease which had justified me and not these others, and I shall read a letter later on containing a statement relating to it. This is return No. 83 that I have referred to, and I have referred to the regulations that became law on March 5, 1898. There is not a single syllable in these regulations that authorizes this practice that the department has resorted to in the case of Philp. There is not a line there to authorize Mr. Ryley to give Mr. Philp, in his own name, or in the name of his wife, or in the name of his partners, or in any of these various names, an option for a single foot of territory, and yet, the return which is now laid on the Table shows that this man went there, and to the exclusion of other people secured these options, and that he made money out of them by dealing with them as his property. The

regulations under the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 54, paragraph 99, became law on March 5, 1898. Bear these dates in mind, because this gentleman got these options under regulations that did not become law until March 5, 1898. I asked the hon. acting Minister of the Interior across the floor of the House as to when these applications had begun, and he replied that they were in existence on the 22nd of January, 1898. That is the time that Philp's applications came in by the score. That is the time he got options by the score, and to show what delicate ground it was, when I asked for the papers in connection with the first option that was given, some other name was mentioned and some other lease was brought down, but the return shows the number of applications that Mr. Philp made. Now, Mr. Ryley comes down with this memorandum that this practice prevailed in 1883 in regard to timber. I have no doubt whatever that he made that other statement I have referred to on the authority of Mr. Ryley. He was the officer that the matter would be referred to, and that stood good for two or three weeks. For some reason there is a reference to 1883, and the practice regarding timber limits that is unexplained. I have the regulations touching the applications for dredging leases, and I know that a man has to have a free miners' license, to pay down hard cash, and that no man has the right, Philp, or any one else, to go to the Department of the Interior, or to Mr. Ryley, and get an exclusive option. He got this without qualifying as a free miner and following out his reckless course in every respect, ignoring the regulations absolutely, he put his hand down, or whatever he did put down, and he covered area after area, in his own names and in other names until he went around to see what they were worth, and then he got some one to put money up and the lease was obtained without difficulty. Then, we have Mr. Ryley's memorandum that the hon. minister used, to which I have been referring, and which comes in at this stage so as to make what I have said more easily understood. This is Mr. Ryley's memorandum and we will see what the hon. Minister of the Interior made of it:

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, in the course of his speech, stated that the Hon. Clifford Sifton had been guilty of favouritism and partiality in the administration of the laws and regulations applicable to the district of the Yukon in the North-west Territories.

With reference to this assertion, I may say that favouritism and partiality in connection with the leasing for dredging purposes of portions of rivers and creeks in the Yukon territory could not have been shown without my knowledge, as all applications passed through my hands and were dealt with personally by me.

So soon as regulations for the disposal of leases to dredge for minerals in the beds of the rivers were promulgated, I personally asked the Minister of the Interior whether he desired that each application should be submitted him for his instructions. In reply, he instructed me that

all the applications should be dealt with strictly in accordance with the provisions of the regulations in that behalf.

That direction was clearly a farce. He did not deal with due respect to the regulations, or pretend to do it.

And according to the priority of date of filing in the department, and that none of the applications need be submitted to him, these instructions were fully carried out, and the first applicant, irrespective of who he was, obtained a lease of the stretch of river applied for, provided he paid the rental within a given period.

Why the correspondence that was in the hands of Mr. Ryley and which was brought down this session, shows that Mr. Sifton was concerned, and was appealed to in connection with the granting of these various applications. The memorandum then after referring to this statement 83, that I have mentioned, goes on to say:

A. E. Philp, said to be of Brandon, for a lease of Bonanza Creek—

That is quoting from my charge, and Mr. Ryley said:

Mr. Philp applied for a lease of a portion of this creek, but it was not granted, as will be seen by referring to page 4 of the said return.

That is untrue. It does not appear that it was not granted by that return, and in the second place there was concealed from the House, that though the lease had not been granted, there had been granted that which was tantamount to a lease, and what was commercially valuable.

Second, A. E. Philp, said to be of Ottawa, for a lease of South Fork of Stewart River. Mr. Philp was in Ottawa at the time of the application. No lease was issued in favour of Mr. Philp, as will be seen by referring to page 10 of the said return.

You turn to page 10, and nothing of the kind appears. There is a blank simply as to the number of miles leased, but it is a form endorsed by the department, as a return purporting to show these leases that have been granted with the blank form at the end of them. Whether that be a fair criticism or not, there is concealed what these papers show us this session, namely: That Mr. Philp obtained what was at the time far more valuable than a lease. He paid nothing for it on earth, but he was hawking it about trying to sell it and some of it he did sell.

Third, A. E. Philp, said to be of London, for lease of Big Salmon. No lease was issued in favour of Mr. G. Philp, as will be seen by referring to page 16 of the said return.

I have the same criticism to make about that, and so about Lindsay and Mitchell and these others. He says that Mr. W. L. Parrish received a lease of ten miles of the Hootalinqua, and that is amply sufficient as the basis of my charge, if all the rest should disappear. Now, what use was made of this memorandum, and the consultation and reference to Mr. Ryley, by the Minister of

the Interior? In that same speech the Minister of the Interior says:

The hon. gentleman says that I was guilty of favouritism and partiality in the administration of my department, and he cites as a reason that certain gentlemen, who were formerly partners of mine, have procured dredging leases, as shown by this return. The regulations, which are published regarding the mining affairs of Canada, give to every citizen of Canada the same right, and I have no power on earth, justly or properly, in administering my department, nor have the officers in that department any right or power, to refuse Mr. Philp, or Mr. Cameron, or anybody else, his just rights under these regulations.

Again I call the attention of the committee to the very important fact, that contrary to the law, men not complying with the regulations—not being free miners, and not putting down one red cent—were being granted these favours in this department by Mr. Ryley, who did not state honestly and candidly to the House what occurred, as he should have done. Again the Minister of the Interior says:

It would be rather a peculiar doctrine that because a man had been my partner he would not be entitled to the same rights as any other citizen in connection with the affairs of the government of Canada.

Everything here goes to show that no concessions had been given to Mr. Philp, that no favouritism of any kind had been shown. None of these statements could have been made, had the return been before parliament, that we have here now. The Minister of the Interior proceeded to say:

Would you believe it that the hon. gentleman cannot read a return when it is brought down to the House of Commons. What does the return show? The return shows that Mr. Philp and all these gentlemen who are named, never got any leases of any kind whatever.

There is the broad statement, and it had its effect, coming from the head of the department, who ought to know. But that is absolutely incorrect. That return shows on its face in the first place, that one of the leases was granted to Mr. Parrish, and that it was applied for by Mr. Philp. The return shows another one to Mr. Philp direct, on the Klondike River. That I did not by some accident put in the list I set out, but when he makes the statement that Mr. Philp got no lease whatever, as between man and man in the rules of fair-play, that covers a contradiction in the case of these options that I have been referring to, which were merchantable or saleable concessions. But the minister uses stronger language. I am not charging him with bad faith; he is absent. But on this wholly inaccurate statement which he has made, I am asking that this officer shall not be rewarded for having misled the House. That is a much more serious offence than that this officer allowed himself to be used to enable his minister to choke statements down my throat, to use the language of the minister. Pretending to

quote, and I suppose he is quoting correctly from a memorandum, he says:

Here we have the name of applicant A. E. Philp; address, Brandon; river or creek, Bonanza; number of miles leased, none.

All this appears in the minister's speech, as he said it. You look at the return and you do not find that. You find:

Number of miles leased , and after the word leased you find a blank.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You do not find there were any miles leased?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, and if the minister said, 'number of miles leased, "blank," it would be following out the return, but I can remember with what force and emphasis he called out 'number of miles leased, none,' emphasizing the word 'none,' and I must say that supposing we were being candidly dealt with, it came to my mind that the information which I had, and which I had no doubt whatever was genuine, was based, not on these applications, but simply on that Klondike River matter, because it was not included in my recitals, but it was in No. 83. The minister further says:

It has been my invariable rule since I took charge of that department to exercise no discretion whatever in connection with mining applications of an individual character. . . .

If it is a matter for which there is no regulation, then it is brought before me in order that I may consider, &c.

The minister's point is to bring everything down to Mr. Ryley. I am not going, in the absence of the minister, to criticise the spirit that will induce a man to do that, or to say whether or not he was abusing his position, but all of these references are for the purpose of showing that this man Ryley was really the minister in regard to these leases. Then the minister bolsters himself up by the memorandum, which had great force, because it concealed most material facts. He said:

I said to Mr. Ryley: 'Now, I do not want to know of a single man making application for a lease. I want you to take these papers and deal with them according to the regulations, each on its merits and according to their priority, as each man is entitled to them under the regulations.'

I have shown that a very extraordinary thing occurred, that he violated the regulations at the start, for he had no more authority to grant these options than the office boy. The Minister of the Interior further referred to this:

I took the statements which the hon. gentleman made, sent them to Mr. Ryley, and asked him what he had to say in regard to them.

Now, Mr. Ryley attempts to contradict his minister. If hon. gentlemen followed the statement of Mr. Ryley read by the acting minister to-night, they will see that according to him the minister did not say any-

thing of the kind. I am bound, however, to take the ministers explanation, and I say that if that officer had regarded his position in the proper spirit, and not considered himself the mere tool of the minister, desiring to be upheld by him and promoted by him, and given this year an increase of \$400 in his salary, he would have prepared a return as fair to me as to the minister. He knew the minister was coming to parliament to answer my statement, and he prepared for the minister this absolutely misleading and unfair, if not dishonest, statement, which merits the severest censure. Here is what the minister says :

I want to know whether any one under him has been guilty of favouritism, and I demanded that he shall make a report to me for presentation to parliament in connection with that matter; and this is his report.

That was the main defence the minister used to contradict me, and he afterwards boasted that he had choked down my throat several of my statements by virtue of that document. The Prime Minister used strong language to back up this garbled statement. In the debate that followed, this is what he said, and I venture to say that he will not repeat it after I have given him some of the explanations in Mr. Ryley's possession that were brought down this session :

It was not worthy of him——

That refers to me.

—to make charges against my hon. friend in a solemn document, which even at this moment, before an investigation is granted, are proved to be baseless and false.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman ought to say that just before that he himself had risen in the House and acknowledged that he had made a mistake.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. The hon. gentleman has not listened to me. I said that the Postmaster General was the only man on the Treasury benches who, though he criticised me in the severest terms, having before him Mr. Ryley's memorandum, gave me the right to speak or open my lips. I was bombarded after I had spoken, and it was just before the vote that the hon. Postmaster General gave me the opportunity to say a word. Here is what the Postmaster General said on that occasion :

I will give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to answer it. Does he now say, in view of the light that has been thrown on the matter since this discussion began, does he now adhere to the statement contained in this resolution?

Then, I made my explanation which I have stated substantially this evening, and the postmaster General said :

We have it now from the hon. gentleman that he must fail to prove that important charge contained in the resolution.

Then, I say : 'I can prove the substance of that charge.'

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Did not the hon. gentleman then and there admit from his place in the House, that he had been mistaken, after reading the return, and that he found it did not bear out the statement he had made ?

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Yes, I said substantially, when the memorandum of Mr. Ryley was read, that I must have been misled ; but I said I could prove that he did get a lease, even though I did not know of those options, and that is the substance of my charge. There is nothing in the ten or fifteen or twenty leases. The charge is that having got a lease from this government through the Minister of the Interior's department, he invited others to come into the venture, representing to them that the Minister of the Interior and Major Walsh were interested with him, but that their names could not appear for obvious reasons. I held that the substance of my charge was supported, but I admitted frankly that No. 83 showed no miles opposite to these names. We had that important point made by the Minister of the Interior, though it did not shake my real point, one lease being sufficient to prove my charge. I had not any doubt in my mind then, and have not now, that Mr. Philp wrote the truth ; but I do not know him sufficiently to stake on his standing a charge that Mr. Sifton was interested with him. That is a charge resting on the veracity of Mr. Philp, so far as I am concerned. But my point was that if I could prove that this man wrote that letter, and was granted favours by the Department of the Interior, it was a matter that the government and the Minister of the Interior ought to have investigated. But instead of that, after this matter got into court, and a statement of defence was filed, and the record referring to political irregularities and misconduct, a settlement is reached, the pleadings are withdrawn, and, as I am informed, through the intervention of two ministers of the Crown, colleagues of Mr. Sifton. But I think there is more to show that there was a reason for this extraordinary defence that was put forward by this gentleman. Now, this return would show how much discretion Mr. Ryley exercised. I do not wish to give my interpretation of that statement ; but here you have a document which goes to show that the Minister of the Interior, who is paid to discharge those duties, turned them over to this gentleman, except where some matter came up for reference. You have that statement made for the purpose of shielding the minister. In my own case, I went, as a professional man, to this very officer in 1898, and I applied on behalf of a client for a timber limit. I put the money up, after finding from Mr. Ryley what the fees were, and made application for a limit. To my amazement I

could not get a definite answer. Although he had all the discretionary powers, he could not tell me whether my client could get that timber limit or not. He told me there were others ahead. There was a system of options, under which one man would have an exclusive right for a number of weeks and another man would come after him, and that officer said he was not at liberty to give me the names of those men. My intention was that if these men stood in the way, my client would have to buy them up, as he wanted a limit at once, although they had not paid a dollar and had never been in the country. But although these men stood in the way, I could not obtain their names from that officer who, it is pretended, was clothed with all these discretionary powers. He said that he was only a subordinate and had to obey instructions, and of course there was no use discussing the matter with him. I then went to the Minister of the Interior and said I had put in an application and paid in the money, but could neither get the limits nor be told who were the men in ahead of me; and he off-hand wrote a letter, which I think, I did not deliver, but kept in my possession, directing Mr. Ryley to give me the information I desired. If my memory serves me right, when I put in that application, the rights of these prior parties had expired—these rights for which they never had paid. Ultimately I got the lease. The main object of my referring to that is this, that I could not find out from the public officer in the minister's department who these men were, without getting written authority from the minister, although we are told that this public officer was clothed with every discretionary power.

The other day, this same officer was asked by Sir Charles Tupper's secretary for certain information in regard to some claims that I wanted to get. He went to Mr. Ryley and asked him for a copy of an advertisement published in the *Gazette* long ago, so as to save him the trouble of going to the library and hunting that advertisement on the file. Will it be believed that this man, to whom was handed the administration of that branch of the department, and who was clothed with full discretionary powers, except in the case of something peculiarly exceptional, wrote this letter in reply to the application made to him:

Ottawa, May 31, 1900.

Dear Sir,—I received your letter of the 29th inst., asking me to send Sir Charles Tupper a copy of the advertisement issued by this department giving the conditions under which a license may be issued for exclusive right to dredge for gold in a part of the bed of the Stewart River. Will you kindly request Sir Charles to ask Mr. Sutherland, the acting Minister of the Interior, to give me instructions to furnish the information asked for.

Yours truly,

G. U. RYLEY.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

There is a thing which any person has a right to get, and yet when the secretary of the leader of the opposition wrote a polite note to this officer, he was told that so absolutely subordinate was this official that he required instructions from the head of the department before he could supply the information needed. I do not think that the committee will consider that that supports Mr. Ryley in the statement which he made, for the benefit of the minister in debate, and on which the minister founded the statement he made.

But I have another reference which gives more information on this matter of discretion. In the answers given in all the cases—for instance, the case of the option given Mr. Philp and all these cases of transfers and so on—you will find that under the regulations the minister had to be directly appealed to, so that it was impossible for an officer to act on his own motion.

1. Referring to applications for dredging leases made by A. E. Philp for himself and others, and mentioned in the return now on the Table of this House, was Mr. Philp, in December, 1897, January, 1898, or at any time, permitted to examine the public records, books, &c., or any of them, in the Department of the Interior, to obtain descriptions for applications, information as to prior or other applicants for dredging leases?

2. Did Mr. Philp examine the books or records, as above, in connection with these applications or otherwise?

3. If yes, in reply to above 1 and 2, by whose authority did he do it?

4. Was this information open to the public as a matter of course?

5. Do the same rules in this connection prevail as obtain in respect to applications for timber leases?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. 1. The public, including Mr. Philp, were informed, upon making application, of the portions of the rivers applied for and granted. The names of the lessees were furnished, but not the names of the applicants. 2. Yes. 3. The chief clerk of the timber and mines branch. 4. Yes. 5. Yes.

Then, later on, I asked the further question on this subject:

Referring to question and answer, May 10, 1900 (page 5175 'Hansard'); Bonanza Creek lease, Mr. A. E. Philp:

1. When was the commissioner asked for a report?

2. How long will Mr. Philp be allowed in which to comply with the provisions of the regulations referred to?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. 1. The commissioner was not asked by the department for a report. The applicant is required to furnish the report. 2. Mr. Philp was given six months from February 1, 1889, to file in the Department of the Interior a report from the commissioner. The department was advised in August, 1889, that letters to Dawson to obtain a report from the commissioner had gone astray; and a further extension of three months was given. Mr. Philp was advised by two letters on May 12 and 14, 1900, that the report from the commissioner had not been received. No application has been received for further extension, and the matter has not been considered.

From the statement made by a minister of

the Crown using that memorandum, we stand in this position, that Mr. Philp had not obtained a lease of any kind whatever up to this session. But what do we find when this session opens? Let us look at the departmental record first. Let us look at the departmental report first. On page 46 we find that leases 28, 29, 30 and 31, are granted to A. E. Philp, Klondike River, five miles in each case. On page 47, P. C. Mitchell, whose name Philp used, gets leases 60, 61, 62 and 63—four leases on the Stewart River, five miles each. On page 49, Frank Burnett gets two leases of five miles each on the Indian River, and on page 50, W. L. Parrish gets two leases 269 and 270, five miles each on the Hootalinqua River. Now, let us take a look at the exploiting by Mr. Philp. The gentleman who we are told did not get a lease of any kind whatever. I have here a schedule made up from the return. I have not checked it over with any one, but I have taken pains to make it correct, and, though I do not know that it is absolutely free from error, I believe that it will be found quite correct, and I feel sure that it is substantially so:

namely, to the 31st March, 1898. Now, touching the statement I made, this correspondence shows that the leases under the names of Lindsay, Mitchell & Philp, all of which run out on February 15th, as stated, Philp wires on the 15th to the department not to cancel leases—and it is quite evident that Mr. Ryley knew what was meant by 'leases.' Mr. Philp wires on the 16th of February, after the time is run out, that he is leaving for Ottawa with the cash. On February 28, he is not in Ottawa, as can be shown, and he is in Chicago, and he wires that cash will be sent for all leases. That cash seems to have been received, for Mr. Ryley signs this receipt:

Received from Mr. A. E. Philp, of Colborne, Ont., the sum of \$4,000 in payment of one year's rent of four leases of five miles each on the Klondike River, \$2,000 applied for by him and one year's rent of four leases on Stewart River, applied for by P. C. Mitchell, \$2,000. See file 54,297.

All that information was before Mr. Ryley, but it was all kept from the memorandum supplied to the Minister, to enable the minister to make statements, none of which

Name of Applicant	Date of Application.	Address.	Locality Applied for.	Date of Exclusive Option for Lease.	Duration of Option.	Extensions.
	1898.			1898.	1898.	1898.
W. J. Lindsay, per A. E. Philp.	Jan. 12	Ottawa...	Stewart River .....	Jan. 22	Feb. 25	
P. C. Mitchell	" 12	" .....	" .....	" 22	" 25	
A. E. Philp .....	" 12	" .....	Klondike River .....	" 22	" 25	May 1
F. Burnett, per A. E. Philp....	" 12	" .....	Teslintoo River.....	" 22	" 25	
W. L. Parrish	" 13	Colborne.	Teslin River.....	" 22	" 25	
A. E. Philp....	March 4	Ottawa...	Stewart River .....	Mar. 14	Mar. 29	April 4, 6, 10, 21, 29
Hearn, per A. E. Philp.....	" 12	" .....	Pelly River.....	April 7	April 17	April 29
Mrs. G. Philp	" 21	" .....	Big Salmon, Little Salmon and Pelly Rivers.....	Mar. 24	" 3	
F. Burnett, per A. E. Philp....	" 22	Ottawa...	Indian River .....	June 24	July 9	Aug. 11
F. A. Philp	" .....	" .....	Teslin River.....	" .....	" .....	
W. L. Parrish	Mar. 25	" .....	Pelly River.....	April 7	April 18	May 3

As to the lease of F. Burnett, per A. E. Philp on Indian River, a curious thing in regard to that is that under date the 3rd of March he refers to an application he made for this on the 18th January, which he says has been lost, though there is no explanation of where it was lost. Now, Mr. Chairman, you have, no doubt, followed with a great deal of interest this schedule. You will notice the options that Mr. Philp gets, and the correspondence will show that in no case was an application of his for extension refused. But Mr. Claxton of Montreal, who, I believe, is a Conservative, asked for an option. And the correspondence shows that his application was made on the 12th March, 1898, and the option was granted to 28th March; and when he asked for an extension he could only obtain three days,

he would have made if there had been a memorandum containing the information which was then in the hands of Mr. Ryley. Now, in regard to the Parrish lease, I think the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) will know something of it. Parrish and Lindsay is the name of a firm in Brandon which accounts for the connection of these two names with that of Mr. Philp. The others, no doubt, are his relatives, except possibly Mitchell, whom I do not know, and Burnett, of whom we shall hear later on. The power of attorney from Parrish to Philp is dated 4th February, 1898. On March 1, he sends \$1,000 from Chicago. There are two leases to Parrish and assignment to Ramsdal on March 24. On March 31, 1898, application for option for ten miles, to April 12, with a five days'

extension on April 13. New lease will be granted on April 9, for Ildo Ramsdal. A further change was asked on May 12, and on May 14, granted. The Adsit trouble and the Forbes trouble arose in this connection. I asked the government some questions in connection with these leases. These came before the courts and almost came before the public. Now, there was a suit of Forbes and Philp, and in which Philp was sued for a large amount of money in this connection. I have statements taken from the files of the court both for the prosecution and the defence, and I am informed this was at the intervention of two ministers of the Crown, not the Minister of the Interior, which is very significant, if true.

These leases are sent to Adsit, of Chicago, July 21, and by Adsit to Parrish, on August 1. That schedule is interesting to any one who wishes to study the return. We have the return printed for the use of the House, and I want to run over a few of these. The papers are mixed up in such a manner that it is almost impossible to get a consecutive story out of them, there is no chronological order attempted. On page 23 there is some information on the points I was mentioning. Here is an application of A. E. Philp, to lease and dredge on the Klondike River. This is the stereotyped form of his application, and the option granted. I will read this one :

January 12, 1898.

To the Minister of the Interior,  
Ottawa.

Sir,—I desire to apply for dredging licenses for that part of the Klondike River beginning at the upper boundary of application reference No. 49547; thence extending up stream a distance of twenty miles.

Yours truly,

A. E. PHILP,  
Brandon, Man.

There were no regulations then, as is explained before. When the regulations were first adopted, they did not become law until March. I wish to call attention, as we go on with two or three letters that follow, to the important fact, that under these regulations this gentleman was not entitled to have his name recorded at all, much less to obtain exclusive options.

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, Jan. 15, 1898.

A. E. Philp, Esq., Colborne, Ont.

Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 12th inst. applying for a lease for dredging purposes. . . . In reply I am to say that regulations are now being framed for the issue of leases, for dredging purposes, of rivers in the Yukon district, and that so soon as they are printed a copy thereof will be sent to you, and you will then be given a certain period within which to pay rental on the tract applied for.

This is the form of the letter. I think the Minister of the Interior stated that every one got this. Well, I do not think that statement is correct. We will see how some were treated :

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Ottawa, Jan. 22, 1898.

A. E. Philp, Esq., Colborne, Ont.

Sir,—Referring to your application for permission to dredge for minerals in a portion of the submerged bed of the Klondike, I am now directed to inclose herewith a copy of dredging resolutions for the provisional district of Yukon, from which you will see that it will be necessary for you, before a lease can be issued, to obtain a free miner's certificate, and to pay the rental for one year at the rate of \$100 per mile, for the stretch of river applied for, which, however, must not exceed thirty miles.

If you turn to the regulations you will see that they do not recognize any application at all. Not only is Mr. Philp's application recognized, but he is given this letter :

A lease in your favour for a term of twenty years from the date thereof, to dredge in the portion of the stream applied for, will be issued upon receipt here on or before the 15th day of February next of the fee for a free miner's certificate, amounting to \$10 in the case of an individual, and \$50 or \$100 in the case of a joint stock company, and the rental for the first year at the rate of \$100 per mile.

If the amount of the fee and rental is not received here within the prescribed period, your application will be cancelled without further notice, and the stretch of river applied for by you will be leased to any person who may make application therefor and comply with the provisions of the regulations.

Now, I make the statement without fear of contradiction from any one, and corroborated by the acting Minister of the Interior, that that is intended to be, and was treated as, an exclusive option for the territory acquired, that was dealt with and recognized by the department in that way, and that those documents were used by Mr. Philp in that way. Now we find how he treated this. There is his option on February 16, 1898; he sends a telegram :

Am leaving for Ottawa with money for leases.  
A. E. PHILP.

He had not a lease, what he had were exclusive options, and he calls them leases, the real fact being that the actual formal lease came when he got the money from different quarters and put it up. In case he did not get the money, his options expired until the date of the last extension, and he got those extensions whenever he asked for them.

On February 15, 1898, he wires from Brandon :

See that my application dredging not cancelled; am remitting.

From Chicago, the Bank of Montreal wires one thousand dollars, on February 28. On March 1, 1898, there is a receipt from Mr. Philp for the sum of \$4,000, in payment of one year's rent for four leases of five miles each on the Klondike River, \$2,000, applied for by him, and one year's rent for four leases on Stewart River, applied for by P. C. Mitchell, \$2,000. See file 54297.

P. C. Mitchell was the name used by A. E. Philp, who used a great many of those

names, without the slightest knowledge of the parties, as I can prove, whose names he was using. We find in connection with another return in which the Minister of the Interior took great pains to advise Mr. Belcourt, a member of this House in regard to another application, that he himself produced the same authority to the department. Mr. Philp had to produce no authority. Here is a letter to the department, of July 2, 1898, written from Brandon :

I am in receipt on behalf of A. E. Philp of two notices from your department, one stating that he has been awarded five miles each upon Little and Big Salmon rivers.

That is the way they talk of them—'He has been awarded.' This gentleman that had not a lease of any kind whatever, was awarded five miles each upon Little and Big Salmon rivers.

Another for thirty miles on the Teslin River for dredging purposes, with a rental of \$100 per mile. The former is to be paid on July 7, and the latter fifteen days from June 24.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** How many leases were actually granted ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Parrish would be four or five miles each, and his own on the Klondike would be four or five miles each, and one of the Burnett applications. I think those are all. Now, there is this application from Mr. Lindsay, of Brandon. He was using the names of both Mr. Lindsay and Mr. Parrish. He applies in this way :

Ottawa, January 12, 1898.

The Honourable  
The Minister of the Interior,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—I desire to apply for a dredging license for that part of the Stewart River lying between application reference No. 54117 and 53850 ; about twenty miles.

Yours truly,

A. E. PHILP,  
W. J. LINDSAY,  
Brandon, Man.

On March 23, 1898, there is a letter from Mr. Philp to Mr. Smart, of the Department of the Interior :

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, March 23, 1898.

James A Smart, Esq.,  
Deputy Minister of the Interior,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Prior to the eighteenth day of January last, I made an application on behalf of Frank Burnett, of Vancouver, for the right to dredge on the Indian River and Stewart Rivers, and such application appears to have been mislaid or lost in the department, and I now submit that the department give me any parts of these rivers now remaining unleased in place in the rights applied for previously.

Yours truly,  
A. E. PHILP.

On March 24, the Department of the Interior wrote to Mr. Parrish as follows :

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, March 24, 1898.

Frank Burnett, Esq.,  
Care of A. E. Philp, Esq.,  
Barrister, &c., Brandon, Man.

Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22nd inst., and to say that your application has been recorded for the portion of the Indian River lying between leases 136 and 137, being ten miles. A lease for dredging purposes of this portion will be issued in your favour on receipt here within 10 days from this date of the annual rental at the rate of \$100 per mile.

If a lease is issued in your favour it will be necessary for you to obtain a free miner's certificate, the fee for which is \$10.

I am, sir  
Your obedient servant,  
LYNDWODE PEREIRA,  
Asst. Secretary.

Then, we have the application of Mr. W. L. Parrish, in this form :

Colborne, Ont., January 13, 1898.

The Honourable  
The Minister of the Interior,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—I desire to apply for a dredging license for that part of the Teslin river (Hootalinqua) commencing at the upper boundary of application reference No. 54299 thence up stream a distance of thirty miles.

Yours truly,

WM. L. PARRISH,  
per his Attorney,  
A. E. PHILP.

Then, in reference to Mr. Dunlop, he is told in the first place, in regard to his application of March 12 :

I am to add that before a lease can be issued in your favour it will be necessary for you to obtain a free miner's certificate, for which a fee of \$10 is charged.

I am, sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
LYNDWODE PEREIRA,  
Asst. Secretary.

In the other case they simply told Mr. Philp to send the money and they would attend to all these things. Then, there is the telegram to Mr. Claxton :

Canadian Pacific Railway Company's Telegraph.  
From Montreal, Que., March 28, 1898.

To Secretary,  
Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa,

Will you extend John Dunlop's option on Hootalinqua River ten days longer ? See file T. M. 56141. Answer.

JAMES CLAXTON.

And the answer comes back sharp and quick :

(Telegraph.)

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, March 29, 1898.

James Claxton,  
Montreal, Que.

Time for payment John Dunlop's option extended until thirty-first this month. Cannot extend beyond that date.

JAS. A. SMART,  
per G. U. R.

Then, we have a reference to the case of Mr. Ramsdell, of Chicago, and a receipt for \$1,000 on March 9 from Mr. Philp. There is a power of attorney dated February 4, 1898, from Mr. Parrish to Mr. Philp, and that is important in this connection that when Mr. Philp was here he had authority from not one of these persons. He started nearly every one of these applications in January. He was here in December, and he remained around Ontario. Later on, he got authority from some of these persons, and he got into some trouble with Burnett when he tried to get authority from him. Then, there is an assignment of the dredging lease by W. L. Parrish, by his attorney, A. E. Philp, to Ildo Ramsdell, of Chicago. The document is drawn up, sworn to and the proof of it is made before Mr. Rothwell in the Department of the Interior. In this return there is a letter dated April 9, 1898, in which Mr. Philp, acting in the department for Ildo Ramsdell, points out that a mistake has been made and asks to have it corrected, and they meet the views of these parties. There are some further letters in regard to representations made by Mr. Philp which did not prove correct. As to how these other people are dealt with, here is a letter from Mr. Adsit in connection with the Parrish lease applied for by Mr. Philp. The letter is dated May 14, 1898 :

James A. Smart, Esq.,  
Deputy Minister Interior,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—In February last we purchased of Mr. A. E. Philp, of Brandon, Man., two five-mile dredging leases.

There were no leases in the sense in which the expression is used by Mr. Ryley in existence, but they purchased these options, and the correspondence will show that these leases were granted and that they were used for the purpose they were intended to serve. Then, there is a letter from Mr. Forbes in the return, which I am going to read :

British American Prospecting and Developing Co.  
Head Office, Toronto, Canada.

Chicago, May 19, 1898.

Mr. Ryley,  
Department of Interior,  
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—No doubt you will remember that Mr. A. E. Philp and I called on you in reference to location of dredging claim on the Teslin River, which we sold to Mr. Ildo Ramsdell, of Chicago. He claimed that the lease he received was not what his company bought. The trouble was, as you explained, due to one of the junior clerks measuring the Lewis River as the Teslin ; thereby bringing the location on the map in a very much different position to what was expected. Mr. Philp wrote to the department and Mr. Adsit, of the Argonaut Company, received a reply stating that they could get ten miles sixty miles from the mouth of the Teslin River instead of what they have, which will be satisfactory. I am inclosing the map Mr. Philp left us stating that his application, reference No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

54400, commenced ten miles above application reference No. 54299, which is marked on the map. Trusting that this explanation will be satisfactory.

I remain, yours truly,  
J. W. FORBES.

Then, there is a reference to him again :

Chicago, May 19, 1898.

To the Secretary,  
Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Replying to yours of the 17th inst-ant, (file T. and M.), I herewith inclose the leases in question and also a letter from Dr. J. M. Forbes, in reference to the plan referred to in your letter of above date. Dr. Forbes visited your department with Mr. Philp when Mr. Philp was last in Ottawa. Trusting this will be satisfactory.

I am, very truly, yours,  
B. B. ADSIT.

Your proposition will be satisfactory. Send new leases to me.

And the new leases are sent to him accordingly. The power of attorney in the case of the Anderson lease was regarded as a matter of some importance, but the importance is entirely overlooked in connection with all of these leases of Philp's. That will be seen from an examination of one of the cases in the return touching the Anderson lease. We find that on January 15, at Ottawa, in the Timber and Lands Branch, at Ottawa, \$500 is receipted in this way :

Department of the Interior,  
Timber and Lands Branch,  
Ottawa, Jan 15, 1898.

Amount, \$500, cheque.

Received from Messrs. Belcourt & Ritchie, of Ottawa, Ont., the sum of five hundred dollars being payment made on behalf of Robert Anderson, Esq., for rent to dredge for hydraulic purposes in the Yukon district.

G. U. RYLEY,  
Clerk in charge of Timber, Mineral and  
Grazing Lands Branch.  
Per (Sgd.) F. L.

Mr. Belcourt writes to the department :

Ottawa, Ont., Jan. 17, 1898.

Dear Mr. Smart,

I am sorry to trouble you so often about this Anderson business, but Mr. A. wants to sail for England to-morrow, and he must be away this p.m. at 3.

Could you very much oblige me by giving bearer the two copies of order in council which I had hoped to get by this morning's mail.

Yours faithfully,  
(Sgd.) N. A. BELCOURT.

He simply asks for two orders in council. It is interesting to compare the treatment accorded to Mr. Belcourt, a member of this House, with the run that Mr. Philp was given of all these departments in the name of these various people whose power of attorney he did not pretend to have when making the application, and on the 17th January, if you please, Mr. Belcourt receives the following :

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, January 17, 1898.

Dear Mr. Belcourt,—In reply to your note of this morning, I beg to say that I have now the papers in the Anderson case ready, but I saw the minister on Saturday about the matter, and he informed me that what would be necessary under the circumstances would either be a letter from Mr. Anderson himself authorizing you to receive the copies, or an official communication from you to the effect that you are acting as his solicitor. Upon receipt of either of these, the papers can immediately be handed over.

Yours very truly,  
(Sgd.) JAS. A. SMART,  
Deputy Minister.

N. A. Belcourt, Esq., M.P.,  
Ottawa.

It is a very significant thing to compare the treatment accorded Mr. Anderson and the treatment accorded this gentleman, Mr. Philp. In connection with the Burnett matter we find in this return the application of Frank Burnett, per A. E. Philp, in the same language as the others, dated Ottawa, and signed A. E. Philp for Frank Burnett, Vancouver, B.C. Then there comes on the 22nd a letter to Frank Burnett, in care of A. E. Philp, Colborne, a letter which the correspondence shows never reached Burnett, but was an option in the name of Burnett which Philp got without Burnett's knowledge for his own purpose. There are frequent letters here addressed to Frank Burnett, per his attorney, A. E. Philp. Then on May 30, there is a letter from Senator Kirchhoffer to Hon. Clifford Sifton, and the following correspondence takes place:

The Senate, Canada,  
Ottawa, May 30, 1898.

Hon. C. Sifton, Minister of the Interior,  
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Mr. H. H. Beck, of Winnipeg, has requested me to ascertain the present position of a dredging license, referred to in the Department of the Interior as Ref. No. 54299, an interest in which he has purchased from Frank Burnett, who stated that he was the licensee. Mr. Beck says he understood that the time for the license had matured, but that it had been extended and could be further renewed. He says that he now has an opportunity of disposing of the property to an English company, if the title is correct, and he would like to know if the rent has been paid, as if not, he would like to do so.

An answer by return would oblige,  
Yours truly,  
J. N. KIRCHHOFFER.

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, June 11, 1898.

Honourable J. N. Kirchhoffer,,  
The Senate,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 20th ultimo, addressed to the minister, with relation of the application of Mr. Frank Burnett for a lease for dredging purposes of 20 miles on the Teslin River. In reply I am to say that on April 9 last, Mr. Burnett was given twelve days from that date to pay the rental at the rate of \$100 per mile and to obtain a Free Miner's Certificate, the fee for which was \$10, and on the 16th of the same month the time was extended to May 1, and that no payment having been made

on that date, 10 miles of the portion of the river applied for by Mr. Burnett was leased to another applicant. An applicant has lately been given a certain period within which to pay the rental for the remainder of the portion of the river applied for by Mr. Burnett, and in the event of his not making the payment there are several other applicants who will then be given the opportunity to acquire the lease thereof.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
LYNDWODE PEREIRA,  
Assistant Secretary.

Brandon, Man., June 14, 1898.

Hon. C. Sifton,  
Minister of the Interior,  
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I would ask for a reply to my letter written to you in Ottawa, when I asked for information regarding the position of dredging license on the property referred to in the Department of the Interior at Ottawa in application as reference No. 54299. Mr. Beck, who holds an assignment from F. Burnett of one-third interest tells me that he is prepared to pay the rent, and can dispose of the property. Please let me hear what is the position of the affair, and what has to be done to complete title.

Yours,  
J. N. KIRCHHOFFER.

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, June 17, 1898.

Honourable J. N. Kirchhoffer,  
Brandon, Man.

Sir,—Replying to your letter of the 14th instant, to the Minister of the Interior, I am directed to inclose herewith a copy of the departmental letter of the 14th of this month to you in relation to the application of Mr. Frank Burnett, of Vancouver, B.C.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
LYNDWODE PEREIRA,  
Assistant Secretary.

Brandon, Man., July 5, 1898.

Hon. Clifford Sifton,  
Minister of the Interior,  
Ottawa.

Dredging license 54299.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter on this subject, Mr. Beck wrote to Mr. Burnett and received a reply which he forwarded to me. It states, amongst other things:

'I never got a notice, good, bad or indifferent, in regard to the dredging license, nor do I believe one was ever sent as, if so, I would have received it.'

It seems strange that a period of three weeks and over should have elapsed between the date of my letter asking what the position of the matter was, and stating that Mr. Beck was prepared to pay the rental, and your reply, to the effect that a part of the property had been disposed of and the remainder was being negotiated for. I again now state that Mr. Beck is prepared to pay the rental for the original license, and as no notification was received by Mr. Burnett, his assignor, as to the property, it seems to me that his rights, and those of Mr. Beck, claiming under him, cannot be abrogated without some definite step being taken. I would ask you, therefore, to be kind enough to let me know what Mr. Beck has to do to carry out the agreement.

Yours,  
J. N. KIRCHHOFFER.

He goes on to show that undoubtedly Mr. Philp was using his name, as the evidence proves, as well as the names of all those

other parties for a long time without the knowledge or consent of any of them.

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, July 12, 1898.

Hon. J. N. Kirchhoffer,  
Brandon, Man.

Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 5th ultimo, addressed to the minister in relation to the application of Mr. Frank Burnett, of Vancouver, B.C., I am directed to say that all the correspondence in connection with the application was addressed to Mr. Burnett in care of Mr. A. E. Philp, who filed the application in this department.

With respect to your assertion that the letter from yourself to the minister was delayed in the department for three weeks without a reply being sent thereto, I am to point that your communication was dated May 30, and that an official reply thereto was sent to you on June 11, so that only eleven days expired, and not three weeks, as stated in your letter.

I am to add that the prior applicants for a portion of the Teslin River, covered by Mr. Burnett's application, did not pay the rental therefor, and that the department is now in a position to offer Mr. Burnett a lease of ten miles of the river, commencing at a point 70 miles from its mouth, thence up the river 10 miles. If Mr. Burnett desires a lease of this portion of the river it will be necessary for him to pay to this department the rental thereof within twenty days from this date, and also the sum of \$10 for a Free Miner's Certificate.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
LYNDWODE PEREIRA,  
Assistant Secretary.

Brandon, July 21, 1898.

To the Secretary,  
Dept. of the Interior.

Dear Sir,—In reply to yours of the 12th inst., stating that 'only eleven days, not three weeks expired' before I received an answer, I would refer you to your letter of June 11, in which you say, 'I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 20th ulto,' and I am still of opinion that three weeks is too long a time to leave unanswered, a letter on such an important subject and then to inform me that in the interim the property had been disposed of.

You now offer Mr. Burnett, through me, a lease of ten miles of the river, but I cannot tell whether this is part of the original license property or not, nor is it possible for me to communicate with Mr. Burnett and get the matter investigated within the time named, twenty days.

Have you sent a notification of this to Mr. Burnett, through the usual channel Mr. A. E. Philp? If so, there would be considerable delay, as it would have to go via Dawson City, where, as you probably know, Mr. Philp now is. It would, however, very likely reach Mr. Burnett, as soon as any other communication sent him through the same channel, as Mr. B. informs me, he has not so far 'received one word, good, bad or indifferent' on the subject.

Awaiting your reply,

Yours,  
J. N. KIRCHHOFFER.

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, July 27, 1898.

Hon. J. N. Kirchhoffer,  
Brandon, Man.

Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 21st instant I am directed to say that it is found upon referring to the departmental letter to you of June 11 last in relation to the application of Mr.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Burnett, that it is therein stated that your letter addressed to the minister was dated May 20. It should have read May 30, that being the date of your communication. As your letter was acknowledged on June 11, only eleven days elapsed between the date it was written and the reply thereto.

You stated that between the date of your letter and its acknowledgment the property applied for by Mr. Burnett had been disposed of. This is not in accordance with the facts, as owing to Mr. Burnett not having paid the rental within the period given to him for that purpose subsequent applicants had before the date of your letter been given the right to acquire a lease, and one of them had acquired a lease of ten miles.

As it appears from your communication that you desire an offer should be made direct to Mr. Burnett from this department, I am to inclose herewith a copy of the departmental letter of this date to him.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
LYNDWODE PEREIRA,  
Assistant Secretary.

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, July 27, 1898.

Frank Burnett, Esq.,  
Vancouver, B.C.

Sir, I am directed to say that on April 9 last, a letter was addressed to you, care of A. E. Philp, barrister of Brandon, advising you that a lease of twenty miles of the Teslin River, commencing at a point sixty miles from its mouth, thence extending up the river twenty miles, would be issued in your favour upon receipt here within twelve days from that date of the annual rental at the rate of \$100 per mile and the sum of \$10 for a Free Miner's Certificate. The rental not having been paid within the period allowed, an extension of time until April 1 was given in compliance with a request made to that effect by Mr. Philp. The rental not having been paid, ten miles of the portion of the river applied for by you was leased to another applicant.

I am now to say that the remaining ten miles of the portion of the river applied for by you, commencing at a point seventy miles from its mouth, thence up the river ten miles, will be issued in your favour upon receipt here within twenty days from this date of the annual rental at the rate of \$100 per mile and the sum of \$10 for a Free Miner's Certificate.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
LYNDWODE PEREIRA,  
Assistant Secretary.

That letter shows that the department having being told that Philp without authority from Burnett got hold of this property, and that property went away from Burnett to somebody else. This option expired before Mr. Burnett had an opportunity of closing. As the correspondence from Burnett indicates, this property had gone to some of Mr. Philp's or Mr. Sifton's friends, and then the department pursues this extraordinary course of offering Mr. Burnett something else. Why they should do anything of the kind or approach him in that way is only explained by the reason that they feared this gentleman's anger and indignation in connection with the matter in which Mr. Philp had been without authority using his name and obtaining options. There is a reference to the report to the Bonanza Creek lease, and this gentleman had got no

lease of any kind whatever. This session I was informed in regard to the fact that the Bonanza Creek, I speak subject to correction—

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us a rest.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What did the hon. gentleman say? His interruptions do not amount to much.

Mr. McMULLEN. Neither do you?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose the Chairman is asleep or he would try to keep order.

Mr. McMULLEN. Almost everybody is asleep.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am only beginning, Mr. Chairman. There is in reference to Bonanza Creek something which shows that the indulgence given to Mr. Philp is that he holds the right to take a lease to do certain things and how long this indulgence is going to be granted is not exactly explained. The acting minister again this session has shown that the conditions of this lease has not been complied with. I stated that the pleadings in the case of Forbes and Philps would be interesting reading.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I hope you are not going to read it to us to-night.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The government, I dare say, could tell me something about these pleadings, because I am sure the settlement of that suit under the auspices of two members of the government, Mr. Sifton not being one of them, ought to put the government in possession of those pleadings. So far that statement stands in this way. Mr. Forbes was mixed up with Mr. Philp, and in the press was this statement:

Special to the 'Free Press.'

Toronto, Ont., July 18.—A. E. Philp, of Brandon, the gentleman mentioned in Sir Hibbert Tupper's Yukon charges, is the defendant in an action brought by Dr. J. N. Forbes, of Caledonia, for the recovery of \$4,000 advanced by Forbes to Philp, when the latter went to the Yukon. Dr. Forbes claims that the sum was advanced by way of loan to enable Philp to secure certain dredging lease. Philp says that the advance was not a loan, but a gift or consideration for services to be rendered, and that have been rendered. He also denies the jurisdiction of Ontario judges to try the case as he is a resident of Manitoba. Then there are some statements in regard to how the matter stands by appointments in chambers, and so on. I attempted to obtain the pleadings in that case. I thought that with the other information I had they would be instructive, and I found from a correspondent in Brantford where the papers were:

I have caused a search to be made for information in the suit of Forbes vs. Philps.

Strange to say the defence was taken from the files evidently by consent of parties.

Inclosed I hand you letter from Messrs. Wilson & Watts who looked up matter for me.

Here is the letter of Wilson & Watts:

As requested by you I searched the records of this action in the office of the local registrar. The action was brouhgt on by Forbes to recover \$4,000 loaned to the defendant under the following circumstances, as set forth in the Statement of Claim:

On the 1st of March, 1898, the Defendant met Plaintiff at Chicago, and an agreement was entered into by which the Plaintiff was to immediately proceed to Hamilton and raise \$4,000 and pay it over to the Deputy Minister of Interior, at Ottawa, the money to be repaid by the Defendant to the Plaintiff within a few days. The Plaintiff proceeded to Hamilton, obtained the money, and forwarded it as requested on the 2nd of March, 1898. The Plaintiff alleges the Defendant failed to repay the money as agreed. From this you will see that the claim as set forth in the Statement of Claim was simply a claim for money loaned. The Statement of Defence was filed, but was afterwards removed from the files on the consent of the solicitors for both parties and there is nothing on record showing what was contained in the Statement of Defence. I have interviewed Mr. Brewster, the solicitor for the Plaintiff, and he intimates that the Statement of Defence set forth the whole transaction, but he refuses to let me see a copy on the ground that it would be a breach of good faith on his part as a professional man to his client.

Now, some hon. gentlemen will know Mr. Frank Burnett better than I do. He was the organizer of the Liberal party in Manitoba for several years.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. No, no.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At any rate, he is a leading Liberal on the coast to-day. Mr. Frank Burnett is a gentleman whose character is unimpeachable, and I do not suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will attempt to impeach it in any way. He is referred to in the correspondence of the Department of the Interior as having been offered a lease. After they found that Mr. Philp had used his name, and after allowing others to come in and get leases, they offered him a lease of ten miles on Indian River.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. How could Mr. Burnett prevent anybody putting in an application in his name?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He could not, but I think the hon. gentleman would be rather indignant if he found that others were applying for a permit in his name, and afterwards found it granted in another's name. He writes to Mr. Kirchhoffer as follows, referring to an interview prepared for Mr. Richardson, a member of this House:

I have no doubt the interview in question would prove a veritable bomb shell in his camp and would dismiss him completely, because you would scarcely credit some of the things said by me and which are absolutely gospel truth, but the trouble is this—1st. I have no proof except that I am prepared to swear to the truth of my statements. 2nd. At the time I gave the

information I was willing that it should be published in a Liberal paper, but was not, and am not now, agreeable to furnish openly ammunition to the enemy. You will understand my position—I am a Liberal to the core, not known, however, of the S— stamp, and I think that it is the duty of the Liberal party in its own interests to purge the party of men like him; but hey should do it themselves, not ask the Tories to do it for them. Consequently under these circumstances I do not feel prepared to give you a copy of such interview—but if I am compelled, am quite willing to testify under oath all I know in the matter.

Now, I have this letter from Senator Kirchoffer, corroborated by Mr. H. H. Beck :

Brandon, March 1, 1900.

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir Charles Hibbert,—In reply to your request, I beg to say that in the latter part of March, 1898, I was in Vancouver and in company of Mr. H. H. Beck, of Winnipeg, called upon Mr. Frank Burnett, formerly of Belmont, Manitoba, and one of the most active of the Grit-organizers in this province.

In the course of conversation he complained bitterly of the treatment he had received at the hands of Mr. Sifton and said :—

'I assure you that neither I nor any one else out here, no matter what their claims may be, can get any concession from his department unless Sifton himself has a share in it and his partner, Philp has the making out of the papers.'

'Now,' he continued, 'you know all I have done for him and the party and what I am entitled to at his hands, well, quite recently, after a good deal of trouble and considerable expense, I had discovered what I considered would be a valuable concession to me, and I wrote to Sifton applying for it. He replied that under the existing state of the law this could not be granted to me but he would see that at the next session of parliament an amendment should be made to the Act which would allow it. Imagine my astonishment when I subsequently discovered that a few days after the receipt of my letter he had granted the concession to another party, and I know that in doing so it was granted really to himself.'

Mr. Beck and I both sympathized with him, and he continued :

'Now there are these dredging licenses, they have put my name down for a number of them, though I never asked them to do so.

'There is one on the Teslinto River that Philp wrote me about last February and sent a power of attorney for me to sign for him to deal with it, saying he had sold the property and wanted to complete the deal, and he is in a great stew about it, for two days ago I received another power of attorney and a most peremptory letter to sign and return it,' 'which, of course, you have done.' I said, 'not a bit of it,' he replied, 'and I don't intend to either; they put my name down without consulting me and now I'm not going to help them out of the hole.'

On this Mr. Beck suggested that he and I would take it up for him, I assented and said we would give \$50 (\$25 each) if it was a genuine transaction and see if there was anything in it.

'Oh, but,' he explained, 'I can only give you an interest in one-fourth share, that's all they allow me for the use of my name; here is what Philp says about it,' and he handed me a letter from Mr. Philp to him, stating that although the

allotment had been made to him, he was only to be entitled to one-fourth share, the other partners being Mr. Sifton, Major Walsh and himself (Philp) who 'for obvious reasons' did not wish their names to appear.

Burnett showed us the document allotting 30 miles on the Teslinto River to him and we each paid him \$25 and agreed to take equal interest with him in his one-fourth share, and as I was leaving for the east next day, he promised to have the assignments ready in the morning. 'Now,' I said, 'I want those letters of Philp's, and I intend to use them politically;' he replied that he would not give me the originals, but he would have copies made for me, which I said would be satisfactory. When I called next morning on my way to the train I got my assignment of the concession, but Burnett said the copies of the letters had not been made yet, but he would send them to Ottawa after me. I said, 'Frank, I don't want you to deceive me in this matter, as I am only going into it from political motives, and I know they'll make a great effort to buy you off.'

He replied, 'They can't do it; I'm a hellandman and a hellandman never forgives and he never forgets; Sifton has turned me down once too often, and I'll stay with it till I get even with him.'

As this is the part of the transaction which was personally taken part in by Mr. Beck, I have asked him to confirm the above and will later on detail what occurred subsequently.

Yours faithfully,

J. N. KIRCHHOFFER.

I beg to say that I have read the foregoing and I corroborate all the statements therein contained.

H. H. BECK.

Dear Sir Charles,—In further communication of this subject I may say that after reaching Ottawa I waited some days in expectation of receiving the copies of the Philp letters which Burnett had promised to forward to me. When they did not arrive, I telegraphed Burnett, who replied that he had mailed me 'the originals' on a certain date. They have never since reached me, but as he had previously refused to send me the originals and only promised copies, I assumed, and have no reason to doubt, that he had been 'got at' in the meantime and that it was convenient for the originals to disappear, so that copies could not be obtained. Of course when I wrote him about their non-arrival, he sent me a copy of the letter he wrote when forwarding them, but no explanation as to why he had changed his mind as to sending the originals.

When I saw that I was not going to get the letters, I applied to the Department of the Interior for a statement as to how the lease of 30 miles of the Teslinto River, in which I had taken an interest, stood. I did not receive any reply until after I had written a second time, two weeks later, from Brandon, when the secretary replied that 20 miles of it had been cancelled, notice having been given to Mr. Burnett for him to make good the rental within twenty days, which he had disregarded. I forwarded this to Mr. Burnett who indignantly denied having ever received any such notice.

I forwarded his letter to the department, who then replied to us that the notice had been addressed to him, care of A. E. Philp, Brandon, and they sent me a copy and, as 20 miles had evidently been disposed of, they sent him a notice direct, as to the other 10 miles.

In the meantime Burnett had made a trip to Winnipeg. While there I learned he had given

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

an interview to Richardson, M.P., of the 'Tribune,' in which the incidents of the dredging deal were given in detail, and a number of others, of which Burnett speaks later in a letter to me as follows:—

'You would scarcely credit some of the things I said (in the interview), and which are absolutely gospel truth.'

I had applied to Richardson for a copy of this interview, which he declined to give without Burnett's authority. This I obtained, but Richardson still refused. He said that he had sent two copies of this interview to two individual members of the government and expected it would lead to Sifton's immediate retirement. One of these ministers had replied, saying he did not think it would be wise for the government to take any notice of the matter. The other had never acknowledged it. As, however, if it were quoted they would know from whence it came, Richardson did not wish to give me the copy thus furnishing us with ammunition against his own party.

Burnett has again and again assured me that though the letters had been lost he would come before any tribunal and give the evidence as to their contents.

Yours faithfully,  
J. N. KIRCHHOFFER.

Now, take the returns that I have referred to. On their face they furnish ground for an inquiry with regard to the extraordinary concessions granted Mr. Philp and the use he was making of these various names. If these statements I have just read be correct, if Burnett's interview was in the possession of the government, then, when I made that charge last session that that letter had been written by Mr. Philp, it is incredible, if Mr. Philp made that story out of the whole cloth, that the Minister of the Interior could have had the relations he has since that time with that man, his old partner, and continued them all during the summer, after the decision, as the return shows. It was in the public interest that that matter should have been probed to the bottom. It was a far stronger case on suspicion than Mr. Sifton had in his possession against the men he prosecuted in Manitoba, and shows the serious ground that I had for the charges that I had made last session; and coupled with the other facts, all this indicates the extremely unfair use made of Mr. Ryley by his minister, and the disingenuous manner in which Mr. Ryley prepared that memorandum for his minister to use on that occasion.

The next phase of the subject is with regard to Dominion Creek, but as I had to speak this afternoon and have spoken at considerable length to-night, though I have not endeavoured to drag the material out at all, I would consider it great indulgence if I were permitted to postpone my observations on this item until to-morrow.

The committee rose and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.55 a.m. (Tuesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, June 19, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SALARIES TO JUDGES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the following resolution be referred to the Committee of the Whole to-morrow:

That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts and to provide as follows:

That the salary of the chief justice of the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories shall be \$5,000, and of the five puisné judges of the said court each \$4,000 per annum.

That the salary of an additional judge of the Territorial Court in the Yukon territory shall be \$4,000 per annum.

That the salaries of seventeen puisné judges of the Superior Court of Quebec, whose residences are fixed at Montreal or Quebec (including the judge to whom the district of Terrebonne is assigned), each \$5,000 per annum

Motion agreed to.

### THE INDIA FAMINE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my right hon. friend if he has yet given consideration to the question that I ventured to bring to the notice of the government a few days ago, that is, as to the propriety of this parliament making a contribution to the India famine fund. My right hon. friend knows that on a former occasion that question was taken up by the people of Canada with great spirit, and a very admirable contribution was made to the Indian famine fund; and I believe that the necessities are very much greater now than they were on that occasion. The deaths from starvation and disease—because the plague has been added to the famine—are, perhaps, unexampled even in the history of India. I also drew the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the fact, of which he is also well aware, that owing to the very patriotic spirit that now exists throughout the country, and which has been nobly responded to by all classes of citizens, a very large amount has been contributed to the patriotic fund in connection with the war in South Africa; and in addition, a demand has recently been made upon the citizens of Canada to which they have generally responded, in consequence of the fire that took place in Ottawa. In consequence of all these demands having drawn so heavily on private resources, I think that, in view of the very flourishing condition of the financial affairs of the country, an appropriation in aid of the sufferers by famine and disease in India would be not only well received by the House, but, I believe, would be thoroughly appreciated by the country.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not prepared at this moment to make any announcement to the House, either affirmatively or negatively. But at an early day the government will announce its policy upon this question.

#### PRIVATE COURTNEY'S TEMPERANCE PRINCIPLES.

Mr. **GEO. TAYLOR** (South Leeds). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the government to a matter which I have had before me for several days. I regret the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) is not in his place, because it properly comes under the cognizance of his department, but, perhaps, the Prime Minister can give me an answer at present. I will read a letter which I have received, setting forth the case I refer to :

George Taylor, Esq., M.P.,  
House of Commons, Ottawa.

(Re Corporal Courtney.)

Dear Sir,—Could you inform me if it is true that Corporal Courtney, of 'A' Battery, Kingston, was ordered to march a squad of men (Battery men) to the canteen there to drink the Queen's health in beer on the 24th of May; that for refusing to obey that order (he being a temperance man) he was placed under arrest for insubordination, and that Major Fages ordered Courtney to be reduced to the ranks, &c. Could you get the particulars of the matter? If you will be good enough to attend to the matter, and ascertain if our teetotal brother was so harshly dealt with for his loyalty to the temperance cause, which this government so sadly lacks, you will greatly oblige.

Yours truly,

**GEORGE SHEPPARD,**  
Gananoque, Ont.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I understand that this matter has been discussed in the newspapers for several days; if so, the hon. gentleman has had ample time to give notice to the minister that he intended to bring it up. However, I will convey the matter to the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence.

#### APPROACHES TO HALIFAX HARBOUR.

Mr. **R. L. BORDEN** (Halifax). I desire to bring a matter to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), which is dealt with by a resolution or memorial of the Board of Trade of Halifax. I refer to the approaches to the Halifax harbour, and if it is necessary to put myself in order, I will conclude with a motion.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The House will be moved into Committee of Supply in a short time, and I suggest to the hon. gentlemen that he bring it up then.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). I desire, of course, to follow the suggestions of the right hon. gentleman, but I understand there are some other matters coming up when the

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.**

House is moved into supply. I do not desire to make a motion.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). As the matter is a very important one, I may require to read some documents, and, perhaps, the hon. gentleman will prefer to discuss it in supply.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). It seems so uncertain when we will reach supply, that I do not like to lose the opportunity. Of course, I will give way if the government desire.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. **G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.) Might I ask the leader of the government if he has come to a conclusion as to when he is going to take morning sittings?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I intend to put a notice on the paper to-morrow on that subject.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. POWELL.

Mr. **H. A. POWELL** (Westmoreland). Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I wish to call the attention of the House to a personal matter. It appears in the *Charlottetown Daily Patriot* of May 31, but it has only lately been brought to my notice. I will read it :

The report of Commissioner Bill, who investigated the conduct of Warden Foster, has been issued, and is interesting reading.

In it evidence is given that even Mr. Powell, of Westmoreland, who made so indignant a speech about the enormities practised in West Huron election, had considerable trafficking in illegal ballots in the elections for Westmoreland in 1891, one of the witnesses proving that he got ballots from Powell to give to the electors.

I may say that in the province of New Brunswick this matter, which is in connection with a local election, would be too ridiculous to mention. The statements in the commissioner's report could, probably, be truthfully said of every man who, during the last fifty years, sat in the legislature of New Brunswick. I did not have the honour to sit there as long as the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), or as the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Lewis), and some other hon. gentlemen in this House, but they know how absurd the insinuation is. So far as issuing ballots is concerned, probably in the ten years preceding his advent to this House, the Minister of Railways and Canals did, and, I think, he will bear me out in the statement, directly or indirectly cause to be issued probably no less than 75,000 ballots for distribution among the electors in his constituency.

I certainly have been a party directly or indirectly, to the issue of probably forty or fifty thousand. At every election in the province of New Brunswick, the candidates are responsible, probably, for the is-

sue of not less than four or five hundred thousand ballot papers. The secret of that is, that in the province of New Brunswick there are no official ballots whatever, as there are in the Dominion. Upon the candidates themselves devolves the task of supplying their own ballot papers. Every hon. gentleman from New Brunswick knows that this is so, and I would ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to endorse what I am saying to the very letter.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). There is no doubt about that.

Mr. **POWELL**. The method pursued is this—each candidate, or, if there are a number of candidates on a ticket, those candidates together, have the ballot papers printed, and these—

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. At the candidates' own expense.

Mr. **POWELL**. Yes—and they are distributed among the workers and by them to the electors. The electors take these ballots into the polling booth and deposit them in the box. The duty of the returning officer is to see that only single ballots are deposited. The Minister of Railways and Canals is familiar with the law. That, Mr. Speaker, is all that there is in the matter, and I need not detain the House longer.

#### SUPPLY—REPRESENTATION OF THE YUKON.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER** (Cape Breton). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the motion of which I gave notice yesterday. I shall claim the attention of the House but a very short time. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the leader of the House is aware that a petition in regard to this subject was sent by the inhabitants of the Yukon territory, and subsequently a public meeting was held and the following resolution was moved, seconded and carried unanimously:

Whereas, by petition dated the 10th day of March, 1900, the citizens of the Yukon territory, through their properly authorized committee, duly petitioned the government of Canada, to wit: the Governor General, the Senate and the House of Commons of Canada, for the right to elect two or more members to the House of Commons at Ottawa;

And whereas, a public mass meeting of the citizens of the Yukon territory ratified and seconded the said petition, and insisted upon the immediate granting to the said Yukon territory of the right to have representation in the Dominion House of Commons, which mass meeting was held on the 23rd day of March, 1900;

And whereas, no answer has yet been received from the government, or any of the governing bodies of Canada, relating to the said petition and resolution, nor has any account reached

the Yukon territory as to what action, if any, is being taken by the House of Commons or Senate in regard to the same:

Now, therefore, this mass meeting of the citizens of the Yukon territory, do most respectfully draw the attention of the government of Canada to the necessity of immediate action upon our petition for representation in the Dominion House of Commons, and beg to point out that the granting of the said petition during the present session of parliament is absolutely necessary in order that the important and pressing questions relating to the Yukon territory may be properly brought before the House of Commons by members thereof, properly acquainted with the conditions of the Yukon territory;

And further, to draw the attention of parliament to the fact that the failure to grant this petition during the present session on account of it being of the most vital importance to the citizens of this territory, who pay over one-twenty-fifth of the gross federal revenue of the Dominion of Canada, cannot but have a most harmful effect upon the opinions and judgment of the citizens of this territory with regard to the relation between the citizens of this territory and the government of Canada, and we therefore request that parliament take special and urgent cognizance of the importance of this petition, on account of the uniqueness of our conditions and the pressing nature of the reforms which we consider necessary in the laws governing this territory, but which reforms are not properly understood or advocated by citizens or members outside of this territory, and that parliament grant the said petition during the present session and allow us to elect at least two members of parliament for the next session of parliament;

And that a copy of this resolution be telegraphed to the Speaker of the House of Commons at once, and copies be mailed to the Governor General, Speakers of the House of Commons and Senate, and to the Premier and leader of the opposition.

That petition sets forth so clearly not only the claim of the inhabitants of the Yukon territory, but the ground on which they make their claim, to representation in this House as to make it unnecessary that I should add much to what has already been stated. In fact, the only reason why I have ventured to bring this matter at the present moment to the attention of the House is the fact that my right hon. friend stated a short time ago, apparently in answer to the petition, that the government had come to the conclusion not to take any action in regard to the representation of the Yukon territory in the House of Commons until the general census of 1901 had been taken. Now, as I do not see any necessity for postponing, and as my right hon. friend has virtually admitted that when that census is taken, it will become necessary to provide representation for the Yukon territory—because I take that to be the view that my right hon. friend holds—I wish to press upon the attention of the government and the House the importance of not waiting for that decennial census to be taken, but of acting upon the official census that has already been taken under the direction, I presume, of the government, or, if not of the government, of the Yukon council, by the mounted police—which census furnishes all

the information that is necessary in regard to a question of this kind. I find, in that organ of public opinion which so strongly supports the government, the *Globe* newspaper, remarks upon this subject, so concise and conclusive—an argument, as it seems to me, so thoroughly unanswerable—that I propose to detain the House only while I read that article. It has put the case in so clear and strong a light that it is unnecessary that I should add a single word. This is from June 16 :

A copy of the Dawson 'News' to hand reports a public meeting that has clearly expressed a strong local desire for a wider share in the government of the territory. This is a feeling that cannot be ignored, and that should be respected and used to the building up of stable institutions and the strengthening of a proper national sentiment. There is naturally a strong feeling in Dawson in favour of electoral representation in the Yukon council and also in the Dominion parliament.

I may say, with regard to the Yukon council, that my right hon. friend has already stated that the government propose, by proclamation to bring into effect the provisions of the Act of last session which provides for two elective members, I think in addition to the six nominative members. I will not go into the question that might arise as to whether this is giving the elective portion sufficient representation, but, that having received the sanction of parliament I am only surprised that the Prime Minister has not had the proclamation issued long ago so as to give the citizens an opportunity of exercising the rights and privileges which they will enjoy under that legislation. I struck that portion out of my resolution because it is covered by the statement already made by the right hon. Prime Minister :

There is naturally a strong feeling in Dawson in favour of electoral representation in the Yukon council and also in the Dominion parliament. Complaints about taxation without representation have a disagreeable sound, and should not continue unheeded in any British colony.

And especially, I may add, in relation to a section of the territory of Canada which claims to have contributed one-twenty-fifth of the entire revenue of the country :

According to the census just taken by the mounted police, the population of Dawson is 5,404 persons. This includes the suburbs of the city not included in the census of 1898, which gave a population of 16,600 for the smaller area. The rush has come and gone. And the present population is evidently substantial and based on the commercial and mining possibilities of the district. The census returns show a gain of 959 over the enumeration last September, notwithstanding the stampede of more than a thousand people over the ice to Cape Nome. The influx from Bennett and Skagway more than made up for this exodus.

Returns in details show a population of 4,514 men, 648 women and 242 children. Of the total, 3,364 are American citizens, and 1,712 British subjects, 1,120 of the latter being qualified voters. On the strength of this return and of the estimated population out on the creeks, a reasonable

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

demand can be made for representation in the Dominion parliament and also in the Yukon council.

Again, they say :

The demand for Dominion representation is well founded. The petition to parliament sets forth that the people of the territory pay one-twenty-fifth part of the gross revenue of the Dominion. It also dwells on the reforms needed in the territory, and the failure of parliament and of people outside of the territory to properly understand its position. It may not be convenient to make any increase or change in federal representation till after the next Dominion census, but this seems a case in which the needs and sentiments of the territory should be the first consideration. Dawson is represented in the Imperial forces in South Africa. It made a contribution to the Ottawa sufferers. The people are fellow-citizens, and have clearly a right to Dominion representation. All the details connected with this extension of jurisdiction cannot be arranged satisfactorily at once, but where an obvious grievance exists every possible effort should be made to remedy it. Representation in the territorial council would also tend to inspire confidence and lessen the antipathy naturally aroused by taxation without representation.

I do not intend to detain the House further than to say that if there has ever been any portion of this Dominion of Canada in regard to which it has been proved by the discussions in this House to be absolutely necessary that we should have the means of knowing the concentrated views of the citizens themselves, I think it has been established in regard to the Yukon territory, and as a simple act enabling them to elect a member to represent them in the House of Commons before the next session of parliament would be very easily passed, I sincerely hope that the Prime Minister will accept the motion in the spirit in which it is made and give effect to it. The motion that I propose, seconded by Mr. Foster, is as follows :

That all the words after the word 'that' be left out, and the following added instead thereof : 'this House is of the opinion that immediate provision should be made for representation in the Yukon Territory in the parliament of Canada.'

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The principles with which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has supported his motion are of such a character that they will not engage us in any controversy. It is in the spirit of the British constitution that the people should be represented in all legislative assemblies. It is also in the spirit of British institutions especially that all changes should be made slowly and gradually, and that no legislative action of any kind that would disturb the existing condition of things should be precipitate. The matter to which the hon. gentleman has alluded has already engaged the attention of parliament no later than last session. The Yukon territory has been in existence now, for only four years—it is now in its fourth year. The tentative legis-

lation about it had to be more or less proved, and as time develops we are able to understand the condition of things better there and able to provide for it accordingly. The question of representation from the first has engaged the attention of parliament, and last year it came up prominently in our deliberations. As a result of the best judgment that parliament could then give to the question it was resolved that a provision should be introduced into the statutes providing for representation, not in the parliament of Canada, but in the legislative council of the Yukon territory. Last year parliament passed the following statute:

The Governor in Council, by warrant under his privy seal, may constitute and appoint such and so many persons, from time to time, not exceeding six persons, as may be deemed desirable, to be a council to aid the commissioner in the administration of the territory, and such persons so appointed to the council shall, before entering upon the duties of their office, take and subscribe before the commissioner such oaths of allegiance and office as the Governor in Council may prescribe.

A majority of the council, including the commissioner, shall form a quorum.

The natural-born and naturalized male British subjects in the territory, who have attained the full age of twenty-one years and continuously resided there for a period of not less than twelve months, shall elect two representatives to the territorial council, and such representatives shall have the same power and be charged with the same duties as those members of the council who are appointed by the Governor in Council; and any person qualified to vote shall be eligible for election.

Subsections 3, 4 and 5 of this section shall come into force at such time as the Governor in Council shall think proper and shall fix for that purpose by order in council.

I have already stated that it is the intention of the government to have the proclamation issued for this purpose immediately; I would say that it is intended that the proclamation shall issue about the 1st of July, so that immediately the elections shall take place to give representation to the people of the Yukon upon the executive council. As to that point we are all agreed. The question is raised by my hon. friend as to our giving representation also to the people of the Yukon upon the floor of parliament. My hon. friend bases his remarks upon a mass meeting which took place some time ago in the city of Dawson, and which adopted certain resolutions which my hon. friend has just read, and which were forwarded to the Governor General and to some other persons for the advice, not only of the Governor General, but of the people of Canada generally. Of course, every one must admit that representations made by a mass meeting of citizens anywhere under our system of government are always entitled to respect and consideration, but whether or not they should carry such respect and consideration as to be absolutely binding is a thing that I am not prepared, nor is my hon. friend, I am sure, to admit. The

policy of the government upon this subject, as I have already stated, is to deal with it next session, after the census has been taken, and we propose, if possible, to have an early census.

**Mr. WALLACE.** When will that be?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** That will be early next year.

**Mr. WALLACE.** How early?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** It is sufficient for the purpose of my hon. friend that I should say that it will be early next year; perhaps in the month of January, not later, certainly, than the month of April. When we have this information from the census, we will be in a better position to frame a law to give representation to the Yukon. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper), will notice that the resolution adopted by the mass meeting, asks that the Yukon should be represented in the federal House of Commons by two members. I think my hon. friend will not dispute that such representation would not be in accordance with the acknowledged unit of representation in all the portions of the Dominion. That unit of representation is one member for about 22,000 electors. If we were to give two members to the Yukon territory, then judging of the population, from the imperfect knowledge we now have, two members would be largely in excess of the proportionate representation for the rest of the country.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** We did not adhere to the numerical representation in the case of the smaller provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** There may have been existing conditions which affected that, when we took British Columbia and Prince Edward Island into confederation. These were established provinces, and it would have been difficult to disturb the representation which the people expected, judging from the number they had in their own legislative bodies. Whether or not it may be advisable to depart from this principle of representation in the case of the Yukon, is a question which I am not prepared to discuss just now. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that we have hardly the information to-day which would enable us to form a practical conclusion upon the conditions which exist in the Yukon. First of all, I expect that when the people have elected two members within the next few weeks to the council of the Yukon territory, we probably shall have representations made by the executive council, reinforced as it shall be by the voice of popular opinion, as to what shall be the representation of the Yukon territory in this parliament. I expect we shall have a much more valuable suggestion from such a body as the executive council as then constituted, and one which will be entitled to more con-

sideration than the simple resolution of a mass meeting. Then the census will give us information which we have not to-day. The census lately taken by the North-west Mounted Police is undoubtedly a valuable source of information, but it is admittedly not absolutely correct. The mounted police did the best they could, and they did very good work, but they had no training for it, and it gives us only an approximate estimate of the population.

Mr. FOSTER. As how much ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The city of Dawson is in the vicinity of 5,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. A little over.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps so. Out of that population, nearly three-fourths are American citizens, and about one-fourth British subjects. We want to be informed by the census as to the total number (alien as well as British), the conditions of the people, how many residents there are, how many families there are. We have provided at present that the franchise which is to prevail for the representation in the executive council, is to be universal manhood suffrage. So far that is satisfactory. We would like to have the view of the council as to whether or not that franchise should be adopted for representation in the House of Commons. For my part, I am quite agreeable to it, but it would be preferable, everything considered, to proceed not hastily in this matter. After all, it cannot be very long now, and I do not think the people of the Yukon will have any cause of complaint, if in the fifth year of their existence, they are admitted to representation upon the floor of the national parliament. If you compare that with the conditions which exist in the American territories, the people of the Yukon will have no reason to complain at all. For those reasons, I would ask that the House do not adopt the motion of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper), but rely upon the statement which we make, that as soon as the census has been taken, we will deem it our duty to introduce a Bill to admit the population of the Yukon to representation in this parliament.

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I have some remarks which I intended to make at a later stage, but this motion makes them quite apropos now. I can hardly see the force of the arguments which have been advanced by the First Minister, either against giving the population of the Yukon comparatively large representation in this House, or, against giving them that representation at once. It is quite well known, and the last census makes it undeniable, that in Dawson City, there is a little over 5,000 people, and in the creeks and tributaries around it, 10,700, or nearly so. The number of British voters in Dawson and the Yukon is given by the last census as in the neigh-

bourhood of from 4,200 to 4,500, and that is certainly a large number of people in a portion of Canada not to be represented. The *Dawson Weekly News* of May 11, gives the exact figures of the total number outside Dawson, at 10,703; the voters being 2,462, and the foreign population amounting to about 6,500. In Dawson itself the population is a little over 5,000, with some 1,700 British voters. That makes a very respectable body of voters of British citizenship, and if they had had representation here at any time during the last three years, we should have had far more useful and reliable information in this House than we have had, and I think the course of legislation would have been quite different from what it has been. With regard to the number of representatives, that is a question to be arranged; but I do not think that the Prime Minister will know anything more as to the principle or expediency, after two gentlemen have been elected to the Yukon council, because they will there be overshadowed by what you may call the official vote, they being only two out of seven members. I think the representations made by that council will scarcely be so authoritative as the representations made by the people in mass meeting assembled, on the general principles which rule in these matters, namely, the representation of population, the importance of the interests involved, and the expediency of having in parliament men who are directly representative of the people themselves. But what I wanted to call the attention of parliament to was the peculiar methods of government which we have had in the Yukon for the last year, to go back no further. You have there a council made up of a possible six or seven members, every one of whom is a paid official either of the Department of the Interior directly or of some one of the other departments or of the government as a whole. The powers that are had by that council are very extensive. If you take the Auditor General's Report of last year, you will find that in actuality they imposed upon and gathered from the people of Dawson about \$130,000, that they expended about \$130,000, and that they imposed that and expended that almost entirely without supervision of or responsibility to any department of the government here in Ottawa. That, I think, is a very anomalous condition of things. That is made more striking last year, the report of which I have here, in the lately published report of the commissioner of the Yukon, and I find that that revenue, and which is called local revenue, has gone up from \$130,000 in the year before to \$210,000 odd in the year ending September, 1899. During the current year there is little doubt that that revenue will far surpass \$250,000. The broad statement to be made with reference to that is that you have a number of paid officials of the Department of the Interior or of this government collecting over a quarter

of a million dollars and spending every dollar of it without one iota of supervision or responsibility by or to any department or minister here in Ottawa. I think that is an anomalous condition of things; and I do not think any man sitting around these boards, if he were a citizen of Dawson, an owner of property and a ratepayer there, would have lived in that city one month without making his protest as strong and persistent as it possibly could be made against that anomalous condition of things. This fact has been brought out in another place, and has been admitted by the acting minister himself. Not only is that revenue absolutely within the power of the council, but the expenditures are all made by that council on the council's own initiative. There is no audit of that expenditure by any department of this government or by the government itself. If the council have an audit, it is an audit made by one of their own appointees, and the only thing that is known by this government is that after the expenditures have been made, after the bills have been paid, after the audit has been made by the council's own auditor, the accounts are sent down and filed away here in the Department of the Interior or the Department of the Secretary of State, I have not yet been able to find out which. But I would like to know if a similar condition of affairs has anywhere else existed in a freely governed country. Now, Sir, during the whole of last year the people of the Yukon have been holding mass meetings and making representations to the Yukon council to endorse petitions which they have passed at those mass meetings, pointing out that the law which was passed here last year making provision for two members of that council to be elected by the ratepayers of Dawson, thus representing the population to a certain extent, and which was to be brought into force by proclamation, has not to this day been proclaimed; and the consequence is that the people have to sit by and see the results of the expenditures, but not to see them at close hand, for that council has been so autocratic that it has not only not allowed the public, but the public through the press, to have any access to its meetings or give any report as to what has been done there. Now, I think that these people, reputable citizens of a free country, with their interests at stake, have a grievance and a very strong grievance against the government of this country. What is the reason that Act was not proclaimed immediately after its passage by this parliament? Not by lack of protestation by the people themselves, for the people have been protesting and protesting, and I have before me the papers which have been brought down, and I find that after all their protests they have been unable to stir the department or the government. But at last they sent their petition to the Governor Gen-

eral, and the Governor General sends the papers to the government with this remark:

The above correspondence appears to His Excellency of such importance, as affecting the government of the Yukon territory, that he ventures to draw the consideration of council towards it.

That is dated the 25th of April, 1900; and I venture to say that if the people of Dawson had not directed their petition directly to the Governor General, they would have been without reply and without action upon it up to the present time. They are without action upon it yet, because even at this late date the Prime Minister only says that the government propose to bring this section of their law into force by proclamation, and give to the people of the Yukon that small representation in their local affairs which they ought to have had, and which I think they ought to have in a larger degree. For, what is the government they have had up to the present time with regard to the disbursement of this \$200,000 or \$250,000 of revenue? It is simply government by officials—an autocracy; because everybody knows that the Minister of the Interior it is who will have his will carried out, though he takes no responsibility, has no apparent supervision, and assumes no responsibility. What are the duties of the commissioner, as set out by order in council on the 7th of July, 1898? The Commissioner has tremendous powers:

He shall have power to suspend any official for neglect of duty or misconduct, in his discretion and to replace such officer temporarily, pending decision by the minister of the department to which such officer is attached. It shall be the duty of the commissioner also to receive monthly or more frequently reports from the officers of the government in the district, and to receive from such officers all revenues, the property of the government of Canada, which may come into their possession, to be transmitted by the commissioner to the Department of Finance in due course.

All matters not provided for in the instructions of the officers of the government and rules of the department, acting in the Yukon district, and which require immediate action to be taken, shall be referred to the commissioner for his instructions. He shall be particularly charged with the duty of deciding questions not provided for by law, order in council or departmental instructions with regard to the disposal of land and timber in the district.

These are amongst some of the duties of the commissioner himself, but when I come to the duties and powers of the council itself—an irresponsible council mind you, made up of paid officials, not supervised by any department at Ottawa, their accounts not audited here—what do I find? They have powers to make ordinances and to impose penalties, provided that the penalties shall not exceed \$500 for a sentence. That is a very wide, large power. They have the power to grant shop and saloon and other licenses, and to place fees upon them. That is, the whole administration of the sale of

intoxicating liquors is given to over half a dozen paid officials in the city of Dawson, without the least supervision or control by any governmental authority here in Ottawa.

They have the power to make regulations for the preservation of health and for local improvements, and to impose taxes in order to provide for those matters, should they decide that taxes are necessary. That is a wide power given half a dozen paid officials, without any initiative supervision or control by anybody under the sun. They have the power of bestowing powers of taxation on municipal corporations which may wish to be incorporated for municipal purposes.

These are the powers of the council itself; they are the powers of an ordinary government. They are larger than the powers that a municipal council possesses. No municipal council that I know of in the Dominion possesses as wide powers as are possessed by those half dozen paid officials in the city of Dawson. Yet that is their power; and under it they have collected a taxation which, in this current year, will run over one quarter of a million dollars. It is instructive to just look over the statement I have here of the sources of their revenue. I asked for this and have received it, although it does not appear in the Auditor General's Report. For that year in which they got \$130,000, and paid out or expended \$130,000. What are some of the representative items? Without going into particulars, I simply state that the most of that revenue comes from liquor and vice. Of the amount of \$130,000, which is accounted for in that year before the last of which I have spoken, for permits and for liquor licenses, these sums respectively have come into the hands of that council. Liquor permits, \$27,758.14; liquor licenses, \$72,899.93. That makes up altogether over \$100,000 of revenue. From what you may call vice, there is an additional item running up pretty closely to \$30,000, and no one can take these items and look them over without coming to the absolute conviction that those two vices are legalized and regulated by this irresponsible council of half a dozen paid officials, merely and solely with reference to their revenue-producing powers. That is the astounding thing, that half a dozen paid officials of the Minister of the Interior or other members of the government should be put into a position, where they not only can legislate on those vital matters but collect and impose fees. Here, comes a significant illustration. What happened in 1898? In the year 1898 the Yukon commissioner, Mr. Ogilvie, had relegated to him the sole right of granting permits. The department here washed its hands of it; the minister here gave it over to Mr. Ogilvie. Much has been said with regard to Mr. Ogilvie, his wisdom, how fit he is to govern and everything of that kind, but here is a lurid light, thrown upon

his position in this respect. No sooner did he get that great power to himself than he did what? Simply gave the impression as broad as it should be, that anybody might bring liquor into the Yukon if he would simply pay the \$2 per gallon when brought across the border. What did that mean? It meant unrestricted permits. Not many weeks had passed before he issued permits up to 100,000 gallons of whisky to come into Dawson district and city. The moment that leaked out, the government here became alarmed, and in April, 1898, finding out what had been done by Mr. Ogilvie, the government passed an order in council prohibiting him from granting any more permits and prohibiting the entrance of any liquors on permits which had been given by Mr. Ogilvie, provided these liquors were not already in transit. There came a very odd state of things; men had made application to the Minister of the Interior here; they had been referred by him to Mr. Ogilvie as having the power to grant permits; Mr. Ogilvie had granted the permits and taken their money, and these men had made their purchases, and were preparing to take in their liquor under that authority. All at once, and before that liquor had started, or when some of it was under way, they were met by an order in council declaring these permits cancelled, and that all liquor not actually in transit should be prohibited coming in. Then followed an interesting chapter—how the minister backed and tided. First he declared he would stand by the prohibition of the council, and then gave way to attorneys who were selected for the purpose, and compromised gradually with one after another, until he had allowed some 50,000 gallons to come in, although he had declared by his order in council that none of it should come in. That is a sample of what has taken place under what you may call one man government. That is why the people of Dawson City and district have been for the last year agitating, in a perfectly orderly way with great persistence, in order that at least they might have some share in the local government at Dawson and in the disposal of the moneys which they themselves contribute. No one dare for a moment say that had the Yukon country and Dawson City had an able representative in this House, direct from the people, any of those things could have been allowed to go on a single year. Under the pressure of the people, through the mouth of their representative, this state of thing would have been so shown up that it would have been impossible to allow it to continue. But none of us here could speak for the people, we had not the representative authority, we were away from the scene of government, and consequently this kind of government had gone on. There does not seem any reason at all why the Act giving the powers parliament was willing to give, and which went into force last year, should not have

been proclaimed, and the people of Dawson have had their representation, small though it was, in the Yukon council, where such large revenues were collected, such important ordinances enacted, and such large expenditures made presumably in the people's interests. Now, there is another instructive thing, and that is as to the kind of expenditure. But, I do not propose to go into that to-day; I shall leave that until we get into the consideration of the Yukon items—although, I must say, I shall be at the mercy of the House if I discuss it there, because we do not make the appropriations; it is not our revenue under the law, but entirely a local revenue. Nevertheless, I may be allowed to make a few explanations with reference to the manner of their expenditure. Under these circumstances, I think we should not delay one single moment in giving to the people of the Yukon an authoritative and representative status and place in this parliament by one of their own people, one from that country who knows that country, one elected by the people there, one who will be ready and able to point out to us—to every man on both sides, every one of whom I believe, wants to do what is best for the Yukon, but for lack of knowledge and extreme conflict of opinion does not know—what is best for that country. But one thing I am sure of, and that is, that an autocratic government of the kind I have described as existing in Dawson is not the best kind for an intelligent people, so active, with such large money and property interests—a people have made their homes in the Yukon, and who ought not to be kept out of their proper share of representation in this House. From seventeen to twenty-five thousand people in that district, ought, apart from all other considerations, to have ample representation at home and in this House if for no other reason, than because of the great material interests that are involved. Therefore, I am sorry that the First Minister has not acceded to the request to give representation in this House to the city of Dawson and the Yukon territory, just as soon as proper legislation can be put upon the statute-book.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). There can be no possible objection to the principle involved in the motion before the House. Certainly, when a people who are being taxed make representation that they ought to be able to send representatives to parliament, there is only one answer that can be given, and that is to grant the request. But, of course, it takes a special case, and a special case has been made out. But, I affirm there are other cases that can be made out, and any proposition that sets out to deal with the matter should cover all cases. There are other cases that the rapid development of the North-west has made it just as important should have consideration in the matter of representation as the Yukon at the present time. The constituency that

I represent, for instance, at the time the last census was taken, was just about up to the unit of representation—one member of this House to about 22,000 or 23,000 population, that being about the population of the city of Winnipeg at that time. But, since then, the population has doubled, and we are at great disadvantage and have not proper representation in this House. But, there is this further difficulty. It seems almost certain, in fact, with the steps we are going to take, it is certain, that in the next parliament the Yukon will be represented here. But, are some of the western constituencies going to be properly represented in this House for the next five years if some provision is not made? I cannot see that Winnipeg is going to have adequate representation with other communities in this parliament. It is almost impossible that the next election can be held on the basis of the census to be taken next year. And, that being the case, the next election will settle representation in this House for the next five years. So, in 1904, we shall have one representative here for a population, probably, of from 70,000 to 75,000. That is quite as important a consideration and quite as important a grievance as the Yukon can have. At the same time, I imagine the feeling of the House is to concede this case; and the only question is the proper way and the legal way to do it. I submit, even to the mover of this motion, that the whole North-west should be taken into consideration on this question.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I would ask the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether he will state to the House, after what he has told us, if it is his intention to introduce legislation this session making provision for an early census next year?

The PRIME MINISTER. I shall have to take that into consideration.

House divided on amendment (Sir Charles Tupper):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Beattie.	Macdonald (King's).
Bell (Addington).	MacLaren.
Bell (Pictou).	Maclean.
Bennett.	McAlister.
Blanchard.	McCleary.
Borden (Halifax).	McInerney.
Cargill.	McLennan (Glengarry).
Casgrain.	Martin.
Clancy.	Mills.
Clarke.	Monk.
Cochrane.	Moore.
Craig.	Morin.
Dugas.	Poupore.
Ferguson.	Powell.
Foster.	Prior.
Ganong.	Rcche.
Gillies.	Rosamond.
Gilmour.	Sproule.
Haggart.	Taylor.
Henderson.	Tisdale.
Hodgins.	Tupper (Sir Charles
Kaulbach.	Hibbert), and
Klock.	Wallace.—46.
LaRivière.	

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Bazinet,	Joly de Lotbinière
Beith,	(Sir Henri),
Belcourt,	Lang,
Bell (Prince),	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Blair,	Lavergne,
Bourbonnais,	Legrin,
Britton,	Lewis,
Burnett,	Logan,
Calvert,	MacPherson,
Campbell,	McCarthy,
Casey,	McGugan,
Charlton,	McHugh,
Copp,	McIsaac,
Cowan,	McLennan (Inverness),
Davies (Sir Louis),	McMillan,
Dechêne,	McMullen,
Demers,	Madore,
Dobell,	Meigs,
Douglas,	Mignault,
Fielding,	Morrison,
Fitzpatrick,	Mulock,
Flint,	Oliver,
Fortier,	Parmalee,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Paterson,
Fraser (Lambton),	Pettit,
Frost,	Proulx,
Geoffrion,	Puttee,
Godbout,	Richardson,
Gould,	Rogers,
Graham,	Ross,
Gulté,	Russell,
Harwood,	Rutherford,
Heyd,	Savard,
Holmes,	Stubbs,
Hurley,	Sutherland,
Hutchison,	Tucker, and
	Wood.—72.

## PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Scriven,	Marcotte,
Davis,	Hale,
Tolmie,	Montague,
Snetsinger,	Reid,
Christie,	Roddick,
Featherston,	Carroll,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Gibson,	Corby,
Talbot,	Bergeron,
Fisher,	McNeill,
Johnston,	Wilson,
Turcot,	Robertson,
Ratz,	McIntosh,
Ethier,	Osler,
Costigan,	Caron,
Stenson,	Davin,
McGregor,	Kendry,
Champagne,	Kloepfer,
Ellis,	McDougall,
Sifton,	Hughes,
Tarte,	Ingram,
Semerville,	Earle,
Landerkin,	Guillet,
Bostock,	McIntosh,
Lemieux,	Tyrwhitt,
Maxwell,	Pope,
Penny,	Quinn,
Semple,	Robinson,
Edwards,	Kendry,
Carroll,	Broder,
Macdonell,	Seagram,
Fortin,	Chauvin,
Dyment,	McCormick,

Amendment (Sir Charles Tupper) negatived.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

## APPROACHES TO HALIFAX HARBOUR.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before you leave the Chair, I desire to bring to the attention of the House the matter which I mentioned a short time ago, that is the question of the approaches to Halifax harbour. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) will, I think, agree with me that no public expenditure is productive of greater benefit than an expenditure which renders the harbours of this country safe for the commerce which enters them. They are the highways which connect our country with foreign countries, and it is absolutely necessary, if the commerce of this country is to be developed, that our harbours should be made absolutely safe, or at least as nearly safe as it is possible to render them. Now, representations have been made to the government now in power, as well as to the governments which have existed in the past, with reference to the necessity of a lightship in the harbour of Halifax. I believe that reports have been made on that subject, and that the matter has been to some extent investigated by the Department of Marine and Fisheries; but I do not know to what extent it has been dealt with by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is perfectly obvious that it is a matter which should receive immediate attention, if it has not already received that attention. The harbour of Halifax has probably as great natural security as any harbour in the world. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows well that a steamer leaving the harbour of Halifax can be out in the middle of the Atlantic two hours after she has left the wharf. The natural position of the harbour is all that could be desired, the approach to the harbour is perfect, and the only thing that is necessary is for the hon. gentleman to give such attention to the matter of lighting the approaches to that harbour as will put it in that respect upon an equality with the best harbours in the world. As the hon. gentleman has no doubt had his attention directed to the subject, I will not occupy much time with it, but I will read, as placing in a concise form before the House the reasons in support of what I am now urging upon the minister, the report made by a sub-committee of the Halifax Board of Trade to that body in the latter part of the month of March. The report is as follows :

The President of the Board of Trade.

Sir.—At a meeting of ship-owners, ship agents, ship masters and others interested in the port of Halifax, held on Monday, 12th instant, a committee was appointed to report to your council the opinions of that meeting as to the necessity for improving the approaches to the harbour.

The meeting had before it the correspondence between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and your board on the same subject.

The committee would report to your council the information gained at that meeting, and

since then in conference with ship masters and others sailing in and out of this port.

The consensus of opinion is that the guides to the approaches to the harbour of Halifax are not in keeping with the importance of the place as a great commercial port, and the great number of vessels of all sizes which frequent it. That a properly equipped lightship, with a powerful siren, is a necessity off Sambro as a safeguard to the harbour in foggy weather, or during snow-storms, that being the most dangerous part of the entrance in such weather.

Your committee are of the opinion that if the lightship placed there in 1874 was deemed necessary at that time, that it is much more so now that the trade of the port has increased. Some who had doubts about the possibility of keeping a lightship at Sambro, have changed their opinion since seeing so many lightships on the American coasts, and which they have no difficulty in keeping in just as much exposed conditions as Sambro. It has been urged that the experiment was tried and failed. Your committee would point out that the vessel placed there was not at all adapted for the purpose, and had to ride from her heavy chains and was not of sufficient buoyancy. Modern lightships are built and fitted for the service. Many ship masters at the meeting stated, that they rarely hear the bomb now used at Sambro; that since the introduction of the ten-minute service they seem to be less powerful than before. They also are of the opinion that while the automatic buoy off Pennant is of some use, it does not meet the wants, and must only be considered as there temporarily; that these automatic buoys are hard to locate and are apt to lose their sound through ice or debris collecting in them, and under any circumstances cannot be heard any distance from them;

This committee agrees with them for the reason that they who navigate those waters are better judges of what is required than are those who are only theoretical navigators, and would earnestly recommend your board to again make an insistent application for a properly equipped lightship at Sambro. As to the cost, your committee would point out that one vessel lost in that vicinity for want of some such warning might cost more than a lightship many times over, to say nothing of the lives that might be lost.

That clause emphasizes in a very forcible manner what I pointed out to the minister a moment ago, namely, that you cannot expend public money to better purpose than in making the approaches to the harbours on our coast as nearly absolutely safe as it is possible for us to make them; because the loss of one steamer in any of our harbours would mean many times over the expense of a lightship of this kind. The report continues as follows:

Your committee have had placed before them a letter from Capt. Pye, ss. 'Halifax' (which they inclose). He complains that the fog-horn at Meagher's Beach cannot be heard at any distance, complaints are numerous as to that signal; ship-masters and pilots declare that they very seldom hear it in thick weather, and have sometimes come in the harbour without hearing it. Either it is not powerful enough or it is not properly attended to. Attention should be directed to it.

The buoy on the Middle Ground has been complained of by masters of steamers coming in at night as liable to break their propellers; being in

the fairway, it is hard to locate at night. Your board first asked for an electric gong buoy, failing that, for a gas buoy. Application has been made to the department on the same subject from other sources and would bear renewal by your board.

Now, there is a letter referred to in this report from Captain Pye of the steamship *Halifax*, who is a navigator of great experience in many parts of the world, and who has had many years of very special experience in entering and departing from the harbour of Halifax. The steamship *Halifax* has plied between Halifax and Boston for many years, and Captain Pye has taken his vessel in and out of the harbour under all possible conditions of wind and weather. In a letter dated the 13th of March last, directed to the board of trade, he says this:

Dear Sir,—I desire to call your attention to the bomb signal now fired from Sambro Island in thick weather, and to report that since the change in the time of exploding them, neither myself nor my officers have been able to hear them, although we have passed, as you know, frequently during thick weather and as close as safety would warrant my going.

I do not consider them of any service, nor could they be depended upon to navigate into Halifax harbour. I would also call your attention to the fog signal at Meagher's Beach light. It is impossible to hear this at any distance. It is now useless, as a ship would be on shore before hearing same in a southerly wind.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I know that he has this matter at heart, that if nothing has been done to remedy this condition of affairs in Halifax harbour since this report has been forwarded to him, it is high time more active measures were taken. This experienced navigator says that he passed in thick weather, close to Sambro Island, that he could not hear, that he never heard the bomb signal at all, and that he does not consider this bomb signal of any service at all, that it cannot be depended upon for safe navigation into Halifax harbour. If Captain Pye is correct in regard to that, and I cannot assume that he would wilfully make any misstatement, it seems to me that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if he has not done so, should take action in regard to it at once.

This matter is more urgent, and there is more necessity that the minister should deal promptly and energetically with the question, not only in Halifax harbour, but in every other important harbour upon our coasts, because of the unjust discrimination in insurance rates which is being made against us in the old country. In respect to that we do not want anything more than fair-play, but we think, after what has taken place in the past, we are entitled to fair-play in respect to this as well as to other matters. Is it right or just that Canadian ports should be discriminated against in the way in which they are being discriminated against at present by the underwriters? We know that the har-

bour of Halifax and all the other important harbours in this country, are perfectly safe for navigation, and that many of them are a great deal safer than American ports, which receive lower rates of insurance. I can safely challenge any hon. gentleman in this House, or any person anywhere else, to name an American port which is as safe, other things being equal, as the harbour of Halifax. Provided with proper lights, lightships and signals, I can most confidently assert that there is not a harbour in North America that has as safe an entrance as the harbour of Halifax.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Except Sydney.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, would like me to except Sydney. I would not like to except Sydney, but Sydney comes second to Halifax.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is St. John?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will not make any remarks in regard to St. John. I am not prepared to enter into any controversy in regard to these harbours. We must look upon all of our harbours as Canadian harbours, and not regard them from the local standpoint. I think they are all pretty good harbours; I have only dealt with Halifax particularly, and, I repeat, that other things being equal, it is the safest harbour on the North American continent. Is it right, when we are trying to develop our commerce and improve our steamship facilities, and when our steamship trade and commerce are developing in this country in such a marked manner, that we should be subjected to this unjust discrimination? I have brought this matter to the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries before: I urged upon him the importance of taking some action in regard to this matter. I know that boards of trade throughout the country have attempted to take action, and the hon. minister has asserted that the government is taking action. I would like the hon. minister to tell me what action the government has taken, as to remedying this intolerable state of affairs in regard to insurance rates. Is it taking any action on its own motion? Is it asking the boards of trade in this country to take any united action? Is there anything which the hon. minister might convey to the House in the way of information in respect to it, and if he has not seen his way clear to taking any effective action in regard to it, or, if any action which he has taken has not been effective, will the hon. minister inform the House what the government intends to do in order to remedy this state of affairs which cannot be allowed to exist in this country? We have the harbours, we have the facilities, we have the commerce, which we desire to expand and develop, and we cannot expand and develop our commerce anywhere in a way that we otherwise would be able to do, if we are to be subjected to this unjust and scandalous

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

discrimination in insurance rates. I say the circumstances that this state of affairs has prevailed should impress upon the attention of this government the absolute importance of leaving nothing undone to render the important harbours of this country absolutely safe, and to remedy the state of affairs that exists, so far as it is possible, for the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with the resources of this country behind him, to remedy it. I, therefore, trust that the hon. gentleman will, in the first place, take into consideration what I have endeavoured to impress upon him in regard to the harbour of Halifax, and that, secondly, he will not fail to take effective action in respect to these insurance rates so far as it is in his power to do so.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). Mr. Speaker, I fully endorse the views so well expressed by the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), in respect to the necessity of a lightship at the mouth of Halifax harbour, off Sambro Island. There is no person in this House who is more familiar with that harbour, the hon. senior member for Halifax not excepted, than myself, having occasion to enter and depart from that harbour very many times during the year. I have frequently been off that harbour for hours in a snowstorm, or in stormy weather, during which time the master tried to ascertain his whereabouts, and was compelled to remain, in one case, all night, in order to feel that he was affording perfect safety to his ship and to his passengers, before entering the harbour, whereas, if a lightship had been there, he would have had no difficulty in proceeding up the harbour without delay. There is need of a lightship at the entrance of the port of Halifax, for the benefit of the merchant shipping, and it would be of advantage to foreign shipping as well as our own, entering the port, in the way of a reduction of insurance rates. Insurance rates at present are enormous, and are becoming greater every year for the want of better harbour guides, or approaches, to the harbour of Halifax. Halifax harbour is the principal port in Nova Scotia, and next to it, I think, I can place the harbour of Lunenburg, in the county which I represent. I feel satisfied that I am not exaggerating, when I say that next to the port of Halifax, there is no other port that has a larger amount of shipping owned by it, than the port of Lunenburg, and the entries and departures of vessels to and from the port of Lunenburg, are greater than there are to and from any other port in Nova Scotia, save that of Halifax.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And Sydney.

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), says 'Sydney.' I think I may agree with him that it may be equal to Lunenburg, but I do not think it will surpass it—certainly not in ownership.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I admit that.

Mr. KAULBACH. In regard to Lunenburg I made application for a bell buoy at 'Eastern Point,' on the eastern side of the harbour of Lunenburg, which has proven a great necessity from the fact that last year, within a few weeks, a vessel and a steamer were wrecked at that point, and became total losses, besides several other vessels in that neighbourhood. I was a passenger on the *Dominion City* three years ago when that vessel was wrecked and completely destroyed. We were in a perilous position all night, having had to put to sea in the smaller boats, the lifeboats being carried away, and the only way in which we were able to keep afloat was by means of separate life-belts lashed beneath the thwarts of the longboat, in which eighteen of us were, the sea playing over us all the time. Had there been a bell buoy on the eastern side of the harbour we would have known our position accurately, and we would have been able to escape the dangerous island beyond that, known as Duck Island. I wrote to the Minister of Marine and strongly urged the placing of a bell buoy there. We have an automatic on the west side of the harbour, but we want a bell buoy on the east side. It is a small matter, but I have had nothing more than a mere acknowledgment of the receipt of that letter, and the request has not been complied with so far. I trust that in the interest of the shipowners and of the insurance companies, the minister will meet that request at the earliest possible moment, not forgetting the lightship off Halifax harbour, which is a very great necessity for the shipping of Lunenburg, as Halifax harbour is a port they frequent repeatedly on their way east. I, therefore, in the most earnest manner, urge upon the minister the request that has been made by the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden.)

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I acknowledged the receipt of the letter received from my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach), and I have had his request submitted to the engineer of the department, who, a short time ago, made a report not favouring it very strongly, at all events for the present. The report of the engineer has only come within the last week, and I will have great pleasure in informing the hon. gentleman of the contents of it. The matter has not been finally disposed of. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) was courteous enough to let me know that he intended to bring this matter up to-day. I did not expect, however, that he was going to ally the increase in the insurance rates so much, with his demand for a lightship in Halifax harbour. This subject of insurance rates which, as the hon. gentleman properly observed, is applied unfairly towards Canada and British North America, is a larger one than the

hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) seems to think. It is a conclusion reached by Lloyds under the assumption that our River St. Lawrence route has not been provided with as many aids to navigation as it should have, and in addition to that, it partly arises because of the alleged improper manner in which we place deck loads on deal-carrying ships. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has asked what we have done to bring the facts to the attention of those who are responsible for these increased rates. Well, my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Dobell), a member of the government, was in England a year ago, and he brought the matter specially to the attention of Lloyds, and had a consultation with the leading men of that great insurance body.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do I understand that the navigation of the River St. Lawrence, and the question of deck loads, has induced Lloyds to make the change with respect to Halifax and other ports of Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I fear very much so. Illogical as it may appear, they class all British North America together, and the people of St. John and Halifax, to some extent, suffer from the want of knowledge which this insurance body possesses of the improvements we have made in the St. Lawrence route. They will insist upon classing them all together. My hon. friend (Mr. Dobell) went to England and he submitted to Lloyds and to the English Board of Trade what the true facts are. I had a very carefully prepared memorandum, which was presented by the hon. gentleman to Lloyds and to the English Board of Trade, stating what we had done during the past few years towards improving the navigation of the St. Lawrence. I pointed out to them that everything was being done that could be done in the way of buoying and lighting the St. Lawrence. It was stated that we had completed a most costly fog-alarm, provided with all the latest improvements, at Belle Isle light station. It was shown that this was a most desirable improvement, and that it was much appreciated by those interested in shipping and insurance. I pointed out that we had a very large new and improved lighthouse at Flower Ledge, opposite Pointe d'Amour in Belle Isle Straits, and that I knew of no other aids to navigation which were recommended by those who understood the route thoroughly. Then, coming up the river, we had constructed, at a large cost, a permanent lighthouse at the Traverse instead of the old lightship, and I also showed that we were increasing the power of the lights as opportunity offered. All these matters were submitted by my hon. friend (Mr. Dobell) to the Lloyds, but they contended that the manner in which we loaded our deals was one of the reasons why they increased the rates against us. That matter has been under con-

sideration for some time. I had a consultation this very session with shipping men from the different parts of the Dominion, but we could not get them to agree in the suggested changes which my hon. friend (Mr. Dobell) submitted to me with regard to the loading of these deck cargoes. The contention of Lloyds is, that no ship should be allowed to sail from Canada unless the deck load was inspected and approved by a proper officer appointed for that purpose. The merchants in some parts of the Dominion insist that they should not be subjected to this, because they said that they were satisfied with the rates of insurance—one of the largest firms in the city of St. John stated that the insurance rates they obtained were satisfactory to them, and while they had no objection to inspection at St. John, yet if all deck loads were inspected it would apply to Granite Island and Parrsboro, and other outlying ports and their vessels would be subjected to great delays. The matter is under consideration. I know the great importance that Lloyds attach to that particular feature, and I know how persistently and consistently, in season and out of season, my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Dobell) has urged this matter upon me. However, in face of the strong differences of opinion which exist among shipping-owners, I did not feel myself in a position to introduce that compulsory law. But we have submitted to the English Lloyds and the board of trade all that we have done in relation to these aids to navigation, and all we propose doing. In face of the fact that some merchants are not subjected to these increased insurance rates, the matter is one not so very easy of determination. I have been obliged to give a great deal of study to this matter, and I think that the shipping interests of the maritime provinces, and also those of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, are most unjustly and irrationally discriminated against by the English Lloyds; but they say that the losses have been so great that we shall have to give them time, and prove by the results of the present year, that the navigation of our rivers and harbours is as safe as we claim it is. They say that the losses of previous years justified them in increasing the rates; but that if we show that by the improvements we have made, navigation is safer than it was, they will be prepared to reduce the rates later on. With respect to the immediate subject which my hon. friend has brought to my attention, I had an opportunity, when in Halifax last year, of seeing the board of trade and listening to their representations on this subject; and, after I had seen them and heard their representations, I had the good fortune to have the officers of the department there—Capt. Smith, chairman of the board of examiners of Masters and Mates, who has had a large experience of

ocean navigation when commander of one of the Allan boats; Capt. Bloomfield Douglas, Commander Spain, Mr. Hutchins, and Capt. Campbell of the steamer *Newfield*. I had the opportunity of going over with them all the representations made by the board of trade, with the aid of charts and maps, showing all the aids to navigation in and around the Halifax harbour, and the conclusion reached was that there was no necessity for a lightship. Halifax harbour is one of the best and safest harbours on the Atlantic coast, and the evidence was that even in the greatest fogs, with the existing aids, it was possible to navigate any ship safely into the harbour. I am very far from throwing any cold water on the proposition. I recognize the force of what the hon. gentleman says that in a matter of this kind the expenditure of a few thousand dollars should not stand in the way. If the lightship is a necessity, it should be granted; but my hon. friend will agree with me that if those to whom I have to look for advice, advise me that it is not a necessity, although it may be to some extent desirable, I am justified in going a little slowly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my hon. friend will permit me, I might suggest that if the opinions of his officers do not coincide with the opinions of persons who have navigated the harbour and have had practical experience of it, such as Capt. Pye, he might make a departmental investigation under chapter 115 of the statutes, and take evidence on the subject.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Precisely. The board of trade of the city of Halifax last winter, I think about the middle of March, forwarded through the colleague of my hon. friend another representation to me on the subject, and they forwarded a second one to me through the Minister of Finance. I sat down with my hon. friend's colleague, Mr. Russell, and showed him the inquiries I had made, and the facts I had gathered when I was in Halifax in the previous autumn, and the advice then given to me by the officers to whom I have referred. Some of those officers were sailing in and out of that harbour every few weeks. For instance, Capt. Campbell, the commander of the *Newfield*, one of the most experienced men of Halifax harbour, was one whose advice I had the opportunity of getting. I also had the advice of Capt. Smith and Commander Spain, who are in and out of that harbour pretty often. I thought it better to have a formal report made by these officers; and almost as soon as I received the request of the Halifax Board of Trade, I sent it down to Halifax, and desired that the agent there should call all the officers together and have them make a thorough examination of the statement made in the memorial of the board of trade, and a full

report to me on the subject. On the 25th of May I received that report, which says :

At a conference held at the Nova Scotia agency of the Department of Marine and Fisheries on Wednesday, the 23rd day of May, to discuss and report on a letter addressed by the Halifax Board of Trade to the department relative to improvements in aids to navigation in the approaches to Halifax harbour, and also within the harbour limits, there being present the following officers of the department, viz.:

Mr. C. A. Hutchins, superintendent of lights and acting agent.

Capt. W. H. Smith, R.N.R., chairman of board of examiners of masters and mates.

Capt. Bloomfield Douglas, R.N.R., naval assistant.

Commander Spain, fisheries protection service.

The following conclusions were arrived at: 1. We are of opinion that it would be advantageous, in order to follow out the salutary principle of 'lighting outside the danger,' to establish a lightship off the approach to Halifax harbour, but we are by no means agreed as to the absolute necessity for it, considering the little difficulty, under existing aids, experienced by vessels entering the harbour, especially by coastwise vessels, or others having made and located a 'landfall' east or west of Halifax.

The general conclusion embodied in that sentence I have from almost every nautical man, that Halifax harbour is such a magnificent harbour that there is not so very much difficulty even in fogs, with the existing aids, of entering it in perfect safety.

We beg to point out that, since the unsuccessful attempt to establish a lightship off the harbour in 1874, various additions and improvements have been made by the department to assist vessels in finding their way back into the port, especially in foggy or thick weather. In 1877 the inner automatic buoy was placed, followed by the outer automatic in 1878, and the Sambro automatic in 1890. In 1891 the steam fog whistle was removed from Sambro to Chebucto Head, and explosive rocket signals established at Sambro.

In 1899 a fog trumpet was established at Meagher's Beach, and the fog bell removed to George's Island. Therefore, the argument used by the board of trade 'that if a lightship was considered necessary in 1874, it is much more necessary now,' loses much of its force.

Because, although there has been an increase in the shipping of Halifax harbour, there has also been a great increase in the aids to navigation in that harbour.

Besides the foregoing, the 'Neverfail' and 'Middle Ground' shoals have been buoyed, a bell buoy substituted at Thrum Cap for a can buoy, and the S. W. breaker off Sambro marked by a can buoy instead of a spar. The automatic buoy established last year off Pennant, although not much use to ocean-going ships, is nevertheless useful to coasters and fishermen.

Now, I am not going to permit my mind to come to an adverse conclusion on this matter simply because an attempt was made to have a lightship in 1874, and was unsuccessful; far from it. We have made great advances in the construction of lightships since 1874. A good lightship, with the latest improvements, will cost about \$80,-

000; but the matter of cost in my mind is not going to stand in the way. Halifax harbour is of sufficient importance that if a lightship is a necessity, the matter of \$80,000 or \$90,000 is not going to stand in the way; but the officers do not share the opinion of the board of trade that it is a necessity.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask whether that report has been submitted to the board of trade?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. They report upon other matters. In case the lightship should be constructed, where should it be placed? On that point they seem to share the opinion of Capt. Pye, that if built it should be placed near Sambro Island. I may say the chief engineer of the department dissents from that in toto. He thinks the lightship should not be placed near the existing danger, but away out in the fair haven, some miles away from the Island of Sambro.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was not the old lightship run into?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If drifted away altogether. The vessels that seek to gain Halifax harbour from the south and west are too apt to creep in around Sambro Island instead of giving that island a wide berth, and the difficulties and accidents which have occurred have been almost always due to the fact that these vessels will hug too near these dangerous shoals and places. There is plenty of room at the entrance of the harbour, and there is no justification for vessels creeping in around Sambro Island at all. The *Portia* I think it was, which came up the other day, got into trouble there simply because, instead of keeping well clear of Sambro Island, she came along at full speed in foggy weather and as near as she could to the fog signal. The object of fog signals is not to induce vessels to come near these dangerous spots. They should keep away from them. The chief engineer reports that if parliament determines to build a lightship, that ship, instead of being placed near the island, should be placed midway in the harbour, far from the island, thus inducing vessels to keep out in the open water where there is no danger whatever. I referred that part of the petition to the chief engineer for his report, and the chief engineer, who has given the matter a great deal of consideration, thus commented on this report from the officers in Halifax:

I have given serious consideration to the report submitted by Mr. Hutchins on the subject of improving aid to navigation in the approaches to Halifax harbour. With reference to improved signal buoys, I am not sure that the new buoy is yet a practical success, but I am now writing to the inventor asking him to send me particulars, cost, and so forth.

That paragraph would hardly be intelligible unless I referred to the letter which Mr.

Hutchins wrote, inclosing the report I have just been reading. In that letter he calls special attention to the fact that there had been lately discovered new automatic signal buoys, whereby the rise and fall of the waves is utilized to furnish the necessary power to generate electricity, and suggests the desirability of purchasing some of those new automatic signal buoys. The advantage over the ordinary Courtney whistling buoy we now possess is that these other automatic buoys signal not only one sound but several distinctive and recognizable blasts of different kinds as a warning to ships. The chief engineer is in correspondence with the inventor, and is endeavouring to form a conclusion whether that automatic buoy has reached that stage of advancement when it would be safe for us to purchase any of them. The chief engineer says :

There is no doubt that the local sentiment is very strongly in favour of establishing a first-class modern lightship in the fairway outside Halifax harbour, and such a lightship would doubtless be regarded by sailors as the best aid to navigation that we could possibly put. Personally, I have never been able to convince myself that so expensive an aid is absolutely necessary.

That is the state of mind the chief engineer is in now, and as he doubts the absolute necessity for a new lightship recommended by these gentlemen whose report I have read, I have not yet been able to reach the conclusion that I would be justified in recommending to council that such an aid to navigation was imperatively necessary and that immediate provision should be made for it.

There are one or two other points to which my hon. friend referred and concerning which I would like to draw attention to the report made upon them. For instance, with reference to bombs :

In regard to Captain Pye's statement that since changing the time of firing the bombs from twenty minutes' to ten minutes' interval neither he nor his officers have been able to hear them, it would infer that a change has also been made in the explosive power of the cartridges since supplied. We have no information in regard to this, but presume that no such change has been made; and we have evidence that they have been distinctly heard by others.

With regard to Meagher's Beach fog-alarm, these gentlemen say :

The sound is produced by a trumpet operated by compressed air. It is not advisable to make this alarm too powerful for fear of conflicting with the steam fog-whistle at Chebucto Head. It should be distinctly heard as far as the Litchfield buoy, and some overhauling by Inspector Stevens would doubtless result in increasing its efficiency to this end.

The chief engineer upon that recommends that a better light be put in the lantern at Meagher's Beach and an occulting light be put in at George's island. That improvement will be carried out. The improve-

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

ment recommended in the report I have read is that at George's island the two vertical lights be changed to the following : Upper to be a revolving or flash white light and lower light to be a fixed white light. That also has been approved and will be carried out.

There was another point. The middle ground shoals was complained of as being somewhat dangerous to navigation, and the board of trade reported to me that the naval authorities were willing to remove that middle ground if we would undertake the expense of supplying the necessary bomb material. I advised that we would bear that expense, but was informed afterwards that the board of trade had received a letter from the officer in command stating that after making an examination of the middle ground, the work was found very expensive and recommended that it should be removed by dredging. I have, therefore, referred the papers to the Minister of Public Works, in the hope that he will remove that middle ground by dredging. It may be a little expensive but ought to be done, as far as I can judge from the reports made to me.

I do not know that I can add anything more to what has been said. If my hon. friend desires, I will give him a copy of these reports, or, better still, furnish them to the Halifax Board of Trade. And if any reasonable doubt is left in my mind, after thinking the matter over further, as to the propriety of recommending the building of this lightship, I will adopt the course recommended by my hon. friend, and take the opinions of others than the officers of the department, and have a report made, not only by the mercantile marine officers, but by the admirals and captains at the naval stations.

Mr. KAULBACH. I think it is very unfair for the hon. minister to give as a reason why that public work should not be erected, because of the opinion of one of his officers. His officer, it is well known, is confined to his office the major portion of his time and knows nothing comparatively of the necessity for the work.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Kaulbach) has already spoken.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have only a word to say—I wish to ask a question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It can only be by the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. KAULBACH. I do not intend to make a speech. But I will not allow that any person can advance an opinion on this subject better than my own. I am familiar with the port ; and I think that my opinion should be accepted by the minister himself and not referred to an official with little knowledge of the requirements. I am sure the people of my own county will accept it, and will say I am right and that he is wrong in coming to the opinion he has ex-

pressed as to the report of this official, Colonel Anderson. I would also ask the minister if he is not in error with regard to the expense of the lightship. He says that it would cost \$80,000 or \$90,000. That seems to me an immense amount.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I spoke with knowledge when I mentioned that amount. The officer went to New York for the purpose of examining lightships and ascertaining the cost, and we learned exactly what it would cost.

Mr. R. R. DOBELL (Quebec West). I do not know that I can add very much to what has fallen from the lips of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). I entirely agree with what he has said; but I think I may, perhaps, explain a little more closely, the change that I believe is wanted in the deck-load law. I may also say that I sympathize, to a very great extent, with what has been said by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) and the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach). I once had an experience off Halifax somewhat similar to that described by the hon. member for Lunenburg. I arrived off Halifax on a January night about seven o'clock. A heavy snow storm was raging. We made Chebucto Head light, but lost it again. We went out to sea and came back, and repeated that two or three times; and it was not until morning that we got into Halifax harbour. I could easily understand that it would be of very great benefit if a powerful lightship could be anchored in such a way, that, in entering the harbour, the mariner could keep the lightship on the one hand and Chebucto Head light on the other. At the time, I made inquiry as to the practicability of placing a lightship there, but I was told that no lightship could hold in the bad weather. That, I think, is a point that requires grave consideration. The bottom there is very rocky, and I am told that in the heavy gales you get off that coast the lightship would very likely be driven on shore, and, instead of being a protection to the steamers seeking entrance to the harbour, it would actually be misleading and dangerous. But I am not sufficiently acquainted with the coast to give a definite opinion. If it is possible to put a lightship there, it should be done.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) state how long it was since he received information that a lightship would not hold there?

Mr. DOBELL. Just four years ago. I made the inquiry for the purpose of suggesting to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—the present minister (Sir Louis Davies)—that it was wanted. I believe that that or some other light is wanted off Halifax.

Now, as regards deck-loads, I may express personally my disappointment that we have not had a measure introduced changing the

present deck-load law, because I believe that the present law is, very largely, the cause of the discriminating in insurance against us, which has tended so much to place us at a disadvantage as compared with other North American ports. I had had two meetings with Lloyds last summer, and have had several letters from them since. They claim that it is not the total losses that caused the insurance to be so high, but the great number of small losses from deck-loads. They go as far as to state that, at one time, there was scarcely a single steamer that arrived on the other side without more or less loss. I looked into the reason for these losses, and found that the deck-loads were very carelessly put on the steamer, and very often the steamers left very cranky; so that, the moment they got to sea, over went a portion of the deck-load.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. You are speaking of summer deck-loads?

Mr. DOBELL. Heavy summer deck-loads.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) allow me to ask him a question. I wish to understand this matter. In view of what he says, why do not the insurance companies forbid deck-loads, instead of placing a ban on all the ports in Canada?

Mr. DOBELL. I do not think it is necessary to forbid deck-loads. But it is necessary to take other steps to meet the case. There are certain steamers, so built,—I will give you one, as an instance. She is on her way across the Atlantic now. She carries 600 St. Petersburg Standard deals on deck—that is, Mr. Speaker, 2,000 tons on deck—and she comes across the Atlantic with perfect safety—and I should have no objection at any time, to taking passage in her. But, with some steamers, if you put half that quantity on deck, they are not safe. Before they got to the European market, a portion of that deck-load would be thrown off. And that is what Lloyds have complained of over and over again, and what I would wish to have provided for. I would like to see a law providing that no deck-loads should be sent across the Atlantic without an examination and certificate given that the vessel has been properly loaded, and also that she is not overloaded. We received very strong opposition to that proposal, as stated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, from the city of St. John. But that is the only place in British North America that has raised any objection, and the opposition there is largely owing to the objection raised by one firm. It is quite true that the Board of Trade of St. John has sent out a petition against the change; but I claim that we should get a compensation in the carrying of winter deck-loads that would far

more than counterbalance any little charge that might be made for inspecting deck-loads during summer months.

Mr. KAULBACH. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) object to saying what firm in St. John he refers to?

Mr. DOBELL. I may give the name. It is public property. I refer to Messrs. William Thompson & Company. Other firms have approved the inspection, but this firm seemed very strong against it; and, at one time, they advanced arguments that did appear unanswerable. It is not worth while for me to enter into details as to how we met their objections, but I do not think there was any ground whatever for it. But, inasmuch as that change is necessary to the removal of discriminating rates against the ports of British North America. I feel very strongly that it ought to be made. Another reason why it should be done is this—that the Board of Trade of Great Britain at present will not allow more than three feet for a winter deck-load. Now, any one acquainted with the modern steamer knows perfectly well that with three feet of a load on the deck of a steamer crossing the Atlantic, if she takes a heavy sea on board, the sea will wash up the deck-load, causing it to float to and fro along the deck of the steamer, making it very dangerous for the men. The British Board of Trade said: If you will have satisfactory inspection of your summer deck-loads, we will amend the law by bringing in a Bill to allow you to load your deck-loads up to six feet in winter. This would be quite up to the bulwarks. By that means you can make your deck-load perfectly safe, and if a sea came over the side of your ship, instead of falling into the hold, it just floats off this deck-load, and makes the ship safer for life and for property, and meets the views of Lloyds. I cannot understand why it has been stopped. I had hoped that my hon. friend and colleague would think it wise to bring in a measure to add to the safety of ships, and to the lowering of the insurance, and I believe also very much to the advantage of navigation. The time has passed, I think, for getting legislation in England for this year to establish the six feet of deck-load in winter, therefore, we can wait till next year without any loss.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I am sorry the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House (Mr. Dobell), has resumed his seat, without referring to the very important subject raised by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), a subject on which he is especially qualified to speak, that is the question of discrimination by insurance companies, the increased rates of insurance against the ports in Canada. This is a matter of the gravest importance, and one of the strong reasons upon which, I understand, the member for Halifax bases his argument as to the necessity of estab-

Mr. DOBELL.

lishing this lightship, and of adopting every possible means to improve the harbour of Halifax, is that at this moment a harbour that is known to be one of the safest in the world, is under a ban by no less an authority than the insurance at Lloyds. There is an erroneous opinion that this is done by a committee of Lloyds. That is not the case. The insurance is fixed by the members who have desks in Lloyds, they are not under the control of what is called Lloyds' committee, who have no control over the rates of insurance. That is a matter I had occasion to learn, because I was specially requested by the Board of Trade of Sydney to investigate this question when I was last in London. I was most kindly received by Lloyds, and the fullest information was given me upon the subject, and they expressed their great regret that any such discrimination had been adopted. They said it was beyond the power of their committee to make a change, because the rate was established by the members who have desks in Lloyds, and who effect the insurance directly. I say it is urgent that the government should adopt measures to get rid of the increased rate of insurance that is now placed upon all vessels frequenting the harbours of British North America, that is practically what it amounts to. Every seafaring man knows that the port of Sydney is probably the safest on the continent of America, as there are dangers even at Halifax and on the St. Lawrence, that are not encountered at all at Sydney. Still the port of Sydney was discriminated against, with its enormous tonnage coming inwards and going outwards. The hundreds of vessels that visit that section of country are unable to go in and take the coal they require, in consequence of the increased rate of insurance that they are exposed to. My hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), knows perfectly well that there is not the slightest comparison in respect to the safety of vessels going to Sydney and those going to New York. Sydney is infinitely safer, yet a vessel goes to New York with immunity, where she is free from this additional charge imposed in Halifax and Sydney, and on the St. Lawrence generally. Looking at it from that point of view, I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not sufficiently appreciated the importance of establishing a lightship at the harbour of Halifax. The fact that there was one there before, and that it has not been maintained, does not alter the case, because since that occurred, a great improvement has been made in lightships, and it is now known that so far as the holding ground is concerned, lightships are to be found along the coasts of the United States in places where the holding ground is not anything like as good as it is in the harbour of Halifax. There is a general consensus of opinion that a lightship would greatly add to the safety of the entrance of that port. I hope that the gov-

ernment will give this question of discrimination immediate attention, and deal with it in the most energetic manner possible. It is a ban against the whole of Canada, and is having the most serious effect upon the trade and business of the country. I do not see why what is called Lloyds, should persist in maintaining a discrimination against Canadian ports, that is not justified by the facts, and if we cannot get relief in any other way, I would be in favour of considering the question of establishing a Canadian Lloyds of our own, in order to effectually protect our great and important shipping interests from discrimination.

Mr. DOBELL. I do not think the leader of the opposition heard what I said in my opening remarks. I said it was not so much the total losses that affected our standing at Lloyds, as the small and vexatious losses of the deck-loads.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You did not go into the general question of the discrimination against all shipping.

Mr. DOBELL. I said that if it was practical to keep a lightship on at Halifax, it was very desirable to do so. But the losses from Halifax have been very small. I do not know of any serious loss.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Still the discrimination exists.

Mr. DOBELL. Perfectly true, because Lloyds say it is the number of petty and vexatious claims they have arising from so many deck-loads being practically lost on way to Great Britain, and which we should provide against. I am happy to say that Lloyds are so well satisfied with the efforts that have been made to make our coasts safer and better lighted that even now they are not charging that 1 per cent extra insurance to September 1. After September 1, we hope they will not charge the additional 2 per cent which they charged last year, and which was a very serious burden. It is so serious, that one of the large corporations of this country, the Canada Atlantic Railway, say that after September they will not be able to bring any grain to Montreal, they will have to take it all to Boston, if this additional insurance is charged. So, I consider it is of the first importance that every effort that can be made to add to the safety from Belle Isle up the St. Lawrence and also to the Bay of Fundy, or Nova Scotian ports, should be made. There is nothing that will prove of greater advantage to the commerce of Canada than that we should be able to bring our cargoes and take our cargoes to and from Canada at the very lowest rate of insurance. It should be remembered that it is not 1 per cent on the cargo, but 1 per cent on the steamer that is charged. A steamer is worth from £75,000 to £80,000. Even some of these freight carriers cost from £150,000

to £200,000, and if they are to discriminate after September 1 to the extent of from 2 per cent to 3 per cent, it is prohibitive. Lloyds say that if you only can get through this year without any losses, this discrimination may be removed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to distinctly understand if it is a fact that, because the underwriters have lost on deck-loads, they have placed this ban upon all the harbours in Canada in respect to risks which do not relate to deck-loads at all. That seems to be a most extraordinary and illogical course.

Mr. DOBELL. I do not think any one would lay claim to that, because they take the average of their losses and see the result at the end of the year. If they have lost money in British North America, there is one or other of the underwriters who will say: What rate can you give on that risk? I will take nothing further north than Portland. Naturally, they have to go to outsiders to underwrite these risks, and they must pay a higher rate. When you have losses like that of the *Scotsman* and the *Castilian* upon our shores, although we are really not responsible for these, they operate against us. But, Lloyd's clearly say that they do not intend to go on in that way, because, they say: If you escape this year without any such losses we will remove that discrimination next year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They even charged the *Labrador* against us.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I think it is almost a pity that, with the best of intentions, we have permitted the question of insurance rates to be associated with the question of a lightship in Halifax harbour, because the question of the discrimination in insurance rates has nothing to do with losses that have occurred to vessels going into the port of Halifax. I am inclined to believe that the question of the discrimination of insurance rates is not based upon anything that has happened in connection with the harbour of Halifax, and that whether we should put a lightship off that harbour or not, although I would like to see one placed there, it would not have any serious effect on the question of insurance rates. But, I desire it to be understood that, while the question of insurance rates has arisen, it has not arisen because of any difficulty in connection with the harbour of Halifax, which, as has been pointed out, is one of the finest harbours in the world.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) will not understand me to suggest that that was the case.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) did not understand it in that way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was suggesting that since the board of trade has raised the question of the deficiency in the approaches to the harbour, it was the duty of the government, particularly at this period, to give attention to that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I quite understand that my hon. friend is only doing his duty in bringing the matter up here. At the same time, I think it is well that we should record the fact that the questions are in no way associated.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, I agree with that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) will be able, at no distant day, to comply with the request that has been made, but I would not like the impression to go abroad that even if a lightship should not be placed in Halifax harbour, the harbour would cease to be what it has always been, one of the best harbours in the world. When you get away from Halifax, I believe that, next to Halifax, the best harbour in Canada is the harbour of Shelburne, but it is too near six o'clock to dwell upon that.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

It being six o'clock, the committee took recess.

### AFTER RECESS.

(The House resumed in Committee.)

Department of the Interior, including  
\$2,400 to T. G. Rothwell and P. G.  
Keyes, \$2,200 to G. U. Ryley and \$1,800  
to J. White, notwithstanding anything  
in the Civil Service Act ..... \$102,524

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). When last I spoke on this matter I had concluded a review of the facts and the returns relative to the question of Mr. Ryley's conduct, touching important matters on the charges which I made relative to Mr. Philp having obtained concessions, or leases as they were termed, and of the connection that he said existed between Major Walsh, Mr. Sifton and himself in that regard. Now, the other improper interference of which I complain on the part of Mr. Ryley, is in connection with Dominion Creek. In the resolution that I took the responsibility of moving on the 31st of May it was important to show, touching the interest Major Walsh exhibited with reference to claims located by his servants and his ordering of the transfer of these claims to his brother, that he was the chief actor in regard to the closing of these properties against outside competition. The statement in my resolution was:

The Dominion Creek hills and benches in the Yukon district were closed from the location of

Mr. FIELDING.

claims by order of Major Walsh, contrary to the protest of the gold commissioner, on November 15, 1897.

I gave in that paragraph two references; one to page 79 of the evidence before the commission and the other to page 80; the former fully supporting the statement that the gold commissioner protested, and the later showing that the closing of the creek begun on the 15th of November, 1897. That was not (as often these resolutions may be in the introductory statement), a full and complete statement, but it was substantially correct because it was introducing as a relevant point the fact that Major Walsh was the party responsible for the closing of the creek. The evidence shows that while Major Walsh had the supreme authority he did not actually reach Dawson, though he had his commission. He was in the territory, however, on the 15th of November, 1897, and Mr. Fawcett had closed the creek proper, but not the hills and benches at that date. Major Walsh was shown to have come to Dawson and approved of Mr. Fawcett's action in closing the creek claims, and thus taking complete charge, and contrary to the written protest of Mr. Fawcett closing the hills and benches. It was considered important by the government in resisting this motion, and to establish that the foundation of this charge was entirely aside from the facts, to show that in truth Major Walsh had not been instrumental in closing the creek, but that it was the sole act of Mr. Fawcett, and the House must have appreciated the force of that argument if it were founded on the evidence because then a portion of the irregularity that was charged against Major Walsh would fall to the ground, and it would be seen that he had not paved the way for his servants and employees to go in advance of other prospectors and locate and record claims to advantage, which were afterwards to be transferred by Major Walsh to his brother. Therefore, as heretofore, in order to strengthen the position of the government on that point, Mr. Ryley was brought forth. Before coming to that point it is necessary for me to refer to the complete authority and responsibility of Major Walsh and his ratification of the action of Mr. Fawcett, which only partially served the plan upon which he subsequently acted. On February 7, of this session, this House ordered a return:

Of all reports, papers, telegrams and correspondence not already brought down relating to the closing (so-called) and opening (so-called) of Dominion Creek, referred to on page 79 of the Yukon evidence blue-book.

And it is significant that that order was not complied with until long after the debate, which was on the 31st of May. The order was complied with on the 13th of June; but the acting Minister of the Interior made use of a part of that return which had not been brought down, and which shows the ingenuity of Mr. Ryley,

and that is the document we will find relied upon by the Solicitor General and by the acting minister in combatting that substantial point as to the responsibility for the closing of the Dominion Creek hills and benches—because Dominion Creek could not be closed by simply closing the creek proper. Dominion Creek was fully closed, of course, when the hills and benches were removed from the enterprise of prospectors. On page 10 of this return, there is a memorandum entitled 'Memo. re closing of Dominion Creek;' and the statement there is from Mr. Fawcett:

No applications were accepted for claims on Dominion Creek from the 15th November, 1897, until after the 20th of December, 1897. Then, afterwards, at the solicitation of a number of applicants, the limit of the closed portion was set by me at 120 below. This I placed far enough down, so that the closed part would include all claims recorded prior to the closing. Again:

From the latter part of December until the 1st of February, there were more than 150 claims staked and recorded on the lower part of Dominion Creek.

Showing that by the action of Mr. Fawcett there had not been any complete closing of the hills and benches of the creek.

The closing of Dominion Creek was reported to Major Walsh, and approved by him.

Now, that information was before Mr. Ryley; but the information he gave to the acting minister and the Solicitor General is found on page 9 of this return; and we will see the part which Mr. Ryley played in this connection. He conducted an ex parte examination of Mr. Fawcett with an obvious purpose, so far as this paper goes; that is, in the language of lawyers, he led him and induced him to say by his questions as follows:

Q. At what date did you discontinue granting entries for claims on Dominion Creek?—A. November 15, 1897.

Q. What was your reason for closing the creek?

And so he goes on—no reference whatever in that document—and that is my object in referring to it—to the action of Major Walsh; and anybody looking at that return and reading that part of it prepared by Mr. Ryley, and his examination by Mr. Fawcett, would come to the conclusion that the acting minister came to and the Solicitor General came to, that is, that instead of Major Walsh having anything to do with the closing of that creek, it was Mr. Fawcett. I think that is clear. Neither of these gentlemen had pointed out to them by Mr. Ryley the manner of the classification of claims on Dominion Creek—the creek claims, the hills, and the benches. But when we come to the use that is made of this information, I would refer the committee to the Solicitor General's statement in debate. He was arguing—and his point was well taken if the facts warranted it—that I was entirely on the wrong track, that Major

Walsh did not interfere, that it was Mr. Fawcett, and therefore, there would have been no design at any rate on the part of Major Walsh to give his servants any advantage. And so he says:

The information I have is that it was done on the 17th of November, 1897, before Major Walsh went into that country, and that it was done, not by Major Walsh, but by Mr. Fawcett. That is the information I get from the officials of the department. Now, Mr. Walsh proceeds to the Yukon and arrives in Dawson—

I interrupt him on this point, and he says:

What I said a moment ago is information that I got from Mr. Ryley. I do not know who the gentleman is at all. It is to the effect that on November 15, 1897, Dominion Creek was closed by the gold commissioner, Thomas Fawcett. I give the information that was given to me.

Then he says:

Mr. Walsh reached Dawson somewhere towards the end of the month of May. It was then determined that as this creek had been surveyed, it would be advisable to open it up for settlement.

So that we have it, according to this, that Mr. Fawcett closed the creek, and Major Walsh interfered simply to open it. Again the Solicitor General says:

My hon. friend will realize that in the autumn of 1897, Mr. Walsh could not have given these instructions, because he was then on the road to the Yukon; he did not give them, and he never was consulted about them, and Mr. Fawcett never acted under his instructions at all.

Again, he says—and he appreciated the strong point he was making if his facts were right:

First, what about Dominion Creek? Was Dominion Creek closed by Major Walsh or not? My information is that Dominion Creek was closed on November 15, 1897, previous to the coming of Major Walsh into the country, and further that Dominion Creek was closed at that time without the intervention of Major Walsh.

This statement simply indicates that he had not been fully advised. He was not far wrong, but the statement before that was. Then, the acting Minister of the Interior came on, fortified by this document prepared by Mr. Ryley, and at page 6602 he says:

I find that among the statements of the hon. gentleman is this one, that Dominion Creek hills and benches in the Yukon district were closed for the location of claims by order of Major Walsh, and contrary to the protest of the gold commissioner, on the 15th of November, 1897.

Then, again:

I do not think that he has done that— That is, bring such evidence as would lead one to believe that the statement was reasonably true—

—but on the contrary, I think I can show clearly and beyond doubt that this statement on which he asks us to vote censure on the government is not true.

Then, the acting minister reads the document which I have read, which was the result of Mr. Ryley's ex parte examination;

and undoubtedly that was the document on which both he and the Solicitor General took such strong ground. I now turn to the evidence or oath of Mr. Fawcett taken before Mr. Ogilvie. I shall not weary the committee by reading page 79, because that has been read already, and some difference of opinion has been expressed as to what it means, but the following references in the evidence will remove all doubt :

Mr. Fawcett, examined by Commissioner Ogilvie :

Q. I would like to ask you a few questions about the history of Dominion Creek. When was the creek closed, not for hills and benches?

—A. The 15th November was the last date on which any applications were taken.

Q. The date of the closure you have given, did you immediately report that to Ottawa?

A. Yes, and also to Major Walsh.

Q. Was it endorsed by Major Walsh?—A. It was.

Q. Did you permit prospecting to go on on the hillsides?—A. There was no recording or prospecting on the hillsides until the spring, when the men were over there surveying.

Q. When?—A. In April.

Q. Then they began to prospect?—A. Yes; the first prospecting was in April.

Q. You received these applications, didn't you, in the office?—A. Yes, we noted them.

Q. Didn't put them on record?—A. No, because we were not in a position to designate them properly until the ground was surveyed.

Q. Was that privilege of prospecting and making application for record abrogated?—A. No, sir, that was open to every one.

Q. Was it afterwards abrogated?—A. It was, under the resolution that declared the hills and benches closed.

On page 80, that resolution is set out which Mr. Fawcett says he protested against. After setting out the resolution of the 30th of May, passed by Mr. Walsh and his informal council, he says :

I may say that this was moved by Mr. McGregor in council, and he gave as his reason for bringing up this resolution that he had told people on the creeks that the hills were not open, and said he was not going to be made a fool of; and so he presented this resolution.

Q. Did you object?—A. I did.

Q. On what ground?—A. On the ground that men had gone out there under my permission and had prospected, staked their claims, made applications at the office, and their applications had been accepted, and I thought that this would simply throw them out, undoing the work I had done. It was no longer the rule of the gold commissioner; I was overridden by the council. That occurred on the 28th May, and the creek was considered closed then.

Later on he says :

Frank Buteau asked: Why was Dominion Creek closed? Do you recollect what you answered?—A. I think I answered I do not know; that was regarding the hills and benches. That is the proper answer.

Those members of the committee who have followed this at all will appreciate my point, namely, that the statement in the resolution is strictly accurate, although at first blush it would not seem to be so, for this reason, that any one reading that resolution

of the 30th of May will see that on that date, contrary to the intention of Mr. Fawcett and against his protest, Mr. Walsh and his council passed a declaratory resolution that the hills and benches—that is, the whole of that creek—were closed, and by virtue of this order of Mr. Fawcett. Mr. Fawcett complained in his evidence that he only closed the creek claims and allowed prospecting on hills and benches, but Major Walsh came in and applied a total closure by this declaratory resolution, confirming the construction that Mr. McGregor had put on the order of Mr. Fawcett of November, that everything was closed by that order. But that result could not obviously have happened had Mr. Fawcett had his way, and it happened simply because the man in supreme control, Mr. Walsh, insisted on having his way and had it.

On page 88, of the evidence, Mr. Fawcett thus gives evidence :

Q. When was the privilege stopped on the hillsides?—A. On the 30th May.

Q. What led to it?—A. A resolution by Major Walsh and his council.

Q. How was that council constituted?—A. The commissioner was the council himself, but there were other members of the administration whom he invited in for consultation; he sometimes sent written requests that we should call upon him. On this occasion there were present Messrs. Wade, Bliss, McGregor, myself and Mr. Pattullo, who acted as secretary for whatever was done.

Q. Do you recognize that as his report?—A. I recognize Mr. Pattullo's signature.

Q. Would you read the part of it relating to the closing of the creek ?

Then he read what I have already cited. This provision applies to hill and bench claims as well as creek claims, and besides, if the creek was closed since the middle of November, at the time Mr. Fawcett says, he only acted on the supposition that he had closed the creek claims. This resolution, however, declares the whole thing closed.

These council meetings were held after the office was closed; during the office hours all the officials were busy, and Major Walsh himself was open to the public. These meetings, therefore, took place in the evening.

Q. Did you object to that being done?—A. I did.

Q. Why?—A. Because a great many miners had gone to the hills with my permission, and staked their claims, made applications and had the applications accepted as far as protecting of claims, so far as we could, pending the return of the survey. I considered I had granted them a right, and this motion was taking the right away from them, that is why I objected; I would not have had any objection had that not been the case; I did not object on that ground.

Q. Your objection was overruled?—A. I was in the minority.

Then, at pages 110 and 112 of the evidence, there are further references in the evidence by Mr. Craig and Mr. Bolton, two clerks in the office, and they confirmed Mr. Fawcett's statement in full.

Then, we have a formal answer given in this House to a formal question. I have referred to this before, but I think it ought to be mentioned in this connection to make the statement complete. On page 14, the minister was asked a question as to this and he answered, and no doubt that answer was prepared by Mr. Ryley, just as he has prepared nearly all the briefs the ministers have held on this subject.

The department have approved of the action of the commissioner of the Yukon territory closing Dominion Creek. This is the only case of the closing of a creek that is on record in the department.

I think I have made good my position, and that was that the House was misled by the statement prepared by Mr. Ryley. I understand, though I have not a copy in my hands, that the acting minister read an explanation from Mr. Ryley to the effect that he had not appreciated this distinction between the creek claims and the hillsides and the benches when he was consulted by his minister. I am not going to dispute that, I am not going to say that Mr. Ryley told an untruth, but coupled with the experience that I have had in regard to this Philp matter and the very important use that was made of Mr. Ryley's information touching this question of debate, I think that there is more than cause for complaint. I do not believe that an officer who has figured in the debates, as that officer has, is entitled to remain in the responsible position he holds. My position is that no minister ought to drag into debate the names of subordinate officers. He has supplied to him officers to do all the necessary departmental work, and if he has not sufficient assistance he is entitled to ask for more. But when he retains these officers and acts on their information and does not dismiss them, he assumes responsibility for all that they do, and under our system he is bound to assume in every sense all responsibility. And here we have this officer in this position, and the minister asking in this appropriation not merely that the usual salary shall be voted to him, but that he shall have an increment to his salary to the extent of \$400. I would propose that the salary be not voted. I move:

That all words relating to Mr. Ryley be struck out, and that the item be reduced by \$2,000.

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), in discussing this item, has discussed a great many other questions in connection with the Yukon. I do not intend to take up the time of the committee making any particular references to his remarks in that connection, except on one or two particular points. The hon. gentleman tries to make it appear, or to make himself believe, that Mr. Philp, who was at one time, I understand, one of the partners in the law firm of which the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was the head,

received some special favours at the hands of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) as Minister of the Interior. Like other members of the committee, I have followed the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) on previous occasions, and also through the long speech we heard last night and to-night, and I fail yet to see where, in one instance, Mr. Philp was treated by the minister in any different way from any other individual making an application for a mining claim or dredging lease. The insinuation is made that because, at one time, Mr. Philp happened to be a law partner of the present Minister of the Interior, there must be something wrong. On the contrary, I think it will be seen that Mr. Philp received from the minister and the department exactly the same treatment as dozens, if not hundreds, of other applicants did. Now, there was some very unfair evidence given in this matter by the hon. gentleman. He said that it was reported by some one that Mr. Philp or some person had stated that the Minister of the Interior had some interest in these leases, or would grant some special favour. I think the hon. gentleman read some documents, anonymous letters, or reported statements—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.  
No anonymous letters.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Not anonymous letters—well, letters by some dissatisfied people, that this was told them by Mr. Philp. No reasonable person would think for a moment that because another stated that he had some special privilege, or would get some special privilege, or that the minister was in any way interested in any of the claims in which these gentlemen were interested, there was any real evidence against the minister. On the contrary, I am free to say that I believe, and it will be found, that the Minister of the Interior had at no time any connection or association with Mr. Philp or any person else in any claim, dredging or otherwise, in connection with the department.

But, during this debate, my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has proven one thing. We know that during last session, hours of the time of this House were taken trying to prove that the present Minister of the Interior had given a liquor permit to Mr. Philp. The newspapers throughout the country have been full of this charge, a serious charge against the minister, that he had granted a liquor permit to this partner of his, while others could not get such permits from the department. The leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), I understand, while he was out west, repeated this very serious charge against the Minister of the Interior, and stated that he knew it to be a fact that Mr. Philp had received a permit, that he had taken liquor into the Yukon, and that the Minister of the Interior was associated with him in the

profits. But, to-night, what do we see? We have the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) standing up in this House and exploding that untruthful statement, that slander, and showing that while Mr. Philp telegraphed the minister asking the permission of the department to take in liquor into the country, the minister at once telegraphed him that he would not grant him the permit. Mr. Chairman, I think, after all the country has heard about this very charge against the minister—and it is one of the most serious, one of the most aggravatedly untrue statements made against that hon. gentleman—the people will note with satisfaction that we have the evidence from the mouth of the hon. member for Pictou himself that there is not one iota of truth in that charge—that not only was there nothing in it, but that the application of Mr. Philp was at once and promptly refused. In view of the kind of evidence that has been given here, and outside this House in the newspapers, against the Minister of the Interior, in view of the way he has been attacked and slandered, now that it has been proved beyond any doubt that there was not a syllable of truth in that charge, hon. members will be able to judge of the value of other statements that are made against the minister. It will be found the same way with regard to all the charges made concerning dredging claims. There is not a single iota of truth in the statement that the hon. minister (Mr. Sifton) has ever granted any special favour or has had, directly or indirectly, an interest to the extent of a single dollar in any of these transactions. We had the statement of the minister, of course, on a previous occasion; and we all believed and felt that there was no truth in the accusation made against him. But now we have the evidence from the hon. gentleman himself; and we want the people to know that they may compare this with all the other malicious and untruthful statements made without evidence against the Minister of the Interior. And I may say that I have no doubt that, as time goes on, whatever evidence—if evidence it may be called—has been furnished from time to time to try and blacken the character of the Minister of the Interior, to try to make the people believe that there was something wrong, it will be found as unreliable and as completely without foundation as this particular charge has been. The members of this House and the people of this country will find that since the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) took charge of the department, he has administered its affairs promptly and in a businesslike way, to the satisfaction of the great number of people who have business to transact with the department. And it is because of the satisfaction he has given to the people of the west in dealing with the affairs of the department in a prompt and businesslike way, that the charges are

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

made against him, in order, if possible, to injure him in this way in the country. But, he has administered the department ably and honestly, and no person, I am sure, can be found, either in the House or out of it, that dares, in any substantial way, to say anything to the contrary.

Now, with regard to the charges that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made concerning Mr. Ryley, one of the officials of the department: I do not think that the members of this committee will think that he has maintained that charge. I was inclined to think that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) simply moved this motion that he might have an opportunity, which he has enjoyed, of dealing, for a few hours, with these old matters that we have heard re-hashed so often. Now, what are the charges the member for Pictou makes against Mr. Ryley? The first charge is:

That he prepared a memorandum for the minister, upon which the minister made a statement that A. E. Philp had not obtained a lease at all, that he suppressed the fact that he had received an option, which he considered was tantamount to a lease.

Now, I say the hon. gentleman has not proved that statement. When an official of a department is asked for information in the branch to which he belongs, his only duty is to furnish that information. The hon. gentleman has argued that because he kept back some information that would put a different phase on this question, for that reason he was guilty. He does not say that Mr. Ryley did not give a correct and truthful statement to the question asked of him, but that he did not furnish some further evidence that was in the department, and that was not asked for. Now, what is Mr. Ryley's answer, and what is the evidence we have? My answer to the argument of the hon. gentleman that it was desirable to have a full explanation of this matter, and that Mr. Ryley should have given further evidence on that memorandum, is this, that the House, that the hon. gentleman himself, that the minister, who the hon. gentleman says was deceived by this memorandum, were all in full possession of that information from a return that was brought down and laid on the Table of the House some time before, giving the fullest information with regard to the applications that had been made for the leases to which the hon. gentleman refers. The hon. gentleman was in full possession of that knowledge, the minister was in full possession of that knowledge, the members of this House were in full possession of it. How then could the memorandum that Mr. Ryley gave to the minister, either deceive the minister, or deceive the member for Pictou, or deceive the members of this House? I submit, Mr. Chairman, that so far as this particular charge is concerned, there is not the slightest suspicion attached to Mr. Ryley

of an intention to do anything wrong at all.

Now, the second charge is that in his memorandum to the minister he had stated that he had full control of matters pertaining to the branch, and that the minister also stated that he had practically delegated to him authority and discretion to administer the affairs of the branch. Now, that, so far as it was stated by the minister, was strictly true. The applications are received by Mr. Ryley, or the clerk under him, without any knowledge of the minister, who does not trouble with them. I do not know that it is necessary for me to refer to that in defence of Mr. Ryley, but the hon. gentleman has laid some stress on the fact that an option was a lease, and so on, and that the applications should have been included in this second return, although the information was already in possession of the House. Now, the facts are these: In the department an application is received from any person, either on behalf of himself or on behalf of another; and the rule in the department is that the application cannot either be withdrawn, nor will the lease be granted to the person, or to any assignee he may have, without either a power of attorney, if the application is made on behalf of another, or the evidence that the party that applied for it is entitled to it. So that nothing could have occurred that was irregular. Why, at that very time, by the returns brought down, we find there were some seventy-eight applications from different parties all over the country for these dredging leases, and every one of them was treated exactly as Mr. Philp was. That is why I say that there has not been the slightest evidence submitted by the hon. gentleman to show that Mr. Ryley, in furnishing the information that he did, has done anything wrong, or acted inconsistently with his position as an honest and straightforward officer of the department.

The hon. gentleman laid a good deal of stress upon the point that in giving information with regard to applications, and so on, before the department, he had, under the direction of the minister, acted in some way differently from that which had been previously the practice of the department. Now, Sir, I am assured that that practice has prevailed for a great many years in the department, there was no change whatever in that respect.

Now, the reason that we have asked for an increase of salary to Mr. Ryley on the present occasion, is that he has been a long time in the service, and I find that Mr. Daly recognized that he should be made a chief clerk. He has been a very efficient officer, and the duties he has to perform in the timber and mines branch have increased. In fact his work has nearly doubled within the last two years. I think it is only fair that when a gentleman proves himself efficient in his position, and is performing more

than double the work he had previously to do, some recognition should be given of his services that he has performed to the satisfaction of the minister and to the satisfaction of the public. I may say this on behalf of Mr. Ryley, that from my own personal knowledge, since I have been in the department, and from information I have received, for some time he has been accustomed to work steadily from nine o'clock in the morning until six o'clock every day, and has often come back nights in order to overtake the increased work in the branch of which he is the head. Under these circumstances I think I can appeal confidently to the committee to vote down the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman against granting this increase of salary to Mr. Ryley.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to correct a statement made by the acting minister, which, to my mind, seems extraordinary. He said I had withdrawn the charge that was made last year touching the nature of the permit that had been given to Mr. Philp. I did nothing of the kind. What I read was Mr. Philp's own statement in which he mentioned that he had never been interested, directly or indirectly, in any liquor permits. I read that with only a passing comment on the fact that he obtained a permit from Mr. Sifton to the officers of the Yukon district, which reads thus:

This letter introduces Mr. Philp, who will be permitted to enter the Yukon district with such provisions as he may choose to take with him, without regard to the regulations.

He telegraphed to the minister asking him to wire if that permit included liquors, and I, of course, stated that the minister wired back that it did not. And yet that same gentleman, after having obtained that permit, as was shown last year by a letter read to this House, trafficked in it, or endeavoured to sell it for a large sum of money, to be used for the purpose of taking liquors into the Yukon, and he wired again to Mr. Sifton later on that he never had been interested, directly or indirectly, in the subject of liquors going into the Yukon. I do not comment upon it. The two telegrams speak for themselves, but whatever interpretation was afterwards put upon that document by the hon. Minister of the Interior, or Mr. Philp, I never withdrew the argument, and it was only argument, I admit, that was based on the document itself, about which there is no dispute, that it covered liquors, that it was sufficient, coming from the minister, to have enabled liquor to have been taken in. I am not going into the argument of the other side, that it was not sufficient. I did not conceal any of the facts that the minister produced, that is, subsequent correspondence between Mr. Philp and himself to show that

when Mr. Philp asked that this permit should be declared to include liquors the minister said that if he wished to obtain a permit to take liquors in he would have to apply in the regular way. So, there is no explosion of the statement that I made, and the matter stands where it was. While hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have their views, I do not agree with them. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) puts Mr. Philp in a very extraordinary position. He uses strong language in regard to the statement made by Mr. Philp, that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was interested with him in these leases or options, or exclusive rights which he, notoriously, from the evidence, was hawking about the country, and upon some of which he was obtaining cash. In regard to that subject Mr. Philp made the statement in a letter to Mr. Burnett, of the city of Vancouver, that the hon. Minister of the Interior was interested. The hon. acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) says that there is not a word of truth in that. He brands the statement of Mr. Philp in the strong language that the sentence conveys.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not know enough about Mr. Philp—I never met the gentleman—to say that I will stake my reputation on his letter, or his statement, and I told the committee that I had no evidence that Mr. Philp's statement is true, but, my point was that the subject was one that the hon. Minister of the Interior ought to have been willing to have had an inquiry into for the reason that this gentleman was closely allied with him when he entered the government and that from that time on he was closely identified with him as one of his personal and political friends, and since that letter was written by Mr. Philp, and the hon. gentleman made the statement on the floor of the House, Mr. Philp has obtained extraordinary treatment at the hands of the Department of the Interior. The hon. gentleman met me fairly if he could have supported what was said. He met me by saying that this gentleman received no exceptional treatment at the hands of the Department of the Interior. I showed that the regulations were broken on his behalf, I showed, as distinctly as a person could show, that the laws of the country were violated on behalf of Mr. Philp and in his interest by the Department of the Interior. I showed that that gentleman had got extensions of his options whenever he desired them, running, in one case, from January clean up to August, when Mr. Claxton could only get an extension from the 28th of March to the 31st of March, and no longer. That is exceptional treatment. I am told that Mr. Claxton, who lives in Montreal, is a Conservative. I do not know whether he is or not. I presented a schedule based on the return to indicate the extraordinary concessions given to Mr. Philp

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

in regard to these regulations, even before these regulations had become the law of the land. So, I do not think the hon. gentleman has made good the very strong statements he has given to the committee by way of an attempted answer to me. Then, touching the statement of Mr. Ryley, if the hon. acting minister is content to leave that matter where he put it, I am content. He says: We have all the information before us touching what remained unsaid by Mr. Ryley in that memorandum, and he referred to the document brought down among a pack of documents about a yard deep last session. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman never saw that document last session. I venture to say that not a single member of this House ever saw that document last session or ever referred to it. I say, further, that the hon. gentleman has not met, in any fair or reasonable sense, the statement I made, that if the facts that we know now by the return this session had been before us, neither the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), nor the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), nor, I hope, the hon. Minister of the Interior himself, would have used the language that was used by him on the strength of Mr. Ryley's statement, that he would choke my statements down my throat. That was the language of the hon. Minister of the Interior. The right hon. Prime Minister having said that I had been guilty of falsehood, I venture to say, with the facts before us, would not repeat that statement. I would be very much surprised if any hon. member of the House would repeat it in face of the evidence, and this evidence was in the possession of Mr. Ryley. When the hon. Minister of the Interior asked him, not as Mr. Ryley says, because we must take the word of the minister, for information, he asked Mr. Ryley to give him, not the specific statement that Mr. Ryley says he asked, whether leases had been granted, but he asked for a full and complete statement on that subject from Mr. Ryley, and my quarrel to-night, on that point, and my grievance is that there was no full statement, and in the absence of a full statement that debate took a turn that it could not have possibly taken if a full, fair and accurate statement had been made to the hon. Minister of the Interior by Mr. Ryley.

Amendment (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) negatived.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.). I would like to ask the hon. acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) for the names of the five second-class clerks who are left at \$1,100.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They are James Dunnett, James Ferguson, Peter Robertson and Pierre Marchand. There is one vacancy. Mr. Rowatt was promoted, and his place has not been filled.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is that estimated for ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is no person named for it. I suppose it will be filled by the promotion of some of these other clerks. The change has not been made.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. minister able to say whom it is proposed to put in that vacancy ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No ; the deputy says that there is no decision as to who is to be promoted.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask again as to the peculiar qualifications of Mr. Marchand. The minister knows that there has been for a very long time in that department, a revenue branch, and in that branch there are clerks who are thoroughly up in all the work of the department, and it seems very hard that where there are competent clerks, who have passed through the different grades of the service, that they should be denied their chance of promotion, and that an entire stranger should be taken into the service and placed over their heads as an accountant. I wish to have the reasons of the heads of the department for doing so unusual a thing. So far as I can learn, Mr. Marchand has no special qualifications in any way.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As I have already stated, the minister and the deputy took the responsibility of making this appointment, as they did not think they had a clerk in the lower class who was fit to assume the responsibility. I can give no other explanation. I suppose there might be a difference of opinion as to that, but they ought to know. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) and myself are not capable of telling the qualifications of the clerks in the office as well as those who are at the head of the department. I was informed by the deputy the other evening, when these estimates were under consideration, that they wanted a more proficient man as an accountant than they had in the lower grade.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the minister will take the responsibility of informing the House, that in the revenue branch they have no man who was capable of doing this work, and that, consequently, they had to go outside for a man who was entirely new to the civil service. That is the estimate which is now publicly stated of the young men in the service, who, from ten to fifteen years, have been doing, and doing, as I am informed, thoroughly well, the work of that department. That is a very grave charge to make, and if that be so, will the minister inform us what was the special excellence of Mr. Marchand, who he was, and where he had performed the apprenticeship which proved him to be so extraordinary an accountant that he had to be pitchforked into the Department of the Interior over and above all the old and tried servants ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If you want a clerk for a special position, I do not know that there can be any reflection on the men in the service that they are not properly doing the work assigned to them. They wanted in that branch a clerk of special qualifications, and this man was recommended, and I suppose they took the trouble—or they ought to have taken the trouble—to find out whether he had these qualifications. He would not likely be retained in the branch if he had not. I was also informed that he was a resident of this city, that he had occupied a position in a mercantile establishment, and those with whom he was employed, and others, recommended him as having the qualifications. I am told that Mr. Marchand has so far fulfilled the expectations formed of him.

Mr. FOSTER. Where did he get his experience ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I cannot now give the hon. gentleman the name of the establishment he was connected with.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the acting minister think that the committee is entitled to that information ? Surely, when you say you have to go out of the department in order to get a man of sufficiently high qualifications, the House ought to be made acquainted with the information that the department had. The minister does not seem to see anything hard in passing over all the men below \$1,100 a year in the department who have spent years there, and refusing them their proper promotion, to which they had a right to look. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) were among the undergrade clerks and had done his duty well, he would not like to see a 'novus homo' put above him simply for political reasons. What information has the department as to Mr. Marchand's qualifications ?

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). I may, perhaps, be able to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) the information which he so much desires. Mr. Marchand was recommended to the office he now holds by my colleague and myself.

Mr. FOSTER. Now we have it.

Mr. BELCOURT. I have known Mr. Marchand for fifteen years, and I know that he was considered to have special qualifications for this office.

Mr. FOSTER. What were these ?

Mr. BELCOURT. If the hon. gentleman will have patience I will tell him. Mr. Marchand is a gentleman who is thoroughly well educated in French and in English, and he is a first-class accountant.

Mr. FOSTER. He understands French figures.

Mr. BELCOURT. He understands French correspondence and French accounts. Mr.

Marchand has had charge for many years of the very large mercantile interests of a gentleman in Ottawa. He is a man who is worthy of trust, and had special qualifications to fill this office. There was another reason which, perhaps, will not appeal so strongly to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), and which, though not the principal reason, or the strongest reason, was, at all events, one of the reasons that weighed with the minister in making the appointment. The former accountant of that department was Mr. Pinard. It has been felt in Ottawa that, so far as possible, the different elements should be represented in the civil service, and that the proportion of the different nationalities should be preserved as much as possible. When the late Mr. Pinard died I pressed strongly for the position, not of assistant accountant, but of accountant, and the Minister of the Interior considered he should promote some one in the office, and he promoted Mr. Beddoe. The minister consented, owing to my strong pressure, to appoint an assistant accountant, provided I recommended a first-class man. Mr. Marchand, to my personal knowledge, was a first-class accountant, having the additional qualifications I have mentioned of being thoroughly well educated in English and in French, and, under these circumstances, I think the appointment was a good one.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he pass the civil service examination?

Mr. BELCOURT. He passed both civil service examinations.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). Perhaps it is well that when vacancies of this kind occur they should be filled by promotion if possible, but I draw to the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) the fact, that he did not follow that rule himself. Let me remind him that he took Mr. Jenkins into the Department of Finance. He promoted Mr. Jenkins to a position over the heads of others who had been in the department a considerable number of years, and gave him a first-class salary, besides making him his private secretary with \$600 in addition to the \$1,100 that he started with. In less than four years Mr. Jenkins was receiving \$1,800 a year. I think the hon. gentleman divided the sum he was allowed for private secretary between Mr. Jenkins and a young lady who stayed at his house, giving Mr. Jenkins \$400 and the young lady \$200. So that when my hon. friend points out that men have been taken into the department and put over the heads of others, he should remember that he himself found it necessary to go outside of his department for assistance. I am not finding any fault with Mr. Jenkins; I have no doubt he was a clever man and well fitted for the position; but I am pointing out that my hon. friend did not follow that rule in his own case.

Mr. BELCOURT.

Mr. FOSTER. All we succeeded in getting from the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) was this travelling around in a circle to show that Mr. Marchand was a very fine man and fitted for the service; but we look in vain either to the acting minister or to the member for Ottawa for any information as to the special qualifications which rendered it absolutely necessary that the department should have recourse to an outside man. I know whereof I speak when I say that the acting minister will find, if he makes diligent inquiry, that he has just as good men in that department as Mr. Marchand can be. My hon. friend from Ottawa, in order that he may have a French representative in the Interior Department in the place of a French Canadian who has died, will not surely make it an absolute condition that the man who comes in must take exactly the position of the man who died.

Mr. BELCOURT. He did not.

Mr. FOSTER. But it was not through any lack of pressure on the part of my hon. friend that he did not. That is the principle he held for, and tried to have adopted, but fortunately or unfortunately he was not able to get to that point.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am sorry I did not.

Mr. FOSTER. This is just one of the political appointments that are being made in the Department of the Interior. I make the statement that the promotions and appointments in that department have been notoriously partisan from the very start. What are the facts of the case? In the first place, the old men have almost entirely gone out of that department. Mr. Burgess was set aside in order that a friend and political supporter of the minister might take his place. Mr. Hall has been set aside in order that Mr. Keyes may take his place. Mr. Commissioner Smith has been set aside in order that Mr. Turiff may take his place. Mr. Pedley has been made superintendent of immigration—Mr. Pedley, who knew about as much about immigration as any other clerk in a lawyer's office—simply as a reward for his canvassing services. Then, Mr. Preston, who was the originator of the machine, and had given great service to the party, had a position made for him at \$3,000 a year, and is now hugging the machine. I suppose in the different countries of Europe. Then, there were Mr. White, the press agent, Mr. Jury, Mr. Devlin, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Grieve. I cannot take up the time of this committee naming them all; their name is legion. We may have a short digest of this when we come to the Immigration Department. Will the House attend to this, and say if the Minister of the Interior is not rushing political appointments and promotions against all rule or reason to the detriment of the great mass of the clerks, numbers of whom

are refused promotion, while new clerks are put over their heads, and others are refused their statutory increase. When these hon. gentlemen came into power, Mr. Keyes was getting the moderate salary of \$1,400; to-day he is getting \$2,400. Mr. Campbell, a nephew, I think, of Premier Ross, was receiving \$850.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Kindly tell me when Mr. Keyes entered the service?

Mr. FOSTER. I am telling the hon. gentleman and the House what has been done in making inordinate political promotions in his department. Mr. Campbell now receives \$1,400. Mr. Rowatt had \$950; he is now receiving \$1,400. Mr. Dunnet had \$650; he is now receiving \$1,100. Mr. Ferguson has been put in at the second class minimum of \$1,100. Mr. Robertson was receiving \$950; he is now receiving \$1,100. Mr. Marchand was not in the service, and he is receiving \$1,100. Mr. McKenna was receiving \$1,400 when these gentlemen came into power; he is now receiving \$2,050. These are samples of the kind of inordinate promotions for political purposes and grounds solely, which are going on in the Department of the Interior, until every well-meaning, honest clerk in that department feels that there is no chance for fair progress from one grade to another on merit alone, as against the favourites of the minister. Now, I do not think there is any necessity for me to reply to the hon. member for North Wellington. He answered himself, as he always does in these later times. There is no greater example of inconsistency to be picked out from the Atlantic to the Pacific than that hon. member in these degenerate times of the new liberalism. Well, I have done my duty as far as I can in showing this state of things, which I am sure will be appreciated by the country, whether it is by the committee on that side or not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. All I have to say is that while I have very little knowledge of the politics of the gentlemen in the department, or whether they have any party feeling. In looking over the list I find that the hon. gentleman is not correct in trying to make it appear that the clerks have been unfairly dealt with for partisan purposes. I find that the promotions and the higher salaries paid by the Minister of the Interior have gone to well-known Conservatives, at least to gentlemen who took an active part on the Conservative side before they were appointed, and who were appointed by a Conservative government. Nobody will dispute that. If the hon. gentleman pretends that this efficient officer, whom he names, who had been in the department for twenty years and was found to be one of the most faithful and efficient officers in it, had been kept back simply because he was appointed

by a Liberal government, then the sin is on his shoulders and not on Mr. Sifton's. The others were all, I understand, appointed by Conservatives and some of them were well-known Conservative workers before appointment.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). There is one thing that does not seem to accord very closely with the principles laid down by the Reform party before they came into power, and that is this increasing of salaries at rates far above the statutory increase. This is hardly in accord with that plank in their platform of stringent economy in public affairs. We would have no reason to complain of this increase of \$500 if equal justice were done the others who are serving at lower salaries, but what we complain of is that many faithful and deserving officers have been kept out of their statutory increase of \$50 per year, to which they were entitled, while special favourites of the government are given advances of eight times that amount. The hon. member for Ottawa said that, in the special case under consideration, the officer was deserving of this large increase because he understood French and English. I do not know whether accounts are sent in indiscriminately in French and English or not, but I am confident that there are many men in the department who are just as capable of making up the accounts in both languages as this gentleman is. I was somewhat amused at the other argument of the hon. member for Ottawa, that because a Frenchman occupied this position before, no one of any other nationality should replace him; and not only that, but whatever other Frenchman was put in his place should be given at the outset as high a salary as his predecessor had acquired after years of labour and experience. No business man would pretend that a man is equally good who is new to the business as one who has been working at it for years. I was further amused at the pretense made by the hon. member for North Wellington, who, as we all know, is a slavish supporter of the government. His argument is the time-honoured one of, 'You're another.' But I would remind that hon. gentleman that when he was in opposition there was no man who condemned that style of argument more vigorously. If the hon. gentleman has no better argument than that to offer in support of the government, it would be more in keeping with his dignity if he would remain silent in his seat.

Department of the Interior—To increase the salary of Mr. James White, geographer of the Department of the Interior, from \$1,600 to \$1,800, from July 1, 1899, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act \$200  
Contingencies—Printing and stationery ...\$1,000

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. White was transferred from the Geological Survey on the 1st of July, 1899 and appointed geographer for the Department of the Interior at

a salary of \$1,800. But in the estimates of that year he was only voted \$1,600, and the matter was overlooked in the supplementaries. The sum voted for the fiscal year for printing and stationery was \$8,500, the same amount as has been voted for that service for some years past. Last year, it was found necessary to increase the vote by \$1,000. The same additional sum will be required this year. The money is needed in connection with books, forms, &c., used in connection with the various departments. Owing to the growth of the general business, the cost of supplies has greatly increased, especially the amount spent for typewriting machines.

Dominion lands chargeable to capital—  
to pay L. E. Fontaine difference between \$400 per annum and \$3 per day for sixty days' services, from January 17, 1899, to March 18, 1899, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$112 67

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Fontaine was employed at \$3 a day in the Surveyor General's branch, in connection with the examination of survey returns. The Auditor General ruled that it was not legal to pay him more than \$400 per annum.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Fontaine a temporary clerk ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, and the desire was to pay him at the rate at which he had been employed, \$3 a day ; and this is to make up the balance.

Mr. FOSTER. The question arises, if they want a temporary clerk for a number of days, why they should pay him at the rate of \$900 a year, instead of complying with what the statute allows for a temporary clerk.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You cannot get a man at \$400 a year with the technical knowledge required for this work.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the kind of work ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know that I can quite explain it. He was in the Surveyor General's branch, and was doing, as I understand it, technical work, work that required a specially qualified man. Mr. Fontaine was engaged by the Surveyor General who thought he had authority to pay him \$3 a day.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Fontaine now engaged in the service ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not certain.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will make a note of it, and will get the information.

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Department of the Interior—To supply seed grain to settlers whose crops were destroyed in 1899 ..... \$6,000

Mr. FOSTER. Please explain this.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. On the 15th of August, 1899, a cyclone passed over Flett Springs and Stoney Creek settlement in the neighbourhood of Prince Albert, totally destroying the crop. Petitions were sent in stating that unless the settlers got advances of seed grain, they could not seed the land they had ready. The homestead inspector, Mr. McArthur, was instructed to investigate, and he confirmed the statements of the petition. At Rosthern and Hague south of Prince Albert, there was a very severe loss by frost ; and it was decided to supply those whose applications were in on the 23rd of February last. There is a full report made by Mr. McArthur, giving the names and the amounts.

Mr. FOSTER. Was this a gift or a loan ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The borrowers give security on their property for the amount. Where they have no patent, it is entered against their land, and where they have a patent a mortgage was given.

Mr. FOSTER. What rate of interest do these loans carry ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no memorandum as to that. I am informed by an hon. gentleman near me that the rule in these cases is to charge 6 per cent. If that is the rule, it will be followed in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we ought to have a pretty strong case made out before the department interferes in the loss of crops, through frost, wind or other accidents of that kind. Where are we drifting to ? For instance, I am sorry to say that the reports have come down, that, owing to high winds and drouth, the crops in portions of Manitoba seem to be utterly destroyed. Does the department propose, in all cases of that kind, even at this late day, to come to the relief of settlers in any part of the Northwest and loan them money in order to buy seed grain ? We used to have to do that in the early days, because the settlers then had not much means, nor had they many neighbours to help them, and were almost absolutely dependent on the government. But surely there must come a time when the government will not be obliged to interfere in these cases.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). I do not think that seed grain is furnished in any of the provinces. But, in the Territories where, though they have self government to some extent, the land is all owned by the Dominion, and the revenues come principally to the Dominion, the case is different. This is just such a case as the hon. member re-

ferred to. These people are living a long way from the railroad and from neighbours, and they met with very heavy loss. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) would agree that, on the report of the homestead inspector that such was the case, and that the settlers would be unable to procure seed grain unless somebody came to their assistance, it was quite right for the government to act.

Mr. FOSTER. Were these old settlers?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I infer that some of them probably were, because I find they have received their patents—though, of course, they might have purchased their land. But a great majority of them must be recent settlers, or, at least, they have not prospered very much, because patents have not been granted for their lands.

Mr. FOSTER. In what part of the country are they?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. On the South Saskatchewan.

Mr. FOSTER. Near Prince Albert?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that in the constituency of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) who received a large amount for the settlers on Birch River?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Without distinct knowledge, I should be inclined to think that it must be in Saskatchewan.

Mr. FOSTER. Whether it is Providence or the Minister of the Interior, who is helping the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), he certainly seems to have come in for a great deal of help. An amount of \$10,000 was put in the estimates for some of his constituents at Birch River; but that was so gross a case, that, when the acting minister came to look into it, he reduced it at once to \$5,000, and did not seem to think that even that would be required. And now we find that in another section of this gentleman's constituency there is to be \$6,000 of public money distributed on easy terms.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It has already been distributed. I find that the accounts are nearly all in, amounting to \$4,600. I think therefore, that \$5,000 will cover the whole amount, and I move that the item be reduced to \$5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a remarkable similarity between the two cases. With the right hon. gentleman, nothing is too good for Tarte; with the Minister of the Interior, nothing seems to be too good for Davis.

Mr. CLANCY. On what terms are the repayments made?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The grain was purchased and forwarded to these people. Mr.

McArthur, the inspector, purchased the grain.

Mr. FOSTER. Have the accounts been paid?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think the accounts are paid yet. I have not the full statement here which I thought I had.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What security do they give?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In cases where the settler has not received a patent for the land, it is registered here against his land. In cases where they have received a patent, a mortgage of the value of the land has been taken from the settler. Security has been taken for the amount in each case. The quantities vary from twenty bushels to thirty or forty bushels.

Mr. CLANCY. How is that loan to be paid?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know on what terms. It is to be paid the following season after the harvest.

Mr. FOSTER. In grain or in money?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In money, at the cost price of the grain to the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister say whether that grain has been paid for or not?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It was bought last February. It had to be purchased early so that it could be delivered to these people in time for seeding, and they are ninety miles from a railroad. I thought I had a memorandum, which I have not, but from inquiry I have made I find that the accounts were met as they came in. I will obtain the information and produce it as to how they are paid, and whether there are any accounts still due.

Mr. FOSTER. I think you had better let that stand until we have that information. If the department has actually paid that money, they must have stolen it from some other vote, unless they got a Governor General's warrant.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have given full information as to the whole matter, and I do not think the item should be required to stand merely for want of information as to whether the accounts have been paid. I do not know of any way by which the department could steal money to pay them.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes; Mr. Tarte did it last year actually, and the Prime Minister had to acknowledge it before the House, that it was diverted from a vote from which there was no legal possibility of taking it, but they got a credit, and they used it surreptitiously. We want to know whether that is the custom of this government or not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think it is hardly fair to block the item. This was a

case of the utmost necessity, as every person will recognize.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will recognize that if he is going to get along with his estimates, he had better let this one stand and take up the next.

Mr. CLANCY. What instructions were given the inspector? He evidently made a report to the hon. gentleman that he would require \$6,000. Was the inspector given discretionary power to expend any sum he might think necessary?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; when the petitions were sent in they were referred to Mr. McArthur, homestead inspector, and he made a report, which I have referred to, giving the condition of the settler, the number of acres of land he owned, whether it was patented or not, what stock he had, and the necessity for assistance. On that report, instructions were given to procure this seed grain.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister will just bring down that report and give the information with reference to the other points.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman any other reports than the one he now speaks of with regard to that matter?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No official reports. If there are any I will be glad to bring them down.

Mr. SPROULE. From whom was this grain purchased, and at what price?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Of wheat, there were 4,425 bushels, averaging 67 cents a bushel; oats, 3,160 bushels, at 40½ cents a bushel; of barley, 700 bushels, from 44 cents to 54 cents. The inspector recommended the purchase of grain in Manitoba, as he could not get good seed grain in that particular locality.

Repairs to bridge between Banff and An-taracite in the Rocky Mountain Park.... \$2,400

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is a bridge erected by the government of the Territories which was recently handed over to the Dominion. Owing to a change in the course of the Cascade River it became apparent that the bridge would be carried away by the freshet of the following spring and summer unless further protection was at once provided above the bridge.

Mr. FOSTER. How were the repairs made?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. On the report of Mr. J. R. Roy, who was at that time resident engineer of the Department of Public Works in British Columbia, and Mr. Douglas, the superintendent of the park.

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this bridge within the bounds of the park?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Expenses of commission re inspection of staples ..... \$9,000

Mr. FOSTER. What department is this in?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This was paid out by the Department of the Interior. I think a vote of \$5,000 was taken last year by the Inland Revenue Department and handed over to the Department of the Interior to administer.

Mr. FOSTER. Inspection of staples; what in the world is that handed over to the Department of the Interior for?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It was the Elevator Commission.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you not say so?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is what is commonly known as the Elevator Commission.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total cost of the commission?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The total of the accounts, and I think they have nearly all been paid, is \$13,793. They were paid to the following parties: Joseph Parkins, typewriter, \$115.50; William Lothian, commissioner, \$1,478.15.

Mr. FOSTER. At what rate?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Ten dollars a day.

Mr. FOSTER. And expenses?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes. Mr. W. F. Sirett, \$1,608.40; Mr. C. C. Castle, \$1,773.30; Judge Senkler, \$2,598.90; Judge Richards, \$575. On the death of judge Senkler, Judge Richards was appointed to take his place on the commission. Mr. George Simpson, \$1,443.65; Mr. A. C. Campbell, estimated, \$700; William Perkins, \$200; Charles N. Bell, including all general accounts, \$3,300, making a total of \$13,793. This amount has already been paid out.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the report been printed?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The report has been printed and a Bill based upon that report has passed this House.

Mr. CLANCY. How much more is there to pay out?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Very little more; that is practically the whole amount.

Government of Yukon Territory—

Living expenses of officials and transport and maintenance of lunatics.... \$10,000  
General expenses ..... 15,000

\$25,000

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have a full explanation of this.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The living allowance for officers of the Yukon staff was fixed at \$75 per month, or \$900 per annum, but the cost of living, instead of being reduced, as anticipated, has been increased. The price of board in Dawson was raised, during the past winter, to \$100 per month, and it was found necessary to increase the living allowance to \$1,200 per year from the 1st of November last. As there are about 50 clerks in receipt of this allowance the increased expenditure from the 1st of November, 1899, to the 30th of June, of this year, will be in the neighbourhood of \$10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Are all the clerks entitled to \$1,200 a year for living expenses?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. All the clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. No matter what their grade is?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No matter what their grade is.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it extend to the housekeeper?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The housekeeper and janitor are the only ones in the employ of the government who do not have an allowance for living expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought now that transport was more easy the expenses of getting food into that district would be less. How is it that the cost of living has increased instead of diminished?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The representation is made to the government that under the allowance of \$75 per month the officials were unable to pay their board. They had to pay their board out of their salaries. I think that in future we would expect to find a reduction in the cost of living there, but these are the actual facts as reported to us by our officers.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the salaries of these men besides their living expenses?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I read all the salaries when the vote for them was put through. They average from \$720 to, excepting the higher officials, \$1,200.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that not seem pretty steep if you give them a salary of \$1,200 and \$1,200 for living expenses, making \$2,400? It is said that living is a little higher in that country, but it cannot be so much higher. It is coming down all over the country generally, but there it seems to be coming up instead of coming down. It does seem extraordinary that it costs \$1,200 to keep a man up there. I should think he could live tolerably well on half that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The reports from Mr. Ogilvie and others, are that the board there costs \$100 a month.

Mr. SPROULE. With wheat 50 cents a bushel and other necessaries of life in the

same proportion, \$3 a day seems an enormous amount for board.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is all for Dawson City, and wheat is more than 50 cents a bushel there.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The reports of people who go into that territory are to the effect that the cost of living and expenses are much below what they were a few years ago.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. At first, the officials received certain pay and their expenses, but that was a source of difficulty and dissatisfaction, and it was thought that they should be paid \$75 a month; but after a few months' trial, it was found that they could not live less than \$100 a month.

Mr. SPROULE. How many lunatics have to be maintained up there?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There are five. We have made arrangements with the British Columbia government to maintain these lunatics in British Columbia, and the most of this money is for their travelling expenses to the asylum.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of that \$15,000 item inserted without any detail?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There was an assistant gold commissioner, Mr. J. L. Bell, appointed at \$3,000, and Mr. McLeod was sent out as a commissioner to adjust land disputes, accompanied by a surveyor and stenographer.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the general item of \$5,000 for expenses, intended to cover salaries of permanent clerks?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Part of it. There is also the travelling expenses of Mr. Stephenson who went out there, and there is the expenses of witnesses and clerks and of jurors, and the increase in the salary of the commissioner and other officials.

Mr. FOSTER. I call the attention of the Finance Minister to the fact that it is not regular to include in a general item, the salaries of officials, and the increases of salaries.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But this is a different matter altogether. There was a general vote taken for \$212,000, and that was found not large enough, and so this \$15,000 is required.

Mr. FOSTER. But there should be some definite system. I will not press my objection in this case, as a general vote seems to have been taken in the past, but now that there is some definiteness about things up in that territory, these votes should be defined in detail. I hope that will be done in the future.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in that.

Mr. SPROULE. When you adopt a system like this, it is a kind of an invitation to evade the law and spend the money beforehand, as appears to have been done in connection with one of these items to-night.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the acting minister can give some explanation about this Mr. J. A. Grose, who was sent up there as a special officer from November 8, 1897, to July 3, 1898.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I thought I handed the hon. gentleman a memorandum in regard to that. I will make a note of it again.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman can give the information on the seed grain item.

Domain Quarantine Stations—Repairs to Grosse Isle Quarantine Steamer 'Challenger' ..... \$4,050

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). This is a vote for extraordinary repairs required to the steamer *Challenger*. The repairs were executed by the departmental staff employed in the shipyard at Sorel. These repairs were called for by the Department of Agriculture.

Rideau Hall—Furniture and fittings for new wing of Government House..... \$5,454 50

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Last year a new wing was built to Rideau Hall, running to the south-west of the building; and this is to cover the cost of furnishing that wing.

Mr. FOSTER. How is it proposed to buy these fittings and furniture?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The architect made an estimate of the various articles, and a schedule of them was furnished.

Mr. FOSTER. Are tenders advertised for?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. These things are not bought directly by the officers of the department.

Rideau Hall—Remetalling drive ..... \$3,000

Mr. SPROULE. What drive is that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The drive from Sussex street to Rideau Hall. There has been no metal put on it for many years, and it requires remetalling.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that let by contract?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We made an arrangement with the Ottawa Improvement Commissioners. Near the entrance to the grounds, there has been a widening of the road, and during the winter the commissioners had a large quantity of

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

stone broken for the general purposes of their trust; and the department arranged with them to put some of this metal on the drive, we paying them for it at the regular fixed prices. The stone being so close at hand, it was more economical to get it there than to take it from a further distance. This money will be paid at the regular rate fixed by the department.

Winter Harbour, N.S.—Sheerdam, training dykes and deepening River Avon—to make good damage done to works..... \$2,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is this done by contract?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These repairs were done under the superintendence of the engineer by day's labour.

Judique—New wharf at McKay's Point—to complete payment for work done..... \$1,113

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This work was done by contract. The contract price was \$14,142. This is required to complete payment for the work.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the \$2,000 complete the work at Windsor harbour?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not quite. This amount is to cover payments made for damage done last fall and paid for by Governor General's warrant.

Cape Cove Breakwater—To provide for urgent works and repairs ..... \$30,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In Digby County. This is to repair damages done by storm.

Comeauville Breakwater—To make good damage done by gales ..... \$1,200

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). This reminds me of an appeal made year after year by myself for the repairs of a breakwater at Petite Rivière in my county. The breakwater was commenced and half completed, but the repeated gales have made great inroads on the work and the repairs should not be longer delayed. I have brought this matter repeatedly to the notice of the government, but have received no favourable answer. I would ask the acting Minister of Public Works why no recognition has been given to this matter? It is a great shame that a work of this kind should be so badly neglected.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to answer for the past, but have made a note of the hon. gentleman's request and will look into the matter.

Mr. KAULBACH. Will an amount appear in the supplementaries for this year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I could not anticipate His Excellency's action.

Church Point Pier—To rebuild and repair cribwork broken and displaced by heavy seas ..... \$800

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. This makes good the damage, but a grant will be required for rebuilding a portion of the face of the shore end of the pier, which has also suffered. Whether or not that grant will be asked this session, I am not in a position to say.

Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I.—China Point Pier—Revote of part of lapsed amount to pay for work done ..... \$700

Mr. A. MARTIN (East Queen's, P.E.I.) There is a boat that formerly called at China Point pier once or twice a week, communicating with Charlottetown. It has been represented to me that since the building of the present wharf, that boat is unable to call, because the wharf is too low. If that is the case, it will be a great inconvenience to many people. I would ask the acting minister to ascertain the facts.

Slides and Booms, St. Maurice District—Works of reconstruction and improvement in connection with booms between Grandes Piles station and the city of Three Rivers, in the River St. Maurice.. \$25,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Does that complete the work?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I understand that this amount is to cover a Governor General's warrant that was issued on the 16th January last, to make immediate repairs on account of the breaking of the boom. My hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) is better acquainted with the district than I am. I understand that this was a matter of urgency, to prepare for the logs coming down this season. The work was carried on by the resident engineer by day's labour.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I know the nature of the case, and I am quite prepared to say that I think it is absolutely necessary that this work should be done, because the lumber business on that river, which is very great, depends absolutely on these booms being repaired. But I understand when I was down in the constituency, that there were other works which were required; and what I wish to ask the acting minister is whether this \$25,000 is solely for the purpose of repairing the booms, or if it included the other works, which I am told are absolutely necessary to make the booms available for the lumber drive.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) is quite right. This does not cover the whole cost of the works. There is another item in the main estimates to cover other works in this connection.

Roads and Bridges—Bridge over the Saskatchewan River at Edmonton, N.W.T.—To complete payments ..... \$5,500

Mr. CLANCY. Please give some explanation.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. This is to close up the account.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). What is the total cost of this bridge?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The total up to the 1st of May last was \$82,659.57.

Mr. CLANCY. When was the work commenced?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Two years ago. This is to make the final payments.

Telegraph Lines—Land and cable telegraph lines, Gulf of St. Lawrence, &c.—Land line between Margaree and Mabou..... \$1,600

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a new line?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. No, it is to re-pole the line.

Telegraph Lines, B.C.—Alternative line connecting Cape Beale and Carmanah with Victoria via extension of French Creek-Alberni line, built southward to the south-west coast of Vancouver Island ..... \$1,273 50

Mr. PRIOR. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) say what work is to be done?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. This is to complete payments on the telegraph line in question. It is to supplement a vote of \$1,000 which was granted by parliament in 1899. The line originally estimated for was estimated at thirty-eight miles long, but, when actual construction was proceeded with, it was found much easier and less expensive to carry it around the coast by a less direct line. The total cost of the alternative line was \$6,422. The work was carried on by contract, the contract price being \$95 a mile. The contract was entered on the 15th of March, 1899.

Mr. PRIOR. Before leaving the coast I had some conversation with the local member for Alberni with reference to this line. I must say I do not know the district myself, never having traversed it. But he tried to impress upon me the necessity of a much better route being found than the present one. The line as now built is very often down. It is a very rough coast, and wrecks, I am sorry to say, often take place. On such occasions, many lives are endangered if the telegraph line is down when most required to be used to telegraph for assistance. According to the notes I have, in his opinion the line about seventy miles long should be built from Alberni Town via Sproat Lake, Kennedy Lake, Ucluelet, and up the coast to Clayoquot. There is a large mining and fishing business carried on at Clayoquot, and there would be quite a little business for the line from those engaged in trade. To take a cable across from Cape Beale to Ucluelet is very dangerous, owing to the currents. The minister will find in his department a petition which was sent last year asking that the line be built according to the scheme I have just brought before the committee. I can only ask the

hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) to look into the matter and give it his careful consideration, as it is a matter of importance not only to the people who live in the district, but to the people of Victoria as well.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am told by the deputy that all these lines are on the south-west coast of the island.

Rent, fuel and light for public buildings,  
Yukon territory ..... \$14,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is in addition to the \$27,000 voted last year to provide for the payment of rent of buildings and for fuel and light in connection with buildings in the North-west Territories. At Dawson City, rent of commissioner's office and post office, \$14,400 ; Crown timber lands office, \$9,000 ; commissioner's office, \$3,000 ; gold commissioner's house and officials, \$3,000 ; office for legal adviser, \$780 ; fuel for buildings, \$400, 400 cords of wood at \$25 a cord. These with other small items total up \$41,000 ; less appropriation, \$27,000, leaves a balance of \$14,000 now required.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a tremendous item. What was paid for the post office as rent ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The post office and the commissioner's office are put together as \$14,400. We have not got the details in the Department of Public Works. The figures are sent to the department by the Department of the Interior. If the hon. gentleman wants any details the item will have to stand.

Yukon and Lewes Rivers—Improvements including allowance of \$1,000 per annum to superintending engineer, P. C. Taché, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ... \$39,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This vote of \$25,000 is to supplement the appropriation of \$40,000 made by parliament in 1899 for carrying on during the fiscal year 1899-1900 the works undertaken in connection with the then projected improvements on the Yukon and Lewes Rivers, viz. : Head of Lake Labarge, construction of 5,000 feet in length of pile, brush and stone-work, \$30,000 ; Rink Rapids, improvement of rapids by removal of boulders and construction of two beacon piers on each side of channel, \$10,000 ; Hell Gate, Lewes River, construction of 3,570 feet of pile, brush and stone-work, \$18,000 ; White Horse Rapids, construction of pile wharf, 400 feet long, \$18,500 ; Tagish Lake, construction of buoys and piers at mouth of Six-Mile River, repairs to wharf built by the mounted police, \$3,500 ; Five Finger Rapids, improvements by the removal of boulders, \$40,000 ; surveys and inspections, \$8,000 ; superintendence and contingencies, \$4,000 ; total, \$138,000.

During the present fiscal year improvements were carried out at the following places.

Mr. PRIOR.

Cariboo Crossing.—A dam 400 feet long, 12 feet wide, and 10 feet high, was built to close a channel through which a great quantity of water escaped especially during the spring. Two permanent beacons on piers were also built, and seven floating buoys were placed in position. The above mentioned works have greatly improved the navigation of the river at this point, and have given an increased depth of water of over eight inches.

Tagish.—Six floating buoys were placed in the channel of the river at dangerous points, and repairs were effected to the wharf built by the mounted police.

Six-Mile River—A number of boulders were blasted and removed from the bed of the river, and floating buoys have been placed in position. The channel is now in very good order. Two lifting barges were constructed to remove the rocks from the bed of the river after they had been blasted.

White Horse Rapids.—Is the head of navigation to Dawson City and the terminus of the White Pass and Yukon Railway. It is situated on the west bank of Fifty-Mile River. A number of piles have been purchased together with a 1,600-pound hammer and necessary cable, with a view to the construction of a pile wharf, 400 feet long, at this point. A dangerous boulder situated eight miles below the rapids was blasted and removed.

Thirty-Mile River.—This river was the most dangerous to navigate on this route, it being very swift and crooked, besides being obstructed with any amount of boulders and rocks. During the present fiscal year the bed of the river was cleared of all obstructions and four stationary beacons were placed at the head of the river.

Five Finger Rapids.—These rapids are very dangerous although fit for navigation. They are difficult to ascend, it being necessary to ascend by warping up the channel through the rapids. The removal of boulders was commenced during the present fiscal year, and according to the latest report from the engineer in charge the work is more than half completed.

Rink Rapids.—Three miles below Five Finger Rapids.—The channel through the rapids was obstructed by a number of boulders which have all been removed. The channel is now in good condition.

That is the return of the work during the fiscal year. The appropriation of last year was \$40,000. This \$25,000 will cover the expenditure to date of \$65,000 in all. It is not more than half what will be required to make these various improvements—about half.

Mr. FOSTER. On what plan are these being made ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have a local resident engineer there, Mr. Taché. The work is not done by contract, but by day's labour.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is responsible for it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Taché, the engineer of the department resident there.

Mr. FOSTER. On what plan are these improvements being carried out—on a plan that has been approved by the department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Coste personally made the surveys with a party, prepared plans, and submitted them to the minister, and the improvements are being carried out on Mr. Coste's plans. Mr. Coste is not now in the service, but his recommendations have been adopted, and they are working on his plans.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way are the money payments made there?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A credit is sent to Mr. Taché on a bank at Bennett, and he draws the money, disburses it and receives vouchers.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he sign the cheques simply or solely himself, or is there a countersigning?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are paid to his own order; there is no countersigning.

Mr. FOSTER. With Mr. Taché is there any man of accounts sent up there to keep track of all these very large expenditures?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is furnished with a clerk. Mr. Taché and his assistant keep the accounts. Mr. Taché is now on his way back; the department wish to consult with him in reference to the whole of the work, and he is expected in a short time.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the assistant an engineer or an accountant?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, he is not an engineer; he is a clerk who keeps the accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. He does not countersign the cheques?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, Mr. Taché alone draws the money.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole thing sounds like a fairy tale the way the money goes out. I suppose we know about as much about it as the hon. acting minister does. It is not a really satisfactory way of doing things. The House ought to know more about the whole transaction than it does. Here is an expenditure of \$130,000 going on out there, and there seem to be no means of supervision of the money paid out by one man. I am not saying that it is not well done, but the House has very fragmentary information about it. We have heard that to take out one boulder cost \$8,000, and to build a dam costs \$5,000, and the like of that. It does not seem, with such very large amounts, that proper care is taken on the accountant's side of it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think that I can take exception to that view. It seems difficult to carry on works involving a large expenditure so far away from the place of government. I dare say it would be very proper to appoint an accountant to act generally in connection with the expenditure in the Yukon. I think it would be a proper thing to consider and I will bring that before council to see whether they will recommend a policy of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. These expenditures began more than a year ago. To what extent have these accounts and vouchers come to the department and been sent to the audit office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am informed that all the vouchers, with the exception of bills for \$15,000, are here, and these latter Mr. Taché will bring with him.

Mr. FOSTER. Those vouchers have gone to the Auditor General, I suppose?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They have gone to the accountant to the department in the usual way, but the officers do not know whether they have passed over to the Auditor General or not. I presume, in the ordinary course, he would transfer them to the Auditor General.

Mr. FOSTER. I should think, in a case of that kind, so long as you have taken no precaution to put a first-class accountant up there, no delay should take place in getting these vouchers into the hands of the Auditor General in the regular order, because he is an auditor, and as an auditor would be able to point out any irregularities immediately to the department, and greater care could be taken in the matter.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think the system may be improved, but I am quite certain that in so far as Mr. Taché is concerned, the government could not have a more reliable man. He has been a number of years in the Department of Public Works, and I am quite sure that he is absolutely reliable. Of course, the system of leaving all these important matters, even to one man, I think, is increasing his responsibility beyond what it should be.

Mr. FOSTER. A good engineer is not necessarily a good accountant.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, but I think his work has been carried out in different parts of Quebec, where he had to take the same responsibility in such a way that his reputation stands high in the department, as it stands high outside amongst those who know him. As to the system, I think, if it is possible, to give him the assistance of an accountant it would be an improvement. But, as to his qualifications, I think no man could have been sent there who could do his duty more faithfully than Mr. Taché.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). This system seems very much like that which

prevailed under the old head of the department; it looks very suspicious from the start, and the present acting head of the department seems to be doing things in the same way. Mr. Taché's reputation may be all right in Quebec, where there is a close supervision over him, but it may be altogether different in the Yukon. But, whether it is good or bad, we have had experience of sending men out and giving them a free hand; it means that we do not get full value for the money. I think the department should devise some better check than there appears to be over the expenditure of this very large amount.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no system of check at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I have no doubt that in the beginning of the Yukon business many things had to be done in ways which were not in accordance with strict rules, but now, when we have reached a stage in the Yukon business at which we can bring work there under the usual restrictions of government, I think these should be applied to work done in that country. It may be said that an engineer in another province, or in any other section of the Dominion, has not the payment of accounts in his own hands, but in reality he has the payment in his own hands, because he has to certify to the accounts. Though he does not actually sign the cheque, his certificate leads to the payment and the responsibility is about the same. It is certainly undesirable that any one officer should have unchecked control over the funds, and for the coming year we ought to introduce some restrictions which will meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Working expenses—Bennett, Dawson and Atlin telegraph lines ..... \$45,000

Mr. FOSTER. How long have these two lines been running?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Both these lines were opened in September, 1899.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been the total cost of these lines?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About one hundred and forty-nine thousand dollars for the two.

Mr. FOSTER. How many miles?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Five hundred and sixty-five miles to Dawson, and eighty miles to Atlin, total 645 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. In the ten months, what has been the income?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have here the income to January, June, 1899, \$45.40; July, \$465.45; August, \$1,060.69; September, \$3,787.87; October, \$7,552.90; November, \$3,990.18; December, \$3,181.27; January, \$5,438.52. Of course the months of June and July cannot be taken as representative, because the line was not finished, but the gross revenue for the nine months, would be \$25,522.26. I gave the figures for the balance the other day, and they are printed in *Hansard*.

Mr. FOSTER. How is this \$45,000 to be expended?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will give the hon. gentleman the names of the operators and linemen and their salaries. When these stations were established last fall at these more or less inaccessible points the men were given provisions to carry them through the winter. I do not know that any arrangements have been made for the permanent operation of the line, but that has to be considered. These salaries may or may not be reasonable, but I do not consider that they represent a normal state of affairs. The following is the list:

Stations.	Operators.	Salary per Month.	Linemen.	Salary per Day.
		\$ cts.		\$ cts.
Dawson.....	J. Cleg.....	125 00	W. McNamara.....	3 00
".....	D. S. McKenzie.....	125 00		
Ogilvie.....	J. Wilkinson.....	100 00	O. Martineson.....	3 00
Selwyn.....	J. H. Bronlow.....	100 00	A. McDonald.....	3 00
Five Fingers.....	W. Holden.....	125 00	M. Oleson.....	3 00
Selkirk.....	H. Hutchison.....	100 00	H. D. Card.....	3 00
Tantalus.....				
Big Salmon.....	G. A. McLaughlin.....	100 00	T. C. Kirk.....	3 00
Hootalinqua.....	F. R. Walker.....	100 00		
Lower Labarge.....	J. P. Phelan.....	100 00	J. H. Brown.....	3 00
White Horse.....	G. Fleming.....	125 00	T. Dickson.....	3 00
Miles Canyon.....	G. Stronack.....	100 00		
Tagish.....	N. R. Grimes.....	100 00	S. E. Chambers.....	3 00
Atlin.....	A. H. Hansfield.....	125 00	Fred. Milligan.....	3 00
			J. Huston.....	3 00
Cariboo Crossing.....	G. S. Srepley.....	100 00		
Bennett.....	A. E. Carvey.....	125 00	H. B. Gagne.....	3 00

Charles Couture, stationed at Dawson, is in charge of the repairing of the line, and of all the linemen from Dawson to Big Salmon, inclusive. Napoleon Bellefeuille, is in charge of all the linemen from Big Salmon to Bennett, as well as Tagish-Atlin line. His salary is not stated. In addition to the foregoing, Mr. W. N. Crean is the superintendent of the whole telegraph system in the Yukon. His salary is \$2,000 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of this amount is expended for salaries?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are two or three employees whose salaries I have not given, but allowing them to be about the same as the others, I suppose the total amount for salaries would be about \$30,000. Then, there will be the cost of maintenance and repairs, involving the hiring of horses, and I suppose dog-trains in winter. That would leave \$15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How are the supplies got?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The superintendent of telegraphs in the inside service, Mr. Keeley, was instructed in the early part of April to consider a scheme for a businesslike and economical management of the line, and he wrote to Mr. Crean, the superintendent, asking him for a general report and recommendation, with a view to devising a scheme. The report has not yet come to hand, but it is intended in the near future, to put the management of the line upon a proper, permanent basis. The arrangements in the past have been of a temporary character. I do not know whether these salaries are reasonable or unreasonable, or whether the allowances for provisions or otherwise are necessary, or whether a better plan can be adopted. It may be that at leading points, like Bennett and Dawson, where there are opportunities for men to maintain themselves and get board, a cash allowance should be made. That is always desirable, if possible; but at unimportant points, where some of the operators may have to live, it may be necessary to provide them with shelter and accommodation.

Mr. FOSTER. Who provided them with food last year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am told that the construction staff opened a store at Bennett for the purposes of construction, and had quantities of food in that store for the use of the construction staff, and the maintenance of the operators throughout the winter, and that about nine months' supply was given to them when they entered upon their duties. I suppose that supply is now about gone, and it will be necessary to adopt some different plan.

Mr. CLANCY. Were the supplies purchased under the control of Mr. Charleson?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They were purchased from Kelly, Douglas & Co.,

of Vancouver. I am told tenders were invited by the secretary of the department from fifteen or sixteen people, and that firm got the contract.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If tenders were called for by the secretary of the department, it seems to me that the department might be able to furnish more information than we have received to-night. We have not heard yet how the tenders were called for, whether by public advertisement, or by distribution among fourteen or fifteen of Mr. Charleson's friends. The matter possibly requires more looking into, from the fact that this parliament granted a charter to a company for the purpose of building that line; and on the good faith of that legislation, English capitalists in London invested their money and got up a company. When the company was organized, immediately after the first meeting the government took into their own hands the building of that line. Representations were sent to the Governor in Council from London; and before this item passes, I would ask that every information which the government has in regard to the tenders for supplies, and so forth, be brought down. I do not know whether my information is correct or not, but the only way in which it is possible to show that it is not correct would be for the government to bring down all the information required. It is difficult to explain why these men should have been paid these high wages and have been allowed to draw upon the supplies furnished by the government. If tenders were called for, the government must be in possession of the notices given and the tenders received. I did not know that the item was to be taken up to-night, or I would have brought with me letters I have received from London, which I would be happy to lay before the House. The item should stand until full information is brought down.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are most anxious to bring down all the information. I am not able to say where the wire was bought. The invitations to tender were not published, but the secretary of the department sent notices to leading persons in the trade, not merely in Vancouver but also in Canada.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think that the hon. gentleman will find that these notices were not sent except to a certain number of people—not all over Canada—but in Vancouver, Victoria and Chicago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They were sent to a certain number, not resident merely in Vancouver, but in other leading points, and I will produce the list.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The papers regarding the wire were brought down last session.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The item should stand until we get all the information. We should have the list of all these tenders and know exactly who the parties are that were invited to tender. This line has attracted a good deal of attention outside of Canada owing to the fact that the charter was financed in London. The credit of Canada has been injured to a great extent through the fact that parliament gave a charter and immediately after a company was organized in London, the government ignored that charter and built the line itself.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not going to press the item. There is quite a feeling in favour of the government acquiring telegraph lines, but it is more difficult to acquire existing lines than to build new ones. The cost of this line was \$235 a mile, which covers the cost of all the material and labour involved in its construction. I think that if properly managed this line will be a very good investment. There is a prospect of it being used as a connecting link between Alaska and this country and other parts of the world, and we will probably do the whole of the Alaska business with the outside world. That will double the revenue.

Mr. SPROULE. What rate do you charge ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Fifty cents per hundred words. If my hon. friend will consent to let the item pass, we can have the discussion on another item.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have no objection to allowing the item to pass providing the discussion may come up on another one.

Civil Government—Department of Public Works ..... \$46,300

Mr. FOSTER. There is an extra first-class clerk here. Who has been promoted ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The promotion has not yet been made, but it is contemplated to promote Mr. Vincent, the senior of the first-class clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. His name is mentioned in the detailed item. Why is it mentioned ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Technically, it ought not to be mentioned, and there is no objection to its being struck out.

Mr. FOSTER. He is a second-class clerk, and at the head of his class ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes : I am told by the deputy that he is the senior.

Public works chargeable to capital—Public buildings, Ontario—Ottawa military buildings, new store ..... \$5,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is this to be built ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This work has just begun. The building is to be

Mr. FIELDING.

in Cartier Square, just behind the drill shed.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Who has the contract ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Bourque.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the amount of the contract ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is \$50,745.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the lowest tender accepted ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Does the building face the Model school ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The sketch given me by the deputy shows the drill shed facing the north, towards Maria Street, and this building at the back of it, on the south side.

Harbours and rivers, Quebec—River St. Lawrence ship channel ..... \$433,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is a tremendous vote—nearly half a million. What is to be done with this ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is required to cover expenses of management, working expenses, and the maintenance of dredging plant, operating the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec, as well as two new steel elevator dredges now under construction ; to complete the tug *St. James*, and one stone elevator, and three new hopper scows, and electric plant for the dredges. I will give the details of this estimate :

Working Expenses—	
Including maintenance of hulls, machinery, &c., of six elevators, dredges, tugs and scows, daily wages of crews, &c....	\$125,000
Extra running expenses for six months of three dredges engaged on night work .....	25,000
	\$160,000
New Plant—	
To complete one new elevator dredge, now under construction .....	\$ 70,000
Material and labour on one new steel elevator dredge, to be completed in 1902 (estimated cost, \$110,000) .....	40,000
One twin screw tug .....	20,000
New hull and boiler for tug 'John Pratt' .....	16,000
Complete tug 'St. James' .....	25,000
One new wooden 400 ton coal barge .....	12,000
Three new wooden 250 yard hopper scows .....	27,000
New wooden hull for No. 1 anchor scow .....	1,800
One new stone lifter (to complete) .....	10,000
New electric plant for dredges, &c. ....	10,000
	231,000

## Ship Yard—

New board fence around ship-yard at Sorel .....	\$ 2,000	
Repairs needed to wharfs at ship yard .....	6,500	
Repairs to rented wharf on Sorel side of the river.....	2,800	
		11,300

## Hydrographic Survey—

Salaries of engineers, gauge keepers and other labour, including supplies.....	25,000
Contingencies .....	5,000

Total grant required for 1900-1901.. \$433,100

N.B.—Beside the wooden elevator dredge under construction, to be completed in the early spring of 1901 there is an item of \$40,000 for material and labour on one new steel elevator dredge, to be ready for work in spring of 1902. At the opening of navigation there will be six new steel elevator dredges available for work on the St. Lawrence, but two of these are of the old stock and have been already condemned, and at best can only last one more season.

Total expenditure on the River St. Lawrence Canal up to the 31st of December, 1899, was \$4,392,602.97. Deduct ship channel debt assumed by the Department of Public Works 1st of July, 1888, \$2,725,504.10, and we have \$1,667,098.87 as the total expenditure by the Department of Public Works from 1st of July, 1888, to January, 1900. In addition to the \$2,725,504.10 a further sum of \$185,605.10 was expended through the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, pending the completion of arrangements by the Public Works Department for taking over the works, which arrangements could only be completed on the 1st of January, 1889.

Mr. FOSTER. This does not seem to be a satisfactory statement. Here we have the River St. Lawrence ship channel debited with between \$400,000 and \$500,000, and when the acting minister has read over these items, our mind is filled up with a bewildering amount of construction work which is being done, from board fences up to steel elevators. So far as I could take it in, there does not seem to be of that \$422,000, which is ostensibly for making the navigation better in the River St. Lawrence, one dollar of it spent in making the navigation better. It is all for piling up a thundering quantity of machinery, keeping up an immense ship yard at Sorel, and all seems to be expended in machinery and in salaries. What has been done, and what is to be done, in real actual work in the River St. Lawrence? It looks as if the whole thing is run to seed in appurtenances, and that the money does not go to the River St. Lawrence channel for improvements.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The first item of \$160,000 of this vote is all for the purpose of dredging, improvements of the channel. There are six dredges at work between Montreal and Sorel. The item of \$160,000 comprises \$35,000 for doing day work and \$25,000 for night work. The whole of that is for the purpose of improving the channel. The balance is for new

plant or for renovating practically the old plant so as to make it more efficient. The demand for dredging, I suppose, will never cease. I have but a limited experience in the department, but so far as I can form a conclusion I should judge that dredging in this country is hardly begun. I venture to think that the government waste a good deal of money by having inefficient plant, There are better devices for removing some classes of deposit than those the government now possess.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is \$260,000 for plant for the River St. Lawrence alone. This does not go to dredging anywhere else.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will be the property of the country, it will be available if needed anywhere else. I am told the new dredging costs \$110,000, so that the \$231,000 which is composed of the items of new plant, which I have read, does not supply a great deal of new dredging material. The dimensions of the ship-yard are 2.100 x 700 feet.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was spent last year in real work on the channel?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About \$80,000.

Mr. FOSTER. If the acting minister will add \$80,000 and \$160,000 this year, there is \$240,000. Now, that has gone into the real actual work of dredging out the channel. If he will add the two votes together he will find in the two years that he has taken close on to \$900,000. Subtract \$240,000, and it makes over \$600,000 that has gone in plant and labour at Sorel. This is actually stupendous. In my time we used to get \$90,000 to \$115,000, and then you used to think that vote was tremendous for the channel. Now, we take, in two years, \$865,000, and out of it less than \$240,000 have gone into the actual improvement of the channel. That leaves over \$600,000 that has been and is tucked away somewhere in plant. What have we got for it? We have two new elevators. What, under God's heaven, has been done with the rest of it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are six elevators.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but we have not built these six elevators in two years. It is only a portion of this money that has gone into the elevators.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The engineer informs me that we have rebuilt four elevator dredges, that we have built two new ones, and that we have two others that have been rebuilt.

Mr. TAYLOR. Last year the hon. Minister of Public Works asked for \$432,000, and he gave an explanation similar to that which the hon. Postmaster General is giving here to-night as to what he was going to do with that money. I put a question on

the paper this session to know if the government had purchased the steamer *Eureka*, and if so, at what price. It was answered that this steamer had been purchased from the Connolly Brothers, naming the price. Then, I put another question on the paper, in which I wanted to know out of what money the boat had been paid for, and the reply was that she had been paid for out of money voted for the ship channel last year. The hon. Minister of Public Works did not tell the House last year that he was going to purchase a private yacht for himself out of the money which was voted. What is the use of coming down and asking for money and then misappropriating it, as has been done in this case. I want to know what became of that \$432,000. What amount has been paid for the *Eureka*, which was purchased from the Connolly Brothers for the private use of the hon. Minister of Public Works? I want to know what the *Eureka* is doing now, what necessity there was for her purchase, and what benefit she is to the dredging of the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec? Last year the hon. Minister of Public Works gave us every detail as to how he was going to spend this money, and the acting minister is doing the same thing now. I want to know why \$35,000, or \$40,000, has been paid out to purchase a private yacht for the minister?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The chief engineer informs me that the *Eureka* is not a pleasure yacht. Of course, she could be used to convey people, but the purpose of her purchase was that she might be used for the general purpose of towing on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is she being used for that now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. In reference to the inquiry as to the vote of last year, I am told that \$150,000 has not been expended. It was \$432,000, of which \$150,000 is yet unexpended, leaving \$270,000 expended, and when you take that \$80,000 expended in dredging and improving the channel and the building of two new steel elevator dredges, you have accounted for a good deal of that vote.

Mr. TAYLOR. The government came down and asked for a certain sum of money, and they told us what they were going to expend it for. There was no proposition last year that they were going to purchase a pleasure yacht for the hon. Minister of Public Works. There was a charge for his trip down the river of \$2,236, which is charged as follows:

Harbours and rivers, P.E.I., repairs to piers .....	\$ 200 00
Harbours and rivers, maritime provinces generally .....	1,618 50
Harbours and rivers, Quebec generally..	366 82
Harbours and rivers generally .....	51 50
	<hr/>
	\$2,236 82

Mr. TAYLOR.

Here, I have a list of the purchases made to make the *Eureka* a pleasure yacht, and I intend to read it when we come to the vote of harbours and rivers generally, just to show the people of the country the way this government have squandered their money in purchasing and fitting out the steam yacht that the government purchased and fitted out, and for which they took the money out of the vote for the Quebec ship channel. Now, the acting Minister of Public Works comes down and asks us to vote \$433,000, and he tells us what the money is to be spent for. Have the government any right to misappropriate \$30,000, or \$40,000, of the money voted by parliament for the purchase of a steam yacht? Before this item is passed, we want all the details of that \$433,000. It is simply intolerable that this government should come down and ask parliament to vote money for a specific purpose, and then go and spend it for something else.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). I think it is about time that this ridiculous story of a pleasure yacht should be exploded. I do not think that anything more absurd could be given as a comparison as between statements of the press and hon. gentlemen opposite and the facts of the case about this so-called private pleasure yacht. I have seen references to it in the press, and I thought I would like to see the boat myself. I had the pleasure of being on board of her. I think we went two or three miles upon her.

Mr. TAYLOR. When?

Mr. FLINT. Last summer or the summer when the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) made his trip to the maritime provinces. She is not a pleasure yacht in any sense of the term. She is a very ordinary type of boat, which was fitted up cheaply and inexpensively, but not decently nor comfortably. She is not a boat that any gentleman, or anybody going for pleasure, would use for such a purpose, and when she is referred to as a pleasure yacht, the thing is utterly ridiculous. Speaking as one who saw the boat, who knows about her, and who had an opportunity of investigation, I may say that the charge is utterly ridiculous. In regard to the trip which the hon. Minister of Public Works took around the provinces at that time, I may say that I met him at a remote portion of my county, and accompanied him, not on a pleasure yacht, except it was a short distance, but by teams, to the public works in the county of Yarmouth, and to several public works in the neighbouring county, and I think, as a matter of fact, that probably the most useful visit that was ever made by any Minister of Public Works, or any other official in control of a department of the government, was the visit made by the hon. Minister of Public Works to the public works in the maritime provinces. I may say, that

although it involved a great amount of labour, these public works were inspected in storm and fine weather as well, and I think the mere physical labour performed by the hon. Minister of Public Works was something highly to his credit, and something which very few men, even strong men, could have stood. I think the amount of money saved by the personal inspection of the Minister of Public Works is something which is highly to be commended instead of being condemned as it has been done very frequently in this House. It was in no sense of the term a pleasure trip, but a most laborious, painstaking and useful expedition by the head of the Public Works Department, and I would recommend that other cabinet ministers, so far as they can find it possible, should follow the example of the hon. Minister of Public Works. As one who had a partial opportunity of seeing the nature of the laborious work he did that summer, I say that the Minister of Public Works should receive credit for what he did, rather than the censure of gentlemen opposite, who know absolutely nothing about the matter. To start from Quebec and call at every port and pier and personally to go over it with his accompanying engineer, and the resident engineer of the district, taking notes of the complaints of those who lived there, was not at all easy work. In my own county of Yarmouth, the Minister of Public Works did not give ten minutes of his time to anything except work of this kind. He was accompanied by the representative of the county, and by the engineers and he sent for the foremen and others, and examined them with painstaking care. In one or two instances, under the immediate direction of the minister, there was a small amount of money expended, and that saved a great deal to the country, because we all know that the expenditure of \$50 or \$60 to make absolutely necessary repairs in time, may save perhaps hundreds of dollars at a future date. There was a flagrant case in my own county, where the neglect of the previous government to expend a few hundred dollars subsequently led to the necessity of spending \$8,000. Probably in the whole annals of the Public Works Department of this Dominion, there has nothing more beneficial been done for the country, than the trip made by the Hon. Mr. Tarte. As to the absurd talk about a yacht, it is about time hon. gentlemen dropped that, because she is not a yacht at all, but simply a tug boat fitted up so as to be decently comfortable.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). I regret that I cannot endorse the views of the hon. gentleman from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), because I have practical knowledge of the uselessness of the visit of the Minister of Public Works to my county. He visited some of the public works, and gave a very warm expression with regard to their needs,

but I believe in a man who will show his works, and not his words. For the short time he was in the harbour of Lunenburg, his boat was detained in consequence of grounding near the pier, and so he had ocular demonstration of the absolute necessity of dredging that harbour. Not alone at the pier, but along the portion of the harbour required for the general shipping, it is so shallow that it is almost impossible for a vessel of any draught to get up. The Hon. Mr. Tarte assured me that the dredging would be done. In order that I might satisfy myself and the friends who were standing on the pier, I said to him, as his boat was about to leave: 'Well now, Mr. Tarte, I hope you will see that this dredging is attended to at once,' and he replied: 'Oh, yes, oh, yes, that will be attended to, that will be done sure the coming year.' I have since appealed repeatedly to him, but he has turned a deaf ear to my recommendation for that work. There is not a public work in the country that is more greatly needed than the dredging of that harbour, and it is a disgrace to the minister and to the department that it is not attended to. I hope the acting Minister of Public Works will note my remarks and will take action this year. I trust that he will see that the dredges that are now being built, will perform a certain amount of work in that harbour, so as to meet the necessities which I have detailed. Words can scarcely describe the urgent need for that dredging at Lunenburg. A dredge is repeatedly being sent to the harbour of Yarmouth, in fact the dredge is so often there, that they might as well keep her altogether, but still the harbour is filling up. In Lunenburg harbour, when it is once dredged, that will be sufficient for a great number of years, simply because there is not much of tortuous water there. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) can, I think, endorse what I have said, for he was present when the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), made that pledge to myself, and to the people who were on the pier at the time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry I cannot exactly endorse the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach), although, no doubt, he makes it in good faith. I think he is unnecessarily severe on the Minister of Public Works, who certainly was much impressed with all he saw on the coast of Nova Scotia, Lunenburg included. The difficulty has been that we have not dredges enough to do the work. Prior to the application from Lunenburg, there was an application from Bridgewater, also in the hon. gentleman's county, and assurances were given, so far as it was possible to give assurances, that the first dredging in that neighbourhood would be done at Bridgewater. Unfortunately we have not so far been able to secure the services of a dredge. I tell my hon. friend frankly, that until we fulfil our

obligations to Bridgewater, I hardly feel at liberty to advocate the claims of Lunenburg, although I know that what the hon. gentleman has said as to the needs of dredging there is well founded. I do not go so far as to say that the Minister of Public Works made the promise, but I know that he believes in good faith that the work should be done there if it is possible to get a dredge. I may state that the dredging equipment for the maritime provinces is exceedingly defective. We have had no new dredges built for that service for some time. The dredges, generally speaking, are small and inefficient and we will have to spend more money for building large and powerful dredges, if we are to meet demands such as have been made from Lunenburg. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach), will have to be patient and hopeful. When the first order from Bridgewater is filled, if after that we can send a dredge to Lunenburg, I will give it my cordial support.

Mr. KAULBACH. There is a county of Lunenburg, and a port of Lunenburg, and a town of Lunenburg, and I am now referring to the county of Lunenburg. I made appeals for dredging at Bridgewater, and also at Mahone Bay, but no attention has been paid to these appeals. I feel satisfied that the promise made by the Minister of Public Works, was made in the hearing of the Minister of Finance. Anyway, every man on the pier referred to heard the expression, or promise made by the Minister of Public Works, and I am a little doubtful whether our friend did not also hear it at the time. He may have forgotten it, because it did not interest him as much as it did me. However, if he says that no amount is to be put in the estimates this year for dredging in the county of Lunenburg, I must be content; but I think the people of that county will view the situation in a way in which they will be justified in viewing, and will not fail to resent it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the people of Lunenburg want to recall the neglect which they have received in the matter of dredging, they will have to begin with my hon. friend, who spent a good many years in this House when he had the power of securing dredging for that port and neglected to do so; and now he desires that we should do what he neglected to do for a long period. I hope my hon. friend will be very patient. If he speaks of the county of Lunenburg generally, I have been making every possible effort to secure a dredge to be sent to that county this season, as my hon. colleague knows. There are three ports in the hon. gentleman's county which he wants to have dredged all at once. I do not know that that is possible; but if we can get a dredge, we will send one into that county at a very early day, and that has been the instructions of the Public Works Department for several months past.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. KAULBACH. I wish to be charitable to my hon. friend, but I beg to correct him when he states that during the time the Conservatives were in power I neglected the interests of the county of Lunenburg. I had a dredge at work in Lunenburg harbour, at La Have and at Mahone Bay, and I am free to state that I at no time neglected the interests of the county, and I would ask him to take that back. Hon. gentlemen know that no person who has ever represented that county has been more earnest in the discharge of his duties towards it than I have been.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has been doing all the attacking, and he must not be so sensitive when he gets a shot in return. The hon. gentleman said that the dredging done at Lunenburg would stand for many years. If he secured a dredge there some years ago, then I fail to see the necessity of our sending one now. However, the county of Lunenburg will receive, as it has been receiving, all consideration in the matter of dredging at the hands of the present government.

Mr. KAULBACH. The dredge that was sent there broke down and had to go away for repairs. After she left she never came back, and the result was that we only had a couple of months of work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We must try and send one that will not break down.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) raised the question whether the *Eureka* was or was not a private yacht. She was purchased as such, and was used as such. The point I raise is that the Minister of Public Works last year asked a sum of money for a certain purpose and diverted it to the purchase of this boat. If the government want to purchase a yacht for tugging or for any other purpose, they must come to parliament and ask for a vote for that particular purpose. The purchase of this yacht was a misappropriation of funds. It was a job to buy from the Connollys this boat for \$26,000 and to spend \$27,000 on her for repairs. The government did in the purchase of that boat what they had no right to do, whether it was a tug or a pleasure yacht to take the minister on a pleasure trip.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is that a pleasure trip?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have heard people say that when he took that boat down, flying the American flag and the tricolour, and not the Union Jack, he said he was taking a pleasure trip. But the point I make is that the government have misappropriated the money in the purchase of that yacht. Whether there was a job in it or not I do not know. The minister seems to think that when we vote money for public works,

we vote it to him to do as he pleases with it. I say he should be censured by this House, and he will be when we come to concurrence on this vote, for having misappropriated \$26,000 in purchasing a steamer which the department has no use for. That is the point I raise, notwithstanding the eulogy of the hon. member for Yarmouth on the Minister of Public Works for the great benefit he did by spending \$2,236 on that trip, inspecting the harbours and piers, which he did in a month's time. He liked the yacht so well for a pleasure yacht that when he came back he purchased her out of the money voted for dredging the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call the attention of the minister to a detailed statement of the expenses as shown in the Auditor General's Report for 1898-9. He will see that the first ten pages from Q-17 are taken up entirely with the payment of labourers, carpenters, &c., at the shops at Sorel, showing an expenditure of about \$115,000 there. Then he comes to the expenses of the different tugs and dredges, which I suppose represents the actual work put into the ship channel, and he will see how very small a proportion that bears to the total. For instance, the dredge *Laurier* cost for her summer's work, \$1,300; another, \$2,200; the dredge *Laval*, \$4,000; the tug *Cartier*, \$2,200; dredge No. 11, \$3,700; the tug *Parsons*, \$1,700; dredge No. 12, \$2,600; the tug *Brydges*, \$1,147; the tug *John Pratt*, \$3,362; the tug *St. James*, \$2,585; dredge No. 8, \$608; tug *Emelia*, \$387; tug *St. Francis* \$204. That altogether makes about \$30,000, and that represents the work that was put by the dredges and the attendant tugs into the ship channel.

Mr. GIBSON. Does that include wages?

Mr. FOSTER. That includes everything, because all the rest I have read over is the labourers in the shops. This is for the operation of each one of these dredges and tugs. Then, there is an item for the new semaphore at St. Jean de Challons, about \$7,500. Then, we come down to a long list of expenditures, which is entirely the expenditures in the office at Sorel, and for machinery for Sorel, and the purchase of supplies of all kinds, of iron and ropes, &c., evidently in the construction work, and that makes up an immense sum. So that, charged to the ship channel altogether you have about \$285,400, and of that a little more than \$30,000 has actually gone into the dredging of the channel. That seems a tremendous disproportion. It does seem as if nearly everything was put on machinery and labour in the machine shops, office expenses, &c., and an infinitesimal proportion went into the actual work in the channel.

There is the payment for the tug *Eureka* of \$26,000. You will find that on page Q-34 Steam tug *Eureka*, bill of sale, \$26,000; the

hire of it until bought, \$792. \$7,000 spent in repairs and a lot of supplies. What did the tug *Eureka* cost? We have here her cost of running for the season, \$2,091, but, evidently, even that cost did not go into the work of the channel, because the *Eureka* was being used by the minister on his trip.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. She was only used for a month and a half.

Mr. FOSTER. She was bought July 21, and a month and a half would bring you pretty well through the working season in the St. Lawrence. My hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) was perfectly correct in saying the buying of the *Eureka* was an improper use of money. By what rule is it that she was taken down on the minister's visit all along the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Atlantic coast, and while she was on that trip her maintenance and crew were charged against the ship channel. That should have been charged somewhere else. What is the need of a tug costing \$26,000, and \$7,000 for repairs, in the ship channel? What does she do?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. She is used in towing dredges from place to place, and in towing the coal barges. About 6,000 tons of coal a year is used by the vessel. She is to-day placing the scows. My hon. friend has given his estimate of the expenditure last year on the ship channel as \$30,000 or \$40,000. Does that represent the wages?

Mr. FOSTER. It is the working account of the dredges and tugs. I do not know.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This amount does not include the coal, which amounts to some \$20,000: the cost of maintenance and various kinds of stores, all must be added: and then you would get the expenditure of last year in the actual work done in the channel, amounting to about \$80,000. I would point out that the equipment in the way of dredging was found to be antiquated and inefficient, and the work was not conducted to advantage. This year, I am told by the chief engineer, that in consequence of building two elevators, the better equipment of these, and strengthening of the dredges, making them more powerful, and the regulating of the tugs, they are now doing service in the way of dredging 100 per cent more than last year.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the capacity of these dredges per day?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. According to the material, from 1,200 to 4,000 cubic yards in a day of ten hours. I would quite agree with any criticism if the aim of the department was merely to develop plant; because, of course, it is the result of the plant that we want. But if a better service is being done this year by 100 per cent than was being done last year, we can look

forward to an expenditure of capital in order that good may come from it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The acting minister made the statement that the tug *Eureka* was required to tow her dredges and to tow coal to the dredges. Now, if the minister will turn to the Auditor General's Report, pages Q—25 to 29, he will find that each dredge has her own tug. The dredge *Laurier* has her own tug, the *Jean d'Iberville*, on which there was an expenditure of \$2,236. Next is the dredge *Laval*, which has the tug *Cartier*. Next is No. 11, which has the tug *F. M. Parsons*; then dredge No. 12, which has the tug *C. J. Brydges*.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) will understand that every dredge has to have a tug with her to take the scows to her, and tow them away, and that is a service different from the service performed by the *Eureka*.

Mr. TAYLOR. But will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) wait until I get through. Then we have the tug *John Pratt*, for which there is no dredge, and she is at work on the ship channel. There is also the tug *St. James*, for which there is no dredge. Then we have dredge No. 8, which has the tug *Emelia*. There is also the tug *St. Francis*. There are three tugs besides the *Eureka*. Where is the work for these other dredges and for the *Eureka* too?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The chief engineer informs me that the tug *John Pratt* is used for what is called testing the channel, ascertaining the depth, taking the soundings, in order to see what has to be removed. The *St. James* is used for the hydrographic survey.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is a special vote for the hydrographical survey. Why should any tugs connected with this hydrographic survey be referred to under this service. What does the *St. Francis* do?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. She assists a dredge, but is not strong enough for the work under all circumstances. She can move her dredge in a harbour, but if the dredge has to be moved against a current another tug is required.

Mr. TAYLOR. But each dredge has its own tug, and there are these four besides, including the *Eureka*. Where is the work for the *Eureka*?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To tow the dredges themselves from place to place with scows and equipment.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, certainly, the minister knew, before he purchased that boat, that he wanted one to do that work, and why did he not ask for a vote?

Mr. MULOCK.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is proper that all the information of that kind should be given in advance. I have not read *Hansard* to see what information was given at that time. But I see as the vote is given this year, and as it appears to be extended from last year, it reads in the estimates, so much for the St. Lawrence ship channel, not giving particulars. Now, I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) does not want to be unfair. But, is it a fair representation to describe the *Eureka* as a mere pleasure yacht, when it was bought in July, 1898—two years ago—and from that time to the present has been engaged in legitimate work of the St. Lawrence channel, with the brief exception of one and a half months at the commencement of the fiscal year, 1898, when she carried the minister on his official mission to the maritime provinces. You can hardly call that a pleasure yacht, when she was used for this special purpose for so short a time, and has ever since been used for the regular tug purposes for which she was acquired.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister is mistaken. The journey of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was begun on the 13th of July, and ended the 9th of September. He chartered this yacht from the Connollys and paid for her at so much a day.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) still calls her a yacht.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly; but call her a tug, or anything you like. She was chartered specially for that business, and when the minister came back, the bargain was concluded some time in September, 1898. She was chartered at so much a day in the first place, and it was only after he came back that the job was put up by the Connollys to unload this vessel on to the government for \$26,000, and charge her to the ship channel. She was bought from the North American Transportation Company, which means M. K. Connolly & Co.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) can tell what tug did the work of towing for which the *Eureka* was afterwards purchased?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The *John Pratt* was the tug for that purpose before the *Eureka* was bought. But the channel had not been surveyed or swept for a long time, and it became necessary to have that done. That work is going on; it is a continuous one, and proceeds *pari passu* with the work of dredging. The *John Pratt* is used for that purpose. The chief engineer informs me that the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal made a request that an extra tug should be acquired in order that that deepening of the channel might go on.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the cost of the tugs generally? Is the *Eureka* a more costly tug than others in the service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The chief engineer informs me that before the *Eureka* was bought, they made an estimate and found they could not build a tug as useful as the *Eureka*, at the price for which she was bought. The superintendent of dredging certified to the *Eureka* being suitable and the price reasonable. But the chief engineer tells me they could not have built so good a tug at that price.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask how this tug classes with the *John Pratt*, and others, as to value and capacity?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The *Eureka* is a much larger vessel, of greater tonnage, and much greater value. The *Eureka* is a steel tug, and the *John Pratt* is a wooden tug. The engineer says the *Eureka* is a much more powerful tug.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will say whether the *Eureka* was built as a tug boat in the first instance, and for that purpose?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am told she was built for the express purpose of towing barges. In the waters where she runs there are very strong currents and a powerful tug is very desirable.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was the \$7,000 for repairs that were spent on her?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That expenditure was for the purpose of building a new cabin for the chief engineer, and providing the necessary accommodation on the boat, also a draughting room for the staff and general repairs.

Mr. CLANCY. A tug boat does not require any draughting.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When the dredges are at work the superintendent of dredging, with any assistants he may have with him, has the plans on board, and it is necessary to have a proper working room for the proper understanding of the work that is to be done.

Harbours and rivers, Ontario—Rainy  
River, lock and dam ..... \$25,000

Mr. CLANCY. Would the acting Minister of Public Works tell me why the items that appeared in the two former years for some work on the River Sydenham in one case, and the other case in Little Bear Creek, have been dropped, and why the work has really been dropped? Last year I called the attention of the Finance Minister to that, and pointed out to him that if there were no dredges belonging to the department, good dredges could be obtained in the locality to do the work. I think I had a partial promise from the hon. gentleman that he would turn his face that way, and take hold

of this work again, but nothing has come of it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to recall the circumstance to which my hon. friend alludes. I am told by the engineer that the true explanation was that no dredges were available.

Mr. CLANCY. That is not true, so far as other dredges outside the department are concerned. I can get the hon. gentleman a dredge in twenty-four hours, a good one, that will do that work cheaper than the departmental dredge will do it. There are a number of dredge men who are contractors with good dredges, and ready to do the work; so the hon. gentleman need urge that excuse no longer. But the item has been dropped, the appropriation has disappeared. I am told the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), is not going back to that riding, and perhaps he thinks it is just as well to drop Little Bear Creek. But still the work is an important one, and ought to be done. Then the work on the Sydenham River was commenced, but it was left unfinished.

Mr. GIBSON. What can you hire a dredge for?

Mr. CLANCY. A good dredge for \$60 or \$80 a day.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no recollection at all of the circumstance, the matter has not been brought to my mind at all as to why the work was not performed.

Mr. CLANCY. The engineer can tell him now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He tells me that the reason the former vote was not utilized, was because there was no dredge available. But as to why the estimates do not contain other figures, that is information no minister could give.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say with regard to dredging, that it seems to me that it is done in a very loose way. I am credibly informed that the dredging going on at Owen Sound for two or three years, is done by a dredge owned, as I said a short time ago, by certain parties who are very closely related to one of the members of this House. There is Dr. Horsey, son-in-law of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), Dr. Horsey's wife, daughter of the hon. member for East Huron; Miss Maggie Macdonald, spinster, unmarried daughter of the hon. member for East Huron, and Mr. A. J. McKay, Crown attorney. There are two ladies and two gentlemen who own a dredge, and they have gone in and got contracts from the government. Can any one imagine that with all the recklessness of human nature, you could find another example in the country of two ladies and two gentlemen going in and buying a dredge, without knowing anything about the plant

they were purchasing, and spending a large amount of money on it, unless they knew that they had a friend at court who would get them dredging to do for the government?

Mr. CLANCY. Two ladies, a lawyer and a physician.

Mr. SPROULE. Two ladies, a lawyer and a physician, who know nothing about dredging. These are the parties who were engaged at \$80 a day, and they are putting in full time, I presume. Somebody is profiting by it. An inspector is put on to see that the work is perfectly done. That inspector ought to be on the dredge all the time, from the moment it goes out in the morning, until it comes in at night, to see whether these scows are properly filled, to keep the time, and to see that the dredge is working, so as to know that there is full value given for this money. Instead of this, the inspector is on shore a good share of his time up around the hotels, smoking 10 cents and 25 cents cigars. I drew attention to this matter last year, and the government stated that they would look into it, but, I am told it is going on right through the season in the same way. I am also told that this inspector is employed by the dredge company to do work for them as well. Imagine the inspector that the government employ to look after their interest being employed by the dredge company. That is a matter that may not be correct, but the gentleman who informed me believes it to be correct. No inspector who is doing his duty properly can lead the life that this inspector leads and do justice to the country. Now, I say as well that if it were not for the fact that this dredge is owned by friends of a member of this House it never would be found engaged in that work up there. Other parties who owned a dredge of their own could not get an hour's work. They could not get employment for it, and they were obliged to sell out. As soon as the dredge was bought by these parties who were friends of the government, it got steady employment at \$80 a day. I am told that the dredge is not doing \$5 worth of work an hour instead of \$8, but that if the owners were paid fair remuneration for the work that they have done \$4 or \$5 an hour would be ample. There is no kind of proper supervision over it, and the money is being squandered.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know that the ownership of the dredge has anything to do with the question, providing that the government is getting fair value for its money.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was not aware that this dredge was at work at Owen Sound or that there was any question of ownership. But on general principles, preferring in my own way to have

Mr. SPROULE.

public work let by tender, when I took charge of the department I gave general instructions that tenders should be called for, and tenders will be called for in a short time for Owen Sound dredging. In compliance with these general instructions, not only general, but in reference to some particular points, a contract is being prepared the specifications are nearly ready and the work is about to be advertised. The work is going to be advertised in a few days. I may say that the chief engineer has called my attention to the fact that the dredging done at Owen Sound by this wicked dredge, which is paid for at the rate of 13½ cents per cubic yard, is being done at the lowest price that any dredging of that kind has been done on behalf of the government. What I ought to say is that taking a lot of tenders that have been invited there has been no tender procured at so low a rate as 13½ cents.

Mr. FOSTER. It depends a good deal on the quality of the work.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course it does. I am speaking of the same class of work done under the same conditions. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has told us that he is credibly informed that \$4 and \$5 an hour is fair remuneration. I am going to give him advance information so that he may get ready. He has the information for his friends there, who can tender, and if they are the lowest tenderers this work will go to the dredge that he alludes to.

Mr. SPROULE. I am alluding to the dredge they are working now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend says that he is credibly informed that this price we are paying, 13½ cents per cubic yard, or \$80 a day for a minimum days' work of 600 cubic yards, ought to be cut down to \$4 or \$5 an hour, or \$40 or \$50 a day.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister evidently misunderstands me. My information is that for the amount of work she is doing the dredge is not earning more than \$4 or \$5 an hour. The scow ought to contain so many yards, but I am told that the scows are not nearly filled, that they are often taken away when they are nothing like full, and yet they are charged for at the full rate, and on the basis of a full scow.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has no evidence to support such a statement. I do not think there is any such evidence at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I have the evidence of a man who is just as truthful and as honest as the hon. minister himself, and who is a respectable citizen of Owen Sound.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman has any information at all

he should have every opportunity to bring it forward. I would not tolerate for a moment what would be a manifest fraud on the country such as that. But the mere general statement of somebody looking on proves nothing. We have the reports of the engineer, and we believe that the inspector is a reliable, honest man. It is quite immaterial how full or how empty the scow is if the contents are fairly measured. It is very easy to get up and say that you are credibly informed by a very reliable man. That does not prove anything at all, and I question very much whether it is a fair way of trying to make a point. I think that is a course of argument which is hardly creditable. It is no evidence. It is merely throwing about insinuations and nothing more. There is nothing tangible. If the hon. gentleman can bring me the name of the reliable citizen in Owen Sound who makes these statements, I will send an officer there to examine into it, and I will pledge him not to protect any man who is blameable. But when the hon. gentleman will not give the name of his informant he should not make these statements. I will investigate his statement if he will take the responsibility of giving me the evidence, and of giving me the name of the witness. Let him give me an opportunity, and his statement will be investigated without any hedging at all. Unless the hon. gentleman does that I will consider that he has withdrawn his statement.

Mr. SPROULE. I made my statement in my place last year that the inspector was going around town, and that he could not possibly keep track of what was going on at the dredge, spending his time around the hotels, instead of on the dredge. I made that statement, and the reply was that it could not possibly be the case, but two or three men have told me so, and it is known to every citizen of Owen Sound.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON. (Kingston). It is quite common that persons who want to do any work of this kind generally form themselves into an incorporated company, and rightly or wrongly, the law requires at least five stockholders before a company can be formed under the Joint Stock Companies' Act. As persons want to limit their personal liability and prefer to do business in the name of a company they generally bring in members of their family holding one or two shares in order to comply with the law. That has been done time and time again in reference to ordinary business establishments. That being so, it matters nothing that the principal owner of the dredge in order to comply with the law, should include the members of his family. This has nothing to do, of course, with the question as to whether the dredge is doing proper work, but it seems to me it is an explanation which it is only fair to offer to the House.

Mr. SPROULE. This dredge was owned by a company previously who happened to be Conservatives, and though they understood the business thoroughly they could not get an hour's work. As soon as it was sold to friends of the government it was immediately employed and has been employed since. That is why I object to the whole thing. Like that other case in Toronto, as soon as friends of the government got hold of the dredge, it was employed at remunerative rates.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) to say that this loose system of inspection took place last year in Owen Sound, and that he brought it to the attention of the committee, and that this year there has been no improvement.

Mr. SPROULE. I made no inquiries this year and I am not speaking of this year. I was told later on in the season last year that there was no improvement, and my remarks applied to the balance of the season last year.

Mr. WM. GIBSON (Lincoln and Niagara). It is quite evident that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) knows very little about dredging operations.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) knows all about it, as he does about everything else.

Mr. GIBSON. I know a good deal about it, and I will leave it to the House to judge whether I do or not. I do not offer my opinions about everything, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) does, and the less he knows about a thing the more he talks about it. It is well known to people who understand this kind of business that when dredging operations are to be carried on, surveys are made and soundings taken and cross-sections of the work are laid out by the engineers of the department. That is especially the case where the work is to be done by contract. Under these circumstances the inspector could even absent himself from his duties and still do his work—suppose the statement that he does absent himself is correct—for the reason that all the work done by the dredge, whether the scows are filled or only half-filled is measured from the cross-sections upon the completion of the dredging. Whether it is measured in scow lots or by measurement in place, is an arrangement between the engineers and the contractors. Now, the price of 13½ cents per yard is, in my judgment, very cheap. If this dredge is worth anything at all, it would require \$8 an hour to operate it and to pay operating expenses at 13½ cents a yard, it would be necessary to take out five or six hundred yards per day. I am quite satisfied that no man, I do not care who he is (even the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), with all the knowledge he

possesses, and I will give him credit for a great deal of industry;) could judge as to the quantity on any scow unless it is measured carefully, because a great deal of water is always taken up with the silt, and it can only be properly measured by displacement. If it is measured in the scow there is a certain allowance made for the water, and if it is measured in place, it is on account of the cross sections that are made previous to the dredging being commenced and after the dredging is completed. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) should not be unfair in his criticism because it happens to be a son-in-law of a member of this House who owns the dredge. What we want to know is, whether this dredge is doing good work and is the price fair? If the inspector is remiss in his duty it is quite an easy matter for the government to attend to that part of the business. No reflection should be put upon the owners of the dredge simply because there happens to be the names of a couple of ladies in connection with it. We know that the late Senator Sanford, who did a large amount of work for this government and for the late government, carried on his business in the name of himself and every member of his family. This is done to get over the Joint Stock Companies' Act, by people who have money enough of their own to carry on business, and in order to conform with the law they bring in the names of members of their own family in preference to outsiders. I do not believe that the House or the country care whether Dr. Macdonald's son-in-law owns one dredge or fifty dredges. What we want to know is: Is the work being done by that dredge in conformity with the contract. Judging by the prices quoted by the minister, he can well afford to offer any one else to do the work for less money.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) as usual, brings a great deal of experience to bear on the subject, although he was good enough to say that the hon. member for Grey knows nothing about it. I want to tell him that I know something about it. I know that it is the opinion in the county that the country is not getting value for the money. He says, that it makes no difference whether the inspector is there or not, but who is to tell that these scows contain a certain number of yards. Is it the dredge owner who is interested that is to do that? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) says that there may be cross-sections, but I am told that it is not measured by cross-sections. The dredge is supposed to put out at least 600 yards a day, and that is one of the troubles arising from the loose system in which the work is being done. The dredge company, it is said, whenever they get to easy dredging naturally go deeper than is actually required to give the eighteen feet of water, but I am told that when they come to hard places they skip over them so

Mr. GIBSON.

that the bottom of the river is not level. There is no person to see whether they do that or not, and the inspector ought to be there.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that if a dredgeman did that, he would not gain anything by it, because a survey is made to see how the work is left, and if a man were to leave holes and hills, he would be charged accordingly. The inspection is not made blind-fold or by the eye, but by a careful examination.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told that is just the way it is done, and it can easily be seen. It is in the interest of the dredge owner to work in the soft places as much as possible, and to skip over the hard places.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The engineers say that is not a fact. If the hon. gentleman will give me the name of a harbour where that has taken place, I will have it investigated.

Mr. SPROULE. I am told that it has taken place in Owen Sound.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman's reputation is involved in this matter. Will he name some person, and I will send him with the chief engineer to see whether that is correct or not?

Mr. SPROULE. I will try and get the town to appoint a man for that purpose. This has been brought to my attention, and I believe it to be a fact, and am so stating it to the House. When I mentioned it last year, I was told that it would be remedied, but my opinion is that it has not been remedied. I am giving the information which I have, for the purpose of enabling the government to look into the matter, and see if it is not so.

Mr. GIBSON. I was quite sure when I spoke of the hon. gentleman's knowledge of dredging, that he did not know anything about it, as is evident when he speaks about letting a plumb-line down into the water. I spoke of a cross-section, which means that a mark is put on the side of the river to be dredged, from which every foot of the area about to be dredged is carefully noted and measured, and after the work is done, it is gone over carefully and the quantity dredged ascertained to a cubic foot. With regard to what the hon. gentleman says about the dredge working only in the soft places, surely he knows that the arm of a dredge is of a certain length, and would not go beyond its own length. Dredge men would not seek out the soft places to suit their conveniences; it would not pay them; they would have to let the water out of the harbour or river to dredge below the length of the arm of the dredge derrick.

Mr. CLANCY. How can the hon. gentleman tell how much is done each day?

Mr. GIBSON. I quite appreciate what the hon. member for Bothwell says. If the dredging were done at so much an hour, it would be the imperative duty of the inspector to be continually on the dredge, to see that it worked to its fullest capacity, during every hour for which it was paid, and to note the break-downs and stoppages that took place. But where dredging is being done by the cubic yard, soundings are taken carefully and plans made, with cross-sections, originally, and after the work is completed. The number of scows a day taken out is simply approximate, so that at the end of a month the amount of work done may be approximately estimated.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member shows how little he knows about what I said. I say the dredge is working by the day, and in order to see that it does a reasonable day's work, the inspector ought to be there all the time. How can he take account of the work done, if he is running around the town of Owen Sound? The measurement is not made after the dredging is done; but they give as an evidence that a day's work has been done, that they have taken out so many scows containing so many cubic feet.

Mr. E. COCHRANE (East Northumberland). I want to ask the acting Minister of Public Works if this work at Owen Sound is being done by the hour or by the yard?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The rule is \$80 per day of ten hours; but there must be a minimum day's work of 600 cubic yards. That would amount to 13½ cents per cubic yard.

Mr. COCHRANE. This dredge is working by the hour.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And by service too.

Mr. COCHRANE. She is working by the hour, and you require an inspector there to keep account of the scows that go out, and a scow is supposed to contain a certain number of yards. How do you know what she is doing per hour unless she is filled and contains a certain quantity of material? Why do you keep an inspector there if not to keep an account of the scows and know what they are doing. But, if that gentleman is walking around town, smoking cigars, how do you know the amount that dredge is costing you? The hon. member for Lincoln reminds me of the scriptural adage: 'When a man is wise in his own conceit, there is more hope of a fool than of him.' If your inspector does not attend to his duty, how do you know what the scow is doing? If it all depends on a survey made after the season is over, when the influence of the river is felt, taking in silt all the while, the dredge is paid twice over for what she has done. I do not care who does the dredging, I do not care whether it is Dr. Macdonald or his daughter or his son-in-law

who do it, but it appears to me, from the information before the committee, that the inspector has not attended to his work.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be done at the Rainy River?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The trouble about that work is that the place where the dam and lock will be erected is on the international boundary, and we have not yet been able to secure the consent of the American government. Last year, when this item was before the committee, it was stated that what was contemplated was to construct a wing dam, in the hope of raising the level of the water, but it is doubtful if that will meet the requirements of the case, and a dam and lock will likely be required. There is an island in the middle of the river, and the locks would be on the Canadian side. The engineer advises that the dam be constructed on the south side of the island, to the south side of the river, and that is in American territory. The lock would be between the island and the main shore on the north side. Until we get that consent, we cannot proceed. The United States government has been written to, but have not yet signified their consent to the work.

Digby post office, customs-house, &c..... \$15,000

Mr. FOSTER. Has this been begun?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, plans are now in the course of preparation. The total cost is estimated at \$20,000, including the site. The site cost \$3,000, and was paid out of last year's vote. Fittings, furniture and boxes, \$3,000; estimated construction, \$12,000; heating, \$1,200; fencing, \$600; clerk of the works and incidental expenditure, \$1,200; total, \$21,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the postal revenue there?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A little over \$3,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the post office kept now?

Mr. A. J. S. COPP (Digby). In a miserable little place, 20 x 25, fitted up temporarily for the purpose until we can get a new building. The rental is about \$50 a year.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the population?

Mr. COPP. About 3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Owen Sound, which is a county town of over 9,000, has not a post office yet, notwithstanding the fact that the Postmaster General was there in 1896, at the time of the elections, and gave the people to understand that if they returned a supporter of the government, they would be likely to get a post office. But, although he will not give a post office to that important town, a town of nearly 10,000 inhabitants, he builds one in a place whose

population is but 3,000. When the Minister of Customs was elected the people of Owen Sound thought that they were sure of a post office, but they have since learnt not to place such faith in the promises of the government.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The hon. gentleman's imagination seems to be very vivid to-night. There is not the slightest foundation for any statement that I ever promised or suggested or hinted in Owen Sound that we would build a post office there. And I will challenge the hon. gentleman to find that I ever made a promise to any locality about anything of that kind. I prefer to give no promise, or hint, or suggestion; but rather to preserve my views until the government, of which I am a member, has decided, and then, and not until then, to speak. The lease of the premises occupied in Owen Sound was about to expire, and I was importuned by numbers of people to buy buildings or to rent buildings, and so on. I gave one answer to all, and that was I thought it was in the interest of Owen Sound, at this time, not to have a post office building erected. Owen Sound is a promising and progressive town, and it would be much wiser to wait until her future is much more settled and so that the matter of the post office building can be more correctly decided in the future. For this reason, I refused to assent to the erection of a public building in Owen Sound, either when I was there or since. It is better to spend any money that we can spend in Owen Sound, rather with a view to improving the trade facilities, and not upon buildings that can be dispensed with in the meantime. If I have said anything to contradict this, and raised hopes among people in Owen Sound that I would favour the construction of such a building there at this time, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will have an opportunity of sending up a report of the remarks I am making to counteract any misleading effect. But the hon. gentleman will find nobody in Owen Sound to support the statement, that I ever hinted, either during an election or at any time, that I favoured such a proposal just now.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I can tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Hopkins is my authority for what I have said. Mr. Hopkins was taken into the minister's room in my presence, and when he came out he took me down to look at a site that he said the Postmaster General had looked over. He said that it was between him and another party, and if he had a little more influence, he could get him to purchase it, but that he had practically promised to build the post office in Owen Sound and must select one site or the other. And several parties in Owen Sound have expressed themselves as though they believed that the Postmaster General had promised to have a new post

office in Owen Sound in the near future. I shall act upon his suggestion and send a copy of *Hansard* with the remarks he has made. I am sure that some of his friends there will be very much surprised when they read it.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Why could not the acting Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General—because I do not suppose that the Public Works Department would put in an item of this kind without the recommendation of the Postmaster General to carry out the excellent business plan with reference to Digby that he thinks is so eminently well suited to Owen Sound. Owen Sound is a larger place. But, as a business man the Postmaster General says it has a better claim for a suitable building. The Postmaster General says that Owen Sound had better rent a suitable building. That will involve a less expenditure year by year, and it will suit the people for the present at least; and it is better to expend the public money on more important things, for instance, in improving the harbour. Does not he think that would be an eminently wise thing to do with reference to Digby? That is a town of 3,000—a nice little town—a beautiful summer resort, but its population is not large. I do not think it would be impossible for the Postmaster General to find a suitable place for a post office—

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. No, I could not?

Mr. **FOSTER**. Could not? I venture to say that statement could be successfully challenged.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I was informed so.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Of course, because it is the laudable ambition of the member who represents Digby to be able to go down and say that he has got \$20,000 to build them a new post office, and therefore, he ought to have their support. We do not blame him for doing that, if he can get the Postmaster General to go outside of what is fair and businesslike to make this appropriation. See how it would be—you need not tell me that it is impossible to get a fair place to rent. Let it be known that you want it, and you will find some person who will give it, and that at a fair rental. The country is going to spend \$20,000 on this new building. At a low estimate the cost of maintenance will be 10 per cent a year, so, year by year, it will cost \$2,000 upon the capital expenditure made. Once you get a building of that kind, you have to have a caretaker, and you cannot get a man to take care of that building without spending money.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. You do not count 10 per cent outside of the salary of the caretaker?

Mr. FOSTER. I say that taking the cost of money and the repairs, the maintenance outside of the caretaker one year with another, will amount to about 10 per cent. Because the time will come when we will have to make very large repairs.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You would not count 10 per cent on the site?

Mr. FOSTER. No. Well, we will count 10 per cent on \$17,000, the cost of the building. Then, you have to get a postmaster; and for a postmaster in that building you cannot engage one as economically as under the present arrangement. You have to have larger salaries. Well, what is the principle on which we are going? Are we going to build a twenty thousand dollar post office in every town or village of two or three thousand inhabitants. I remember that some years ago, Hon. David Mills, the present Minister of Justice, when he sat on this side of the House, brought in a resolution which laid down a principle in these matters that was acceded to by the whole House. We were supposed to have that matter settled; and especially, we thought that when the gentlemen who were so vehemently in favour of it were in power, it would be carried out. But gradually they have commenced putting post offices in little places, led by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who wanted one for his town of Shelburne.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry that Shelburne has not got one yet. But I will keep it in mind.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) will keep it in mind. But is there any principle upon which we are proceeding, as illustrated by the fact that Owen Sound is refused while Digby was not refused?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are two reasons why I think it not wise to build a post office in Owen Sound at the present time. It is a very growing town, and it is quite possible that what would suit the population now, might not suit it in five years from now. And, just as we rather economize in the purchase of clothing for children when they are growing very fast, in like manner it is not advisable to erect a relatively expensive building when, in a very short time it is not going to be large enough for the needs of the place.

Moreover when a locality is getting a considerable portion of public money for one purpose, it may well forego the privilege of getting public money for another building, even though it is very desirable. For these reasons I did not favour the erection of a public building at Owen Sound. As to Digby, I have not the same knowledge, therefore, I could only form an opinion from evidence, but the evidence I had was of a reliable character. I was told that Digby had been swept by a fire, and almost wiped out.

It was represented to me that it had special claims. In addition to that, it is a favourite summer resort, and the people take pride in having their post office in a presentable place. At all events, the representative for Digby pressed this matter upon me strongly, and I felt he had advanced a good claim. Perhaps it is not growing as rapidly as Owen Sound, but its growth is of a more stable character. For these reasons, considering it was the shire town of the county, it seemed to me it had as good claims as other towns in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to know at what stage in the growth of Owen Sound they might expect a post office? Suppose it reached the population of 50,000 and was still going on, would the minister use the same argument, that because it might continue to grow larger, a post office that would suit now, might not suit five years hence?

Mr. CLANCY. The member for York (Mr. Foster), has raised a very important question. I can find in Ontario probably fifty towns having as great a claim as Digby, and that have no post office erected at the expense of the Dominion government. Take the town of Wallaceburg, with a population of something over 3,000, and yielding a revenue of \$3,414. I think only \$140 a year is paid in that town for rent of a suitable place. Now, there is just as good reason for building a \$20,000 post office in Wallaceburg as there is in the town of Digby. Take another town in the same county, Ridgetown, it has even a larger revenue, and the population is somewhat larger. I would like to know what principle the government follow in granting public buildings to the various towns of this country. If you are only erecting a public building where the member supports the government, is able to bring pressure on the government, I think you are leading to one of the worst abuses we can have. I have no hesitation in saying that if ever there was an unblushing bribe offered to a county, this is such a case. Digby is not so poverty stricken as that a building cannot be rented there suitable for a post office, for \$150 a year.

Mr. COPP. We discussed this question pretty fully last year when the matter was before the House. On this occasion I have to assure the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), that I do not have to bribe the people of Digby, in order to secure election in that county. I am not asking for this post office with any idea in my mind of bribing the people of Digby. Possibly he is not aware that Digby has a majority of voters supporting the hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not expect to gain a single vote by the erection of this post office, I did not ask the Postmaster General to erect this post office in that town with the idea of securing votes. It is absolutely necessary that we should have better postal accom-

modation in the town of Digby. If you search the records of the Post Office Department, you will find that for the last eighteen years the people of that town have been trying to get better postal accommodation. As every one knows, it is a popular summer resort. Hundreds of American visitors come there every year, from 500 to 1,500, spend three or four months there. This building is not merely for the purpose of a post office, but it can be used as a custom-house, and for an inland revenue office as well. The town is growing. Last year and the year before, we spent over \$75,000 in putting in waterworks, and now we contemplate putting in a system of sewage which will cost \$50,000 to \$75,000 more. A large number of buildings are being erected by Americans. Last year a Buffalo gentleman erected a building costing over \$50,000. We are hoping that the erection of this post office will assist in securing a larger number of summer tourists from the United States. I consider that \$20,000 for a post office is a small sum of money to invest as an advertisement to outsiders. When this matter was up last session, I mentioned several towns in Nova Scotia having a smaller population than Digby, where hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power, had built post office costing over \$30,000. In the town of Annapolis, with a population less than Digby, and with a revenue less than Digby, hon. gentlemen opposite built a post office that cost \$30,000. Yet, they are finding fault because this government is building a post office in Digby. If there is any one place more than another in Nova Scotia that needs a post office, it is Digby.

Mr. SPROULE. You have a population there for half a year.

Mr. COPP. During half of the year I suppose the population is somewhere near 5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the hon. Postmaster General, or the hon. Minister of Public Works would have any difficulty at all, if he would offer a rental of \$150 a year in getting a commodious building put up in Digby in which the work of the post office and of the customs could be carried on. But, suppose he cannot do that, and that he has to build, the hon. minister knows quite as well as I do that he can get a building for \$5,000 that would be suitable for the work of the post office.

Mr. COPP. Why did you not do that in St. Mary's?

Mr. FOSTER. We are not talking about St. Mary's. If we were to go back only a little distance we would find the Liberal party solidly grouped together on a policy which they solemnly undertook to have carried through the House, that in reference to these public buildings population and revenue should be taken into account and they declared themselves against erecting large and expensive buildings in small places.

Mr. COPP.

What is the principle that the hon. minister is going on to-day? When we ask him for a principle, he gives us an ingenious defence as to his discrimination between Owen Sound and Digby, but he did not lay down a principle. When you go into a town that has about made its growth and that has about 3,000 of a population, are you going to put up a \$20,000 post office? That would seem to be the principle that the minister took up, that if the growth was not completed he would wait and see what the future needs would be. But, let us come down to what is sensible and economical. No person would conduct his private business in that way. The hon. Postmaster General would not do it. He would put up a building which was necessary for the work he was carrying on and do nothing more. In this case he is going to put up a \$20,000 structure, he is going to use up all the post office revenue that there is, whilst, under a business, common sense, economical plan he could get everything he wants for \$100 or \$200 a year and save the largest share of the post office revenue for the country. Digby is a nice little town, and I wish it all prosperity, and hope that enterprising men from abroad may go there and build houses for \$20,000 and more, but I do not think this charge should be put upon the revenue of the country.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think there is a good deal in what the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) says, but the trouble is that other governments have set such bad examples that modest buildings do not appear to be at all popular just now. The hon. member for Bothwell asks me how I am going to justify giving Digby a public building and not giving one to Wallaceburg. To be perfectly frank, the claims of Wallaceburg were never presented to us. The hon. member for Bothwell did not bring the claims of Wallaceburg to our notice. He never asked for a building at Wallaceburg.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that the only reason why the hon. gentleman withholds it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not say that is the only reason, but I say that we have not had our attention brought to Wallaceburg. It would have been only fair for the hon. member for Bothwell to have presented the claims of Wallaceburg to have a public building, and the hon. gentleman has no ground for complaint when he has quite failed to speak for Wallaceburg. As to the principle upon which localities are selected for public buildings, it is difficult, I confess, to find a general principle. We claim, and I think, correctly, that regard is had to the public interest, but, I will confess that the character of some of the post offices that have been built in the past has been quite in excess of the requirements, that there has been too much money spent, and yet, knowing that, it is difficult to adopt

a more modest style because of the bad example that has been set. I recall a case where the plans of a certain public building were exhibited in the town interested, and the people were very indignant at the modesty of the proposed building because a neighbouring town had a more extravagant, or a more expensive and showy building.

Mr. CLANCY. It is perfectly astounding that an hon. gentleman of the experience of the hon. Postmaster General, presiding over a great department, setting out as he has done in this wild goose manner, giving grants here and there, should state the defence which he has just now. I never said that Wallaceburg deserved a post office. I tell the hon. gentleman that it would be an outrage, as it would be a folly, to build a \$20,000 post office in Wallaceburg. I do not propose following the line of saying that while I have been sitting on one side of the House I would be prepared to reverse entirely that which I said when I was on the other side. I would not erect a \$20,000 post office in Wallaceburg, because there, a man invests his money in erecting a good building which rents for \$140 a year. The reason I say there should not be a building costing \$20,000 in Wallaceburg, or Digby, or any other town of that size in Canada, is that I know that there is enough public enterprise in those towns for men to invest their money in buildings to supply the public wants. To erect a building costing \$17,000 or \$20,000 in Digby, I care not what its prospects may be, is a public outrage, and nothing else. It is no excuse to say that a former government did this. It is no excuse for the hon. gentleman to say that he has his hands tied. He declared that if the people put him in power he would take a position the very reverse of what he has taken to-night. He has practically declared from his place in parliament to-night that his word is not worth a bad dollar bill, so far as his public pledges are concerned. He has declared from the statement made here to-night that he is not to be belived no matter what he says. I have mentioned three towns in the judicial county of Kent, each of which is well supplied, and the gentlemen who own the buildings, all of them political friends of his own and very respectable citizens, would be much offended if these rentals would be taken away from them. That, I dare say, is the case throughout the whole Dominion of Canada. It is not a very creditable defence to say that I have never brought the interests of Wallaceburg to his attention. He knows perfectly well that is not the reason. The hon. gentleman has no defence, he has no principle, and his word is worth nothing in this country, so far as his pledges are concerned.

Springhill public building ..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The estimated cost of the building is \$12,000; fittings and furnishings, \$3,000; heating, \$1,200; fencing, \$600; incidentals, \$1,200. Last year there was an appropriation of \$5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the site been bought ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The chief architect has not yet made his report, although the particular lot has been practically decided upon, and the deputy thinks the price is \$2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the revenue and population ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postal revenue is \$2,500, and customs revenue, \$1,690.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The population was 4,800 in 1891, and it is much larger to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it has grown. This is on the same principle as the Digby post office.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.20 a.m. (Wednesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, June 20, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY—INCREASES TO OFFICERS.

Mr. FORTIN asked :

1. What officers have been recommended for an increase of salary at St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary?
2. How many of those so recommended have received such increase, and what are their names and amounts in each case?
3. If said increase has not been granted to those who were recommended, why was it withheld?
4. Upon whose recommendation were said increases given?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. The following officers were recommended for an increase of salary at St. Vin-

cent de Paul penitentiary : On October 31, 1899—Dr. J. A. Duchesneau, warden ; Dr. L. A. Fortier, surgeon ; G. S. Malepart, accountant. On November 3, 1899—E. Lachapelle, warden's clerk ; U. Chartrand, chief keeper ; D. O'Shea, hospital overseer ; J. T. Dorais, school instructor ; E. Champagne, engineer ; G. A. Pratt, chief trade instructor ; V. Lortie, shoemaker instructor ; G. Nixon, keeper ; H. C. Fatt, guard ; E. Letang, guard. On January 7, 1900—Rev. J. Rollitt, Protestant chaplain. 2. E. Lachapelle, \$100 ; U. Chartrand, \$400 ; D. O'Shea, \$70 ; G. A. Pratt, \$500 ; V. Lortie, \$40 ; G. Nixon, \$10 ; H. C. Fatt, \$10 ; E. Letang, \$10 ; Rev. J. Rollitt, \$400 ; Dr. J. A. Duchesneau, \$400 ; Dr. L. A. Fortier, \$100 ; G. A. Malepart, \$100 ; J. T. Dorais, \$100.

#### PELISSIER POST OFFICE.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. Whether the post office of Pélissier, township of Wakefield, Wright County, has been changed?
2. Why?
3. Was an inquiry made before the said change, as promised by the government before any change?
4. Was any notice given?
5. By whom was the change asked for?
6. On whose complaint was the change effected?
7. Was there any complaints in relation to the office? By whom were they made, and what is their nature?
8. Has the office been given to a political partisan?
9. Has the office been removed to the premises of a liquor seller?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). 1 and 2. The name of the Pélissier post office has been changed to 'St. Pierre de Wakefield,' and the post office has been removed from the residence of Mr. C. Pelletier to that of Mr. V. Deziel, the latter being considered a more convenient situation for the office. 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. It was shown to the satisfaction of the department, on behalf of many of the residents of the district, that they were in favour of the change, because of the greater convenience to the patrons of the office. 8 and 9. The department has no knowledge whether the person to whom the position has been given is or is not a political partisan, nor has it any reason to believe that the office has been removed to the premises of a liquor seller.

#### PLUMBING—PUBLIC BUILDING, NEW GLASGOW.

Mr. BELL (Pictou)—(by Mr. Taylor), asked :

1. Were tenders asked for plumbing of New Glasgow, N.S., public building?
2. Who were the parties tendering?
3. What was the amount of the tenders?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). 1. Yes. 2. D. W. Crockett, of Westville, and Chisholm & Co., of New Glasgow, N.S. 3. D. W. Crockett, \$700 ; Chisholm & Co., \$749.

#### SALE OF COVE FIELDS, QUEBEC.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to dispose of any portion of the Cove Fields, Quebec, by sale or lease?
2. Has any application been received for such disposal of said Cove Fields?
3. If any has been received, who are the applicants?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Not at present. 2. Yes. 3. The Quebec provincial government applied for a site for a Normal school.

#### SUBWAY, I. C. R. CUMBERLAND COUNTY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER asked :

1. Was the contract for the construction of a subway under the Intercolonial Railway near Christie's Pond, in Cumberland County, let by tender?
2. If so, who were the tenderers?
3. What was the amount of each tender?
4. To whom was the contract let?
5. Was he the lowest tenderer?
6. If the party to whom the contract was let was not the lowest tenderer, who was?
7. Why did not the lowest tenderer get the contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Yes. 2. The following persons have tendered for the said work ; J. Nelson Fage, Amherst ; Willard Kitchen, Fredericton ; John H. Hamilton, Robert Mitchell, S. M. Steele, Amherst ; Rhodes, Curry & Co., Amherst. 3. Amount of each tender was as follows : Fage, \$4,325 ; Willard Kitchen, \$4,164 ; Hamilton, Mitchell & Steele, \$5,878 ; Rhodes, Curry & Co., \$5,937. 4. The contract was awarded to Willard Kitchen. 5. He was the lowest tenderer. Answer to No. 5, does away with questions 6 and 7.

#### MEMBERS OF THE YUKON COUNCIL.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Who are the members of the Yukon Council? What salaries, allowances, rents, &c., do they receive?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have received this answer from the department. I do not know if it meets the wishes of the hon. gentleman. The following are the members of the Yukon council : William Ogilvie, commissioner ; J. E. Girouard, registrar ; Hon. C. A. Dugas, judge ; W. H. P. Clement, legal adviser ; E. C. Senkler, gold commissioner ; A. B. Perry, superintendent, Dominion Mounted Police,

These gentlemen do not receive any salary or allowance of any kind for acting in this capacity. Does the hon. gentleman wish to know the salaries they receive for the other positions they hold?

Mr. FOSTER. Everything they get in every way.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then I would have to get this information from the different departments, for instance, the salary of the judge from the Justice Department. I will get the information and bring it down.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we might let that stand.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR— TIMBER LICENSES.

Mr. GILLIES asked :

1. Referring to questions 2 and 3 see 'Hansard,' June 11, 1900, page 7321, when and how was the sum of \$2,727.97 paid?
2. Was it paid in cash, by cheque, note, draft or how?
3. How long was the sum of \$2,727.97, or any part thereof, due and payable?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. 1. The sum of \$2,727.97 was paid by draft on the 6th instant. 2. This amount was made up as follows :

Dues for 1896-7 .....	\$519 28	
“ 1897-8 .....	950 05	
“ 1898-9 .....	937 16	
		\$2,406 49
Ground rent and renewal fee—		
1898-9 .....	\$ 65 00	
1899-1900 .....	65 00	
		130 00
Interest on dues .....		191 48
		\$2,727 97

3. Answered by No. 2.

#### CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the House do resolve into Committee of the Whole, to-morrow, to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to provide with respect to the Bill intituled: 'An Act respecting and restricting Chinese immigration,' now before the House:

1. That a tax of \$100 shall be imposed on every person of Chinese origin entering Canada;
2. That the person in command of, or in charge of, any vessel or vehicle bringing Chinese immigrants into Canada shall be personally liable to Her Majesty for the payment of the said tax with respect to any such immigrant carried by such vessel or vehicle.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE LIEUT.-GOVERNOR OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. AULAY MORRISON (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), having regard to the unsettled condition of local political affairs in British Columbia, if any steps are being taken by the government looking to the re-establishment of some stable form of government in that province, and if there is any announcement to be made in respect to the rumours we hear regarding the governor of the province.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have to inform my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) that the matter is at present engaging the attention of the government. I was under the impression that I could make an announcement to-day, but I am sorry that I cannot do it at this moment.

#### THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PRIVATE BAMFORD.

Mr. FREDERICK D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to call the attention of the government to the case of Private Bamford, who has been, as I understand, wounded in South Africa. Private Bamford is a son of a constituent of mine who writes me as follows :

Montreal, June 18, 1900.

F. D. Monk, Esq., M.P.,  
Ottawa, Ont.

My dear Mr. Monk,—You have no doubt observed by the press despatches from London, England, that my son Willie, a member of the first contingent for service in Africa, is invalided to Shorncliffe hospital.

I cabled the following to Shorncliffe camp Saturday at 1.30 p.m., and prepaid reply, namely:

Montreal, June 16, 1900, 1.30 p.m.

Hospital, Shorncliffe Camp, England.

Advise exact condition Bamford.

(Sgd.) BAMFORD.

Answer prepaid.

I also wired to Hon. F. W. Borden, Minister of Militia, Ottawa, the following:

'Notice "Herald" states my son, Private Bamford, invalided to Shorncliffe hospital; ascertain his exact condition and advise me fully.

(Sgd.) J. P. BAMFORD.'

Not having received a reply to my message to the Hon. Mr. Borden, I again wired him at eleven this a.m. as follows:

Montreal, June 18, 1900.

Hon. F. W. Borden,  
Minister of Militia, Ottawa, Ont.

Please reply to my message regarding Private Bamford; anxious.

I received the following reply to my last telegram, namely:

Ottawa, June 18, 1900, 11.22 a.m.

J. P. Bamford, Montreal, Que.

Department will give you all the information received here as it comes. If fuller details is required, would suggest your cabling direct.

I reply to Mr. Borden's telegram I sent the following message, namely :

Montreal, June 18, 1900, 2.55 this p.m.

Hon. F. W. Borden, Ottawa, Ont.

Cabled direct Shorncliffe camp, prepaid message Saturday, but no reply. Can you not cable High Commissioner ; anxious.

(Sgd.) J. P. BAMFORD.

1. I would feel extremely obliged if you would kindly bring this matter up in the House and enable me to procure some definite information regarding the present condition of my son.

Yours very truly,

J. P. BAMFORD.

I received later the following telegram from Mr. Bamford :

Montreal, Que., June 19.

F. D. Monk, M.P., Ottawa.

Wrote you last evening re my son. Am advised he is wounded. Have you any particulars?

(Sgd.) J. P. BAMFORD.

I will send these communications over to the government and I suggest that it is a case where the government might go to the expense of cabling to satisfy this gentleman.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I remember receiving one of the telegrams, and only one which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has read. I suggested to my private secretary that the answer which was read by the hon. gentleman should be sent. I think it is in accordance with my instructions to him. When the next telegram was received all the telegrams in connection with the matter were handed over to the department with instructions to obtain all the information possible and to forward it direct to Mr. Bamford. That is all I am able to say at the present moment. I will make further inquiry, and either let the hon. gentleman know by letter or by making a statement in the House at a later period to-day.

#### EMERGENCY FOOD RATION.

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N. B.) Mr. Speaker, some days ago the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) promised the House that he would look into the matter and bring down an answer in reference to the passing through the customs of the emergency food. The hon. minister has not brought that information down to the House, but I notice that in the newspapers that information seems to be going the rounds, and it seems to me that we have a right as members of the House to the information in accordance with the promise of the hon. minister.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The question was asked me if

Mr. MONK.

any order had been given by the government for the free admission of this food, and if so, whether it would be brought down. There was no order given by the government. The despatch that I saw in the papers was read before the committee yesterday, was a telegram that the commissioner sent to the collector of customs at Montreal in reference to the matter, and also the latter's reply thereto.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. minister contend that he is not bound to bring down whatever information there is in reference to the matter in accordance with his promise? He surely does not bind himself to an order or any single particular. What the House asked for was the information as to how this food got through the customs. The commissioner is in print now with the information about it, and yet the hon. minister does not think he is under any obligation to the members of the House as to the exact nature of the transaction that took place as regards the passing of this food. Surely the minister is treating the House with scant courtesy.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. By no means. The statement was made that the government had given an order for the free admission of this food and I was asked to see if such an order had been given by the government, and if so if I would bring it down. I said that I would make inquiries. I did make inquiries and at a subsequent date I replied to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) that I had been unable to find that any order had been given in reference to the matter. That was all that was brought before the House and all that was asked for in reference to the matter.

#### IMPERIAL FEDERATION—PAMPHLET BY THE RIGHT HON. W. E. FORSTER, M.P.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorancy). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to call the attention of the government to a pamphlet which is being distributed just now, entitled 'Imperial Federation: by the Right Hon. W. E. Forster, M.P., reprinted from the *Nineteenth Century*, February and March, 1885. Ottawa, Government Printing Bureau, 1900.' It contains a note signed by Richard R. Dobell. I suppose this is the same gentleman who sits for Quebec West. It is dated Ottawa, Ont., June 6, 1900. Among other things I find in this note the following :

It would be difficult to imagine the formation of any council that would exercise a greater weight upon the policy of the empire than an Imperial Council, which, Mr. Forster indicates, might be formed to sit in London, receiving advice from the various component parts of the empire, and deliberating on questions raised, not only by members of the self-governing colonies, but also in conjunction with the representatives of Great Britain herself.

I would like to ask, in the first place, whether this statement contained in this note is an indication of the policy of the government, and secondly, how it is, that, when the House is calling for most important documents, which are not printed, and which this House requires, it is possible that the Government Printing Bureau should be employed in printing this pamphlet, which, no doubt, is of very great value, but which is not of very pressing urgency at the present moment. The House and the committees are anxiously waiting for printing that is necessary for the transaction of business, and it seems to me that this pamphlet could have been delayed. I would like to know who gave the authority for the printing of this document at the Government Printing Bureau?

Mr. R. R. DOBELL (Quebec West). I have no difficulty whatever in answering my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain). At the last meeting of the Imperial Federation League in the Railway Committee room of the House, I promised, as some gentlemen present will remember, that I would have reprinted that essay, because I thought it pointed to the most practical way of adopting Imperial federation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) is evidently anxious about the cost of printing the pamphlet. My private secretary, I understand, had it done entirely at my cost. I think it has taken about six weeks to have it printed; but I was not in any hurry for it, and I received it yesterday.

#### PRIVATE COURTNEY OF 'A' BATTERY.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). Perhaps, now that the Minister of Militia is in his place, he can answer the question that I submitted yesterday, and which the Prime Minister said he would communicate to him. If the minister has not been informed I have the letter here which I can read again.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden.) If the hon. gentleman will wait until to-morrow I will have an opportunity of reading the statement, and can give him an answer.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—THE EMERGENCY RATIONS.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I ask the Minister of Militia if he is yet prepared to lay on the Table the promised analyses, and the affidavits of the tests made at Kingston?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden.) I handed the affidavits to the deputy minister yesterday to be presented to the committee, and I asked him to have copies made so that I could lay the copies on the Table. I have not yet received them. The tests are now completed. I am told by the deputy that they were

received a few minutes ago, so that to-morrow I will lay on the Table copies of the affidavits, and copies of all the tests that have been made.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister of Customs lay on the Table of the House to-morrow what information he has as to the manner in which this so-called food was passed by the customs-house at Montreal?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I understand that this is a new request. The matter is before the committee now, and as to whether it should not be left there to be dealt with by the committee appointed for the purpose, is a question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I can hardly think that the minister (Mr. Paterson) is serious in telling the House, that when this subject, as to how a product from a foreign country passed through the customs, has become a matter of discussion in this House, the information should not be laid on the Table. It is treating the House with scant courtesy. In my experience of parliamentary life I have never heard of anything so at variance with responsible departmental government. I hope, for the respect the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) owes to the government and to himself, he will not hesitate to do that which has never been refused to be done before.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I take some exception to the statement just made by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper). I am not prepared to say that this information should not be laid on the Table of the House, and neither am I prepared to say that it should. Charge seventeen laid by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), says:

17. The substance brought in from the United States, as above stated, in Saratoga trunks was detained by the customs officers for duty thereon, but under direction of the government it was allowed to pass without payment of customs dues.

That being so, and the matter having been referred by the House to a special committee for investigation, I question the propriety of the House dealing with it until it is reported upon by that committee. It seems to me that it would be prejudging the case if the papers were placed on the Table of the House, when the House itself has ordered an investigation upon this subject. There is certainly much to be said in support of the position taken by the Minister of Customs.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Prime Minister is inverting the order of procedure in public business. The order of procedure is this: That these papers are first laid on the Table of the House, and then they are sent to the committee appointed. This House is not dependent on any committee

to get information, and this information as to how the product of a foreign country came to be admitted free of duty into this Dominion, has never before been refused. It is no answer to say that a committee has been appointed, and that information will be given to that committee. This House is higher than the committee which it has appointed, and this House is the channel through which the committee should receive the information.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). The House has determined the method whereby it will receive this information, by giving the committee power to call for persons and papers, and this particular accusation having been included in the charges, and the committee having been appointed to inquire into it, the committee is the channel through which the House should receive a report on the matter.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). In reply to the Minister of Finance—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no question before the House.

Mr. WALLACE. The Speaker informs me that there is nothing before the House. There was a moment ago apparently when the Minister of Finance was permitted to speak.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. When the leader of the opposition was permitted to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. WALLACE. I have another matter to bring before the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker. When the question was raised by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) as to a wounded soldier in South Africa, I attempted to make some reference to that matter, but I was precluded for the time being, and I shall revert to that for a moment.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman has any matter personal to himself to bring before the House he can do so.

Mr. WALLACE. I have not a matter personal to myself—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, sit down.

Mr. WALLACE. The polite intimations from the other side that I am to sit down will not be obeyed.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). When the Speaker rises the hon. gentleman ought to sit down if he has any respect for the Chair.

Mr. WALLACE. If the Minister of Railways knew the rules of the House he

would know that he is violating those rules now by yelling out while sitting in his seat. I endeavour to obey the rules. I have not broken any rule yet, and I do not intend to.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman has.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not intend to allow any hon. member on that side or anywhere else to browbeat or bully me. I said I had some matters to bring to the attention of the House that were germane to those brought by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. I am going to bring them to the attention of the House. I am quite in order.

Mr. BERGERON. No surrender.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. John Hewitt, of Toronto, whose son is in the first contingent, has written to me asking me if I could procure any information with regard to his son, who is ill. He has apparently exhausted every means known to himself, and I therefore beg to call the attention of the minister, to whose department I have written to-day, asking if any information can be obtained as to the whereabouts of Mr. Hewitt's son, the seriousness of his complaint, and so on, so that the information may be given to his family. I have also a letter from Dr. Freeborn, of Magnetawan, asking for information with regard to William McCullough, who became a member of the second contingent of mounted forces, who enlisted, I think, at Edmonton, who is ill and whose parents live in Algoma and wish to get some information about him. I took occasion to call the attention of the House, and before the House met, the attention of the government, to the fact that the government had not in my opinion done their duty in giving means of information.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the point of order?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The point of order is that the hon. gentleman cannot make a speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would ask my hon. friend to confine himself to a statement of the facts which he wishes to bring to the attention of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. That is what I have done so far. As to the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that I cannot make a speech—

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). You are sorry.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, I am sorry, but the Minister of Marine ought to be glad. I called the attention of the Minister of Militia long time ago, before parliament met, to

the importance of furnishing information as to any casualties or illness among the soldiers who were sent to South Africa, as I did not think the government had done their duty in that matter, so that friends might get information without undergoing great expense. It appeared to me all along, and it appears to me to-day, that they have been very lax and derelict in doing what was a plain duty. Now, Sir, I wish to call attention to this further fact in direct connection with this. Lord Lansdowne, the Minister of War for Great Britain, had arranged that the British soldier could communicate with his friends at home in Great Britain, and that they could communicate with him at a reduced rate—that cablegrams, instead of costing eight or nine shillings a word, could be sent to and from England at two shillings a word. Lord Lansdowne, after a good deal of correspondence with the Post Office Department in England, also made arrangements that the Canadians could send their cablegrams as official government messages, having precedence over all other messages, for two shillings a word, plus sixpence a word for the cablegram from Canada to Great Britain. Lord Lansdowne communicated the facts to the Minister of Militia here, and requested that all the cablegrams be sent through the general officer commanding the Canadian militia, so that they might go through official channels, and have precedence over all other messages. Although that was arranged many weeks ago, the government never communicated a line of that arrangement, so far as I know, to the people of Canada, or to the thousands of friends of soldiers who are desirous of communicating with them. I ascertained it and I endeavoured to send a cablegram under these conditions. I sent my money to the department and the message; but that message never was sent under those conditions. The government, though they retained the money, never complied with the conditions.

Mr. FOSTER. You ought to know better than trust them with your money.

Mr. WALLACE. It seems that I was a little innocent in the matter. It is true, afterwards the deputy minister undertook to send a cablegram through Lord Strathcona; but as it would be ten or eleven days before I received an answer, I cabled through the Red Cross League, and got an answer in two or three days. This shows that the government are utterly reckless and helpless in a very important matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. I shall have to ask my hon. friend to stop his argument. He is not asking a question.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not asking a question; I am making a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to make an argument.

Mr. WALLACE. If the Speaker says I have no right to make a statement to this House, I will sit down; but I will protest against any such ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. The position is just this. My hon. friend is aware that when the Orders of the Day are called, it is open to members to ask questions or to make personal explanations; but it is not open to a member to address the House and discuss a question.

Mr. WALLACE. If it is necessary, I shall move the adjournment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. WALLACE. I think, Mr. Speaker, your attention might very well be called to the boorish noises heard across the House. I have made my statement; I have nothing more to say, only this, that I think the government should have carried out the regulations provided by Lord Lansdowne.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member had better make his motion to put himself in order.

Mr. WALLACE. I shall move that the House do now adjourn.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman, the gentleman's tone and manner. If I were to attempt to do so, I hope I would utterly fail, but I must say, with reference to the hon. gentleman's money, that I shall make immediate inquiry, and see that it is returned to him forthwith. I want the House to distinctly understand that I have not any of it in my pocket. With regard to the inquiry the hon. gentleman has made of a man named Hewitt and a man named McCullough, he says he has written me to-day. Well, I have not received his letter, but so soon as I receive it, I shall send him a reply, giving all the information we have in the department. So far as the special rates are concerned, I understand that Lord Strathcona arranged for a half rate by cable between London and South Africa. I think that that has been made public, and has been generally understood.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not catch what the hon. gentleman said. Who, did he say, made the arrangement?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I did not say who made it, I said it was made through Lord Strathcona, and that cablegrams to South Africa through Lord Strathcona, go at a reduced rate—I think a half rate.

Mr. WALLACE. Did the hon. minister announce that to the country?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think it was announced in the papers.

Mr. WALLACE. Where ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I shall find out where, and let the hon. gentleman know. At any rate the hon. gentleman seems to have known it. With regard to communications between the people of this country, and the soldiers in South Africa, I can only say that they are precisely the same as between the people in England and their friends in South Africa. All the news received at the War Office in London, has been promptly forwarded here, and we have not only had the news coming from the War Office, but also have had direct communications from Colonel Otter, and the other commanding officers from Canada in South Africa, and communications through the Governor of Cape Colony, direct through His Excellency here. We have done the best we could in the Militia Department to give all the news possible to the people interested in this country. I may be pardoned for referring to a personal matter, Sir, but if I do so, it is only to show that there has been no partiality in this matter. I myself, although my son is in South Africa, have not had one word from him direct, since April 14 last—not a single word; and I doubt if there is any one of the parents and friends of the soldiers in South Africa, who have had to wait as long a time as that. We have done our very best to answer all inquiries. We could not undertake to enter into an avalanche of cabling, because we would not know where it would end, but we have, in every way in our power, done what we thought was our duty to the friends of the men out there, in obtaining best information we could. I understand that there is some information in the department which has come in within the last half hour. I have sent over for it, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will break into the proceedings to read any cablegrams there may be which will be of interest to the House or the country.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I am somewhat surprised at the statement of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, that the government are not prepared to go into an avalanche of cabling to satisfy those who have relatives doing service in South Africa. It is not an avalanche of cabling that is in question, but the news has been so very scarce, and it has been so difficult to get any information from the Minister of Militia or his department, that the people justly complain. Although there is an official over there whose duty is to give all the information possible to the people in this country about their friends and relatives in South Africa, that information is so very scarce that the people think the government are perfectly indifferent in the matter. The flippant remark of the minister that he would return the money to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), may be very well passed over in sil-

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

ence. If he would show the same honesty in every department of life, that would be very commendable on his part. The hon. gentleman said that Lord Strathcona had made some arrangement.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I said that an arrangement had been made through Lord Strathcona.

Mr. SPROULE. I took down the hon. gentleman's words, and I am quite sure that *Hansard* will bear me out in what I say. The hon. minister subsequently altered that statement and said that an arrangement had been made through Lord Strathcona. Well, my information is that it was not Lord Strathcona who made the arrangement at all, but Lord Lansdowne, representing the War Department, and he made it for the special purpose of enabling those Canadians who had friends and relatives in South Africa to get information about them as rapidly and cheaply as possible. Such messages were given precedence as official messages, by being transmitted through the channel of the War Office. But the Department of Militia here has not given this information to the Canadian people, so that they might avail themselves of the facilities provided for the people of Canada to get the information they are justly entitled to. Besides there has not been a single word of information given to the public, up to the present, of the arrangement to which the hon. minister referred. The department did not deign to tell the Canadian people that there is a way by which they can get information from their relatives very cheaply and rapidly, namely, by means of this arrangement made by Lord Lansdowne for enabling our people to get information through the War Department. The Minister of Militia never gave publicity to that arrangement. Will any one then say that he has done his duty faithfully? Is it to be wondered at that the Canadian people who have relatives in South Africa, who may be languishing on beds of sickness, should feel anxious about their fate, and should be willing to go to any expense to get even the most fractional information about them, and they cannot understand the callous indifference of the Minister of Militia and his department. Now it comes out at the eleventh hour, that the department knew of an arrangement made for the benefit of our people, but never made that arrangement known to the people, who consequently could not take advantage of it. The hon. minister has endeavoured to excuse himself, by saying that he cannot send an avalanche of cables, but he was not asked to do that. He also adds that he has not received any word from his own son, who is out there, since April 14. That does not show any great anxiety on his part as to what his son is doing, but I am told that his son is not in any place where he is likely to be injured, except by sickness.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. What does the hon. gentleman mean? It is only fair to my son to say that in yesterday's *Globe*, there is the announcement in the correspondence of that paper, that he was one of the six men who swam the River Vet on the forward march from Bloemfontein, and one of the men who defeated a party of Boers on the north side of that river, and were successful in turning the flank of the Boers. I want to know what the hon. gentleman means when he has the hardihood to make a statement here to the injury of that young man and myself, namely, that my son is not anywhere where he is taking any risk. I have a right to explanation, and so has this House. A meaner or more contemptible insinuation was never before made on the floor of this House.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, King's) that no such insolent bluff as he has made to-day shall deter me from saying what I have to say. Nor will his graveyard reminiscences deter me. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I saw the statement in the press that his son was in no danger, and I said we had never heard that he had been in an engagement.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. He left as second lieutenant in the—

Mr. **SPROULE**. Mr. Speaker, I have the floor and I intend to keep it. I accept everything that the hon. gentleman says, and I am glad to withdraw anything that I may have said that he thought reflected upon his son. I gave the information at my disposal. I did not say a word, directly or indirectly, reflecting on his son. I said that the information in the press was that he was in no danger, and that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, King's) would not have the anxiety suffered by parents whose son was wounded or lay in a hospital ill with enteric fever and not expected to live twenty-four hours. The hon. gentleman could afford to say that I had no information more than others, but that is no reason why others should not be more anxious than he when they knew that their children might be in a dying condition and could get no information concerning them. Wise provision was made by Lord Lansdowne by which they could have gained information, if the minister had done as he should have done and made the fact known.

Motion (Mr. Wallace) to adjourn, negatived.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. The information I referred to is as follows:

(Sir Alfred Milner to Lord Minto.)

Cape Town, June 18.

Regret to report that Lieut. H. G. Blanchard, 2nd Mounted Infantry, wounded Roodevaal, June 7th.

(Sgd.) MILNER.

(Sir Alfred Milner to Lord Minto.)

Cape Town, June 19, 1900.

Regret to report following casualties:

Captain A. C. McDonnell, 2nd Mounted Rifles, dangerously wounded in abdomen.

108. Private W. Frost, 2nd Mounted Rifles, dangerously wounded; since dead.

46. Corporal H. H. Baines, 2nd Mounted Rifles, slightly wounded.

129. Private F. Greenal, 2nd Mounted Rifles, slightly wounded.

2nd Mounted Rifles, near Pretoria, June 12.

Lieut. H. G. Blanchard, died of wounds on June 15.

7208. Private G. W. Leonard, wounded Zand River, May 10, died of wounds.

7820. Private J. McElkmey, missing, May 29. Both Canadian Regiment of Infantry.

(Sgd.) MILNER.

Mr. **PRIOR**. May I ask if the Lieut. Blanchard referred to is of British Columbia?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. I suppose so.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). I think he was a native of Nova Scotia, though a resident of British Columbia. He was the son of a respected barrister in the town of Windsor.

#### SUPPLY—DUTIES ON TOBACCO.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. **JAMES CLANCY** (Bothwell). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay in your hands a resolution which I may fairly anticipate will commend itself to the government and will be accepted by them—namely, a motion in favour of a reduction in the duties on tobacco. I hope the government will not receive it as a motion of want of confidence, but will be prepared to accept the terms of my resolution. In the first place, I desire to remind the government that we are living now under exceptional circumstances with regard to our revenue—that we are collecting a very much larger amount than the public service requires. We are collecting, in round numbers, 40 per cent more taxes from the people than we did when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. Whether hon. gentlemen opposite are or are not prepared to say that, owing to change of circumstances, that that was warranted, I shall not discuss at this moment. My motion is made in view of the fact that a very large sum is being collected from the people—according to a significant phrase made to us by the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), we are collecting a sum in excess of the public needs that should be in the people's pocket. We are collecting a sum of about fourteen millions that, according to the profession—leaving aside the practices—of hon. gentlemen opposite should be left in the pockets of the people. That being the case, it seems

proper that we should look around and see whether we can make any reasonable reduction in the taxes. And if we can accomplish two things—if we can encourage certain industries and, at the same time, reduce the taxes of the people, we shall accomplish two things greatly to be desired. My intention is to propose that we should remove the excise duty of five cents a pound on Canadian leaf tobacco. I do not propose to go further than to ask that it be removed. Now, what is the object in removing it? The first point is that the Canadian-grown tobacco to-day stands in a very difficult position. There is an unfounded prejudice from one end of Canada to the other, leading the people to believe that we cannot produce a good class of leaf. There are a number of persons engaged in the trade who are naturally prejudiced in consequence of their business being affected by it; and for them to keep up that prejudice is a very natural thing. I am glad to say that, with the increase in the duties—first, the customs duties, and later, in the excise duties—considerable additional protection has been given to the Canadian grower. But, it has had the effect of advancing to a very considerable extent the price upon tobaccos of foreign growth.

I wish it to be clearly understood at the outset that we must always recognize this fact, that tobacco is one of the articles that has been in the past and must in the future be selected as an object of taxation. I am not in any sense contending that tobacco is an article that should go untaxed; whether it is taxed too highly or not, may be a question open to discussion. But for my purpose it is not necessary to discuss that point further than to say that I think we can with profit and with great benefit to the people of this country reduce or remove entirely the excise duty from Canadian leaf. Now, what will be the effect of that? First, it will encourage the growth of Canadian tobacco. It may be said that it is encouraged now, but in spite of that encouragement we are not making as much headway as we should. I am convinced that as prejudice is gradually removed, and once the Canadian leaf has been placed upon its feet in Canada, it never will recede, because I have not the slightest doubt that we can grow a quality of tobacco in Canada that will suit a large share of our market. It is true that tobacco will have to be imported of certain kinds and for certain purposes at all times; but we can produce in Canada probably 60 per cent of all the tobacco that can be consumed in Canada, I have not the slightest doubt of that. But we can only do that by giving it encouragement in the meantime so as to place it upon its feet, and it will be able to take care of itself after that.

Therefore, hon. gentlemen will see that in the meantime I have two objects in view,

one is to accomplish the purpose of encouraging Canadian tobacco, and the next is to reduce what seems to me the enormous rate of taxation now existing. Now, if we remove the duty of five cents a pound on Canadian grown leaf, what is the effect? The effect is that the manufacturer has an additional protection if he manufactures Canadian leaf; the effect is that the grower has an additional protection of five cents per pound; and another effect is that we will lower the taxation to the consumers of this country correspondingly upon Canadian grown leaf, and upon the foreign leaf to the extent that the foreign leaf comes into competition with the Canadian grown leaf. That object seems to me to be so commendable and so fair that the government should without hesitation accept this resolution, and remove in the meantime the excise duty from the Canadian leaf. I say in the meantime, for this reason: We are collecting now a very large revenue. It is possible, should a contraction of our trade set in such as usually takes place after a great expansion, there will be a diminution in our revenue; suppose it diminishes very much at the end of five years, we will have during all that period given protection to the grower and the manufacturer, we will have reduced the taxation to the consumer, and we will then have placed Canadian-grown tobacco upon a proper footing. Once it stands upon a sound footing it never can recede, because the public taste will have become suited to it, people will become accustomed to using it.

But some hon. gentlemen may say: If you take the duty off now, do you mean to take it off for all time? No, I do not mean that, I mean that it might be in the discretion of any government, five years from now or two years from now to put it back, if they found there was a great shrinkage in the revenue. If they found that in the meantime Canadian-grown tobacco had received that encouragement, and it had taken a higher place, it seems to me we would have accomplished everything we desired and that then the duty might be restored on Canadian leaf. Now, hon. gentlemen may say that five cents a pound is not a great deal. I wish to say to hon. gentlemen that it is a great deal, if we consider that the probable average price the grower is getting to-day in Canada does not exceed six cents a pound. True, there are some qualities for which a higher price is paid, but when we take the grades that are classified by growers, we find that the average price does not exceed six cents a pound. If that be the case, hon. gentlemen will say that five cents a pound is not a very large encouragement. They may say: You have a very large encouragement now, you have practically, upon stemmed tobacco, 14 cents given by the legislation of 1897 in addition to what you formerly had. Well, that

is only partly so. Hon. gentlemen who have taken the trouble, as I have no doubt hon. gentlemen all have, to inform themselves upon that point, will see that stemmed tobacco has not been imported to any extent, only a bare fraction. Therefore, the tobacco that has come in, the foreign leaf, has all paid a lower rate, namely, an advance of ten cents a pound on unstemmed tobacco. I believe there was some arrangement made in the Inland Revenue Department by which the importer or the manufacturer of imported foreign leaf, had some reduction by reason of an allowance on the stems, and it is now being reduced so much to the manufacturers of that class of tobacco that they are manufacturing almost entirely the unstemmed leaf, and that is the kind that is being imported.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to detain the House with doing more than saying this: that it is one of those matters that seems to me so perfectly plain and reasonable, so perfectly consonant with the present state of affairs, that it should commend itself at once to the consideration of the government. Remember that we are collecting \$14,000,000 more now than we did in 1896. We have added to the taxation upon the people in two ways. First, hon. gentlemen have upon the whole increased the taxes upon the people considerably over the rates of 1896. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries nods, I hope, assent to that proposition, but I will not argue that point now. But every hon. gentleman on that side of the House knows perfectly well that there are just two ways by which people may be taxed. One way may be owing entirely to the expansion of trade in the country and the broadening of the basis of taxation upon which the same rate of duty is collected. Those are periods when it is the duty of the government to reduce the taxation, but if they stand idly by and make no change, I say that in that way alone it means a broadening of the basis of taxation when you collect from the people \$2 where you formerly collected \$1. I have no hesitation in saying that any government is remiss in their duty who do not reduce the taxation while there is an expansion in trade. They should take advantage of the expansion to reduce the taxation. But the exceptional circumstance in this case is that we are collecting \$14,000,000 a year, according to the statements of hon. gentlemen, that should to-day be in the pockets of the people. Now, the object of my resolution is to reduce that taxation upon the numerous consumers of tobacco in this country. To a great many people in this country tobacco is a luxury, to the workingman who gets his dollar a day tobacco is almost his only luxury. He earns a scanty living for his family, he is placed in such a position that he has nothing else to look forward to. You may say that it is only a habit; that is hardly the proper way to put it, it is the only

solace he has. It seems to me that if there is any means by which we can give him temporary relief it ought to be done. Probably 90 per cent of the people of this country use tobacco, and if we reduce the taxation upon that article we relieve to that extent that large proportion of our whole population. The next is that we increase to the grower of Canadian tobacco the protection of five cents a pound without increasing the taxation upon the people of the country; but we lessen the taxation. The next is that we give encouragement to the manufacturer of Canadian leaf whose interests are conjointly always with the growers of Canadian tobacco. The man who is manufacturing foreign leaf does not want this change made, because, he says: You will bring Canadian-grown tobacco into the market and drive mine out. Therefore, I am not favourable to it. I hope the government will not treat this as a motion of want of confidence, although it might be so regarded in the form in which it has been introduced to-day, but it is so manifestly fair to the consumer while giving additional encouragement to the grower and manufacturer of home-grown tobacco that I hope the government will see their way to adopting it. I therefore have much pleasure in moving:

That all the words after the word 'That' be left out, and the following added instead thereof: 'the additional taxation imposed on many articles by the tariff of 1897 and the great expansion in trade have increased the revenue from \$36,618,590 in 1896 to \$46,741,249 in 1899. That the Minister of Finance has stated in his budget speech that the revenue for the fiscal year 1900 would reach the enormous sum of \$50,000,000, or \$14,000,000 greater than in 1896.

That in the opinion of this House a reduction in the present taxation could be made with great advantage to the people of Canada, and it is therefore expedient, in order to give greater encouragement to the growth and manufacture of Canadian tobacco, to remove for the present the excise duty on tobacco grown in Canada.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). That there have occasionally been complaints in regard to the tobacco duties I have been well aware, but I am bound to say that I have never up to this moment heard a complaint in the terms expressed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) and in his resolution. He has proceeded on a line in regard to the matter at variance with every complaint that has hitherto been received against the duties on tobacco and the adoption of his amendment would not, in the slightest degree, meet whatever demand there is, if there has been a demand, for a reduction of the duties on tobacco. When we reduced the tariff in 1897, we made a large number of changes, changes which, in the main, were in the direction of lower taxation. We reduced the duties on many articles, we added a number of articles to the free list, we made large changes in the way of reduced taxa-

tion. It was of the utmost importance that we should maintain a strong financial position and in view of the uncertainties as to the amount of revenue that might be produced by this lower rate of taxation it became necessary that we should take some steps to make good any possible loss that might result. It was thought that it might fairly be met by providing for the raising of some additional taxation in order to balance, or make good, the loss occasioned by the reduction of duties. We made some increase in the tobacco duties, and I am glad to be able to say that these increased duties, in the main, have operated well. I think we were informed at the time that we would not get the increased revenue from these duties which we anticipated. Experience has shown that although there may be some smuggling, as there always will be where there are tobacco duties, yet we have collected a very substantial increased revenue from these increased duties, probably as much as we anticipated. Then, there has been another result of the tariff change. The change was made on the principle of revenue production. It was necessary to have an increased revenue in certain directions when we were to lose revenue in other directions. But, while the object of these changes was in the direction of revenue, the duties operated, as revenue duties frequently operate to a certain extent, as protective duties, and there has been under that policy a very large development of the native tobacco industry. The figures showing that great increase, have, on several occasions, been presented to the House and need not be dwelt upon to-day. It is admitted that there has been an enormous development of the native tobacco industry as compared with what there was before. The hon. member for Bothwell proposes a step which is calculated to give a further benefit to the native tobacco industry, but anybody who looks into the matter will see that the native industry under the operation of our tobacco tariff, whether it be called a revenue or a protective tariff, has an enormous amount of protection such as would not justify anybody in asking that it should receive more. Indeed, if there is any room for criticism of the tobacco duties it is that the discrimination between the native and foreign tobacco is so large. The hon. member for Bothwell by the course he is pursuing, if the House should carry his resolution, would simply abolish the excise duty on native tobacco, but he would not change the duty in any way whatever upon foreign tobacco or on blended tobacco which is so largely used. The complaint here has been that native tobacco did not meet the taste of the people. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan) showed very conclusively that native tobacco was being produced of good quality, that it was now being sold at moderate prices, so much so that you can buy a plug of tobacco to-day of a larger

Mr. FIELDING.

size at a smaller price than the same could be bought for before the change in the tariff took place. He met to some extent the statement that the people do not want native tobacco. I am glad to know that native tobacco is becoming so popular with tobacco users that its production has increased everywhere and that many persons, who, a few years ago, would not have it at all, are now using it. As a result of the improvement in the methods of cultivation and methods of treatment we may expect a still further increase. But, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that the motion which the hon. member for Bothwell makes does not deal with the complaint that has hitherto been made about the tobacco duties. It proposes further discrimination in favour of the native industry which is already protected to the full. I am perfectly satisfied that the change which the hon. member for Bothwell proposes is not necessary, in the interest of the native tobacco industry, and that it would not operate in bringing about any substantial reduction which would, to any extent, meet the complaint that has hitherto been made. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) who raised this question on a former occasion did not ask for a reduction in the duty on native tobacco. He told us that the people had not become accustomed to the native tobacco and he demanded a reduction of the duty on foreign tobacco to meet the wishes of the people whom he represented.

Mr. CLANCY. He wants to remedy that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I want to show what was the nature of the outcry against the high duties on tobacco, and that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is making a motion which would only make the matter worse, because he would increase the discrimination between the duties on native and foreign tobacco, which would not meet the complaint which has been raised in regard to the high duties on tobacco.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) prepared to say that in regard to the lower grades of foreign leaf imported into Canada for blending purposes, the reduction of the duties on Canadian leaf would not have the effect of reducing the price of foreign leaf which comes into competition with it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, nothing that you can do with the native leaf will affect the price of the foreign article, because the price of foreign tobacco is governed by the markets of the world, by the inexorable law of supply and demand, so much so that when the Spanish war broke out the price of Havana tobacco went up to large figures.

Mr. GILLIES. Is not the price of foreign tobacco governed very largely by the duty on the article coming into the country?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, but the hon. member for Bothwell is not touching that at all. I agree that my hon. friend is right. The price of foreign tobacco to the consumers in Canada is influenced to a large extent by the duty we impose upon it. But the price of foreign tobacco as it is imported into Canada, except as respects the duty, is governed by the price in the markets of the world. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) simply proposes to increase the discrimination which now exists, and which exists to the fullest extent possible for the benefit of the native tobacco. The wildest protectionist could not ask a greater protection than exists to-day upon the native tobacco of Canada. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) proposes to still further increase the discrimination he is asking that which is not reasonable, and which will not meet in any degree the demands of the people. He is asking that which is utterly at variance with the demand voiced by my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Gillies), and by others who have been dealing, not with the question of the duty on native tobacco which it is said the people do not use, but with the duty on the foreign tobacco which it is said the people prefer. If we had to adopt a method of reducing taxation, I am not prepared to say that we should begin on tobacco. I do not say that tobacco is in the broadest sense a luxury, though in a sense it is, but most people use it not as a necessary. At all events perhaps it may be considered the poor man's luxury. However, if we were looking over the tariff for some item on which we could reduce the taxation on the masses of the people, there are very few who would say that tobacco was the one article above all others which we should select. I have no doubt further that with the development of trade, the opportunity will come to us for making tariff changes in the direction of reduction some day, and then tobacco will have to be considered. But I do say that at the present time, to single out tobacco and to say that it is the particular article upon which there must be a reduction of taxation does not indicate, in my judgment a keen perception of the wants and views of the people.

I have been discussing the tobacco question on its merits, but I want to present the question more broadly, though briefly. We have to take the tariff, not as a matter affecting one particular section of our industry, but we must make the tariff as a whole. Each one of us, I have no doubt, would be able to suggest some particular thing in reference to which he would be pleased to have the tariff changed. I do not imagine that under the present government, and still less under any other government, that you are going to have a tariff which is so absolutely perfect that every one is going to be satisfied with it. I have repeatedly made the statement, and though

criticised for it in some quarters, I repeat it again: That the tariff must always be to some extent a matter of compromise, an effort to give and take throughout our wide Dominion. Upon that principle the tariff has been established. We have already announced in an earlier stage of the session that it was not our purpose to make any tariff changes this present session, except as respects the reduction of the duty under the preferential tariff. I think I can fairly ask the House on general principles to adhere to that position. In asking hon. gentlemen to take that attitude, I do not expect them to vote that they are satisfied with every detail of the tariff, but I say that in the main the tariff has proved a successful tariff for Canada, and if we were looking around for some particular item in which a change was necessary, about the last item I should have imagined any one would have selected is a reduction in the duty on the native tobacco, I repeat that the change which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) proposes would not in the slightest degree meet the demand, so far as there is such a demand, for lower duties on tobacco, because he does not touch the question of the tobacco which the majority of the people still use. I point out at the same time that so far as the encouragement to the native tobacco industry is concerned, it had a liberal encouragement under the tariff of the former government and it has obtained a still larger encouragement under the tariff of the present day, and to add to that encouragement, by simply taking off the excise duty of 5 cents, would be giving something more to the native tobacco industry which it does not require. I am sure that every hon. member who represents a tobacco-growing county, if he looks at the development of the industry which has taken place in Canada during the last three years under the present tariff, will feel that he cannot ask for anything more in that direction, and will feel that he should sustain the tariff under which that industry has prospered so largely, and under which, I am sure, it will continue to prosper in the years to come.

Mr. ALVIN H. MOORE (Stanstead). In rising, Mr. Speaker, to second the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), I may say that I was much pleased with the concise, lucid, and convincing manner in which that hon. gentleman treated this very important matter. The hon. gentleman has covered the ground so completely that I do not propose to occupy the attention of the House but for a very short time. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has been severely criticised by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who has stated that he has placed this matter before the House in a different light from that in which other gentlemen dealt with the same question. I would remind the Minister of Finance that the hon. member for Both-

well has in view the benefit to be derived by the people of this country, and his concern is not for giving that benefit to the people of foreign countries. The object of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is to reduce the duty upon the home-grown leaf for the purpose of encouraging this home industry, instead of depending upon foreign producers for our tobacco supply. The motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is in the direct line of carrying out the national policy, and of giving to the producers of Canada the control of the Canadian market; while the policy of the Minister of Finance is to take away the control of the Canadian market from Canadian tobacco producers, and to hand it over to foreigners. The hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) in his budget speech, informed us that he contemplated a surplus of over \$7,000,000 for the ensuing year, and he further said: That with an overflowing treasury the people of Canada had a right to expect a reduction in taxation. To-day he told us, that notwithstanding this great surplus, and notwithstanding the overflowing treasury, the only change he proposes to make is the increase of the preferential tariff on goods coming from Great Britain, and that preferential tariff has no effect whatever on tobacco, because no tobacco is imported from Great Britain and is especially exempt. Now, Sir, if the people have a right to expect a reduction in taxation in consequence of the financial position of this country, how can we give credit to the Finance Minister for consistency when he says that he does not propose to make any tariff changes whatever. One plank of the platform of the Ottawa Liberal convention of 1893, was:

To so adjust the tariff as to bear as light as possible upon the necessaries of life.

It may be considered by some, although the Finance Minister would not go so far as to make the statement, that tobacco is a luxury, and not a necessity, but however that may be, if you ask a man who has been using tobacco for a number of years what he thinks about it, he will tell you that he would prefer being deprived of bread, or any other article of food, than of tobacco. The duty on tobacco affects a vast majority of our people financially, and so we may assume that it is a necessary of life, and consequently comes under the provision of this plank in the platform of the Liberal party. There is another idea which I shall not, however, dilate upon at any length, and that is, that were we to call tobacco a necessity of life, we might say that we are taxing it out of existence. It has been stated that every nation, tribe and tongue in the world is in the habit of using some kind of narcotic; and the hon. gentleman who sits at my left, the learned Dr. Roddick, of St. Anne's division, Montreal, says that tobacco is the least injurious narcotic used by any people in the world.

Mr. MOORE.

Consequently, there cannot be so much objection to the use of tobacco as one might infer from the statement of the Finance Minister. Considering that tobacco is in one sense a necessary of life, that the cultivation and manufacture of Canadian tobacco should be encouraged as a native industry, and that the people should be encouraged to consume a larger quantity of Canadian tobacco in place of the foreign article, I think that, with an overflowing treasury and a great surplus in view, the government should commence to reduce the taxation of the people by removing this duty on Canadian tobacco. Coal oil and other articles have been mentioned as subjects for the reduction of taxation; but, the Minister of Finance declares plainly that he is not going to reduce taxation on anything. Therefore, he is not carrying out the policy adopted in the Liberal platform in 1893, or the policy he outlined in the budget speech he made this session. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. friend from Bothwell.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say but very few words on this subject. The hon. Minister of Finance said that the cheaper kind of tobacco was the poor man's tobacco. I agree with him in that. Then, it is the native tobacco which is the poor man's tobacco, and any reduction in the cost of that would be a benefit to the great consuming class to whom tobacco is a luxury and even a necessary of life, almost as much as tea or bread or butter, the habit is so general. But the hon. Minister of Finance says he does not think it would do the poor man any good to make this reduction. If you reduce the excise duty five cents a pound, that enables the manufacturer to sell at five cents a pound less; and five cents a pound is a very large consideration for the poor man who buys tobacco from week to week and month to month out of his small earnings. Therefore, I think it is desirable to make the reduction if it can be done without injury to any other line of industry. If it could be shown that the revenue could not bear this reduction, I would say not to make it; but, as the Minister of Finance says that the revenue is so buoyant that he expects to have a surplus of between five and six million dollars, he is in a good position to meet the wants of the poor man by making the reduction. The Minister of Finance says this is a species of protection. I do not care what you call it; if it lowers the price of the article to the consumer and does not injure any other industry in the country, I would be willing to adopt it every day in the year. Such an argument is not worthy of consideration. It is not proposed to reduce the customs revenue on imported tobacco, costing from fifty cents to a dollar a pound, nor upon Havana cigars sold at twenty-five cents each. The rich man is able to pay the duty on these, and no person complains of it. But, in the case of Canadian tobacco, we

have it in our power to give to the poorer classes a substantial reduction in the cost of living, and, at the same time, to encourage those engaged in the production of the raw leaf in the country. For these reasons, I heartily support this reduction.

Mr. L. A. CHAUVIN (Terrebonne). Mr. Speaker, I heard a lecturer of the government state in my county that our country can produce every kind of tobacco that is imported—that we only have to learn the proper methods of cultivating and preparing the tobacco; and he was appointed by the government especially to instruct his hearers in regard to these methods. Therefore, I think the government will be inconsistent with itself if it does not reduce the duty on native tobacco. In my province native tobacco is as highly esteemed as foreign tobacco, both by manufacturers and consumers. I have been informed in the Department of Inland Revenue that just as fine cigars can be made from Canadian tobacco as from foreign tobacco. In view of these facts, I think that this government, who profess to be in favour of reducing the taxation of the people and to be a national government, should reduce the taxation on native tobacco and encourage its cultivation, as advocated by their own lecturers, who assert that the native tobacco is just as good as foreign tobacco.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is just because the government are fully convinced that the native tobacco is just as good as foreign tobacco, that in 1897 they introduced the present policy, under which the customs and excise duty on the foreign leaf is 35 cents a pound, whilst the excise duty, the only duty on Canadian leaf, is only 5 cents a pound. My hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Chauvin) will see the great advantage which this tariff has given to the growing of Canadian tobacco. The present policy has produced, especially in the province of Quebec, which my hon. friend and I represent on the floor of this parliament, enormously beneficial results. In fact, it has introduced a new industry in that province. Now, I ask my hon. friend if he thinks it desirable to change that policy at all?

Mr. CLANCY. Change it for the better.

The PRIME MINISTER. You do not change it for the better if you reduce the duty on Canadian leaf, because if we do that to-day, we shall be told to-morrow that the disproportion is too great between the duty on Canadian leaf and the duty on foreign leaf, and that we must reduce the duty on the foreign leaf also. Therefore, under the pretense of encouraging Canadian tobacco, the hon. gentleman is moving a resolution which is a stab at the policy we introduced in 1897. What are the figures? Does my hon. friend expect that under any policy he could introduce, he could do better

for the growth of the Canadian weed than has been done already? What are the figures? In 1896-7, the total production of Canadian tobacco that went through the manufactories was 690,000 pounds. In 1897-8, under the experience of twelve months of the policy adopted in 1897—this had increased to the enormous figure of 1,949,000 pounds. From less than 700,000 pounds in 1896-7, the policy which we introduced increased in twelve months the production of Canadian tobacco to nearly 2,000,000 pounds. That was brought about simply by putting 5 cents per pound duty on Canadian leaf and at the same time charging 35 cents on the foreign leaf, which was an encouragement of 30 cents on the Canadian product. The following year, the production of Canadian tobacco increased to 2,500,000 pounds, and the first six months of the current year shows a production of 1,900,000 pounds; and, supposing the same proportion continues—and it will be larger—we will have a total production this year of 3,800,000 pounds. Is it to be expected that you can do better for the province of Quebec and the county of Essex and perhaps also the county of Bothwell? I do not think that the electors of the county of Bothwell will thank my hon. friend, because if his policy were to be adopted, we would be repeating the old performance of killing the hen which lays the golden egg. We had better stick to the present policy and continue to encourage the growing of the native plant as we have done already.

Mr. CLANCY. The right hon. gentleman says that the great increase is due to the additional protection, and he has pointed out what that increase has been. By what process of reasoning is he going to escape the fact that this increase was caused by increased protection.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend had his answer a moment ago from the hon. member for Grey who wants to reduce the price of tobacco. If the price be reduced, who will benefit? The consumers or the growers? The consumers no doubt, and therefore my hon. friend, instead of helping the farmers would do the very reverse. If you want to have the duty reduced on tobacco, well and good, but this is not the way of doing it. If the hon. gentleman wants a reduction on the duty all along the line, I am prepared to see how far we can go to meet his views; but when he proposes a one-sided policy, he is simply introducing the thin end of the wedge to destroy the very industry we want to protect. The hon. member for Richmond will tell you that the price of tobacco is too heavy for the consumers.

Mr. GILLIES. Hear, hear, and that is because of the increased duty.

The PRIME MINISTER. He says the price of tobacco is too heavy to the cou-

sumer. Very good, but I have not heard that it is too much for the growers. We must take the tariff as it is. It is not perfect, but just about as good as it can be made: although it has made the price of tobacco somewhat higher than it should be, still we expect every man to do the best he can to encourage our native industry, and if that policy be continued, the time is not far distant when we shall be able to grow in Canada every pound of tobacco we consume. It is perhaps not many years distant when we will be able to grow every pound of tobacco we use. I do not smoke myself, and I do not know if my hon. friend is a smoker, but if he is, he will have to pay his quota, and he will bless the day when it can be said that Canadian tobacco is as good as the foreign leaf and we can produce every pound consumed in the country. The policy we adopted has been proved eminently successful. It has more than quadrupled the growth of Canadian tobacco. Why then should we interfere with it? Why not let well enough alone? Why attempt to do better when it is not sure that we can do better by simply reducing the duty on foreign leaf? To-morrow, if this motion were to carry, the hon. member for Richmond or some one else would rise and say that the disproportion was too great between the price of the foreign leaf and the price of the Canadian leaf, that we had reduced the price of the Canadian and therefore should reduce the price of the foreign leaf. The only thing I ask my hon. friends, if they have at heart the development of a Canadian industry, is to adhere to the policy which has worked so successfully for the development of that industry.

Mr. G. E. CASEY (West Elgin). This question, as the right hon. the First Minister has pointed out, has clearly two sides to it—the questions of price to the consumer and of price to the grower. The object of the present tariff arrangements is to encourage the growth of Canadian tobacco by increasing very materially the difference between the price of the imported article and the price at which the home-grown article can be put on the market. That policy has certainly achieved a marked success, as the figures read to the House show. It is always a serious matter to attempt to disturb or derange a policy which has produced already good effects, and I think that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has not shown reasons why the policy he proposes would of itself improve the existing tariff arrangements and materially benefit either the producer or the smoker of tobacco. As the Premier has pointed out, that policy would immediately derange the existing balance between the import duties and excise and lead to a strong agitation for a reduction of the import duties. It is open to very serious consideration, and I would urge the question upon the government for their consideration, whether, in the near

future, some such double arrangement as has been referred to might not advantageously be carried out. If the government were to remove the 5 cents excise on Canadian tobacco and at the same time make a proportionate reduction on the import duty and the excise on imported tobacco, the percentage of protection to the home producer would be left as it is, while at the same time the actual price of the imported article would be reduced. It is for the government to consider maturely whether they could not with advantage adopt such a policy.

Most of the constituents of my hon. friend from Bothwell as well as my own, and most of the constituents of members from western Ontario generally are in the habit of smoking imported tobacco. They have not yet been induced, and will not soon be induced by any difference in the price, to smoke the home-grown article. It is a question of taste; a man will pay an extra price to get just what he likes to smoke. So, our constituents are deeply interested in getting a reduced price for imported tobacco; and, at the same time, they are deeply interested in getting an increased price for the home-grown leaf. I think it is extremely worthy of consideration whether the two things could not be attained at the same time. The reduction of the excise on the home-grown leaf would certainly be an encouragement to the growing of tobacco, and the reduction by a proportionate amount, of the import duty would reduce the price of the foreign tobacco;—those who produce would get a little higher price, those who consume would get a little lower price.

It must be remembered that you cannot speak of tobacco as being one uniform, individual thing all over Canada. When you say that the price of tobacco has increased to the consumer, you do not meet that by the statement that Canadian tobacco is put on the market at a very much lower price; because the greater part of people in Ontario and the west will not and do not smoke Canadian-grown tobacco. That tobacco is grown largely for export, for consumption by people abroad to whom it is agreeable. But it will take a long time before our native smokers accustom themselves to use it. So, the problem is a double one. It is quite possible to increase the price of imported tobacco as high as you like without increasing the price of home-grown tobacco. If you were to put two dollars a pound upon foreign tobacco you would not induce more than a certain number to use the native article, nor would you materially increase the price of the native article, because the price of the native article is fixed by what it is worth in some foreign market. The amendment of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) certainly does not meet the case. It is only a part of what, it appears to me might be advantageously obtained; and it is part which cannot be obtained by itself without en-

dangering the whole structure of our tariff system in that respect.

But it seems to me that the eventuality that the right hon. the Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) seems to fear—that, possibly, the reduction of the excise might lead to a reduction to the custom duty,—is not, perhaps, quite as dreadful an alternative as it might appear to him to be. I think the combination of these two plans sometime in the future, after mature consideration of the subject, is possible and would be advantageous. There is no doubt that it would be a popular thing all over Canada to reduce the price of imported tobacco, so far as the needs of the revenue and the rights of the Canadian grower will permit. At the same time, it would be popular over a large part of Canada to increase the value of the home-grown leaf. My point is simply that the mere protection against foreign importation, does not necessarily increase the value to the home-grower. The two kinds of tobacco do not necessarily come into competition, and the raising of the price of one does not necessarily increase the price of the other. The price of Canadian tobacco is decided by what you can get for it in the foreign market. It is in the export trade that the future of the Canadian tobacco is to be looked for. In the part of Ontario in which the hon. member for Bothwell and I reside, the climate does not differ materially from that of Kentucky and Virginia, and the quality of tobacco we grow does not differ materially from theirs. The curing of the tobacco we grow can be improved, I think, until the brand is made equal to the best Kentucky, and, perhaps, to ordinary good Virginia tobacco. When this is done, we shall doubtless have a large export trade in tobacco. This export trade would not be affected if the resolution of the hon. member for Bothwell were carried into effect, because, the excise levied on the home-grown leaf does not apply to tobacco that would be exported, for that tobacco would be manufactured in bond and taken out of bond only to be exported, without paying the excise, just as whisky or any other excisable article is manufactured and exported without paying the excise. So, the export trade, which is the real future of the tobacco industry so far as the grower is concerned, would not be affected by the reduction or the total abolition of the excise duty on the home-grown leaf.

The future of that industry with us rests more upon the business aptitude and energy of those who are concerned in it than upon any change in the present legislation of the country. I do not think that a further increase of the duties on foreign tobacco would raise the price of Canadian tobacco half a cent a pound. I do not believe that a moderate reduction of the duty would lower the price of Canadian tobacco half a cent a pound. The value of Canadian home-grown tobacco depends on this—if the grower and

curer of the tobacco are progressive in their methods and take every opportunity to learn from men in the same business in Kentucky and Virginia, the nearest approximate climate to us in the United States, if they are prepared to put that tobacco on the market in the very best condition, I think they can have a very large share of the world's trade in the leaf. But I do not think the measure proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell, taken by itself, would afford any particular assistance or relief, for the reason that it does not affect the principal market of the future for that tobacco. For the time being, a large amount of this tobacco is manufactured and sold in Canada, but, at the same time, to my knowledge, a considerable amount is exported, and the price is based on the value at which it can be exported. No Canadian manufacturer will pay more than the producer can get abroad—the 5 cents excise, in other words, does not come off the market price of the exported tobacco. At the same time, I must urge upon the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to consider whether he could not, in the near future, grant a relief to the Canadian smoker of foreign leaf, while removing the appearance of imposing on the home-grown leaf by combining the two ideas of reducing the import duties and taking off the excise duty at the same time. Of course, I cannot support the resolution of my hon. friend from Bothwell. We have to take that resolution as it is, and it is not the scheme I would propose or the scheme I think best in the interest of the Canadian growers. I cannot support it even inferentially, but the proposing of it gives me an opportunity to urge what I think would be a better plan upon the attention of the financial authorities of the government.

Mr. JOSEPH A. GILLIES (Richmond, N. S.) On March 7 last, I moved a resolution in this House declaring that the duties on tobaccos should be reduced. On that occasion, I went fully into the question. I spoke in no spirit of recrimination or fault-finding, much as the action in this regard deserved condemnation, concerning the action of the government in increasing the duties on that article of very general consumption among the people, but in the way of assistance, as I thought, by showing how entirely oppressive the duty is as it exists now in consequence of the increase imposed upon that article by the tariff brought down by the present government in 1897. I showed, I think, to the satisfaction of this House, at all events, to my own, that the climatic obstacles that exist in this country would for ever prevent us from becoming a great tobacco-growing country. I had very excellent authority for stating that there was no tobacco equal to that of Cuba as a cigar tobacco, no tobacco equal to that of North Carolina as a smok-

ing tobacco, and no tobacco equal to that of Kentucky as a chewing tobacco. These are the three great qualities of tobacco—cigar, smoking and chewing. I stated then that if it was impossible for adjoining states in the great republic to rival each other in the growth of tobacco, when they possessed the same climate, how much more difficult it would be for Canada, having a much colder climate, to produce tobacco that would compete with that grown in any one of the states that I have mentioned. I felt, therefore, convinced that it would be for ever impossible for us to become a great tobacco-growing country. However, as a protectionist, I was quite willing to go a certain length in imposing a fairly heavy duty upon foreign tobacco, in order to enable our own home growers to produce that article with profit. I thought that the old duty of 25 cents a pound upon foreign tobacco was surely a sufficient protection to the growers of domestic tobacco, and was a sufficient tax upon the people who smoke tobacco. But the Minister of Finance and his colleagues were stronger protectionists than I was, they did not think that 25 cents per pound was enough, and their first act upon coming into power, in the way of relieving the people of taxation, was to go a long step further than the old protectionist government had gone. The old protectionist government had put 25 cents a pound upon tobacco, which, I think, in all conscience, was a sufficient protection to the domestic article, but as soon as our friends opposite came into power, in face of all their declaration to the contrary, while in opposition, in face of the attacks upon the then existing duty made by the present Minister of Finance in his own province, they increased the duty by 14 cents a pound upon stemmed tobacco, and 10 cents a pound upon unstemmed tobacco. That made tobacco that much dearer to the consumer. I put the question to the Minister of Customs this year, as will be found in *Hansard*, how much taxation was paid by the people of this country in consequence of the increased duty upon tobacco, imposed by the tariff of 1897, and if my memory serves me, the minister answered that the additional amount saddled upon the people in consequence of that increase was about \$1,200,000

Now, I am amazed at the inconsistency of our friends opposite. While they were in opposition they constantly berated the Conservative government on the awful taxation the people were subjected to in respect to that very article, and the moment they came into power, they outheroed Herod, and they increased the duty exactly 14 cents per pound. I must say that I am amazed at the red-hot protectionist speech made in this House by the Prime Minister to-day. If he would only go a little further and adopt our policy in its entirety, which he has tried to do in a mutilated form,

Mr. GILLIES.

I would be inclined to say that we should all join him, or, rather, he join us, and all be protectionists together. But I would respectfully ask the right hon. gentleman how he can reconcile his statement now, when we have an overflowing exchequer, with his pre-election statement that the public expenditure and the amount of taxes raised in this country could be very materially reduced. I have shown that upon this one article alone, instead of reducing the taxation they have raised it to the extent of \$1,200,000. The consumers of tobacco in Canada pay this extra on account of the additional duty imposed by the government in 1897. The Minister of Finance agreed with this pre-election statement of the Prime Minister and yet he states to-day, that in consequence of the diminution of the receipts made by a displacement in the revenues under the new tariff, it was necessary to make up the loss by increasing the duty in some other direction; and so he goes to work and selects this article of almost universal consumption by the poorer people of this country, and puts upon it an additional duty, yielding \$1,200,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I intend at a later stage to move a resolution on this subject myself, I will not say any more upon the resolution moved by my hon. friend for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). I shall support his resolution, inasmuch as it has a tendency to bring about a reduction in the price of tobacco, even if it is only to a small extent. Anything that brings about a reduction in that regard will have my active and sincere support. I now give notice to the Minister of Finance, that I will later on move a resolution upon the lines of my motion of March 7, last, asking for a further reduction in the present duty upon tobacco. As I said before, I think the old duty of 25 cents a pound was amply sufficient to protect the domestic industry. There was no complaint about it; and inasmuch as that meant a fairly heavy taxation upon every pound of tobacco smoked in this country, I think that was not only sufficient to protect the domestic article, but was a sufficient sum to levy upon the smoker for every pound of tobacco consumed.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). There is no doubt the increase of the tobacco duties imposed in 1897 has been the subject of considerable comment in this country. The very fact that one-fifth of our population is called upon to pay an increased tax of \$1,151,345 over what was imposed previous to 1897, is in itself quite sufficient ground for considerable complaint. As I have stated before in this House, when you leave out all the women and children, and the non-smokers amongst the men, certainly not more than one-fifth of the population is called upon to pay this increased tax. It is, therefore, class legislation, and is unfair to the small number who use tobacco, and who have just as much right to use it,

if they see fit to do so, as any other citizen has to use tea or coffee. Now this is the question before us: Will the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell in any way help to remove the difficulty? I think myself it will. It will not remove the whole difficulty, nor entirely remove the unfairness of the extra taxation upon the people of this country who use tobacco, imposed by the legislation of the Minister of Finance in 1897. I say it will not remove the whole difficulty, but to a certain extent it will mitigate it, and for that reason I shall support the resolution of the hon. member for Bothwell. Now, will it help the grower? If I understand the right hon. Prime Minister aright he contends that it will not benefit the grower. If we take off a tax of \$150,000 a year, because that is the amount that 3,000,000 pounds of tobacco, at 5 cents a pound, would increase the duty, to my mind some person must get the benefit of it, either the grower or the consumer. It may be said that if the excise duty is removed the manufacturers of tobacco will not pay the grower any more for it, but that they will simply reduce the price to the consumer by 5 cents a pound, give the consumer cheaper tobacco, and that therefore, the farmer who grows the tobacco will not be benefited in any way. To my mind the removal of this duty of \$150,000 a year will be divided between the two. I believe that the grower of the tobacco will get the benefit of a portion of it, and that the consumer will get the benefit of the remainder. Probably, it will be divided somewhat equally between the two, and therefore, it will benefit a very large class of the community in this country. If we make home-grown leaf cheaper, I believe that our manufacturers who use very largely, or almost entirely, imported tobacco will adopt a system of mixing, and by that means will produce a class of tobacco, although not quite as good as imported, but certainly less inferior than our Canadian tobacco, a class of tobacco which will be acceptable to a great many of the tobacco users of this country, a class of tobacco much more acceptable than the tobacco which is manufactured from our Canadian leaf. In that way I believe the consumption of Canadian leaf will be very much increased indeed. A larger demand will be created, farmers will grow a larger amount of it, and if the demand for raw leaf is greater for the purpose I have stated, I have no doubt that just like any other article where the demand has been increased, the price will be increased. So that, I think it is very fair to assume that the grower of tobacco will be benefited to the extent of at least half of this excise duty, and that the consumer will get the benefit of the remaining portion of it. I do not know that it is necessary for me to say more. I have expressed myself freely on this question before. Perhaps I would

go a little farther even than the resolution which the hon. member for Bothwell presents. It may be a personal matter with me, but at any rate we are not dealing with the question of whether the present tax on imported tobacco is too high or not; we are dealing with the simple question of home-grown tobacco, and for the reasons that have been advanced this afternoon, which I do not think have been met. Mr. Speaker, by hon. gentlemen on your right, I feel it my duty to support the resolution moved by the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to say one word.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Clancy):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	LaRivière,
Bennett,	Macdonald (King's),
Bergeron,	McCleary,
Blanchard,	McInerney,
Cargill,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Carscallen,	McNeill,
Casgrain,	Marcotte,
Chauvin,	Martin,
Clancy,	Moore,
Cochrane,	Morin,
Craig,	Prior,
Dugas,	Sproule,
Ganong,	Stubbs,
Gillies,	Taylor,
Gilmour,	Tisdale,
Guillet,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Henderson,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Kaulbach,	Hibbert), and
Kendry,	Wallace.—38.
Kloepfer,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Angers,	Heyd,
Bazinet,	Holmes,
Bell (Prince),	Hutchison,
Blair,	Lang,
Borden (King's),	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bourassa,	Lavergne,
Bourbonnais,	Macdonald (Huron),
Britton,	McGugan,
Brodeur,	McIsaac,
Burnett,	McLennan (Inverness),
Calvert,	McMillan,
Carroll,	Malouin,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Marcel,
Casey,	Meigs,
Champagne,	Mignault,
Charlton,	Monet,
Comstock,	Morrison,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Mulock,
Dechêne,	Oliver,
Demers,	Paterson,
Desmarais,	Pettet,
Edwards,	Préfontaine,
Featherston,	Puttee,
Fielding,	Ratz,
Fitzpatrick,	Rogers,
Fortier,	Ross,
Fortin,	Rutherford,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Scriver,

Fraser (Lambton),  
Frost,  
Geoffrion,  
Godbout,  
Gould,  
Guité,

Semple,  
Somerville,  
Sutherland,  
Talbot,  
Tucker, and  
Turcot.—68.

## PAIRS :

## Ministerial.

Davis,  
Tolmie,  
Snetsinger,  
Christie,  
Gibson,  
Campbell,  
Belcourt,  
Lewis,  
MacPherson,  
Macdonell,  
Johnston,  
Ethier,  
Ellis,  
Costigan,  
Stenson,  
Beith,  
Russell,  
Dobell,  
Flint,  
Sifton,  
Landerkin,  
Tarte,  
Joly de Lotbinière  
(Sir Henri),  
Legris,  
Proulx,  
Brown,  
Fisher,  
McMullen,  
McGregor,  
Bernier,  
Mackie,  
Dyment,  
Logan,  
Copp,  
Parmalee,  
Cowan,  
Bostock,

## Opposition.

Hale,  
Montague,  
Reid,  
Roddick;  
Corby,  
Monk,  
Clarke,  
Poupore,  
Rosamond,  
Roche,  
Wilson,  
Osler,  
McDougall,  
Caron (Sir Adolphe),  
Davin,  
McAlister,  
Borden (Halifax),  
Foster,  
Mills,  
Haggart,  
Hodgins,  
Hughes,  
Ingram,  
Powell,  
Earle,  
Tyrwhitt,  
Pcpe,  
Quinn,  
Robinson,  
Robertson,  
Ferguson,  
McCormick,  
Beattie,  
Broder,  
Klock,  
Seagram,  
McIntosh,

Amendment (Mr. Clancy) negatived.

## YUKON—MR. OGILVIE'S REPORT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). Has the acting Minister of the Interior been able to obtain any reply from Mr. Ogilvie respecting his report? The hon. gentleman inquired on May 3 last from Mr. Ogilvie, and he has frequently informed the House that he has endeavoured to obtain an answer. Judging by the condition of the telegraph service, it seems to me that on June 20 we should have some reply to the telegram of May 3, and a statement from Mr. Ogilvie as to why the report has been delayed.

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). A telegram has been received in the department from Mr. Ogilvie. It appears there was some delay in the communication to him during the last two months, and he says he sent a telegram on May 19, which does not seem to have reached the department. We will have to wait for the mail for a full explanation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What does he say as to the cause of the delay in forwarding the report?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am under the impression from his telegram that Mr. Ogilvie did not receive the request from the department to complete the report up to the end of the year. He refers to some interruption in the communication, but he says he telegraphed on May 19 that he was ill at that time, or that he either has or is sending all the report. I have not the message here.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the minister lay on the Table of the House a copy of the telegrams he sent and of the telegrams he received?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There were several telegrams sent which, I think, I brought down from time to time. However, there is no objection to bringing them down again.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

It being six o'clock, the committee took recess.

## AFTER RECESS.

(The House resumed in committee.)

Brockville drill hall..... \$10,000

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) What is to be the full cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). \$42,000. The contract was let within the last few days.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has got it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Booth, of Brockville, the lowest tenderer.

Kingston drill hall ..... \$31,500

Mr. FOSTER. Is that to complete?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. \$80,000.

London drill hall and armoury, site, &c. \$20,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the contemplated expenditure?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Nothing has yet been done in that matter, and it is somewhat complicated. There is a site that is owned by the government, and there is some proposition by the people of London to have the site exchanged for a more commodious one, they supplying the site. A portion of the site has been acquired, but not the balance.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total expenditure proposed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. \$80,000; about the same as Kingston.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It does seem to me that when the government are making such a large expenditure in these towns the town should provide the site. When a town like Kingston gets a public building costing \$80,000, I think it ought to contribute something, and that something might be in the shape of providing the site.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot recall the details of this particular case, but I think the city is in a way giving something. My recollection is, that the city complained that the government interfered with the drainage of certain works, and that the city had a cause of action for which they claim \$20,000, although I do not know that they could establish that in law. Dominion property is not taxable, as we know, for drainage, and although it has been drained and otherwise improved, it is exempt from municipal taxation. I understand the city is to forego any claim it may have upon the government; and I think there is some other consideration, but I cannot recall it now.

Sarnia public building ..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is this contract let?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is advertised, but not yet let.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the contemplated cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About \$40,000.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I wish to ask the acting Minister of Public Works if the site for the Sarnia post office has been decided on?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, it has been acquired.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to repeat what I said last year, that I very much approve of the site selected for the post office in Sarnia. It is an admirable site, most suitable in every way, and I am not going to take exception to the large expenditure of \$40,000 for the post office. The site is beautifully situated on the banks of the river opposite Port Huron, a city of about 50,000 population. It is very desirable that the Canadian government should erect there a building which will command the respect of every one passing up or down that river and which will be in keeping with the location and a good advertisement for Canada. A great many vessels pass up and down the river day and night, there are many visitors there, and I know of no place where it is more desirable that there should be a creditable public building. As the government may control the land between the post office and the river, it is not likely that it will ever be built upon, so that the buildings will always com-

mand a view from the river. For these reasons, I am not going to find any fault with the government if they spend even a little more than \$40,000 for the erection of this building. While on this subject, I desire to speak on another somewhat related to it. I have raised the same question before. It seems to be the policy of the government, as a rule, to erect post offices or other public buildings only in the larger towns of the country. By a resolution that was adopted by this House in 1891, it was declared that, in the selection of a place where a public building should be erected, regard should be had to the revenue derived from it, and that preference should be given to the larger places. Now, there are counties in the province of Ontario which have no large town, and which, in all probability, in the next twenty-five years at any rate, will not have a town as large as Sarnia or Ingersoll, and will therefore not have the right on that ground to a public building. Surely a county which has four or five smaller incorporated villages or towns is just as much entitled to one or more public buildings as a county which has a large town. In such a county, I think that instead of erecting one large building, it would be only fair to divide the money up and erect smaller buildings in the different towns or villages, which would provide all the accommodation required. I will take as an illustration the county of Halton, which I represent. In that county we have five incorporated towns and villages, ranging in population from 1,200 to a little over 1,800, and the revenue in these places is considerable. I will give the revenue and population of each place according to the census of 1891:

	Revenue.	Popula- tion.
Acton .....	\$1,999	1,209
Burlington .....	1,348	1,325
Georgetown .....	2,857	1,509
Milton .....	2,364	1,450
Oakville .....	2,553	1,823
Totals .....	\$11,121	7,316

Now, the town of Sarnia, where the government propose to expend \$40,000 for a post office, has a revenue of only \$10,028, or \$1,000 less than the combined revenues of these five incorporated towns and villages of Halton, and a population of 6,693 as against their population of 7,316. Yet, because in Halton there is not a town of similar size to Sarnia, we are to be debarred, for the next quarter of a century at any rate, from having any public money expended for the erection of a public building. The county of Halton is as old as the county of Lambton, and as fairly entitled to an expenditure of public money for that purpose. In each of these towns and villages there is a small building used as a post office; but not one of them is sufficient for the purpose. They are all so cramped

that in the morning and evening when the mails are distributed, it is almost impossible to get in and out, and it is a matter of complaint that suitable buildings of sufficient extent are not obtainable in the business centres. My plan is that instead of the government spending \$30,000 in one town of the county, they divide that sum into five shares of \$6,000 each, and erect in each of these places a building that would cost say \$5,000, leaving \$1,000 in each case to purchase the site. In that way you could have a building that would afford ample accommodation for the post office, with a dwelling in connection for the postmaster or his assistant. On that plan no expense would be incurred by the government for taking care of the building as a paid caretaker would not be required. The interest on \$30,000 at 3 per cent—and the government can borrow the money readily at that or even less—would amount to \$900 annually. In the five towns and villages to which I refer, the government allows \$540 for rent and fuel. If you deduct \$140 as the allowance for fuel, you will have \$400 for rental. Each of the dwellings connected with the post office would be worth \$100 a year. They would be cheap at that, because they would not be liable to taxation, and the postmaster or his assistant would be quite willing to allow that in each case. So that you would have \$500 of rental from these buildings, to which add the \$400 allowance for rent, and you get the sum of \$900 exactly the amount necessary to pay the interest on the cost of these buildings. In this way the government would not lose anything by adopting that system. They would simply borrow the money and erect the buildings, and there would be sufficient savings to pay the interest, and ample accommodation would be provided for the post office in each place. There could be an entrance and an exit in each office, so as to avoid crowding in the morning and the evening when the mails are received and delivered. Then, there would be the greater security from having the post office in a substantial brick building instead of in an unsuitable frame building. A fire-proof vault could be built in each, and additional protection thus afforded to the property of the public. I think this a most feasible scheme, and one which the government would be justified in trying in some county such as I have referred to. I would, of course, prefer that they would make the test in the county of Halton, which is most suitable for the purpose. I may say to the Postmaster General, who is the acting Minister of Public Works, and who, therefore, feels a double interest in having everything connected with his department move along smoothly, that this question of post office accommodation in the county of Halton is not in a satisfactory condition at the present time. He may have heard of it from petitions or otherwise, but if he has

Mr. HENDERSON.

not, I can at any rate assure him such is the case. If this matter receives favourable consideration from the Postmaster General, I believe that he will find a scheme that will prove very materially to the advantage of the public, and not at all a burden on the country. I hope that the hon. minister will give this his earliest attention.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am glad that my hon. friend approves of the location of the proposed building for Sarnia.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do, I know it very well.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I may also remind him that the location is a very suitable one on which to construct lights for the guidance of mariners on the river, and no doubt it will be utilized for that purpose. My hon. friend is in error in assuming that the government own the land on the river side. I think it is owned by the railways, but it is very low and will be entirely overlooked by the structure on the other side. I looked at various sites, and although I had no right to exercise any authority in the selection, when asked an opinion, I gave it in favour of that particular site. There is a great deal in the scheme the hon. gentleman suggests, and the only question is its practicability. It comes as a new proposition, and the hon. gentleman cannot expect an opinion now, but the government will consider it, and I hope that in time it will reach the period of fruition.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). I would like to say a word in support of what my hon. friend from Halton has just said. In addition to what he has urged, the government would save the rentals they now have to pay for the public offices, as this proposed building could be utilized for all the government offices, and the government would make money out of the saving of rent. I do not think that the rule of population should always decide these matters, and for this reason. Suppose the government are paying \$400 rent for a post office and customs, they would save money by erecting a building in a county town which would contain all these offices, and give better accommodation to the people, provided the interest on the expenditure would not amount to the rental they are now paying. If the interest would only amount to \$300 per year, and the rental they are now paying amounts to \$400 per year, will any one say that it is not an excellent investment to put up a new building by which they would save \$100 per year and own the building? It would be much better that the postmaster should live over the post office. In my county, in stormy weather when the mails are late, it would be a great advantage to the postmaster to live in the building, and would be a much greater convenience to the public. We

should revise our past methods, and the sole question ought to be: Will the government get a better service and save money by putting up a new building?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to say that I approve of the statements made with reference to this subject. I think there is a great deal of force in them. It is very desirable that in those rising towns, in those ridings and counties where very little money has been expended, that the government should consider the claims of those places, although there may be larger towns in other places, especially when the interest on the money expended will not amount to the rent now being paid on the buildings used. In the riding I represent there has never been any public money expended, and the people have borne their share of the burden of governing the country. I think it is about time that the government should consider the propriety of looking into those cases, and see if suitable buildings could not be erected for the purpose of carrying on the postal and other public services. It is about time that this matter was forcibly impressed on the government. The policy of the government has changed since the resolution passed in the House some years ago, and I am glad to notice that we have converted the opposition in favour of doing justice to those constituencies entitled to the consideration of the government. I hope that the acting Minister of Public Works will look into this question very carefully and do justice to those constituencies entitled to consideration, which have not benefited by the expenditure of any public money in their midst, and have in consequence a strong claim on the government, which I would urge with all the force I can.

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond, N.S.) While on this item of public service, I would like to draw attention to the fact that in the shire town of the county I represent the government some time ago bought a site for a public building which would include the custom-house, post office, inland revenue, and the other public offices. That site cost \$1,000, and is now at the disposal of the government, and I would draw my hon. friend's attention to the necessity of having a public building constructed there. One of very moderate dimensions would be quite sufficient. The present building, in which the post office is held, was repaired some years ago, but is again in a very sad state of disrepair, and further expenditure is required to put it in proper condition. If the hon. the Postmaster General will be good enough to remember the suggestions from this side of the House, he would receive perhaps considerable assistance from us, because it is really with that object I am addressing him now. At this moment the customs authorities are paying \$60 a year rent for a small room in the town of Arichat. That office would be in the new

public building to be erected. The department, at considerable expense, is supporting a dilapidated building at Arichat now as a post office, a building on which we must put considerable repairs in the near future—in fact, should do this immediately as it is at this moment most uncomfortable. Then there is the tide-waiter, and there is also the post office savings bank. He receives, or should receive, for the room he places at the disposal of the public not less than \$60 a year. For these offices the government are paying, or should be paying \$180 a year or thereabouts. This represents the interest on \$6,000 at 3 per cent. This amount would give us a good public building sufficient for all purposes. The convenience that would result to the public of having all these officers under one roof is obvious. There is a good site that has been at the disposal of the government for some time past and is now awaiting the erection of a public building. I think it would be worth while to see if a public building cannot be constructed at something like \$5,000 or \$6,000, thus making a considerable saving to the government, besides providing a great convenience for the public. I urge this important matter upon the government with all the earnestness that I can command.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to call the attention of the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock) to the matter of the public building at Halifax. Last year there was an item in the estimates to provide additional accommodation in Halifax for this purpose. The Postmaster General, no doubt, knows that better post office accommodation in Halifax is very necessary. The Customs Department, the Inland Revenue Department, the Post Office and the Marine and Fisheries Department are all located in one building, and the accommodation for every one of them is extremely limited. A representation has been made by the Halifax Board of Trade with respect to the matter, and, last year, I understood that immediate action was to be taken. Very likely the government has something now in contemplation with respect to this, and I would like to be informed by the acting Minister of Public Works what is the intention of the government. The present state of affairs certainly should not be allowed to continue very much longer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax), I would say that last session a sum of money was voted for the purchase of a site for a suitable public building in Halifax. When I was in Halifax this year, the hon. junior member for the city (Mr. Russell) brought the subject to my attention, and, in order to emphasize the needs of Halifax, took me to the city post office to show me its inadequacy. I was quite convinced of the shortcomings of the post office

there. We have recently acquired a site in Halifax, the old city market site, and the intention of the government is to proceed with the construction of a building in Halifax in the near future. I cannot anticipate what is to appear in the estimates yet to be laid on the Table, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) may rely upon it that the matter is receiving every attention.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may not have an opportunity of referring to this matter again, and therefore I desire to impress on the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), not only in his capacity as Postmaster General, but also in his capacity of acting Minister of Public Works, the extreme necessity there is that some immediate action should be taken in this matter. The old market site is, I think, a very suitable one. It is in immediate proximity to the present Dominion government building, and I think it is large enough to erect an adequate building upon it for the various departments of the government service. But I really think that the matter should not be left over the present year but that an immediate appropriation should be made and the work begun without delay. I am sure my hon. friend the Postmaster General, in looking over the accommodation of his own department in Halifax must have been thoroughly convinced of this—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postmaster had an office there six by six—what more does a man want?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He must have been convinced of the necessity of some improvement in the accommodations.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the government own the land?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We bought it this spring.

Mr. SPROULE. At what cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. For \$24,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I would remind the Postmaster General that Sarnia has a revenue of about \$10,000, and the government is paying there a rent of \$360. They have bought a site there for, how much?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Between \$6,000 and \$7,000.

Mr. SPROULE. And they purpose putting up a post office at the expense of how much?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At about \$40,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That will be a total of \$47,000 spent in Sarnia. In Owen Sound, there is a revenue of \$11,000, which is \$1,000 more than that of Sarnia. They pay in Owen Sound a rent of \$650, nearly double of what they pay in Sarnia. But Owen Sound, according to the Postmaster Gen-

Mr. MULOCK.

eral's contention, is not entitled to get a post office, while Sarnia is.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). I desire to draw the attention of the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock) to the need that exists for a post office building in Bridgewater, in the county I represent. I have brought this matter to the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) each session since 1896, setting forth the claim of that town to a building suitable for a post office, custom-house, savings bank, &c. I have no hesitation in saying that the claims of the people of Bridgewater are exceptionally good. It will be remembered that they had a very large fire there some few years ago, which wiped out the entire business portion of the town. The devastating effects of which were very great, far greater in proportion to the population than the fire that took place here in Ottawa. They were left houseless and homeless in many cases, with scarcely a building left as a landmark. The post office, a comfortable building, having been burned with the rest. Representation was made by me the first session after the fire in favour of having a post office, custom-house, savings bank, &c., built there, but the claim was not recognized, for what reason I cannot understand. I contend that there is no town of its size that has greater claims for such a building than the town of Bridgewater. This deserving town, at the head of the navigable waters of the beautiful La Have River, is in the very centre of the great lumber trade of E. D. Davidson and others, has a number of important industries, is a large agricultural centre, and is entitled in every way under the claims that I here put forth for such a public building. I cannot see why the appeal has not been acceded to. There are other places smaller than Bridgewater where post offices have been erected, and in some cases two in a county, and I make the same appeal now that I did previously, and hope the government will not overlook this exceptionally urgent claim. I think it is worthy of favourable recognition by the government, particularly in view of the terrible losses that they sustained, as I named, by the fire that took place a few years ago. Then was the time immediately after that terrible conflagration for the government to have extended their sympathy and to have come to their rescue, but still it will be acceptable now, and I hope to see a sum in the estimates this year for the purpose.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With all that the hon. gentleman says with regard to Bridgewater, I should like to concur. The view of the government, however, was that Bridgewater at that time was more interested in having its harbour and river dredged, if we could bring that about, than in the construction of a post office.

Mr. KAULBACH. Give them both.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The trouble is that when we do try to do any of these things in a generous spirit, some one on the other side tells us we are spending too much money. Now, you are having an economical Minister of Finance to deal with, and he has to be considered. There is another consideration, which is not fatal, but which always comes to the front on an occasion like this, and that is that there is a public building already in another town in the same county. I do not lay it down as a rule that there should be only one building in a county, for we know that there are several counties in which there are more than one; but when there is a building in the shire town within a short distance of another town, it is not always so easy to obtain a second building, particularly if there are other interests seeking recognition. However, I do not wish to discourage the hon. gentleman. I know Bridgewater well. It is a most thriving, progressive and enterprising town, and I hope before long we will be able to carry out that which is his wish, and which is mine also.

Mr. A. C. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I am much pleased to find that there seems to be consensus of opinion in this committee in favour of more numerous and less expensive public buildings, and I think there is very little doubt that such a proposition will meet with the approbation of the members generally. While I do not object to seeing a good and permanent building put up in county towns, I think it would be much better if some of the smaller places could be accommodated in that way with buildings that would not be very expensive. For my part I consider an expenditure of from \$4,000 to \$6,000 sufficient for almost any ordinary town, and it would give sufficient accommodation for the post office, the custom-house and inland revenue office, if such were required, as well as a house for the postmaster to live in. There are a couple of such places in my own riding that I would like very well to see accommodated, that is the shire town of Georgetown and the town of Souris. They are both thriving and populous places, and both contribute, I am sure, a very fair revenue to the government. Buildings in these towns that would not cost over \$5,000 would no doubt be an ornament to the towns; and by saving the rents that are now paid would not be any extra charge upon the government.

Mr. SPROULE. Although there may be a general consensus of opinion in favour of putting up more post offices in small places, I want to say that I dissent from that view. I hold that where, in a town or village, a suitable building can be had for a moderate rent, there is no justifiable reason why the government should put up a public building. It is not the first cost of putting up

a building that has to be considered. We have to take into account the interest upon the money, a caretaker is nearly always required, and there are repairs which in the aggregate amount to a good deal at the end of every year. When you take all these things into account they will overbalance a good deal the rent of a suitable building. My opinion has always been that wherever you can get a suitable building at a moderate rent, the government is not justified in putting up a post office, but there may be a justification for it in large towns or cities. In a small town you can nearly always get a suitable building for \$150 or \$200 a year.

Mr. JOHN McALISTER (Restigouche). When the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was down in Campbellton two years ago and observed the lack of accommodation there for the post office and custom-house, he said that the town required better public buildings, and he promised at that time that an item would be put in the estimates the next year for a post office and custom-house. I regret to see that that has not been done. Bridgewater is a thriving town, no doubt, but I see the revenue from the post office in Bridgewater last year was only \$2,551.40, and the total of money orders paid was \$14,969.63. Now, the town of Campbellton, in the county I have the honour to represent, yielded a postal revenue last year of \$3,708.80, and the total amount of money orders paid was \$32,508.60. Campbellton is a growing town, and I think in justice to it the government should make an appropriation for a post office and custom-house there. It seems to be the policy of the government to go on building post offices and public buildings in places of less importance than Campbellton, and it is only fair that Campbellton should be provided with a public building. The post office and custom-house are established in private buildings giving very poor accommodation, for which the government has to pay in one case \$100, and in the other case \$120 for rent. The accommodation is entirely inadequate for the want of the place. I hope the government will take into consideration the promise of the Minister of Public Works and fulfil it by making an appropriation.

Woodstock post office ..... \$21,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total of that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The total cost of the building is \$43,600. There has been paid up to the 1st of May, \$10,860.

Public Buildings—Regina land titles office, Lieutenant - Governor's residence—improvements, greenhouse, sidewalks, &c. \$7,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for? Does one Governor take out everything?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is to make provision for wood work and re-

pairs, \$2,500 ; house furnishings, \$300 ; green house, \$5,500 ; stable, foundation, \$238 ; and wood structure, \$1,485.

Mr. FOSTER. What about that green house, \$5,000 ? Is there a greenhouse now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A greenhouse had been erected, but fell down, and this is rather for the restoration of the old structure.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it worth while putting \$5,000 into a greenhouse out there ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is claimed that it is necessary to have some way of protecting plants which would otherwise, I suppose, be destroyed.

Mr. FOSTER. A good root cellar, I believe, could be built for less than that to keep things in the winter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You could hardly put these exotics in a root cellar.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of plants have they there ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose the kind that are found in ordinary ornamental grounds.

Mr. FOSTER. I think, instead of growing flowers, it would be better if they had turnips and potatoes, and things like that.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the work will be done by contract ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Kamloops post office ..... \$2,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the total cost of that building ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Eight thousand dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. That completes it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Nelson public building ..... \$20,000

Mr. FOSTER. What has been done on that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The site has just been acquired.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of the building you propose to erect there ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The estimated cost is about \$30,000. The site has been acquired.

Mr. SPROULE. What did the site cost ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About \$11,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a large amount for a site.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have some explanation about it. These towns have been very anxious, and they have had a

Mr. MULOCK.

proper anxiety for public buildings. The town of Nelson is one of the best in the whole of the main line of British Columbia, and it is quite a proper thing to have a proper public building in that town. It is a solid town, and it is going to stay. But when you come to pay \$11,000 for a site, it seems that it is too much. That is more than half the total cost of the building.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About one-third.

Mr. FOSTER. You are going to pay \$30,000 for the whole thing ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Eleven thousand dollars for the land, and about \$30,000 for the building.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is it that you have had to pay \$11,000 for a post office site in Nelson ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The site in question is the site that public opinion seemed to point out as one that ought to be acquired. I am not familiar with the geography of the city, but if the hon. gentleman is, I can give him the position of the site.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is on the corner of Ward and Vernon streets, in Nelson. Here is the note that I have about it:

This site is opposite the new hotel and close to the provincial buildings.

The lots were purchased from William Gallagher and F. A. Howie ; lot 1 and west half of lot 2, in block 1, at the corner of these two streets.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the area ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not the area.

Mr. FOSTER. We ought to have the area.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will get that in concurrence.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know if any efforts were made to get a suitable site there ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, the deputy tells me that great efforts were made in connection with it, and it was only after considerable correspondence that finally the department consented to the purchase of the site at that price. The hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), was consulted about it ; he was anxious to acquire this site on business principles, and he took an active interest in it. He is a careful man himself, and I think would not have approved of any extravagance in the matter. This selection has been made with his approval, and it was only assented to, after a great deal of consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. Who valued the land ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. William Henderson, inspector of public buildings in British Columbia.

Mr. **FOSTER**. It seems a tremendous amount to pay for a site.

New Westminster public building—Reconstruction of building destroyed by fire, September 11, 1898 ..... \$25,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is to be the cost of that building?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The estimated cost of the reconstruction of this building is \$50,000.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is it on the site of the old building?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Yes.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Was the old building insured?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The government does not insure its buildings.

Rossland public building ..... \$20,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. Where is the site of that building?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. In this case the public contributed \$4,500.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is our share?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The site cost \$12,000. The situation of the site is the corner of Columbia and Maple streets. The land has been purchased from H. N. R. H. Bullen. The first amount demanded was \$18,000, and the actual selling price was \$16,500. The people contributed \$4,500 on account of this purchase, leaving the share of the government \$12,000.

Mr. **SPROULE**. What is to be the cost of the building?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. About the same as the Nelson building.

Mr. **SPROULE**. About \$30,000.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Something like that.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Does it take in all the offices?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It is intended to do so.

Public buildings generally ..... \$5,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. What does the hon. minister intend to pay with that \$5,000. I would venture to say that there is not a nail or clapboard which is paid for out of that \$5,000, and yet it is put there as if to pay for public buildings?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. My hon. friend is right. The note that I have states that this \$5,000 covers a number of items, which have to be met in connection with public buildings in the Dominion generally, and are not chargeable to any particular place.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I have for several years called attention to the fact that this is an altogether insufficient nomenclature for this vote. Any one looking at the public accounts would imagine that this money is actually spent on public buildings, when it is not. The travelling expenses and the like of that should be taken out of contingencies, and if there is a larger amount required for running the elevators, it ought to be put down to that special purpose. I again plead with the government to remedy this evil next year at least.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I think you are quite right.

Mr. **BENNETT ROSAMOND** (North Lanark). I would ask the acting minister if anything has been done towards supplying the public buildings in Almonte with electric light. Last year I called the attention of the Minister of Public Works to it, and he promised to look into the matter, but nothing has been done yet. The post office at Almonte is lighted by the antiquated system of oil lamps and there may be a conflagration there at any time.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rosamond) for bringing the matter to my attention. I was not aware that that antiquated system of lighting was in vogue in the Almonte post office, and I will endeavour to have it remedied.

Mr. **ROSAMOND**. Thank you.

Experimental Farms—New buildings and implements, renewals, repairs, &c., in connection with existing buildings, fences, &c..... \$10,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. Would the minister give a full explanation of what is to be done with this \$10,000.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. This is on the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture. Central Experimental Farm, cost of furniture for laboratory, shelving, &c., \$1,500; sheep building, \$500; horticultural building, \$2,000; Nappan, new stable, \$2,000; Agassiz, dwelling for the farm foreman, \$1,500; improvements, renewals and repairs, &c., to buildings on the experimental farm, \$2,500. Last year the following expenditure took place: Ottawa farm, \$8,710.95; Three Rivers, expenditure on dairy equipment, \$869; Brandon, \$32.32; Indian Head, \$30.15; Nappan, \$359.59. During the previous year the expenditure was very much the same.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I did not catch that any particular part of that vote was for painting the buildings on the experimental farm here. The condition of the exterior of the buildings on that farm is a disgrace. They need painting for their preservation, to say nothing of the look of the thing. We have strangers going there from every part of

the world and they must be struck with the shabby appearance of the buildings at the present time. Whilst this government is making expenditures with a generous hand in every other respect it ought not to allow these buildings to be so neglected.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The architect tells me that he intends doing part of that painting work out of the \$2,500 for the experimental farm here.

Mr. **FOSTER**. They need painting very badly.

Mr. **SPROULE**. How many cattle are there in the stables on that farm to-day?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. One hundred and twenty.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Then it is not very creditable to the government that the old-fashioned system should be followed of carrying the water to these cattle in pails. It is nonsense to be hiring men to go around carrying water to 120 head of cattle on a farm that ought to be regarded as a model farm. A modern system of watering the cattle should be introduced at once. I agree with the member for York that the buildings require painting very badly. The vote for the shelvings and the laboratory, and the improvement in the dairy branch is also a good appropriation. We have never grumbled on this side of the House to make that farm what it ought to be, but in many respects it is not up to date.

Mr. **KAULBACH**. Every time I have visited the experimental farm at Ottawa it has occurred to me that the barn is most objectionable. If you wish to find a thrifty farmer look as to how he keeps his house and particularly his barn, and it will give an idea of the kind of man he is. The barn on the experimental farm here is not a model barn as it should be. It should have all modern improvements so that it would be an object lesson to persons going there. I would not have that barn on my farm if it were given to me as a gift. If the Minister of Agriculture were to go to the Annapolis valley, Nova Scotia, he will find barns there that will strike his fancy and give him an idea of what a modern barn should be.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. There are a number of improvements going to be made to that barn this year, and for one thing a better system of ventilation is to be put in. The water system will also be improved and the buildings painted. The vote last year had to be applied to the re-erection of the roothouse, which had completely rotted down, and to provide a shelter for the implements and wagons, which have been left out of doors ever since the farm existed. We also had to finish the laboratory which was burned some time ago, and the old offices where the laboratory was had to be refitted so as to give

Mr. **FOSTER**.

better shelving accommodation for papers, and especially for the entomological collection under Mr. Fletcher.

Mr. **JAMES CLANCY** (Bothwell). I have taken occasion to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to a general expression outside with regard to the experimental farm and some of the buildings there. The hon. gentleman knows that in many respects it is very disappointing to persons coming to Ottawa to see what is called the Central Experimental Farm. A good many people think it is only that in name, while, in fact, it falls very far short of it. He knows that very many of the buildings are unsuitable. He may say that he could not throw them away; but I know of no service that would be more beneficial as an example to the people of this country, than to throw away some of the buildings there and build new ones. Any person who has visited that farm, knows that it is very much hampered for the want of suitable accommodation for the different kinds of stock; and I am sure the hon. gentleman would be supported by both sides of the House in making a great improvement there in the way of buildings.

Public buildings, Ottawa, including ventilation and lighting, repairs, materials, furniture, &c. .... \$100,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. Does this vote take in that hive of industry down on the street where I do not know how many scores of people are employed?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Yes.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Has the acting minister ever made the interesting experiment of standing around there about the time the dinner-bells rings—

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I have not any time now for standing about.

Mr. **FOSTER**—and seeing the immense hordes of worthy Grits who come out of that place, has he really satisfied himself as a conscientious acting minister, that we are getting the worth of our money out of it? I have seen myself, although I have not much time to spare, from half a dozen to ten men putting a barrel in there. Two were directing them how to do it, two others were warning them to take care they did not get their fingers splintered, and the rest were waiting to see the result of the experiment. That is an illustration on a slightly exaggerated scale, I admit, of the leisurely and multitudinous way in which work is done in that establishment. How many men are employed there and paid?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The architect tells me that there has been no material increase in the staff since days gone by. The number employed is 134.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Whereabouts are they hived now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On the south side of Wellington street, between Bank and O'Connor.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister give us an idea of how that immense number of men are marshalled and kept track of, and what they are doing?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are in chief command of a man named Breton, and there is a foreman for each trade—carpenters, masons, painters, steamfitters, and so on—as in any well organized mechanics' shop. There is nothing new in the vote, except that it is much smaller than it has been in years gone by. As far back as 1879, this vote was \$220,000, and the table I have, prepared by the deputy, does not show it to have been less than \$100,000 in any year since, except in 1888-9. For example, in 1891-2, it was \$149,000; in 1892-3, \$165,000; in 1893-4, \$119,000; in 1894-5, \$114,000; in 1895-6, \$100,000; in 1896-7, \$107,000; in 1897-8, \$102,000; in 1898-9, \$106,000; and in 1899-1900, \$100,000. This vote has to do with the maintenance and repairs of the buildings we are in, the eastern and western blocks, the Langevin block, the Geological Survey, the Museum, the Art Gallery, the Printing Bureau, and all the other public buildings here. There are many millions of dollars' worth of property to be maintained and repaired throughout the year. Every one knows that the annual maintenance of the property is absolutely necessary, and I think this property has been fairly maintained, although I can take exception to some of the features of maintenance I have seen.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way are all these materials for repairs procured?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are purchased on the requisition of the chief architect in Ottawa and Montreal. Paints, oils, and things of that kind kept in stock are purchased by tender, and the lowest tender is always accepted, but there are other articles which cannot be bought by tender.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this item for ventilation and lighting some new system of light and ventilation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it is for the lighting and ventilation of this building, and the system is the same as last year. But of course it has to be maintained each year. This is not for the acquiring of new plant but for keeping up the old.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Has anything been done towards the erection of a proper building for the Geological Survey? This is a matter which has been discussed almost every session since parliament began. Every one admits that there is no proper accommodation for the collection in the Geological Survey building. I am also in-

formed that there is a great mass of public documents in different public buildings which should be put together in a proper place so as to guard them against fire. Has anything been done in that connection this year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The chief architect has prepared plans of a public building intended to provide accommodation for the Geological Survey, the Fisheries and the Art Gallery. Those plans were submitted to me a couple of months ago, and I certainly think them extremely beautiful, but the estimated cost was so large that I felt it was quite impossible to ask parliament to vote the necessary money. The estimated cost would have gone up in the vicinity of a million dollars. With the other demands on the treasury, it is impossible just now to entertain a proposition involving that expenditure. The Geological Survey is in a very unsatisfactory condition. Collections of rare value, which could never be replaced if destroyed, are in a very unsatisfactory building, but so far we have been favoured by Providence and have not suffered from any conflagration. But if a fire should overtake that building, this government and its predecessors will be largely blamable for having taken that risk so many years. It is a matter of urgency and ought to be dealt with.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). I would also urge the necessity of providing a proper building for the storage of patent samples. This is a matter to which, in the neighbouring republic, a great deal of attention is paid. The Patent Office in Washington is one of the finest buildings in the country. In this city I have had something to do with patents for clients and others, and I think that the hon. Minister of Agriculture will admit that the arrangements for the housing of the patents and the transaction of business in connection with that important branch are very inadequate, and I would ask the acting Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Agriculture to provide for better arrangements for our patent office branch in any future vote for a new public building. The apartments now rented by the government on Sparks Street are not even an apology for a patent office. The patents are simply stored in the dark where they cannot be inspected with any satisfaction.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an item for steamer chairs in the Public Works Department, what use is made of those?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are special chairs used by typewriters.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they not the ones that went down on the tug *Eureka*?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am informed that they are not.

Mr. FOSTER. On that same page there is a very remarkable item, especially taken in connection with the celebrated speech made by the irrepressible Minister of Public Works lately in 'gay Paree.' I find there the immense charges made of \$5.50 each for two tri-coloured flags. Where are those flags? Is the public money of this country spent to pay for tri-colour flags for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte)? Surely the acting minister will look into that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will communicate with my colleague about it. The chief engineer says he thinks these flags are in store.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the use of buying them if they are only going to be stored? Or, are they to be kept for some future dreadful occasion, which may happen, we do not know when, after the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) gets more power than he has to-day?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The cost of these flags was \$5.50 each—a modest price.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they been unfurled?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know personally; but I have read in wicked newspapers that they have been.

Mr. FOSTER. We must know before concurrence where they have been used.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will learn.

Mr. FOSTER. One more matter—is George Bailey an employee of the department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is not an employee of the department, but he occasionally does locksmithing and general iron work for the department.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice his name appearing very often. I know that he is a good workman, but it occurred to me that if you are going to have a great workshop, you might have a man who is able to do locksmith work.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deputy informs me that Mr. Bailey is in business for himself, that he is an expert locksmith, and that for twenty-five years he has been engaged in doing this class of work for the government.

Mr. FOSTER. There is not in the establishment an expert in this line?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. What rent is being paid for the present hive on O'Connor Street?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Seven hundred dollars.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. FOSTER. Who owns the building?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Slater estate.

Mr. FOSTER. I would be glad if the acting Minister of Public Works would have one of his officers make out a tabulated statement of the places we are now occupying under rental for the public service in Ottawa, and the amount paid in each case. I am afraid we shall find that an immense expenditure is taking place for rent outside of these vast buildings that we have; and it might be a question worthy of consideration whether the proper generalship is shown in utilizing the space we have under roof in our own buildings.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will have that prepared.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the acting minister made any progress in getting a room in this building for the French translators?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not see how we can do it. I have been through the building with Mr. Speaker and the members of the committee. We have been from the basement to the attic, and there seems to be a good deal of difficulty in finding spare room.

Mr. FOSTER. There may be difficulty, but the acting minister is a man built by Providence to overcome difficulties.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I could easily find room, if I chose to disregard the feelings and wishes of people. I think that if a committee of the House would consider the question and arrange how much space should be taken up by those who have rooms, something might be done. Members of the House themselves should get together and decide.

Mr. SPROULE. That is very much needed. I have noticed for years that it is utterly impossible for certain members of the House to get any space here where they can do work except at their own desk, while other members, many of whom have come in much more recently, have very commodious rooms at their disposal. I am inclined to think that if a conference of members on both sides of the House could be held to determine this, it would be most desirable. It would be very advantageous also if there could be a few more rooms. Many members have a great deal of work to do which they cannot very well do at their desks here in the House. The only alternative with many of them is to take their work to their hotel or boarding house, which is very inconvenient. I do not think that members should be subjected to that inconvenience when they desire to economize time and do as much work as possible.

Public works chargeable to income—Public buildings—Rideau Hall, including grounds, renewals, improvements, repairs, furniture and maintenance ..... \$17,000

Mr. WILSON. How is this money spent ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is the usual maintenance vote for Rideau Hall. Last year the expenditure was :

Wages—

Clerk of works .....	\$ 655 20	
Staff of carpenters and labourers .....	5,833 85	
Ironworkers on heating apparatus .....	688 72	
Gardeners, &c. ....	1,739 33	
		\$8,917 10

Supplies—

Carpets, linoleum, curtains, &c. ....	\$1,157 60	
Furniture .....	342 73	
China and glassware.....	213 35	
Hardware, including material for heating apparatus.....	996 29	
Lumber .....	169 73	
Paints .....	514 65	
Wall paper .....	427 35	
Seeds and plants .....	535 48	
Miscellaneous .....	247 77	
		4,609 94

Total expenditure.....	\$13,527 04
Balance unexpended .....	3,472 96

Appropriation .....	\$17,000 00
---------------------	-------------

Mr. COCHRANE. What kind of seeds are these that were bought ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The item includes seeds and plants—ornamental plants and that sort of thing.

Mr. WILSON. There was a grant last year of \$14,000 for a new building or a new wing at Rideau Hall. Has that been built, and if so, at what cost ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The wing was built last year at a cost of \$14,000.

Mr. WILSON. Is that for the building alone or the building and furniture ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. For the building alone. The furniture cost \$4,454.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it necessary to expect this item of \$14,000 to \$17,000 every year ? Do we never reach a time when it will be completely furnished ? I should imagine the furniture was carried away every year, because we seem to be constantly renewing it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These are the ordinary repairs, maintenance and keeping up the grounds.

Heating public buildings, Ottawa, including salaries of engineers, firemen, elevator attendants and caretakers ..... \$65,000

Mr. FOSTER. In what condition are the wood and coal contracts now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are no wood contracts now, we have discontinued using wood. In procuring the coal, notices were sent to a number of leading coal merchants in the city of Ottawa for tenders, and the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer, John Heney & Son.

Mr. SPROULE. What did the coal cost per ton ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. \$4.75 for anthracite. This year it is more.

Gas and electric light, public buildings, Ottawa, including roads and bridges.... \$18,500

Mr. SPROULE. It will be remembered that when the fire took place we were left in darkness in this building, and had to adjourn the House for a short time. When the old gas lights were taken out it was said by some members that such an accident might happen, and we would find ourselves in a very awkward situation, as we did. Has it been decided to take the gas lights out of all the buildings ? I understood the Minister of Public Works to say that it was an experiment here, but in future the department intended to take the gas lights out of all the buildings and substitute electric lights.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The gas fixtures are not removed from the public buildings as a rule, though they have been removed from this chamber. In many of the buildings the gas fixtures are utilized for the purpose of electric lights. The pipes are still available if desired, and gas can be turned on. The electricity is generated by the Ottawa Electric Light Company.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there only one powerhouse available in case of accident ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are several power-houses near the Chaudière, each one of which could be available in case of interruption.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the lights were put in by the Minister of Public Works in this building. Do the government own their own plant, the dynamo and generator ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We pay so much per light to the company. The Minister of Public Works gave the figures last session. There has been no change in the rates as announced by him last year.

Rents—Dominion public buildings ..... \$18,000

Mr. SPROULE. Where do we pay this money for rent ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. For all the public buildings over the whole Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. More particularly, what rent are we paying down on Sparks Street where we have the models ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I will give the sums paid for rents in Ottawa: Upper floor of Ottawa Bank, \$1,600; Geological Museum, Sparks Street, \$600; French translators' office, Sussex Street, \$240; workshops, Wellington Street, \$650, taxes, \$265; examining warehouse, Sparks Street, \$850; Slater Block, Sparks Street, for patent office, \$1,700; gas inspection, Wellington Street, \$300; excise warehouse, Chaudière, \$800; Dominion Church, for militia and defence stores, \$500.

Water—Dominion public buildings ..... \$16,000

Mr. **URIAH WILSON** (Lennox). Was not that included in the \$60,000 grant we gave to the city of Ottawa? I understood this was to be covered by the \$60,000 given to the city of Ottawa, and that we were not to give a special grant for water.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The deputy thinks that the hon. gentleman is right, but he is not quite sure, and he has gone to speak to the hon. Minister of Finance on the subject.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson), is right too.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Let it stand, and we will come back to it.

Department of Agriculture—Steel shelving.. \$700

Mr. **SPROULE**. We had an item for shelving; what is that for?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. They are gradually adopting steel shelving.

Mr. **FOSTER**. How is that bought?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. There are only two or three places in Canada where it is made, and there is a certain amount per file fixed upon as a fair value by the chief architect. There is no use of asking for tenders, because there are only two manufacturers in Canada.

Mr. **FOSTER**. It is manufactured here in Ottawa.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. There is a company in Toronto and one in Ottawa, and the chief architect fixes the price for each file, which is required to be of a certain quality. In regard to the item of \$16,000 for water for public buildings, that refers to public buildings other than those in Ottawa. There was an item in the estimates before, and the item for water for public buildings in Ottawa has been dropped.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the \$16,000 for then, unless it is the self-same vote of last year, which takes in the Ottawa supply? That is the only water vote I see, certainly the only one in the Auditor General's book.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The chief architect has furnished me with a list of various public buildings throughout Can-

Mr. **SPROULE**.

ada, and this \$16,000 is for the water supply of these buildings, not including buildings in Ottawa. I have the Supply Bill of 1896-7, which probably my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will say meets the case. It provides for the very same vote, and I will send it over to the hon. gentleman, that he may see. In this vote for 1896-7, there are two items:

Water, public buildings, Ottawa, including Rideau Hall ..... \$16,500

And then also:

Water for Dominion public buildings generally ..... \$16,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. That is all right.

Ingonish, North Bay—Breakwater ..... \$10,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is going on there?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. This is work under contract at the present time.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What will be the total expenditure?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Twenty-eight thousand dollars.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Where is Englishtown?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It is in Victoria County.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is being done?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The breakwater there is 484 feet long, running parallel to the sea. The work is under contract, and the contract price is \$27,250. The land and the superintendence costs about \$1,250, total \$28,500. The contractors are Heney and Smith, and the contract is dated December, 1899.

New Harbour breakwater ..... \$8,000

Mr. **R. L. BORDEN** (Halifax). Where is New Harbour?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It is at the mouth of the St. Catharines River. This is to assist in the construction of two piers, and to do some dredging. The total amount of the contract is \$17,070, and the estimated cost is \$19,000. The contractor is J. B. McManus, and the contract was entered into on the 26th May, 1900.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). What is the object of the expenditure?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. This is to provide a harbour for the fishing boats at the mouth of the St. Catharines River. It is in fact a harbour of refuge for the fishermen.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). Along the southern coast of Nova Scotia there are a great many very good natural harbours, and one would not suppose it would be necessary to go to such a large expenditure for the particular purpose the minister has in view. Of course, if the vote is necessary, I have no objection, but I would suppose that there

is some natural harbour in the immediate vicinity of this place which might answer the purpose.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. This is on the north-east coast.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). I hardly think so. The county of Guysborough is on the southern coast of Nova Scotia, and is immediately adjoining my own county.

Mr. **GILLIES**. I presume that before the department consented to this expenditure they would have statistics showing the number of boats this will shelter? How many boats will it accommodate?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. That information was given last session when the work was inaugurated.

Mr. **BORDEN** (Halifax). There was some information given about it last year, and I may mention to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) that one of his own friends in my county, who has a great deal of business in the county of Guysborough in connection with fishing, very strongly stated to me that he thought the expenditure of such a large sum of money at this particular place was entirely unnecessary. I mention that particularly in view of the fact that the contract seems to have been entered into at so very recent a date.

River John wharf ..... \$700

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). Has an application been made to the department for a small harbour in the vicinity of Toney River.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The chief engineer does not remember any application.

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). Well, that is a work that has been repeatedly applied for in past years.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I know of my own knowledge that this matter has been mentioned in the department. When unfortunately we were not so rich in funds this work could not be done, but it is a most important and necessary work, because along that coast at that place there is really no protection in the way of a harbour. A great many fishermen have been from year to year seeking protection for the landing of boats, and I am surprised to hear the acting minister say that his officers have no knowledge of the matter. It has been pressed time and again upon the department. I have sent communications myself to the department, and since we have been in opposition I have continued to press the subject on the attention of parliament. I was in hopes that when we were in funds, as the government now say we are, the wants of the fishermen in that locality would be attended to. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the matter is really a very serious one. There is a very large population along that shore, where extensive lobster fishing and salmon

fishing is carried on, and where there are hundreds of boats which have to run great risks and suffer great inconvenience because they have to land simply on the natural shore where there is no protection at all. In years gone by I presented petitions to the Department of Public Works, not through parliament, pointing out this necessity, and the answer has been that they have not been able to overtake this work. I would like to know if the acting minister can hold out any hope to these people of an early expenditure there.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The chief engineer informs me that he has only been in office two years last March, and that during that time the matter has not been brought to his attention; so that those petitions must have been presented before that period. I have not had the matter brought to my attention before, and therefore, I can only say that a note will be taken of the hon. gentleman's representations. I am afraid it will be rather late to give any effect to them in the present session.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. If the acting minister looks up the records of the department, I think he will find that the engineers reported—and that was the difficulty in the way—that to make a permanent breakwater there would require a very large expenditure; and in the time of the late government we were not able to undertake it. But hope was held out, I think by the authority of the department, that the work might be favourably considered when the finances were in a better condition. Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches profess that the finances are now most buoyant, and I think it is about time this work was undertaken. If the acting minister would be good enough to look into the matter before the supplementary estimates are brought down, he might come to the conclusion that some money might be usefully expended there.

Mr. **J. A. GILLIES** (Richmond, N.S.) I wish to point out to the acting minister that on the southern coast of Cape Breton, from the harbour of Louisburg to the harbour of St. Peters, a distance of some sixty or seventy miles, there is not a single shelter for a boat along that wild and iron-bound coast, except the breakwater which the late government constructed at Lower Lardoise, and which would have been extended westerly before now some 150 feet, and also towards the shore at the eastern end if the late government had not been deprived of power. I cannot too strongly impress upon the minister the dire necessity of having a shelter constructed at a place called Chapel Cove, some miles distant or west of the breakwater at Lower Lardoise. In the year 1895 the Department of Public Works sent an engineer there to examine the place and make a survey of it

and report. The hon. gentleman will find in his department a plan of the proposed breakwater made by an engineer of the department, a Mr. Bemasoni. He went to the place, examined it, and reported that a breakwater could be constructed there for \$5,000 that would afford the necessary shelter at that place. This would afford shelter to forty or fifty large boats which are now exposed to the storms that prevail on that coast during the fishing season. This matter was looked into by the late government, and they proposed to take it up and had the survey and estimated cost made, but before anything further could be done they went out of office. Since then I have been hammering at the present Minister of Public Works, seeking to induce him to take up the work. He promised that he would do so, but so far I find no provision for it. I would ask the minister to make a note of this, and consider it before the supplementary estimates come down.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The chief engineer has made a note of the hon. gentleman's request

Harbours and rivers, P.E.I.—China Point—  
Reconstruction of head pier ..... \$500

Mr. A. MARTIN (East Queen's, P.E.I.) I would like to ask the minister if this work is completed yet?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not begun yet. The work will be undertaken probably as soon as the money is voted.

Mr. MARTIN. There was \$1,500 voted last year, and if the minister looks at the supplementary estimates, he will find this item: 'China Point pier—revote of part of lapsed amount to pay for work done, \$700.' There is an item here, amount to pay for work done, and yet the minister says there is no work done.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The item in the supplementary estimates was to provide for work already completed. This is to provide for more of the same kind of work that has not yet been undertaken—sheet piling and so forth. It has not been let at all yet. The engineer says this work cannot be let by contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is the vote less? I submit to the acting minister that it is quite improper, at this important juncture, to make that vote less than last year, if for nothing else than for the sake of the name and tender associations between this name and the Minister of Inland Revenue, who wears the Order of the Dragon, and I believe is already taking his gripsack and starting for this same place.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister what he proposes to do at Pinette harbour.

Mr. GILLIES.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I could hardly tell what will be in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the department received a petition from that section?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The matter of Pinette harbour has been under consideration, but I cannot say whether there was a petition or not.

Mr. MARTIN. I asked last session whether a petition had been received by the government, and he said not, but strange to say last fall, during the progress of a by-election, a letter came from the department saying that there was a petition in the department, naturally leading the people to understand that the prayer of petitioners was about to be granted. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries then told me that he would make inquiries at the Department of Public Works whether or not there was a petition, but they could not find out until a by-election was on six months later. I hope that some attention will be paid this harbour. I was told last year that no moneys could be voted for harbours in the southern part of Prince Edward Island because a vote had been given for the construction of a railway, but only a very small sum has yet been expended on that railway.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). I would like to ask my right hon. friend whether these repairs to breakwaters have anything to do with the rumour that a knight sitting on the Treasury benches lately and wearing the Imperial Order of the Dragon is to be Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend has gone very far to come very near. His question is very simple, but I am sorry I cannot gratify his curiosity this evening. I hope in a few days, if he will renew his question, that I will be able to give him every satisfaction.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will be very glad to hear it if true.

Mr. WILSON. I see that the hon. Minister of Public Works is able to make speeches in Paris, and since his health is apparently restored I would ask when he is coming back to his duties. From all we can hear he is not in as bad a state of health in which he was reported to be when he left.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He can fight in Paris anyway.

Mr. WILSON. He is able to take ladies to the theatre at a very large expense, and it is time that we ought to know something about when he is coming back, or whether he is to continue to be a member of the government.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am glad to say, from the last communication I have

had from Mr. Tarte, that his health is improving. No wonder, having taken some rest, that his health is better than it was a few weeks ago, and if it continues to improve he will be back at an early day.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the government put any extra insurance on Perreault lately?

Campobello, N.B. (Wilson's Beach)—Breakwater repairs, &c. .... \$9,000

Mr. G. W. GANONG (Charlotte). What are they doing there now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At present there are certain repairs being made to the old wharf, but this is for the purpose of extending the new wharf.

Mr. GANONG. I notice a reduction of \$1,000 in this estimate. I have before me the report of the chief engineer, which says it will cost \$19,500 to complete the work the minister refers to. What is the intention with regard to that—to proceed with it or to keep re-voting this each year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will not be possible to complete the work in one year. After parliament prorogues a good deal of time will be taken up in preparing plans and specifications and calling for tenders. So, we are not able to accomplish much the first year. This is all we require for this fiscal year.

Mr. GANONG. I have some correspondence before me in connection with this breakwater business which has a suspicious flavour about it. It would appear that some of the people in this district think that it was manipulated to help the last local election in New Brunswick. Of course, I would not suggest that. But, the correspondence goes to show further that if this administration had attended to its duties, it would have saved \$750. The estimate made before was \$1,250. But, through their negligence, things have got worse, and now the report is that it will take \$2,000 to do this work.

Mr. MARTIN. I notice that in connection with the appropriations for Prince Edward Island there is an entry in the estimates, 'appropriations not required for 1900, \$48,800.' Can the hon. minister give me the sums that go to make that up?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would be necessary for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) to refer to the Supply Bill of last year, where, no doubt, these items appear.

Mr. GANONG. Before this item for Wilson's Beach is passed, I would ask the acting minister if it is the intention of the government to continue the larger work in addition to the repairs?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is the intention of the government to extend the breakwater. It will be 225 feet in length. The plans and specifications will be

prepared and tenders invited, and the work will be put under contract in the ordinary way. I know nothing of any manipulation such as that referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ganong). There was nothing of that kind, so far as I know.

Mr. GANONG. Will the hon. minister say why this work, so far as it is gone, was not put under contract instead of being done by day's work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not always practicable to do repairs by contract, you cannot specify what is to be done.

Cape Tormentine—Repairs to breakwater. \$15,000

Mr. FOSTER. Will that completely repair the breakwater?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be done with this \$15,000?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am informed that the wood used in building the breakwater was not treated with any preservative, and, consequently, the teredo worm has injured it, and thus it is necessary to rebuild. The probable cost of the protection work is \$65,000, of which some \$27,000 has already been spent.

Shippegan Harbour—Extension and repairs to protection works ..... \$7,000

Mr. McALISTER. What is the nature of these improvements? I see that \$2,400 was appropriated last year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is to be applied to the repairs of the eastern and western beaches of Shippegan harbour and to protect the cribwork pier. The estimated cost of the work is \$7,770.

Mr. McALISTER. Is it a shipping port?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very large shipping operations are carried on there, and there have been serious accidents in that neighbourhood, attended with considerable loss of life, from the want of protection to these fishing vessels.

Mr. McALISTER. Is it the intention of the acting Minister of Public Works to make an appropriation this year for harbour repairs in Campbellton?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to answer that question now.

Mr. McALISTER. Last year I asked the Minister of Finance who had charge of public works, if it was the intention of the government to send a dredge up to Campbellton, and I was informed that as soon as the dredge left Pictou it would go direct to Campbellton. I may say the dredge has not come yet. Is it the intention of the government to send a dredge there, and if so, when?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I remember having said something of that kind. The plans were marked out, but the dredge being delayed in any one place, sometimes upsets the whole programme for the season. At that time it was expected that the dredge would go to Campbellton.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). I was not in when the item for the Cape Tormentine pier was under discussion. Would the minister tell me what it is contemplated to do with it this year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I mentioned before the hon. gentleman came in that on account of native timber having been used, the pier had fallen into bad condition, and it is contemplated to rebuild it. It will cost about \$62,000, and a part of the work has already been done.

Mr. POWELL. Is it creosoted timber that you intend to use ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Part of the facing is to be stone-work, and on the wood-work it is proposed to use a material called carbolineum, which is raised to a temperature of 150 degrees, and then applied where it is wanted. We propose to try a few dollars' worth of it, which we are getting through an agent. I think Mr. McGuire, of Quebec.

Mr. POWELL. I do not know what advice has been given by the engineers of the department, but I know that the expenditure of this money will be largely wasted, as it will not suffice to put the pier in a satisfactory condition. Tinkering away with \$5,000 or \$10,000 is going to accomplish very little. Engineers may know a great deal, but they knew very little when they were constructing this pier. Time and time again these gentlemen who had this matter in charge, were warned of the fact that this worm would destroy the work ; and indeed during the two or three years it was in process of construction, the wood was actually destroyed to the extent that a portion of it floated up. It baffles all idea the way the worms destroy wood at certain points along our coast, and this is probably one of the worst places along the whole St. Lawrence shore. The result is that the wood has been eaten away, and the whole work is undermined. I may say that the worm will not work in the dark, but wherever the sunlight strikes it will operate, below the water of course, and the whole under portion of that pier is destroyed. Expending a few thousand dollars on it as the government are doing, will not remedy the evil. The most drastic measures require to be taken in order to make that work permanent. The money that already has been spent there, is largely wasted, I do not mean to say through extravagance or corruption, but as a result of a false economy. A large expenditure requires to be made at once to put that pier

Mr. McALISTER.

in proper shape. It will go on getting worse and worse, until ultimately a very heavy expenditure will have to be made, if the harbour is going to be preserved. The use of creosote wood would make the work permanent. I brought this matter myself to the attention of the engineers in charge of the construction during the regime of the late government. It was brought time and time again to the notice of the engineers ; but as the hon. gentleman is aware, an engineer sometimes knows it all, and any observations a layman may make falls on deaf ears.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Engineers often want more money than they can get.

Mr. POWELL. Very likely. But wherever the fault was, there was extreme shortsightedness manifested in the construction of that work.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The engineers, I am told, desired to put in concrete walls at the time. You must not blame them unduly, because it often happens that we do not vote all the money they want, and we cannot proceed with all these works at once. I can very easily understand that it is advisable to proceed to meet all these plans at once, but we cannot. There is \$27,000 already spent, and then there is this \$15,000, which makes over \$40,000.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman will go on to spend \$40,000 and probably \$100,000, and then do nothing.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What we are doing is permanent.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman may think that it is permanent, but if you saw the pier there, which is undulating, like the waves of the ocean during a storm, you would come to the conclusion that it is not in a very excellent state of repair.

Mr. SPROULE. Some years ago a discussion took place in this House in which it was stated as the intention of the government that in these localities where the destruction of wood occurs the wood was to be treated with creosote or plated with copper. It was said that the Public Works Department had it in contemplation to find out those localities where the destruction of wood occurs, and that when piles were to be put down they were to be prepared in this way. It is a waste of money if you go on putting them down when they will be destroyed.

Mr. POWELL. It may be advisable for the department to take into consideration the propriety of having an establishment for creosoting.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are considering that.

Mr. POWELL. There is no difficulty at all about finding out where woodwork will stand and where it will not. Wherever you have fresh water freshets such as in the Miramichi River, in the St. Lawrence and at the head of the tide in the Restigouche the worm cannot live. It can only live in salt water.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It will live in muddy water.

Mr. POWELL. There is the borer and there is the nipper. There is one that nips around the wood like a beaver, and then there is the borer that bores into the wood. The borer will not live where there is fresh water. No matter how bad the bottom of a vessel is if they run into fresh water the worms are all killed. The cheapest way for the government, as far as the future is concerned, is to have one of those establishments and creosote their own wood.

Lower St. Lawrence—Removal of rocks.. \$1,500

Mr. FOSTER. This cannot be the whole of the lower St. Lawrence.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The chief engineer explains that this item is for the removal of rocks from small streams that small boats enter.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the localities ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As cases arise they are brought to the attention of the government. Applications of this kind are made.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this to take rocks out in the vicinity of where that winter ferry service plies ? Whatever became of that service ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am very glad to see that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) takes an interest in it. So far we have not been able to get it started as the subsidy is too small. I will have to rely upon my hon. friend's generosity to increase it.

Magdalen Island breakwater ..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. You had \$10,000 last year. What is the total estimated cost of the work ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Thirty-seven thousand dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. How much have you expended already ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The work has been under contract and it is expected that the vote of last year will be exhausted by the 30th of June.

Newport breakwater ..... \$7,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is this ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In Gaspé County.

Mr. FOSTER. In Gaspé itself ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On the Baie des Chaleurs.

Mr. FOSTER. What is it proposed to do there ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To construct a breakwater for the protection of the fishing fleet.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Newport ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not any information as to the population, but it is a fishing district and the population depend almost entirely on fishing for a livelihood.

Mr. FOSTER. What are you doing there ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is proposed to build a breakwater on the west side of Newport harbour, 370 feet long and 20 feet wide, standing in 26 feet of water.

Percé (North Cove) wharf ..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is a large expenditure. We should know what we are going to do there.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a wharf at Percé, North Cove, to consist of six contiguous timber cribs, with a timber superstructure 670 feet long. There will be expended up to the 30th of June about \$2,000, and the total expenditure will be about \$25,000. The work is under contract at \$25,792. The chief engineer reports that a new wharf is absolutely necessary and that North Cove is the best place for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a trading wharf ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, it is on the regular route of steamers.

Mr. FOSTER. Between Dalhousie and Gaspé ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, between Dalhousie and Gaspé.

St. Jerome wharf, Lake St. John..... \$2,500

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The estimated total cost of this is \$16,000. There was an appropriation last year of \$5,000, and this vote will bring the expenditure up to \$7,500.

Bruce Mines wharf ..... \$5,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the wharf that was bought by the government there. What is the cost of it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is for the construction of a new wharf 1,200 feet long. We did not buy the other wharf.

Mr. SPROULE. What will it cost ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. \$12,500. \$800 has been already spent.

Ontario—Burlington Channel—Repairs to piers ..... \$20,000

Mr. A. T. WOOD (Hamilton). I must express my disappointment at this appropriation. Two years ago I was promised \$80,000 for the rebuilding of this channel, but in the absence of the minister it was cut down to \$40,000, and again it was cut down to \$20,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the way they keep their promises.

Mr. WOOD. I must say that my constituents have been pressing me to know the reason why this has been done. I very seldom say anything against what the government do, because, as a rule, they generally do right, and I am perfectly satisfied with them.

Mr. COCHRANE. What are you talking about, then?

Mr. WOOD. Unlike the hon. gentleman opposite, when I feel that my leaders are doing something wrong, I am not afraid to tell them so. I say that this channel, as it is called here, never cost the government anything. They advanced the money to build it in the first place, but every dollar was paid back several times by the tolls collected. When I told my constituents two years ago that the whole channel would be rebuilt within the next two or three years, they were perfectly satisfied. I feel that I will be called to account by my constituents—

Mr. SPROULE. That is right.

Mr. WOOD. I feel that I will be called to account by my constituents if the promise made to me by the minister two or three years ago, is not carried out. If the government state they will soon commence and finish the work in a reasonable time, I will be perfectly satisfied.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who promised the \$80,000?

Mr. WOOD. It was promised to me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman state by who?

Mr. WOOD. I do not think it is necessary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It was a private bargain.

Mr. WOOD. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why are you afraid to tell it then?

Mr. WOOD. It is my business, and not yours.

Mr. FOSTER. It is public business.

Mr. WOOD. You can take my statement for what it is worth.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That would be small.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. WOOD. Possibly in the estimation of the hon. gentleman, but where I am known it is quite as valuable as his statement would be.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Just whisper who promised you the \$80,000.

Mr. WOOD. I would impress on the government the necessity of prosecuting this work at the earliest possible date. There are two or three large steamers on the way out from England which will be employed in carrying ore from the west to Hamilton, and this work will be necessary. I urge on the government that the work should be done at once.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was the promise of the \$80,000 in writing or under seal?

Mr. WOOD. There was no seal about it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then it was not worth much.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) does not want the government to keep its pledges, and thus go back on their whole record.

Collingwood harbour improvements ..... \$40,000

Mr. SPROULE. In what stage is this work now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is a channel being constructed 110 feet wide, and they are engaged in dredging that channel 20 feet deep at low water mark.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you decided to make it a 20-foot channel?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have. The original contract in 1895 called for a channel, I think, 400 feet wide and sixteen or seventeen feet deep, which was thought to be twenty feet deep from what they call zero, but zero turned out to be a point away up in the air, and so it was necessary to revise these specifications. They were revised, and instead of adhering to the old specifications for a channel 400 feet wide, it was made narrower and deeper.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What will the whole thing cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the original estimate, when the matter was before the House in 1895, was about \$210,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any blasting to be done?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, from the south shore to a certain point half way down is rock, and from there out towards the bay there is a good deal of hardpan. Still, very good progress is now being made, and it will be a very good work. Collingwood is likely to become a very important town. There are enterprising peo-

ple there, they have established lines of steamers, and they are now about to establish a ship-building industry for the construction of steel ships for the upper lakes. They have also established a dry dock, and there is a large pork packing industry in the town.

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to the channel, my information from men who are handling boats on the upper lakes is that the entrance to the channel is a very narrow one. They said that a channel of less than 150 feet would be scarcely suitable, because where so much blasting is done, there are jagged edges of rock left, which in a narrow channel are dangerous.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The channel can be made bell-mouthed, that is, wider at the entrance and narrowed down to 110 feet, where you are in still water. Of course, one would not look to 110 feet as a finality. As the trade increases future governments may consider it advisable to widen the channel; but it will now meet present wants.

Mr. SPROULE. If it meets present wants, I think it is wise economy to narrow the channel and deepen it, so that large vessels can get the use of it without delay. I have nothing but commendation to express with regard to the government's action if they go on and improve the channel at as early a date as possible, because Collingwood is a live town, and is destined in the future to be very much larger than it is now. I was told that it is contemplated to build a harbour above the meat works, where the smelter is being built, as deep water could be reached there much more quickly than at the lower harbour. Has the department any knowledge of that, or has any investigation been made to ascertain whether that is a fact or not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have no information on that point.

Mr. HENDERSON. With regard to the Burlington channel, on examining the estimates I am very much surprised to find that the only appropriation asked for this year is \$20,000. Last year \$40,000 was voted to improve this channel, and I think that was only to commence a work which was to cost \$200,000. It looks as if the government were going to abandon this work entirely, because I believe that not a dollar of that \$40,000 has been expended, and at the end of the present fiscal year it will lapse. The contract has only recently been let for this work; in fact, I do not think it has yet been signed; so that in a few days the only money that will be available for this work will be \$20,000, which to my mind is utterly useless for the purpose. There is no question of the very great importance of the improvement in this channel, which at present is not at all suitable for the large vessels that go to the

city of Hamilton and are necessary to the trade of that very enterprising city, which has recently started some very important industries. Surely there has been some oversight in this matter, and I would draw the minister's attention to it very closely in the hope that when the supplementary estimates come down, there will be an additional grant for the prosecution of this work in a manner which the rich agricultural country and the enterprising city of Hamilton at the head of the lake have a right to expect. I hope that this vote of \$20,000 is real, and that we shall have \$60,000 when the supplementary estimates come down.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this vote for Collingwood harbour to complete the work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, that will not complete it.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the \$40,000 voted last year spent, or will much of it lapse?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not much will lapse. We terminated the old contract because the contractor was not very progressive. His time for completion expired, I think, on the 1st of July last.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is doing the work now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The same man, under different terms, is doing a part of it. His contract ran out, and he had not finished it owing to lack of experience. But he had the plant there, and has been given work up to a certain point. He will do a full season's work there with his dredge, blasting the rock and removing it. We are calling for tenders for the dredging from that middle point northerly. The old contractor's name was Boone, of the firm of Boone and Armstrong, and he is now making very good progress, and the people are well satisfied. We hope to have this channel completed by the end of this season. This 110 feet is expected to be completed this season. We are paying \$2.25 per cubic yard for the rock.

Mr. SPROULE. How much for the other one?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not let yet. The dredging from the middle point northerly is hardpan, and we are inviting tenders.

Mr. SPROULE. At Meaford harbour the people have gone to considerable expense to provide for a railway going down to the dock, and also to build an elevator. Two by-laws have been passed, one to build an elevator and the other to take the railway down to the harbour, and I would like to know what the government propose doing?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As that is a matter of great urgency, we have called for tenders, and the attention of the com-

mittee may be called to the matter at a later date of the session.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** With regard to harbours and rivers in Manitoba, what is the policy of the government regarding St. Andrew's Rapids?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** To call for tenders and proceed promptly. Advertisements are now issued calling for tenders. There was an appropriation last year of \$225,000. That will lapse in July, but it will be necessary to go on with the work.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** I suppose it will be revoted in the supplementaries?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I do not know that it would be proper to allude to the supplementaries.

Columbia River, B.C.—Improvements above Golden .....

Golden ..... \$500

**Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.)** Has the government done all the necessary improvements there? I see that only \$500 is asked for this year.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** This is to continue the improvements. There is one dredge there.

Columbia River, B. C.—Improvement in Narrows between Upper and Lower Arrow Lake .....

Arrow Lake ..... \$6,000

**Mr. PRIOR.** There is a great difference between the vote this year and that of last year. Twenty-five thousand dollars was voted last year, and you only ask \$6,000 now. What work was done during the year?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** The expenditure last year amounted to about \$5,000.

**Mr. PRIOR.** Out of the \$25,000?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Yes.

Fraser River—Improvement of ship channel .....

channel ..... \$15,000

**Mr. PRIOR.** With regard to the work done at a place called Sumas Bar, on the Fraser River, the hon. minister told me some time ago that the work done was most satisfactory. Is that the case? There was some \$7,000 expended on that bar, and I am informed that there is nothing to show for that expenditure, that the whole work that was done last season has been swept away. I am informed also that the work was not needed, and the money was uselessly expended. Whether that is true, I am not able to tell; but I would like to have information from the acting minister on the subject.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) is more familiar than I am with the Fraser River and the difficulty of protecting its banks. It might well be that work would be done and give satisfaction one year and the next year not

**Mr. MULOCK.**

a trace of it remain. I am told the Fraser River is so eccentric in its movements that it goes around the country without regard to dykes. Even canning factories that are built at great expense and apparently safe places sometimes find themselves swept away. The Fraser River problem is a very serious one. It is a question also whether the protection of that river is a matter that belongs to the Dominion or to the province. I do not know whether that has ever been the subject of negotiation between the Dominion and the province. I have no opinion on these matters—have not been studying them long enough to have formed an opinion.

**Mr. PRIOR.** But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has not given an answer to my question. I asked whether the work was satisfactory and whether it was standing now.

**Mr. AULAY MORRISON (New Westminster).** I may be able, in a measure, to answer that question. The hon. acting minister has stated that he is not familiar with the locus in quo that he has not been there. I have been there quite recently, and I know that all trace of that work is not obliterated.

**Mr. PRIOR.** Not all, but the greater part, I suppose?

**Mr. MORRISON.** No. There is a large bar shot across the channel, and the river wound around the end of it. It was supposed that if this dredge ran through the bar, it would train the current through and thus make the channel direct instead of circuitous. It was merely an experiment and an experiment urged by the people there. I think I am right in saying that it was not according to the best judgment of the local engineer that the work should be done; but he yielded to the wishes of the people. He brought the dredge *Mudlark* there. The people of British Columbia know that the *Mudlark* is utterly insufficient—not suitable for the work required in the Fraser River or in British Columbia generally. But she was the only available dredge. She was brought there and the work was done.

**Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.** Why 'profitable'?

**Mr. MORRISON.** It demonstrated that if we had a dredge sufficiently large for the work, the channel could be diverted. The test having been made with this small dredge, I at once urged strongly on the minister to give us a proper dredge for British Columbia. I am very glad to see the amount of \$75,000 is in the estimates to provide a dredge. I am glad the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) has brought this up, because it gives us a cogent argument in favour of the vote of \$75,000 to provide a sufficiently large dredge for British Columbia. It may be said that we have no sufficient

dredge in British Columbia, and that state of affairs has existed for many years, while the maritime provinces and Quebec and Ontario waters are absolutely studded with dredges. British Columbia, having a coast line, I suppose, equal to that of the maritime provinces and Quebec, has not even one dredge worthy of the name. Speaking for myself, and I am more concerned in the matter than other hon. members, I am very glad that we have expended this amount on this work on the Sumas bar, and I think the people there are thoroughly satisfied.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have been at Sumas bar since the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) was there. There was no trace that any intelligent person could point out of the work done.

Mr. MORRISON. The water was muddy when you were there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was with a pretty good captain and with people who were interested in the district. I had *Hansard* in my pocket in which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) had told the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) that \$7,000 had been spent on Sumas bar, and that the result was very satisfactory for the amount expended. I was inquisitive enough to ask where the work was. It excited some derision. At any rate, no individual whom I met either on the boat or afterwards at Chilliwack could point out to me a trace of the work. The member for New Westminster said that the value of the work was to show the uselessness of the *Mudlark*. I would ask the acting Minister of Public Works, as he had his officers there, if he could tell us in what respect the expenditure of \$7,000 was satisfactory so far as it went. What was the ground for making that statement?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to answer that question at the moment. The chief engineer is not able to give me the information. But, at a future sitting I will be able to answer the question.

Mr. PRIOR. Then I suppose this vote can stand.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You will have a vote for a dredging plant later on and you can discuss it on that.

Mr. PRIOR. I am glad to learn that at last the government have recognized that British Columbia is entitled to a better dredging plant, and that more money will be expended. I wish to say in this connection that I was glad to hear the way the member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) spoke in regard to this, because, although I am on this side, and the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is also on this side, and is now living in British Columbia, we are heartily in accord with the hon. member for New Westminster,

and with the government in regard to the expenditure for a new dredge in British Columbia. We know that Fraser River is a very hard river to tackle. The engineer, Mr. Gamble, who was previously the engineer there, is a first-class man, you could not have had a better man. But he had his work cut out for him with the Fraser River. Mr. Roy, who is now secretary of the department, was also very satisfactory; I do not believe any better gentleman could have held the position. I wish to congratulate the government on behalf of the people of British Columbia in the appointment of Mr. Keefer as the resident engineer. He is one of the best appointments that the government could possibly make. He is a gentleman who stands very high in the estimation to everybody who knows him, and his name is an honourable one. The Keefer family is a family of engineers. I hope the hon. gentleman will tell us why the answer was given to me some time ago that the work on Sumas Bar was satisfactory. My information was that the whole thing had been swept away. I do not lay any blame on Mr. Roy or anybody else.

Williams head quarantine wharf ..... \$2,000

Mr. PRIOR. What is that work for?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Repairs to the wharf and quarantine station.

Mr. PRIOR. Is that sufficient to put the whole wharf in a first-class condition? I may say that it is a most important station at the present time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has been a good deal of it expended last year, over \$5,000. This is all that will be required.

Harbours and rivers generally ..... \$5,000

Mr. PRIOR. I notice that in these votes for British Columbia there is nothing put down for the harbour of Victoria. I wish to call the attention of the government to the fact that the harbour of Victoria needs some money expended upon it. In conjunction with my colleague, I have for years brought to the attention of the government the needs of that harbour. Since this government came into power not one cent, so far as I know, has been expended upon that harbour until within the last couple of months. More than that, in 1896, when a sum of money was voted by the former government, the present government did not see fit to expend that money. Now, a letter was written to the Minister of Public Works by the British Columbia Board of Trade, of Victoria, as letters were also written by myself and by my colleague several times, insisting upon a proper amount of money being expended on such an important harbour. In reply to the communication of the board of trade the hon. Minister of

Public Works (Mr. Tarte) saw fit to send the following letter, and with the permission of the House I will read it, as I think it is something unique in the history of politics :

Ottawa, February 9, 1900.

F. Elworthy, Secretary British Columbia Board of Trade, Victoria, B.C.

My dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your communication of January 31, forwarding the information that your board of trade was unanimously disappointed at what they call the 'absence of any indication that the board's recommendation will be acted upon.'

Perhaps you will permit me to say that the present government has been in office only four years, and that we have not been able to do in that short period of time everything that has been asked from us in all parts of Canada. British Columbia has had a large share of public money. The Conservative party, so faithfully supported by Messrs. Prior and Earle, had been in office for twenty-five years, practically, and I am very much surprised that your board and their predecessors have not been able, during those long years, to impress upon the late government the improvements that you so strenuously press upon this government at the present time.

Your board, I am sure, cannot forget that the Conservative party, in the House and outside of it, are constantly reproaching my department and myself in particular, with the tendency to spend too much money. Well, I cannot possibly dredge and build harbours, improve navigation and rivers, and not spend any money.

Yours truly,

J. ISRAEL TARTE.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that any hon. gentleman who has been in this House, I care not for how long, has ever heard of such a letter being written by a member of a government, as the letter I have just read. I say it is a contemptible letter, but I am not astonished that it came from the hon. gentleman in question. It is incredible that any minister of the Crown should write such a letter to a representative body such as the British Columbia Board of Trade. All they asked for was that a reasonable amount should be spent in the harbour of Victoria, and this is the answer they got. They might have expected that he would have given any way a courteous reply, instead of that they get an answer that I think every member of that board looked upon as an insult. The hon. gentleman saw fit to make the statement that British Columbia receives a great deal of money from the government. Well, I deny that. In the first place, British Columbia pays more money into the Dominion treasury, according to her population, four or five times as much, as any other province in Canada. I would also ask whether any minister has the right to cavil about a reasonable expenditure. That money is not the property of Mr. Tarte or of any other minister: it is money that is paid into the treasury by the people of British Columbia, and they have a right to expect that they should get some reasonable return from it.

Mr. PRIOR.

This does not affect people in the east, so I suppose we cannot expect much sympathy from them; but we can expect that when British Columbia pays into the treasury the tremendous amount of money in taxation that she does, she shall get a reasonable return on her public works. Now, I asked a question in the House to this effect :

What amounts have been voted by this House for the harbour of Victoria in the years 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1900? What amounts of said votes, if any, have been expended up to December 31, 1900? How much has been expended on the said harbour from the votes for dredging?

There again the Minister of Public Works gave what he seemed to think a smart reply; but I do not think it was a reply that should have come from an hon. gentleman holding the position he does. His reply to that was :

Parliament having thought that public money could be spent to better advantage elsewhere in the British Empire, I have not spent any money in Victoria.

As the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says, it was a contemptible reply. The hon. gentleman there undoubtedly had a fling at the money that the government are expending for the British Empire in sending a contingent to South Africa. That is the only translation I can put upon this answer. He asks here: When the Conservative party were in power, why did not you get it from them? From the year 1871 to 1897, I may tell the hon. gentleman who is now at the head of the department, that a total of \$302,908 was spent on the improvement of Victoria harbour, and the last expenditure of \$3,462 in 1896-7, when the present government were in power, was made out of an item of \$10,000 which the Conservative government voted, and the remainder of which the Liberals, in their wisdom, saw fit not to expend. I believe it is the opinion, not only of the hon. gentleman who is now on his way from Paris, but the opinion has been expressed to me by other members of the government, that because Victoria saw fit to elect two Conservatives at the last general elections she should have no money expended on her harbour or public buildings. I was asked this year, more than once, by members of the government: Well, what right have you to expect any money to be expended? What have you done for us? It is not the government's money, it is the money of the people that they are expected to expend, and because the people of British Columbia saw fit to elect gentlemen to oppose them there is no reason why they should not give them a proper amount of money in return for what they pay. I do not want to go into a lot of figures at this hour of the night or at this period of the session. Year after year I have brought the question up in the House as to the amount of money that British Columbia pays into the treasury of the Dominion.

ion, but I will just show hon. gentlemen opposite the amount that British Columbia does pay into the treasury. British Columbia paid in customs revenue alone last year \$2,113,927.24. It is a tremendous amount for a population of not more than 150,000 people. I have made a little calculation in regard to this sum, and I find that the customs revenue of the province of Quebec was \$10,000,000 odd. The amount paid by the city of Montreal was \$8,668,000, which leaves to the province of Quebec, outside of Montreal, \$1,342,000. In other words, British Columbia, with 150,000 people, contributes \$771,000 odd more to the customs than 1,200,000 people in Quebec province do; that is, allowing the province of Quebec 1,500,000 people and deducting the 300,000 population of the city of Montreal. I am well aware that, perhaps, hon. gentlemen will say that the whole of the province of Quebec pays duty in the city of Montreal, but the fact remains that 150,000 people in the province of British Columbia pay more than 1,500,000 people in the province of Quebec. While I am on this subject, I would like to call attention to the public buildings. I am sorry that I was not in the House when the vote for public buildings in British Columbia came up. There is a case in regard to these public buildings that I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. acting Minister of Public Works. I believe that he is an honourable and fair-minded man, and that he will regret with me that a great injustice has been done to a most deserving man in connection with these public buildings. When the new post office in Victoria was built the old post office was shut up. The new building comprises the post office, the customs, inland revenue and other public departments. At the time that the old post office was shut up a man named W. H. Bailey was caretaker of the building. Instead of this man being continued by the government as caretaker of the new building, the government saw fit to appoint another man who was, if nothing else, a first-class Liberal, and a strong supporter of hon. gentlemen who are now in power. I do not know whether Mr. Bailey was or was not; I do not think he had any politics whatever. But, the services that Mr. Bailey has rendered to the British Empire, I think, entitled him to far better treatment than he has received at the hands of the government. I am going to read an extract from the *Victoria Colonist* of October 18, 1899, in regard to the service that this man has given to this country:

In the local list of names of those who have volunteered for service in South Africa appears that of Sergt. W. H. Bailey, of No. 1 company, who already is decorated with the Egyptian medal and three clasps—El Teb, Tofrek and Suakin—and appears to be entitled, according to all rules of the service, if not to the Victoria Cross itself, the most prized of all worldly decorations,

at least to the medal for distinguished gallantry. Sergt. Bailey was formerly a private in the Royal Marine Light Infantry, a battalion of which, under Lieut.-Col. Ozzard, formed part of the brigade commanded by Sir Gerald Graham, which was landed at Suakin on the Red Sea in 1885 to protect the construction of a line of railway proposed to be built from that place across the desert to Berber on the Nile. This was undertaken with the object of facilitating the operations of the expedition which had worked its way up the Nile past Berber and headed for Khartoum for the relief of Gen. Gordon, then besieged by the Mahdi.

The particular action for which the decoration is claimed for Sergt. Bailey was that popularly known as McNeill's Zeriba, or according to the War Office description, the battle of Tofrek, which took place on the afternoon of the 22nd of March, 1885. It was during the fiercest attack of the Arabs that Lieut.-Col. Bridge, adjutant of the marines battalion, called for volunteers to capture a standard of the enemy, and his call was answered by Sergt. Bailey, who, along with his officer, dashed into the midst of the dusky horde, and captured the trophy. Sergt. Bailey some years ago wrote Col. Bridge to see if the medal given for conspicuous bravery on the battlefield could not be secured, and has from that officer a letter, an extract from which runs thus:

'I recollect you and your gallant and plucky conduct on that memorable and trying afternoon, and I hoped that if we two could not both obtain the Victoria Cross, that my strong recommendation of you at that time might have obtained for you the medal for distinguished gallantry. At the time, as the whole affair was nearly a catastrophe, it was only half understood afterwards, when the full result of the day was known, a clasp was given. The death of Col. Ozzard, our C. O., doubtless put a stop to anything being done for us two.'

Col. Ozzard died, Sergt. Bailey says, on board the transport carrying the marines home to England after the close of the campaign, and he himself was invalidated out of the service shortly after.

In addition to the above recommendation, Sergt. Bailey's name was twice mentioned in despatches from Gen. Graham to General (now Field Marshal) Wolseley, then commander-in-chief in Egypt, and in addition his former adjutant, Lieut.-Col. Bridge, says Sergt. Bailey 'will find full mention of his name in "The Battle of Topek," a book published in 1887 by W. H. Allen.'

This was the man that hon. gentlemen saw fit to turn out upon the world. He was the caretaker of the post office, and he was a man who enjoyed the confidence and respect of every man, woman and child in Victoria. That man was turned out to make a place for a party heeler and nothing else. It may be said that he was left in charge of the old post office, but that was only for one or two months. What reason was there that this man could not have been put in charge of the new post office? Very different was the conduct of the government in regard to one of their proteges, whom they appointed as an appraiser in Victoria, a man, who instead of being loyal, was the most disloyal man we have ever had in British Columbia. Mr. W. Marchant had been a strong supporter of the government, and

had spoken on various platforms in their favour, and in 1897 he was made customs appraiser. When the war broke out between South Africa and the British Empire, we found this gentleman writing such a pro-Boer and disloyal letter to the press that it at once set the whole of British Columbia in a blaze. I have not his letter here, for the simple reason that I found on applying in the reading room and library of the House, that the numbers of the paper in which it appeared were torn out. I cannot say who did that, or for what reason it was done, but at all events, I took care at the time, to send that letter to the Minister of Customs, and to draw his attention to the fact that he had a man so disloyal in his employment. A few days after the letter was published, the mayor of Victoria, at the request of a large number of prominent citizens, called a public meeting and of all the meetings ever held in Victoria, that was the most crowded; the people surged around the buildings by hundreds, not being able to obtain admission. The following resolution was carried unanimously at that meeting, and I shall read it, in order to show the sort of man that this government thinks is worthy of being appointed to a position in the public service, while a man who has served his Queen and country like Mr. Bailey, was turned out on the street, without notice. The resolution is as follows:

Be it resolved, that in the opinion of this meeting the conduct of William Marchant, customs appraiser, and one of the school trustees of the city of Victoria, in writing the letters addressed to Bishop Cridge, Dr. Campbell, Bishop Perrin, Revs. J. C. Speer and Robert Hughes, published in the issue of the Victoria 'Daily Times' on the 28th day of October instant, is offensive and unpatriotic in the extreme, unworthy of one occupying the position of school trustee, and an office in the service of the Dominion of Canada, and meets with the unqualified disapproval of this meeting, which hereby demands of him that he resign forthwith his position of school trustee.

Be it further resolved that a copy of the said letter, so published, be forwarded by the chairman and secretary of this meeting, accompanied by a suitable covering letter, to the Premier of the Dominion of Canada, and also to the senators and members of the House of Commons for the province of British Columbia.

This resolution was carried unanimously by the immense audience gathered together that night. I do not know Mr. Marchant very intimately, and he may or may not be a good appointment, but he got his position simply because he was a staunch supporter of the party in power, and the government has given a raise of salary of \$100 lately; but Mr. Bailey, who had fought for his Queen and his country so gallantly, was turned out of office. Now, as to Victoria harbour, I saw the minister personally the other day, and I explained the whole matter to him and to his deputy. What the board of trade and the people of Victoria

Mr. PRIOR.

want is, that a good, round sum should be placed in the estimates so as to give a depth of at least sixteen feet to the harbour. The secretary of the Public Works Department, who had been the resident engineer in British Columbia, knows whether that is feasible or not. I call the attention of the minister to it, and I ask him to give the matter his most careful attention, and to see that after four years of side-tracking, justice is at last done to the city of Victoria. It may surprise hon. gentlemen to hear that the sea-going tonnage of the port of Victoria is larger than the sea-going tonnage entering and clearing the port of Montreal. Although the population of Victoria is not much over 25,000, still the amount of shipping at that port is enormous. Considering the amount of money that the province of British Columbia and the port of Victoria pays into the treasury, I consider that we have a right to expect, that not \$10,000 or \$15,000 be voted for that harbour, but that a regular system of improvement shall be inaugurated by the government, that their engineers shall make a proper plan, and that the government shall see that a substantial sum is placed in the supplementary estimates to give us the improvements in the harbour which we are justly entitled to.

Mr. ANGUS McLENNAN (Inverness). Coming back from war to rivers and harbours once more, I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that an item of \$2,000 for a wharf at Margaree Island was in the estimates last year, and that this item has been dropped from the estimates this year. I understand that the work was in progress, and missing the item from the estimates leads me to ask the minister for an explanation as to how that came about. I am glad to see the deputy minister here. I think this is a matter that comes within his duty, to see that items of this kind, particularly unexpended items are carried from one year to another. I may say that I only hope that he will give the committee a better explanation than I found him inclined to give me, when I approached his office. I always understood the Deputy Minister of Public Works was the servant of the people of Canada. Again I will ask that some explanation be given as to why this item was dropped. I observe that all the items for public works in the province of Nova Scotia are taken down in their proper columns, and repeated from the year 1899 to the year 1900, except this particular one. I only hope the acting minister will give a proper explanation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Explain how that was overlooked, now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With reference to the observations of my hon. friend from Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Prior)—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. From Inverness.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. I cannot in courtesy, allow the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Prior), to pass without reply. I have no knowledge of the case of Sergeant Bailey and, therefore, am not able to offer any explanation. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior), has reason to feel that I recognize the importance of Victoria harbour. I presume that it is not so much a round sum in the estimates that the hon. gentleman desires, as to have some work done.

Mr. PRIOR. It cannot be done without a good appropriation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That may be, but I do not think that the size of the sum is so material as is having the work done. There is nothing gained by putting fictitious sums in the estimates that are not likely to be expended. I have studied the harbour question there, and I think it requires improvements in the way of deepening, and the removal of dredger rock. We may very well devote our attention to the interior harbour of Victoria, and I believe the dredging is going on there now, and hope it may continue during the present season. With reference to the question of my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan), as to why this vote of \$2,000 for a wharf at Margaree Island was dropped. I cannot give him that information, because I had not the preparation of these main estimates, which were settled prior to my going into the Department of Public Works. But I will endeavour to ascertain for the hon. gentleman the explanation, and I hope it will be satisfactory.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). I feel it my duty to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a matter to which I have called his attention several times before. In the River St. Lawrence, between Kingston and Brockville, and opposite Gananoque, there are three distinct channels—the north, the middle, and the south or American channel. At the foot of Wolfe Island, eighteen miles below Kingston, where steamers going down either the north or the middle channel desire to turn into the American channel, which is considered the better, especially for steamers with a tow of barges, there is a small rocky bar, on which there is only about twelve feet of water, and as I believe fourteen feet of water is now obtained all the way down the St. Lawrence route, it is very desirable that this obstruction should be removed. The best information I have is that it will not cost very much to do it. I have had no promise in writing that it would be done, but I have understood each year that some dredging would be done there. I quite realize the amount of dredging that has been

done, and the comparatively small number of dredges at the disposal of the government; but I am very anxious that all these channels in connection with the St. Lawrence route should be available, and I now call the attention of the acting minister to this matter so that during this year, if possible, the obstruction there may be removed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would just say to the hon. gentleman that a hydrographic survey is about to be made of the river from Kingston to Prescott, with the intention of giving fourteen feet of water.

Dredging—Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick.... \$87,000

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to know what work was done in Prince Edward Island last year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At Summerside, in the county of Prince, 10,305 cubic yards removed; at Hurd's Point, 18,235 yards; at Charlottetown railway wharf, 19,630 yards; at Charlottetown, 2,280 yards.

Mr. MARTIN. That is a very small amount of dredging for that province. I am very sorry the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) is not in his place when these estimates are before the House. For the last fifteen years he has been complaining that very little dredging was done in Prince Edward Island, and I may say that for the last four years there has been much less done than for the same number of years previously. I want to call the minister's attention to some promises that were made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries not long ago in the province. We had an election in the riding which I have the honour to represent, and he went down to Wood Islands and told the people there that the dredge would certainly come to Wood Island, and that the breakwater there would be repaired, and advised them to send a petition to Ottawa. I do not see anything in these estimates for the repairs to the Wood Island breakwater, and I wish the minister to promise me that the dredge is going there. I would also like to know where the dredge is going to be at work next summer, and what work is proposed to be done in the province. In my riding there are the harbours of Murray River, the proposed terminus of the railway which is to be built, Wood Island, Pinette Harbour, and Vernon River. I suppose the Minister of Marine and Fisheries covered pages of *Hansard* years ago calling attention to these.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How many years ago?

Mr. MARTIN. Say from five to ten years ago. There has been some little work done, but none at all on these harbours since 1896. With very little dredging and extension of breakwater, the harbour of Wood

Island could be put into good order. The late government spent some money there in 1893 or 1894, but more must be spent if it is to accommodate vessels of any capacity. As the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was so generous in his promises there last fall, I would like to see his promises implemented. I asked last year if there was a petition in the department on behalf of the harbour of Pinette. I was told there was none, but when the elections came on, a letter was produced from the Public Works Department stating that they had the petition. Where was the petition all the time? It was trotted out at the right time during the by-elections in October. That petition had been forwarded by somebody when the House was in session last year, but it was pigeon-holed until the elections were in progress. When the elections were in progress, there came a letter from the Public Works Department saying that a petition had been received. Is the hon. gentleman going to carry out the promises made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. During those last four years there has been little or no expenditure in that section of the province. In Nova Scotia last year large amounts were voted for over 80 piers and wharfs. I do not know whether the money was all expended or not, but I know that the half of what was put in the estimates for Prince Edward Island has not been expended. I hope for a favourable reply from the hon. minister, and would ask him to let me know where the dredging is to be done, and if the harbours I mentioned are to be improved.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. So far as this summer is concerned, the difficulty is the scarcity of dredges. There are very few in the maritime provinces. There is only one dredge for Prince Edward Island, and we have sent another there from Nova Scotia. I do not know how long it will be kept there. The hon. gentleman will have to support a vote to increase our dredges, as there are not enough at present.

Mr. MARTIN. Where is the dredging to be done? Where is the dredge *Prince Edward* to be at work this summer, and where is it at work now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will get the programme of dredging, and give the particulars to the hon. gentleman when we are next in committee.

Mr. PRIOR. I hope the hon. gentleman will see fit to furnish a better dredge than we have now in Victoria harbour. The amount of money voted in past years was almost all expended in paying for wages.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was pleased to hear the hon. gentleman speak so highly of Mr. Roy's qualifications. I have had several conversations with him,

Mr. MARTIN.

and he is of the opinion that the present dredging system in British Columbia waters is very unsatisfactory. What is required is a hydraulic dredge, but part of the machinery for such a dredge is not manufactured in Canada at all, and Mr. Roy has been the last week on a mission with the view of providing hydraulic dredges for British Columbia.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is there any special work for to-morrow? What is the programme?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the election Bill is ready, we may go on with that. Failing that, we shall continue in estimates. There will be still a few items of the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock), and after that the estimates of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). We did not expect to get so far to-night and had not arranged for it.

Mr. PRIOR. When are we going to finish with the Minister of Agriculture?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I have only one item in the main estimates; I am ready to take that up to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. (Thursday).

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, June 21, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### YUKON TERRITORY—SALARIES OF OFFICIALS.

Mr. FOSTER (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

Who are the members of the Yukon council? What salaries, allowances, rents, &c., do they receive?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In reply to the question, I would say that the members of the Yukon council do not receive any salaries in their capacity as such, but in the positions which they occupy in that district, their salaries are as follows: Wm. Ogilvie, com-

missioner, salary, \$6,000 per annum; living allowance, \$2,000, and a free house. J. E. Girouard, registrar, salary, \$4,000 per annum; living allowance, \$100 per month. Hon. C. A. Dugas, judge, salary, \$4,000 per annum; living allowance, \$2,000. W. H. P. Clement, legal adviser, salary, \$5,000 per annum; living allowance, \$100 per month. E. C. Senkler, gold commissioner, salary, \$5,000 per annum; living allowance, \$100 per month. A. B. Perry, superintendent, Dominion Mounted Police, salary, \$1,400 per annum; when in command at Dawson he is allowed \$2 per day extra. He also receives \$1.25 per day living allowance, in addition to rations supplied to the police. These gentlemen do not receive any salary or allowance as members of the Yukon council.

#### SUPPLY OF MEAT TO MILITARY CAMP, KINGSTON.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

To whom was the contract let for the supply of meat for the military camp at Kingston for the present year? Were tenders called for by public advertisement? Was the lowest tender accepted? At what price per 100 pounds was the contract let? Was any change made in the contract entered into, by transfer or otherwise? If so, why? What was the rate per 100 pounds for the changed contract, and to whom was it awarded?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Con. Millan, Kingston. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4. At 634-100 cents per pound for beef and 7½ cents for mutton. 5. Yes. 6. After calling for tenders the date of the camp was changed from June 26 to the 19th, and the lowest tenderer refused to deliver the meat from the 19th without extra charges. New arrangements were made. 7. Eight and one-quarter cents per pound for beef and mutton; Con. Millan. The other tenderers were 943-100 cents, 960-100 cents, 975-100 cents and 983-100 cents per pound for beef and mutton.

#### INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—SUNDAY WORK.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked :

1. Has the hon. the Minister of Railways received a copy of the following resolution adopted at a public meeting in New Glasgow, Pictou County, N.S. : 'While we fully recognize the increased traffic on the Intercolonial Railway and the consequent increased difficulties in forwarding such traffic, we would nevertheless give strong expression in favour of the cessation of work on the railway and in the roundhouse at Stellarton and elsewhere during the full twenty-four hours of the Lord's Day, and would urge upon the government the necessity of putting the road in such condition and furnishing such locomotives as necessary to that end?'

2. If so, what instructions, if any, have been given since the receipt of this resolution?

3. If no instructions have been given, why not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). In answer to the hon. member's question, I would say that I did receive a copy of the resolution contained in the question, and I immediately called for an explanation from the officers of the department in respect to what occurred, although, perhaps, I ought to say that the inquiries had been made before the receipt of the resolution. The resolution, I think, did not come to hand until about ten days or a fortnight after the trouble complained of had occurred. There was only one Sunday upon which it was necessary to continue work, and that was because of a condition of business which was entirely exceptional. That will not occur again, it should not have occurred, and it has not occurred since the time referred to. I gave instructions not to allow work on Sunday, in fact, that is a standing order, and I do not think the officers of the department would disregard such an order except it might be in a case which is very exceptional, under which circumstances they could not avoid doing it.

#### TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND JAPAN.

Mr. MORRISON asked :

1. Has Canada taken advantage of the provisions of Article XIX. of the treaty of commerce and navigation between Great Britain and Japan which was signed in London July 16, 1894, the ratifications whereof were exchanged at Tokio August 25, 1894? Or, has Canada become a party to the said treaty?

2. If not, upon what ground has Canada refrained from becoming a party to the treaty in question?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). After the treaty between Great Britain and Japan had been negotiated Canada was invited by Great Britain to declare whether or not she would become a party to it. The government, having considered the question, came to the conclusion that Canada would not be a party to the treaty. The reason was that we did not want to alienate our liberty, and thereby preclude the possibility of making an arrangement in future which might be found beneficial to Canada.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PURCHASE OF MEAT FOR CANADIAN CONTINGENTS.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

1. Were the supplies of meat required for the men of the Canadian contingent, which left Halifax for South Africa, purchased by public tender; if so, from whom, and at what prices?

2. How many pounds of meat, both fresh and preserved, were put on board each of the four transports that left Halifax for South Africa with the Canadian contingents?

3. How much per pound was paid for fresh meat, and how much for preserved meat?

4. What was the total amount paid for the meat purchased, and what quantity of fresh meat

and preserved meat respectively was purchased?

5. What are the 'reasonable terms' referred to by the Minister of Militia and Defence on May 10, 1900 ('Hansard,' page 5021), upon which the government reimburses the steamship companies and remunerates them for their time and labour in connection with the provisioning of the men of the second Canadian contingent during the voyage to South Africa?

6. What provision and supplies did each such steamship line so provide for such purposes, and at what price?

7. From what persons or firms were the respective provisions and supplies in each instance purchased by each steamship line, and in what quantities and at what prices in each instance?

8. What persons or firms were suggested or named to the steamship companies in connection with the purchasing of supplies or provisions by the steamship companies conveying the Canadian contingents to South Africa?

9. Were the supplies or provisions which were purchased by the steamship companies respectively as agents for or on behalf of the government, and which were or are to be paid for by the government, supplied by tender, or purchased by private contract?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Everything was supplied by the owners of the transports. 2, 3 and 4. The accounts are not yet received from the transports. 5. The terms are not fixed, but compensation will be offered either in the form of a small commission, or payment for the actual time occupied in securing the supplies. 6 and 7. These are answered by the answer to 2, 3 and 4; the accounts have not yet been received. 8. The names are: J. and M. Murphy, Kelly & Glassy, John Tobin & Co., Charles Ackhurst, Bauld. Gibson & Co., Mr. Fenton, Black & Finn, Maling & Co., John F. Ryan, Mr. Hames, Dillon Bros., J. W. Hamilton, John F. Out-hit, H. H. Fuller, N. Russell & Co., Irwin & Sons, W. L. Kane & Co., John Murphy, John Wallace, J. McInnis & Son, Brander & Morris, Gordon & Keith, J. F. Kelly, Mr. Chittick, J. A. Gass, Gregory & Mitchell, Mr. Myers, Globe Laundry, John Fry, John Lawlor, Geo. A. Pyke, M. E. Keefe, Billman, Chisholm & Co., R. J. Sweet & Co., John Rawley, John Ead, and Lane & Co. 9. I am not aware whether they were purchased by tender or not.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not quite catch what the hon. gentleman said in reference to No. 9, whether they were acting for the government or not.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The answer given me here is: 'Not yet known.' I suppose the accounts have not been received and the department is not aware whether tenders were asked for in any of the cases or not.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—APPOINTMENT OF CHAPLAINS.

Mr. WALLACE asked:

1. At what date did the first contingent sail from Quebec?

Mr. CLANCY.

2. At what date was the Church of England chaplain for such contingent appointed?

3. What were the dates of the appointments of the other chaplains for the first contingent?

4. What was the cause of delay in appointing the Church of England chaplain?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. October 30, 1899. 2. Rev. John Almond, Church of England chaplain, embarked on the steamship *Sardinian* on October 30, under verbal instructions from the minister. His appointment was recommended by the major-general on November 1 and approved by the minister. 3. The other chaplains were appointed on October 28, *vide* Militia Order No. 222. 4. Answered by No. 2.

#### POST OFFICE AT ATHENS, ONT.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

Has the Postmaster General given the postmaster at Athens, Ont., instructions or permission to close the post office at six p.m., on three days of the week? If so, is the Postmaster General aware that it is a great inconvenience to the farmers of that section of the country who drive in for their mail after six o'clock p.m.?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor), I have to state that no application for such permission has been made to the department, nor has the department granted any such permission, and the department has no knowledge of the postmaster's doing what it is suggested he is doing.

#### I. C. R.—TRAIN SERVICE ON CAPE BRETON DIVISION.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to a matter of some importance. I have received the following telegram from the Board of Trade of Sydney:

At a large meeting of the Sydney Board of Trade held this afternoon, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

Resolved, that this meeting of the Sydney Board of Trade has witnessed with exceeding regret the departure made by the management of the Intercolonial Railway from their published time-table, in running the fast express into and out from North Sydney twice a day. That this diversion from the main line to a branch delays the arrival of the train by schedule time thirty minutes, and from past experience, it can be concluded that the delay will largely exceed that limit; that this delay is particularly annoying, as it prevents the possibility of delivering any mails that come by that train on the night of its arrival; that it is contrary to the spirit and object of the system of fast travel, and is a source of annoyance to each and every traveller whose destination is Sydney; that the large volume of passenger traffic at present is to Sydney, and the slight inconvenience of changing cars at North Sydney is trivial in compari-

son with the unnecessary and annoying delay caused by running the whole train down to the North Sydney station, and very frequently down to the North Sydney wharf; that the time-table, as arranged, settled and published by the Department of Railways, was acceptable to this board as a compromise, in view of the fact that the early express was still allowed to continue the old system of running on the North Sydney branch of the up and down trips, but the unexplained change compelling both trains to run into North Sydney is an act of injustice and injury to the town of Sydney which this board regards as utterly unjustifiable; further resolved, that the representatives of this county in the Dominion parliament and local legislature be asked at once to demand of the Department of Railways its adherence to the printed time-table, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the representatives of the county, to the Minister of Railways and to the Minister of Finance.

(Sgd.) D. A. HEARN,

Secretary Sydney Board of Trade.

After this very full statement of the case made by the Sydney Board of Trade, I need not point out to the minister (Mr. Blair), the extreme inconvenience of changing this running arrangement, which was arrived at by a compromise acceptable to the town of Sydney. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) is desirous of meeting the necessities of the case as far as possible, and I would suggest to him that there be an equal service from both towns, joining at the junction, both engines going west if necessary, and on returning, dividing again at the junction. I may say that the traffic warrants two parlour cars and two first-class cars. That is a suggestion that would meet the difficulty and avoid this annoyance to the board of trade and to the people of Sydney. I presume the arrangement was come to after some difficulty, but it was acceptable, and as the hon. minister knows, the vast influx of the travelling public to the town of Sydney, is no doubt much greater than it is to North Sydney. It would seem to me very unjust that there should be such delay as absolutely prevented replies being sent to letters. The minister will see that every facility should be given by the government to such an important town as Sydney is rapidly becoming. It is a serious matter to change an arrangement which was deliberately come to, and to change it in such a way as to adversely affect the interests of the community there. If the minister would give attention to the suggestion made, it would remove the difficulty without doing an injustice to any one, and it would meet the wishes of the Sydney Board of Trade.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I received a similar telegram to that read by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), and no doubt the conditions as described actually do exist at the present time. The facts in connection with the matter are these: There has hitherto been only one express train a

day running to these towns, and that express train has been running into Sydney as its eventual terminus; first calling at North Sydney. That system has obtained for a long period of years, until the people of North Sydney have come rather to regard it as their right, that they should be the terminus of the road, and that Sydney and not North Sydney, should be compelled to make any connections that are required. When we were adding another express train to the Cape Breton service, we felt that it would be a very proper arrangement that we should continue the running of one train to North Sydney, backing down to Sydney as heretofore, but that the new train should run direct to Sydney, providing a train connection for North Sydney at the junction. The time-table was arranged upon that basis. The feeling, however, as I am informed now, was so extremely intense in North Sydney, and the indignation was so great that the general manager was prevailed upon to look into the situation again, to see whether he could make a readjustment of the time-table which would be satisfactory to both towns. From the assurances which he tells me he received from people who are interested in the business at Sydney, he was led to conclude that it would not be so very much opposed to the wishes of the people of Sydney, that the second express should run into North Sydney as the other express had done, and then back down, according to the usual plan. He communicated to me by wire that he was satisfied from what he had gathered, that both towns would be content with that arrangement, and he asked my consent to his making the change. I did feel a great deal of doubt as to whether it would be possible to satisfy both towns. I felt convinced that it was practically impossible to make an arrangement which would be acceptable to both localities. I did not think that any service that would be justified in the public interest, and that the railway could afford, would be absolutely agreeable to both towns, under the conditions of apparent conflict between them. Nevertheless, having an assurance from the general manager, that in his opinion a satisfactory arrangement could be made, I left it to his discretion, and I believe that he has varied the time-table somewhat, so that the trains could run as formerly. From the information I gather now, it appears that my original fear was well grounded, and I am in communication with the department at the present time, and am in hopes that we will be able to arrive at the solution moderately agreeable to both parties. If not, we will have to determine the question according to what we conceive to be the interests of the different localities, the interests of the railway, and the interests of the public service, and make our decision accordingly, even though neither of the parties might be content with it.

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond). Mr. Speaker, I endorse in all possible earnestness the suggestion that has been thrown out in the telegram that has been read by the hon. leader of the opposition by way of a compromise in the existing arrangements as to the running of trains at the eastern end of the Intercolonial Railway into Sydney. Early in the present session I called the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to the great dissatisfaction that existed in the town of Sydney at the existing arrangements. The hon. gentleman will remember that I called for a return of the business done at Sydney, which is the terminus of the Intercolonial system, and the return showed that an enormous amount of business was done at that station.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall have to call the Speaker's attention to the argument which the hon. gentleman is proceeding to make. I think it is exceedingly irregular and inconvenient, because he will be making statements which I ought to comment upon, and which I cannot according to the rules.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the real object of my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) is to throw out a suggestion to the Minister of Railways and Canals by which this matter may be arranged.

Mr. ANGUS McLENNAN (Inverness). More than the people of Sydney and North Sydney are interested in the management of the Intercolonial Railway, and if there is going to be a discussion on it, the representatives of other parts of the Island of Cape Breton should have an opportunity of speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he had better put himself in order by making a motion.

Mr. GILLIES. It is only by way of assistance to the Minister of Railways that I intend to make a few suggestions, which I hope will be taken in the spirit in which they are made. I quite agree that the existing system by which the trains run into the town of North Sydney and then go back five or six miles to the junction, and then run around to the town of Sydney, has obtained for a considerable time past. There was not much complaint of that system while the business over the road was comparatively light; but the great development that has taken place in the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway certainly necessitates a reform in that regard. I do not for a moment wish to interfere with any conveniences which the town of North Sydney at present enjoys.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman proposes to conclude with a

Mr. BLAIR.

motion? because if he does not, I think that is hardly regular.

Mr. GILLIES. Well, I will conclude with a motion, Mr. Speaker. The town of North Sydney is a progressive and enterprising town, and I very much admire its people; but the House will at once recognize the great hardship which not only the people are subjected to by the whole train running into North Sydney, and then backing out to the junction again, and running around to Sydney. What I suggest is the adoption of a compromise suggested in the telegram signed by Mr. MacKeen and Mr. Chisholm which the leader of the opposition has read, and which is as follows:

Regarding board of trade resolution re train going into North Sydney advocate equal service from both towns joining at junction, both engines going west if necessary, and on return dividing again at junction. Traffic warrants two parlour cars and two first-class cars.

If that suggestion is acted upon, the convenience now enjoyed by the town of North Sydney and the travelling public going in that direction will not be interfered with, while the convenience of the travelling public going to the town of Sydney and to the great southern districts of Cape Breton, such as Louisbourg, Gabarus, Main à Dieu, Mira, Catalone and the large and important towns and mining districts of Glace Bay, Port Morien, Bridgeport and other adjoining localities, will also be served. Every person travelling in that direction now is bound to go to North Sydney at the risk of losing his connections at Sydney to these points. I really wish to assist the Minister of Railways in every possible way in bringing about the reform now clamoured for.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him one question? Do I understand that the proposal is that the junction shall be the terminus of two distinct and separate trains connecting with the main train—one for North Sydney and one for Sydney?

Mr. GILLIES. That will do very well if you cannot do better.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is that the proposal? If it is, it is not practically different from one train running from one place and making connection at the junction with another train running to the other place. We could not locate at the junction, because we have not the necessary facilities there.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman is playing with the question, or else he does not understand it at all. I am not Minister of Railways, and it is not my duty to formulate a plan. I bring his notice to the difficulty, and he should find the proper relief and remedy. I do not wish in the

slightest degree to interfere with the convenience now enjoyed by the town of North Sydney or to encourage any spirit of rivalry between the two towns; but what must be patent to every person is that the travelling public are subjected to unnecessary inconvenience by the present arrangement, and that it can be got over by the method suggested in this telegram. It is not my purpose to contrast the business done at one town with that done at the other. The terminus of the road is palpably at Sydney. The terminus of the Newfoundland steamers is at North Sydney. Both are important points. The conveniences now enjoyed by North Sydney must not be interfered with, and they cannot be if this suggestion is acted upon.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. At the risk of the hon. gentleman suggesting that I do not know what I am talking about, I would like to ask a further question. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that the main train shall run into Sydney, and that a branch connection shall be made at North Sydney; or that the main train shall run into North Sydney and a branch connection be made at Sydney? It has to do one or the other; which does he suggest?

Mr. **GILLIES**. I do not care how the hon. gentleman may manage it. What I complain of is that the train going to Sydney should not be compelled to run into North Sydney and then back again five miles to the junction before going to Sydney. I say that the travelling public and the mails going to Sydney should not be detained in consequence of the present arrangement.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Which of these proposals does the hon. gentleman understand that the telegram points to?

Mr. **GILLIES**. I am not going to travel outside of the suggestion made here. I ask the Minister of Railways this question: Does he approve of the present arrangement? If he does not, some reform or change is necessary, and the change suggested in this telegram will very fairly, I think, meet the difficulty if it can be worked out. Of course, if it is unworkable, there it ends, and some other system must be devised. But the hon. gentleman must see that the present arrangement is absolutely intolerable, and I think it is incumbent upon the government at once to bring about some change in the way indicated by the Board of Trade of Sydney. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. **ANGUS McLENNAN** (Inverness). Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear what the hon. the leader of the opposition—the representative of the county of Cape Breton,

in which the town of North Sydney is situated, has to say in regard to this matter.

Mr. **GILLIES**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan, Inverness) will remember that I am a citizen of the town of Sydney. I live there. And I am speaking not only in the interest of the town of Sydney, but in the interest of the great travelling public going to that town.

Mr. **McLENNAN** (Inverness). And I am going to say a few words in behalf of the great travelling public going to that town. I submit that the travelling public, above all the country people living in the villages and on the farms in eastern Nova Scotia and on the Island of Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island are infinitely more interested in the management of the Intercolonial Railway than the Board of Trade of Sydney and the hon. member for Richmond. It seems to me that since a certain enterprising institution has established itself in the town of Sydney, the board of trade of that town seem to imagine that the whole Island of Cape Breton should revolve around that institution. But I submit that the travelling public are really the parties to be considered by the Intercolonial Railway management in this regard. The hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), having the responsibility on his shoulders of being, in a very great measure, the spokesman for the interest of these two towns and of the whole county of Cape Breton, his views should have greater weight with the House and with the country than the views of the hon. member for Richmond; but he preserves discreet silence. The reason I claim to offer any observation with regard to this matter is that the people of the very large and important county I have the honour to represent have great interest in the management of this road, and I say without hesitation, that the travelling public generally have every interest in having the trains make their calls regularly and continuously upon these two towns. Very few indeed have business in one town that have not something to do with the other. When people leave the various stations of the Intercolonial Railway with some mission to fulfil in the town of North Sydney, in nine cases out of ten their business brings them to Sydney as well, and, of course, the people's railway should carry them and should carry their goods also. It would indeed be a great injustice to these people to deprive them of the accommodation that the Intercolonial Railway thus affords them. Therefore, I hope the railway management will continue to serve these two towns alike. With regard to the lead that the town of Sydney happens now to have of the town of North Sydney, this lead has hitherto always been the other way. The commercial importance of North Sydney for thirty years past has been infinitely superior to that of

Sydney. Now that a boom has come to Sydney, it would be unfair to the people of the sister town that they should be deprived of the railway facilities that they are entitled to and that they have always enjoyed.

Mr. GILLIES. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman—

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I say it would be a great injustice to deprive them of the facilities they now enjoy merely because the town of Sydney and its Board of Trade have attained an importance—

Mr. GILLIES. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness)—which was brought to them, Mr. Speaker, not through any merit of their own at all, not through any increase in their enterprise or any change in their public spirit, not through anything done on their behalf by the hon. member for Richmond, though he resides in the town of Sydney. I may say that that town has been for the past fifty years what the Americans call a 'finished town. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) has long resided there; but he never started any of these enterprises, never had any hand in bringing them there, though I am glad to say that he has derived a very comfortable income from the establishment of these enterprises as did also his fellow-townsmen. But that is no reason why the town of Sydney should endeavour to deprive the country people of railway facilities on their own road. I may also say in this connection that, important as the people of Sydney feel just at this moment, equally important may the town of North Sydney feel before twelve months are over; because the prospects are—it is understood all over the country—that a similar enterprise to that in Sydney is going to be established in North Sydney in a short time. The Intercolonial Railway management would then naturally feel they had made a great mistake if they had sidetracked a town of the enterprise and with the prospects of North Sydney. Nor is this merely a question of local trade. Passengers coming across the Atlantic travel largely by the Newfoundland Railway to North Sydney and the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal and all parts of the country. To deprive the town of North Sydney of uninterrupted communication would be a great injustice to these people. As every traveller will understand, these people generally have heavy baggage with them travelling as they do from the various parts of Europe. This is the class of passengers that generally patronize the Intercolonial Railway at North Sydney, and to deprive them of any reasonable railway accommodation would drive them from this route altogether to the great injury of the road and therefore to the people of Canada. So, while the Minister of Railways and Canals and his department

Mr. McLENNAN.

might not be doing exactly what would be satisfactory to the Board of Trade of Sydney, that very important institution, or the hon. member for Richmond, I can assure the hon. minister that he will be giving great satisfaction to nine out of ten of the country people, who are most interested in this road after all, if he goes on serving the two towns alike; and not, as the hon. member for Richmond suggests, establish a terminus of the Intercolonial Railway in the woods at the junction, North Sydney, something like that which they had before in a field in the town of Lévis. The present management of the Intercolonial Railway, I hope, are not inclined to go back to that sort of terminus, but will establish the eastern terminus in the now very important town of Sydney, while the western terminus is in the prosperous commercial centre, Montreal. I only hope that the minister will in this respect stand by his guns and give the country people a fair show.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies), expressed the desire to be of some assistance to me in coming to a conclusion on this question, and I have no doubt, he desires to aid me. But he seemed to be unwilling to give me the benefit of his opinion with regard to what the hon. gentleman who sent this telegram proposed:

The board of trade advocates equal service in both towns joining at the junction, both engines going west if necessary, and on return dividing again at the junction.

I asked the hon. gentleman whether he thought it would be possible to make the junction the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway at that point?

Mr. GILLIES. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And he told me that I simply did not know what I was talking about.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me in that regard. I would not be so abrupt.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was not much concerned about the opinion the hon. gentleman expressed, because I know it was not expressed through any personal feeling, but because for the moment he thought I really was not aware of what I was talking about. But the difficulty is this: You have either to make the junction the terminus and break your trains there and have separate engines, one running with a portion of the cars into Sydney, and the other running with the balance into North Sydney, or you have to run the engine and the cars containing the passengers into Sydney, with a branch connection to North Sydney, or run into North Sydney with a branch connection to Syd-

ney. It is utterly impossible to make the junction the terminus. We have not the requisite facilities there, and it would be useless to incur the expense of establishing them, so that we have to make one of the other of these towns as practically the terminus of the line. I wanted my hon. friend to say which of these towns should be made the terminus, and which of them should have the branch connection, but failed to elicit any suggestion from him on the subject.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman knows that the town of Sydney is the terminus of the system. The round-house and the general despatching office are there and it is the end really of the government road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is not my hon. friend rather begging the question because he knows that while it has been named the terminus, yet the trains have always run up to North Sydney and backed down?

Mr. GILLIES. Not always.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only express train which has been running on that line for years—long before I had anything to do with the road—has always run into North Sydney, and then back to the junction and to Sydney, so that while Sydney was in name the terminus, it was placed somewhat at a disadvantage as compared with North Sydney. What was nominally the terminus was really not the terminus in the ordinary sense. My hon. friend has not suggested whether he thinks North Sydney should be the terminus with a branch train to Sydney, or Sydney the terminus, with a branch train to North Sydney. That is the question to solve, and the desire of the department is to solve it, if possible, to the satisfaction of both localities. But if it is impossible to do that, we will have to take the consequences, and solve it as we believe in the best interests of the public and the service.

Mr. GILLIES. My hon. friend from Inverness seeks to put me in a false position, and I do not propose to allow him to do that, without some remonstrance on my part. I stated at the inception of my remarks that I did not for a moment advocate, nor would I advocate, any system or change that would deprive North Sydney of one iota of the railway conveniences which that very enterprising town now enjoys, and has been enjoying for some time past. The hon. gentleman talks as if I were seeking to side-track that town. I distinctly stated all through my remarks that I would not for one moment advocate any system or change in the present system which would deprive North Sydney of one jot of the conveniences it now enjoys. How then does the hon. gen-

tleman dare to get up, here or anywhere else, and seek to create the impression that I was endeavouring to side-track North Sydney when the thought never occurred to me? His motive is too plain, and I would remind him of this fact, that early in this session, I drew his attention to the present unsatisfactory condition of running the whole train into North Sydney, five or six miles away from the junction, and then backing into the junction, and running to Sydney, and he then agreed that the present system was unsatisfactory, and when I said that I was going to bring it to the attention of the House, he promised to join me. But to my great astonishment, I find him going the other way, and seeking to perpetuate that which is admittedly unfair to the great travelling public going to the south of North Sydney. The hon. gentleman thinks that I am interfering with the farmers of Inverness. Why, I am trying to benefit them by the very suggestion I am throwing out. How can the change that we propose and that the Board of Trade of Sydney is advocating, of having the trains running to the town of North Sydney and the town of Sydney direct, be construed as in any possible way militating against the interests of the farmers of Inverness, or any other place in Cape Breton? That idea could only occur to some one like the hon. member for Inverness, who seeks to create an impression that he should be the last man in this House to try and create, and thereby place another hon. gentleman in a false position. I state again that I will not, here or elsewhere, seek in the least degree, to promote a change in the present railway system that would in any way interfere with the town of North Sydney, and my friends there. In that town I have business relations of a professional character. Very many of my political friends are there. I admire the town in many ways, and would do anything in my power to further its interests. I am ready now to join the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Finance in promoting an arrangement that will be satisfactory to both towns, and not in the slightest degree interfere with the conveniences now enjoyed by the town of North Sydney. Let me not be misunderstood. I would not stand here or anywhere else, and for one moment seek to have a scheme brought about that would in any way whatever militate against the interests of the town of North Sydney, or interfere with its present position.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The town of North Sydney is quite satisfied with the present arrangements, and when the hon. member for Richmond, N.S., (Mr. Gillies), wishes to disturb that arrangement, I do not think the town of North Sydney will construe his action as being in line with its own views. If he does not want to interfere with North Sydney, he should let matters alone, because as they

now stand—whether the present arrangement be right or wrong is a matter of opinion—North Sydney is quite well satisfied.

Mr. GILLIES. I ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he is satisfied with the present arrangement of running a train into North Sydney from the junction, and then backing from the junction, and running around to Sydney, and if that is fair to the travelling public?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Although I may be radical in some things, there is a wholesome amount of conservatism in my nature; and when I know that the arrangement referred to is exactly the same as has prevailed for many years under the late government and under the present government, then I am bound to believe there must be some reasonable ground for it. It is not exactly conclusive because it has existed for years, but I am conservative enough to believe that when it has existed for years there is probably some fair amount of reason for it. The leader of the opposition, who understands this matter well, has avoided undertaking to speak as an oracle, he realizes the difficulties of the matter as I do. Here are two towns, both thriving, energetic and progressive towns, which happen to be placed, as it were, on the forks. If one was only a little distant from the other on a straight line, it would be a simple matter, but how to reach both of these towns and satisfy them both, I can assure the hon. member for Richmond is a much more difficult problem than he imagines. I think the discussion that has taken place will show the House the wisdom of reserving its opinion, and of leaving the matter to the Minister of Railways and Canals, who I know has been giving it a great deal of attention. There are three things that may be done. You may adopt the junction as the terminus, as has been suggested by the member for Richmond, and from there you may start two branch trains each running five or six miles away into the respective towns. Although that was suggested, I do not think it is a very feasible arrangement. Or you may run your main train into the town of Sydney, then back out and run it into North Sydney; or you may reverse the order and run the train into the town of North Sydney and then back out and run it into the town of Sydney, which is the arrangement which has subsisted for many years, and the arrangement which the minister for the present has adopted. Sydney has been making exceptional progress of late, a great deal of business is going on there, I suppose the bulk of the travellers go to that town. Though the arrangement has been in existence for many years, it may be necessary to revise it. In view of the difficulties which have been made apparent by this discussion, I think we shall do well not to

Mr. FIELDING.

imagine that they can be settled in any off-hand way, but to leave the matter to the Minister of Railways and Canals with the fullest assurance that he has no other object in view than to try to meet the wishes of the travelling public.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). One word in answer to the hon. member for Richmond. He said that I joined him in the justice of side-tracking North Sydney. I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House whether I did not take issue with him promptly and right on the spot. With regard to the junction, I want to say that the distance between the junction and North Sydney is not six miles, it is only three miles and a half.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). With respect to what has been suggested by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), I do not think the methods he has proposed are sufficiently comprehensive or exhaustive. I do not see why the town of Sydney should not be regarded as the terminus, I think its importance entitles it to be so regarded; and why at the same time North Sydney should not receive substantially the same service as at present. Any one who has travelled over that line, as I have done many times, must see that the present service is by no means satisfactory. The passenger traffic to the town of Sydney in the summer time is very large, an enormous number of American tourists go over that line and make their headquarters at the new hotel at Sydney. All these people have to be conveyed from the terminus to North Sydney, then from North Sydney back to the terminus and into Sydney. It makes their arrival at Sydney half an hour or three-quarters of an hour later than it otherwise would be. There should not be a tremendous difficulty in the Minister of Railways and Canals devising some means by which the town of North Sydney may have the same service that it has at present, or an equally good service, by having an engine and a train to run into North Sydney, and let the main train run to the terminus.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will the hon. gentleman guarantee that that will be acceptable to North Sydney?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not guarantee anything about it; but I think the people of North Sydney will find the service reasonable and satisfactory, if the ordinary main traffic proceeds over the road to its terminus. The Minister of Finance says that he is so conservative that he does not want to change the present arrangement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I did not say that, I said that I was always willing to consider reasons.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He said he had a large element of conservatism in his char-

acter, and did not think it was worth while to make any change, it had existed so many years, and because it had existed under the late government. Very likely the fact that it had existed under the late government would commend itself to him as a good service. But, I may remind him of the fact that a long continued state of affairs has not in the past always commended itself to him as one that could not be changed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is not quoting me fairly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not desire to quote the hon. gentleman unfairly, I think I have stated fairly the substance of his remarks. Now with regard to what the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) said, I take it for granted that the Board of Trade at Sydney will at once disband after his sarcastic references to them. He has seen fit to sneer at the Board of Trade of Sydney as a body that is entirely beneath the notice of any reasonable man. Now, I happen to know some of those gentlemen who compose the Board of Trade at Sydney, and all I have to say about them is that they are gentlemen of the very highest standing in their respective professions and business in the county of Cape Breton.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). How much traffic do they supply the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not talking about the traffic they supply; I imagine any one of them supplies a good deal more traffic than the hon. member for Inverness does.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I am speaking for the people of Inverness, not for the board of trade.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is not the point. The point in question is whether these are representative men in the community, and whether their opinion is worth something, whether they are men who may have reasonable ideas about matters of this kind. I know some of these gentlemen in Sydney, and I do not think that they are deserving of the sneers of the hon. member for Inverness or of any other gentleman in this House. They are men, every one of them, so far as I am acquainted with them, who are well known in the community, men of good judgment, representative men. I venture to think that a memorial coming from these gentlemen is as deserving of respect at the hands of the government as a memorial from any board of trade of any other town of similar size in Canada. Therefore, I think the hon. member for Inverness is not doing himself justice when, repeatedly through his speech, he undertook to sneer

at these men as if their voice should have no weight in regard to this matter.

I admit that the problem that lies before the Minister of Railways and Canals may not be very easy of solution, but I think that he might very easily, on the lines I have suggested, find some method of dealing with this matter so as to put the service of the town of Sydney on a satisfactory basis, and still render the service to North Sydney not less satisfactory than it is at present. I, for one, would be the last person to suggest that North Sydney should not have every consideration at the hands of the government. As has been said by the member for Inverness, it is a very progressive town, and is likely in the future to develop more rapidly than in the past. But still we must have some recognized terminus on this line; if we have a recognized terminus it is right that the train should run to that terminus, without neglecting this branch in any way.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I have been considerably perplexed this afternoon. In the first place I look across the floor and I see on the troubled countenance of the Minister of Railways and Canals some great depression. He moves from seat to seat, he is unable to answer the questions that are brought up. He simply turns round and asks the member for Richmond, What would you do? What have you to recommend? Well, surely, that is not the way the Minister of Railways and Canals usually does. He does not generally come to the member for Richmond and ask for his opinion and guidance as to the conduct of the Department of Railways and Canals. He runs it himself. The hon. member says that it would be better run if he would do that, but he will not do it, and therefore, the road is badly run. Then, along comes the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan), and if ever a man slid around a question without coming to a conclusion it was the hon. member for Inverness. Why, Sir, he had nothing but nasty words to say of the board of trade of the town of Sydney, and those were the only things he did say. He asks what business they do, what traffic they give to the road. I presume the board of trade is representative of the mercantile, manufacturing and industrial branch of the community that furnishes business to the railway, and that the town of Sydney Board of Trade is no exception to all the boards of trade throughout the Dominion. I would therefore, say, off-hand, that if the board of trade is representative of the commerce and trade of the community its views should be heard. What is the difficulty? The next one who comes along is the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who, in order to smooth things over tells us that although in some things he is quite radical, in other matters he is exceedingly conservative, and that in this particular matter, which has existed

for a number of years, he is very conservative, and he proposes that the condition of affairs shall exist for a number of years longer, that is, that North Sydney shall be the terminus, while the town of Sydney is the place that is to be accommodated. He says there are great difficulties. Well, as has been asked by the hon. senior member for Halifax: What is the difficulty, anyway? The difficulty, to my mind, seems to be that there is too much business. We are growing too much in that part of the Dominion. There is too much traffic, too much freight, too many passengers, and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals does not know what to do about it. I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that he should meet the emergency by supplying the wants of the community. That is a general proposition. If there are twice as many or four times as many passengers, or ten times as many passengers as there formerly were going into this place, if there are four times, or ten times as much freight as formerly the duty of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is to meet the emergency and supply the wants of the community instead of having boards of trade and individuals complaining that this great Intercolonial Railway which has cost so much money, which we are told, has the finest appliances, the finest road-bed, and all the necessary terminal facilities that railways should have, that, in short, is in a state of perfection, is unable to supply the wants of the community. There are not as many people who have grievances as there were two, three or four years ago, but there are five times as many people who have grievances at the present time. I think if we were to make some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and see many who, I think, could accomplish the work, Minister of Railways for a short time, these difficulties would disappear and the grievances would be remedied.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Take it yourself.

Mr. WALLACE. No, I would not take it myself. I am not looking for any position, but I see a score of men who would not allow themselves to be troubled by this question for one day, but who would be able to solve the problem and give accommodation to the people of Sydney and of North Sydney—

Mr. GIBSON. You would go on strike.

Mr. WALLACE. They would remedy the difficulties and complaints which seem to be such a stumbling block in the way of the government who do not know what to do. I see the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson); I know he would like the chance of tackling that job and straightening it out.

Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. GIBSON. I would not go out on strike.

Mr. WALLACE. I am afraid we could not let him have it though.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) is not before the House.

Mr. WALLACE. That is where you make a mistake, Mr. Speaker, because he was throwing across some remarks to me which I have to notice, and he was thereby putting himself before the House. I imagine that he would want to put himself in the position of Minister of Railways and Canals, but we cannot put him there just now. Here is a question of more business, of more travel, and here is a railway that is running at a loss. Here is a chance of doing a good business. These people pay their way, they pay their freight and passenger rates, they want better facilities; what is the difficulty in the way of the government supplying the wants of the community? Every railway in the country, when business grows, meets the public demand whether it be in regard to freight or passenger traffic, and why should not our Intercolonial Railway do the same?

Motion (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjourn, negatived.

#### EMERGENCY RATION.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Before you proceed with the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) if he has caused to be put on the Table of the House the analysis made by Dr. Ruttan, of McGill University, which, I think, was promised the other day.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The report of the analysis was sent to the department yesterday and the original papers were sent to the committee. I spoke to the deputy before I came in here and asked him to have the copies made which I promised to lay on the Table of the House. He told me that the originals had been sent over to the committee. They are there now. If it is possible to get these papers, we will be able to copy them. The same thing happened in the portunity of making copies before they were subjected to the test at Kingston. The original papers are there. They were required there, and we did not have an opportunity of making copies before they were sent to the committee. I am very anxious to lay the papers on the Table of the House, but it seems to me we could get them quite as expeditiously from the com-

mittee as to lay them on the Table here. If I can get the originals and have them copied, I shall be very glad to do so.

#### NORTH-WEST GRAIN COMMISSION.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) if the report of the grain commission has been brought down, and if so, if it is being printed?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It seems to me that it has been brought down. I could not say for certain, but it seems to me that it has. I will inquire.

#### LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he is in a position to make a statement to the House as to the position of affairs in British Columbia. I understood that he intimated that he would be in a position at an early day to state what the government propose to do in regard to the condition of affairs in British Columbia?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry to say that I am not to-day in a position to make a statement to the House. I hope to be in a position to do it to-morrow, although I cannot say for certain.

#### PRIVATE COURTNEY, 'A' BATTERY.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) can give me the promised answer to the question I put the day before yesterday.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The hon. gentleman the day before yesterday made an inquiry which was repeated yesterday, as to the case of Corporal Courtney, from whom the stripes were taken for some alleged act of insubordination. On June 18—the day before the hon. gentleman mentioned the matter in the House—it was brought to my notice, and I sent a memorandum to the deputy minister to ask the military branch to have a report made upon this case and all the papers sent forward. They have not yet come, but there is the report, dated June 15, in the department, from Lt.-Col. F. G. Stone, Inspector General of Artillery, an Imperial officer:

There are no grounds for considering that Corporal Courtney was detailed for duty which he was justified in objecting to perform for conscientious motives.

When I get the further information and papers, I will be happy to bring them down.

#### MAIL DELIVERY AT DARTMOUTH AND HALIFAX.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I bring to the attention of the Postmaster General the question of establishing a letter carrier delivery in the town of Dartmouth. That town is connected with Halifax by a ten-minute ferry service, it has a population between 7,000 and 8,000, and it is, to all intents and purposes, a part of the city of Halifax. I do not know whether or not any representations on the subject have been made to the Postmaster General, but, if not, I will take this opportunity of doing so. I may further mention, that so far as the postal delivery in the city of Halifax is concerned, the attention of the Postmaster General might be directed to whether or not the number of letter carriers should be increased. Looking at the civil service list of 1898—and I do not think there has been any change—I observe that the city of Halifax has seventeen letter carriers, and the city of St. John has twenty-one. I do not suggest at all that St. John has too many, but I do suggest that Halifax has too few, and I understand that a good deal of delay has taken place in Halifax on account of the insufficient number of letter carriers. From the standpoint of revenue, the Postmaster General will see that the total post office revenue at Halifax from all sources is \$80,084.94, whereas, in St. John, which has a larger number of letter carriers, the total postal revenue is \$66,985.46. As I said, I am not objecting to the number which are employed in the city of St. John, because I have no doubt there are no more there than are actually necessary, but I do think the Postmaster General should seriously take into consideration the question of increasing the number of letter carriers in the city of Halifax. This, as well as the matter of mail delivery in Dartmouth, will, I hope, have the attention of the minister at his very earliest convenience.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I am not able to do more than to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that the suggestions he has made will receive careful consideration. I am not in a position to admit whether or not either of these places is sufficiently or otherwise supplied with letter carriers, but I might say that since the comparison is made with the city of St. John, I can recall a circumstance which would, perhaps, in some way be negatively satisfactory if it is thought that St. John is receiving any undue favours.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not suggest that.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I am not implying that my hon. friend suggests that, but I have the impression in my mind that the inspector some time ago stated that the staff in connection with St. John had been at one time more than the legitimate needs required. Perhaps I am not correctly remembering what was in that report. However, I will give the matter careful consideration.

#### DUTY ON GRANITE.

**Mr. A. H. MOORE (Stanstead)**. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the attention of the Minister of Finance, of the government, and of the House, to a matter which seriously concerns a very large and important industry in the Dominion of Canada. It is a well known fact that large deposits of granite are found in various portions of Canada, and especially in the eastern townships of the province of Quebec. A large number of quarries have been in operation there, and until the preferential tariff—

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Order.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. My hon. friend (Mr. Moore) cannot enter into a discussion at this stage. The House will be moved into Committee of Supply shortly, and then it will be competent for him to proceed with his remarks.

#### SUPPLY—TAXATION OF CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LAND GRANTS.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding)** moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

**Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar)**. The matter I have to bring before the House this afternoon is one of the very greatest interest to the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I apprehend that before I conclude there will be the most complete unanimity with regard to the motion I have to offer. I entertain little doubt but that both sides of this House will heartily endorse the motion which I shall propose. While it is a motion going into supply, nevertheless, it is one that ought certainly to be accepted by the government, and for that I have a precedent set by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), who moved, on going into supply, with reference to the preferential tariff, and whose motion was accepted by the government. I believe I shall be able to satisfy the House that my motion is one that should commend itself to the good sense of the hon. gentlemen, and to the good sense of the country. I shall read the motion, because it is well that each member should be seized of the principles contained in it, so that they may be able to follow in detail the argument which, I will be obliged to offer

**Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)**.

in order to establish my case. I ask hon. gentlemen to bear with me as patiently as possible while I make my argument. I am not a lawyer; I have had no legal training, and as the arguments which are necessary may to some extent partake of a legal nature, I trust that the members will deal with me in that matter as kindly as possible. The motion which I propose, seconded by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is as follows:

That clause 16 of the contract between Her Majesty and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, ratified by the parliament of Canada on the fifteenth day of February, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, and set out in the schedule to chapter 1 of the statutes of one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, provides as follows: 'The Canadian Pacific Railway, and all stations and station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances required and used for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the company, shall be for ever free from taxation by the Dominion, or by any province hereinafter established, or by any municipal corporation therein; and the lands of the company, in the North-west Territories, until they are either sold or occupied, shall also be free from such taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.'

That in answer to an interpellation in parliament on the 12th day of February, 1900, as to the date of termination of the said period of exemption from taxation, it was stated on behalf of the government that: 'This is a matter of legal opinion, which, if disputed, can only be settled by a judicial decision.'

That progress in the North-west is enormously handicapped by the exemption from taxation of so vast a quantity of land as has been set apart for the company, and would be seriously paralysed should the tax exemption be indefinitely continued.

That it appears from the debates which occurred when the said contract was before parliament, and from the wording of the Act itself, that the exemption was intended to cover a period of not more than twenty years from the date of the passing of the said Act, and that it was so understood by the railway company, which, on the conclusion of the bargain, raised \$25,000,000 on the security of the said land grant.

That for the foregoing reasons, in the opinion of this House, the period of exemption from taxation of the said land grant expires on the 16th of February, 1901, and that all such lands should be patented to the said railway company by that date, inasmuch as it is impossible to collect taxes from such lands until they are patented.

If hon. members refer to the notice of motion I gave on June 13, they will observe that its conclusion is a little different. The conclusion of the motion of which I gave notice is as follows:

That for the foregoing reasons, in the opinion of this House, the lands covered by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will become subject to taxation on the 15th of February, 1901, and that all such lands should be patented to the said railway company of that date, so that they may become subject to taxation as soon as the exemption contemplated by parliament at the passing of the Act has expired.

I have said on February 16, because the date of the contract was the 15th of February, 1881. Now, it has been suggested that inasmuch as I state that the lands should be patented by that date, this might imply a doubt in my mind as to whether the exemption expires at the end of the twenty years. The reason I state that they should be patented by that date is this: Lands that are not patented cannot be taxed; they belong to the Crown, and you cannot tax the Crown. A patent for land must be issued and the land must belong to somebody before it can be taxed. The idea I had in view was that the patents should issue so that these lands could be taxable, and I make that clear when I say:

Inasmuch as it is impossible to collect taxes from such lands until they are patented.

I may say that when I came to Ottawa at the opening of the session I introduced a Bill for the purpose of interpreting the clause which I have read referring to the exemption period. It was among the public Bills and Orders, but inasmuch as the order of public Bills and Orders was only reached one evening during the entire session, and then I think after nine o'clock, and my seconder was absent from the House, I did not feel that it was desirable to go on with my Bill. So that I am forced in this way to bring before the House this matter which is one of supreme importance to the people of the North-west.

This clause in the contract provides that the exemption period shall extend for 'twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown;' and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company interpret 'the grant thereof from the Crown' to mean the issue of the patent. Up to the present time, so far as my knowledge goes, the company have never applied for a patent for a single acre of that immense land grant of 25,000,000 acres. The House will see that this means exemption from taxation in perpetuity, but the moment they sell any lands to intending settlers they apply for the patent, and the patent issues to the intending settler, who is thenceforward responsible for paying taxes on the land. Suppose you gave the company the patent even to-day—and it is now about nineteen years since the ratification of the contract—they contend that the exemption period extends for twenty years from the issue of the patent, so that according to that contention the exemption period would extend for twenty years from the present time. Now, parliament made a clear and distinct bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I do not think there was a man—including even the distinguished leader of the opposition, who was Minister of Railways in the government of the late Sir John Macdonald and who put this contract through parliament—who for a moment thought that the twenty years period would extend beyond twenty years from the date

of the ratification of the contract; and I think I shall be able to prove to a demonstration, from the debates which occurred when that contract was before parliament, that I am absolutely correct in saying so. Inasmuch as this twenty-year period will expire on the morning of February 16, 1901, it is extremely desirable that this parliament should make a declaration on this point, which would make it perfectly clear to the people of the North-west, the people of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself, that the tax exemption shall expire twenty years from the date on which the company obtained the land grant. That is particularly desirable because of this consideration. All who have visited the North-west know how sparsely it is settled. In many places you can almost fire a bullet from a rifle without reaching your next neighbour. These people are going on improving their lands and by doing so they are increasing the value of the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is not fair that they should bear the entire burden of taxation to maintain schools, erect bridges and all other municipal improvements. It is only fair that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should bear its share of this burden after the twenty-year period has expired.

I do not wish to say anything offensive to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; but I want to point out that the parliament of Canada gave to that company \$25,000,000 in cash, \$35,000,000 of completed railroad and 25,000,000 acres of land, and I shall be able to prove from the company's own reports that these lands are very valuable. Assuming them to be worth two dollars an acre, we gave to that company a value of \$100,000,000, whereas the estimated cost of the road, according to the company itself was \$81,500,000 plus \$10,000,000 for equipment. So that the Dominion of Canada gave to the company in cash, in completed road, and in land, far more than the entire value of the road itself; and is it to be said in this year of grace 1900, that this parliament of Canada shall grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company exemption from taxation in perpetuity on this vast land grant? I say that the time has come when parliament must declare itself on this question, and say when this exemption period shall lapse. If there is an election in the fall, another parliament will be here, which may not be prepared to take up this question, and I think it is desirable that it should be settled right here and now. If this motion is adopted, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will understand that this parliament intends to stand by the bargain which was made nearly twenty years ago, and to see that those lands become taxable.

Canada has contributed to railroad corporations in the way of subsidies about \$198,000,000 in cash and about 40,000,000 acres of land, exclusive of what has been given in British Columbia.

And surely these railway companies, which have got these vast subsidies, should bear their share of the burden of taxation. There are the other railway companies which have obtained lands in the North-west Territories, and they have been able to evade the taxation by not taking out the patents for their land, although there is no exemption granted by parliament. They decline to take out their patents for their land, but the land is set aside for them by the government, and until they chose to take out patents the entire burden of taxation falls upon the settlers in that rather sparsely settled country.

The point is that the Canadian Pacific Railway get their land set apart for them. They apply to the government, and the government sets apart a large section of land for the benefit of the company, but the company does not take out the patents. There were some questions asked with regard to this matter some years ago, and in order to show the position the government has taken, I will ask the House to bear with me while I read the very brief answers given in one or two cases.

The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), on the 31st of August, 1896, asked :

What amount of land in the North-west Territories earned by the Canadian Pacific Railway on account of grant, has not yet been transferred to that company? If any land so earned has not been transferred, why has it not been, and when will it be?

To this the right hon. the Prime Minister replied :

The Canadian Pacific Railway is still engaged in the selection of the lands earned by the construction of its road. The original land grant was 25,000,000 acres, reduced by 6,793,000 acres under the operation of the Act 49 Vic., chap 9. Of the 80,206,986 acres of which the company were still entitled after the settlement under this Act, 13,844,871 acres have already been selected—

Thus, on the 31st of August, 1896, the Prime Minister informed the House that 13,844,871 acres had been selected, and he went on to say :

—and the company and the government are together prosecuting the work of completing the company's land grant as rapidly as circumstances will permit. No specific portion of the company's land grant is, under the statute, to be found in the North-west Territories, but 11,388,187 acres of the selections already made by the company are situated in the Territories. Only a small percentage of the land in the Territories has been patented to the company or their nominees.

Only a very small portion has been patented to the company or its nominees, and of the portion patented it has all been patented to the company's nominees with the exception of a very small amount patented to the company itself.

In 1898, 13,824,871 acres had been selected by the company, and these lands now belong to the company and should be taxable.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

On the 14th of September, the hon. member for Alberta asked this question :

What amount of land has been granted from the Crown to the Canadian Pacific Railway? When was the grant made?

To this the acting minister (Mr. Dobell) replied :

The original area of land granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, under the provisions of the Act 44 Vic., chap. 1, was 25,000,000 acres, which was reduced by 6,793,014 acres under the provisions of the Act 49 Vic., chap. 9. 2. The date of the original grant was February 15—

The hon. minister used the word 'grant,' and I want the House to remember that that word is very important and may become a historic one, if this matter is not settled by parliament now.

—February 15, 1881, being the day upon which the Act was assented to by the Governor General, and the statute under which the reduction was made was assented to on June 2, 1896. The area for which letters patent have issued to the company, or the company's assignees, up to the end of the month of August of this year, is 1,359,727 acres.

You see, Mr. Speaker, that although in 1881, I think it was, we gave this immense land grant to the company, in September, 1896, patents were only issued for 1,359,727 acres.

These patents are issued usually from the Crown direct to the people to whom the company dispose of the land, and before patent can issue, the mortgage created by the Act 51 Vic., chap. 32, has to be paid for in so far as it affects the land.

When parliament gave the Canadian Pacific Railway this immense land grant of 25,000,000 acres, the Canadian Pacific Railway immediately raised on that grant \$25,000,000 in land grant bonds, but the government held a mortgage on all of it for the purpose of seeing that the company fulfilled the conditions of its bargain, so that you see this mortgage covering the entire land grant has to be arranged for when a patent is issued to any single individual for any portion of the grant. Let me read next a reply to a series of questions which I myself asked on the 12th of February, 1900 :

1. How much land has been voted by the Dominion parliament to the Canadian Pacific Railway as a subsidy in connection with the construction of the company's main line and branch lines (the Manitoba South-western and Glenboro' roads being included in the branches)?

2. What proportion of the land subsidies so voted has been allotted by the government?

3. At what dates were the several allotments made?

4. Were the allotments made by the government and the lands set apart for the uses of the company immediately or shortly after the lands were selected by the company? If not, what periods were allowed to elapse between the selection and the allotment of the various land subsidies or portions thereof?

5. For what proportion of the land subsidies earned by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have patents been issued by the Crown?

6. Under the terms of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's charter from the govern-

ment, when will the first allotment of land made to the company by the government become amenable to taxation for school and municipal purposes?

I want the House to mark the answer given by the Minister of the Interior :

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. The original land subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on account of its main line was 25,000,000 acres, but it was subsequently reduced to 18,206,986 acres. The land subsidy on account of branches, including the branches named in the question, amounted to 2,983,680 acres, making a total of 21,190,666 acres of land for the main line and branches.

Then he said in reply to questions 2, 3, and 4:

It is not possible—

I cannot understand why it was not possible because the questions are very plain.

2, 3 and 4. It is not possible to give categorical answers to the 2nd, 3rd and 4th questions, on account of the way in which the questions are framed, but the following information appears to cover the points sought to be brought out by the questions.

The Prime Minister told us in 1896 in answer to my hon. friend from Alberta, that the company had selected some 14,644,871 acres, but now we are told that the railway company only indicated the tract or belt in which it cared to select its land.

The railway company indicated between 1881 and 1891 the tracts or belts within which it agreed to select 14,644,871 acres on account of the land subsidy in connection with the main line.

You see that the company at first may not have seen how it was able to evade the law in this matter and may have actually made the selection of some 14,000,000 acres, but now we find that between 1881 and 1891 they only 'indicated where it would select its land.' This land is set apart for the company, nobody else can touch an acre of it without the company's permission, and the company can take out patents for it just when it likes. That is how the Canadian Pacific Railway seek to evade the terms of the contract so that it may be able to have exemption from taxation in perpetuity. I read further from the answer :

In February, 1891, the company agreed to select from the lands reserved for the purpose along the international boundary 1,000,000 acres of the land subsidy in connection with the branch known as the Manitoba and South-western Colonization Railway.

In February, 1891, the company agreed to select. That means clearly that they had not actually selected. Here were 1,000,000 acres of land in South-western Manitoba which, according to its own reports, the company valued between \$4 and \$5 per acre, as I will show later on, on which it pays no taxes and which it only agreed to select and did not select.

The company has selected the lands to which it is entitled on account of what is known as

the Pipestone branch. Nothing has been done in the direction of selecting the lands to which the company is entitled on account of the Glenboro', or as it is known in the department, the Souris branch. The government, from time to time as the land grant was earned, set apart tracts of land out of which the selection was to be made. A question was raised as to whether or not the land comprised in the tracts so set apart was 'fairly fit for settlement,' and this question of the selection of the balance of the land subsidy is still the subject of correspondence between the department and the company. 5. Up to the end of January last patents had issued covering an area of 1,649,880 acres. 6. this is a matter of legal opinion, which, if disputed, can only be settled by a judicial decision.

That makes it clear that the railway company disputes that point, and we are told by a member of the government that it can only be settled by a judicial decision. I claim, and I think I can make it abundantly clear from the extracts I propose to read from the speeches of members of the government that made this contract and members of the House of that day, that the period of exemption will expire on February 16, 1901. I contend that this parliament ought to interpret the Act, this parliament ought to say that the twenty years period expires at that time, and not leave it to a judicial decision. I hold in my hand *Hansard* of the session of 1880-1, volume 1, in which is contained the debate on the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, as well as the contract itself. In order to impress my argument in connection with the word 'grant,' I will read a few brief extracts from the contract itself. Subsection *b* of section 9, says :

Upon the construction of any portion of the railway hereby contracted for, not less than twenty miles in length, and the completion thereof, so as to admit of the running of regular trains thereon, together with such equipment thereof as shall be required for the traffic thereon, the government shall pay and grant to the company the money, and land subsidies applicable thereto.

'The government shall pay and grant' these subsidies. Surely that is distinct. And section 16 of the contract provides :

And the lands of the company in the Northwest Territories, until they are either sold or occupied, shall also be free from such taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

And it will be observed that the other section says that the lands shall be granted as they are earned. As I have said, the grant was made available to the company at once, because the company issued \$25,000,000 in land grant bonds as security, and, for all practical purposes, that land grant has been as much available to the company and for the uses of the company, as it would have been if they had held a patent for it themselves. Clause 10 of the contract reads :

In further consideration of the premises, the government shall also grant to the company

the lands required for the road-bed of the railway, and for its stations, station grounds, workshops, dock ground and water frontage at the termini on navigable waters, buildings, yards, and other appurtenances required for the convenient and effectual construction and working of the railway, in so far as such land shall be vested in the government.

Clause 14 reads :

The company shall have the right, from time to time, to lay out, construct, equip, maintain and work branch lines of railway from any point or points along their main line of railway, to any point or points within the territory of the Dominion. Provided always, that before commencing any branch they shall first deposit a map and plan of such branch in the Department of Railways. And the government shall grant to the company the lands—

The same word 'grant' that is used within the contract.

—required for the road-bed of such branches, and for the stations, station grounds, buildings, workshops, yards, and other appurtenances requisite for the efficient construction and working of such branches, in so far as such lands are vested in the government.

Then there is clause 16, which is the one I have already read, and which it is unnecessary for me to read now, as it appears in my motion. Clause 17 reads :

The company shall be authorized by their Act of incorporation to issue bonds, secured upon the land granted and to be granted to the company.

This issue is to be for \$25,000,000, and it is provided :

And should the company make such issue of land grant bonds, then they shall deposit them in the hands of the government; and the government shall retain and hold one-fifth of such bonds as security—

That is the mortgage I referred to—

—for the due performance of the present contract, in respect of the maintenance and continuous working of the railway by the company as herein agreed for ten years after the completion thereof, and the remaining \$20,000,000 of such bonds shall be dealt with as hereinafter provided.

Clause 18 reads :

The company shall be entitled to receive from the government out of the proceeds of the said land grant bonds, the same number of dollars as the number of acres of the land subsidy which shall then have been earned by them, less one-fifth thereof, that is to say, if the bonds are sold at par, but if they are sold at less than par, then a deduction shall be made therefrom corresponding to discount at which such bonds are sold.

Clause 20 :

If the company should not issue such land grant bonds, then the government shall retain from out of each grant to be made, from time to time, every fifth section of the lands hereby agreed to be granted, such lands to be so retained as security for the purposes and for the length of time mentioned in section 18 hereof. And such lands may be sold in such manner and at such prices as shall be agreed upon between

the government and the company, and in that case the price thereof shall be paid to and held by the government for the same period, and for the same purposes as the land itself, the government paying 4 per cent per annum interest thereon. And other securities satisfactory to the government may be substituted for such lands or money by agreement with the government.

So, the House will see that the government had an arrangement with the company by which they could deal with the entire land grant in the way of borrowing money and so on. The entire land grant was made available to the company the moment the contract was ratified; because, as I have stated, they proceeded to borrow \$25,000,000 upon it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson), said he was going to make an argument on the use of the word 'grant' in the other sections.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The word 'grant' meant that as the land was earned, it should be granted to the company. The words used in clause 16 are :

Shall be free from such taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

I take the word 'grant' to mean not the issue of the patent, but making available to the company these lands for the use of the company. The word 'grant' is used all through the contract, and it clearly says that as the land is earned, the government shall grant it to the company—it does not say the government shall issue the patent. The point I want to establish is that the word 'grant' does not mean the issue of the patent. When you hand over any asset to a person or make it available to him for any purpose which he chooses, you then grant it to him. Now, I propose next to give some extracts from the remarks of hon. gentlemen who were then members of the government or private members of the House. The first extract I shall give is from the speech of the distinguished leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), who introduced the Bill and pushed it through parliament with his accustomed vigour. I read from page 71, as follows :—

The United States government has given great land grants to railways under what is called the head grant system, and in one case a company was authorized to select any part of the public lands of Texas, that magnificent country that has excited the admiration of hon. gentlemen opposite, the most beautiful and fertile areas, without any hindrance or any responsibility whatever. The company received twenty sections of 640 acres each of the unappropriated lands of the state for each mile of railroad which has been, or may hereafter be constructed, pursuant to the Act of 1870. The said company, its successors and assigns, to have the right to locate the said lands as head rights certificates, without the necessity of alternating the sections; the said lands and certificates to

Mr. RICHARDSON.

be released from all county, state, municipal and other taxes for a period of twenty-five years. The hon. gentleman was arguing that in the United States they not only gave exemption from taxation for twenty years, but for twenty-five years. Therefore, the idea he had in his mind, no doubt, was to show by comparison that the bargain which parliament was making with the Canadian Pacific Railway was a much better one than the American government was accustomed to make with railroads there. Remark these words :

The moment our lands, however, are sold they become liable to taxation.

I may say that when that contract went through parliament it was never anticipated that the land granted to the company would remain in the hands of the company for any lengthened period ; it was anticipated there would be such a boom in that country that the entire land grant would be sold before the expiration of twenty years, and that is why the clause was put in, 'until either sold or occupied.' That was supposed to be a remarkable saving clause. If it had read, 'shall be exempt for twenty years from the date of the contract,' why, parliament, according to the debate, would have held up its hands in horror, and would not have permitted such a clause at all. But the hon. gentleman evidently took it for granted that in ten years or so most of these lands would be sold and occupied, and would be paying taxes for the maintenance of government and for municipal improvements. I continue reading from Sir Charles Tupper's speech :

The moment our lands, however, are sold they become liable to taxation. Under the United States law they remain free for twenty-five years after coming into the hands of private purchasers. There is nothing of the kind here. The moment our lands are utilized or sold, and the company cannot afford to keep them from settlement, which will add more to the value of the remainder than is possible in any other way, they fall under taxation.

These words show clearly what interpretation the present leader of the opposition placed upon that clause when he made the speech from which I quote.

The next quotation I wish to make is from the speech of the Hon. Edward Blake, that distinguished leader of the Liberal party at that time ; and I may say to the House that it is worth the while of every member to read the debates that occurred upon this question, and to read what that great tribune of the people, Edward Blake, had to say, and to see the fight he made against this clause, and against the other clauses in the contract which the editor of the *Globe* recently pronounced to be 'the most insane contract ever perpetrated by a free people.' Here is what Mr. Blake said :

They have freedom to reject land they deem not fairly fit for settlement and to choose the best land elsewhere. They have perpetual exemption from taxation of their enormous pro-

perty, a most monstrous provision, in my opinion. Why, this monstrosity is not to last merely 20 years, which is to be the period of bondage in other respects, but it is to last for ever.

Remark these words, 'perpetual exemption from taxation of their enormous property, a most monstrous provision.' 'Why, this monstrosity is not to last merely twenty years.' So you see that Mr. Blake had in his mind that this state of bondage was already monstrous if it lasted only twenty years. So we have in his own words his view of that contract. Let me read for the benefit of the House another extract from Mr. Blake's speech, one that does not relate altogether to the question of taxation, but it shows that Mr. Blake had a prophetic vision of what would happen in the North-west Territories. I quote his language because he could speak with so much greater effect than probably any living Canadian. He took the side of the people so strongly that I want the people of the North-west and everybody else to see what his opinion was with regard to that contract:

The hon. gentleman says, perhaps, it does look awkward at first sight ; but if the government, who own the lands, were to build the railway the lands would not have been subject to taxation, and why should they be when they are placed in the hands of the syndicate. It does seem to me that because the government, in the interests of the country, and for the public good, could construct the railway, the syndicate, who are getting the bargain to which I have referred, should have this privilege. Why, it is turning the syndicate into the government—putting them in their places to a considerable extent. But, Sir, I say there is a difference between a private interest and the public interests. With the government in possession of those lands, do you suppose they would delay a day in selling them because they are exempt from taxation ? Do you suppose that the possession of these lands, free from taxation would render them less earnest or less eager to sell ? Not so. Their interest would be only to sell, and to sell rapidly. But the interest of the syndicate is to make as much money as they can, and more money is to be made by delaying than by selling, their interest will be to delay, and to have as little expense as possible meantime. All their lands are exempted from taxation in the North-west Territories for a generation to come. What a discouragement this is to the settlers along the line of railway, to those who are settled on the homesteads, and pre-emptions alternating with those blocks of land which are to be the property of the syndicate. We know the result of exemption from taxation. We saw it on a small scale in the city of Toronto not long ago. Our lawns there were exempted from taxation because it was supposed that it was a good thing, for the public, that there should be these open spaces in the city. Happily the exemption has now been removed ; the proprietors of these lawns have to pay taxes upon them. The result is that they are putting them in the market. They said to themselves before : 'We have nice lawns ; we enjoy them very much ; they are gradually increasing in value as other property in Toronto becomes more valuable, and we are paying no taxes. Other persons who are operating in lands are paying heavy taxes ; we turn our land into lawns, we need pay no taxes, and we

can afford to wait a long time, and make our profits free from taxes.' That is the effect on a small scale, upon a man's mind, of exemption from taxation. That on a gigantic scale will be the effect of exemption on the syndicate who can hold their lands from year to year for twenty years, without any drawback in the way of taxes. And for that the progress of this country is to be interfered with. There can be no greater obstacle to the progress of that country by the encouragement of other settlers than that large spaces of unoccupied lands should alternate with settlers' farms. We, who are familiar with the early settlement of this country, all know the effect upon farmers holding even smaller areas—farms of 100 or 200 acres—by the intervention of unoccupied spaces between such farms; we know that the farmer's disadvantages are trebled because there is not continuous settlement; he lacks the joint fencing, the road work and the neighbour's assistance, and all those other things which increase his capacity for making his land valuable and productive. Now, add to the difficulty which exists in that respect, which the largeness of that area will enhance, at any rate, in a large degree, the fact that there is no power to impose municipal taxation on 25,000,000 acres of the choicest lands, those nearest to the railway, and you place a bar to progress and render it impossible to get over the difficulty; you say that the cost of roads and bridges, school and other municipal taxes will have to be imposed on the settlers, to enable the worthy syndicate to hold their lands until the reduced labours of those settlers shall have sufficiently increased the unoccupied areas in value to induce the millionaires, the holders of the lawns of the North-west to turn them into money. Why, Sir, it was only last year in the discussion of this subject when we objected to the speculator holding land, when we said to the hon. First Minister that settlement would be impeded by areas of land being held by persons who were not bound by conditions of settlement, that he answered us by this very argument. He said: 'They will be compelled to sell and settle because they will be taxed into it. Municipal taxes will compel them to do it, and therefore, your fears are void.' That was his answer to our argument; but where is that answer in the face of this contract? As to the 25,000,000 of the choicest land next to the railway, the only thing the hon. gentleman could bring forward to prove that great injury would not be done by not assigning conditions of settlement, is removed in favour of this unfortunate syndicate. I say, Sir, that if they are going to establish an immigration agency, it would probably be to their interest to see the free grants settled, and they could afford to hold over a very large area of their territory until the labour and industry of the free grant settlers had made the roads and bridges and improved their farms, and thus made their untaxed domain valuable.

The next quotation I will read is from the speech delivered by Sir Hector Langevin, then Minister of Public Works in Sir John A. Macdonald's cabinet. I would call particular attention to at least one sentence in his speech. Mr. Langevin, as he was at that time, said:

The next point the hon. gentleman alluded to was this: He says we have exempted the lands of the company from taxation for twenty years. Well, in the same way as he finds fault with our scheme by saying we are giving too much

Mr. RICHARDSON.

money away, I reply to him, if the lands are to be taxed, you must consider at once what would be the result. The company, which has stated to the government that the amount of money and lands required by them is only a quid pro quo for the work they undertake, and the working of the railway, will say, if we tax their lands: 'You must come to our relief; we have not money enough. It will take ten years to build the road, and, till completed, we can have only a certain number of immigrants yearly; and until it is in operation, after ten years, we cannot derive the benefits necessary as compensation for its construction. So, if you tax our lands, you will have to give us more money.' If we were to revert to the scheme of last year, and to that of hon. gentlemen opposite, what would be the result? We should have to tax the people to the extent of \$78,000,000 or \$88,000,000 on the estimates of last year. The lands would be in our hands, and only those sold would be taxed by the municipalities. Therefore, there will be no more taxation under the present scheme than if the government were to build the road. Why should we compel the company to sacrifice every acre of their lands in order to avoid taxation? You must see that their interest is to settle these lands. They would not be so blind as to retain them long for future enhancement. The value or price of an acre is not the point so much looked to as the benefit the railway must derive from the settlement of the lands, and the carriage of produce to market.

Down a little further Mr. Langevin spoke as follows, and I want the House to listen to these words, because they were most significant as coming from an important member of the government in connection with that contract:

Therefore, in a very short time the parish or municipality—

That is the parish or municipality through which the road would run:

—will be settled and the exemption of taxation on these lands will not be felt, because really the lands remaining to be sold will remain there only until the settlement can be extended in that direction, so that after those twenty years—

Now, listen:

—what will remain exempt from taxation will be just the 100 feet in width on the length of the municipality.

So that, after the expiration of twenty years from the date of this contract, according to a distinguished member of the government, all that will remain exempt from taxation will be the road-bed, 100 feet in width, which runs through the municipality.

Mr. WALLACE. Whose statement is that?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is the statement Sir Hector Langevin, who was Minister of Public Works in the government of that day. It would almost seem to me to make it unnecessary that I should go further. We have the distinct declaration from the Minister of Public Works in the government of Sir John Macdonald which put that contract

through, that after the expiration of twenty years only 100 feet, or the road-bed, would remain exempt.

Mr. WALLACE. Would that make it law, though?

Mr. RICHARDSON. He says further:

I think the roads in the North-west are about 100 feet wide. Is it worth considering in the settlement of that country that 100 feet in width on the length of the municipality should be exempt from taxation? I think that is a very small contribution on the part of the settlers towards the building of the railway. I am sure if we were to ask the people of any portion of old Canada that is deprived of railway communication: 'Will you consent to have a railway on condition that you will neither tax the track of that railway nor the stations?' they would be only too glad to have the railway; but because the government brings the scheme forward, hon. gentlemen opposite object to it. I have not made the calculation out which, perhaps, some of my hon. friends who will follow me will make, as to how many acres 100 feet in width on the length of a municipality will make. It will be a very small amount, and that will be the only exemption in the whole township.

He says it will be a very small amount, and that it will be the only exemption in the whole township. So, you see, he repeats that very important statement to which I have already called your attention:

Besides that, if some of these lands remain unoccupied and unsold, the neighbours will take care to make of these lands pasture grounds. But the hon. leader of the opposition will say: 'Oh, the company will take precious good care to make those settlers who use the lands as pasture grounds, pay a certain amount every year.' In that case, these lands will at once be subject to taxation, and therefore there is no fear of these lands remaining, even two or three years, without being taxed.

So that you see Sir Hector Langevin expected that the land grant would remain but a very short period exempt from taxation.

The next extract that I would read is a very brief one, and is from the speech of a Liberal member, Mr. Rinfret, who is not now a member of this House. He said:

The exemption of the syndicate's lands from all taxation, whether municipal, school, federal or local, can be estimated at half a million a year, making for twenty years some \$10,000,000.

He made an estimate that the taxation on this land grant would amount to half a million of dollars a year, and he says that in twenty years the amount would be \$10,000,000, so that it is perfectly clear what he had in his mind.

I will read an extract from a speech made by the Hon. Mr. Ross, who was then member for Middlesex, and who is now the Premier of the province of Ontario. He said:

The fact that taxes could be imposed would ultimately compel the speculator to dispose of those lands; otherwise, the taxation from year to year would absorb the profits that would, perhaps, accrue in the increased price of the land. But in what position will this syndicate

be placed? They will have their 25,000,000 acres exempt from taxation, and, as I have shown from the order in council of 1866, they will derive the profits of the energy and industry of the settlers. Every man that settles on a section of government land in the North-west will be a hewer of wood and drawer of water to this great corporation. Every road he makes, every bridge he builds to span a little stream or rivulet will be clear gain to this syndicate. Every dollar he invests in the improvement of communication between the back parts of the government lands and the front will benefit the syndicate. Moreover, if the settlers wish to levy rates to secure the construction of roads or erection of schoolhouses, instead of levying a single rate, which they would do under other circumstances, they will have to levy two rates on their own properties, because the syndicate property is free. I believe this will be a practical bar to the settlement of the lands in the North-west. It is tantamount to telling every man we invite from the other side of the Atlantic that the moment he settles on our lands in the North-west, instead of contributing of his means for his own advantage and comfort of his family, every dollar he invests for the benefit of himself and neighbours will be so much to the advantage of the company that contributes not one dollar itself. This exemption is more monstrous and more burdensome, and will be so found by the settler than, perhaps, any other. How was it in old Canada with the Canadian Company's lands? Those of you who are older than myself and more familiar with the early settlement of the country, know at what disadvantage the settler was placed in having to build his road past the Canadian Company's lot, that they did pay a certain amount of taxes; and such disadvantages will accrue in a much more painful and serious degree to the settler in the North-west. This provision is worthy of consideration, and should be struck out of the contract. But we are sometimes told by hon. gentlemen that railway lands in the United States do not pay taxes. I have shown that the Union Pacific Railway lands were exempt in the territories only so long as they so remain. When they were erected into states, each state was permitted to exercise its sovereign right of imposing taxes upon railway lands, and I notice a quotation from the Chicago 'Railway Age,' under date of December 30, as follows:

'The Illinois Central Railway is an institution in which this state ought to take great satisfaction. During the six months ended October 31 this company earned on its Illinois lines \$2,893,728, of which \$202,561 was paid over to the state, being the 7 per cent tax on its receipts.'

Thus we have the Illinois Central Railway paying in about one year \$400,000 into the state treasury in lieu of taxation; and I have a statement which shows that the road, since 1870, has contributed \$2,934,654 to that state, and to the state treasury of Iowa, \$371,340.

If there was a provision in that charter, that the lands of the syndicate be exempt from taxation, and that, in lieu of it, this railway should pay into the treasury of the Dominion, or into that of the provinces to be erected in the North-west, a certain proportion of their cash earnings, then there would be some reason in asking the House to consider this proposition. But instead of there being any return to the Dominion, or the future provinces for this exemption, we have, on the contrary, a proposal of this government to bind the provinces hereafter to be erected so that they may not exercise their

sovereign rights in taxing those lands. If the North-west happens to be settled, as I trust it will be, by people of the spirit and independence of the inhabitants of Ontario, I venture to say there may spring up in the North-west a series of troubles and annoyances to the syndicate, in regard to which the government may be called to interfere. By this exemption, I fear, we are sowing the seeds of future trouble in regard to the social and political quietude of that vast territory.

Another very brief quotation from the speech of Mr. Ross :

But, Sir, without insisting on the valuation to which I have referred, we find that the Act of 1874 was exceedingly different from the one we are considering. The Act of 1874 did not exempt the lands from taxes for twenty years. How much is that worth? Let the hon. member for Niagara put a cash valuation on that. The hon. member has been reading the Railway Acts of the United States. He will find that some of the railway lands of the United States were taxed 14 cents an acre, and some 11 cents an acre, and the hon. gentleman knows that lands in Manitoba, held by non-residents, are taxed from 5 cents to 6 cents an acre. Put that same rate on 25,000,000 acres for twenty years and it will amount to \$10,000,000, an enormous sum which shows the immense gain which this tax is to the company. It not only relieves them from a regular payment of, say \$50,000 a year, but enables them to hold their lands in order that they may increase in value.

You see the clear understanding that the present Premier of Ontario had with regard to that contract was, that the lands were exempt only for twenty years from the date of the contract. I will read from the speech of Mr. Paterson, the present Minister of Customs :

The hon. minister has stated that this is no more than is conceded to American roads; but it is well known that the American railways do pay large amounts of municipal taxation. There have been given to the syndicate rights, powers, and privileges not given to American companies, and if that was not enough iniquity to put in the clause, he also provides that the lands of the company given by this Dominion are to be free from taxation for twenty years. Last year, when the First Minister was speaking on the land grants, he alluded to the question of exemption, his remarks being found at page 1058 of the 'Hansard' for 1880. He knew the dangers that accrued from exempting large tracts of lands from taxation. He was cognizant of the evils of exemption in the case of the Canada Company in days gone by, and he told the House that he had given power to the resident settlers to tax the lands of the non-resident, and therefore, those non-residents must either pay the taxes or sell out. He thus qualified that clause himself, and yet the same gentleman has since become a party to a contract wiping out that exemption clause and giving the company freedom from taxation for twenty years, so that the settler will have an unsettled mile on the east, west, north and south, exempt from taxation. He will have to bear the whole burden, build churches and make road improvements, and the hon. Minister of Railways asks parliament to adopt that clause.

It is abundantly clear what the view of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) was with re-

Mr. RICHARDSON.

gard to this period of exemption. I will read a brief statement from the speech of the late Mr. Anglin, your predecessor in the Chair, Mr. Speaker :

When the contractors hold the land, instead of being compelled to proceed to settle the land, as the leader of the government boasted last year would be the case by the operation of local taxation, they are to be absolutely exempt for twenty years to come, so that if they choose they may hold their lands idle while the government proceed to settle up the alternate blocks, and thereby add largely to the market value of the lands held by the company.

That is exactly what occurred. Let me next read one or two brief sentences from the speech of Mr. Blake, who addressed the House a second time on January 18, on this question :

Hon. gentlemen will observe that here is an important departure from the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, a departure of great consequence, upon which it will be my duty, and the duty of others, further to enlarge at a later stage. While under the Act the land grant of the company would remain subject to taxation, under the contract that grant is exempt from taxation of all kinds until used or occupied for twenty years from the date of the grant.

It is abundantly clear what Mr. Blake understood.

That also is an exemption of great value to the company, of enormous value to the company; an exemption which, added to the right of selection, makes the land grant a wholly different thing from a land grant subject to taxation. A land grant subject to taxation, in a country like that, is as different from a land grant not subject to taxation as a fertile field is different from a rugged hill. There is an annual burden increasing as the country grows and prospers, of the most serious character upon all the lands which are subject to the common burden, and this makes the contract altogether different, and makes the value of the company's possessions enormously greater, besides which we have to consider its injurious effects upon the development of the country and upon the prosperity of the adjoining settlers.

The next extract which I shall read is also from a speech of Mr. Blake :

Then the contract provides that the land grant shall be exempt from taxation for twenty years, unless sold or occupied from the date of the grant. The money gain to the company is enormous, there can be no doubt about that. There can be no doubt that the burdens which this company are freed from are most serious. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said so. They have said they could not use this land grant otherwise, that nobody would buy if they supposed the syndicate was to be subjected to the same taxes as the rest of the world. They got the choice of land and they are not to pay the same taxes as the rest of the community. Why should they not? Is it because they get a large profit? Because they are getting altogether four prices for building the prairie section, that therefore, they are to be untaxed and free? Then the indirect loss is still greater by this mode of settlement, by the burdens it imposes on the adjoining settlers for the benefit of the railway company itself, by the imposition of

double taxes on those who go in for the benefit of this great corporation. I do not know of anything that will more interfere with the development of the North-west than this clause of exemption from taxation.

The next extract which I shall read is from a speech of Mr. Rykert, who was one of the leading supporters of the then government, and apparently its leading statistician.

I do not suppose the speeches of hon. gentlemen are much read throughout the country, but their organ is, and I am quoting from that, and I want to show the public what a political humbug they have to direct the opinion of the hon. gentlemen opposite:

'This land grant is infinitely more valuable than that of the Union Pacific. Therefore, the least value that can be put upon the exemption from taxation of the Canadian Pacific land grant is twenty times \$835,023, or \$16,700,460. The exemption from taxes of the railway itself is worth at least as much to the company as the liability to taxes costs the Union Pacific, namely, \$279,158 per annum. Capitalizing that sum at 4 per cent, we arrive at the value of the exemption from taxes of the railways—it is \$6,978,950. Add value of twenty years' exemption from taxes on land grant, \$16,700,460. Total value of exemption from taxes, \$23,679,410.'

Now, Sir, the company has had this land for seventeen years—I call it twelve years, making an average of \$69,585 a year—if we take the \$20,000,000 acres which we gave to the company having retained 5,000,000 acres for security, and estimate the taxes at the same rate as the Union Pacific, it would make an annual payment of \$139,170. Multiply that by 20, assuming that not an acre of land is sold for twenty years, and we find that the total of taxes paid by the syndicate would be \$2,783,400, or a difference between the 'Globe's' calculation and mine upon the land alone, of \$13,917,060.

It will be noticed from the context that the extract I have read was taken from the *Globe*, and it is quite clear therefore that the view which that great journal held at that time was that the land grant was only exempt from taxation for a period of twenty years, dating from the contract. Mr. Rykert continues:

Now, I go still further. I will give them the benefit of last year's taxation. Mr. Poor says that the taxes last year were \$108,437. I will double that, which will make \$216,874 a year, multiply that by 20, allowing one-third off for sales only, and I find the total amount would be \$2,891,654, or a difference of \$13,898,806. It does seem to me that the hon. gentlemen ought certainly to withdraw that statement upon the floor of this House or admit that the organ was incorrect or misinformed. It is an unfortunate thing that these statements should go about the country in order to mislead the public mind with a view of getting a snap verdict against the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

I gather from a perusal of Mr. Rykert's speech that he entered very carefully into calculations with regard to the value of exemption from taxation.

I have only read his conclusions, although I think it is desirable that the House should

understand that they are based on elaborate calculations. The last extract which I propose to read from the debate is a brief statement by Mr. Anglin:

Mr. Anglin said it was very extraordinary. There was a very remarkable fact in reference to the lands. Eleven million acres would furnish 10,000 acres per mile for 900 miles, making a total of 9,000,000, and furnish about 2,000,000 acres more for the three-tenths of the road of the eastern section, which the company were required to build within the first three years. So that within three years, the company should have acquired and obtained possession of the two twenty-four mile belts in the prairie section.

I do not recall that I have read the contention of Mr. Blake, in reply to a statement made by Sir John A. Macdonald—the contention that within ten years at least more than half the entire land grant would be sold or occupied, and would be subject to taxation thereby minimizing the onerous nature of the twenty-year exemption period.

Now, having dealt somewhat exhaustively with the debate on this subject, I want the House to bear with me while I refer briefly to the opinion entertained by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself with regard to this land grant, as contained in its own reports. I may say that I have secured copies of its reports from the inception of the company. The first report is dated Montreal, December 12, 1882, and here is what it says:

The proceeds of the \$20,000,000 of land grant bonds, as sold, are deposited with the government, which pays interest on such deposits at the rate of 4 per cent per annum.

So that you will see that my statement is correct, that they proceeded to raise \$25,000,000 on land grant bonds. I suppose the difference between \$20,000,000 and \$25,000,000 is the \$5,000,000 which was retained by the government as security for performance of contract.

These proceeds are paid to the company in agreed mileage proportions (in the same manner as the government cash subsidy), as construction progresses; and the balance of these proceeds and of cash subsidy coming to the company amounts to about \$31,500,000. It is believed that this sum, with the proceeds of the capital stock now remaining unissued (exclusive of \$10,000,000 of the stock which is to be reserved), will be amply sufficient for the complete construction and efficient equipment of the railway, and that 1,800,000 acres of land will be more than sufficient to extinguish the outstanding \$2,700,000 of land grant bonds.

The position of the company may, therefore, be thus stated:

After providing fully for the construction and equipment of the railway and telegraph lines, the company will hold in their treasury \$10,000,000 of unissued stock.

They will also hold about 17,000,000 acres of land, unincumbered except by the \$5,000,000 of bonds held by the government as security for the operation of the railway for ten years.

The whole property of the company, when completed, will be represented by \$90,000,000 of capital stock, and will be unincumbered except for about \$5,500,000 on the purchased lines.

The company are authorized, and will continue to pay interest semi-annually upon paid-up shares during construction, at the rate of not less than 5 per cent per annum.

It is important for the House to remember that this great company did not wait until its road was built before paying a dividend. It was going to pay dividends during construction.

And the proceeds of the unsold lands (about 17,000,000 acres) will be available and specially reserved, if necessary, to supplement the net earnings in the accomplishment of that purpose.

This report is signed by George Stephen, now Lord Mount Stephen, as president. The next report I shall read from is dated December 31, 1883, and this is what it says with reference to the land department :

A statement of land sales from the commencement of the company's operations, is also submitted.

It will be observed that a considerable reduction is shown in the acreage sold, as compared with the statement published in the official memorandum, dated December 12, 1882.

This has been caused, mainly, by a reduction of the acreage originally sold to the Canada North-west Land Company, from 5,000,000 acres to 2,200,000 acres.

Let the House mark that out of this immense land grant the company had sold as early as 1883 to the Canada North-west Land Company 5,000,000 acres; and yet how much do you suppose patents have been issued for? A trifle over a million acres, showing that although the land was sold to the North-west Land Company by the Canadian Pacific Railway it did not become taxable and when it reverted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, as it did, was still exempt from taxation the patents not having issued. Then this report goes on :

The Canada North-west Land Company having found themselves unable to deal with so large a quantity of land, it was considered desirable, both in the interest of the railway company as well as of North-west settlement, that relief should be afforded them; and a new agreement, reducing the quantity of land, but maintaining the same terms and conditions as to price, &c., was entered into.

It may be added that full payment has been made for the reduced acreage, and that the land company are actively engaged, both in this country and abroad, in securing purchasers and settlers for their lands.

Notwithstanding the fact that these 5,000,000 acres were transferred by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the Canada North-west Land Company, the latter company also evaded taxation, no doubt in the same way as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, because it did not take out any patents for those lands. A patent was

only issued when a parcel might be sold to a poor settler, who might not have enough money to pay taxes, while the land company and the parent company both escaped taxation altogether. I read further :

The following is the position of the 5 per cent land grant mortgage bonds:

Total issue .....	\$25,000,000
Deposited with the government as security for completion of the contract, no interest being payable thereon .....	\$ 5,000,000
Deposited with the government in trust until earned by the company .....	10,000,000
Redeemed by land sales and cancelled .....	6,667,000
	21,667,000
Balance outstanding .....	\$ 3,333,000

I presume that this report was also signed by George Stephen as president. I do not see any report for 1884. The next report from which I quote is for the year 1885 :

Should this measure become law—

This refers to some Act submitted to the House embodying some financial arrangement between the government and the company—

—the position the company will occupy on the opening of the through line next spring may be summed up as follows:

It will have a cash deposit in the hands of the Dominion government sufficient to pay semi-annual dividends at the rate of 3 per cent per annum on its \$65,000,000 capital stock for seven and a-half years, or until the end of the year 1893. It will own 3,299 miles, and will hold under lease 695 miles, of fully completed and thoroughly equipped railway, forming a total mileage of 3,994 miles. It will own more than 21,000,000 acres of agricultural lands.

Does anybody suppose that the president of this company would put that statement before the public unless these lands really belonged to the company? Of course, I have proved to a demonstration that they were available for the purposes of the company; but the president says, in 1885, that it will 'own' more than 21,000,000 acres of land. He goes on :

It will own three fine steel steamships on the great lakes, and an extensive and well-appointed telegraph system, with power to extend its telegraph lines to all parts of the country.

All this property, together with certain outside assets, in all valued at \$230,960,585, will be represented by a total indebtedness of \$53,892,545, bearing an unusually low rate of interest; and by \$65,000,000 capital stock, for which dividends for seven and one-half years will be in hand.

With regard to this \$65,000,000 of capital stock the statement was made very generally—I see it printed in the newspapers and it has never been denied, either officially

or otherwise—that of that \$65,000,000 capital stock not more than \$8,000,000 ever went into the construction of the road at all. I have made the statement on the floor of this House, and have been able to prove it by the official records, that the members of the syndicate distributed among themselves a very large portion of this \$65,000,000 of stock at 25 cents on the dollar, and in five years they received 20 per cent more back in dividends than they paid originally for their stock, for they paid themselves 6 per cent on the par value per year or 24 per cent annual dividends on the value at which they obtained their stocks. No wonder the president of the company is able to boast that they will have a cash deposit in the hands of the company, able to pay semi-annual dividends at the rate of 6 per cent per annum, on its capital stock until the end of 1893.

Sixty-five million dollars capital stock, for which dividends for seven and one-half years will be in hand.

I quote from the balance sheet attached to that same report :

That as security for the payment of the balance of the said loan, amounting to the sum of \$9,880,912, and the interest thereon, the government shall have a first lien and mortgage, subject to the outstanding land grant bonds, on the whole of the unsold lands forming the remaining part of the company's land grant earned and to be hereafter earned.

Just think of this proposition, that the government shall have a lien on the land grant earned and to be thereafter earned. Here we find the company giving a mortgage to the government on its land grant. But how could the company give a lien or raise a mortgage on a land grant that it did not own? It must be clear to every one that it did not own the land grant and that the land grant was available to the company for all purposes.

Such principal and interest to be paid out of the net proceeds of the sale of such lands; and the government shall continue to hold and retain the entire amount of land grant bonds now in its custody and possession as provided by the said Act. And if the net proceeds of such sales, to be made from time to time in due course, shall be insufficient to pay the interest on the said last mentioned amount as the same shall fall due, or the principal thereof, when the same shall become due, the Governor in Council may order the sale by trustees of such lands or any part thereof in such manner as shall be fixed by such order, in satisfaction of the interest or principal in respect of which default has occurred. And after the sale of the whole of such lands any deficiency in the proceeds thereof to pay the amount charged thereon shall be a charge upon the company's entire revenue after providing for its fixed charges and by preference over the shareholders.

The next report which I shall quote from is the report for the year 1885. On page 8, of that report, I find :

This agreement, in effect, provides that the company shall—

Another agreement, evidently, that the company made with the government—

—by the 1st July next, repay to the government in full, in cash, the amount of that portion of the debt secured by the pledge of the \$20,000,000 first mortgage bonds, and that the government shall then accept in full satisfaction of its claim for the balance of the debt, amounting to \$9,880,912, with interest, lands sufficient to cover the amount at the rate of \$1.50 per acre.

I would ask this pertinent question, how could this company return to the government this vast amount of land if the company did not own the land? On page 17, I read this clause :

The new agreement with the government provides for the immediate cancellation of the \$8,996,000 of these bonds now held by the government; and for the ultimate cancellation of the remaining \$5,000,000. When these bonds have all been cancelled, the \$3,612,500 bonds outstanding in the hands of the public will be the only charge on the company's land grant of 14,734,667 acres.

	Acres.	Acres.
Total land grant .....	25,000,000	
Sales to Dec. 31, 1885.....	3,757,662	
Less cancelled .....	285,644	
		3,472,018
		21,527,982
To be retained by government under new agreement, approximately .....	6,793,315	
		14,734,667

The next report from which I shall quote is the report for 1886, on page 9 :

To represent this capital liability, the company has a well-equipped railway system of 4,651 miles, a thoroughly efficient commercial telegraph system, and nearly 15,000,000 acres of selected agricultural lands—

In 1884, we have the president of the company telling us that they then had 15,000,000 acres 'of selected agricultural lands,' and you will see by this statement that they were able, under the late government, to obtain power to select their land and that in 1886 the company had 15,000,000 acres of selected lands.

—the latter subject only to land grant bonds of \$8,527,000, of which \$4,000,000 are in the hands of the company and \$1,000,000 are deposited with the government, these \$5,000,000 not bearing interest. The company has also a cash deposit in the hands of the Dominion government sufficient to pay the guaranteed dividend of 3 per cent per annum on its entire capital stock until August, 1893. These lands, together with other valuable assets of the company, held outside of capital account, will be available when required, for providing for the further improvement of the line, and for such additions to the equipment and appurtenances as the increasing traffic may demand, so that, after the completion of the works now in progress, the surplus net earnings may be free, to be used for their proper purpose of paying dividends to the shareholders.

From the same report on the land grant I read :

	Acres.
Original grant.....	25,000,000
Surrendered to the government under agreement of March 30, 1886.....	6,793,014
	18,206,986
Sales to Dec. 31, 1886.....	3,527,954
Less cancelled in 1886.....	280,686
	3,247,268
Quantity of land on hand.....	14,959,718

The cancellations of the past year include the contract of the French Colonization Company for 200,000 acres. This was one of the colonization companies formed in the early years of the organization of the railway company at a time when the speculative fever in lands in the North-west was at its height. The colonization company failed to carry out the conditions of their contract as to cultivation and settlement, and the agreement was cancelled. These lands are situated within the province of Manitoba, and will ultimately realize a much better price than that provided for in the contract with the colonization company.

So that notwithstanding the fact that these lands were sold to a colonization company, when the company failed to carry out the conditions of its bargain, they reverted to the Canadian Pacific Railway with the result that they became exempt from taxation.

The next report is that of 1889 :

The interest on the land grant bonds, while an obligation of the company, is not included in the fixed charges, because the interest paid is chargeable against the land grant, and will ultimately be returned to the shareholders. The proceeds of land sales, less the expenses of the land department, going for the present towards the extinguishment of the debt upon the lands, the arrangement works practically as a sinking fund. It is expected that the annual receipts from Vancouver and other town-sites, together with the surplus proceeds of the Manitoba South-western lands (the property of your company) will cover the interest on the land grant bonds, leaving the ordinary revenues of the company intact.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

### AFTER RECESS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was reading from the annual reports of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to show what view the company itself took of the land grant—to demonstrate that the company, according to its own language, according to its own understanding, owned this land grant for all practical purposes. I will read a brief extract from the annual report of the company presented on Wednesday, the 5th of May, 1889 :

In addition to the lands embraced in the foregoing statement, the company holds 1,389,424 acres of land in southern Manitoba, which came to it from the purchase of the Manitoba South

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Western Railway. These lands are among the best and most available in the North-west. At the average of the sales last year, \$4.64 per acre, their value is \$5,944,785. They are subject only to a lien of \$884,773 in favour of the province of Manitoba. Your directors believe that they will yield at least \$5 over and above the amount due to the province, and, as they are not liable to any other mortgage or lien, the surplus will be available for the general purposes of the company.

Here is a statement that the land grant of the company in southern Manitoba was worth, in 1889, \$4.54 per acre. The company received 6,400 acres a mile as a subsidy for the building of their road. If you multiply 6,400 acres by \$4.54, you find that the company received the enormous amount of \$29,056 per mile for the building of the railway. What does that mean? It means that the company has received in land, according to its own statement, \$29,056 per mile, or about three times the cost of constructing the railway. As you know, Mr. Speaker, railways can be constructed very cheaply in a prairie country. The cost is estimated at from \$7,000 to \$9,000 a mile. If you take it at \$8,000 per mile, you find that the company have received considerably more than three times the value of the road in land subsidy. And yet, notwithstanding that, we are actually face to face with the proposition that the company expects us to exempt these lands from taxation in perpetuity. It seems to me, in view of a statement of this kind, taken from their own reports, that this is the most monstrous proposition ever made in this parliament. Let me read—this is the last extract I shall give from the company's report—from the report presented on Wednesday, the 4th of April, 1894 :

The company's lands are seldom sold to new immigrants, but generally to those who have already established themselves on free homesteads, and who, from their improved condition, are able to increase their holdings by the purchase of adjoining railway lands. Therefore, an unfavourable season in agriculture is to be unfavourable in regard to land sales. The established farmers have had little money to spare during the past year, the land sales, consequently, have been low, and the receipts from town sites have likewise suffered.

It will be quite clear to hon. members who have listened to the remarks I have made that the company has received an enormous amount of money on account of their land grant, and that the land grant is an exceedingly valuable asset. I could go on and multiply the reasons why this parliament should act, and say that these lands are liable to taxation when the twenty-year period expires. But surely I have made the case sufficiently strong to convince any hon. member of this House that this parliament should act. I think that parliament should have acted long ago in this matter, and should have insisted on the company taking out its patent for the land grant, because, as I pointed out in the beginning

of my remarks, that would facilitate the taxation of the land, for, as the House will understand, unpatented lands cannot be taxed. To the settlers of the North-west this is an exceedingly important question, as hon. members will understand, because it is desirable that taxation, which is heavy in that country, and which, by virtue of the necessity for bridges and other improvements, municipal and otherwise, must always be heavy, should be distributed over as large an area as possible. In the speeches from which I quoted, the possibility of considerable discontent arising in the North-west over this matter was alluded to. I think I am safe in saying that the people of the North-west are as loyal and peaceable a people as will be found in the Dominion; but if you are going to impose an odious condition on them with reference to this exemption from taxation by extending the taxation exemption period indefinitely, or in perpetuity, it will certainly give them cause for very serious agitation and discontent.

I have already spoken of the fight which Hon. Edward Blake, when he was leader of the Liberal party in this House, made against this Canadian Pacific Railway contract, which, as I said, has been pronounced by the present editor of the *Globe* to be the most insane contract ever made by any free people—I think those were his words. Mr. Blake, as any one can find who will read the debates, made a long, ardent and persistent fight against the consummation of this bargain; and in that fight he was assisted by every Liberal who was behind him during that period. The debates show that an enormous number of amendments to this contract were moved, and that also a most exhaustive case was made by practically every speaker who participated in that debate against the contract, and especially against the clause therein granting exemption from taxation. The Liberal party has changed sides in this House since then, and now sits on your right, Mr. Speaker, but I think it would be safe to assume that Liberals have in no way changed their opinion in regard to this contract, and the iniquitous provisions contained therein. Therefore, we may surely hope that on this question no uncertain sound will be given by the Liberal party represented in this House. As I said at the outset there should be no reason why the opinion should not be unanimous in this House, declaring that the tax exemption period will expire on the 16th February, 1901.

Now, I expect to be met by the argument of 'vested rights,' and I should not be surprised if I were characterized as a socialist, as I was in connection with the elevator discussion which took place in this House. I would like to inquire from you, Sir, where the vested rights of the company come in, and I would also like to ask if the settlers of the North-west who took up their home-

steads on the understanding that this vast land grant would share the tax burden in 20 years have no vested rights. Should not the first duty of the House be to protect their vested rights? We have given the Canadian Pacific Railway, as you know, \$25,000,000 in cash, and \$35,000,000 worth of completed railroad; we gave them perpetual exemption from taxation for their road-bed, rolling stock, stations and appurtenances; we allowed their material to come into the country free of taxation; we gave them a monopoly of the carrying trade of that country for a long period; we put a clause in the charter that until they earned 10 per cent on the capital actually expended, we could not control the rates, and gave them many other important concessions, such as stocking and bonding privileges, &c. It seems to me we have given up practically everything that could be given, and now the company expects this parliament to grant them tax exemption on this land grant in perpetuity. If parliament declines to say that that tax exemption period shall expire when the twenty years after the contract was made, have elapsed, then I fear there will be considerable reason for the feeling that exists in the country, and which I think prevails to a large extent, that parliament is dominated by these railroad corporations. But I have a strong hope that this House will arrive at such a conclusion as will remove to some extent that impression.

I may say that this is probably the last session of this parliament. The probabilities are that before another session is held, there will be a general election, and no man knows whether he will be slain in the fight or whether he will be elected. But I would like to say that should this be the last word I shall ever utter in parliament, I shall at least be able to look back with pardonable pride to the fact that my last parliamentary utterance was a protest against the domination of either the government or parliament by railways or other monopolistic corporations, and in behalf of the rights of the settlers. That stand I have always maintained in the newspaper which I control in the west, and in taking the view I do at present, I am merely following a consistent course. I beg, therefore, Sir, to move, seconded by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), that all the words after 'That' be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:

Clause 16 of the contract between Her Majesty and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, ratified by the parliament of Canada on the 15th day of February, 1881, and set out in the schedule to chapter 1 of the Statutes of 1881, provides as follows: 'The Canadian Pacific Railway, and all stations and station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling-stock and appurtenances required and used for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the company, shall be for ever free from taxation by the Dominion, or by any province hereinafter established, or by any municipai

corporation therein; and the lands of the company, in the North-west Territories, until they are either sold or occupied, shall also be free from such taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.'

That in answer to an interpellation in parliament on the 12th day of February, 1900 as to the date of termination of the said period of exemption from taxation, it was stated on behalf of the government that: 'This is a matter of legal opinion, which, if disputed, can only be settled by a judicial decision.'

That progress in the North-west is enormously handicapped by the exemption from taxation of so vast a quantity of land as has been set apart for the company, and would be seriously paralyzed should the tax exemption be indefinitely continued.

That it appears from the debates which occurred when the said contract was before parliament, and from the wording of the Act itself, that the exemption was intended to cover a period of not more than twenty years from the date of the passing of the said Act, and that it was so understood by the railway company, which, on the conclusion of the bargain, raised \$25,000,000 on the security of the said land grant.

That for the foregoing reasons, in the opinion of this House, the period of exemption from taxation of the said land grant expires on the 16th of February, 1901, and that all such lands should be patented to the said railway company by that date, inasmuch as it is impossible to collect taxes from such lands until they are patented.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend who has brought this question before the House, stated in opening his remarks, that he hoped that after the House had heard his arguments, it would unanimously agree to the motion which he has placed in your hands. I listened to my hon. friend very carefully, and my deliberate opinion is that if the House is to come to a unanimous conclusion, it will be, not in favour of the motion which he has brought before the House, but against it. I think that my hon. friend himself, when I have placed before him a few considerations which have escaped his attention, must come to the same conclusion. Before I proceed any further I may say that I admire the energy and industry with which he has constituted himself the champion of the rights of the people of the North-west Territories; and whilst I give him due credit therefor, I must say that I cannot admire the spirit which seems to have influenced him in this matter. For my part, I cannot admit that the hon. gentleman has duly reflected as he should have done—if he will pardon me for so saying—before stating that if parliament did not come to the conclusion to which he has come, it would be an evidence that parliament was dominated by railroad corporations. For my part I resent any such imputation, I believe is not true. My hon. friend has no right to argue that, although the people in the contract which was made in 1881 did not receive the consideration to which they were entitled, and because at the present time we find a condition of things

Mr. RICHARDSON.

which is legal, and because we respect the law which we find on the statute-book, therefore, the conclusion must be drawn that we are in the power of a great corporation. My hon. friend must remember that the parliament of Canada, in the session of 1880-1—whether wisely or unwisely does not affect the point under discussion—voluntarily adopted a law which we now find upon the statute-book. I have to call my hon. friend's attention to this, that, although from the facts which he has stated, he must be convinced, and every man who sympathizes with his views must be convinced, that the people of the North-west Territories were not properly dealt with, that their rights were jeopardized by the contract of 1881, still it does not follow that any man who holds these views must come to the conclusion at which he has arrived. He bases his whole argument upon these two propositions: That parliament, when it sanctioned the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway on February 15, 1881, granted to that company a cash bonus of \$25,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres of land to aid in the construction of the railway, and that upon that grant the company were allowed exemption of taxation for twenty years. So far we are all agreed, but, he concludes, and this is the mistake he makes, that the grant of land took effect when the contract received the sanction of the Governor General of that day, on April 15, 1881. My hon. friend surely has not read the statute. The statute cannot be read as stating, not even as implying, that the grant of land of 25,000,000 acres which was made by the Act of that date, took effect from the date of the sanctioning of the Bill which was introduced in that session of parliament. If the grant of land could be held by any process of reasoning, or argument, to have taken effect on the day of the sanctioning of the Bill, the argument of my hon. friend would be beyond answer. It would simply end the case. But, my hon. friend has not read the statute properly when he states that the grant of land took effect upon the sanctioning of the Bill. He quoted the section 9, but he did not quote it entirely, and the ending of section 9 has an important bearing upon the proper interpretation which the section must have. Section reads:

In consideration of the premises, the government agree to grant to the company a subsidy in money of \$25,000,000, and in land of 25,000,000 acres, for which subsidies the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be completed and the same shall be equipped, maintained and operated.

These words are very clear that, for a subsidy of \$25,000,000 in money, and for a further subsidy of 25,000,000 acres of land, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company undertake to construct, maintain and operate a railway from Callander to the shores of the Pacific Ocean. That was the undertak-

ing. When did the grant of money and of land take effect? Was the grant of money to take effect immediately upon the sanctioning of the Bill? My hon. friend will not pretend that. He knows that the grant of money was to take effect only as the road was constructed, and that the grant of land was to take effect exactly in the same way, as the road was constructed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. They borrowed \$25,000,000 on the land grant.

The PRIME MINISTER (reading):

The said subsidies respectively to be paid and granted as the work of construction shall proceed.

Could anything be clearer than that? The company were not entitled, upon the sanctioning of the Bill, to receive from the treasury of Canada \$25,000,000; neither were the company entitled to receive 25,000,000 acres of land. The company were actually to receive a sum of money as the road proceeded and a subsidy in land as the road proceeded as well, and it is quite clear that the land grant cannot be held to have taken effect from the date of the sanctioning of the Bill, but it must be held to date from the time the road was constructed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the company got the grant of land as it was earned, did the government see that it was not granted to the company until they earned it in twenty-mile sections?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is another argument; I will come to that presently. But, the conclusion of my hon. friend was that the Bill was sanctioned on April 15, 1881, and that, therefore, in twenty years the exemption ceases. My hon. friend cannot justify that argument. I will come to the only part of my hon. friend's position that is arguable, but, it is not arguable to declare that the grant took place on February 16, because there was not a penny of money, or an acre of land earned. The grant was earned only so far as the railway proceeded, and, therefore, my hon. friend must see the error of the proposition which he has placed before the House. There is nothing upon which it can stand.

Mr. RICHARDSON. How could they borrow \$25,000,000 then?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend must wait a little; I will answer that presently. The ground upon which he bases his argument is that the statute gave to the company 25,000,000 acres of land. I have shown the hon. gentleman by the terms of the statute itself, that when the Bill was sanctioned in 1881, the company was not entitled to receive one acre of land, but that it was only entitled to receive the grant of

land to the extent of 25,000,000 acres as the road proceeded and, therefore, it cannot be shown that there is any ground upon which the exemption from taxation could take place until the time that the railway was proceeded with, and the subsidy was earned. The exemption from taxation could take place only from the time the subsidy was earned and it was earned long subsequent to the time it was granted, and, therefore, it is not possible for any one to reason that the exemption from taxation could be held to come to an end on February 16, 1901. It is not susceptible of argument and it cannot be debated any longer. I think I could very well stop here and ask the House to vote down the motion of my hon. friend, having shown that the motion which he has placed before the House is not even susceptible of argument. But, if I were to do that, I concede I would not discharge my full duty to the House. It would not be right for me to rely upon a mere technical objection, but, I must look upon the question in all its bearings, because I know that under the contract that my hon. friend condemns, a condition of things was imposed in 1881 upon the people of the North-west Territories, west of Lake Superior, which is a grievous one, and one which constitutes a condition for which they feel there should be a remedy, whether they have that remedy before parliament or whether they have not. My hon. friend has recalled the opinion of Mr. Blake; he has recalled the opinion of the Liberal party of that day, and for my part, I have no quarrel with the views held at that time by the Liberal party. We thought at that time that the contract was an altogether one-sided one, but our views did not prevail. My hon. friend is aware that we moved amendment after amendment against the Bill, and that we moved against this very clause to which he objects to-day. My hon. friend is aware that our motion was defeated, and that the contract was passed in spite of all our efforts. Well, then, he asks us: Are you going, in view of the position you adopted in 1881, to go back upon that position, and are you to become the slave of the great corporation which was then formed? That is not a fair way of putting it; that is not a fair argument. Our views at that time did not prevail, the parliament of Canada passed that contract, it became law, and whatever be the law, whether it be disadvantageous or advantageous to the people of Canada, it is the duty of the people of Canada, even those who struggled against it, to accept the responsibility of it. We cannot do otherwise. I say, speaking in the name of the people of Canada, that I resent the doctrines of my hon. friend. My hon. friend said that he was a socialist; he may pardon me if I repeat again, that the proposition which he has placed to-day before parliament is a proposition strongly smelling of socialism, if not of absolute socialism itself. In the very strong and ela-

borate argument which he made this afternoon, he made use of these very words: Parliament must interpret that law. That law embodies a contract, and will my hon. friend, or the parliament of Canada, say that when a contract has been made between two parties—I do not care whether it be between the parliament of Canada, on the one side, and any of Her Majesty's subjects on the other—parliament must undertake to interpret that contract? No proposition of that kind was ever heard of in parliament. In the British parliament, when contracts are made, they are left to the judicial authority to interpret, and I am glad to say that in the whole history of England, so far as my memory goes, there is not a single instance where parliament undertook to interpret one of its own laws or contracts. It is left to the courts to determine. Having made these preliminary observations, I come to the grievance set up by my hon. friend. My hon. friend has based his argument upon section 16 of the Act, which reads as follows:

The Canadian Pacific Railway, and all stations and station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances required and used for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the company, shall be for ever free from taxation by the Dominion, or by any province hereafter to be established, or by any municipal corporation therein.

That is not, however, the point in issue. Here is the portion on which my hon. friend relies:

And the lands of the company, in the Northwest Territories, until they are either sold or occupied, shall also be free from taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

That is very plain. Now, what is the grant from the Crown? That is the whole question. The grant was not made by the Act itself, as I think I have shown conclusively. The Act simply empowered the Crown to grant 25,000,000 acres of land; and by the terms of the Act the grant could only be made gradually, step by step, as the construction of the road proceeded. Now, the question, and the only question is, what is the grant from the Crown? There are two constructions put upon that phrase. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company hold that the grant from the Crown dates from the issue of the patent. My hon. friend contends that this is not a fair way of looking at the contract. He contends that as the construction of the railway proceeded, blocks of land were chosen by the company and set aside by the Crown for the purpose of fulfilling the grant of 25,000,000 acres authorized by the statute, and that, when a block of land of 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 acres was set aside for the company, from that date those lands belong-

ed to the company, and that would constitute a grant from the Crown. I am not prepared to say that the argument of my hon. friend is right or that it is wrong. It may be right; I do not think it is. I think it is only from the date of the issue of the patent from the Crown that the grant is to be construed.

But whether my hon. friend is right or wrong, or whether I am right or wrong, it surely is not a question for this parliament to settle. It is only for the courts to determine who is right and who is wrong in that particular—whether the grant should be held to date from the day when a block of land is set aside for the company, or from the day the patent for the land is issued by the Crown.

I have followed the argument of my hon. friend on this subject. It is not a legal argument; it is not even a political argument; it is simply an argument of convenience. My hon. friend says, and says very truly: If you admit any other interpretation than the interpretation which I put on this statute, that the grant of land must be held to reckon from the day the land was set aside for the purpose of fulfilling the conditions laid down in the statute, what is the result? The result is that the settlers who are toiling every day, who are making this country smile, who are developing it, who have a hard life of it, who have to toil in the wet and in the sun in order to make this country better than it is, have to bear alone the burden of taxation, whereas the lands of this wealthy company are exempt from that burden. My hon. friend is right; I have nothing to say to that; but if parliament decided otherwise in 1881, what has he to say? Why, all the arguments which my hon. friend adduced this afternoon, Mr. Blake presented with great force to parliament in 1881. Mr. Blake represented that if parliament gave these lands to the company for ever free of taxation, it would impose a heavy burden of taxation upon the settlers. But parliament did not accept the views of Mr. Blake. Parliament went on and decreed that these lands should be exempt from taxation for twenty years.

But, my hon. friend says, if parliament decided that in 1881, let us set aside that legislation; let us say that parliament was wrong in 1881, and that the superior wisdom of parliament in 1900 shall do away with that legislation. Sir, if we were free, if this were not a contract, I would agree with my hon. friend; I would say, we shall correct the error of 1881. But parliament is not free in this matter. As I said a moment ago, here was a contract agreed upon in 1881—between whom? Between Her Majesty the Queen, representing the people of Canada, and certain subjects of Her Majesty who were constituted a corporation. The contract was sanctioned and approved by parliament; and though it may be injurious to the whole people of Canada, and especi-

ally injurious to certain sections of the people, still in a British parliament it will not be pretended that parliament should step in and violate vested rights and interfere with rights which were given for good or for ill to certain people in 1881.

What has my hon. friend to say to this? He has to say: Oh, but that cannot be the true meaning of the contract, because the company issued land grant bonds secured upon these 25,000,000 acres of land. There is nothing at all in that argument; for, let my hon. friend look at the bonds which were issued. I do not know that he ever saw one, for my part. I never saw one either; but I am quite sure of one thing, that the bonds which were issued in 1881 or 1882 never purported to be secured upon an actual block of land, but were secured on the undivided 25,000,000 acres of land, which, under the authority of the statute, were to be selected out of the millions of acres in the North-west Territories for the railway company and the proceeds from the sale thereof. Therefore, the argument of my hon. friend amounts to nothing at all.

If my hon. friend wants to be convinced in favour of the argument I present, he has only to look at section 11 of the contract. My hon. friend contends at this late day that the bonds were a mortgage on the lands of the company, like a mortgage given by a homesteader on his homestead or pre-emption. Although the land grant bonds of the company were issued in 1882, if I remember rightly, at that time it would have been impossible for the company to mortgage any of its lands. Look at section 11:

The grant of land hereby agreed to be made to the company shall be so made in alternate sections of 640 acres each, extending back 24 miles deep, on each side of the railway, from Winnipeg to Jasper House.

This is very plain; it provides that the blocks of land shall be taken on either side of the railway. But in 1882, when the bonds were issued, the lands were not even located, and therefore it was impossible to say that the lands were here or there. It depended altogether upon the location of the railway. If the location of the railway were at a certain latitude, the lands would be on either side of that location. If the location were made 50 miles further north, the lands would be 50 miles further north. If the location were not on the prairies, but on the banks of the Saskatchewan River, as first contemplated, the lands which would be subject to the bonds would not be as they are to-day, on the prairie, but on the banks of the Saskatchewan River. My hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) can, therefore, see that there is nothing in that argument of his. I have only to mention it to show the fallacy of the basis of the argument presented by the hon. gentleman. As I said a moment ago, the question is dependent altogether upon the interpretation

of section 16 of the statute, as to what is meant by a grant. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) has argued that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, after having chosen a certain block of land, neglected to take its patent, that the land is therefore, in the occupation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that being so, no one can settle on the land except by the permission of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He complains that the letters patent have not been issued, and therefore, that it cannot be taxed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Why were not the letters patent issued long ago?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a thing which I do not know. But, suppose that the government of that day were lax in their duty in that respect, suppose that they insisted upon issuing patents to the Canadian Pacific Railway as soon as the lands were chosen, that would not alter the legal aspect of the case at all, although it might be a point against the government for being remiss in their duty. It does not in any way alter the legal construction of the Act. I tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson), as I told him on a former occasion when he asked the government what we were going to do in the matter, the answer then was: That we have nothing at all to do, that it was a question altogether for the courts to determine whether or not his contention was right, or wrong. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) holds strongly to the view that the exemption from taxation must come to an end by the very terms of the law upon the 16th February, 1901. If my hon. friend is convinced of his opinion, and if he believes he is right that the exemption from taxation will terminate on the 16th February, 1901, it is open to any municipality to then levy taxation upon these lands. Whether the hon. gentleman's interpretation is correct or not, I do not argue at the present moment, but if he believes in his heart that he is right, let any municipality impose taxation upon these lands after the 16th February, 1901, and from that moment the position will be before the courts. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which is at present the owner of these lands, or rather, for whose benefit these lands have been set aside: the Canadian Pacific Railway then, will have to do either one of two things. They will have to pay the taxation that is imposed, or contest it in the courts. Then you will have a solution of the whole difficulty, and that is the only possible solution I can see. There is, moreover, another consideration which must appeal strongly to the sense of fairness of every member in this House. My hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) has referred to the fact that bonds to the extent of \$25,000,000 have been issued upon that grant. These bonds are in the hands of disinterested

owners, probably distributed all over the civilized world. The faith of the Crown and the faith of the people have been pledged upon these bonds that the terms of the contract would be respected. Would it not be monstrous that under such circumstances, parliament should undertake to say that the rights of the bondholders who have invested their money in these bonds should be abridged and determined by an Act of this parliament. If we were to decide on anything of the kind, the bondholders would have a right to complain to the Queen of England, that the parliament of Canada was not respecting the vested rights which they had in Canada. This circumstance is sufficient to show that the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) cannot be entertained for one single moment. I sympathize very strongly with the people of the North-west on this question. I sympathize with the settlers west of Lake Superior, but I have simply to tell them—and I would not hesitate to say it before any audience west of Lake Superior, because I know that they are law-abiding citizens, and that they will be the first to respect the law of the land—I would not hesitate to tell them that for good or for evil they must take the consequences of the law which has been placed on the statute-books. If after the judicial interpretation of this statute, there is still found a grievance, then it will be time enough to apply to parliament to find a remedy for it, if a remedy is to be found. But so long as the question remains in the position it is to-day, it is for the courts and not for this parliament to determine it. Let the people of the North-west go to the courts of the land, and there they will find the justice to which they are entitled, and the justice in which, I believe, they have ample and abundant faith. If after they have gone to the courts, and if the courts sustain the view that the grant is such as to make their position a perilous one, then they may perhaps, apply to parliament; but certainly before this has been done, and at the present time, I must say that I believe there is not a man in this House who will have the slightest hesitation in voting down the proposition of my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). It is unnecessary for me to add anything to the argument which has been addressed to the House by the First Minister, in order to convince even the mover of the resolution (Mr. Richardson) that he has asked this parliament to do an entirely impracticable thing. He has in terms, asked the House to do what, on the face of his own resolution, is shown to be utterly impossible, if we have any regard to the faith of parliament, or any regard to the law of the land. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) stated that he was not a lawyer, and even an ordinary layman would

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

have suspected that, from the argument he made to the House. In the course of my experience, I have never heard a more lame or impotent conclusion than that which the hon. gentleman has come to. What is it? Why his very resolution recites the fact which has already been referred to by the First Minister:

That the lands of the company in the North-west Territories, until they are either sold or occupied shall also be free from such taxation, for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

Could anything be clearer than that? The hon. gentleman in the last clause of his resolution invites this House to violate the solemn contract made on the part of Canada with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That proposition is revolting to every sense of justice, and strikes at the very foundation of all faith in contracts. It invites this parliament to set at defiance all law and constitutional principles, and to vote on a principle which is entirely contrary to law. I cannot understand how my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) could have ventured to put such a proposition as that before the House. As to the terms of the grant from the Crown, that has already been dealt with by the First Minister, and I need not repeat it. It is perfectly obvious that no man living could for a single moment contend that that grant became a grant when the contract was made, and when not an acre of land had been earned. Not only that, but the hon. gentleman declares that in answer to an interpellation in parliament on the 12th February, 1900, as to the date of termination of the period of exemption from taxation, it was stated on behalf of the government:

That this is a matter of legal opinion which if disputed could only be settled by a judicial tribunal.

That is the opinion of the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General and the law officers of the Crown. He took the trouble in fact to obtain an absolute legal decision, so far as a legal opinion in this House can go, and the House must be governed by the legal opinion of the officers of the Crown in such matters, and that opinion was that this is a question beyond the powers of this House, which can only be settled by a judicial decision. Yet the hon. gentleman asks us to vote that that question, which can only be settled by a judicial decision, shall be settled by this House in defiance of the contract and the law.

I need not take up more time with reference to that. The proposition is so self-evident as not to require a single word of comment other than the argument which has just been addressed to the House by the right hon. the First Minister and which covers the entire case. But I must take

some little exception, not only to the statements of my hon. friend in moving the resolution, but of my right hon. friend in rejecting this resolution. The hon. gentleman started with the premise that far more was given than was necessary in order to secure the construction of this road, and therefore that parliament has a claim against the Canadian Pacific Railway because the Canadian Pacific Railway received too much. I am sorry to say that that position my right hon. friend has slightly countenanced in the statement he has made as to the fierce and determined manner in which that contract was resisted by the Liberal party, of which the Hon. Edward Blake was then the leader and of whom my right hon. friend was one of the able followers. I want to deal with that subject for a few minutes, because, although it is not pleasant, twenty years after the battle was over, to have to shoulder one's crutch and fight it over again, I cannot allow these statements, so utterly at variance with the history of this transaction, to go forth to the country without challenging their accuracy. I say that one of the greatest things ever achieved for Canada, one of the greatest acts that any government was able to achieve in the interests of our people, was that Canadian Pacific Railway contract, and I not only say that, but will prove it, I think, to the satisfaction of even my right hon. friend before I sit down. What are the facts? The hon. gentleman talks about this land being worth \$4.54 an acre, and he goes on to make, as a man with a lively imagination can, almost gigantic computations, showing the enormous cost of this work, but he forgets that so able and distinguished a public man as the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie declared on the floor of this House that this land was worthless. He forgets that when I was asking this parliament to give a large grant of this land to secure the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie said on the floor of this House that you not only could not sell the land, but would have to give it away and then hire people to live on it. What more? That same hon. gentleman, a man of great ability, one of the greatest ornaments of the parliament of Canada, and one of the greatest men that has ever adorned these benches, but who was not infallible in his opinion on all occasions, declared on the floor of this House that the whole resources of the British Empire could not build the Canadian Pacific Railway in ten years. Well, Sir, it is all very fine after this road has been built and the country opened up, after the impossible has been achieved, to talk as the hon. member who introduced this motion has done. But what did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) say on this subject? With reference to this very contract he declared that Canada was going to be ruined by it, that the result would be to so impoverish Can-

ada as to leave no alternative but annexation. I am not blaming him for that expression of opinion, if he held it, as Mr. Blake undoubtedly held the opinion that it was an impossible undertaking, and as Mr. Mackenzie held the opinion that the whole resources of the British Empire could not accomplish it. I have no doubt that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries honestly held that opinion, and therefore I am not accusing him or any of these other gentlemen of any wrong-doing in having stated their views to the House; but when my hon. friend speaks of the enormous grants of land and money that were given to the Canadian Pacific Railway to secure the construction of the work, am I not justified in going back to the period when the contract was made and asking whether, as matters then stood, that great work, which every man of every political complexion in this country now admits to be an absolute necessity, was not constructed on the very lowest possible terms? What is the fact? I hold in my hand the evidence, and I draw the attention of my right hon. friend to this fact, that when he himself was a member of Mr. Mackenzie's government, Mr. Mackenzie stated to this House that he acted on the authority given him by the Railway Act of 1874, passed by the Liberal party and government in this House. My hon. friend subsequently became a member of that government and was a member of it in 1877, when Mr. Mackenzie made the statement I am going to read:

The whole effort of the administration from that day to this, has been directed to the accomplishment of this subject, the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to which he held his predecessors had improperly bound and committed the country. The whole effort of the administration from that day to this has been directed to the accomplishment of this work in the way that would seem to be most practicable and most available, considering the difficulties to be encountered and the cost to be incurred.

Well, the Mackenzie Railway Act of 1874 provides that 20,000 acres of land and \$10,000 in cash per mile, actual cash, the land to be subject to certain regulations provided by the Act, should be granted and that tenders should be invited to state the additional sum, if any, upon which a guarantee of 4 per cent should be given by the Dominion for 25 years. What does that mean? It means that Mr. Mackenzie took from this parliament authority by law to offer to anybody who would do the work 20,000 acres of land per mile and \$10,000 in cash per mile, and then invited the tenderers to state on what sum over and above that they would be willing to take 4 per cent for 25 years in order to induce them to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway. That means that on the 2,529 miles from Lake Nipissing, the terminus in Ontario, to the Pacific Ocean at Fort Moody, 20,000 acres would be granted per mile, which would amount to, not

25,000,000 acres of land but 50,580,000 acres. That was the land grant which Mr. Mackenzie and my right hon. friend offered for the purpose of securing the construction of this work, and in addition \$10,000 in cash per mile or \$25,295,000 in cash and fifty and one-half millions acres of land. What further? Mr. Mackenzie informs us—and at the time I am speaking of my right hon. friend was a member of the government:

Hon. gentlemen opposite and the whole country are aware that we solicited tenders in vain for some months upon this grant of fifty and a half millions acres of land and over \$25,000,000 in cash, besides an invitation to state how much over and above that they would be willing to take interest on at 4 per cent for twenty-five years.

Also that Mr. Sandford Fleming, the chief engineer, was instructed, while in London to place himself in communication with contractors and financial men and also to obtain the assistance of Sir John Rose, who, in many things, had been the active, energetic and patriotic agent of the Dominion, with a view to the carrying out of this scheme.

Now, Sir, what further? Mr. Mackenzie informs the House:

But I am informed that, notwithstanding all our efforts, we signally failed in obtaining one single offer (there was one imperfect offer made) for the construction of the railroad on those terms, which were the grant of 20,000 and \$10,000 cash per mile, with a guarantee of 4 per cent upon such balance as might be represented as necessary. No terms could be more explicit; it would be difficult to mention terms more favourable. . . . I have made up my mind long ago that it will be exceedingly difficult for a population of 4,000,000 so to conduct financial transactions connected with the building of that railroad of 2,600 miles across an unknown and an almost untrodden continent, in many places extremely difficult. I frankly say now, after my experience in endeavouring to accomplish something in that direction that I fear we shall be incapable of accomplishing anything in that direction at present.

That is historical; that is on the records of the country; showing the position in which we stood when the contract was made. No person has a greater responsibility than I have in that regard, and I may say that what occurred was this: The Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, who was Minister of the Interior, had made up his mind to go to England and see if he could not obtain the construction of certain sections of the road in the North-west Territories, which he found to be absolutely necessary for the settlement of the country. He invited the council to meet him that day week and offer suggestions to him for carrying out his object in that regard. I said: Sir John, would you have any objection to my, as Minister of Railways and Canals, submitting a proposition, when we meet this day week, for the complete and prompt construction of the whole line of the Canadian Pacific Railway? His answer was: Well, Tupper, that is a very large order; but of course, we will be very glad to see any-

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

thing you may submit. I have under my hand the very report—in the handwriting of Mr. Tilley, then a clerk in the Railway Department, now dead—which I made to the council, proposing that we should endeavour to secure the prompt construction of the road from Nipissing in Ontario to Port Moody on the Pacific, and offering to give those parts of the road already completed, 25,000,000 acres of land and \$25,000,000 in cash. We went to London, and we were able to secure the signing of the contract on those terms. And will any one be surprised at the terms we offered, when he considers what had been said by men in such a position as Mr. Mackenzie when Prime Minister of Canada, Hon. Edward Blake, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), and other gentlemen, declaring the utter impracticability of the scheme for a country such as Canada? Under these circumstances, it is too late in the day for me to be told in this House that that contract was obtained under improvident terms. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who has just taken his seat used language that he ought to recall when he said that it was a 'grievous act.' I am glad to know that Mr. Blake—who, undoubtedly, had underrated the great resources of Canada, and especially of British Columbia—when he had the opportunity of travelling over that road to the coast, he fully recognized the mistaken view that he had held as to the ability of Canada to accomplish that work and the terms upon which it was accomplished. The present Premier of Ontario, Hon. Mr. Ross, who has been quoted here as an opponent of the contract, has recently felt called upon, in justice to his own reputation, to declare that he was entirely wrong and that one of the greatest and most beneficial acts that ever was accomplished by the parliament of Canada was the carrying through of that contract and the construction of that great line of railway. If the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) thinks that no change has taken place in the opinions of the Liberal party since 1880-1, when we were struggling for this contract, he is a veritable Rip Van Winkle—he has been asleep and is asleep now, or he would know that the greatest men in the Liberal party, with one voice, admit not only that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was an absolute necessity for Canada, but that it has proved one of the most fortunate acts of this parliament from the beginning of its history down to the present time. I am not surprised that there was opposition; I am only surprised that there were any public men who had, I might almost say, the audacity to grapple with such a giant undertaking. There is no parallel in the history of the world for four millions of people as we were then grappling with so arduous a work and carrying it to a successful completion.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) speaks sympathetically of the people of the North-west. No person has deeper sympathy with the people of the North-west than I have. But, my right hon. friend should not forget that there are not merely scores, not merely hundreds but thousands of men who have gone into that North-west, opened up as it has been by this great inter-oceanic line of railway, and, with nothing but their honest industry, have made themselves and their families independent. Look at what has been achieved for Canada; see these Rocky Mountains pierced by this railway and shown to be—instead of a sea of inhospitable mountains as Mr. Blake believed them—charged with gold, silver, copper, lead and other metals. That country in which he had no faith—and especially if we include the Yukon, which, by communication with the Pacific coast has been given communication with all Canada—will rival any mineral country in the world. I was told in another place that I was making myself the exponent of the great railway corporations of this country. I have not done so. I stand here as a thoroughly independent member of this parliament, prepared to do battle where I think honesty and justice and fair-play require it, in favour of any corporation however large and of any man however humble. I may just say in passing that I was subjected to insult by—I will not say a gentleman, because he is no gentleman—a representative in the legislature of Prince Edward Island. I refer to Mr. Arthur Peters, whom I charge here and now on the floor of this House with having uttered a monstrous, lying and thoroughly unfounded libel against myself on the floor of the legislature of Prince Edward Island. What does he say?

Sir Charles had the effrontery to make a charge of this kind in face of the fact that he himself was at one time a poor medical practitioner, in Halifax, a man who made no money in his profession, and yet to-day we find him one of the richest men in Canada. From politics, and from no other source under heaven did Sir Charles derive his wealth. Much of it, we know, was gained from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Now, Sir, it would be impossible to crowd more base, unfounded, and malicious falsehoods into a few lines than Mr. Arthur Peters succeeded in crowding into this statement made on the floor of the legislature of Prince Edward Island; and as this matter has come up here, I think it not improper to refer to it. I fought the battle of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract in this House, and subsequently it was proved to a demonstration that we did not give enough to accomplish the work with all the monopolies and privileges which that contract gave to the company; they were utterly broken down in 1884, and

all the directors with one single exception, were ready to throw up their hands and abandon everything they had put into it, and give it up as a hopeless task. The credit was assailed in New York by the Northern Pacific Company, it was assailed in London by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, they were paralysed, they were unable to pay their men, and the whole enterprise was in the utmost peril, simply because, with all the concessions granted them, they could not carry their work through. What did I do? At the request of Sir John A. Macdonald, I came out from England, I came to this parliament, and I asked parliament to lend them \$30,000,000 more in order to prevent that work from becoming a wreck, and to secure its prompt completion, and parliament granted the money. Mr. Blake said: Do not call it a loan, you know it is a gift, you know we will never see a dollar of the money. The money was all repaid before it was due, and one of the most successful enterprises that has ever redounded to the honour and progress of Canada was that Canadian Pacific Railway enterprise, I say that unhesitatingly.

But I say that if there is a man in this country who is in a position to vindicate himself from ever having forfeited his independence as a member of this parliament in reference to that great work that man is myself. Why, Sir, the time came when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, no doubt under the impression that they were entitled to it, made a claim on the government of Canada for \$5,000,000 in connection with that work, basing that claim upon statements made by myself to them, as they recollected the statements, at the time the contract was signed. Arbitration was resorted to, a body of high-minded and able arbitrators was appointed. The Hon. Edward Blake was the advocate of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and Mr. Christopher Robinson, a very eminent lawyer, defended the government against that claim. I was sent for to come out from England, because I was the party who had made the contract, and with whom these conversations were alleged to have taken place upon which they based their claim. I admitted frankly that about half a million dollars was practically due, because it would require something like that sum to complete the work with the degree of efficiency that was contemplated under the contract. But something over four millions of money rested upon the claim that I had lowered the character of the work after the contract was made, and contrary to the understanding with these gentlemen; and therefore, it would take \$4,000,000 to bring the work up to the standard that was demanded. I came out here and went to see Sir John A. Macdonald. I said: 'Sir John, you surely remember when the contract was signed that there was no conversation of this kind.'

'Well,' he said, 'Tupper, I really do not remember anything about it. I had such entire confidence in your management of railway matters that I confess I did not give the subject attention at all; I depended upon you.' I therefore, went single-handed into the witness box in the presence of these arbitrators, and under the cross-examination of Mr. Blake, I entirely destroyed the claim these gentlemen had put forward for about four millions of money. Now, I ask whether I did not there and then give clear and incontrovertible evidence of my thorough independence as a public man. I may say here that never, with respect to anything that I did for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in this House, or as a member of the government of Canada, did any person connected with that great organization ever insult me by the offer of the slightest compensation or return whatever—because I should have treated it as nothing else than the grossest insult.

This gentleman who appears to have studied my career with great care, says that I was a poor medical practitioner in Halifax. Well, I may have been a poor practitioner, because a man who is not skilful may be called a poor practitioner. But if he means to say that I was a poor man, his statements are false. I went to the city of Halifax after fourteen years of laborious practice in my profession, where I had a great and most profitable practice; I went to the city of Halifax as a public man, and when I took office in 1867 I was an independent man. Therefore, the statement that I went there impoverished is a falsehood of the most glaring character, as can be established in the most incontrovertible manner. When we were defeated at the end of three years, I went into practice in the city of Halifax, and at the end of a little over three years, when we carried the province from end to end, when there were only fifteen Liberal members elected in the whole province of Nova Scotia in a House of fifty-five members, I had at that time acquired so valuable and important a medical practice, that I could not afford to give it up. It was worth three or four times what my salary as provincial secretary would be worth, and I was compelled to take a medical partner and to remain in the profession, because I could not abandon my lucrative practice. I spent twenty-nine years of my life in the arduous practice of the medical profession, and it is not for me to say with what success. But I certainly never had reason to complain of a lack of lucrative practice wherever I was engaged. So much for that falsehood.

Then, there is another greater and still more monstrous falsehood in this statement of Mr. Peters, and that is that I am one of the richest men in Canada. I have no hesitation in saying frankly to this House that I profess to have some ability, some

financial and commercial ability, the same ability to manage business that every person requires in his own interest, and I have had opportunities of a very admirable character to give me a field for the development of that talent, whatever it was. I do not hesitate to say that I should be greatly ashamed of myself, if under those circumstances, I was a pauper; I should feel it would be a great reflection upon my character as a business man, which I always profess to be, and not only a business man, but a great economist, I may say that when I was asked to take the position of Prime Minister of Canada, I resigned positions of high character and standing in the city of London, that gave me £90,000 sterling a year over and above the income I was receiving from the country. That was as director of the Bank of British Columbia, chairman of a cable company connected with Brazil, and director of the General Mining Association, positions which, instead of impairing my usefulness to the country, I think, greatly increased it, because they brought me into contact with men of standing and of character in business life, and enabled me to serve Canada more fully than otherwise I could have done. But when I took the position of Prime Minister I felt bound to relieve myself of all these obligations and connections, and I did so. When I was invited to become the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party, and when I accepted that leadership, my financial position was such, and such obligations rested upon me, that I felt the necessity of doing something to increase my annual income. I was, therefore, compelled to accept positions in connection with the development of our gold mining industry in this country, in order to increase my annual income so as to enable me to discharge my duty to the great Liberal-Conservative party that had done me the honour to invest me with its leadership. I feel bound to meet this slander of my being a rich man, which I am sorry to say, brings constant claims upon me, that I am unable to respond to. In self-defence I am obliged to protect myself against such slanders, because this is a base falsehood uttered by a man who is no gentleman, and it is without any ground whatever. Do not mistake me, Mr. Speaker, I do not deny Mr. Peters' right, or the right of any man in this House, or even any man taking an interest in public affairs, if he knows that a man has dishonoured and degraded himself by attempting, as a member of the parliament of this country, to enrich himself, to make the charge public. There is no higher crime, in my judgment, which can be brought against a man, and any man has a right, and he would be fully justified if he has such knowledge, to make that charge against me, if he could. I have shown the House how utterly unfounded it is, and I regard Mr. Peters as having disgraced himself by this attempt to injure a man whom,

I am happy to say, is out of his power to reach or injure. I shall join the right hon. First Minister with great pleasure in voting down the resolution which is the most illogical and the most unreasonable that I have ever seen offered in this House.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being included in the same strong language that we have heard applied to gentlemen who think along the lines laid down in the resolution my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). I take the liberty of seconding that resolution in this House. In doing so let me say that when I agreed to second it I hardly expected that the resolution would be met by the opposition of the leaders on both sides of the House or I might have been somewhat more delicate about accepting the responsibility. It is not, however, a matter of choice in my case. The question of the taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands is, I may say, the question in the part of the country that I represent. For reasons good or bad the greater part of the land grant of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been selected in northern Alberta and western Saskatchewan. To-day that country is settling up rapidly and the question of the possibility of taxing land owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is the most important question facing the people there, which, they certainly expect, will be dealt with by this House. As to the importance of that question to the people there I may explain that there are sixteen sections of Canadian Pacific Railway land in each township and wherever there is a settlement in a township, that township is set apart as a statute labour district, and every settler has to pay \$2.50 on a quarter section of his land. The exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway in every statute labour township in the North-west Territories is \$160 a year—\$160 a year that the people in that township have practically to pay, or, they have to do without the work that the money will pay for. Wherever there is a township settled there is also a school district which has to be supported by the taxes of the people, and it means that wherever there is a settlement the exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway land in that country amounts to \$5 per quarter section, which has to be paid practically by the people settled there. It is a live question in that country, and the people, believing that this exemption from taxation would expire at the beginning of next year, and expecting to be able to tax that land in January, or February, of next year, certainly will read with very great pain, with very great surprise, with very great disappointment the declarations that have been made in this House to-night, not so much that the law will not compel the payment of taxes on this land, as that the leaders on both sides

of this House have declared themselves against aiding in any way to compel the company to pay taxes on that land.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think in the absence of the right hon. First Minister, I must justify both him and myself by saying that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is entirely mistaken. No statement has fallen from the lips of either the First Minister or myself that has indicated any indisposition whatever to do anything that can legally be done to aid the people of the North-west, but what we object to is the attempt to invite this House to override the law instead of settling the law in the only way in which it can be settled, by a judicial tribunal.

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose I am at liberty to interpret the words uttered in this House according to my own judgment. If I believe that the argument used by the hon. leader of the opposition is in favour of the company and against the people, I am entitled to say so. I certainly do understand so, and I say that the company is very fortunate in having such an able advocate in this House; and the people would be very fortunate if they had as able advocacy in their effort to secure bare justice in this House, which is all we are asking for. The argument which has been carried on in this House to-night will be disappointing to the people of the west because of its absolute, utter and entire unfairness; for the hon. gentlemen who have spoken have not spoken on the point at issue. They have, either deliberately and intentionally, or through a failure to understand the matter, misrepresented the question that is before the House. The question that is before the House is not whether the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be brought under taxation in February, 1901. That is not the question embodied in the resolution. The direction contained in the resolution, upon which the House is asked to vote, is that lands owned, or earned by the company shall be patented to them. That is all that the House is asked to declare. The opinion is expressed that after a certain date in February of next year the land will be taxable, but no action is asked to be taken on that point. The action is asked to be taken on the patenting of the lands, so that if perchance they are taxable then the taxation may be levied. If the lands remain as they are to-day, and if it should be that the law would permit of them being taxed in February, 1901, the taxes cannot be levied, if the lands have not been patented, because you cannot collect a tax unless the people own the land, and they do not own the land until they have got their patents.

Mr. POWELL. How many acres are yet unpatented?

Mr. OLIVER. More than 15,000,000 acres, I think. What we want is, that this parliament shall declare, and that this government shall act, to put the land in such a position that when and so soon as the law declares it shall be taxable, that it may be taxable. We say, in our ignorance if you like, as laymen, as men who do not understand the quips and quibbles of the law; we say, that if that land was in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, solid enough for them to mortgage it on a certain date, it is in their hands solid enough for the exemption from taxation to begin from that date. If we are mistaken on that point, then Sir Hector Langevin, and the leader of the opposition (as shown by the pages of *Hansard*) were mistaken too. They are on record as saying that that exemption would expire in twenty years. They asked their followers to vote the contract through the House on that plea. If we are mistaken they were mistaken. They ought to have known at least as well as the members of this House. Surely the men who made the bargain ought to be good evidence as to what the terms of that bargain meant. Now, supposing the land does not become taxable in twenty years from the date of the charter being granted; suppose the intention is that it shall become taxable after twenty years from the date it is earned in sections; still it must be patented before it can be taxed, and several such sections of that land under that arrangement would be taxable within two years from the present time. Supposing, again, that the land is only taxable twenty years after it is patented by the Crown, then all the more reason that this resolution should be passed, so that in twenty years from now it may be taxed. Under the interpretation which the leader of the government favours, it is not taxable until twenty years after it has been patented. Then, I say, it is all the more reason that this resolution should be adopted and that the lands should be patented forthwith, so that if it only becomes taxable at twenty years from this date, it shall not be more than twenty years. Then, if it is not taxable in 1901, or if it is not taxable until twenty years from its being earned, or if it is not taxable for twenty years from the granting of the patent, you may ask: Why pass this resolution? I will tell you why it should be passed at once and why it should be acted upon at once. It is the system of the Canadian Pacific Railway not to sell their land outright, but to give an agreement of sale. As a matter of fact, the lands which are stated to have been sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway are not yet out of their hands, to a large extent. The land, by an arrangement with the government, is listed to the Canadian Pacific, and when a buyer wants a quarter section he makes a selection, the price is agreed upon, and he gets an agreement of sale. The pay-

ments extend over ten years, and the patent is not issued until the last dollar is paid at the end of the tenth year. And, inasmuch as that land has not been transferred from the Crown, taxes are not collectable upon it by process of law until that time. If the Canadian Pacific Railway have sold 1,000,000 acres of land, the chances are that the greater part of that million acres is still not paying taxes, although it has passed properly out of their hands. It is necessary that the land should be patented to them in order that the land they sell would become taxable at once for school and municipal purposes. The reasons that these lands are not actually sold is to avoid the possibility of back taxes being collected from the railway company. Suppose Mr. A. buys a quarter section, if the company sold that land outright to him, and he had taxes assessed against him, and the land reverted to the company, then the taxes would revert as well if the patent had been issued. But under this scheme of the patents not being issued, Mr. A. does not need to pay any taxes as long as he is on the land, and so if the land reverts to the Canadian Pacific Railway, there are no back taxes against them. I say that in all fairness to the people of the North-west, we want you to pass this resolution so that the government will know that the voice of the people is in favour of the granting of these patents, and so that this rank injustice which prevails in all the settlements of the North-west where land is being sold, shall at any rate be stopped now. That much should be done at least. As to the urgency of this matter, we hold, on the authority of the men who made this bargain, that the exemption expires in February next. We may be wrong, but at any rate there is a reasonable probability that it expires then, and if there is such a reasonable probability it is the business of this parliament and of this government to put the land in such a position that if it should turn out that our contention is correct, taxes may be collected upon that land at that time. We do not ask you to declare that it is taxable at any time; we ask you to give an opinion, but we do not ask you to take any action on that opinion. There is no necessity for the leaders of both sides of this House to weep on each other's shoulders at the danger of some injustice being done to the Canadian Pacific Railway in this matter of taxes, because it is not an arguable question until next year. When next year comes, then it will be an arguable question and it will have to be fought out in this House from year to year. But, in the meanwhile, the Canadian Pacific Railway is perfectly safe, and they are in no danger if we resolved until the cows come home. What we want is to provide at the present time for a certain contingency which in the resolution we say may arise. That is reasonable and fair, and we are asking nothing but plain justice in asking that

Mr. POWELL.

that action be taken. I want to say just a few words on another feature of this case. It seems to be a habit in this House, that when any question comes up which concerns the interests of the people the cry of confiscation or socialism is at once raised. If we demand the rights of the public, we are regarded as doing wrong to somebody else. We are here for the purpose of doing the best we can in the general interest, and we have heard time and again, year in and year out, that the general interest of the country is to have the North-west developed. I can tell this House that nothing has stood more against the development of the North-west in the last fifteen or twenty years than this bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the restrictions and disadvantages put upon the settlers by virtue of it. They have looked forward to relief from this burden at the end of twenty years; they have looked forward to it with confidence, because they never supposed, and the country never supposed, that such a course would be taken as to extend that exemption indefinitely, as appears to be the intention now. They fully expected that that relief would come some time next year; and because of that there has been a feeling of confidence and hope in the North-west and the country generally in the matter of settlement. But when you turn round and say to them, this burden from which you have been suffering during these years is not only not to be lifted from you, but those who should be your champions are champions in the other cause, I say you are taking the heart out of the people; you are doing more to keep back the settlement and development of the North-west by intelligent and progressive people than you could do by any other means. It is a matter of fact, a matter of figures, that our Canadian-born citizens have been going to the United States for the last twenty or thirty years three to one as compared with those who have gone to our own North-west. Why is this? Do the United States offer better natural inducements for settlement than the North-west? They do not. But there has been fostered in the minds of the people of this country a feeling that injustice is done to the settler of the west, that his interest is a secondary interest, that it is the Canadian Pacific Railway first, last and all the time, and the settler comes in nowhere. It is that feeling that has caused our people to go to the United States instead of to the North-west; and I am sorry to think that means are not taken at the earliest possible moment to remove that impression—to say that these difficulties which, for good reason or bad reason, have existed there so long, shall cease at the earliest possible moment—shall cease exactly when their time is up. Give that idea throughout the west, and throughout this country generally, and then you may expect to see development. Then

you may expect to see our sons, our brothers, our people settling on those plains, and giving you a civilization such as or better than you have here. You will not then need to go to Russia or to Galicia to bring people who certainly degrade our civilization and are a detriment to the settlement of our country. If we need to bring those people—and we do not need to bring them—it is because we have not made the conditions of that country such as the country requires. It is because we have not done the best we could for the people of the country; and when the time has come for which the people have waited to be relieved of this incubus, they are told not only that the time is not up, but that it is extended not merely for twenty years more, but for twenty times twenty years, so far as any practical sympathy in this House is concerned. In this you are doing the greatest injury you can to the progress and development of the North-west, as well as to this eastern country, whose success and development depends so much on the success and development of that.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). Before the hon. gentleman takes his seat, I would like to ask him a question, simply for information. When does he claim that the exemption begins?

Mr. RICHARDSON. On February 15, 1881.

Mr. POWELL. When was the road completed?

Mr. RICHARDSON. In 1886.

Mr. POWELL. Would not the term of exemption be from the completion of the road? I am simply asking for information?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The statute says for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown—these are the words.

Mr. POWELL. That would be construed to mean, would it not, after the Crown should make the grant?

Mr. RICHARDSON. There is one clause that says after the completion of twenty miles, the land and money pertaining to that twenty miles, shall be granted.

Mr. J. G. RUTHERFORD (Macdonald). Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from the province of Manitoba, I have a great deal of sympathy with the resolution laid before the House this afternoon by the hon. member for Lisgar. There is no question that the immunity from taxation which the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have so long enjoyed in the west and are now enjoying, has been a great grievance to the settlers in that country. As this question has been fully discussed this afternoon, I

do not think it necessary for me to take up the time of the House in again going over the ground. There is no question, however, that every effort should be made by the government to put those lands in such a position that they can be taxed at as early a date as possible. Had the resolution not contained a clause distinctly specifying the 16th of February, 1901, as being the date on which the immunity from taxation would cease, I would have had a very great deal of pleasure in supporting it. But I feel, especially after the lucid explanation of the leader of the government, that any one supporting the resolution as it now stands would be guilty of self-stultification to some extent. I would suggest to the hon. member for Lisgar, if he can obtain the assent of the House to do so, that he should eliminate that portion of his resolution. If that were done, the rest, I am sure, would meet with the approval of the majority of the members of this House. Being, like the hon. member for Lisgar, not much of a lawyer, I do not intend to weary the House with legal arguments, which, coming from one of my standing, would have no great value; but I would simply say that whether or not the date of the land becoming liable to taxation is in February, 1901, whether or not the grant from the Crown is at the date of the issue of the patent, there is no reason why the patents should not issue at as early a date as possible. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are entitled to these lands, I cannot see why they should not be compelled to take their patents now, or as soon as possible, and I think there can be no excuse for delay in issuing them. For these reasons, I regret to say that with the clause in the resolution to which I have referred, I feel unable to support it, although I have full sympathy with the object at which it aims.

**Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg).** The motion before the House, Mr. Speaker, has certainly had a very harsh reception, and it does not appear to me to have been fairly or frankly treated. I have not been in any way convinced by the arguments made by the leaders on both sides that theirs is a right view of the case which we ought to accept. Of course, I concur heartily in the proposition that this parliament would not think on any consideration of placing an interpretation on its own acts. We have no intention of going back on the British principle of leaving the interpretation of all Acts to the courts; but, if this is a matter for reference to the courts, it should be referred to them without further delay. The exemption clause as regards the land read as follows:

The lands of the company in the North-west Territories, until they are either sold or occupied  
**Mr. RUTHERFORD.**

shall also be free from such taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof by the Crown.

There are three possible interpretations. Does that twenty years mean twenty years from the passing of the Act, or twenty years after the completion of certain sections of the road or the whole work, or twenty years after the patents for the land are issued? If the last is right, then the Canadian Pacific Railway has an exemption in perpetuity, because that company does not take out patents and need not do so until it sells the land; and when it does sell the land and the land passes to the purchaser, the purchaser becomes liable for the taxes. In my opinion, there is no doubt that such an exemption was not in the minds of those who made the contract and is not in the Act. Then, does the twenty years mean from the completion of the work? There is less to support this ground than any other. The Act seems to me to state that the twenty years should count from the date of its passage, and that on the passage of the Act these lands became immediately available for the use of the company, and to all intents and purposes, the grant was then made to the company. At all events, it is a matter of contract, and there are two parties to the contract—the people of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway—and this parliament should look after the rights of the people.

The right hon. the leader of the House took the position that the party in opposition in 1881 did not succeed in having their views prevail, and that the Act now in force was passed and became the law of the land. That is the case, but I cannot find—and I have read through the debates of that period, as well as the Act itself—that either the opposition or the government were of the opinion that this Act gave the Canadian Pacific Railway exemption from taxation in perpetuity on those lands. I do not think that any question was raised on that point at all, and I do not find that the Hon. Edward Blake claims that this monstrosity was perpetual. He said:

They have perpetual exemption from taxation of their enormous property, a most monstrous provision, in my opinion. Why! this monstrosity is not to last merely twenty years, which is to be the period of bondage in other respects, but it is to last for ever.

That is exemption in perpetuity as regards the right of way, and in other respects it was for twenty years.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** If the hon. gentleman will read that closely, he will see that Mr. Blake was referring to the road-bed, which is for ever exempt from taxation.

**Mr. PUTTEE.** I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I used the expression 'right of way' when I should have said 'road-bed.' But, the onus of proving this matter, if it goes

to law, should not be placed on the municipalities of the North-west. Of course, the North-west is most concerned, but this is a contract made before the people went into that country, between parliament and the Canadian Pacific Railway; and the North-west has the right to look to the Dominion parliament to have this matter settled and have the people relieved of this burden. I do not see in any case, that the people of the North-west have an opportunity to bring this matter to the courts, because the lands are not taxable until patented, and if they are not patented, how can the municipalities tax them?

I see no difficulty in supporting the motion before the House, but it should be pointed out that the motion is not in the exact words of the notice in the Votes and Proceedings. In the Votes and Proceedings it reads:

That in the opinion of this House the lands covered by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will become subject to taxation on the 15th of February, 1891.

It would not be right to pass the motion in that shape, but I understand that, as read by the mover, it provides that the lands shall now be patented, so that whatever the ruling of the courts may be, we shall put the municipalities in the position of being able to tax these lands when the exemption period expires.

The House divided on amendment (Mr. Richardson):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Graham, Oliver, Pettet,	Puttee, Richardson, and Rogers.—6.
-------------------------------	--

NAYS:

Messieurs

Angers, Bazinnet, Beattie, Bell (Addington), Bell (Pictou), Bell (Prince), Bergeron, Blair, Borden (Halifax), Bourbonnais, Britton, Broder, Brodeur, Brown, Cargill, Caron (Sir Adolphe), Carroll, Casey, Cochrane, Copp, Craig, Davies (Sir Louis), Dechene, Demers, Desmarais, Dugas,	Lavergne, Lemieux, Macdonald (King's), Macdonell, Mackie, McAlister, McClure, McGregor, McGugan, McIsaac, McLellan, McLennan (Inverness), McMillan, Madore, Malouin, Marcel, Marcotte, Martin, Meigs, Mignault, Mills, Moore, Morin, Morrison, Mulock, Parmalee,
--	---

Dupré, Edwards, Ellis, Featherston, Fielding, Fisher, Fortier, Frost, Ganong, Gauvreau, Geoffrion, Gibson, Gillies, Gilmour, Godbout, Guillet, Harwood, Holmes, Hutchison, Ingram, Johnston, Kaulbach, Lang, Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Powell, Prior, Proulx, Quinn, Rats, Rosamond, Ross, Rutherford, Savard, Semple, Snetsinger, Sproule, Stenson, Sutherland, Taylor, Tisdale, Tucker, Tupper (Sir Charles), Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert), Turcot, Wallace, Wilson, and Wood.—99.
--	---

Amendment (Mr. Richardson) negatived.

DUTY ON GRANITE.

Mr. A. H. MOORE (Stanstead). Before we go into Committee of Supply, I desire, for a few moments, to direct the attention of hon. members of this House to a matter affecting an important industry in this country. It is well known that there are large deposits of granite in various parts of Canada. In one county in the province of Quebec there is a deposit of granite sufficient, perhaps, to supply this whole country for a hundred years to come. For years the prospects seemed to be favourable for those operating the quarries, there being every reason to believe that they could carry on their business at a fair profit. But, since the preferential tariff of 25 per cent was put in force the companies operating quarries in this country have been simply striving for existence instead of making the profit which they were able to make when they commenced their industry. And, since the Minister of Finance has announced that it is the intention of this government to increase the present tariff from 25 to 33½ per cent, some of these parties who have been doing a fairly profitable business, say that it will be impossible to continue the same class of work to compete with granite that is imported into this country from Great Britain. One gentleman connected with this industry, said:

If this further preferential tariff of 33½ per cent is to be enforced, we may bid good-bye to a large proportion of our business.

And the manager of a large industry in this line makes this statement:

Now, we submit it is not just. And we have a large amount of capital invested in this business, and a number of our men own their homes and the only means whereby they can earn their living is in the stone business, or, at least that is the business by which they can best earn a livelihood for themselves and their

families. We ask only for justice for ourselves and for those who work for us.

They claim that it is an unjust thing, that after spending large sums of money in acquiring quarries in different parts of the country and, further large sums in providing sufficient plant not only to quarry the granite but to dress it and prepare it for market, the government should take off the protection which they had counted upon, leaving them in a position in which their vested interests in this great industry are injured.

The great difficulty seems to be that, since the preferential tariff has come into effect and the duties have been reduced—and that difficulty will be increased when the preference is still further increased—they cannot compete with the cheap material and cheap labour of Great Britain. One of the parties interested in that industry says that if this 33½ per cent comes into force they may bid good-bye to a large proportion of their business. It will have the effect, it seems, of shutting them out of a large proportion of the business; and there is no other employment into which a great number of the people now engaged in that business can go. They will feel it all the more, because many of them own their houses and will be obliged to go to some other country to find employment. The difficulty is that in England they can employ men at 14 cents an hour to dress granite, while in this country, the price paid is regulated by what is paid to American artisans—35 cents an hour, the price that is paid along our borders. I have a statement which will show to the members of the government something of the position in which the industry of this country finds itself. Take, as an example, 25 cubic feet of granite in England and in this country. The relative cost is shown by the following figures:

Great Britain —	
Stone costing, laid down in yard, say 25 feet at average price of 60 cents per foot .....	\$15 00
Say 100 hours labour finishing same, at 14 cents per hour.....	14 00
Boxing.....	1 25
Duty on \$29, at 35 per cent.....	10 15
<hr/>	
Total cost.....	\$40 40
Less 25 per cent on \$10.15.....	2.54
<hr/>	
Net cost.....	\$37 86
Canada—	
Say 25 feet at average price, 75 cents per foot .....	\$18 75
Say 100 hundred hours finishing, at 35 cents per hour .....	35 00
Boxing.....	1 50
<hr/>	
Total showing cost in our yard here, of stone when finished and ready for shipment.....	\$55 25
<hr/>	
Great Britain.....	\$37 86
Excess of Canadian price over English price .....	17 39
<hr/>	
Mr. MOORE.	

This is a difference of about 48 per cent. It will be seen at once that the increase in the preferential tariff from 25 per cent to 33½ per cent will destroy this important industry, and throw a great many people out of employment, while compelling the people of this country to import their granite from outside instead of supplying it for themselves. I do not propose to embarrass the government by making a motion in regard to this matter. I merely wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to it. We heard that hon. gentleman say that he was not going to reduce the duties on any article. We had hoped that he would reduce the duties on coal oil, tobacco and other necessaries of life. But the announcement has been made that it is the policy of the government not to reduce the duties on the necessaries of life, notwithstanding that a large surplus is anticipated for the present year and that they have an overflowing treasury. Instead of making a motion, I merely suggest the idea to the government. The hon. minister said he would not reduce the duty on any article—it is said that a bad promise is better broken than kept—but he has not said he would not increase the duty. I propose that they should increase the duty on granite by from 10 to 20 per cent. That would not mean the breaking of the hon. gentleman's promise, and it would preserve that industry to this country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I suppose that, following the same rule, if we increased the duty on coal oil, my hon. friend (Mr. Moore) would not be so much pleased. But, after all there is as much reason for increasing it in one case, nearly as in the other. I appreciate the importance of the industry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Moore) has referred to, and it is hardly necessary to say that the government would not take any step which they believed would bear unfairly upon that industry. We know that whenever a change is made in the tariff there is always a strong disposition on the part of people interested in particular branches of trade to fear that they are going to suffer from it. I suppose a tariff change, especially a reduction in the tariff, was never made without exciting in some quarters a certain degree of anxiety and alarm, and in many cases it has been found that the anxiety was needless and the alarm was mistaken, and I trust it will be proved so in this case. The duty on the manufactured granite is 35 per cent. If you take off the preferential duty, even at the increased rate as proposed on the 1st of July, you still have a duty of upwards of 23 per cent on the manufactured granite, and I really think that is still a fair revenue duty, indeed some persons might almost be justified in calling it a protective duty. However, the hon. gentleman is correct in stating that the

determination has been announced by the government not to make changes in detail during the present session. If the time comes when such changes generally will have to be considered, we shall keep in mind what the hon. gentleman has said respecting the granite industry. But I have a strong hope that experience will show that with the reduced duty of 23 and a fraction per cent, there will still be a sufficient basis to enable the industry to be carried on as successfully in the future as in the past.

Mr. MOORE. The hon. gentleman referred to coal oil, and asked if I was in favour of increasing the duties on coal oil. I would not be in favour of increasing the duty on coal oil. It has already been increased during the last two years by 200 per cent. I think that is high enough, and instead of increasing it I would be in favour of taking it all off.

#### PRIVATE MAIL BAGS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). As it is possible I may not be present when the estimates of the Postmaster General are under discussion, I would like to bring to his attention a matter connected with the administration of the Post Office Department in my county. Last year I called his attention to a matter relating to the delivery of mails by private bags to one W. C. Henley, a municipal councillor and well-known man in my constituency; and the hon. gentleman was good enough to say that under the circumstances as they then presented themselves to him, there was not the slightest objection to Mr. Henley's request being granted. I forwarded a *Hansard* containing the hon. gentleman's remarks, to Mr. Henley, and he induced the postmistress to carry out the arrangement which had been in effect before. What the hon. gentleman stated at that time was merely this: He said there was not the slightest objection to the postmaster delivering mail to a carrier as the agent of the person to whom it was addressed and at the request of that person, the postmaster under such circumstances assuming no responsibility whatever, because the person to whom it was addressed received delivery of it when it was handed to the carrier. Well, the difficulty which subsequently arose seems to be this: Mr. Henley resides at Spry Bay in the county of Halifax, and the bag which he had made up was made up at Tangier, while his mail matter is addressed to Spry Bay. It seems that some regulation of the department has been invoked on account of which it is forbidden to deliver mail at Tangier addressed to Spry Bay, and it is with regard to that that Mr. Henley makes his complaint. Now, the arrangement that I asked for last year was carried out for some months, after the debate which took place, and no difficulty

whatever arose about it. I may also mention to the Postmaster General that the same arrangement accorded to Mr. Henley had been carried out for about twenty-five years before the interference of the post office inspector. During all that time not the slightest difficulty had been found with regard to it. But the peculiar position of this matter is that although the post office inspector placed his reason for refusing this concession to Mr. Henley upon this ground, there are no less than three instances in my own county where, under exactly the same circumstances, private bags of this kind are allowed. One of those is referred to by Lieut.-Col. Macdonald, post office inspector. I will read to the hon. gentleman his letter addressed to myself, and I will inquire of him what he thinks of the views of the post office inspector with regard to this subject. His letter is dated the 20th of October, last:

My dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 18th instant, and in reply to say that it is a fact that, on my recent visit to Tangier, I instructed the postmistress to discontinue the making up of a private mail bag containing the correspondence of Mr. W. C. Henley. My reason for doing so was, that Mr. Henley's mail matter is addressed 'Spry Bay,' and as the regulations of the department expressly prohibit the delivery of matter directed to a particular post office from another office en route.

I have no doubt whatever that, had the hon. the Postmaster General been made acquainted with all the circumstances of the case when the matter was brought up in parliament last session, he would have given quite a different answer to your question. I have the best of reasons for believing that he was under the impression that Mr. Henley's correspondence was addressed 'Tangier,' in which case there would certainly be an objection to its being delivered from that office to the mail courier or any one else designated by Mr. Henley.

As regards Mr. Kirker's bag, I may say that I found him in enjoyment of the privilege when I was appointed inspector, and understood that he had enjoyed it since before confederation. I did not therefore interfere with him.

Yours very truly,

CHAS. G. MACDONALD.

Post Office Inspector.

Now, that seems to be a very remarkable statement from an officer administering affairs under any government. He says to Mr. Henley: I cannot permit you to enjoy this privilege; but because Mr. Kirker has been allowed to break the law for twenty-five or thirty years, I propose to continue allowing him to break the law and the regulations of the department. I really cannot understand a post office inspector advancing such a reason as that. If this is an infraction and violation of the law, if Mr. Kirker is to be allowed to do exactly what Mr. Henley is asking to do, will any man in his senses say that the post office inspector should advance as a reason for that the fact that Mr. Kirker had been breaking the law for thirty-three years? I am astonished that although I brought

that answer of the post office inspector to the attention of the hon. gentleman's department on the 20th of October last, and although on the 14th of November last the Deputy Postmaster General told me that that matter would be inquired into, I never heard a single word about it from that day to this. When the post office inspector informed me that there was to be a period of prescription in this country which would enable a man to violate the law with impunity, I brought that to the attention of the hon. gentleman's department at once, and I have never heard a word from him since except the statement that the matter would be inquired into immediately. In the case of Mr. Kirker, mail matter is carried past five separate post offices, yet the inspector tells me that the regulations of the department forbid mail matter addressed to a particular place being delivered at a post office in advance of that, that is to say, you cannot have mail matter addressed to Spry Bay delivered to the carrier at Tangier. But in Mr. Kirker's case mail matter is delivered to the carrier at another post office altogether, and is carried past five post offices before it reaches Mr. Kirker. In the case of P. G. Archibald, of Upper Musquodoboit, exactly the same thing is done as was done in Mr. Henley's case until the post office inspector interfered. In Mr. P. G. Archibald's case the mail matter is delivered to the postmaster at Middle Musquodoboit, where the mail carrier receives it and leaves it at Mr. Archibald's place on his road to Upper Musquodoboit. The same thing is true in the case of Mr. Alexander McKenzie. He resides at Mooseland in my county. His mail matter is addressed to him at Mooseland, it is delivered by the postmaster at Tangier, and a carrier goes on with it to Alexander McKenzie's place. These statements have been verified to me by Mr. Henley himself, and by Mr. Thos. G. Stewart, one of the municipal councillors of Halifax, and a well-known and highly respected man. Under the circumstances, I regard the action of the post office inspector as very extraordinary and I think it requires careful inquiry on the part of the hon. Postmaster General. I know from the way in which he has met me in regard to this matter that I will receive from him a fair answer to my inquiry. Just one more suggestion and I have done. It is said to Mr. Henley, that if he will have his mail matter addressed to him at Tangier, there will be no difficulty about it. As I understood in a conversation with the Postmaster General, when he was good enough to discuss the matter briefly with me to-night, the reason of this regulation of the department is, that the postmaster at the point of delivery is supposed to know the person to whom mail matter should be delivered, and for that reason there should be no delivery at any other office. I will

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

point out to the hon. Postmaster General that if Mr. Henley's mail matter were addressed to him at Tangier he would not have any further safeguard than at present. The postmaster of Tangier would have no further knowledge as to whether mail matter should be addressed to Mr. Henley or not. The difficulty about complying with the suggestion is that Mr. Henley is such a well-known man in the county of Halifax, and in the province of Nova Scotia, that it would be useless for him to attempt to have his mail matter addressed to Tangier, because he lives at Spry Bay and they address his mail matter to Spry Bay. It is impossible to have his mail matter addressed to Tangier owing to that difficulty. It is because he is such a well known man that he cannot change his post office address. Whatever the regulation of the department may be, I do not want it overridden, but so far as this case is concerned there is no practical difficulty. I do not wish to be understood as desiring for Mr. Henley any privilege that any other person does not enjoy; but others enjoy this privilege without causing any difficulty whatever in respect to the distribution of mail matter. As a matter of fact, this practice has not led to any difficulty in the past, and I submit to the hon. Postmaster General that if this is done in regard to the three or four cases that I have mentioned, it is not fair to Mr. Henley, to whom it causes great inconvenience. It is a convenience of which he is deprived and which others enjoy. If there is no regulation of the department against this, let Mr. Henley enjoy it, if there is any regulation of the department which is unreasonable in that respect, it ought to be amended, and if there is a regulation of the department which is reasonable it ought to be applied to all alike.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think there is a general regulation in the department, that mail matter cannot be delivered by postmasters to the addressee except by the postmasters to which the matter is finally addressed. It is not a regulation of recent date; it has been in force for many years. It is probable it is that general regulation which has been so interpreted in this case. Personally, I have no knowledge of the matter. It has not been brought to my attention. I would say, in reference to the various instances cited by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), that there is only one law for the public in the post office, and that there could be no such thing as interpreting a law one way for one man and another way for another man. Mr. Macdonald is, I think, a very zealous and faithful officer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have always found him so except in this instance.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Quite so; I dare say he may have some explana-

tion that would satisfy me and whatever he has done, even if he has made some mistake of judgment it has been done for a good purpose. I should think so, and I hope so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend would hardly agree with Mr. Macdonald's view as to the statute of limitations.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. But I am only saying that perhaps his judgment has erred. I have always found him a faithful officer, but even faithful officers make mistakes of judgment at times. This matter, my hon. friend says, was brought to the attention of the department. It has never been brought to my attention. I think on one occasion only had I to deal with a similar question. I remember of a similar point arising at the post office known as Oliver's Ferry. I do not remember the name of the office at the ferry itself, but the ferry is called Oliver's Ferry. There is a post office about a mile away from Oliver's Ferry, and in that case a question similar to this arose. The addressee wished to get his mail at the other post office inasmuch as there was not equal frequency at the actual office of address. His request was denied by the intermediate postmaster. The matter came before me, and I made an inquiry of the secretary of the department. The secretary of the department cited to me the rule which had been referred to, and he gave me the reasons for the rule, namely, that if mail were delivered by postmasters to addressees en route it might lead to some difficulty as the postmasters might not then have the same knowledge of the identity of the addressees as if they delivered mail matter only directed to the postmaster where the addressee lived. When I found that to be the only reason I felt that a mile's difference ought not to destroy the identity of the addressee and directed that if the addressee left a written order that his mail matter should be delivered at the other office, such a delivery should take place. That was the interpretation in that case. I shall see that the regulation is so interpreted in this case. These regulations are not intended to be enforced wherever their disregard can lead to no confusion or mistakes. I will have the matter looked into, and I think there will be no difficulty in arranging the matter as my hon. friend desires.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for his statement. He will understand that in criticising Mr. Macdonald it is only in regard to this particular instance, because I entirely agree with what the hon. gentleman has said in respect to the faithfulness, diligence and the efficiency that have characterized Mr. Macdonald's administration of his office since it was assumed by him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When I find an officer who is zealous and doing his duty, and when I have a good opinion of him, I like to support him even though he may make these errors of judgment. I do not say that even in this case he has done so. Once the matter is brought to the attention it is dealt with by the department.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Speaker, the regulation is exactly as the hon. the Postmaster General has interpreted it. I think it is a regulation that cannot be overlooked. Now, if a postmaster could distribute the letters irrespective of the address, it might lead to a very great inconvenience and the Postmaster General is quite right in saying that these regulations, though most of the time indispensable, ought to be set aside for valid reasons. The local postmaster is not to blame. The regulation can only be waived by an order from the Postmaster General.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Public Works—Collection of Revenue—  
Collection of slide and boom dues..... \$5,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (Three Rivers). The other night the minister mentioned that a sum of \$25,000 had been expended upon the St. Maurice River for repairing the damages caused to the booms. I commended that vote at the time. The minister knows that extensive lumbering operations are carried on there by some of the wealthiest lumbermen in Canada, amongst others, Mr. Baptist and the Canadian Lumber Company. Now, that vote of \$25,000 was merely for repairs. But, what about the vote which is necessary for carrying out works in order to accommodate the lumber trade on that river.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). The hon. gentleman is right in assuming that the \$25,000 in the supplementary estimates would not meet the requirements of the case. Last night we voted \$45,000 in the main estimates, and this is added to it.

Telegraph line between Prince Edward Island and the mainland..... \$2,000

Mr. J. V. ELLIS (St. John). May I ask what this \$2,000 means?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is to carry out a contract entered into at confederation and continued ever since for the maintenance of the telegraph system in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. ELLIS. I do not see any of the Prince Edward Island members here, but I have to say that this is the very worst possible telegraph service in the country and something should be done to improve it. If there is a contract binding on the govern-

ment to give this subsidy, then there ought to be some power in the government to make the company give the public a fair and reasonable service. At this time particularly, when the whole country is anxious over news and when those connected with its transmission should be on the alert particularly in connection with the South African war, these people who have charge of the telegraph cable between the mainland and Prince Edward Island pay no attention whatever to the public demands. They close their offices sometimes about dark, and you cannot get any communication with them after that. They carry on their service without the slightest regard to the public needs. I do not wish to take up time in talking about it, but every person who has in any way to do with the telegraph system of Prince Edward Island, knows that the service is so far behind the age, that it is a disgrace to the country. It seems to me that it is the clear duty of the government under the circumstances to insist that this company shall render some service commensurate with the money that is paid them. Whatever may have been the facts of the case when the grant was originally made, the conditions in this country have so entirely changed that the telegraph company should be compelled to meet them. I would not hesitate a moment to vote in this House to confiscate that company. I would consider that in doing so I would be only doing my duty to my country. I think I have some regard for honesty, and I can say that a company that does not discharge its duty; a company that fails utterly to discharge its duty as this company does, ought to be compelled in some way to do it. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), I regret, is not here, but I understood there was some correspondence going on between the government and the authorities connected with this cable company, to get if possible a better telegraph service. Might I ask what has been the result of that correspondence?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). What company is it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Anglo-American Company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I think the arrangement was made before confederation with the Anglo-American Telegraph Company, which is today practically associated with the Western Union. They have a monopoly of cable landing on Prince Edward Island for a number of years, four or five of which have yet to run, and until that time expires we are not in a position to do anything except by friendly arrangement. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) has been endeavouring for some years to induce them, from ordinary business considerations, to give a better service. I do not think it is

Mr. ELLIS.

in the power of the government to dictate any terms to them until their monopoly has expired.

Mr. ELLIS. When the Minister of Marine is present, and on the supplementary estimates, I will bring this whole question up, because it is a matter of great importance to the people of New Brunswick and of Prince Edward Island as well.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I should like to draw the attention of the government to the necessity of having telegraphic communication with Belle Isle. Commercial people in Canada, as well as in England, feel that telegraphic communication between the island and the north shore is much needed in the interest of trade. I am not a believer in the dangers of the navigation of the St. Lawrence or the Gulf; but it is well known that that is the extreme point from which news could come; it is the boundary between the Gulf and the Atlantic Ocean; and communication with it is very difficult at present. The navigation of the St. Lawrence is continually being improved; but the trade of the country will not be satisfied until we have communication between the rock on which stands the lighthouse on Belle Isle and the north shore. Representations have been made on this subject on more than one occasion by ship-owners. If it were known abroad that the island was in telegraphic communication with the north shore, the apprehensions of a good many people with regard to the dangers of navigation there, would be very much diminished. I am sorry the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), is not present. I know he has taken a great deal of interest in this matter, for I have had occasion more than once to discuss it with him, and I altogether agree with the views he entertains with regard to it. If the hon. gentleman now in charge of the Public Works Department would ask the hon. member for Quebec West his views on this subject, I think he would be satisfied by that hon. gentleman, that it would be an expenditure altogether in the interest of the country.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). I fully endorse the views expressed by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, in regard to the desirability of a line of telegraph across the Straits of Belle Isle and to connect with a line along the Quebec shore. It would be advantageous, not only to shipping coming from the old world and entering the Straits of Belle Isle, but to all shipping that may visit that point from different parts of Canada. Fleets of fishing vessels belonging to my county and other counties west of it—Queen's, Shelburne and Yarmouth—are accustomed to visit the fishing grounds on the coasts of Labrador, and very little is known of their whereabouts, or what they are doing from the time they

leave their homes in the month of May, till the end of the fishing season. They may meet with casualties, or may be deprived of the comforts of life, or the chances of aid in saving their vessels, in case of accident, but if there was a line of telegraph to some near point, communication could be had with them at any time. I fully endorse the position taken by the hon. member for Three Rivers, and I hope the acting Minister of Public Works will look carefully into the matter, and furnish the much needed requirement.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would like to say just one word more. The hon. gentleman will remember that a very valuable ship, the *Scotsman*, was lost on Belle Isle. I happened to be in London at the time, and some shipowner there represented to me that if there had been telegraphic communication she might have been saved.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With reference to the point raised by my hon. friend from Three Rivers, as to the need of communication between Belle Isle and the north shore, I think there can be but one opinion on that point. More than a month ago the matter was brought to my attention by the department, and I caused tenders to be invited for a cable from Point aux Esquimaux on the north shore of Belle Isle, to be completed this fall. The time for receiving the tenders has just expired, and the deputy informs me that certain tenders have been received and opened, and the disposition of them is to be submitted to me to-morrow. The tenders are for the supply of cable. The laying of the cable will be done by the department's steamer *Newfield*.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I congratulate the hon. gentleman.

Rent, fuel and light for public buildings,  
Yukon territory ..... \$14,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The following are the buildings that are rented. The commissioner's office, in the post office, is rented from T. C. Long, including the post office at \$1,200 per month. The old post office, owned by Bedford & Long, was rented for \$850 per month. The Crown lands, timber and registry office, is rented for \$750 per month. The commissioner's house is leased from the Rev. Father Gendron by the government for \$250 per month. The information furnished by the Department of the Interior is to the effect that there are very few available buildings at Dawson City for government offices, and that the nature of the settlement there, causes the people to require much higher rentals than are paid in more settled countries, where there is less chance of depreciation of property. Part of this item covers fuel. The Department of the Interior paid in December, 1899, from \$22.50 to \$25 for wood to Messrs. John Evans and J. L. White. The department

paid for wood from \$22 to \$26 per cord. The price paid for fuel in Dawson is at \$15 to \$18 a cord, exclusive of sawing, splitting and piling, which costs \$8 to \$8.50 per cord.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Are these on the water front?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Are any of them on patented land.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no information on that point.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman promised to give information as to whether this wood is taken from government land or furnished under contract after calling for tenders.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I remember the question being asked, and will furnish the information on an item in the supplementaries.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). Would it not be better, instead of paying such enormous rents, for the government to erect buildings themselves?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is quite right. Some weeks ago plans were prepared for certain buildings in Dawson City and tenders were asked for up to the 13th June. Mr. Fuller, the government architect out there, was instructed by telegraph to advise the department so as tenders could be dealt with. I hope it will be possible to escape these enormous rentals at the earliest moment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In his report, Mr. Ogilvie speaks of renting the post office from Morrison & McDonald. Who are the landlords?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The landlord is Mr. D. Long. The former building was destroyed by fire not long ago, and a new one had to be rented.

Lewes and Yukon River improvements.. \$40,000

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman promised some information the other night on this item.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the *Hansard* the hon. gentleman will find the explanation I made of the different works about to be undertaken with the view of improving navigation. The improvements are at Hell's Gate, and Horse Rapids, and Five Finger Rapids, and other places, and will not all be gone on with this year, but be proceeded with gradually. Mr. Taché is the officer in charge.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. And a very good man.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He has done the best he could. Mr. Taché is on

his way down now—the deputy expects him in three or four days—for the purpose of reporting as to the work accomplished, and to make arrangements and receive instructions for the work yet to be done.

**Mr. CLANCY.** It would seem that Mr. Taché has had the whole matter in his own hands, that practically the department were giving no directions and they are unable to say really what the extent of the work would be in the end.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has misunderstood me. I stated the other evening that the former chief engineer of the department, Mr. Coste—I do not know whether I stated in what year, but it was, I understand, in 1898—surveyed those waters and made plans and recommendations as to the improvements. His report has been passed upon since, and certain of the proposed improvements authorized and undertaken. My hon. friend, perhaps, has in his mind one point that was brought up by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster)—a very good point indeed—the necessity of having a good accountant there to keep the accounts. Hon. gentlemen will be glad to know that I reported the matter to council and council authorized me to make the necessary arrangements. When Mr. Taché arrives here, the operations of the year will be decided upon and instructions will be given him; and when he returns, I trust that with him will go an accountant to superintend the accounts. Mr. Taché superintending the work of the improvements.

**Mr. CLANCY.** What is the total cost of the work, according to the plans of Mr. Coste?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** The estimated cost of the work is \$138,000. Of course, it is not intended to do the whole of it this year. There is a general plan, and the policy will be to work out that plan as rapidly as circumstances will justify, doing the more urgent parts first.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Mr. Taché has a clerk with him now. Who is that clerk? There was some mention made of that the other evening, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) was not able to give the information.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** The engineer's clerk is Mr. Bray. In order to give Mr. Taché instructions, it is necessary that he should be here, but in the meantime, the work does not go on. When the money is voted, he will be given his instructions what to do for the remainder of the year.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Is this work carried on by contract?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** It is carried on under the direction and supervision of Mr. Taché by day's labour. It is impossible to make the contract for work at so great a distance.

**Mr. MULOCK.**

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** In the case of such improvements as this, how are the supplies procured? For instance, if lumber is required, how is it bought? The other evening we were speaking of the work on the St. Maurice. A great deal of timber was required to repair the slides and for the other work. I may mention now, as it will save me asking questions on other items, that I would like to know the system followed by the department in these matters. I should also like to know the names of those who contracted in the case of the St. Maurice works.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** As to the supply of lumber on the Lewes River—

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** It was the St. Maurice I wanted.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** That work, as my hon. friend knows, was of a somewhat urgent character and the material had to be acquired at the earliest moment. The chief engineer informs me that the plan adopted was to send communications to all dealers in the vicinity to tender, and the lowest tender was accepted.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I should like, if it is quite convenient—and if not some other occasion would do—to have the names of the people to whom notices were sent to tender and also the name of the lowest tenderer.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I have not that information, but it will be given on some supplementary item. Whatever item of Public Works may be up, the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) will be free to ask for the information and to discuss the point.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I am seeking information rather than an opportunity for discussion. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) anticipated the questions I was going to ask about Louiseville, to which he referred—

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** The hon. gentleman misunderstood me—I spoke of the Lewes River.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I speak of Louiseville on Rivière du Loup. The hon. gentleman will remember that some important works were carried on there and some people have applied to me to know what amount of money was expended last summer on these works. I would also like to know if it is the intention of the government to prosecute the works already undertaken, and also the name of the person who is overlooking the work.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I will have all the information furnished at a later date. The deputy informs me that the work was carried on under Mr. Howden, the superintendent of dredging.

Mr. F. A. MARCOTTE (Champlain.) (Translation). As regards the works on the St. Maurice River, I understand the hon. gentleman has declared that the timber to be used in the building up of the booms had been bought without tenders being asked for.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We asked for tenders.

Mr. MARCOTTE (Translation). The hon. gentleman did not ask for tenders so that he might choose the lowest.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The chief engineer informs me that the actual work was performed under the direct supervision of the officers, but that the timber required was purchased, after quotations being asked from all the local dealers in the vicinity. The people who had timber available were asked to give quotations. It was not a case where we could wait till timber could be manufactured, the work had to be performed at once, in time to take care of the logs that come down in the opening of navigation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Can the hon. gentleman furnish the names of the people who tendered, and the lowest tenderer?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will give the quotations, that is practically the same.

Ocean and river service—Outfit and stores of ss. 'Minto' in Scotland, including wages of crew to Canada and extra nickel steel propeller blades..... \$12,869

Mr. CLANCY. This is evidently a new item.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is the cost of bringing the ss. *Minto* out from Scotland, of which the items are as follows: Passage of crew from Charlottetown to Glasgow (sixteen in all), \$816.88; David S. Bryson, Dundee, stores (engine room and deck supplies), \$1,000.54; Capt. Finlayson, expenses and wages for August and September, while in Dundee, and wages of crew coming to Canada, \$1,466.22; wages of eight seamen shipped at Dundee, including firemen returning to Dundee, \$457.69; Gourlay Bros. & Co., Dundee, for bunker coal, furnishings for staterooms, magazine, labour, bagging coal and loading, \$2,939.52; J. B. Cognlin, for cutlery, silverware, crockery, &c., \$1,265.32; painting after arrival from Dundee, \$182.87; fittings of mail rooms for winter service, \$185.19; extra nickel steel propeller blades in case of accident, \$1,318.25; Bruce Stewart & Co., Charlottetown, repairing damages owing to heavy gale experienced on passage, the forward deckhouse was damaged and had to be repaired; for supplying an ash ejector, and extra heating apparatus required for winter, \$3,236.52, making up the total of \$12,869.

Mr. MARTIN. Can the hon. minister tell us the total cost of the steamer *Minto*?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I gave that the other day to the hon. gentleman, he will find it in the *Hansard*, the whole cost including extras and everything. I cannot recollect the figures at the moment. The details were brought down in a return to the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN. I think we are entitled to have this information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not got it under my hand. I stated when we went through the main estimates what the whole cost of the vessel was. The hon. gentleman will find the details in a return brought down in the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to know the cost of this steamer, the amount of the extras given to the contractor, where the steamer was built, and the extras that were put on to the steamer since she came over here. I think we are entitled to have that information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not dispute the hon. gentleman's right to it. I tell him it has already been brought down to the Senate in a return.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would suggest, since the hon. gentleman has brought down a return to the Senate of the full cost of that vessel, that this item should stand until that information can be given here.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has nothing to do with this. I gave my hon. friend every detail in connection with this year. The matter to which he refers belongs to the previous year altogether, and it has nothing to do with the present financial year. I will give it again. The cost of bringing the vessel out from Glasgow and furnishing it, was \$12,869. The hon. gentleman is asking me for something about a matter that occurred in a previous year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. minister will admit that my hon. friend, sitting behind me, will not have any other item upon which he can bring this up.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, I have items in the supplementary estimates on which he can bring it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. On the *Minto*?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and I will have all the information.

Alteration to the steamship 'Aberdeen'.. \$7,000

Mr. CLANCY. What alterations are these?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The steamer *Aberdeen* was found to swim when loaded too much by the head and did not carry sufficient cargo. There was too much cabin accommodation, and we found that by removing the cabin in the afterpart of the ship and making it into a freight room, we would have a great deal more room for the carriage of supplies down to the coast, and make the vessel trim better, which we did.

To complete the construction of Traverse light pier by giving it additional protection by rip-rap ..... \$5,000

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. What is that for?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. We built that pier last year under the vote, and we carried it out very successfully, but the engineer thought that it should have some extra protection on account of the prevalence of high winds, and it is thought expedient to extend the rip-rap around the pier to a greater width in order to secure the foundation.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. Was that work done by contract?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No, it was done under the supervision of the engineer.

Mr. **McALISTER**. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, if the Oak Point lights below Campbellton on the Quebec side of the river have been lit?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I will make a note of it, and tell my hon. friend.

Mr. **McALISTER**. If they have not been, I would like to know what is the difficulty, and when the light will be lit?

J. W. G. Roberts, draughtsman in the office of the chief engineer, from October 24, 1899, to June 30, 1900, 8 8-31 months at \$50 a month, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.... \$448 87

Mr. **CLANCY**. What is this extra service there, performed by this draughtsman?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The Auditor General will not allow me to hire any extra clerk in the department at a higher salary than \$400. It became necessary to hire a draughtsman, and I thought I would be entitled to pay him out of the general vote for departmental contingencies. But the Auditor General would not allow me to do so, so that I must take a special vote for it. I could not expect to get a draughtsman for \$400; I had to pay him for eight months at the rate of \$50 per month, and I had to take a special vote for it.

C. W. Gauthier, amount allowed him in full settlement of his claim of \$2,100 for supplying fish ova to the Sandwich hatchery from 1886 to 1890 ..... \$1,300

Mr. **CLANCY**.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. What is this?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. This is an old disputed claim that I found when I came into the department. It was a claim for \$2,100 for fish ova supplied to the Sandwich hatchery. A letter was written to Mr. Gauthier by the department, asking him to supply a quantity of fish ova, which it was necessary to obtain if it had not been supplied by Gauthier. It was not stipulated what he should be paid. The whole question arose owing to a misunderstanding as to the instructions given to Mr. Gauthier. In 1895 the claim was referred to the fishery officers for a report, and Mr. Webster reported in favour of paying Mr. Gauthier \$1,300 for 65,000,000 ova which he had supplied, reducing his claim by \$800. That report was submitted to Mr. Venning, and approved by him, and after the report had been considered by Mr. Venning, the matter came before me the year before last. I hesitated about paying it at first, but I did not see very well how I could get over the report of these officers in favour of paying this amount.

Mr. **CLANCY**. What was the ground of refusal of the department to pay?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It was not a refusal so much as a misunderstanding, as the instructions were not definite enough.

Mr. **CLANCY**. What indefinite instructions were given him?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. He was asked to supply ova to the Sandwich hatchery without fixing any price. After supplying it, and after taking the average cost of supplying it in previous years, Mr. Webster reported in 1895, that Mr. Gauthier should be paid \$1,300, if he would accept that in full. He would not accept it in full at the time. The claim came up in 1898, and last year they came in force with Mr. Gauthier, and discussed the question. I said that I would not pay any more than Mr. Webster and Mr. Venning recommended, and he finally agreed to accept that.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I think in my time that claim was absolutely rejected.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I have nothing before me to show that.

Sir **CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER**. I am only speaking from memory.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I have only Mr. Webster's report.

Mr. **WILSON**. I might ask the hon. minister if there is no record in the office of

this claim having been brought to the notice of the department before this time. It seems strange that it should have remained there from 1889 to 1895 without being settled, or without an effort being made to settle it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The only thing definite that I had to go upon, was the report of Mr. Webster. It came to a head in 1895, when it was submitted to Mr. Webster, who recommended the payment of \$1,300, and Mr. Venning endorsed that recommendation.

Mr. SPROULE. How did you ascertain the number of ova delivered?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was ascertained from the fishery officer.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). Might I ask the hon. minister if he has ever settled an old claim that I brought to his attention once or twice. I refer to the claim of Mr. McCammon of Gananoque.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I had forgotten all about that. I will make a note of it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I asked the hon. gentleman last year to look into it. This is a settlement made by the late minister (Mr. Costigan), and it was agreed upon between Mr. McCammon and the department. It was left there in the department, when the change of government took place, and it was not settled.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What was the name of the man?

Mr. TAYLOR. Samuel McCammon, of Gananoque, and the claim is \$100. I want the amount put in the supplementary estimates or I want permission to bring suit.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That seems reasonable.

Mr. MARTIN. If the minister (Sir Louis Davies) is settling up old claims I would like to bring to his attention the claim of Louis P. Tanton.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has nothing to do with the fisheries.

Mr. MARTIN. It has something to do with the department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is a claim of \$24 for freight carried over on the *Stanley*, and correspondence is going on between our department and the Railway Department.

Mr. MARTIN. This gentleman cannot get a line from either of these departments. Will the minister promise me that he will look into the matter?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I certainly will look into it.

Mr. MARTIN. Before the session closes?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is a little matter about \$24 about freight and I will look into it when I get time.

H. H. A. Bruce, settlement in full, including interest up to June 30, 1900, of claim for damages arising out of the lease of fishery on the Richelieu River..... \$3,504

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My predecessor in office (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in assuming that we had the right to the eel fisheries on the Richelieu leased these fisheries to Mr. Bruce and put him in possession, but he was ousted by the lessee of the provincial government. Mr. Bruce lost what money he had invested. I found a memo. in the Marine Department from my predecessor stating that he was willing to pay the actual disbursements. Mr. Christie represented Mr. Bruce, and I discussed the matter with him and consented to pay the actual disbursements and nothing more. Mr. Christie would not consent at first and he asked for a fiat to sue which I could not refuse, but later on he thought better of it and the matter was referred to the accountant and the actual disbursements computed as represented in this vote.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is quite fair.

Mr. SPROULE. What has been done in the case of the Noble Bros. on the Georgian Bay?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nothing has been done. There is a mass of papers which it would take an industrious man a month to understand and they asked me to hear counsel presenting their case, which I did. He prepared an elaborate brief which I listened to, but I have not had time to do more since.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It suits them very well to have delay because they got their tugs back.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was before my time.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes, but when any attempt is made to exact the fine, they having their property back, whenever the department moved they wanted a hearing, and they have been having hearings for six years now.

Salaries and disbursements of fishery officers and to purchase steam launch for the Fraser River fisheries ..... \$15,000

Mr. CLANCY. This is a new vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When the Privy Council de-

cision came we expected that all the officers in the Quebec district would be dismissed as they were in Ontario. Then the question came as to whether the Dominion or the province had jurisdiction in the Gulf district. We retained the officers on the Gulf shore and as the estimates were originally made we did not provide for them. We are exercising jurisdiction over the Gulf division of the province of Quebec and receiving the profits. In British Columbia we had the steamer *Wanetta*, an extra steamer for the protection of the salmon fisheries at the mouth of the Fraser River which cost \$2,500. In Nova Scotia we had to hire two or three tugs at a cost of \$2,800 for enforcing the lobster regulations. In Prince Edward Island for the same purpose we hired tugs which cost \$1,295, and in New Brunswick, \$575. In British Columbia we had to purchase a new steam launch for the Fraser River, which makes up the whole amount.

Mr. MARTIN. What tug was engaged in Prince Edward Island?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think it was *Batts*.

New hatchery at Flatheads, County of Restigouche..... \$3,590

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This hatchery was destroyed by fire at Restigouche; no doubt by an incendiary. I placed the matter in the hands of the Minister of Justice to prosecute the criminals, but with what result, I do not know.

Mr. JOHN McALISTER (Restigouche). Is this the total cost?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. McALISTER. The hatchery is absolutely necessary there. This should be 'Flatlands' instead of 'Flatheads.'

Mr. WILSON. Are we still to keep up these hatcheries even if the provinces have the right to the fisheries?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia pending the decision, we are administering the fisheries and receiving the revenues.

Mr. WILSON. And even if the decision should be against you, will you keep up the hatcheries?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will have to carefully consider that matter and take the House into my confidence. In view of the importance of the matter, it would be unwise to come to a hasty decision to abolish these hatcheries.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

Mr. McALISTER. It would be a very great mistake to discontinue these hatcheries. I know they have done a great deal of good in the Restigouche and Metapedia Rivers, and they undoubtedly should be continued.

Cost of defence of Indians at St. Régis,  
Que. .... \$1,305 14

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We all know that there has been a great deal of unrest among the Indians of St. Régis. According to the information which I have received personally as well as through the press, there seems to have been a great deal of trouble lately over the construction of a lock-up on the reserve. I would like to know if any means have been taken to come to an understanding, or if the trouble still continues.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I may say that this matter was pretty fully discussed the other evening. It came under my notice as acting minister for the first time. The whole difficulty seemed to arise from the fact that ten or twelve years ago the Indians refused to obey the law and elect their chiefs. Many efforts were made to enforce the Act, and for a while they submitted and elected chiefs. Without this election, there is no person whom the department can consult. They wanted to turn to some old tribal custom which neither they themselves nor any one else understood. They do not seem to be at all unanimous for one system or the other. In the meantime, I have given instructions to stop this work, and to have the whole matter looked into and reconsidered before anything further is done.

Relief and medical attendance in the province of Ontario ..... \$700

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the acting minister if he has had any intimation from the Indians of Walpole Island with regard to the change of the physician in attendance upon them. Indians do not take very kindly to changes of any sort. My information is from a Methodist minister, who is in charge of a large section of the Indians there, and who stated to me some months ago that since the former medical attendant was dismissed and a new one appointed in his stead, many of the Indians refused to have anything to do with the new appointee. They even preferred dying, and the result was a large number of deaths. I said to the gentleman that the best thing he could do would be to communicate that to the department. Has the department been in possession of any information of that kind during the last year, and if so, has any action been taken in the matter? It is a very serious matter to make a change of this kind on mere political or party grounds, because of some tittle-tattle which the minister may have heard. There can be no greater outrage on the part of

any government than to step in and take the money belonging to the Indians and use it to change the medical attendant because of some petty political spite or spleen.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not very familiar with this matter, but my impression is that I had a letter not many days ago calling attention to it, and I referred it to the chief officer. I will look into it and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman any objection to say whom the letter was from?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it was referred to me by Mr. Mills, and was from the same person the hon. gentleman mentions, along the same line.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this vote for any special case or for whatever may occur?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The present vote for the province of Ontario is \$1,100. At the end of February \$295 remained unexpended. The district is so large that the amount voted is quite inadequate. The Indian bands on the north shore of Lake Superior have no funds of their own to provide medical attendance or relief for themselves. During the current year the demands on the department have been larger than usual. This vote includes an item of \$150 for the purchase of garden tools and seed grain for the Indians of Gull River.

Mr. SPROULE. How is the medical attendance supplied? Is one physician employed or is any one employed as he may be required?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Only as the Indians are inclined or express a wish.

Relief of distress and the purchase of seed grain in the province of Quebec ..... \$2,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Where is the relief distributed, and to what bands?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will give my hon. friend the report of the inspector. There was \$3,000 voted for the province of Quebec, which proved inadequate to supply the demands for the current winter. The failure of the hunt and the present game regulations in the province have rendered it necessary to issue larger supplies than usual. For the same reason it will be necessary to supply somewhat larger supplies of seed grain this spring to cultivate gardens and small plots of ground. The department also desires to assist the Maniwaki Indians in the purchase of some wagons and agricultural implements to assist them in cultivating the land for themselves. This distribution is made just where it is reported to be necessary.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That information is really not satisfactory. It is impossible to say whether the expenditure is proper or not unless we know exactly how it is distributed. For instance, on the north of the St. Lawrence down to Mistassini the Indians go as far north as James Bay hunting and working for the Hudson's Bay Company. These Indians would never take to agricultural pursuits. It would be quite useless to give them seed or anything of that kind with the idea of inducing them to follow an agricultural life, though there are a few bands who have taken to agricultural pursuits, but unless we know how this money is distributed, how the seed is distributed, I consider that it will be impossible to know what this vote means. I would suggest the hon. gentleman allow the vote to stand and bring down the information. We all know the method adopted by the department to make that distribution.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no objection, but there is a small item in the supplementaries for next year, and I will bring down a detailed statement if that will satisfy him.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. And the hon. gentleman will allow the discussion on that item?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Indians, Nova Scotia—Medical attendance and medicine ..... \$700

Mr. CLANCY. Have they medical attendance as in other cases?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. For a number of years the expenditure has averaged about \$3,000, but the habit of the department has been to get a vote of \$2,300 and a supplementary vote of \$700.

Indians, Prince Edward Island—Medical attendance and medicine ..... \$300

Mr. MARTIN. Is this the usual vote?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, I think it is a little larger. The vote proved inadequate.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Every band, no matter what its size, seems to get about the same vote, except in the case of Prince Edward Island—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They always cut down Prince Edward Island.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The thing looks anomalous to me. Perhaps if they got less medicine they would be better.

Mr. CLANCY. We passed over the item for New Brunswick, though I tried to catch the attention of the acting minister. Is that

in the same position as the vote for Nova Scotia ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Exactly in the same position. I understand from the accountant that they have got into the habit of getting the supplementary vote. It would be better to have the whole thing in one amount, as will be done next year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think we have done enough, and had better adjourn now.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There are only a few items in the Indian Department. They are not controversial, and if my hon. friend will allow a few moments, those items can be dealt with.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to know if this money is paid to the same persons in Prince Edward Island year after year ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will bring down a detailed list. I cannot give the information at the moment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think they are the same persons—there is no change that I know of.

Indians, Manitoba and the North-west Territories—Payment to Indians of Treaty No. 8, \$19,550; supplies for working and destitute Indians, \$10,000; mower and horse rake and set of double harness for Lesser Slave Lake, Treaty No. 8, \$150; general expenses, \$13,000; total ..... \$42,700

Mr. CLANCY. How are these supplies purchased ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I must really ask that these items be not gone on with. There are hon. gentlemen on this side not present just now who wish to discuss such items as these. Besides, I doubt that we have a quorum.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would appeal to my hon. friend to deal with these items before we rise. We have had most of these items discussed in the main estimates, and in next year's supplementaries there will be items on which a full discussion can be had.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am always ready to accommodate my hon. friends on the other side. My hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) is new in the department and he has been doing very well indeed; but, I do not think he should ask us to pass these large items when he knows there are gentlemen on this side who wish to discuss them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But we have to sit here all day waiting until a late hour, and then there is no person here to discuss the items.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it would be better to adjourn. Of course,

Mr. CLANCY.

it ought not to be a precedent. We ought to work harder and get to the end of the session.

#### ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What will the business be to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We may take up some Bills.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And if we get into supply, we shall probably finish the estimates of my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) and proceed with the railway estimates.

Mr. CLANCY. When the idea is proposed of finishing the estimates of the Department of the Interior, are the estimates of the immigration branch included ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I should like very much to take that up. But, we are kept waiting until eleven or twelve o'clock, and then every one objects to going on and wants to go home. I have waited here for almost three weeks, from three in the afternoon to twelve at night, and have not been able to get on with the work.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We have got on very well to-night.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not finding fault; but, my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is asking an explanation.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be well if we could take up the immigration estimates after we have had the report on immigration and colonization, as there is a great deal of valuable information that we require to refer to from time to time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. At the request of members on both sides, the immigration items have stood from time to time.

Mr. CLANCY. The reason I asked is, because I endeavoured at an earlier stage to have an interim report made in order that we might proceed with the estimates, and I asked the hon. gentleman to let them stand for the reason pointed out by the hon. member for East Grey. Does the hon. gentleman propose to proceed without having that report made by the committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am most anxious to oblige my hon. friends on both sides, and will not press the matter.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, June 22, 1900.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PROROGATION.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I beg to move, seconded by Sir Richard Cartwright:

That on Monday next and for the remainder of the session this House shall meet at eleven o'clock in the morning of each sitting day; that in addition to the usual intermission at six o'clock p.m., there shall also be an intermission on each day from one to three o'clock p.m., and that government orders shall have precedence at all such sittings after questions on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER** (Cape Breton). I am glad to see this evidence on the part of my right hon. friend of a desire to bring this very protracted session to a close, but I think we must ask the Minister of Finance, at this late period of the session, and with this intimation, that within a few days we shall be relieved from our duties, we must ask him, when we may look for the rest of the supplementary estimates, and also any subsidies with reference to railways. I would ask the right hon. gentleman what measures we may expect or what the position of the business of the House will be in. Perhaps this is the most convenient mode of asking these questions.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). As to the estimates, I hope that on Monday next the supplementary estimates will be brought down.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. As to railway subsidies, I cannot say exactly when they will be brought down, but I have hopes of bringing them down next week. As to measures, there is no important measure to be brought down except the Conciliation Bill.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER**. Then, there is nothing to prevent the business of the session being brought to a close at the end of next week?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I see nothing to prevent prorogation during the week that commences after next, or, perhaps, the coming week.

**Mr. G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.) If the House commences at eleven in the morning and sits all day, I think we ought to have an agreement, not absolute, of course, but an agreement between both sides of the House that we should not be kept here at unreasonable hours at night. I should think we ought to make a point to adjourn about

twelve o'clock. It is very exhausting to sit here all day and all through the night.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Twelve o'clock is, perhaps, a little early. I do not think it would be advisable to come to any absolute binding agreement, but if we can manage to get along as we have for the past day or two, we will have no difficulty in agreeing to the adjournment each day.

### VACANCIES.

**Mr. SPEAKER**. I have the honour to inform the House, that I have received notification of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of the electoral district of St. Hyacinthe by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by Michel E. Bernier, Esq., member of the said electoral district. I accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

### LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF BRITISH COLUMBIA—REMOVAL OF HON. T. R. McINNES FROM THE OFFICE.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER** (Cape Breton). The right hon. the Prime Minister promised that we would probably have information to-day as to matters in British Columbia.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I was about to rise to make an announcement when the hon. gentleman put the question.

I have the honour to inform the House that, for reasons which are well known to the public, but which will be officially communicated to the House under section 59 of the British North America Act, it has pleased His Excellency the Governor General to remove the Honourable Thomas R. McInnes from the office of Lieutenant-Governor of the province of British Columbia. It has also pleased His Excellency the Governor General to appoint the Honourable Sir Henri Gustave Joly de Lotbinière as Lieutenant-Governor of the province of British Columbia. It has further pleased His Excellency the Governor General to appoint the Honourable Michel Esdras Bernier, the member for the electoral division of St. Hyacinthe, a member of the Queen's Privy Council and Minister of Inland Revenue.

### YUKON MINING LEASES—CHARGES AGAINST THE MINISTER OF INTERIOR.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I desire to make another announcement to the House of a different character, and with reference to a statement that was made a few days ago by my hon. friend the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). In the course of

his speech in this House the hon. gentleman read two letters addressed to himself by Senator Kirchhoffer. In these letters there was a statement made on the authority of Mr. Frank Burnett, that an interview had been sent to two members of the government in which grave charges were made against the Minister of the Interior in connection principally with mining claims in the Yukon. I have to state to the House that I have never received any communication from Mr. Frank Burnett on that subject, nor am I aware that any member of the government received any such communication. But, in the month of October, 1898. I received a private letter from a friend inclosing the text of a proposed interview which I was informed was to be published by Mr. Burnett in a western paper, and in which charges or insinuations of the character to which I have just referred were included. Upon receiving this communication, though I had no reason to doubt in any way whatever the perfect 'honorabilité' and honesty of my colleague the Minister of the Interior, I thought it due to him to give him communication of the letter—not the letter, because it was private—but communication of the interview which had been sent to me. I called on him at his office, and I gave him communication of the text of the interview. He satisfied me then that he was absolutely innocent of any charge made against him, and in corroboration of the statement he then made to me he placed in my hands at once, two letters, one addressed by Mr. Burnett to Mr. Philp and transferred by Mr. Philp to the Minister of the Interior, and the other the minister's own answer to this communication. The letter of Mr. Burnett to Mr. Philp, and which was transferred by Mr. Philp to Mr. Sifton, was as follows :

(Copy.)

Vancouver, B.C., February 1, 1898.

Mr. A. E. Philp,  
Care Philp & Cameron,  
Brandon, Man.

My dear Philp,—I duly received your two letters, 15th and 25th instant, and while thanking you for what you have done regarding mining concessions in the Yukon district, I might say that such concession has come too late, as it appears any one can now obtain the same on payment of \$100 per mile. If our mutual friend had had the decency to grant this at the time we first made application, it might have been of some use to us. As it is, he is granting us now no more than any one else can get. I might also say that I am not in the mood to accept anything from Mr. Sifton on account of the way he is treating my other requests, which treatment, I understand, is about on a par with that meted out to others of his old friends.

Thanking you for the trouble you have taken in the matter, and with kind regards I am,

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) FRANK BURNETT.

The letter of Mr. Sifton to Mr. Philp in answer to this was as follows :

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

(Personal.)

Ottawa, February 9, 1898.

My dear Philp,—I have your letter inclosing one from Mr. Burnett. I may just as well say, without any circumlocution or hesitation, that my friends cannot get any better treatment in regard to mining claims than any one else. I did not grant the application when Mr. Burnett first wrote me because we had at that time no regulations adopted. When they were adopted your application came in on the same basis as the others. I do not want to get your friendship or Mr. Burnett's on any false representation. Therefore, I feel it is my duty to say that I do not think my friendship will be of any advantage to you in mining matters.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) CLIFFORD SIFTON.

E. Philp, Esq.,  
Barrister, &c.,  
Brandon, Man.

After having had this conversation with my colleague, and that explanation from him, I informed my correspondent that I attached no importance to the interview, and I am not aware that it has been published in any newspaper since.

#### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS, &c.

Mr. GEORGE TURCOT (Megantic). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if any investigation was held on a report sent to the department concerning a letter which was deposited and registered at the post office of Kinnear's Mills, said to have contained \$200, and addressed to Dr. Warden, of Toronto. As the matter has caused a great deal of excitement in the locality, I beg to ask the Postmaster General to lay on the Table of this House the evidence, correspondence, reports and all other papers in connection with it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). An investigation was held into the matter to which the hon. gentleman alludes. At first it was held by one inspector alone; and one of the parties interested, taking some exception to his report, a second investigation was held, another inspector being associated with the first. The report of the second investigation has been received, I think, in the department, and there will be no objection whatever to laying both reports and all other papers in connection with the inquiries, on the Table of the House. I will endeavour to have them produced by Monday.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) yesterday wanted to know if the report of the Royal Commission on the shipment and transportation of grain had been brought down. I am happy to inform him that part of the report was brought down on March 19, and the balance on April 25.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the report being printed?

The PRIME MINISTER. I could not say as to that.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), to a return ordered on February 19, for copies of all telegrams, letters, reports and documents of every description, between the Department of Militia and Defence, or any member of the government, and J. H. Wilson, M.D., ex-M.P., or any person or persons on his behalf, regarding the military parade ground at St. Thomas, Ont. I notice that there are some letters missing from the return that should appear in it. I would ask the hon. gentleman to bring those down. While on my feet, I may say that at a later period of the session I intend to deal with this subject.

#### I. C. R.—TRAIN SERVICE ON CAPE BRETON DIVISION.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I drew the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), yesterday to the correspondence which I had in reference to the very strong feeling of the Board of Trade of Sydney, in regard to the present railway arrangements there. I think it right, therefore, to put into the hands of my hon. friend a telegram which I have since received from Mr. Geo. H. Dobson, a prominent gentleman of North Sydney. He says:

Present train arrangements satisfactory, and necessary for large Newfoundland and St. Pierre travel.

This completes the information, and it shows my hon. friend the Minister of Railways that the present arrangements is entirely satisfactory to the people of North Sydney, and that all he has to do is to devise some means by which, without interfering with their interests, he can meet the wishes of the board of trade and people of the town of Sydney.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). My hon. friend puts the case very mildly when he says that all I have to do is to make an arrangement satisfactory to Sydney, allowing matters to remain as they are as respects North Sydney. When he states that, he states a much more difficult proposition to solve than would appear from the language he employed. No doubt the people of North Sydney have a very keen appreciation of the importance of the business they do there, and a very strong conviction as to their rights. They regard the making of North Sydney the terminus as essentially their right, and anything that would be done to meet the de-

mands of the Board of Trade of Sydney would necessarily conflict with the demands of the people of North Sydney. The matter, therefore, is not in a nutshell, or so simple of solution as would appear from the hon. gentleman's remarks.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I might be permitted to say one word more on this subject, as it is one of pressing importance on which there is a great deal of feeling. I was at once confronted with this question when I went to the county of Cape Breton in the winter of 1896, to offer as a representative, and I immediately took the matter up and placed it in the hands of the Railway Department, to see if they could not devise a means by which, without any additional burden upon the country, but in a way that would be both useful and profitable, the very anomalous condition of things which now exist, could be changed. Every person knows that it is a very serious matter for the Railway Department to do what they were doing then, and are still doing, that is, back a train down several miles. I have very grave doubts as to the legality of that, and as to any resulting destruction of life or property, not involving very serious consequences to the government. That is a matter on which the hon. gentleman is as well qualified to judge as I am. At all events, the results of my investigation was that the Railway Department suggested a plan which I brought under their notice, by which greater convenience could be afforded, and a branch connection provided with the General Mining Association's operations and with an important section of the county of Cape Breton, in a way which I think would be a complete solution. I referred that report to the very able manager of the Intercolonial Railway, Mr. Pottinger. Mr. Pottinger reported that instead of involving any additional expense to the country, that arrangement could be carried out in such a way as to be actually profitable. I was so soon deposed that I had not the power to carry out this arrangement, but otherwise I was prepared to carry it out. I would like to ask my hon. friend, as the reports are in the department, to give his attention to that matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). That question has already been considered by the department, and I think I am right in saying that the town of North Sydney would not be satisfied with the arrangement to which my hon. friend refers. I do not think that any suggestion offered by my hon. friends opposite would meet the case. The difficulty is one arising out of the rivalry between the two towns and their geographical position, and the situation is an embarrassing one. Every suggestion from hon. gentlemen opposite has been employed in the matter, but unfortunately none of them seems to meet the difficulty.

### MAJOR MAXWELL.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to the state of case of Major Maxwell, concerning which there was some discussion last year on the militia estimates. Last year I urged that some reasonable sum should be granted in the estimates to that gentleman, and the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Finance made some remarks on the subject, and eventually the matter was left for further consideration. I mention the matter now in order that the Minister of Militia may carry out the desire which both he and the Minister of Finance expressed, that some sum should be put in the estimates, if at all possible.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). I pressed the same matter on the Minister of Militia last year, and I trust that this year he will give it his favourable consideration and give something to this officer, who was one of the most enthusiastic militiamen in the province of Nova Scotia. If any exception can be made, it should be made in his favour because the financial position of his family is not at all what is ought to be.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA (Mr. Borden). I remember what occurred last year and have not at all lost sight of the matter and hope to be able to give an answer on Monday.

### THE EMERGENCY RATIONS.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the report of the Dominion analyst which has been laid on the Table with reference to these emergency rations. This report shows that the material which has been obtained, and which has been described as concentrated food, is not a concentrated food at all. It appears from the analysis that this material is not so valuable a food at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The whole matter is under consideration now by a special committee.

Mr. McNEILL. I would request that I may be allowed to make my statement, whether approved by the House or not. I say that this material now turns out to be not so valuable for food, that it is practically but little more valuable than ordinary oatcake.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. My hon. friend is clearly out of order.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. McNEILL. I shall move the adjournment if necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER. That will not put the hon. gentleman in order. He is seeking to discuss a matter which is now being investigated by a special committee.

Mr. McNEILL. I am not discussing the matter before the committee, but simply the analyst's report, and the suggestion I want to make to the government is this, that in view of the fact that it is believed that this is a concentrated food and that our troops in South Africa may use it, it would be well for the government to cable across and let it be understood by those who are distributing this food what really it turns out to be.

### INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to direct the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to an order of the House passed last year directing that a copy of the report of Mr. Frank Shanly respecting the claim of Starr and Wood against the Queen be brought down. Shortly after the order had passed, I received a letter from the hon. gentleman's secretary stating that it could not be brought down because it was of a confidential nature. I would like to suggest to my hon. friend that when an order of the House is passed, it is not competent for his secretary to state that it cannot be complied with. Any objection of that kind should have been stated by the hon. gentleman when I made my motion, and I would suggest that the order of the House either be complied with or rescinded.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I do not know that my hon. friend has stated correctly the position with regard to orders of the House. Had I been present, I would have felt it my duty to make the gentleman who moved for the order of the House aware of the impossibility of producing the paper in question. It often happens, however, that these orders pass perfunctorily; attention is not particularly directed at the time to the documents desired; and the order for papers often covers a large area, requiring a great many papers which need to be looked into a little before it can be judged whether they can all be properly produced or not. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, will hardly expect that, if attention was not particularly called to the character of the document, the order would be intended to require the production of papers of a confidential character which ought not to be laid on the Table of the House—the House would not so interpret its order. Therefore, my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) must see that discretion must necessarily require to be vested in some-

body, particularly where attention was not directly called to the documents asked for. I do not remember the contents of the paper at the moment, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that if it had been possible to have brought the paper down it would have been brought down.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, in this particular case, the paper required was directly stated in the order of the House.

An hon. MEMBER. What was it?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It was the report of Mr. Shanly, in the case of Starr & Wood vs. the Queen. I think that the circumstances was that there being no certificate, and no engineer to give the certificate, Mr. Shanly was instructed by the government to investigate the claims and ascertain whether or not he could give a certificate. The matter between my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) and myself perhaps is more than a matter of procedure, than anything else. Possibly, it would not be proper for me to press for a paper which is, in the judgment of the government, confidential. But what I thought would be due to the House, and possibly, to myself as I moved for the order, was, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) happened to be out at the time, the matter should have been mentioned in the House, and the records of the House kept right in that respect. Further than that, I would hardly suppose, as the claim has ceased to be an existing claim against the government, that there would be any objection to bringing the paper down.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to say that some time ago, I asked the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he would bring down copies of reports, papers and correspondence with the government or any member thereof, all orders in council and statements of all moneys paid in respect of the bridge over the Richelieu River and the \$35,000 voted therefor by parliament. The date at which this was put on the paper precluded my reaching it, since the government have taken all days for their business. I think the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) promised that he would have these papers brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not think I went so far as that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I hope my right hon. friend will promise it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I told my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that I thought the correspondence was going on. I will inquire whether the papers can be brought down and give an answer to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I have had no response to the orders of the House passed in 1898-9, and 1900 respectively, for papers relating to the dismissals of employees on alleged grounds of partisanship, so far as concerns three or four departments of the government.

The PRIME MINISTER. I thought I had brought down a very complete return. The hon. gentleman says that there were some departments not mentioned. Will he say which they are?

Mr. FOSTER. The whole of the return brought down by my right hon. friend had relation solely to half the order, which was for the expenses of the commission. The other half of the order has not been fulfilled. I wish to draw the right hon. gentleman's attention also to the fact that the return to the order of the House for the correspondence relating to the purchase of hay for the British government has not come down. I would like to have that before the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture pass in review.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The hon. member (Mr. Foster) asked some days ago for the correspondence between the Department of Finance and the Canadian Bank of Commerce respecting the government banking business in the Yukon district. There has been no motion to bring the papers down. I move for leave to lay the papers on the Table.

#### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 183) to amend the Companies' Clauses Act.

#### CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). In moving the third reading of this Bill, I desire to say that when the Bill was—

Mr. FOSTER. Unfortunately, I have not had an opportunity of looking over that. Does it matter whether it goes on now or on Monday?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. I will let it stand until Monday.

#### THE CITY AND DISTRICT SAVINGS BANKS, AND LA CAISSE D'ECONOMIE DE QUEBEC.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 177) to amend chapter 32 of the Statutes of 1890, intitled: 'An Act respecting savings banks in the province of Quebec.'—(Mr. Fielding.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. What amendments were made?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This Bill, I may say, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. It was very well considered and some slight amendments were made, but nothing very material.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

#### EXPROPRIATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 160), to amend the Expropriation Act, were read the first time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that said amendments be read the second time and concurred in. He said: In this case the House passed the Bill adopting 5 per cent as the rate of interest instead of 6 per cent in the Expropriation Act, and likewise in the corresponding Bill respecting the rate of interest in general. The Senate has recast the Bill, but without changing its purpose. It is merely a change in the drafting.

Motion agreed to.

#### PENITENTIARY ACT AMENDMENT.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved that Bill (No. 174), to amend the Penitentiary Act, be read the second time. He said; These amendments merely apply to the schedule to which I wish to make certain additions respecting penitentiary employees who were omitted last year.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee thereon.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.). Will the minister read over that schedule and note the changes from the present Act?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In the Bill you will find the changes in brackets. The first is assistant storekeeper, who is not provided in the schedule of 1899.

Mr. FOSTER. What did he get?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. His salary is \$600, there is no change in the salary. It simply adds his name to the list, and under this law the limit mentioned in the schedule is the limit within which the Governor General in Council must keep in fixing the salary. In this case the maximum is \$600.

Mr. FIELDING.

No. 2 is assistant hospital overseer and schoolmaster, not provided for in schedule of 1899. It is proposed to increase the salary by \$100, in view of the length of service and special qualification of the officer, Mr. Thompson. No. 3 is the electrician, not provided for in schedule of 1899. The salary is that now paid. No. 4 is the assistant electrician, not provided for in schedule of 1899. It is proposed to increase the salary by \$100, in view of the efficiency of the officer and the increasing responsibility of the work. Nos. 5 and 6 are the superintendent of the cordage industry and the assistant superintendent, not provided for in schedule of 1899. The salaries are those now paid. No. 7 is the firemen. This merely changes the word 'stokers' to that of 'firemen' in order to retain uniformity of expression. No. 8 is the assistant storekeeper at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. This office has been created during the past year, and is filled by one of the guards who has special qualifications as to education and fitness otherwise. The salary is fixed at the same rate as that paid to the assistant storekeeper at Kingston. No. 9 is the firemen, not provided for in schedule of 1899. The salary is that now paid. No. 10 is the steward of Dorchester penitentiary, not provided for in schedule of 1899. It is found undesirable to amalgamate the offices of storekeeper and steward, as it destroys the check which is afforded by having the purchase and distribution of supplies under the control of separate officers. The salary is fixed at the same rate as that paid the storekeeper, which is the rule existing at other penitentiaries. No. 11 is the firemen at Dorchester, not provided for in schedule of 1899. The salary is that now paid. Nos. 12 and 13 are the storekeeper and steward of the Manitoba penitentiary. The schedule of 1899 provided for united office of steward and storekeeper. The remarks under No. 10 apply. The salaries are fixed at the same rate as those of Dorchester and British Columbia. Nos. 14 and 15 are the firemen at the Manitoba penitentiary and the British Columbia penitentiary, not provided for in schedule of 1899. The salary is fixed at the same rate as that paid to guards, which is the rule applied at other penitentiaries.

Mr. AULAY MORRISON (New Westminster). I would like to draw the attention of the Solicitor General to the salaries of the wardens. In two penitentiaries they receive \$2,600 and in the others only \$2,000. I would like to know why this apparent discrimination is made. Of course it may be answered that there is a difference in the number of inmates in those institutions respectively, but I should rather think that that is not a sufficient reason for making a difference in the salaries. There may be a difference of 100 inmates between the British Columbia and the Kingston penitentiary, but I should think it would take just as

much ability, and time and care to administer the affairs of the one institution as the other. I do not think that the number of inmates should decide the amount of the salaries of the wardens at these various institutions. I am not satisfied that there is a justification for such a difference, for instance, between the salary of the wardens at Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul on the one hand and the salary of the wardens of Manitoba and British Columbia in the other case. I would strongly urge that some different arrangement should be made in respect to salary. It may be that \$2,600 is too much for the wardens of Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul, and I am certain that \$2,000 is very much too small for the wardens in Manitoba and British Columbia. If \$2,600 is a fair remuneration for the wardens of the two first named institutions, I would suggest that the salaries of the wardens in British Columbia and Manitoba be increased to at least \$2,500. In the penitentiary in British Columbia, the warden and other officers are under greater expense than they are in the eastern institutions, enough greater to make up for the difference in the number of inmates. I believe that within the last year or two the wardens in the western institutions have had eliminated certain privileges which had been accorded them hitherto, notwithstanding that their living expenses are higher. I would mention the fact that since his visit to British Columbia the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has seen fit to increase the rate of salaries in that province owing to the greater cost of living. I think that what applies in the customs would apply with equal force to the penitentiary officials, and I would strongly urge the government to consider the advisability of increasing the salaries of the wardens of the Manitoba and British Columbia penitentiaries. If the hon. Solicitor General does not see his way clear at present, I would strongly urge that the items stand until this matter is looked into further by the government, because I am sure the question has not been considered with that care that is usually given to these matters by the Department of Justice.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Some consideration must be had for the responsibility which attaches to the persons who are at the head of the penitentiaries in determining the salary to which they should be entitled. In reference to Kingston penitentiary the limit fixed by the schedule for the warden is \$2,600, St. Vincent de Paul \$2,400, Dorchester, Manitoba and British Columbia, \$2,000. If we look at the penitentiary returns we find that the number of inmates at Kingston on June 30 last year was 570, St. Vincent de Paul 447, Dorchester 226, Manitoba 112, British Columbia 90.

Mr. MORRISON. May I tell the hon. gentleman that a great many of the British

Columbia convicts are transferred to Kingston and Stony Mountain? There is not accommodation enough in the building at New Westminster to hold all the inmates, and the consequence is that the figure 90 does not represent the number that ought to be credited to the penitentiary in British Columbia. I think you would find that if the institution there could hold all that unfortunately are eligible to be sent there the number would be very nearly 200, so that the objection of the hon. gentleman does not hold good.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid the hon. Solicitor General has not taken into account one thing which might have an effect in carrying out the wishes of my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison). That is, the admitted general cussedness of convicts in British Columbia. Aside from that, I would like to ask the hon. Solicitor General if he has yet found out the age of the newly-appointed warden at Dorchester?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have asked the age of this gentleman, and I have made a memorandum of it, which is with some other memoranda containing other information that the hon. gentleman asks me. I have to answer two or three questions asked by the hon. gentleman. I will answer them altogether when the estimates come up as I have not the information by me.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not wish this clause to pass without having something more definite in regard to the remarks which I have made. I think these reasons which I have given are sufficiently cogent to receive some little entertainment at the hands of the government. I have not made these remarks in an idle way at all or for the purpose of saying so many words and taking up so much time. I think the situation there has not been considered as seriously as it should have been. Although there may be 570 convicts in Kingston penitentiary, there are in reality very many more than ninety in British Columbia penitentiary. But, as I said before, I do not think the number of inmates is a fair criterion. That does not increase the responsibility of the warden at all in my opinion. I think that should not be the standard or the criterion to adopt in gauging the salaries that should be paid in these respective penitentiaries. I think the salaries should be as nearly uniform as possible, having, of course, regard to the difference in the expense of living in the different provinces, and I also think that the wardens should be interchanged between these institutions. I think, in regard to the administration in these institutions, that if the wardens were changed about more than they are a great many of these investigations, which are taking place so frequently, would

be obviated. I think there should be some readjustment of the salaries of the wardens. I do not see where there is any justification for such a difference between the salaries paid at Kingston and in British Columbia and Manitoba as \$2,000 and \$2,600. As the hon. Solicitor General has stated the number of inmates seems to have been the reason for it, but this criterion is altogether fallacious as far as the British Columbia penitentiary is concerned. The government have not furnished sufficient accommodation for the requirements. The penitentiary is a small one, and met the requirements of the province when it was a small and obscure province. But, to-day, the population has increased very much, and I am afraid that the government has not that regard for the institution there that it should have. I might say further that we must anticipate an influx from the Yukon to the provincial institution, and I think, with that in view, and the additional responsibility that it would entail, there should be some change made. I again press very strongly upon the Solicitor General that before this Bill passes an amendment should be made now increasing the salaries of the wardens of British Columbia and Manitoba to \$2,500, or some assurance should be given that the matter will be seriously considered. I would like something to be done.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think my hon. friend ought to claim that the warden of British Columbia penitentiary is entitled to additional remuneration merely because a certain number of convicts which otherwise would be confined in this institution have been removed to Stony Mountain and Kingston. It might be a reason for increasing the remuneration of those who have the responsibility for their custody, but, perhaps, when the penitentiary is enlarged, as we intend to enlarge it, it may be possible to increase the salary of the warden, but I cannot see under what circumstances the government would be justified at present in making any change.

On section 2,

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a new clause? What is the purpose of it?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I ought to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), that under the statute that existed, previous to 1895, the salaries then payable to officers were larger than the salaries that have been paid since 1895, and this section is intended to protect those who were appointed at that time when these larger salaries were payable, so that nothing done under the provisions of this schedule can affect the salary paid to a person previous to that time. I think it is fair that a man who has entered the public service on the consideration that he should receive a certain amount should not be

Mr. MORRISON.

affected in connection with the payment of this salary.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House do resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

He said: In the budget speech the announcement was made of some change in the tariff. The matter has yet to be finally ratified by the House in the shape of a Bill. The object of the present motion is, that we may go into committee with a view of passing the necessary legislation to give effect to what was communicated to the House in the budget speech. The proposed increase of the preferential tariff takes effect on July 1, and it is, therefore, desirable that it shall be now consummated.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). The Minister of Finance has now an opportunity of saving the granite industry which it was stated yesterday, would likely be destroyed by the increase of the preference to 33½ per cent. My hon. friend will remember that when the 25 per cent was announced, previous to giving that preference some very material additions were made to the tariff on certain articles. My hon. friend can now, by a stroke of the pen, and with the assent of the House, which I am sure he will receive, he can except the granite industry in Canada from the imminent destruction which my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Moore) so fully portrayed to the House yesterday.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already given my opinion on this subject. I feel very hopeful that my hon. friend from Stanstead was mistaken, and that the case is not so serious as he imagines. Whenever a change is made in the tariff, gentlemen interested in a particular industry often expect danger, but, in very many cases, the danger does not turn out to be so serious as they expected. I am in hope that that will occur in this case. I do not think it would be wise for us to exempt from our general policy a particular item in this way.

Mr. GILBERT W. GANONG (Charlotte). This is a very much more serious matter than the Minister of Finance recognizes. Once or twice I had occasion to bring this question to the attention of the House, and it certainly is a most serious thing for the workmen of the county whom I have the honour to represent. The granite manufacturers have had great difficulty in the past

in securing the Canadian trade, and in anticipation of this additional reduction in the duty they are much alarmed. The question brought before the House by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Moore) has apparently not received that attention from the government which it deserves. The conditions of trade in Canada and the United States are so nearly identical that our people have to pay very much higher wages in the manufacture of granite than are paid in Scotland, which is our principal competitor. We found difficulty in the past, in the village of St. George, N.B., where there is an extensive granite industry, in retaining men in our workshops, as they gravitate to the United States, where higher wages are paid and where the manufacturers have a greater protection for their industry. The government should look into this matter immediately and not defer it to some future time, when it may be found that the granite industry in my county, as well as in the rest of Canada, has been seriously damaged.

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

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 184) to amend the Customs tariff, 1897.

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

#### LAND TITLES ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford) moved that the House do concur in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 139) to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been done in the Senate?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As to the sale of land for non-payment of taxes, the point was raised that we were interfering with the jurisdiction that was given to the North-west Territories, and there was considerable doubt as to whether the Act we passed did not do so, although the amendment had been made at the suggestion of Judge McGuire and some of the barristers in the Territories. That has been dropped out, and it has been left in the hands of the North-west council to make provision. As to the other clause, we passed the Bill here, I think, at the instance of the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin); and the clause in the Bill we passed and the one the hon. member for Western Assiniboia moved which was accepted were put together in the Senate and made clause 5.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it carry out the idea of the hon. member for Western Assiniboia?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, to the fullest extent.

Motion agreed to, and amendments concurred in.

#### ELECTION ACT CONSOLIDATION AND AMENDMENT.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 133) to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I would draw the attention of my hon. friend the Solicitor General to the inconvenience of taking up this Bill while some hon. gentlemen who take a very active interest in it are engaged on another committee. I refer particularly to the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). If it would be equally convenient, I would suggest that the hon. gentleman take this up at another time.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). We ourselves have every interest in having the hon. member for Montmorency present, as he has made a special study of this subject. As I understand that the government desire to have the Bill disposed of, so as to get it before the Senate, perhaps as a compromise it might be agreed that we should now take the clauses not dealt with by the hon. member for Montmorency's amendments, and take the others after eight o'clock.

Mr. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). There are some gentlemen from Ontario who have considered the Bill carefully, and if we took it up in their absence, the discussion would probably occupy more time than it would if they were present. I would suggest that the Bill be taken up on Tuesday.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). There was a large amount of discussion on this Bill, and a great many of the sections are in such a shape now that with very little further discussion the Bill can be got into such a shape that it can be passed. It will have to be reprinted. I do not think there is anything in the general clauses of the Bill about which there is much dispute, and there are some amendments relating to Prince Edward Island in which the hon. member for Montmorency has no interest, and I think we had better dispose of these this afternoon.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We all have a common object, that is, to promote the business of the House as rapidly as possible, and I am satisfied that my hon. friend the

Solicitor General will do that by not taking up this Bill under circumstances under which it will be impossible to deal with it in a satisfactory manner.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I suggest that we deal with the Prince Edward Island amendments this afternoon, and leave the others.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well.

On section 21,

Mr. MARTIN moved to insert after the word 'Act' in line 43, of section 21, the following words:

And in Prince Edward Island only, a copy of the Franchise Act of 1898.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There seems to be no reason for that particular amendment, but the next amendment commends itself to the committee. There is no more reason why a copy of the Franchise Act should be sent to Prince Edward Island, any more than to any other part of the Dominion.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that in section 31, line 45, after the word 'Act,' the following words be inserted:

Such instructions to Prince Edward Island shall contain such sections of the provincial law as relate to the qualifications of voters, and shall also contain the oath required by sections 65 and 66.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. I beg to propose a further amendment, that in line 50, after the word 'election,' the following words be inserted:

Including in Prince Edward Island such notices or advertisements regarding the qualifications of voters as are required to be placed under the provincial law.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Those amendments suit the purposes of Prince Edward Island, but supposing this matter is discussed again by those who reside in other provinces?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). The sections could be passed if my hon. friend the Solicitor General would permit them to be taken up again if any gentlemen would desire them to be taken up.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have no objection to that.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. To carry out the same view, I move that section 41, subsection a, after the word 'mentioned' in the 39th line, the following words be added:

And in Prince Edward Island such notice or advertisement regarding the qualification of

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

voters as is required to be posted under the provincial law.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that in the same section, subsection c, line 48, after the word 'Act,' the following words be added:

And in Prince Edward Island a copy of the Franchise Act of 1898.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have objected to this on the same ground as that on which I objected to the previous amendment. It is possible that we may have to consider the question of sending the Franchise Act as part of the instructions to the returning officers all through the Dominion; but I see no reason why we should make an exception in the case of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MARTIN. Does not the hon. Solicitor General see that it would be necessary for the returning officer to have a copy of the local Act?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But this is not the local Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The local Act is provided for under the amendment moved by my hon. friend with reference to section 21.

Mr. MARTIN. The Franchise Act should be ordered for all over the Dominion. Otherwise, there is liable to be a good deal of confusion. There is the Franchise Act of the Dominion, and the officers will be at a loss which to follow.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that in section 41 the following words be added at the end of subsection c:

And one copy of instructions approved by the Governor in Council as provided by section 21 of this Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is already provided for.

Mr. MARTIN. It is provided that it shall go to the returning officer, but not that it shall be sent to the deputy returning officer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is one of many forms which he sends to his deputy, and it is not necessary to make a statutory provision that it shall be sent.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the Solicitor General, in the meantime, if it is the intention that the Election Act and the Franchise Act shall be bound together, and be for distribution, in the limited sense required to carry on the election—that the candidates should have them as well as the officers.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is invariably provided that way.

Mr. INGRAM. In one volume the Franchise Act is printed in full. A portion of that is taken out and placed in the election law; but I do not find the Franchise Act in full with the Election Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) will find the sections of the Franchise Act not printed with the other are in the Election Act, because they properly refer to the Election Act.

Mr. MARTIN. I would press my amendment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. May I call the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) to section 21, and if that does not cover the point, then let the words that he has proposed be inserted. Section 21 says:

The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall transmit to the returning officer a sufficient number of copies of voters' lists, if there are any, one copy of this Act, and of such instructions approved by the Governor in Council as are required to carry out the election according to the provisions of this Act (with a copious alphabetical index prefixed), for the returning officer himself, one copy for the election clerk, and one for each of the deputy returning officers, and also for each deputy returning officer, a sufficient number of blank poll books—

And so on. Is not that plain enough?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) is not out of place. It is true you send enough for the deputy returning officers, but why not give the same directions that they are to be sent to the deputy returning officers? There would be no harm, and I think I would rather see it in than out.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 64,

Mr. MARTIN. I move that subsection 2 be amended as follows:

After the column headed 'place of residence,' another column be provided headed 'qualification of voters.'

Mr. INGRAM. This is one of the sections there is going to be considerable discussion upon, if the Solicitor General advocates the same as he did the other evening. We, in whose province the law provides for manhood suffrage, are not satisfied with this section, because it is in direct conflict with the provincial Franchise Act, which you have adopted.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. A part of this section reads this way:

If in any polling division where, under the provincial law, no list of voters is provided or required, he is found qualified—

I do not see any necessity for saying 'is to be found qualified.' That would imply that the deputy returning officer had some judicial functions to find out whether the voter was qualified.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is something in what the hon. gentleman says, but I think it is better to leave it as it is, because in Prince Edward Island the returning officer has to determine something in spite of anything we may desire.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In many cases the deputy returning officer has to exercise practically judicial functions. Take for instance, a case that may arise when a man who would be otherwise qualified to vote is disqualified because of some local enactments, notwithstanding his name is not on the list, he may be entitled to vote by taking the oath. Under these circumstances it would be necessary for the deputy returning officer to find that that man is not entitled to vote.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not see any use of the word 'found' there. It might be misleading, because some deputy returning officers might think it was their duty to decide whether the voter is qualified or not. In the province of Prince Edward Island there is no such thing as a deputy returning officer being clothed with judicial functions, he has only to administer the law as it is. If a man takes the oath he is qualified, and the returning officer has nothing to do in determining any other qualification. I know that the deputy returning officers in different parts of the province are sometimes inclined to go beyond their duty, and to say that a man is qualified when he is not qualified. If they are left with the impression that they have a judicial function to find out whether a man is qualified, I think they may fall into mistakes. The qualification is determined by the statutes, not by the deputy returning officer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman sees that the section applies to the whole Dominion, not to Prince Edward Island alone. It is not necessary to retain the words for other parts of the Dominion. In Prince Edward Island there are certain judicial functions, if we may call them such, that the deputy returning officer must exercise. If the voter votes on what is called the statute labour qualification, he must produce to the presiding officer a receipted certificate in writing, subscribed with the name of the road overseer. The returning officer must determine whether he has really produced that or not. As the word is unnecessary in other

parts of the Dominion and cannot do any harm with us, I think it had better be left alone.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I think in subsection 3, there is a clause that overturns the spirit of the Act in the province of Ontario, namely this:

If the elector's name is found on the list of voters for the polling district of the polling station, he shall be entitled to vote.

Now in the province of Ontario the essence of the qualification is residence; but any person, although he is not a resident, might come in and take the oath, unless there is a special form required in the province of Ontario to conform with the franchise in that province. The hon. gentleman has made no provision for that. He has a general oath under which every voter in the country who is on the list can come and vote. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if he proposes to meet that difficulty by having a very explicit oath in conformity with the franchise in Ontario, so that a person will only have one vote as under the Franchise Act of that province?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot say exactly now as to the nature of the oath that I intend to provide, but I see immediately that some provision must be made to meet the difficulties suggested by my hon. friend. But I do not want to deal with any of these clauses at present except as regards Prince Edward Island, because there are several gentlemen here who want to consider these clauses independently of Prince Edward Island altogether. That point is one that interests largely gentlemen from the west, particularly the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke).

Mr. CLANCY. It may involve doing the work over again. Take, for instance, subsection 3, it does not specifically mention Prince Edward Island, therefore, whatever effect it might have, will be upon all the provinces. It seems to me it would be well that section 64 should stand in the meantime.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We want, in the meantime, to dispose of the Prince Edward Island amendments. In other respects I want to keep this clause over, because I think I made a statement when the matter was up the other night, which is misleading. I think I stated that if a man's name is on the list, the question of residence would not affect him. I think I was wrong when I made that statement; therefore, I want to take that clause up again when all those who are interested in that particular section are present, and we can do that on Tuesday.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

Mr. INGRAM. If it is the intention of the government that they are not going to adopt the provincial franchise of Ontario as they find it, and as I understood that they were going to do—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We are going to.

Mr. INGRAM. If you purpose doing that, then, certainly, this subsection 3 must come out of this Bill and some such amendment as I propose must be placed in it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think it must be amended. I think we might perhaps be able to hold over that section as I think there will have to be some amendment, and perhaps if we went on with these other sections and came back to this one again we would avoid having two discussions over it.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, I understand that the government are not going to frame any legislation that will be the means of bringing in the outside or non-resident vote under the section as it will be amended.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. INGRAM. That is all right.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This section has to be amended.

Mr. GEORGE GUILLET (West Northumberland). I would like to direct the hon. Solicitor General's attention to a case of hardship that would arise under this clause. That is the case of a business man who has had his name placed on the list, but whose business requirements take him away from the electoral division for perhaps the whole period of the year, and who is not, therefore, a continuous resident. There is a young man, a civil engineer, whose home is in one of the rural sections of my county, and whose business takes him to different parts of the province for two or three months at a time. He is not a continuous resident anywhere to an extent sufficient to enable him to qualify in any other division, but his name is on the list in the constituency that I represent.

Mr. SPROULE. That is his domicile.

Mr. GUILLET. No, not necessarily. His home has been there, and he is on the list as an owner of property there, but he will have no vote anywhere else, and if he is disqualified for want of continuous residence he will have no vote at all.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If I understand the hon. gentleman this gentleman, whom he represents, has his name on the list for local elections?

Mr. GUILLET. He is on the Dominion list now.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. And on the local list ?

Mr. GUILLET. Yes.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then he will come in under our Act.

Mr. GUILLET. If he is not a continuous resident ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The clause will stand.

On section 65,

Mr. MARTIN moved :

That section 65 be amended by striking out the following words in the 6th, 7th and 8th lines: 'Such changes being made in the form of oath as are necessary to make it applicable to the election being held.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think whoever drafted that amendment could not have given it any consideration. This relates to the oaths which are provided for by provincial Acts to be taken in provincial elections, and when these oaths are administered at a Dominion election there must necessarily be some changes made in their form. You would have a slightly different oath at a provincial election. You do not change them excepting in so far as it is necessary, because one is a Dominion election and the other a provincial election.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this confined to Prince Edward Island alone ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, it is not. It would be just as much essential in Ontario to have these words in as in Prince Edward Island, because there are oaths under all the provincial Acts which would have to be taken. I think a mistake has been made by whoever gave the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) that memorandum.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not quite certain that this section does not complicate the difficulty, although I quite see the importance of the section, as pointed out by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The section reads :

An elector, if required by the deputy returning officer, the poll clerk, one of the candidates, or an agent of a candidate, or by any elector present shall, before receiving his ballot paper, take such oath of (or sign such statement as to) qualification—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The words :

—or sign such statement as to—

—were struck out when we discussed the Bill the other day.

Mr. CLANCY. There is no qualification in the province of Ontario.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It does not apply to Ontario if there is no qualification.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not think it will do to strike out these words.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This amendment was introduced because the intention originally was to make this Bill applicable to the North-west Territories where an elector might have been called upon to sign a statement, but in no other province of the Dominion would it be applicable.

Mr. HENDERSON. My difficulty all along has been to find what form of oath will be used in the province of Ontario in the case of the ordinary voter whose name is on the list, and, of course, votes under the manhood franchise provision. Where are we to find the form of oath that a voter may be required to take ? There is no oath provided for in the schedule of this Bill, and I fail to find it anywhere other than in the statutes of the province. That would seem to me to be very troublesome. Besides, if it is the intention of the hon. Solicitor General that the elector who has gone out of the riding should be permitted to come back and vote, notwithstanding that he has ceased to be a resident, as indicated by section 64, then, the form of oath would have to be verified. I submit that it would be necessary to prescribe the form of oath and put it in the schedule of this Bill, so that it would not be left to the deputy returning officer to say what form of oath shall be administered to the elector. If it is the intention of the hon. Solicitor General to adhere closely to the principle that is adopted in Ontario that a man, to entitle him to vote, must be a resident of the riding at the time of voting, there will not be a variation of the oath that is used in elections for the Ontario legislature, and if it is the Ontario oath that is to be used I would suggest that it should be incorporated in this law so that the deputy returning officer could put his hand upon it. Until we can get a full answer from the hon. Solicitor General as to the meaning of that section we cannot decide upon the oath.

Mr. MARTIN. That is the trouble that I referred to in making this amendment. If the hon. Solicitor General will turn to section 21 he will see that it refers to the same oaths, and the same in regard to section 66. If you leave these sections as they are then the deputy returning officer has the changing of the oath.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. There must be a few words changed in the oath as taken in a provincial election to make it applicable to a

Dominion election, and that change is sent in the instructions.

Mr. MARTIN. If it is left altogether with the deputy returning officer to make the change, one deputy returning officer will make the change at one poll and another deputy returning officer may vary it at another poll. I want it specifically laid down what this oath shall be. The deputy returning officers all through the Dominion are sometimes not very well educated men, and they should not have control over the changing the form of oath.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, the change in the form of the oath is made by the amendment which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) has already suggested, and which has been accepted by the Solicitor General in section 21, under which instructions are sent to the returning officer as to the form of oath. This particular section applies to the whole Dominion and not to Prince Edward Island alone. I approve of the suggestion, and I merely point out that it has been incorporated in the previous amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. The deputy returning officer has still charge of changing the oath, and so long as I have a voice here I will not allow this clause to go so far as my province is concerned.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin). The experience is that you find deputy returning officers who cannot select the oath or word it properly, and there often arises a dispute between the agent and the deputy returning officer. I have known this to occur several times, and if some provision could be put in whereby the form of oath is given in the instructions, it would be desirable.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is what is done with regard to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SPROULE. It should be done with regard to the other provinces.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think that suggestion is one we ought to adopt and the best way to adopt it is by making the amendment suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) in section 21, applicable to the whole Dominion.

On section 65,

Mr. MARTIN. In my opinion, after the amendment that has just been made, it will be necessary to amend this section because this leaves it for the deputy returning officer to make the changes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend must see that

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

he is wrong, because I hold in my hand the oath that must be taken under the provincial law, and if he strikes out those words, the provincial oath would have to be followed literally, and if so, a man would have to swear: 'I have not voted before in this election for an assemblyman;' which would be absurd. These words must be changed to 'the House of Commons of Canada,' to make the oath apply to a Dominion election.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Does not section 21 provide that the oath shall be changed and that the form of oath as changed shall be taken?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who is to make the changes in the oath?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Under the original amendment they would be made when the instructions were sent by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the returning officer, and the oath as changed would be put in the instructions.

Mr. MARTIN. If that is the case, it is all right.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That being the case, if the hon. gentleman's amendment were accepted, and these words relating to the changes were struck out, the voter would be obliged to take the provincial oath.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would make a suggestion, because I confess I see a difficulty. You have in the schedule the actual oath that is to be taken, and therefore why refer to the provincial oath at all?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend must remember that this is a general section applicable to the whole Dominion, whereas the amendment relates only to Prince Edward Island.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand that the Solicitor General proposes to amend section 21 so as to make it apply generally, and not merely to Prince Edward Island. If so, there is no necessity of referring to any change in the provincial oath.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This Act provides necessarily that before a man gets his ballot paper he must take the oath of the particular qualification in the province on which he proposes to vote. He cannot take that oath in the form in which it is made for the province. It is essential that a few informal changes be made to make it applicable to a Dominion

election. So that this section was drafted improperly by the draughtsman.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who is to modify the oath ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So far as the law goes now, it is modified by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery under the instructions of the Minister of Justice, I suppose.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will there be a modification in the oath in the instructions for all the other provinces ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Solicitor General has stated that he will consider the application of that amendment to the other provinces when we come to take up the question again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Under this section it would be the duty of the deputy returning officer at each polling booth to deal with the matter, and you would have an enormous variety of votes. It would be advisable to make this a little more definite. The difficulty is we do not want to encumber this statute with a long schedule of votes in the different provinces, but on the other hand you do not want to leave the matter indefinite.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If this section stood alone, I could understand the difficulty, but if you read it in conjunction with section 21, as amended, making that section applicable to the whole Dominion, then the authority would be contained in the instructions to the returning officer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). By what authority is the form of the oath to be forwarded by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to be settled ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I presume in the same way as the instructions, by the Governor General in Council.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That would be quite satisfactory.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) I would suggest that the wording be changed slightly so as to read 'and such changes being made in the form,' instead of 'as changed in form under authority of section 21.'

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would propose that the wording be changed to 'such changes having been made in the form of oath.' That would meet the difficulty.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. INGRAM. I would draw attention to the necessity of having two forms of oath in the province of Ontario, one to suit the rural sections, where they have manhood franchise straight and the lists prepared in

the ordinary way, to which form 16 is applicable; but, where you have manhood registration in the cities and county towns, it is necessary to have form 17.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Quite right.

On section 67.

Mr. MARTIN. I would propose in amendment to add to the end of this section the following words :

Such person having taken the proper oath described by this Act and the laws of the province shall be entitled to receive his ballot and to vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That would seem to imply that when a man took the oath, without producing his certificate, he would be entitled to vote, but that is not the law. The object my hon. friend has in view is correct, but a man is not entitled to vote simply because he takes the oath; he must produce his certificate. Can my hon. friend show that any evil has ever existed that he is wishing to overcome ?

Mr. MARTIN. The evil is that in our province where the qualification is decided at the poll, the returning officer may say: You have not answered these questions. Perhaps he may raise a great many objections to the answer that may be given. The returning officer may say to him: You shall answer a number of other questions, otherwise you shall not get your ballot paper; and upon his refusing to answer the questions he gets no ballot paper. Of course, section 66 provides about the statute labour receipt, but the door is open to the returning officer, under this section, to say that a man has not answered questions properly, although he is ready to take the oath and has produced his statute labour receipt. I think we had better leave it open, because I have known, in by-elections that were held in Prince Edward Island last December, where a deputy returning officer took it on himself to say when a man was qualified and when he was not; and when a man had taken the oath the deputy said he had no right to vote; and another man refused to vote although the deputy said he could vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will you adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Halifax: 'And has otherwise complied with the requirements of the law.' When you say, in so many words, that when he takes the oath he shall be entitled to his ballot, I think that is all that is necessary.

Amendment negatived.

On section 67.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to ask the Solicitor General, at this stage, in order to save time,

if it is his intention that the oaths for the respective provinces are to form a schedule to the Act so that we may see what they are ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think, since we are going to make an amendment to section 21, it will be necessary to have the provincial oaths put in the instructions that are sent to the returning officer.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it intended to have a schedule to that ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, he will see that we are going on with our eyes shut. I am sure the hon. gentleman has given a great deal of attention to the form of the oath, but he will pardon the suggestion that other members of the House should see the form of the provincial oath before we go any further.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would state my reason why I think it necessary that these separate oaths should form part of this Act. Now, we are commencing to revise the list in the province of Ontario for 1900, and if an election should not be held until after January 1, the lists that we are now making will be the lists on which the election will be held. Now, it is absolutely necessary that we should know, whilst these lists are being revised by our county court judges what the qualification is. The oath is really the qualification, that is the final test, and it will never do for us to be groping in the dark and revising the lists without knowing what test is going to be submitted to the voter when the election comes on. I think we ought to know the oath now, before the lists are revised. Certainly it will be a great advantage, and it will be a terrible disadvantage if we do not know.

Mr. MARTIN. There is another objection in this section. This has also reference to ballots which are to be initialled, and the question may arise with the returning officer whether, when a man's vote is objected to, he is to receive any ballot at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Do you not see that he has to put his name and initials on his ballot ? That is all right.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 172) respecting the Canada Mining and Metallurgical Company.—(Mr. Casey.)

Bill (No. 181)—from the Senate—for the relief of William Henry Featherstonhaugh (on division).—(Mr. Gibson.)

Mr. CLANCY.

#### ELECTION ACT—CONSOLIDATION AND AMENDMENT.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 133) to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members to the House of Commons.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 67,

Mr. MARTIN. We were discussing this clause. Mr. Chairman, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) took exception to the amendment that I proposed. The exception he has taken to the amendment has reference to the case of a franchise voter who is known in Prince Edward Island as a person voting on the performance of statute labour, or the payment of commutation money, or poll tax.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I expressed myself as willing to accept the suggestion made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden).

Mr. MARTIN. I have prepared since an amendment, which, I think, will cover the ground still more fully. I propose to add to the clause the following words :

—and such person having taken, if required, the oaths prescribed by this Act and the laws of the province, shall be entitled to receive such ballot paper and to vote, provided always that any person qualified to vote on the ground of the performance of statute labour, the payment of commutation money, or the payment of poll tax, shall be required before taking such oath to produce the certificate that is required by the provincial law.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not as comprehensive as the words suggested by the hon. member for Halifax: 'Otherwise complying with the requirements of the law.' I think you had better adopt his suggestion. The suggestion did not seem to be amiss, and I think, it meets the situation pretty well. You limit it entirely to the statute labour vote there.

Mr. MARTIN. No, statute labour, poll tax in cities, and commutation money. There are no others.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If there are any others you put them out altogether.

Mr. J. H. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) The suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) is an innovation ; it is asking us to amend our provincial system of conducting elections. The proposition is to make a material change in this respect ; the deputy returning officer has of necessity to perform certain quasi judicial functions, and we cannot di-

vest him of these, unless we put these functions into the hands of the voter. You can easily see that would be getting out of the frying pan into the fire. The statute labour certificate, for instance, is produced and the deputy returning officer has to look over it and see whether that certificate is for the proper year. That is one difficulty that most frequently occurs. A proposed voter produces his certificate, it turns out that it is not a proper one, that it is not for labour performed within the time prescribed by law. The deputy returning officer has to act in a judicial capacity to decide that point. Very often he sends the man away to get a proper certificate.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it the returning officer, or have not the agents as much anxiety about that certificate as the deputy returning officer?

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) Well, the deputy returning officer has to decide, among the different contentions. I am only speaking of this one point; there are others that frequently arise. Of course, in a general way, the matter largely rests with the voter. If he swears that he is twenty-one years of age that ends it, if he swears that he is a British subject that ends it, or if he swears that he has resided twelve months in the subdivision, that ends it. In most cases, therefore, the whole matter depends upon the oath of the voter. All the voter has to do is to make out a prima facie case. But there are matters which are in the judgment and discretion of the deputy returning officer, and our system prevents us from taking them out of his hands. The voter may be willing to take the oaths, but that does not determine the whole of his qualification. You must, therefore, leave the matter where it stands. We have grown up under that system, we have become satisfied with it, and I say we have no right now to attempt to substitute another. Our policy is, and should be, to adopt the system as it is in force in the several provinces. Under these circumstances, I think the better way is to leave matters as they stand. My hon. friend proposes to meet this difficulty, and says: Let us provide that when the voter takes the necessary oaths and produces the necessary qualifications, then let him vote. That puts the thing exactly as it was before; it makes it no better and no worse. It is a work of supererogation; there is no necessity for it. Supposing a voter who is qualified comes up to vote and the returning officer refuses his vote. What then? The voter has his action in the Supreme Court against the deputy returning officer. The deputy returning officer dare not refuse to allow him to vote.

Mr. INGRAM. That would do him a lot of good after the election was over.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) That is the penalty under our system. I do not

say whether it is a good system or a bad system, but you do not make it any better by adopting the suggestion of the hon. member for East Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Martin.)

Mr. MARTIN. Does not the hon. gentleman who is making that statement know that the practice in Prince Edward Island is that when the voter takes the necessary oath the deputy returning officer cannot reject his vote? Is not the hon. gentleman aware that when that is the case the only remedy is to mark the vote 'objected to' in the poll-book? It counts all the same until a recount is demanded.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) That is what I say; the matter is largely with the voter, but not altogether.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman said that it was with the deputy returning officer, that the deputy returning officer could refuse the vote.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I am saying that in a general way it is with the voter if he is willing to take the oaths. But the deputy returning officer has, nevertheless, under some circumstances, to exercise judicial functions, and I instanced the point in regard to the statute labour certificate. Here is your certificate produced, but whether it is for the proper year as prescribed by law, or whether it is signed by the proper overseer, these questions must be determined by the deputy returning officer.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) If he has not the certificate in proper form it is of no value?

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) That is not to be decided by the voter, but by the presiding officer. There, you have got to leave a certain degree of discretion with the deputy returning officer in whatever way you put the matter, and if my hon. friend's amended suggestion is adopted, even still the deputy returning officer has to determine.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think we both agree on the substance, and as it is only a matter of form, there is no use delaying the House about it. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) made a suggestion to meet the difficulty, and I am prepared to accept that suggestion. I do not think that the proposal of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) will meet the difficulty. The hon. gentleman will see that by section 78, it does not do for a man to come up and take the oath holus bolus. He must answer certain questions if he is asked, and describe the property on which he is going to vote, so that if he swears falsely he may be indicted for perjury. I myself have taken part in these prosecutions for perjury, and have seen men convicted. The voter is bound, if asked, to give the

boundaries of the property on which he votes.

Mr. MARTIN. And suppose he makes a statement that is incorrect with regard to the boundary, that does not prevent him from voting.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In that case he could be indicted for perjury. I am quite willing to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). The amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) would take away from the returning officer the duty which the law imposes upon him, of questioning every man and of compelling him to give a description of his property. If a man says he is qualified to vote on fifty acres of land, the returning officer asks him to describe it, and by the 78th section he has to properly describe the property, where it is situated, whether it is held under lease or agreement for lease, the annual rent, and all that. That is a condition precedent before he has the right to get a ballot. Suppose the voter says, that he is willing to take the oath, but that he will not answer questions, then the amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) would compel the returning officer to give him the ballot if he refused. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) would do well to accept the suggestion of his own friend the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), which is: That after the word 'Province' you should insert the words 'and otherwise comply with the requirements of the law.'

Mr. MARTIN. The objection to that is that it is very indefinite.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I know it is, but it is the best you can do.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 68,

Mr. MARTIN. I propose in that section, after the word 'affirmation,' to strike out the words in lines 35 and 36, 'or to sign the statement, or to answer questions or produce evidence as to qualifications.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Solicitor General has moved to strike out the words 'or to sign the statement.'

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it intended that section 68 should have general application to all the provinces?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Of course.

Mr. HENDERSON. I regret very much, indeed, that we on this side of the House cannot agree to that clause. I thought it only applied to Prince Edward Island, and, therefore, did not give much attention to it. The clause reads:

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

No voter who has refused to take the oath or affirmation (or to sign the statement), or to answer questions or produce evidence as to qualification as aforesaid (or to take the oath in the form U), when required to do so, shall receive a ballot paper or be admitted to vote.

Surely the Solicitor General does not intend that that clause shall have application in provinces other than Prince Edward Island?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Why not?

Mr. HENDERSON. Because, to my mind, it would make it utterly impossible to run an election. If the voter is to be subjected to all kinds of questions and to be asked to produce all kinds of evidence as to his qualifications, it will probably not be possible to poll fifty votes in any polling division.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Would the hon. gentleman point out some law in the province of Ontario—for which, I presume, he speaks—which would enable you to put a question to the voter?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am very much mistaken with regard to the law as we have had it in the past, if it permits the agent or scrutineer of any candidate to submit any question to the voter, other than to ask him to take the oath.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No one said anything to the contrary.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does this not say something to the contrary?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not at all. If the law of the provinces provides for putting questions, this applies; otherwise it does not. If the law is not applicable to Ontario, there is no use talking about it.

Mr. HENDERSON. But it will be applicable to Ontario if this clause goes through as it is now, because it is general in its terms. If the hon. gentleman's intention is to confine it to the province of Prince Edward Island, I do not object to it; but there is no limitation to it, and in my opinion it is unworkable.

Mr. INGRAM. This section 68 deals with the preceding sections which refer to the province of Prince Edward Island. In the old Act this same section referred to the province of Prince Edward Island. It is intended in the new Act to refer to that province, and I cannot see that it has anything to do with the province of Ontario at all.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That section has nothing at all to do with the province of Ontario.

Mr. CLANCY. Let us read the section as it is presented to the ordinary mind; be-

cause it must be remembered that deputy returning officers are not usually lawyers. It seems to me that an Act of this kind should be made as simple as possible. It is declared here that the voter must answer such questions and produce such evidence of qualification as is asked of him. The deputy returning officers and scrutineers are not going to read all the sections leading up to this to find out its meaning. As the section reads now, without any limitation upon it, it applies to any of the provinces. My hon. friend, I think, could simplify it by declaring in the section that it applies to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. INGRAM. We know perfectly well that in the province of Ontario no agent, candidate or elector is allowed to ask questions of any voter going to the poll to vote. This section applies only to cases where the law of the province allows questions to be asked. Therefore, it does not apply to Ontario at all.

Mr. McALISTER. The section speaks of the 'qualification as aforesaid,' which is the qualification for Prince Edward Island, mentioned in sections 66 and 67. Therefore, this can only refer to that province.

Mr. MARTIN. The reason I want this amendment adopted is that on election day, by a series of cross-questions put to the voter the polling might be indefinitely prolonged. As a matter of fact, in that province the crucial test with regard to voting is the oath. The questioning of the voter is for the purpose of showing the voter himself whether he has a right to vote or not. A man coming up to vote, may be in doubt whether he has that right, and after some questions are put to him he may be convinced that he has a vote, and then, when he offers to take the oath, his vote cannot be refused; but if the deputy returning officer is to be made the judge whether he has answered the questions properly or not and be given the decision as to whether he shall be allowed to vote or not, then you are putting an extraordinary power into the hands of the deputy returning officer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This law has been in operation in Prince Edward Island for fifty years and has never given rise to any trouble. We are simply applying to the Dominion elections the provincial laws. Under the provincial law of Prince Edward Island, if a man claims to vote on land, he has to describe it and the description is entered in the poll-book, and if he then takes the oath and votes he is liable to be prosecuted for perjury, should he have made a false statement. If he claims the right to vote on the ground that he has performed statute labour, he must produce the certificate, or if he has lost the certificate, make an affidavit to that effect.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We have passed section 66 within the last hour and this section 68 is a necessary sequel.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CLANCY. I intend moving an amendment to that section to make it clear. I hope the Solicitor General will accept it; it does not disturb the principle he holds to be involved in the two preceding sections. I move that, after the words 'evidence as to' to put in the word 'the' and after 'qualification,' to strike out the words 'as aforesaid' and substitute the words 'referred to in the two preceding sections.' Perhaps, the hon. gentleman will be able to put this amendment in better language.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) will agree to allow the clause to pass as it is, on the understanding that it with others is to come up for further discussion. What we want is to settle the Prince Edward Island amendments. Meantime, I will consider the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Clancy's) proposition.

On section 69,

Mr. MARTIN. I move that this clause be struck out, and the following be substituted :

In Prince Edward Island if the deputy returning officer refuses a ballot and the right to vote to any person who is willing to take the oaths prescribed by this Act or the provincial law, or gives a ballot to and allows to vote, any person who refuses to take such oaths, he shall for each such offence be liable to any person who may sue for the same to a penalty of \$200.

Under this Bill, the deputy returning officers are given judicial powers which they should not have, and then they seek to protect these officers by making them immune—they shall not be subject to penalty. I have already proposed amendments limiting the judicial powers of the deputy returning officers; but these have been voted down, and now I propose that these officers shall be held responsible at least for their acts.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am instructed by the Solicitor General that this is not a new provision inserted merely to apply to Prince Edward Island, but it is the existing law, and has been for a number of years, in the province of Ontario.

Mr. CLANCY. A very bad one it is too.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not discussing that. But my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) in framing his amendment, no doubt, overlooks section 19 in which it is provided that every officer or clerk who is guilty of any wilful misfeasance or any wilful act or omission in violation of this Act shall forfeit to any person aggrieved a sum of not exceeding \$500 in addition to actual damages.

Mr. CLANCY. This section was put in the Ontario law as a whitewashing section. I had some experience when that Act came up. A deputy returning officer had been guilty of wrong-doing, and this was to protect him from suffering any penalty. Under this section the burden of proof is cast upon those who take objection, who have been excluded from voting, it may be on the mere whim of a deputy returning officer. All the officer has to plead is : I did it in good faith. It is utterly impossible to show that a man did an act otherwise than in good faith. I shall not go into the history of what gave rise to this section, but no lawyer, not to say no layman, will say that it is sound in principle.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am sorry to say, as a lawyer, I am obliged to take the position that it is perfectly good law ; but it is the law, whether it is stated in this paragraph or not. Any officer who, in good faith and with reasonable and probable cause refuses to do a thing is certainly free from penalty.

Mr. CLANCY. In good faith and with reasonable and probable cause as it appears to him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, as it appears to the court.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is a mere statement here of what the common law is.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, hon. gentlemen may say that this is perfectly good law, but it is very bad morals. It places a most extraordinary power in the hands of the deputy returning officer. The deputy returning officer may reject a vote on a mere whim. Who then is to take the trouble to go into the courts to secure his rights ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) permit me a word in order to facilitate matters ? The Solicitor General says that if the members from Prince Edward Island are willing to eliminate the clause he does not care about it for the rest of the Dominion. I quite agree that it only states what the law is. If there is any objection to stating it, I am willing that the clause should be struck out. But I object to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Flint). Shall clause 69 be struck out—carried.

Mr. MARTIN. The circumstances in that province are different from those in any other province of Canada, and the difficulty of grafting a Dominion election law on the provincial franchise is apparent in every clause of this Bill. If you are going to clothe deputy returning officers in that

province with the judicial power which has been given them in these clauses, an election is not safe in Prince Edward Island. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says there has been no difficulty for the last fifty years. That is not the point, we have to consider what has been taking place within the last two or three years in other parts of Canada. In Ontario we have to provide now for circumstances as we find them. We want to prevent the machine from being introduced into Prince Edward Island. I think these clauses are the thin edge of the machine. In an election held in that province not long ago a deputy returning officer make this declaration on election day: he said he was the law ; and he was a friend of the hon. gentleman who is trying to keep this amendment from being inserted in the Bill. The local Act was put in his hands, and he said : 'Oh, I do not want that, the Attorney General told me that I was the law on election day. He said to me : You can do on election day whatever you like.' I say this is the thin end of the machine that the hon. minister is trying to introduce into Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I want to point out to the hon. gentleman that I think it is he himself who is trying to introduce this machine there. The Solicitor General introduced a Bill here to provide that for all breaches of duty of this kind there should not be merely a penalty of \$200, but a penalty of \$500.

Mr. MARTIN. You want to strike that out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I do not, that clause is already passed. But the hon. gentleman wants to cut down the penalty from \$500 to \$200. I object to that, I want a returning officer who acts so flagrantly in violation of the law to be punished up to the hilt. There is another point where I think he is introducing the machine. He wants to declare that a drunken rowdy can come forward and refuse to answer any question, or produce any certificate at all, but simply to offer to take the oath, and if he does not get a ballot the returning officer is to be liable to a \$200 penalty. He need not answer any questions, he need not say where his land is. Now, section 19 provides for that : 'Every officer and clerk who is guilty of any wilful malfeasance—'

Mr. MARTIN. Who is to prove whether it is wilful or not ? That means nothing at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does he want to fine a returning officer who acts bona fide ? I want to point out the three main objections that I have to his amendment. First, he minimizes the fine to a degree that I will not consent to ; secondly, he renders liable a

returning officer who does not allow a man to vote though he agrees to take the oath, and whether that man will answer the proper questions or not; thirdly, he renders the returning officer liable to a fine if he refuses a ballot to a man who comes up claiming to vote on a statute labour certificate and refuses to produce the certificate.

Mr. MARTIN. Was there ever a case where that section 19 was applied?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, in McLeod's case, at Murray Harbour, where the returning officer was fined the full amount that the statute permits.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The amendment proposed is:

In Prince Edward Island if the deputy returning officer refuses a ballot and the right to vote to any person who is willing to take the oaths prescribed by this Act or the provincial law, or gives a ballot to and allows to vote, any person who refuses to take such oaths, he shall for such offence be liable to any person who may sue for the same, to a penalty of \$200.

Mr. MARTIN. Make it \$500.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Section 20 of the Bill says:

Every returning officer, deputy returning officer, election clerk or poll clerk, who refuses or neglects to perform any of the obligations or formalities required of him by this Act shall, for each such refusal or neglect, forfeit the sum of \$200 to any person who sues therefor.

My hon. friend proposes to put in what is contained in section 20.

Mr. MARTIN. In this case it is wilful malfeasance.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, not in section 20.

Amendment negatived.

On section 78,

Mr. MARTIN moved:

That at the end of subsection 1. line 39, the following words be inserted: 'and in Prince Edward Island the words "objected to" opposite the names of such persons voting, whose right has been objected to under section 67 of this Act.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I think that is already in the Bill, but it will do no harm to put it in again.

Amendment agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL moved:

That the words 'or signed statement' in the 30th line, the words 'or refused to sign statement' in the 34th and 35th lines, and the words, 'or to sign a statement which he has been legally required to sign,' in the 38th and 39th lines, be stricken out.

Amendment agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL moved:

That the word 'works' in the 40th line be changed to 'words.'

Amendment agreed to.

On section 82,

Mr. MARTIN moved:

That the following words be struck out of subsection 2, line 19: 'in counting the ballots,' and that these words be inserted after the word 'Act' at the end of the subsection: 'such ballot papers being counted for the candidate for whom, respectively, they have been cast.'

He said: The section will then read:

The other ballot papers being counted and a list kept of the number of votes given to each candidate, and of the number of rejected ballot papers, all the ballot papers indicating the votes given for each candidate respectively shall be put into separate envelopes or parcels, and those rejected, those spoiled and those unused, shall be put respectively into separate envelopes or parcels, and all such envelopes or parcels shall be endorsed so as to indicate their contents, and shall be sealed by the deputy returning officer, and shall be marked with the signatures of any agents present in the polling station who are willing to do so by writing their signatures across the flap thereof.

2. In the province of Prince Edward Island, the deputy returning officer shall also place in a separate envelope or parcel all ballot papers numbered and initialled under section 67 of this Act, such ballot papers being counted for the candidate for whom respectively they have been cast.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Why do you strike out 'in counting the ballots'?

Mr. INGRAM. It makes better language.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not think these words are necessary.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It would not do at all to strike out the words 'in counting the ballots.' The only object of the section is a direction to the officer that in the process of counting the ballots he shall place in an envelope those that have been marked and numbered objected to. It would not do to give a special direction to him for a particular part of the Dominion. The words 'in counting the ballots' mean that it shall be done at the time he is counting them.

Mr. INGRAM. It would appear to me from reading the sections of the Act that all this is already provided for.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is.

On section 90,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend (Mr. Martin) discussed the matter of his proposed amendment thoroughly the other night, and it was shown that a scrutiny could only take place at the time of the election petition.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) We always had the privilege of a scrutiny under the local Act.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Not under the existing local Act. You have never had a scrutiny since the Controverted Elections Act was passed in the Island.

Mr. **MARTIN**. If you do not adopt this amendment, what is the use of having initialled ballots?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do not want to abridge for one moment the right of my hon. friend to discuss this matter over and over again. But we discussed it the other night, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) pressed it to a division, and lost it.

Mr. **MARTIN**. And the Solicitor General promised an amendment by which in cases similar to this, recourse should be had on the part of the defeated candidate in a less expensive way than at present.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I intend to make an amendment to the Election Act to facilitate the general contestation of elections, but not with reference to Prince Edward Island exclusively.

Mr. **MARTIN**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has placed the province of Prince Edward Island in a very inimical position in regard to these initialled ballots and rejected votes. It is incumbent upon him to meet the objection I have raised. It will not do to say that you cannot try this in a recount before a judge. The machinery that is necessary to carry out my suggestion is very simple indeed, and it would be a very easy matter to investiate the character of the votes. If the amendments I propose do not meet the case, I think it devolves on the Solicitor General to provide a remedy; otherwise, I would go the length of omitting anything about initialled ballots altogether, because there is no use of having such a provision unless you have a simple way of having a recount and deciding on a close vote whether any of the ballots are good or bad. If you have to use the machinery of the Controverted Elections Act, you might as well leave the clause out altogether.

Mr. **BORDEN (Halifax)**. I have not yet understood from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whether or not when the voter comes forward you have the right in addition to putting the oath to him, to cross-examine him.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. When a man comes forward to vote, if he votes upon real estate, whether freehold or leasehold, you have a right to ask him on what property he votes and where it is situated. If it is freehold he must describe it by meets and bounds; and if it is leasehold, he must state the annual rent to be paid. All these particulars must be entered in the poll-book, so that his statements may be tested afterwards, and if

Mr. **MACDONALD (King's)**.

necessary he may be prosecuted for perjury. If he votes on statute labour qualification, he must produce the book and state that he is the man mentioned in it.

Mr. **BORDEN (Halifax)**. That is satisfactory as far as it goes. Suppose the man is questioned, is he sworn to his answer?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Any one of the scrutineers, if not satisfied with his answer, may require him to be sworn to it, and he is there and then sworn.

Mr. **BORDEN (Halifax)**. But if you know he is stating an absolute falsehood, he must be allowed to vote?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes.

Mr. **BORDEN (Halifax)**. It appears to me that you have this difficulty in Prince Edward Island; you are doing two things on election day; you are making the list and running the election at the same time. That gives rise to a rather curious state of affairs, as has been suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Martin). Apparently the only remedy you have, if the list of voters is improperly made up at the time, is by an election petition, which is rather an expensive remedy. If you happen to know that fifteen or twenty or a hundred men have given incorrect answers and are not really entitled to vote, you are driven to a scrutiny by means of an election petition; but you do not have any relief under section 90. All that my hon. friend is asking is that inasmuch as there is a simple, inexpensive and summary method provided for all the other provinces of Canada, you should, in the exceptional circumstances that exist in Prince Edward Island, provide, if possible, a similar summary and inexpensive method of dealing with the case there. It really does not seem to me that that is at all unreasonable. It may require a peculiar provision with respect to Prince Edward Island, but where you are dealing with half a dozen different provincial franchises your Act must embrace peculiar provisions of that kind. I would submit to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that this is a matter that might very well be taken into consideration by him, as he is more familiar with and has had greater experience of the law of Prince Edward Island than anybody else, to see whether some measure of relief looking to that end could not be provided in this Act.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There is no question that I have thought of it, but I have thought of it in the light of these facts. Twelve years ago the Controverted Elections Act was first passed in Prince Edward Island. Previous to that we had a scrutiny similar to what my hon. friend proposes to-day, under which a protest was entered on election day and a scrutiny was held by triers. But I

can only recall three cases of that kind. Since the Controverted Elections Act was passed, so smoothly has our local law worked, and the qualified voters are so well known, that I cannot recall that a single scrutiny has been asked for in the last twelve years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is exactly the answer that I have received on both sides of the House with regard to the working of this law. For my part, I cannot see why there is not difficulty. It must be owing to the local knowledge of the voters; because if the same system were applied to any other province, I am sure there would be great difficulty in working it out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is one suggestion of my hon. friend which I intend to consider—whether any amendment can be made or proposed to the Controverted Elections Act which would simplify and cheapen the holding of a scrutiny; but it is quite impossible to superadd to the power of the county court judge to recount the votes, the power to hold a scrutiny.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There seems to be this difficulty about Prince Edward Island compared with my own province. In my province men are put on the list, but you have an appeal to another tribunal for the purpose of finding out whether or not they were properly put on the lists. But in Prince Edward Island you settle the matter at the election itself, and the only way by which you can obtain an appeal is to deposit \$1,000 and go to the enormous expense of a petition under the Controverted Elections Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You cannot decide a case more summarily before a county judge than before the Supreme Court; but if you attempt to add to the powers of a county court judge the power of holding a recount, and having a scrutiny, the time given under the existing law will not permit of that being done. Before you can hold a scrutiny, you must comply with the ordinary rules which belong to all courts. You must give notice to the party opposite of the votes you are going to attack, and the ground of your attack, and the party opposite has to give you notice of the votes he intends having set aside, and the grounds of his challenge. Suppose there are 100 votes challenged on the one side and 70 on the other, witnesses will have to be summoned and notices served and all that cannot be done in four days. The only hardship I can see in an appeal to the Superior Court, under the Controverted Elections Act, is the deposit of \$1,000, and we might reduce that one-half.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You could get a much simpler and more expeditious procedure than under the Controverted Elections Act. You could abolish all that difficulty about service and preliminary exceptions,

and the other delays of election petitions, and have a much more summary trial than you could have under the Controverted Elections Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am devoting my attention to that now.

Mr. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) There is another difficulty besides that pointed out by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a few minutes ago. It is proposed to submit the matter of the validity of the doubtful votes to a county judge, but although I have every confidence in the county judge, I have more confidence in the two judges of the Supreme Court who compose the tribunal for trying election petitions. Suppose you bring this matter before a county judge, he will try one half of the questions in dispute, and then the other half will be tried by the two judges of the Supreme Court. But the more important half, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, is that which will go before the county court judge, because he will have to determine the qualifications of the voters. For instance, a statute labour voter claims a right to vote on the ground that he has been a continual resident within a particular polling subdivision for twelve months. The question comes up: What is continuous residence? That question the county court judge would have to determine, and not the two judges of the Supreme Court. And there are questions of title, of value of property, of length of possession, of construction, of local statutes and the like, which are very intricate, and ought to come before the Supreme Court judges. Therefore, in order to have uniformity in your proceedings, you ought to have your whole case proceeded with before the two judges for the purpose of determining, first, whether the parties objected to are qualified to vote, and then whether there has been any fraud or illegality in connection with the election. Under our peculiar conditions, the difficulties with us arise mainly in respect of qualification of votes, and the question of qualification ought to be decided by the two judges along with any other question that may arise, and not be referred separately to a county court judge. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) says that with us the deputy returning officer is also a sort of a revising barrister, and has to determine right on the spot, at the election, whether a voter is entitled to vote or not. That is quite true, but in this regard we are better off, and in another sense worse off than the other provinces. In the other provinces where you have voters' lists, there are always men whose names are not on the list and who should be on, there are, for instance young men who have come of age since the lists were compiled, and who consequently cannot be put on them, and cannot vote at the election. These difficulties do

not obtain in Prince Edward Island, because at the very moment the election is being held, we determine who are and who are not entitled to vote. But we are under the disadvantage, that the deputy returning officer has to act in a judicial capacity. He has to determine in a rough and ready way, whether a man is entitled to vote or not, and there is no appeal. With us a man who is twenty-one years of age on election day, can come up and poll his vote. That is perfectly right—but he cannot do it anywhere outside of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would be inclined to think that the simplest way would be for Prince Edward Island to amend its law. There does not seem to be much force in what my hon. friend suggests about having the voters' lists settled by two judges of the Supreme Court. In the other provinces they are settled by assessors with an appeal to the revisers—men without the technical qualifications, who are not lawyers at all, and yet the results are fairly satisfactory. So I do not see why, in this particular province, my hon. friend thinks it necessary that two judges of the Supreme Court should be called upon to settle the question as to a man's right to vote, when that right is settled in the other provinces by two or three business men having a knowledge of the circumstances.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is what is done in our province in the elections, the matter is settled by the returning officers and the scrutineers, a few business men, neighbours, among themselves. Practically, it comes out all right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But with this difference: In the other provinces you have the right to have an appeal and to summon witnesses on each side and have a finding by the court. But in Prince Edward Island you cannot have that settled on election day, and you must resort to the cumbersome procedure under the Controverted Elections Act. But if, as I understand, the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) has this under consideration and may propose some relief, I think the matter could be allowed to stand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend (Mr. Martin) intimated that on the third reading he intended to move his clause. I do not wish to interpose, but if he leaves the matter in that form, I have another amendment to propose. Clause 60 of the Bill provides that in Prince Edward Island every resident voter shall vote in the polling division in which he resides, and not elsewhere. I propose to add to section 60, subsection 2:

And every elector qualified to vote in any electoral district in which he does not reside shall vote in the polling division thereof in which the property on which he claims to vote is situated, and not elsewhere.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.)

If I reside in polling division No. 20, I must vote in that polling division and not elsewhere. That is right, and the object of it is plain—to provide that a man shall vote where he is known so as to prevent personation. But if I have a piece of property in polling division No. 20, can I vote in polling division No. 19? The law does not say explicitly whether I can or cannot. The object of the amendment is to make this clear. This is the local law now, and it is supposed to confine it to Prince Edward Island.

Amendment agreed to.

The committee rose and reported progress.

#### SUPPLY—I.C.R. FREIGHT RATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I venture to mention a matter which I intended to speak on during the consideration of the railway estimates, if they had come on. Some time ago there was a representation of the Board of Trade of Halifax to the Minister of Railways and Canals complaining of discriminating rates as against Halifax, as compared with Montreal and some other places. The rates complained of were from Montreal to Sydney, which were very much lower, as I understand, than the rates from Halifax to Sydney. I believe there was a delegation from the Halifax Board of Trade, or, at least, there was a written representation from them, a copy of which was handed to me at the time. I did not bring the matter up before, because I understood that negotiations were going on between the Minister of Railways and Canals and the representatives of the board of trade, which would possibly result in a solution satisfactory to the board of trade. Some solution may have been reached, as I have heard nothing of the matter very recently. It seemed to me that the rates did discriminate against Halifax in several respects and that they could not well be justified. I shall be glad to hear that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) whether any solution has been reached.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Board of Trade of Halifax and some of the gentlemen who are interested in the matter brought to my attention several instances which they complained of. They thought there was some discrimination against Halifax as compared with Montreal, in the rates that had been proposed. I called the attention of the department to the question; and while I think all the points have not been adjusted, I think that some of the difficulties have been removed. I am not sure whether it will be

possible to remove them all, but they are the subject of consideration. They will be dealt with just as soon as possible, and a decision arrived at one way or the other.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I understand, so far as the duties have not been removed, they are now engaging the consideration of the hon. gentleman's department with a view to their removal if possible.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Charges of management—Printing Dominion notes ..... \$5,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I explained this in connection with the main estimates for the coming year. The usual expenditure for that service is about \$50,000, but owing to the increase in the volume of the circulation and the general expansion of business, a larger sum has become necessary, and we are asking this \$5,000 to close up the present year. As I have already explained, we have to ask for an increase also for the coming year.

Civil Government—Governor General's Secretary's Office—Contingencies:

Clerical assistance .....	\$ 300
Printing and stationery (to recoup the vote for unforeseen expenses) .....	500
Sundries .....	1,300

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Owing to the retirement of one clerk as explained in a previous discussion, it became necessary to employ additional assistance, which accounts for the item of clerical assistance. The item for printing and stationery, \$500, is not an increase, because a corresponding vote was made last year. As respects the other item, sundries, it is chiefly due to the large amount of telegraphing in the Governor General's office arising out of the war in South Africa.

To supply seed grain to settlers whose crops were destroyed in 1899..... \$6,000

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). The hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) asked me the other night one or two questions that I was not able to answer. I think the chief one was whether the grain had been paid for. The grain was not paid for, it was ordered to be purchased by the agent, and it was bought with the understanding that it would not be paid for for two or three months. I will read the petition asking for assistance:

We, the undersigned settlers of Flett's Springs, in the electoral district of Saskatchewan, do humbly petition: 1. That owing to the total destruction of our crops on August 15, 1899, that seed grain be distributed here: 2. That said seed grain be supplied us at as reasonable a price as possible.

This was signed by seventeen settlers in that district. That was referred to J. McArthur, homestead inspector, to report upon. He says:

I have visited the localities mentioned, and saw each settler re information required. Information required I now inclose. In all about five of the settlers who had grain destroyed this year were away, but their neighbours informed me they would be back in the spring if they got seed grain. It was the urgent request of all the settlers that should the government decide to supply them with seed grain, they should know at the earliest possible time, and that the grain should be on hand early in February—reason being sixty to ninety miles from railway, having no grain, their horses are poor and will require time on the road. The South Saskatchewan River cannot be depended on later than March 20, owing to light snow they fear the roads will give way early. About 4,500 bushels will be required, half oats. At this writing the wheat and barley could be got in Carrot River, saving a haul of forty-five miles. There are no oats there or elsewhere in Saskatchewan good enough for seed.

He submits with this report the names of the settlers, the number of their lot, the number of horses and cattle, as to whether the land is patented, and as to whether they have received their patents, and the number of bushels that he recommends to be granted to each one. Then the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked a question as to the prices. The prices seem to be, for wheat, 60 cents in every case except one, where it was 70 cents. This latter case, I am told, included the freight. The total amount due is \$4,725.03.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). I understand seed grain is furnished almost every year when any accident happens. On what general principle is it done? Is it simply on a petition signed by the people of that locality, or what general principle governs the granting of seed grain to certain settlers?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am inclined to think that the department, when an application is made, no matter from what quarter, refers it to the inspector in the district, and on his report and recommendation action is taken. In this particular case I may say that we have a mortgage for the repayment in every case where they have a patent for their land; in every case where the patent is not granted, the amount is registered against the land. So I have no doubt that in this case the full amount will be repaid.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). What has been the experience in the past in regard to repayments? I understand it is not a new departure, but it has been done in past years.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In some special cases there has been no difficulty about repayment. But my hon. friend will remember that in past years when the country was young we had to forgive a good many set-

tlers their payments, or rather we had to release their bondsmen from payment where the settlers had abandoned their lands. Outside of that, payments are pretty well made.

Department of Indian Affairs—

Clerical assistance ..... \$ 575  
 Printing and stationery ..... 1,000

Mr. SUTHERLAND. For clerical assistance the amount provided did not prove sufficient to pay the staff the total amount for the year. On examination I find there is a small decrease in the total amount for expenses in connection with civil government and contingencies. There have been some additions for statutory increases, but on the whole there is a slight decrease in this connection.

Medical attendance and medicines..... \$1,500  
 Relief of distress in British Columbia.... 1,000  
 Grant for fifty pupils, at \$60 each, at the  
 Squamish boarding school ..... 3,000

\$5,500

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) What is this distress in British Columbia?

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). The main appropriation for this service is \$3,500. Up to the middle of March the expenditure has been \$2,829.63, and the balance, \$670.37 is not more than will be required to cover the accounts for the month of April. The \$1,000 now asked for is to meet the accounts for May and June. The reason for the expenditure this year is owing to the salmon fisheries not being as successful as usual, and the vote is to cover demands for the relief of aged and destitute Indians in various districts in British Columbia where this industry is the main resource of the Indians.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the whole sum that has been expended in relief?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Three thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. In what district?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. All over the province.

Mr. PRIOR. Are these sums asked for by the Indian agents?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, all these grants are made by the agents and upon their recommendation.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). Is the Squamish boarding school under the supervision of any missionary society or church?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, it is a school under the supervision of the Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the only one?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. At Squamish, opposite Vancouver. The population is 3,165, made up as follows: Anglicans, 91; Methodists, 153; Roman Catholics, 2,740; and Pagans, 181. It appears from a report made by Mr. Vowell that when Mr. Hayter Reed visited the coast as Deputy Supt.-General of Indian Affairs, he led the Indians who petitioned for a school at Squamish to understand that the desired provision would be made. Moreover, in 1895, the chiefs forwarded a petition in which was set forth that although the school had been promised forty years ago they were still waiting for it, and it was asked that a convent or college should be provided where the children could be taught, fed and clothed. Mr. Reed approved the petition and said that an item would be inserted in the estimates to provide for the school. On the chiefs expressing their pleasure at the reply, Mr. Reed wrote to Mr. Vowell to dispossess the Indians of their impression as to the character of the proposed school, as he understood that it was a day school that was asked for. Whatever may have been Mr. Reed's impression the Indians made a very clear request for a school in which their children could live, and his reply was such as to lead them to expect that their request would be entertained.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to call the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to the fact that only one item of No. 71 was carried.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, we are going back to No. 71.

Supplies for working and destitute Indians \$10,000

Mr. CLANCY. What is the nature of that?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The amount is intended to make provision for supplies which have been purchased for Indians outside of the treaty limits issued for the most part by the Hudson's Bay Company to Indians to prevent actual starvation. The past two winters have been very severe, and the scarcity of rabbits caused a great deal of suffering and some loss of life in the unorganized districts. The Hudson's Bay Company, under instructions from the department, has so far as possible, prevented suffering and as no special provision was made in the destitute vote for the somewhat unusual demands, it is necessary to provide for the amount here. The department was unable, at the close of the last fiscal year, to pay the voucher for all the beef issued in Treaty No. 7, on account of some misunderstanding over the accounts. The vote lapsed, and it was therefore necessary to pay them from the current year's vote. The amount of the vouchers so paid was \$6,102.71. That leaves an extra \$4,000, which is required for the assistance of the Indians.

Mr. FOSTER. I suggest that the item should be changed. You are including under charity what is not charity.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am informed that this is the usual way of making the estimate. It reads:

To provide an additional amount for the purchase of supplies for working and destitute Indians.

Mr. FOSTER. Six thousand dollars is under the treaty.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not for the purchase of supplies for destitute Indians nor supplies for working Indians. It is just the same as a payment in beef or a payment in cattle.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Scott says that it is the ordinary estimate for beef under the treaty. They are not entitled to it under the law, and it is only issued if it is thought necessary to keep them from starving.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to judge of that?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Scott says that it is the ordinary ration. It is provided on the report of the Indian agent.

General expenses ..... \$13,000

Mr. FOSTER. We want a full explanation of this vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This amount is intended to cover the unprovided balance of the expenses of the commission, which in the spring and summer of 1899 made a new treaty with the Indians north of the Saskatchewan, now known as Treaty No. 8. Exclusive of the amount which was charged to the account of 1898-9, the appropriation for the current year has borne an expenditure of \$20,911.86, divided as follows: salaries, \$6,166.41; expenses, \$14,745.45.

Mr. FOSTER. Who were these commissioners?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Macrae, Inspector of Indian Agencies, is up this year alone. The commission who made the treaty with the Indians in 1898-9 was composed of the Hon. David Laird, the Hon. J. Ross and Mr. McKenna of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this \$20,000 include the annuity to the Indians?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, this is for the expenses connected with the commission and Mr. Macrae's expenses this year.

Mr. FOSTER. What is Mr. Macrae paid?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. His expenses are paid, and he is allowed \$6 a day while he is out.

Mr. FOSTER. You have adopted the method of sending out officials whose whole

time is due to the department, and giving them a large daily pay as well as their salary.

Mr. SPROULE. What is Mr. Macrae's salary?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is \$1,800 at present including his \$200 increase. The committee will understand that some allowance is reasonable to a person taking this trip which is a long way out of civilization. The only question arising would be as to how much that allowance should be.

Mr. FOSTER. Whilst I would not expect to force a man in the department to go out there, and undergo hardships without giving him a certain allowance, still there ought to be a good deal of care taken in that respect. This after all is a very enjoyable outing. Every good healthy fellow in the service who has a taste for outdoor life would snap at the chance of getting away during the summer months. Besides Mr. Macrae is in the service of the country and that kind of work tends towards his claims for promotion hereafter. Mr. Macrae is paid for his time by his salary, and it does seem to me, when you pay every dollar of expense he incurs, that \$6 a day extra is, I think, too large an allowance. Here is Mr. McKenna, whose case we discussed a little while ago, who has been very speedily and highly promoted. What extra pay does he get?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Five dollars a day.

Mr. FOSTER. In nine cases out of ten a man is glad to get away on one of those expeditions, and whilst he should have something for extra wear and tear, I do not think his salary ought to be doubled in this manner.

Mr. CLANCY. When permanent officials have their salary doubled in this way there is naturally a very great inducement to them to prolong the work. Will Mr. McKenna and Mr. Macrae get this extra daily pay from the time they leave Ottawa until they return?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. McKenna got paid from the time he left Winnipeg, but Mr. Macrae's matter has not been settled. This work is altogether outside of what Mr. Macrae was expected to do, and although some of these commissions may be an outing, as the ex-Minister of Finance says, yet there is very considerable hardship if not danger in connection with this. A man who has experience in dealing with Indians is much better fitted for this than a person who has no experience.

Mr. FOSTER. You have him here because of his experience?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. His duties are as inspector of Indians for the province of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. And he has to travel over the wilds of Ontario where he will experience just as much hardship as in this case.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The only question is as to whether the allowance is too large. No one would begrudge him some little allowance.

Mr. FOSTER. No one would begrudge him a fair allowance.

Mr. CLANCY. The ex-Minister of Finance stated with great clearness that some additional allowance might be made. But Mr. Macrae should be selected on account of his position. He is there to go beyond Ontario if the service requires him to do so. Then it becomes a question of whether he should not receive something in addition to his salary. I do not think the hon. gentleman will say that the allowance that has been made is not too much; because it is more than doubling his salary, if he is paid for Sundays. Will the hon. gentleman tell me how many there are in the service getting paid under similar conditions?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. At present only three. I do not know whether there will be any more commissions to go out or not. There may be for the Indians; but we are pretty certain that there will be no more commissions in connection with half-breed scrip.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). His salary is \$1,600 a year, and next year it will be \$1,800. I should think if he were paid \$3 a day in addition to his salary, when all his expenses and all necessary equipment are provided, he would be very well paid. I think there are plenty of good men in the department who would be glad to do the work with that advance on their usual salary.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You would want a pretty good man to pay out, as Mr. Macrae will do during this trip, about \$40,000 to the Indians; and I doubt if you could get a good man to do the work less.

Mr. SPROULE. There was a very good man out there for years—a man from Toronto, a Mr. Wadsworth—and the highest salary he got was \$1,800 and expenses; and at that time travelling was very much more difficult than it is now. He commenced the work at \$1,200 a year, and was glad to take it at that; and he was very well pleased when his salary went to \$1,800.

Mr. WILSON. What was the number of days these men were out?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Macrae will probably be out four months. The other commission are through. They were out about 120 days.

Department of Justice—P. Mungovan, for copying, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... 347 62

Mr. SPROULE. Who is this?

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He was employed by the minister to copy a return for the House of Commons. The Auditor General refused to pass the account on the ground that Mr. Mungovan had not passed the qualifying examination, and was not qualified to act as a clerk. Therefore, a vote is necessary to pay the amount.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a thing the Department of Justice ought not to do, and Mr. Mills ought not to be guilty of doing it. We pass a law, and the Justice Department above all others ought to be careful to follow the law, as an example to all the other departments. There are hundreds of people who have qualified themselves under our law, have paid the fees and passed the examination, and are able to do the work, and Mr. Mills goes outside of them and breaks the law in order to get this man to do the work. I should think he would feel mean in being brought to book, as he is by the Auditor General, year after year, for this nasty little business.

Mr. SPROULE. I object to this item; for while it may nominally be for services rendered, I question very much whether there has been any substantial service for the money. I know Mr. Mungovan. I met him in the Brockville election. I have no doubt he was valuable there. I have seen him at every election at which I have been present for some years. When the Conservatives are in power he is a Conservative, and when the Reformers are in power, he is a Reformer. He is an electioneering agent, and he is found in every riding in which an election is being held. After the Brockville election, I saw him in the library and around this House. I was told he was doing a little work to earn a little money, but it was not because the work could not be done without the employment of extra clerks, but simply because it was desired to give him a little money—I was going to say for doing nothing; it is the next thing to it.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that the item be struck out.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not know anything of the details further than I have communicated to the House, but I am quite certain that this item would not be reported to the House if the work had not been done.

Mr. SPROULE. No doubt others have been paid salaries for doing that work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend is surely not serious in pressing that to a division?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I am.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not object to my hon. friend's protest, but it would be grossly unjust not to pay the man for the work he has done. It may have been wrong for the minister to have given him the work, but

he certainly ought not to refuse to pay him. I have myself got into a similar difficulty a couple of times by employing agents or workmen on the bounty check system. I did not think that they were officers within the meaning of the Act, and I employed a number of young ladies in Ottawa who had not passed the civil service examination. I took the ground that they were not under the Civil Service Act at all, and the Auditor General said: That is true, and if you had employed them in Montreal or Halifax there could have been no objection, but as you have employed them in Ottawa they must be treated as clerks within the meaning of the Civil Service Act, and only those who have passed the examinations could be employed. The Department of Justice took the same view, and since then I have only employed those qualified, but I think it would have been cruel to refuse to pay these people who had done their work because they had been improperly employed.

Mr. FOSTER. The trouble is this, that this same thing has been done every year since you have been in power.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it has been done by the Minister of Justice himself, and a strong protest made against it. He knows perfectly well that in this he is doing a thing not contemplated by the law, and against which parliament had protested.

Mr. SPROULE. Besides, we have no information what work was done. There may not have been two pages copied.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The account is certified to, and the Auditor General has passed it.

Mr. SPROULE. The Auditor General is not paying it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He objects to its being paid solely on the legal ground.

Mr. SPROULE. This is intended to pay for political services. I met Mr. Mungovan within a few rods after I passed Gorman, one of the machine men, and shortly before that Tom Lewis. I have met him election after election, and have found him constantly doing that kind of work, and then he is brought down here and some excuse made to vote him public money.

Mr. WILSON. It seems to me that the Solicitor General should give us the details and should not ask us to vote even this small amount without the necessary information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The idea that because a certain amount is paid, we are to assume that nothing was done for the money is rather a novel one. It would be more reasonable as well as charitable to assume

that when an officer certifies to an account, the work has been done, unless somebody knows to the contrary. I take it for granted that an officer of the department is not going to certify to an account for political services.

Mr. CLANCY. Our objection to this vote is reasonable under the circumstances. The work was done in violation of the Civil Service Act, with the knowledge of the minister, and after his attention was brought to it. This is not the first time that this has happened in connection with that same gentleman, who has not hesitated, on the streets of Ottawa, and in the corridors of this House, to tell members themselves, within my hearing, that he would go to their constituencies and overturn them. The question of my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) is a very fair one. The Solicitor General should make it perfectly clear what has been the character and the extent of the work done. It is not the beggarly sum of \$47 that is in question, but a practice that cannot be justified on any ground whatever. It is no excuse to say that the work is done and ought to be paid for. Let the minister pay it out of his own pocket. If it were done innocently, if the man were not known and I am not going to say anything against him personally—the case would be different, but this is not the first occasion the hon. minister has had his attention called to that kind of thing, and there is no excuse whatever for his action.

Mr. WILSON. Will not the Solicitor General undertake to give us the information?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am quite willing to give all the information I have. The work consisted in the copying of a report, but as to the nature of the report and the case in which the report was made, I cannot say anything. As to what the work was worth, that is for the officials of the department to determine, and the Auditor General would not pass the account if he were not satisfied that the work was really performed. The objection taken by him is one of a purely legal character, namely, that a man who has not passed the qualifying examination under the civil service cannot be employed to do that work.

Mr. SPROULE. We know from past experience the loose way in which these accounts are passed and certified to, especially when any information is given the accountant that it is desirable they should be certified to. It is easy to make excuses when the government desire to pay a certain amount of money. In a case like this it might be naturally expected—especially in view of the fact that such items have previously been objected to—that the government would be prepared to show that value had been given, but we are without any information beyond the fact that the work consisted in copying the report, whe-

ther a report of one page or fifty pages, we cannot say, but in all probability, it was but a few pages. I would not like to say what I did not believe to be correct, but, in my judgment, it is simply an excuse to take money belonging to the country to pay for a political agent who is at the command of the government whenever there is an election to be held.

Amendment negatived.

Administration of Justice—Additional amount required for circuit allowances in Manitoba ..... \$500

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This additional amount brings the total estimate to \$3,000. The increase is necessary because of the additional county courts that have been held in Manitoba as a result of the increase of business following an increased population.

Exchequer Court of Canada—Further amount required for contingencies—judge's and registrar's travelling expenses, salaries of sheriffs, &c., printing, stationery, &c. .... \$1,000

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There have been heavy expenses on account of contingencies generally, necessitated by a number of heavy cases brought before the court during the present year which caused heavier expenses in the way of remuneration for sheriffs, constables and stenographers. Travelling expenses also have been higher. Of the \$4,000 already voted, I have expended \$3,500, and I estimate that at least \$1,500 will be required to complete the present fiscal year.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the stenographers paid out of this vote?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes—the stenographer for the Exchequer Court.

Mr. WILSON. What is the total amount paid to the stenographer?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am afraid to say what the stenographer of the Exchequer Court earns; it is a very large amount. He is paid according to the work he does—so much a folio. But, in order to have a thoroughly competent man, it was settled, when the court was established, that he should receive in addition a travelling allowance to enable him to attend upon the judge in any part of Canada. The stenographer is Mr. Butcher, of Toronto. He is an exceedingly competent man and gives very great satisfaction.

Dominion Police—

Retiring allowance to Constable Mathew Heron.....	\$ 250 95
Further amount required .....	1,000 00
Special police service .....	1,800 00

\$3,050 95

Mr. SPROULE.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This first item is the usual allowance for a man who becomes incapacitated after being a member of the force for at least five years. The second item is rendered necessary because of extra men having been placed on duty about the buildings as a precautionary measure.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they employed still?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, they are about the buildings all the time. Recently there have been special reasons for this. The third item is to pay the special police on duty on the Welland Canal from May 20 to June 30. There are twenty-one men, and they are paid \$1.50 a day. The superintendent of the force is Mr. Hugh McKinnon, ex-chief of police of Belleville, who is paid \$3.50 a day and expenses.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the provincial police were co-operating with the Dominion?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understand from the report of the superintendent that it is all done by the Dominion police. That will be quite right, as this is a public work of the Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that to be continued?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think it is well for the present to continue it. This is to pay up to the end of the current year.

Penitentiaries—Kingston—Further amount required for material for binder twine..\$30,000

Mr. SPROULE. When is that material for binder twine purchased?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have here the report on the item given me by the inspector. He says that owing to the rise in price of fibre and the consequent shortage of the vote for the previous year, a consignment of fibre, which was received in June of last fiscal year, and which otherwise would have been paid for this year from last year's appropriation, was carried over and paid for this year. This amount is about \$14,000. When the estimates were prepared, in December, 1898, it was not expected that the price of fibre would remain at the abnormally high figure which then prevailed, nor was the South African war anticipated, which has caused a general increase in the price of all articles required outside of contract. The amount represents the value of fibre which will require to be paid for between this date and the end of the present twine season.

Mr. CLANCOY. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) the quantity there? Is it 260,000 pounds?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot give that.

Mr. WILSON. Nor the price?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I had the price when we discussed the question some time ago. My impression is that I stated it then at 9 cents. I speak subject to correction.

Mr. FOSTER. This takes you up to the end of the fiscal year?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has it already been purchased?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes. I was asked to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to this—that the words 'for material for binder twine' should be struck out. These were put in after the vote left the office. The \$30,000 is required to recoup the general vote for the year, money from the general vote having been used to purchase material for binder twine.

Mr. SPROULE. This expression 'material for binder twine' is very general. What does it include?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It includes all three kinds—manila, sisal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps, as the explanation has been given to the committee of the state of affairs, it would be better to leave out these words. I put them in because I thought that it was necessary for explanation. There is a memorandum from the warden to the inspector asking him to explain to the minister that the supplementary vote must be for general expenditure or it would be of no use to them; that they have bought material out of the general grant, and are brought to the extremity of asking for this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. It is to recoup the vote for general expenses.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the practice has been to include the purchase of material in the general vote. I inserted these words because I thought they helped to explain the matter to the House, but now that the House thoroughly understands what it was for, we will omit these words, 'for material for twine.'

Mr. CLANCY. It is just as well that the statement made by the Solicitor General should be corrected. I will not say that there is a determination on the part of hon. gentlemen to do so, but they take no pains at least to prevent the statement being made that raw material immensely advanced in the twine that is being used for the present year. The hon. gentleman stated, probably off-hand, that he thought it was 9 cents.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The statement I made with reference to the purchase and the increased value, was made on the authority of the gentleman who made the purchase, Mr. Stewart, the inspector of penitentiaries, a gentleman in

whom the department has absolute confidence. I gave the statement as to the figures in the House, three or four weeks ago, I stated it then at 9 cents, I think.

Mr. SPROULE. You merely make the statement now that you gave it then as 9 cents, but you may not be more accurate with regard to that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am certain as to the fact of the great increase in price.

Mr. SPROULE. No doubt there is an increased price. But in looking up the trade returns in New York, it does not give any such increase as 9 cents, and I have looked over the returns carefully for three years.

Mr. CLANCY. The sum mentioned by the hon. gentleman was \$14,000, or to be exact, \$14,458.68. Now the quantity of twine purchased was 362,850 pounds, and that cost 5½ cents a pound. Now it is unfair that the statement should go at 9 cents when the fact is that it only cost 5½ cents. If the hon. gentleman has a report from the inspector that it cost 9 cents, it conflicts with the statement made by the Auditor General.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not say that I have at the present time, any such report. I do not want anything I said to be attributed to the inspector, beyond what he is responsible for. I have no information coming from the inspector as to the price of twine, except so far as I recollect the information given to me to be used in the debate I referred to. The only statement definitely given by the inspector relates to the general increase, that is all.

Mr. CLANCY. But the hon. gentleman did make the broad statement some time ago, and gave the impression that it cost 9 cents.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You are giving the average cost. Some might cost more and some less.

Mr. CLANCY. There could be no average price so high as that, because that constitutes more than one-third of the whole output for the year.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary—Further amount required ..... \$5,000

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. During the year the population of this penitentiary has increased by about forty convicts, necessitating not merely an additional expenditure for maintenance, but the appointment of additional guards and keepers. During the year a stonecutter instructor has been appointed. In addition, the abnormal rise in the price of hardware, machinery and other articles, outside of the contract, has necessitated the provision asked for.

Manitoba Penitentiary—Further amount required ..... \$5,000

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The laundry building was destroyed, and had to be

rebuilt at a cost of \$1,600. In addition, insane convicts and incorrigibles are transferred to Kingston, which necessitated an additional expenditure for travelling, \$2,000. The material for the prison and other improvements not estimated for, make up the balance.

To pay H. Gilbert Smith the difference between \$430 and \$500, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act..... \$70

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In the estimates for the current year, the amount of \$500 was included for Mr. Smith's salary. After the session, an order in council was passed in reference to that provision, and the Auditor General took the ground that because the amount was not especially set apart in the Supply Bill it was not available.

Mr. WILSON. 'Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act'—I find these words occurring often in the estimates. It seems to me that persons properly qualified might be easily had to do this work.

Investigation—

To pay Albert Horton the balance of his account re Devlin ..... \$ 83 70  
To pay E. J. Duggan the balance of his account re St. Vincent de Paul..... 107 50

Mr. FOSTER. What Devlin is that ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is the engineer at Kingston. I will explain the reason of this vote. Some years ago an order in council was passed, under which it was provided that for investigations to be held under the control of the government, the *Hansard* men were to be employed; and it was also provided that they should be allowed a living allowance of \$3.50 per diem. The Auditor General took the ground that he would not pay anything except the amount for which vouchers was produced. This was introduced for the purpose of making up the \$3.50 which is provided for by order in council.

Mr. CLANCY. Have not other stenographers been employed as well ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not when the *Hansard* men are free for these investigations.

Mr. CLANCY. Are there any in addition to these ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Of course, there have been stenographers employed in addition, but at all times the preference has been given, as the order in council provides, to members of the *Hansard* staff.

Sessional indemnity of Senator Sullivan... \$1,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). When this item was placed in the estimates, I was informed that Senator Sullivan was so ill that he would not be here at all. I have been informed that he is in at-

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

tendance upon his duties in the Senate, and we will therefore have to strike this out. I beg to move that this item be struck out.

Mr. FOSTER. It must be quite lately.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, within the last three or four days.

Motion agreed to.

Sessional indemnity of S. Hughes and J. H. Leduc, \$1,000 each, and of the late G. H. Bertram, \$1,000, and the balance of the sessional indemnity of the late A. Haley, \$573; these sums to be paid as the Treasury Board may direct ..... \$3,573

Mr. FOSTER. Has Mr. Leduc not been here during the session ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he still ill ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Very ill. He will not recover.

To complete payment of expenses of taking the vote under the Plebiscite Act..... \$1,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total payment now on account of the plebiscite ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total, as shown by the Auditor General's Report, is \$197,932.79. This is the balance of unpaid accounts.

Portraits of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and Sir J. S. D. Thompson..... \$800

Mr. FOSTER. Who painted these ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Forster, of Toronto. They were placed in the library several years ago with perhaps a very loose understanding. The matter has been brought to our notice recently and particularly to the notice of Mr. Speaker, who advises that we should purchase these pictures at the price named. They are the only portraits of these two distinguished gentlemen that we have.

Mr. CLANCY. I notice that the portrait of the late Sir John Macdonald has been removed from the library. Is that one that is being paid for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, these portraits are only of the late Sir John Thompson and Mr. Mackenzie.

Henry A. Quinn, for services in connection with the rebellion of 1885..... \$292 40

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is a claim made by Henry A. Quinn, of St. Paul, Minn., who was present at Frog Lake when some white people were massacred by Indians in 1885. The claim amounted to \$520.44, made up of witness fees at \$2 a day from the 22nd of June to the 1st of October, 1885, 100 days, \$200; travelling expenses and mileage, \$56.40, with additions for interest, making a total of \$520.44.

Mr. FOSTER. What trial was this?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The amount allowed was \$292.40. The claim is for attendance and mileage as a witness for the Crown in connection with the trials of Indians accused of murder and other crimes incident to the Riel rebellion in the North-west Territories, in the year 1885, and also for a shotgun appropriated by an Indian, and interest. Included in the amount charged as a witness are his charges for services travelling through the country for the purpose of identifying the accused and collecting evidence against the hostiles. Quinn, after the trials in the North-west and before the witnesses were paid, was hurriedly called away from the North-west to St. Paul, Minn., and therefore was not paid his witness fees when the other witnesses were paid. He, on several occasions, sought to get these fees paid, but those to whom he applied had no recollection of his being a witness and thought he must have been paid when the expenses connected with the trial were disbursed. In December, 1898, he again submitted his claim to the Department of Justice and verified it by oath, giving full particulars of his connection with the cases. His affidavit was sent for report to all the parties concerned with the prosecutions who would likely have some knowledge or remembrance of the witnesses. Reports were received from these parties, including Judge Rouleau, who was one of the trial judges. Some of these parties could not recall the circumstances set forth by Quinn in his affidavit and could not state whether or not he was paid. But Judge Rouleau remembered the witness quite distinctly and states in his report that if he had not been paid he should have been. There is no record whatever in the department as to any payment having been made to him.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there records in the cases of other witnesses in the Department of Justice?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, there are some.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they all there?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think they are all in the department. I do not think there has been a strict accounting to the department for the expenses connected with the trials. Trials took place all over the North-west Territories, and Mr. Leslie, of the Department of Justice, was sent up for the purpose of auditing and taking care of the disbursements. He has a record, which he has examined for the purpose of ascertaining whether there is any record in the case of Quinn. He finds that there is no evidence that Quinn ever received anything. The Deputy Minister of Justice reports that when Quinn first submitted his account it was not entertained,

but when he gave a history of his connection with the matter and verified his statement by oath the claim was thoroughly investigated with the result that the department decided that he was entitled to \$292.40, for witness fees and other services, 100 days at \$2 a day, \$200, and mileage, 1,540 miles at 6 cents a mile, \$92.40. Quinn was present at the massacre, and was used for the purpose of going through the country to identify the Indians who had taken part in it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that substantiated by other evidence?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, by the evidence that I have in my hand. Having witnessed the massacre Quinn went around to identify the Indians and was afterwards in attendance at the court.

Mr. FOSTER. Really, the only additional testimony you have is Quinn's affidavit.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. And Judge Rouleau's report.

Mr. FOSTER. Judge Rouleau's recollection of it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I take it as a matter of fact that Quinn was called as a witness.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but he does not know whether he was paid or not.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, that is a point upon which we had to rely upon the affidavit of Quinn and upon the further fact that the records of the department did not show that Quinn had received any remuneration for his services.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Quinn a British subject?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He was, but he is not now. He says in his affidavit that he is a naturalized citizen of the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. Was he a British subject then?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, he lived in the North-west Territories, with his father. I have said that he lived in the North-west Territories with his father, but I find that he left the North-west Territories for the purpose of going down to his father who lived in St. Paul. I gather from the affidavit that he was a British subject.

Amount required in the case of Wentworth vs. Mathieu ..... \$7,569

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is for expenses connected with an appeal to the Privy Council which was taken under the following circumstances. A number of suits were taken in the district of St.

Francis, P.Q., for penalties incurred under the Dunkin Act, and the cases were decided by the magistrate against the defendants. A writ of certiorari was taken to a judge of the Superior Court who quashed the convictions on a point which would make inapplicable the Dunkin Act if it were maintained. Under our system there is no appeal from a judge of the Superior Court in a case of certiorari, and thereupon application was made for means to appeal to set aside the judgment. The costs of the appellant were assumed by the Crown.

Mr. FOSTER. These have been taxed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They have been taxed in the regular way.

Mr. FOSTER. What territory is under the Dunkin Act at present in Quebec?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I can only speak in a general way as to that.

Mr. PARMALIEE. Only the county of Richmond.

Mr. FOSTER. The facts are that a large amount of money was spent to determine in favour of an Act which is existent only in one single county in the province of Quebec; and which practically has been superseded by the Scott Act, and by the general march of progress in temperance work. I suppose this was a little sop to the disappointed temperance people who did not have the promises included in the plebiscite carried out. I suppose the minister who was so very severely wigged for that has helped himself a little by this.

Mr. WM. GIBSON (Lincoln and Niagara). The Dunkin Act is still in force in the townships of Gainsborough and Ressler in Ontario. They have never been able to repeal the Dunkin Act in these two townships.

Mr. CLANCY. My impression is that it falls to the lot of the province to enforce a law of this kind, and if that be so why should the Dominion interfere.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It falls to the lot of the individual.

Mr. FOSTER. The Ontario government had to enforce the Scott Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The individual could not very well go to the Privy Council, and this was a matter of very great public importance.

Mr. CLANCY. It does seem strange it should be brought here.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I wish you had seen the representations.

Mr. CLANCY. I have no doubt representations were made, but it is the justice of

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

the case I am speaking of. It is a matter for the province to administer these laws.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is not a provincial law.

Mr. CLANCY. But the province is nevertheless bound to enforce the Dominion laws.

Mr. FOSTER. The question involved was not as to the constitutionality of the Dunkin Act, for if that were the case the Dominion parliament could intervene. But this was merely a process of law, the solution of which was for the provincial government in carrying out the general law.

Contribution for Canadian Law Library,  
London, England ..... \$250

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is the usual fixed sum which we contribute to the library of Canadian books of reference, which is in the High Commissioner's office. It is supported not only by the Dominion, but by the provinces.

Mr. FOSTER. Who makes the purchases?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I really do not know, but I have used it very often.

Mr. BRITTON. A son of the Hon. Edward Blake interested himself in the formation of this library, and he made application to the Ontario government and also to Osgoode Hall. I think, perhaps, he buys the books.

Expenses connected with suit of the Queen  
vs. British American Bank Note Com  
pany ..... \$5,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of that?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The British American Bank Note Company at different times made several contracts with the government; the first on the 8th of February, 1868; the second on the 22nd of October, 1873; the third on the 22nd of October, 1878; the fourth on the 22nd of October, 1886; and finally, the fifth on the 23rd of April, 1892. Under these contracts the company was to supply stamps as required, printed from steel engraved plates, at prices in the case of the first four contracts to be fixed from time to time by the minister, and in the case of the fifth contract fixed by a schedule annexed thereto. The first four contracts provided that the stamps should be charged at rates per thousand stamps to be agreed to by the minister, and that engraved steel plates were to be charged extra. In the fifth contract the prices fixed per thousand stamps include the cost of engraving the necessary plates. As a matter of fact, under these contracts, large quantities of stamps were delivered to the order of the government of Canada that were printed from stone by a lithographic process, instead of being printed directly from engraved steel plates. Action was taken by

the government for the difference in value of the lithographed stamps and the steel engraved stamps contracted for. Under the first contract, there were 5,455,933 stamps delivered, of which 3,807,713 were lithographed, and the difference in value was \$4,553.33. Under the second contract there were 5,873,000 stamps delivered, of which 3,261,500 were lithographed, and the difference in value was \$10,611.38. Under the third contract, there were 55,276,046 stamps delivered, of which 42,082,448 were lithographed, and the difference in value was \$71,616.34. Under the fourth contract, there were 76,037,335 stamps delivered, of which 31,174,058 were lithographed, the difference in value being \$50,968.17. Under the fifth contract, there were 82,144,382 stamps delivered, of which 6,157,945 were lithographed, the difference in value being \$11,778.61. Under the fifth contract there were also supplied 25,639,908 stamps, of which 290,242 were lithographed, and the difference in value was \$601.32. The claim we make, therefore, amounts to \$150,129.15. This is the amount ascertained to be due on the reference made by the court.

Mr. FOSTER. How was that ascertained? Has it been decided by the court?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The point that came before the judge to be determined was whether the defendant was responsible for the difference in cost as between the lithographed stamps supplied and the steel engraved stamps contracted for. The trial took place in November last, and at the close of the case, the judge referred the question of the amount to Mr. Audette, the registrar of the Exchequer Court. I asked for damages arising under all contracts. There is no question under the judgment as to the right of the government to recover damages; and it is in connection with that suit that this sum is asked to cover counsel fees and the auditor's report.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is acting for the Crown?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Mr. Chrysler and myself.

Mr. FOSTER. The case is of course before the court, and what the Solicitor General has read is simply the claim of the Post Office Department.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The claim is made by the Inland Revenue Department chiefly. The stamps were supplied to the Inland Revenue Department for the tobacco industry.

Mr. FOSTER. The Solicitor General made in this House the other day a statement something like this:

That is the point, that is to say, whether we are now face to face with a contract similar to the one that we are now dealing with in the Exchequer Court, in which a contract was

made by which it was agreed that steel engraved stamps should be supplied to a department of the government, and lithograph stamps were supplied instead—whether we are face to face with another fraud of that description.

This statement was made in regard to a case that was pending for judgment before the court, and I do not think it was such a statement as ought to have been made. It is a clear statement that the case was one of fraud. Mr. Burland, since that statement was made, has sent me this telegram which he authorizes me to read:

Please contradict malicious and false statement of Fitzpatrick. Government never paid steel plate prices for lithographic printing.

And it is not yet established that they did. The case is still before the court. The government may make their claim and may think it is a proper claim; but it is hardly right, while the case is pending, for one of the government to state that it is actually so, because that remains to be established.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. On that point the finding of the court is absolute and conclusive, notwithstanding Mr. Burland's declaration on oath that he had not furnished lithographic stamps instead of steel engraved stamps contracted for.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not the point whether he gave to the government what the government ordered?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There can be no dispute about the contract. The only point he has endeavoured to make out is that some of the officials of the Inland Revenue Department authorized him to furnish lithographed stamps instead of steel engraved stamps, but he has never been able to prove it.

Mr. FOSTER. And on that order he supplied lithographed stamps and charged the price of lithographed stamps?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In one of the contracts there is a schedule fixing the prices.

Mr. FOSTER. The contract may have been varied.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was not shown that the contract was varied. The rule laid down by the hon. gentleman that while a case is under investigation the word 'fraud' should not be applied to it is a very excellent rule. I regret that the hon. gentleman and others on this side of the House did not act on this rule in another case a few days ago, when the word 'fraud' was freely used before the case was tried, and in a matter which was insignificant from a money point of view, when compared with this.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the cases are not similar at all. Here is a case before a court of law.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The other case was before a higher court.

Mr. **FOSTER**. A higher court ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes, the highest court in the land, the High Court of Parliament.

Mr. **FOSTER**. This is a case in which one of the officers of the law, when he was conducting a claim before the court and where a decision was not given, actually came down to the House and made the decision himself.

Expenses in connection with the arrest and trial of counterfeiters and to recoup the vote for unforeseen expenses, amounts paid from that vote..... \$4,300

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Hon. members may be aware that for some time past it has been necessary to take special precautions against the counterfeiting of some of our Dominion notes, and the Finance Department has for a long time had detectives employed looking into the matter. The upshot was that we have made very important arrests, and broken up the gang of counterfeiters who were counterfeiting our one dollar and two dollar notes chiefly. I have here a memorandum giving the particulars of the expenses :

1. In connection with the arrest and conviction of Anthony Decker, Paul Decker, Hanz Kuntz and Robert Nurnburger, for counterfeiting Dominion of Canada one dollar note of the issue of June 1, 1878. Anthony Decker was arrested in Baltimore, Mrs. Decker in Hamilton, Paul Decker and Hanz Kuntz in Woodstock, and Robert Nurnburger in Montreal. All were brought for trial at Woodstock, where the plant was found. Anthony Decker and Paul Decker received five years each; Kuntz fifteen months; and Nurnburger was allowed out on suspended sentence. The amount expended in this case, covering a year's investigation, was \$2,220.81.

2. The arrest, prosecution and conviction of Angus Chisholm, John Doyle, James Barkley, Wilson Meyers, Arthur Stewart, Neil Barkley, Thomas Little, T. S. Moore, W. W. Black of Amherst, N.S., Herbert Smith, George Smith and R. L. Marshall of Turo, N.S., L. W. Davis and George E. Litchfield of Boston, Mass., U.S., all of whom were concerned in counterfeiting the Dominion of Canada two dollar notes of the issue of July 2, 1897—\$517.52.

3. Arthur Patenaude of St. Scholastique, and Paul Berthiaume of St. Hyacinthe, P.Q., for counterfeiting and uttering Canadian silver—\$112.11.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Was the counterfeiting of Canadian silver proved ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The parties pleaded guilty. In the case of the Nova Scotia gang, they were in communication with some parties in the United States, so that the investigation covered a very wide area. The whole work was done very satisfactorily by the various officers concerned—the legal gentlemen, the officers of the Department of Justice and Col. Sherwood—and we have reason to believe that the money was very well and usefully expended.

Mr. **FOSTER**.

Mr. **SPROULE**. When were the arrests made ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. A few months ago. They were tried at Woodstock and Amherst, N.S.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the view of the department as to the amount of counterfeiting going on ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Our impression now is that there is none. A few cases of counterfeiting were brought to our notice, and as they occurred in different sections of the Dominion, that gave rise to the impression that there was widespread counterfeiting, but after careful inquiry we find that the two particular gangs we arrested embraced all those who were engaged in that business.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. As I had something to do in connection with Col. Sherwood's visit to St. Regis, I think that in justice to Col. Sherwood I should explain to the House what I know about the matter. I was obliged to go down to St. Regis at the time, and I think it only right to say that Col. Sherwood exposed his life two or three times, and when the Indian was shot it was quite evident that Col. Sherwood had to take the course he did, not only for the protection of his own life, but the lives as well of the other three constables. The matter was investigated by a coroner's jury at the place, and that jury declared that the circumstances justified Col. Sherwood's conduct.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Nobody blamed Col. Sherwood.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I have had a great deal to do with Col. Sherwood in connection with the counterfeiting and other matters, and can testify that he is a most faithful and efficient officer. If anything said with regard to the St. Regis business reflected on Col. Sherwood, whoever said it did so as the result of a complete misunderstanding.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What was said was not in criticism of Col. Sherwood, but rather calling into account by my hon. friend on my left the wisdom of the measures taken by the government in their treatment of the Indians which led up to the difficulty. It will be in the memory of the House, that when some such interpretation as that was given of the remarks made, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) rose and made it clear that that impression was an incorrect one. I am sure everybody sympathized with Col. Sherwood in the circumstances of the case in which he was engaged, and I do not think that any one blamed him for his action but rather quite the contrary.

Expenses in connection with the arrest and trial of the officials of La Banque Ville Marie, and to recoup the vote for unforeseen expenses for amount paid from that appropriation for this service. \$9,000

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. It will be hardly necessary for me to remind the House of the disastrous failure of La Banque Ville Marie. The inquiry disclosed that there had been a falsification of the reports made by the bank, under the Banking Act, which amounted to a serious offence. We deemed it necessary to take proceedings against the officers of the bank, and placed the matter in the hands of Mr. Hutchison, of Montreal. Ultimately, other legal gentlemen had to be associated with him, and the Solicitor General also had charge of the case. The trial attracted a great deal of attention, and resulted in the conviction and punishment of several officers of the bank. The expenses incurred are set forth in a memorandum as follows :

Expenses connected with police and detectives .....	\$2,745 90
Hutchinson's bill .....	2,451 69
Duffy's bill.....	750 00
Kent (liquidator), services .....	1,000 00
Various payments .....	1,810 00
	\$8,757 59

A further bill has come from John Hyde, accountant, for services and expenses, amounting to \$546.50, which will make the amount a little over the \$9,000. The legal expenses, of course, will be taxed by the Justice Department.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Did I not see a report that Herbert had been let out ?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. Yes. He was accountant in the bank, and after we got him it was by his aid that we obtained the information necessary to enable us to take proceedings against the other directors, and also against Baxter and the other brokers. It would have been absolutely impossible for us to have made any evidence, except in the case of false returns to the government, without the assistance of Herbert. Without going into details, I may say that he gave us all the information we required in order to make a complete case against the cashier of the bank, and also against some of the customers—against Mr. Baxter, who is now in penitentiary, and two other brokers, who are under indictment and are to be tried. Mr. Herbert was allowed to go under suspended sentence until October—practically on bail—when he must appear. This was done after consultation between the Crown prosecutor, Judge Wurtele and myself.

**Mr. FOSTER**. What is the bail fixed at ?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. Two thousand dollars.

**Mr. FOSTER**. That seems very small.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. Well, I can only say that, from my knowledge of the assistance rendered to Colonel Sherwood by

Herbert, I would be prepared to take even a more lenient view of his case than that.

Civil Government—Queen's Privy Council for Canada—Contingencies ..... \$1,500

The **PRIME MINISTER**. The efforts which were made by the Eastern Extension Company to establish their rival scheme to the Pacific cable, made it necessary that we should communicate by cable repeatedly with the different Australian colonies, and this is simply to cover the bill.

Miscellaneous—Expenses connected with inquiry into labour troubles in British Columbia mines, and to recoup vote for unforeseen expenses ..... \$7,000

The **PRIME MINISTER**. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior), knows a good deal about this matter. This is the case in which the report of Mr. Clute was made. Early in January, we received complaints from some miners in British Columbia to the effect that the alien labour law was being violated and asking the interference of the government in the matter. We asked for some explanation, and the explanation given convinced us that the troubles were far deeper than simply a violation of the Alien Labour Act. In fact, there had been a strike in some of the mining camps, and there was a possibility of that strike extending all over the Kootenay mining section. The state of things was alarming. It would have been a terrible calamity if the strike had become general and the mines closed. We thought it advisable, under the circumstances, to send an experienced commissioner, one in whom we had reason to have confidence, to investigate the matter and to see if it was possible to establish an understanding between employers and employed. We selected Mr. Clute, and he went to the Kootenay and visited the different mining camps and made a most valuable report—which is before the House—and succeeded generally in restoring harmony. And this is to pay the bill.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Seven thousand dollars is a large sum. What are the items ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Perhaps my hon. friend, the Solicitor General can give them, as the bills were taxed by the Department of Justice, I do not think the expenditure is quite \$7,000; but that amount was taken out of the vote for unforeseen expenses, and this is to recoup that vote.

**Mr. FOSTER**. I think we should have some details.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. If the hon. gentleman will let them pass, I will give the details later on.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Better let it stand.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Very well.

**Mr. PRIOR**. What experience did Mr. Clute have ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We employed him the year before to investigate the trouble that arose on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway.

Mr. PRIOR. Is he a lawyer?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What effect had Mr. Clute and his mission on the final settlement of the strike? Does the Prime Minister think that it was due in any large way to Mr. Clute's investigation, that the men and the mine owners came together?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do believe that it was due to the efforts of Mr. Clute that the miners and mine owners were brought together, and I think the report will show that conclusively.

Mr. FOSTER. In both Slocan and Rossland?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. PRIOR. The difficulty is about as acute now as it was then.

The PRIME MINISTER. It has broken out again, I am afraid.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it proposed to print the report?

The PRIME MINISTER. It has been ordered to be printed by the House.

Mr. PUTTEE. Does this item cover both visits of Mr. Clute to the west?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item stands.

Civil Government—Contingencies—Department of Privy Council for Canada—

Clerical and other assistants, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act .....	\$2,000
Printing and stationery .....	2,000
Sundries .....	4,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason of this increase in clerical assistance?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry to say I can give but little information. I took the estimate as it was prepared in the department. It is reported to me that this is what is required for this year.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister is taking a good deal for granted.

The PRIME MINISTER. No; because this vote has been standing for years at the same figure, and as there is a reduction in it of \$800 as compared with last year, I thought I could accept the estimate without much question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I laid on the Table some papers in relation to the Bank of Commerce. I would be glad to take up that item if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), has read the papers.

Mr. PRIOR.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not seen the papers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then we will let that stand. We have made very good progress and I think that we might now adjourn.

Mr. FOSTER. Would hon. gentlemen opposite say that they have run out of business—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, but hon. gentlemen opposite are so anxious to have business to stand over. The whole election Bill has stood over, except a small fragment in relation to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. FOSTER. The trouble is, the ministers will not indicate what they propose to go on with, but take us unawares. We were ready to go on with the immigration vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Speaker is present, and we can go on with the estimates under the head of legislation.

Legislation—Senate—Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate..... \$68,388

Mr. FOSTER. There is a large increase there, how is it caused?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid we cannot give any further explanation, except that the officers of the Senate sent us this memorandum; and I suppose we must vote it. If we do not, I do not know what they may do.

Mr. FOSTER. In consideration of the good work the Senate has done, we will let it go.

Expenses of committees, sessional and extra clerks, &c. .... \$21,900

Mr. FOSTER. Are these increases of \$100 and \$150 statutory increases merely?

Mr. SPEAKER. Those are the increases that were ordered under the direction of the Committee of Internal Economy a year ago. I think they are only the statutory increases. They were done, of course, by my predecessor.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the miscellaneous branch take in? Does that take in the records branch?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, this is confined to the pages and sessional messengers.

Mr. FOSTER. What extra sessional clerks have been put on this year?

Mr. SPEAKER. We have not made a single appointment this session. It is the same staff as last session.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is sustaining the new faces that we see around.

Mr. SPEAKER. They are not under the pay of the government, so far as I know.

Mr. FOSTER. Have there been any changes in the sessional clerks, in the personnel ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There was just one, I forget his name now. The Speaker of the Senate, perhaps a month ago, said that upon condition of being allowed to appoint another man in his place, there was a young man in whom he was interested that he wished to put in a better position, and with the concurrence of the clerk who said he was satisfied with the new man, we allowed the change to be made, to enable the one going to get what he considered a better position.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the Speaker thoroughly satisfied with the work of the sessional clerks ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Well, as a matter of fact they do not come under my personal supervision, being more directly under Sir John Bourinot, but he expresses himself as satisfied.

Mr. SPROULE. I am surprised to hear that there have been no new men put on lately, because we see a number of new faces around.

Mr. SPEAKER. They are not sessional clerks.

Publishing debates ..... \$40,000

Mr. FOSTER. What will the debates cost this year ?

Mr. SPEAKER. We have been in the habit of leaving that to the committee appointed by the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Speaker know what they are to cost for the current year ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that, perhaps, there is an item of \$16,000 for increased expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. So the debates cost well up towards \$60,000 ?

Mr. SPEAKER. They are costing more than formerly.

The PRIME MINISTER. The opposition contributes a share to that expenditure.

Estimates of serjeant-at-arms as approved ..... \$34,267 50

Mr. FOSTER. Have there been any changes in the sessional messengers during the present session ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The staff is pretty much the same as it has been. I think there was a similar case, in which a messenger was substituted for one who was unable to attend. With that exception we have not appointed any new messengers since I took my present office.

Library of Parliament—Contingencies.... \$2,000

Mr. FOSTER. There is one thing I would like to mention about that Library Committee. There is the Library Committee of the House, and it has the most unfortunate habit of calling its members together on some day when all the other committees are called. A little forethought and consultation might avoid that. It is really an important committee. I am a member of that committee myself, and I should like to attend it, but I do not think I have attended it more than twice in two years, simply for the reason that the call comes when other important committees are on. If some one who has direction of things would just bear that in mind, I think we could get a meeting of the Library Committee at times when the members would be there.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am in the position of the hon. gentleman, I do not think I have attended a meeting of that committee since I have been Prime Minister, for the same reason, because meetings are called when we are otherwise engaged. It is for the reason that we are busy otherwise. We are so busy that when it reaches a certain stage of the session I do not know what day the committee might take except it might be Monday forenoon, and then we might not have a very large attendance of the members of the committee. Upon every day of the week committees are meeting. The only way I could suggest would be to get the librarian to consult with some of the leading members of the committee and fix a day that would be satisfactory. I will speak to the librarian.

Printing, binding and distributing the laws ..... \$ 6,000  
Printing, printing paper and binding.... 85,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is under whose charge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot answer the question as to who has charge of that, but it would be the Secretary of State, I fancy.

Department of Railways and Canals, including \$1,400 to J. L. Payne, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$40,550

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have some explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There have been five statutory increases allowed to members of the staff in the department, and five others have been allowed increases in excess of that.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are they ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. John H. J. Gleason, third-class clerk, increased from \$700 to \$800 ; Graham

A. Bell, third-class clerk, increased from \$650 to \$800; J. P. Wright, third-class clerk, increased from \$550 to \$800; A. W. Cameron, promoted from a third-class to a second-class clerk, increase \$100; W. C. Little, promoted from a third-class to a second-class clerk, increase \$100.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation in these cases?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The total amount of the increases in this branch of the department is \$950. The explanation in regard to those who are receiving exceptional increases is that they are exceptionally efficient clerks. The work which has devolved upon them has been very heavy this year. The amounts which they were receiving, having regard to their qualifications, were, in my opinion, very low indeed, and I felt that as we were not exceeding our usual vote for the purpose of giving these deserving clerks an increase, having regard to their merit and qualifications, I should ask parliament for authority to make their salaries uniform at \$800.

Mr. FOSTER. In one case you have given \$250 of an increase, in another case \$150, and in another case \$100.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the reason is that they are all put on the same level.

Mr. FOSTER. These are large increases. Take one of these clerks whose salary was \$550 a year, and you are giving him an increase equal to five statutory increases.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It appears to be a very considerable sum, but his services, his qualifications and merits generally entitle him to be put upon an equal footing with the others.

Mr. FOSTER. He cannot have been in the service as long as the others.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He has not been in the service as long as the others. He was in the department before I came in; in fact, all these gentlemen were in the department before I came in.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of the words 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act? They do not refer to any of these officers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They refer to Mr. Gleason. In the vote on page 11 the names of Messrs. Gleason, Bell and Wright have been left out, whereas in the details submitted on page 17 their names have been inserted. I would move to add, after the word 'Payne' in the second line of the vote on page 11 the words, 'J. H. J. Gleason, J. A. Bell, and J. P. Wright.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are being promoted from second to first-class clerkships?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Richard Devlin, Mr. H. LeBreton Ross and Mr. Payne.

Mr. FOSTER. What are these gentlemen getting now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Devlin gets \$1,400, Mr. Ross \$1,350, and Mr. Payne \$1,350.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Payne still your private secretary?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One of them.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you two?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. You are almost as rich as the Prime Minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One secretary could not do my work by any possibility.

Mr. SPROULE. Does Mr. Payne get \$600 as private secretary in addition to the \$1,350?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, he gets a portion of the \$600.

Mr. SPROULE. What he gets as private secretary and his salary make up the \$1,350?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, his salary as a second-class clerk is \$1,350. He gets a portion of the allowance for private secretary in addition to that, last year, amounting in all to \$1,700.

Mr. SPROULE. What will Mr. Payne get now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not yet settled for the year altogether how the secretarial allowance will be distributed.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the other private secretary?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Currier. He was Mr. Haggart's secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. What clerks have not received the statutory increase?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Shannon.

Mr. FOSTER. What salary did he get?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. \$2,050.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Dickson, getting \$1,800; Mr. Stewart, \$1,800; Mr. Currier, \$1,800; Mr. Pugsley, \$1,800; Mr. Chubbuck, \$1,450; Mr. Almon, \$1,450; Mr. C. W. Ross, \$1,400; Mr. Fortier, \$1,200; Mr. Dionne, \$1,100. These

are the clerks who have not received any addition during the present current year.

Mr. FOSTER. All your third-class clerks received statutory increases, or a special increase.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I thought their salaries were low.

Soulanges Canal, construction ..... \$350,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the state of the work when this is expended, and what proportion remains to be done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The total amount expended upon this canal up to March 1 last, according to my memorandum, was \$5,586,788.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimated cost of the whole canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We estimated that it would cost close on to \$6,500,000. I think, perhaps, we may have to revise that estimate a little, because there has been a considerable demand upon us to make some improvements, which we did not contemplate when this estimate was made. There is some additional work at both entrances.

Mr. FOSTER. Then this vote will very nearly finish the canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I expect that it will.

Mr. CLANCY. What will the additional work cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot give a precise statement as to that now. I will have it when the canal items come up.

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, construction..... \$40,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for levelling the canal grounds, widening the upper entrances, and work at other points. There is only about 18 feet of water at the entrance to this canal, whereas there is 20½ feet on the mitre sill of the lock.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that \$40,000 do the work on that pier entrance or is it only partial?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is estimated to be sufficient.

Mr. FOSTER. When that is done will the Sault Ste. Marie Canal be practically finished?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the comparison of business through that canal this year and last year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not quite up to last year,

I am sorry to say. There has been quite a falling off.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that attributed to?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is not the shipment of grain being made from the west this year. The falling off is also noticeable on the American side.

Lachine Canal, construction of lock.... \$500,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This lock is in a very bad condition and requires to be renewed. Its size is not satisfactory, and it must be enlarged. It is proposed to build a lock suitable for vessels drawing twenty feet of water.

Mr. FOSTER. What present depth does it accommodate?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not presumed to be capable of carrying more than sixteen feet. The estimate is that it will take half a million of money to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is navigation hindered while you are working there, or how are you going to work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We cannot, of course, do the work at a time when it would obstruct the use of the canal.

Mr. FOSTER. That means that it cannot be done during the season of navigation. Have any contracts been called for that work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Which lock is it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the main lock at the terminus of the canal, next to Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it proposed in the construction of that lock to make it a sort of harbour as well?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. We have two or three basins there which answer for the purpose.

Lachine Canal—Dredging between locks 2 and 3 and basin ..... \$21,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is this done by contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this complete the dredging that is necessary there?

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

Lachine Canal—Building slope walls..... \$11,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This work is under contract now.

Mr. FOSTER. Will this \$11,000 finish the work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. This is all we shall spend this year. The total estimated cost of this work is \$70,000.

Mr. CLANCY. How much has been spent on it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my memory serves me, we spent the whole \$21,000 appropriated last year.

Lachine Canal—To build a quadrant pontoon gate..... \$20,000

Mr. FOSTER. What does that mean?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a new description of gate, which is described by the engineer as the Dutton quadrant pontoon gate. I understand from him that is an experiment that we are trying. It is a gate highly commended. We have none at present on any of our locks.

Mr. FOSTER. Where have they been used and been proved to be good?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not say, but I am informed by my deputy that they have been used and are spoken of very highly. Chauncey M. Dutton is the name of the original inventor.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it an American patent?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is an American product; I do not know whether it is a patent or not.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it not usual for persons who are asking the government to adopt some untried device, to bear the expense of the experiment themselves, or at least the greater part of it? This seems to be a new departure on the part of the hon. gentleman to pay \$20,000 to try somebody's invention. I think we should have some explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know nothing personally about the merits of this gate, but the engineers speak very highly of it. One guarantee which we have that makes the experiment practically safe is that the man who puts it up is to satisfy us that it is workable and will do as he represents, before he is paid for it. I do not know the man; I never saw him.

Mr. FOSTER. Before you allow even that, there must have been a pretty good examination by your engineers. What is their report? What new features in it do they recommend?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what the new features are.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman a report of the engineers on the subject?

Mr. FOSTER

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume there is one in the department. I have not seen any such report. I have not passed on the sufficiency of this gate.

Mr. FOSTER. But you are asking us to pass on a vote of \$20,000 for an experiment. Before you do that you ought to give us some information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Probably if you got all the information the department has, you would not be any the wiser. I do not think you could have any better guarantee that the thing is bona fide than that Mr. Dutton has agreed to satisfy the department that the gate will be what it is represented to be before he is paid.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you get at the estimate of \$20,000 for this experiment?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not get at it.

Mr. FOSTER. Who does?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The officer of my department.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, let us have his report.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In that case we had better let the item stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Lachine Canal—Installation of electric light ..... \$40,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for the purpose of installing the electric light throughout the whole canal.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you propose to make this installation?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I judge that we shall contract for the work of putting it in and the erection of the building. We shall buy what electric machinery we require in the usual way.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you going to have the motive power yourself, or take the light from the company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am taking it on the Lachine Canal, where we will have all the power we require without hiring it from any one. We have in this proposed grant a sum to provide hydraulic machinery which will enable us to generate a current, and the whole cost is estimated at \$40,000, including the building, hydraulic machinery, the electric plant and installation.

Lake St. Louis—Forming channel..... \$14,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This vote is asked for the pur-

pose of obtaining a new and correct chart. In order to make that chart, new soundings will have to be made over the whole width of the channel, and it is estimated that that will cost \$4,000. In addition, we require the sum of \$10,000 to pay the balances of the drawback and the salaries of the staff of engineers in preparing the final estimate. Hon. gentlemen know that after the work of the contractors has been completed, it takes a good deal of time and a considerable staff to complete the final estimate. The work is very nearly finished, and the contractors have been paid up to March 1, \$235,000. Then, in addition to that, there is miscellaneous expenditure, including engineers, amounting to \$24,000, which has been paid, so that \$259,000 will represent the expenditure made up to March 1.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the forming of your channel is really to test the sufficiency of the work done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Soundings are being taken for the purpose of making a new chart.

Grenville Canal enlargement ..... \$5,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is required to complete the work under contract. Amount paid to the contractors up to March 1, \$73,859; miscellaneous expenditure, including engineers, \$12,765. That gives a depth of nine feet clear on the mitre sill, probably in the neighbourhood of ten feet. This work will widen the canal. There has been quite an addition of business on it in the last year.

Lake St. Francis—Removing shoal..... \$5,000

Mr. FOSTER. What remains there to be done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to get over the shoals and straighten the channel.

Cornwall Canal enlargement ..... \$60,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to complete the opening and widen the upper entrance. It is under contract with the Welland Dredging Company. I judge that this will be sufficient to complete the canal entirely.

Farran's Point Canal ..... \$69,500

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This will complete that work. It is being done by the Canadian Construction Company.

North Channel—Forming ..... \$200,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to complete the work.

Galops Rapids—Forming channel..... \$100,000

Mr. FOSTER. Will this finish it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we will require to have something in the supplementary for the next year.

St. Lawrence River and reaches—Surveying, buoying, &c. .... \$15,000

Mr. FOSTER. What does that amount cover?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have decided that it will be in the interest of the channel that we should put down buoys; and we have to do some surveying in connection with it, take soundings and so on.

Canals, Chargeable to Capital—Trent Canal, construction ..... \$320,000

Mr. FOSTER. What works are going on there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to complete the Onderdonk contract on the Balsam section. Then there is the contract of Brown, Love & Aylmer on the Wakefield section; while Corry & Laverdure are working on the Peterborough section, and their work, according to the estimate, will absorb \$140,000. The Dominion Bridge Company are building the new hydraulic lift, which we have selected as the mode of getting up and down, the cost of which will be \$134,000. Then, sundry small items, such as operators' workshops, land damages, small works not under construction, and so on, will absorb the balance.

Mr. FOSTER. And with this done, what part of the Trent system will be finished?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This does not take you all the way to Balsam—to the upper lake. You still have a stretch to be completed, in order to get you up to between Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe.

Mr. FOSTER. And is this interval difficult work, or is it river work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is cutting through—no river work.

Mr. FOSTER. How much will it cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not wish to be held as stating the figure with absolute certainty, but I think it is going to take \$900,000 or \$1,000,000 to complete the section from Balsam Lake to Lake Simcoe.

Mr. FOSTER. And will, say, a million dollars finish the system?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, you do not touch the down river section below Peterborough.

Mr. FOSTER. You finish from Peterborough through?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I think so—with what we have already under contract. The section that I speak of between these two lakes is perhaps thirteen or fourteen miles. That has not been touched at all. We have con-

tracted for a portion of the distance, but not for the balance.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. minister an estimate of the whole canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have figures; but I do not think I can state them with any advantage at present, because we are making a careful survey of the lower stretches to determine whether we shall continue according to the original plan, or go through Rice Lake and make the connection from the head of Rice Lake through to Port Hope.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that supposed to be cheaper?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have reason to think that it will be much less expensive. But that is a point that is asserted on one side and denied on the other, and it is to determine that, that the present investigation is directed.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been spent?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The total expenditure up to March, 1900, is \$2,393,000.

Mr. CLANCY. If you followed the original plans, what would it cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it was estimated that it would take something like \$3,000,000 and more to complete by the original plan—that is, the lower section. The Trent Canal altogether, has been estimated to cost somewhere between \$6,000,000 and \$7,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, we have gone over these items; but I suppose it is with the understanding that when we take up the three items that are left, questions may be asked about any of these items?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objections.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What estimates will you go on with Monday?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We expect to go on with the Chinese Bill. When we resume on the estimates, we will probably go on with my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. FOSTER. And what after that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not thought beyond that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may say I was intending to make a general statement on the subject, which may, perhaps, occupy an hour or two.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.10 a.m. (Saturday.)

Mr. BLAIR.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, June 25, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SITTINGS OF COMMITTEES.

On motion of Mr. D. C. Fraser (Guysboro'), the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, were given leave to sit during the time the House is in session.

### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 184) to amend the Tariff of Customs, 1897.—(Mr. Fielding). On division.

### CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved:

That the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 156) to amend the Civil Service Act be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of being amended as follows:—

In section 7, 1st line, strike out the words 'for special cause shown.'

In section 12, 7th line, after the word 'salary' insert the words 'or emolument.'

In section 13, add the following words: 'Provided, however, that this section shall not prejudice or affect any of the rights or privileges which such third-class clerks would otherwise have.'

He said: The first amendment is intended to strike out the words which are rendered unnecessary by a proviso which was inserted in the Bill after it was introduced. It makes no material change. The second amendment is intended to apply to temporary clerks, who perhaps are technically not in receipt of 'salaries.' While the Bill was going through the House, we agreed that it was well to designate all the third-class clerks who remained in the service as junior second-class clerks, so as not to multiply the different classes. I have been advised by the Department of Justice that it might be necessary for one of these third-class clerks, on being designated a junior second-class clerk, to serve a period as such, before he could be eligible for an increase. That was not intended, and therefore I propose this change.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Suppose you have messengers who have qualified themselves for clerkships, and are now being paid the maximum salary as messengers and are paying superannuation upon that. If any of them are appointed as junior second-class clerks, would they pay the superannuation deduction upon the salary they received at the time of being appointed second-class clerks, or upon the whole salary they receive?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I fancy that the rule of the three years' average would apply.

**Mr. FOSTER**. That is what I wish to ask the minister—if he is certain about it. If so, there are consequences which run into the Superannuation Act. I do not suppose there would be very many cases of that kind, so that it would not amount to a very large sum, and it would be rather awkward, I should think, to have to discriminate between what such a man was getting before and what he received afterwards. His appointment is really in the nature of a promotion.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My attention had not been drawn to that point; but I should think the cases would be so rare that special legislation would not be required to meet them.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I move the amendments I have read.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Subsection 2 of section 7 provides that an appointment shall only be made under this section in two cases, one of which is where a junior second-class clerk shall be appointed to take the place of a clerk of the second or of a higher class. I suppose that means that if a second class vacancy occurs, you take the power to appoint a junior second-class clerk to fill that vacancy, whose salary cannot go over the maximum of \$1,000.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes.

**Mr. FOSTER**. How are you going to tabulate your clerks? Is that person to be a second-class or a first-class clerk or a chief clerk?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. He will be a junior second-class clerk.

**Mr. FOSTER**. In the books he will rank in your departmental allocation as second or first-class clerk?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No, if a vacancy should occur in a second-class clerkship, where the incumbent was receiving say \$1,400, of course if you had an equally good man that you wished to put in, you could put him directly into the second class. Beginning at \$1,000, and rising up to \$1,400. But if you thought you had another man who could do the work, who was not in the second class, you could put him in as junior second-class clerk, beginning at \$800 and rising to \$1,000.

**Mr. FOSTER**. He would be doing the same work as the second-class clerk did at \$1,400.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Quite so.

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

## CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Bill (No. 180) respecting and restricting Chinese immigration (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) read the second time; and the House resolved itself into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to provide with respect to the Bill intitled: 'An Act respecting and restricting Chinese immigration,' now before the House:

1. That a tax of one hundred dollars shall be imposed on every person of Chinese origin entering Canada;

2. That the person in command of, or in charge of, any vessel or vehicle bringing Chinese immigrants into Canada shall be personally liable to Her Majesty for the payment of the said tax with respect to any such immigrant carried by such vessel or vehicle.

**Mr. G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.) Before the adoption of the resolution I would like to know whether the right hon. the First Minister has carried out in this resolution and the legislation which he proposes to base upon it, the wishes of his supporters from the province of British Columbia. I think it is on the public records that during the last election campaign a very strong telegram came from British Columbia asking what would be the position of the Prime Minister and his party on the vexed question of Chinese immigration; and viewing the condition of the party and the waiting electorate at that time, and anxious no doubt to get for his party as large a vote as possible on the Pacific coast, I think the Prime Minister sent a telegram to the coast saying that he and his party would be prepared to carry out whatever was the wish of the Liberal members on the Pacific coast. It would be interesting now to know whether or not, in the legislation before the House, the Prime Minister and his party are acting in accord with the Liberal representatives of British Columbia. It is a matter of grave importance, I think, that a pledge given like that should be carried out, and the Prime Minister could be said to have carried it out if he is acting in strict accord with the wishes of his Liberal supporters in British Columbia. Otherwise an explanation is due.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think I can satisfy the curiosity of my hon. friend—

**Mr. FOSTER**. It is more than curiosity.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. It is very hard, as my hon. friend knows, to satisfy the expectations of everybody in this world. I have not yet seen a man who could do it, except perhaps my hon. friend himself, with absolute certainty and to the fullest extent. I do not pretend that in this legislation we will perhaps satisfy all the aspirations of the Liberal members who represent British Columbia in this House.

But we are proceeding in the same direction as they are in this respect. Perhaps

they would like to see us go further than we do at the present time; but as we are going in the same direction as they are, they have jumped into our wagon, and, so far as we go, they are ready to go with us. I do not pretend to say, nor did I say, in introducing the Bill, that we pretend that this should be a finality. But, under the present condition of things, we thought it was as far as we could go; and I believe that the Liberal members from British Columbia are satisfied with the position we have taken. This is not a finality, but it is a legitimate concession to the aspirations of the people of British Columbia, who, upon this question, entertain views peculiarly their own, views which are not shared by the people of the east, who are represented by a majority in this House, and who are not prepared to go as far as the people of British Columbia would go in this matter. But, no doubt, a process of education will harmonize the views of all the people on this question. We propose, as I have said, to have a commission, following the precedent of 1885, to advise us further on this question. But, so far I believe I can say that not only the support of the British Columbia members is with us, but that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) himself.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), then, is much more conservative in his actions than in his promises. Did it never strike him that it would be well for him to exercise a little more of that conservatism about the time he is making promises, especially on the eve of a general election, when the only object of a promise of that kind can be to secure votes. If he is not fully persuaded that he can go as far as he promises, it is very like getting power under false pretenses—getting votes under promises which the hon. gentleman is not sure he can fulfil. However, he says that the Liberal members from British Columbia have jumped into his wagon. Several people seem to have jumped into his wagon. I think that when he was in Ontario, last year, speaking in a certain county in reference to his friend Mr. Tolmie, he said that Mr. Tolmie was a Radical and far in advance of him in his opinions, but willing to jump into his wagon and go as far as the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself went. Is that the case with the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) and the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell)? Have they jumped into his little cart, and, under promise of fifty dollars addition to the Chinese tax, are they going in the wagon as far as the right hon. gentleman goes? And do they intend to go any further? And, if they go further, will they change the team, or what will they do about it? It would be interesting, at this stage, to know where we stand with regard to this matter. One thing we do know—that the Prime Minister

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

made an unqualified promise, which to-day he unqualifiedly refuses to carry out.

Mr. AULAY MORRISON (New Westminster). I have no hesitation in saying that I am in the same wagon as the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and I prefer it to the very old, ramshackle affair in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) finds himself. And not alone is the vehicle better, but the horses that are drawing this wagon are sound in wind and limb; they are not spavined, nor asthmatic, nor wind-blown and liable to break down. I would strongly advise the hon. gentleman to come in with us. He would find it very smooth riding.

An hon. MEMBER. We do not want him.

Mr. MORRISON. No; I would like to have him alongside of us, in our highly-varnished, well-greased, well-equipped and staunch vehicle.

Mr. HAGGART. Do you call it well-greased?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes, like all wagons that go well. The grease has apparently given out with hon. gentlemen opposite—they have run out of that, as of everything else. However, as to the Bill which is about to be brought in, I may say, speaking for myself, I am not satisfied. I say that frankly—and no one knows that I am not satisfied better than the right hon. gentleman who leads the House. I may go further and say that, so far as I am concerned, and so far as my constituency is concerned, I do not think there was one vote affected one way or the other by the telegram it was stated was sent before the elections of 1896. I do not think that was the object with which it was sent; and if it was the object, I do not think it had the effect which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) insinuates. I am certain this fifty dollars increase is an earnest of what we very soon shall have, and I think when the matter is fully investigated and looked into, the Prime Minister will feel justified in giving that measure of protection in this respect to the people of British Columbia that they have been asking for, particularly for the last three or four years.

It is rather a matter of comment that my hon. friend the member from Victoria (Mr. Prior) should be so solicitous and perturbed, at this late stage of his parliamentary career, on this question of Chinese restriction. I look in vain for any indication of any efforts on his part before 1896, or on the part of other gentlemen who represented British Columbia, to bring about reform in this matter. I find that in 1885 there was a commission appointed, which commission investigated this question of Chinese immigration into British Columbia. That report, so far as it was the work of the commis-

sioners—that is, the report exclusive of the evidence—is directly against the increase of the tax on Chinaman; it is strongly against the restriction of Chinese immigration. And that is one of the greatest difficulties the Liberal members from British Columbia have had to contend with in this matter—the report of hon. gentlemen opposite, which was not justified, I believe, by the evidence before the commission. And doubtless the hon. senior member for Victoria was quite satisfied with this until 1896, when he found a government in power against which he desired to make political capital. He was perfectly satisfied with the report of that commission.

Mr. PRIOR. To what report does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) refer?

Mr. MORRISON. The report of the Chinese commission in 1885, the only report on the subject, so far as I know. I have yet to hear that the hon. member for Victoria or any of the members from British Columbia ever attacked that report or did anything to offset the erroneous impression which that report must have made throughout eastern Canada. Now, as I say, instead of being satisfied with the legislation brought down here, I am not at all satisfied. But as this government has done infinitely more than hon. gentlemen opposite, I am surprised that in any way they should seek to raise any invidious comparison between the way this administration has handled the matter and the way they handled it themselves. When they had an opportunity, why did not they bring in legislation of this kind and give the people of this House an opportunity to express their opinion? It would be a step at least toward the education of the people of eastern Canada as to the necessity for stringent restriction of Chinese immigration.

Mr. PRIOR. Which party was it that took the initial step in this matter?

Mr. MORRISON. That is exactly what I am pointing out, and it is where I say hon. gentlemen are to blame. If they had taken no step, they might have been defended. But, to acknowledge that the restriction was necessary and then to come down with a paltry restriction like this tax of fifty dollars, which, for eighteen years, we did not have the opportunity of increasing, was worse than no action. When they had the opportunity of effectually stopping the immigration, and did not stop it entirely, they are culpable, and that is my argument against them. I say when the first legislation against the Chinese coming into Canada was enacted, if the tax had been made \$500 or even \$250—still better, if we had had legislation on the lines of the Natal Act—we should not have to-day such a question as the Chinese question; we should not have had a yellow blot on the map of Canada, as

we have to-day. If we go back and consider the initiatory steps that were taken in this matter, and consider who neglected their opportunity to introduce stringent and effective legislation, we shall find that they are the same men who are to-day responsible for the state of affairs which exists in regard to this Oriental immigration.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS (Russell). I do not suppose that in opposing this proposition I shall be able to accomplish much, but as a free trader I cannot allow this Bill to pass without at least offering my protest. I am strongly opposed to this measure, and notwithstanding the remarks of my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) I consider it retrograde and inhuman legislation. Now, what is the purpose of this legislation? Is it for the purpose of excluding Chinese from entering Canada, or is it for the purpose, in an indirect way, of collecting taxes from them?

Mr. WILSON. It is to keep them out.

Mr. EDWARDS. To keep them out. Mr. Chairman, if this principle is correct, then the Chinese who are to-day trying to exclude foreigners from entering China are right, for they are in exactly the same position that we are. There is no difference in principle. Why, Sir, if this principle is right, then the Boers of South Africa were right in the stand they took, and the Chinese are right in the stand they are taking. I suppose this legislation will pass. I have no doubt the other side of the House will support it, and I suppose the majority of this side will support it; but all the same I say we are placing ourselves exactly in the same position that was taken by the Boers in South Africa.

Mr. MORRISON. Speak for yourself.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have a right to my opinion, and I will always give expression to them whenever I feel disposed to do so. When any attack is made on the principle of free trade, on the principle of freedom, as is made in this case, I am certainly bound to speak. Why, Sir, if Chinamen were made by another Creator than the one who made us, then this principle is right; but if they are the offspring of the same Creator, then the underlying principle of this legislation is entirely wrong; it is barbarism and nothing else. To-day the Chinese are opposing, not only certain persons whom they call Christians, but they are opposing a certain party among themselves who claim the right to rule China, and I submit that we have no more right to interfere with them than they have to interfere with us. I offer my sincere protest against this kind of legislation, and if I were able to muster up members enough to vote it down I would certainly do so, because I consider it abhorrent to the principles of free trade and to

the commonest rights of all men who occupy this earth. Now, then, is it on behalf of the rights of labour that this measure is introduced? Why, Sir, nothing is more diametrically opposed to the rights and best interests of labour than this kind of legislation. Especially is that true in a new country like Canada, with such boundless and unlimited resources that are waiting to be developed. If we had a hundred million more labourers to develop Canada, so much the better for Canada.

Mr. MORRISON. Nonsense.

Mr. EDWARDS. That sentiment can only come from narrow minds, from men who have never studied this subject. It is a mistake to say that keeping out labour will benefit our native labourers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. EDWARDS. Hon. members may laugh. Perhaps they have not studied this question as I have studied it. Every idle man in the world keeps another man idle; whereas every man who labours gives labour to another man. That is a sound principle of economics. Nothing is more hurtful to labour than unemployed labour. Let labour come in from all parts of the world, and the only effect will be that our commerce will be enlarged. We shall have more commodities to exchange with other parts of the world. Whether a Chinaman is labouring in China or labouring in Canada he is just the same a producer, and the transference of his labour to Canada enables us to increase the produce and commodities that we shall have to exchange with those of the rest of the world. Nothing can be more short-sighted and mistaken in the best interests of Canada than the principle underlying this legislation. But beside altogether from an economic point of view, just think of Canada, the right arm of an empire who proclaims freedom the world over, who is trying to maintain everywhere an open door, introducing restrictive legislation of this kind.

Mr. MORRISON. Go to Australia.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am not talking for Australia; I am taking as a Canadian and as a Britisher, and I say that this legislation is wrong from an economic point of view and I am utterly opposed to it.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). I think the spectacle we have this forenoon is a very edifying one. We have one of the most loyal supporters of the Prime Minister, one of his most devoted supporters, declaring want of confidence in him and in his methods. Then we have the Prime Minister's action in regard to British Columbia, and we have a kind of understudy of it on the part of the hon. member for New Westminster, reminding us of the Comedy of Errors in which there are two

Mr. EDWARDS.

leading characters very like each other, and then there are two servants, the brothers Dromio. Nothing could furnish a closer parallel to the dual plot than the conduct of the hon. member for Westminster and the conduct of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister sent a telegram on the eve of the election saying that the government would be guided by the opinions of the Liberal members as to the immigration of Chinese. He comes forward to-day, after four years have elapsed, and he adds \$50 to the duty on Chinamen. It is notoriously at variance with the opinions of the Liberal members of British Columbia, and it is notoriously at variance with the opinions of the people of British Columbia, and it is therefore at variance with the position taken up by the Prime Minister when he sent that telegram. Then we have the member for New Westminster, with glowing countenance and with evident self satisfaction, saying that he is in the same wagon with the right hon. gentleman, and that he is glad to be there, that we should envy him, that the wagon is well set up, that it has been newly painted and varnished. Why, Sir, I thought there were two spokes out of the wheels of that wagon, two great spokes, the Tarte spoke and the Sifton spoke. We knew there was a lot of varnish about the wagon, there always has been a lot of varnish about the policy of the right hon. gentleman ever since he came into power. In fact, Sir, the policy of our hon. friends opposite is all varnish, and when you get below the varnish in those ministers and in their policy, you find a very common kind of basswood, nothing like the hickory of the true Grit principles which they used to profess.

But now look at the position of the hon. gentleman. He says: I am delighted to be in this wagon, but then he says: It is not [the kind of a wagon for me to be in. I want something better. Fifty dollars is not enough. Then, what does he do? He falls back on, I will not say an insincere excuse on his part, because it would be unparliamentary, but, if not insincere, an ignorant excuse. In regard to the legislation that took place in 1886 on this question, he says that the report of the Chinese commission was against legislating on the line of limiting the importation of Chinese. That is quite untrue. I have here, in my hand, the report, signed by the late Mr. Chapleau, who was chairman of that commission. It is the main report, and I am largely responsible for that report.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, I am largely responsible for it. The 20th clause of the resume reads as follows:

That assuming Chinese immigrants of the labouring class will persist in retaining their present characteristics of Asiatic life, where

these are strikingly peculiar and distinct from western, and that the influx will continue to increase, this immigration should be dealt with by parliament; but no legislation should be such as would give a shock to great interests and enterprises established before any probability that parliament would interfere with that immigration arose. Questions of vested rights might come up, and these ought to be carefully considered before action is taken.

That, therefore, if restrictive legislation were considered opportune, it should aim at gradually achieved results, and the history of the question, as well as the evidence, shows that by legislation regulating, not excluding Chinese labourers, every purpose can be effected with those who apprehend evils from Chinese immigration could, and actually do desire.

Immediately following that was the legislation placing a tax of \$50 on the Chinese. If, after a period such as has elapsed since 1886, hon. gentlemen opposite think that \$50 added to the \$50 originally placed on the Chinese would be in the spirit of the recommendation, would be as advanced as the spirit of that recommendation, then, I do not know what language is. But, look at the position taken by the hon. gentleman further. He says that the telegram of the right hon. Prime Minister was not intended to influence votes. What was it intended for? The men who asked for that telegram were about to vote. What was it intended for if it was not intended to influence their votes? Then, he says that he does not think it influenced a vote. It was sent all over British Columbia and into every constituency.

Mr. PRIOR. It influenced thousands.

Mr. DAVIN. If it did not influence votes it was because the voters of British Columbia had that astute insight into the character of the right hon. Prime Minister to know that, like all the other promises of the hon. gentleman, that telegram was of no more value than the paper it was written on. The position taken by the hon. gentleman in crawling into that wagon and then apologizing for being there, and justifying himself by looking at the varnish and the paint on the wheels, is certainly a very edifying one. His position finds a parallel in that of my hon. friend from Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), and the hon. gentleman from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) and other hon. gentlemen in this House, who also got votes in consequence of promises made by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture to the people of the North-west Territories that agricultural implements and certain other things would be placed upon the free list. We find that they had to crawl into this wagon, this accommodating wagon, which jogs along in the old rut and which does not attempt to take that high road of liberalism promised by the right hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman may have only read the minority report, which was prepared by Mr. Justice Gray. Even that minority report does not report against

legislating in the direction which was subsequently adopted in regard to Chinese, but it does show a sympathy with Chinese immigration that is not shown in the principal report.

In reference to the speech made by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), there is a reason which does not seem to have been present to his mind that justified the legislation in the direction which was taken in 1886, and in the direction which is being taken now by the present government, and it is that the Chinese do not come into this country as immigrants, meaning to identify themselves with the country, The Chinese do not come here with their families, take up homesteads and settle down. If they came here and settled, if they were going to be part and parcel of Canada, take part in our life and be loyal to our institutions, I would not vote in favour of placing any tax upon them. But, this is a special and peculiar kind of immigration, a male immigration of labourers, who come into the country, compete with our own labour, under conditions unwholesome to our social, civil and national life, who, having made money, go back to China and take a lot of money out of the country. But this last is a feature of the question upon which I would not lay any particular stress. It is the peculiarity of the immigration that I lay stress upon, that they come in here without their wives, and that it is an unwholesome immigration. It is proved by the evidence of this commission that while evincing wonderful virtues of toil, patience and perseverance, there are characteristics attached to that immigration which are inimical to our national, to our social, to our political life, and if it were to become very large it would be alarming. Therefore, I believe that as the first law of the individual is self-preservation, so it is of a people, and this law justifies such legislation as took place in 1886, and such legislation as we are now enacting. It is trifling with this question if such legislation is not made effective. The right hon. gentleman, in adding \$50 to the tax after this long period, unless he is convinced that it is going to give the relief that is desired, is doing something which is worse than useless, which is a mockery. I am not going to say now whether \$100 is enough or not, but the right hon. Prime Minister holds out to the people of British Columbia the hope that it will accomplish a certain result, and if it does not accomplish that result it is a mockery, and he will be false to the telegram he sent just as the Liberal members from British Columbia are false to the interests of British Columbia to-day.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, I will follow the example of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) and state frankly that this proposition is not satisfactory to me, and I do not think it would be right to support it. I am sure that it will not be satisfactory

in any way to the people of the province of British Columbia, as to the representatives from that province, they can speak for themselves. It has been said during the debate that it would be better for all of us if we had free trade, and if 100,000,000 of such immigrants were to come into the country. The province of British Columbia is becoming overrun with Chinamen now, and, if they are allowed to come in, we are going to have a condition under which the white workmen will be driven from the province, or those who stay will be foremen and bosses of Chinese gangs—we shall have a condition of labour that we do not want and that we should not encourage.

But not only as a worker, but as a Canadian, I object to this immigration. For the sake of all that is best in our Canadian life, we should be protected from it. We should be free to achieve something far higher than we can possibly achieve if this Chinese immigration is allowed to come in as in the past, and as it will come still more quickly in the future, if it is not checked. Other British colonies and the United States have provided against this immigration, and we are practically the only new country that is open to Chinese immigration to-day. As the government have admitted the strength of the claim of the people of British Columbia to be protected, it is not a fair and reasonable acceptance of that condition, I submit, merely to raise the Chinese tax from \$50 to \$100. It has been stated—and I believe it is accepted in the east, because it is told us by the people who know—that the Chinese immigrant does not pay the present tax of \$50 himself—for he has not the money—but he is brought in by some labour contractor, who advances the money, and then the immigrant is kept in virtual slavery to that contractor until he has earned enough—until he has earned enough several times over—to pay that advance. And to increase that tax to \$100 will only keep the immigrant in slavery a longer time, but it will not stop this immigration. For my part, I think we should exclude the Chinese. I do not take any stock in the plea that is raised that we should in any way offend China or Japan by putting restrictions on the immigration of their people. The governments of those countries are not interested; they do not care whether their people emigrate or not. I believe that we here are doing more to hatch this trouble with regard to Chinese and Japanese feeling or retaliation than is done in China or Japan. I believe that the Natal Act is the proper one, so as to make the exclusion apply to all undesirable immigrants. The province of British Columbia and the labour bodies of this country have petitioned for years to have the tax increased to \$500; and after all the promises that have been made, it is simply absurd to propose to raise the tax from \$50 to \$100.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.). I felt very sorry indeed for the hon. member for Mr. PUTTEE.

New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), when he tried to bolster up the Bill which is now before the House. The hon. gentleman knows that his heart is not in it; he knows that what he has said will not give satisfaction to the people he has been sent here to represent. He knows that the question is one that affects his constituency almost more than any other portion of the people of British Columbia, and that it is a burning question among them. The hon. gentleman thought fit to say that he was going to stick to the wagon of the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He seemed to think the Conservative party wagon was a ramshackle affair. The Conservative wagon has been doing service for a great number of years, and it has done good service. I will admit that the wagon he is in is a little newer, it has not been tried, and it probably has a little fresher horses. But I fear the horses are so fresh that in a little time they will run away with him and throw him out of parliamentary life. The hon. gentleman says that the Conservative members from British Columbia have never seemed to take any interest in this question until within the last three or four years. If he will look at *Hansard*, he will see that for the last ten, fifteen, yes even twenty years, the Conservative members from British Columbia have brought this question constantly and consistently forward on the floor of this House. If the hon. gentleman denies it, I ask him how about Mr. Bunster? How about Mr. Shakespeare? How about Mr. Baker? How about Mr. Gordon? Time and again these hon. gentlemen have brought the question up. He said I had taken no interest in the question before. I admit that I had not spoken on the floor of this House, I think, before 1895 or 1896, on that question. But on every platform from which I addressed the electors, that has always been one of the questions I have discussed; and I have always given my opinion, and that opinion was sufficient to satisfy them that I was the proper man to represent them. The hon. member for New Westminster stated that this was a serious question and that it had become more serious within the last four years than it had been before. I myself have taken the same view. I admitted frankly to my constituents that up to six or seven years ago I did not think it was such a burning question as it is, because I had not seen sufficient of the Chinese immigrants to realize the evil that their coming here meant to Canada. But since then I have seen the great detriment that they are to the country. Can any one blame me for having a different opinion on a subject after experience than I had before? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) also said that the Conservative party never took steps to stop this immigration. But, as I asked him when he was speaking: Who brought in the first Bill to tax the Chinese? It was the Conservative party. They fixed the tax at \$50, and everybody thought, in

those days, that it would be nearly enough, if not quite enough, to stem the tide. But time and experience have proven that it was not. It was stated, I think, by Mr. Chapleau, in that report, that he was afraid that \$50 would be found in time only a milk-and-water measure—he could not tell. We find by experience that it is not enough to keep out the Chinese.

Mr. CHARLTON. How many Chinamen are there in British Columbia? To what extent has that tax proven effectual?

Mr. PRIOR. That question was brought up in the House the other day, and I stated that I believed there were many more thousands of Chinamen in British Columbia than when the present tax was imposed and the Canadian Pacific Railway was finished building.

Mr. CHARLTON. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) any definite idea how many Chinamen there are in British Columbia?

Mr. PRIOR. I should think that there must be 20,000 to 25,000; that is my opinion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Out of a total population of how many?

Mr. PRIOR. About 160,000. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) said that \$50 was a paltry restriction. I say it is. But is there any reason why the present government, who have been in power for four years, and who have had this question brought before them by every member from British Columbia, besides having presented to them resolutions passed by boards of trade and trades and labour unions, urging this question upon them in the strongest manner, should not have taken the opportunity of raising that paltry restriction, as the hon. gentleman calls it, before this date? The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) wanted to know what difference there was in the stand taken by the great powers to insist upon Europeans being allowed into China, and Chinamen insisting on coming into Canada. Well, the great difference, to my mind, is this: The Chinaman can come into this country and make a first-class living and compete in such a manner that white labour cannot enter into competition with them; whereas, Europeans going to China find that they cannot do the Chinamen any harm, because they cannot live on the same scale as Chinamen do. When the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) gave notice of this Bill, I said it would be a great disappointment to British Columbia. I find, by the telegrams and the newspapers that have come in since then, that I was right, that from one end of British Columbia to the other there is a feeling of intense disappointment that the increase of this tax should be only fifty dollars. It has been contended that, to do any good, that tax should be raised to \$500 per head.

The other day just after an election of the local legislature, the government members, fresh from the polls, in caucus assembled in Vancouver, passed a resolution to this effect, that the federal government would not be doing their duty to British Columbia unless they increased the tax to \$500 a head, and brought in the Natal Act, which would materially assist in keeping the Japanese out of the country.

Everybody knows the detriment these men are. The hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) gave us a long speech last year, as I did myself, setting forth the reasons why these men should be kept out; so that I do not think it is necessary for me to say much on that head. But I would say this, that although it may be a slight inconvenience to a few manufacturers, a few fishing industries, a few canning industries, and some householders who want Chinese servants, yet a very large majority of the people of British Columbia are in favour of a higher restrictive tariff, and would be willing to put up with the inconvenience at first. Get rid of the Chinese and Japanese, and the people from eastern Canada will come to our province and take up the employment now done by those people.

The people of British Columbia expect that the Dominion government will use their utmost influence with the Imperial government to try to stem the tide of Japanese now coming in. I am aware that for state reasons the government cannot itself use too strong a hand in the effort to keep these people out, but they can use their influence with Great Britain. We know that England looks to Japan in the event of any eastern trouble, such as that now rearing its head in China, and that any government has to be careful in dealing with a question of that kind. Still, I think the present government might use the very great influence they undoubtedly have with the Imperial government at the present time, to see if some means cannot be devised by which this influx could be stopped. There has never been a time when the Imperial ear has been so open to suggestions from Canada as it is at the present time, owing to the magnificent sacrifices made by Canada's sons on the field of South Africa. Now is the time, of all times, when we might ask a quid pro quo for the services rendered.

The right hon. leader of the government has informed us that he is going to appoint a commission to inquire into this question of Chinese and Japanese immigration. I contend that such a commission is perfectly useless. Everybody knows all that can be known about those races in British Columbia. Everybody who has lived in British Columbia has had an object lesson for years before his eyes. The government must know, from resolutions which have been sent to them, and from public speeches, exactly how matters stand; and statistics will show, or should show, exactly how many

there are in that country. The government to my mind are going to appoint this commission for two reasons, and two reasons only. The first is that it affords the chance of giving one or two or three or four of their good supporters a good position for a few months, in which they will get a trip out to British Columbia, will live on the fat of the land, and will have a little reward for performing political services. That is one reason. The other is that if a commission is appointed it will take at least nine months or a year for that commission's report to be laid before the House. In the meantime, the government will go to the country, and although I myself believe they have not the slightest chance of being returned to power—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PRIOR. That is my firm conviction, if it does hon. gentlemen opposite any good to know it. But if by any chance they are returned to power again, they will simply ignore this question for another four years, as they have done in the past. I say again deliberately that the government have shown a great want of pluck in not dealing with this question at once. The hon. member for Burrard, speaking on this question in the House last year, said :

This question, Sir, let me remind hon. members of both sides of the House, is of greater consequence to-day than it was then, and is of greater importance to eastern provinces to-day than it has ever been, and to the members of the present government to whom we look with considerable confidence that they will not disappoint us, I would say, that our demand cannot be overestimated, it cannot be slurred over, but must be breasted, and the sooner the better.

That is correct. Instead of showing the white feather and putting off the question from day to day, I think the government should have been brave enough to have tackled it at once and to have put on a tax of very near, if not quite \$500.

Mention has been made of a celebrated telegram that was sent by the right hon. leader of this government to Mr. McLagan of the *Vancouver World* immediately previous to the election of 1896. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) says that he does not think that affected one vote. I deny that in toto. I will show what effect it had in Vancouver; I know myself what effect it had in Victoria. Let me read again a few words from the speech of the hon. member for Burrard. On the subject of this very telegram, he said :

Now, I want to say in conclusion that when the telegram which came from the Premier was read at one of the largest meetings, I believe, ever held in the city of Vancouver, saying that our wishes would be his wishes, a cheer went up, one of the most enthusiastic I ever heard, because then the people seemed to realize that our political Moses had been found at last. I hope that the government will be true to that position. In the good old Book we read of a woman who came again and again to a judge

Mr. PRIOR.

appealing for justice. Again and again, she was denied, but by persisting she succeeded. Now, we, the people of British Columbia, have this grievance, there is no doubt about that. They have done everything they possibly could in order to have their grievance ventilated, and to obtain the sympathy of the government. We have been refused again and again. Now we are making this one more effort, and I do hope that the government, at this late stage of the agitation, will feel it to be their duty to respond to our wishes, and that they will at least give us some more restrictive power than we have at the present time.

Now, Sir, that telegram, if it had that effect on a meeting in Vancouver, must have been the means of raising the hopes of hundreds of men who were looking for protection from this curse; I do not think the hon. member for Burrard will stand up in this House and repeat the language used by the hon. member for New Westminster, that it had no effect on the voting in that election. The promise then made by the right hon. leader of the government, was that the wishes of the Liberal members would prevail. Like almost all the other promises that have been made by the right hon. gentleman, it has been lightly broken. Like many other promises of his, it was made to serve the purposes of the moment only. The right hon. gentleman was in that instance, as in many others, an opportunist, and I do not think he stands any higher in the estimation of the people of British Columbia to-day than he did then.

Nobody can know; but it seems to me that now that trouble has arisen in China, we can look for a greater horde of these people coming over than ever, especially if the great powers are successful in stemming the revolution that is now on there. If things are quieted down and more Europeans than ever go into China, you will find more Chinamen than ever wanting to come to British Columbia. That is a natural consequence. Therefore, I think, the government ought to put forth its most strenuous efforts and take the only means possible to keep these men out.

The other day I was reading in the *English Hansard*—the *Hansard* of extra parliamentary debates for 1890—and I came across a speech delivered by the Right Hon. Mr. Gladstone, whose authority I do not think the right hon. leader of this government will call into question. Speaking on May 12, 1890, at the Prince's Hall, Piccadilly, with the Earl of Granville in the chair, on free trade and protection, he said :

I must own it is a great and heavy disappointment to see how much ground has been lost by the doctrine of free trade within the last twenty-five years. I have no doubt that the dreadful militarism which lies like an incubus, like a vampire, on Europe is responsible for much of the mischief, but not for all, because free trade has receded in countries where militarism does not prevail. It has receded, and protection has gained ground in the United States of America, and I yet more regret, and much more regret, to see the same thing in the colonies of Great Bri-

tain, because we had no title to expect that America should respect, in any degree, our example when we adopted free trade. I do not say that we had a title to expect that, but it would not have been unreasonable to hope that the colonies might have attached more weight to our experience.

He then went on to say :

Protection used in old times to be confined to goods, and I remember I used sometimes to ask, 'Why do you confine protection to goods? Why don't you apply it to persons?' Why was it that the wealthy and powerful class of this country, when they controlled its legislation, did not lay prohibitive duties on the importation of Italian singers? Why was not the labour of the honest, hard-working, though perhaps not equally melodious, British singer entitled to protection just as much as bad production or inferior production in other departments? Well, nobody thought of placing the Italian opera singer under the ban of protection. Gentlemen knew too well to sacrifice their own pleasures and their own comforts to the protective doctrines when they came so near home as that. But though it really may seem almost like the incredible, yet you all know that, as has been well said: 'truth is stronger than fiction,' and protection is now freely applied against persons and not simply against goods. I am not sure what the state of the law in the United States is and whether in the incursion, as it is, I believe, called, of the Chinamen is simply resented or whether it is barred by any kind of a legislative restriction or pecuniary tax; but undoubtedly in the Australian colonies among our own kith and kin, the Chinaman is either prohibited or heavily taxed upon his importation. That is protection pure and simple. It is quite right to exhibit it as such in the face of the world; and why is the Chinaman thus taxed? Not because a superior race resents the contact, you may say the contamination, of an inferior one, and not because civilization recoiled from companionship with a people that are considered uncivilized. The Chinaman comes to compete with the hand labour, and his entry is, in some, if not all of these colonies prohibited or restrained by heavy taxation, amounting in some cases, I believe, to virtual prohibition—and why? Because he does more work for the money, because he is less exacting, because he consumes a great deal less of alcoholic liquors. On those accounts the Chinaman is a formidable rival. It is not for his vices, but for his virtues that he is dreaded. On account of those virtues protection has developed itself in a manner and degree happily far beyond our experiences, and is applied—as I admit in consistency it ought to be applied—to the importation of human beings as well as to the importation of things made by the labour of human beings.

The right hon. leader of the government is a free trader. He has stated that he has been so for many years past, and he—the democrat up to the hilt—is the proud possessor of a medal given him by the Cobden Club. Is this why he dare not protect the labouring men of British Columbia? Well, Mr. Gladstone here states that, to be consistent, a protectionist must not only protect the goods, but the human hands who manufacture those goods. The right hon. gentleman, although he is a free trader and wears the Cobden medal, has swallowed our protective tariff, body and bones and all. If he wants to be consistent, he

should throw that Cobden medal away; and to be consistent as a protectionist, he must protect persons as well as goods. That is the point I wished to make in quoting that speech of Mr. Gladstone.

I have very little more to say on this question. It is one that has been well threshed out for years, and it is one on which both parties are united in the province from which I come. There is a crying need felt there, not for a commission, not for any further delay, but for this resolution now before the House to be so amended that instead of \$100, the sum be fixed at \$450, so as to make the tax \$500.

Mr. G. R. MAXWELL (Burrard). I did not intend to speak at this stage at all, but several of the points noticed by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior), demand a few explanations. With a great deal of what has been said, I am in sincere sympathy. Dealing with the question generally, I think that the hon. member's statements are perfectly sound and reasonable; but when he falls into other matters, I think he puts a wrong construction on a great many of the questions he has introduced. With regard to the famous telegram which bothered the hon. gentleman so much—

Mr. PRIOR. It bothered you last year.

Mr. MAXWELL. Not at all. I may say that that telegram was sent by an individual entirely unknown to any of the members who were running in the interests of the Liberal party. Mr. McLagan, as we all know—that is all of us who reside in British Columbia—is a most enthusiastic Liberal; and without consulting me or any one else, sent that telegram to the leader of the government, and received the reply which has been printed. A great cheer went up on the night, it is true, when that telegram was read, but my hon. friend forgot to state that the then leader of the government, now the leader of the opposition, sent also a telegram to counteract the one sent by the present leader of the government. In that telegram, the same offer was made by the Conservative leader as was made by the Liberal leader. A Conservative in the city of Vancouver got up at one of the campaign meetings and read what purported to be a telegram from the leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), stating all he intended to do, if returned to power, on that question.

Mr. PRIOR. When?

Mr. MAXWELL. During the campaign. So that I think that the point made by my hon. friend from Westminster (Mr. Morrison) was well taken, namely, that in view of those two telegrams from the two leaders, the matter was simply left where it stood. Seeing that the Conservative leader had sent a telegram similar to that sent by the Liberal leader, both parties fell into the regular line and voted according to their party allegiance.

Mr. PRIOR. I never saw one in Victoria.

Mr. MAXWELL. I heard it read, and it made every Conservative in the city of Vancouver fall into line. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior), ought to be responsible. I would like to ask him who brought the Chinese first into British Columbia. What party is responsible for having Chinamen there at all? My hon. friend (Mr. Prior), and those gentlemen who sit opposite, desire to ignore the fact that to the Conservative party we owe the introduction of the Chinese into British Columbia. Not only did they bring these men into our province, but I understand they gave a distinct promise that after the Chinese had performed the work of railway construction, they would all be sent back again to China. That promise was never kept. I do not know what influences were at work at that particular time, but instead of sending the Chinese back, as the Conservative government promised they would, they scattered them all over the province of British Columbia, and that was the beginning of our trouble. We must fix on the Conservative party the whole responsibility for the trouble which we have with the Chinese to-day in British Columbia.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And for all our troubles.

Mr. MAXWELL. Yes, and for all our troubles, as the hon. member (Mr. Landerkin) says. I do not think the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Prior) is exactly sincere in the position he takes to-day. I would ask him: Who employs these Chinese in British Columbia? We are told they are employed by the canners and manufacturers, and who are these canners and manufacturers, to a great extent? Are they not almost all leading members of the great Conservative party?

Mr. PRIOR. Not all.

Mr. MAXWELL. A great many.

Mr. PRIOR. They are just about equally divided, I think.

Mr. MAXWELL. Oh, no.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They are all on our side now.

Mr. PRIOR. How about Mr. Munn and Mr. Ewing?

Mr. MAXWELL. We have only six or eight out of forty-six or forty-eight.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We will get them all next election.

Mr. MAXWELL. Almost all who employ these Chinese in the city of Victoria are members of the great Conservative party. No matter how willing my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) may be to do anything against the Chinese, I doubt if his supporters would allow him to do it when it comes to the point. It may be all right for him to take this

Mr. MAXWELL.

stand here for political purposes—and he is quite cute politically—but the experience is, that when it comes to the point of doing anything in this matter, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) never has been in it, and I do not think he ever will, even if his party were in power. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) said this question will run us out of parliamentary life. Well, I do not know that this sort of life is so very desirable after all, and it would be better, perhaps, even if that did take place; but, I am perfectly certain that whatever may be the issues of the next conflict, or whatever may be our fate after the battle is over, I am perfectly certain the people of British Columbia will realize that of the men who have been sent to this House, and who have stood by their interests, and who have tried to get beneficial legislation for them, they have no kick against the present Liberal members from the province of British Columbia. While we may not have got all we desired, and while we may not have got all that the province of British Columbia deserves to get, yet, at the same time, I think we shall get credit from the electors of that great province that we have tried to do our duty, and not unsuccessfully. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) has stated that the Conservative members have brought up this question again and again. In that speech which my hon. friend referred to this morning, I distinctly paid my compliment to the members who had brought up the question in the past. I admit that they did good missionary work, and I am free to confess that we are largely profiting by their labours. We owe a great deal to them for the statements they made in this House, and the speeches they delivered in order to endeavour to get the people of the east to understand this question. But, the point is, that for the whole of sixteen years the Conservative party tinkered with the subject. It took them sixteen years to give us a \$50 tax, and when Hon. Mr. Chapleau brought in that measure, he apologized for doing so, and he was not in sympathy with it. He knew perfectly well that most of the members who sat behind him were not in sympathy with the measure, but they were compelled to support it in order to satisfy the clamour of the people of British Columbia, and out of their munificence of sixteen years they gave us a miserable \$50 tax. What possible credit can the Conservative party take for dealing with this question? We, in four years, have, at least, accomplished just as much as it took the Conservatives sixteen years to do, and over and above that we are getting a commission to deal with the whole question. I believe, Sir, that we may rely on the promise of the Prime Minister, that this is not the final effort on the part of the government. It is the first step, and I am perfectly certain that we have nothing to fear so far as the result of the commission is concerned. When the whole

facts have been found out as to the present condition of affairs, I am certain the government will feel impelled to gratify the wishes of the people of British Columbia in this respect. My hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) gave us a magnificent oration on this question to-day. I am free to concede that so far as the bases of his facts are concerned, my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) is perfectly right. We all recognize that God made the Chinaman as well as any other man. I do not advocate laws against the Chinese on that ground, but I was in a committee of the House the other day where my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) was present. The hon. gentleman is a great breeder of cattle, and he takes a great interest in getting good stock for the country, and I heard him make the statement that all the cattle that were not tainted he put to one side. He would not allow any animal that was tainted to come into contact with his good cattle. Now, in the name of common sense, if he will be so particular about his cattle, how is it that he will not be so particular about humanity? The position which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) takes seems to me absurd. And when you come down to the main point, I think the old law of the Jews that was given by the Creator was perfectly right; the law which distinctly forbade communication on the part of the Israelites with those who were tainted, and who were not up to the standard which the Jew was expected to attain. We make no quarrel with the poor Chinese as a man. We have complete sympathy with him in his present condition, but as the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) has stated, we object to encouraging a class of men who are making money out of the bone and out of the blood, so to speak, of these poor Chinamen. We want that traffic in slavery abolished. We do not want the door of our province to be opened to herds of these poor dumb-driven cattle to be rushed in as it may please these men, who want to get rich out of the fruits of Chinese labour in British Columbia. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) has referred to the action of the newly-elected members of the British Columbia legislature. I am glad that the Conservative members in British Columbia are coming up to our standard. My hon. friend (Mr. Prior) knows perfectly well that the Conservative party was not a unit on this question until a short time ago. He knows that the great bulk of the leading men of the Conservative party were utterly opposed to any action being taken in this matter. A convention of the Conservative party was held in New Westminster, and they could not decide on any policy so far as the Chinese were concerned, but they instead brought in a resolution recommending that girls be brought from the east to take the place of the Chinamen who were employed as cooks.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MAXWELL. I know my hon. friend from Victoria would like that very well, and I may say that we all would like it. Now, I am not for making this a political question at all. I know, as has been stated, that the people of British Columbia, with the exception of a few manufacturers, are almost a unit on this point, and I would have wished with all my heart that the government had been able to go a good deal further to satisfy what I believe is the legitimate demands of the people of that province, based on the actual condition of affairs. I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) was right in casting a reflection upon the commission which the government is about to issue. Who asked for this commission? Possibly the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) does not know, but I received a request from the Trades and Labour Council of the city of Vancouver, asking the government to appoint a commission to inquire into all the facts. I wired to them asking if they wished that legislation should be deferred until this commission had reported; but they said: No, we will take all the government will give us in the way of legislation, but, in the meantime, we ask that a commission be appointed to inquire into the whole business, so far as the Japanese and Chinese are concerned.

Now, I have to commend the government for what they have done, and while I am not satisfied, as the member for New Westminster has said, my position is that a bit of a loaf is better than nothing at all. I am decidedly pleased that the government is going to issue this commission, because I believe that when all the facts are ascertained we shall have nothing to lose, and our demand will become more and more loud until the government will hardly refuse to go the whole length that the people of British Columbia want them to go.

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

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that said resolution be referred to the Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 180) respecting Chinese immigration.

Motion agreed to.

House resolved itself into committee on said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

The PRIME MINISTER. I may here give the committee some information with regard to the new provisions which are to be found in this section. First of all, there is a new provision for the establishment of a chief controller. Practically this officer is not new, but the legislation is new. There has always been a chief controller appoint-

ed by order in council, the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce being that officer; but here we provide for a chief controller by statute. Mr. Parmalee, the deputy minister of that department, will continue to act as chief controller.

Mr. G. R. MAXWELL (Burrard). Am I right in understanding from the right hon. gentleman that it is the intention to keep the present controller?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. MAXWELL. Well, I do not think that is fair. Everybody knows that Mr. Parmalee is entirely hostile to this legislation, and a good deal of the trouble we have had there is due to his efforts in opposition to it.

Mr. FOSTER. He has to carry out the law.

Mr. MAXWELL. Yes, but there are different ways of carrying it out.

Mr. FOSTER. Only one right way.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry this provision does not meet with the approval of my hon. friend. I must say that Mr. Parmalee is one of the best officials that we have in the civil service, as everybody knows. He has acted loyally, as I will show presently, because some of these new provisions, which I am sure will meet with the approval of my hon. friend, have been suggested by Mr. Parmalee. The object of my hon. friend is to exclude the Chinamen. I have had several conferences with Mr. Parmalee upon the subject, and whether he holds the views of the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell), that the Chinaman is a nuisance and ought to be excluded, or whether he holds the views of my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards). I only know that in this matter, as in every other respect, Mr. Parmalee's sole desire is to administer the law as he finds it. Subsection *g* is a new provision:

The expression 'vehicle' means any ferry boat, boat, railway car, wagon, carriage, sleigh, or other conveyance whatsoever, however propelled or drawn.

This expression 'vehicle' does not occur in the old Act, and Mr. Parmalee has suggested this expression in order more completely to carry out the spirit of the Act, which is to exclude Chinamen. The old Act applied only to Chinamen coming in by water, but we know that many come in by land, and this provision is to cover every other method of ingress. At present Chinamen come into the country in three different manners: They come by sea directly; they come from the other side by railway or otherwise; and they come in on foot. We have later on a provision covering these three methods, and this is one of them, and it shows a thorough loyalty to the spirit of the Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS (East Assiniboia). I have an objection to that portion of subsection *d*, included in brackets:

(d) The expression 'Chinese immigrant' means any person of Chinese origin (including any person either of whose parents was of Chinese origin) entering Canada and not entitled to the privilege of exemption provided for by section 6 of this Act.

I wish to point out the fact that this excludes the children of a family whose father is European. It excludes, for example, the children of a very distinguished missionary, the Rev. Dr. McKay, perhaps one of the most successful men of the 19th century. He could not be allowed to bring his family here for education without paying a poll tax on each member of it.

I have in my eye not simply his case alone, but also the case of the Rev. J. E. Gardner, of the Methodist Church of Canada, who, for many years, lived in Victoria, and as is known to many hon. members of the House, he has Chinese blood in his veins. He is married to an English lady, but still his children would come under this section. He has rendered good service to the Methodist Church, he has rendered good service to this government as an interpreter at the coast, and he, at present, occupies the distinguished position of being interpreter for the United States government in San Francisco. Mr. Gardner is a well known gentleman of high culture and scholarly attainments; yet, Mr. Gardner's family would be excluded or would be brought under this clause, and he would be called upon to pay \$100 for each member of his family. Dr. McKay is a Canadian, and certainly a large body of the Christian people of Canada would resent this principle if it were adopted by the government. I think that this clause might be altered to meet the cases which I have mentioned. As we go farther on and bearing on the same subject I propose to change subsection 4 of section 6, which really involves the same principle:

Any woman of Chinese origin who is the wife of a person who is not of Chinese origin shall, for the purpose of this Act, be deemed to be of the same nationality as her husband.

I would like, to change this subsection to read thus:

Any woman or the children of any woman of Chinese origin who is the wife of a person who is not of Chinese origin, shall, for the purpose of this Act, be deemed to be of the same nationality as the husband and father.

I think the House will sympathize with the view I have in bringing this matter to its notice. Personally, I am not here to encourage Chinese immigration. I have spent two winters at the coast, one in Vancouver and one in Victoria, and I know the complications which the presence of Chinese labour have given rise to there. I believe that Chinese can be better Christianized in their own land. Personally, I have

no desire to encourage the immigration of Chinese into Canada, but when they are here we must do the best we can with them. While with the general spirit of the Bill I have a great deal of sympathy, I wish to bring these two subsections of section 6, b and 4, to the attention of the House. There is also another important point which I shall call attention to as we proceed.

The PRIME MINISTER. I need not tell my hon. friend (Mr. Douglas) that the whole House will sympathize with him in the views which he has expressed, and I need not tell him further that the Act has no intention of reaching the class of persons to which he has alluded. I think, however, it is not necessary at all to amend this section in the direction in which the hon. gentleman suggests, and which, I think, is intended to serve a good purpose. The exceptions to which my hon. friend alludes can be better made in another section of the Bill, and if my hon. friend looks at subsection c of section 6, he will find there that the exceptions are provided for which he has in mind. If that subsection is not sufficiently clear to meet the view which he has in his mind at present we can amend it. The exceptions which are provided for are :

Merchants, their wives and children, tourists, men of science and students.

I believe that under that clause the particular class of persons to which my hon. friend alluded, missionaries, will come, and that they will be exempt from the tax. If the Rev. Dr. McKay were to come to Victoria I am sure the moment he disclosed his identity our officers there would at once decide that subsection c of section 6 would apply to his family.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that would follow.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the section is not broad enough to meet the exception that my hon. friend has in his mind we can provide that missionaries shall be included among these exceptions, because it is not intended that the Bill shall apply to them.

Mr. PRIOR. A case occurred some years ago when Mr. Moore, a highly educated English gentleman, who had lived in China many years and married a Manchoo woman, came to the province of British Columbia, and his wife and family had to pay the poll tax.

Mr. FOSTER. Our officers cannot vary the law.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Bill is not intended to apply to men of science. It is intended to apply to labourers who come into competition with our own workmen, but it is not intended to cover men of science. There are Chinamen who are very

able men in their own way. If possibly Confucius were to come here and settle in Canada there would be no objection to his doing so.

Mr. FOSTER. Was Confucius a scientist?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think in his day he was supposed to have been a scientist, but at all events if men of that class were to come into the country the Bill would not apply to them. The intention of the Bill is not to reach people of that class, but the intention is simply that it shall apply to a class of men who come here to compete with our workmen. I think, under the circumstances, the Bill as it is framed, is broad enough to meet the exception which the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia has in his mind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It does not take in the other case.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think it does. However, we can make all these exceptions later on.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would call the attention of the House and of the right hon. leader of the government to the fact that the Act, as it now stands, in respect to this section to which he has directed our attention, has not been satisfactory, and that the party administering the law at Victoria distinctly assured us that he could not interpret it as covering the cases of ministers. In one case I was called out at two o'clock in the morning, and we had to go to work, raise and put up the money before a very distinguished missionary was allowed to land at Victoria. That was in the year 1896. So that the clause, as it now reads, is not interpreted in such a sense as has been suggested, and men of this class have been obliged to pay the poll tax. I believe the scope of the Bill is not to interfere with men of that class, but it is necessary to have such legislation perfectly clear so that those administering the Act may not violate its spirit.

Mr. J. V. ELLIS (St. John City). I am afraid that the proposition to amend section 6, paragraph c, would not reach the objection raised by the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) as section 6 refers to persons of Chinese origin, and to those persons alone. The hon. gentleman's statement refers to British subjects, so that the amendment of subsection c would not cover it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). But, if you amend subsection c to read as follows :

Merchants, their wives and children, the wives and children of clergymen—  
Etc.

Mr. ELLIS. That would only refer to persons of Chinese origin.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think that even under the old Act this amendment would be necessary, because I am informed by Mr. Parmalee that the old Act would not apply to missionaries. The Rev. Mr. Moore, who married a Manchu woman had to pay the tax for his wife, but the tax was afterwards remitted when it was brought to the notice of the department. I am also informed that the Rev. Dr. McKay, when he was here a few years ago with his wife and children, was not obliged to pay the tax for his wife and family. The old Act was so interpreted, and it seems only common sense that it should be so interpreted, if we keep in mind the broad principles on which it was based. There is a well-known class of Chinese immigrants to which the law applies, and the officer, if he understands the Act, would not apply it under such circumstances as those indicated. If the officer should do so, the department in the past has remitted the duty, and it will do the same again. However, when we come to the clause, I will have no objection to consider the amendment of my hon. friend.

It being one o'clock, the Committee took recess.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

#### DEATH OF MR. TYRWHITT, M.P.

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before we resume the business of the House, I wish to refer to the common affliction through which we are called to pass, not unfortunately for the first or second time during this parliament. I refer to the death of another of our colleagues, our friend and co-worker Col. Tyrwhitt, member for the electoral district of South Simcoe. Col. Tyrwhitt was well known to members on both sides of this House, and no words of mine are needed to voice the sorrow we feel, and the loss we have to deplore at his last sudden departure from among us. Col. Tyrwhitt came into this House in 1882, and he was a consistent and most honourable member from that up to the date of his death. He was not a man who forced himself to the front in discussions in this parliament, but he was a man whose sterling common sense made itself felt both in this House and in the country. He was not what you might call a noisy partisan in any sense of the word, but he was a good consistent party man, feeling that he could be so consistent with his best duty to his country and to the body politic. Col. Tyrwhitt was a friend who was staunch and honourable in every respect. He was a liberal-minded man and patriotic. He was a gallant soldier as well, and served his country with honour in 1866, and in the troubles of 1885. We on this side of the

House, who were associated with him as political and party colleagues, will of course, feel his loss more deeply than other members of the House; but I am sure that all of us will realize that a thorough man and a gentleman has been called from our midst. I do not need to say more, except to voice my own, and I am sure the feelings of every member of this House, in the heartfelt sympathy that we tender to the family and friends of the deceased.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I can certainly re-echo everything that has been said by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) in reference to our late departed colleague. Col. Tyrwhitt was for eighteen years a member of this House. He always associated himself with the Conservative party, and he gave it a most honourable support; a support which his political opponents could find no fault with. He had no enemies in this House; he had none but friends, and every one, political friends or political opponents, appreciated his gentle humour, his genial nature and his sound sense whenever he chose to give us his views upon any question before the House. Col. Tyrwhitt was a type of man which is to be admired in this country. He held strong views, very strong views undoubtedly, but he always placed them before the House in a manner not to offend any one, but on the contrary in a manner which secured the respect of all who listened to him. We, who were his political opponents, mourn his loss. It is quite natural that we should not have the same degree of feeling which must be experienced by those who were more closely associated with him, but I may freely say, speaking for my friends about me on this side of the House, that we shall miss from the benches of the opposition his honest, manly countenance.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). An intimate acquaintance with Col. Tyrwhitt, extending over a period of thirty years justifies me in saying, that by his early death this parliament has not only lost one of its most honoured and useful members, but the country and the empire has lost one of its best and truest citizens. I but feebly express the gratitude of his relatives and constituents when I express their thanks for the kindly words that have been spoken of the deceased by the acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Foster), and by the right hon. the leader of the government. Col. Tyrwhitt was a man who was ever regarded, not only as a useful member of the party to which he belonged, but as a staunch and consistent and industrious representative of his constituency. Wherever his name was known it was a synonym for honour, and integrity, and uprightness and manhood. An ardent enthusiast in military life, he gave liberally of his time and of his means towards the promotion of the

best interests of the militia of Canada. Whenever duty called he was always found unflinchingly to the fore, to discharge that duty to the best of his ability.

By his untimely death the country has lost one of its best citizens, and his constituents have lost a worthy representative. But it is not in these directions that his loss will be most felt; it is in that loving circle of home of which he was the head. Knowing him intimately as I did, I can with a feeling of sympathy express the grief that will be shared in his family at his untimely death. A kind and loving husband, an affectionate father, a true friend, he was everything that a man at the head of a home should be. A social and genial companion in the locality where he resided, his presence was ever welcomed in every class of society; and the record he has left behind him is one which the youth of this country might well emulate and take pattern from in shaping their future lives. I am sure this grateful tribute to his memory from his comrades, this beautiful wreath, will be honoured by his loving wife and bereaved children; and those of the rising generation who take pattern by his life will be following an example of all that is good and kind in humanity.

#### CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 180) respecting Chinese immigration.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

(In the Committee.)

On section 4.

Mr. THOMAS CHRISTIE (Argenteuil). Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to occupy the time of the House at any great length. I simply desire in a very few words to record my protest against the Bill now before the House. I may say that I have no sympathy with any legislation which discriminates unjustly against any creed, race or nationality; I think they should all be treated fairly and alike. I am convinced, however, that we have treated the Chinese people very unfairly and very unjustly. If I am not mistaken, they have not only national rights, but treaty rights from Great Britain; but, notwithstanding that, we have imposed a tax of \$50 per capita on every Chinese immigrant coming into this country, quite irrespective of his character, capacity or worth. I am convinced that we would not like to be treated in that way at the hand of the Chinese government; I have no doubt that such treatment would be looked upon as an act of barbarism and inhumanity. It is true, we are told the Chinese are heathens, that they are addicted to the use of opium, that they are moral lepers, that their presence is a menace to our civilization. I am convinced that this charge of immorality has been greatly exaggerated. I think many of the Chinese are not as black as

they are painted. No doubt a great deal of this hostility was originally due to the fact that their labour entered into competition with white labour. It is true that some of them are addicted to the use of opium. It is equally true that most of them are heathens. But surely our churches and Sabbath schools are able to deal with that aspect of the question, and to do something to provide a remedy. We all know that even now many of these people walk to our churches and Sabbath schools every Lord's Day, and are being instructed in the English language and also in the principles of Christianity. In that way they are being uplifted into a higher and Christian civilization. Some time ago I saw the statement in a Montreal paper that 400 Chinese are in Sabbath schools in that city. The same thing is going on more or less all over the Dominion. In the town where I live we have a few Chinese, not very many, and I am glad to say that they have conducted themselves with great propriety. In business they have given satisfaction to their employers; they have been very regular in their attendance at church and Sabbath school, and have been orderly and law-abiding. In every particular they have been as quiet and inoffensive as any other residents of the town. Now, I think it is a monstrous injustice that such men as these should be fleeced or robbed of \$50 or \$100 or \$500 under the operation of these anti-Chinese laws. But we are told that by right they should be excluded, as they are not desirable immigrants. We are told that they come here to make money, and that as soon as they have secured enough to retire, they gather it all up and carry it off to China and spend it there, where they desire to be buried. Now, I do not see that there is anything wrong in that. They have given full value for the money they have received, and if their labour has been really a benefit to the country, and if by diligence, frugality, perseverance and thrift they have succeeded in making a little money, surely they have an undoubted right to take that money and spend it wherever they please; and if they desire to be buried in China, I do not see why we should object. But that is not all. If hundreds of them or many of them become Christianized, they will be likely when they return to China to give a good report of our country and be able still to contribute largely to its welfare. We know that it looks now as if most of the ports of China will be thrown open at no very distant day. If so, it is perhaps impossible to overestimate the amount of traffic that we may secure with China, and considering the matter from the usual business standpoint, I think it would be unwise to do anything to prevent our securing the freest commercial relations both with China and Japan.

It appears to me that instead of amending or changing this law so as to make it more oppressive and more tyrannical, we

ought to amend it exactly in the opposite direction. We should wipe it out altogether, root and branch. We should let these poor oppressed and persecuted Chinamen come in free, we should treat them like men, and make Canada a free country. But be that as it may, I hold that this measure is not in accordance with our free, liberal institutions in Canada. It is not at all in accord with the principles of free trade; nay more, it is not in harmony with our Christian civilization, with the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man and the golden rule. It is both unjust and un-British, and, therefore, cannot fail to be detrimental and injurious to the best interests of Canada and be a reproach to the good name of our country.

These people only ask to be permitted to labour in our midst, and I am fully convinced that their labour has been a great boon to Canada during the past. I may be all wrong, but so far as I can see, their labour in the garden, in domestic service and in other walks of life, is calculated to be productive of the best results at home, and to promote the best interests of our nation in China and Japan. I cannot see why we should adopt a policy which would be so detrimental to ourselves and injurious to our country, and, holding these views, I must say that I cannot record my vote in favour of the present measure.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). The views advanced, Mr. Speaker, by my hon. and esteemed friend, the member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie), do at least credit to his heart and aspirations in favour of humanity and his love for freedom; and speaking in the abstract, his arguments may perhaps be considered unanswerable. It was long ago declared by a very high authority, that God made of one blood, all nations of men, to dwell upon the face of the earth, and I suppose that warrants us in the belief that there should be such a thing as the brotherhood of man. Consequently speaking in the abstract, my hon. friend's arguments are well-founded, and I can sympathize most fully with the views he expresses as to the natural right of man to seek the best places and positions for bettering his condition. There are, however, the interests of the two classes to be taken into consideration, when dealing with the question of immigration. There is first and primarily, the interests of the immigrant who proposes to change his home and cast in his lot with another race and in another land. There is in the second place, the interests of the occupants of that place, where he proposes to make his home, and who have a preemptive right as residents, as citizens of the country, and as having built up its institutions with the desire of founding a free country and free institutions, to hand down to posterity. They too have rights and are warranted, when determining what their action may be with reference to per-

Mr. CHRISTIE.

mitting others to share with them the blessings they have created and the country they have opened up, in taking into consideration what the influences are likely to be of those who propose to seek an asylum and a home with them. The position of the government in this connection is one of great difficulty. Abstractly, I repeat, the government are wrong, perhaps, in placing restrictions upon immigration to this country. But while a thing may be right or wrong in the abstract, it may be exactly the reverse in the concrete. We have confronting the government to-day, on the one hand, the demand of the members from the Pacific coast, and on the other hand, we have the expression of sentiments given by such gentlemen as my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards), and the hon. member who has just spoken, which are correct in the abstract—sentiments which these gentlemen thoroughly believe, which are perhaps calculated to commend themselves to the better judgment of the country, unless all the circumstances of the case are carefully weighed and considered. Now, it is a remarkable and very significant fact, that sympathy with Mongolian immigration is not found in any section of the country that these immigrants go to. You will find that sympathy in the United States, in the Mississippi valley states, in the eastern states, in any of the states, where there are very few Chinese immigrants. But you will not find it in California, Oregon, Washington, or the states that are brought directly into contact with this class of immigrants. We have that same sentiment in eastern Canada, which we find exhibited in the eastern parts of the United States—a sentiment in favour of the equality of man, of his right to better his condition, the right of a down-trodden people to come to a free country, and better their condition. But against that we have the sentiment of the people who have been brought into contact with this Mongolian immigration, who know its character, and who for some reason, sufficient or insufficient, are bitterly opposed to permitting these Mongolians entering the country. When I look over the field, when I see in British Columbia, Oregon, Washington, California, South Africa, Australia—in all countries where the Anglo-Saxon live—when I see in every one of these places, where the people are brought into contact with Mongolian immigration, a bitter hostility to that immigration, I am forced to believe that there is something about this matter that requires careful consideration. My hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) said that the motive that prompted the government of Canada to exclude this immigration was the same as prompted the government at Peking to prohibit the immigration of Christian people into China. The motive is the same abstractly—it proceeds in each case from a desire to prevent the subversion of the institutions of these re-

spective countries by immigration. The Chinese government prohibits or discourages the immigration of Christian people because it does not wish to see China Christianized; it does not desire to see western civilization take the place of the civilization of Confucius, it does not desire to see the civilization which is characteristic of China and has been for thirty or forty centuries; submerged or removed, and western ideas and western thoughts and western religion take its place. To-day the same motive exists in British Columbia. There, the people do not desire to see the civilization they possess, the institutions they possess, in any way endangered by the influx of a great swarm of people who will not believe as they do, will not act as they do, but will subvert their civilization and will not subscribe to their religion and belief. That is the case in a nutshell. And so the government to-day confronts this problem of Chinese immigration, and confronts it with a demand on the part of the people who are directly interested in this question that some action shall be taken, some action adverse to the unrestricted admission of Chinese immigrants. That is one view of the case. Another view of the case is that of our friends in British Columbia. I am inclined to think their fears are perhaps overdrawn or not justified. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) in answer to a question this morning, informed us that there were perhaps 20,000 Chinamen in British Columbia. I imagine that, perhaps, that estimate is high.

Mr. PRIOR. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) that on second thoughts I have come to the conclusion that that estimate was high. I would say there are from 10,000 to 15,000 Chinese in British Columbia.

Mr. CHARLTON. I imagine that 10,000 would be quite a liberal estimate of the number of Celestials in British Columbia. If there are 10,000 Chinamen in British Columbia, I do not see that there is a very crying necessity for making the laws very stringent to restrict or prevent Chinese immigration. If there are 10,000 Chinamen in British Columbia, I think it is quite evident that the tax of fifty dollars per head has proved efficient as a means of impeding that immigration, and I am doubtful whether it is necessary to impose a heavier tax; and, certainly, I think it would be entirely unnecessary to accede to the demand for a tax of \$500. I believe that the government, in taking the step it has taken—I suppose it was obliged to do something to meet this demand—instead of showing as my hon. friend from Victoria charged, want of pluck, on the contrary, showed great discretion. And I believe the government have gone as far as it is necessary or desirable to go, at least until the effect of the increased tax of \$100 per head is shown by

actual results. I am not sure that it is necessary to take even the step here proposed to restrict this immigration. I do believe that bringing the Chinese into contact with our western civilization not only will have a very great effect in changing their views, but will exert a great influence upon the sentiment in China by the communication of this element that has been brought into contact with the Anglo-Saxons with the element at home. I believe we can reach these people with our elevating Christianizing agencies better here than in China. There coming here is not an unmixed evil. I do not regret that there are 10,000 Chinamen in British Columbia. I would not object to see that number increase, so long as it increased at a rate consistent with safety. I would dread the pouring in of a horde of Celestials from the practically illimitable fountain of four hundred million in China. I admit that it is necessary to be cautious, but I doubt that it was necessary for the government to take any action at all, to impose a single dollar of tax in addition to that already imposed of fifty dollars a head. Certainly, I would be the last to join in condemnation of the government for not having gone further. In my opinion, the government have done all that could be asked of them in the way of restricting Chinese immigration. There is a great deal to be said in favour of the views of the hon. member for Argen-teuil (Mr. Christie) of the brotherhood of man, of the value and the advantage of the unrestricted intercommunication of these peoples, and of the influence that may be exerted upon a barbarous or unenlightened or semi-civilized people by the enlightened of our own race. If we rest where we are, we shall have gone, in my opinion, as far as we need go. The government has proposed the issue of a commission that will sift this question to the bottom, that will ascertain exactly, as far as may be, what the influence of Mongolian immigration is upon society in British Columbia, what the character of this immigration is and the effect of their presence upon social and commercial relations and will give us information of a reliable character, not based on prejudice or on preconceived notions. Let us have the commission; let us sift this case to the bottom; let us inquire and decide what is to be the effect of this immigration upon us and its reflex action upon the Chinese at home, and the step will be a wise one. In the meantime, I can have no sympathy with the views advanced in this House condemning the government for not going further than they have, and I express my doubts whether they have not already gone further than it was necessary to do.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not share the views of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I have always held that every country has a perfect

right to exclude from its borders any undesirable element of humanity whether it be a criminal class, a pauper class, or a class that will be found to be to the disadvantage of the people of that country. Every civilized country does that to-day. Only a few days ago, the United States sent back two criminals to England and would not allow them shelter upon their shores—and this, notwithstanding that the United States people claim that theirs is, perhaps, the freest country in the world. Why did the United States exclude them? Because they were an undesirable element, they were of a class whose presence would not tend to the elevation of humanity or the bettering of society. And on that ground also they exclude paupers, and so do we. Why? Because they become a burden upon our charity and upon our finances from the day they reach our shores. The Mongolian is a different class of man. While he may not become a burden upon our charge; while he may not be especially vicious as a criminal, still he is destroying the living of a much more desirable element in our country, an element who are bone of our bone, and humanity of our humanity—part and parcel of ourselves. The Mongolian is a supplanting and destroying element. There is no fusion of races with them, and his presence is an injury to our own citizens who are only in a lower scale financially, and, perhaps, socially than other people in the community to-day, but who are kept down by the very presence of this undesirable element,—this element that does not unite with our people, that does not help our country financially—because whatever they make they take away—that does not help our country socially, that does not help our country in any way, except, it may be, to do some of the menial work of life. The hon. member (Mr. Charlton) said we should have a commission. We have had one commission already, a commission that did its work very intelligently, so that we have all the information, in my judgment, that it is necessary for this House to have to enable us to judge whether or not we are doing right to let these people come in. It is a fact that in every country in the civilized world where Chinamen go, people have a bad opinion of them. They are not liked in British Columbia, they are not liked in California, they are not liked anywhere else. That to my mind is another argument why we should take hold of this problem early while we have yet control of it, instead of allowing them to come in in large numbers and having to take up the problem and deal with it when it will be much more difficult to do so. The hon. member said: I think the amount of tax that is put on will be quite insufficient. The question is: Will it keep them out? What is aimed at by the government? Is it not their exclusion? If it is not to exclude them, then the government cannot be sin-

Mr. SPROULE.

cere in proposing this legislation; if it is to exclude them, then in my judgment the tax is too small. There is no doubt that they will continue to come in, even after paying this tax, in order to earn money here to send home to enrich their own country. In the earlier part of my life I entertained the idea that perhaps the dictates of humanity should lead us to allow them to come in; but the longer I live and the more I know of their history, the more I know of the Chinese character, the more I am inclined to the opinion that we are justified in excluding them from this country. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) says that they come here by virtue of treaty rights. I do not think that there are any treaty rights that allow them to come here; we have no treaty rights with China which enable them to take advantage of our country as they do. They are not allowed to come into the United States except they pay for the privilege. Now, as I said before, if the object of this tax is to keep them out, and I assume it is, it requires to be higher than it is at present, because they will pay that tax, and they will come in. This additional tax will only afford a little more temptation to smuggle them in. I say that we have knowledge already that they are a most undesirable class, that there is no fusion of their race with the white race, there is no elevation of humanity, there is no benefit to our country financially, there is no substantial advantage that I can see accruing to our country by allowing them to come in except that they perform for us some of the more menial occupations of life. On the other hand, by allowing them to come into our country in numbers they only displace the honest labourer of this country, the man who is one of ourselves, and whose industry tends to the betterment of his own condition as well as the elevation of the social life of the country. Therefore, I say we are not doing all that we should do in raising this tax by \$50, and I do not think we would do wrong at all if we passed a law to exclude them entirely.

Mr. MORRISON. At this stage of the Bill I rise to propose an amendment. I have a great deal of sympathy with the position in which the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) finds himself; but I am confident that if that hon. gentleman knew the circumstances which exist to-day in the province of British Columbia, he would entertain a directly opposite opinion of these people to that which he now entertains. I must say, without desiring at all to be offensive, that the opinions which the hon. gentleman entertains to-day in regard to Chinese immigration are based upon a lack of knowledge of the facts and the circumstances that exist in our province. I am quite sure that if the circumstances existed in his own county that exist in my

county, and in other counties of British Columbia, he would be one of the first to rise and demand a remedy. I regret to say that there seems to be the same lack of knowledge of the circumstances in the minds of many members of this House coming from the eastern provinces. I cannot admit that the members from British Columbia, who are but a mere handful, are to blame for this paucity of information which exists in the east, for we have been doing all we could to disseminate a knowledge of the facts, and there is an abundance of material at hand from which any hon. member, who is so disposed, can gather a full knowledge of the state of affairs. I fear, Mr. Chairman, that not many members on either side of the House have taken the trouble to read the published report of the Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration, published in 1885. I am sure that if they would take the time to glance, if only cursorily, at that report, they could not maintain such opinions as we have heard expressed to-day by the hon. member for Argenteuil, and the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). I care not what arguments may be used in favour of allowing Orientals to come in here, there is sufficient incontrovertible evidence against them to justify us in excluding them. I am sure that the hon. member for Argenteuil, who is a medical man, would change his opinions were he to read the evidence of other medical men given in this report; and I would ask him and other hon. members to read the evidence that has been adduced in San Francisco, in Victoria, and other places that were visited by that commission. Perhaps it has been so long since that evidence was published that hon. gentlemen may have forgotten the salient features of it, if they ever read it. Now, I state that our objection to these people does not spring from the fact that they come from China, it is not that they are Chinamen. Our people would have just as strong objection to people coming from any other country if they were as obnoxious as these Chinamen are. Our great objection to the Chinese and to the Japanese, whom I will include in the same category, is that they tend to degrade labour, and I say that anything that degrades labour strikes at the foundation of the institutions of any country. No government is justified in permitting into the realm of labour the intrusion of Chinese and Japanese in the way they are admitting them into British Columbia to-day. What are the conditions in British Columbia? There is no part of the Dominion of Canada that displays greater evidences of wealth, greater elements of prosperity than that province. It is a province richly endowed with metalliferous mountain districts, vast fertile valleys, unparalleled water-courses, a sea-coast teeming with fish, vast areas of uninhabited lands of fertile character; and the first care of this government should be to see that such a province is

populated with manly, independent, God-fearing men of intelligence and moral habits.

What are you doing to-day by not restricting the immigration of this pernicious element into the province of British Columbia? I do not wish to speak in a sentimental way; I do not think that the strongest ground that can be taken against these people coming into this country is the sentimental ground. It is largely an economic question, and I think we should discuss it from the economic standpoint. These people come in, they are virtually slaves, they are entirely and humbly submissive, they do not live like rational beings. That is incontrovertible, and nobody will deny it. For a great number of years they have been in the province of British Columbia, mingling with the people of that province, having the advantage, as some people would term it, of receiving instruction from the missionaries and yet, can anybody in this assemblage, who knows anything about the question, point out the beneficial results of the sojourn of these people in British Columbia? By saying that there is no evidence of improvement in these people I do not cast any reflection on the people of British Columbia, but rather, it is an evidence that these people consider themselves, as they are the older civilization, and the stronger characters. They ignore the people of this country, and, in my opinion, they will never be converted in the sense in which we are attempting to convert them. If they pretend to be christianized they are not sincere, and that is evidenced by people who have lived amongst them as missionaries. They are not sincere, but their profession of Christianity is entirely a matter of expediency on their part. The evidence produced before the Royal Commission shows what degree of effective progress has been made amongst them by missionaries in their efforts to christianize them. From any standpoint which you choose to take there is an objection to Chinamen coming into this country. I did not intend to dwell upon that phase of the matter, but I have been led to refer to it particularly owing to the fact that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in his excellent speech spoiled the whole effect of that speech in his closing remarks. I think the sentences uttered by the hon. gentleman in his opening remarks were more cogent and were such as would be of material assistance to hon. gentlemen here in coming to some satisfactory conclusion upon this matter. But, when the hon. gentleman came down to the stereotyped sentimentality of the brotherhood of man, getting away from the practical side of the question, he entirely detracted from the effect of any remarks which he had previously made. The sentimental aspect of the question is too large a field to enter upon on an occasion of this kind. But, I rose simply for the purpose of asking the at-

tention of the committee to the amendment which I propose to submit. It does not only affect the Chinese, but it also affects the Japanese. Reference has been made to treaty obligations existing between the Chinamen and the people of Canada and Great Britain. I do not know of any strong treaty obligations that exist between these two nations. There are treaties between Japan and Great Britain, and in referring to the Japanese I may say that the objection, economically, to their existence in British Columbia and in Canada is even greater than the objection to the Chinamen. They are, as far as opposition with white labour is concerned, infinitely more objectionable than the Chinamen. They meet the white man at a greater number of points of competition. They live just as objectionably as the Chinese. To give an idea of the manner in which these people live in British Columbia, and there is no necessity for them to do so, but to show their inherent nature, which certainly is most objectionable and un-British, I will read a short extract from a sanitary report of the health inspector of the city of Vancouver, published a few days ago. Attention was directed to the existence of these Chinese and Japanese who, it was said, were living in a very unsanitary way, by the report of the existence of bubonic plague across the border in some of the American towns and by the report that the disease had been brought to the continent of America by immigrants from China and Japan. The inspector made his report, and he reported very strongly in regard to the way these people were hived together. I take the extract from one of the Vancouver papers :

The fact that eternal vigilance is necessary in watching the Chinese and Japanese in their crowded quarters was well shown last night by a trip made by Health Inspector Marrion among the Oriental denizens of Chinatown. It may also be mentioned in this connection that the recent quarantine vigilance against southern cities has not been without its reason, for during May there were fourteen cases of small-pox in Seattle. This is according to the health reports recently issued for the month, and which also includes the statement of quite a large number of cases of scarlet fever and measles.

Health Inspector Marrion made the trip last night for the purpose of seeing how the Orientals were complying with the regulations of the lodging-house by-law. This provides that each person shall be treated to the full benefits of 400 feet of fresh Vancouver air in his sleeping quarters. The inspector visited particularly the new, large lodging-houses facing on Carroll Street, near the Royal City mill, in company with Police Officer Park and the two assistant inspectors. There are about 100 rooms altogether in these two buildings, and in more than half there were too many men sleeping. The Orientals were lying sandwiched in their bunks, so close to one another that it was a wonder how they managed to breathe at all. The curious fact was also developed that rooms occupied by Japanese were much more crowded than those in which were Chinamen. In small rooms, say twelve or fourteen feet long, nine wide and seven high, there would be as many as seven or eight

men. So hot were the unventilated rooms in many cases that the Japanese were lying in rows, stark naked. They were, too, much harder to arouse than the Chinamen, and very seriously objected to opening their doors even when they saw the police officer's uniform through the window. The most flagrant case of overcrowding was where nine Japs were in one room of about the dimensions given above. One Chinaman was found in an outhouse, scarcely long enough to contain his body.

This is only one of very many reports which we have as to the way in which these people live and the way in which they want to live. It takes a great deal of trouble and expense to get them out of that way of living. Take the report of the provincial board of health on the plague. A visitation of that disease was thought to be imminent a few months ago, and it was feared that it might spread into British territory. The suggestion is made in the report that precautionary steps should be taken against the introduction of the plague through the medium of the Chinese and Japanese. It is a real danger on the Pacific coast, the people of the United States realize it, and they take the most stringent and strict steps to prevent any possibility of such a contingency occurring. We find that hordes of these Japanese, and I use the word advisedly, who came to British Columbia this summer, were prevented from going into the United States. A great many of them attempted to go in, and when the American authorities found this out, they undertook to return them, and they have been returned in large numbers. The consequence is that the labour market in British Columbia is glutted by these Japanese, and even such skilled tradesmen as ship carpenters have to compete with them for as low a wage as \$1 per day. We find that one of the railways is discharging its section men; men of families, men who have been in the province for a number of years, men who are educating their children and contributing to the institutions of the country; such citizens of Canada are being discharged and these Japanese are taking their places at very low wages. We do not know where that will end. I would ask hon. gentlemen who seem to place great reliance upon the principle of the brotherhood of man; I would ask them whether the people of British Columbia should be sacrificed in that way? Let these gentlemen consider for a moment what the conditions would be in Ontario and Quebec if the employees of the large mills were to be discharged to make room for the Japanese, or else compelled to work for three-quarters of the wage they are now getting. Where would our institutions in these older provinces be if such were the case? Some of our newspapers are creating quite an uproar against the government and against members who are supporting the government in bringing in restrictive legislation, but I

Mr. MORRISON.

would like to know where these papers would be if this part of the country were overrun by Japanese and Chinese. It is quite certain that if such were the case there would not be many subscribers to some of our flourishing newspapers. That is only one instance. These people contribute nothing to the maintenance of the institutions of the country, and they are, therefore, valueless to aid in the progress and prosperity of Canada. As an evidence of the number of Japanese who are coming to Canada, I will quote a despatch from the newspapers, and in this connection I may say that the department in charge of this branch have not, in my opinion, the fullest information available upon this point :

Japanese are still pouring in here. The steamer 'Riojun Maru' brought 800, and the big liner 'Goodwin' 1,100. The steamer 'Milos' brought eighty more, and the 'Braemer' at the end of this week will bring more than 700.

This is the record for only part of the month of April of this year. Before that time they were coming into Canada in even greater numbers, and since then the other despatches show that the Japanese are still pouring into British Columbia. In view of these facts, the government should take the matter up more seriously than it has done, and some more stringent steps should be taken to prevent this very undesirable immigration. In Natal and Australia the people are just as solicitous about their welfare as we are, or ought to be, and they have passed practically prohibitive laws against such immigrants. Australia, I think, has a tax of \$500, and Natal has a tax of \$500 and what is known as the Natal Act. The main point of the Natal Act is that it provides an educational test for immigrants going into that country, and it would not be a bad thing if Canada should have a test of the same kind. The amendment which I intend to propose is along the lines of that Natal Act. I do not think that it can be seriously objected that by introducing legislation on the lines of the Natal Act we are violating any treaty obligation. The only treaty that exists between Great Britain and Japan relating to immigration is the treaty passed in 1894 and ratified in 1895. In that treaty Canada and the other colonies are specifically exempted, and so objection cannot be raised that we would be brought into conflict with Great Britain if we introduce legislation of this kind. There may be sufficient and cogent grounds other than that existing, but certainly the treaty is no bar. I refer to article 19 of the treaty, which reads as follows :

The stipulations of the present treaty shall be applicable, so far as the laws permit, to all the colonies and foreign possessions of Her Britannic Majesty, excepting to those hereinafter named, that is to say, except to :

India, the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Cape, Natal, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania, South Australia, Western Australia, New Zealand.

Provided always, that the stipulations of the present treaty shall be made applicable to any of the above-named colonies or foreign possessions on whose behalf notice to that effect shall have been given to the Japanese government by Her Britannic Majesty's representative at Tokio, within two years from the date of the exchange of ratifications of the present treaty.

That is an article which expressly excepts Canada from the operation of the Treaty of 1895 between Canada and Great Britain. In addition to that we have the despatch from Mr. Chamberlain, dated July 20, 1898, and addressed to the Governor General, referring to the disallowance of a certain British Columbia statute. In the last clause of that despatch, Mr. Chamberlain, in deprecating the passing of the legislation on that occasion by the province of British Columbia as against the Japanese, says :

In the meantime, I have to request that you will impress upon your ministers that restrictive legislation of the type of which the legislation in question appears to be, is extremely repugnant to the sentiment of the people and government of Japan, and you should not fail to impress upon them the importance, if there is any real prospect of a large influx of Japanese labourers into Canada, of dealing with it by legislation of the Dominion parliament on the lines of the accompanying Natal Act, which is likely to be generally adopted in Australia.

Now, I take it that if legislation on the lines of the Natal Act were passed by this parliament it would not be looked upon with displeasure by the Imperial government, and it certainly would meet with the approval of those who have such serious objections to this immigration. I, therefore, beg to move that a substantive clause be added after clause 5 and before clause 6, to read as follows :

The immigration into Canada by land or sea via British Columbia of any person of the classes defined in the following subsections, is prohibited, namely:

(a) Any person who, when asked to do so by an officer appointed under this Act, shall fail to himself write out and sign in the characters of any language of Europe, an application to the Secretary of State in the form set out in schedule \_\_\_\_\_ to this Act.

(b) Any person being a pauper or likely to become a public charge.

(c) Any idiot or insane person.

(d) Any person suffering from a loathsome or contagious disease.

(e) Any prostitute and any person living on the prostitution of others.

I trust that this amendment, particularly the first clause, will be incorporated in the Bill. If there are objections to the insertion of that clause and to the bringing of it into force at once, I trust that, at any rate, the government will consider the idea of having it inserted, even if it were not brought into force except by proclamation specifically made. The existence of these Japanese in our midst is a real menace to the people of Canada, as well as to the people of British Columbia, and I would strongly urge that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. ELLIS. I have raised the point of order and I wish for your ruling, Mr. Chairman: That this Bill, having originated in the Committee of the Whole, it is not competent for the hon. gentleman to offer this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Flint). I am afraid I shall have to rule against my hon. friend.

Mr. GEO. E. CASEY (West Elgin). The amendment of my hon. friend, who has just sat down, mixes several very different propositions. Some portions of it we might perhaps all agree to; but there is no doubt that the main object of the amendment is to exclude Japanese and Chinese immigrants. The government have considered this question no doubt, very fully, and have decided upon a certain course. As the debate has taken a wide range already, it is perhaps no harm to indicate more fully the great diversity of individual opinion on this question. Some of us, on one side of the House or the other, object to the immigration of any of these men; some object to the immigration of Chinese, and do not object to that of the Japanese; and so forth. For my part, I have pretty strong individual opinions on this question, which I intend to mention; but I must say, speaking as a member of the House, that I do not feel inclined to oppose anything which the government have felt themselves bound, after the fullest consideration of the question, to put into this Bill. Circumstances may change in the next year or two, so that the opinion of the government on the question may change. But they have had to consider great Imperial questions, as well as local questions, and for the time being, I do not see my way to vote against any of their proposals.

My individual opinion may be stated briefly thus: We have a right, as every other people inhabiting a country have, to object to the introduction among our population of any race whom we may consider hopelessly barbarian, or not capable of assimilating with our population. I do not think there is anything in this statement to make us comparable with the Boers, or any other too exclusive people in the world. We have the right, then, to say that Chinese or Japanese, or any other people shall not come into this country and take possession of lands here, and compete with our own people. The question is, what races should we exclude? I have no doubt personally, that it would be much better for this country if no Chinese ever came here. They may be a convenience as domestic servants, or as labourers in the construction of certain public works; but on the whole I consider them an element that can never be assimilated with the rest of our population. They are so totally different, not only from us, but from other civilized races—I will not say from European races only, but all races possessing any kind of modern civilization—that I do not believe they can ever

Mr. MORRISON.

really become citizens of this country. If the diplomatic relations of the empire and the general interests of the country would permit of it, I should be glad to see Chinese entirely excluded. If the government consider that not practicable, I am glad to see that they have, at all events, made it more difficult for Chinese to enter this country, by doubling the capitation tax upon them.

The case of the Japanese I look upon as totally different. I have given a good deal of attention to Japanese history during the few years in which it has been known to the world, and I am satisfied that the Japanese are people who can be assimilated in Canada, and can become civilized in the proper sense of the word. They are not only a nation of clever mechanics and hard working people, but in their habits they are not so dissimilar from Europeans as the Chinese. When they come to Canada or to any European country, they live in a cleanly, descent, respectable manner, like other citizens. They are not, like the Chinese, merely labourers; but they apply themselves closely to business, and may come into sharp competition with many of our own people. They will probably go into manufacturing; they might even become naturalized and go into politics. I am not prepared to say that it would be any detriment to this country if they did all of these things. Competition with people who are capable of citizenship in the proper sense of the word, is not a thing that we should be afraid of, so long as that competition is not unduly emphasized, and does not bear unduly upon certain classes of the community, on account of the peculiar habits or ideas of profit that the foreign competitor may possess. The Chinaman who is able, as a former member from British Columbia aptly described it, 'to live on rats and mice, and work for nothing, and take home all he earns to China,' may be an unfair competitor with our fellow-citizens. I have never met a Japanese yet who was not anxious to get as much for his work, physical and intellectual, as any other member of the community. I do not think the influx of Japanese will permanently lower the rate of wages for Canadians. I think the Japanese on the whole are as fitted for citizenship in this country, as any European people. They have shown themselves capable, not merely of imitation, as the Chinese are, but of taking hold of everything that Europeans do, in business, in politics, and in war. They have taken a front rank among modern powers in the last few years. More than that, Japan is the only probable, I might say the only possible, ally of Great Britain in the far east. Japan is a country situated very much like Great Britain, inhabited by a people naturally maritime and naturally warlike, and she will be the natural and useful ally of Great Britain in all dangers that may threaten the empire

in that part of the world. What is passing at present in those regions, may emphasize this view of the question very strongly indeed, and I think the present moment is emphatically not the one when we should try to throw any slurs on the Japanese people, by declaring them not fit for citizenship in this country, or by trying to exclude them as immigrants. On the other hand, what is passing in China, may bring the empire, and especially that important part of it which we form, to the conclusion that further intercourse with that country on the same terms on which we admit other civilized nations, is impossible. That is my own view of what is likely to happen, and I expect that this question will come before the House in future sessions, with a very different complexion. On all these grounds, I cannot accept the amendment of my hon. friend. I do not discuss any clause of his amendment, except the first, which I believe is the only one in issue before the committee at the present time.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I would like to express my support of the amendment moved by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison). I understand it to be a very radical amendment, inasmuch as it would practically exclude all Chinese and all Japanese from the country. If we are right in passing an exclusion Act, we are right in accepting the evidence of the people of the province who are chiefly interested in the working of that Act, as expressed here by their representatives as to how far the Act should go. While we do not escape responsibility, as the representatives of other sections of the country, by adopting their views, we are certainly not doing justice to them or to those they represent if we do not accept their opinions and expressions as very strong evidence of the condition of affairs prevailing in that province and of the opinions of the people of that province. I cannot recall just at the moment the slurs which it seems to me were cast on the representatives of that province by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) when he spoke of the necessity of a commission to find out what was the feeling of the province and the condition of the province with regard to Chinese and Japanese immigration. It seems to me we have a commission here and now from that province, sent by it to give an opinion with regard to these matters, having full knowledge both personally and gathered from other parties of the conditions, and if we are not prepared to accept their evidence, I do not see how much better off we will be after we have got the evidence of a commission on the subject.

I want to present another side of the question which does not seem to me to have been shown very strongly. It is apparently the general impression that this is a question which merely concerns British Columbia. I contend that it is one which con-

cerns the whole of Canada and very greatly eastern Canada—quite as much eastern as western Canada. I look upon the matter in this way, that the presence of a Chinese or Japanese labourer in British Columbia displaces a citizen from eastern Canada or some other part of the British Empire in that province. I look upon the presence of Japanese and Chinese labourers in that province as objectionable because they monopolize a field of labour to which our young men, who are compelled to look outside for fields of labour, would properly and naturally go. In that field these Mongolians have established a condition of labour that we would not want our young men to go and compete against, and causes us to rather desire that they should go to the United States and look for opportunities there, than give their mental vigour, education and physical strength—which is second to none in the world—to developing our own province of British Columbia and building up our own country for our benefit as well as theirs. It is said you cannot get white labour in British Columbia, but how can you expect to get it when you put it in competition with labour under conditions that it cannot compete with, that you would not want it to compete with, and that it would not be white labour if it did compete with. You do not want your sons to go to British Columbia and compete with men who live, as the hon. member for New Westminster has shown, like pigs. If they would compete with these men, they would have to sleep and eat and live as pigs. You do not want them to compete with such men, and therefore you do not want to have such men there. You cannot have that field for the work and the advantage of your sons and daughters if you allow it to be occupied by Chinamen and Japanese.

I do not know what particular objection there is to an exclusion Act with regard to the Chinese. It seems to me that in view of what is going on at present in China, where the Chinese have no difficulty about passing very drastic exclusion Acts affecting British subjects, there should be no difficulty on our part or hesitation in passing any exclusion Act we may see fit with regard to them. As to the Japanese being a different or better people, I do not care whether they are or not a great deal better people than we are. I will admit, if you like, for the sake of argument, that they are, but they are not our people, they do not belong to our civilization, they do not strengthen our country, and we are here for ourselves and not for them. Let them be as good or as bad as you like, inasmuch as they displace our people, we do not want them. We want our people in British Columbia to build up in that province such a country as we have here, and we cannot have that if the labour field is to be monopolized by Chinese and Japanese who live under conditions that our people cannot compete with.

that we have educated them not to compete with, and that we do not want them to compete with, and would not have them compete with even if they could.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think the House will agree with me that this amendment cannot be accepted. If the mover will look at section 12 of the Bill, he will find that a great many of the exclusions he has introduced in his amendment are to be found there. That is to say, paupers, idiots, persons suffering from loathsome or contagious diseases, prostitutes, and so on, are to be excluded under the provisions of the Bill and when we come to that subject. I have no objection to add other similar exceptions which may be needed to carry out the spirit of the Act. The amendment is to be extended to the Japanese by submitting them to an educational test. On a former occasion I gave the reason why the government could not agree to adopt this policy, especially at the present juncture. It is not because if we adopted that policy we would go against any treaty obligation of Britain at present. That is not the view I took or would like the House to take; but if we were to adopt this policy, everybody must admit that it might seriously jeopardize the good relations which to-day exist between Great Britain and Japan, and which it is almost impossible to preserve at this juncture. That is a reason which, I am sure, ought to convince even my hon. friend who has just addressed the House that we should proceed very slowly before doing anything which might in any way affect the good relations that now exist between Great Britain and Japan. On a former occasion, I stated that this was a question as to which we should proceed very slowly. I made a great difference between China and Japan in that respect. In so far as Japan is concerned, I have to call the attention of the House, and the members from British Columbia especially, to the fact that Japan and its government have themselves taken the initiative in this respect and actually restricted immigration from Japan to Canada. The *Evening Post* of New York contained an article on this subject, which has been reproduced in the weekly edition of that paper, the *New York Nation*, and which I might read to the House as an evidence of what I am now saying:

The government of Japan has been obliging enough to relieve some of the authorities in this country and in the Dominion of Canada from an embarrassing problem. The influx of Japanese in British Columbia and in the state of Washington has recently become so large as to disturb the labour market on the Pacific coast, and to arouse very emphatic demands from the labour unions for the prohibition of immigration. Neither Great Britain nor the United States could comply with these demands, and the government of the former power has been obliged to nullify some of the measures proposed by the legislature of British Columbia. The Japanese government has now relieved the situa-

Mr. OLIVER.

tion here by issuing an order which will reduce the number of its subjects emigrating to this country to insignificant proportions; for which relief the demagogues of this continent should express much thanks. Henceforth not more than five persons in a month may emigrate to the United States from any of the forty-seven prefectures in Japan, and not more than ten will be permitted to go to Canada. The immigration to the Pacific coast has been so large as to make it probable that it has been artificially stimulated, and the action of the Japanese government, although arbitrary, may be for the interest of those of its subjects who are now in this country.

This is the actual order issued by the Japanese government restricting the number of emigrants to Canada to ten per month, or one hundred and twenty per year. In the face of this condition of things, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) will find that it is not necessary to adopt an amendment which, if adopted, might lead to serious international difficulties, and which, if not adopted will not affect the case as the point is covered already by the action taken by the Japanese government. When we come to section 12. I may be prepared to suggest an amendment which will meet the views of my hon. friend. But I think the House ought not to accept the amendment.

Mr. MAXWELL. I would like to mention just one point. And, by the way, I was sorry to see the acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Foster) dumb on such an important matter as is now before the House. I think the very people of British Columbia will look to the hon. gentleman for an expression of his views. He has had a good deal to say in an indirect way in regard to the action of the government, but I have failed to hear him make any statement of his own views on this question. I am afraid he is not ready to express his real sentiments. But I rose to say one word which will give an idea of the number of Japanese in British Columbia. I wrote to the inspector of fisheries asking how many licenses had been given to Japanese last season, and he said the number was about 900. That means that 1,800 Japanese were employed on the Fraser River last year, which, according to the argument of my hon. friend from Alberta, which I think was a proper argument, that 1,800 white people were deprived of a living on the river last year. I do not think that it is at all fair or desirable that such a state of things should exist. Besides, I received a letter not long ago—it was not written to me, but it was sent to me—of a Japanese in Vancouver who wrote to all the employers of labour there that if they wanted skilled or unskilled labour he would be happy to supply them with any number of workmen they required, at any wages. That also is unfair to our workingmen; for it is not hard to see that if these men are employed, white men must be set aside to make way for the Japanese labourers. I appreciate what

the Japanese government are doing, and I suppose they are in earnest as to the restriction put on these gentlemen at the present time. But the point is that the door is open, and, if labour troubles arise in British Columbia, the employer of labour can go to the Japanese consul in Vancouver and make arrangements by which, perhaps in one month, a thousand or two thousand can be brought into British Columbia, with no possibility under the law of preventing them.

The PRIME MINISTER. When we come to section 12, I am prepared to deal with that feature of the case.

Amendment (Mr. Morrison) negatived.

On section 5,

Mr. FOSTER. What is proposed as the machinery for carrying this out?

The PRIME MINISTER. We have the same machinery at the present time. That is to say the chief control will be with the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, and there will be the customs officers as there are at the present time.

Mr. MAXWELL. Would it not be possible to put in charge to look after this business, some man on the coast?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not prepared to say yes or no at present. My attention had not been called to the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has said no, as he proposes to keep as controller, the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, and to use, as he says, the officers who have already been used. I think that these officers are in a better position to fairly enforce the law even than officers who might receive the high distinction of the recommendation of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell), who has just taken his seat. A man who is free from the exciting passions of the coast would probably do better than one who is too near the source of heat there.

Mr. MAXWELL. That is where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is wrong, because there is no man more liable to superior influence than the collector of customs. He is brought into contact directly with the men who are most interested in having these immigrants brought in. We want a man distinctly free, a man who can deal with these things fairly as between man and man.

On section 6,

Mr. PRIOR. Before that passes, I would like, if possible, to move an amendment. I know that it is not quite in order unless the government sanctions it; but if they would allow it, I would move, after the word 'tax' in the 11th line, to strike out the words

'one hundred dollars,' and insert the words 'five hundred dollars' instead.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is out of order.

Mr. PRIOR. If it is out of order, and the government will not allow me to move it, I can only give notice that on the third reading of the Bill I will move that the Bill be referred back to the committee to make this amendment.

The PRIME MINISTER. It would be out of order then too.

Mr. ELLIS. What do the words, 'irrespective of allegiance' in this section mean?

The PRIME MINISTER. These words are new; they are intended to meet a difficulty that has always been found in the carrying out of the Act. Unless these words are inserted, Chinamen coming always claim that they are British subjects. There are a few Chinamen who are British subjects, but at all events, we do not want to have the claim raised under any circumstances. If he is of Chinese origin that disqualifies him.

Mr. ELLIS. Even if he is a British subject?

The PRIME MINISTER. We do not want to entertain the claim.

Mr. PRIOR. The right hon. gentleman has informed me that the amendment I proposed is out of order, but could I not beg of him to allow me to put it to the House? This is a very serious matter. He has heard what has been said by the British Columbia members, and I think he might allow it to be submitted.

The PRIME MINISTER. I find it is always safer to adhere to the rules of the House. To meet the views of the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), I move to amend section 6 by inserting after the words 'merchants, their wives and children,' the words 'the wives and children of clergymen.'

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. gentleman for Eastern Assiniboia mentioned two cases, one the case of a Chinese woman who married a clergyman, and the other a Chinese woman who married some one else not a clergyman.

The PRIME MINISTER. Suppose a clergyman is married to a white wife there is no exclusion; but if he happens to be married to a Chinese wife, then this amendment is proposed to meet that case. A Chinese woman could not be admitted, but if she is found to be the wife of a white clergyman, then she can be admitted.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you do with a Chinese man who marries a white woman?

The PRIME MINISTER. There are none, I understand, in British Columbia.

Mr. PRIOR. No, we have not got to that yet.

On section 7,

Mr. MORRISON. I move, in amendment, that in the first line after the word 'Chinese' the words 'or Japanese' be added. Whether Japanese or Chinese, they should be prevented from huddling together as these people do. I think the ships should be restrained from bringing excessive numbers of passengers aboard. These vessels can only carry Chinese or Japanese as immigrants, and from a sanitary standpoint the Japanese should be included. The extract I read a little while ago shows the great numbers that come in on a single ship.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to press the amendment at the present time. We will reserve it for consideration a little later.

Mr. PUTTEE. There is a necessity for this, because the steamship companies are trying in every way to avoid the clause restricting the number of passengers. I noticed a vessel arrive lately with Chinese, and they were shipped as freight so as to avoid the laws.

The PRIME MINISTER. I propose to add to subsection 7 the following amendment:

(2) No Chinese immigrants shall be allowed to land or enter Canada coastwise or overland arriving in transitu from any port or place in America ex any vessel entering at such port or place, in excess of the number which would have been allowed to land from such vessel had it come direct to Canada.

I may say that this amendment has been suggested by Mr. Parmalee, the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has made to me a communication on the subject.

Amendment agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER. I move that in line 5 of section 7, \$200 be substituted for \$100.

Motion agreed to.

On section 10,

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a new provision, which is intended to apply to Chinamen coming into the country on a railway train. In line 33 I propose to strike out the word 'duty.' It is merely a verbal correction.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 11,

The PRIME MINISTER. This section is intended to apply to Chinamen entering the country on foot, jumping the boundary line, as many of them do. As I stated at an earlier stage of the debate, Chinamen have

Mr. FOSTER.

three modes of coming into the country. They come in by sea direct, by railway or vehicle, or they walk in. We have a provision for every one of these modes, and this section is to apply to Chinamen who walk in over the boundary line. I propose to amend it in this way: Strike out the words 'railway train or car,' and put in the word 'vehicle.' The word 'vehicle' is defined in section 1.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 12,

The PRIME MINISTER. I propose some alteration in this section. First of all, the section which is included as to the restriction of Chinese immigration might very well apply as an amendment to the Immigration Act. It is quite proper that we should exclude paupers, idiots, sick persons and prostitutes. There is already a provision to that effect in the Immigration Act, section 17, subsection 2, which is as follows:

If, on examination, there is found among such passengers any lunatic, idiotic, deaf and dumb, blind or infirm person, not belonging to any immigrant family, and such person is, in the opinion of the medical superintendent, likely to become permanently a public charge, the medical superintendent shall forthwith report the same officially to the collector of customs at the port at which the vessel is to be first entered, who shall (except in the cases in which it is hereinafter provided that such bond may be dispensed with), require the master of the vessel, in addition to the duty payable for the passengers generally, to execute jointly and severally, with two sufficient sureties, a bond to Her Majesty, in the sum of \$300 for every such passenger so specially reported, conditioned to indemnify and save harmless the government of Canada, and of any province in Canada, every municipality, municipal corporation, village, city, town, county and charitable institution within the same, from any expense or charge incurred within three years from the execution of the bond, for the maintenance and support of any such passenger.

This provision is already very stringent, still, I would have no objection, at a future session, to make it as stringent as it is in this Bill, but, as this Bill simply deals with the Chinese, I propose this amendment: In the 11th line after the word 'person' insert 'of Chinese origin.' I propose to fill in the blank left for the amount of the penalty with the words 'two hundred dollars,' and the blank for the imprisonment with the word 'six,' so that there shall be a penalty not exceeding \$200 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months. I promised my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) that I would deal with the question which he had in his mind as to the number of Japanese immigrants who may come in at any time or at any time of stringency in the labour market in defiance of the order of the Japanese government. At the present time, under the order recently issued by the Japanese government, only 120 can come in during the year, that is

twelve a month. But it may be possible that at a time when there may be, perhaps, a restriction in the labour market some designing person might send over and bring in a lot of Japanese immigrants. I propose to add this section :

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, make such regulations as are necessary to prohibit the entry into Canada of any greater number of persons from any foreign country than the laws of any such country permit to emigrate to Canada.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 15,

Every master or conductor of any vessel or vehicle bringing Chinese immigrants to any port or place in Canada shall be personally liable to Her Majesty for the payment of the tax imposed by this Act in respect of any immigrant carried by such vessel or vehicle, and shall deliver, together with the total amount of such tax, to the controller, immediately on his arrival in port and before any of his crew or passengers disembark, a complete and accurate list of his crew and passengers, showing their names in full, the country and place of their birth, and the occupation and last place of domicile of each such immigrant passenger.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are some amendments to this section which the committee will understand at once. I propose in the first line to erase the words 'or conductor,' and the words 'or vehicle.' This section will then read.

Every master of any vessel, &c.

The reason why I do this is that we have provided already in section 10 for the liability of the conductor of a vehicle. This is simply for the sake of clearness. In line 4. I propose to add the word 'such' to make it clearer, so that it will read :

For the payment of the tax imposed by this Act in respect of any such immigrant, &c.

The words 'any immigrant' may be liable to misconstruction. In the fifth last line of this section I wish to insert after the word 'or' and before the word 'passengers,' the word 'Chinese,' so as to make it read 'and before any of his crew or Chinese passengers disembark.'

Mr. PRIOR. Why not put in the word 'Chinese' before the word 'crew,' so as to make it read 'and before any of his Chinese crew or passengers disembark' ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Very good ; we will insert that. In line 50, I wish to insert after the word 'and' the word 'such,' so as to make it read 'and before any of his crew or such passengers disembark.'

On section 17,

Persons of Chinese origin may pass through Canada by railway, in transit, from one port or place out of Canada to another port or place out of Canada without payment of the tax provided for by section 6 of this Act, provided that such passage is made in accordance with, and

under such regulations as are made for the purpose ; and any railway company which undertakes to transport such persons through Canada, and fails to comply with such regulations, or to take such persons out of Canada at the designated port of exit within            days from the date of their entry into Canada, shall be subjected to a penalty equal to double the total amount of the tax payable under the provisions of section 6 of this Act.

Mr. ELLIS. I would ask the Prime Minister if this section is sufficiently broad to permit vessels coming from the West Indies with Chinese, to enable these Chinese to take the Canadian Pacific Railway across the continent ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think the clause is all right. The deputy minister informs me that so far no occasion has arisen to meet the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis). In the last four lines of this section, I would strike out the words 'days from the date of their entry into Canada,' and substitute the words 'within a period to be fixed by the chief controller.' This section is in effect the same as section 2 of the Act of 1887, the wording having been changed somewhat so as to more effectually meet the requirements as shown by thirteen years experience, and it is suggested that the blank space be filled by inserting the words 'within a period to be fixed by the chief controller.'

Amendment agreed to.

On section 18,

1. Every person of Chinese origin who wishes to leave Canada, with the declared intention of returning thereto, shall give written notice of such intention to the controller of the port or place whence he purposes to sail or depart, in which notice shall be stated the foreign port or place which such person wishes to visit, and the route he intends taking both going and returning, and such notice shall be accompanied by a fee of one dollar; and the controller shall thereupon enter in a register to be kept for the purpose the name, residence, occupation and description of the said person, and such other information regarding him as is deemed necessary, under such regulations as are made for the purpose.

2. The person so registered shall be entitled on his return, if within six months of such registration, and on proof of his identity to the satisfaction of the controller (as to which the decision of the controller shall be final) to free entry as an exempt or to receive from the controller the amount of the tax, if any, paid by him on his return; but if he does not return to Canada within six months from the date of such registration, he shall, if returning after that date, be subject to the tax payable under the provisions of section 6 of this Act in the same manner as in the case of a first arrival.

Mr. CHARLTON. It has been represented that this period of six months is, under the circumstances, too short. When Chinamen, returning home, reach China, they have not the facilities for travelling in that country that we have here, and they are consequently delayed. The representation has been

made to me by an intelligent Chinaman in this city, that this period of six months does not afford sufficient time for a Chinaman to return home, visit his friends and do whatever work he has to do. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that the period should be made twelve months.

Mr. MORRISON. One of the greatest difficulties in California was with regard to Chinamen going home and returning. It was proved conclusively that a great percentage of these people who got the certificates sold them to others in China and did not return themselves. The longer they stayed in China the greater the difficulty in detecting this fraud. I would point out that the furthest point from Vancouver to which these Chinamen return would be Hong Kong, and that can be reached by steamer. If there is some cogent reason given in a particular case, it might be left to the discretion of the controller to extend the time.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. How long does it take from Vancouver?

Mr. MORRISON. Twenty-one days to Hong Kong, but Shanghai and other points are nearer. It is a notorious fact that a great many of these Chinamen sell their certificates in China and do not return here.

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me that so far as this fraud may be committed, it makes very little difference whether the period is six months or twelve months. The authorities must exercise due caution to prevent fraud of this kind. But on the face of it, this law provides certain regulations for the Chinaman who desires to go home to China, and return to British Columbia or Canada; and we start out with the supposition that he acts in good faith, not that he intends to commit fraud by sending another man in his place. It takes twenty-five days to reach Hong Kong; but his home may be in the interior, and when he reaches Hong Kong or Shanghai—for China is a vast empire, and it has not the means of communication that we have in this country—he may have to go to his home in a junk, or on foot, and, after his visit, return the same way; and it may take him the whole six months to go and return. I do not suppose the government wishes to inflict any hardship on these people beyond what the Bill is intended to impose, and I think it will make no difference if we substitute twelve months for six months. Give the poor fellow time enough to go home and return, and do not make the conditions any harder, for they are hard enough.

Mr. MAXWELL. I may say I have no particular objection to an extension of time. I am sure we are all perfectly willing to help them in any way we possibly can. They must be pretty well off individuals, if they

Mr. CHARLTON.

are able to take such a trip, and spend so much time on their way.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If it takes twenty-one days to go out and twenty-one days to return, it seems to me that with all the restrictions contained in this Bill, the time should be extended. Six months would be almost useless. As the hon. member for North Norfolk has stated, the means of communication in that country are very different from what they are in our country, or in any European country, and travelling is very slow. It seems to me that with the restrictions which you have placed upon their leaving the country and returning, you had better make the time twelve months.

The PRIME MINISTER. Carried—twelve months.

Mr. PRIOR. As the object of the Bill is to keep Chinamen out of the country, it seems to me that extending the time to twelve months is going in the wrong direction. As the hon. member for New Westminster stated, it is almost impossible to distinguish these Chinamen from each other. The consequence is that when a man goes back to China, he is nearly always personated by a new man who comes in his place, and gets in without paying the tax. Instead of making the time twelve months in place of six months, I think it would be better to strike out the whole clause altogether, so that if they go out of the country, they will have to pay the tax to come in again.

Bill reported.

#### SUPPLY—INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, to the fact that I have not yet received the return with reference to the purchase of hay for the British government. I would also like to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the fact that I have not received those canteen papers yet.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, if he could not give me some indication of what letters he wants, as there is a great mass of correspondence from all parts of the country. If he wants the letters from New Brunswick, or from any other part of the country, I shall be glad to get them copied. I have several clerks at work on the return, but if he wants all the correspondence, it will take some time; but I shall be glad to meet his views in any way I can, if he will indicate to me what particular letters he wants.

**Mr. FOSTER.** What I want is the correspondence relating to the appointment of persons to purchase hay, the prices paid, what hay they purchased, and generally the information which was ordered by the House. I do not see how I can pick out from unknown correspondence what I want. The minister himself will know exactly what I do want. I want everything that will throw light on the purchase of this hay. If the hon. minister will do the New Brunswick portion up and bring it down, he will facilitate the work that much, but it is not simply that I want.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I will bring some papers down just as soon as they are ready, and the hon. gentleman will then see what more he wants.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** I will bring the papers asked for down to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Department of Militia and Defence, including E. F. Jarvis at \$1,600, H. D. J. Lane and J. B. Donaldson at \$1,450 each, and G. W. Young at \$700, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act..... \$44,670

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** I think, perhaps, in view of the prominence which has been given to military matters during the past few months, not only in this country, but in the empire at large, it is advisable that I should make a statement with reference to the condition of our militia force and give a somewhat detailed historical account of the events, not only of the past few months, but of the past four years during which I have held the position of Minister of Militia. Perhaps it may be desirable that I should go back a short time and review very briefly the militia of Canada from a historical point of view. In the first place, the *raison d'être* of the militia of this country is twofold. First, and chiefly, for purposes of defence against a possible enemy from the outside. Secondly, for the maintenance of public order within the country itself. That is, for the purpose of assisting the civil power when such assistance may be required. Every self-respecting country must provide means of defence, and in each country, as it grows and develops, the responsibilities of defence increase. In Canada to-day, the responsibilities of the government with reference to the question of defence are greater than they ever were in the past. Any one who will take the trouble—not going further back than the date of confederation, 1867—of looking at the history of the militia, will admit at once that the objects I have just mentioned, for which the militia was organized, have been fully met and fully served. I need only mention the fact of the Fenian

raids which were made upon this country just about the time of confederation, 1866-7, and 1870-1, and the two North-west rebellions, to show that the Canadian militia is quite equal to the task of defending this country both against foreign invasion, threatened from the outside, and the rebellions which unfortunately took place within our own country. What has happened too within the past seven or eight months, I think, has justified in the highest degree the expectations of the men who established the militia of Canada, and has given the people of Canada great cause for congratulation. To have fitted out, within the short space of fourteen or fifteen days, a force of over 1,000 men, and despatched them fully equipped on a long journey six or seven thousand miles to assist in the Imperial war in South Africa was a deed of which, I think, the Department of Militia, and the country at large, have a right to be proud.

The first contingent was decided upon, and the general orders for its assembling issued on the 14th day of October. On the 30th of October that contingent sailed from the historical city of Quebec. The second contingent was decided upon in the month of December, and had it not been for the unfortunate mishap that the transport ship which had been engaged, was found to be unfit owing to an outbreak of fever on board, the second contingent would have set sail during the month of January.

**Mr. McALISTER.** When did it sail?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** A portion in the month of January, but the balance some time in February. Three transports had been chartered, and the largest one of the three was prevented from sailing in January, but did sail, I think, about the middle of February. One of the transports sailed on the 19th or 20th January, and the other on the 25th or 26th. Then again, there was Strathcona's Horse—although the idea was conceived by the generosity of Lord Strathcona, and the expenses paid by him, nevertheless the work of organizing that force devolved upon the Department of Militia, a duty which its employees were glad to undertake, and which they cheerfully performed.

I have here some statements as to the dates on which the orders were given for the recruiting of these contingents and the dates on which they set sail, and perhaps it may be desirable to put these on record. But I wish, before proceeding to that, to say this—that, in making the preparations for the sending out of the contingents at the very outset it was considered to be desirable that they should be entirely representative of the militia of the country and of every district in the country. And so, before the general orders were issued in October, the whole question was very carefully looked into from this point of view, and opportunities were given to every dis-

trict to send its fair quota in proportion to the number of the militia in that district. I am happy to say that, in every district of the Dominion, the difficulty we had was not to get recruits, not to get officers, but was to select from among those who were so willing to go forward. In this way we have a representation in South Africa of every portion of the Dominion. And I felt that this was important for a reason beyond the sentimental idea of having every part of the Dominion represented. I felt there was a practical idea connected with it; and that was that the men who were allowed to go there and who would return to their respective homes, would, on coming back and rejoining their old corps have a beneficial effect on the militia from one end of the country to the other. And as with the men, so with the officers. Representatives were permitted to go from every part of the Dominion. And so, when this war is happily over, and our friends return to Canada, men from every part of the Dominion and connected with almost every corps in Canada of the acting militia, men who have seen service, will return to their duties with renewed energy and renewed interest, and the militia of Canada will profit by their experience. The first contingent was recruited by companies as follows:

- 'A.' British Columbia and Manitoba.
- 'B.' London.
- 'C.' Toronto.
- 'D.' Ottawa and Kingston.
- 'E.' Montreal.
- 'F.' Quebec.
- 'G.' New Brunswick.
- 'H.' Nova Scotia.

The regiment was concentrated at Quebec by the 29th of October, and it embarked on the ss. *Sardinian* on the 30th of October. The strength was 41 officers, 978 non-commissioned officers and men, 7 horses. Now, with reference to the second contingent, some criticism was made from the extreme east, and, I think, from the extreme west, of the Dominion because men were not accepted from certain districts. The reason is plain. We were sending mounted men, cavalry and artillery, exclusively, and it was felt that, as in the case of the first contingent, we were limiting ourselves to the infantry in drawing men and officers for that contingent, it was only fair to the cavalry and mounted troops and artillery that we should follow the same course with regard to them in the case of the second contingent and draw the men only from those corps that were already in existence. So it came about that some hardship was felt in some portions of the Dominion. But that is the reason I then gave and that I give now; and it is a reason which, I think, under the circumstances, will be considered a sound one. So far as British Columbia is concerned, any loss of opportunity which may have been felt there was amply made up in the organization of Lord Strathcona's

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Horse, which was recruited from Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia. I think that to-day our friends in British Columbia are as well represented on the battlefields of South Africa as any portion of the Dominion—in fact, I am not sure that they have not a larger representation than any other province according to the population. The orders for the organization of the second contingent (the Canadian Mounted Rifles and Brigade Division of Field Artillery) were given on the 20th of December, 1899. The squadrons and batteries were enrolled as follows:

#### First Battalion Mounted Rifles.

'A' Squadron.—First troop, Toronto; second troop, Toronto, St. Catharines; third troop, Peterborough, Ottawa, Montreal; fourth troop, London, Kingston.

'B' Squadron.—First troop, Winnipeg; second troop, Portage la Prairie, Virden, Brandon, Yorkton, Winnipeg; third troop, Montreal, Quebec, Cookshire; fourth troop, Sussex, N.B., St. John, N.B., Canning, N.S.

'C' and 'D' squadrons, 2nd battalion Mounted Rifles, were enrolled and concentrated under arrangements made by the commissioner, North-west Mounted Police, North-west Territories and British Columbia.

#### Brigade Division, Field Artillery.

Batteries were enrolled and concentrated as follows:

'C'.—Kingston, Gananoque, Winnipeg, Hamilton, St. Catharines, Toronto, concentrated at Kingston.

'D'.—Guelph, Ottawa, London, Port Hope, concentrated at Ottawa.

'E'.—Quebec, Montreal, Granby, Woodstock, Newcastle, Sydney, concentrated at Quebec.

This force embarked as follows: 'D' and 'E' batteries and the brigade staff on ss. *Laurentian*, 21st of January, 1900; the 2nd battalion, Canadian Mounted Rifles, on ss. *Pomeranian*, 27th January, 1900. The ss. *Montezuma*, which was chartered to convey 'C' battery and the 1st battalion, Canadian Mounted Rifles, and was expected to sail the 20th of January, was, owing to being placed in quarantine, not used. The ss. *Milwaukee* was chartered in her place. She arrived at Halifax on the 6th of February and sailed 21st of February. The strength of the contingent was as follows:

Canadian Mounted Rifles.—Officers, 38; N.-C. officers and men, 704; horses, 750.

Brigade Division of Artillery.—Officers, 19; N.-C. officers and men, 520; horses, 427.

The orders for the organization of Lord Strathcona's Horse were issued on the 1st of February, 1900. The force was recruited in British Columbia, the North-west Territories and Manitoba. It was concentrated at Ottawa, where it came under military control on the 24th of February, and embarked from Halifax on the ss. *Monterey*

on the 17th of March. The strength was : Officers, 28 ; other ranks, 512 ; with 599 horses. We sent a further number of about 100 men to make up for losses which had by that time occurred in the first contingent. The orders for the organization of this force were issued on the 8th of March, 1900. And the recruiting was apportioned as follows : Toronto 20, Kingston 10, Montreal 10, Ottawa 10, St. John, N.B., 10, Halifax, 15, Charlottetown 15, Quebec 10. They concentrated at Halifax on the 13th of March—orders issued, as I have said, on the 8th of March. They embarked on the steamship *Monterey* on the 17th of March. The strength was : Officers 3, other ranks 101.

In order to fully cover the ground as to what has been done, either directly or growing out of the South African trouble, I must refer to the organization of a battalion to replace a portion of the Imperial Garrison in the city of Halifax. Owing to the unexpected requirements in South Africa, it was found necessary to send off a portion of the Imperial garrison from the city of Halifax. The Canadian government, with the approval of this House, at once offered to the Imperial government to replace the infantry regiment at Halifax with Canadian volunteers, and to that end a general order was issued on the 5th of March for the organization of a temporary battalion to replace the Imperial garrison there. The companies were recruited as follows :

- (a) Orders for organization were issued March 5, 1900.
- (b) The companies were recruited as follows:
  - 'A.' Right half, British Columbia ; left half, Manitoba.
  - 'B.' London, military district No. 1.
  - 'C.' Toronto, military district No. 2.
  - 'D.' Right half, Kingston military district Nos. 3 and 4; left half, Ottawa brigade.
  - 'E.' Montreal, military district No. 5.
  - 'F.' Right half, military district No. 6; left half, military district No. 7.
  - 'G.' Three sections St. John military district No. 8; one section, Charlottetown military district No. 12.
  - 'H.' Halifax, military district No. 9.

(c) The battalion, with the exception of the right half of 'A' company, which was detailed to assist in garrisoning Esquimalt, B.C., was taken over by the lieutenant-general commanding at Halifax on April 2.

(d) Strength : Officers, 29 ; N.-C. officers and men, 975; horses, 4.

RECAPITULATION.

	Officers.	N.-C. Officers and Men.	Horses.
First contingent.....	41	978	7
Excess .....	..	20	...
Second contingent, C.M.R.....	38	704	750
"    "    Artillery.....	19	520	227
Strathcona's Horse .....	25	512	548
"    "    Excess .....	3	...	51

Recapitulation—Con.

	Officers.	N.-C. Officers and Men.	Horses.
Reinforcements, first contingent..	3	101	...
Artificers for duty with Imperial forces .....	..	21	...
Third (special service) Battalion, R. C. R.....	29	975	4
Officers for instructional purposes, or to be attached in excess of establishment .....	15	...	...
Chaplains .....	6	...	...
Nurses .....	8	...	...
Postal corps .....	1	4	...
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>3,835</b>	<b>1,787</b>

Now, I would point out that during the North-west rebellion the total number of officers, men and horses sent to the North-west, was 251 officers, 3,042 non-commissioned officers and men, and 141 horses. It will be seen, therefore, that the forces equipped after the 14th day of October, and who were either on the way to South Africa or stationed at Halifax or Esquimalt, were very much in excess of the total number of officers and men sent forward to the North-west during the rebellion—800 more men, and 1,650 more horses. I mention this, not with any desire of making an invidious comparison, but merely to show that the work which was done exhibits the fact that the militia force of this country is a live and effective institution, that it has developed since 1885, and has done work which I am sure meets with the full approbation of every one in this country who takes an interest in military affairs.

Now, it is scarcely necessary for me to make any remarks as to the manner in which our troops have acquitted themselves in South Africa. That matter has been discussed here over and over again. The fact is that what they have done there is beyond and above what any weak words of mine could express. They have done all that could be expected of them, and that is saying a great deal. They have done all that could be expected from men of brains, men of strong muscle and strong endurance, men fitted by our mode of life in this country and by our climate to distinguish themselves in military service. We all desired that the Imperial authorities should show their confidence in our troops by giving them opportunities. There were critics here in the newspapers who said, when our first contingent was despatched, that they would be kept somewhere in the background doing garrison duty ; but we find that at the very earliest moment our men were given the opportunity that they were longing for, and so we have had a long list of actions in which our men have taken a distinguished

part. The first great opportunity they had was at Paardeberg, where they were complimented by Lord Roberts himself. At Kroonstadt, later on, in the advance from Bloemfontein, our Mounted Rifles distinguished themselves, and they have been distinguishing themselves continuously from the date of the commencement of the march from Bloemfontein towards Pretoria. Again at Pretoria they were on hand, and, with the Australians and other colonial troops, contributed their important share to the capture of the Transvaal capital. So it was at Mafeking. We have the story of one of the most important and most extraordinary marches that ever occurred in the march of the Artillery under Major, now Lieut.-Col. Hudon, from Beira, to assist at the relief of Mafeking, and it is a matter of record that the part taken there by Canadians was of the utmost importance. So, I say, I think we have every right to feel entirely satisfied with the work which our troops have done in South Africa. Strathcona's Horse, coming upon the scene later in the day, have not had the same opportunity, but now we find that they have been given a prominent place, and to-day we hear that they are at the front with Gen. Buller at the moment when he is making an important junction with Lord Roberts. I have no doubt that under the able leadership of Col. Steele we shall very soon, if opportunity offers, if the war continues, hear of brave deeds by the force supplied so generously by that great friend of Canada and that great friend of the empire, Lord Strathcona. In this connection, perhaps, I may be permitted to say a word or two as to the work which has been done by the Militia Department, here at headquarters, and the Militia Department generally in the different districts throughout the Dominion. I do not know that I can do better, Mr. Chairman, than to quote very briefly from the report of the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence :

Of the work done in the department during the year, that connected with the organization, equipping and despatch of the first contingent, and the organization and equipping of the second contingent was, in a way, the most important, and possessed a more absorbing interest than any feature relating to military operations carried on in connection with the permanent force, or with the drill or manoeuvres of the active militia.

I take this opportunity of assuring you that the loyalty and patriotic devotion to Britain evinced by Canadians of every creed and nationality, and wherever living, also existed to the fullest extent among the officials of the department.

The work of organizing and enrolling the contingents was carried out with zeal by the officers of the military branch of the department, efficiently aided by the district officers commanding and staff officers in the various military districts.

As intimated elsewhere herein, practically the whole of the clothing, the necessaries, the equip-

ment, &c., had to be purchased for the contingents and delivered to them within about two weeks.

To accomplish this the officials in the purchasing branch, in charge of Captain A. Benoit, worked early and late in a systematic and businesslike way that could not be excelled.

The distribution of the supplies, involving as it did a great amount of labour and exceptional care, was carried out very successfully by the stores branch, under the control of Lieut.-Col. Macdonald, chief superintendent of stores, who states that the officers of his branch spared neither time nor effort to thoroughly and rapidly do the work connected with the equipment of these forces.

The experience gained in connection with the sending out of the contingents, from the inception of the work until its completion, is regarded by the officers of all the branches of the department as having been of great advantage and service to them.

I cannot close this report without expressing my appreciation of the earnest co-operation I have received, throughout my first year as your deputy minister, from all the officials in the department. They have invariably discharged their duties in a most satisfactory and earnest manner. But I desire to especially refer to their willingness—I might say eagerness—to work with unremitting application in getting the contingents ready to go to South Africa. Night after night for weeks, some of the clerks in our department worked in their offices till a very late hour, and when necessity arose, they did not hesitate to come on Sundays and holidays; a number of them, in fact, cheerfully gave up both Christmas and New Year's Day to help to get their own particular work done and prevent delay. The work was done in a marvellously short time. That there was no hitch in the preparations nor any avoidable delay in the despatch of these troops, is due in a very great measure to the intelligent way in which this service was performed.

I take this opportunity of showing that I recognize and highly appreciate the zeal and efficiency displayed by the departmental staff in the discharge of their different duties.

I desire to add one word to this, and it is, that I endorse it absolutely. I was on the ground, and I had an opportunity of observing the unremitting zeal, as the deputy says, and the eagerness with which these men engaged in their duties. I never, in my life, saw or had to do with a more loyal and painstaking set of men than the men in the civil and military branches of my department. It was only necessary to suggest to them that something had to be done and they were ready to give to it their effort, their time and their attention without any thought of holidays or of the ordinary rest which they required. So, I most cheerfully endorse every word the deputy minister has said in reference to the efficient manner in which the officials of the Militia Department, both at headquarters and in the districts outside, have discharged their duties in connection with the despatch of these contingents.

It being six o'clock, the committee took recess.

### AFTER RECESS.

(The House resumed in committee.)

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). At six o'clock I was referring to the duties discharged by the officials of the Militia Department in connection with sending off the contingents to South Africa, and I expressed my entire approval of the terms in which the deputy minister's report has spoken of that work. I may add that no one who was not engaged in the midst of that work could have the slightest idea of the enormous increase of labour involved in it. From the moment the orders were first issued in October up to the present time, the work of the department has been abnormally increased, and that will continue until the last of our men have returned to their homes.

Now, Sir, I want, for a few minutes, to call attention—I think, perhaps, this is a most appropriate time to do it—to the charge which has been made in some quarters; in the press, in this House and elsewhere, to the effect that the present administration of the Militia Department is influenced largely by political considerations. I wish to give that insinuation—that statement boldly made in some instances—a flat contradiction, and to challenge any one in this House or out of it to prove the truth of any such assertion. I say that in the administration of the department, both here at Ottawa and in the outside service, politics has not exercised an undue or improper influence. Let me point to the personnel of the officers of the contingents. I assert that the officers in every single instance were chosen with reference specially and chiefly to their fitness, and so far as politics are concerned, it so happens, I believe, that a very considerable majority of the officers happen to belong to the Conservative party. The question may be asked: How does that occur? It has been sometimes the habit of our friends on the other side of the House to claim special ownership of all the patriotism and all the loyalty in this country, although, I think that to-day that claim will not be reasserted. Nevertheless, I have seen the statement made: That the reason there are a majority of Conservative officers on the contingent is because the Liberals did not volunteer. Well, Sir, that is not true. I believe that five men volunteered for every one we were able to accept, and I have no doubt that if the minister had been actuated by a desire simply to reward political friends it would have been quite possible for him to have found among the gentlemen who volunteered a sufficient number of Liberals to officer these contingents. But, as I say, we were not actuated by any such motives. I asked the officers at the head of the militia here to advise me as to the best men to fill these positions, and I think that in every single case their advice was followed. But, Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that in the militia

of Canada there is a larger number of officers belonging to the Conservative party than to the Liberal party, and the reason of that is as follows: Going back to the time of the reorganization of the militia after confederation, in 1868 and 1869, there was a Conservative government in power, and that Conservative government—I do not say wrongly; I do not say whether rightly or wrongly—the Conservative government then in power chose the officers to take charge of the different districts in Canada, and the officers to command the various regiments in Canada, largely out of their own party. And so, these officers, having the right under the regulations to select the captains and lieutenants under them, they chose a preponderance of Conservatives. That is a simple, plain statement of the truth. If there ever was any politics in the militia it was at the time that the reorganization of the militia took place in 1869. Now, I am here not only to say that there has been no politics, so far as the active militia is concerned, under the present administration, but I will say that there has been no undue interference on the part of past ministers of the governments which have preceded the present government. I venture to say that there has scarcely been an instance since 1869 down to the present date; I doubt if there has been a single instance in which a Minister of Militia has interfered with the regular course of promotions in the militia. I insist that that is the truth under the existing regime, and I am quite prepared to concede, knowing nothing to the contrary at the present time, that it was the custom under the rule of my predecessors.

Now, Sir, let me briefly analyse the appointments, or some of them, made in the militia since I took office. First, let me refer to the chief appointment, that of Adjutant General of Militia. When I came into office that position was vacant. The Assistant Adjutant General of Militia, Colonel Aylmer, was thoroughly familiar with the duties of the office of adjutant general, and I presume that if the late government had remained in power, they would have appointed him to the vacant position. By general consent, it was felt that he deserved the position, and he was appointed to it. Not on account of any political leaning. His family may be connected with the Liberal party; I believe they are; but that fact had nothing whatever to do in influencing the government to appoint him. Another important appointment which had to be made, was that of Assistant Adjutant General of Artillery. Instead of looking around for a political friend to fill that position, I asked General Gascoigne, then the General Officer Commanding, and another Imperial officer, to advise me as to the best man for the position. They agreed in recommending Lieutenant-Colonel Cotton, then district officer commanding at Kingston, and he was appointed.

Mr. PRIOR. You could not have got a better man.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I believe Colonel Cotton belongs to a Conservative family, and is himself a moderate Conservative. I do not care to inquire into that. He has been a very efficient officer, and I have never had any reason to regret his appointment. Then we had to appoint an Assistant Adjutant General. I again asked General Gascoigne to assist me. He took the list of officers of the permanent force, and from that list selected Lieutenant-Colonel Cartwright, who now fills that position. I believe that was an equally good appointment. In the outside service, we had to fill positions at Montreal, at Quebec, and at St. Johns, Que. We selected Colonel Gordon, who had been in charge of the school at Fredericton, to fill the important position of district officer commanding in the district of Montreal. Colonel Gordon was a life-long Conservative, belonging to a Kingston Conservative family, but he was selected on account of his fitness for the position, and I have had no occasion to regret his selection.

Mr. PRIOR. Was he not a junior?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, he was one of the seniors. Then we had to appoint a district officer commanding for the district of Quebec, and the selection we made, was the subject of some criticism. A gentleman was selected, who was, no doubt, quite a junior; I refer to Lieutenant-Colonel Pelletier, then, I think Captain Pelletier. This gentleman was selected by General Gascoigne, and the other officers of the staff here approved of that selection, and he was appointed. Lt.-Colonel Pelletier had distinguished himself in the North-west rebellion; and it was necessary to appoint a French Canadian. Although I have been criticised for having appointed so young a man, I have never heard any one yet say whom I should have appointed in place of Lieutenant-Colonel Pelletier. He is now in South Africa, distinguishing himself there as he distinguished himself in the North-west. I may say that the generals and staff at Ottawa have told me repeatedly that Lieut.-Colonel Pelletier is one of the brightest and most brilliant officers in the Canadian militia. Lieutenant-Colonel Roy, I believe, is a Conservative. He was selected on account of his fitness, for the position of district officer commanding at St. Johns, on the south side of the St. Lawrence River. He had had special opportunities of fitting himself by a course in England. It was necessary to have a French Canadian for that position also, and he was chosen by the staff, and recommended to me as a man eminently qualified for the place. I believe that the result has justified his selection. So I might go on; but suffice it to repeat, that in making my appointments, I have not

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

been actuated by political motives. I have not refused my political friends their chance; and, as I have said before in this House, where the qualifications and claims from a military standpoint are equal in any two cases, I should feel it my duty, under our system of government in this country, to give the place to a political friend; but I would consider that I was far from doing my duty, if I passed over a better qualified man, because he happened to be a Conservative, to give the place to a man who was not well qualified, because he happened to be a Liberal. In the department at Ottawa, we have advanced some clerks more rapidly than others. It so happens that the clerk of the Militia Department, who has been the most rapidly advanced, is the man who was private secretary to my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Patterson; I refer to Mr. Jarvis. I found him a second-class clerk; he is today a first-class clerk; and we have asked this House, session after session, to vote him special sums of money other than the statutory increase, because he is qualified, and because he is doing work for which, even with what we are giving him, I do not consider him fully or adequately paid. I will not detain the House longer on this point; but I thought it was only fair to myself to state that I have not been actuated by political considerations to the detriment of the service, and to challenge any one who has that opinion, to make it good. I may say, with reference to the permanent force, that when I came into office, I was told that every officer of that force, with two exceptions, was a Conservative. The two exceptions were Lieutenant-Colonel Pelletier and Lieutenant-Colonel Cartwright; and I believe that to my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), is due the honour—the fairness, at any rate—of having appointed those two officers. It is very undesirable that the militia, either the active or the permanent force, should be political in any special sense of the word. I think it is in the interests of the people and the militia of this country, that the force should be representative of every class of the people, and of both political parties. Since I came into office, I have appointed a great many men to the permanent force, and among these appointments, I think, at least half have been Conservatives—men belonging to well-known Conservative families.

After I had been in office a couple of years, I took the precaution to have certain regulations made controlling the appointments of officers to the permanent force, taking the appointments very largely out of the sphere of politics, so that today a man cannot be appointed to the permanent force unless he is under the age of 25, and unless he is a graduate of the Royal Military College or possesses a certificate of having matriculated at one of the chartered universities of Canada, and has

passed certain examinations in military work; so that in the future, if the regulations which became law on July 1, 1898, are followed out, we shall have, as a chief requisite to appointments to the permanent force, the military knowledge and skill and the experience which would justify such appointments.

I wish to call attention for a short time to the work which has been done in the department in addition to what I have already mentioned. The most prominent feature perhaps of the administration of the Militia Department during the last four years has been the adoption of the principle of annual drill for the whole of the militia. So far as it is possible to do that, we have had the whole force drilled every year since 1896. I felt, as an old militiaman, that it was of the first importance, in view of the short time—only twelve days—during which our militia are drilled, that we should have that drill annually, and that every corps should be turned out once a year for its regular drill, because under the old system of having the drill every other year, or every three years, it was found that the men lost all the benefit which they derived from their first twelve days drill. It is true that you cannot get the same men into camp every year, but you will get a larger percentage, when you have the annual drill, than you would under the old system. When you have the twelve days drill every year, you get far more for your money than if you leave an interval of one or two years between drills as was the case under the old system. In that connection the permanent force has been largely utilized in the camps to assist in the training of the active militia. This has also been very useful to the permanent force itself as well as an immense advantage to the officers and men of the active militia.

Another reform which has been carried out, but which was to some extent introduced by my predecessor, is the limiting of the term of commanding officers. Prior to the advent of the present administration to power, a regulation was passed limiting, in the case of all future appointments, the term of the command of a lieutenant-colonel to five years or at most to eight years. After looking carefully over the field and finding a large number of lieutenant-colonels who have been in command for terms running from ten to thirty years, I made up my mind—and I know that all the military men will not approve of this—upon the advice of the staff in Ottawa, that it would be wise to make the law retroactive, and that we should at once, as rapidly as possible, get rid of the lieutenant-colonels who had served over five years and give opportunities for promotion to those beneath them. Undoubtedly the most important thing in connection with the military force is to have thorough-

ly qualified officers, but under the old system this was absolutely impossible. Where you had men retaining command for twenty or thirty years, the majors and captains and lieutenants acting under them, perhaps fifty or sixty years of age, what chance was there of promotion, and what inducement was there either for young men to join the militia or for men to remain in it? Every man who accepts a commission from Her Majesty, if he is the right kind of man, looks forward to some day occupying a position of command. That is all there is in it for him, and that is the reward to which he should look forward. But under the old system, with a lieutenant-colonel remaining in command for life, and his major and captains and lieutenants under him, there was no chance, except when death occurred, for any promotion whatever. Now, by the present rule, the lieutenant-colonel goes out automatically at the end of five years, or at the most he may have eight years command. Then his major, if qualified succeeds him, and the junior major, and so on. Each one takes a step in advance until he reaches the top, so that every man who enters the militia now, no matter how young he may be, or how far down on the list, may fairly hope that the day will come when he will be rewarded for the time he has spent in the militia, by receiving either the command of the battalion itself or some higher position in the corps than the one he holds. I look upon this as one of the most important changes which have been made in the militia corps.

Then we have been endeavouring to carry out the enforcement of the age limit. The age limit of a lieutenant-colonel was sixty-three, and this has been reduced to sixty. I need not give the different limits of the different officers; but suffice it to say that at present, automatically, when the limit of age is reached, each officer goes on the reserve list; and let me say here that we have established what we call a reserve list, upon which the officers who have retired are placed, so that if an emergency should arise, they can be called upon, and that list is being increased every day. That list is composed of men who have had experience in command. If an emergency should arise we have to-day a very large number of competent officers at the disposal of the country. In addition to that, an unattached list has been established with largely the same object in view. So, as a result of what I have been speaking about, we have to-day in Canada a very much larger number of efficient and effective officers than we ever had before.

Another reform which has been carried out by the department in the last two years is the establishment of a cadet corps in connection with the high schools and the collegiate institutes in the province of Ontario. I do not say that we have originated this, but we have introduced new regulations

and have afforded very much greater facility than ever existed before. New regulations have been issued respecting cadet corps in collegiate institutes and high schools, and lately these have been extended to include public schools. This has led to the formation of a large number of cadet corps, which are feeders to the militia and are a great benefit in that they give lads a taste for soldiering. In June of last year regulations were promulgated for the formation of cadet battalions and cadet corps to be attached to existing battalions of militia. In special cases they may be formed independently of any existing corps. These corps are to consist of youths from fourteen to eighteen years. A few such corps have been already organized under this regulation; and in time a number of them will be formed. In the city of Montreal, I believe, there are two, and there are also some in Toronto. Steps have also been taken to organize engineer companies. We have today only two engineer companies in the whole Dominion, one in the province of New Brunswick, and one in Prince Edward Island. It is proposed to extend these to the universities. The University of McGill and the University of Toronto have indicated their willingness to co-operate and to facilitate in every way in their power the organization of engineer companies within these universities, and steps have been taken to that end. Instructions in Maxim gun drill have commenced. In 1898 the first instructions in Maxim gun drill were given in Canada, and it is now carried on in the various schools of instruction. A veterinary department has been authorized and, beginning with 1899, a course of instructions for veterinary officers was provided. Another important and novel change in the administration of the militia within the last four years has been the interchange of units of the permanent corps in Canada with units of the Imperial forces. In 1897 a company of the Royal Canadian Regiment of Infantry was exchanged with the Royal Berkshire Regiment stationed at Halifax, and, early in the next year, a company of the Royal Canadian Garrison Artillery was similarly exchanged with a company of the Royal Artillery. These interchanges have had happy results, particularly the first named, tending as they do to bring the militia into touch with the army.

Then we had, in 1898, a defence commission sitting here in Ottawa, composed of the following officers: Major-General Leach, president, Capt. White, R.N., Col. Dalton, Royal Artillery, and Major Lake, then Quartermaster General of Canada, East Lancashire Regiment. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) and myself represented the Canadian government as part of that commission. I cannot, of course, make public any of the recommendations which were made, but suffice it to say, that these gen-

tleman were eminently qualified for the work they were set to do, and they took the greatest pains to inform themselves as to the condition of affairs; and, to-day, the work which they did forms part of the Imperial defence system. And, so far as we have the means at our disposal, the Militia Department is endeavouring to carry out the recommendations made by that commission. Then, perhaps, I may be pardoned for mentioning as one of the things which has been accomplished under the present regime, the giving of a general service medal for Canada. In the early summer of 1898, Her Majesty the Queen was graciously pleased to approve a general service medal for Canada, to be bestowed upon those who have served in the defence of their country, and which has so far been given to those who served in repelling the Fenian raids of 1866 and 1870, and in quelling the rebellion of 1870. This medal, it is to be understood, is not simply, as it has been called, the 'Fenian raid medal,' but is a general service medal for Canada. In the future, whenever anything occurs that renders it proper to reward any meritorious act by the giving of a medal, this will be the medal to be bestowed. Of course, the particular operation for which it is given will be indicated by the clasp and the name. My hon. friends opposite, from time to time, were petitioned by the veterans of 1866 and 1870 and their friends to procure some recognition of the great services rendered in those two years. But, up to the time of the coming into power of the present government, no progress whatever had been made. There is nothing that has occurred during my administration which I feel prouder to have had some connection with than the fact that this medal, coming late though it does, has at last been granted and the services rendered by these men who fought for the very existence, we may say, of this country in 1866 and 1870, has been recognized. There is another matter in this connection to which I wish particularly to refer. Some years ago, the Imperial government gave to the volunteers of Great Britain a long-service medal. Attempts were made, from time to time, to procure for the militia of the colonies, and of Canada especially, a similar recognition. We claimed to have a force in Canada which, though called a militia, was essentially a volunteer force, and one more closely resembling the volunteer force of Great Britain than the militia of Great Britain. After a great deal of correspondence, and after a special board, appointed by the War Office, had looked into this matter, it was at last decided to grant the long service medal and decoration. And, during the past year, Her Majesty has been pleased to give long service decorations to officers of the colonial auxiliary forces, and a long-service medal for the men.

Regulations governing the issue of this decoration and medal to the Canadian militia

have been framed and forwarded to England for the approval of the right hon. the Secretary of State for War. As soon as these regulations have been finally approved, the necessary steps will be taken for the issue of the decoration and medal to officers and men entitled to them. I have already referred to the appointments to the permanent force. New regulations respecting appointments to the permanent force, requiring candidates to be within a certain age limit, twenty-five, and to be a graduate of the Royal Military College, and to be in possession of a long course certificate of qualification, and to have passed a literary examination, have been in force since July 1, 1898. These regulations are very strict, but they were necessary to ensure that appointments to the permanent corps are made from the best material available. Another important reform which has been recently brought into effect, is insisting that every field officer should take a course in equitation. We had in the past some extraordinary examples of the necessity for a course of this kind, and with the recommendation of the staff officers here, a little more than two years ago, that matter was taken up, and a regulation was passed, requiring all field officers and adjutants of battalions, infantry and rifles, to qualify in equitation, and requiring officers to hold equitation certificates to make them eligible for promotion in field rank, or for appointment as adjutant. This rule has been strictly adhered to from the time that regulation was made. Then another important reform which has been inaugurated is supplying professional schools of instruction. It was found to be a great hardship to compel officers who were busily engaged in the various walks of life to earn their living, to go away and spend a long time at the different depots. I do not say that this was not done before in any instance, but I say it has been done much more frequently during the past two or three years, than it ever was done before. Schools of that kind were established at Quebec, at Montreal, at Halifax, and I think St. John, N.B., and in addition, in the annual camps of instruction.

Early in 1897, regulations were promulgated, providing for the formation of provisional schools for infantry officers in centres, as might be required from time to time. A number of these schools have been held and in consequence a large number of officers have been enabled to obtain certificates, who would not have been able to do so otherwise.

Then the course of instruction has been somewhat modified at the different depots. In February, 1899, the duration of the short course of infantry instruction was reduced from three months to two. Officers reporting to undergo this course are now examined by a board, and if it is found they have no military training, they are required to undergo what is known as a cadet course. At the end of the cadet course, if they are

able to pass a prescribed examination, they are qualified for the appointment of lieutenant. They are also then eligible to undergo the short course. This change, in many cases, necessitates officers going twice to a school, where once sufficed before, but on the other hand, it provides that officers who have considerable knowledge of their duties will not be kept back by officers who know nothing.

Then another thing which I think worth mentioning in this connection, is the establishment of a band. An efficient band in connection with the garrison division of the Royal Canadian Artillery at Quebec, has been organized. We have now a really first-class band in connection with the permanent force, and the question of establishing courses of instruction in music for bandmasters and sergeants of bands, is under consideration. This will probably be undertaken at an early date. Bands, which are so essential in connection with our militia, will become more efficient, which will materially benefit the militia generally. I think my hon. friends opposite, who are interested in this matter will highly approve of this new departure. There is one other matter to which I would like to allude in some detail. I found, as my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) will know, that the medical branch of the militia service was very defective, as I think he will agree with me it always has been, through no fault of his own, I am sure. But it has so happened in this country that it has rather been the fashion to neglect that which is perhaps one of the most important branches of the service. I have been myself over thirty years connected with the medical branch of the service. I have been principal medical officer several times when my hon. friend was Minister of Militia and Defence, I think; and the reports of those days will show that medical men were calling attention to the fact that the outfit with which they were supplied in camp was altogether inadequate. I think, however, that during my hon. friend's tenure of office, the first real step toward improvement was made. I think when General Herbert was here, that some decided steps were taken, and I think my hon. friend was Minister of Militia at that time. At any rate it was begun at that time, long after it ought to have begun, and it has been carried on, I will not say to perfection, but very great strides have been made in the right direction during the last year.

In July, 1896, the medical service consisted of regimental medical officers only. The service was carried out in an unsatisfactory manner, without method or system. Few militia medical officers had any conception of their military duties, besides those strictly pertaining to their civil profession. I may say it was not their fault, they had not had an opportunity up to that time. To be entirely fair, I may say that

under my hon. friend's regime, a system of lectures was undertaken, either in 1888 or 1889. I remember that some of the principal medical officers from the depots were sent out from the camp, and delivered courses of lectures to the medical men there. I had the pleasure myself of attending one course of such lectures at Aldershot, and the equipment of panniers, &c., shown there was of a very satisfactory character. But it was nothing like a general system. In some military districts, however, some of the more zealous senior medical officers endeavoured to convey to their subordinates some insight of what a militia medical organization should be. The medical equipment was barely sufficient for the regiments of the annual camps of instruction. The necessity for a head for the militia medical service, to create an organization suited to our militia system, yet modern and closely in line with the Imperial medical service, which has proved itself so effective, was apparent. This officer would organize, direct, unify and administer it. He would be the headquarters, advising the military and civil branches on questions directly pertaining to the discipline, equipment, requirements and administration of the militia. Lieut.-Col. Neilson, an officer who I had reason to believe had large experience—who, I may say, was the gentleman who gave the course of lectures to which I refer in Nova Scotia camp in 1888, or 1889, and who was then, I think, the principal medical officer at Kingston or at Quebec—and had displayed already zeal and administrative ability, being also senior medical officer in the militia, was selected for this duty, and took up his duties at headquarters permanently on the 1st of February, 1899. The outcome has been that, at the present moment our militia army medical staff consists of: One director general at headquarters, seven lieut.-colonels, seventeen majors, twenty-two captains, and twenty-five lieutenants, unified into one corps, having promotion within the corps, wearing a departmental uniform with special distinctive badge, &c. This makes a total of seventy-two officers gazetted to the army medical staff, twenty-seven of whom are detailed in command of, or as subalterns of five bearer companies, and four field hospital companies of the army medical corps. That is an entirely new departure which my hon. friend, I think, will admit. We had no such things as bearer companies or field hospital companies of the army medical corps. It is proposed during this session and henceforth annually, to increase the army medical corps by eight units (four bearer companies, and four field hospitals) until a complement sufficient for a complete army corps of 36,000 men is reached, viz.: thirty-one medical units. The \$18,000 appropriation of last session for this special service has been expended in procuring technical equipment for this corps,

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

surgical and medical panniers, &c., as detailed in the army medical manual for field service, 1898, consisting also of stretchers, ambulance, wagons, water carts, cacolets, &c. An equipment embodying the most recent improvements for field hospital service is being devised, including ambulances, Munson's ventilated hospital tents, &c.; also requisites for carrying out the drills and training of officers and members of the army medical corps, as detailed in Militia Order 21, 1900; and General Order 19, 1900. Courses of special training under qualified instructors and assistants will shortly be opened. They will give medical officers opportunities of qualifying for their commissions, as provided for in General Order 62, 1899. We have been in the habit of sending officers over to England for special instruction at Netley. We are still doing that, but now we are undertaking to give instruction in Canada, and at present we have a number of men who have taken a course in the old country, who are quite competent to give this instruction. Several medical officers, and four non-commissioned officers have been sent to and obtained qualifying certificates at the Royal Army Medical Corps Training School at Aldershot. Eight militia medical officers are now serving with our troops in South Africa. Some of them have already been given special praise for bravery, zeal and devotion to duty. I may mention Dr. Fiset especially. These officers were selected not only on account of their proved professional ability, but on account of their youth, bodily strength, and love of the service, so that on their return to Canada we may count for many years on the valuable experience they will have acquired. Each combatant unit sent to South Africa was provided with the medical equipment ordered by Imperial regulations, also with specially ample ship medical supplies.

Mr. DAVIN. He is reading it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) object to my reading? I am sure that he is as tired of it as I am, but this is the quickest way to get through.

Mr. FOSTER. Take a reef or two in it, and shorten it up.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will do the best I can, but this is a very important part of the work.

Mr. DAVIN. I apologize to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden). It was a whisper, and I did not intend it to reach his ear.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was audible here. It is proposed that the bearer companies will perform their annual training at the unit's headquarters, except two days, which will be devoted to field manoeuvres with troops, at the close of brigade or divisional camps;

while the field hospital companies will act and train as such in the camps, replacing the old station hospital system, of little practical training value. It is proposed to supply the field hospital with the newly invented Munson's field hospital tent, which has been found excellent in the United States army medical service. While we have established this army medical corps very largely on the lines of the Imperial service, we have retained, what has not been done in the Imperial service, the regimental medical service in a modified form so that now instead of two medical men in each regiment there is one. Many of the second medical officers have been drafted into the army medical staff. The system of promoting these officers has been changed. Their first appointment are now in the lower rank. They are obliged to qualify for further promotion, and their period of regimental service has been limited. Per contra their rate of pay has been raised to the level of the pay of officers of corresponding combatant rank. In addition to the field hospital accommodation and equipment available in camps of instruction, it is proposed now to supply the regimental medical officers with emergency cases. This is a new feature, which will be appreciated, no doubt. Regimental medical officers are now obliged to organize, instruct and drill during fixed periods, their battalion stretcher bearer sections. For that purpose a syllabus of a course has been drawn up by the director general. A loan equipment box containing books, diagram, technical necessaries, is now at the disposal of corps, together with light field stretchers. A reserve of medical officers has been created where officers desirous of retiring from the active lists either of the army medical staff or regimental service, can be placed, and yet remain available for service should they be needed. So that those hon. gentlemen who are following me, and who take an interest in the subject, will see that a great number of improvements have been made in the medical branch of the service. In my opening statement I omitted to refer to two matters which I will simply refer to as part of the important work which has been carried out by the Militia Department since 1896. I refer to the preparation for sending forward of a contingent to represent Canada at the Queen's Jubilee in 1897, and also to the sending forward to Selkirk and Dawson of the Yukon force of 200 men. In both of these instances great honour was reflected upon Canada, and in the march which was made through a very difficult country to Selkirk by the force that we sent to the Yukon, additional proof, if proof were necessary, was given of the hardihood and capacity of the Canadian volunteers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say two or three words as to the future of the militia. That is the aspect of the case, which, I suppose, is occupying more of the attention of

those who are especially interested in military matters, not only here, but I may say throughout the world, and especially, we know, it is the case in the mother country. It is too soon yet to propose to undertake to lay down any change of policy. I am bound to say that I believe, as I said in the opening, that the militia of Canada has fairly well fulfilled the expectations of those by whom it was established, and I think, that what has happened has shown that, whatever may be in store in future there is no force of men anywhere in the world more capable, perhaps as capable, of adapting themselves to new circumstances as are the militiamen of Canada. It is obvious that there are two or three lessons to be learned from the South African war which we must pay heed to. The military force of the future must be one capable of great mobility; a force which can be rapidly moved from place to place. In that connection the question of changing largely the infantry to mounted infantry is one which will claim very careful consideration. So far as my view of the subject goes, I think that we in Canada should at any rate make the experiment, and I propose during the next financial year to make the experiment in Manitoba and the Northwest. It is proposed there to change the cavalry into mounted infantry, and to change the only corps of infantry there into mounted infantry also. In certain other centres the nuclei will be established to make at least one regiment of mounted infantry.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The same experiment will probably be tried to a more limited extent in the east. Another lesson and probably the most important one to be learned from the war in South Africa, is the importance of teaching, not only the volunteers but everybody who is willing to learn the use of the rifle.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have already done a great deal in Canada in that regard. We have appropriated money in this parliament for the encouragement of rifle shooting, and we have constructed almost under the shadow of this building perhaps one of the best rifle ranges in the world. We are now constructing rifle ranges in British Columbia, in Montreal, in Lévis, in St. John, N.B., and we are perfecting and improving the rifle ranges near Halifax. Last year we constructed a magnificent range near the city of Hamilton, and so on throughout the Dominion as fast as the parliamentary grants will permit us. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the idea of affording every facility to the people to learn the use of the

rifle. Any one who follows the current literature and reads the reviews will be struck with the large amount of space devoted to this subject. The *Nineteenth Century*, the *Contemporary Review*, all the leading magazines contain the expressions of the desire of able men—not confined to soldiers alone—expressions of men who are honestly trying to work out the means by which the people at the lowest cost to a country shall be taught that important accomplishment of the use of the rifle. I read an article quite recently which describes the method in vogue in Switzerland, and so far as my study of the different military systems of the world has gone, I am convinced that for Canada the most useful method for us to imitate is the Swiss system which is the most inexpensive system in the world to-day. Every man in Switzerland is a soldier; every man takes his rifle home with him and is completely equipped, and at an hour's notice almost, is ready to take the field. The matter is so carefully studied in Switzerland with a view to taking the men as little as possible away from their ordinary avocations, that they are adapted under the military system to the callings which they follow in civil life. The blacksmith is a farrier, the carpenter is utilized for artificer's work, and so on, and when they are called upon for military service, they are simply acting as far as possible in the line of their everyday work. But this is a digression. The Swiss Rifle Club system is one which the military men of Canada might well give some attention to. I have read the article to which I have referred with a great deal of profit, and I am sending for the books quoted there so that I may pursue the study further. I gather from that article that many of the clubs are directly connected with the military system of Switzerland, but there are as well independent clubs including not only men enlisted in the active military service but men altogether outside of it. If some system of that kind could be devised in Canada it would be very desirable. We have it to some extent now. We have rifle leagues which have done very good service, and are doing good service. I do not know whether they were inaugurated under the rule of my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) or before, but at all events I look upon them as one of the best features of our system, and one deserving of encouragement in every way. We have distributed last year between 150,000 and 200,000 rounds of ammunition free. We have been in the habit during the last three or four years of giving free ammunition to the Dominion Rifle Association. We are giving to a number of rifle associations free ammunition and also to the rifle league, to some extent. At any rate we shall not curtail that.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. To what extent are you giving that free ammunition?

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think for their rifle matches only, but perhaps to some extent for their practice. I think we could at least go so far as to sell to the rifle clubs their ammunition at cost price.

Mr. DAVIN. And you will supply them with rifles too?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly. We have been in the habit of loaning rifles and taking bonds for their safe return and care.

Mr. DAVIN. May I ask the minister what progress he has made with the promise he gave in the earlier part of the session to provide for rifle associations in the North-west?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have already sent forward several instalments of rifles. I think Moose-jaw and Regina—at least three points in the North-west, and I think more than that.

Mr. DAVIN. Have any been sent to Swift Current?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I could not tell the hon. gentleman now; I will give him the information later.

Mr. DAVIN. Before leaving this part of the question, I hope my hon. friend will explain what system he has inaugurated; because he will remember that in the early part of the session he told me that until some legislation took place he would not be able to meet the views of the associations in the North-west Territories, and I would like to know how these associations now get their rifles.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There has been no departure. I do not think I said that legislation would be necessary. That remark referred to the establishment of mounted rifles; but my recollection of my answer to the hon. gentleman's question is that I said I was considering the subject. We have for years had rifle clubs, particularly in the North-west, where there is no militia organization. We have felt that we ought to encourage these clubs as much as possible on the lines which have existed in the department for a considerable time; that is, an organization is formed, the minutes are forwarded to Ottawa, we find that the people are the proper kind of people, they are recommended by the district officer commanding; and the rifles are issued, bonds being accepted by the department for their safe-keeping.

Mr. DAVIN. My object is just to elicit the information. Early in the session, after receiving the reply of the minister, I saw Mr. Pinault, the deputy, and he showed me a Bill on the table before him, and said: We cannot do anything for these associa-

tions yet; but when this Bill is passed, we shall be able to meet the wishes of your friends at Moosejaw and elsewhere.' I pointed out to the minister in this House that the Moosejaw association had already been supplied with rifles. So that now I understand any rifle association that can show that it is composed of responsible persons can get rifles by applying to the Department of Militia.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Yes. I omitted to refer to the improvements which have taken place in the Royal Military College. I think the success which has attended the administration of that college during the last four years must gratify everybody in Canada, and I think the Department of Militia has some right to feel proud of what has taken place. I am sure that everybody in Canada who had any doubt as to whether that college should be continued or not, has no longer any doubt on that question. When we consider that in South Africa to-day there are some eighty or ninety officers representing Canada who are graduates of that college, among them some of the most distinguished officers in the British army, I think we may feel that all the expenditure which has been incurred for that college has been amply justified by the result. Nothing has done more to bring Canada to the front, so far as the empire is concerned, than the Royal Military College. Men have gone forth from it who have distinguished themselves in their sphere as greatly as any men in the whole British Empire. I do not intend to animadvert or reflect in any way upon the condition of things which we found when we came into office. Our predecessors had been anxious to make a change in that college. For some reason or other, the change had not been made. I felt it to be my first duty as Minister of Militia to see that that change was made, and we were exceedingly fortunate in the selection made for us by the Imperial authorities of an officer to take command of the college. Everybody, I think, will agree that Col. Kitson is the right man in the right place. The college has never done better work than it is doing at the present moment. It is true, the term has been reduced from four years to three years. Many friends of the college felt that that was a dangerous experiment. I am bound to say that I felt some doubt on that score myself. But I am glad to find that the college has not in any respect deteriorated. The age for entrance has been raised and the requirements of matriculation have been increased.

**Mr. PRIOR**. What is the age of entrance—seventeen years?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Yes; one year older than before. The commandant has assured me that with the increased age and the increased require-

ments, in the three years term we shall send out young men as fully equipped for their life work, be it in the army or elsewhere, as any who have ever been sent from the college. We have to-day something like ninety students. Over fifty young men went up for their matriculation examination in May, and to-day it is a question of competition to get into the college—a condition of things which I believe has not existed more than once before in the history of the college; and I think thirty-eight have entered. So highly is the college thought of that the authorities of the Imperial War Office no longer wait for young men to graduate; but we are constantly being asked to allow the cadets to accept commissions in the British army. Only the other day thirteen cadets received commissions at the end of their second year; and shortly after that four or five commissions in addition to those given annually, were given to cadets. So I say we have every reason to feel satisfied with the work that is being done at the college. I suppose it would be better, so far as the votes are concerned, to explain each as it comes up. But there is just one word I would like to say in connection with proposals for the future, and that is that very much might be done by the co-operation of the provinces in the matter of introducing a system of drill into the provincial schools. If this government would supply instructors, as we are now doing to a large extent, to the higher schools, some arrangement might be made. I have already spoken to the Minister of Education and the Premier of Ontario and also of Nova Scotia about making some arrangement under which the provincial government would require that a system of drill be taught to the tutors in the Normal schools, and that before Normal school teachers received their school certificates, they should have to pass an examination qualifying them to teach the rudiments of drill in the schools and that the provincial legislature should insist that drill be taught in the schools, if only for fifteen or twenty minutes per day, so that a commencement would be made in the way of teaching drill to the boys. That would improve their physical condition and give them a taste for military affairs and make it very much easier for them, later on in life, to become proficient when they would join some military organization of the country. I have to thank the committee for having so patiently listened to what I am afraid has been a rather tedious statement.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON** (Three Rivers). I happen to be on the retired list as a militiaman, but I remember the day when, as Minister of Militia and Defence, I took, not a deeper interest than I do to-day, in military matters, but when I had to see to the organization of the force. I may tell the hon. gentleman, at the very outset, that in sending the contingents to South Africa he

did his work well. As an old Minister of Militia I appreciated the work which the hon. gentleman was called upon to perform, and from old experience knew the difficulties he had to contend with. But, I must say that the difficulties in his case were very much less than those which existed at the time when I was at the head of the Militia Department. The hon. gentleman has made a comparison between the expediting of the Canadian forces to South Africa and those which we had to send to quell the rebellion in the North-west. But, let me tell the hon. gentleman that possibly the fact of his having had fewer difficulties to contend against was due to our previous success in improvising, under very different conditions, a force which, at a moment's call, responded to that call and performed its duty under the circumstances, as thoroughly as the Canadian soldiers have performed theirs in South Africa. The effectiveness of the militia force of Canada does not depend so much upon organization as upon the sturdy hearts and stalwart physique of the men who, loyal to their country and their flag, and loyal to the empire, are always ready to respond to the call of duty.

The hon. gentleman has referred to the organization of cadet corps. Why, that is not at all an organization which originated with the hon. gentleman. It existed under his predecessors. It was under the late government that the first note was sounded, when the cadets in Montreal, following in the wake of the old military organizations, came into the ranks and said: What we want is to start early in life, and to keep up the traditions of the militia corps which we know and whose history we want to continue and whose example we desire to follow. The organization of the cadet corps is, therefore, not a thing of which the hon. gentleman can boast. I had occasion, in a previous discussion, to tell the hon. gentleman that, from my previous experience, I thought it was of the greatest possible importance to Canada to organize cadet corps, and I then said to the hon. gentleman: You should enter into an agreement with every public school and with each local government, and devise some scheme under which any school in the receipt of any subsidy from a local government should be required to drill its pupils two or three days in the week, the federal authorities supplying the rifles and ammunition and furnishing instructors, so that the young men should be drilled from the very beginning of their education. If they were trained early in life, I pointed out that that training they would never forget, and they would become the best soldiers that could possibly be called upon, when they came to manhood, to carry on the military affairs of this country.

Veterinary officers the hon. gentleman has spoken of as a new feature in this organization, but if the hon. gentleman will look up the records of his own department he will

see that in every corps, where a veterinary surgeon is required, it is specified in the regulations that such an officer had to be appointed, and such an officer was appointed under the late government and received the rank to which he was entitled.

The hon. gentleman made a point about the exchange of units, and I fully agree with the hon. gentleman, that is one of the greatest possible advantages that could be accorded to our force. With the relations existing between Canada and the empire, if our soldiers are called upon to fight, they shall fight side by side with the British soldiers, upon equal terms of efficiency. It is most necessary, to my mind, that we should educate our soldiers to handle the same rifle as the Imperial soldiers, to know the same drill as the Imperial soldiers, so that when called upon, to go along side of British soldiers, as they have done in South Africa, no difference shall be found between them in efficiency as there has been none in the bravery with which they have fought for the flag and the empire. In my time as Minister of Militia and Defence, all these points were brought before the government. I think I have been fair in my criticism, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) will be fair enough to admit that at that time the evolution of our force had not arrived at the point when these reforms could be carried out. They have been carried out since, but they were not inaugurated by the hon. gentleman. Not only under myself as Minister of Militia, but under those who succeeded me in that high office, the first steps were taken to arrange some means whereby units could be exchanged between the Imperial forces at Halifax and the Canadian force, to the advantage of both.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has spoken of the defence commission, which was organized. On that also, I would refer him to the records of his own department. He will see that a commission was organized long before this commission of which he speaks. There is a book there which was prepared by Mr. Campbell, a naval officer, who had joined the department. These books were looked upon as absolutely confidential, and were prepared for the purpose of giving information to the commission that was organized to study the defence of the country. I am giving details which the hon. gentleman can verify by the statements of officers of his own department.

**THE MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) must have misunderstood me. I did not intend to take special credit to myself for the appointment of that commission. I know, quite as well as he does, that defence commissions are of frequent occurrence—of necessity, for conditions change. This commission has done its work, and, after a

time there will be another commission. In the War Office the question of defence is being studied constantly. I did not intend to take special credit for this commission; I was merely giving a historical account of what had occurred in the last four years in connection with the department.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** If the hon. minister (Mr. Borden) did not intend to take credit for it, he took credit accidentally. But on the point of this commission, I can refer him to the records of his own department. I have my own copy of this red book which is No. 1, and which was given me as Minister of Militia. One was sent to the Prime Minister, one to Sir John Macdonald as Premier, and one to the Governor General. There were only very few copies of that volume to be given out; and they were thus restricted because it was considered that the volume was of such very high value from the standpoint of the defence of Canada that it should not be known outside of the department or those who took a deep interest in studying the defence.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say it was written by Mr. Campbell?

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** Not written by him, for it is impossible to write a thing of that kind. A study of the defence of the country is picked up from the geography of the country, from records of various kinds. This book was an interesting study made from maps, old records, reports of generals, and everything that pertained to the defence of the country.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** I have never seen it.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I am not surprised the hon. gentleman had to get up a commission, if he had not looked into the records of his own department.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** It is not there.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** It is there, or it has been taken away. I have my copy, which I am prepared to show to the hon. gentleman. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the officers of his department, for instance to Mr. Benoit, who, at that time was acting as secretary to the department, he will get information exactly as I am giving it to him now.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Would the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) give me the year approximately?

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I could not give the year, as I am speaking from memory; I did not know the hon. minister was going to make so elaborate a speech. But I am

giving him sufficient information to enable him to get the book of which I speak. The point I am making is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) seemed to believe that this defence commission organized by himself was a revelation to this country. It was no revelation at all. In my time the Imperial authorities called upon us to study up the question; as to the means by which we should be prepared to deal with an invading force. We ought to be able to inform the empire what are our weak points, and what we can do within the limits of our force to defend our country and stand by the empire.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** This is a very important point, and I would like to say a word, if the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) will permit me. In 1897, I was in the War Office a great many times, and in the intelligence branch of the War Office; and there I was shown, in confidence of course, the way in which the books were containing the memoranda of the defence scheme, the great defence scheme of the empire, including all colonies and branches. But my attention was called specially to the fact of the absence of any defence scheme for the Dominion of Canada. That was really the start of these appointments on this particular mission. As I said a moment ago, I take no special credit for this, because it was the intelligence branch of the War Office which was particularly urging that something of this kind should be done; it emanated from them rather than from me.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I know nothing about Australia. When I was in the Department of Militia, I thought I had enough to do to look after Canada. The hon. gentleman, when he was in England, may have overlooked Canada in his anxiety to look after Australia, and some other of the great colonies of the empire. In any case, I have given the hon. gentleman the facts, and he can verify my statements inside his own department, for the books are there to prove what I am now saying. The hon. gentleman says that he applied for medals for service in the Fenian trouble, and also for long-service medals. Now, the hon. gentleman knows that the War Office in England, takes a long time to consider questions such as that. If the hon. gentleman will again refer to the records of his department, he will find that the first application for these medals was made when General Middleton was commanding officer, and when I was Minister of Militia and Defence. I am prepared to give the hon. gentleman all the credit which he is entitled to, but when he makes an elaborate statement—a statement which it took him a long time to make, and which I found very interesting—I think he might give some little credit to those who initiated the very measures which resulted in securing the medals under his

regime. Now these are facts, and I speak from intimate knowledge of what took place at that time. I say I am prepared to congratulate the hon. gentleman upon the fact that these medals were sent out from Great Britain while he happens to be Minister of Militia and Defence. But the hon. gentleman cannot claim that the services for which these medals were given, were performed under his regime. When the next medals are given out, then we will be able to discuss whether it took less time to procure them than it took when I was in the position which he occupies to-day.

Now, the hon. gentleman seems to think that he accomplished a great reform, in insisting upon equitation certificates. Why, Sir, if he had picked up any regulation book he would have seen that long before I came into the Department of Militia, and long before he came into it, the regulations insisted upon staff officers and men belonging to the mounted corps having a certificate, they could not get promotion without it. I do not know exactly what the hon. gentleman means by speaking of equitation certificates being required for staff officers, as they were required under all the regulations. A staff officer is a mounted officer, and he must have a certificate of equitation before he can occupy the position for which he is appointed.

Then there are the provisional schools of instruction of which the hon. gentleman speaks. Sir, it was under my predecessor, under the Hon. Mr. Masson, that two of the artillery batteries were organized. I will state the reason for which they were organized. We considered that the militia force of Canada was a defensive force, not an aggressive force, and it was necessary that we should have some schools wherein men who wished to qualify for the active militia could get instructions. General Strange was the first to organize 'A' and 'B' batteries. He was brought out here by the late Sir George E. Cartier, who at the time was Minister of Militia and Defence, and a better officer than General Strange has never commanded the militia of Canada. I am glad to know, that although he has arrived at a very advanced age, he is still enjoying good health, and the honours which long and faithful service has procured him. These batteries became the first schools in which our militia was trained. When I succeeded Hon. Mr. Masson, I organized the infantry school, and the mounted infantry school in Manitoba, and those were all training schools where a man belonging to any branch of the service had to get a certificate before he could obtain his commission. The hon. gentleman says he organized the provisional schools. Sir, the provisional schools were organized in my own time, before Sir Mackenzie Bowell was Minister of Militia and Defence, and before Mr. Dickey's time. But they were much more limited than they are to-day, that I am prepared to admit. But

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

the hon. gentleman has only been forced on by the development of the country. He has a much larger force than I had. He has nearly double the amount of money to expend that was voted by parliament when I was Minister of Militia and Defence. The fact that the hon. gentleman has six or seven provisional schools, when I only had two or three, merely means that he has been pushed along by the course of events which have forced him to increase the schools of instruction which I originated when Minister of Militia and Defence, and which were already doing good service.

Next the hon. gentleman states that the officers who go through training, must be given a preference over those who do not. Well, in my time, no commission was ever given to an officer unless he qualified, and I can recall, possibly, to the hon. gentleman's memory a case. It was a very hard case. He was an officer, who, as a cavalryman, was equal to the best officer I ever met in the Dominion of Canada. I do not suppose it is necessary to give his name, but, unfortunately, for some reason or other, he could not pass the examination before the school. Great pressure was brought to bear upon the minister at that period. He was known to be one of the best military officers in the country, he was a magnificent rider, he was known to be perfectly qualified, and he occupied a very prominent position in Winnipeg. Nevertheless, he could not qualify and he could not get his commission. Well, then, there is no change in the system to-day from that which existed in the past.

Mr. DOMVILLE. What became of him?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I could not exactly say, except that from the fact that he was such a well-qualified officer, although he could not pass his examination, he was, I think, given a position by the hon. gentleman, which he fills in the most creditable manner to himself.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Is he in the militia now?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He is in the militia, but I could not say what position he occupies. In regard to the medical service the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has taken a great deal of credit to himself, and he ought to. The hon. gentleman, being a medical man himself, probably gave more time to the medical service than to any other branch of the militia. But, I want to tell the hon. gentleman that the organization of the system took place during the troubles in the North-west, when men like Surgeon-Major Bergin, Dr. Roddick and several of the most prominent medical men in Canada, French and English, volunteered their services, went to the front and formed the nucleus of the medical system which exists to-day. When Dr. Bergin, the surgeon-major, died, and when the hon. gentleman was in a position to appoint his successor,

he did nothing more than appoint Dr. Neilson to replace the officer who died, but the hon. gentleman has not created any new system. He has merely been following in the wake of those who preceded him, and he has merely been carrying out the organization that obtained long before he was Minister of Militia. When Dr. Roddick and Dr. Bergin volunteered their services we had to improvise medical stores. We had no medical stores, and we had to improvise everything for that short campaign. It was due to the knowledge and ability of such men as Dr. Roddick and Dr. Bergin that we were able to organize a service that in any case was equal to the requirements of the campaign, and through which our men, during that campaign, were prevented from suffering. It was through General Middleton, who was in command at that time, that the medical service was organized. I remember very well, that on the day that he was leaving Ottawa to go to the North-west, he said: The first thing you have to do is to organize a proper medical service. We took up the list of the surgeons in the service, and there were Dr. Powell, Dr. Bergin and Dr. Roddick who volunteered their services, and we got up a medical service which was quite equal to the requirements of the case. The hon. gentleman has also told us that the militia force of to-day is improving a great deal under the course of lectures which was organized under his regime. Well, Sir, I again refer him to his department. The hon. gentleman will see by the records that lectures were delivered in Quebec, in London, in Toronto, and all over the country, at different centres where it was possible to get men to give them such military education as could be conveyed by lectures was given by some of the ablest men that we had. Col. Otter, Col. Montizambert, Col. Wilson in Quebec, and several of the men in whom he places his confidence because they are still retained in their important commands, gave these lectures, and I do not see exactly how the hon. gentleman can imagine that he organized these lectures that had been going on for so long. Now, there is one point in the hon. gentleman's remarks which I object to. The hon. gentleman has taken the credit to himself for sending 200 men to Selkirk and Dawson. Well, Sir, I consider that if a mistake has ever been made, if a useless expenditure of money has ever been authorized by a government, it was in the sending out of 200 men to Dawson and Selkirk.

**Mr. DOMVILLE.** It was not the minister's fault.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** Well, I do not know whose fault it was, and as I do not know whose fault it was I have to attack the minister who sent them out. I want to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) that the fact of its being a mistake is proved beyond doubt by the statement that as soon

as these men got out there, or very shortly after, they were brought back, and Canada had to pay for the trip. Mr. Chairman, when the government of Canada sent out the mounted police, I was prepared, and I am prepared to-day, to say that they were right in sending out that force, but, in sending out 200 infantrymen to a country like that, has been one of the greatest mistakes that could have been committed, and if the hon. gentleman is responsible for sending out that contingent, that mistake, to my mind, is one of the greatest that has ever been perpetrated. I cannot exactly say how much it cost. Can the hon. gentleman tell me what the cost was?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Probably \$500,000.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** Well, of course, I suppose the hon. minister looks upon \$500,000 as very little to send out 200 men to Dawson and bring them back to their headquarters. What did they do? Ask any man who has been in that district, ask any miner, or any one who has come out from the Yukon, and he will tell you that these 200 men were as absolutely useless as if you sent out one man, excepting that the only difference is that the contingent cost Canada \$500,000 or \$600,000. The hon. gentleman will not be quite certain as to the amount. It may come up to nearly a million, for all I know. But, it was a mistake that I heard discussed long before the hon. gentleman made the statement. Yet, the hon. gentleman looks upon it as one of the great epochs in his reign as Minister of Militia to have sent out 200 men, and to have brought them right back. He has proved that they were absolutely useless when they were sent there by bringing them back.

I agree with the minister to a certain extent when he says that in the future the chief characteristic of our military force must be mobility. I believe that wherever it is possible we should have mounted infantry, and horse artillery instead of garrison artillery. But I heard it rumoured amongst the military men in Montreal that the minister was anxious to transpose the different infantry battalions into mounted corps. That would be a very great mistake. It should be remembered after all that the want of mobility in the British forces was chiefly because of lack of transport as compared with the enemy. The soldier is useless unless he can get to the place where he will be called upon to fight, and in that way the Boers had the advantage, because each Boer not only rode one horse, but he generally managed to have a couple of remounts to follow him. I am opposed to the present infantry battalions of Canada being disturbed, but I do believe that wherever possible when new battalions are being organized, they should be mounted infantry or horse artillery. I again agree with the minister when he says

that good marksmanship is of all importance, and I felt it my duty to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to this on a former occasion. The best training that Canada can give to her soldiers is practice in sharp shooting. I would suggest to the minister that he should have ranges wherever it is possible to get men to utilize them, but these ranges need not necessarily be very expensive. The range at Montreal, I am told by military men is probably one of the best on the continent, and the range at Ottawa has proved a great success; but of course these are quite expensive. Wherever men have ranges to fire at I would suggest to the minister that he should give the men free ammunition for a certain number of days in the year, and place it under the control of some officer who would insist upon their firing this free ammunition at the targets. The strength of the Boers lay in the fact that from their childhood they had been trained to handle a rifle, and this, together with the geographical conditions of their country, enabled them to contend against much better trained troops. I believe that if the minister adopts some policy to promote sharp shooting generally amongst Canadians, it will do more than any other thing to make his regime in the Militia Department a great service to the military force of Canada. We have to-day as good rifles as we can get, and although I know it costs money to manufacture the cartridges, yet if we devote that money to encourage first-class marksmanship it will be cheaper in the end than any other system we can possibly adopt. I agree with the minister about the advantages of the Swiss system. It is the best system extant, and is to my mind the most adaptable to the conditions existing in Canada. I think, however, that their annual drill is for a much longer period than ours.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Forty-five days every other year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I thought they were called out every year, but of course I am only speaking from memory. The fact of our drilling our men for twelve days is, to my mind, a waste of money, as it hardly teaches a man more than to learn how to button on his tunic. It is next to impossible in that short period of time to train men in battalion and other drills which go to constitute the education of the soldier. As a matter of fact it only means ten days in camp, because the first day is occupied in getting in and the last day in getting out. When I was head of the department I fought very hard with my colleagues to get the whole force drilled every year. I believe that is a necessity, for the reason that our men enlist for three years and if they are drilled only every second year, they practically have only twenty days' drill during their period of service, which

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

amounts to nothing at all. It is my opinion that if Canada cannot afford to keep up the present number of men, it would be far wiser to reduce the number, but to drill them every year. Although I do not pretend to be an expert, I visited all the camps for three or four successive years with the general officer commanding, and it was quite apparent that twelve days' training was altogether too short for any practical purpose.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Hear, hear.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If we do not train our soldiers properly the money is actually thrown away, and if we cannot afford to train every man for twelve days every year then some other system should be adopted by us. The system suggested by the hon. gentleman of arranging with the schools to drill the children is, to my mind, the most inexpensive and practical system.

Mr. DOMVILLE. At what age would you drill them?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would drill them from the time they enter the school. Of course, it would be necessary for a child to be old enough to carry a rifle.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask a question? About two-thirds of our schools in Ontario are conducted by ladies. The Minister of Militia said that in the normal schools there ought to be drill. I imagine that I see the ladies of our schools drilling their pupils with rifles.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Of course, my hon. friend points out a difficulty, and I think an exception might be made of schools which are under the control of ladies. But when the boys in the public schools come under the control of men, I would apply my system. The rifle league, I am proud to say, was organized by myself, and I was the first Minister of Militia to address them, which I did in the Russell Hotel here. We gave them free ammunition, for which they passed a resolution thanking me as Minister of Militia. They sent in an application, and a deputation called on the government. Sir John Macdonald was present, and I as Minister of Militia, met the deputation.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Last year we issued 164,000 rounds to the rifle league alone.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I say we gave them free ammunition, and the rifle association at its following meeting in the Railway Committee room, again thanked me for it. Now, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what he meant by saying that the success of the military college during the last four years had been a great credit to Canada? The military college was organized by Mr. Mackenzie when he was Prime Minister of Canada. He had to contend with

great opposition, and even on this side of the House there were men who believed that Canada was not quite ripe for an institution of that kind. I tell the hon. gentleman that every man who has left that college has been a credit to Canada; they have been the best advertisement Canada has ever had. Why, four years ago Girouard was helping Kitchener in the Soudan to extend the authority of the British Empire there. What about the other men in India and elsewhere?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am sure my hon. friend does not wish to misrepresent me. Very likely I may have used those words; but I did not intend to convey the meaning the hon. gentleman attributes to me. If my hon. friend had listened to what I said afterwards, he would have heard me say that there were over eighty graduates of the Royal Military College in Africa to-day; and although I did not mention Girouard by name, I pointed directly to him as one of the distinguished men to whom I referred. I simply wished to compare what has happened since Col. Kitson came in with what was happening immediately before he came in.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I wish to be absolutely fair in my criticism. I mentioned Girouard's name, not because I thought the hon. gentleman had overlooked him, but because the hon. gentleman spoke of the success of the college in the last four years. I am mentioning the names of men who long before four years ago took a very proud position as graduates of the Royal Military College. So far as Col. Kitson is concerned, although I have not the same opportunities of judging to-day as I had when I was the head of the department, from all I can learn, I am quite prepared to admit that he is an excellent man for the position. I have heard men in England speak very highly of him, and I believe the selection made by the government is an excellent one. At any rate, the results show that he is conducting the college in a way that reflects credit upon himself and upon Canada. I am not prepared to agree with the hon. gentleman that the change in the curriculum from four years to three years is an advantage. I think it is not, and I do not believe the raising of the age of matriculation from sixteen to seventeen years compensates for the deficiency. The men who left the Royal Military College after a four years' course, and who had to pass examinations in England, were able to make the highest points against great competition. They went there without influence, having to rely upon their training in a competition where nothing but merit counted, and if that system succeeded so well, in my opinion, it would have been better to have left well alone, and not to have made the changes which have been made. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the

numerous applications which have been made for entrance to the Royal Military College. I quite agree with him that they are more numerous than they were in our time; but the hon. gentleman has not surely overlooked the fact that that is caused by the great military enthusiasm of the present time. But whether there are fifty to-day and there were only forty in my time, or not, makes no difference, so long as they came out properly trained and prepared to do their duty to their flag and their country. The hon. gentleman speaks of thirteen additional commissions being given to the cadets. Well, after the Egyptian war, over and above the commissions which were granted the Royal Military College cadets, England granted fourteen new commissions for the trained men of the Royal Military College. But we acted differently from the hon. gentleman at that time. The general appealed to me to know what course we should adopt, and I said to him: Follow the system you have always followed. Take the six highest men for the first commissions, and then take the others who follow and give them commissions in their order of proficiency.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What system did we follow?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman may remember that we had some little discussion here on a previous occasion, when it was supposed the system was not followed.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as the military college is concerned, the system followed in the hon. gentleman's time is the system that is followed now. The commandant selects the men in order of their fitness, as shown by their examination, and their names are sent to the government here and approved by His Excellency, and then forwarded to the War Office.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We will not discuss that part of the programme, but it seems to me that the other day it was not quite so clear.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That was with reference to the other commissions outside the military college.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have only one more word to say, and that is concerning the system suggested by the hon. gentleman of coming to an understanding with the provinces about the schools. I think that nothing can do more good for our militia force than to start drill just as soon as possible in the schools. That is done in France, Germany and Switzerland, and it is a pleasure to the boys to go through drill, and not only is it a good training for the future, but is as good training for their physical condition as any that could be devised. I

am sorry to have taken up the time so long, but have simply followed the hon. gentleman and tried to be as brief as possible. One thing we are all agreed upon, and that is that no matter how we may differ on other points we all wish to see our Canadian militia force in the best condition. It must be in that condition, not for ourselves alone, but for the defence of the empire, and I think that the sooner the reforms of which the hon. gentleman has spoken are introduced the better it will be for Canada.

Mr. JAMES DOMVILLE (King's, N.B.) This is a matter somewhat removed from the arena of practical politics, and the two gentlemen—the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), and the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Adolphe Caron)—have endeavoured to approach it without any political recrimination. I admired the manner in which my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) discussed this question. Of course, he wanted to take all the credit he could, as he always does, for what the present minister has done, and I have no doubt he is entitled to considerable credit. There are very few of us in this House who know much about militia matters. I have had a long practical experience, it is forty-two years since I first joined the volunteer corps, and I commanded a cavalry regiment for twenty years, and I am not prepared, looking at the matter from a national standpoint, to accept in their entirety the statements on either side. But that is only a matter of opinion and not one of recrimination.

The hon. Minister of Militia talked about the promotions to colonelcies, and the result of getting rid of colonels in five years. That is starting at the top of the list, but I propose to start from the bottom to the top. You may find a regiment that has had a colonel for a long time, and in which some other man wants to get his place and does so. But you will find regiment after regiment that has neither a colonel nor a major, and in saying this I am not finding fault with the Minister of Militia because it is not his doing. But you will find regiment after regiment with hardly a commissioned officer—all of them provisional. How is that? The reason is that of the officers who go into the militia, some go for one reason and others for another, and they disappear. If my hon. friend will turn to the list of twenty-five years ago, he will not find one of those then on the list here to-day. Therefore, it is not at all in accordance with the facts to say that these commissioned officers continue on for ever. Supposing for a moment that it was a good thing to clear out all the colonels in five years—of course I am not referring to the honorary colonels at all.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, they are too useful to be removed.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Supposing you went through the ninety-eight regiments and retired the ninety-eight colonels in one year, all of them having gone in at the same time. Could you calculate on having ninety-eight officers to succeed them sufficiently well qualified for the work? I do not think anybody would pretend that you could. It is all very well in England in the regular service. The officers there have a vested interest in the service. When they go out they get their pension. If an officer does not become a major or a colonel at a certain date he has to go out, but he goes out on a pension. He knows what is ahead of him, and he can go out with £200, £300, £600, or £800 a year, according to his chances; but take an officer of the militia, what does he get? He has to buy his own uniform, and we know that a cavalry officer's uniform is worth \$1,800. Well, if every officer had that expense to undergo, where would you get your officers? Take the military regulations, and you will find that it is perfectly useless to attempt to enforce them. If you did, you would have a mutiny in every regiment. You have to ride with a firm hand and light rein; and if you get a man who can ride a horse and is fit for his work, you will not impose on him the expense of providing himself with this magnificent uniform and the golden cordons that we see flourishing around Ottawa. I do not agree with the minister, but I do not think it is his doing. I can imagine an officer coming from England, taking this view, and we have had a great many commanding officers from the old country, no two of whom agree in their ideas of what should be done. We had General Herbert, a splendid officer, who went into the ranks and drilled the men in sections himself; we had General Gascoigne, who went in for shooting, and we had no ranges. There is no range in Canada to-day except at Ottawa. All the others are condemned because the rifles are superior to the ranges. The buying of the rifles was not the fault of the minister, because it was not he who bought them. But in hot haste we armed our men with effective rifles and omitted to provide places where they could practice shooting. We have our armoury filled with rifles and uniforms of all sorts, and I would burn every uniform in the Militia Department. I would not allow the men to wear a uniform for three years, but would take them out and teach them how to shoot first. It might be a very hard method, but I think that any gentleman who wanted to do service to his country would be willing to learn to shoot. You see them going about Ottawa here with four or five sticks shod with iron—going to play golf, they say. Would it not be better for those young men, and young ladies, too, to learn to shoot. That would be something of practical bene-

fit to the country. Take the case of New Brunswick before it came into confederation in 1867. We had an army of 43,000 men in round numbers—artillery, cavalry, infantry and everything else; and the whole cost was \$148,000. To-day with us in Canada the great question is: What is to be done for the future? I say we should start with the foundation; we should reorganize our militia from the bottom. I have no doubt my hon. friend the Minister of Militia has this under consideration. He has not had a chance to take us entirely into his confidence to-night. First of all we should have men trained to shoot. Then we should have our men drilled; then have officers; then commanding officers, and then a general and staff. That is impossible to-day; you must reorganize your militia entirely. Suppose men learned to shoot, where are the non-commissioned officers to drill them? These men cannot go to the military schools; the schools are not large enough in their scope to drill sergeants and drill instructors. Our officers now only get such military education as they can pick up in the twelve days' camp, together with such little work as they can do on their own account. There should be some means to educate these men better. Then, according to the system laid down, as soon as they get into a certain condition they must be commanding officers and they must go into the field and command though they have had no experience and no instructions. We should endeavour to train these officers, either at Kingston or somewhere else. Then send some of them abroad to join the English army, the French army, the German army—to get all the experience they can. Then, when they have had the education, we may choose from them a proper man to command our militia as adjutant general, commander of whatever you choose to call them. There may be five men capable as soldiers for this work, but there may be only one of them who is just suitable to handle the militia of Canada, understanding not only his work as soldier but the people he has to deal with. In what respect can we say that our militia is better than it was five years ago? There is no use in expecting to achieve the desired results by simply bringing generals here. I am told that we are to have a general who is an antidiluvian, one who has been on the retired list for ten or twelve years. If he had been a man of capability, I suppose he would have gone to South Africa with Sam Hughes; and if he is not a man of capability, what is the use of his coming here. I agree with the Minister of Militia—I believe in our own people, and I hold that we shall never have our militia properly organized until we are prepared to allow the minister, without politics being brought into it, to surround himself with young men of ability who know what is wanted, and until we get rid of the attempt to organize without

the money necessary to do it. We are not going to have any fighting, I hope, but suppose that to-morrow we were to have trouble, what is the use of us taking out 40,000 men who cannot shoot? What is the use of taking about an ambulance corps and medical staff?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They did good work in South Africa.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Of course, we sent a little force of 2,500 men. It was a very good and effective force—but suppose we were called upon to put 100,000 or 200,000 men in the field, where would you get your officers? If you are going to retire your colonels after five years' service, you have no officers fit to command, and you have to fall back on the mother country, allowing them to send out here people who will be pensioners on us. You must have in the ranks men who can shoot and know their work, and then every rank above that rank, from the non-commissioned to the commanding officers and so on to the general and staff must be efficient or you must abandon the idea of having a militia for Canada. If you are going to have a proper militia, as the minister wishes to do, you must have a large sum of money. If the opposition are really sincere in what they say, they should back the minister up with a good deal of money.

Mr. PRIOR. So we will.

Mr. DOMVILLE. 'So we will,' says the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior). But what will the country say? The country will want something more for their money than when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) was Minister of Militia—as I think he was.

Mr. PRIOR. Not Minister of Militia, but next door to it.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) was responsible anyway. And the rifles that were bought at that time were practically useless. Why, they were not sighted right. I know that from practical use of them. I think the hon. member for Victoria will agree with me in that. I do not know who was to blame. These things will occur. When it comes to the question of militia, it should not be a matter of the pot calling the kettle black and vice versa, but we should all strive together to put the militia on an effective footing, but, as my hon. friend from Victoria said to convince the world that it is so. The force that we sent out to South Africa was not for amateur service. These 2,500 men were sent out partly to demonstrate to the world that if Canada was called upon to defend herself within the gates or without the gates, she had men and organization to do it. But we have not got the organization we ought to have, nor are we striving in that direction. There is no politics in what I say; and I am sure the Minister of

Militia will accept it in the best of good faith. The time has come when men on both sides of politics should take a retrospect of the whole position. I begged the Minister of Militia as a friend to have a Royal Commission, as they do in the War Office in England. That would strengthen his hands. If he is attacked by those opposed to him, his answer is: There is the Royal Commission. If there is any kudos to be made out of it, then the minister makes it; and if there is anything to be made out of our experience, then both sides of politics can benefit by it. Take South Africa, is not that a moral for everybody? Here we had scientific officers saying: We want only infantry. They did not go a long way before they found that they wanted artillery, and not long after they found they wanted mounted men. But if you go back to the schools only a few years ago in London, you will find nothing but infantry, they had an idea that cavalry men and artillery men were no good. So all these wars teach us something. They have taught us that if our militia is to be effective, it must be placed in a different position than it is to-day. My hon. friend the minister thinks the officers should always be ready to go out. They spend money and get nothing. The officers keep up the regiments at their own expense, with silver cups and everything. When camping comes round, they have to pay the bills, they have sometimes to entertain Ministers of Militia and other visitors at large expense. But when you come down to some little idea from gentlemen from England who want to inoculate us with some new ideas, then away they must go.

Now, I do not propose to go into this thing any further, because it is a long subject. If I was going into it before a commission with my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior), I think we would discuss the organization at every point. I would ask the Minister of Militia and Defence, without attempting for a minute to cavil at what he has done, to look into the future of Canada, into the defence of the empire, if it is to be not merely an empire of show; and I would ask the hon. gentleman to take some of the members of the House into his confidence, and probably he would find that some of the members of this House would be quite as competent to give a good opinion as some of those officers that went from the old country to South Africa. I think we would all agree that in a country like this, where we all understand the uses of an axe, an auger or whip-saw, we would be able to give an opinion as to what was needed in Canada far better than those on the other side would give. If we were taken to England, or to Germany, possibly we might find their ideas of defence and attack would be far superior to ours. But we have learned a lesson in this African war, we have learned that England will fight, that Canadians

will fight, that there are no cowards among them. Many mistakes were made, but we have learned that from now out, when they attack an enemy's country, they have got to fight the enemy according to the country that they are in. This kind of fighting we have had before, will not answer any longer. I ventured a remark here a few months ago, which did not meet with very much approval, but nevertheless it was true, when I referred to the way they were carrying on the campaign in Africa. But we have learned a good deal since then. I would like to see the Minister of Militia and Defence discuss this before a committee. There is no use discussing it among the members of this House generally, because they would have so many different views, and so little experience in military matters. But I would like to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence to consider whether Canada is prepared to place herself on an armed footing before the world, as the world stands to-day, or whether she is prepared to abandon the whole thing? Now there is no half-way house between those two positions. If we are going to place ourselves in a position where we can be of service to our own country or to the mother country, then let us never mind whom they send over from England to fill the position or earn a pension. Let us take some of our own men who know what is wanted in Canada. I have every faith in Canadians. I am not so wrapped up in royal titles or in aristocracy, that I am prepared to accept every dictum at a nod or a smile. I shall take an opportunity later on, when we get into details of these estimates, to discuss more fully the militia of this country.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) When the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden), took his seat to-night, he apologized to the House for having taken up so much time. Well, Sir, I do not think that there was any need of making an apology, because I do not remember ever having listened to a more interesting speech than the speech he made, and also the speech of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron). I do not think I have listened to a more interesting speech for many years, a speech that must have been interesting to everybody who takes an interest in the militia. The minister took advantage of the occasion to blow his own trumpet a little, and the trumpet of the department, but I do not say he was wrong in that. I can say more than that, I can say that I am glad that I am not in a position to gainsay much that he said. Although my duty as a member of the opposition is to criticise the department, I think there is very little criticism that I can offer on the speech of the hon. minister. There is one matter, however, that I cannot let pass. He said that he wished to deny altogether that politics had ever entered into the Militia Department. Well, we had that question out hot

and heavy some few weeks ago in regard to the case of Colonel White and Colonel Vince, where, I must say, I think he showed that politics for once, had influenced his action. But I will say this, that I think the appointments the hon. gentleman has made since he came into the office, especially the appointments in the headquarters staff, and in the higher positions, are very good, no minister could make better ones. He has surrounded himself with a most admirable staff of officers.

In regard to the question whether everything has been done that could have been done in sending away the contingent in good shape, I think we shall have to wait until these gallant fellows come back from the seat of war, before we can decide. There have been rumours, as the minister, perhaps, knows, of shortages in clothing, of poor boots, and several other things; but as no direct charges have ever been made to my knowledge, I think it is only fair that a member of the House, occupying the position that I do here, should give the minister the benefit of the doubt, and not try to make out that anything has gone wrong until we are in a position to prove that such has been the case. One thing is perfectly clear to my mind, and that is that everybody connected with the Militia Department, every officer on the staff, has worked honestly, hard and faithfully to do his best in getting off this contingent to South Africa. As to whether they were sent off as quickly as they could have been, I am bound to say that I think good speed was shown, considering the difficulties under which the minister was placed, in a country like this. I only wish I could say that the government as a whole showed the same desire for speed in allowing them to go. We know perfectly well that Canada, instead of being the first to offer these contingents, allowed some ten or twelve other colonies of the empire to volunteer assistance to the Imperial authorities before Canada did. However, that is hardly a question to bring up on the militia estimates.

Now, just one word in regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for King's N.B., (Mr. Domville). He and I, as a good many hon. gentlemen in this House know, do not agree in regard to the appointment of the Major-General Commanding the militia of Canada. I, for one, am strongly in favour, and will always be strongly in favour, of keeping to the policy that has been in vogue for so many years, namely, of giving the supreme command of the militia to an officer of the Imperial service. In saying so, I do not wish to reflect in the slightest degree upon Canadian officers, or upon any Canadians, because, I believe, we have as good men, considering the advantages they have had, as there are in the world; but one of the great things that appeals to my feelings in this regard is that it is a link that binds the Imperial government to

this country. If the government can pick out a Canadian by birth who has passed the Royal Military College, who has gone into the Imperial service, has there had a large experience and proved himself to be a man fit to command a large body of men, either in peace or in war, then, I say, by all means let the Canadian government try to get a man of Canadian birth and place him in command of our own militia. If no such man can be found, then bring a man of English, Scotch or Irish birth here, but, by all means, bring a man who has served many years, who is still serving at the time, and who has had large experience in the Imperial service. I do not say anything more about that except that while, perhaps, some of our Canadian officers may feel disappointed that the highest position in the gift of the department, or of the government, is not to be theirs, I think, the colony is a little young for that yet.

The subject has been so largely covered in the admirable speeches which we have listened to to-night that I shall be able to curtail, to a certain degree, the remarks which I intended to make when the militia estimates came forward. I am one of those who has taken for many years a great interest in the militia service of Canada, having served for many years in the militia myself, and on that account, I may be allowed a little more latitude in point of time than those who do not take such a deep interest in the subject. I see that it does not possess the same interest for every one in the House, because I notice that there are some hon. gentlemen taking advantage of the opportunity for a quiet snooze at this late hour. I do not blame them as we have had pretty hard work during these five long months of the session. I have had the advantage of consultations with some of the district officers commanding and with some of the commanding officers, and I may say that the majority of these gentlemen agree with what I shall put forward in the remarks which I propose to make to-night. I am largely indebted to the officer who is now in command of the Toronto district. I refer to Col. Peters. He and I have been personal friends for many years, he having been district officer commanding in British Columbia, and I am glad to see that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence has put him in such a high position as commanding officer at Toronto. Although we sometimes laugh at him, because he is a man of strong ideas, I think, when we come to look into them we find that he is generally about right. I want to say a few words on the rifle practice and the ammunition of the militia. I think everybody will agree with me that these are about the most important matters that can be referred to in regard to the militia. I am sorry to say that in the past they have been to a great extent neglected. I do not say that there have not

been good shots who have taken an interest in the question, but the general public and the militia at large have not taken as much interest in it as I should have liked to have seen. I believe that at the present moment a large portion of the militia force is armed with the very best rifle that there is in the world. That is the Lee-Enfield, but there are plenty of men in the city corps who have never fired that rifle at all. The allowance of ammunition made to the militia men, 40 rounds, if I am not wrongly informed, per man per annum, is, to my mind, absurdly small. I think the hon. minister should make up his mind to supply every militia man who is duly enrolled with at least 250, if not 500 rounds of ammunition per annum. In the United States I am told that they allow a thousand rounds per man per annum. I think an allowance of 250 rounds for every man, these rounds to be shot off under proper surveillance of the officers, and the commanding officers to be made responsible that this ammunition is properly expended, would produce a very great betterment in the rifle shooting of the force. At present, in the camps, and also in the regiments that do not go into camp, the city corps, too much time is taken up in battalion and company movements. Especially is this useless nowadays, as anybody can see by reading the accounts we get from the war in South Africa. In the twelve days' camp that annually takes place it is impossible to train men in manoeuvring, in company drill, battalion drill and shooting to the same extent that the regulars can be expected to be trained. The time is altogether too short, and, therefore, I think that a greater portion of the time would be far better spent if it were devoted to rifle practice and to firing exercise and fire discipline. There is also another change that should be made in a great many cases, and that is, that instead of sticking to the old stationary target, there should be moving targets allowing the men to have practice in the work that they will have to do in the field, giving them targets more like the targets they will have to shoot at if they are called upon for active service. It is hard, I know, to obtain room on many rifle ranges for moving targets; but, while this cannot be done everywhere it can be done in certain portions of the Dominion. The government grants that are given for rifle shooting are at present given largely to the Dominion and provincial rifle associations. I do not want to say a word against these associations, which do a great deal of good, but I think the money could be far better expended. I think if the money were to go to the regiments which the Major-General Commanding knows to have commanding officers who take an interest in and keep their men and regiments up to the mark and which have rifle ranges, I think it would do a great deal more good. They could then have matches arranged on

Mr. PRIOR.

strict service lines instead of allowing these contests to be conducted in a happy-go-lucky manner. I am not a believer in training a small number of men to be first-class shots to be sent out to the ranges with their tubes and glasses and head covers and boxes. I think it is far better to have a thousand men who can shoot more than fairly well than to have a hundred men who are first-class shots and who can hit a bull's eye at 1,000 yards five times out of six. Another thing is the feeling of despondency there is at the present time amongst young men in joining a militia regiment. The young shot has no chance whatever now. If he goes out to shoot for the prizes, he comes into competition at once with men who have been practising for years. The rifle matches should be so arranged that the men would be classified and handicapped in order that the men who have been shooting for years would have no unfair advantage, and then the young men would have some heart put into them. The feeling of the young shot now is: What is the use of my shooting against Tom Jones who has been at it for years, I have no chance of beating him. If the suggestion I have thrown out were adopted, it would also put a stop to what is popularly known as pot-hunting. I do not wish to say anything against these men who go to the Dominion and provincial rifle meetings every year, for they do good, but I say that all the prizes should not constantly go to them. Young men very often cannot pay their way as the majority of the old hands do, and they are often not in such an independent position to get away from their employment. The majority of the men who year after year contest for the prizes, are officers and non-commissioned officers, and as the prizes are good, it pays a great many of them. Nearly all these men who attend large meetings are what might be termed professional shots, and there is no hope left for the younger men. These professional shots, if called upon for active service, being mostly officers and non-commissioned officers, would not have to use the rifle, and so the very men who ought have the practice in sharp shooting are precluded.

Mr. ELLIS. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) allow me to ask him if he does not think it would be better to abolish these money prizes altogether?

Mr. PRIOR. I would not go that far. These rifle matches lead to a great deal of good, but I think a system of handicapping should be introduced so that the same men would not win the prizes year after year. I would be the last to ask the government to give less money for rifle practice, but on the contrary I would hold up both hands to get more. The minister has very fully explained the Swiss system, but I confess I do not quite understand it. However, if its effect is to make every man in the coun-

try capable of bearing arms at a small expense, I should be thoroughly in favour of it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In the article to which I referred it is stated that there are 250,000 men in Switzerland (out of a total population of 3,000,000), who are members of these rifle clubs and are effective shots.

Mr. PRIOR. As the minister has made a study of the Swiss system, I can leave its application to Canada with great faith in his hands. Recently I noticed in the *Broad Arrow*, a service paper of the British army, an article which concluded with the statement: That good shooting, good discipline, good marching and quick and intelligent field manœuvring are points that now constitute a good battalion. The *Broad Arrow* puts good shooting first of all, so that we as members of parliament cannot do better than to impress upon the Militia Department of Canada that they should endeavour to make it a sine quo non of our soldiers that they should be good shots.

I am strongly of opinion that the drill book now in use should be thoroughly revised. I believe that a commission of intelligent and experienced officers should be appointed to go through that drill book, and to cut out what in the opinion of myself and of a great many commanding officers, is absolutely useless for the Canadian militia. Our militia has no time to pretend to be as highly trained as the regulars in the British service are supposed to be. If trained in a practical manner during their short time in camp they would make a most useful force, as they have proved themselves to be in South Africa. There has been no complaint from any quarter that the Canadian or Australian militia or volunteers were found wanting in ordinary drill; but on the contrary we have heard high praise from them from Lord Roberts himself, and we can rest assured that if he thought they were a mob, as they must be unless they had some drill, he would be the first man to say so.

Now, as to the uniform. I know it is very nice to strut about in fine uniform, and that young fellows like it—even old fellows like it as my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Tucker) will agree. But the time has come in Canada when we should get a business-like, economical and serviceable uniform of a distinctively Canadian pattern. The British uniforms, which we copy at present, are no doubt very handsome, but they are too expensive for the ordinary Canadian who enters the militia. Besides, why should we not have a distinctive Canadian uniform, of which our boys would be proud, even if it were only a kahki suit with a hat such as we saw the Strathconas wear. I believe that our Canadian young men would feel all the prouder of it, if there was something

distinctly Canadian about it. At the present time, many of our best young men cannot join the service because of the expense of the uniform, and although the last two generals have stated that they had no need to purchase anything but the undress uniform, yet every man of spirit wants to be dressed as well as his brother officers. I believe that you should have a distinctive, plain practical uniform with an aigrette or something like that for dress purposes. The richest man is not always the best soldier. I have found in my experience in the past that I have been at great trouble sometimes to get a fine young fellow to join, but he refused for the simple reason that he could not afford it, and that is a distinct loss to the country. Another young fellow may not be half as good a man, but his father is willing to put up the money, and he is able to enter the service.

There are two or three branches of our militia service which have not been referred to by previous speakers, and so I may be pardoned for saying a word in regard to them. I wish to speak of the district officers commanding, and of the permanent corps. The district officers commanding at present are in charge of large districts, some of them having ten or twelve thousand men under their control. They are, I am glad to say, a fine body of men of whom any country might be proud; but the only rank they have at present is that of lieutenant-colonel. I think that men holding such a position should at least have the rank of colonel. In war times these gentlemen would be called upon to command either brigades or divisions, with thousands of men under them. In Great Britain, men holding similar positions, in command of districts, nearly always have the rank, at least the brevet rank, of major-general. There are some district officers commanding in Canada at the present time who have been in the service for thirty years—men who have given thirty long years of steady, hard and faithful work for their country, and who have only the rank of lieutenant-colonel. Yet we see many instances of young men joining the active militia who, in three or four years, some even in less time, attain the same rank as those who have served thirty years. To my mind the lot of these men is an especially hard one. They see these young lieutenant-colonels springing up all around them after having put in very little time in the service. Besides, even with their thirty years' service, they are junior to the youngest lieutenant-colonel in the British service. That is not right. I think Canada has shown in the last few months that her men are equal to the men in the Imperial service; and why should not our officers be put on the same basis as the officers of Great Britain? As I have said before in this House, the permanent force cannot be looked upon quite in the same light as the active militia.

They are to all intents and purposes Canadian regulars. However much Canadians may dislike the idea of a standing army, the fact remains that the permanent corps, although called a school of instruction, are Canadian regulars. I hope the hon. minister will take that matter into his consideration, and see if something cannot be done to have these men rank as colonels. With regard to the pay of the officers of the permanent corps and the district officers commanding, I have brought this matter before the House three or four times in connection with the question of pensions; but I am sorry to say that outside of three or four gentlemen who take a special interest in militia matters, I have got very little assistance. An officer commanding a district in Canada at the present time receives \$1,700 a year and his quarters; that is the ordinary pay. Where can any hon. gentleman show me a man with the same responsibility on his shoulders, a man at the head of a business or at the head of a department, who has put in years of hard work, who has not more remuneration than that? In some of these districts, there are from 10,000 to 12,000 men at the present time. Why, Sir, in the British service an instance came under my notice of a subaltern of the Royal Marine Artillery in command of only 70 men, who was in receipt of \$2,300 a year and his quarters. There is a young lieutenant of the Royal Engineers as Esquimaux who gets \$2,000 a year, and yet the officer commanding the whole militia of the district gets only \$1,700 a year. In the United States an officer holding a similar command would get about \$5,000 a year. I do not say that Canada can afford to pay as much as the United States can; but she certainly can afford to pay more than she does now. An officer in command of a British regiment gets about \$2,700 a year, and when he retires he gets a first-class pension. This House readily voted the money the other day to bring the pay of the Canadian troops in South Africa up to the standard of the Canadian militia. If the House and the country wish Canadian privates to be paid more than British privates, surely the Canadian officer ought to be paid as much as the British officer; or, if not paid as much, he certainly ought not to get so much less, as he does at the present time. In the case of trouble, these officers commanding districts will be our chief support, and unless something is done in this regard it will be impossible to get good men to join the service and stay in it. Then, as the minister and other hon. gentlemen who have been around the barracks know, these officers have a certain position to keep up. Many men who know nothing about militia matters have said to me, 'That officer gets \$1,700 a year and his house; why, he ought to save money.' But these gentlemen ought to remember that an officer, for the credit of Canada and his regiment, has a certain position to keep up;

Mr. PRIOR.

he must dress as a gentleman and live as a gentleman; and he must incur a heavy expense in the mess room entertaining guests whom he cannot turn away merely with a little civility. Officers are expected to subscribe to this and that, to go to this entertainment and that; so that unless a man has private means, he has, in time, to leave the service, or come to the end of his tether. Not only so, but at sixty years of age these men are dismissed from the service without a pension; and what is the consequence? They are not able to save a dollar. A man who is a bachelor may come out even; but if a man raises a family, which we all ought to do, and raises it properly, he is turned out on the world without a dollar to his name, and perhaps in debt. I am informed that two gentlemen holding the rank of lieutenant-colonel, who have served their country faithfully and well, are now obliged to earn their living by sweeping offices. If that is a fact—and I am told on the best of authority—it is a crying shame and a disgrace to Canada. If the hon. members of this House knew that matters had come to that pass, I cannot believe that they would refuse to hold up their hands for higher pay to the permanent officers. I think all the officers commanding districts, too, should have the same rate of pay. Because one man has 10,000 men under him and another has 2,000 under him, I do not think it is right that one man should get more pay than the other, as their responsibilities are the same. Now, I would like to ask the Minister of Militia in regard to the officers who so nobly gave up their commissions and joined the ranks to go with the troops to South Africa. Some time ago I asked in the House whether these officers would have the first chance of obtaining commissions when any were given. I believe the minister stated that the matter was going to be left to Lord Roberts. Well, I think that is hardly satisfactory, unless the minister recommends that they should be given the first chance. It was a noble example they set, and I think that any man who had a commission and willingly gave it up to join the ranks and go and fight for his country should be the first to obtain a commission given by the Imperial service or by the Canadian government to fill vacancies caused by casualties.

Another matter I want to bring up, is the rations now issued to the troops in camp. I put a motion on the Order paper, which was never reached, to the effect that a certain addition should be made to these rations. I am told that the dinners given the troops in camp, are satisfactory, but that the breakfasts and suppers are too light altogether for men doing hard work in the open air. I would ask the hon. minister if he cannot see his way to give, say half a pound of bacon to each man for breakfast, and some dried apples for supper. If he were to do that he would find that the men

would do far better work, and there would be fewer men falling out of the ranks, and a more general feeling of satisfaction, and, I may say, feeling of repletion, than now exists among them.

Another question is that of the rifles. I have received letters from some officers with regard to the issue of the Lee-Enfield rifles. The minister informed me, in answer to a question some weeks ago, that a report had been called for from the superintendent of the cartridge factory, I believe, regarding these rifles. I never heard the result, but have been told that some of the rifles sent out from the old country, are what are called plugged rifles, namely, old Martini's plugged and bored with the Lee-Enfield rifling, and after they are fired off rapidly fifteen or twenty times, they show a space between the old barrel and the plug, and are useless. Has the hon. minister had any report to that effect, because if that be true, it is evident that we have been swindled by the old country contractors?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. You mean the late government?

Mr. PRIOR. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am informed that there is no official report of that kind in the department.

Mr. PRIOR. I would ask the hon. minister to look into the question, and if he will make inquiries, he will find that such is the experience of some of the regiments. Many officers and men have told me that they could not use these rifles for first-class shooting, but had to buy good rifles from good makers. The hon. gentleman knows that in pointing this out, I am only actuated by a desire for the efficiency of our force.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer, and I am sorry to have to detain the House so long, but it is far better to discuss these things at once, than keep them until the votes comes up in supply. The question I wish to refer to is that of a reserve force. We have a reserve of first-class officers, but I do not think the officers are much good unless we have a reserve force of men. It has been suggested to me by one very good man, and the matter has been talked over on several occasions, that the government should have a reserve of some 20,000 or 25,000 men. That could be very easily obtained. We are passing out hundreds of men every year from the active militia, who have served their time and have a very good knowledge of drill. It would cost very little to form a reserve of these men, just as there is a reserve in England formed from the retired men of the regular army. These men might be supplied with a cheap khaki uniform, which would cost very little, and they might be drilled three or four days every year, just sufficient to keep them from getting rusty, and with little expense. The necessary rifles and proper transport and equip-

ment might be kept in store. These should be kept in store even if we had not the men, for in case of trouble, what is the good of calling out men, unless we are able to supply them with the necessary rifles and transport equipment. This is one of the most important matters that can be possibly dealt with by a gentleman holding the responsible position which the hon. minister does.

Another question I would ask is, why the staff course inaugurated by General Hutton at Kingston, was put an end to. It seems to me that that was a most important course. If the militia is to be put on the very best footing, we must have commissioned officers capable of performing staff duties. I was in hopes, when we started that course, that in a very short time, we should have men thoroughly qualified to fill important staff positions, but, if I am rightly informed, that course has been put a stop to. Why, I do not know. All I can say is that I hope the minister will see fit to start it again, and see that the very best men are appointed to follow that course.

I also wish to draw the attention of the House to a notice I read in the newspapers the other day, with regard to the company of Royal Canadian Infantry, now stationed at Victoria, having offered their services to go to China in case any Canadians are wanted to take part in defending the British flag in that country. If such is the case, it does credit to the officers and men of that company, who have thus willingly and bravely offered their services, if required, to be despatched to China. I cannot say that will be a 'happy despatch,' and I hope they will not receive it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The report is a telegraphic one to the newspapers, and I presume will come by mail, but it has not reached the department.

Mr. PRIOR. I hope that the newspapers and the department will give these men due credit for the offer they have made.

There is another matter in which I have taken a great personal interest during the past few years, and to which the hon. minister and the hon. member for Three Rivers have given attention, and that is the repatriation of the Old Hundredth Regiment. That regiment has left these shores, and I am afraid that the same interest will not be taken in it by the home office that it would have done had it still remained here. I know well that the first battalion is particularly anxious to be repatriated as the Royal Canadians. I take an interest in this, because I had relatives in it as officers when it was formed here, and they urged me many years ago to do my best to have this accomplished. I trust that the hon. minister will not lose sight of it, but keep urging the Imperial government to have that matter brought to a successful issue.

The next matter I have to speak about is the younger portion of our population, the

school boys and cadets of Canada. I was very glad to hear the hon. minister say, that he thinks it very essential that our public school children and the young cadets of Canada should be thoroughly trained to the use of arms and in military drill. No doubt every commanding officer looks forward to that with the greatest pleasure, for it means the establishment of the very best recruiting ground for him when the boys leave school. They will have acquired a liking for drill, and have become impregnated with the martial spirit, and the first thing they will do will be to join some militia corps. I would like to know from the minister, what means one has to take to obtain rifles for these school boys. We have in Victoria and Vancouver and other portions of British Columbia, as strapping young lads at school, as you can see anywhere, and they are all wanting rifles. They are drilled now, but the drill is of very little use unless you give them rifles. You might provide them with carbines or light rifles, which would be of great benefit to them and to the militia in the long run.

I thank the hon. the Minister of Militia and this House, for having borne with me so patiently, but as this is a matter in which we all ought to take a deep interest, I do not feel myself under any necessity to apologize for having spoken at such great length. As this is a matter in which I have taken a great deal of interest, I shall not apologize for having spoken at the length I have.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think it is only due to my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) who has just taken his seat, and to the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), that I should say just two or three words. I think I might say in beginning, that what has taken place this evening should be a lesson to the ordinary politicians in this House—when they see how gentlemen as strong in their political views and predilections as any men in this House, can come together and enter upon a friendly discussion of an important branch of the public service such as the militia undoubtedly is. I appreciate very highly the fair manner in which the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Adolphe Caron) and the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) have approached this discussion and have carried it through from beginning to end, actuated, as I believe them to be solely—chiefly, at any rate—by a desire to throw some light on this important subject, and to give to the House, the country and myself the benefit of their views. I do not find any fault whatever with my hon. friend from Three Rivers for having told us that he himself had had something to do with originating some of the things which he thought I had unjustifiably taken credit for. I think, if he will take the trouble to look over my speech when it is printed, he will see that he is mistaken in some of the cases, notably in

Mr. PRIOR.

the case of the improvement in the medical branch of the service. I distinctly pointed out to the hon. members of this House that I was myself in camp during the time the hon. gentleman was Minister of Militia, and that during his regime some great improvements had taken place.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) will permit me to interrupt him for a moment—what I claim, and what I still claim, is that the medical service, which did not exist before 1885 when the troubles in the North-west commenced, was organized then; and I mentioned that Dr. Bergin and Dr. Roddick were the ones who advised the department at that time. I do not pretend to say that the system was as perfect as it became afterwards, by reason of the fact that we had not the advantages which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has possessed since. But the service was organized when the troubles in the North-west arose.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is practically what I intended to say—although very radical changes have been made within the last six or eight months which I believe to be great improvements. I desire to say a word on some of the questions which my hon. friend from Victoria brought up. I agree with him entirely as to the desirability of giving a larger number of rounds per man for the shooting. Under our present system, however, it is very difficult for us to use in the camp more than the number issued. I presume that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) would mean not to limit the shooting to the camps.

Mr. PRIOR. No.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then, I think my hon. friend made a capital point with reference to the question of uniform. I am entirely in sympathy with the view expressed by him as to the undesirability of having our present expensive uniform. As he says, it deters many of the best young men in the country from joining the militia. That is a subject to which I have given some attention, and I am entirely in sympathy with the view he has expressed. With regard to the pay of the permanent force, I agree with him there also. The difficulty is to persuade everybody else of the desirability of the increase. I also believe that we should have some pension system. I promised last year to try to introduce it. I have done the best I could; but, I am sorry to say, that this session must go through without my accomplishing it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) has asked me a question as to the officers who gave up their commissions and voluntarily went into the ranks of the contingents sent to South Africa. I think it was quite right to offer to Lord Roberts the gift of twenty-four of the commissions that were given to this country—I think that twenty-four

out of forty was not too large a number to have given to the men in South Africa. I think also that it would have been scarcely proper to have restricted Lord Roberts. I felt that he would call upon Colonel Otter, Drury, Lessard and Evans and the other officers there to advise him as to the best men to receive the commissions. And I think that already at least some of the men who gave up their commissions in Canadian regiments and went to South Africa as privates have been promoted. I think there has been one or two, if not more, cases of that kind. I feel, and have always felt, that these men were entitled to special considerations; and if they do not receive it there, I think they should receive it when they return to Canada. With regard to what the hon. member for Victoria has said in the matter of camp rations I shall be very glad to take that into consideration and see what can be done. The hon. gentleman says that if we are to have a reserve of officers we ought to have a reserve of men. There is a great deal of force in that remark. Still, I think it is of the first importance to have a reserve of officers, because they can be utilized in case of difficulty. But I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that we should have the militia reserve enrolled. Theoretically, we have it already, but practically we have not. I think that is one of the things that the department should take up; and even if the men were only called out for a single day, simply to perfect their organization, I think that should be done. And, as the hon. gentleman says, it could be done at very little expense indeed. I agree also that the country should have a reserve of arms sufficient to arm the reserve in case it is organized. With regard to the repatriation of the 100th Regiment, it came very near being carried out before the regiment left Halifax; but, unfortunately, it was not carried out. I felt that was the opportune moment to bring it about. The matter is still in abeyance, and is now before the War Office. The proposition is that Halifax or some other point in Canada should be made a depot of the regiment; it should be transferred from its present position in Ireland to Halifax.

They would have there all the machinery of an Imperial depot. That is the proposal now before the War Office. There are those who think we would find it difficult to recruit, but the events of the last six or eight months have converted me to the view that there would not be a great deal of difficulty. I have reason to think that the War Office looks favourably upon the suggestion. The hon. gentleman asked me what steps were necessary in order to procure rifles for the cadets of schools. The only thing that is necessary is to complete an organization and then make application to the district officer commanding. We have still a number of rifles that are coming in, as we issue the new Lee-Enfield the old

rifles are returned to the store, and we are not only willing but anxious to get rid of them in this useful way.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). I regret that I was not aware that the subject of the militia was coming up for discussion this evening, as I had entertained some views that I would have been glad to have laid before the committee in proper shape. I had the pleasure of listening to some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Victoria, and I must say that I heartily approve of them. He seems to have made a study of this question, and they certainly were of interest and of much value to the service. I was especially pleased to note the harmonious and generous spirit in which this whole militia matter was discussed this evening. With regard to giving boys military training, I think no better plan could be adopted than for the Federal government to arrange for giving military instruction to the youths of this country, and imparting it to them in all the public schools. I would suggest the Federal government communicate with the superintendents of education in each province, and let them devise some scheme or plan whereby that instruction and the character of the same could be given during school hours. One-half an hour can be employed very profitably each school day in drill instruction that is now idly employed by the boys in going out for recreation during the term of recess. They are supposed during recess to move about and kick up their heels for physical exercise, which exercise can be profitably employed in military drill. I would not say that such drill should be confined strictly to the boys; if the girls wish to form a corps for similar drill let them do so, where there is a mixed school let each be separate. Where boys and girls are taught in separate departments, they might receive drill instruction in each department. By training of this sort, youths acquire not only the military drill, but a graceful and easy carriage, a fine physique, a martial appearance, and a noble bearing most essential to both sexes, as you will see as they approach and arrive to ripe young manhood or womanhood. I think that if our boys were given military training and some instruction in military tactics it would stand them in good stead in riper years, and they would be better able to shoulder a rifle, and know its use in defence of their country in time of need. It is evident that after receiving such instruction they would be ready to enter the ranks with very little training, but with excellent beneficial results.

I may here mention that I am interested in a little corps of youths in my own county, for whose instruction I am paying, especially for a bandmaster to give them instruction in music. The reason I have not given them instruction in drill is simply because I cannot get the rifles. The hon.

member for Victoria referred to the matter of rifles to be placed in the hands of the boys. If the minister could furnish a certain description of rifle, a little lighter than the present rifle which is being used, I think it would be more advantageous to the boys, and greatly tend to inspire them with a martial spirit if in possession of such arms better than were they drilled without. With regard to a school of instruction, I may say that I referred to it in a letter that I sent to the head teacher at Mahone Bay school in my county on last Empire Day. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend in person, and so I did the next best thing by sending a letter with some advice on loyalty, &c. I think if these ideas were promulgated and brought into practice amongst the youths of the various provinces by the federal government they would have a very useful effect. I would suggest that the Minister of Militia and Defence take this matter up with care and move in the direction I suggest, and I am sure he will see very useful results.

Now, with regard to the uniform, as was well said by the hon. member for Victoria, is a very expensive bit of clothing for an officer to furnish, particularly if he is not blessed with considerable means in the needful. I may mention that my own uniform cost me, with the horse equipment, &c., no less a sum than about \$600. Of course, a uniform for an officer of lesser rank would cost less, and we might find the material in Canada and adopt a style of uniform that would cost very much less than that at present in vogue. I do not see why we should follow the example of old England as to the colour and quality of uniform; we can adopt one of our own, if we see fit, in which we would feel greater pride, knowing it to be a Canadian uniform, and the material manufactured at home or in Canada. With regard to the rank of colonel, I do not know whether it would be in place for me at present to offer any remarks on that subject, seeing that there is a Bill coming up for its third reading in that connection. I will, however, venture to say this much, that I think it would be a mistake to place a civilian who has never known anything of military tactics, over the head of a lieutenant-colonel who has risen in the service to possess the title of lieutenant-colonel. I think after he has spent his whole life in that work, borne the burden and heat of the day, it would be unfair to place over his head a civilian without any knowledge of drill or military tactics, simply because he happened to be wealthy, or belonged to some political stripe, or had some political influence with the government of the day. It would be also unfair again to those occupying a lesser rank, such as that of major or lieutenant, or an officer of the staff. If the hon. minister will permit me, I would suggest that the object could be readily attain-

Mr. KAULBACH.

ed if he would adopt a mode of procedure which I will here propose. He will pardon me if I make bold enough to dictate to him what I think would be advisable to meet his purpose. I would say that the friend or friends of any person who is desirous of having the rank of colonel or lieutenant-colonel should advise the officer in command of the regiment to bring the matter to the notice of the battalion at a meeting that would be called for the purpose, at which the matter could be discussed pro and con in regard to this party. If it was considered that the appointee was one worthy of the position of being a colonel or lieutenant-colonel, the name so submitted at that meeting and approved of would be reported to the government, or to the hon. Minister of Militia, who would report and make a recommendation to the Governor in Council, if he approved of the nomination, and so accomplish his object. In that way a person would acquire the rank of colonel or lieutenant-colonel, but it would emanate from the battalion, and he would become a colonel or a lieutenant in a way that would be more regular and more satisfactory than if a Bill were passed whereby he would be hoisted into a position by a government or a political party of which he would, perhaps, be very undeserving. I repeat again, Mr. Chairman, that I am sorry I did not know this matter was coming up this evening or I would have been able to have formulated my ideas, and to have placed them before the committee in a better position than, perhaps, I have done this evening.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think it was agreed that when we had two sittings a day we would not sit beyond twelve o'clock. The hon. gentleman knows that we have the Railway and Agriculture Committees tomorrow morning in addition to a morning sitting of the House, so that if the hon. gentleman does not mean to ask us to do more work than we are able to do he will consent to an adjournment, which, I think, will contribute to the expedition of the passage of the estimates instead of interfering with their progress. We have had a discussion that has cleared the atmosphere to a very great extent, and if the hon. gentleman will agree to the adjournment now, I think it will not interfere at all with the progress of the estimates to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I hope the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) will not object to some of the estimates going through. We have spent a good many hours in the discussion. Some of the items may be left over. The course that was pursued last year, after the discussion, was that one item was reserved with the understanding that the whole discussion on every branch of the militia estimates could be had on that item. I am quite willing, and not only willing, but anxious,

that an arrangement of that kind should be made now. It seems to me that after sitting here so long we ought to have at least the appearance of getting through with some work, and I would suggest that to my hon. friend as a solution of the difficulty. I would like to give some explanation of the items, and we can reserve one or two upon which the whole question can be reopened at any time when we take them up.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think this is a very unsatisfactory way of dealing with estimates. The hon. gentleman says that we will go through the whole discussion again. It is better not to go over it twice. It is better to give it up to-night and to take up the estimates to-morrow and dispose of them. I do not think it will expedite matters to continue the discussion. The hon. gentleman must admit that most of the points at issue have been pretty well ventilated to-night. There are some points about promotion and other matters that will necessitate some discussion. I think we have done pretty well to-day, and I would ask the hon. gentleman, in his own interest, not to insist upon proceeding. I think it would be far better to adjourn now, and to take up the estimates whenever the government see fit to take them up again. To-morrow will be a very busy day, as the Railway Committee will have an important session, as the Committee on Agriculture will sit at ten o'clock, and as the House will also be in session.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I quite agree with my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron), that, as we have morning sessions of the House, we should not be expected to sit late at night. Although my hon. friend says that the atmosphere has been cleared, the evidence on the Votes and Proceedings of the work that we have done will be rather small. I would prefer that we should take some of the non-contested items to-night and make a reasonable degree of progress. I have no desire to ask the House to sit very late. I think we might take a few items and then adjourn.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think we have done a sufficient amount of work to-day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, we have not done any work that will show on the Votes and Proceedings.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Votes and Proceedings will not be out until we have done the work, so that nobody will know anything about it.

Mr. CLANCY. I think, since we will have two important committees sitting to-morrow, one at ten o'clock and another at eleven o'clock, the hon. Minister of Militia can hardly ask us to proceed further to-night. We have had a very interesting discussion, and the hon. gentleman should remember that he has taken up a good deal of the time

himself. I think it is hardly fair to ask us to go on.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will ask my hon. friend to compromise in this way; take vote No. 30 for civil government contingencies. That will leave all the main estimates open for discussion. The contingent vote is the same as last year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Very well.

The committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Might I ask the government what they intend taking up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think there is an understanding between the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) that the Election Bill should be considered on Tuesday, if my memory is correct. Failing that we will go on with the militia estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Tuesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, June 26, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### YARMOUTH STEAMSHIP COMPANY AND THE DOMINION ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). I have a motion to bring before the House, for which I ask the kind indulgence of the House when I state the circumstances. It is for leave to suspend the rules and introduce a Bill permitting the Yarmouth Steamship Company to sell and the Dominion Atlantic Company to buy all the vessels and stock of the former company. The Dominion Atlantic Railway Company runs between Halifax and Yarmouth, and has steamers connecting with Boston. The Yarmouth Steamship Company is an old company, that for many years has had a steamship line between Yarmouth and Boston. A certain amount of rivalry and competition has grown up in the steamship business between these two companies, and has lasted many years. Their differences have been before the Privy Council, and their competition has been, no doubt, disastrous, or at least not advantageous, to both companies. Up to within perhaps a fortnight the rivalry was going on in the usual way in which struggles of that kind are carried on. But the Yarmouth Steamship Company

lost its chief manager, the Hon. Mr. Baker, whose death was a great loss to the whole province of Nova Scotia, and probably that fact, combined with the continuous efforts of the steamship company to promote its business, has brought the companies together, and within the last fortnight a proposition has been made by the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company to purchase all the outfit of the Yarmouth Company, and the latter company is in the process of agreeing to the sale. I think that the amount of the purchase is in the neighbourhood of \$350,000. No time for advertising or giving the usual notices can be had, and it is of the utmost importance to the two companies, and of considerable importance to the community, that this bargain should be consummated. The Bill has been submitted to the solicitors of both companies, and both have agreed to it, and the Minister of Railways is favourable to the proposition, and requested me to introduce the Bill. I therefore move :

That all the rules and orders be suspended in relation to the Bill authorizing the sale of the Yarmouth Steamship Company's property and certain of its rights, privileges and franchises to the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, Limited.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) The date at which this is brought in makes it impossible, I suppose, that the different interests shall have the notices which are thought reasonable and necessary in order that no individual interests may be injured. It seems rather an important thing to undertake to give the power of purchase and amalgamation in a case involving such large interests, without public notice. What statement has the hon. gentleman from the solicitors of the company showing that all the interests are united in this matter, because the majority of interests might be united and individual interests might object and be seriously injured?

Mr. FLINT. I can give the hon. gentleman my assurance that I am personally aware that it is the unanimous wish of the shareholders of the Yarmouth Steamship Company that this amalgamation should be effected. They are very much in favour of the transaction, and the negotiations are going on in the town of Yarmouth.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the extent of the controlling interest? Is it widely distributed or in compact form?

Mr. FLINT. I think that the principal shareholders are in Yarmouth and Halifax, but there may be a few shares held elsewhere. I was in Halifax and met some of the shareholders, and they were all unanimous in desiring to have the sale take place.

Mr. FOSTER. Has there been any meeting of the shareholders?

Mr. FLINT. The Bill does not provide for the sale, but only for the permission to

Mr. FLINT.

sell, and of course they have to carry through the transactions leading up to the sale according to law.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FLINT moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 185), authorizing the sale of the Yarmouth Steamship Company's property and certain of its rights, privileges and franchises to the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, Limited.

Motion agreed to : Bill read the first and the second time, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the order being called for—

Introduction of a Bill to secure uniform conditions in the policies of fire insurance.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) At this time of the session, it does not seem right that any Bill that the government really propose to put through should now be kept back from introduction, printing and distribution. We have already had notice given of an entirely new Bill, the subject of which was discussed at the beginning of the session ; and there does not seem to be any reason under heaven why that Bill should not have been down, discussed and acted upon months ago—but it is left now until the dying hours of the session. Here are two government measures on the Order paper of which notice is given, but neither of them is ready for introduction at this moment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The first is not a government measure, and though I am not authorized to speak for the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) I believe he does not intend to proceed with it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). As to the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), in whose name the other measure stands, he is away at this moment and was away yesterday for a very pious object—that of attending the funeral of Col. Tyrwhitt.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I wish to call attention once more to the fact that I have not yet got the returns from the different departments of the government with reference to the officials dismissed on account of alleged partisanship. Although I have asked for the return for both years, and the House has ordered it, I have only fragmentary returns and returns which only come down to the 26th of April, 1899. Despite all the promises of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and all the even humiliating requests that I have made, I

find myself now actually out of court so far as getting the information I want is concerned. The order of the House is treated with contempt—nothing more and nothing less.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) tell me the particular departments to which he refers?

Mr. **FOSTER**. All of them. There is not one of them that has complied with the order, with the exception of that of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—which is complete, if the wording corresponds with the intent, as I explained to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies).

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) does not mean that all departments have failed to make returns. I am not aware of anything in my own department.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Some of the departments have no returns to make. But even of those that have returns to make, none have given anything later than the 26th of April, 1899, and some of them have not even returned up to that date.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I do not think that any dismissals have taken place since 1899.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Yes; I know of some. I have a special case, which will be brought up, which took place in 1900.

Mr. **NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN** (West Assiniboia). I wish to say, in regard to the large return that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) brought down, I have looked through it, and the letters I wanted, I regret to say, are not there.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I am not answerable for that. I do not know particularly what letters the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) wants. But I am sure—and I know that the hon. gentleman has no doubt—that Mr. White would comply with the order of the House.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—ASSIGNMENT OF SOLDIERS' PAY.

Mr. **GEORGE TAYLOR** (South Leeds). Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden) to a letter I have just received:

Seeley's Bay, June 25, 1900.

George Taylor, Esq., M.P.,  
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—My son Charles, who is in South Africa, signed over half his pay to me. Please inform me the cause of the difference in the amounts we receive. On April 1 we received \$11.25; on May 1, \$9.20; June 1, \$6.

Please favour with your attention.

(Sgd.) A. W. SWEET.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). I will get the answer this afternoon if possible.

#### CORPORAL COURTNEY.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. I would like to know from the Minister of Militia if he is prepared to give a supplementary answer in regard to Corporal Courtney?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. I have not yet received an answer. The papers have not yet come. I will telegraph for them to-day.

#### HONORARY COLONEL.

Mr. **A. McNEILL** (North Bruce). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the Minister of Militia whether there have been recently any Canadian civilians appointed as honorary colonels, and whether the House is to understand that that splendid soldier and military organizer, General Hutton, recommended appointments of that kind.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). All the appointments that were made up to the time General Hutton went away were recommended by him.

Mr. **McNEILL**. I understood from the hon. minister that he wished the House to understand that General Hutton had recommended—and some of us were a good deal surprised—the appointment of civilians as honorary colonels of military regiments. Were we correct in understanding the hon. minister in that sense—that General Hutton had recommended the appointment of civilians as honorary colonels?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Yes.

Mr. **McNEILL**. Canadian civilians?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Yes.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. In one case, General Hutton certainly recommended.

#### YUKON TELEGRAPH—MR. PERCY CHARLESON AND THE PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES.

Mr. **G. R. MAXWELL** (Burrard). Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to make a brief statement. It will be in the recollection of hon. members that the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made a serious charge, in his usual reckless way, against Mr. Charleson, in the city of Vancouver. I did not bring the matter up then, because I thought the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) would make some statement to the House to try to prove the charge he had made—

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I think if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell) is going to rise at this stage, and without any motion, make statements charging gentlemen on this side with making reckless charges, the House will probably be taken a long way afield. I call the attention of the Speaker to it.

Mr. MAXWELL. I simply want to read a telegram—

Mr. FOSTER. I beg to call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell) did not simply read a telegram, but proceeded to make a charge.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Maxwell) that he withdraw that statement about a reckless charge being made.

Mr. MAXWELL. I do not know—unless it is the wish of the Speaker and the House—I feel very strongly on this point.

Mr. FOSTER. I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell) has not withdrawn his statement.

Mr. MAXWELL. I beg to withdraw the statement. However, I shall have an opportunity at a more convenient season.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BERGERON. That is worse.

Mr. MAXWELL. The telegram is as follows:—

Vancouver, B.C., June 13-14.

George R. Maxwell, M.P.,  
Ottawa.

Re construction Yukon telegraph. Press dispatch says that my son, Percy Charleson, receives five per cent on all government goods bought here. Sorry Sir Hibbert Tupper made such a charge. I respect his father very much, but must say his son makes a false assertion. My son is in a more lucrative business than politics.

(Sgd.) J. B. CHARLESON.

Brokers here are the Crickmay Bros., who are strict Conservatives.

(Sgd.) DONALD B. CHARLESON.

Mr. Donald B. Charleson, who has signed, is a brother of Mr. J. B. Charleson, the superintendent of Yukon telegraphs.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether an hon. gentleman has a right to rise in this House and read telegrams or letters sent to him, making charges against members of this House? That telegram does that, and does it in a very offensive way. I would like to have your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to the rights of members in that respect.

Mr. HAGGART. It does much more, it contradicts a statement in this House, contradicts a statement by a telegram.

Mr. MAXWELL. I would point out that the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles

Mr. MAXWELL.

Hibbert Tupper) made serious charges against this gentleman, and without attempting to substantiate that charge he runs away now to the Pacific coast. The impression has gone abroad that the statement made by the hon. member in his charge, is true. Now, I say it is surely the right of a member of this House to clear the character of a citizen than whom there is no more honourable and respectable in the city of Vancouver.

Mr. FOSTER. Chair.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I do not dispute the right of the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) to ask for your ruling, but I would like first to call attention to the fact that he read the other day a telegram from a gentleman accusing the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) of making a false and malicious statement. I thought it was an improper telegram, and I think my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) is not within the rule in reading this telegram. But I do not think the member for York should raise the point, after violating the rule himself within the last few days.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not alter the point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must say that the rule has been violated in this case. I think there are some statements in that telegram that, to say the least of it, are unnecessary; but the practice of the House has been, as a matter of courtesy to outside individuals, to allow hon. members to deny charges made against outside individuals. But I think it is unfair to the dignity of the House that suggestions should be made against the fairness of members of the House by outsiders.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Or by members of the House, for that matter.

Mr. GEO. LANDERKIN (South Grey). If a member is shielded by privileges of the House in assailing a person who has no opportunity to reply, it is natural that the person assailed should take the first opportunity to defend himself.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, but he should not strike back.

Mr. BERGERON. I think the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) is unjust to the hon. member for Pictou in saying that after having made accusations he then ran away. My hon. friend from Pictou asked this House to make a full investigation into all these charges, and the government denied the hon. member for Pictou the opportunity to prove his charges.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to

call the attention of the government to the fact that a return promised by Mr. Ogilvie over a year ago has not yet been brought down to the House; and to the further fact that the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) has acknowledged before this House that he has telegraphed to Mr. Ogilvie repeatedly for that report, or an explanation of why it has not been sent, and that he also wrote Mr. Ogilvie later, demanding an explanation for his conduct, and that afterwards, in response to a request made from the House, he sent an urgent telegram to know why there was delay. Up to the present hour parliament is in this position, that one of its paid officers, with very great power in the Yukon, has actually refused to send in his report, has actually refused to answer telegrams of urgent inquiry. Parliament is to-day without the information which it ought to have from this officer, and without any satisfactory explanation as to why he has acted in that way. I think we ought to know whether communications with the Yukon have been entirely interrupted, and we ought to know the position of the government in reference to that matter.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no objection to my hon. friend bringing up the question, he is within his rights in doing so. But this is not the proper time: and moreover, I would remind him that the Railway Committee is sitting at this moment, and the acting Minister of the Interior is not in the House and is unable to give any answer.

Mr. FOSTER. But the right hon. gentleman is here, and I think it more nearly affects him as leader of the government, than probably it does the Minister of the Interior.

The PRIME MINISTER. I decline to discuss this question in the absence of the Minister of the Interior.

### THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 180) respecting Chinese Immigration.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Militia—Pay and allowances ..... \$381,094

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). There is an increase in this vote of \$28,198. The increase in the pay of headquarters district staff is \$3,198; and the increase to permanent force, 101 additional men, is \$25,000. Major Rivers, of the permanent force, was invalided some time ago as a result of his services in the North-west rebellion, and became unable properly to perform his duties. He was brought to Ottawa to do work here in connection with the medals, he is head of the

Medals Claim Board. We have found him an efficient officer, and it is proposed now to make a permanent provision to retain him here. As his services are thought to be very valuable, \$1,800 will be used in that way. That, with certain smaller items, accounts for \$3,192 of the increase. The rest of the increase is \$25,000 additional to permanent force. We have increased the permanent force to 966 men from 865 last year.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before the minister passes on to his estimates, will he tell us if there is anything decided as to who shall be the general of our troops here, taking the place of General Hutton permanently.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may say to my hon. friend that there is a name before the government for its consideration. I daresay I may be able to state this afternoon, but at the present moment I am not able, particularly in the absence of the Prime Minister, to make any statement in reference to the subject, although I think the matter will be settled in a day or two.

Annual drill ..... \$275,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There appears to be a decrease of \$25,000 in this vote, but I do not wish to mislead the committee in any way in reference to it. The vote for annual drill will not be reduced. As I have explained several times to the House, we never know in advance when the major part of the force will be called out for annual drill. This year the largest proportion of the force has been called out before the 1st of July. Circumstances may occur next year under which it will not be necessary to do that, but, in any case, I may say that the annual cost of drilling the force has been demonstrated to be about \$425,000. I think this has been the cost for the last two or three years, so that although there is an apparent decrease here, no doubt supplementary estimates for next year will be required next session, which will make up the vote for the year to about \$425,000.

Mr. FOSTER. But you have your details for \$425,000. Look on page 41.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is a misprint. It should be \$275,000. There are other misprints. A little farther down there is a worse misprint.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men will have been drilled this year when all the drills have taken place?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. About 35,000 within the financial year.

Mr. FOSTER. How many days actual drill do these men get?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They are paid for twelve days,

but it takes one day to get into camp and one day to break up camp. That leaves ten days, and then there are two Sundays, which reduces actual drill to eight days. Of course, there are services on Sunday, when the men are paraded and marched to Divine service, which is of some use to them from the point of view of discipline and drill, although the actual drilling days are about eight. The other two days are also useful, going into camp, learning how to put up the tents, and organizing the camp. In the same manner, the last day, going out, is useful, as the men receive instruction in striking their tents, packing them up, and getting ready for the march.

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion of this amount is for transport?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. About \$45,000.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) How does the minister apportion the transport? Does he give contracts or call for tenders for moving the troops?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have a fixed rate with the railways. Under the Militia Act we have power to force the railways to accept the lowest current rates prevailing at the time for freight and passengers. An order in council was passed some three years ago, when Colonel Lake was here, dealing with the subject. A good deal of reduction was made at that time by the railway companies, as compared with the old rates. As far as steamboats or any other kinds of transportation, outside of the railways, are concerned, we ask for tenders in every case.

Mr. PRIOR. Will the minister say that in all cases he has called for tenders and given the contract to the lowest bidder?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. In all cases to the lowest tenderer?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In all cases.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be with a great deal of assurance that I should attempt to criticise militia matters, but, from a layman's point of view, there are two or three things that strike me. Of these 35,000 men who may, in the course of the year, be called out and given these eight days' drill, how many of them, from past experience, take a second year's drill? What proportion of the people drilled would be recruits or raw men?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is a very interesting and very important question. The percentage will differ a good deal in different places. But, my experience is that not more than 66 per cent, and even, perhaps, as low as 50 per cent, will go out a second year.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Mr. FOSTER. Then the point of my remark is this: We are here face to face with an expenditure of close upon half a million dollars, or say, \$425,000, each year for the mere purpose of what you may call mechanical drill. This is an immense amount of money. Outside of its being a large amount of money in itself, the question which ought to be satisfactorily answered, I think, is as to whether it is an amount of money for the expenditure of which we are getting the advantages that we ought to get from one point of view and one only—the actual defensive power of the country. I do not think it makes very much for the argument as to whether you have a few persons finely drilled in all the technical movements of the army. The main point, in the end, is this: What is the effective power of the country, as a whole, to defend itself in case of attack, and what is the power of the country if it becomes necessary to make an offensive movement? Now, it seems to me, as a layman and an onlooker, that a great deal of money has been spent in the past, and is being spent at present, upon what is absolutely of no value at all in the actual work of battle, or in the field, and I think nothing has been a greater object lesson to the world at large, and to Canada in particular, from that point of view, than what has taken place during the last six months in the Transvaal. Speaking briefly, and without going into details, it has shown that it does not take any three or four years to make a soldier, that it does not amount to very much as to whether a man has been in camp eight days out of the year every other year or every three years or not. You make soldiers in this age out of self-reliant men, who have initiative, men used to intelligent and self-reliant action; you make soldiers out of these men in a very few days time during the actual work of battle.

Provided that you have the courage, and there is no doubt of that in reference to Canadian militiamen and the Canadian people; provided that you have the intelligence; the initiative; the power to act independently of suggestions which is the characteristic of our Canadian people, and provided you have in the hands of these men an effective weapon and the knowledge by these men that they are able to use that weapon; you have, I believe, the nucleus of the best army in the world, and one which only requires a very little of the active field work under intelligent commanders to make the most effective defence, when defence is necessary, and the most successful offensive movement, when that is necessary. Is there not some way in which you can spend \$425,000 much better than to call from amongst our rural population young men of different ages, green as far as anything like military evolutions are concerned, altogether unused to the rifle; herd them in close railway carriages and carry them away to the place where they are put to drill. There is no doubt they will get

some good in the eight days they are there, but they get it at a tremendous expenditure of the people's money. Coming right down to common sense, what do they learn after all? They hear the bugle call, they get the announcements that are made from day to day; they know they have to be in at a certain time and out at a certain time; they are to keep themselves spick and span and all the like of that, and they get a certain amount of practice in marching in an order which I suppose once out of a hundred times is not carried out in the stress and storm of battle. During that eight days drill how often do they fire a musket? What knowledge do they get of the power and the control and the use of the one weapon upon which they have to depend in battle for their effectiveness against the foe? I tender my remarks with a great deal of modesty, but I must say that I believe they echo the lay idea which is growing pretty strong in this Dominion, that more effective use can be made of this half million dollars than in gathering these men together in order to give them an eight days drill in the semblance of war manoeuvring, which is so different from the actual that it is of very little use. I presume that 55 per cent of these young men never see a second drill, and during their ordinary avocations they do not practice what they learn in the camp. If they do not forget it they certainly do not learn any more in the interval. Could not the \$425,000 be better placed in teaching young men throughout our country the proper use of the proper rifle, and so making them masters of the weapon which is their sole reliance in time of war. I see through the press that there has been some practice with the Morris tube. I do not know what in the world a Morris tube is, but I do not imagine that Lord Roberts has any Morris tube business in the Transvaal, and I do not imagine that the men who simply practice in Morris tubes are going to know very much about the effective use of the rifle in time of war. It seems to me that what you want to get is something like the conditions of war. You want to shoot in the open air, you want to be practiced in taking cover, you want to be practiced in firing at a moving object. The enemy do not stand up and put their hands in their pockets and tell the opposing soldiers to fire at them. Our soldiers in actual warfare will have to fire at those who are taking advantage of every bit of cover, and it seems to me that the mimic warfare that you get out of this drill is just about as useless as it can be in comparison with the better practice which I think they might have. Take your 50,000 or 100,000 men, and with a proper expenditure of money teach every one of them during the year the use of the most approved rifle so that they will have confidence in it and become good shots, and you have an effective force in this country which I think will be sufficient for all our needs. These are in the rough, some

thoughts which have been running through my mind for some years and which have been impressed upon me more strongly by the lessons of the South African war. In that war after some experience has been gained the British troops when they advance, instead of marching shoulder to shoulder, three deep, have given up that kind of thing. Now, a reasonable general gets his men as far away from each other as he can so that there will be as little advantage as possible to the shooting of the enemy, and instead of walking right up and waving their flag and daring the whole world, I find that the soldiers now in battle dodge whenever they can dodge, seek cover wherever cover is afforded, and the men who do this are the most effective in the practical art of war to-day. I do not propose to teach the Minister of Militia anything. He knows it all, and I know nothing about it. However, I submit this little screed for what it is worth, and I still maintain that there could be a better use made of the \$425,000 than by investing it in the present system pursued during the eight days' drill.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) had been present last evening when this matter was fully discussed, he would have heard interesting views from some gentlemen on his own side of the House, even if he did not pay much attention to mine. There is without doubt a great deal of force in some of the observations which the hon. gentleman has made. However, if he were at all familiar with military matters he would know that it is a very long time since the idea of marching shoulder to shoulder was exploded. That idea only exists to-day in songs.

Mr. FOSTER. It exists in the drill to-day, for I see it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, in marching past on the Queen's Birthday. But, thirty-five years ago when I first became a volunteer, advancing and retiring were done in skirmishing order. However, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says, many valuable lessons have been learned from the South African war, and the most important is that the soldier is no longer a part of a machine in which he apparently has no interest but to march to the front and do what he is told. He must under modern conditions be a man of brains, and capable under a commander of taking advantage of every opportunity he can get to save himself, both during his advance to the front and while retiring.

But I think my hon. friend is quite mistaken in supposing that anything could take the place of annual drill. If any change should be made, I think it should rather be in the direction of increasing the term of the annual camps than diminishing or doing

away with it. If the hon. gentleman had said that the time was so short that very little good resulted, and that therefore we should abolish the whole thing unless we saw fit to increase the time, I might be inclined to listen to what he said: but to say that we should sweep away annual drill absolutely is equivalent to saying that we should wipe out the militia organization altogether. We must have organization; that is the underlying principle of an army. Whatever changes may be made in the future, you never can have an army fit to go into the field to fight, either offensively or defensively, without ample and careful organization. That is what is done by the annual camp. The most important part of the education of officers is to send them into the field where they will have an opportunity of putting their knowledge into practice, and learning how to lead men, if the necessity ever arose compelling them to take up arms. So with the men: they must know their places. Even though not more than 50 per cent of them go into camp the second year—and that is a very fair percentage—you will have men who are fond of soldiering; you will have the right-hand men and the left-hand men of sections, and non-commissioned officers; and you will have in these men the nucleus of an army when the occasion arises. I think it would be a very serious retrograde step, indeed, to do away with annual camp. My hon. friend talks about the expense. The expense amounts to about eight or ten cents per head of the population of this country to-day. There is not a country in the world, pretending to be a nation of any importance, and not a colony of the British Empire, I believe, where the expenditure per head of the population for military purposes is as small as it is in Canada. While I am quite at one with the hon. gentleman in believing that in the near future important changes will be made, that evolution will take place which will put matters on a better footing than they are to-day, I am not prepared to advise the House that we can dispense with the vote which is now before us.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I want to say a few words on this question, especially in view of what took place last night. I have always thought that it was fortunate for us in Canada that we are so situated and constituted that the great bulk of our inhabitants can follow the peaceful pursuits of life. I have invariably believed that one of the evils under which European countries are compelled to subsist is the militarism and military spirit prevalent amongst them—not because they desire to cultivate that spirit, but because they are so situated as perhaps to be obliged to do so in self-defence. As an evidence of the baneful effects of that spirit upon the European countries where it is so rampant, I may point out that many of their inhabitants are leaving and coming to Canada, the United States and

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

other countries where they are not compelled to do so much military service. For instance, the Doukhobors and Galicians come to this country because they do not want to fight, but want to follow the peaceful pursuits of life. I do not go so far as to say that the inhabitants of a country should not be compelled to fight in its defence. I think that is one of the duties that devolve upon the citizens of any country—that in the hour of danger they should be prepared to sacrifice human life if necessary in the defence of the country and of the rights they enjoy. But I draw a marked distinction between that and the military spirit which seems to be so rampant in European countries. I was struck last night with the suggestions made looking to the turning of the youth of our country towards a military life. One hon. gentleman said he regarded it as very important that we should make it compulsory upon every school teacher in the country to give military drill to the pupils. I drew attention to the fact that about two-thirds of our school teachers were ladies, and that it would be very inconvenient to put rifles into their hands and ask them to drill their pupils. I mentioned that to show that there is so little disposition to cultivate military discipline in our schools that it would be quite out of the question to expect that suggestion to be carried out: and I think it would be very unwise to incorporate any such suggestion in our school regulations. I can understand that when our young men reach the high schools or the collegiate institutes, it might be desirable to give them that preliminary military training which would be of use to them in the event of their taking to that line in after life; but to carry the system into the common schools of our country I have always thought would be very unwise. According to these main estimates, we have an expenditure to-day on military affairs of \$1,618,000. I suppose I would be within the mark in saying that in round numbers we spend \$2,000,000 a year on military affairs. I am far from saying that it is not wise to spend a considerable sum for that purpose, because while we remain a part of the British Empire, our position demands that we should incur an outlay and assume a responsibility for our share in the defence of the empire. But I think we may learn from the experience of European countries, where the military spirit is so rampant, that there is a danger of directing too much attention to military matters. There is a danger also of creating a desire on the part of a large number of our rising generation to go into unproductive lines, and this is one of the showy lines of life. No doubt it is useful, in times of need, but, as the ex-Minister of Finance has said, it is remarkable the rapidity with which ordinary labourers and artisans are able to go into military lines and make themselves efficient soldiers when the occasion arises. It is not necessary for a young man to have years of his life taken

up in soldiering. Such young men are taken from the farms and the workshops, and from behind the counter, and the experience of the American war, and the recent experience of our young men in South Africa, shows that such men, when put alongside the tried, steady military men of the regular ranks, are able to hold their own and prove themselves equally useful and efficient.

An hon. MEMBER. In the lower ranks.

Mr. SPROULE. In all the ranks except perhaps, at the very top as commanders. One of the great dangers in making military life so attractive for our young men is, that they will be tempted away from peaceful pursuits in large numbers and add to a class who are not wage-earners or producers. There are two reasons which attract young men into military life. One is the glitter, and the other is the comparative ease and luxury it offers, compared with the manual labour required in other peaceful pursuits. We should rather guard against the danger of fostering too much the military spirit in our young country. If history teaches us anything, it teaches us the evils that have resulted from this spirit in European countries, and, fortunately, as we are situated, it is easy for us to avoid those evils. I would, therefore, be rather opposed to the inclination to extend this spirit to any large extent, as some of our military men are disposed to do to-day. It is incumbent on public men rather to sound a note of warning than a note of encouragement when we see the inclination that is manifested in some quarters at present for military display and glory. For that reason, this very large expenditure does not meet with the warm and hearty approval on my part that it does on the part of some hon. members of this House who are infected with the desire to shine on the field of arms.

Mr. JAMES DOMVILLE (King's, N.B.) I think that the hon. minister is right in saying that we should extend our annual drill a few days. A great deal has been said about what can be learned in camp, and no doubt in twelve days a soldier will learn something. Our officers, for instance, will thereby become accustomed to handle and drill large bodies of men. Our men are enlisted for three years: and if 60 per cent only turn out every year, I should say that we should extend the annual drill to fourteen days, and alter our system in camp somewhat by giving more attention to shooting and less to drill. A great deal of this military display which we have witnessed in the past is not of much value. What we want is to turn out men thoroughly able to shoot. The first day of the camp does not amount to anything, neither does the last day when the camp breaks up; then there is a Sunday on which the men cannot drill, which makes three days gone, and the chances are that there will be two wet days when they cannot turn out, and this

takes a loss of five days, so that you have only seven days practically in which to teach the men everything. How much shooting can you do in that period? Every one with any experience knows that when regiments go to the butts, a number of men simply fire off their cartridges so that they may show they have shot, and very often a man who does not care about shooting will hand his ammunition over to one who does. I think that if the drill were lengthened by four days, the men could shoot more at their leisure and be better instructed, and then, perhaps, would continue their practice when they reach their homes and take a great deal of pride in learning the business. I should like to suggest also that every regiment should average 350 or 400 men when in camp, so that in the three years each regiment would pass through 800 or 1,000 men, and I should like to see these men who have put in their three years drill placed on the reserve of the regiments, and compelled to remain on that reserve for three years, so that if at any time a regiment should be called out, we would have 300 or 400 men of a reserve to fall back upon to make up the deficiency caused by those who did not respond to the call. Those men on the reserve list would learn to shoot in the way I have pointed out. I would also have the Militia Act amended so as to compel the reserve men to go into camp for one day in the year. Give them one day's pay and their rations, and let them use that day in practicing shooting. By that means we should double up our men, and instead of having 35,000 men capable of bearing arms and shooting, we would have 80,000 on hand, the majority of whom could be put into the field at almost an hour's notice. The same rules might be applied to horses for the cavalry. Let the horses be registered in the various districts and some little gratuity offered for the purpose of registration, so that the men might always know where they could get mounts.

We must also have cannons and machine guns. We talk about putting a force in the field, but we have only rifles for a certain number of men, and we should have sufficient rifles to arm, not only those who go into camp, but the reserve force as well, if we are to have an effective force. I feel very much inclined to agree with the hon. member for York in his opinion, that if we are to go on from year to year not getting more out of those camps than we do for the money we spend, it would be a very good plan not to have them at all. The regiments come into camp filled up with all sorts of men, despite the regulations as to height and health and uniforms, because the great struggle is to get enough men. Everybody is pretty well agreed that we must have these camps. They furnish opportunities for forming acquaintances in life, men from all parts are brought together, and each man is able to see what the other is worth, and obtains an experience which

makes him intelligent and which he would not get in any other way. But, what we require in camp is less drill and show and more shooting. We are all agreed on that, and I think that if my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) would reconsider the matter, he would agree that instead of twelve days we had better have fourteen or sixteen days. I think that every officer will agree with me. I am sure that the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Prior) will agree that there are hardly any of the men in any of the regiments who can shoot properly. Of course we have a Wimbledon here, and a Wimbledon in New Brunswick. But when the men went to South Africa the other day, not a single man of the shooting team went out. They have so many thousands a year to spend on ranges, and then the crack shots meet and arrange the matter among themselves. The young men do not go there; the rifle associations are not bringing out these young men and making them efficient as shots. Rifle shooting cannot be practiced without ranges, as the rifles have such range and penetration. I would like to see the government ask a certain amount of money for every district, and offer prizes for rifle shooting at local rifle ranges. I take very little stock, I must say, in the Dominion or rifle associations. There are just a few men who win all the prizes, and they shoot until they are sixty or seventy, and the young men do not come forward to learn.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. And the old men do not go to war.

Mr. DOMVILLE. No; as soon as they can shoot and have spent five years in a colonelcy, the hon. minister sends them away and gets others. I would like the hon. minister to think about this shooting business. Let prizes be offered, even though the smallest trifle, so that a young fellow who takes an interest in shooting, will feel that his skill has been recognized. They all have their girls; as they walk around, they like to have the girls point to them and say: Our man won the prize.

Mr. FOSTER. The point of the remarks I made, and the point of the remarks since made, I think converge on this idea: That while you must have your young men out, and while you must bring them together, the main thing is to see that they get the most and best possible out of the training when they are together, and out of the money that is spent upon them. I think the people of Canada have come to the point where they are not satisfied with the results we have got out of the large expenditure of money up to the present time. And, while parliament, and the country behind parliament, have been generous in the amounts of money placed at the disposal of the militia—and are willing to continue paying—I think the country feels that more should be done to prepare us for defence.

Mr. DOMVILLE.

We are a great country; and while we do not want to be Jingoese, while we do not wish our young men to take as the ideal of life the idle soldier's life, we want our young men to feel patriotism in the first place—and what is equally good—to feel the confidence in their trained ability to enforce that patriotism if necessary. Now, the frills and ornaments have taken up a great part of the money hitherto—that, and the good time. I feel certain that there is a way that could be found out and adopted to make these young men who go into the drill in summer and autumn, something better than they have the chance of being made under the old system. I believe that a system can be worked out and adopted under which rifle shooting will become common throughout the country. Rifle shooting should be supported and aided by the government. You have made a big rifle range at Ottawa. That is good. But it costs a large amount of money, and the people from all parts of this Dominion cannot come to this rifle range to shoot. A few of them do come; but it is said—and, I think, with a good deal of truth—that it is the old hands that come here every time, and while they become crack shots, the young fellows do not find very much encouragement to come. But you should have a system of helping the men to come from within any fair radius to the point where you gather your regiment together, and of developing in them an interest in their rifle ranges and in their rifle shooting. Making appropriations of money for the purpose of encouraging them, so that, whilst they are in the actual work of drill, they may carry on the practice of rifle shooting. The result of this would be greatly to improve the militia; and, what is best of all, we should keep the people of this country with us in the actual keeping up of the defences of the Dominion.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). I am fully in accord with the idea of the military camp, if the money of the country is not misappropriated to benefit political friends of the government. I am informed, and credibly informed, that there is a huge job in connection with the military camp going on at Kingston. That is what I find fault with. We spend large sums of money, but very little of it goes to the men who do the actual drill. It is spent for other purposes. I have a letter here, which reads as follows:

Kingston, June 16, 1900.

George Taylor, Esq., M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Taylor,—I inclose a clipping from the 'News' of to-day to throw a little light on the way in which good Grits are rewarded.

This is the newspaper item that is referred to:

Government Pap.

The Meat Contract for the Military Camp.

Con. Millan secured the contract to supply the military camp with meat. His figure was \$6.34 per cwt. This morning he showed on the mar-

ket a telegram from Ottawa, and his contract price for one week will be \$8.25 cwt., not much of an increase, but sufficient to indicate that the 'gang is all here.' It seems that the Laurier patriotic and loyal government, in advertising for tenders qualified the same by 'camp opening on June 26.' Mr. Millan tendered, as did others, with the 26th date being the understanding. The government either changed this date or some one erred—and also changed the price for the contractor. The hand of another is seen behind this episode, and the question now is, 'Did politics play a part?' Cornelius is a strong Grit, but many wonder what are Duncan's politics. If Mr. Millan was not a Reformer, would he have been shown the consideration he has received? It is certainly evident that the error was expensive, but the man who secured the contract could just as well have served, with a large margin left, for \$6.34 as \$8.25. The pap is being distributed, the elections are on. How much will the contractor contribute?

I put a question on the Order paper the other day, and the minister in his reply verified the statement that Mr. Millan had received the contract at \$6.34, but that it was afterwards decided to change the figure to \$8.25. My correspondent goes on:

It seems that Millan tried to get some of the local butchers to take the contract off his hands (he is not engaged in butchering business at present), but being unsuccessful, he went to Ottawa and succeeded in having the price raised from \$6.34 to \$8.25. The matter might be worth bringing to the notice of the Minister of Militia.

It appears that Mr. Con. Millan is not a butcher; but he had to be rewarded. He, I presume, was one of the faithful to whom circulars were sent inviting them to tender for this contract. I have not heard if it is the intention of the government to make Mr. Con. Millan an honorary colonel, but no doubt that will follow.

I may say that according to orders the medical officers of the A. M. S. (not regimental surgeons) were to do the work connected with the permanent corps, but Dr. Kilborn, who was appointed a surgeon-lieutenant in the 47th Battalion last June, was given the position of medical attendant at the Royal Military College at \$2 per diem. He received his commission of surgeon-lieutenant to the 47th Regiment long after the government had declared that no appointments of the kind should be made, and he is not on the A. M. S. (Army Medical Service) at all.

You might ask if it is the intention to reward Con. Milan with a colonelcy in the militia.

That is the complaint that is heard year after year since this government came into power, that contracts to supply the camps are awarded to political supporters at outrageously high prices.

**THE MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Who is the writer?

**MR. TAYLOR.** Mr. George Kidd, of Kingston.

**THE MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** My hon. friend always suspects that there is some corruption or something wrong in the departments. Let me tell him that every contract for every camp in Can-

ada has been advertised publicly, and that every man in Canada is at liberty to tender, and that in every case the contract has been given to the lowest tenderer. I do not know who Con. Millan is, what his politics are. I never inquired, but I am told he is a Conservative. This is what happened at Kingston. The hon. gentleman says that I answered his question, but he did not do me the justice to read more than half the answer. Tenders were asked for supplies for Kingston for June 26. It was found later on that it interefered with some other camp, and that it was necessary to ante-date that camp to June 19. Mr. Millan then said: I am not prepared; I would have been prepared at the prices I offered, but I cannot supply the meat on June 19, at that price, it will cost me more to get it. As a result, he wished to withdraw altogether. Besides this man Millan, there were three or four other tenderers. Evidently they had entered into a combine, all the tenders being between nine cents and ten cents, I think some of them ten cents. The department found itself in the position that it either had to place itself at the mercy of these men, or it had to make some better arrangement with Mr. Millan who was the original tenderer. Negotiations were opened with Mr. Millan with the result which has been given, and the meat was supplied to the camp at Kingston, notwithstanding that the camp was antedated, at a price decidedly lower than that of the three or four other tenderers who had combined in order to put up the price. That is the whole story with reference to Kingston. As to Dr. Kilborn and the Royal Military College, that is another matter; when we come to that item I will deal with it. But, I may say in passing that the hon. gentleman's correspondent is mistaken when he says that Dr. Kilborn is not in the militia. Dr. Kilborn is a surgeon of the militia, attached to one of the regiments at Kingston.

**MR. J. V. ELLIS (St. John City).** I think it is a pity the hon. gentleman (the member for South Leeds) did not allow the discussion to proceed along the lines on which it was going when he brought this matter up, because we were discussing the general question of how the militia was adapted to the country, and whether it was doing all we desired of it, considering the amount of money that is spent upon it. Like the hon. member for York, N. B., (Mr. Foster) it is a long time since I did any military duty, although I did some; and one has ideals with regard to these things. Every man feels, I presume, that the country should be, man for man, able to defend itself against attack; and one may also have ideas as to how the militia service should be conducted. I may say that I have been in general agreement with both sides of politics in the past as to the management of the militia business. But the hon. member for King's County (Mr. Domville) made

a speech here last night which was calculated entirely to shatter one's ideas with regard to the whole militia system; and today the hon. member for York, not having heard that speech, seems to have reached the same conclusion along different lines. I paid great attention to the remarks of the hon. member for King's, because I know he has had a great deal of experience in the militia. I remember with pleasure that once I visited his camp and saw his long line of soldiers stretched out three or four miles, with all his machinery for carrying on war in the county of King's; and I came to the conclusion—of course my opinion was not that of an expert—that his men were pretty well drilled, and that a fair amount of usefulness could be got out of men who go into camp and are drilled for a time at least. What better system can take the place of the present system, it is pretty hard to say. I think the course of the war in South Africa enables us to reach certain conclusions as to the success with which the defence of a country can be carried on by the inhabitants themselves. On the other hand it must be apparent to every person that our own system has not by any means broken down, or even shown to a disadvantage as compared with the war system of that country. The Boers have proven themselves to be good soldiers in matters of defence but not good soldiers in matters of attack. For instance, they were not able to carry on sieges, they were not able to overcome the patience, or the endurance, or the training, or any of those great qualities which the British soldier acquires by association, and which the British officer acquires by study and training. The future historian of the Boer war will come to the conclusion that while they were brave men, and good shots, and had great mobility, they were not trained soldiers, and were not successful in the matter of attack. I presume that our men will learn in the same way, certainly the training the officers get must be of use to them.

One of the great difficulties I observe is that our population is of such a shifting character that when you visit a regiment year after year, as I do some of them at their annual turnout, the new faces which you see gives you an idea that we really have no permanent force, that is to say that while we have a force of men on paper, while we have a certain number regularly drilled, we find that we have not a continuous force that can be called upon one year after another. With regard to rifle shooting I quite agree with the member for York. I asked the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., (Mr. Prior) last night if he would abolish money prizes. I wanted to get his opinion on the custom of giving prizes, and he said: No. But the speech which the hon. member for King's made leads me to the conclusion that he would abolish many of the prizes given at the rifle ranges. I think myself that the

government might well begin by abolishing the money prizes given at the main ranges, and acknowledge excellence by giving medals or trophies of some kind. I think when the government spends money in providing ammunition for the men, there should be an ample number of men to take advantage of that offer, and that in consequence better work will be done than is done now by the same men going year after year to the local ranges, or to the county and provincial ranges, and ultimately to the Dominion range to carry off all the prizes. You can sit down really at your own home, and you can speculate, or you can bet, if you care to put it that way, as to who will carry off this and that prize in this particular competition when you know who has started in for them. It seems to me that this is a great mistake, that we are not pursuing proper lines, and I do hope that the hon. Minister of Militia will take this question into his consideration. Notwithstanding what the hon. member for King's, N.B., (Mr. Domville) said last night, I intend to vote this year for the money for the camp. I express my views with a considerable degree of diffidence, because I am not sure that I know as much about the question as I would like to know from the attention that I have given it.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). I do not think it would be a slander to say that the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) sees everything through political spectacles, and he can hardly ever give credit to any person who happens to be of the opposite political persuasion for anything in the shape of honesty or fair-play.

Mr. TAYLOR. Con. Millan is not a Conservative.

Mr. BRITTON. I do not know about that, but I will speak about Millan in a minute or two. The hon. gentleman will condemn, in the strongest possible language, conduct on this side of the House that he, himself, would persistently follow and has followed for years in connection with politics. Whether it is in connection with the distribution of literature, or the awarding of contracts, or anything that was done on that side of the House with his sanction and approval, if it is done on this side of the House, or if there is any suspicion that it has been done, it meets with his strong condemnation. In regard to this particular matter, he says that Con. Millan is not a butcher at all. I believe that at this time, his business was in a transition state; he was then selling out his business at the corner of Earl and Bagot Streets in Kingston, but whether he intends to enter into business again or not, I do not know.

Mr. TAYLOR. I read the letter, and it says that he is not in the butcher business.

Mr. BRITTON. He was in the butcher business, and he was engaged in selling

meat when this contract was let. Two weeks ago Saturday night, on my way home, I passed Con. Millan's shop, and saw him myself with his apron on selling meat. I went into his shop and we had a conversation about his receiving the contract for supplying meat for the camp. He told me that he had received it, and he was pleased that he had got it. I did not know Mr. Millan as a Liberal, although he may have voted for me and may be a Liberal. I think that Conservatives have claimed him sometimes as well as the Liberals. He is a very respectable man in every way, and I do not think he is what would be called a pronounced politician on either side. He was glad to have received the contract for the supply of meat for the camp at Kingston. On Monday morning early he came to me and said: There has been a mistake in this matter. He showed me a poster, and in the poster tenders were called for the supply of meat for the camp beginning on the 26th of June. He said: What I am asked to contract for is the supply of meat for the camp beginning on the 19th of June. He said: This is very unfair to me, because I cannot supply meat for the week beginning the 19th, anything like as cheaply as I can supply meat for the week beginning on the 26th. I said: You had better make representations to the government in reference to the matter. The fact is the next tenders were very much higher than his. I do not know what arrangement was made, but if I understood the hon. minister correctly, it was that he was allowed, in consideration of the mistake, a higher price from the week beginning the 19th and on to the 26th. The contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer in pursuance of the poster that was distributed throughout the city. When the mistake was discovered an arrangement was made by which the government did not lose anything, but made something instead of asking the next highest tenderer to undertake the contract, which, I think, was a business arrangement under the circumstances. If there is any blame to be put upon the person who put up that poster, let that be made the subject of a little discussion, but, to bring a charge about Con. Millan's tender for meat, which was the lowest tender, and to try to give any political colour to that, and to say that it is merely giving some money to one's friends is not fair. Now, I think that it will not be a difficult thing to answer other matters about which Mr. Kidd has written to the hon. member for South Leeds. When these matters come up we can discuss them in detail. Every one who knows how matters stand in Kingston in regard to those men who have received appointments knows that the government would not be justified in going into the camp of the hon. gentlemen opposite to find persons to fill offices. I think that they would fill them unworthily by going to the friends of hon. gentlemen

opposite. They can find qualified men to fill these offices when offices are vacant and not made vacant for the purpose, by going to their political friends. In connection with the filling of public offices in Kingston there is not a single appointment that any fair-minded man could say savours in the slightest degree of a political job or anything against the best interests of the country.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten the case of the Kingston post office already?

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to support the views that have been presented by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), and the hon. member for St. John, N.B. (Mr. Ellis) in reference to the great importance of encouraging rifle shooting. I do not suggest any system that may be adopted, but I do think that we have learned a lesson from what has occurred in South Africa, which we should lay to heart, and I am satisfied that there are few expenditures which the government could make that would be more valuable or popular than that which has been suggested.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to say that I will most heartily support any grant for the improvement of the militia of this country. This year, above all others, is one in which we cannot treat the militia in a spirit of parsimony. They have done more for this country than perhaps either political party has ever done in any one year. We do not know what will be the outcome of this war so far as military tactics are concerned, or what may be the best line to be adopted for the defence of this country. It may be looked upon as certain that the tactics of war will be changed, but, as I am not an expert in military matters, I have very little to say upon that phase of the question. So far as rifle shooting is concerned, there is no doubt that our militia have not had as much practice as they should have had. It occurred to me that I might mention this fact to the House in connection with the discussion that the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) started this morning: in my own county a prize is given for competition. The county council give a very handsome cup to be held by the company which is best qualified each year. This competition does not take place at the annual drill. It takes place in the autumn months after the annual drill in June. I would not strike out the annual drill, on the contrary, I would suggest to the government that they should supplement it by having competitions between the companies of the different battalions, thereby affording encouragement to the officers to keep their men in proper condition for the competition which will take place in the autumn, thus increasing the benefit of the experience gained in the preceding June. If the minister would consider some such proposition

as that, I submit it would be for the welfare of the militia of Canada from whom we have received so much benefit, and who in the future we may well expect will keep up to their traditions of the past.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Last year I brought to the attention of the minister a fair subject of complaint on the part of companies located where there is no government armoury. In the town of Barrie there is a building the property of the government. The captains of the two companies receive \$40 a year, the same as is given to the captains of companies outside of the county town. The result is that the captain in the county town is furnished with a free drill hall, whereas the captain in the outlying town has to pay the rent of one out of the \$40. It cannot be expected that a suitable place will be obtained at a less rent than \$3 or \$4 a month, and so the captain of the company outside the larger town has to pay the rent out of his own pocket. He has also to provide for the care and maintenance of an armoury, which in the larger town is supplied by the government. Does the minister intend to give an allowance for the renting of rooms, so that captains in towns where there are armouries will not be \$40 better off than captains in towns where there are no armouries.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Before the minister answers that question, I wish to say that last year I urged that some provision should be made in this respect in one of the outlying towns in my constituency, and I was informed that it had been strongly recommended against by the Major-General Commanding. I believe that in the larger towns which are not for the time being the headquarters of the battalion, the companies should be provided with suitable quarters in which to drill.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I understand my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to refer to the rent of buildings in which the captains of companies keep their arms, and for which the allowance of \$40 is made. I would point out that the allowance of \$40 covers the rent, and for the captains who live in towns where there is a drill hall that is a clear gain to them, and I think it does not do any harm to any one else. Every captain understands distinctly when he receives his \$40 a year that he is supposed to take care of the arms and to find a place for them. In my own battalion for instance the captains keep the arms in buildings of their own, buildings which are not worth much to them, and for which they do not have to pay rent, and that I think is the usual practice in the country districts. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) that it is the intention to establish, as rapidly as possible, central armouries for all the rural battalions and then this allowance or part

Mr. McCARTHY.

of it will be withdrawn and given to an armourer or a central caretaker who will look after the arms. I do not think that at the present moment I can do anything to meet the difficulty referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett). I will look into this special case and see whether these captains have any right to occupy the building. If they are not interfering with the usefulness of the building for other purposes I suppose there can be no objection.

Mr. SPROULE. Will you not incur extra expense in transferring the arms from distant localities to the central armoury?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That will not amount to very much.

Mr. BENNETT. At Barrie there is a good hall 25 by 60 feet, which is the property of the Dominion government, and it is a splendid place for the two companies to drill during the winter months. You have a district outside of the town which is not so fortunately situated. The captain has \$40 paid him. Several times during the year, he has to call on the men to look after the equipment, and the expense of this comes out of the \$40. In addition to that he can secure no fairly good room where the arms will be safe for less than \$3 or \$4 a month, and the result is that he is out of pocket, whereas his fortunate brother officer in the other town is \$40 ahead. That is manifestly unfair. Why should not all the captains be placed on the same footing? I myself do not think that the \$40 is enough for a man who has to meet all the disbursements necessary. Why should not the government supply a suitable room for the drilling of companies in these smaller towns, which they may utilize during the winter months. In my own town, which is the headquarters of a company, the captain has to hurry around for a week preceding the annual drill, and the day before the camp he brings in twenty or thirty men who never had a uniform on previously, and to say that they are an awkward crowd is no slander on them. Now, in the county town the government have furnished a splendid hall which is heated in the winter months, and the young fellows utilize it for a gymnasium and as a social club. I believe that the conveniences furnished in the larger towns should be extended, and if we cannot build drill halls, then, at least, the government should allow the captain of the company a sum sufficient to hire a hall for the winter months, over and above the \$40 allowance.

It being One o'clock, the committee took recess.

At Three o'clock, the House resumed in committee.

Militia—Salaries and wages ..... \$73,000

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here of \$3,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). This is the amount for the salaries and wages of civil employees in the outside service. The increase is partly due to the fact that the per diem payment has been increased in some cases from \$1 to \$1.25, and in the cases of men who have served a long time, from \$1.25 to \$1.50, on the recommendation of the men in charge of the different districts. In military district No. 2 there is an increase of \$730, in No. 4 an increase of \$1,600, in No. 5 an increase of \$273. In district No. 2 there is a new appointment. In No. 7 there is an increase in the salary of a clerk, amounting to \$144.75.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (Three Rivers). In No. 2 who was the new appointment, and to whom were the increases given ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have not the names. The appointment was that of a labourer at \$1.25 a day.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Has he been a long time in the service ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, he is a new appointment.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. A new appointment, with an increase ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would like to know exactly what it means. You had better let the item stand. It is quite unusual to make a new appointment at an increased salary. I think we ought to have some explanation of that.

Item allowed to stand.

Military properties ..... \$175,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is for the care and maintenance of rifle ranges, drill halls, and military properties generally. The rents of ranges, armouries and buildings amount to \$10,000 ; fuel, \$8,000 ; light, \$11,000 ; water rates, \$1,500 ; removing snow, \$1,000 ; targets, telegraphs, &c., \$3,500 ; making a total of \$35,000, the usual vote. Then, there is \$70,000 divided among the different military districts—the usual vote for repairs of buildings, renewals, &c.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Is it equally divided ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have not the list showing the exact amount in each district.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend will admit that in some districts the expenditure must be very much heavier than in others. Some districts have a very small number of military properties, and others a very large number. At Quebec and at Kingston they are the most extensive.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can tell my hon. friend that the money is paid according to the rule laid down during his time. That rule has been followed for years.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. And we will have a list.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. What is done with the old drill sheds when they get out of repair ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Those which are reported unnecessary are sold by the government. Perhaps half a dozen were sold within the past year. In some cases, the land belonged to private parties, who gave it during the time it would be used for drill purposes, and after we sell the sheds, it reverts either to the municipality or the private owner.

Warlike and other stores ..... \$55,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The details of this vote is as follows: Camp equipment consisting of blankets, water-proof sheets, tents, marquees, &c., \$23,000, the same as former years. Harness and saddlery, \$16,000, the usual vote. The only change is the vote for medical supplies for camp of \$1,000, a new vote. Barrack stores, including sheets, pillows, horse blankets, &c., \$15,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Are the stores purchased by public tender ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would like to ask if any of the stores which were obtained for the Imperial government, were obtained by the Department of Militia and Defence. I am told that during the war in South Africa the Imperial government applied to the Canadian government to use its good offices in obtaining the supplies that were purchased in Canada.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I understand that Lord Strathcona Horse supplies were purchased by the government of Canada. I am also informed that the Imperial government have given out orders to the Canadian government for uniforms and other supplies, which are to be turned over to the Imperial stores in England.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What was done in the case of the Strathcona Horse does not necessarily have any connection with the Imperial government at all. Lord Strathcona requested the Department of Militia to take charge of the organization from beginning to end with certain exceptions. For instance, the purchases

of horses he retained under his own control, and the financial part of the business was also entirely kept in the hands of his agent in Montreal. But he asked us to give him the benefit of the organization in the department, which we cheerfully did, and our contractors supplied most of the clothing required. The money was taken out of the vote for the South African contingent and returned by Lord Strathcona's agent. With regard to the Imperial government, whatever was done in that regard was done through Lord Strathcona, who acted for certain contractors in Canada. The department assisted only so far as inspection is concerned, exactly the same way as the English government acts in the case of purchases by the Canadian government in that country. We ask for an Imperial government inspection in the case of arms and so forth. That is all we have to do in connection with the Imperial government. We had nothing to do with the transaction except to loan our inspectors, who would see, before the goods were shipped, that they were according to specifications.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Were tenders called for ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Imperial government acted upon its own responsibility and utilized the contractors of the Canadian government, and the orders were carried out under the inspection of the Canadian inspectors ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. PRIOR. Looking over the report of the minister this year, I find that the deputy minister makes the following remarks:

The necessity of providing a reserve of clothing, camp equipment and barrack stores is continually being forced on my attention; the lack of even a sufficient supply in store to meet ordinary requirements with the promptness and satisfaction so essential to the maintenance of a volunteer force has again and again been a subject of anxiety in the department. In his report dated March 1, 1898, the late Colonel Panet, then deputy minister, pointed out that 'the demands for clothing for the force cannot always be answered with satisfaction on account of the small amount kept in store,' and he 'recommended that the estimates on this head be increased sufficiently to prevent any delay occurring when dealing with requisitions for clothing which is due.' He 'recommended also that a small reserve be kept in store for issue in case of any emergency.'

Further on in the same report, the deputy minister says :

As estimated elsewhere herein, practically the whole of the clothing, the necessaries, the equipment, &c., had to be purchased for the contingents and delivered to them within about two weeks.

Now, that seems to be a very bad state of affairs. In Canada we have a force from

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

35,000 to 38,000 men that may be called upon at any time. A good many of them have been called upon lately, and there was nothing to equip them with from the stores. According to the deputy minister's report—and it is really the minister's report, because he is responsible for it—he admits that though his attention has been called to this matter again and again by his late deputy, Colonel Panet, still this has never been remedied. Whether he has asked parliament to grant him supplies to purchase these stores, I know not ; but I have no recollection of having seen such a sum in the estimates, or of hearing the Minister of Militia make that request to parliament. There can be no doubt that it is a most lamentable state of affairs, if we have a body of troops ready to go to the front, but no means of providing them with the necessary equipment. One excuse, I suppose, can be put forward by the hon. gentleman as set forth by the deputy minister, and it is this :

It may be pointed out that a considerable quantity of clothing, stores, ammunition, &c., paid for out of the appropriation annually voted to the department by parliament is sold on repayment, and the money received therefor, instead of going back to the credit of the department, is paid to the credit of the Receiver General. In the last fifteen years over \$225,000 worth of clothing, ammunition and stores have been issued for which payment went into the general revenue.

In Colonel Panet's report, dated December 14, 1892 (page viii.), he refers to this matter, and states 'our estimates may, therefore, be considered as practically curtailed to that extent.'

The conclusion he comes to, with respect to that is perfectly correct. Thus it seems there has been \$225,000 received for clothing, ammunition, &c., issued on repayment—which means that it is issued to members of the militia on the understanding that they shall pay for it—and when it is received by the Militia Department, it is not taken by the department, but is turned over to the general revenue. As my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) says, the return from auctions also goes into the general revenue. That is entirely wrong. If parliament votes a sum of money to the Militia Department, that department ought to have the spending of that money, and if they have a repayment of money, when it is repaid, it ought to go to their credit. The deputy minister also said :

The inadequacy of our supplies of the above description was very much felt when preparations were being made to send to South Africa the contingents which have gone there to assist the empire; as you are aware a very large proportion indeed of the clothing, equipment and stores had to be purchased after it was decided the contingents should be sent.

Now, as I have said before, that is wrong entirely. The government should have sufficient stores on hand to equip a large force of men on a very few days notice ; and the minister should not be placed in such a

position, that he is obliged to go out at a moment's notice to purchase supplies for these troops. One sufficient reason for that, even if there were no other, is that supplies purchased in a hurry cannot be nearly so economically purchased as they could be if time were allowed to call for tenders. I would ask the minister whether he is satisfied in his own mind that he has sufficient stores, and if not, whether he is asking parliament this session to grant him a sufficient sum to place the stores department in the state of efficiency in which we all expect it to be?

**THE MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** I have no hesitation in saying that we have not the quantity of stores I should like to see—I do not think that a Militia Department has ever had. I hope the day may come when we shall have enough. But, I may say, in this relation, that we have had no suitable storehouse. Particularly since the change was made by which the stores building here was handed over to the Canada Atlantic Railway, our storage room has been very much less than it was before. At the present moment we have no place in which to put a large accumulation of stores. We are building, as will be seen by the estimates of the Public Works Department, a large and commodious special stores building in Ottawa, near the drill shed. And, when that building is completed, if I am in the position which I now hold, I shall ask parliament for a vote for stores; and, even if I am not, whoever may occupy the position, will probably follow that course. I am inclined to think, for my part, that it will be a proper thing to ask for a vote on capital account to put our stores on a proper footing; and after that, we can take the annual vote out of income. So far as the stores purchased for South Africa are concerned—though that matter is not before us, it comes up incidentally, because of the extract read by my hon. friend (Mr. Prior)—I would point out that a large part of the stores which were required for that special service, differed to a considerable extent from those that could have been used here in Canada. So far as the equipment of the force for purposes at home is concerned, I think it is fairly good for emergencies, both as regards clothing and other equipments.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I was glad to hear my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior), read the extract he did from the report of the deputy minister. From past experience in the department, I know the system that obtains to-day which unfortunately obtained also when I was Minister of Militia. For instance, the stores of the militia in Ottawa, Quebec, or Hamilton, are depleted by the sale of clothing, and by the stores for one reason or another. But goods though no longer useful for the purposes of the force, may be useful to others. Though they represent money which has been voted

by parliament to the Department of Militia and Defence, that money, instead of going back to the department, goes into the hands of the Receiver General. This is a system which in my time, seemed to me to be absolutely without justification; I have the same opinion of it still. If parliament, in its wisdom, votes certain money for militia stores, and if for one reason or other they are sold and bring in \$200,000 or \$300,000, we ought not take that money from the Department of Militia. It seems to me that if the Minister of Militia, exercising his judgment and discretion, decides to dispose of the stores belonging to the militia, that money should be available to the Minister of Militia for replenishing the stores, or procuring improved uniforms, or other articles required for the purposes of the militia.

That is the reason why it has always been impossible to keep up the proper quantity of stores required for the equipment of the militia force in Canada. The vote of every year is about the same; but it is easy to understand that if, out of an appropriation of parliament, one or two hundred thousand dollars are taken in the shape of stores and disposed of by auction, and taken away from militia and put into the general fund of Canada, I say it is impossible under these circumstances to keep the stores up to the condition in which they should be. It has been a crying evil, it still remains so, and I think ought to be remedied as soon as possible.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER** (Cape Breton). I always listen with great pleasure and interest to the remarks of my hon. friend on my right (Sir Adolphe Caron), who has had so much experience in the Militia Department, but I cannot agree with him in the principle he has propounded to the House just now. I believe it would lead to the greatest misconception and complication of public accounts. The whole principle is this: If a provision is made from year to year by the House for the demands of the Militia Department, for instance, for stores, the moment you admit that the Minister of Militia and Defence may put up at auction and sell certain stores, and may utilize that money for purposes other than the one for which it was voted, you have changed the whole foundation of parliamentary control. I cannot help thinking that my hon. friend has hardly given that subject the consideration that he usually does to these matters. I am satisfied it would lead to confusion in the public accounts, and it would take away that absolute control by parliament of public funds, so that we may know what is expended by the department year after year. The moment that anything that has been voted on account of militia assumes the character of something that has got to be got rid of, the very money realized should go back to the public treasury, and another vote of

parliament should be taken to provide for whatever is necessary.

While I am on my feet I may say that the suggestion that has just been made by the Minister of Militia and Defence would be a very bad precedent, namely, that a large amount of stores should be provided for the Militia Department and charged to capital account, in order to establish a reservoir as it were. That, I think, will be found equally objectionable. I am sure the Minister of Finance will support me in the view that I take in reference to that matter. Especially when you have a very large surplus revenue it would be a very unwise thing, in respect to sums voted year after year to the militia service, to charge any of that amount to capital account. It leads to extravagance in the first instance, and it will lead probably to the accumulation of stores that will afterwards have to be sold at public auction, and probably at a great loss. I think we must keep the administration of public affairs in such a shape that the House and the country may know year by year what the amount provided for the various branches of the public service is. I think it would be introducing a very faulty principle to purchase and charge to capital account stores that, under our ordinary practice, are charged to the consolidated fund for the year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I may have been misunderstood, and I wish to make myself clearer. Every year you have a vote which remains about the same for military stores. Now, you have got in your stores what represents the value of the money which has been voted by parliament. If you dispose of that—I do not mean to say that the Minister of Militia and Defence should handle the money himself—but if the department thinks proper to sell at auction any portion of those stores that money should be reappropriated to the purposes of the militia, that is the position I take. Suppose one year you have a certain amount of money voted for stores, my point is that when you take out of those stores 25 per cent or 50 per cent, you leave your stores minus that quantity, and that money, instead of going into the general fund, should find its way back to the militia. Let it be voted by parliament for militia purposes. Let the Minister of Militia and Defence come down and say in his estimates that last year he sold \$5,000 worth or \$10,000 worth of stores, and let him ask parliament to vote it back to militia. Let him not take away from the stores the money that parliament has voted for that specific purpose, which parliament voted for the purpose of the militia and for no other purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me the weakness of this system is apparent. Parliament in its wisdom votes a sum of money for a specific purpose and the money

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

is used for that purpose in purchasing stores. Afterwards a portion of those stores is sold and the money comes back—into whose hands? If it is the Receiver General's, then parliament votes it again for that or any other purpose it pleases. But if it goes back to the Militia Department, then it must be under the control of the Minister of Militia and Defence. But there is no safeguard exercised over that expenditure by parliament, in fact parliament has nothing to do with the expenditure after that, the Minister of Militia and Defence has it to spend at his own will, and may spend it very unwisely without parliament having any control over it. You may apply the same principle to the Department of Railways with equal propriety. Let old rolling stock be sold, and that money with equal propriety would be payable to the Department of Railways to be re-expended, not by vote of parliament, but by the judgment of the head of the department. I do not wonder that the stores are short, when we remember that a year or two ago we had such sales as took place of some thousands of rifles that were bought at considerable expense and sold at 25 cents apiece.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Between 75 cents and 80 cents, I think 78 cents.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not find fault with the amount, but I always thought they were sold very much below what might have been realized if they had been sold by public auction.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They were advertised in public in all the leading newspapers of Canada, and were sold by auction.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, it was not generally known, because I have heard a great many say since that they would have taken advantage of it if they had known of the sale and purchased some. I was told by a gentleman who had examined a large number of these rifles that a number of them were new rifles which had never been used. They had cost the country a good deal of money, and they were sold to some foreign corporation for 75 cents a piece.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They were all sold in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. They were sold in Canada to be taken to New York.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not a rifle went to New York. Certainly not a thousand rifles went out of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether it was in the Auditor General's Report, or in an explanation given by the minister himself in answer to a statement that I made in regard to the matter, but I remember the statement being made that on account of

the sudden demand, owing, I think, to the war in Manila, a favourable opportunity was given for a contractor to buy these rifles, and that they could not have been sold at the price that they were sold at but for these exceptional circumstances. I understood, whether incorrectly or otherwise, that the rifles were going to the United States.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. At any rate, I thought the amount received was very low, and I think so still. I said then that I held the opinion, as I do to-day, that if there is any necessity for giving instruction in our high schools to the students who assemble there, we might well have retained and used these rifles for that purpose. If we are to go as far as was suggested last night by a number of hon. members in this House and equip our schools, we will require to provide an arm for that purpose, and we will be obliged to pay a much higher price than if we had retained these rifles. Therefore, I think it would have been well to have retained these rifles in the country and to have distributed them in this way.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It would be just as well to correct the misrepresentation which, I am sure, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) does not intend to leave upon the House. We discussed this matter last year, and I am sorry to-day to have to repeat what I said then. The rifles which were sold, numbering somewhere about 20,000, were rifles which had been returned after having been used for many years, and they were practically worthless. They were obsolete rifles, rifles which were no longer used by the militia, and would never be used again.

Mr. SPROULE. They were the old Enfield rifles, were they not?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes. They required entirely different ammunition, ammunition of a different size from that required for the new rifles, and that reason alone would be sufficient to make them useless for any of the practical purposes of the militia. We were paying a large amount of money for storing these rifles. They were coming back into store as we were issuing the new rifles. We did not require them, and we thought we would be saving money to the country by selling them. We offered them for sale by public tender, and the sale was advertised in all the newspapers in the country. They were sold to the highest bidder at 78 cents per rifle. In reference to the supplying of rifles to the schools, my hon. friend will be relieved when he hears that we have some 30,000 more of these rifles coming in all the time as we issue new rifles, and we are distributing these rifles

to the schools. We shall have enough to supply the schools and the cadets.

#### THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—DEATH OF PRIVATE LARUE.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I have a very unpleasant announcement to make. I have a report which has just come from Cape Town, dated June 25, which reads as follows:

Regret to report that 7818. Private L. Larue, Canadian Regiment of Infantry, died of enteric fever at Wynberg Hospital on June 24.

Private Larue was an officer of the 87th Battalion, and resigned his commission to enlist on the first contingent. He was wounded on February 18 at Paardeberg. He was a son of Dr. Larue, of Quebec.

Warlike and other stores..... \$55,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia to a very serious statement which is made by the Deputy Minister of Militia, and which, I think, demands the attention of the House. The report of the deputy minister is dated April 17, 1900, and it is apropos of this question of supplies. He says:

The necessity of providing a reserve of clothing, camp equipment and barrack stores is continually being forced on my attention; the lack of even a sufficient supply in store to meet ordinary requirements with the promptness and satisfaction so essential to the maintenance of a volunteer force has again and again been a subject of anxiety in the department. In his report, dated March 1, 1898, the late Colonel Panet, then deputy minister, pointed out that 'the demands for clothing for the force cannot always be answered with satisfaction on account of the small amount kept in store,' and 'he recommended that the estimates on this head be increased sufficiently to prevent any delay occurring when dealing with requisitions for clothing which is due.' He 'recommended also that a small reserve be kept in store for issue in case of any emergency.'

Colonel Panet's recommendations have not been followed to that extent, if at all, that seems to me to be now necessary under the new and changed conditions that have arisen since then; in both his remarks and his recommendations I fully concur.

The inadequacy of our supplies of the above description was very much felt when preparations were being made to send to South Africa the contingents which have gone there to assist the empire; as you are aware, a very large proportion indeed of the clothing, equipment and stores had to be purchased after it was decided the contingents should be sent.

This requires no comment to impress upon the House the very grave condition of affairs that has arisen in consequence of the hon. Minister of Militia entirely neglecting to carry out the very wise suggestions contained in the report of his deputy, Col. Panet, to him, in 1898. Col. Panet, in addition to the necessity of being able to respond promptly in reference to matters of this kind, pointed out how very necessary it was

to make provision to meet any case of emergency. The emergency arose, and according to the present deputy minister, it found the Militia Department utterly unprepared to meet it. There was consequent hurry, and when there is hurry there is usually a failure of excellence, such as I believe was the case in the present instance. The accounts we have received of the condition of the clothing of the contingents that went to South Africa were certainly not such as to afford pride or satisfaction to Canadians, or to reflect any credit upon our troops in that far-off country when they came to be placed alongside of other troops. The effect of the rain upon their clothing was to present the brave yeomanry of Canada that went there, with their lives in their hands, to defend the empire, and to shed great lustre and honour upon their country, as a very ragged regiment indeed.

I now draw the attention of the minister to this, and say that he stands in the position of being severely reprimanded by his own subordinate, and that not without the very best possible reason, because the fact is pointed out that the minister has neglected to comply with the urgent demands of his predecessor on this matter. The minister is placed in a very indefensible position, and I trust that this will be a lesson to him. He has been told from this side of the House that we are ready to give the government all the means that may be required for to make the force completely efficient to meet any emergency that may arise. This has been a very grave neglect on the part of the minister, and one that has proved not only to be unfortunate but to be attended with very serious and very unpleasant consequences.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. This matter was brought up by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) and discussed fully, and in the absence of the leader of the opposition I gave an answer to it. I quite agree with the report of the deputy minister, and I repeat that we have perhaps a better equipment to-day in every respect and a larger reserve than ever before in Canada. I explained in part why I did not ask for a special vote, that at present we have no suitable store accommodation. The central store at Ottawa is much less than it was a few years ago owing to the fact that the building was handed over to the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, and they are using a large portion of it.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Why should that be?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. It was done by the late government, but I am not finding fault with it. I have explained that a vote has been taken in the Public Works for the construction of a large and commodious central storehouse at Ottawa. The contract has been given for

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**.

the construction of the very large building, and when it is completed, and when there are facilities for taking care of a large supply of clothing, I stated that if I happened to be Minister of Militia then I would ask for a special vote for that purpose. I believe that whoever happens to occupy the office at that time will feel it his duty to ask for such a vote when the stores can be properly taken care of.

Mr. **BERGERON**. The Minister of Militia stated that he had sold no rifles in the United States. That statement seems somewhat peculiar in view of the following correspondence which I read from the Auditor General's Report:

Audit Office, Ottawa, June 28, 1898.

Sir,—On the February return of the director of stores there is entered a sale of rifles to Hartley & Graham, of New York, as follows:

3,450 Enfield at 25c. ....	\$862 50
1,572 Peabody at 25c.....	393 00
70 Spencer at 25c. ....	17 50
219 Winchester at \$1.50.....	328 50

No vouchers in connection with this sale have been furnished. Please forward them.

In the meantime, I have to inquire if these rifles were examined and condemned by a board of examiners; and if the sale was advertised and held by auction, or by tender.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. L. McDOUGALL, A.G.

The Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence.

This is the answer:

Dept. of Militia and Defence,

Ottawa, July 7, 1898.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 28th ult., re sale of condemned stores, I have the honour to inform you that the rifles referred to were obsolete and condemned as unfit for service by the annual boards of survey from year to year. They were altogether unfit for the present requirements of the militia. The sale was not by auction, but by private tender, by order of the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence. There are no vouchers in the case.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

B. SULTE,

Acting D. M. of M. and D.

The Auditor General.

It would appear that the Minister of Militia must have forgotten this transaction.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Not at all, but I thought the hon. gentleman referred to the sale of some 20,000 old Enfield rifles. These rifles referred to here were a few odds and ends which Col. Lake, then Quarter-Master General, over and over again reported should be disposed of and which were never likely to be of any use. They were disposed of with my approval by Col. Lake, as Quarter-Master General. I thought the hon. gentleman was referring to the sale of the 20,000 rifles at some 78 cents apiece, and that sale was effected after tenders had been asked for by public advertisements in all the leading newspapers. Last year I had copies of these advertisements here and read them as a re-

ference to *Hansard* will show. It was stated that that sale had been made to an American firm, but I repeat that so far as I know not a single one of the 20,000 went out of the country. Some people said it was a dangerous thing to allow 20,000 rifles to be scattered amongst people who were not skilled in the use of them and that accident would likely result, but up to the present time not a single accident has been reported. On the contrary, I have been told by military men that this distribution was a great advantage, as it created a taste for rifle shooting and rifle practice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the minister expect that we are to hold Col. Lake responsible for this?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No. I am responsible.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then why introduce Col. Lake's name?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND DEFENCE. I said he was the officer who recommended the rifles to be sold.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The responsibility rests upon the minister himself. A few moments ago the minister told us that not a rifle had been sold in the United States, and that not a rifle had been sold for 25 cents, but now we find from the Auditor General's Report, that he sold 5,000 rifles at 25 cents each, and that no vouchers even were forthcoming for the transaction. A more loose and more disgraceful state of affairs cannot be imagined in connection with any department, than that the minister without public tender should sell to parties in the United States, upon what he calls private tenders, these rifles for 25 cents. A more indefensible action and a lamner apology for it I have never heard in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad the minister made the correction, because I had a distinct recollection of what I was speaking about. But I referred to the fact that I had spoken of it in this House, and that I had condemned the sale of rifles to Americans, as they were going out of the country, and suggested that it would have been much wiser, if the department could realize no more than 25 cents apiece for them, to put them in the hands of the cadets in the country. The whole transaction was referred to last year, not only by myself, but by the Minister of Militia. I can scarcely understand the statement he made, that there was not a rifle sold at 25 cents, and not one taken out of the country in the face of the fact that the Auditor General's Report shows the very contrary, and the *Hansard* containing the admission by himself, last year.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I remember that this matter was discussed very much last year. I think I brought out the fact that a great many of these rifles

were sold to one or two firms in Montreal, and a great many were in the hands of well known friends of the administration, who got them at 25 cents apiece. I know that some were sold in my own county at from \$1.50 to \$2 apiece, and the people who got them for that were well satisfied. So that there must have been a great margin between what was realized by the government and the prices at which they were sold by these parties.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Perhaps I had better read from the Auditor General's Report of last year:

Re Sale of Rifles.

Audit Office, Ottawa, Nov. 30, 1898.

Sir,—I have to-day received a statement of the sales of ammunition, military stores and clothing during October, on which there appear the following entries:

Lt.-Col. Cole, 15,000 Snider rifles at 75c..	\$11,250
" 195,000 Snider ball at \$5	
per M. ....	975
" 5,300 Snider rifles at 75c...	3,975

I have to ask for the usual certified vouchers. Were these sales authorized, and by whom? Were they advertised, and if so, in what papers? Were they disposed of by public auction or by tender?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. L. McDOUGALL, A.G.

The Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence.

Dept. of Militia and Defence,

Ottawa, Nov. 5, 1898.

Sir,—In answer to your letter of the 30th instant, requesting vouchers for the sale of 18,300 Snider rifles and 195,000 rounds of Snider ammunition, I have now the honour to inclose herewith:

With reference to the queries contained in your letter of November 30 last, as to this:

1. Were the sales authorized, and by whom? Ans. Yes, by the Minister of Militia and Defence.

2. Were they advertised? Ans. Yes. List of papers herewith.

3. Were they disposed of by public auction or by tender? Ans. By tender.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

B. SULTE,

Acting D. M. of M. and D.

The Auditor General.

Mr. BERGERON. How is it that the answer is dated November 5, when the first letter is dated November 30?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The date in the answer must be a misprint for December 5. Here is the list of papers:

London, the 'Advertiser'; Toronto, the 'Globe'; Kingston, 'British Whig,' the 'Freeman'; Ottawa, 'Free Press,' 'Le Temps'; Montreal, 'La Patrie,' the 'Herald,' the 'Daily Witness'; Quebec, 'Le Soleil,' 'Daily Mercury,' 'Daily Telegraph'; St. John, 'Daily Telegraph,' the 'Globe'; Halifax, the 'Chronicle,' 'Recorder,' the 'Echo'; Charlottetown, P.E.I., the 'Patriot,' the 'Guardian'; Winnipeg, the 'Tribune'; British Columbia, Victoria 'Times.'

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask the hon. gentleman why he selected *Le Temps* to receive the patronage of the government?

I thought they repudiated *Le Temps* when it said: 'Not a cent, not a dollar, not a man, will go to South Africa.'

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is another question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, it is not another question. The hon. gentleman has read a list of government papers which receive money from the reptile fund, and what I want to know is why he includes a paper which they have repudiated as representing the views of the government?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Perhaps the repudiation took place since that date—I do not know.

Mr. PRIOR. What make of rifles were those sold to the United States?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The old Snider-Enfield.

Mr. PRIOR. What are the rifles the hon. gentleman has in store now?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The same. We have about 50,000.

Mr. PRIOR. We used to be armed with the old Snider-Enfield, then with the Martini-Henry, and now we have the Lee-Enfield. Was it something prior to the Snider-Enfield that you sold for 25 cents?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. None of these were sold for 25 cents, I believe. The rifles sold at 25 cents were a lot of different makes—the Peabody, and other American rifles.

Mr. PRIOR. Were there any Martini-Henry?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. None of those have been sold.

Mr. PRIOR. I see that the superintendent of military stores makes some remarks in his report about the rifles. The hon. gentleman said, I think, that 30,000 were ready to be supplied to the schools for the boys.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That would include the Martini-Henry.

Mr. PRIOR. The superintendent of military stores says:

The demand for Martini-Henry rifles for issue to drill companies in educational establishments, since the public schools were brought within the scope of the order in council, has largely increased. The supply of rifles available for this purpose will soon be exhausted. It would seem desirable to limit the issue to young men of a certain age—the rifle must in many instances be too heavy for the lads of which the companies are composed.

Does he refer there to the Martini-Henry rifle alone?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, he refers also to the Snider.

Mr. PRIOR. Then, according to that, the Minister of Militia must be wrong, because

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

he says: 'The supply of rifles available for this purpose will soon be exhausted.'

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may explain to my hon friend, that owing to the fact that the armouries in the rural districts have not been completed, the rural militia are still armed with the Snider-Enfield. We are calling these in—20,000 or so—and they are included in the 30,000.

Mr. WALLACE. Has the minister considered whether it is necessary to have an establishment in the province of Ontario for the manufacture of cartridges, or whether he has taken any steps to establish such an industry?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have not. We are enlarging the factory at Quebec, and I have not thought it necessary to go to the expense of establishing another factory at the present moment. The factory at Quebec, with the enlargement now proposed, and the new machinery that is being added, is quite equal to any demands that can be made upon it at present.

Mr. WALLACE. I think we ought to have a cartridge factory in the province of Ontario. There are many reasons for that opinion. I have read a report of an American engineer with regard to the canal system in this country and in the United States, which I think furnishes in itself one very strong argument why steps in that direction should be taken. That furnishes in itself one very good reason why steps should be taken not only to establish a cartridge factory in Ontario, but other methods of defence, in view of what is taking place on the other side of the line. I will take the trouble to read a portion of this report made by Mr. Thomas W. Symonds to the American government in relation to the question of the ship canal from the great lakes to the Hudson River:

#### Military Aspect.

I am unable to believe that such a ship canal is needed for the military advantages which it would confer. It would only be of use in the event of war with Great Britain for the passage of our warships from the sea to the great lakes. In the event of such a war, it is inconceivable that any of our warships would be allowed to leave the sea-coast for service on the lakes. All that we have, and many more, in fact, would be needed for the protection of our sea-ports and for aggressive operations against the navy and commerce of Great Britain on the high seas. If proper and comparatively inexpensive precautions are taken, the great lakes will, in the event of such a war, need no naval assistance from the sea-coast. An English naval force could only reach the great lakes by way of the St. Lawrence River and its canals, which latter limit the size of vessels to those of a small class. The St. Lawrence lies along and near our border, and within easy reach, and in some cases they can be enfiladed, and even taken in reverse, from good artillery positions on our side of the river. The difficulties of the hostile

movement of the river to Lake Ontario would be very great if opposed with vigour, and might easily be rendered impossible by the destruction of some of the canals. Arrived in Lake Ontario, such a hostile force would have to pass the Welland Canal, a canal also within easy reach of our borders and subject to being assailed and destroyed by a land force or an improvised naval force on Lake Erie. Upon the upper lakes—Erie, Huron, Michigan and Superior—the United States has a vast merchant marine, eight times greater in tonnage than the merchant marine of Canada, and vastly excelling in individual ships. If the government, as has been suggested and recommended, would provide at the different lake ports stores of arms and war munitions suitable for arming our best lake vessels, and arrange for taking possession of and arming and manning these vessels quickly and effectively, an American naval force could be improvised upon these lakes which would greatly preponderate over any which could be improvised against it or brought to oppose it.

Here they propose that right here, where there is a narrow place, they could cut the country in two, and we would be left in Ontario without communication with the province of Quebec, and without the supplies necessary to carry on a defensive warfare. That is one reason in itself why we should have a cartridge factory in Ontario. There are other reasons too, but I shall not dwell on them now, only to reiterate, as forcibly as I can, the necessity of having warlike equipments provided in Ontario for those emergencies which are so clearly outlined in the report of Mr. Symonds to the American Secretary of War.

With regard to the sale of those rifles, that looks to me as the most impolitic and absurd way of disposing of them that could be devised. Here are rifles sent over to the United States at 25 cents apiece.

Mr. WOOD. They were not worth that.

Mr. WALLACE. We are asked to believe that the Americans are such fools that they will buy a rifle that was entirely worthless, because if not worth 25 cents it is worth nothing, and these rifles up to that moment had been used by our own Canadian militia.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They had not been used for twenty-five years.

Mr. WALLACE. I refuse to believe that these rifles were so utterly worthless, and that those which were sold for 75 cents apiece were worth less. There are skilled workmen in the government employ whose duty it is to repair rifles when they get out of order, and these men could have put those rifles into excellent state. I get letters every session asking if rifles could be provided, or if possible, to get rifles for rifle clubs all over the country to practice with. It would have been better to have provided those rifles to Canadians for practice after having had them repaired by the government armourers, rather than have disposed of them in the way we did. We

know that the wars of the future will depend largely on skilled marksmen, and yet the government are sending rifles out of the country.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We advertised them.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the good of advertising 20,000 rifles for sale to a club that wants only about twenty. Why should not the government, when these tenders came in at 75 cents, have decided that it was better to put these rifles in the hands of Canadians, who are willing and anxious to use them in order that they may become good marksmen and be of value for the defence of Canada when required. The government seem to me to be utterly lost to all sense of responsibility. The department was established in order that it might do everything possible for the defence of the country, and yet when the means are at hand to defend the country almost without expense, the government send a portion of our arms to the United States and sell another portion, and once these rifles are sold we have no control over where they may go. The establishment of a cartridge factory in Ontario is urgent and desirable, and I urge the government to do it at once. And I shall be prepared to censure them if they fail in their duty in that regard.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. As to the disposal of these rifles, I may say a word with regard to my own experience. When I was Minister of Militia, we had obsolete rifles, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) knows. My deputy minister at the time suggested that we should dispose of those rifles. I refused. We had offers—I am speaking from memory, but I think I am absolutely correct—sent to the department for the purchase of those rifles.

Mr. PRIOR. At what rate?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. At very low rates. I found that the rates were so low that the money we should receive would not compensate us for the inconvenience of sending these rifles off to be distributed. Besides, it was represented to me that the rifles might get into the hands of the Indians of the North-west or others in whose hands the government did not desire to have them. I thought it not worth while to let them go for a few shillings, considering that each rifle was really all right. Though the improvement upon the rifles of that day was considerable, I asked the deputy minister to inform himself upon the possibility of having these guns converted. We had offers from England and also, I believe, from Canada to convert these rifles; but they were not converted. But we did not dispose of these rifles because the amount we would have received was not sufficient to counterbalance the inconvenience and risk we should incur. This was

about the time we were organizing companies in the different colleges. The Jesuit College, for one, had applied to have arms sent them; and I thought that if we kept these arms, they might be utilized for these military organizations in the colleges. The hon. minister is in a far better position than I was, because, the whole of the armament has been practically renovated since my incumbency. I believe it was a mistake to dispose of these guns for the small amount that the department received. I was unfortunately detained in the Committee of Railways and Canals this morning, and I find an item has been passed by which an increase is given to two clerks in the department—

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, if he would allow me, that in the supplementary estimates, which will be down in a day or two, is an item which will bring up the question of civil government again.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. Very well, I can discuss the matter then.

Mr. **A. T. WOOD** (Hamilton). I wish to make a remark as to what has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace). It would really be refreshing to hear from that gentleman a single word of praise for anything the government does. During all the time I have sat here, I have never heard him say that anything that was done by any minister was to be commended in any form. Now, with reference to the prices obtained for those rifles—78 cents—I think the government got a fair price. After the Franco-Prussian war, a large number of rifles were left on hand in Germany, quite as good as the rifles under discussion. These German rifles were imported largely by wholesale merchants in this country. I imported many of them, and they cost very little more than the price paid for these rifles by the party who bought them in Montreal. I know there is not one of these 20,000 rifles that went out of the country. I would have tendered for the purchase of them but my position prevented me from doing so. But I bought quite a large quantity of them both for my Hamilton house and my Winnipeg house. They were sold to country merchants in tens and twenties, and by them sold to the farmers—not to learn the rifle practice, but simply that they might have a rifle in the house for an emergency. To say that accurate rifle practice could be learned with these guns is drawing upon the imagination, I think.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. What did the farmers pay for them?

Mr. **WOOD**. A reasonable price, perhaps \$1.50 in ones and twos and threes.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. Three dollars each.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**.

Mr. **WOOD**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) seems to know everything about everything; he knows the business of other people better than they know it themselves.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. I know that I paid \$3 for one of them, and many others were sold in my town at the same price.

Mr. **WOOD**. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is not as sharp as I thought he was.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. That was the price.

Mr. **WOOD**. I suppose it was twelve months credit—they charge a larger price on yearly accounts than for cash down.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. They were sold for cash.

Mr. **WOOD**. But what I wish to say is that the rifles were regularly advertised in the newspapers, and were sold to the highest bidder. They were sold in small quantities throughout this country, and I am satisfied that though they went all over Canada, none of them went to the United States. I think the government did right to sell them.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Wood) affirm or repudiate the statement of the Minister of Militia, that one of the great objects of disposing of these rifles at 75 cents was that the people throughout the country might perfect themselves in rifle practice. That is the reason the hon. minister has offered for selling them at this figure. But the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) tells the minister that he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. **WOOD**. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) would like to see one of his sons shoulder such a musket and go to war.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. I am not disputing, I merely wish to know the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Wood's) position.

Mr. **A. C. BELL** (Pictou). In the report of the chief superintendent of stores, I notice a startling statement. This is on page 2 of the report:

Attention is requested to the issues ordered to be made to field batteries. Equipment to the value of over \$50,000 is issued to an officer without any guarantee of safety, and stored in a gun-shed without any adequate protection. The greater part of this equipment is unnecessary for drill purposes. The present establishment of horses for a field battery is thirty-four, yet seventy-eight sets of harness are issued; forty-four sets, therefore, lie in the gun-shed from year to year deteriorating.

I would ask the Minister of Militia if that is the practice—to issue twice as many sets of harness and other equipments as are necessary. Then, again, I observe a little further on he urges the same point that was

brought up by the member for Victoria and the leader of the opposition, as to the clothing and the necessity for a sufficient supply. I quote from the report again :

The advantage of having at least one year's supply of clothing on hand as a reserve cannot be too forcibly urged. This would greatly facilitate issues; a sufficient supply of any size could be guaranteed, and exceptional demands could be met without difficulty.

A little further on the same page :

Of the fifteen Maxim guns imported, two are in South Africa, two in the Yukon territory, and two in British Columbia. An additional supply is required.

These are all important suggestions, and I think they should be carried into effect by the department. I would like to ask the minister, as a matter of the highest public importance, if these recommendations and suggestions have been considered, and what action, if any, the government proposes to take ?

Mr. PRIOR. Before the minister answers my hon. friend, I want to say that I heartily endorse the remark made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) in regard to the necessity of having a cartridge factory in Ontario. The reason that he gave is a very strong one, and there is another reason which I think should be considered, namely, that the one factory might be destroyed by fire at any moment, and we might be left without any cartridges at all. I would ask the minister if he has ever thought of the advisability of having resort to private enterprise for the manufacture of ammunition. In Great Britain I know they do all they can to get private firms to undertake the manufacture of ammunition. Could that not be done in Canada ? I think we have one or two large firms in Canada, the Hamilton Powder Company for one. It seems to me it would be a good idea to look into that matter thoroughly, and see if you cannot get your cartridges manufactured by private firms, perhaps cheaper than the government could do it. At all events, the necessity that exists of having a cartridge factory west of Quebec is a matter of serious moment.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think the matter brought up by the member for West York is entitled to very careful consideration, and I shall be prepared to give it consideration, namely, the encouragement of private enterprise in this direction. I may say that that matter occupied my attention more than two years ago. I had several conferences with Dr. Brainard, who has a factory at Lachute, with reference to that subject, and my idea was that the government would undertake to give his company a guarantee of a certain order each year, providing the company would undertake to fit up a factory with machinery sufficient to make a much larger

quantity in case it should be required. The negotiations did not come to anything, I was not able to get that gentleman down to any definite statement as to what guarantee he would give, and what increased amount he would undertake to manufacture in case we guaranteed him a certain order each year. Possibly the negotiations may be renewed. Now, replying to the questions of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell), I may say that the first paragraph he read in the report concerning the issue of valuable stores to the field battery, has occupied my attention. Unfortunately, as military men know pretty well, there is apt to be, from time to time, a certain amount of friction between the different branches of the department ; there always seems to be a little friction between the stores branch, the civil branch of the department, and the military branch. I think that probably the superintendent of stores implies, perhaps, a slight reflection upon the military branch. But, I can assure the House that now every precaution has been taken to see that the property issued is properly taken care of.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Is it a fact, as is stated in that report, that more equipment is issued than is necessary ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can only say that there has been no equipment issued which the military authorities did not think necessary. Now, with regard to the year's supply of clothing, I have already given the reason why I did not ask for a special vote this year, that was because we had not proper central warehouse at Ottawa in which to store them. With regard to the additional Maxim guns, I think that orders have been given to replace those which have been sent to South Africa. I do not know that it is necessary to increase the order at the present moment, but it is easy at short notice to do so. It is very difficult to get stores at this time in Great Britain, but at almost any other time, by cabling over, we can get any supplies we require inside of ten or twelve days.

Now, one word in reference to the old rifles. The hon. member for Three Rivers said that he had this question before him when he was Minister of Militia and Defence. Well, I think he must be a little mistaken, because when he was Minister of Militia and Defence the rifles which are now obsolete were the only rifles with which the militia of Canada was armed, that is, the Snider-Enfield rifle. Since the hon. gentleman ceased to be Minister of Militia and Defence, \$40,000 worth of new rifles have been purchased. I was advised, and I believed that it would be in the public interest, to sell at least 20,000 of the superfluous obsolete rifles. With reference to the statement that I sold these rifles in order to give the people an opportunity of rifle practice, the leader of the opposition is mistaken in

imputing that statement to me. What I said was, that I believed one of the results would be to give the people an opportunity, if they saw fit, of using these rifles for the purpose of improving themselves in marksmanship. I may say to the member for West York, that the very thing he thinks ought to have been done, that is, the distribution of these rifles throughout the country, has been done by the government, and to-day 20,000 rifles are scattered among the people of Canada, from the extreme east to the extreme west. So far as they are of any use, I suppose they are now being used for the purpose of practice. But, the hon. gentleman himself understands that the rifle clubs all over Canada would feel insulted if we were to issue to them rifles of this obsolete character. They would be absolutely useless, absolutely worthless. As a matter of fact, they are absolutely worthless. Their limit in carrying power is a few hundred yards, and they are not exact after five or six hundred yards, whereas the rifle of to-day will carry 1,500 yards, or as far as it is possible to see, even with the aid of a magnifying glass. The rifle of to-day is a weapon of precision, whereas the rifle we have discarded is practically worthless, and it would be an insult to offer a rifle of that character to rifle clubs for the purpose of practice.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I was called out, but I understood the hon. minister to state that I was mistaken in the statement I made in reference to the obsolete rifles in my time. Is that the hon. minister's statement?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, the statement I made was that the hon. gentleman could not have had 20,000 rifles to dispose of, because the militia were using what was then an up-to-date weapon. The rifle which we have sold was then the only rifle which the hon. gentleman had, and therefore he could not have considered the question of disposing of it. What I suppose he did consider the question of disposing of were three or four thousand rifles which were disposed of at 25 cents apiece, rifles that were heirlooms, that had come down from the old government of Canada, and which had been in the department for twenty or thirty years.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I want to rectify the statement of my hon. friend. I never mentioned 20,000 rifles. I do not know how many there were. I did not intend to dispose of the rifles that the whole militia force of Canada were armed with then. We had different patterns of rifles, amongst them Spencer rifles, a large quantity of which were used in the first trouble in the North-west. The question of the disposal of these rifles was brought to my attention by the deputy, and it was suggested that it would be better to dispose of them. I ascertained what they would bring

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

into the department, and I found it to be a very insignificant amount. Then, it was suggested that we should have them converted, and that, after having them converted, although not equal to the rifle with which our force were armed, they might be brought into use by being utilized in the schools for drill purposes. That was my statement, and the hon. gentleman will find, in the records of the department, the report which was made to me by the deputy at that time. I never mentioned 20,000. There may have been 20,000 for all I know, or there may have been one or two thousand for all I know. I never mentioned the amount simply because I was speaking from memory, but my memory is accurate as to my having discussed the question with Col. Panet of the disposal of, or conversion of the rifle to be utilized in the way that I have mentioned and not to be supplied to the rifle clubs. I am quite at one with the hon. minister as to their rifle clubs. The very best arm that can be found must be given to the rifle clubs. They are composed of the crack shots of Canada, and they must be armed with the very best arm that can be given to them.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I understand now that the hon. gentleman referred to the three or four thousand rifles.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not know how many.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think there were about that many composed of Peabody's, Spencer's, and half a dozen other varieties in store at Quebec, and in different places. The deputy recommended that these rifles should be got rid of, or that they should be remodelled and distributed to the schools. Neither was done, and all these years they remained in the stores a bill of expense to the country. They were not issued to the schools, and they were not remodelled. When I came in I found them there, and I found report after report in regard to them. Finally, I said to Col. Lake: Go through the stores from one end of the country to the other and see what they contain. He did so, and he made a very strong report. In view of the fact that we were bringing in the new rifle, which was an additional argument that did not exist in the time my hon. friend was in office, in view of the fact that we were under additional expense and required more room for the new rifles, it was considered advisable to dispose of the old rifles, and as we had twenty or thirty or forty thousands to dispose of we were advised to get rid of them by sale, and that was done.

Mr. SPROULE. In reference to the hon. minister's statement that young men throughout the country would not think of

learning shooting with these obsolete rifles because they would only carry straight for, perhaps, 200 or 300 yards—

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Five hundred or six hundred yards.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the good shots in the country learn their shooting with rifles that would not shoot more than 200 yards. The ordinary rifle that is carried through the bush and through the country is the rifle that is most used. I do not see any difference between young men learning to shoot with a rifle that will carry 200 yards and with a rifle that will carry 1,000 yards. It is only a matter of a steady hand and clear sight. I would not have referred to this again had it not been for the statement of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood), that not one of these rifles went out of the country.

Mr. **WOOD**. I was speaking of the 20,000. I know nothing of the first three or four thousand sold. I was speaking of those advertised last year.

Mr. **SPROULE**. The hon. gentleman made the statement in such a way as to leave the impression that none went out of the country. The hon. minister said that only a few of the old Enfield rifles went out of the country. Well, there were 5,090 Enfields, Peabodys and Spencers, which is not a small number. There were in addition 219 Winchesters sold at \$1.50 apiece. I remember some years ago some parties buying Winchesters at \$15 apiece, and they were considered very cheap at that, because the price then was \$25. These Winchesters were sold at \$1.50, and there were 1,090 sold for 25 cents apiece, including Enfields, Peabodys and Spencers, to Hartly & Graham, of New York. They were sold to a firm of foreigners at 25 cents apiece, which is a very low figure. They were sold at private sale as the Auditor General's Report shows. The Auditor General says:

No vouchers in connection with this sale have been furnished. Please forward them. In the meantime, I have to inquire if these rifles were examined and condemned by a board of examiners.

The answer is:

The sale was not by auction, but by private tender, by order of the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence.

So that instead of being a small number there were 5,309 of these rifles sold. I said that instead of being sold to men in the country they were sold and taken out of the country, and I find that to be the case. They were sold without tender, without advertisement, and even without vouchers being returned, under the instructions of the minister.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), has received no reply from the minister in reference to the matter which he brought to his attention. Here is a statement, which coming from the chief superintendent of stores, is startling:

Attention is requested to the issues ordered to be made to field batteries. Equipment to the value of over \$50,000 is issued to an officer without any guarantee of safety, and stored in a gun-shed without any adequate protection. The greater part of this equipment is unnecessary for drill purposes. The present establishment of horses for a field battery is thirty-four, yet seventy-eight sets of harness are issued; forty-four sets, therefore, lie in the gun-shed from year to year deteriorating.

I only wonder that he did not add: 'Wanted, a Minister of Militia.' More reckless conduct on the part of a minister than to permit this condition of things, it is impossible to conceive. Here we have a Minister of Militia bringing down this condemnation on himself by his subordinate officer; this proof of the utter inadequacy of the minister to discharge the ordinary duties that the country requires of him. This officer says that \$50,000 worth of equipments is issued without any guarantee of safety, and that the greater part of it is unnecessary, and the minister brings down this certificate of character furnished by an important officer, and he has no justification and no explanation to offer. These reports from the minister's own officers, indicate an utter want of management, and indicate the fact that there is no person giving attention to the department. I want to get on with the business of the House, and I do not wish to delay; but the minister ought to understand that when he puts on the Table of the House statements from high officers in his department, showing utter neglect on the part of the head of the department, he ought to make some apology to the House for the position he finds himself in.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. If any member of this administration waited until the leader of the opposition would admit that any member of the government possesses any qualification of an administrative character, he would wait for the millenium. I do not ask the leader of the opposition for a certificate as to my fitness or unfitness, but I am entitled to expect at least a little fair-play from him. It seems that the hon. gentleman will not extend even that. The issue of these stores is made by the order of the General Officer Commanding, and it is a thing with which the Minister of Militia has nothing to do.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Hear, hear.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Yes, 'hear, hear.' The General Officer Commanding is responsible to the minister, and the General Officer Commanding knows, or ought to know, and I think did know, what was necessary to have issued

in order to carry out his plan with reference to the training of the militia. It seems that the chief superintendent of stores has a different view from the General Officer Commanding, and, in this instance, I am inclined to think that the General Officer Commanding knew better what the requirements were, and what his own objects were, which he may not have explained to the superintendent of stores. Every precaution has been taken to see that the stores issued are properly taken care of, and there is not the slightest question that at the present moment these stores are being properly cared for, and that proper guarantees for their safety have been given.

Mr. DAVIN. I will ask the Minister of Militia to definitely explain what is necessary to be done by gentlemen in the North-west, who are desirous to have rifles and to be equipped as rifle associations? Let me say that what we want for the rifle associations in the North-west Territories, and all over the country, is the very best weapon. I do not differ from the statement of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), that good use might have been made of the discarded rifles for the purposes of drill. But he is mistaken in the idea that you can cultivate marksmanship with a rifle of 400 yards range, in such a way as would help you when armed with a rifle of 800 yards range. The man who has practiced with a 400-yard range rifle would have to relearn his business to a certain extent when he wanted to use a modern rifle. In order that our marksmen may be equal to any emergency, we want to have them armed with the very best rifles. I quite agree with the views expressed to-day, that what we want in order to have marksmen all over Canada, is not centralization but decentralization. You want local initiative, you want local clubs, and if you have in every part of the country local clubs constantly practising, and if from the centre you content yourselves with encouraging this practice by giving prizes, you will accomplish in that way, far greater results for less money than is accomplished by the large outlay, nearly half a million dollars, on the annual drill. Reference has been made in this discussion to the Swiss system, and the hon. minister showed that he had studied that system, or that it had been called to his attention. All over Switzerland, in every little locality, there is an association, the members of which have constant practice; and this practice is not merely a duty, but it is a pleasure. It fills the place in Switzerland that the manly games that fitted men for warfare did in the days of Merry England. I should like to hear from the minister a definite statement of what has to be done in any locality in order that it may have a thoroughly equipped rifle association.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is necessary for gentlemen

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

who wish to form themselves into an association to meet together and adopt certain by-laws. This is the regulation governing the matter, in the Regulations and Orders for the Militia of Canada, 1898, No. 161:

All rifle associations applying for aid out of the government grant are required to send to headquarters, through district officers commanding, a copy in duplicate of their rules and regulations for approval.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman will see that that cannot apply to the North-west Territories, because we have not got the militia there. I understand that these are the militia regulations which he is reading from.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There has always been some question as to whether the Militia Act applied to the North-west Territories. As the hon. gentleman knows, the mounted police has been the arm utilized in that part of the country to preserve order; it has taken the place there which the militia to some extent occupies in the rest of Canada. But I may say to the hon. gentleman that the opinion of the Department of Justice has been taken upon the question as to whether the Militia Act applies to the present organization of the North-west Territories, with the result that we are assured that no change of the law is necessary, and that the Act does apply. Having settled that point, which has been settled only within a very short time, it will be necessary, I think, to make a further regulation declaring in distinct terms that for the purposes of this particular regulation, the district officer commanding, say at Winnipeg, shall be the officer through whom these applications shall be made, or that they shall be sent direct to the adjutant-general at Ottawa; and now that my attention has been again specially called to the matter, I give the hon. gentleman the assurance that at once such a regulation will be formulated and promulgated, and that every opportunity will be given to the people of the North-west Territories to form themselves into rifle associations, with the same advantages and the same opportunities as are enjoyed in the rest of Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. That is so far satisfactory, because the opinion that has been obtained from the Department of Justice places the question in a different position from what it occupied in the early part of the session. Early in the session, when I called on the deputy minister, he told me that nothing further could very well be done until an Act was passed; but now that we have the assurance of the Department of Justice that the Militia Act applies to the North-west Territories, and that the present machinery is sufficient, I would ask the Minister of Militia not to make the district officer at Winnipeg the officer to deal with

this question. He says another regulation will have to be passed. Then, I would suggest that the order in council embodying that regulation should make the adjutant-general here the officer with whom the Territories will have to deal. Let the Territories deal directly with the Department of Militia. Then we shall be in a position to get ahead, because, as he is aware, up to the present we have always been met with a non possumus.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the Oliver equipment has given universal satisfaction. I heard many complaints about it when it was first issued, and there seems to be a feeling among a good many militia officers that it is cumbersome and uncomfortable for the men, and that better equipment might be found. At the time it was ordered, the experts who were called in to judge it, gave it as their opinion that it was the best equipment that could be found. I would like to know if the officers still consider it a perfectly satisfactory equipment.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as I know, the Oliver equipment has given great satisfaction. We have had no serious complaints. The department, after careful inquiry, both before the present government came into office, and for a year afterwards, decided that it was the best equipment known. I thought I had here the extract of a letter recently published in the *Army and Navy Gazette* by a distinguished Imperial army officer, in which he says, discussing the conditions in South Africa, that if the British army had adopted the Oliver equipment, some of the serious disasters which took place, resulting from the ammunition having become exhausted, would not have happened. He praises the Oliver equipment in the strongest possible terms, and congratulates the militia of Canada upon having adopted it, and expresses his belief that it is the best equipment in the world.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Has the hon. gentleman received any application for the sale or lease of a portion of the Cove Fields in Quebec? The hon. gentleman knows that these old ordnance properties are divided into two classes, *a* and *b*. Class *a* is reserved for defensive purposes and cannot be disposed of without application to the Imperial government; and class *b* consists of properties which were handed over by the Imperial government and can be disposed of by the Canadian government without special application to the home authorities, the only condition being that they must be sold at public sale. In my time application was made for a portion of the Cove field, and refused on the ground that it was in class *a* and could not be disposed of. The Cove field, of course, forms part of the property attached to the Plains of Abraham, and extends from the citadel right out to the Plains. It is used to-day by the golf club,

which has considerably improved the property. Being in class *a*, I do not see how it possibly could be disposed of.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have already answered an inquiry with regard to this matter in the House. There has been an application from the provincial government of Quebec for a portion of this land on which to erect a normal school, but I understand that the land is now under lease, no doubt to the golf club, and, therefore, it is quite out of the question for the government to do anything in the matter.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It could not be disposed of in any case?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia to consider the question of giving aid to the establishment of rifle clubs. The House is aware that the Prime Minister of England has drawn special attention to the great importance of establishing such clubs. I am not now referring to the rifle associations but to rifle clubs. I hope the government will give such aid to these clubs as will promote their establishment generally throughout the country. The *Star* newspaper has offered very considerable prizes for those who will be first in the field in adopting Lord Salisbury's suggestion and establishing rifle clubs in Canada. Have the government considered the question and what aid do they propose to give?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The question has been under consideration for some time. What I am doing is to consult the district officers commanding and military men in the different provinces with the view of formulating some scheme which will afford the greatest possible opportunity for the formation of these clubs. The department will do everything possible in the direction suggested. Rifles will be issued free, as is generally done in the case of the rifle associations, but how far we could go in the supplying of free ammunition, I am not prepared to say, but, certainly, we can sell the ammunition at cost or less than cost, and might give a limited quantity to the members of each club by way of encouragement. Perhaps, before the House rises, I will be able to add something to the statement I now make.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to ask something, so that the government, if it should decide to give free ammunition, will be able to carry out its decision.

Mr. WALLACE. Where is the supply of gunpowder for the cartridges obtained?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. At the War Office. Cordite is the explosive used—the smokeless powder.

Mr. WALLACE. Do the government propose to continue getting supplies from the War Office?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Clothing and necessaries ..... \$110,000

Mr. PRIOR. I see in the Auditor General's Report, on page L—3, that the sum of \$2,607.32 was paid to James Robertson, inspector of clothing, 227½ days at \$10 per day. Who is Mr. Robertson, and what are his special qualifications?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He was formerly a citizen of the city of Hamilton, and a merchant there, and has been doing the work of inspection ever since 1896. He is a most efficient and able inspector, a man who has had great experience in cloths and clothing, which has been his business for many years.

Mr. PRIOR. Was he permanently employed?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He was not at that time. He is in receipt of the same pay as has always been given by the department—\$10 a day.

Militia—Provisions and supplies ..... \$125,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This is for the camps, and schools and everything?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, to provide rations, forage, fuel, light, postage, and other items, and to purchase twenty-one remounts.

Mr. SPROULE. I would remind the hon. minister, that when the accounts for the contingents were under consideration, I asked for information regarding the amount paid for horses, and he promised to get it for me. I suppose, however, that in the multiplicity of his duties, he has forgotten it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have all that information prepared, and I will get it for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule).

Militia—Transport and freight..... \$40,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Is this for the camps?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No; this includes transport for the officers of the headquarters district staff, permanent corps on staff duty (annual drill excepted), \$12,000; transport of officers and men of the militia, and permanent corps attending schools of instruction, transport of the permanent corps, to and from stations, \$10,000; freight charges and expressage of military stores, also truckage of same, \$18,000. This is the vote we take annually, and it is the smallest amount we can manage with.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Militia—Rifle associations and grants.... \$38,000

Mr. PRIOR. May I ask if the rifle range in Victoria, B.C., has been made?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The survey has been made, and expropriation proceedings are now going on.

Mr. PRIOR. No work has been done?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, we could not do work until the ground was located. The work will go on at once. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior), there will be no delay.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I desire to ask the minister what is being done with regard to assisting rifle ranges in small places—other than those for Dominion or provincial use?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is a very large question. The moment we step outside of the large centres, it is difficult to say where the expenditure will end. But I should feel like recommending that where a piece of ground is by nature specially adapted for a rifle range, where there is a good background, and it would not be necessary to buy a large quantity of land, we should assist to some extent in either buying or renting the ground. I intend to proceed upon that line at any rate. I think there has been some assistance given to small ranges, but not to a very great extent.

Militia—Miscellaneous and unforeseen ... \$22,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is an increase of \$2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is it for?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. When the total force is drilled, there are more claims on account of injuries, than when only half the force is drilled. Of this increase, \$1,000 is for injuries at annual drill. The other \$1,000 is due to increase of expenses for telegraphing, legal expenses and so on—which is also the direct result of the annual drill. The telegraphing bill has increased very much indeed as a result of that. The legal expenses have increased on account of the expropriation proceedings which we have been taking and shall have to take in connection with the expropriation of land for various rifle ranges.

Mr. PRIOR. At page L—83 of the Auditor General's Report, I find a charge for the Defence Scheme Committee. What has been done with regard to that?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The defence committee sat here for two or three months and finished their work, and these are the accounts.

Mr. PRIOR. The committee reported?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, and the report has been for-

warded through His Excellency, to the Intelligence Department of the War Office.

Mr. PRIOR. It is not published here ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, and will never be published. But it is open for any prominent military man who cares to see it.

Mr. PRIOR. I see, in looking through the Auditor General's Report, very large amounts paid to individual firms—Doull & Gibson, over \$7,000 ; Sanford, over \$52,000 ; Marsolais & Monday, over \$15,000—and so on. I would like to ask the minister whether all these supplies were ordered by tender ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, so far as I know. If there was any exception, it was for the installing of heating apparatus in different depots.

Mr. FOSTER. On page L-72 of the Auditor General's Report, I find an item of \$300 for Wm. P. Laird, services, April 25 to July 1, 1898, preparing militia regulations for revision, also revising the same. It seems to me the hon. minister's staff is quite sufficient for that class of work. Why should \$300 extra be paid out for some person to prepare militia regulations for revision ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There had been no satisfactory revision for a long time ; and it was thought advisable to employ somebody who had had experience in matters of this kind to do the work. Mr. Laird, I think, has had some experience in connection with the Ontario statutes, and he was employed as being a suitable man, and I think did the work very well.

Mr. FOSTER. Had not the hon. gentleman a man in his own department for that ? Who is so well fitted to revise these regulations as an officer of the department who is familiar with them ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This gentleman is a lawyer, and he had the benefit of the constant advice of military men and the head of the department, the late Col. Panet, to assist him in his work. It was necessary to go through all these regulations and take out all those that were contradictory with each other. That was a work that a lawyer alone could do.

Mr. FOSTER. What experience had Mr. Laird in army regulations ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He had no experience perhaps in army regulations, but he had experience in the codification of statutes, and could easily detect regulations which contradicted each other.

Royal Military College, Kingston..... \$70,500

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I had not an opportunity of being present when the Min-

ister of Militia and Defence made his statement with reference to this and a number of other subjects yesterday. I desire to take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the committee for a few moments to what took place in this House on the 19th of March, when, according to *Hansard*, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) asked :

1. During what years was Major-General Cameron the head of the Royal Military College at Kingston ?

2. When did his connection with the college cease ?

3. How many cadets were in attendance at said college during each year that Major-General Cameron was in charge ?

4. Who succeeded Major-General Cameron ?

5. How many cadets have been in attendance at the college each year since Major-General Cameron's official connection therewith ceased ?

6. Is it the intention of the government to reinstate Major-General Cameron ? If not, why not ?

I want to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence and the hon. member for North Wellington whether they think any great advantage is to be gained by putting on the *Hansard* utterly delusive and misleading statements. The Minister of Militia and Defence answered these questions in such a way as to suit the question by giving answers so prepared as to have the effect of misleading and deceiving the people. I think it is a prostitution of the position of a minister of the Crown to lend himself to anything of that kind, and I want to take exception to it. These were the answers given :

1. Major-General Cameron was head of the Royal Military College from August 16, 1888, until August 25, 1896. 2. August 25, 1896. 3. In 1888, 81 cadets; in 1889, 76 cadets; in 1890, 71 cadets; in 1891, 57 cadets; in 1892, 66 cadets; in 1893, 63 cadets; in 1894, 56 cadets; in 1895, 59 cadets; in 1896, 50 cadets. 4. Major Gerald Charles Kitson. 5. In 1897, 57 cadets; in 1898, 75 cadets; in 1899, 87 cadets. 6. No.

Now, I ask the committee if any person with that information before him could come to any other conclusion than that the great increase in the attendance of cadets at the Royal Military College resulted from the change of commandant. I need not tell the House that the Royal Military College before either of these gentlemen went there received the highest commendation from Major-General Sir Andrew Clarke, G.C.M.G., a military authority of the highest character, who put on record his flattering declarations that in his judgment there was no military college in the world superior to the Royal Military College of Canada ; and not only that, but he said he spoke from the curriculum of study which they had in force and from the character of the men who had graduated from that college and had become officers in the British army. Now, in view of the fact that the government have given a great many answers that were not categorical replies to the ques-

tions put to them, and have entered fully into circumstances foreign to the question, I ask whether it was worthy of the Militia Department, worthy of the government, for these questions to be asked and these answers to be made in such a way as to deceive and mislead the country as to the comparative merits of the gentlemen who were in charge of the college at the two periods. I say that never in the history of the college did the cadets take a higher position or acquit themselves more honourably from the time they went into the Imperial army than did those who graduated during the period of the management of that institution that it is now sought to be belittled. Now, was not the Minister of Militia and Defence bound in justice to these gentlemen, gentlemen who are not here to defend themselves, to state frankly to the House that there was no relevancy in these questions as to the number of cadets attending the college? Was he not bound to say that since this government came into power they had entirely changed the position of attendance upon that college? Was he not bound to say that they had altered the age of admission? Was he not bound to say that they had reduced the period required for graduation from four years' study to three? Was he not bound to say that they had changed materially the curriculum of the college, and, in fact, had dispensed with a number of very important subjects? And lastly and especially was he not bound to say that the present government had largely reduced the fees payable by cadets entering that college? Every person can see that the questions had no point except the object of casting discredit upon the administration of the college during a certain period. I confess that when these changes were made I feared very much the consequences. I do not speak of the reduction of the fees which is a matter of public policy, and which could have but one result, and that was to produce a larger number of attendants as it rendered the attendance very much more easy, and made the college available to persons who would otherwise be unable to attend. I did express my great fear that the standard of education given at the Royal Military College would be so much lowered as to prevent it receiving that high encomium, that, under the former regime, it had received from the highest military authorities. I regarded the reduction of the period of attendance, before graduating, from four to three years as an experiment, but I am only too glad to learn by the statements that have been made that it has not been attended with the results that I feared. We all have a common interest in the Royal Military College, and in maintaining that high status which, from the first, it has enjoyed. We all have a common interest in finding that such a course as is adopted by whoever is in

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

charge of the institution has enabled its cadets to maintain in the British Empire the very high position to which they have attained. I could point to gentlemen who graduated during the period that Major-General Cameron was commandant of the college, who have received the highest encomiums from the most eminent authorities in the British Empire upon their ability and great knowledge of their profession in which they have been able to serve the empire in South Africa, but I do not intend occupying the time of the House at this stage of the session further than to draw attention to the gross injustice and unfairness—I think I might say dishonesty—of putting questions and receiving answers of that character, thereby misleading the House, or, not misleading the House, because the House understands it too well to be deceived.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). I would just like to say a word in reply to the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper). I put the question on the Notice paper entirely on my own responsibility. The hon. Minister of Militia never said a single word, directly or indirectly, to me. Since the hon. gentleman has reopened the question, I will give him the reason why I put the question on the Notice paper. I was personally intimate with some of those who attended the military college, and in the course of a conversation one of the cadets told me that Major-General Cameron was virtually a stranger to the cadets of the college, that instead of being personally familiar with them, knowing every one of the cadets by name, and taking an active interest in the progress of the institution, such as he should have taken, he did not know the name of half of these cadets. Having heard a report of that kind I decided, as it was my duty, to put a question on the Notice paper, and I did it of my own accord. I think if Major-General Cameron stands in such bad need of commendation before this House and the country it would certainly have looked better to have allowed some other person to have spoken in his behalf than his father-in-law. I think it would have come very well from some person other than the hon. leader of the opposition. The hon. gentleman characterizes my course as being what he is disposed to call unfair and small. Well, I put the question through a desire to gather information in regard to the duty of Major-General Cameron. I certainly thought that if that was the character of the service that he was giving to Canada in return for the kindness that Canada had shown him, the House should know it. When Major-General Cameron came here we not only put him in the college at a high salary, but, through the good offices, I presume, of the hon. leader of the opposition we provided him with a

house, paid for it, and we furnished it. Everything about it was furnished at the country's expense down to the coal with which he warmed his feet. I certainly think in return for all that we should have got better service than that which was reported to me by the cadet as having been rendered by Major-General Cameron, and I pledge my word of honour, as a member of this House, that I have stated exactly what he said to me. The cadet said to me that Major-General Cameron was unacquainted with the students, and that he did not appear to take any interest in them. He came there now and again, strutted around amongst them, looked at them, but, as far as making himself familiar with them and taking any interest in their education was concerned, he did nothing of the kind. That was the reason why I put the question on the Order paper. I had nothing to do with the hon. Minister of Militia, and he never suggested anything of the kind to me. I did it for my own information.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman has evidently been misinformed, and I am quite sure, if I may be allowed to use a vulgar expression, that the cadet has been pulling the leg of my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen).

Mr. McMULLEN: No.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I ought to know something about it. I was Minister of Militia when Major Cameron came to Canada. I had on several occasions an opportunity of going to Kingston, as hon. gentlemen know. I was always present when the prizes were distributed, and moreover, time and again I had occasion to run down on business of the department, connected with the Royal Military College. I had an excellent opportunity of judging of the relations which existed between Major-General Cameron and the cadets. On more than one occasion it was my pleasure at his own house to meet the cadets who were invited by Major-General and Mrs. Cameron to partake of their hospitality. I can say more; of all the officers who have had charge of the Royal Military College, without disparaging any of the others, I do not know any one who gave more of his time to the institution, or took a deeper interest in the progress of the cadets than Major-General Cameron. The hon. gentleman says that he did not know them by name, that he never met them, that he never mixed with them, but the hon. gentleman must see himself that that would be impossible. The officer commanding in charge of the Royal Military College, has, several times a day to be with the cadets. He has to superintend the instructors. He has the superintendence of the education which is being carried on. It is upon his own ideas that the curriculum is formulated

for the scholars. I suppose that well-informed cadet also told the hon. gentleman that Major-General Cameron knew nothing at all. He is one of the greatest scientists. This is a fact that was very well known long before he came to Canada. On most important questions, of great importance to the British Empire, Major-General Cameron was consulted by the Imperial authorities. But take Canada alone; we all know that in a work of great importance, namely, the delimitation of the boundary from the Lake of the Woods to the Rocky Mountains, he was employed by the Imperial government and received honours and decorations for the services he rendered. That cadet may have been one of the cadets who was not very often in the college, and possibly that might have been the reason why he did not meet the general.

Mr. McMULLEN. He was there, and he passed through the college.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Well, if he did, and did not meet the commandant of the college, he must have lost a good deal of his time remaining there. Major-General Cameron may have had people antagonistic to him, as every man in a prominent position will have, but every one who knows Major-General Cameron knows that he was most attentive, so far as the cadets are concerned. And as to his scientific acquirements, there is no use arguing about that, because Major-General Cameron was well known in England to be a man of high attainments.

Defence of Esquimalt ..... \$125,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is this increase of \$16,000 for?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As explained to the House last year, a new arrangement was made with the Imperial government in accordance with the terms which that government suggested. The agreement with the War Office, which took effect on October 1, 1899, requires the Dominion government to pay as follows:

- (a) Half the annual cost of the Imperial garrison of 320 officers and men..... \$102,207
- (b) Half the prime charges for the barrack accommodation of the force .... 60,000

This was provided for in the estimates of the current year, and does not require to be estimated for again.

- (c) To continue to pay, as at present, the whole cost of the maintenance of the local regiment, the strength to be maintained at the establishment fixed, and the militia to be subject to inspection by the Imperial officer commanding at Esquimalt or the lieutenant-general commanding in North America. \$45,000

The establishment of the militia force to be as follows: Artillery, five officers, 150 non-commissioned officers and men; submarine and mining engineers, three officers

and fifty non-commissioned officers and men; infantry, fifteen officers, 400 non-commissioned officers and men; total, twenty-three officers, and 600 non-commissioned officers and men.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is the increase for this year?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The annual cost prior to the new agreement was about \$45,000. Last year the old agreement was in force up to October, when the new agreement came in, and we had a vote in the supplementary estimates to make it up. The new arrangement was suggested by the Imperial government, discussed in the House last year, and acquiesced in, and it involves greater expense to this country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I understand it, the force is provided by the Imperial government, but paid by the Canadian government?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We pay half of it, and the government of Canada provides for a certain militia force as I have mentioned, and which is prescribed by the Imperial government.

It being six o'clock, the committee took recess.

### AFTER RECESS.

(The House resumed in Committee).

General service medals ..... \$15,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). It has been found, under the regulations promulgated, that there is a larger number of medals required than was at first supposed, and the additional vote of \$15,000 is required to provide the necessary number of medals for the men who served with credit during the Fenian raids of 1866 and 1870.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the relatives of the parties that were in action and have since died, be entitled to the medals?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The War Office in England has provided that the following are entitled to the medals: The surviving officers and non-commissioned officers and men who, during the operations in question, performed active service in the field, or served under orders from competent authority, on guard at any point where an attack was expected or who were detailed by competent authority for some specific or special service. The date of that order is July, 1898. In the case of any veteran who died subsequent to that date, his medal will be issued to his legal representative.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister a question with reference to medals for the North-west Mounted Police. From

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

time to time, I have brought before his department the claims of the mounted police who served in the rebellion of 1885, to medals, and I should be very glad to know that the hon. gentleman has decided to give medals to the mounted police who fought in the rebellion. I would not disparage the services of those gallant men who in 1867 and 1870 fought against the dubious cloud of invasion that gathered on our confines, but surely no men ever did better service for their country than was done by the North-west Mounted Police in 1885. I should be glad to know what arrangements the hon. gentleman has made to provide those of the North-west Mounted Police who served in 1885, with medals.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can only say, that so far as I am personally concerned, my sympathies are entirely with the gentlemen for whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) speaks; and so far as I have any opinion in the matter I feel disposed to recommend that the medal shall be granted to the gentlemen to whom he refers.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the minister if there is any reasonable time put upon the applications of those who are deserving of medals?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. None. We are open to receive applications at any time in the future.

Mr. HENDERSON. I suppose the hon. minister is quite aware that all of those who served in 1866 have not received medals. I am aware that in the county I represent the greater number have received medals, but, for some reason that we have not yet had explained, a number who are equally deserving and who also made application have not received any. I trust it is not more than an oversight, and if it is a case of oversight, I trust that the minister will see that these men are not overlooked.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may inform my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) that the applications have been dealt with in chronological order as received. And, though it may appear that some applications have been overlooked, they have not been overlooked. I know from my personal knowledge that many applications have come in only within the last two or three weeks. I assure my hon. friend that every application will be carefully looked into and will receive the proper recognition.

Militia—Capital account—Arms, ammunition and defences ..... \$240,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of that? What is it to be expended on?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. With reference to this vote, I have only to say that I am not able to give

the whole details. In this vote will be included the purchase of arms and ammunition which may be necessary to carry out the policy of the government, to be initiated later on, with reference to the formation of rifle leagues and rifle clubs to which reference has been made yesterday and to-day, I think that it will be prudent for us as a government to wait for further developments. We know that the South African war will be fruitful in the way of lessons to be taught even to the Imperial army and the Imperial War Office. And I have only to say that we propose to spend this money in accordance with general principles which shall be laid down by the Intelligence Branch of the War Office later on. I may say, moreover, that it is not an additional vote, but it is a balance of the \$3,000,000 which was appropriated by this parliament in 1896 to be devoted to purposes of defence.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a rather peculiar statement. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) asks for a vote of a quarter of a million dollars, and then follows it up by a statement that he does not propose to give any plan at all as to how it is to be expended, or any particulars as to what kind of armament is to be obtained, where it is to be placed or how it is to be distributed.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is what the minister said. At least he did not give a single detail. If he has details to give, why, of course, we shall be happy to listen.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I repeat what I said—this is a balance of the vote of \$3,000,000 which, in 1896, under the regime of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was appropriated by the parliament of Canada as a contribution to the defence of Canada and the defence of the empire. This amount of money here proposed remains unexpended. I say that I do not propose, as head of the Militia Department, to finally conclude the expenditure of this money until the Intelligence Branch of the War Office in England has come to a conclusion as to what is the best arm, the best rifle, to purchase, and as to what is the best method of organizing rifle clubs. I am sure that after what my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) himself has said to-day, after what has been said in the House, he will be willing to leave, not to me, but to the wisdom of the government, the decision as to what course should be adopted with reference to these matters, and will not require me, as head of the department, in advance of the sober and serious conclusions which must be arrived at as a result of the operations which have taken place in South Africa, to anticipate these conclusions by making any statement here to-night. I am sure that my hon. friend, in view of the statements that have

been made here to-day by his leader and by the leaders of military opinion on his side of the House, as well as this side of the House, as to the means of organizing military clubs and rifle clubs in the country, will not require me to come down and define, especially and particularly the exact line we propose to take in the expenditure of this money. I am sure that my hon. friend, zealous as he is for the defence of Canada, will be willing to accord to the government of this country time to await developments which will give us the best opportunity to ascertain how this money can be most profitably expended. That is the answer I have to make to my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. I must say that is a very peculiar answer. I do not know what is the matter with the hon. gentleman, but I am quite sure there is no necessity for such emphasis as he has put into his remarks. I never yet saw a minister come before the House with a quarter of a million dollars of capital expenditure, who made such an odd speech as he has made. The amount of emphasis and vehemence in his speech was exactly proportionate to the meagreness of the matter which it contained. What does the hon. gentleman wish the House to infer? That he is going to take a quarter of a million dollars to establish rifle clubs in the Dominion of Canada? That is the only detail the hon. gentleman alluded to at all—that it was not quite yet decided what was best, but after the discussion we have had with reference to the establishment of gun clubs and rifle clubs, he thought he should not be pressed for details. Now, that is somewhat startling. If the minister means to say that this \$240,000 is to be expended for some sort of rifle club business, out of capital, I think he will pause before he asks the House to adopt the vote. I, for one, do not propose to give an unlimited capital account to the minister or the government, if it is proposed to scatter it in the formation of gun clubs and rifle clubs upon some plan which is not detailed to the House and of which we know absolutely nothing. He seems to plead that he ought not to be asked to explain this because it is the residuum of the \$3,000,000 that was passed in 1896. It is not the residuum of the \$3,000,000 that was voted. When we came down in 1896 and asked for this vote, we had to explain in the most elaborate detail, and rightly so, just the kind of arm that we proposed to purchase; and there was on this side of the House, by the gentlemen who were then in opposition, the most exigent demand for complete details and for cutting down the vote to the expenditure upon the plan of armament which was detailed to the House. Everybody who was here then will recollect the debate that took place, and they will recollect that the greatest detail, not only the kind of arm, but the distribution of the arm, the cost of the arm, the manner

in which it was purchased, purchased as it was almost entirely through the home government, had to be detailed to the House. Now the minister comes down with a vote of a quarter of a million dollars, and he gives us no idea, he merely appeals to us to put it into the hands of the government without details at all. But, he accompanies it with the most significant statement, by the way, that leads us to suppose that he proposed to spend a large amount of this in establishing gun clubs and rifle clubs. Now, Sir, so far as I am concerned, I think there will have to be a detailed statement of the kind of gun clubs and rifle clubs we are going to have established before we allow this \$240,000 to be used out of capital account. What we want to know from the hon. gentleman is the kind of armament that he proposes. We have now, I suppose, the latest arm, and a sufficient arm for our soldiers in the shape of a rifle.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, will the hon. gentleman say that he proposes a vote just enough to furnish our troops with the Lee-Enfield, or that he proposes to discard the Lee-Enfield, and to substitute in its place some other rifle? He must show to this House, before we entrust him with the money, something in the way of explanation as to what arm he proposes to substitute for the Lee-Enfield. For my part, I have not thought for a moment that any part of this \$240,000 was going to substitute a new arm for the rifle which we got on the recommendation of the British government, a rifle with which the soldiers of the British Empire are armed all the world over. I supposed that this was in part for bringing up the heavy proportion of the armament for our Canadian militia, large guns, armaments, batteries of one kind and another, in the proportion that we need them. I think the minister ought to take us into his confidence as to the kind of armament and as to the distribution. But, the government, outside of the hon. gentleman, will see how perfectly absurd it is to ask us for such an expenditure as this, to vote a capital sum of \$240,000, on such information as has been given us.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think the hon. gentleman is somewhat unreasonable. If the occurrences which have taken place during the last eight months had not taken place, I would think that his criticisms were perfectly fair. But the hon. gentleman told us here this afternoon that the conditions had been entirely changed by the developments in South Africa since October last. Because those conditions have changed the hon. gentleman proposes to deny us, not a new vote, but the remnant of the vote of \$3,000,000 that we took in 1896 in his regime.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is quite incorrect.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not incorrect.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman, I think, will take my word when I give the explanation. When we brought down our scheme we said that the total scheme involved an expenditure of about \$3,000,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not about—exactly.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, if the hon. gentleman is a stickler for words, we will say exactly; but, I do not know that anybody was foolish enough to say it would be that to a dollar. \$3,000,000 were mentioned, but the vote was not taken for \$3,000,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, I think it was.

Mr. FOSTER. My recollection is that it was not. Is the hon. gentleman sure that it was?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well, I do not wish to be too sure.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will find that he must not be too sure in that, because only a part of the vote was taken. So, this is absolutely and entirely a new vote, although it may be the complement of what was supposed to be necessary in order to carry out the total new armament which it was contemplated at that time. But the money was not voted; even if it had been it would have lapsed if it had not been spent.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that there was a general consensus at that time that the sum of \$3,000,000 should be voted towards armament in this country. I do not remember what the vote was at that time, but I think it was \$2,000,000.

Mr. BERGERON. No, it was \$1,300,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Whatever it may have been the sum named now is the balance of the \$3,000,000, which, by the general consensus of opinion of this parliament in 1896 should be voted for the purposes of defence, was agreed to. Now, I wish to point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) and to this committee, that since that time great events and great changes have occurred, that during the last eight months events have occurred and are transpiring which are vitally instructive. I do not think, in these events one could find any reason for denying the government of Canada the balance of the vote agreed upon in 1896 of \$3,000,000, but I do think that my hon. friend may agree with me that there is reason

to pause as to the exact manner in which that money should be expended. The hon. gentleman, in more forcible and eloquent language than I am able to command, pointed out to the House this afternoon the importance of the lessons being learned by the experience of the Imperial army in South Africa. Surely, my hon. friend is not prepared now, in view of these important lessons, to say that he will ask this House to deny this vote to this government to be expended after the 1st of July next. I am not able to give the details; I am able to say this, however, that in view of the general desire of the people of Canada to form rifle clubs, in accordance with the general consensus of opinion expressed here this afternoon, we should have the most improved rifles at our disposal to give to these clubs in order to be used in the interest of the defence of Canada. I am not able to say to-night that the Lee-Enfield or the Lee-Metford is the best rifle. Perhaps either of them is, but I do not know whether it is. I am compelled to say that from what I have read of them I have my doubts as to whether either is the best rifle or not. That being the case, it is only prudence for me to say, as Minister of Militia, that I think we ought to wait before giving to this House the details as to how we propose to expend this money. I may say, speaking generally and broadly, that it is proposed to expend the money under the advice of the War Office in Great Britain.

Mr. FOSTER. The War Office is not responsible to us.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman is condemning the War Office, is he?

Mr. FOSTER. Not so much the War Office as its exponent.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well—

Mr. FOSTER. You ask a question which is not very pertinent, and you get your answer.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is a very easy thing for the hon. gentleman to say, and the hon. gentleman can say it with as much facility as any hon. gentleman I know in this House or out of it. What I desire to say, notwithstanding the impertinence of the hon. gentleman—

Mr. FOSTER. I will accept that if the hon. gentleman means impertinence in the ordinary sense.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well, then, I withdraw it. I did not mean it in the ordinary sense. I hope the hon. gentleman will understand exactly how I meant it. I withdraw it in the parliamentary sense.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, all right; go ahead with your details.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. These are details that the hon. gentleman may not like. It is the purpose of this government or of the Militia Department to expend this money in accordance with the best advice which can be obtained from the Intelligence Branch of the War Office in England, but not until the headquarters staff here is satisfied that a wise conclusion has been arrived at.

Mr. FOSTER. I appeal to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). Here is a government, and here is one of the cabinet ministers who comes down and asks a grant of \$240,000; when he is humbly and courteously asked for an explanation as to how he proposes to expend it, he says: I will spend it as the Intelligence Department of the War Office in Great Britain advises me to, when once the headquarters staff here is convinced that that is the best thing to be done. Now, I invite the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to express an opinion upon that method of getting estimates through. Would it not be lovely? We could get all our estimates through in about three snaps of a small dog's tail, if we did it in that way. But, here is a detail started upon, and we cannot get the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) to follow it out. The \$240,000 then, it seems, is to guard against the possibility of our being in possession of an insufficient rifle. The Lee-Enfield is not the best. Will the hon. minister state what other rifle is taking its place in the British Empire amongst the British troops in advance of the Lee-Enfield or the Lee-Metford? Surely he must give us the name of the rifle.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows that in these matters of military training and military discipline it is always in order to have a little lively discussion. However, I think he will say, after all said and done, that it is not a very unreasonable proposition for the hon. Minister of Militia to have asked the House, if they agree in his general policy, which, I understand, was enunciated here yesterday, when I had not the advantage of being here, to vote this sum. I think, we may all agree, after all said and done, that there have been sufficient developments since 1896 to warrant the government in considering very carefully whether some alteration should not be made in the supply of arms to our troops. For example, I have no doubt that gentlemen who have followed affairs in South Africa as closely as the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) has done, will have observed, that apparently, the Boers had succeeded in placing the British troops at a very great disadvantage in numerous

encounters from the fact of their being supplied with the very latest species of artillery. Unless our information has been absolutely incorrect the Boer artillery, in a great many cases, was found far superior to the artillery employed by the British government in the field, and probably to the artillery with which we had provided ourselves. I think that was fully apparent.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has been talking about rifles.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman will look at the vote he will see that it is for guns, and ammunition as well as rifles. 'Arms, ammunition and defences.' That will include artillery as well as ordinary rifles. As to which particular description of rifles and equipment might prove to be most effective for use in the field, I would not venture to pronounce an opinion, but I think the hon. minister will exercise a very wise discretion in availing himself of the experience of many of our own officers upon their return from South Africa, and also of the experience which the English government have acquired at a very great cost of life and treasure. It may be proved that the equipment which the hon. gentleman and his friends provided four years ago, and which was then and, with reason, supposed to be the very best equipment, is now more or less antiquated. Even so short a period as four years allows of very great mechanical changes and improvements in projectiles of all kinds. Under these circumstances it is not unreasonable for the hon. minister to ask the House to trust a little to the information that may be obtained from actual campaigning, before he decides what particular arm should be supplied to our crack shots. I speak under the disadvantage of not having heard my hon. friend's statement, but if I followed correctly what I saw in the newspapers, the idea was to make use of the advantages we possess in Canada, to train a large number of rifemen who must be supplied with the very best arms that can be devised. I have always felt that in Canada we could probably, in the course of a few years, and without any extravagant expenditure, train a very large percentage of our younger men to the use of the rifle. I do not think it is proper for us, for many years to come, to maintain a standing army to any material extent, but I do think it is quite possible you might have in Canada from 100,000 to 200,000 men, all more or less trained rifle shots. The country which possesses 100,000 or 200,000 well trained rifemen, fairly acquainted with the elements of drill (which are very much simpler nowadays than they used to be, in the older shoulder to shoulder formation), might develop a force which would be of extreme value in the event of any serious danger threatening, not merely

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

ourselves, but the empire at large. It is to that, as I understand, that the minister was directing his attention and inviting the concurrence of the House. Although \$240,000 is a large amount of money, yet it would not, I fancy, supply more than 12,000 rifles of the most modern pattern, and it certainly would not go far in supplying us with any considerable quantity of the artillery which is now believed to be the most effective in active service. All that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) desires is, if the House is disposed to repose that amount of confidence in him, that it should not bind him down to any one particular form of weapon, but would be content with a general expression of opinion as to the mode in which our military forces can be best developed. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman agrees with the views I have expounded, but it appears to me they are really the views which are best adapted to our comparatively limited means in providing a sufficiently large number of men to put in the field. I have great confidence in the intelligence and capacity of our people to be turned into good soldiers at short notice. It is a subject which has engaged my attention for a great number of years. It is more years than I choose to mention, since I suggested in a letter to Sir Fenwick Williams, the hero of Kars, the formation of a Canadian Legion, as I called it then, on nearly the identical lines on which our contingents have been sent to South Africa. As far back as 1864, I ventured to lay before the then parliament of Canada, a proposition which, if carried out, would have supplied long ago a large number of men trained somewhat in the way I have indicated. I do not believe it is possible for us, under the conditions which exist in Canada, to maintain anything like a large standing force. I think both sides of the House will agree in that proposition. That being so, is there after all any other mode of developing our resources than by encouraging a large number of our young men from among the volunteers to train themselves to be expert rifle shots. Whether you call them rifle clubs, or rifle associations, or whether you make it, as I would like, a much more important feature of the training which is given in our camps than hitherto; it is obvious that you must have the very best arms. All that is asked for on the present occasion, is that authority be given to make inquiry into the subject, and if satisfied that there is need for a change of armament, to avail ourselves of the equipment which is found to be the best.

Mr. FOSTER. I take it as a very encouraging sign—not of my own wisdom, because I do not pretend to know a great deal about military matters—but it is a very encouraging sign of the trend of public opinion in this country to-day, that we should have heard from the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), such views as he has expressed. If he will read over

what has been said in this House by three or four or five of the gentlemen who took part in the discussion, he will find that he is ipsissima verba voicing the sentiments which they expressed. He certainly is voicing the sentiments which I tried, more feebly than he has done, to convey to the House. I have no desire at all—neither has any person on this side—to be unreasonable, but I cannot help to contrast the suave and persuasive manner and tone of the Minister of Trade and Commerce just now, when he was pleading for a carte blanche vote for his hon. friend, the Minister of Militia and Defence; with the somewhat more vehement tones in which on this side of the House in 1896, he declared, pounding his desk: That not a dollar would the government get, until they had made full explanation in detail. What has changed the principle upon which the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) acted then? Surely nothing. All that we require now is a reasonable explanation. Does the Minister of Militia propose to expend this money in purchasing large arms or small arms? If he proposes to expend a part of it on artillery, let him explain to the House about what he proposes to do. If he proposes to substitute another rifle for the one now in use, that is a somewhat startling proposition, and the minister cannot expect the House to entrust money to him for that purpose, unless he, at least, gives us reason for believing; first, that our present rifle is sadly deficient, and, second, that there is another one in sight which will overcome the deficiencies which he thinks are apparent in the arm which we have at present. I have followed the war in South Africa, and I have failed to find any large expression of opinion on the British side, that the rifles with which our soldiers in South Africa are armed, are not sufficient for offence and defence. I have yet to hear even the suggestion of a rifle for the British force which is considered to be any better than the one in use. We are not disposed to be at all unreasonable, but the government will see that we are perfectly within our right, when we require the broad lines to be laid down on which this expenditure is proposed to be made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we were proposing this vote for the first time, I would agree that the House should have the fullest information. But in view of the fact that this is a mere continuation of the policy generally concurred in by the House, I do not see how the Minister of Militia can add much more by way of explanation. The House agreed that about \$3,000,000 should be appropriated from time to time for arms, ammunition and defences. A portion of that money has been expended, not in rifles only, but also in field batteries, and this is a continuation of that policy. This money is to be applied for the same purposes as previous votes. I am told that one field battery

represents a cost of \$50,000, and consequently, if you supplied four field batteries with guns, you would use \$200,000 of this amount.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the purpose of the vote?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. Minister of Militia is not prepared to say exactly how much he will apply to each branch of the service, nor is it necessary that he should. What the hon. gentleman has said is that the science of war is making very rapid progress, and if, as a result of the experiences of the last few months in Africa, a better gun can be used than has been used in the past, he intends to profit by that experience and take the advice of the Imperial authorities, and get the best weapon that modern science has produced. Reference has been made to rifle clubs. In an early part of the discussion the minister explained that the department lends rifles to these clubs on their giving bonds to return them. In short, this is merely a continuation of the policy of the past.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I fully agree with the hon. gentleman that the money which Canada contributes for the armament of Canada should be expended in the best possible way; but I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Finance to this one fact, that the Canadian forces are armed with the same rifle as the British; and, as I understand that the policy of this country is that in case of any emergency Canadian and British soldiers are to fight side by side, it becomes an absolute necessity that the arm of the British army should be adopted by the Canadian force. I have followed with a good deal of interest the development to which the hon. gentleman has referred, resulting from the experiences of the war in South Africa; but I fail to see in any of the military newspapers of Great Britain that it is intended to change the rifle with which the British army is now armed. The Lee-Enfield is the arm which has carried England through South Africa, and it is the arm adopted for the Canadian forces. Now, the war in South Africa is fortunately coming to an end, and before the Minister of Militia can utilize this vote, we should know what the British War Office will decide as to a change of rifle; then it will be time enough for Canada. If the hon. gentleman had come down with a fixed policy, and had asked parliament to vote \$240,000 to change the rifle which is the arm of Canada to-day, and had stated that the ordnance which he has to-day is not what should be given to our troops, I could understand it. But is it possible to imagine that the Minister of Militia or any other minister would come down and ask parliament to vote \$240,000 and tell parliament: 'I do not just know what I want to do with your money now, but next session when I know it, I will tell

you.' That is not a policy which the hon. gentleman can have seriously considered; it is not a policy which the parliament of Canada can accept. I believe the Lee-Enfield is to-day as good a rifle as can be placed in the hands of a soldier. It is possible, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce has said, that the development of the science of war will be so rapid that a new and better rifle shall soon be found. It may be found in two years or three years. But does the hon. Minister of Militia expect that parliament will trust his judgment or the judgment of his staff to follow the development or improvement of rifles, and vote him \$240,000 without knowing what he wishes to do with the money? The hon. gentleman says there is no importance in this vote, because it is a continuation of a policy that has been accepted by parliament; but, Sir, it must be remembered that when that policy was submitted to parliament, it was explained, and parliament knew exactly what it was doing in voting the \$1,300,000. Without saying a word against the good intentions of the Minister of Militia, I want him to treat parliament as parliament should be treated. I want him to say to parliament: 'I believe it will become necessary for us to change our rifle; instead of the Lee-Enfield, we shall have to adopt the Mauser.' The Mauser may be a better rifle than the Lee-Enfield; but the parliament of Canada is not going to vote \$240,000 on the mere supposition that the experiences of the future may give us a better rifle which we are not called upon to-day to pay for; because the hon. gentleman himself admits that he does not know whether he is going to make any change or not. As to the ordnance, four or five batteries of improved guns would gobble up the whole of this amount, or next to it. But would it not be more satisfactory to the hon. gentleman's department, as it certainly would be more satisfactory to parliament and to Canada, for him not to insist on this amount being voted to-day, but to say, we may be under the necessity of calling on parliament at a future date to vote a large sum of money to change our rifles and our ordnance? Until the hon. gentleman has a policy, how can he expect any man in parliament to assume the responsibility before the electors whom he represents, of stating, we have voted \$240,000 without knowing what we were voting it for? I for one am not prepared to take that responsibility. If I went before my electors and told them that I had voted \$240,000 without knowing what it was voted for, they would say that I was not the man who should represent them in parliament. It is not a small amount of money; it is a large amount. Canada is prepared to contribute all that is required to place her forces in a good position; but it is not prepared to leave the hon. gentleman's staff and himself to experiment as to how \$240,000 of Canadian money shall be expended, when

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

he does not know that he will require even one dollar of that amount to change the armament which we have at the present moment. They want to build up the Canadian force, but of all the mistakes that could be perpetrated by the department over which my hon. friend presides, none could have a worse result than to lead the people of Canada to believe that that department is not conducted with the care and the prudence which its great importance requires; and if I am to be told that it indicates prudence on the part of the hon. minister to ask parliament to vote \$240,000 without telling us what his policy is or how he intends spending the money, then I am unable to understand what prudence means.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia is prepared to call a halt in the improving of the defences of Canada. He desires that this government should determine that during the coming fiscal year no progress at all shall be made in that respect. I differ entirely from my hon. friend. I cannot expect him to have confidence in me, but I am surprised that he should have no confidence whatever in the gentlemen who so ably advised him in the Department of Militia during so many years, and who are still taking the same part in the administration of that department. Those gentlemen he now includes in the category of those who are entirely unworthy of the confidence of parliament.

Out of this vote we shall have to provide at least three batteries of artillery at a cost of not less than \$50,000 per battery, to replace the three we sent to South Africa. Why should we be bound down to declare that we shall purchase a battery which the War Office in England may have at this moment but which may not be the most improved and desirable battery to purchase. Why should this government not be permitted to wait a few days or weeks in order to ascertain from the War Office what is the best up-to-date battery to purchase in replacement of those we sent to South Africa? That will take \$150,000 out of the \$240,000 and leave us \$90,000, which we propose to expend in the purchase of the best pattern of rifles adopted by the War Office in England, and which we propose to furnish to the various rifle clubs of Canada that may be organized in the future. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to dissent from that policy?

This \$240,000 is the balance of the vote of \$3,000,000, agreed to by parliament so long ago as 1896. Is the hon. gentleman not able to give us sufficient of his confidence to suppose that those who are at the head of the militia service in Ottawa will be anxious to give me all the assistance they can in deciding on the best kind of rifle to purchase. I cannot understand why the ex-Minister of Militia should desire to pin us down to a statement of what particular kind of bat-

tery and rifle we should purchase and not leave us liberty to purchase the most improved arms obtainable. I should think that he ought to be willing to accept as a guarantee my promise that we will only make purchases after we have taken the advice of the War Office in England.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister says that this amount is the balance of a vote agreed to by parliament four years ago. Does that not prove the wisdom of our asking explicit information now? If the department has had four years to consider, and its experts have had four years to determine, what is the best kind of weapon, surely the hon. gentleman ought to be able to give the House now the conclusion they have come to. It is one of the fundamental principles of government that no money should be voted at all until explanations are given. But the hon. gentleman has told us that he cannot yet determine what is the best arm to purchase. But in view of the fact that we not only had the experience of these four years but have had the experience of the war in South Africa, I fail to understand his inability to come to a decision. It has not been proven that the arms with which our infantry were supplied were inferior to those used by the Boers in the South African war. I have understood from reading the reports that the artillery, perhaps, was not equal to what the Boers had; but I did not understand that with regard to the infantry arms. At any rate, our experts have been determining, in the meantime, what are the best arms for our troops. Are we to discard what we have already got and get something else? This is information that the House is entitled to, and information that we must have if we are not simply to go it blind. The hon. member says that we need this to provide three batteries of artillery; if so, he should be able to tell us what kind of battery he is going to provide. Some hon. gentlemen opposite are laughing. I do not know whether that is against what I have been saying or something else, but I would respectfully submit that what I am saying is entitled to fair consideration.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What do you mean?

Mr. SPROULE. I mean exactly what I say—that if the minister is going to buy three batteries of artillery, he should be able to say what kind he is going to invest in.

Mr. DOMVILLE. He means guns.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not talking to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville).

Mr. DOMVILLE. I was trying to explain that he is not going to buy batteries but guns.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) will permit me—I am not

talking to him now. I am entitled to this information from another source.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. A twelve pounder is the lightest battery we sent to South Africa.

Mr. SPROULE. That gives a portion of the information, but the hon. minister should give us a great deal more. As to the rifles, I submit it has not been shown that those supplied to our troops are inferior to those supplied to the Boers. If they are, what is to take their place? Surely our experts, in four years, have been able to determine; and if so, we ought to have the information. It will not be long before the next session of parliament, and no great harm can come if this money is not voted but left to be proposed next session, when the minister is able to give us information which he is not able to give at present.

Mr. DOMVILLE. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) need not have been so severe on my attempt to enlighten him. He talks so much that it can hardly be expected that he will be accurate on every question. To us it is a little complicated, when he mixes Mausers and rifles and Morris tubes with batteries.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not speak of Mausers. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) puts words in my mouth that I did not use.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Then, the hon. gentleman should have done so. In criticising the Minister of Militia he should convey some information and not speak of things he does not understand. I admire the hon. member for East Grey, because he does not lose an occasion to talk. In committee I see friends of his own anxious to have him keep quiet. But the hon. gentleman evidently feels that he must have his money's worth, that he must have his name on every page of *Hansard*. In the kindness of my heart I wanted to explain to him that batteries were cannon. But he did not understand that. If he would ask the Minister of Militia what is the initial velocity of a given cannon, what its trajectory is, the hon. minister would give him the information. But, how can any one attempt to answer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) on a subject like this which he does not grasp? When the hon. gentleman talks of rifles, the minister may fairly say: I cannot tell you at the moment what we are to get. We are not going it blind, as hon. gentlemen opposite did when they left to General Gascoigne to bring in rifles, and the thing was done in such a hurry that it has never been settled yet who got the 5 per cent commission—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am entirely within the rules of order. It has never been proven who got that 5 per cent commission. The rifles were bought in such undue haste

that they did not take the trouble to have them properly sighted. Naturally, the hon. member for East Grey is anxious that the Minister of Militia should not fall into the same mistake. I am not prepared to say what the hon. gentleman says is not somewhat to the point. He is a guardian of the purse. The people of Canada do not look to myself and other gentlemen on this side, but to him as leader of the opposition—or expecting to be leader of the opposition; for we know that change and decay are going on, that people pass away, and the time will come when his constituents will press his claims to that high position. They will be able to say that the hon. gentleman was the one who did the work. They will say: Take *Hansard*—six volumes in one session, and on every page you see ‘Sproule,’ ‘Sproule’—like ‘Castoria’ on the wall. They say that children cry for Castoria, and no doubt the hon. gentleman looks for the time when the whole country will cry for him.

Mr. PRIOR. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) a question? He stated that he does not know who got the 5 per cent. What 5 per cent does he refer to?

Mr. DOMVILLE. The 5 per cent that was debated in this House, that was charged in England on this purchase of guns, of which no explanation was ever given. Am I correct or not?

Mr. BERGERON. No. What is it?

Mr. DOMVILLE. We will make that the subject of discussion a little later, if hon. gentlemen opposite wish. They can go to *Hansard* and see the whole story. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) sat in the House at that time and ought to know more about it than I do.

Mr. BERGERON. I have never heard of it before.

Mr. DOMVILLE. Oh, yes; you have. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) has heard of more commissions than that too.

Mr. PRIOR. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Domville) explain later on what he means by that 5 per cent?

Mr. DOMVILLE. Do you want to know the item I am talking about?

Mr. PRIOR. Yes.

Mr. DOMVILLE. You are the item I am talking about.

Mr. PRIOR. Surely I am worth more than 5 per cent?

Mr. DOMVILLE. I am sorry I did not catch what the hon. gentleman said, however, let that pass. There is a disposition here to criticise the Militia Department unfairly. When we have controversies as to the Mauser and other rifles, as to the 12-pounder guns, and guns of position, these things cannot be decided out of hand. It

Mr. DOMVILLE.

is a question whether the artillery will not have to take to guns of position. Instead of going into action with a lot of guns which have been proved to be effective, they are found to be useless, because the army who is first in position would not let an enemy come within three or four thousand yards. I think the minister is quite fair in his statement. He says if these loyal gentlemen are sincere, let them show it. We heard a great deal of the loyalty cry some time ago, but that seems to have blown over to a considerable extent because people do not take quite so much stock in it. But it is fair, seeing that Canada is willing to contribute her share towards the defence of the British Empire, that the minister should say that we should be up to time. When you ask a minister here, a member of the Canadian government, not having before him the data upon which to pronounce which is the best gun to be adopted, and when he tells you to provide the money which will enable him to be ready when the occasion arises, which may be before the next parliament, you turn round and say: Is it the Mauser or is it the Remington? That is something that he cannot tell you, because the British government themselves cannot tell. Supposing that we should have trouble in consequence of this war in China, we cannot tell what is going to turn up after parliament prorogues, and suppose the minister finds himself compelled to send 15,000 men to support Great Britain, then you will charge him with negligence, and say: Why did you not provide the best guns for these men before sending them away with obsolete weapons? Why did not you look ahead and provide the money? That is what the hon. gentlemen opposite would say to him. I think the criticism is very unfair. I do think that at this late period of the session those gentlemen who know so little about the subject should keep silent and let some one talk who has some experience. Let us, if possible, shorten up the session and get away to our homes.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat was not here in 1896; but to those of us who were here this is a very interesting discussion. We have heard of rifles before. In 1896 when the Conservative government wanted to give to our militia what was looked upon as a modern arm they were severely criticised by the then opposition. Those who were then in opposition are now talking in just the contrary way to the way they talked then. At that time my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Foster) was representing the Minister of Militia and Defence who occupied a seat in the other House, and he was asking for \$3,000,000 to pay for rifles. It was not understood then that more than \$1,000,000 would be spent. What were the criticisms made by hon. gentlemen opposite

on that proposition? I propose to make only a few quotations from the many speeches made on that occasion. A gentleman who occupies a very high position in this House spoke upon that subject; and the House will see what a howl arose from the Liberal opposition against spending a cent of money for rifles. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Brodeur) said:

There is one feature in connection with this vote which puzzles me. We have over and over again been told that in the event of a war taking place or Canada being invaded, we could rely on Great Britain's protection; and that the only ground for not severing the colonial tie was that, should international difficulties arise, we might rely on England's strong arm. Now, Sir, I am sorry to hear, under the circumstances, that the government, for the purpose of arming the Canadian militia, have made their purchases, not from private contractors, but from the War Office in Great Britain, and that we are now asked to foot the bills. Is that the protection we have been promised by Great Britain? Is that the position in which we stand as a colony? I think we are entitled to an altogether different treatment at the hands of Great Britain.

Later on he says:

I believe that our public debt is large enough without our Jingoës adding to it a few more millions for an unwarrantable expenditure. I do not think this expenditure was called for, under the circumstances, and I for one am strongly opposed to authorizing the money to pay for that expenditure.

That was the member for Rouville, at present Deputy Speaker of this House. Then there was the hon. member for Maskinonge (Mr. Légris), who was sleeping so soundly a few moments ago while all this discussion was going on. He also took the floor and said:

The course pursued by the government throughout this transaction is an utterly outrageous proceeding, and an insult offered to the House. Why, Mr. Chairman, we have been sitting here now four months; and for the first two months the ministers have kept us here idle, being at the time busy fighting among themselves; and now, in the dying moments of this parliament, when most members have gone home, we are asked to pass this appropriation, and vote the expenditure of millions, which perhaps the government stand in need of for electoral purposes. I fail to see anything else but the interest of the party exchequer in railroad-ing this measure and spending the millions they ask the House to vote, after they have been spent.

That was the opinion of the hon. member for Maskinonge. Later on he says:

I have no doubt that the voters who will be called upon to pronounce themselves within a few weeks will not hesitate in saying that the government have perpetrated another crime. It is quite true that there are so many crimes laid to the door of the present government that the hon. gentlemen are perhaps right in thinking that it matters little whether they go down to hell with a conscience more or less weighted with crime, but I say that such a way of dealing with parliament is an insult offered to the

representatives of the people whom they feign to ignore.

The hon. member also said:

From what has been said on the floor of this House, I gather that the government have not been actuated by an earnest desire to serve the best interests of the country, but by that of filling the empty exchequer of the party in view of the election near at hand.

Now, there was another gentleman who spoke. They all got up. I remember, because I happened to be sitting in the chair which you (Mr. Ellis), so worthily occupy now. The hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Bruneau) also spoke as follows:

This expenditure is altogether uncalled-for on this further ground—and I beg to say so before this House and the country with all the Chauvinism of which I am a fervent adept, and in spite of the loyalty professed by the French Canadian people for Great Britain, a loyalty evinced now, as in the past, by their readiness to shed their blood and expend their money for the defence of the country—but I say the people of our country are unwilling to incur such expenditures to fight the battles of England. But we are told: We have bought those rifles, the honour of Canada is pledged, and we have to foot the bill. We have bought \$2,000,000 worth of rifles, and the government only ask of us a vote of \$1,000,000. Another ground upon which I object to this expenditure is the lack of information as to what they intend to do with the money and as to the purpose to which it shall be applied.

The very case we have now in hand. He says:

Well, the country is surely entitled to inquire, on the eve of general elections, whether the government are in earnest when they come down and ask the House, in the public interest, that vote of money. I, for one, do not believe that they are in earnest. They are so reckless, so extravagant, as evinced by the facts I have just alluded to, that we are warranted in believing that the hon. gentlemen are going to appropriate a certain amount of that vote to meet the exigencies of the electoral campaign which will soon be in full swing throughout the country.

You would imagine that this was said to-night. What did we hear on the hustings? As I said before, this is a picture of before and after. The hon. gentlemen opposite were here then. After the government of Canada at that time had come down, and asked for a grant of money with which to purchase modern rifles to put into the hands of the militia force of Canada, the hon. member for St. James Division, Montreal, (Mr. Desmarais), made a speech at St. Laurent, in Jacques Cartier. What did he say? This will give the committee an idea of the kind of electoral fight that we have to sustain in Quebec. That is what we had to encounter in the past, and probably we may have to meet it in the future, although we are on different sides now. That hon. gentleman said: What did we see in parliament last session? The government of Canada, led by an English Protestant, coming to parlia-

ment, and asking for a vote of \$3,000,000 to buy rifles for the young Canadians. And you, ladies—addressing some ladies at the back—who have taken so much care of your sons, who have educated them, and have given them your love, have made a great mistake, because if the Protestant Tupper remains in power, these boys will have rifles put in their hands, and they will be sent to South Africa to fight the wars of the British Empire. The women commenced to cry. It was a very sad night, but the hon. member for St. James Division, said: Do not cry; I have a remedy for you. Put out the Protestant Tupper, and put in his place the Catholic French Canadian Laurier, and your children will not have to go and fight in South Africa for the British Empire. That is the fight we have to meet in Quebec. That was after the Conservative government had asked for millions to buy rifles for the Canadian militia, as we felt it our duty to put into the hands of the militiamen of Canada, the best possible arm we could find. I may say, en passant, that these rifles were paid for by hon. gentlemen opposite to-day. Two years ago, I found \$100,000 in the estimates, and when I asked the hon. Minister of Militia what this meant, he said, laughing: Well, we have received the guns, and we are bound to pay for them. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to recall the time when they were in opposition, and to say if we are not entitled to some details in regard to this vote. The House of Commons, and the people of this country, when asked to vote \$240,000, are entitled to ask the hon. Minister of Militia what he intends to do with the money.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. He has given the information.

Mr. **FOSTER**. He gave simply nothing.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Surely the hon. Minister of Militia, with all our friendship for him for many years, will not expect the House of Commons or the people of Canada to accept his ipse dixit and vote this money after what we have heard about the emergency ration which is now before a committee of the House. The hon. gentleman is perhaps as honest as can be, but he was played by a contractor to the tune of \$1.70 per pound for an emergency ration, and I say, in view of all these circumstances, the House and the people are entitled to know every possible detail as to what he is going to do with the money before we give him this \$240,000. Our position is a great deal better to-day than the one taken by hon. gentlemen, when they were in opposition. They were then fighting against the vote proposed at that time, without any possible reason, while, now, we are simply asking for details which is a most reasonable request. We want to know what the hon. gentleman proposes to do with the money before we vote \$240,000. I say to my hon. friend, as a friend, that it would be better

Mr. **BERGERON**.

for him to give us every possible detail. This side of the House, which I may say does not represent the spirit of chauvanism, will grant the money he wants, if he puts us in a position to go before our electors and give them every possible detail that they may ask of us, in regard to this expenditure.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Any purchases which will be made, will be made through the War Office, and after due inspection by the War Office. We propose to buy three batteries of artillery at a cost of \$50,000 per battery, making \$150,000, and leaving \$90,000 to be invested in rifles, all of which will be purchased through the War Office, and after due inspection by the War Office. That is all the assurance I can give the hon. gentleman, and it seems to me that it ought to be sufficient.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That is some progress made. We see now that \$150,000 of this money is to go in pursuance of the policy which was laid down in 1896, and which has been consistently carried out since, towards furnishing large armaments for the purpose of the Canadian militia.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Field batteries.

Mr. **FOSTER**. We are perfectly willing to let it go at that, and then we will trust the government to get the very best field artillery that can be got. That is fair and reasonable, but the hon. minister has startled the people of Canada with the statement which he has made to-night. The people of Canada have paid upwards of \$2,000,000, and they have paid it cheerfully, to arm their militiamen with the best rifle which could be given them by the War Office at home.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. At that time.

Mr. **FOSTER**. At that time, and up to the present time there has not been a single whisper in British Army circles, and there has not been in this Dominion of Canada, against that arm. The arm is the arm with which the British soldier, who is fighting to-day, be it in China or Africa, is armed, the Lee-Enfield. It is the arm that was recommended to us by the British government, it is the arm that they themselves had been using, and our Canadian Minister of Militia, after we have made this expenditure, after we have come to the settled conviction that we have put into the hands of our volunteers the best approved modern rifle, calmly gets up and knocks down the whole edifice of security, by the declaration that in his opinion it is not the best rifle.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. No, no.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The hon. minister must allow us to use our own ears. He himself

stated, in reply to a challenge of mine, that for himself, he believed it was not the best rifle. If it is the best rifle, what justification is there for the hon. gentleman taking a vote for a rifle to supersede it? If we have a sufficient number of these rifles, does he wish to supplement the supply? But, he made the statement that it was not the best rifle and he wanted this money, because, in these trying and quickly moving times, there might be, and I suppose the hon. gentleman, to be consistent, would say that there was something about to be fulfilled which would be better than the Lee-Enfield which he proposed to substitute for the Lee-Enfield. Whatever confidence we might give to the hon. gentleman, he must not ask us to be too generous in that respect, because we are not quite yet in the position, by our vote or silence here, to condemn the rifle of the British government and of our own troops, and put into the hon. gentleman's hands a vote of \$90,000 to get a rifle which he does not give even the name of. What is this rifle that is better? It is no state secret. If there is a better rifle who uses it, and who recommends it? The hon. gentleman says we must follow the War Office. That is well. But we have followed the British War Office, and it is the British War Office that has recommended the present rifle for the use of our volunteers. If there is a better rifle not yet evolved into practice, then this vote of \$90,000 is not needed, because the new rifle cannot be made practical before we or other representatives of the people will be here, and Canada may be relied upon to profit by any experience in that direction.

Mr. SPROULE. If we knew that the British War Office were arming the British troops with a new rifle there might be some reason for us to follow their example, but we have no information of that kind whatever. Our men are armed with the same rifle as the British soldiers, and the only possible reason for this vote would be to buy more of those rifles. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Domville) took exception to what I said. I thought that the hon. gentleman, being an old military man would understand when I spoke on military subjects. I did not suppose it was necessary to treat him with diluted milk food, suitable for babes and sucklings, but after I heard him mixing up military matters with Castoria in the same breath, I could not help thinking that a good dose of Castoria would restore him to that equilibrium which would enable him to give some intelligent information to the House. Even if the Minister of Militia does act on the advice of the British War Office, he should give the information we ask before the money is voted. There may be justification for buying three more batteries, because our present batteries are on foreign service, and it is probably the part of wisdom to keep up our artillery standard. However, the balance

of the vote ought not to be passed by this House until we get some reasonable information as to what is to be done with it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Every one is agreed that of the \$240,000, a sum of \$150,000 should be appropriated.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Minister of Militia explained that \$150,000 was required for three batteries which would be purchased under the sanction of the War Office, and now after an hour's discussion every one agrees that that is right. The sum of \$90,000 is required for the purchase of extra rifles which would buy four or five thousand. The Minister of Militia did not say that we were going to purchase a new rifle, but he said that possibly some improvements might be suggested by the War Office upon the existing rifle.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, my goodness.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and I heard the Minister of Militia repeat several times that whatever rifle is purchased will be purchased under the direction of the War Office.

Mr. FOSTER. Why crowd things down our throats which we know are not true.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Did the Minister of Militia state that whatever rifle was purchased would be purchased on the advice of the War Office?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly; but he said the present one was defective.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understood the Minister of Militia to say that probably the experience gained in South Africa, would result in an improvement of the present rifle, and if the War Office should recommend an improvement that he would consider the propriety of making it. The simple question before us is, whether the Militia Department shall be entrusted with a sufficient sum of money to purchase four or five thousand rifles as a reserve, and I do not think there is a man in the House who under prevailing circumstances will oppose that. The assurance given by the hon. minister that no purchase will be made except under the supervision of the War Office ought to be sufficient.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What does the Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies) think of the suggestion which he admits the Minister of Militia did make? Every person knows that only recently Canada went to great expense to arm the militia with the most improved rifle that could be found in the world. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that only the other day a

despatch from Mr. Chamberlain to the government of Canada stated that one of the requisites for colonial volunteers going to South Africa was that they should be armed with the precise rifle that Canada is using now. No suggestion has come from any military authority as to any deficiency in our present rifle, or as to any room for improvement, and I want to know what the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) thinks of the Minister of Militia standing up in this House and suggesting that this money is not to be expended for purchasing an additional number of Lee-Enfields, which are certified by Her Majesty's government to be the best weapon known, but that it is to be used for the purchase of another kind of rifle. What does the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) think of such a suggestion being made by the Minister of Militia of Canada?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I understood the Minister of Militia to say that if he was so advised by the War Office, he would purchase the Lee-Enfield rifle we now have, but if on the contrary the experience in the South Africa war, induced the War Office to make an improvement upon it, he would consider the propriety of purchasing the improved rifle.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** To come back to the point I ask the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) what he thinks of the Minister of Militia of Canada starting an idea of that kind? I cannot imagine an act of great folly than for the Canadian Minister of Militia to pretend that there is any defect in the arm that is accepted by the British government as the very best in the world. It is worse than puerile; it is an act of supreme folly for a minister to ask this House to vote such a palpable absurdity as that.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** It is an act of supreme folly, is it, for the Minister of Militia to admit that the War Office of Great Britain is not absolutely perfect? If it is, then I at once agree that I am guilty of an act of folly. I would recommend the hon. gentleman to read the articles in the *Army and Navy Gazette*, in the *Nineteenth Century*, in the *Contemporary Review*, in *Blackwood's Magazine*, in all the leading reviews of Great Britain, and learn something about a question which he evidently knows nothing whatever about. He will learn that articles contributed by eminent British officers to those British magazines and military reviews, indicate clearly a belief that Great Britain does not to-day possess either the best rifle or the best cannon extant. Is there any crime in that? I am simply stating what any hon. gentleman in this House can inform himself of if he takes the trouble that I have taken to read the current literature of to-day; and I supplement that statement by this further statement that I, as the custodian

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.**

for the time being of the interests of the people of this country, so far as the Militia Department is concerned, promised them that I would not spend any more of their money in purchasing ordnance or rifles until I was satisfied that I was purchasing the very best that the world could afford. If I am guilty of a crime in making a statement of that kind, then brand me and punish me for so doing. I believe I am conserving the best interests of the people of this country in making the statement which I have made, which is only in accordance with the statements made by many of the most brilliant officers of the British army in the leading periodicals of Great Britain.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER.** Now we are beginning to understand what the hon. gentleman means. The hon. gentleman has discovered, by the perusal of the military periodicals and various journals which he has named as very high authorities, that the British War Office does not know what it is about; and yet he tells this House that he is going to be guided by that same War Office. Will he tell us what he means? He is satisfied that the reason the War Office is attacked in these various periodicals is that it has shown such utter incompetence to manage its business that it has not got the proper rifles and guns; and yet, five minutes before, the hon. gentleman tells us that he intends to follow that same ignorant War Office which is held up to the ridicule of the world as being altogether behind the times, in not possessing the arms necessary to maintain the prestige of the empire.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** The people of England should thank God that the hon. gentleman is not at the head of the War Office. The War Office is capable of learning; the hon. gentleman is incapable of learning. Perhaps we should not find fault with the hon. gentleman at this time of day. We have evidence that the War Office of Great Britain has learned something since the inception of the war in South Africa. What I propose to this committee is, that we should wait until the War Office has completed its investigation of the matters to which we are now referring, and that we should take the full benefit of their conclusions, as the government propose to do, before investing the money which we are now asking this parliament to vote. That is all I ask. I have indicated to this committee what we propose to purchase—three batteries of artillery, the balance of the money to be invested in the most up-to-date rifle, as recommended by the War Office at the date when we are prepared to purchase. Surely that proposal will commend itself not only to this committee, but to the people of Canada.

**Mr. FOSTER.** There is another point to be settled. The minister has gone now very far. He has been thoroughly emphatic,

what he wants the \$90,000 for is not to buy Lee-Enfields. If the minister knows anything about the rifle he intends to buy, let him tell the House something about it. He has stated positively that what he proposes to do with the \$90,000 is to buy a rifle to replace the Lee-Enfields.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there is no meaning in what the minister says. He condemns the Lee-Enfields.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. He said it was not perfection.

Mr. FOSTER. He says any man who reads the reviews will come to the same conclusion that he has, that the Lee-Enfield is not the approved rifle. Then he proposes to topple down the whole edifice which we have built, and take away from our people their confidence in the armament which the British government have given to us and to its soldiers everywhere, and introduce in its place—what? Something he knows nothing about, something he gives us no inkling of. What is this other rifle which he thinks an improvement on the Lee-Enfield?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman cannot be serious in the objection he takes. I fail to see where there is any substantial difference between the two sides. I suppose the fair presumption is, notwithstanding what has been said, that the Lee-Enfield is a good weapon. We all think so: and, beyond the expression of some passing opinion, I suppose we shall continue to think so until some competent authority decides otherwise. But suppose the Minister of Militia signs his order for 4,000 or 5,000 rifles, and suppose, as a result of recent experience, the British War Office should say that in their judgment there is some improvement on the Lee-Enfield, should it be the policy of Canada to use the inferior weapon, or should we get the best? That is the whole question in a nutshell. The minister has simply said that he is following the policy of the past, but if, as a result of the war in South Africa, any improvement is discovered either as respects the guns for artillery or the rifles, then that weapon which the War Office decides to be the best is the one he intends to obtain for the militia of Canada. Surely there can be no objection to such a position as that.

Mr. FOSTER. How many Lee-Enfields have we in Canada?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. 40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. And we have 35,000 troops. The minister has sufficient to arm the whole militia and 5,000 to spare.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, we sent 3,000 or 4,000 to South Africa.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. gentleman want the \$90,000 for?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. For the rifle clubs and rifle leagues throughout the country.

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. gentleman has \$5,000 already.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We sent about 4,000 of them to South Africa.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman not expect them to come back?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We do not know. They are not here now.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has 40,000 Lee-Enfields, which is the arm of to-day. He does not need \$90,000 to supply the Lee-Enfields he may want to use for the gun and rifle clubs.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That will only give you 5,000 guns.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose it does, the hon. gentleman has now more than sufficient Lee-Enfields for the militia, and he has told us that that is an unsafe gun. He should give some information as to what rifle he intends to purchase in its place.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think that my hon. friend is very unfair. I hope that the Lee-Metford or the Lee-Enfield is the best rifle in the world, but there are important British officers who say it is not. I simply expressed the view which has been stated by prominent men in the British army, namely, that the Lee-Enfield is not the best rifle, and supposing we purchase 4,000 or 5,000 rifles we will still not have enough to meet the requirements of the country. If we are to carry out the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition and prominent military men on both sides, and issue rifles to rifle clubs, we will require more rifles than we have now, and the 4,000 or 5,000 included in this vote will still be less than we require.

For purchase of land for rifle ranges.... \$75,000

Mr. PRIOR. At six o'clock I said I wanted to say a few words in regard to a matter pertaining to the defences of Esquimalt. I want to draw the attention of the hon. minister to some claims that have for years been before his department. Some five years ago, when the Conservatives were in power, certain gentlemen put in claims for damages to land, which they considered had deteriorated in value owing to the fact that forts had been built at Macaulay Point. The matter was referred to the Department of Justice, and that department gave the opinion that the owners of land at Macaulay Point had a

claim against the government. The late government then paid two or three claimants a certain sum in compensation for the loss they had sustained. The consequence was that some fourteen or fifteen owners of property in that vicinity subsequently put in their claims against the government. For several years I have been asking the present Minister of Militia and Defence to take these claims into consideration. He referred me to one department and the other, and finally, when I put him the question in the House, he said that the claims could not be considered. It seems to me that when the Department of Justice determined that the two or three gentlemen who had put in their claims under the late government were entitled to compensation, the other claimants possessed an equal right. The Militia Department, under the late government, referred the matter to its agent, Major Jones, and if the hon. gentleman will look at the correspondence between that gentleman and the department he will see that Major Jones said he did not like to give an opinion, because if he gave it in favour of one party he would have to give it in favour of some twenty-five others. But be that as it may, the Justice Department decided that the two or three, who had filed their claims, were entitled to compensation, and that being the case, the others, who were equally injured, have an equally valid claim. If the Minister of Militia and Defence thinks they have not, I would ask him to allow those claimants to bring their case before the Exchequer Court. That will be satisfactory to me and to those gentlemen who are making the claims.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I wish to say to my hon. friend that it is unfortunate for his friends—

Mr. PRIOR. They are not all friends of mine.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is unfortunate for them that their claims were not settled by the late government when settling the claims of the other two parties.

Mr. PRIOR. Those claims were not put in.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then my hon. friend is not to blame. I congratulate the gentlemen, whose claims he advocates, on the powerful advocacy of my hon. friend. He has been most persistent in season and out of season. There can certainly be no objection to these claimants, to whom my hon. friend refers, referring their claims in the usual way to the department through the Department of Justice, and I shall be happy to see that they get every opportunity of putting their claims forward and receiving the consideration to which they are entitled.

Mr. PRIOR.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. minister knows that these claims have been before his department for more than a year. Will he allow the parties to state a case before the Exchequer Court?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly, I could not possibly object to that. But it is for the law officers of the Crown to decide as to whether they have a claim or not. So far as I am concerned, I shall be happy to expedite the preferment of any claim of that kind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will now take up the estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals. The minister (Mr Blair) proposes to make a general statement before taking up the details.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to Capital—Lachine Canal, to build a quadrant pontoon gate ..... \$20,000

Mr. J. G. HAGGART (South Lanark). Before the hon. minister (Mr. Blair) makes his statement, I desire to make a correction of a statement I made. I would have made it before, but I was not in the House when any of the railway estimates were under consideration. I made a statement some time ago with reference to the St. John wharf, which statement I made on information furnished to me which I had good reason to believe to be correct. This statement I had already made in the House last session. I have had several letters since from correspondents in St. John, and I find from the tenor of these letters that I was entirely mistaken. I wish to take the earliest opportunity of correcting my statement. I had a letter on the subject from Mr. McLeod, who is, I believe, a judge in St. John. He wrote me a letter explaining the whole facts, and offered to support his statement with affidavits—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) pardon me? I would like him, if he will, to state what was the particular statement made to the House which he wishes to correct.

Mr. HAGGART. It was a statement I made that the amount that was awarded for the wharf was greatly in excess of the amount that I had heard the property had been offered for to private individuals. Here is the letter of Mr. McLeod:

Ottawa, Ont., May 18, 1900.

Dear Mr. Haggart,—In reference to the Long wharf property, so-called, and about which I have written you, I desire to make the following statement:

The facts are these: As I said to you, we never offered the property for less than \$100,000. We did offer it to the government for \$100,000, but they, instead of immediately accepting our offer, filed plans and expropriated the property, and for greater security to themselves as to the value, appointed valuers. The valuers were good men and leading citizens and well

qualified to express an opinion on the question. Leading men of the city on both sides of politics were called as witnesses, such men as W. H. Thorne, E. C. Jones, manager of the Bank of Montreal for over twenty years; D. W. Clark, a well-known wharf-builder, who did a large part of the work on the wharf; and H. D. Troop, of the firm of Troop & Sons, and other well-known and leading Conservatives; George McAvity, of the firm of McAvity & Sons; A. Chipman Smith, who has charge of all public works in the city of St. John, and the late W. W. Turnbull, one of the largest property owners in St. John, the latter of whom are all well-known Liberals, and a large number of other witnesses. The lowest valuation by any witness was \$125,000, and the highest over \$200,000. We also gave a statement of the rentals then received, showing that we then received a net rental of over \$5,000, and the additional rentals which we could receive, and in that connection called the agent of the Dominion Atlantic Railway, which company, as I wrote you, were at the time paying us \$2,400 a year for one berth, and the agent stated that there was an agreement to take the other berth just completed, for which they were to pay an additional rental of \$1,600.

We claim that the government, having left the matter to arbitration, should pay the amount awarded, that is, the property having been taken, we should get what independent men have said it was actually worth.

We purchased the property at auction about the year 1888, when it was sold by the mortgagee paying for it \$25,000. It was then practically a non-producing property, but we made large improvements on it and entirely changed it, and made it, as I have said, a revenue-producing property, spending on it for improvements over \$30,000. We never offered it for \$25,000, and as I have said, never offered it for less than \$100,000. We think, however, that as the government, instead of accepting the offer, fairly enough named valuers to ascertain the value, who took great pains and called, as I have said, a large number of independent witnesses, we should have the value fixed by them. If they had found the value less than \$100,000, we should have been obliged to take it, and we think the rule should work both ways.

I have no doubt that if the valuers had not been aware of our offer to the government, we would have got a much larger award. I repeat that I know you have no desire to do us any injustice, and I therefore trust that you will make this correction.

Yours very truly,  
(Sgd.) E. McLEOD.

Hon. John Haggart, M.P.,  
Ottawa.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) remember precisely the sum that he stated the property had been offered for?

**Mr. HAGGART.** I think I stated that it had been offered for \$25,000, and that the party who owned the property had a great deal of difficulty in getting an offer even for that amount.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The hon. gentleman will perhaps remember that he, at the same time, stated that the reason why a very much increased amount had been secured was that they had employed my son as solicitor in the matter.

**Mr. HAGGART.** The information I got at the time was that the department was defended by the hon. minister's son as solicitor. I have never made inquiries on that point since.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I stated at the time, and I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) to accept my statement, that my son was not employed, so far as I knew.

**Mr. HAGGART.** I would have accepted any denial of that kind from the hon. minister at once. But he said that his son was full-grown, and he did not know whether he was employed or not—had no information on the subject.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** No; I stated that, so far as I had knowledge of the transaction, my son had no connection with the business, but that if he had had I thought I should have known it. I think the hon. gentleman will find that in *Hansard*. I stated I was quite confident that my son had no connection with the matter or I should have been aware of it.

**Mr. HAGGART.** No; I think if the hon. minister will refer to *Hansard* I think he will find I am correct in the statement I have made. There was no denial in the form in which the hon. minister now puts it. However, I wished to make the statement I have made, that from the information I have received. I have no reason to doubt the statement made by Mr. McLeod, and I wish to take the first opportunity of correcting my previous statement.

**THE MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I happened to be acting Minister of Railways and Canals when this transaction took place, and, in reality, had more to do with the purchase of the property than the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair). No doubt, so far as Mr. McLeod's letter goes, it is correct; but I think it right to say, in reference to the government's position, that that letter does not state the whole circumstance of the purchase. That is all I care to say now.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I do not propose to ask the attention of the committee at this moment to this particular item, but I do propose to take this occasion to present—

**Mr. FOSTER.** I would suggest that it would be more in order, if my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) will allow me, for the chairman to read an item for the Intercolonial Railway. I understand it is on that subject the minister wishes to speak.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am not confining my remarks to the Intercolonial Railway. I propose to make a statement, with the permission of the committee, which will have reference not

only to the subject of government railroads, but also—although more briefly—to the general subject of the canals. I presume that in this I am making something of a departure from the course that is usually taken. I think it is desirable that the committee should be put in possession of a general outline of the transactions of this government in connection with the railway system rather than to trust to the opportunities which are afforded by a discussion of the items in detail. That is by no means a convenient method of putting in a condensed form such information as I desire to convey to the committee. The committee are aware that under my departmental jurisdiction there are the two great property interests of the country, the canal and the railway interests. I mention the canal interest first, because the canals are in a sense the larger interest, having occasioned the expenditure of a much larger amount of money, and therefore that may be regarded as the larger property of the Dominion.

Now there has always been a marked distinction, in my opinion, between the manner in which parliament has treated proposals for expenditure upon the canals of the country and upon the railways of the country. When the House is asked to vote a sum of money towards the further construction of the canals, I find that there is on all sides a ready disposition to grant the application. Parliament seems liberal and most generous in the readiness with which it accedes to these demands, no matter how large a sum may be asked for. On the other hand, when we are invited to consider grants in respect of the government railways, parliament at once becomes critical, becomes I might almost say parsimonious, and less disposed at all events to exhibit the same spirit of generosity which it invariably displays with respect to canal expenditure. Now there are reasons for this, and I shall take occasion to make a comment or two upon what I believe to be these reasons. First, however, I wish to call attention to the general subject of the canals. The total expenditure in respect to the canals I presume is carried in the recollection of most members of the committee; but I think it will be convenient to give a short statement showing the financial aspect of the question.

We have a mileage from Sault Ste Marie to Lachine of about 1,000 miles of waterway, including the canals and the river system which is called the St. Lawrence system. The expenditure on this system down to April 1, 1900, is very close to \$80,000,000; to be strictly accurate, the expenditure in respect to canals generally has amounted to \$77,749,586. In addition to that expenditure already made we are contemplating to provide for the laying out of a further sum in respect of the Trent Valley canal, all of which will, when completed, exceed the

Mr. BLAIR.

sum of \$6,000,000, and will bring the total up to \$85,000,000 or \$86,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. For construction alone?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. For construction alone, original construction and enlargement. This last mentioned capital expenditure yet to be made is upon the following canals, namely:

Sault Ste. Marie.....	\$1,050,000
Welland Canal .....	1,270,000
North Channel, Galops Rapids..	510,000
Galops Canal .....	592,000
Rapide Plat Canal .....	319,000
Farran's Point Canal .....	246,000
Cornwall Canal .....	253,000
River Reaches .....	103,000
Soulanges Canal .....	900,000
Lake St. Louis Channel.....	497,000
Lachine Canal .....	967,000
Murray Canal .....	10,000
Trent Canal .....	3,536,000

\$10,253,500

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Does that total include the Ottawa River canals?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not include the Grenville and Carillon, the St. Louis and St. Peter's.

Mr. REID. Has the minister an estimate of the total amount it is intended to expend on the Galops Rapids?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The amount we propose to expend between the North Channel and the Galops Rapids jointly is \$510,000. The amount upon the Galop Rapids will not be very large, because we do not propose to do anything more than remove the obstruction in the rapids. But I would ask my hon. friend if he would kindly not interrupt me until I have finished making this branch of my statement. The amount which we have now voted for canals and which we have not yet expended is \$1,327,000; the amount to be paid the present session and asked for in the main estimates, is \$2,311,500; the amount to be later provided for will run up to \$6,614,000; aggregating the total which I have already stated. It will be convenient, and probably the information would be desired, to state what the canal system has really cost us since its inception; and I will subdivide these items into two distinct periods. The amount expended in addition to this capital expenditure which I have mentioned on consolidated revenue account, from 1868 to 1899 inclusive, is \$15,533,867.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that include operating expenses?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That includes all on consolidated revenue account. From 1868 to 1881 inclusive the revenue from canals exceeded

the expenditure. The expenditure upon consolidated account, in round figures, was \$902,000; or, for the fourteen years within the dates I have mentioned, an average of \$64,000 per year. Taking next the period from 1882 to 1899 the showing is entirely different. The expenditures on consolidated revenue account for maintenance, operation and repairs for these eighteen years, total \$4,356,000, or an average per year of \$240,000. The deficit attributable to the maintenance and operation of canals for the past eighteen years, from 1882 to 1899, has averaged, you will observe, a very large sum indeed. The deficit seems to have been growing from 1882 up to 1892. From 1882 to 1892 it increased from \$142,000 to \$394,000 per year, varying from year to year, the two sums I have named being the lowest and highest deficits during that period. It has somewhat diminished since that time, and last year the deficit upon maintenance account in connection with the canals, I think, did not exceed \$196,000. Now, the committee will see, therefore, that the question of the expenditure, in the first instance, upon this canal system, and the question of the operation and maintenance of this canal system, is a very large financial question indeed, and yet, I am not going to say, or to suggest, that this expenditure is unreasonable in any respect nor have I any disposition to criticise it. There is no disposition throughout the country to criticise it. The people appear to be ready and willing to pay whatever they are asked to pay in order to meet these outlays, and they do it with the most cheerful readiness, because these expenditures are in connection with the canals. But when it comes to the question of the expenditure upon the great railway system of the country—I speak of the railway system which belongs to the government, the Intercolonial Railway—I have discovered, after very close observation a very different disposition on the part of parliament. Every dollar that is being asked for is criticised in the closest manner. I do not complain of the criticism, but the disposition and spirit in which requests for money for these two purposes are met are very different. I think there ought to be as ready a disposition on the part of parliament to maintain its railway system in a proper and efficient manner, and to put it on as good a footing as the railways owned and operated by private railway companies in the country, as there is to put its canal system on a proper footing. It is true that the canal system traverses one section of the country, and that the railway system traverses another. But I would call the attention of the committee to a consideration which ought to lead the minds of members of parliament to regard both services in an equally favourable light. I think if hon. gentlemen would reflect upon the way in which the Intercolonial Railway

came into the possession of the government and the important place that it occupies in the country there would be a disposition on the part of the government to deal as generously with it as it deals with the canal system. It traverses a section of the country, not so populous or influential as the portion traversed by the canal system, but still an important section of the country, which depends upon the proper maintenance and efficient operation of this railway, and in supplying that section of the country with means of transport this country is doing that which it engaged to do as a part of the confederation compact. Under these circumstances I think that parliament should consider these expenditures in the spirit in which I invite them to consider such expenditures. There should be no disposition at all to deal with them in a carping spirit. Let me now turn the attention of the committee to the question of railways. I am not going to do anything further than make a passing reference to the subject of the Prince Edward Island Railway. The Prince Edward Island Railway has never been operated successfully in the ordinary business sense; it has never succeeded in paying its operation expenses, and I think the fact that it has not done so is no discredit either to the management of the road nor to the country through which it travels. It is not connected with any great railway system. It is placed under a disadvantage which no other railway in the country is subjected to, and I think that the road has strong claims upon the consideration of parliament. I am sure that there will be no appeal which might be made at any time to this parliament in the interest of the Prince Edward Island Railway which would be treated in other than in a spirit of fairness and generosity. I think the island has a very strong title to the generous consideration of the country in respect to the railway which traverses it, and we have had no hesitation, so far as the government are concerned, in asking parliament to give us any sums which we felt were really necessary to extend the road, or to put it upon a more efficient footing, or to enable it to be operated more successfully.

But, I desire to turn the attention of the committee chiefly to the subject of the Intercolonial Railway. I want to ask. What have been the real causes of the difference in the spirit and disposition of parliament towards the Intercolonial Railway as compared with our canals? I do not think it would be as easy to say what the causes of this difference are as it would be to say what they are not. It is clearly not the case that parliament is unwilling to expend money for a purpose which appeals to its sympathies, or which appeals to its consideration. Evidence that it is not so influenced is abundantly shown by the readiness with which it has always voted

money in aid of the canal system of the country. There are some reasons which I think do exist in the minds of the critics of the Intercolonial Railway. I think, in a measure, at all events, this distinction is attributable to the fact that the road runs through a less important portion of this Dominion than that traversed by the canals, less populous, less influential, and I think, further, that it is attributable, in a measure, to the fact that the people do not know the importance of the Intercolonial Railway. They do not know the extent to which it contributes to the business prosperity of the country, and even those parts of Canada which are interested in the canals, and which are ever ready to vote millions in order to extend, enlarge and improve the canals—know nothing at all or very little in regard to the business importance of the Intercolonial Railway and the extent to which that railway has added to the business of the older provinces and has increased the trade between the east and west. I think that if hon. gentlemen, when votes are invited in aid of this railway, were to stop to consider the conditions under which it became the property of the government of the country, if they were to stop to consider the effect of the construction of the railway upon the many business interests of the maritime provinces, if they were to stop to consider how important a contribution the Intercolonial Railway has made to the improvement of business and the extension of prosperity in the upper provinces, they would not be unwilling to treat that railway system with the same consideration that they extend to that with which they are more familiar, and which passes through their own section of the country. I said a moment ago that if hon. gentlemen would stop to reflect upon the condition under which this railway came to be the property of the country, came to be a government railway, their minds would be influenced by that, and by the fact that when the Intercolonial Railway was built it was built as one of the factors, and as one of the terms of the confederation between the provinces, and that if it had not been so agreed upon, if it had not been one of the terms of confederation, there would have been no confederation at all. In other words, the people of the maritime provinces, assuming to a greater degree, perhaps, than they were justified in doing, that there would be advantages derived from a railway connection by railway between those provinces and the provinces of Quebec and Ontario; imagining that they would reap material business advantages from that railway connection, they made it one of the conditions upon which they agreed to come into the union, and by coming into the union, they enabled the older provinces of Canada to escape from conditions which at the time were exceedingly unfavourable to their further development.

Mr. BLAIR.

As one of the terms of that compact, this road became a government railway, and it is entitled to ask the people of Canada to maintain it and to operate it—even though it should be operated at a loss—to maintain it and operate it as a government institution, as well as the means of the people of the country would enable it to be maintained.

Mr. HAGGART. Did the minister say that these provinces entered into confederation on terms unfavourable to their future development?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. I made the statement that the people of the maritime provinces insisted upon the confederation assuming the construction and operation of the Intercolonial Railway as one of the terms of union. I believe they expected better results would accrue to them than did actually follow from the operation of that road. They expected they would find a ready market in this portion of Canada for the products of the maritime provinces; but what happened was that it enabled the perhaps more successful manufacturers of Quebec and Ontario, to displace, to some extent, the products of the maritime provinces. It opened up a new field for the extension of the business of Ontario and Quebec, and it placed the maritime manufacturers at a disadvantage, which they did not anticipate. I have never suggested, nor do I suggest now, that by reason of the operation of that railway, advantages have not accrued to the maritime provinces. But certainly these advantages were not to the same extent which the western provinces derived. I appeal to the members of the committee to consider the statement I am about to present, with reference to the past operation of the road and to its present prospects. I appeal to the committee to regard this question in no narrow spirit. I appeal to the House to remember, that even though this road should be maintained at an annual loss, it is for the people of Canada to furnish such means as may be required to fully equip that road, and to place it in the position of being a first-class railway. The country cannot afford to allow that railway to become inferior in any particular. The prestige and the good name of Canada are involved in making the Intercolonial Railway a railway which will compare favourably with any railway in the Dominion. I propose to give the House a statement of the operations of the railway extending over a period of some years.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). I do not wish to interrupt the minister, but I would like to know from him which portions of the road are paying and which are not? It might show that the maritime provinces are not responsible for the deficit.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will make a reference to that

later. At present I propose to ask the committee to glance at what has been the past history of the Intercolonial Railway, as respects its operating expenses and its annual showing from time to time. You are aware, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Ellis), that there was a time in the history of the Intercolonial Railway, when the difference between the earnings of the road and the expenditure for working expenses—not to speak of the capital outlay—was something in the neighbourhood of half a million dollars a year, taking one year with another. Some years it was above that sum and some years it fell below. That state of things continued until the year 1880, and then there was a new epoch in the history of that railway. Prior to 1880, there had always been these large deficits, but in that year there was a change for the better. From 1880, for a period of four years, there was a slight surplus each year, but in order that I may put the case continuously, let me state what the condition was for a few years prior to that. From 1876-7 to 1879-80 inclusive, a period of four years, the deficits on the Intercolonial had averaged \$430,000 a year. From 1880-1, to 1883-4 inclusive, a period of four years, the surplus per year averaged \$17,000, a difference as you will observe of a very considerable amount. That I attribute, in a considerable measure, to the stoppage of large expenditures in maintenance, repairs and equipment. I will make clear to the committee later, by a reference to the items in detail, what I mean by that.

From 1884-5 to 1891-2, a period of eight years, again the deficits appear, and they average in round figures, \$360,000 a year; some years more and some years less. For these eight years there was a total deficit of nearly two and a half million dollars. Then another change occurred; another epoch arrived, and this was an important epoch so far as the comparison between the deficits and the surpluses are concerned. In 1892-3 there was a surplus of \$20,000; in 1893-4, a surplus of \$5,838; and in 1894-5, a surplus of \$3,815. You will observe that the deficits for the three years previous to 1892-3 were on an average \$360,000 a year, and it was made up of the figures for each year as follows:

1889-90.....	\$550,000
1890-1.....	680,000
1891-2.....	490,000

In these three years you will see that there was a deficit of half a million of money a year. Then something occurred. I have stated to you what that was. In 1892-3 there was a surplus of \$20,000, which was followed by a continuation of surpluses for two years more—one of \$5,800 and one of \$3,800. Naturally an inquiring mind would like to know what occurred to produce this change. Did the business increase? Was there any marked growth of traffic? How was it that for those years preceding there were what would be des-

cribed by some as an enormous deficit each year, and that there followed even these small surpluses showing a difference of between \$500,000 and \$600,000 in each year's results as between 1889-92 and 1892-5? Was it due, as in 1881-2-3-4, to an increase in the earnings? No. There had been an increased mileage, and an increase of something over \$600,000 in the actual earnings of the road, in the period of the previous deficits. Was there a corresponding or greater increase in the earnings between the three years of deficits which I have named and the three years of surpluses which I have named? No. Let me tell you what the result was by the actual figures. The gross earnings were as follows:

1889-90.....	\$3,012,000
1890-1.....	2,977,000
1891-2.....	2,945,000

Mark you, those were the years of deficits of over \$500,000 a year. How does the business compare with that of the following three years of surpluses? In those years the gross earnings were:

1892-3.....	\$3,065,000
1893-4.....	2,987,000
1894-5.....	2,940,000

There was altogether no greater increase in the gross earnings in the three years of surpluses which I have mentioned over the three years in which those large deficits occurred than \$20,000 per year, or, in the whole, \$60,000. Now, this naturally suggests the inquiry, how comes it that such a result was brought about? In the first full year in which my hon. friend administered the department he was able to show a surplus of \$20,000. In the year preceding the advent of the hon. gentleman and the year of his advent the deficits were \$680,000 and \$490,000 respectively; and one would be, as I say, naturally prompted to ascertain, if possible, by close and careful investigation, what were the processes, what was the sleight-of-hand employed by my hon. friend to enable him to produce a surplus with practically the same amount of business that had produced a deficit of over \$500,000 a year for the three years preceding? Well, I have looked into this subject, and I think I can furnish to the committee a correct and complete explanation. I am in a position to say, as you have seen, that it was not due to an increase in the business of the road. There was at all events no stimulus given to the traffic. I think I shall be able to satisfy the committee before I get through that it was not due to any remarkably successful railway administration upon the part of my hon. friend—and I am not going to deprecate in any degree his qualifications as a railway administrator. If the hon. gentleman thinks this result is a matter of credit, I am not sure whether the credit is attributable to my hon. friend or not. I am not aware to what extent, if at all, it is attributable to

the gentleman who was acting Minister of Railways for some months prior to my hon. friend's accession to office. I believe that during the year prior to 1892, my hon. friend was Minister of Railways for half the year, and Sir Mackenzie Bowell for the other half. In this respect I feel that I am perhaps deficient in information. I am not able to say whether it was through the action of my hon. friend or through the action of Sir Mackenzie Bowell that this transformation took place. I do know, however, that Sir Mackenzie went down to Moncton during the time he was acting Minister of Railways—at least, I am so informed—and that while there he took very active steps to bring this system of annual deficits on the Intercolonial Railway to an end. Now, that was a very laudable purpose, and I am not going to criticise him for it; but I think it is just possible—and I shall refer the committee to the facts which I have gathered on the subject, and invite them to form their own judgment as to whether it is a subject for congratulation or not—I think it is just possible that there may have been a change brought about which was very much to the disadvantage of the Intercolonial as a railway and was not at all a startling exhibition of railway administration. The acting Minister of Railways went down to Moncton, not, as I gather from the results, to study the railway question at headquarters; but for the purpose of ascertaining why this system of deficits continued, and what could be done, consistent with the public interests and with the maintenance and proper business management of the Intercolonial Railway, to bring these deficits to an end; but he went down there with the determination to cut off the deficit at all hazards and by any means, and produce, if possible, a surplus where previously only deficits had occurred. What did he do? He plied his hatchet, he cut and slashed, he reduced the expenditure here and he reduced it there, he reduced the number of trains, he diminished the staff of employees and workmen in the shops, and cut off and curtailed in every possible direction. If I am correctly informed, he called in the leading men at the head of the different departments and said that the government had determined the half-million dollars of deficit should cease, and that they should make such reductions in the expenditure of their several departments as would bring about that result.

He did not go over the road to see in what condition it was. He did not go over it to see whether or not the amounts which had been expended from year to year on maintenance and repairs were larger than the needs of the road required. He did not go over the rolling stock or inquire into the business needs to ascertain whether more trains were operated and more expenditure incurred in the way of stimulating business than the actual business would war-

Mr. BLAIR.

rant. He did not do any of these things, but simply gave out his order that the deficit should be cut down, and cut down it was. And I know how the newspapers of the time, which were supporting the government of the day, gave no end of credit to the late administration for having achieved what they described as a splendid result—for having shown a surplus, though a small one, where for years there had been nothing but enormous deficits.

But, it depends on the methods pursued to bring about that result, whether it conferred a legitimate benefit on the country or whether an injury was created—whether the road was being injured or benefited. I have the facts before me, and propose to show that no one who had any real interest in the proper maintenance and operation of that great railway would have taken the course which was then followed. It was a course most disastrous and injurious to the proper maintenance of the Intercolonial Railway. There was none too much money being expended in order to keep that road in proper shape if it was intended—I will not say to be a credit to Canada—but to be maintained and operated as it should be. But those who were controlling the operating of that road got their instructions to cut down the expenditure at all hazards, and I propose to show how this \$500,000 of change in the expenditure of the previous years was brought about, and I can give you the precise figures, from which you can draw your own conclusion.

Take 1891-2 as the last year showing this deficit of \$491,000, and take one of the following years. In 1891-2, there was expended upon steel rails laid down on the Intercolonial Railway, \$150,600; the next year the expenditure upon these rails amounted to \$75,000. So that, of the half-million dollars of saving, \$75,000 was made up by putting down less rails than in the year before.

Mr. POWELL. More rails were put down that following year than have been put down any year since.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend smiles as if he had accomplished some great feat. I am prepared for my hon. friend's criticism, I am prepared to put the operations of the Intercolonial Railway every month of every year from 1896 alongside the operations of the previous years. Every item of expenditure can be put side by side, and we will see what the results are, and I have a statement before me covering all that ground. If the hon. gentleman will have the patience to allow me to complete my statement, he can then make any comment he pleases.

Mr. POWELL. I have a statement before me, and this is correct.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What has been expended since does not affect the argument or the case I

am presenting to the committee in the slightest degree. I am now explaining how this wiping out of the deficits which had existed for years was effected, and I am pointing out that it was not brought about by any legitimate means, but by reductions in the very classes of expenditure which were necessary to the proper maintenance and equipment of the railway. That is the point I am trying to make. The ties furnished in 1891-2 cost \$113,000; in 1892-3 they cost \$84,500, or \$28,500 reduction in that particular outlay. On bridges and culverts, in 1891-2, we expended \$169,500, and in 1892-3, \$123,500, or \$46,000 less outlay. On building platforms, in 1891-2, we spent \$88,000, and in 1892-3, \$67,000, or \$20,000 less expenditure. Repairs to engines, \$293,000 in 1891-2, and \$234,000 in 1892-3, or \$38,000 less outlay. Repairs to passenger cars, \$90,000 in 1891-2, and \$83,000 in 1892-3, or \$7,000 less expended. Postal and express cars, \$3,000 of a difference. Labourers and trackmen in keeping up track, \$73,000 difference between the two years. Repairs to other cars, \$9,000 differences—making in all \$300,000 out of these differences I have pointed out. The balance, \$100,000, was made up in the reduction of trains, the reduction in the number of train hands, and engine drivers, smaller additions to the stores, and reductions in the men employed on the line.

Mr. INGRAM. Was the business of the community affected by the reduction of the train service?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not only was a very serious effect produced upon business, but there was a marked diminution in the accommodation furnished to the public.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) state how the reduction of stores enters into that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because every year there is a certain sum expended in stores, and in some years—

Mr. HAGGART. That does not enter into it at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg pardon. I have shown to the committee that there was an actual difference in the figures I have given of \$300,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman stated that the reduction of the stores entered into these figures. How does it appear and how does it affect these results?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) can address his attention to something larger, if he wants to grapple with the question. I say there was also \$100,000 less expended by reason of the trains cut off in all

directions, as everybody knows, in the maritime provinces, together with the train hands, and so on. This makes a total of \$400,000.

Mr. POWELL. There is a reduction of only \$12,000 represented by the train hands.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was not taking up the trifling amounts which made this \$100,000. But there is an item of \$100,000 due to the cutting off of trains and the reduction of train hands and other incidental savings of amounts that were previously spent in the operating of the line. You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that there is necessarily a very marked effect produced by the reduction of these expenditures in the condition of the road-bed, rolling stock, and generally of the equipment of the road. I point to this for the purpose of saying two things: In the first place I say it was injurious to the road; in the next place, I say it is a complete answer to what was said at that time and has been more or less made since, that there had been any marked evidence of success on the part of the minister of that day. Anybody can scamp the road; anybody can starve it, depreciate it. You can cut down expenditure, but when you do so, you are doing serious injury to the railway system of the country. Now, let me pass from that to a statement of recent years' operations under the present administration. I would first give you the gross earnings of the year 1896-7, which were only \$2,866,028. From 1896 to 1898 the amount did increase, but not very largely, until it amounted to \$3,117,000. This was before we had extended the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. The amount was even larger than it had been—before even in the highest of the years when business was prosperous in the maritime provinces—as prosperous as it was at the best of times. The gross earnings of the road rose from \$3,065,000 to \$3,117,669, or somewhere about \$50,000 greater than it had been during the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Haggart's) best year. In 1898-9 the increase was very marked; it had run up to \$3,738,331. The increase, therefore, of 1898-9 was \$872,300 over what it was in 1896-7. Hon. gentlemen opposite may remember the statement I made in this House at the time we were arranging for the adoption of our policy of extension to Montreal,—that we might count with reasonable confidence upon an increase in the earnings of the road, of about \$800,000. My statement was ridiculed as being fabulous, merely imaginary and capable of accomplishment by taking business away from the Canadian Pacific Railway and probably doing it at a loss. It was said that there was not the business which would enable the Intercolonial Railway, even if extended to Montreal to increase its gross earnings to the extent of \$800,000. But, in 1898-9, increase had taken place, and we had \$872,000 over our

earnings in 1896-7. Now, I desire to call the attention of the committee to a very significant state of facts. During the ten years that elapsed between 1886 and 1896, the fluctuation in the gross earnings in the Intercolonial Railway between the highest and lowest amounts was only \$125,000. During all these years, our great Intercolonial Railway system, under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite remained practically stagnant; even though the times were good, though I do not say Canada was as prosperous as it is to-day.

Mr. POWELL. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. minister—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) does not wish to interrupt me, I hope he will not feel under any compulsion to do it—I shall not insist upon it.

Mr. POWELL. But, I wish to point out that the hon. gentleman is wrong. From 1886, the difference instead of being \$125,000 is \$300,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. In the period from 1887-8 to 1897-8, traffic did not vary more than I have said. The hon. gentleman will have plenty of opportunity to deal with the figures I put forward—

Mr. POWELL. The hon. minister is right for those years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know it. If the hon. gentleman thinks he has any ground on which to attack my figures, he will have ample opportunity to do it. In 1898-9, we have an increase of \$872,000. What is it due to? I do not take any credit to myself. I do not say it is evidence of great railway manipulation. I have certainly given my best energies to watching the line and have tried to perform my duties energetically and faithfully. But I do not claim credit for this increase. I do claim that the policy which met with such bitter opposition in this House and in this country from hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends against the extension to Montreal, is the cause to which we are justly entitled to attribute this growth, six times greater than had occurred during the whole ten years preceding. Now, hon. gentlemen may say: Well, that is no great showing, because your mileage was increased. Granted that the mileage was increased, it increased by 169 miles. But I offset that argument by this statement, that there was during the ten years I have referred to an increase in mileage greater by a mile or two than there was by the extension to Montreal; there was an increase in 1891 of 171 miles on the Intercolonial Railway. So you have to look for some other reason than the fact that we have added 169 miles to the Inter-

Mr. BLAIR.

colonial Railway during the present regime. It is due to the extended mileage in a sense, but in a different sense to that to which I am alluding. We extended the line into a great city which would give us business and to which we could take business, and to that cause alone I think I may fairly attribute this improved condition in the traffic upon the Intercolonial Railway.

Now, I suppose it will be said that times were good during the last year or two. Well, they were good unquestionably last year, and are still better the current year. But I want to state positively that in the maritime provinces, during the latter portion of the last fiscal year, we did not begin to realise the prosperity and business which the upper provinces realized. When good times do come we are slow to participate in them, and we do not at any time participate in them to the same extent as the upper provinces. But attributing a reasonable increase of business upon the Intercolonial Railway to better times, I set off against that improved business an equal earning prosperity, and equal good times in the maritime provinces during a portion of the ten years with which I have made my comparison. I do not suppose hon. gentlemen opposite are going to affirm that during all the years between 1887 and 1888, and 1897 and 1898, the national policy of protection did not have any good effect in the provinces. But while these good times prevailed the only effect upon the Intercolonial at the most was an increase of \$125,000 in the total business between the lowest and the highest. During the year or fifteen months before the good times struck the maritime provinces, we had \$172,000 of an increase in our business, furnishing a strong affirmation of the wisdom of the policy of the government in making all possible haste to get into the city of Montreal with our railway. Now, the gross earnings for the year 1898-99, as I have given them to the committee, were \$3,738,321. Our working expenses and outlay upon revenue account amounted to \$3,675,686. That left us a net surplus for the year ending on the 1st of July last of \$62,645. This sum corresponds very closely with the estimate I made at the end of the then fiscal year, when I thought we would have a surplus on the year's operations of \$60,000. That surplus amounts to something more than all the surpluses put together during the whole life of the Intercolonial Railway. There have been surpluses for eight years on the Intercolonial Railway, varying from \$542.65 in one year to \$62,645 last year. Seven of these were under the late government, aggregating \$57,517, and the surplus last year exceeded that by over \$5,000. Now there is a disposition in the newspaper press and I presume it will be manifested on the floor of this House by hon. gentlemen opposite, to say that this surplus has been brought about by not making as liberal an expendi-

ture upon the maintenance of the road and upon everything that contributes to its improvement, as did the late government. Let us examine the facts and see how far that statement is correct. I make the statement that the results in 1898-99 were not brought about by making a reduced expenditure upon the Intercolonial Railway as compared with the expenditures made during the hon. gentleman's term. I will furnish the committee with the exact figures showing what these expenditures were, and you can draw your own conclusions. For the years 1894-95-96 the amount spent upon roadbed by the late government was \$130,912; for the years 1897-98-99 the amount was \$134,928, not a large increase, but still sufficient to rebut the allegation that the expenditure in that particular, at all events, has been reduced. For ties, which is a very important element in a railway, in the first three years the expenditure was \$184,490 and in the last three years \$303,986—\$119,500 in excess of the previous year. On lumber and other things which enter into improvements upon the road, the first three years the expenditure was \$253,284; the last three years it was \$281,758 or an excess of \$28,000, making a total increase of \$152,000. This is not a large increase. I am not going to claim that it is. I am not putting it forward as evidence that we have made a large expenditure. I am not unmindful of the fact that comparisons are always made between two different governments, by the results, and if you desire to have a fair knowledge, and to come to a fair conclusion as to what is the character of the measure of success which has been achieved by either government, you have to come down to the figures, and you are not likely to make any undue expenditures to produce deficits, if you can maintain your road in as good condition as it formerly was, by keeping your expenditure so that the comparison will be fair and legitimate. With an increased expenditure, averaging \$50,000 per year upon the same class of outlay, covering every branch of the outlays on the maintenance of the road, the comparison can be fairly made. The purpose I have in making this statement is this: It is an answer to whoever may allege that the surplus for the year 1899, as shown in the accounts to July 1 last, was brought about, in comparison with the administration of the previous government, by any diminution in the outlay which goes to keep up and maintain the road. I could go into, as I have them before me in detail, the statements of how these different sums were laid out so as to show that the three great classes of outlay, are, for maintenance of way and works, which applies to the roadbed; one for cars, which deals with all classes of rolling stock, and one for locomotives, which deals with that class of equipment, which are covered by different branches of railway expenditure connected with the improvement and main-

tenance of the condition of the road, have all been maintained in this way. A comparison of the results show, by reason of car repairs, an increase of \$72,898, between the two triennial periods which I have taken and by reason of engine repairs, \$20,528, between the triennial periods.

Mr. POWELL. Do you include trainmen in the car statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No we do not include trainmen for a very important reason, for the reason that it depends entirely on the amount of business you have, as to whether the number of train hands will be increased. If you want to furnish all the facilities which the business calls for, and all the accommodation that the travelling public require, it might increase the cost of your train service, but train hands are not paid out of these items of expenditure, but out of another class of expenditure which does not go to build up the road. That, of course, is important in connection with the amount of business that is done, but it does not affect the other proposition in any degree. Now, the question which might fairly be put before this committee, and a question which might be fairly put to the country is this: Is there any better or improved showing, as compared with the control of my predecessor, brought about by spending less upon maintenance? The facts which I have referred to, as to the correctness of which I challenge criticism, enable me to answer that question in the negative. So, I think, I can fairly say that the argument, if used, cannot be successfully used, and that it has been disposed of. I have admitted that we have an increased mileage of 169 miles. We have spent 10½ per cent more than my predecessor spent during these years, taking them altogether, whereas during last year we had 14 per cent more mileage. It may be said: By reason of your having 14 per cent more mileage, you ought, therefore, necessarily, to have spent something more for maintenance and repairs, because you have more road to keep up. I mention that in order that I may put my view before the committee on that subject, and in order that it may not be supposed that I desired to present the question other than fairly, or that I intended to pass over any view of the question which might be criticised. It is correct that we have only spent 10½ per cent during these years more than the late government, under these three important heads, whereas during the period we had 14 per cent more mileage. In that connection, I will call the attention of the committee to the fact that we only had this increased mileage during one year, and during four months of another year. We had during the last year, ending July 1, the full mileage of the extension to Montreal. We only had it during four months of the year preceding, so that during the three years

in regard to which I have made a comparison, it would not be a fair argument to urge that the expenditure ought to be greater, because the mileage is greater, except to a very limited extent, for the reason that the whole additional mileage has not been in operation for half of this period. For half of this period, this additional mileage has been in operation, but we did not have occasion to make an outlay upon it to the extent that we would have, if it had been some years in our hands, for this very good reason that forty-three miles of the road was entirely new. As to the other portion of the road, one of the conditions under which we purchased it, was that it should be put in first-class repair, and \$100,000 was taken out of the purchase price to be expended upon the road, so that we did not require to spend money upon what is called the Drummond County portion of the line. We have only been operating the road for a short time, and any person who has had any experience in any business, much more so, any person who has had any experience in railway business, knows that you must have a railway in operation for a considerable period before you can expect to realise results from it, which you might fairly anticipate after the lapse of a little time. You cannot expect that the business of the Intercolonial Railway arising from its extension to Montreal would jump in a month, or six months, or a year, beyond what it has been during these three years. It will require a longer period, but under the same conditions of business, in five years, the business of the Intercolonial Railway, by reason of the extension to Montreal may be greatly enhanced beyond what it is to-day, as it is to-day greatly enhanced from what it was six months ago. These facts must necessarily be kept in mind if we desire to reach a fair, a just and reasonable conclusion upon the conditions as they exist. As to a large portion of this 169 miles, we did not have to make any considerable outlay upon it, in addition to the outlay I referred to, upon the Grand Trunk Railway end.

Mr. HAGGART. Do you know the exact amount you expended over and above the \$100,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am informed it was about \$15,000. If we owned the Grand Trunk Railway portion of the line ourselves, and if we were operating it ourselves, you would see at a glance that we would have to bear the whole expense of the annual repairs, which would be very considerable. But we only bear that expense in proportion to the amount of business we do on the line compared with the Grand Trunk Railway and the other lines of railway that are using the road. Our percentage is small, and the charge we have to meet now or at any future time, must be small compared

Mr. BLAIR.

with the charge which we have to bear upon the rest of the Intercolonial Railway which we own ourselves, which we operate exclusively, and in connection with which we get no contribution from any other source. In connection with the results as shown by the accounts for the year ending 31st June last, I would like to impress upon this committee another very important fact, and one which accentuates still more the value of that extension to Montreal. Wherever and whenever the opportunities are afforded me, I shall never cease to impress upon those to whom I am speaking, the utter weakness and the utter failure of the contention which the Conservative party in this House made with respect to the Montreal extension. It is a fact, Sir, that we were able in connection with that extension, not only to produce these results, but we paid the rental \$210,000, and had a surplus in addition to it. We practically paid the interest upon the value of the property we acquired. We paid the interest at a higher rate than if we had owned it, because we paid at the rate of 4 per cent on the Drummond County. Was there ever a railway bought by the Conservative government; was there ever an extension of the Intercolonial Railway under their administration that contributed one dollar towards the interest upon the capital outlay? Not one. They never made any addition which contributed to the increase in the business as I have shown, but here we have an act of policy by this government which not only enabled us to produce better results as to the gross traffic upon the railway, but actually enabled us to pay the rental of \$210,000 a year, and upon the Drummond County as part of it, interest at 4 per cent upon the whole value of that road. Now, Sir, this came out of the profits. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) ought to have spoken with some experience on this matter, because I understood him to say that at one time he had in his mind the extension to Montreal, although it did not take a very vigorous hold upon him, nor did it bear fruit, but he must have considered the question, and if he did consider the question he should have formed some idea as to what that policy was worth. However, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) would have us believe in this parliament that when we had the Intercolonial Railway running for one full year and produced our accounts, we would show a deficit in addition to the deficit which he had, by a sum not less than the whole rental we were paying. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) on the authority of a gentleman who had been at the head of the department, and with all the weight that brought; when he was condemning this policy of the present government he deliberately predicted that we would show a deficit of \$260,000. Now, Sir, as it turns out there is \$60,000 the other

way, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) therefore, made and error in his calculation of \$320,000 a year.

Mr. HAGGART. The error is in your statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do I misquote the hon. gentleman?

Mr. HAGGART. No, but I say that your statement is altogether wrong, and I will be able to show it later.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am glad to have the acknowledgement that I did not misquote the hon. gentleman, and if I did not misquote him, no explanation of his can wipe out the conditions as they actually exist. It is possible for my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) to pretend to tell what is going to happen in the future. He may speculate and predict as he has done before, but he cannot wipe out the results as they stand to-day. The accounts are settled, they are kept exactly by the same officers and in the same way as when he was in the department, item after item in detail is published, and therefore, I do not believe that my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) will have an easy task to explain away the unreasonable and incorrect predictions which he made in respect to the operation of this road.

There is another thing that I anticipate will be stated here, because it is stated in the Conservative press with all show of particularity. It is said to us: Your results are misleading and fallacious; you never had a surplus of \$62,000, because you have actually maintained the road out of capital and made improvements which were formerly paid out of earnings, and so no wonder you can show favourable returns under such circumstances. Well, Mr. Chairman, I challenge most emphatically the correctness of that statement. I say that I shall be able to convince the House that there is not a shadow of justification for saying that the results which have been accomplished have been accomplished by any such means. Even the opposition papers which are published along that line of railway which are bitterly opposed to this government and would misrepresent it without much hesitation if they thought they could make a point against us by doing so, even they do not say that the condition of the railway, and of the road-bed is not improved. The equipment, I am free to confess, the locomotives largely, the new cars, have come out of capital. But, even as respects that portion of the expenditure, we have not had as large a proportion available to us yet as we are entitled to by reason of the increase in our mileage. When the line was extended by the late government from Riviere du Loup to Lévis, the calculation was made that they were entitled to so many additional

locomotives, so many additional passenger cars of various kinds, so many additional freight cars, and they got them; and they were paid for out of capital, legitimately and properly. Now, it is not an avower to say that I have got this equipment largely out of capital, because when we added 169 miles to the railway, we had necessarily to get additional equipment, and we have not yet got the proportion which the additional mileage and the additional business requires, as I shall show the committee before I conclude my statement.

Now, in these statements as I have put them to the committee, I think I have anticipated every reasonable argument that would be made against the legitimate character of the surplus which the last year's transactions have shown; and I think I have answered those arguments, and I think the conclusion must necessarily be drawn that we have this surplus of \$62,645 to our credit, as compared to the deficits during the period of the hon. gentleman. The normal deficit got up to about \$55,000; that was the hon. gentleman's last deficit; and if you will add that to the \$62,645 of surplus which I have shown this year, you have, as between those two years, a comparative difference of \$118,000, a sufficient sum to pay the interest upon \$4,000,000 at 3 per cent per annum—I think a very fair showing, and a matter of legitimate congratulation. I am not going to make any boast with regard to this, from any personal point of view. I claim no credit particularly for myself. Whatever credit there may be due to the improved business, outside of the extension to Montreal, I think is fairly due to the increased activity and increased interest which the men employed on the Intercolonial Railway have exhibited. I have had no reason at all to be other than satisfied with the way in which they have responded to the demands I have made upon them. Nor do I wish to criticise the hon. gentleman in any serious way. I am entitled, however, to say that with regard to the hon. gentleman, that I do not think he took any interest in the Intercolonial Railway from the beginning to the end of his administration. I think he wanted the deficits to be cut down, and I think he would like to see a surplus; but, as to his making any study of the situation and devoting his talents to it—and I have no doubt he has exceptional talents—I am compelled to believe that the hon. gentleman gave very little, if any, of his ability to the administration of that railway. And I think that is a legitimate ground of complaint against the hon. gentleman, because there is no doubt that if the men employed on the railway know that the minister takes no interest in it, they take less interest, they become less careful and more lax, and you do not get the results that you would if the minister followed matters up closely, kept himself in close communication with the officers,

advised with them, got their views and gave them his, and spurred them on to greater interest in their work. I venture to say that there is to-day, and has been for some time past, more activity displayed by the officers of the Intercolonial Railway than there was during the hon. gentleman's administration; and any one who travels over that road will acknowledge that the character of the service, the character of the men engaged in the service, the attention people get, and every other element that goes to make the popularity of a railway, have been improved in recent years beyond what they were during the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not pretend to say that down to the present moment the railway is all we desire it to be. It is deficient, no doubt, in many particulars. It is deficient in its equipment; it is deficient in the number of its locomotives, and in the number of its cars. But it is improving. The money we are spending on it we are spending to better purpose and with better results than was formerly the case; and I am in hopes that in four or five years we may have that railway, in all respects, one which will compare favourably with any other railway in the Dominion.

This brings me to the subject of the capital outlay upon the Intercolonial. I will make a comparison between the expenditure in that particular under the late government and the expenditure under myself down to the present date. The capital expenditure, in round figures, was as follows:

1890-1.....	\$ 80,000
1891-2.....	320,000
1892-3.....	297,000
1893-4.....	437,500
1894-5.....	327,000
1895-6.....	260,000

Mr. HAGGART. Where do you get those figures?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I got them from the reports.

Mr. POWELL. They differ tremendously from the official figures in your report.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot help that. I am giving the figures as I have had them taken from the public reports for the whole government system except the Prince Edward Island road. I did not take these figures off myself.

Mr. HAGGART. The figures are all wrong.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Under the present administration, the capital expenditure has been as follows, in round figures:

1896-7.....	\$ 149,000
1897-8.....	253,000
1898-9.....	1,082,000

Mr. BLAIR.

Of the latter amount, \$640,000 was for rolling stock, and there was no corresponding item for rolling stock expenditure out of capital during the recent years of the hon. gentleman's administration. Comparing the three years of Liberal administration with the six years I have given you of its predecessors, the comparison would be, I think, not at all unfavourable to this government, having regard to the fact that we have put the equipment of the railway into the condition in which it is to-day and which is infinitely better, I think, in the judgment of everybody than it ever was before. We have an entirely improved class of locomotives and service. There never was a dining car service until since the change in the administration. There was no such thing as a vestibule train, the locomotives were of an inferior class, and therefore the expenditure which has been made on capital account has produced results which amply justifies it.

Look at the items which go to make up that expenditure closely, and you will not find any of the class which are included in the statements that I have read. These expenditures, every dollar of them, on capital account, are outside of the amounts I have named as paid out of consolidated revenue account, so that the statement cannot be accurately made that we have kept the road up in the condition in which it is by reason of the capital account. An examination of these figures will demonstrate the incorrectness of such a conclusion. Among the items for which we have asked appropriations on capital account, there is only one about which any possible question can be raised, and certainly it cannot be raised with any force. There is only one concerning which it can be contended, with any show of argument, that a similar class of items was charged by our predecessors against revenue. That item is the sum that we have obtained for the strengthening of the bridges on the road. As a matter of policy, owing to the increased weight of engines and trains, it has become imperatively necessary that there should be a strengthening of the bridges quite generally upon the railway. They were built for lighter engines, and must be strengthened if they are to be crossed by heavier engines. When the vote of last year or year before—I do not remember which—was under consideration by this committee, there was a vote on capital account for strengthening the bridges, and I was asked whether it had not been the policy of the late government to expend upon revenue account all that was necessary for the strengthening of these bridges. I stated that I did not think that that was the policy of the late government, although I admitted that there were one or two instances in which that had been done; but I endeavoured to point out that there was no similarity between the classes of work done in the strengthening of

bridges by the late government, and what we now propose to do. We are proposing to spend—not all at once, but in two or three years—\$200,000 or \$300,000, and in referring to what expenditure was made by the late government for the strengthening of bridges, I pointed out that they had only strengthened two or three bridges. I think they were the two Miramichi bridges and the one across the Restigouche.

Mr. POWELL. And the Sackville bridge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. Not one beyond those three I have named.

Mr. POWELL. The Sackville bridge was not charged to capital.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If rebuilt or strengthened, it must necessarily have been built out of capital, because I have had the whole records of the correspondence upon all the bridges on the Intercolonial Railway searched with the utmost thoroughness from beginning to end, with the result that there were only these three bridges, the two Miramichi and the one at Restigouche, and upon those the total, laid out for strengthening, was only \$36,000, or about \$18,000 a year extended over two years.

But no one, with any desire to be fair, will say that because the late government put in a few additional braces and strengthening rods into three of their bridges, during the whole period of their management of the road, at an outlay of \$18,000 a year for two years, I ought to be expected to spend \$300,000 in completing, renewing and constructing the whole bridge system of the Intercolonial Railway, and I ought to do that out of earnings. There is no reason or common sense in doing that. If the argument is made that we ought to do this in order that there may be a continuity in the system and a fair comparison between one administration and the other, then I say the very statement defeats itself. There is no comparison between spending a trifling sum for two years upon some additional braces and the strengthening of three bridges, and spending some \$300,000 in practically renewing bridges. What are we doing? We are replacing one-half nearly of these bridges by new bridges. We are not in any such sense strengthening the existing bridges; but we put two small bridges together so as to double the strength. We have taken a bridge up at one place and put it alongside a bridge in another place. The bridges were good, they did not require repairs, but practically a renewal, and we took that method of doing it. We put an entirely new bridge down double the capacity of the old bridge which we took up. And I maintain that if any person desires to make a fair comparison between our expenditure upon maintenance of the Intercolonial Railway and our predecessors' ex-

penditure for the same service, he will compare on the same basis the work we have done and the little trifling repairs for strengthening bridges and so on which they have done.

I now come to a statement having reference to the business of the present year, as far as I am in a position to furnish it to the committee. But, perhaps, it is well that I should break off here.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY— SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) presented to the House a message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting the supplementary estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1901.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending June 30, 1901, and in accordance with the provisions of 'The British North America Act, 1867,' the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,  
Ottawa, June 26, 1900.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that His Excellency's message, together with the estimates, be referred to the committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT—YUKON ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Before the House adjourns, I desire to give notice that on motion to go into supply I shall move a motion in connection with the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell, Pictou) desire to specify more particularly the nature of the resolution?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). No—further facts in connection with the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose we go on with the debate to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. (Wednesday.)

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, June 27, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SETTLEMENT OF TRADE DISPUTES— INDUSTRIAL INFORMATION.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 187) to aid in the prevention and settlement of trade disputes and the publication of statistical industrial information.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there to be an explanation of this ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. One of the objects of this Bill is, by the aid of boards of conciliation, to promote the settlement of trade disputes and of differences that arise from time to time between employers and employees, and between different kinds of employees. It is hoped that the application of this principle may prevent strikes and lock-outs, and that if, unfortunately, that extreme measure is resorted to in the case of such disputes, the adoption of this method may bring about a more satisfactory and permanent settlement of these disputes.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) says he will use these methods, but he has not explained it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Another object of the Bill is to establish a department of labour. It will be the duty of the department of labour to gather statistical information and other information affecting labour, and to provide for its publication and for its being made accessible to the public generally. In order to carry out that object, the department will publish a monthly gazette, a labour gazette, which, as regards labour, will fill the same place as does the report of the Minister of Agriculture as regards agriculture, and the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the commercial world. This gazette will not be a medium for the expression of opinions, but for the registration of facts. It will be a useful publication for all classes concerned in industrial life, whether employers or employees, and will enable them better to understand not only the conditions affecting their own side, but the conditions affecting the side of the other party. And, with more information, all parties to such controversies will be better able to understand each other's views and conditions, and more amenable to conciliatory arguments and more ready to adopt peaceful arguments for the settlement of controversies. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) asks me to explain the machinery

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

of the conciliation portion of this Bill. I may say that it is not anything new, but is an echo, largely, of the Conciliation Act which has been in force in Great Britain for some four years. Prior to any legislation whatever providing for conciliatory methods of adjusting such disputes, there had been growing up in Great Britain a number of voluntary conciliation boards, which had been able to accomplish a great deal in the way of removing causes or differences, and preventing strikes and lock-outs. The number of these boards in England had increased, and their work had become so important and useful that, at last, in 1896, the Imperial parliament gave recognition to Conciliation Boards by passing the Conciliation Act of 1896. The Act provides for the Board of Trade of England keeping a register of the Conciliation Boards and Arbitration Boards throughout Great Britain, and in that way being in connection with the machinery of conciliation, which machinery can be set in motion whenever the occasion arises. These Conciliation Boards are selected by the interests concerned. The Act provides that if the interests desire it, the Board of Trade in England—it will be the minister charged with the carrying out of this Act in Canada—may, if requested, appoint conciliators or arbitrators. But there is nothing, from beginning to end of the Act, of a coercive character, but the whole rests upon the theory of consent, both in the organization of the board, in their taking any part whatever by way of intervening in disputes, and ultimately in arriving at consent decisions. Failing conciliation, the Imperial Act—and so will this Bill—recognizes reference to arbitration. There is, however, a wide difference between the determination of a dispute by a board of conciliators and by a board of arbitrators. In case of the reference of the dispute to a board of conciliators, the conciliators are the parties to the dispute themselves. The employers or their representatives and the employees or their representatives constitute the board. There is not, as in the case of arbitration, the delegation of power to settle the dispute to an outside tribunal, which may or may not be composed of persons in any way directly interested in the trade concerned, but the persons directly interested in the difference are the persons to settle that difference. If the conciliators arrive at a conclusion, it is a consent conclusion. The parties concerned meet together, employers and employees, around the same table; they exchange views; they become, perhaps, better acquainted, each side with the other, a better spirit is evoked, and the result is that, ultimately, consent is reached. In case of arbitration, it is a delegation of authority to an outside tribunal, whose decision, not being the decision of the parties concerned, is accepted, perhaps, as binding, but not to the same degree of alacrity, perhaps sullenly.

Mr. DAVIN. Who puts the machinery in motion ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will be possible for the machinery to be set in motion either by the parties to the difference themselves, or by the department of labour. Any of the parties can evoke it, can endeavour to secure its good offices for the bringing about of a settlement. There will be no cast-iron rules, one method might be effective in one case and another in another. Hon. gentlemen will find on reference to the reports of the Board of Trade to the Imperial parliament, ample justification for our adoption of this measure. It will appear that it has been effective in England in settling trade disputes of far-reaching importance, and I think there is no reason to anticipate less gratifying results from the principle being adopted in Canada. In Great Britain long before 1896 this system was in force ; since then I think the records show that six-sevenths of all the disputes have been amicably settled by the consent of the parties, either by the board of conciliation or by the parties themselves whilst the boards were in deliberation.

With reference to the labour gazette. I think it may be stated that Canada is behind other countries in not having long since adopted a journal of this kind for the dissemination of useful information in the fields of labour. Great Britain established a gazette some years prior to the Conciliation Act, and that journal I think has been of very great importance in aiding the work of conciliation. I venture the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that there is no subject more deserving of our consideration, no subject of so far-reaching importance, as one that concerns the peaceful, satisfactory and harmonious adjustment of trade disputes. Strikes and lock-outs may have been necessary, but they are an extreme course in dealing with such controversies. Sooner or later an adjustment is arrived at, after great cost to all the parties concerned, and considerable injury to the general welfare. If an arrangement can be arrived at after a strike and after such cost, does it not seem reasonable that we should endeavour to arrive at such a happy state of affairs without such cost, if at all possible, and that gradually it should be recognized that a resort to the extreme course of a strike or a lock-out should only be regarded as justifiable when all other more peaceful and more satisfactory methods have proved ineffective ? I had not contemplated making any observations except merely to state the two objects of the Bill, but since hon. gentlemen have asked me to speak further on it, I have done so.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.). The hon. gentleman's course is a peculiar one for several reasons. The somewhat long, and I think I will not be considered harsh in my application of the term, somewhat bombastic introduction of this Conciliation

Bill by the minister, is remarkable for what it does not contain. The hon. gentleman has spoken and has taken his seat, and there is not one member on either side of your chair, Mr. Speaker, who has the least idea of what the Bill is. On general principles, combined with a great deal of assertion, the hon. gentleman has been most prolix and verbose, but he has been severely economical in any statement that he has made which would refer to the scope or to the machinery of the Bill.

There is one thing to which I wish to call attention, if the country's attention during these dog days can be fixed upon what we are doing here in Ottawa. The hon. gentleman himself has said that there is no more important question to be brought before parliament, that there is no question which has such far-reaching consequences as that which he has just introduced. And what is the period of this parliament ? We have now been in session five months almost to a day, we are here with decimated numbers, we are here entirely fagged out ; and after five months of legislation the hon. gentleman comes down with the most important Bill of the session, whose consequences must be far reaching. Now, I ask the members of this House and I ask the country if that is fair treatment for legislators. But I leave that, and I will ask if it is fair treatment for the measure itself. If a labour question and a scheme of conciliation built upon it is worthy the attention of a parliament like this, and no one doubts it, then it is worthy the attention of that parliament in its earlier days, before its forces have been almost completely sapped by the close application of five months attendance here, and by having entered the summer holidays and dog days. What reason has the hon. gentleman for deferring this legislation until the last days of the session ? The matter came up early in the session, on a resolution. The hon. gentleman was told then that the resolution was merely perfunctory, and he was invited to put his ideas into the shape of a Bill. Well, he did not take the warning. There was no impediment, either in the business of the House or for any other reason, to prevent the hon. gentleman from introducing his Bill three or four months ago, when this House was fresh, and when this parliament could have given something of the attention and consideration to a Bill of this kind which was its due.

Now this is exactly on a parallel with other methods of conducting the business this session. What have we seen with reference to the Minister of Militia and Defence ? No more important subject in one way could be brought before this parliament than a general scheme of administration of the militia system of this country. The Minister of Militia and Defence

waits until the day before yesterday, when the session is very nearly over and when his remarks can be heard by, and his scheme can be laid before, but a very small proportion of the representatives of the country; and then he comes down at five o'clock in the afternoon and ends at ten o'clock at night, in a general discussion upon the policy and plan of militia methods in this country.

The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), dealing with the great problem of carriage by land and water, waits until five months of the session have passed, and then, in the very dying days of the session, he brings up, in a speech of great length, so far, and which probably is to run into a long part of to-day's session, the whole important question of canals and railways. What is the reason why these hon. gentlemen could not have brought these important questions to the attention of the House before? Is it not better that we shall have a discussion upon these great questions before the means of carrying them out, in the shape of the estimates, are submitted for consideration and brought to a point of conclusion? The estimates had been before the House for nearly three months, more than two months anyway, and yet five months of the session have passed before either of these gentlemen brought these questions up, and, as my hon. friend suggests, the railway subsidies are not yet within sight. Yet, these business men, composing this Liberal government, whose whole profession has been that they are legislating for the people and by the people, are the gentlemen who bring questions like these down at the very fag end of the session, preventing a full inquiry or a fair judgment upon any one of these matters. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) introduces this Conciliation Bill. This means that it cannot be taken up until next week. Then, how many members of this House will be present? I do not think you will find one-fifth of the members of the House present, and if you find them here, impelled by a strong sense of duty, you find them under conditions which are not favourable to a fair consideration and a fair conclusion upon measures of so much importance as this. Therefore, in the name of this parliament, I protest against this method of doing business. It is unfair and unbusiness-like, both in reference to hon. members and in reference to the question that has been placed at this period of the session before us. The hon. gentleman has sat down, and not given us one idea as to what the Bill is. He has mentioned that they are going to publish a gazette, but whether it is to be weekly or monthly, I do not know. There is not one word in reference to it. Who is to edit that gazette? Is it to be a party publication? To whom is it to be attached? The hon. gentleman has said that the report is to bear the same relation to the minister as the report of the Minister

Mr. FOSTER.

of Trade and Commerce does to that minister, or as the report of the Minister of Agriculture does to that minister. We want to know if there is to be a ministry of labour, a gentleman added to the present cabinet who shall be the Minister of Labour, and if, under his supervision and authority, the journal, weekly or monthly, whatever it is, shall be issued from Ottawa, and shall be scattered throughout the country. In what way is the journal to be issued? Who is to pay for the journal? Is the whole cost to be borne by this government? Who is to edit it, and when it is edited, is it to be edited in the interest of the party which for the time being has control of the administration? If that be so, I do not hesitate to say that it is doomed to failure from the outset. The hon. gentleman has not given us the least inkling as to how this gazette, whether it be weekly or monthly, is to be issued, and whether it is to be issued from the simply non-partisan and purely labour point of view. He is entirely silent as to whether another minister is to be added to those who already draw their salaries and so poorly perform their administrative duties. He has given us not one word in reference to the rationale or the method of his Bill. I think the hon. minister owes it to the House to give us, with the least interruption to the business of the House, a statement of the general lines and methods upon which the Bill is based that that he proposes shall be passed.

Mr. G. R. MAXWELL (Burrard). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in support of the proposition of the hon. Postmaster General in regard to this Bill. I beg to thank him with all my heart for this effort which is enshrined in this Bill, because I think there has been no Bill brought before the House for many a day that will be hailed with greater delight by the great mass of the people than this Bill. The hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Foster) called the statement of the hon. Postmaster General bombastic, prolix and verbose.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Speak louder.

Mr. BERGERON. We do not hear you.

Mr. MAXWELL. I am very sorry for the hon. gentleman if his ears are a little stopped.

Mr. BERGERON. It is the throat of the hon. gentleman that is stopped.

Mr. TISDALE. Mr. Speaker, we cannot hear, and we are most anxious to hear the hon. gentleman upon this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. If hon. gentlemen will keep order, and if the undertone amongst hon. members ceases, I think it will facilitate business very much.

Mr. MAXWELL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) called the statement of the hon.

Postmaster General bombastic, prolix and verbose. I listened most attentively to the statement of the hon. Postmaster General, and I thought it was one of the fairest, one of the calmest and one of the clearest statements possible to have been made by the hon. gentleman in reference to the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be so.

Mr. MAXWELL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) complains about the Bill being brought forward at this period of the session. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I have attended here pretty regularly for five months, and I think I am only putting it in a very fair way when I say that hon. gentlemen opposite have consumed a very great portion of time with much less important matters than that which is now before the House. So far as I am concerned, I am quite prepared to stay longer, if it be necessary, in order to have this Bill placed upon the statute-books of our country. The hon. gentleman complains also about members going away. Of course, it has been a long session, to a very great many of us far too long from the financial point of view, but as we have already made sacrifices, and as this Bill will no doubt be satisfactory to the great mass of the people in Canada, I think we are prepared, on this side of the House at least, to make further sacrifices in order to help the hon. Postmaster General in getting this measure through. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has been very unfair in his criticism of the hon. Postmaster General. He said distinctly that this was to be a monthly gazette, and that it was to be under the control of a minister to be nominated afterwards, or to be appointed afterwards by order in council.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not a new minister.

Mr. MAXWELL. Not a new minister at all, but simply one of the present ministers.

Mr. FOSTER. That is something new.

Mr. MAXWELL. It is not new information. I heard the hon. Postmaster General use these words myself. I think if the hon. gentleman had listened as attentively to the hon. Postmaster General as I did, he would not have made that mistake. As one who has known for many years something of these troubles, and as one, who, when a boy, was a victim of these troubles, I am most heartily in sympathy with this Bill. I can remember the time in Scotland when I used to work in the mines, during which time several strikes occurred, in which I was obliged to participate unwillingly. One of these strikes in particular lasted for eighteen long weeks, and not the slightest effort was ever put forth to bring the fighting parties together and bring about a modification of the difficulties. Those who have known something of the hardships of these

troubles, the privations and sufferings of the husbands, wives and children, will hail this measure in Canada with the most intense satisfaction and gratification.

Then again, with regard to labour statistics; that is incorporated now in a Bill which is in entire harmony with the demands of labour. For years the labouring men of Canada have been asking very earnestly that this statistical labour branch should be established, and I am very glad that the government has lent an ear to their demand. While this is not to be political in any sense, and not to be biassed in any sense towards any party, yet the very fact of these statistics being gathered and published from time to time will be of immense advantage to our labour interests. Again I say that I am pleased beyond measure that while we have had many serviceable Bills brought before this House since 1896, I know of no Act that will have so far-reaching an influence for good, in the prevention of labour troubles, and in the interest of the working classes of Canada, as this one is bound to have. I am prepared to make any sacrifices so far as time is concerned, or in any other way, in order to get this Bill placed on the statute-books during the present session.

Mr. T. D. CRAIG (East Durham). I believe that without exception the members of the House will admit, that this Bill is altogether too important to be introduced at this very late stage of the session. The member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) has said that it is such an important measure that he is willing to make great sacrifices for it. We can all say the same thing, but the objection is not that we are unwilling to make sacrifices, but it is that there is no need why we should make sacrifices. I challenge the members of the government to give to the House one single good reason why this Bill was not introduced three months ago.

Mr. McMULLEN. They can give half a dozen reasons.

Mr. CRAIG. I have not the slightest doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) could give half a dozen reasons, or a dozen reasons for that matter, to satisfy his conscience that everything the government does is right, or at all events that he could support it. I am doing no injustice to the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) when I make that statement, because I cannot conceive of him rising in this House and finding fault with a single action of the government. To use a common expression, he is not built that way. I say, without fear of contradiction, that if the Conservative party had introduced a Bill of this kind at this late hour in the session, there is no man in this House who would have spoken more strongly against it than the member for North Wellington, and in view of that, his

action to-day shows just how consistent he is.

The remark of the member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell) that if the session is prolonged it is because time was consumed discussing unimportant matters by the members of the opposition; that remark is absolutely without justification. I dispute that statement. The members of the opposition have not wasted time. Everybody knows that the House was called on the 1st of February, and that the government had no business to go on with for a month after that. Departmental reports were asked for over and over again; reports which were absolutely necessary to understand the business before the House, and most of those reports were delayed in presentation, and some of them have even not yet been presented to the House.

It comes with ill grace from any supporter of the government to say that time has been wasted by members of the opposition, for if we search through *Hansard*, we will find that at least as much time was taken up by supporters of the government as by gentlemen on this side of the House. After all, we are here as an opposition to discuss these things. We are here to represent the people of this country, and to show up what the government is doing so that the electors may understand it. I know little about this Bill beyond what the Postmaster General has stated. The Bill is an important one, and I have no doubt it is a good one, or, at all events, it can be made a good Bill, but one great objection to presenting it at this stage of the session is that it will be impossible to hear the opinions of the labouring men of this country with regard to its provisions. I want to hear from the labouring interests in my own constituency about this Bill, but there will be no time for them to let me know what they think about it. That is not justice to them. It is all very well for the member for Burrard to say that the labouring people will hail this measure with delight, but I can tell him that the labouring people of Canada want to do things after an intelligent fashion, and they want to understand just what this Bill proposes in their behalf. Then again, the employers of labour in Canada have had no time to study this measure. If this Bill is important in the interests of labour, and if it is a true conciliation Bill, it must be acceptable to both parties. There has been no time allowed for the employers of labour to examine into this Bill and to say what they think about it. Without entering into the merits of the Bill at all, I say that it is a sufficient objection to proceeding with it that the two great interests concerned in this country have not had time to place before the representatives of the people their views. I would offer the suggestion that this Bill be printed and distributed throughout the country, and then let it be considered next session, when we

Mr. CRAIG.

shall have the views of our constituents upon it. No interests are going to suffer in the meantime. While there have been some strikes in Canada, yet we have got along as a rule without any serious labour disturbances. I presume that the probability is that we shall have another session of this parliament, so that the government will have a chance to bring in this Bill again, and we shall then have the great advantage of hearing from the labouring men and the employers of this country, their views on this very important measure.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). I am rather surprised at the course hon. gentlemen opposite have taken.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is rather amusing to notice the bitter manner in which the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) criticised the Bill, and the statements made by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). It is quite clear that hon. gentlemen opposite feel that the government have taken the wind out of their sails by the introduction of this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes. They know they were in power for eighteen years, although they had every opportunity of dealing with this great problem, they never had the statesmanship or the manliness to introduce into this House a Bill for the purpose of making an effort to settle disputes between employers and employees. Year after year the Conservatives sat in this House with a strong following. They knew how labour disputes in the United States and in England as well, had paralysed trade and commerce; they knew that in Canada we had strikes which have seriously interfered with trade, but they made no effort to interfere to prevent them.

Notwithstanding that fact hon. gentlemen opposite, during all the years they were in power, never dared or never had the statesmanship to bring in a Bill to provide a means for adjusting those strikes. They complain that the Bill is brought in at the eleventh hour. These hon. gentlemen should look into their own record in that respect. The Bill which is properly called the Gerry-mander Act, was introduced into this House in 1882 within eight or ten days of the close of the session. They hawked it around among their followers, and from one constituency to another, until it was in a shape to suit their friends, and then they introduced it and rushed it through in the dying hours of the session. The Redistribution Bill of 1891 was also introduced and passed in the dying hours of the session. Then, take all their grants to railways; will the hon. member for York mention a single year in which they introduced their grants to railways within one month of the closing of the ses-

sion? No, he will not. They were always introduced in the dying hours of the session.

Mr. DAVIN. Why do you not condemn this government for doing the same thing?

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend had better keep his temper. It is desirable that these Bills should be introduced at the very earliest moment. The hon. Postmaster General has done many good things for Canada. He has presided over the department of which he is the head with great credit to himself and great advantage to the country; but he has never introduced a Bill into this House for which he will receive more gratitude than the Bill which he has introduced to-day. It is a Bill that will enable employers and their employees to settle their disputes by arbitration. It is a Bill that is very much wanted, and hon. gentlemen opposite realize that both these classes will appreciate it and recognize it as an act of statesmanship and progress such as hon. gentlemen opposite never dared to introduce during the eighteen years they occupied the Treasury benches. They complain that it is introduced in the dying hours of the session. I have never sat in a session during the last eighteen years in which there has been such persistent, never-ending delay caused by the opposition as there has been this session.

Mr. DAVIN. You were not ready for three months.

Mr. McMULLEN. Every day when the Orders of the Day were called, there was some member of the opposition ready to get up and cause a discussion to take up the time. The hon. member for Western Assinibola (Mr. Davin) might be pronounced a political jumping-jack in this House. There was not a day on which he was not on his feet to talk about something. Then, how many times has the House been able to go into supply without these hon. gentlemen bringing up some question for discussion?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am discussing the question. The hon. member for York is complaining because the Bill has come down so late, and I am showing how the Postmaster General was compelled to withhold the Bill till this time. I say that under the circumstances hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for the delay if anybody is. I will simply say, in conclusion, that the Postmaster General and all the members of the cabinet will receive the united thanks of both the labouring classes and the employers of this country for this effort to establish a system for settling labour disputes without the protracted and ruinous strikes to which the country has so often been subjected in the past.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon.

gentleman who has just taken his seat if he has seen this Bill?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, the hon. gentleman has the advantage of the rest of this House. We are now in the 147th day of this session, and this is the hour chosen by this government to submit a Bill which that hon. gentleman has declared to be the most important measure that has ever been submitted to this House. I would like to know what this government have been doing? The hon. gentleman says that their predecessors did not grapple with this question. If the question has the importance which the hon. gentleman endeavours to give to it—and I do not underrate its importance at all—he pays a poor compliment to the government of the day, who have sat on the Treasury benches during five protracted sessions without having touched the measure which he has just discovered lies at the very foundation of everything that is important to Canada. The fact is, Sir, that the House has long since learned that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is ready to endorse in advance anything that comes from the other side of the House, although the measure is one that will give the most emphatic contradiction to every principle the hon. gentleman has ever propounded. If there is one man in this House who ought to be more ashamed than another to stand up and make such an address as he has made to-day, it is the hon. member for North Wellington. Why, Sir, it is a matter of notoriety that the hon. gentleman has been compelled to sit behind the government and applaud it for acts for which he condemned their opponents. The hon. gentleman says they have taken the wind out of our sails. Well, they have the wind, but they have not much else. What is the position of this House at this moment? I have great reason to complain. I do complain, that the government should have waited until this hour to bring forward a measure of the importance of this one, and should have evaded attending to the public business of this country until a large proportion of the representatives of the people have been compelled by the necessities of their position to leave parliament and go home, because it was impossible for them to sacrifice any more of their time by remaining here to do nothing. That is the course the government have compelled us to take. From the day this House opened down to the present hour, the opposition have been most anxious to forward the public business in every possible way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, and I say that public business has been retarded, and the House has been held down, by the sluggish incapacity of this government to do its duty. Early in the session I said to an

hon. member of the government: 'What is the matter? What is the reason the House has nothing to do but to meet and adjourn?' He said: 'You have deceived us badly.' I said: 'How so?' He said: 'We relied upon you for a three weeks' debate, and you gave us only three days.' That was the complaint, and it was a well-founded complaint. The fact is, the hon. gentlemen hoped, while the opposition were debating the most empty address, probably, that ever was presented for the consideration of this parliament, to get their ideas together and to be able to propound some scheme by which they might hope to stem the current of unpopularity—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes—the current of unpopularity that they knew to be rushing like a torrent against them, and only awaiting an opportunity on the part of the great electorate of Canada to sweep them out of power, as the Liberal government of 1878 was swept out of power. And for what reason? It was for the utter incapacity to administer the public affairs of this country, that the Mackenzie government—the Mackenzie-Laurier government—was swept out of power in 1878, and that by one of the most overwhelming verdicts that ever was delivered in this country or any other. Independent Conservatives, who were misled, when an election was suddenly sprung upon the country, gave Mr. Mackenzie a majority of seventy, in 1874. And yet, after four years of misrule, but not so bad after incapacity, but not so great, and corruption not to be compared with that, and under the present administration the moment the independent electorate of Canada had an opportunity they swept that government out of power by a majority of eighty-six. Has any country ever produced such a spectacle? A government brought into power by a majority of seventy, in four years was swept out by a majority of eighty-six. And a similar condition of things exists to-day. The same causes, intensified by corruption to which Canada had always been a stranger until this government secures power—corruption not only on the part of ministers of the Crown, corruption not only shown in measures of the worst character ever offered for the consideration of an independent parliament, but acts of corruption so monstrous that a number of gentlemen behind the government though anxious to support them, were forced to abandon them, and vote against measures that they proposed. The same incapacity that marked the Mackenzie-Laurier government marks this, while, under this government, we see corruption at which Canada stands aghast. It has grown so monstrous that the First Minister, finding that he could not get even his pliant supporters behind him to support the government in refusing an exposure, by the con-

tinued work of the Privileges and Elections Committee, had to bring forward a measure which he based upon the declaration that in recent years, there had been an amount of attempted fraud in elections that demanded the attention of a Royal Commission to take that matter up, and by a searching investigation, to expose the condition of things that, otherwise would bring the utmost disgrace upon this country. I will not detain the House by showing how the hon. gentleman kept his promise to the ear, but broke it to the hope. He did appoint a commission, but took good care, as on former occasions of a similar character, to so emasculate their power as to prevent the far-reaching inquiry to which he had pledged himself in order to expose the corruption which had transpired within the last few years, and at which, he stated frankly to the House, even as he stood aghast. What has been the course of the present session? It is absurd to say that the opposition have obstructed, or done anything except shown the utmost readiness to promote public business. What do we find in the record of the session? We find that, having no business for the House, the government has resurrected the old dead Redistribution Bill, merely for the purpose of killing time. They knew that it was a waste of time again to put that measure before the parliament of Canada, after it had been decently interred. But these ghoulish vampires dragged from the grave this Redistribution Bill, and brought it, with its offensive effluvia about it, from its sepulchral abode, again to offend our senses. And what next? Finding again that they had nothing to do, the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), brought in a resolution, as he said, for the settlement of disputes. Why did he not then bring in this conciliation measure? The government had had four years to consider the matter, and I think the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) himself will be compelled to admit that four years is enough to enable a government to bring forward one measure worthy the consideration of this parliament. Search through the records for the last four years, down now to the closing days of the fifth session, and you search in vain to find a single attempt to bring forward any measure calculated to promote the progress and prosperity of Canada. At the end of four years, this measure, which the hon. member for North Wellington declares to be one of the most vital importance to the great labour interest of this country—and no one will hesitate to admit that no question demands of parliament more careful consideration than one affecting the great labour element of this country—is at last brought down. That measure is brought in on the one hundredth and forty-seventh day of the session, in the dying hours of the session, when a large number of members on both sides of the House have been compelled to go to their

homes to discharge duties that they could not longer defer. I want the Postmaster General to tell me, as this question is the same as that he dealt with before, why did not he, instead of wasting the time of this House in debating the resolution which he brought forward when the government had nothing for us to do, but meet and adjourn—why did not he bring forward this Bill then? Had not he the experience? Had not he the subject before him? Has anything occurred since then to intensify this question of labour? I say it has not. The government had the whole thing before them. But they have shown their utter incapacity to administer the public affairs of this country, by bringing a measure which they declare to be of such importance, to be brought down in the dying hours of the session, when it is impossible that it can receive that attention from members of the House that it should receive, and when it is impossible for the members to gather from public opinion such data and facts as would enable them properly to deal with this question.

Then we had another measure this session—a vote of confidence in the government proposed by one of the leading supporters of the government on the back benches. This also occupied a portion of the time of this House, and wasted it in a perfectly useless discussion. The Minister of Finance was not ready with his budget speech, as he should have been, with all the time and opportunity he had at his disposal, and so, in lieu of other business, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) was put up by the government to anticipate the budget speech and move a vote of confidence in the government on a question that covered all those within the budget itself. Was there any regard for the public time and convenience of this parliament in adopting such a course? On the contrary, it is an additional proof that this session has been wasted from the hour it met down to the present by the government themselves dealing with public business in a way never before witnessed.

What have we further? We have the supplementary estimates of seven and a quarter million dollars laid on the Table, after a number of the members have been compelled to leave for home and when it is utterly impossible for that enormous additional appropriation to receive anything like the consideration it ought to receive. What have we now? We have now the fact before us that the Minister of Finance, forgetting all the pledges of the past, forgetting every declaration, forgetting that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was submerged up to his neck in declarations of bitter hostility against the extravagance of the Conservative party,—we have the hon. Minister of Finance calling for an expenditure of \$14,000,000 over the ordinary expenditure of the late government, and no doubt we will find the hon.

member for North Wellington rising equal to the occasion and declaring that this addition of \$14,000,000 to our expenditure is one of the most delightful things we could possibly contemplate. We will find him defending this overwhelming expenditure, which he used to denounce in times past as the means by which a government can bribe constituencies by the erection of public works and other public expenditure.

I ask the hon. Minister of Railways where are the subsidies that parliament is going to be asked for this year? Are there to be any subsidies? Or is the list so long that the hon. minister is ashamed and afraid to produce it? He remembers, I suppose, the emphatic declaration of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) given to the people and embalmed in the pages of *Hansard* that railway subsidies are the most dire and objectionable form of public corruption that any government can resort to. Is the delay in bringing down these railway subsidies due to a desire on the part of the government to escape the full examination and exposure which might otherwise be given of that expenditure, in describing which the Minister of Trade and Commerce declared that all that was necessary for a government to do, that wanted to remain in power until the end of its days, was to put in sufficient railway subsidies to buy up the constituencies of this country and enable them to control the independent voice of the electorate.

Let me say this to the hon. member for North Wellington, when he gets up, let us have less wind and more substance. Let him put his finger upon one Act of this government that has done anything for Canada. Let him show any measure of public importance, or anything calculated to redeem the promises and pledges these gentlemen gave to the electorate when seeking power.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This discussion is a very fair example of the tactics followed by the opposition all through this session. Complaint is made to-day that a most important measure is brought down late in the session, and yet when it is admitted that we should endeavour to expedite business, we have had the full whole forenoon consumed in a most useless debate. The hon. the leader of the opposition has gone all over the record and spoken on everything he could possibly think of. He has given us a rehash of his old speeches, which have been repeated again and again.

The hon. gentleman makes me smile when he speaks of capacity for corruption. We know his record too well not to appreciate his remarks at their just worth, and he has just given us a measure of his own capacity in the volume of words he has addressed to the House. He spoke of a motion introduced late in the session by the Post-

master General for establishing a fair system of fair wages, and he has mistaken that for the measure for settling disputes.

Let me remind the hon. gentleman that if he forgets his own record the people of the country know it and remember it well. He has dared to speak of the late Mr. Mackenzie. Well, if ever there was a man who was bitterly assailed by the hon. gentleman, it was Mr. Mackenzie, but Mr. Mackenzie has had ample revenge because if there ever was a man applauded by the hon. gentleman it has been the same Mr. Mackenzie ever since he has been no longer in life.

The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) complained that my hon. friend has introduced this measure in a speech full of words but without substance. What a reproach from that hon. gentleman. What have we heard from him this session, but speeches three and four hours long, abounding in words but lacking in ideas.

The Bill introduced to-day was announced in the speech from the Throne and the Postmaster General has done the very thing that hon. gentleman opposite say should be done. He has consulted the parties interested, the workingmen, the employers and the employees, and we have a result of his consultations in the Bill before the House. It is a most important measure, but I would be much surprised if it should be found to be a contentious measure. On the contrary, I believe it will be accepted by both sides because it is not a contentious measure, but simply the embodying and crystallizing of ideas that have been long in the minds of the people. Therefore, I do not think that the discussion need be lengthy.

Now, Sir, I do not want to follow the example which has been given us by the hon. gentleman. I might be tempted to retaliate upon him, but I will not do so. The hours are too precious at the present time, and we want to proceed to business. But if I had a piece of advice to give to the hon. gentleman, the leader of the opposition—perhaps he will not take it from me, we are on good terms personally, I hope, though politically we are far apart—but if I were to presume to give him advice it would be, when he speaks, to give us less wind and more substance.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). This is a government that has even to borrow its jokes. The right hon. gentleman was so poverty-stricken in resource that he has to do what we often see done when we throw a stone at a certain kind of canine animal not strong enough to face us, and he bites the stone and lets you go by in peace. I will postpone what I have to say upon the merits of this measure until the second reading; but I find on comparing it with the English Act that up to the fourth or fifth clause it is a replica of the English Act, and then some

new and important provisions are introduced, for instance, the creation of a labour bureau and a gazette, which are not found in the English Act. The hon. gentleman has not said a word about the Act of the same kind that was passed in New Zealand, and which has been at work there since 1895; he does not seem to be aware of how that Act has worked.

Now, Sir, I must say that I entirely endorse the position taken by the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), and by the leader of the opposition. My hon. friend from York complained that a measure so important, so far-reaching, touching the two great interests of labour and capital, is introduced at a period of the session when many of the representatives of both parties are not in this House. Is not that a fair and proper criticism? What happened when my hon. friend from York made that criticism? The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen)—I see he has fled the House—rises up, and instead of dealing with the Bill, he brings a lot of unfounded charges against the opposition as to its conduct during this session, and then goes back over a series of years in recriminations that are boomerangs and rebound on the hon. gentleman himself. I have just come from the hon. gentleman's constituency; and when a gentleman said in the meeting we had there that the hon. gentleman was about to leave them his last will and testament, and to leave them a legacy of himself, one gentleman got up and said: All I ask is that he will leave me his gall. I say, Mr. Speaker, that a gentleman who defends this government by merely saying that it does the things he loves, is quite worthy of the appreciation of that gentleman up in North Wellington, who said that all he wanted was his gall. It was a good appreciation of the anatomical make-up of the hon. gentleman. The right hon. gentleman reproached the leader of the opposition with confusing the motions, and he said that a motion introduced some time ago by the Postmaster General respecting fair wages, had nothing to do with the settlement of disputes. Now, how do disputes between capital and labour arise? Is it not that the labourer demands more wages and the capitalist says he will not give it? That is a sample of the superficial criticism that usually falls from the Prime Minister. Now, what is the picture presented by this government in the dying hours of the session? It is a drowning government catching at every straw in sight, and this is one of the things it catches at to save itself. It has been looking around lately to know how it was to float, and it has snatched at one thing after another, and one of the things it has snatched at is such extravagance and boundless expenditure that the result will be that the weight of that expenditure will carry it down instead of

keeping it up. We have a Postmaster General who is past master in trying to manipulate certain interests for election purposes. He was connected with the *Weekly Sun* of Toronto—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never was.

Mr. DAVIN. Was not the hon. gentleman part proprietor of it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Never.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I leave that statement to go abroad. I leave the statement of the hon. Postmaster General that he never had anything to do with the *Farmers' Sun*—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Never.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I let that go abroad. Of course, I have to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, and I accept it. But we know that that hon. gentleman, while the old government was in power, paid attention to the agricultural interests; he was very attentive to the interests of the consumers of coal oil; but he is silent now in regard to the wrongs of the consumers of coal oil, and in regard to the wrongs of the farmers. Now he is coming forward to angle and fish for the labour vote; he comes forward after four years in power, and at the dying hours of the session. The hon. member for North Wellington reproached the opposition that they were eighteen years in power, and did not bring forward this measure. Well, these gentlemen have been four years in power, and with a statute of that kind in England, and a statute of a similar kind since 1895 in New Zealand, they have not brought this Bill forward, until the closing hours of the present session. Mr. Speaker, all these efforts on the part of the hon. gentlemen to save themselves will be unavailing. As the leader of the opposition has said in his own eloquent and powerful manner, the judgment of this country has gone out against them. Take the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), he knows that. He has been up west, he has seen the way ministers of the Crown were received, he has seen the way the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), were received in the west. Why, Sir, they were received in such a manner that even the Conservatives took pity on them, and showed them some hospitality. The right hon. gentleman spoke about corruption. Well, Sir, you cannot keep corruption entirely out of any popular government, but I say that the corruption of the whole eighteen years the Conservatives were in power was but a molehill to the mountain that has been piled up in four years by the nepotists, by the manipulators in deals, by the winkers at fraud, skilful in contrivances to put money into the pockets of friends and middlemen,

brothers-in-law, sons-in-law, and all other relatives. They have all been satisfied. There are very few hon. gentlemen on those benches at whom the finger of scorn cannot be pointed as men who have forsworn all they have promised while on this side of the House. The people are armed against them, and the moment they get a chance, the people, who are the judge and jury, will bring in against them a verdict of guilty, and the punishment will be banishment from the ministerial benches.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, having an interest in the Bill before the House, and deeming it one that we should consider it in an entirely different manner from the way in which it has been considered upon the other side of the House, I wish to make a few remarks upon it. First of all let me say that reference has been made by the last speaker (Mr. Davin) to my visit to the North-west Territories. I was quite satisfied with it.

Mr. DAVIN. We were quite satisfied.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Perfectly satisfied, and if the hon. gentleman by the simple statement thinks that he is making anything out of it he is very much mistaken.

Mr. BENNETT. How about Greenway?

Mr. DAVIN. How about your reception at Moosomin?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). All I have to say about the North-west Territories is that the North-west Territories are all right, and that the hon. member for Western Assinibola (Mr. Davin) will find that even his majority of one will diminish so that he will not be heard of again. I was amused at his reference to corruption. If there is a man in this House, in view of recent matters before this parliament this session that should be quiet on that subject, it is the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough) allow the hon. member for Western Assinibola (Mr. Davin) to state what his point of order is?

Mr. DAVIN. The point of order is this: He says that I referred to corruption, and that if there is any gentleman in this House, after what has taken place this session, who should not do that it is myself. What is the meaning of that? He must take it back.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Because the hon. gentleman pretends not to understand it I must take it back! I cannot do that. He understands it right well.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order again. The hon. gentleman must take that back.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER. All I have to say to the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is that he has no right to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough).

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do I understand the Chair, for the first time in this House, to rule that an hon. member cannot rise to a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. I want to say to the hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) that he is clearly out of order, and so is the hon. member for Western Assiniboia. The hon. member for Western Assiniboia stated his point of order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He attempted to state one.

Mr. SPEAKER. But he had no right to state one in the middle of a statement of the hon. member for Guysborough. I simply asked the hon. member for Guysborough to allow the hon. member for Western Assiniboia to make his statement.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Passing from that, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I simply make the statement that if there is a man in this House who ought to be silent in that respect the hon. member for Western Assiniboia is the man. Let him judge of it as he likes; I make the statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask the Chair whether it is competent for one gentleman to charge another member of this House with corruption.

Mr. DAVIS. You have been doing it right along.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not understand the hon. member for Guysborough to say that he was charging the hon. member for Western Assiniboia with personal corruption.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He made a most distinct charge against the hon. member for Western Assiniboia.

Mr. SPEAKER. You should be the last man in the House to make that statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER. In view of the statements that the hon. leader of the opposition made in his remarks respecting the government, I think he is the last man to raise that point of order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am bound to say that it is exceedingly inopportune for the hon. leader of the opposition to raise that question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will you permit me to say—?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That the Speaker of the House should make personal charges against a member of this House is absolutely without a parallel.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not making any personal charge against the hon. leader of the opposition.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You are making a gross personal charge.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then, I may say that I have no intention of doing so.

Mr. FOSTER. It is an indefensible charge. No Speaker ever made such a charge before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no member on that side of the House—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DAVIN. The Prime Minister is responsible for the conduct of those who sit behind him and he is responsible for this kind of thing.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. I think we ought to have an explicit declaration as to where we stand in this House. As I understand it the Speaker of this House rose in his place, and turning to the hon. leader of the opposition told him to his face that he was the last man in this House to make such a statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. TAYLOR. You will do no business to-day nor to-morrow, nor all week.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Speaker did state—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, he has not misunderstood you.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing personal between the hon. leader of the opposition and myself. I have no desire to be unfair to any hon. member of this House. I would be very sorry if any member of this House thought that I, by any means, undertook to charge the hon. leader of the opposition with improper conduct or with making an improper statement. What I wanted to convey was that his statement was not

well founded, and that there was no ground for making the charge against the hon. member for Guysborough that he did. Coming back to the statement of the hon. member for Guysborough, I understand that the hon. gentleman withdraws anything personal as against the hon. member for Western Assiniboia.

Mr. DAVIN. No, he has not done so; he must withdraw.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). As I was about to say, now that we have cleared the air—

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. gentleman has withdrawn the charge against the hon. member for Western Assiniboia?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). There is nothing to take back.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I will not take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think my hon. friend could close the matter by simply saying that there is nothing personal as against the hon. member for Western Assiniboia.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). There is no personal allusion to any particular member more than the statement contains.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I will repeat the statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should not continue the discussion. If he withdraws the statement we will go on.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I am going to do it. As I was saying the hon. gentleman opposite—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw, withdraw.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I understood Mr. Speaker to say: Let us go on now.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he did not mean to make any personal charge.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I did not make a personal charge. All I said was that it did not look well in the hon. gentleman's mouth to mention the word corruption after what has been done in this House this session.

Mr. BERGERON. There is the whole thing again.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I say that anything like reasonable debate in this House is at an end, if, when the Chair rules that a statement by an hon. member must be taken back, it is taken back in such

a way as to make it worse and to reaffirm it more strongly than before. The hon. gentleman must unreservedly take it back or he cannot proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER. I agree with the hon. leader of the opposition that any personal charges should be withdrawn.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I have made no personal charges.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). If Mr. Speaker says that my statement was out of order I withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER. That ends the matter. Now, we will go on with the debate.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Now, I am going to say to the hon. leader of the opposition—

Mr. SPEAKER. Let us discuss the question at issue and drop these personal matters.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Indeed! Are we to have the bitterest denunciation of the government from the other side, and we are not to say one word in defence. The leader of the opposition and his whole horde are mistaken if they think that kind of thing is to go on.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. My point of order is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) has no right to speak of any section of the members of this House as a 'horde.'

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I will withdraw, and say the crowd at his back.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and you will take back everything that is wrong, if you stay there for three days.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). If there is a member in this House who ought not indulge in loud talk about the future, it is the leader of the opposition. We heard him stand in his place before last election and grandiloquently declare that he was going to sweep the country, and we know how utterly he was defeated. We know how the hon. gentleman can indulge in exaggeration. Why, last election when he was out in Ontario he received two telegrams from Quebec, and at the morning meeting he said he had many telegrams pledging an overwhelming majority from Quebec; in the afternoon he said he had scores of telegrams, and in the evening he was overwhelmed with telegrams. That is the style of the hon. gentleman. He tells us that the country is with him, but if that is so it is a peculiar thing that he should get up in this House and abuse and denounce a measure which is intended for the benefit of the tolling masses in Canada. If he is sure the country is with him why does not the leader of the opposition ap-

proach this matter like a statesman, and say this is a good Bill.

Mr. CRAIG. It is too late.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Too late to do good. Why, I thought the hon. member (Mr. Craig) had some ideas of the principles of Christianity. It is not too late. We are moving in the direction of the legislation in force in Great Britain, and I submit that the question before the House is not whether the government is corrupt or not, but it is whether this Bill is a good Bill or not. The day for bluff to carry an election is gone by.

Mr. COCHRANE. You found that out in Manitoba.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). And you will find it out in Northumberland.

Mr. COCHRANE. Come up and try.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I am going to go where there is some work to be done, and it requires no work to defeat the hon. gentleman. I submit that we badly require in this country the taking of statistics so as to understand the condition of labour. The position of the labour in Canada is different from what it is in the old land, because in England the representatives of labour can meet and make their power felt, but in Canada as a rule the workingmen are scattered in small communities. In the larger cities they do come together to some extent, but unfortunately they have not that information about labour throughout the country which would enable them to co-operate. There is not a public man in England who has not at his finger ends the very best statistics about labour, and there is not an intelligent labourer there who has not an opportunity of studying these statistics. So it is that the labourers and the statesmen in England can come together, and as a result the progress of legislation there is such that the workingman in Great Britain is in a better position to-day than his confrere in any country in the world. In the United States they do not understand it. The whole question there is, not what would be just and fair in the interests of the country and in the interests of labour and of capital; but the question is: What will be its political effect. As our population grows here from year to year, the labouring problem will become all the more prominent, and in order that we may understand the relations of capital and labour, and in order that labour which is the foundation of capital, and which will make Canada a great nation, shall receive just and proper protection under the laws, it is important that this Bill should pass. We anticipated this in Nova Scotia, as we anticipate all progressive movements. We had strikes in the coal mines in that province, and when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, he introduced what was practically a conciliation Bill, and I say that no one Bill ever passed in the legislature of my province did more to prevent strikes and to conciliate labour and capital than did that Bill. If this Bill which we are now debating is a good Bill, is it any argument against it to say that the government is corrupt?

Mr. CRAIG. Is it too late to bring it in.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). There again the true Christian spirit comes out. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) does not believe in instant conversion or instant reformation. Time is the essence of the contract with him in all things; and at the back of it all he expects to make a little political capital out of it.

Mr. CRAIG. Not a bit of it.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). This Bill is on the lines of the legislation existing in England, and we have plenty of time in one day to seriously consider it. If there is a member in this House who has not studied the question of labour in Canada he is not fit to represent any constituency in this country. The representative in this parliament who has not made a study of the questions affecting labour and capital in Canada, has not been alive to the public questions of the day. I take it that there is hardly a member of parliament here who has not large bodies of men engaged in mining, in lumbering, in manufacturing, and in the different avocations of life.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) mean to say that every member in this House is sufficiently informed as to the problems involved in the question of labour and capital, to pass this Bill without discussion?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Every member in this House ought to know the needs of labour and capital if he has studied the current questions of the day.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) think he himself is so informed?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I have given the question my best study, and speaking modestly, I believe that I do fairly well understand the question of labour and capital.

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us something about it.

Mr. BERGERON. Have you ever read the Bill?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I can understand that the hon. gentlemen opposite do not study the question. I can understand, for example, the man who only wants to boost the workingman getting up and saying: 'I am a friend of the workingman; I am

your man.' That is entirely different from the study of the question. He is simply the vote-taker without reference to the conditions of the man whose vote he is asking. But the man who has studied the question will understand it differently; and I would feel that there was no hope for Canadian legislation in this direction or in any other direction that was right if the hon. members of this House could not more intelligently approach a Bill of this kind. Let us take the Bill and see what is good in it, instead of talking about the dying hours of the session. I trust that we have not received the valedictory of the hon. leader of the opposition; for, with all his faults, he is a giant, whichever way he goes, a giant in statement, a giant in prophecy. Talk of Isaiah and Jeremiah and Ezekiel and all the other prophets; they are not in it with the hon. gentleman. If he were among the prophets of old and the prophets of to-day, he would be elected perpetual high prophet of them all. He would give them answers in a speech of half an hour, he would convince them in an hour, and he would then make them all bow their heads in two hours, in regard to prophecy of the past, the present and the future. He would explain all the prophecies of the past to mean what he wants, he would explain the prophecies of the present to mean just what he says, and he would point to the future with all the influences of heaven and earth converging to return him to power. So that he would cover the whole ground. What has that to do with this Bill? It is marvellous that on the first reading of the Bill such an exhibition should be made. Let hon. gentlemen opposite read the Bill, and let every member, whatever his politics is, approach this question with an honest desire of seeing if there is not in the Bill that which is going to help the wage-earner and the son of toil in Canada, while not doing any injury to legitimate capital. Because, I believe there is, I hope that this House, irrespective of anything else, will come to the consideration of the measure honestly desirous of doing all we can in the direction in which reform is necessary.

Mr. THOS. BEATTIE (London). Mr. Speaker, I must confess that it is somewhat amusing to listen to the members of the government and their supporters, talking of their great interest in the workingman; but their actions do not bear out their words. Three years ago we had an Act passed which was of quite as much if not more importance to the workingman than the present Bill; but that Act is to-day a dead letter. I refer to the Alien Labour Act. There are a large number of workingmen in this country who have been suffering severely during the last three years in consequence of workingmen being brought from the United States and put in their places. At Belleville, the Grand Trunk Railway discharged a number of its employees and put

Americans in their places. The same thing has taken place in London and other places. Then, only a short time ago a ticket clerk at Buffalo was absent for a few days on account of sickness, and a man was sent from London to take his place while he was sick; but that man was sent back to Canada. If the government imagine that they are going to obviate all labour difficulties by this Act, they are much mistaken. They had better put in force the Act already in existence before they pass another.

It being One o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I regret very much that I was not in the House when the hon. the Postmaster General introduced his Bill, but I have had an opportunity of glancing over it hurriedly, and I find in it some few imperfections. In the first place it does not define whether or not it interferes with any establishment employing, we will say, from one hand upwards. In other Acts that I know of, take the provincial Act of Ontario, a restriction is placed as regards the size of the factories to which such Acts shall apply. The Ontario Act only applies to factories engaging ten men and upwards. But the Bill before the House does not say anything with respect to the number of employees with which the arbitrators, provided under that Bill, will have power to deal. Then the Ontario Act is not compulsory, but only applies when the parties consent to have it applied, and the question occurs to me, whether we have the right to pass legislation of the kind submitted by the Postmaster General, and which will come into conflict with provincial Acts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). It is not customary to discuss the details of a measure on the first reading, but I do not wish in the slightest degree to interfere with the hon. gentleman's right to raise these points at this stage. I do not quite appreciate his question.

Mr. INGRAM. I have just said that the Bill before the House does not define the number of hands to which it will apply. It does not say whether it will apply in the case of one employee having a difficulty with his employers, or whether there must be a number of employees, and if so, what number. I would like also to know whether this Bill will apply to the province of Ontario, where there is an Arbitration Act in force, with all the machinery necessary to apply it to disputes of every description between employers, who employ over ten men and upwards, and their employees. I would, therefore, ask the hon. gentleman whether this Bill, if it should become law, will apply to the province of Ontario?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This measure deals with differences and trade disputes, '7' a trade dispute or a difference

is irrespective of the number of disputants, so that it would apply to anything that came within the definition of a trade dispute or a difference. On referring to clause 3, the hon. gentleman will find what is contemplated to be dealt with by the measure :

Where a difference exists or is apprehended to exist between an employer or any class of employers and workmen, or between different classes of workmen, the minister may, if he sees fit, inquire into these causes and adjust the differences.

The rest of the clause goes on to elaborate that provision. Of course the Bill will apply to the whole Dominion, and its aim will be to promote the establishment of conciliation boards throughout the Dominion, and thus have machinery for dealing with such differences when they unhappily arise.

Mr. INGRAM. I know well that it is not customary to discuss the details of the Bill on its first reading, and I am not in a position to discuss them because I have only read it but once, and very hurriedly, but I have always understood that the provincial governments have power to pass certain legislation, and that legislation passed by this parliament conflicting with such legislation, would be ultra vires. In Ontario we have an Act respecting councils of conciliation and arbitration. I know that some years ago this Act applied to everything affecting labour, except wages. But in the province of Ontario, the greatest difficulties between employers and their employees have arisen on the question of wages, and I introduced an amendment, which was carried through the local legislature, giving these boards the right to deal with the question of wages, the same as every other question. Still this Act of the Ontario legislature is of very little importance, because it cannot be put in force without the consent of both parties to the dispute. So it is with my hon. friend's Bill. Supposing employees are dissatisfied and desire to have an arbitration, they must previously have the consent of the opposite party in the dispute, and if an employer refuses arbitration, the Act is useless.

I am one of those who believe that while arbitration may be a very difficult matter to deal with, there are some disputes—those which cause public interest to suffer—which power should be placed in the hands of the government to interfere with, and settle. Take the city of Ottawa, we have here a very fine electric railway system. Supposing a dispute should arise between the employers and the employees on that system, the present Bill would be entirely useless if the employers refused to consent to arbitration. A provision should, therefore, be put in the Act to meet such cases, by enabling the government, at a certain stage of the dispute, to interfere, and compel a settlement. Take the case of St. Louis, for instance, there public life has been endangered and several

Mr. MULOCK.

lives lost, by its people taking the law into their own hands ; and if such a case should occur in Canada, it would be advisable that some power should be in the hands of the government to deal effectively with it.

Reference has been made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) to the alien labour law. He said he understood the labour question well and was speaking, as he believed, in the interest of labour. I do think the alien labour law, like the law introduced by the hon. member, lacks in the quality of workableness. It should be amended, so that less machinery shall be necessary to gain the object in view. No person can deny that our workmen are suffering more or less and that our alien labour law is not sufficiently stringent to protect the labourers against injustice inflicted upon them. The government should amend the Act so as to make it more workable and give better satisfaction to the country. I do not wish to take up the time of the House now, because I know that we shall have another opportunity when the Bill is in our hands.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). I do not wish to delay the House, but I must express pleasure that provision is being made for the collection of statistics with regard to labour. I rise chiefly for the purpose of urging upon the government the necessity of arranging for the collection of crop statistics in connection with the Department of Agriculture. Arrangements were made some time ago for that purpose, and I am sorry that the present minister has not carried them out. In my judgment, there is nothing of more value to the farmers than to have reliable information which will enable them to form a judgment whether they should sell their grain or not, and this could not be in better form than in the form of reliable crop statistics compiled by the Department of Agriculture. I hope they will deal with the subject when they are dealing with labour statistics.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. minister (Mr. Mulock) what he means by a 'department' of labour? If it is a department in the ordinary sense of the word, that means a departmental head and another portfolio. But, I presume this is a branch of some other department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Clause 1 of the Bill states that the working out of this Act shall be placed by order in council in charge of one of the ministers. Therefore, this does not mean the establishment of a new portfolio. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) suggested the word 'bureau.' That is a term often used.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is used in the United States.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. In the Imperial Act it is called a department of labour. It is not presided over by a

separate minister, but is attached to the Board of Trade, a department like that of Trade and Commerce here.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is attached to the Department of Agriculture in the United States.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. The head of the Board of Trade in England, who has this matter in charge, has many other subjects in charge also. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) may rest assured that, no matter what may be the name assigned, it is not intended to create a new portfolio and have an additional minister. If there was no definition of duties, one might be in doubt. But, on reference to the Bill, the hon. gentleman will observe that the duties of the department of labour are named by the Bill. For the present, these duties consist of the gathering and digesting of statistical information and preparing it in popular form for publication, and publishing it in the form of a monthly labour gazette.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

#### JUSTINIAN SAMPSON AND THE FISH BOUNTY.

Mr. GILLIES asked :

1. Did Justinian Sampson, of Lower L'Ardoise, Richmond County, Nova Scotia, receive the fish bounty for the season of 1899?

2. If not, why, and upon whose report or advice was the same withheld?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows: 1. No. 2. Because no claim for such bounty has been received at the department at Ottawa.

#### BASIC SLAG FERTILIZER.

Mr. DOMVILLE asked :

1. Did the Minister of Inland Revenue receive a copy of the following letter:

United States Dept. of Agriculture,  
Division of Chemistry,  
Washington, D.C.

H. W. Wiley, Chief.

E. E. Ewell, First Assistant.

W. D. Bigelow, Second Assistant.

April 13, 1900.

Mr. M. Dietsch,  
Verein deutsch-oesterr. Thomasphatfabriken,  
Hafenplatz 4, Berlin; S.W., Germany.

Dear Sir,—The proper method of analysis of the Thomas phosphate powders has been considered very carefully in this country by the Division of Chemistry of Agriculture and by the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists. Various methods of analysis have been tried very thoroughly. At the last meeting of the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists, held in San Francisco in July, 1899, the referee on phosphoric acid, as a result of the experiments which had been tried, made the following statement, on page

68 of bulletin No. 57 of this division, a copy of which I send you under separate cover: 'Of the many methods and solvents used in these trials, Wagner's method seems to be the only one that will give uniformly concordant results.'

In the second volume of my work, 'The Principles and Practice of Agricultural Chemists,' on page 74 and following are given the various methods practiced for the analysis of this material. In these the method of Wagner is given the preference, only one objection being urged to it, namely, the failure to specify the temperature at which digestion with the reagents is to be carried on.

You will see from the above that Wagner's method is the only one which has any standing in this country, in the estimation of the basic phosphatic slags, such as the Thomas phosphate powder.

The method referred to has not been adopted officially by our association simply because there is practically no commerce in such goods in this country. Should occasion arise for official control in this country, there would be no doubt of the adoption of the Wagner method in all of its essential points, as the official method for the United States.

Very truly yours,

(Sgd.) H. W. WILEY,

Chemist.

2. If so, from whom did he receive it?

3. Did he answer it?

4. If so, what answer did he give?

5. Does he now see his way clear to instruct the chief analyst of the department to adopt the Wagner method?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In reply to questions 1, 2, 3 and 4, I would say: The minister has no record of ever having received a letter from Mr. H. W. Wiley. 5. On the 6th of the present month, the minister, in answering question No. 6 of that day, stated that the department would be inclined to adopt the system recommended by the Society of Public Analysts in London, whose opinion it is proposed to ask.

#### PASSENGERS ON BOARD THE STR. ABERDEEN.

Mr. MARCOTTE asked :

1. Whether, on or about May 30 last, the steamer 'Aberdeen,' under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, made a trip from Quebec to Les Eboulements?

2. What was the object of the said trip?

3. At whose request was the said trip ordered?

4. Outside of the ordinary crew what persons took passage on board during the said trip?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would say: 1. No: the *Aberdeen* did not make any special trip to Les Eboulements, but touched there on her ordinary trip with supplies down the St. Lawrence. 2. The delivery of supplies to the different lighthouses. 3. It was made in the customary time and manner, without any special order. 4. Sir Alphonse Pelletier and party were taken from Quebec to Les Eboulements.

### SEARCH OF PREMISES OF J. H. OSBORNE. OF UTTERSON, ONT.

Mr. McCORMICK (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

1. Upon what authority did officers Floody and Franklin, of the Inland Revenue Department, search the premises of Mr. J. H. Osborne, of Utterson, Ont.?

2. If authorized by the department, what were the instructions given to said officers?

3. By whom was the information laid against Mr. Osborne, and what was the substance of said information?

4. Did the officers discover any violation of the inland revenue law on the premises of Mr. Osborne?

5. What was the nature of the officers' report to the department?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No report of any such matter has been received at the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. In reference to this question, I would ask the Prime Minister to allow that to stand. The answer given, that there is no report, does not fully cover the question on the paper. The party who has asked the question wishes to get the information that it calls for.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection.

### YUKON—APPLICATION OF C. HAMILTON AND Mr. CONSTANTINE re COAL.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (by Mr. Prior) asked :

1. Has an order in council been passed respecting an application to Mr. W. Ogilvie, commissioner of the Yukon district, by C. Hamilton, Esq., and Mr. Constantine for a coal area in said district?

2. If so, what is the date thereof?

3. If an order in council passed, did it refer to any of the areas covered by the following extract from the report of Mr. Ogilvie (33 V., Doc. Sess., 1900):

Coal.

'In my report of 1889, and also in the "Official Guide" published in 1898, I referred to the existence of coal at several points, notably on Coal Creek, in the vicinity of Forty-Mile, and at several other points in that region; also on Twelve and Fifteen-Mile Creeks, between Forty-Mile and Dawson. Since that time several discoveries of coal have been made, which I will not speak of, but simply state that they show beyond doubt that the coal-bearing zone runs through our country, crossing the Yukon River in the vicinity of the international boundary line, and continuing south-east along the base of a range of mountains named the "Ogilvy" range, to the Stewart River. Quite recently, in conversation with a miner who had prospected considerably on the Pelly River, I was assured that a distance of sixty or seventy miles up that stream, on the southerly side, he had, during the process of putting down a prospect hole, run across a seam of coal which he described as being twenty-two feet thick. This shows that fuel will not be wanted for future mining operations in that district.

Mr. McConnell, of the Geological Survey, has made an examination of part of the Indian River

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

district during the past season, and assures me he has discovered in the upper parts of the same some of the tertiary measures. This being so, it is not improbable that coal may be found there, of course, in limited areas.

I consider the existence of these coal areas most important in the development of this country; in fact, it might be considered one of the most important factors in connection with the industrial development of the country, and I am happy to be able to state that the exposures are convenient, easily worked and inexhaustible. As to its quality, I have already referred in this report to a test made of it in the steam fire-engine at Dawson, and I may safely say that it will suit all ordinary requirements.'

4. If no order in council, as above, has been passed, is the government aware whether Mr. Ogilvie is or is not interested in any of the coal areas in the said district, and if he is interested, when did he, if at all, acquire such interest?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. 1. No. 2. Answered by No. 1. 3. Answered by No. 1. 4. Although an application was filed in 1896 by Messrs. C. A. Hamilton, C. Constantine and William Ogilvie for a coal mining location within the territory described in the abstract from his report of 1899, no grant of said location was made. Mr. Ogilvie is not interested, as far as the government is aware, in any coal areas in the said or any other district.

### EMERGENCY RATIONS.

Mr. TALBOT asked :

1. Is it true that Mr. White, collector of customs at Montreal, allowed the emergency rations shipped to South Africa to enter Canada from the United States free of duty?

2. Upon what authority has he done so?

3. What is the law in a case of this nature?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. R. S. White, collector of customs, Montreal, allowed delivery of emergency rations imported from the United States on collector's permission, without payment of duty, pending entry. 2. Upon his own responsibility. 3. Under the customs laws, imported goods are required to be entered for consumption, unless entered for warehouse, before the collector's permission for the delivery of the goods shall be issued.

### TRAMP CATTLE IN NORTH-WEST.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

What steps, if any, are being taken by the government to abate the nuisance of tramp cattle from below the international boundary crowding on to the ranches and feeding grounds of our North-west?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The mounted police on the frontier are instructed to stop the encroachments of tramp cattle from the United States as far as possible. The question as to further measures for checking these encroachments is being considered.

### THE CENSUS.

Mr. DAVIN asked :

Is it the intention of the government to take the census on the 'de jure' principle? If so, why? Is not the 'de facto' the true principle? Is not the 'de facto' principle that which has been upheld in the past by the Liberal party?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). It is the intention of the government to take the census on the de jure system. The reason of this is that that has been the principle on which all the census of Canada have been taken, and that for purposes of comparison between different periods it is necessary that the new census should be taken on the same principle as the others.

### McNAB LAKE.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

Has McNab Lake, township of Keppel, been sold or leased? If so, who was the purchaser or purchasers? At what price per acre and upon what terms? If leased, to whom was it leased, what price per acre, upon what terms and for how long?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. McNab Lake, in the township of Keppel, was leased to Mr. Edward H. Horsey, of Owen Sound, for the term of 99 years, to hold the same for the purpose of draining the lake and removing marl, clay and any other materials found therein from the land leased upon payment therefor of a yearly rental of \$100. The lease provides that the lessee shall begin operations within one year from April 3, 1901, and operate the same for at least, three months in each year. The other conditions in the lease are the usual ones as regards payment of taxes, &c., transfer of lease, sale of liquor and re-entry for non-payment of rent.

### SUPERINTENDENT MILITIA STORES, QUEBEC.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Who is superintendent of militia stores at Quebec?

2. Have any instructions been issued to him giving him authority to take the regular employees of the stores away from their regular duties to do his private gardening, furniture moving, &c.?

3. If not, will the government make inquiries and ascertain if the superintendent has not been using these employees for such work?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Lieut.-Colonel W. H. Forrest. 2. No. 3. Yes. I may explain that I found this gentleman in office when I came in. I do not know what evil habits he may have fallen into prior to my coming into office. It is possible he may have fallen into some and he may have continued therein. I will make inquiry into the matter.

### BELFAST AND MURRAY HARBOUR RAILWAY.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the government decided to proceed with the survey and construction of a cross section of the Belfast and Murray Harbour Railway from some point not far from Caledonia, passing at or near Montague Bridge to Cardigan Station or New Perth, on the Prince Edward Island Railway, as proposed by notice of resolution on the 21st day of April, 1896, by the late Minister of Railways?

2. Has the government received any petitions asking for the survey or construction of this cross section? If so, how many, including the number of names thereto attached?

3. Has the government decided to call for tenders for the construction of section of the Belfast and Murray Harbour Railway from Village Green to the terminus or any intervening points?

4. Has the government definitely decided as to route, where loop lines have been surveyed? If so, state, with particulars, the route decided upon?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The government has not yet decided to build the cross section or branch line referred to in the question, but the minister hopes to be able to make a personal examination of the locality this summer with a view of reporting to his colleagues thereon. 2. Yes, petitions have been received asking for the survey or construction of this cross section. Four petitions were received. One from Murray River in King's County, signed by Charles L. Barnes, and four others. One from Melville, P.E.I., signed by A. M. Beaton. Another from Grand View and Wood Islands signed by Malcolm E. MacDonald, secretary. A fourth petition received from John G. Mackenzie, corresponding secretary of the Belfast and Murray Harbour Association, and D. MacPhee, secretary of the Glen William Railway Association, signed by thirty persons. 3. Yes, tenders will be called at an early day, but the minister hopes first to make a personal examination of the localities as rival routes are being pressed upon the department for adoption. 4. No, answered by preceding question.

### HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, SOUTH-PORT.

Mr. MARTIN asked :

1. When are tenders to be called for the construction of the Hillsborough Bridge at Southport, in Prince Edward Island? Are the tenders to be called for the work as a whole? If not, what division of the work is proposed to be made?

2. What limit of time is proposed for the completion of the work?

3. Does the government provide for the safety of foot-passengers and other persons using the highway portion of the bridge?

4. What is the estimated cost of the bridge now proposed to be built? What was the estimated cost of bridge proposed to be built under section 2 of chapter 4 of the Statutes of 1899?

5. What proportionate share of the cost of the bridge is the province of Prince Edward Island to contribute under the agreement for construction entered into on the 18th day of April, 1899?—capitalizing the half-yearly subsidy from the province at current rate of interest?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). 1. Preparations are being made for inviting tenders for this work, and hope in a few days to send out advertisements to newspapers. The work will be divided into two sections, the sub-structure in one, and the superstructure in the other. 2. Not yet fixed. 3. I ask the hon. gentleman to allow that to stand. The answer I have received does not correspond with my own recollection of the facts. 4. The estimated cost of the bridge is \$750,000. The original estimate was, something less than \$1,000,000. 5. The provincial government shall contribute annually towards the interest on the cost of the construction and maintenance of the said bridge the sum of \$9,750 per annum, in semi-annual payments of \$4,875; that such contribution shall be deducted half-yearly by the Dominion government from the grants, subsidies or allowances payable by the Dominion government to the said province, the first deduction on account thereof to be made from the grant, allowance or subsidy due and payable to the said province next after the completion of the said bridge, pro rata, according to the number of days elapsing between the date of such completion and the date of payment of such first allowance.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

**Mr. G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to mention that a rumour is going about in the House and in the newspapers that the prohibition question is to be brought up on Monday. I do not think there has been any statement made in the House about it, and I would like the First Minister to say what truth there is in the rumour.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It has been represented to me that Monday will not be a convenient day, and that Tuesday would be more convenient to several hon. members, and the government are prepared to give Tuesday.

**Mr. T. D. CRAIG** (East Durham). Will the House sit on Monday?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I think the House will sit on Monday, and on Saturday also.

**Mr. CRAIG**. There is a strong feeling among some of the members that we ought not to sit on Monday, Dominion Day. We have only one national holiday for the Dominion, it is a holiday all over the country, all the cities and towns are celebrating that day. In my opinion the House ought not to sit.

**Mr. MARTIN**.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. My hon. friend will recollect that on one or two occasions already when we were near the close of the session, parliament has sat on Dominion Day. Of course we would all prefer to celebrate it, but I think it is still more preferable that we should bring on prorogation as fast as possible.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

**Sir CHARLES TUPPER** (Cape Breton). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a book that I have received today from the author, 'Canadian Diplomacy.' I dare say a similar compliment has been paid to my right hon. friend. I only received the book this morning, and have not had an opportunity of ascertaining its merits. It is published by an eminent Queen's Counsel, Mr. Thomas Hodgins, of Toronto, and I have no doubt will contain a great deal of valuable information. At all events, it is very desirable to have a book of that kind in our hands. I rise at this moment for the purpose of drawing the attention of my right hon. friend to the last paragraph in a letter that Mr. Hodgins has written to me in kindly sending me a copy of the book. He says:

Might I suggest that General Cameron's report, referred to on page 86, and also the Alaskan return moved for last session, be presented to both Houses and printed.

I want to call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the fact that this return was ordered by the House, and I think it is desirable that the suggestion made by Mr. Hodgins, who has had access to it, should be adopted, and that this return, along with Major Cameron's report should be brought down and printed. I may say to my right hon. friend, although I speak with great trepidation, for fear of being reminded that a certain relationship exists between Major Cameron and myself, that when the government decided to take up the question of the boundary between Alaska and Canada, I was instructed to communicate with Her Majesty's government upon the subject. Lord Rosebery, the then Foreign Minister, met the then Colonial Minister, the Marquis of Ripon, and the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Mead, and Lord Rosebery said: But, we really have no information upon the subject. It was suggested by Mr. Mead that the services that Major-General Cameron had rendered to the British government in connection with the delimitation of the boundary between the Lake of the Woods and the Rocky Mountains had shown that that gentleman was possessed of a great deal of technical knowledge in regard to such subjects. Upon Mr. Mead's recommendation he was borrowed from the War Department and installed in the De-

partment of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. He made an elaborate report upon the treaties and documents in the Foreign Office. I dare say that the right hon. gentleman is quite aware of the character of the report. It is in the library, and, I think, will be found to be very well worthy of the perusal of any person who is engaged in dealing with that subject. In connection with the matter I may say that the return which has already been ordered by the House, I think, should be brought down, and that it should be printed as well.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The suggestion of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) is certainly a good one so far as it goes, because I have no doubt that the more light that is thrown upon the Alaskan boundary the stronger will become the case of Canada. I think Canada has nothing to conceal; on the contrary, Canada has everything to gain by the most abundant publicity in connection with the question. The reports brought down last session were considered by the Printing Committee, but evidently they did not think they should be printed. Of course, they did not pay that attention to them which, perhaps, they would have if their attention had been brought specially to the subject. But since these papers were not ordered to be printed last session, I do not know whether they would now come within the jurisdiction of the Printing Committee. If they do not do so, I will have an opportunity of looking into the book of Mr. Hodgins, which I received this morning. I have not yet had time to peruse it, but I will give an answer to the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

#### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he has considered whether he is going to give the return to an address, notice of which was given by myself, but which has not been reached in the Orders. It has reference to the papers in respect to the bridge over the Richelieu River, and the \$35,000 voted therefor by parliament. It will be found on page 6 of the Order paper, under the head of 'notices of motion.'

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I cannot give an answer to my hon. friend to-day. I shall have to look into the matter, and I will give him an answer to-morrow.

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond, N.S.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the hon. acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock) to the fact that on the 10th of last July I moved for a return which was ordered by the House, and which has not been brought down. Nearly twelve

months have elapsed since that order was made, and I have been waiting for it day in and day out, week in and week out. I would ask the hon. gentleman to have it brought down at the earliest possible moment. He will find a reference to it at page 6939 of *Hansard*, 1899.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). What is the motion?

Mr. GILLIES. It is in reference to expenditures on public works that are specified in that motion.

#### ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) I see the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) in his place, and I would remind him of the remark I made yesterday in regard to the offer of the Royal Canadian Infantry in Victoria, B. C. The newspapers state that 'A' Company of the Royal Canadian Infantry have the honour of being the first to offer their assistance in case any Canadian troops should be required in China. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he has had any word of such an offer?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Since the hon. gentleman brought the question up yesterday a communication has been received by the Department of Militia upon this matter, and I have here in my hand the offer of the officers, non-commissioned officers and men serving now as 'A' Company of the Royal Canadian Regiment at Esquimalt, to serve in China or elsewhere in case their services may be required. It is in the following terms:

Hospital Point Barracks,  
Victoria, B.C., June 19, 1900.

To Capt. and Lieut.-Col. Mackay,  
Commanding 'A' Company,  
Royal Canadian Regiment.

We, the undersigned non-commissioned officers and men of 'A' Company, Royal Canadian Regiment, respectfully request that you lay before the authorities at Ottawa, at your earliest possible convenience, the keen desire that we all have of serving Her Majesty Queen Victoria on active service in China or elsewhere.

(Sgd.) CHRIS. W. HOLLYER,  
Colour-Sergeant.

I need not read all the names, but the name of every non-commissioned officer and man is appended to the communication.

Mr. PRIOR. How many are there?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. About sixty.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). The other day I drew the attention of the hon.

Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) to an incomplete return, and I furnished him with a memorandum of some correspondence that should be brought down.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Copies of the extra letters that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) desires are being prepared.

#### STATUTORY INCREASES TO CIVIL SERVANTS.

Mr. ALEXANDER McNEILL (North Bruce). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask whether the government have determined to state a case for the opinion of the courts as to the right of civil servants to their statutory increases. I have called the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) once or twice already to that subject, and I would like to know whether the government have made up their minds on that question. It is one of very great importance, and one of very serious interest to the civil service.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I do not think that we can give any assurance to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) of any intention to carry out the suggestion which has been given by him. Whatever is the desire of parliament as respects statutory increases can be given effect to without the intervention of any legal tribunal.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. STUBBS.

Mr. WILLIAM STUBBS (Cardwell). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to rise to a question of privilege. I find that an hon. member of this House recently, as quoted by the press, has been accusing me, while a member of this House, of acts of which I am not guilty. I see by the press that a charge has been made against me by an hon. member of this House, who, I am sorry to see is not in his seat at present. I have reference to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). Speaking at the Conservative convention in my riding the hon. gentleman is reported to have made this charge against me, as I find in the following statement in the press:

Amongst the political sins with which William Stubbs, M.P. for Cardwell, is charged, is that of attending the caucuses of the Grit party at Ottawa. Mr. W. H. Bennett, M.P., seems entitled to the doubtful honour of putting this charge in circulation in Mr. Stubbs' constituency. In his speech at Mono Mills, the member for East Simcoe boldly stated that Mr. Stubbs attended these caucuses, and used his statement in proof of the assertion that that gentleman had gone hopelessly over to the Grit party.

Mr. INGRAM.

I emphatically deny that charge. In the presence of the members of this House, and in the presence of the whips of both parties, I deny the charge in toto; it is absolutely false. I have never attended the caucuses of either political party since I came into this parliament.

#### INCOMPLETE RETURNS.

Mr. A. MARTIN (East Queen's, P.E.I.) I call the attention of the government to the incomplete return they have laid on the Table with regard to the dismissal of R. K. Bruce, formerly inspector of gas at Charlottetown. Some correspondence, which I have information was addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), is not brought down, and the hon. gentleman said that he had received no petitions. That may be all right so far as it goes, but has not the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received letters that have not been brought down in the return?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will look into the matter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I did not quite hear the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I gave the Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière), all that I had relating to the return.

#### SUPPLY—DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

Mr. T. G. RODDICK (St. Antoine, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into supply, I wish to make a few suggestions to my right hon. friend the leader of the government, and to the ministers who may be interested, with reference to the establishment of a department of public health in Canada. I have found on many occasions, when looking up statistics and information generally on the question of health, that I have been obliged to go to two or three different departments, in order to get the facts I required. I would be referred from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior, or to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and probably to some others. It seems to me it is time that the government should concentrate this subject more than it is at present the case. I would suggest, therefore, that the right hon. the Prime Minister should take into consideration the advisability of establishing a bureau, or a department of public health. I do not know that we are ready yet for a portfolio of health, as is to be found in other countries, espec-

ally in the government of France, but I believe that a department of public health is absolutely necessary in Canada, and when we have so efficient an officer as Dr. Montizambert available, it is an excellent opportunity to begin this work. Under that department would come the following subjects: The deputy minister, or controller of that department would be the sanitary adviser of the Dominion government; superintendent general of marine and inland quarantine; sanitary superintendent of the Indian reserves of the Dominion; director general of the leper asylums; supervisor of the establishment of a service of Dominion vital statistics; director of the sanitary portion of the census; director of the service of the protection of waterways, international and interprovincial; supervisor of the establishment of a sanitary police and of sanitary measures in the unorganized territories of the Dominion; supervisor of the protection of public health against the invasion of tuberculosis or other diseases, by the importation of consumptive immigrants, of sick animals, of unhealthy articles of food, or of undesirable freight, such as rags, &c., which should be thoroughly disinfected at the point of shipment, before being allowed to enter this country. As to the sanitary portion of the census, it is not desirable that the present official should be displaced, because he is a very efficient officer, but he should be asked to co-operate with the controller of this department. The establishment of a sanitary police is a very important matter. I believe there should be a strong corps of sanitary police, under the control of the Dominion government, who could co-operate with the provincial boards of health. I think at present there should be one or two such officials in British Columbia, watching the possibility of the invasion of that shocking bubonic plague, which at present is devastating the Orient. Besides that, I think it is time that we should have in connection with the central government, a bacteriological laboratory. That is a most important thing. At present we have to depend upon England, and upon our neighbours in the United States, for information regarding several very important questions in this regard. This laboratory should be equipped at the expense of the government, and I hope that my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, will be able to find a few thousand dollars to immediately start this work. Such a laboratory should be under the control of a capable man, and I trust that politics would not be allowed to enter into the question of his appointment. He should be the best man that could be found for the money. If this suggestion is carried out, we would have in this country, and right in this city, a laboratory in which would be manufactured tubercular and prophylactic serum of various kinds, and anti-toxine, and where men from every quarter could get information. I was present at a

meeting the other day, where a gentleman read a paper on leprosy, and he said that he intended spending two or three weeks in Ottawa during the present season, in order to study this subject at the government laboratory. I was obliged to tell him that we had no such thing in Canada. In the United States they have a very efficient one; and ever since Pasteur, and Lister, and Koch began their work, each government in Europe has been vying with the other in inaugurating this work and comparing notes. Canada is behind the age in this respect. I, therefore, believe it is a matter worthy the consideration of the Prime Minister and of the ministers who may have to deal with it. This branch might well come under the Minister of Agriculture, and he might be named the Minister of Agriculture and Public Health. That would prevent the necessity for a separate department. I understand that already by order in council, Dr. Montizambert has all the emoluments and the position of a deputy minister, so that no change would be required in that respect. I have another suggestion to make, and that is that this government should have at the great ports of exit in Europe and in the Orient, well selected medical men, who would examine as carefully as may be necessary the immigrants who are coming to this country. I myself made passages westward bound on two occasions when immigrants died of consumption who never should have been allowed to leave the port of embarkation. These men should also see that the ships bringing immigrants to Canada are suitable, properly equipped, and disinfected, and that arrangements are made so that in the event of sickness on board the immigrants may be properly attended to. We have no consuls, as other nations have, and hence I think a corps of medical men of this kind would be found most desirable; and when we get our Dominion Medical Registration Act, which I hope will be passed at no distant date, and get reciprocity with other countries, our Canadian doctors will be able to fill those positions. I hope these suggestions will be taken in the spirit in which they are given, and that during the recess something may possibly be done.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I have no doubt that every member of this House and the country will appreciate very much the spirit as well as the manner and the succinctness with which my hon. friend from St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Roddick) has brought this very important question before the House. He has studied these medical questions from the public point of view as well as with the knowledge, the learning, and the advantages which a practitioner of his standing possesses. I think the House will congratulate him on bringing forward this matter even at this late day in the session. I notice that

he suggests that it should engage the attention of the government during the recess, in the hope that something may be done at a future session. It therefore does not matter at all that this question has come forward at a late date this session, as no desire or intention is expressed that an attempt should be made to do any of this work this session. It falls to me as the minister who has charge of the quarantine regulations to take up this matter and refer to it along the line the hon. gentleman has taken. It is perfectly true that a little over a year ago I found it necessary to bring the chief quarantine officer, Dr. Montizambert, to headquarters here, and I asked my colleagues in an order in council to give him the title of Director General of Public Health, believing that in addition to the strictly quarantine work, there might come up various matters connected with the public health on which the government might seek his advice and take advantage of his knowledge and experience. An instance of this has already occurred in the passage of certain rules and regulations in regard to sanitation and health on public works, the chief management of which has been placed in the hands of the Director General of Public Health. Consequently this work, although perhaps in other respects not pertaining to my department, has been placed there. I confess I feel myself hardly competent as a minister to undertake the responsibilities of a large department or even of a branch of a department dealing with public health generally, in the wide way in which my hon. friend has suggested. The subjects which come under my particular charge as Minister of Agriculture are rather different in their character from those to which my hon. friend has referred this afternoon, and it would be very difficult, I think, for one who is particularly charged with the agricultural interests of the country to be burdened with the large branch suggested by my hon. friend. But there is another obstacle in the way which I think it would perhaps be more difficult to overcome. It is a fact that in our scheme of confederation, matters pertaining to public health have been relegated to the provincial authorities. Even in the slight way in which as head of the quarantine department I have to deal with these matters, I find some difficulties arising. I find some little clashing of authority, the provincial authorities as a rule being jealous of any interference with what they regard as their special prerogative. I have found this in one or two cases in connection with the diseases of cattle and in some other matters; and I really fear that if we were to undertake to establish here a medical department, or even a medical branch of the Department of Agriculture, we would find that friction increased and great difficulties arising, unless there was some more defined distribution of the relative powers and positions of the local governments and

Mr. FISHER.

the central government. These difficulties, of course, might be overcome; but, knowing as I do the complications of the legal interpretation of the British North America Act which have arisen on various other questions, I fear that a great deal of difficulty and complication might arise in this case.

My hon. friend has spoken about the establishment of a Dominion medical council. I believe myself that that would probably be a first step in the direction he desires to take, and it would lead to other arrangements by which the medical men of the different provinces might bring pressure to bear upon their various local governments to consent to and co-operate with the Dominion government in establishing some general department and some general laws in regard to public health; and in that way it would accomplish a great good. In saying this, I indicate very clearly what is my deliberate opinion, that in these matters, so far as general principles and general action are concerned, I have no doubt that laws passed by a central authority, with a central administration, could be made more effective and more useful than any local or provincial laws. Therefore, I am quite in accord with the general ideas advanced by my hon. friend. These matters have been brought to my attention and been discussed in my presence by medical men. I have had the advantage not only of my friend's discussion of them, but that of many other leading medical men in the country, and I am very much interested personally in the working out of some such scheme. But I have not felt that it would be justified under the present circumstances in attempting to work it out, nor have I been able to give that time and attention to it, in the multitude of other duties in my department, which I think its importance demands. As soon as the work of the session is over, however, I would be glad to look into the matters which my hon. friend has alluded to, and deal with that correspondence which has already reached a considerable volume in my department, and consult, as occasion offers and permits, with such medical men as have taken an interest in this matter, in conjunction and co-operation with my hon. friend. I understand that that is his suggestion, and I am glad to fall in to that extent with it, although I feel that it would be a little premature at the present time to undertake to draw up a definite scheme. I feel that these things must develop gradually, from a demand on the part of the people, and that if we attempt to force the pace, it would be detrimental to the public interest and would only interfere with our progress towards the goal we have in view.

Under these circumstances, I am glad that my hon. friend has brought the matter up and drawn the attention of the House and country to it, and I shall be glad if the

medical men, in their various assemblies and discussions, will go into it more fully and give the government the benefit of their views and advice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER (Cape Breton). I quite agree in the opinion expressed by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that we are deeply indebted to my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Roddick) for the manner in which he has placed this very important subject before the House. Its importance cannot be overrated, but, unfortunately, under our constitution, great difficulties are encountered at the very outset. I am free to admit that it was a great misfortune that the question of public health was not made, in the constitution of Canada, a subject pertaining to the central rather than to the provincial governments, because it is that absolute control which the provincial governments have that stands in the way of any organized and effective system being established by this parliament. There is a number of subjects, however, that have been touched upon by my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Roddick) that may properly engage the attention of this House. The formation of a Dominion medical council, I fear, can only be achieved by the various provinces agreeing to pass legislation of a similar character, to be afterwards ratified and endorsed by the parliament of Canada. In that way a substantial step might be taken to obtain that concurrent action in regard to professional status in the medical profession throughout the Dominion, which it would be very difficult to obtain by any other mode.

There is, however, the question of quarantine in the hands of this government, and by the appointment of able and efficient quarantine officers, the public health may be promoted to the largest possible extent, and I am glad to say that, so far as I am able to form a judgment, the officers appointed are men of very high character and standing.

Another question which has been brought up by my hon. friend is the treatment of leprosy. It is not to the credit of the Dominion that at this moment a disease of such a terrible character—but which, happily for us, exists in this country to a very limited extent—should yet exist to the extent it does and should not have attracted sufficiently the attention of the government with regard to the means of furnishing absolute separation, and, at the same time, providing such medical and nursing assistance for those suffering from it as would mitigate and divest it of some of its horrors.

There is also a subject which has been brought to the notice of the House by my hon. friend from Montreal, and no man in Canada, in the opinion of the medical profession, is a higher authority on such questions. He is known and recognized, not only as an exceptionally able member of

the profession, but as enjoying, from the high position he holds in the profession throughout the whole Dominion and the standing he has attained in the great medical organizations of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, a prominence and public confidence and respect that cannot fail to make any suggestion from him be accepted as one of the greatest value. He has spoken of the question of tuberculosis in cattle. We know that that practically means what is recognized by the great body of the people as consumption in the human race, and we know that if there is any one disease that inspires dread, and with which the medical faculty have been less able to cope than almost any other, it is the disease of consumption. We know its ravages and extended character. We know that a great number of people annually die from that disease, and that the impression, to a large extent, has governed the medical profession, as well as the public, that it was a hereditary disease with which it was impossible to cope. But, we know that, in the present condition of medical science, that idea is exploded, and consumption is regarded more as a contagious than a hereditary disease. According to the best authorities, consumption in the human family is perpetuated and extended more by the use of milk from cattle suffering from tuberculosis than by any other means. Fortunately for us, the Department of Agriculture has the subject of tuberculosis in cattle thoroughly under its control, and if necessary parliament will give the Department of Agriculture any additional authority that may be required to grapple with it. As I will not have an opportunity, when this subject comes before this House again this session, of discussing it, I may be permitted to say a few words with regard to the extremely interesting discussion that took place in the Committee of Agriculture, when a very eminent professional gentleman, Dr. McEachran, gave an account of a series of most elaborate experiments that he has been conducting on the farm of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), who had given him the greatest possible facilities for conducting these most important experiments, and, as far as I am able to judge from the discussion, Dr. McEachran actually demonstrated the great achievements that may be accomplished by the application of professional attainments to the discoveries that have been made with regard to tubercule as a test for finding out the disease of tuberculosis in cattle, and the measures to be taken for preventing the existence of that disease in cattle, and also preventing the milk of cattle thus affected from being attended with the serious effects which at present follow from its use by human beings.

These experiments, as I say, were of a most interesting, and in my judgment, of a most conclusive character and opened up

a very wide field for dealing with a subject of gigantic importance—the effect of tuberculosis in cattle, not only upon the herds of cattle, but upon human beings using the milk of those cattle. A suggestion was made that I think well worthy the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, and of the government and this House. That suggestion was that the government should make experiments with a view to ascertain what could be accomplished to exterminate tuberculosis from Canada. It was proposed that they should take a limited field, such as Prince Edward Island, and by the application of the principles that have been demonstrated on the farm of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), ascertain what could be accomplished. If the results are as successful as the experiments already made would lead us to believe, they would lead to the result of absolutely exterminating tuberculosis at no distant day from the whole Dominion of Canada. No person can estimate the enormous pecuniary benefit—to speak of nothing else—that would accrue to this Dominion, if the country, at no distant day, could occupy a position of that kind. I am quite sure that the experiments have been carried sufficiently far to warrant the government in taking the matter up. The great difficulty in exterminating pleuro-pneumonia in Great Britain and in the United States, was that it was found absolutely necessary to destroy promptly every animal affected with the disease. That disease has been exterminated in Great Britain, and repressed to the extent it has been in the United States, only by enormous public expenditure, because it was necessary for the protection of the whole country to take this course, and it was felt that the loss should not fall upon the owners of these herds. These experiments conducted so ably and successfully by Dr. McEachran and Dr. Higginson, on the farm of the hon. member for Russell, I think, show conclusively, that it is not necessary, in a great number of instances, to destroy the lives of the animals affected with tuberculosis; but, having discovered the effect of the disease existing, to separate them and thus avoid the great loss to their owners, or to the country, if the country has to pay for the cattle that are killed. I will not detain the House, great and important as this question is, further than to say that the subject is one, taken in connection with the statements of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Roddick), of the very greatest importance; and I believe there is a field for the improvement of public health of incalculable value to the whole country.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) I am glad that an hon. gentleman of the well-known ability of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Roddick), has seen fit to bring this matter before the House. The Pacific coast is particularly interested in this ques-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

tion. As the hon. Minister of Agriculture knows, there is quite a danger, at the present time, of the bubonic plague and other plagues being brought into Canada from the east. I am glad to say that I believe the government is paying great attention to quarantine and has got it into first-class condition. I do not think any trouble or expense has been spared in making that establishment as good and safe as it possibly can be. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), has mentioned cases of leprosy that are now in Canada. In British Columbia, we have six cases of leprosy. These unfortunates are kept on D'Arcy Island, not far from the city of Victoria. I have asked questions in regard to their removal and have received answers from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). In answer to one question, the hon. minister said he had never been asked to take the British Columbia lepers to Tracadie. Now, on May 30 last, in this House, the minister said:

My hon. friend (Mr. Montague), who preceded me in office, knows that the British Columbia people have been asking to have these lepers taken over and dealt with by us. I have never been convinced that the government at Ottawa was called upon to do that, and have not acceded to the request. No new arguments have been given that would cause me to change my opinion.

In 1899, July 24, *Hansard* reports as follows:

Mr. PRIOR. Has the minister yet changed his mind with regard to the necessity of compelling the lepers in British Columbia to go to Tracadie?

That proves very clearly that I had asked that they be removed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is such a new departure and one of such an important character that I would not, on my own responsibility, like to do it.

One would infer from this that the hon. minister had great objection to removing lepers from anywhere to Tracadie. But I find, in his answers given this session, that he has taken three lepers from Manitoba to Tracadie, one from Prince Edward Island and one from Nova Scotia—and not only that, but he had taken one from Nova Scotia within twelve days of the time when he spoke as he did in the House, stating that this was a new departure. The correspondence in the department will show that the government have been asked time and time again, by my colleagues and myself, to take these lepers, these wretched men, from British Columbia to Tracadie. We were told that this was a contagious disease, and they could not get the railways to carry the lepers. But they got the Canadian Pacific Railway to carry them from Manitoba, why cannot they carry them from the coast? They had to be put in special cars, and these cars had to be disinfected afterwards. But if they can do that for Manitoba or Prince Edward Island, they ought to do it for

British Columbia. The government paid for the transportation of these lepers, a sum of about \$1,500, and took them to Tracadie, and are keeping them there. And yet, when they have been asked, time and again, to allow the province of British Columbia \$1,000, that is, to continue the allowance made by the previous government, they have refused to do it. The last grant for this purpose in British Columbia was in 1895, \$1,000; but since then, it has been refused by the present government. We ask and we insist, either that they be taken to Tracadie, or that the \$1,000 be paid annually as formerly for their maintenance, and handed over to British Columbia, and that we be treated the same as the other provinces. There are six of them, and last year they cost \$1,116.82. The better plan is for the government to take them to Tracadie and let us get rid of them in that province. These lepers at the present time are on an island by themselves. There is nothing to prevent anybody from going on to that island and mixing with these lepers. It is not likely that white people who know anything about them would go near them, but no doubt there are Chinamen and Indians, men and women, who go there to buy vegetables. This is a state of affairs that ought not to be allowed to exist for a moment, and the government can stop it if they take the measure I suggest. They are there without any guard at all, they are left to themselves. Every three or four months a little steamer goes over from Victoria with some inspectors to see if they are alive, and if they have got all they want, and these wretched men are left there by themselves. Now and again one of them dies off. I say that it is not human, the government ought to take charge of them and look after them the same as they do the lepers in other portions of the Dominion. These are all Chinamen, they have paid their head tax to the government of \$50 each, and I think the government should look after them during the short time they have to live.

Mr. J. V. ELLIS (St. John City). I think this matter is somewhat broader than appears from the observations of the hon. gentleman, because the whole subject of the Tracadie lazaretto is involved. I do not know what view the government may take of it, but after the discussion we had here the other day as to the undesirable character of the Chinamen, certainly we do not want Chinese lepers taken to the east and put into the Tracadie lazaretto. While that is a public institution, it is one of an entirely different character from a general lazaretto founded for the purpose of taking in lepers of all nationalities. It came over to the Federal government from the provincial government when the province of New Brunswick entered confederation.

Although I presume this is not the first time that this matter has engaged the attention of representatives from that province, I would like to get the opinion of my colleagues from that province, as perhaps the suggestion of the hon. member for Victoria might mean more than it appears to him. The strong testimony that the British Columbia members gave against the Chinamen the other day naturally arouses somewhat of a feeling against them.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I think the House is under an obligation to the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine's (Mr. Roddick), for bringing this matter before us. I would take this opportunity of bringing to the attention of the government a communication I have received from Rev. Mr. Ancient, secretary of the Episcopal diocese of Halifax. He writes:

Dear Sir,—In compliance with instructions received from the diocesan synod of Nova Scotia, I hereby forward to you the following copy of a resolution passed unanimously at its last session, which closed on the 18th inst.:

'Whereas, there are lepers in the Dominion of Canada who are very much neglected, being placed on an island without medical attendant, nurse, or even an overseer to attend to a proper and just distribution of food, this synod would urge upon the government of Canada the necessity of taking upon itself the care of all cases of leprosy that may be found throughout the Dominion, believing that such action on the part of the government of Canada is not only proper from a humanitarian point of view, but a wise and necessary sanitary precaution.

'That this resolution be sent to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and to each of the members of the Dominion parliament from the two provinces in the diocese of Nova Scotia.'

Now, so far as I am acquainted with the facts, there are no lepers in the lower provinces who are in the position of neglect such as that described by that resolution. There is a lazaretto at Tracadie which is under the care and supervision of a priest of the Roman Catholic church, who devotes himself to that work, and I presume that some medical supervision, nursing and attendance are supplied. It is a serious matter if the lepers in British Columbia are neglected in the manner stated by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior), and I would be glad if the Minister of Agriculture would give us some information in reference to that matter. I suppose there can be no contradiction of the statement made in this communication, and of the statements made by the member for Victoria, and they certainly reveal a state of affairs that should not be allowed to continue. We cannot consent that Canada should leave these unfortunate creatures, suffering under the most terrible of all diseases, in a state of neglect such as described. If there be access open to them on this island as described by the member for Victoria, and they can be visited by

Indians and other Chinamen, it is evident that a serious danger exists to the health of the whites also.

Mr. PRIOR. Just one word in defence of the credit of the province of British Columbia. I cannot allow it to go forth that these lepers are neglected in all respects. They get plenty to eat, small houses are provided for them, but they are left alone without medical attendance all the time, and with nobody to take care of them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I received that circular which the hon. gentleman himself has just read, and I replied to it, stating that the expressions used in it were hardly justified from what I knew of the facts of the case. Some years ago I was appealed to in regard to the position of these lepers on Darcy Island, British Columbia, and I felt it was a matter for the local authorities in British Columbia to deal with, I have taken that ground always.

Mr. PRIOR. Why not with the other provinces ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The cases are different, and I think the hon. gentleman would recognize the difference. At that time I caused an inquiry to be made by one of my officers in British Columbia into the facts of the case, and I found that even more was true than was stated by the member for Victoria. These lepers are placed on a small island not far from Victoria. They are visited regularly by a medical man, they are housed, they are supplied with food, and even with some luxuries. Some of them are far advanced in the disease, and are consequently somewhat helpless ; but out of the six, there are three or four who are but little affected, and are able to help themselves and to take some care of the others, and they do so. While they are not attended by any nurses from the outside, they nurse each other. They are able to carry on their gardening operations, they raise vegetables and food, besides the food with which they are regularly supplied by a little steamer that goes over from Victoria. Therefore, they are not at all in a destitute or neglected condition. What care they receive is given them by the provincial government conjointly, I think, with the cities of Victoria and Vancouver. Under these circumstances, I do not think that the terms used in that resolution are justified. I am glad to have an opportunity of putting this statement publicly before the House and the country, as I do not think it right that such a sweeping statement as contained in that circular should go abroad without correction. I would just say further, that, in regard to the Tracadie Lazaretto, it is in the hands

of the Dominion to-day by reason of a definite agreement being a portion of the terms of confederation under which New Brunswick came into confederation. The Dominion government was obliged by the terms of confederation to take over the management and support of the Tracadie Lazaretto. If other lepers come to the Tracadie Lazaretto it is by reason of a favour that they are allowed to do so. But, I would say frankly that if we were to undertake to place Chinese lepers there we would have to start another lazaretto. The authorities would not accept Chinese at that institution. That is the chief reason why I felt that it was impossible to take these Chinese lepers from British Columbia and place them in the lazaretto at Tracadie. I grant that the reason which was given is a complete reason ; that is, that these lepers are under the control of the health authorities of that province as other lepers are in other provinces except those in New Brunswick, and if lepers are received there from any other province it is only as a matter of favour. The lepers who have been taken from Nova Scotia and Manitoba to Tracadie Lazaretto have been placed there with the consent of the people who have charge of the lazaretto. Without that consent I do not think we would have the right to impose upon them people from other provinces. I am not speaking now, from a judicial judgment or upon any legal opinion, but this is the ground that I have taken in discussing this question. I think it is tenable ground and a ground which would justify the course of the department in regard to the matter.

Mr. PRIOR. Does the hon. minister contend that if he is responsible for the lepers in Manitoba and Nova Scotia he is not responsible for the lepers in British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly, I am not responsible.

Mr. PRIOR. Then, why does he take lepers from those provinces.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because it was a favour.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Intercolonial Railway ..... \$900,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Chairman, before resuming the subject as I left it last evening upon the adjournment of the House, I wish to make reference to the statement I presented in regard to the addition to capital expenditure that had been made during the six years preceding the change of government and from the date of the change of government down. I read the figures which had been prepared for me by the account-

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

ant of my department, to which the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) took exception. He was following me, I suppose, with the report in his hand containing the table of the capital outlay upon the government railways, and he observed, or he thought he observed, that there was an error in one of the figures—in the figure which I had given for the years 1890-1. I gave the amount, in round figures, which was added to the capital account for that year at \$80,000, and the hon. gentleman said that it did not correspond with the statement he had in his hands. I have had the figures verified or looked at since I spoke on the subject, and my attention has been called to the way in which possibly the difference of opinion arose, or the error, assuming it to have been an error, which was noticed in my statement of the accounts, occurred. By referring to page 41 of the Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for 1891, the hon. member will see that the accountant of the Intercolonial Railway furnishes a somewhat detailed statement of the capital account for the year ending June, 1891. This gives the statement at \$79,929.34. I made it in round figures at \$80,000. My statement, therefore, was correct, but there is a sense in which it was not correct and in which the hon. member for Westmoreland might have been said to have been accurate.

It will be found on reference to a further account, that, properly speaking, perhaps, there should have been added to the \$80,000, or the \$79,929, which I mentioned, some additional amounts. For instance, there was expended that year upon the Cape Breton Railway \$521,441. I am willing to add that to the \$80,000, which I furnished the committee last evening. There was expended on the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, \$220,886, and I am willing to add that to the amount of the statement I gave yesterday. I am willing, therefore, to correct the statement from \$80,000, and by adding these figures to make it \$825,000, or to multiply it by something over ten times the sum I stated. I am willing that the hon. gentleman should do that. I did not have it done. I gave instructions to the accountant of the department to make up correctly a statement of what had been laid out yearly on the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway. This seems to have been since included in the gross debt of the Intercolonial Railway, but the expenditures were perhaps not made on the Intercolonial account strictly, because the Cape Breton Railway and Oxford and New Glasgow Railway were not then a part of the Intercolonial Railway. But, nevertheless, in order to yield to the view of the hon. gentleman, I am willing to add these sums which will make the total \$825,000 for that year instead of \$80,000, and the grand total will then be \$2,513,000, instead of \$1,750,000.

Mr. J. G. HAGGART (South Lanark). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) had no objection to the figures for 1890-1. It was the expenditure as given by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals for 1893-4, to which the hon. gentleman took exception. I suppose the hon. gentleman included beside the amount named, the expenditure which was made on the Cape Breton Railway, the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway, and the Eastern Extension Railway. The figures for 1894, 1895 and 1896 are given in the report which I have in my hand. For 1894 they are \$166,000, for 1895 \$327,000, and for 1896 \$259,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no question about the figures which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has mentioned. During these years the Cape Breton line was properly a part of the Intercolonial Railway. To make sure that my statement was not excessive in any respect, or was not open to any criticism, I had the expenditures upon these two roads eliminated. But I now propose to add them. The figures for the subsequent years which I have given to the House have been verified by the accountant, and I ask that the committee shall assume that they are correct, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary.

I concluded my observations to the House yesterday by showing how the Intercolonial Railway accounts stood, and what were the results of the operation of the railway during the last fiscal year. I showed that there was a surplus of \$62,000, after having expended on the maintenance and repairs of the line out of revenue, a larger sum of money than had ever before been expended for that purpose.

I dare say that the committee will be interested in learning what have been the results of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway for this current fiscal year. I am glad to be able to state that while the year 1898-9 was a record year in the annals of the Intercolonial Railway, the year 1899-1900, which terminates on the 30th instant, is a still more successful year. I have here a statement for the current fiscal year, and so far as the receipts are concerned, it is practically correct to the dollar. I have the actual receipts for eleven months and three weeks of this year, so that I am obliged to make an estimate for the remaining week, and I cannot be very far astray in placing before the committee the gross earnings for the entire twelve months. I showed the committee that in 1898-9 the gross earnings of the Intercolonial Railway had grown more than three-quarters of a million dollars in excess of what they were when the change of government took place in 1896. I am able to tell the committee now that the gross earnings of the Intercolonial Railway for the current year will exceed \$4,500,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They will amount beyond all question to \$4,530,000, and they may amount to \$4,540,000, or, we will say, between \$4,500,000 and \$4,600,000. These earnings have grown rapidly and most significantly. They have grown until they exceed the earnings of last year, which was a record year, by over three-quarters of a million dollars. The fact is, that we have over 50 per cent of earnings in excess of the earnings when the change of government took place. We have added, it is true, 14 per cent more mileage to the railway, but, while we have done that we have added 55 per cent to the earnings of the railway, and that is a subject of congratulation not only to the government, but to the people of the country. In comparison with our predecessors, we have achieved a most significant and unparalleled result. The 14 per cent mileage which we have added to the road has helped us to secure, if it has not altogether secured to us, these additional earnings, but the experience of our predecessors in office was, that when they added nearly 20 per cent of mileage to the railway that addition was not attended by any such results. I will naturally be asked to state the net results flowing from these gross earnings. The question of the net results is a very important one, and it is one which, perhaps, will, to a greater degree, interest the House and the country. I cannot state with the same accuracy the net earnings as I have stated the gross earnings, because I am not in possession of the final accounts for more than ten months of the year. Perhaps it will be early in July before we can know with accuracy what the surplus for the year 1899-1900 is, but I can speak with a good deal of confidence as to what that result will be. It will be remembered that last year I calculated that the net earnings for the year would be over \$60,000, and as a matter of fact they amounted to \$62,000. I am able to state now with the same confidence, that for this current year we will have a surplus on the Intercolonial Railway of close to \$120,000, if it is not beyond that sum. That will be nearly double the amount realized upon the operations of last year.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not say that a larger result could not have been accomplished. I am free to tell the committee that my view in administering the department is not solely to try and find how large a net result can be achieved on the operation of that railway. My object has been, as far as it was in my power—and I will be able to show that it was, to a great degree, in my power to carry out my object—my object has been to secure the largest possible amount of expenditure upon the maintenance and equipment of the road that our earnings would

permit of, so as to enable me to bring the railway to a higher standard than before. At the same time, I will not deny that I have had a desire to preserve a fairly good record, and to show as good results as possible from a financial standpoint. This net result, which I estimate at \$120,000, has been brought about without diminishing the preservation of the road in any degree, but, on the other hand, we have increased the outlay for the perfecting of our equipment, and we have achieved that very satisfactory result, although we have spent more money this year than was ever spent in any previous year on the Intercolonial Railway. I will read to the committee a statement, which I have had prepared, of the expenditure for the ten months, the accounts for which have been placed in my hands. For the corresponding ten months ending in April, 1896, the last term of the administration of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart)—a term as favourable to him as any of the years that he held office—the repairs to engines, &c., amounted to \$236,328.

For the ten months ending April, 1900, which is the current year, the amount expended upon work of the same character, amounted to \$309,000, or \$72,673 more for the ten months under the Liberal government, than was expended during the ten months under the Conservative government, with which I am making a comparison. During the ten months ending with April, 1896, there was expended on repairs to all classes of cars, \$272,244. During the corresponding ten months of the present year, the amount of exactly the same class of outlay, was \$354,955, or \$82,710 in excess of that expended in the year 1896. Upon maintenance of ways and works, there was expended in the ten months of 1896, \$526,755; and in the corresponding ten months of 1900, there was expended \$730,503, or an increase of \$203,748. This makes a total increased expenditure upon maintenance of ways and works, repairs to cars, and repairs and renewals to locomotives, of \$359,133, or in round figures \$360,000 in the current year, over the last year of the hon. gentlemen's administration, or the last year that he held office. The actual expenditure, therefore, of the current year being so largely in excess of that of any year during the hon. gentleman's term, with which comparisons can properly be made, it will be seen at a glance that the net result of the present financial year has not been achieved by any diminution in the necessary and proper expenditure for repairs and maintenance. In order, however, that a fair comparison may be made with the hon. gentleman's year, 1896, I ought to add one-tenth to the expenditure of that year, which I may fairly and properly add, on account of 115 additional miles which I have to provide for over the mileage of the hon. gentleman, in order to make up what my footing ought to be as compared with his. I add,

Mr. BLAIR.

therefore, one-tenth to \$1,035,327, which is the gross amount expended by him in the ten months ending with April, 1896, and I deduct the total of the two sums from the gross amount expended in these directions during the ten months of this year, and I take the balance as the excess of expenditure over that of the hon. gentleman. Adding these two amounts together, I give the hon. gentleman credit for having laid out upon repairs to cars, repairs to engines, and maintenance of ways and works, these three classes of expenditure, \$1,138,827 which I deduct from the \$1,394,460 which I have laid out during the corresponding ten months of this year. This shows that there has been an excess of expenditure during the ten months of the current year of \$255,600 over the hon. gentleman's expenditure in the corresponding period of 1896. Therefore, the year 1899-1900, in comparison with the year 1896, shows very much better, even than I have just stated; and I will put together the figures which I think I may fairly put together, in order that you may see just in how much better a position the Intercolonial Railway is to-day, in the year of grace, 1900, than it was under the administration of my hon. friend. I point out a net surplus of \$120,000 to begin with; then there was a deficit of \$55,000 under the hon. gentleman, and I add to that the increased expenditure of \$255,000, upon ways and works and maintenance beyond his outlay, for the same purposes; and I get a sum which I say I am entitled to claim as showing the actual result of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway this year as compared with its operation under the hon. gentleman. If you add \$120,000, \$55,000 and \$255,000 together, you will have \$425,000, the sum which I claim as the net result. If I had limited the expenditure on works, maintenance and repairs, as that expenditure was limited by the hon. gentleman, I would have been able to claim to-day a net increase of \$425,000 over his showing; or a net surplus of \$370,000 for the year, to which I would have added the \$55,000 of the hon. gentleman's deficit, making \$425,000, to show the actual result of a comparison for the two years. Now, I am willing to carry the calculation a little further. I am willing to do what has never been done before, what it has never been claimed ought to be done in respect to the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway. I am willing to enter into a calculation on the question of interest, and I am in a position to contend that the Intercolonial Railway, in this the second year of its operation under these improved conditions, has paid its way, and more than paid its way—that, besides having a surplus, it has, in point of fact, paid the interest on every dollar of capital expenditure that has been incurred by this government in respect to it. I do not admit that the Intercolonial Railway ought to be put in any different position from that of any

other public work, because that would be introducing an element of unfairness. I know there is a disposition to say: 'You get parliament to grant you money to improve the road-bed or the equipment of the railway, and you ought to prove to us that you get results sufficient to pay the interest on that added debt.' I wish to say that on sound principles that policy can be repudiated; I do not think the country has a right to ask it. I do not think the thinking men of the country, if they reflect upon it, would make any such demand on this government. I think the Intercolonial Railway is a class of work which is entitled, as I suggested yesterday, to be put on an equally favourable footing with the great canals of the Dominion with respect to capital expenditure, because it is doing a work in the maritime provinces and for a large part of Canada, which is being done by the canals for other parts of Canada. We do not expect that when it becomes necessary to bring the Intercolonial Railway up to a proper footing, when the growth of the business demands it, when the development in any particular direction appears to call for it, there will be any unwillingness on the part of parliament to give the money necessary to put that road into such a shape that it may fulfil the designs in view when the policy of building it was taken up and approved. Therefore, I say, that while we are in a position, by reason of the results of the present year, to pay the interest on every dollar that has been expended in consequence of these improved conditions, we are under no obligation to do it, and I only point to it in order that hon. members may see that even if we were required to do it, we are in a position to meet that requirement.

I have given you the capital expenditure, let me repeat it just for the purposes of the present statement:

1896-7.....	\$149,000
1897-8.....	253,000
1898-9.....	1,082,000
1899-1900.....	1,650,000

We will have, therefore, \$3,134,000 increase to the capital by reason of the expenditures we have made, but there is something I must add. I must add the cost of the Drummond County Railway, and I do it, not because I ought to be asked to do it, but in order to cover the whole ground. My hon. friend opposite, who initiated and introduced this policy when he brought about the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from Rivière du Loup to Lévis—a policy with which I have no fault to find—would not think he was very fairly used if called upon to show that there had been an improvement in the business of the Intercolonial Railway sufficient to pay the interest on the cost of that extension. If the wisdom of that policy had been measured by its pecuniary results—I do not say that it ought to be so

measured—I think that my hon. friend would have been in rather a difficult position. He would have found some trouble in showing that there had been anything more than an infinitesimal increase in the actual business of the Intercolonial Railway due to that extension.

But I am willing to add the cost of the Drummond County Railway, which was \$1,464,000. That would give a total of \$4,598,000 addition to capital account in connection with the Intercolonial Railway expenditure and the purchase of the Drummond County Railway. Well, the interest upon \$4,598,000 at 3 per cent is \$137,000, and that is more than covered by the surplus of the year and by the betterment of the road, which has, as I have shown, run up over a quarter of a million.

One hundred and thirty-seven thousand dollars being the interest at 3 per cent upon the total addition to capital, if taken from \$425,000, would leave very close to \$300,000, as the margin which remains, resulting from the administration of the Intercolonial Railway for the current twelve months, after you make a comparison with my hon. friend's administration in his last year.

There is more than this. We have not only done this upon the same footing, by comparison, with what the hon. gentleman did, but we have been called upon during this current year to very much increase the wages and salaries of the employees. I have reason to believe that there was a hope cherished by some gentlemen, who are much interested in the management of the Intercolonial Railway, that sufficient irritation and dissatisfaction could be created among the employees to bring about a strike unless a very considerable increase was made to their wages. I am not going to suggest that it was necessary for the employees of the Intercolonial Railway to go on strike in order to get their wages increased. I am not going to say that what was done for them by the management of the Intercolonial Railway was done because we feared a strike or as the result of any threat or pressure of that kind. That was not the motive at all. But we realized that the expenses of living had increased, that wages had risen all over Canada, and although the rates on the Intercolonial Railway are not capable of being increased, although we know that the very instant we attempted an increase, the opposition papers would excite the most intense feeling among the patrons of the road and the people served by it. I felt that there was reason in the claim of the employees throughout its entire length, and in some branches of the management, for additions to their salaries. Their claim was a reasonable one, and I gave in to it, with the result that during the year now current we are paying at the rate of \$175,000 additional wages to the men, compared with the amount paid prior to this year and during the term of my hon. friend. That

Mr. BLAIR.

is a considerable amount, and it is proper that that should be taken into account when you are contrasting one period with the other, and I think that the public opinion of the country will admit that it was proper for the government to deal liberally and fairly with the thousands of men in our employ and not wait until we were just reaching a period of dissolution and on the eve of an election. The public will admit that we did well to take up these questions as they arose and deal with them in a liberal spirit, and endeavour to stimulate an interest on the part of employees in the prosperity of the road and good feeling on all hands towards its administration.

This is a showing which proves that our policy has not been a mistaken one, and that when we pressed parliament, in face of very strong opposition, to give us an extension to Montreal, we were favouring a wise and prudent policy, the fruits of which bear the strongest and amplest testimony to its wisdom and prudence. We cannot have such a large increase in the business of the Intercolonial Railway without finding ourselves very much embarrassed by reason of our limited equipment. I think it is an almost self-evident proposition that when we have barely locomotives sufficient to do, in a very inefficient manner, the hauling of trains in a business which yields you \$2,900,000; you must have very much additional locomotive power to do a business that earns you \$4,600,000. If you have barely cars enough to carry a business which yields \$2,900,000, you must have a great increase to the number if you are going to do business to an amount of \$4,600,000. That is the condition of the Intercolonial Railway. We did not have cars enough in 1896 to more than do the business which was offered to the road; and almost immediately after the change of government, seeing that there was evidence on every hand of growth in the business, we felt that we would have to increase our cars and improve our locomotives, and make upon our equipment a large outlay in order that we might be able to meet the conditions that were arising, and to do the business which was offering to us. And we asked for these appropriations and got them. We did not, perhaps, ask for as much as I would have liked; we did not anticipate, perhaps, fully the extent of the growth that was ahead of us; but we did get some additions to our equipment, and this helped to increase the capital account.

But there is one little evidence as to the progress made. It can be grasped by anybody, and it goes to show what the condition of our car service is—I mean how limited and insufficient it is for the purposes of our business. That is the fact that, while under my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart's) administration, the amount we

had to pay for car mileage year by year for several years did not exceed \$1,000 or \$2,000. That charge has been enormously increased during the last three years. I am sure hon. gentlemen will understand what I mean when I speak of payment for car mileage—it is a sum which is charged against one railway whose cars are being used and detained upon other lines, and which are not compensated for by a corresponding number of cars from those other companies. This balance has been growing enormously against us. Instead of paying \$1,000 or \$2,000 for the use of cars belonging to other railways, which we paid prior to 1896-7, we find that we are paying nearly \$70,000 for car mileage. If we had the capital expended upon which that sum would be the interest at 3 per cent, it would place us in a splendid position. I hope the time is not far distant when we shall have all the equipment we require, and shall not have so large a balance against us on account of car mileage. For the years 1894-5 and 1896, under the late government, the car mileage did not amount to \$10,000—the exact figures were \$9,450. Prior to that it was much less—in some years it did not exceed \$500 or \$600. There was no increase of business in these later years to account for the increase; and there is only one explanation I can give, and that is that the cars were not of sufficient quality or they were not being maintained for use up to the standard that should have been observed in order to do the work. But while the amount paid during 1894-5 and 1896 was only \$9,450, the sum that was paid by us during the last three years has exceeded \$100,000—or eleven times as much.

Now, we have been in a very unfavourable condition, and are, to-day, in a somewhat unfavourable condition as respects our locomotive power. I do not hesitate to say that the locomotives in use upon the Intercolonial Railway down to 1896 and 1897 were of an inferior character, and not worthy of the Intercolonial Railway. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) had not to any extent improved either their size or their quality. They were light engines, and many of them had passed the age when they could be useful in the service. Many of them would have answered as well and better in the scrap heap than running on the road, because they actually cost more to keep them in order than it would have cost to purchase new locomotives. Under the hon. gentleman there were 204 locomotives. We have kept up that number, and have added twenty-three. The number of passenger cars under his administration was 276; we have added forty-eight. The number of freight cars of all kinds was 6,344; and we have added 637. And yet, we have made no addition at all commensurate to the addition we should be entitled to make if the road were to be

equipped either with locomotives or with cars in proportion to the amount of business we are actually doing. I have had the proper officer in the service give me a statement as to what he felt we were entitled to in the way of additional locomotives and additional cars, having regard for the growth and increased pressure of the business. His statement shows that the engine mileage has increased 35 per cent, and the car mileage 50 per cent. Our increase of business, therefore, on this basis—which is a fair basis upon which to judge, according to the opinion of experts—shows the proportion of increase that should be made to our car and locomotive equipment.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. minister permit me to ask him a question?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the average life of freight cars according to the estimates of the department?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, a freight car, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) knows, has no fixed life. One kind of car will last longer than another. The ordinary flat car will not last very long, without expensive repairs—it is exposed always to the weather, and the wood must necessarily quickly decay. A box car, which is covered in, will last longer than a flat car, particularly if it is kept well painted and in good shape. I do not know just what would be considered the actual comparison of years between a box car and a flat car, but I should judge that a box car would last double the length of time that a flat car would last.

My deputy tells me that a flat car would last in the neighbourhood of ten years, and he would add two or three years to that for the life of a box car. The average life of a locomotive would be ten years, that is to say, you could put a locomotive on the road in good shape, have it properly repaired when it needed repair, and it would last twenty years. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) I do not complain of him; he was under pressure, I suppose, and not feeling any very great interest whether the Intercolonial Railway was a credit to the country or not—was not anxious particularly to keep up to the highest standard the quality of the equipment. He did not send the cars into the workshops to be repaired as frequently as they ought to go. There were cars—passenger cars—that ran three or four years without going into the repair shops, though that class of cars should be touched up every year. All these things helped, no doubt, to keep down the expenditure on what is called the maintenance account. But, while I say this, I am not complaining of the hon. gentleman.

I think it is well for us to face the facts as they are, it is well not to be too ready to

yield to any public clamour which may arise even though a deficit should become necessary upon the Intercolonial Railway. Let us make it our first object to maintain the road in a creditable manner to the country, even though a deficit should occur. Let us keep it in a condition that will enable it to meet the reasonable demands of its patrons and of the country generally. According to the opinion of the mechanical superintendent, I am entitled to add 35 per cent more to the locomotives we have upon the road in 1896; in other words, I am entitled to seventy-two additional locomotives. I am entitled, upon the basis which he has given us, to 3,500 freight cars, of all kinds; we have only added 637. I am entitled to add to the passenger cars, eighty-eight; we have only added forty-eight. I am entitled, therefore, to forty more of these. So you see, it is not possible for any person to say that these demands which are being made upon parliament to enable us to increase the equipment, are unreasonable, are not warranted by the necessities of the case, and are not such as parliament should be unwilling freely to grant.

I am asking this year for appropriations of a considerable amount. Under the branch of collection of revenue alone, I have asked for a much larger sum than has ever been asked for before. In 1895-6, \$3,200,000 was the amount voted under the head of collection of revenue: in 1896-7, the sum voted was \$3,200,000; in 1897-8, \$3,100,000; in 1898-9, \$3,600,000. In the main estimates of the present year, I have asked for \$3,650,000, and I am obliged to ask for \$900,000 more, which will make \$4,550,000, at least that is the best estimate I can form upon the subject. Why am I asking parliament to give so large an amount, under the heading of collection of revenue? I am doing it because I cannot operate the road, I cannot pay the working expenses, unless I have a sum approaching this amount. It may not be necessary to take every dollar of this sum, but it will take very nearly this amount, therefore, I have added \$900,000, which will make \$4,550,000. In that \$1,350,000 of increase on this branch of the appropriations alone, you will see accounted for a considerable portion of the increase in the added appropriation which this government are asking for during the current year. I see a statement in the newspaper press that the fact that we are asking this additional sum of \$900,000 is a proof that we are bound to have a great deficit upon the Intercolonial Railway. I have explained the reason of that addition. The committee will see that not one dollar of this sum is going to be paid out of anything except current revenue expenses, those which are paid for out of revenue. It is the same with the Intercolonial Railway as with any other department of the government, unless you have a vote for a sufficient sum to enable you to cover all these outlays, you cannot make them, you will have to stop running the

Mr. BLAIR.

Intercolonial Railway. If we should happen to do a ten million dollar business this year we would probably want nine millions of appropriation upon collection of revenue account; and, therefore, the expenses for the year upon the consolidated revenue account would be increased enormously. But, you are getting back every dollar of this, every dollar of money which you are now voting will be returned to you, will find its way into the treasury, and you will have over and above this sum, over and above all other sums that are voted upon revenue account, you will have a surplus when the accounts come to be made out for the year ending June 30 instant, of \$120,000 to the good. The present year I am asking on capital account, in the main estimates, for \$950,000, and in the supplementaries for the next year I am asking for \$400,000, and in the supplementaries for the current year I am asking for \$190,000, making a total of \$1,540,000. I am asking for this money in order that I may increase the locomotive service. I am only asking for enough to build twenty locomotives this year, which will cost \$320,000. I am asking for a sum sufficient to enable me to add 1,250 box cars, which will cost \$1,187,500. I am asking for a sum to enable me to get thirty-nine live stock cars, which will cost \$37,050. These sums will absorb the three items placed in the main estimates, and in the supplementaries for the current year, and in the supplementaries for the year to come.

Mr. POWELL. What about this \$1,915,000 on capital account in the supplementaries brought down last night?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have included the sum in my statement here. I have already mentioned that \$400,000 of that amount is for rolling stock. I have shown that the \$400,000 in the supplementaries, the \$950,000 in the main estimates, and the \$190,000 in the supplementaries for the current year, making a total of \$1,540,000, have been asked for in order to furnish the three classes of equipment, locomotives, box cars and live stock cars.

There is an item in the supplementary estimates of \$420,000 for steel rails. This sum is being asked for in order to put the Cape Breton line in proper shape, to replace the present rails with 80-pound steel rails, from Sydney to Cape Breton, and to put new rails on the main line. The rails there now are 56-pound rails, and have been in use many years. They were old 56-pound rails when they were put down in Cape Breton, they are in a very inferior condition, and are not fit to lie there any longer. We cannot do the business with them. There is unquestionably a great development promised in the island of Cape Breton. The business which is being started in the town of Sydney gives promise of furnishing a large amount of traffic to the road. The department finds itself confronted with this ques-

tion: Shall we allow that business to be done by water transit, or shall we put the Intercolonial Railway in such a condition as to be able to secure that traffic? It will be a profitable traffic, it will be necessarily a large traffic, and it is in our power, I think, to secure it. One of the things which we are bound to do in order to secure that traffic is to put down new rails in place of those which are now lying on the line. The amount which I have asked for here is the difference between the saleable value of these rails and the cost of new ones. I think \$120,000 will suffice for that purpose. I am asking also in the supplementary estimates for a sum to enable me to get a steam ferry for the Gut of Canso. This is practically the key to the railway situation. It is necessary that there should be placed upon the strait a class of steamer which will enable us to carry a full loaded train, whether passengers or freight, to carry the cars over and deliver them promptly without turning the boat, going straight over and coming straight back, and of sufficient strength to confront the ice conditions in winter. We have to do that if we are going to catch the business which is offering now in the Island of Cape Breton. I will enter into that item more in detail later on. I mention it now because it is one of the large items, and because there is no question about the imperative need. If we are going to recognize the need of the railway in the matter of equipment, it is necessary that these things should be done. I think I can appeal to the House with the same confidence as I have done before, in regard to what will be the result of parliament giving us the grants which we asked for. I think I can fairly say that I have not heretofore overstated the probable results, and yet our expectations have been about realized. I have very considerable expectations in respect to the growth of railway business in connection with developments at Sydney and North Sydney. At all events, it is imperative that we should relay the line and improve it, that we should provide additional sidings, and equip ourselves with additional station and yard accommodation and that we should furnish a ferry for the Strait of Canso. That portion of the line between Mulgrave and Truro, is laid with an inferior rail, and it is in an unsatisfactory condition, but it is not in so serious a condition as the line is in Cape Breton Island.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has considered the question of a bridge across the Strait of Canso. The very large amount which he is asking for the improvement in the ferry would almost indicate that by a somewhat larger expenditure, we would absolutely obtain a through line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper), ever given any thought to the probable cost of a bridge?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is what I was asking the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was asking the hon. gentleman if he had ever given the subject any thought while he was in the department?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I cannot say that I have. No, I have not, but in passing the Strait of Canso I have had my attention drawn to a locality where a bridge would be practicable. In that connection, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is aware that the necessity for rapid and easy communication had never arisen to the extent that it has arisen very recently in regard to that line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend is quite right about that. But I thought that, possibly, among the other subjects, he had considered while he was in the department, this might be one that would have come under his notice.

Mr. POWELL. There was no road in Cape Breton when the hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), was in the Railway Department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. I think myself, without undertaking to express any definite opinion upon it, that the construction of a bridge across the Strait of Canso would cost many, many times more than the ferry service. With my crude ideas on the subject, I would not like to say that I would construct a bridge across the strait for much less than \$10,000,000, or \$15,000,000. We are only proposing to ask now for a quarter of a million. It may possibly a little exceed this sum. I want to state the case as strongly against myself as I can. It may be that we will have to expend something over \$250,000, but we are in hopes that we will be able to keep it within the \$250,000. We are in hopes that the ferry service will afford the accommodation we will need for many years and it is the only practical way of making the connection at present.

Now, I think I have dwelt upon mainly, and though at some length, yet as briefly as I could, the question which I thought would be of interest to the committee in a general sense. I have now one or two observations more to make before I conclude my statement. One question I desire to touch upon, is a question that has attracted a good deal of attention in the opposition press. It has not been much discussed in this House of parliament, but I cannot say quite the same in regard to both Houses of parliament. There is a gentleman in another place, who has attacked, with a good deal of violence, the action of the department in respect to its award of contracts for the supply of lubricating oils. It is very evident to me that the gentleman who has taken this subject up with such energy, has not acquainted himself with the facts, and that he has not

really known much about the matter that he was discussing. When I came into the department, tenders had been received by the late government for the supply of oils for the Intercolonial Railway. I think I can say that the contract had been awarded. The contract had not been executed but, it had been awarded to what I considered the company making the most favourable offer. It was awarded very much along the same lines that the contracts had been in previous years, and as far as I could gather, or form a judgment, myself, upon the subject, there had not been satisfaction in the working out of these contracts, as we had a right to expect. Among the many tenderers at that time was a company known as the Galena Oil Company. This is a company which had been organized, which was not then in Canada, but which was an American institution. They tendered upon a new basis for the supply of oils for the Intercolonial Railway. They offered to guarantee to the Intercolonial Railway authorities, that the cost of lubricating the road for a year would not amount to as much per thousand miles during the continuance of their contract, as it had during previous years, by 10 per cent. Or, in other words, they said: We are prepared to furnish oil at a cost of 10 per cent less than oil has cost you hitherto. It looked to me like a very favourable offer, and when I became aware that 90 odd per cent of the railways in America were being supplied by this company with their oil, and were operating under a contract of the same character as, I have reason to believe, I felt that it was an experiment that the Intercolonial Railway might very well make, instead of continuing along in the old groove and getting unsatisfactory service. I thought it would be well to try the Galena Oil Company, and see how their contract would work out. The conditions under which the contract was made, are these: The oils which they supply are charged for at a fixed rate. I state at once, and this is where the gentleman who has been making the criticisms upon this matter has been labouring under a misapprehension, that the prices of the oil they furnish are high, and they claim they are high class oils, but the prices which are charged against the Intercolonial Railway are identical in every particular with the prices that are paid by all the other railway companies. I took pains to satisfy myself that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway Companies pay exactly the same prices for the oils furnished them that this company charge us. But the question of the price of the oil was not a very material consideration, because I had the condition guaranteed, that no matter what quantity of oil we used, and no matter what price they charged, when we came to wind up the transactions of the year our bill should be 10 per cent less than it had

been in any previous year. We therefore, stood to win to the extent of 10 per cent in any case. The Galena Oil Company proceed upon the supposition that a good deal of oil is wasted, and so they have experts of their own upon the railway to instruct the enginemen and drivers to be as economical as possible, and they watch them and complain of them if there is any waste. They have therefore, an interest to keep down the consumption, because the less consumption the less they lose under the arrangement they made with us. Under these circumstances I presented the case to the government, and my colleagues cancelled the award of contract that was made, and authorized the entering into this contract, and it has been continued down to the present time. The service has been eminently satisfactory. The officers of the road from the general manager down, are assured that the results have been much more favourable in every way than under the previous system of contracting. After the first contract expired I thought I would perhaps press the point a little further, and I said: You have guaranteed us 10 per cent saving, but we will only renew the contract upon the condition that you will guarantee us 15 per cent. Rather than not get the contract—and I suppose even at that rate it was profitable to them—they guaranteed that the cost per 1,000 miles would be 15 per cent less than it had been prior to the time they contracted with us. Now we have this arrangement recently entered into. We find that the expense for oils on the Intercolonial Railway has been year by year coming down, until we are justified in forming the opinion that we have pretty nearly struck rock bottom. Under the operation of the old contracts it cost to oil an Intercolonial Railway locomotive per thousand miles \$3.72, to oil a passenger car 80 cents per thousand miles, and to oil a freight car 22 cents. Now we have got down to the point that we have a fixed contract with them that for locomotives we will not pay more than \$2.72 per thousand miles, which is a saving of \$1 per thousand miles for each locomotive; and instead of paying 80 cents for a passenger car, as under the old system we have got it down to 20 cents, and we have got the freight cars down from 22 cents to 12 cents. We are, therefore, actually saving under this contract \$10,000 a year and upwards in the cost of oils for the Intercolonial Railway. Yet this gentleman denounces this government in all the moods and tenses because we have made this contract. We are paying the same price that every railway company in America is paying. However, this gentleman apparently did not care so much about the price of oils, as he did to make his statement a basis upon which to condemn the government for paying alleged exorbitant prices. I thought it well that I should put the committee in possession of

the actual facts, lest hon. gentlemen might be led astray by the statements made in the opposition press and elsewhere, and what are based upon an entirely erroneous conception.

Let me say a word or two in conclusion. I want the House to bear in mind that the improved condition of the Intercolonial Railway during the past year, which is a record of record years, has not been brought about by any diminution of expenditure upon the railway for its maintenance and its repairs, either as respects the road-bed or the equipment. I want the House to remember that the Intercolonial Railway to-day is in a better condition than it ever was before. I want the House to remember that the equipment of the Intercolonial Railway is better than ever before, and on the basis of this year's operations (which I hope will not be an exceptional year) this equipment is costing the people of the country nothing. I want to point out that we can place the Intercolonial Railway to-day alongside of any other railway in Canada, and we can claim honestly that the government has not allowed the character of this great railway system, belonging to the nation to become depreciated in any way whatever. We can claim that our vestibule system of train service is as good as is to be found on this continent. We can claim that the dining car service, which was never given on the Intercolonial Railway until three years ago, cannot be excelled on any railway in America. I believe that the people of Canada take a pride in this railway, and they can now legitimately do so. There may be some narrow criticism because we are spending money, but not only the regular patrons of the Intercolonial Railway, and those who live along the line, but the people from all parts of Canada as well, who travel on that railway, are proud to see that this government road is maintained, so as to be a credit to the country, and that when strangers travel over it they need not be ashamed to point out that it is a railway owned and operated by the government of the country. I believe that the people in all parts of the country will readily respond to a statement of that kind.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman says 'no.' but I believe to the contrary. I believe that while the people will not tolerate extravagance, yet they are proud to see the national railway properly equipped, and they are all the more satisfied because that result has been attained without extravagance. At all events whatever expenditure has been made on the Intercolonial Railway to bring it up to a high standard of efficiency, the results obtained have been commensurate with the outlay that has been made. I want the House to bear in mind that this most satisfactory showing of the Intercolonial Railway has not been

obtained by resorting to any means of cutting down expenditure for proper and necessary purposes, or by any manipulation of the accounts, or by any alteration or change in the system of book-keeping. The figures which I have given to this House have been compiled by the officers of the Intercolonial service, the same men who did the work for my predecessor, upon exactly the same basis, and in precisely the same way. I therefore, wish to emphasize these figures. The earnings in the last four years have been as follows:

1896-7.....	\$2,866,028
1897-8.....	3,117,669
1898-9.....	3,738,331
1899-1900.....	4,533,000

A steady, continuous and marked growth—a growth, the possibilities of which were entirely repudiated and denied by hon. gentlemen opposite in their criticisms upon the statements which were made. Now, Sir, is there a parallel in the life of the Intercolonial Railway for such a statement as I have presented to you? No. Stagnation was the record of the Intercolonial during all the preceding years. It has taken a fresh start; it has received a stimulus. I do not care where it gets the stimulus from, the fact remains, and that may be taken as some evidence that the policy and the administration of this government have not been erroneous or mistaken. Now, I ask you to compare the four years which I have given you with the four years just preceding, some of which were as prosperous years as we ordinarily have in the maritime provinces; put the figures for the two periods alongside of each other, and you will be able to draw your own conclusions. The earnings in those four years were as follows:

1892-3.....	\$3,065,499
1893-4.....	2,987,510
1894-5.....	2,940,717
1895-6.....	2,957,640

Tied almost to the stake of \$2,900,000; they could not get away from it. There was no life in the old road. But whatever may be the causes of it—and I attribute it largely to the policy of giving the road a live terminal in the city of Montreal—we have shown a record of great and continuous progress which, if achieved under the administration of my hon. friend would have evoked adjectives more extreme than any we have ever heard from my hon. friend in his denunciations of the gross misconduct of this administration. Let me emphasize at the same time that this result has not been won by any depreciation in our expenditure. In 1896-7, 1897-8 and 1898-9 there was an excess of \$244,926 expended by this government in keeping up the quality of the road over which was expended in the same direction in the preceding three or four years. I do not say that we spent all that the railway would have stood; it would have stood more. We have not spent all that I would have liked to spend, or that I

could have spent with good results to the country. But the fact remains that in those three years we spent \$80,000 per year in excess of what our predecessors spent in those classes of expenditure which are recognized as proper for the maintenance of the railway. In addition to that, we have paid the rentals of the Drummond County and the Grand Trunk lines; we have increased the wages of our men all along the line to the extent of \$175,000 a year; we have paid car mileage in one year alone enough to pay the interest on \$2,000,000; and we have given you, without adding to the burdens of the people, a class of service and an improved railway of which the people of this country have no reason to be ashamed.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

### AFTER RECESS.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 166) to incorporate the British American Pulp and Paper Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

#### SUPPLY.

(The House resumed in Committee.)

Mr. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). At six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Railways had just finished a lengthy description of the canal expenditure and the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway. Starting at Sault Ste. Marie Canal, he stated his intention of expending about \$1,200,000 for the purpose of completing that work. We will have the details further on when the estimates come up, but I cannot see what work is required to be done there that would call for this expenditure. The hon. minister then brought us down to the Welland Canal, and stated that he intended to make an expenditure there of over \$1,000,000, and proceeding to the Galops Canal, he announced an expenditure on that work of \$750,000, and he followed this up with the statement that he proposed to spend nearly \$900,000 on the Soulanges Canal, and a similar amount on the Lachine Canal. He told us that the expenditure on the canal system of the St. Lawrence had now reached the total of \$77,000,000 or \$78,000,000, and that by an expenditure of \$10,000,000 or \$11,000,000 more we would complete the St. Lawrence system along with the Trent Canal. To complete this last enterprise, he expected to require about \$3,500,000, according to the plans which had been adopted by the department.

I notice that the hon. gentleman, when dealing with the large expenditure on our canal system, did not go into any details, but contented himself with declaring that it was an expenditure to which the people had no objection, and that although the annual expenditure for the purpose of keep-

Mr. BLAIR.

ing those canals in repair amounted to about \$354,000, there was not a grumble, from one end of the country to the other, against it. He did not dwell at all upon the details of the management and expenditure in the case of the canals, but reserved all his details for the work on the Intercolonial Railway.

I would ask the hon. gentleman why it is necessary to spend the amount he proposes, \$1,200,000, on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal? I would ask him further, what does he propose to do with an expenditure of over \$1,000,000 on the Welland Canal? I thought that the hon. gentleman had completed this canal system. I judged, from the speech, made from one end of the country to the other, that the present government had not only completed the canals but done the whole work. Under their management our canal system was to have been completed, at the latest, in 1898, with a draught of water of fourteen feet navigation. But, evidently the hon. gentleman has not completed the canal system any quicker or cheaper than we would have completed it. Every one knows that the Galops Canal will not be completed even this year, and I would like to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the expenditure on that work. With the thorough knowledge of details and management of all the canals and railways of this country on which the hon. gentleman prides himself, he ought to have no difficulty in explaining some of the details on which I desire to be informed now.

I notice in the Auditor General's Report that Gilbert & Co. have a contract for dredging the Galops Canal, and they seem, strange to say, to have got the contract without tender or anything else. They have had it certainly for three years, and I would like to know really how long they have had it. They only get \$425 a day for a dredge and a scow and a tug, and I notice that although the department gives the number of yards taken out in nearly every other case, there are no details given as to the number of yards which Gilbert & Sons have taken out; and I will venture to say that each yard of the excavations made on the Galops Canal costs the country at least \$50 per yard. On the same page in the Auditor General's Report you will find that a dredge, scow and tug supplied by a Mr. Cleveland, and no doubt precisely the same as the dredge, scow and tug for which Gilbert & Sons are receiving \$425 per day, are doing the work at \$100 per day, and, no doubt, the reason is because the work was given out by tender.

Speaking of the Galops Canal, I have drawn already the attention of the minister to the fact, that, perhaps, it was not necessary at all to build a canal there. That part of the work is being utilized now without the expenditure that is being made through the village of Cardinal.

The lock that is being made in the Galops is being utilized, not only for large vessels

and barges going down, but is utilized by them coming up stream. I told the hon. minister at the time that this work was unnecessary and also the Rapide Plat Canal. I stated that vessels of a class to be economically used on the canal and which were being constructed at the time would need to have power to drive them at the rate of ten or twelve miles an hour, the rapid at that place being, I believe, five or six miles an hour. I told the hon. minister that an expenditure of two millions might be saved by utilizing the lock which is at present built to get into the canal, and that the old canal could be used for the present barge system, but that for the modern vessels there was no necessity to build a new canal. However, the new canal is being built—though it is not finished, and, I suppose, will not be finished before next year. We come now to the Soulanges Canal. The hon. minister took the contract for finishing the locks at the lower end from the contractor, and, without calling for tenders gave it to Ryan and Macdonald at \$200,000 more than the work would have been finished for under the contract of Mr. Stewart. Is that part of the work completed? Is it done better or will it be done any more quickly than under the former contract? I say, no. The contract was taken from a capable contractor and given to another without any advantage being gained, and at a higher price. The minister asked \$900,000 or thereabouts for the Lachine Canal. I thought that work was about completed. If the money is not to be spent on an ocean lock so as to use that part of the canal next the harbour for the ocean going vessels, I do not know what the object of it can be.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I stated that the amount was half a million.

**Mr. HAGGART.** I see *Hansard* reports it as \$967,000, and that must be correct, as the whole is totalled up and makes \$10,235,000. I suppose that when the minister speaks of half a million, he means the vote of this year; but what I am speaking of is the amount necessary to finish the work. What I protest against is the claim of the hon. gentleman that this work was completed more expeditiously than it would have been completed under the late government. The work is not finished yet, and I doubt that it will be finished any sooner, or that it will be any better than under my management. The hon. minister is not entitled to any credit. The plan to have the locks 270 feet by 45 feet with a depth of 14 feet of water was approved by Mr. Mackenzie, and, from 1874 to 1878, he worked on that plan. It was continued by the late government up to 1896, when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. They are not entitled to credit for the initiation of the plan or for anything else in connection with it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) makes a claim—at any rate his fol-

lowers do all through the country; it is one of their great boasts—that this canal system has been completed in a short time. The hon. minister (Mr. Blair) stated last year that at the rate at which the work was proceeding under my management, the Soulanges Canal would not be finished for forty years. That is on a par with a good many of his calculations, especially with reference to the Intercolonial Railway. However, the country is to be congratulated on that system, and I hope that the best hopes of the country with regard to these canals will be realized. I have every faith in the enterprise; and I believe that in a short time the trade of that vast western country will flow through these canals and find its way across the Atlantic through the different ports of our own country.

The hon. gentleman stated that there was no fault found with the expenditures on these canals. I wondered what he was leading up to. I thought he wanted to show the vast sum of money that had been spent in Ontario and Quebec, leading up to some scheme of aggrandizement in the maritime provinces. It occurred to me that, perhaps, he would propose to purchase all the roads connecting with the Intercolonial Railway. But what he said was only for the purpose of preparing the House and the country for putting \$4,200,000 into his hands to be expended on capital account to purchase locomotives and other equipment for the Intercolonial Railway. It required a good deal of reasoning. I do not know how the hon. gentleman ever got it through council. I do not know another Minister of Railways who ever succeeded in getting such a large sum as that to be expended on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway. But, before proceeding to discuss what he said about the Intercolonial Railway, I would ask the hon. minister about that 'infamous bargain' that 'most monstrous contract that ever was entered into by same men' which was made by the right hon. Sir John Macdonald and others with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway with reference to running arrangements on the Intercolonial Railway. In 1897, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) assured the House that he had given notice of the termination of that contract—that the government of the country was in different hands now—and they would not be bled to the extent that others had been by the railroad corporations which had virtually a monopoly of the cream of the Intercolonial Railway's business. I hope he will be able to lay on the Table a fresh agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway. He has had four years to do it. But I doubt very much that he has anything to offer. I doubt very much that he has. I told the hon. gentleman that if he had cancelled the contract he could not have got any better terms, and he would be obliged to accept that. I venture to say at this moment that the hon. gentleman

has not been able to make any better arrangement with these railway companies than that monstrous arrangement entered into by the right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, and which he so much decried.

The hon. gentleman takes a particular interest in comparisons. The management of the Intercolonial Railway from 1892 to 1896 seems to annoy him. In the arrangements that were made between 1892 and 1896 he did not give me credit for doing anything which would be for the reduction of expenditure. He said that I never paid any attention to it. He said the then acting Minister of Railways and Canals went down to Moncton and made all these arrangements by which to effect a saving on the Intercolonial Railway. But he has a different tune this time. The railroad by that proceeding was degraded, the rails were not kept up, the stations were not up to the mark, the rolling stock was allowed to deteriorate, and the road was allowed to decline in every respect. The hon. gentleman's tune is changed now. It was the late minister, he thinks, perhaps, that has done that. When he makes a comparison between my management and his own to show that the road was degraded by false economy, he now blames for it, not Sir Mackenzie Bowell, who presided over the Intercolonial Railway for a couple of months before I took charge, but he attributes the fault to myself. He says that perhaps I have ability if I only applied it, but I have not the energy of the hon. gentleman who presides over the road at the present time, I did not familiarize myself with all the details on the Intercolonial Railway. He points to it now with pride as an officer might point with pride to a private in his regiment and say, *Ex uno disce omnes*; and he says that now any person stepping on an Intercolonial Railway car will meet civil porters, courteous conductors, and that there is an air of cleanliness about the Intercolonial Railway now which was absent from it before. Well, perhaps the hon. gentleman, among his numerous attainments, has been able to acquire a detailed knowledge of everything in reference to the Intercolonial Railway. You would think from his reading the statistics over which he gloated, that he is acquainted with all the details. He took up the different reports of the different departments and rehashed them to the House, with but a partial understanding of them.

The hon. gentleman, for the purpose of showing the debasement of the road that occurred from 1892 to 1896, points to the condition of the wharfs, stations and everything else on the road. The deficit of the preceding year, 1891, was in the neighbourhood of \$400,000, and I was enabled to change it in some manner or another which he explained, to a surplus of \$20,000. He said that where my predecessor had expended a large amount upon iron rails, I had

only expended something over \$100,000, and that the amount expended upon ties was less than before, and he gave some other details, which he made to aggregate \$300,000. And to show his knowledge of the book-keeping of the Intercolonial Railway, he said I had depleted the stores which partly accounted for nearly \$100,000 more. The hon. gentleman seemed to have a knowledge of his department, he seemed to think that the store account entered into the expenditure and receipts of the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, has found out now by consultation with his deputy, that the stores account has nothing to do with the receipts and expenditures of the Intercolonial Railway. He drew a comparison. He says that from 1897 up to 1900, to show that he had not degraded the character of the road, the expenditure for rails was as great as I had made from 1892 to 1896. He does not say that it was any greater, he does not say that the expenditure was any larger from 1896 to 1900; but for the purpose of showing that I had degraded the road in comparison with its condition in 1891-2, he said that my expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway for rails, ties and these other things was less than the preceding year. But in order to show that he had not degraded the road, he said that his expenditure from 1896 to 1900 was as great as mine.

The hon. gentleman twitted me with a statement that the acquisition of the Drummond County Railway would be a source of loss to the country. I did say so, I stated that the acquisition of that railway and of the terminus in Montreal would be a great loss to the country, and I can prove that such has been the case from the hon. gentleman's figures. I stated that after I had looked into the affair I decided not to acquire it. I saw that there would be two roads competing for the purpose of bringing to the terminus at Point Lévis all that could be expected from Montreal, and that instead of it being a benefit to the Intercolonial Railway to have an entrance into Montreal, we would only have these two roads rivals to each other. Now, what is the result? The hon. gentleman brags about his surplus. He says that his surplus was caused by the acquisition of the Drummond County Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway into Montreal. How does the hon. gentleman find that out? Where are his figures to justify any such statement? He has the receipts of every office in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, and if he had applied to his deputy he could have found out the contrary. He can find out that there are increased receipts on the Intercolonial Railway by looking at the receipts of the offices. I took the trouble to look them over and to find what the receipts are at the different offices. But that process will not give a correct result, because it gives the total

receipts as each office, and there are no deductions for what we have to pay to the different railways for which we collect freight charges. It only gives an approximate result. Now, if he will investigate he will find out that the increased receipts in Nova Scotia alone was \$257,000. That was accounted for by the completion of the Newfoundland Railway, by the steam communication from Newfoundland to Sydney, by the immense works which are in process of construction, and the development of the mines in Sydney. But no matter what the reasons were, the increased receipts from the Intercolonial Railway from Nova Scotia alone are \$257,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How does the hon. gentleman make that out?

Mr. HAGGART. I will give the hon. gentleman the details, and he will get details to his heart's content in reference to it. The receipts in New Brunswick are as nearly as possible stationary, the increased receipts amounting to \$10,000. The total receipts for the Quebec portion of the road are \$760,000. The receipts before the completion of the Drummond County Railway and the arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway, were in the neighbourhood of \$347,000. The increased receipts from the Quebec portion of the road are in the neighbourhood of \$416,000. Add \$416,000 to \$257,000 and \$10,000, and it will give the hon. gentleman his surplus. Now, let us analyse the \$760,000 which he receives from the Quebec portion of the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What year is the hon. gentleman professing to speak of?

Mr. HAGGART. Eighteen ninety-nine as compared with 1897. The hon. gentleman's returns are for 1898-9 and 1896-7.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How much is it for 1898-9 in Quebec?

Mr. HAGGART. As nearly as I can make out, \$760,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How much for 1896-7 in Quebec?

Mr. HAGGART. Three hundred and forty-seven thousand dollars. That allows \$416,000 of an increase, including the increased earnings for the Drummond County and Grand Trunk Railway sections of the road. As my figures make it out, it will leave a total for the Drummond County Railway in the neighbourhood of \$305,000, taking the mileage into consideration of that portion of the road. The hon. gentleman says that one of the very best bargains that was ever made, was the acquisition of that road, that there was a surplus of earnings for that section of the road. What does he pay? He pays \$160,000 a year to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. \$140,000 a year.

Mr. HAGGART. I took the figures that he gave last night. He said that the total amount that he paid was \$210,000 to the Grand Trunk and Drummond County. Am I correct?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Now, take the hon. gentleman's surplus at say \$100,000 on receipts of \$3,800,000; what percentage is that, allowing 3 per cent, 4 per cent, or 5 per cent on that amount? Allowing to the Drummond County section its share of the profits of the road, 5 per cent on \$305,000 would be \$15,000. The amount earned by the Drummond County is in the neighbourhood of \$305,000, and \$15,000 from that makes \$290,000. The \$290,000 is all taken up by the running expenses of the road, because the whole amount of the profits over and above the running expenses of the road would be, taking the average of the whole, about \$15,000. Take \$15,000 from \$210,000, and that shows the loss that the hon. gentleman made last year on this speculation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), be good enough to refer me to the records from which he has obtained these two figures, that I have just asked him about, the receipts from the Quebec portion of the line for 1898-9, of \$760,000, and for 1896-7 of \$347,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, the hon. gentleman will find them in the Auditor General's Report. They are made up from the amounts received at the different stations in the different provinces. You will find the receipts for Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, in the Auditor General's Report. This is an addition of these amounts taken from the Auditor General's Report. He pays \$210,000 in rental for these two roads. And, if you deduct the share of the profits of the Drummond County and Grand Trunk sections, from those of the whole line, it will show the loss which the hon. gentleman has made on the Drummond County and the Grand Trunk Railways, in getting into Montreal. That justifies the statement which I made and which every railway man in the country knows, that the acquisition of those two lines of road must cost this country at least \$175,000 a year. That represents a loss to the people of the country of \$175,000 a year. The whole of the improvement upon the Intercolonial Railway was practically in Nova Scotia. This is the normal improvement that has occurred in the business of railways from one end of the country to the other. Look at the percentage of increase of earnings of the Grand Trunk Railway, look at the percentage of increase of earnings of nearly every railway in America, and you will find

that the percentage of increase is not much greater upon the Intercolonial Railway than upon these roads. The hon. gentleman says that it was an old fogey road, remaining stationary, until he got control of it. The increased receipts upon the road differed very little in 1893, from what they were in 1898, only by about \$54,000. If I remember rightly the best year, from 1892 to 1896, showed receipts of about \$3,050,000, and the amount which the hon. gentleman received was \$3,112,000. To be deducted from that, and it is a fair deduction from the earnings or profits that he has received this year, is the interest on the enormous amount which the hon. gentleman has expended on capital account. According to his own statement, since he came into power, he has expended \$3,200,000 on capital account. So that, taking wear and tear, decay, decreased value, and the insurance that is necessary, it would be a fair amount to charge for interest on that expenditure, 5 per cent a year, so that he has to deduct from his profits, to make a comparison of my management of the road, \$160,000 a year. In addition to that, he intends to add to that expenditure \$4,200,000. He says that the road, when he came into power, was degraded, that it had not modern engines or equipment, and that it was not up to the mark. All I can say is that the road-bed was the best of any railway in Canada, or America, that the equipment was in abundance, and in excess of the requirements of the road. It was so reported to me by my department. My department made the further statement that if we required the Drummond County Railway, we would not require any more rolling stock, because there was a surplus upon the Intercolonial Railway, sufficient to equip that portion of the road going into Montreal.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) made a comparison of the expenditures on capital account between my time in the Department of Railways and his. He told us that the same items were charged to capital account now, as when I was minister. I deny the statement. My instructions were that unless in the case of the acquisition of a large property, the purchase of a railway or something of that kind, that every thing possible should be charged to the current account of the Intercolonial Railway. Even when there was a new iron bridge to be built I did not charge it to capital account. There were four new locomotives bought, and I did not charge them to capital account, but the thing is different now. My instructions were that train equipment and everything else on the road should be kept up in the best possible way, no matter whether there was a deficit or not. The minister has frankly stated that the charges in that section of the country are, perhaps, lower than they are in any other country in the world. Well, that was the policy of the late government. We looked upon that

as a kind of a gift to counterbalance the free canal system we have in our section of Canada, and we felt that no more charges should be levied on the people of the maritime provinces than was absolutely required for the purpose of carrying on the business of the railway. If the Intercolonial Railway should fall into other hands, and if modern rates were charged for freight and passengers, it would be just as easy for the management of the Intercolonial Railway to clear annually from \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000, as it is to make the accounts balance. There is no trick about it. It requires no special knowledge on the part of the minister to do that. What the people in the maritime provinces want is an economical and efficient management of the road, and that the road should be kept in first class order as it was when I was Minister of Railways. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) is getting engines and modern appliances; yes, and he has modern means of getting them too. It would be interesting to know the system on which he has purchased these appliances. It is certainly not done in the open as was the case when I had the direction of affairs. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), says he has adopted a better system in regard to the purchase of oil, but if he imposes on other gentlemen in this House, he cannot impose upon me in reference to that matter. When I had charge of the department, every bit of the material that was bought for the Intercolonial Railway was subject to the inspection and approval of the officers, and if there was any doubt between the merits of different materials furnished at different prices, the question of the quality was left to the analyses of McGill College at Montreal. The minister may talk as he likes about this Galena oil contract, but he would save all suspicion if he adopted the methods of his predecessor, and have nothing to do with any purchases no matter what technical knowledge he may be supposed to have. I never had anything to do with private tenders and private contracts and awards when I was minister. A list of fifty or sixty persons was selected, and they were asked to tender, and if any one wanted his name added to that list all he had to do was to make application. I never awarded a contract in my life without the sanction and the approval, and the recommendation of the officers in charge of the railway. In fact, later on, I never looked into these contracts at all. I told them to exercise their own judgment, and that I would hold them responsible, and that I would only decide when two tenders were alike. Even then, I left it to the officers. That ought to be the policy which the minister should follow to-day. As to the oil question, the minister could very easily submit it for analyses to McGill University, as was done previously, and then he would know whether he was getting good oil at

Mr. HAGGART.

a fair price, and he would avoid the suspicion of making private terms with companies who come along and are supposed to offer special privileges.

All the development of traffic on the Intercolonial Railway is due to the development of trade throughout the country generally, and in the maritime provinces particularly. It is not the modern methods of the minister which has brought about that improvement. His sixty ton, or eighty ton engines, are only needed between Moncton and Montreal, where they have a long run, and you do not require on the Intercolonial Railway the expensive engines which they have on the Canadian Pacific Railway or other roads. For what purpose is there to be an expenditure of \$4,200,000? amounting to a charge of about \$126,000 a year. Does the minister expect that he will get that return out of the extra earnings of the Intercolonial Railway? The amount of the total receipts on the Intercolonial Railway in 1897, was \$3,112,000; the highest up to that time, and does the hon. gentleman pretend that his management of the road and the acquisition of the Drummond Railway has developed the trade in that section of the country to the enormous extent of \$700,000 or \$800,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not a particle of doubt about it.

Mr. HAGGART. Then you are the only person in the whole country that has any such opinion. There is no increased travel.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. HAGGART. The accommodation on the Intercolonial Railway from 1892 to 1896, was just as good as it is at the present time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We had hardly a through passenger then on the Intercolonial from Montreal.

Mr. HAGGART. We could not have them from Montreal, but we had them from Point Lévis.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We had not.

Mr. HAGGART. The Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway carried them to Point Lévis. Your increase of traffic on the Quebec portion of the road is only about \$400,000, and that is made up by the mileage of the Drummond County Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway entrance into Montreal. If the hon. gentleman will make inquiries upon the spot, he will find that the total increase on the Intercolonial Railway is merely in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, on account of the development of the mines and the increased trade. I am proud of my management of the Intercolonial Railway. I would not make com-

parisons between my management and that of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman, I am sorry to say, has not so much modesty; he makes the comparison with evident pleasure. He wants to show how superior a man he is, how easily he has acquired the knack of managing a railway. I do not think he knows anything at all about it—not much at any rate. He is right if he does what I did—I trusted to the officers of the road, after giving them general instructions as to what I wanted. I wanted no useless employees in the locomotive works, nor any more men on the line than were necessary to keep it in repair. I found an economical and efficient manager, and then I left the management in his hands; and I think we had as efficient a management of the road as we could possibly have. I shall, perhaps, have an opportunity of criticising the details of the different items as they come up. I do not enter into calculations of these matters, as the hon. gentleman has done, because there is the hon. gentleman in this House who is more accustomed to handling details than I am, and who will deal with them. But, I can fearlessly compare my management of the Intercolonial Railway with that of the hon. gentleman; and notwithstanding the fact that its terminus is not now in the old city of Quebec, but in the city of Montreal, I will venture to say—and I will leave it to any railroad man in this country—that the enormous expenditure made by this government for the purpose of bringing the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal will never be recouped to the people of Canada—that the earnings of that portion of the road will never pay the interest which the people of Canada have to pay on its cost. I do not think it is necessary for me to make any longer statement than I have made at present; but there is nothing in what the hon. gentleman has stated to show that his management of the Intercolonial Railway can compare with the management of his predecessors. If we have canals or railroads in this country, it is not owing to the hon. gentleman and his friends. The initiation and construction of the canals and the railway system of this country, which hon. gentlemen opposite now glory in, were due to the leaders of the Conservative party of this country, and I believe we shall soon have a further development of the country when the Conservative party again return to power, and when there is a cessation of the lavish and unnecessary expenditures of hon. gentlemen opposite. What possible need can there have been for an expenditure of \$3,200,000 on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway since the hon. gentleman came into power? And he asks for next year, \$4,250,000. Is it not enough to stagger the people of this country? Why are we to be bled in this way? In order that the hon. gentleman may enjoy the boyish reputation of buying locomotives, painting cars, and making other expenditures which do not amount to the dignity of frivolity.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has discussed the question before the House from a broad standpoint, and has not meddled very much with matters of detail. I can assure you that I was very much pleased to learn from the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals that there was so large an increase in the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway. Every man who has a throb of patriotism in his breast must feel pleased that for some reason or other there is a very large increase of freight and passenger traffic on that line. The transportation facilities of a country afford a tolerably fair index to its commercial prosperity. I am sorry, however, that I cannot congratulate the hon. Minister of Railways on the reason he has put forward for this increased traffic. The hon. gentleman, I may say in the outset, has in his office—not in the office in Ottawa, but in the railway office in the city of Moncton—and under his control, the means of giving a tolerably full and complete statement in respect to this matter which would have been satisfactory to the House and the country. He has not seen fit to do so. I do not know why. During the session I have endeavoured to get some information by asking questions. My questions were generally, though not entirely, shunted off by the minister's expressed desire that they should form the subject of a motion. As you know, that is a very unsatisfactory method of acquiring information in the House, where the Motion paper is so clogged as it has been during the present session. Before proceeding to discuss the main question under consideration, I will direct my attention for a few moments to an attack which the hon. gentleman made upon the management of the late Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart). He accused that hon. gentleman of starving the services of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, the present Minister of Railways and Canals is a very adroit marshaller of facts. I do not know, in my acquaintance, another man who can, by adroit manipulation of conceded facts, give a colouring that is opposed to the truth as the north pole is to the south. In the particular case before us, he attempted. I do not know why, to discredit the ex-Minister of Railways by showing that he had caused a very large reduction in the expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway in the first year of his advent to office. He compared elaborately the year ending June 30, 1892, with the year ending June 30, 1893. Now, I might ask this House, if a gentleman undertook to run economically any department of business, public or private, would not the very first thing he would attend to, in order to succeed in his aim, be the curtailing of unnecessary expenditures? That is what you would expect to find in the management of the hon. ex-Minister of

Mr. HAGGART.

Railways if his management were worthy of the approbation of this country. The charge that he starved the services of the Intercolonial Railway resolves itself into three phases: First, did he starve the locomotive service? Secondly, did he starve the car service? Thirdly, did he starve the service of maintenance of the road-bed? These are the three services to which the Minister of Railways and Canals most properly directed his attention, and to which we must look. If I can succeed in showing that the hon. gentleman expended in 1899 far less upon this service, with an additional mileage of about 170 miles, than the ex-Minister of Railways did in 1892, then I think the charge of having starved the service falls to the ground. What are the facts? The hon. gentleman compared 1892 with 1893, and I will take the same services and compare 1893 and 1899.

I will take first, the repairs to engines, which is a very important item. Is this House prepared for the statement that the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) spent in the year 1893 the sum of \$233,911 on this item, while the hon. gentleman last year, with 170 more miles of railway to keep in repair, and the engines necessarily being worked a great deal more than before, and with additional engines also, did not spend \$233,900, but spent \$12,800 less. If the ex-Minister of Railways was starving the service of the Intercolonial Railway in 1893, what shall we say of the present minister who spent \$13,000 less upon it in 1897?

That is one branch, I pass on to another. We will take the maintenance of water tanks and pumps along the road, and see what amount was expended upon them. The ex-Minister of Railways, it is true, cut down the expenditure upon that item a small amount, but compared his expenditure in 1893 with the expenditure of 1899, and what do we find? I find that the expenditure in 1893 was \$32,193. How magnificently has the present Minister of Railways treated this branch of the service? What was his expenditure in 1899? Why, with 170 miles additional of railway, we find that he spent on this service only \$32,325, or an excess of just \$132 over the expenditure in 1893.

We will look for a moment or two at the car service, which is chiefly freight and passengers. In 1893, it is true, the ex-Minister of Railways did spend about \$7,000 less upon this service than was spent during the previous year. This was a tremendous sin in the eyes of the present minister. The ex-minister was negligent, he had the interests of the west only at heart, he did not consult the interests of the maritime provinces, he did not have an eye to giving a better status to the railway. But how much in excess of the \$82,000, spent by the ex-Minister of Railways, has the present minister spent. Why, in 1899

not only did he not spend \$82,683, but he spent \$8,000 less upon the car service, and with a railway 170 miles longer than before.

But it does not rest there. We will go further. Take the postal car and the baggage and express car service. The ex-Minister of Railways cut down \$3,000—a terrible crime in the eyes of the present minister. He was neglecting the interests of the country, he was starving the service of the Intercolonial Railway, he thought of nothing but the canals of the west. But what was the present minister's expenditure? Instead of spending as much as his predecessor, \$21,639, he spent very little more than half as much. He spent, not \$21,000, but \$9,000 less, or only \$12,000.

Passing along to another item, the hon. gentleman has had a great deal of freight service to be performed by the railway, and he accuses the ex-Minister of Railways of having starved that service. Let us see how the matter stands. The ex-Minister of Railways spent \$208,728 upon that service in the year ending June 30, 1893. The previous year \$210,000 had been spent upon it, so that the ex-minister had the temerity to spend \$2,000 less—a terrible crime! But how much less did the present minister expend? Did he expend, say \$100,000 more in maintaining the rolling stock in a state of efficiency? Why, would you believe it, last year he expended, not only less than in 1892, but expended no less a sum than \$36,000 less than did the ex-Minister of Railways in 1893.

Now, we will go a little further; we will pass along to the road-bed itself. The ex-Minister of Railways spent on rails and fastenings in 1893, \$75,000. In the previous year he spent \$150,000. Over this the present minister grows indignant, he charges the ex-minister with having neglected the interests of the country, with having allowed the road to run down. Pardon if I digress and call your attention to what was going on in the way of renewing the rails on the Intercolonial Railway at that time. A few years previously to the year 1893 a very wise movement was set on foot to replace the 56-pound rails, then in the line of the Intercolonial railway, by 67-pound rails, and for some years this work had been going on. For instance, in 1890, \$250,000 had been expended in that service; in 1891, \$180,000; in 1892, \$150,000. The road was then fairly well equipped with heavy rails along the parts subjected to heavy freight traffic, and it was not necessary to make large outlays thereafter. There was no call upon the ex-Minister of Railways to continue so large an expenditure, and the expenditure dropped to \$75,000—a terrible sin. But what about the hon. minister himself last year? How much did he spend? Why, one would imagine that he spent somewhere about

\$200,000, to hear his intense indignation. But did he spend as much as the ex-Minister of Railways? No. The ex-minister spent \$75,000, and the present minister spent only one-half as much, or \$38,000, and that he calls keeping the road-bed in a very high state of efficiency.

I now pass along to the question of ties. The hon. minister waxed warm on that question. He said that the ex-minister had placed on the road in 1893, 46,000 ties less than in 1892. That is true, and the present minister attempted to persuade us that he was making an excellent point. But what are the facts? The ex-minister in 1893 placed 84,435 ties on the road, and the present minister has 170 miles more railway—or to be exact, as part is joint section, 132 miles more—and that would be between 1-7th and 1-8th more mileage than the ex-minister had to deal with. Add 1-7th to the 84,000 ties, and that would give you about 96,000. Well, how many ties did the hon. minister place upon the road last year? He put 99,000 instead of 96,000, which was the regular proportion on the road. The ex-minister was allowing the road to deteriorate, says the present minister, but you see the absurdity of such a contention. This matter will bear further comment.

Some time ago I asked the hon. gentleman a question and got from him the answer that on the Drummond Railway of 120 miles, he had laid 17,300 ties during the year 1899. Taking that from 99,000, 82,000 is left for the balance of the road. That means that on the portion of the Intercolonial which represents all that Mr. Haggart had in 1893, he placed actually fewer ties in the year 1899, than the ex-minister, whom he condemns, placed in 1893. I do not think it is necessary for me to pursue the matter further; the absurdity of the hon. gentleman's contention is its condemnation. All that is necessary is to supplement his statement by a statement of the facts. What the ex-minister did in 1893, on that road was noble work. He cut down the expenditures, and yet he left the road in a state of efficiency. The proof of that is that the present minister claims that it is in a magnificent state of efficiency at present, yet he did not expend upon it, even in the glorious year 1899, as much as the ex-minister spent upon it in 1893. But he says that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) limited the train service. I live in as close proximity to the Intercolonial Railway as the hon. gentleman did at that time. The line runs through the town in which I live. I travel the road very frequently; I do not suppose there is a man in Canada who has been on that road in the last ten or fifteen years more than I have—for my business calls me out on the line a great deal. I can safely say that, while there were not as luxurious cars as there are to-day, the train service in 1893,

was just as good as it is to-day or even in 1899. There has not been the slightest improvement from that time, with the exception that the cars to-day are much more elaborate and much more expensive than they were at that time. But at that time we had the magnificent cars of the Canadian Pacific Railway which had one of the most finely equipped trains running on the Intercolonial Railway, which was generally patronized by the people.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What did the present cars cost?

Mr. POWELL. I shall come to that later. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) goes further in his claim that his management of the road is most excellent. I can tell the hon. gentleman that there were kings in the land before the days of Agamemnon; there were those who had to do with the Intercolonial Railway who made a record to be proud of. The present leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) made a record to be proud of. The present Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals—chief engineer as he was then called—from whom, I have no doubt the present minister derives a great deal of support, is a gentleman who is believed on the part of the people generally not to be possessed of those feelings that would allow him to be interfered with, in the application of business principles to the management of railways, and he was regarded as a buffer between the government and the public. This gentleman did a noble work, and I will refer to it later on, a work that has been misrepresented—I will not say intentionally, but the effect is just as bad—by the Minister of Railways and Canals last night and to-day. The hon. minister to bolster up himself, to show his magnificent management, stated that in 1899, \$780,690 more was received in revenue than in 1896. Well, what about it? That simply shows that there was more traffic for the road. A much better proof of the hon. gentleman's good management would be to show not an additional revenue, but an economical administration of affairs. Notwithstanding his \$780,000 additional traffic upon the road, the hon. gentleman is only able to claim a surplus of \$62,000—a surplus which is entirely visionary as we shall see later. But suppose even that his claim was well founded, what of it? Go to the record of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway and compare their profits with those of the Intercolonial Railway under the present minister. Why, the hon. gentleman's extra revenue has cost him nearly 100 per cent in outlay. I do not know what the percentage is on the other roads this year; but last year I took occasion to look into the matter and analysed the returns of many railways. On many roads there was a large increase of traffic, and consequently of receipts; and

Mr. POWELL.

I found that in many cases half the additional revenue was profit—that is to say the additional traffic only cost about 50 per cent to carry it. But we will leave that matter for later consideration. The hon. gentleman says: See how grand this is; in the short period of three years, I made an increase of revenue compared with which all former increases dwindle into insignificance. He compared 1886 with 1896—he corrected it afterwards to the period from 1888 to 1898. He says that in all that decennial period there was not an increase of over \$125,000. What does that prove? It is very interesting to know that the hon. gentleman has delved into figures; it is interesting to know that he is considerable of an arithmetical magician. But what interest does the country take in that? What is the logical sequence from it? In support of what argument does he adduce these figures and institute this arbitrary comparison? If there is anything in the comparison why not carry it further? If he had compared 1890 with 1894, he would have found that in these years there was an increase not of \$125,000, but of \$671,000. If he had compared 1880, when the present leader of the opposition took charge, with 1884, he would have found his increase of \$780,000, outdone by an increase of \$878,000—and furthermore, the present minister has the advantage of an increase of 413 miles of railway. Go further, and compare 1880 with 1890, and what do we find? Why, there is an increase of over \$780,000? In that decennial period the receipts increased by \$1,900,000—more than doubled. And to help in this comparison the present minister has 330 miles more of railway than they had at that time.

This leads me to the discussion of a point I was glad to hear the hon. minister touch upon, that is the feeling of jealousy that some of our western friends seem to have with respect to the Intercolonial Railway, that too much money is being spent on that road, and that that expenditure is for the benefit of the maritime provinces. I shall detain the House only for a moment or two while I trace the history of the Intercolonial Railway. At the time of confederation we had in the province of New Brunswick, a government railway which now forms part of the Intercolonial Railway. In the province of Nova Scotia there was also a government railway which also now forms part of the Intercolonial Railway. And I will inform gentlemen of the west, members of this House, and through them their constituents, that, so long as we were not bothered with extensions to the old province of Canada, we did not know what a deficit was. Down to 1873, when the first deficit in connection with what is now the government railway of Canada occurred, the average surplus was \$60,969.

In 1873, a change came over the state of affairs. We know what political party obtained control of matters in Canada at that time. The Liberals came into power, and the administration of government railways passed into the hands of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, who managed them under his subordinate officers. What took place then? Why, from then down to the time that the Liberals were driven from power and down to the end of the next year for which they were responsible, this state of affairs had been brought about that an average surplus of \$60,969 had been transformed into an average deficit of \$618,119. This was largely due to the fact that the Intercolonial Railway was projected through a country that did not pay, part of that country, it is true, in the north-west portion of New Brunswick, but the greater portion of it in the province of Quebec to Rivière du Loup. Well, affairs were very serious. The western members were complaining of this enormous annual deficit. The administration of the railways passed into the hands of the present leader of the opposition, and he set himself to remedy the evil. What took place? The first year of his administration, without lessening the efficiency of the Intercolonial Railway in the slightest degree, he cut down that deficit from \$716,000 to \$97,000, wiped off in one year \$620,000. The next year he converted that deficit into a surplus, a small surplus, it was true, but the hon. gentleman had a surplus of \$542. The next year he had a surplus of \$9,600; the next year, \$10,547, and the next year, \$6,981. Then a change came over affairs. Now, I will tell the hon. gentleman what the secret of that change was. In 1885 that surplus was changed into a deficit of \$78,000, increasing until it reached the enormous figure, in 1890-1, of \$684,000. Now, I will tell you what is the cause of that deficit. The hon. gentleman who had control of the Intercolonial Railway undertook just the same scheme that the present Minister of Railways and Canals has undertaken, he undertook to fight geography, he undertook to fight the territorial lay of the country, and to carry through oceanic traffic between the west and the east via the Intercolonial Railway and to carry coal and other material at cheap rates to the west. I have before me a table which is a perfect object lesson. I put together all the tables bearing upon this matter which are found in the reports of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and I find that synchronous with the taking up of that through traffic is the increase of the deficit. When the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals took charge of the department he dropped that scheme. He did not undertake to further this through traffic and to stimulate, as it were, the carrying of the oceanic goods, and the coal and raw sugar trade. What was the result? Owing to that more

than anything else, more even than to the cutting down of expenses, was the fact that within one year that deficit of \$493,000 was changed into a surplus of \$20,000. If you will look at the trade returns of the country you will find that synchronous with that change was the decrease of the through traffic and the oceanic traffic that was borne by the Intercolonial Railway. Coal fell off, goods imported into St. John and Halifax fell off, and the futile attempt was given up of competing against the Grand Trunk Railway at Portland, and the Canadian Pacific Railway at St. John by way of the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax, with such an enormous disadvantage in the increased mileage against the latter. The hon. gentleman, if he goes on with his scheme, I am afraid will repeat that history; and to-day I have no hesitation in saying to him that if the maritime provinces depended on that railroad, and if that railroad was not sucked of its revenue to pay the deficit over the northern part of the line, he would have a surplus on what is purely the maritime province part of the Intercolonial Railway, not of one or two hundred thousand dollars, but of several hundred thousand dollars. Then the hon. gentleman could increase the wages of his employees, track men and others upon the line, and make all necessary capital expenditures without drawing upon the treasury of the country.

The hon. gentleman claims credit for the purchase of the Drummond County Railway and its extension, and compares the results with those that flowed from the purchase of the Rivière du Loup branch from the Grand Trunk Railway by the leader of the opposition. Now, let me tell the hon. gentleman this: Conceded his own contention, that the purchase of this line of railway has increased the revenue by \$780,000, conceded the absurd contention, as I will show it before I am through, what would the same train of logic lead to if adopted in the case of the management of the Intercolonial Railway by the leader of the opposition in connection with his scheme in 1880 of the purchase of the Rivière du Loup line. That line was purchased in 1880. In 1883, under the increased revenue of the Intercolonial Railway, after the purchase was made, no less a sum than \$1,076,000 or about \$300,000 more than he claims after the purchase of his one hundred and seventy miles was realized.

Now, the hon. gentleman has attempted to answer some newspaper criticisms, which were to the effect that the surplus of \$62,000 was an imaginary and not a real surplus. Well, I must weary the House by going into many details on this matter, but I shall have to call attention in detail to this point. The surplus of \$62,645, the hon. gentleman said, was not brought about by charging to capital what should have been charged to revenue account. As a mere

matter of book-keeping, apart altogether from the history of the Intercolonial Railway, I am willing to concede that a great deal of what the hon. gentleman charges to capital account should be charged to capital account. The former system of bookkeeping in the Intercolonial Railway from the standpoint of scientific railway bookkeeping was faulty, but it was the system which prevailed. And when he changes that and attempts to build up an argument, as I told him a few years ago he would attempt to do, he is guilty of a very fallacious piece of reasoning. The hon. gentleman last night said he was doing exactly what had been done in previous years. We told him that in previous years the charges for reconstruction and strengthening of bridges had been charged to revenue account. The hon. gentleman indignantly denied it, he said that in three cases only was that so. I knew he was entirely in error, and I ventured to suggest one case that I had under my own eye in the town of Sackville. The hon. gentleman said :

We are proposing to spend—not all at once, but in two or three years—\$200,000 or \$300,000 ; and in referring to the expenditure made by the late government for the strengthening of bridges, I pointed out that they had only strengthened two or three bridges; I think they were the two Miramichi bridges and the one across the Restigouche.

Mr. POWELL. And the Sackville bridge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. Not one beyond those three I have named.

Mr. POWELL. The Sackville bridge was not charged to capital.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If rebuilt or strengthened, it must necessarily have been built out of capital, because I have had the whole records of the correspondence upon all the bridges of the Intercolonial Railway searched with the utmost thoroughness from beginning to end, with the result that there were only these three bridges, the two Miramichi and the one on the Restigouche, and upon those the total, laid out for strengthening, was only \$36,000, or about \$15,000 a year extended over two years.

Now, there is a plain statement. I do not accuse the hon. gentleman of wilfully misstating the facts. He has been misled by the information, because, it seems, that he relied on the officers of the department for his information. He either did not know what information to ask for, or they did not give him what he desired. Not only were there a great many bridges which were strengthened in order to accommodate the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway and carry the engines that were introduced upon the line about 1890, but, Sir, I go farther than that, and I tell the hon. gentleman that in rebuilding bridges which were of wood, with steel, almost invariably the cost of the reconstruction of these bridges was charged up, not

Mr. POWELL.

to capital account, but to revenue account. I go further; the hon. gentleman here, today, has brought down in the supplementary estimates, a vote of over \$400,000 for rails on the Intercolonial Railway, which he proposes to charge to capital account. I tell the hon. gentleman that not only during the regime of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), but during the regime of every Conservative Minister of Railways, from 1889, at any rate, down to the time that the late government left office, in 1896, not a rail that was replaced by a higher rail on the Intercolonial Railway in any way or shape, entered into capital account, but every new rail was charged up to revenue, and the hon. gentleman must know it. In order to show the utter and complete absurdity of the hon. gentleman's statements, in reference to this matter, I will take 1889. I am quoting from an abstract I have before me, and if the hon. gentleman wants to look at the statement, I will give him an opportunity of looking at it so that he can see if it is correct. In 1889, the Conservative Minister of Railways relaid 129 miles of track with 67-pound rails, instead of 56-pound rails, and not one dollar of the cost of the work was charged to capital account. Forty-six sidings, aggregating, in the total, 23,221 feet, or more than 4½ miles were put in and railed and charged not to capital account, but to revenue account. Not only that, Sir, but in that year, thirty miles of new fencing, which was put up at a place where never before a fence had existed on the line, was charged not to capital account, but to revenue account, because at that time it was considered advisable that the capital account of the railway should be closed. The Miramichi bridges were strengthened at a cost of \$25,400. There was the Little River bridge over the road which was replaced with iron and masonry at a cost of \$3,591, every cent of which was charged, not to capital account, but to revenue. There was a Howe truss bridge of two spans of 100 feet each replaced by two steel spans of the same length. In addition, there was lateral bracing provided for the Elm Tree bridge with a span of eighty feet, the Wicodoo bridge, with a span of eighty feet, and the McKinnon Brook bridge with a span of eighty feet so as to strengthen them for the purpose of carrying over heavier engines and cars. Then, in addition to that there were no less than eight bridges with a lineal extension altogether of 2,749 feet, under which were placed masonry work and upon which were put standard floors, every dollar of which was charged, not to capital account, but to revenue account, and still the hon. gentleman has made the statement that he has. That is one year.

Now, coming to the next year, 1890, the Conservative government laid down 125 miles of track, substituting a 67-pound rail for a 56-pound rail, every

dollar of which was charged to revenue. The hon. gentleman denied my observation about the Sackville bridge. He will find the facts in the Railway Report for 1890. I was there, I knew about it being strengthened, and I inquired about it at the time. It was strengthened at a cost of \$15,769, every dollar of which amount was charged to revenue and not to capital. The Restigouche bridge was strengthened at a cost of \$10,775, and five other bridges were strengthened by lateral bracing, the New Mills bridge, the Nash Creek bridge, and the bridges over Louison's Brook, Jacques River and Little Forks. In addition to that there were fifty small bridges with wooden trusses, every one of which wooden trusses was removed and replaced by iron, and every dollar of the cost was charged to revenue account, and not to capital. The hon. gentleman can take his own report, and see whether my statement is correct or not.

In 1891 there were sixteen miles of track laid with 67-pound rails, replacing 56-pound rails, on the Intercolonial Railway. Every dollar was charged to revenue account, and not one cent to capital. The hon. gentleman talks about no other bridge. Could he not remember the Rivière du Loup Bridge, which was built of steel at a cost of \$23,900, which was charged to revenue, and not to capital? The Murphy bridge, near Antigonish, was built of steel in that same year, and every dollar of it was charged to revenue. Besides that, there were strengthened by lateral bracings, four bridges, the Caucapsal, the Red Pine bridge, the North River bridge and the Salmon River bridge, all of them three-span bridges with one exception, the spans varying from forty feet to 100 feet, with the exception of two spans of 100 feet, all charged to revenue and not a dollar to capital. Yet the hon. gentleman claims that he is following in the steps of his predecessors. There were fifty-two bridges, of a lineal measurement of 3,691 feet, provided with new and improved floors, all the cost of which was charged not to capital, but to revenue. There was one wooden overhead bridge replaced by an iron bridge, charged to revenue and not to capital.

Now, I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this particular statement. Four new locomotives were bought and charged, not to capital, but to revenue account, and they were not in substitution of those which had been disused, but were additional rolling stock. In addition, there was one overhead wood trestle at Durlotte's Crossing replaced by steel, at a cost of \$1,400.

Now, we come to 1892. Forty-three miles of track were laid with 67-pound rails, and the 56-pound rails were taken up, the cost of which was charged to revenue, and not to capital. Three miles of siding were constructed and charged to revenue. The Lorne Flag station was built. An extension to the Mon-

ton erection shop, a very large extension indeed, 201 x 110 feet, was charged to revenue, and not one cent to capital. There was a brick roundhouse built at Moncton, sufficient to contain twenty-seven locomotives, which was charged to revenue and not to capital. There was a new steel span of 160 feet to replace a wooden one which cost \$10,983, and which was charged to revenue and not to capital. Seventy-five steel plate girders were put in to replace Howe trusses, and these were charged to revenue and not to capital. There was a fifteen foot culvert at Frosty Hollow, which cost \$9,200, which, I think, on principle, as a matter of book-keeping, should be charged to revenue and not capital. There was the Missiquash bridge, with a steel span of 100 feet, to replace a Howe truss, costing \$5,000. That was charged to revenue and not to capital. There was the Loch Broom trestle, which was piled; there was sixty feet of an overhead bridge at Rogerville built of iron and charged to revenue, and the Charles bridge was rebuilt of steel to replace a wooden one, which was charged to revenue and not to capital. There was at River Ouelle eight spans of 44 feet each, steel girders, and there were 44 feet steel girders west of River Ouelle. West of St. Thomas there was a bridge of two spans of 64 feet each span, replaced by steel and charged to revenue and not capital. There was a bridge of six spans of 64 feet each, made of plate steel, and charged to revenue and not to capital. East of St. Thomas, there was a 54-foot steel plate bridge to replace an old one, charged to revenue and not to capital. East of L'Islet there was a 44-foot span, and east of St. Rochs there were two of 44 feet spans each, charged to revenue and not to capital.

In 1893 thirty miles of railway had the light rails taken up and replaced by heavy rails; there were two miles of siding; there was a bridge, 83-foot span, to replace a wooden bridge; there were fifteen steel plate girders, 40 to 60 feet; there was one station building, and there was one agent's dwelling, and all these were charged to revenue.

In 1894 there was charged to revenue and not to capital, twenty-seven miles of railway relaid with heavy rails; two and a quarter miles of siding; two steel bridges of 85 feet span, one steel bridge of 100 feet span to replace a wooden one, and one steel 40-foot span at Union.

In 1896, the last year the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) was in power, he laid down forty-five miles of track, three miles of siding; he put in two steel bridges, 160 feet and 40 feet; one iron bridge removed and a new and stronger bridge put in; improved the strength of several other iron bridges; and replaced the wharfs at Halifax and Richmond, which were burned, at a cost of \$52,475. All of these works were charged to revenue.

Now, we come to another item. In that year ten engines that were condemned were, I believe, not only rebuilt, but they were enlarged and their capacity increased 50 per cent. Every dollar of the expenditure there, amounting to \$17,000 or \$18,000, was charged to revenue and not capital.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) be good enough to give me the references, so that I may be able to inquire as to just what these statements are?

Mr. **POWELL**. I will tell the minister where he will find them. If he will look in his department and get the annual reports of Mr. Pottinger and the annual reports of Mr. Archibald, the engineer of the railway, he will find all the information I have given.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Where did the hon. gentleman procure them; where are they published?

Mr. **POWELL**. Would the minister like to know that?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

Mr. **POWELL**. If the hon. minister will promise me he will not take the head off some official, I will give him the information.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I see.

Mr. **POWELL**. That is what the minister is at? I thought the minister knew all about it, but I will enlighten him. They are published in the public reports, and if the minister just looks at the reports he publishes every year he will get the information there.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The statement made by the hon. gentleman is not correct.

Mr. **POWELL**. What is that?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman says that in the annual reports is published all the information he has read.

Mr. **POWELL**. Will one of you page boys just carry this lot of books over to the minister? They are open at the correct pages.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Can you give me the pages?

Mr. **POWELL**. You can get the page as well as I can. The books are open at the exact page. Now, I want to tell the Minister of Railways this: If last year he had charged up to revenue what his predecessor had been charging to revenue, and had kept up the full proportionate expenditure in connection with

Mr. **POWELL**.

the road, he not only would have no surplus of \$62,000, but he would have had a deficit of, probably, \$200,000. If you take and add to these expenditures in 1897, the proportionate increase in connection with these services I have mentioned, you will find that the deficit this year would be over two hundred thousand dollars, but, of course, I cannot give the figures exactly. As respects that matter, I have a word or two more to say. The hon. minister last year and the year before undertook a new and unheard-of policy. I have heard of new ways to pay old debts, but this scheme of the minister was an old way to wipe out deficits. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) instead of repairing his engines and his cars, introduced the policy of purchasing cars and engines and charging them to capital account. I am informed—and the minister will correct me if I am wrong—that this year he has sold quite a number of the old engines of the Intercolonial Railway that were then upon the register. If the information given to me is wrong, I desire to have it corrected now.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think the hon. gentleman would be correct in saying that some of the old engines have been sold for scrap. They are really not worth any more. But I hope the hon. gentleman will not assume that the engines so sold have not been replaced, because for the current year there have been four large new engines built in the works and five large engines purchased on revenue account, making nine engines of a greatly increased tonnage.

Mr. **POWELL**. The hon. gentleman may be correct in that, and I take his word for it, so far as the engines are concerned. I will have to let that go, because the information is not yet to hand, but I have some information with respect to the cars. The hon. minister bought last year 250 box cars, and every one of these cars was charged up to capital account. Now, we will have a little more revelation as to how the minister is working out his surplus. Would you believe that last year the hon. gentleman closed his year with 528 cars disabled and condemned. In his regime he allowed 330 cars to fall into decay, and has not replaced one of them by rebuilding, as was done by the late government. He bought 250 cars to take their places, and charged them to capital account.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman's statement is not correct as he puts it. There were, no doubt, a large number of cars condemned, but they were cars that were absolutely worthless in 1896, the same as the locomotives were worthless in 1896, and the same as other portions of the equipment was worthless. They were condemned now, but they ought to have been condemned before.

Mr. POWELL. So far so good. The identical men are in the railway to-day who were there in 1896, with the exception of Mr. Joggins. The same principles, I presume, determine matters now that determined them then. The hon. gentleman admits that literally I am correct. I will give the figures. All through it has been the habit on the Intercolonial Railway of condemning a certain number of cars every year. When the ex-Minister of Railways left office, there were 198 disabled cars condemned by the inspector and ordered to be rebuilt during the following year. That was the condition of affairs then. It was all right enough for the hon. gentleman to say that there were a great number of cars that should have been condemned. What does he personally know about it? Or, I might say, what do I know, who live in Westmoreland and see twenty cars for every one that he sees? Simply what I get from official records. I can assure the hon. gentleman that that statement which has been supplied to him by some person, is not, according to my information, in exact accordance with the facts. In the next year, 1897, not under an inspectorate, governed by Conservative men and ordered to condemn what cars they saw fit, but by the hon. gentleman's own administration, there were only 247 cars condemned. Since that time, with an examination by an inspectorate which we must presume was honest, made under the direction of the hon. gentleman, doubtless without any feeling of clemency to the former administration—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The same officers were there in 1897.

Mr. POWELL. That is exactly what I said. The same officers condemned five hundred and twenty-eight that condemned the one hundred and ninety-eight. The next year was 1898. Again under the administration of the hon. gentleman the inspector made the inspection and at the end of that year the condemned cars amounted to three hundred and thirty-three, making under his regime three hundred and thirty cars that were condemned. In 1899 another inspection was made and at the end of that year there were 528 condemned cars. The number of condemned cars which were not replaced or rebuilt increased during his regime was 330. The minister purchased 250 cars and the fraud had been perpetrated in this country of charging two hundred and fifty cars to capital account—that is, a fraud on book-keeping. I do not use the word in an offensive sense; but I say it has the effect of fraud. Then, the hon. gentleman says: 'I have managed this railroad in a most masterly manner.' Now, I will give the House some facts with respect to the traffic increases. Of course,

we would necessarily look for an increased traffic on the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is the hon. gentleman professing to quote my language or the effect of anything I said?

Mr. POWELL. I am putting upon the hon. gentleman's language and demeanour the evident and exclusive interpretation that should be put upon them. Leaving out such charges as those for railway engineers, firemen, brakemen, conductors and men of that class, in which we necessarily expect a very large increase running concurrent with the increase of traffic and bearing some ratio to it, there is quite an increase in one matter in which the hon. gentleman certainly determined the road to fall into disrepute. I refer to the cost of general management. In 1896, when the ex-Minister of Railways went out of office, the cost of general management was \$199,985. In the last year of the present minister's management of which we have record, the cost of management jumped up to no less than \$50,000 over and above that amount. I called for a return from the hon. gentleman as to what additional offices had been created since he assumed control of the Intercolonial Railway. Apart from the officers in connection with the Drummond County line there are additional offices costing \$22,478. Some of these may be useful: some are certainly not. Now, we will pass on to the consideration of a question which has been discussed by both of the preceding speakers; that is, the effect of the Drummond County Railway upon the Intercolonial Railway. In respect to this matter I cannot speak with positiveness. The only gentlemen who can speak with positiveness in this matter, if they care to do so, are the gentlemen who control the Department of Railways. But the Auditor General has given us a statement which is a very fair guide, of the money receipts at each station on the Intercolonial Railway, and I have taken the pains to have these collated according to provinces—Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In 1897, the last complete year of the Intercolonial Railway before its amalgamation with the Drummond County and a portion of the Grand Trunk to Montreal, the total receipts in the province of Quebec were \$343,427; in 1899 they were \$759,787; a difference of \$416,360. In New Brunswick the receipts in 1897 were \$975,407, and in 1899 \$985,348, an increase of \$9,641. In Nova Scotia the receipts were in 1897 \$1,563,933, and in 1899 \$1,803,182, an increase of \$237,249. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows, as every man in the maritime provinces knows, that the development of business in the Cape Breton section has been perfectly phenomenal. We all know to what it is due. I will ask the House to follow me as I look at

Nova Scotia and see where these enormous increases have occurred. In North Sydney alone there has been an increase, owing to the great works undertaken there, of \$18,000. That is in no way due at all to the Drummond County Railway. In old Sydney there has been an increase of \$22,000. If you pass now to Pictou, where the iron works have developed quite a trade in coal, you will find a very large increase indeed. You will find a very large increase in New Glasgow of \$27,000. You will find a considerable increase at Stellarton. You will find a large increase at Trenton, on the Pictou line, and in Pictou itself, and also in Amherst, owing to the fact that from Amherst there is a good deal of trade with Sydney, and the large firm of Rhodes, Curry and Company have the construction of houses down there and patronize the railways to a large extent indeed.

The increases in Nova Scotia are in those few places, and they total up an increase of \$273,000. That is not due to the Drummond County Railway. That freight would have come there whether the Drummond County Railway had been bought or not. If we look to find the effect of the Drummond County Railway, we must look particularly to those places that are in its immediate vicinity. I find that in Montreal and Ste. Rosalie section or the joint section of the extension the receipts were, in round numbers, \$260,000, and that altogether is very little more than the increase in the province of Nova Scotia. Now, on the whole Drummond County system the total receipts were only \$46,000, including the little branch down to Nicolet. I ventured the assertion last year on the floor of this House that these receipts or earnings of this railway as given in the returns to the Railway department were cooked, that the company had not bona fide receipts to that extent. Well here is the first regular record we have, and the receipts are not in the vicinity of \$100,000 as given in that report for the year 1897, but are only \$46,000.

We have got the joint section and the Drummond County Railway in detail as to their station receipts. We have also all the station receipts on the line of the Intercolonial Railway in the Auditor General's Reports for the years 1897 and 1899. If you were searching for a place in which you would expect to find a large increase of receipts, you would expect to find it at Quebec city itself, which is virtually the terminus of the extension at one end. It was only physically that Lévis, opposite Quebec, was the terminus of the old line, and there would expect to find a large increase in the receipts because the Intercolonial Railway had and has an office at Quebec where tickets are sold and freight collected. Well, at Quebec, in 1897, the total receipts—and I call attention particularly to this because this is a place where you would expect

to find a very large increase—in 1897, the last year of the administration of the Intercolonial Railway before this scheme took effect, the total receipts were \$22,276. In 1899, the total receipts were only \$23,123. There is this magnificent railway that was going to transform the whole country; and at the place where you would naturally expect to find the largest increase, you find only an increase of \$846.

At the Chaudiere Junction there is an increase. In 1897, the receipts were only \$2,500, and last year they were \$12,000, or \$10,000 of an increase. But, I find that a very large traffic comes up the Intercolonial Railway which has nothing whatever in the wide world to do with the Drummond County Railway or the extension to Montreal, because it is handed over to the Grand Trunk Railway before it gets there and the increase in the Chaudiere Junction is almost entirely the result of that freight.

At Lévis, there has been a considerable increase, but let us see what it is. In 1897, we had \$65,000, and last year \$92,000, or an increase of \$27,000. This is largely due to freight passing over the old Intercolonial Railway to the Quebec Central. These are the places where you would expect an enormous increase.

If you go down in the province of Quebec again and take in the Metapedia, you will find a considerable increase there, an increase of \$24,000. But is that due to the Drummond County Railway? No, it is due largely to the fact that a railway has been opened there, and it results from the transfer of freight from one road to the other. A large trade is also established there in sleepers, &c.

So that, on analysis, the hon. gentleman's case has no substance in it, but fades into the realm of myth. Let me give you an idea of how this surplus really stands. The alleged surplus is \$62,645. But the deficiency in expenditure on the maintenance of cars and engines and track, compared with the previous administration, was \$148,297. That is an outlay which should have been made in order to bring the expenditures up to their normal figures, to bring up even to the expenditures the minister regards as starving expenditures. Then in addition he has charged to capital about \$60,000, which should be charged to revenue. In addition, the interest on his capital expenditures would be \$40,000, so that the total amount would be \$210,000, which he should have expended on revenue account and did not expend. From that you must take the surplus of \$62,000, so that the balance would be a deficit of \$146,000. On the basis of book-keeping that prevailed before the advent of power of the present administration, that would be near the actual state of affairs.

Does Drummond County road pay? Let us see. A proportionate share of the maintenance of the Drummond system of 133

miles would be : track and stations, \$130,000; maintenance of track and station on the joint section, according to the Auditor General's report, \$70,000 in good numbers. Take the share of the engines and cars maintenance upon the joint section and the Drummond County, which would be \$230,000. Extra cost of general management, \$48,492, which I add, as it has also made an increase in the general cost of management. Add the rental, \$210,000, and you have a total charge against the Montreal extension of \$688,573. What do you credit it with? Credit it with the earnings on the Montreal section, which I think is fair, and add a proportionate increase to bring it up to the full revenue of the road and you get a revenue of \$320,911, leaving a deficit on that part of the road of \$367,342—and this is exclusive of any charge on interest account. That is as near as we can come to it by the data at our disposal. If that is wrong, it was the duty of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) to have given us as fair and definite information as possible, so that the country would know the exact state of the expenditures and receipts of that portion of the road.

I shall not, at this time, touch upon the proposed capital expenditures, or the estimated surplus for the current year ending the 30th day of June, instant, it is not necessary. I am confining myself to what is historic and drawing from the facts such deductions as I think are fair. I think I might refer to the anticipated surplus of \$100,000. His improper charges to capital account alone would reduce this amount to nothingness and produce a deficit. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) said that hon. members on this side were seized with a kind of rabies—that is not the word, perhaps, but it was what he said in effect—against the extension to Montreal. I can inform the hon. gentleman that the objection to extending to Montreal is not a matter of principle but a matter of detail. This side of the House did not quarrel with the extension of Montreal, but with the means taken to get to Montreal. They said there were other means of getting to Montreal without violating sound economic principle.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** For instance, by the Canadian Pacific Railway on the north side.

**MR. POWELL.** Yes, that would have been a very good way. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) laughs. But I tell him, that, though he tells us he has a good road, the Canadian Pacific Railway on the north shore can outstrip him ten miles an hour on the way from Montreal to the city of Quebec. They can make faster time, having one of the best road-beds in the country.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I beg pardon, they cannot.

**MR. POWELL.** I beg pardon, they not only can but do—at least they did last summer.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Whether they do now or not is another question. What I say is that they cannot make faster time.

**MR. POWELL.** When you make as fast time as they do, you will be in a position to say you can. I say that the course of the government on this question violated a sound economic principle—that you should never duplicate a railway service unless it is necessary. There was no need to duplicate in this case. The same policy of joint operation that he pursued in connection with that part of the road from St. Rosalie to Montreal he could have acted upon in connection with the road from Quebec to Montreal, and an arrangement could have been made with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have no doubt, on the basis of running rights, from Halifax to St. John. I may say just a word upon the relations that exist between the present management of the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. One of the great reasons for having a road to Montreal was said to be to drive the Canadian Pacific Railway off the Intercolonial Railway. But they are there; their status is the same as before, their trains are running over the Intercolonial Railway just as they did before. This grant evil was sucking the life blood of the Intercolonial Railway, as we were told, but the monster is as active as ever.

I have shown conclusively, so far as there is any data, that instead of a surplus being attributable to the Drummond County Railway, that surplus is a myth. The only gentlemen who have the information under their control do not bring it down, they do not give us the benefit of their information; but I have shown that from the data before us this is the only deduction to be drawn. I have shown, and the records show, that the surplus of \$62,000 which the hon. gentleman claims is equally a myth, and that by the ordinary method of book-keeping on the road, as established before the advent of hon. gentlemen opposite to power, that surplus does not exist, and that if the road were maintained in a state of efficiency, there would be a considerable deficit. The hon. gentleman boasted of his train service. Why, it is easy to have a magnificent vestibule train. He could have fifty such trains, for the credit of this country would afford him the means for them. He could have a vestibule train that would put the most elaborate trains of other roads completely in the shade. The Chicago express would not be worthy of consideration alongside one that the hon. gentleman might have, for the resources of the country are sufficient if the hon. gentleman chose to mis-

apply them to pay for the greatest magnificence in this respect. But that is not the true test of correct management of a railway. The test is cutting your garment according to your cloth, making the best of your opportunities. I think it would be a poor consolation to the poor men of this country, who pay the great bulk of the taxes, to know that the rich man has a vestibule car with velvet cushions on which he may recline, a better than ordinary Pullman in which he may sleep, a splendid dining car in which he may enjoy the luxury of a dinner at 75 cents or a dollar, while the poor man is obliged to carry his lunch with him or be content with cheaper food at a restaurant. It will be no consolation to such a man to know that the Minister of Railways has imported cars from the United States and has an elegant vestibule train on which he and other men of means may ride about the country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What did these cars cost?

Mr. POWELL. They cost about \$20,000 apiece. I think the hon. minister's policy of building these cars in the United States, and especially of building these engines in the United States is a very bad policy. The construction of these engines led to an outlay of \$150,000 or \$160,000. These engines could just as well have been built in this country. All that was required was a little time. There was no rush about this matter; their construction might have proceeded slowly. Canada had moved along at a tolerable rate of progress for years without vestibule trains and without these large engines. By remodelling the old engines and building new ones leisurely, that \$150,000 or \$160,000 could have been distributed among the artisans of this country. As it is, the money has gone out of this country to the Baldwins; Canada has their engines and they have Canada's money. If these engines had been constructed at home, Canada would have had the money and the engines too. That policy is a very short-sighted policy and one the government should not push, because it is against the interest of labouring classes of the country as a whole. I shall have further observations to make when the estimates come up in detail.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to Revenue—Prince Edward Island Railway.. \$20,000

Mr. HAGGART. The item under consideration was one in reference to canals.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ellis). That item was passed before dinner.

Mr. HAGGART. I objected to that item being declared carried; it was understood that it was not carried.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understood that the item was passed.

Mr. POWELL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, the Chairman said it was carried, but the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) said he had risen to speak and then it was considered not to be carried.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There seems to be a misunderstanding, and I am perfectly willing that it should be regarded as not carried, if anybody wishes to discuss it.

Lachine Canal—To build a quadrant pontoon gate ..... \$20,000

Mr. HAGGART. I understood that three of these canal items were reserved on which we would have a right to discuss any other item. There is an item of \$500,000 for the construction of a lock on the Lachine Canal. I want to know something about that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The explanation I gave the other night when the hon. gentleman was not present, I presume, I will repeat. This is for rebuilding lock No. 1. We want to construct a lock suitable for vessels drawing at least twenty feet of water, which the present lock will not do. The present lock is in a very dilapidated condition, described by the officers as in a tumble-down condition. The estimate is that a lock 350 feet long, 50 feet wide, with 20 feet of water on the mitre sill, could be constructed for \$500,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand the lock is to allow ocean-going vessels to utilize a portion of the Lachine Canal as a harbour. How far above the lock have you the 20-foot navigation? In order to be of any use there must be a portion of the canal up the St. Lawrence deepened to over 20 feet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman knows there is a much increased depth up as far as St. Gabriel basin, about a mile and a half up from the mouth of the canal.

Mr. HAGGART. Will these amounts you are asking for the Lachine Canal complete the whole expenditure required on capital account?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the view of the engineer.

Mr. HAGGART. There is the Galops Canal, to which I wish to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman, and the contract with the Gilbert Dredging Company. I wrote the hon. gentleman a note telling him that I wanted the full information and papers regarding that contract. The hon. gentleman was not in his seat, and I told the page to put the note on the desk under his clip.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have to say that the note did

not reach me. I was not aware that the hon. gentleman wanted the papers with regard to the Gilbert dredging matter. But I can explain to him, perhaps, what he desires to know. I am informed that the original contract for dredging what is called the Galops Rapids was made with Mr. Davis, during, or perhaps prior to, the hon. gentleman's entrance upon the department. During his day the contract was changed, transferred or sold out, with the consent of the department, by Mr. Davis to the Gilbert Company, who were the only people having the necessary plant to do such work. With regard to the cost per yard, the hon. gentleman, I am informed, is in error in attributing to the work which is done in this channel the cost of 50 cents per yard, it does not cost any such money. There were soundings made originally as to what would be required in this channel, and upon the basis of those soundings it was supposed a small amount of dredging would be required. It turned out lately that through the fall of water it would be necessary to make a much deeper dredging, and this conclusion was arrived at during the regime of the late government. Mr. Reid, one of the members of this House, strongly urged upon the attention of the ex-minister the necessity of having deeper dredging done. He pointed out that it would be impossible to get more than six or seven feet of channel with the amount of dredging which was then contemplated. It proved that the hon. member was correct, and as a result a much deeper dredging had to be done and much more material had to be excavated. The cost, while upon the basis of the original subdivision a very little amount of dredging would be required, would seem to be, as the hon. member has stated, very large, perhaps running up to a very high price per yard; yet as there has been much more dredging done, the cost has been much less than the hon. member has represented. I can procure the information showing just exactly what it has cost. I have not it with me, nor has the deputy minister it in his possession. If the hon. gentleman desires to have that information we can procure it for him tomorrow. I am willing to have it understood that the hon. gentleman may discuss that on any one of the canal items.

Mr. HAGGART. If my memory is right, there was a contract at so much per yard let to Davis & Co., and that contract was transferred to W. A. Allan. He had the contract for deepening. This contract with the Gilbert people for deepening the Galops Canal has been let by the hon. gentleman himself. There has been no tender for it, and I would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the enormous expenditure that has taken place:

Use of all plant required in testing and surveying the bottom of the existing 'new channel' and removal of all loose material therefrom

as found above the original contract grade (exclusive of rock in situ above said original contract grade), this latter to be removed at the contractor's expense.

It has been applied to 244 days at \$425 a day, or there was paid last year on this contract \$103,734. This does not give the number of years, but it gives the number of days. I was frightened to state the amount that I have been informed this dredging is costing. I was informed that this work is costing the country over \$125 a yard, and that the contractors do not average four yards a day. You are paying \$425 a day for a tug and scow for carrying the material away, which are hardly employed at all, while, on the same page of the Auditor General's Report you will see that more work is done per day for which only \$100 a day is paid. If there were to be an expenditure of \$300,000 or \$400,000 for this work, other parties could provide dredges and submit tenders for the work. The hon. minister is giving to these people \$425 a day, or a sum four times in excess of the amount that is shown as being paid in the Auditor General's Report to other parties, and this work is costing the country for every yard of excavation at least \$25 or \$50.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman knows the conditions which prevail there very well, and he knows further that so far as the Gilbert dredging people are concerned they have been at work there for a long term of years. I did not bring them there, but I found them on that work.

Mr. HAGGART. Not on the Galops.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, but on that class of work. The hon. gentleman knows that the Gilbert dredging people are the only people in Canada who have the expensive plant which is required to do the work where this dredging is being carried on. He knows that this is being done in the rapids, which is very difficult, a very expensive and a very trying piece of work. They cannot do a very great deal of work in these rapids. I think the hon. gentleman would not be prepared to say that \$425 a day would be an unreasonable amount to pay these people for the use of their dredge. The matter came before me in the first place on the recommendation and report of the superintending engineer. That report was made to the chief engineer and deputy minister. He concurred in it, and recommended unhesitatingly that we could not make any better arrangement, and that it would be advisable to make a contract with the Gilbert Dredging Company at this price for doing work at these rapids. If this is a high price I do not know it, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will say that it is, under the circumstances. At all events, the engineers who could have

no interest in making any recommendation to pay a higher price than they believed would be reasonable, are of the opinion that it was a very proper contract to make.

Mr. CLANCY. Could you not let this work by contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You could not get a bid from any other person in Canada. We were carrying on no undertaking to the amount of \$300,000 or \$500,000. We started out with the idea of moving some of the boulders from the channel in these rapids. The policy of the department is not favourable to making a great deal of excavation there. We do not want to do anything more than is absolutely necessary in order to enable vessels to work their way up the channel, while the canal is being constructed, and to get down again. We do not want to do a great amount of work there, and it is not proposed to spend any such amount of money as the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) has named. We have a vote of \$100,000 in the estimates, and it is not certain that we will require to spend the whole of that. We want to make the St. Lawrence channel, from one end of it to the other, satisfactory to the shipowners and to the shippers who use that channel.

Mr. CLANCY. Have the engineers who made the recommendation to the hon. gentleman that it was a very fair price, reported to him the amount of work that is being done for that money from time to time?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, certainly. There is not a dollar paid, except on their certificate.

Mr. CLANCY. Have they reported the number of yards removed? The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), stated a moment ago that he had information which was so perfectly frightful, that he hesitated about making a statement. It is a very serious thing if there have been no reports of the quantity taken out when this large sum is being paid.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The superintending engineer, either personally, himself, or by some of his competent subordinates, keeps a record of the work that has been done. It is called to my memory that there are two contracts with these Gilbert dredging people. There is one contract under which they get \$425 a day, which is for making soundings and ascertaining where the dredging is required to be done, besides removing loose rocks and boulders, what they can handle without resorting to blasting and subaqueous excavation. When the obstacles in the channel are ascertained, the engineers determine the extent of the subaqueous excavation, and the contractors are paid a price per yard for the work.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister should present that report of the engineer to the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will furnish the information that the hon. gentleman desires. I am given to understand that the estimate month by month is at hand.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister has \$317,000 which he intends to spend on this work and he gets a friend—a dredging company—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are no friends of mine. I do not know them.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not say that they are, I corrected that. The minister employs a dredging company and makes a contract with them contrary to the order in council and contrary to the law, and he gives \$425 a day for doing that work, and it is notorious in every part of Canada that the man is getting \$300 more than he earns. You have in your department what it cost under contract to do the work on the Galops channel and the party who had the contract got so much a yard and nearly made a fortune out of it, but this party without tender and without competition gets a job amounting to \$325,000. He makes a private tender with the minister to receive \$425 a day, and I allege that that is far in excess of the value, as is notorious to every contractor from Kingston to Montreal. I make the charge and court an inquiry, and I say it is one of the most disgraceful contracts that ever was let by a minister. If a man gets five or six times the value of his work by open competition there may be some excuse for it, but when a minister, contrary to the law, makes a private contract like this, it is a bad state of affairs, and the House will be shocked when they come to get the figures from the engineer. Who is the engineer that recommended the minister to give \$425 a day? What number of yards have been excavated? Let the minister bring down the contracts made by his predecessors for the same work by open tender.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) using such language.

Mr. HAGGART. It requires very strong language to express my opinion about it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman thinks there is any fraud in the transaction let it be investigated and let the responsibility be put where it belongs. If he does that he will find me assisting him to the full extent of my ability. The hon. gentleman talks about an illegal and a wrongful contract without public tender. But, what opportunity did he afford to the public to tender for the Sheiks' Island dam, which cost over

\$400,000? There were circumstances in the case before us which it was represented to me justified the awarding of the contract to this company, and if there was any misrepresentation, and if the statement of the officer was incorrect and he was deceiving me and deceiving the chief engineer, then it is proper it should be known in order that the responsible person may be dealt with. I will bring the papers down with the greatest possible satisfaction.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not say that the minister is guilty of any fraudulent transaction, but I charge himself and the department over which he presides with letting a contract contrary to the law. Whether there is a fraud perpetrated upon the country or not, there is what is equally as bad, namely, stupidity and blundering. I never entered into a contract for the Sheiks' Island dam without tenders. Davis & Co. had the contract, and Mr. Davis claimed that the work on the Sheiks' Island dam came within his contract. His contract was extended at the prices and on the schedule which he had honestly and openly tendered for before the whole world. I did it on the recommendation of the deputy of my department, and I did it within the law, and gave the work to the party who had fairly tendered. I object to this constant violation of the law in that department. There is a law which states that in the Railway Department and the Public Works Department, any expenditure over \$5,000 should be put up to public competition and tender, but here is a contract for \$125,000 given without tender. If he got only a fair rate for his work, still the principle would be violated, but it would not be so bad. I say that this contractor is given four times the amount for what an equal service could be obtained for elsewhere. The minister says he has the report of his engineer recommending this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy tells me he has a report in the office, but I do not remember it.

Mr. HAGGART. Of course, you are relying upon the statement of your deputy. When you give us the report of your deputy recommending this it will be, I suppose, sufficient justification for the minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no information of my own. I get it from those in whom I have confidence, and who know what would be a fair price to pay. When the hon. gentleman says that this price is excessive, there is a fair way of ascertaining whether it is or not. If it is excessive, somebody is to blame for having that contract entered into. The hon. gentleman says that the Davis contract in connection with the Sheik's Island work was better because it was an extension. They claimed it at all events to

be an extension of the work which they might fairly and reasonably expect, because they had a contract for other works in the same locality. That is a very proper defence for having made a contract for that work.

Mr. CLANCY. The Liberal party of this House did not think so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not speaking either for the Liberal or for the Conservative party at the present moment. The hon. gentleman must not think that I am precluded by what was said by gentlemen who were in opposition at the time this transaction occurred. Let us take the facts as they are, and deal with them, irrespective of what any person or party may have said in reference to it. What I say is that if a contract should have been properly made by the hon. gentleman with the Messrs. Davis for the Sheik's Island dam, because they claimed that it was an extension of the other work, then I would apprehend that if this work were claimed by the Gilbert Dredging Company to be in the same locality and an extension of the work they had under their previous contract, it would be exactly in the same position and run on all fours with the other case. They may be wrong. It may be claimed there was misrepresentation. The hon. gentleman says that is a fact. His opinion makes it proper that there should be an inquiry as to what was a fair price to pay for this work. I will bring down the papers.

Mr. CLANCY. Is not that an extraordinary statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals, especially within the hearing of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who I am sure, is perfectly shocked, because he made some warm speeches on that Sheik's Island dam affair in past years, and it was referred to in a campaign sheet issued by hon. gentlemen opposite as one of the most gigantic scandals that ever took place in Canada. Yet the hon. Minister of Railways says in the hearing of some of these hon. gentlemen that this may or may not be a proper expenditure. Does this indicate that they deceived the public in the past? If the hon. gentleman is not prepared to discredit his friends in the House, he is bound to profit by what they declared as to this work being a gross wrong to the people of this country. There is absolutely no way of reconciling their statements with a transaction of this kind. My hon. friend has pointed out that there is an order in council that every work involving an expenditure of over \$5,000 must be let by contract. The Minister of Railways and Canals is a little hazy as to whether or not he has a report from the engineers stating that they were obliged to pay \$425 a day, or they could not get the work done at all; because the hon. gentleman stated in an earlier part of the

debate that no other person would undertake the work, and that the department were driven as a last resort to paying \$425 a day on a special report of his engineers. The work was not so pressing that they were bound to yield to circumstances of that kind. The hon. gentleman is not now prepared to say that that was a fair price.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, I am not.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Is that not a reason why the contract should not have been let so hastily? I do not understand that there is a parallel between this and the Sheik's Island dam work. I am not aware that there has been a contract of the same kind let to this Gilbert Dredging Company. I do not understand the hon. gentleman to say that they had a contract for work at a similar price.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They have two contracts—one for the excavation of solid rock, which my deputy tells me is exactly at the same price as previous contracts given to the same people by the ex-minister for the same class of work.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Is there a similar contract let at this enormous price of \$425 a day?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Why does the hon. gentleman say an enormous price? They are doing all they can do in the day.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Has it ever occurred to the hon. gentleman to inquire as to whether they are doing work for that large amount?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not sit over them. The officers are supposed to see that they do a day's work.

Mr. **CLANCY**. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals says that a small amount of work is being done.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. He may have been mistaken.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Whoever is at fault, it seems to me that this is a very loose transaction.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman is jumping to a very hasty conclusion.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I do not think it is a hasty conclusion at all. I think the hon. gentleman ought to be ready to state specifically what amount of work has been done. I think he must have been very busy that he did not direct his own attention to it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Did I not tell the hon. gentleman that I did not get the note? Unfortunately it went astray. I left it on the Table, and probably it was swept off.

Mr. **CLANCY**.

Mr. **HAGGART**. The minister cannot expect us to vote \$100,000 for the Galops Canal without the information being placed before us.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Am I asking the hon. gentleman to do it? I am prepared to have the item stand until I get the information.

Mr. **HAGGART**. These are the estimates of the canals, and the deputy minister should be prepared to hand over all the information with reference to canals.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. My hon. friend is entirely unreasonable. There can be no occasion for the deputy tumbling over files of the whole department in the expectation that some one out of a thousand might possibly be asked for. Had the hon. gentleman's note reached me—and it was no fault of his that it did not—I would have had the papers here, and I will bring them down to-morrow. I have no disposition to conceal anything in connection with the matter. If there is anything wrong I want to know it just as well as the hon. gentleman. I think that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) is not sufficiently informed with regard to the value of the work to give an opinion.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I did not express an opinion of my own, but based my argument upon the opinion given by the ex-Minister of Railways.

Mr. **B. M. BRITTON** (Kingston). Some times a great deal of harm may be done unintentionally to innocent persons by charges hurled across the floor of the House. Is the item to which the ex-Minister of Railways has referred, to be found on page 22 of letter R., Auditor General's Report?

Mr. **HAGGART**. It will be found on R-105.

Mr. **BRITTON**. There are two distinct firms of the Gilberts, one called the Gilbert Engineering Brothers Blasting Company, and the other the Gilbert Blasting and Dredging Company. It is rather important that this item should be applied to the company it belongs to. It is the Gilbert Brothers Engineering Company that this discussion refers to, I understand.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

Mr. **R. R. McLENNAN** (Glengarry). Is this Galops Canal finished?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

Mr. **McLENNAN** (Glengarry). Is navigation completed through it?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). The Governor General in the speech from the Throne, announced that navigation was completed all through along the St. Lawrence. How did that come to be placed in the speech from the Throne?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not stated in the speech from the Throne.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Yes, it is stated that navigation was completed the entire length of the St. Lawrence from the great Lakes to the Atlantic seaboard. I am told that the contract on this Galops Canal is extended to one year longer on condition that the contractors take the boats and vessels up the natural channel with a small tug. If a tug can take the boats up the river, it is most extraordinary why we should spend so much money. When a small tug can take up any boat, I do not see the necessity for this expenditure at all. The hon. Minister of Railways said a while ago that he did not know anything about it, but left it to his employees. But as minister, he should know something about it before he asks this House to pay this amount of money for this useless piece of work. When he is paying so much a day for the deepening of this work, he should be in a position to give us some information. It is all very well for him to get cross and angry, but that is not the kind of explanation this House requires. We require something else, and expect something else from the minister. He has been over the work, yet he has told us that he knows nothing about it, but when my hon. friend alongside me (Mr. Clancy) made some remarks, he asked my hon. friend what he knew about it. And he asked him this after admitting that he knew nothing about it himself.

This item, I believe, is charged to capital account. The minister is charging very large amounts against capital, and then he, his supporters and his party press profess to have a surplus. To charge so much to capital account, and then boast of a surplus is misleading the country. If these hon. gentlemen would give the country the total amount of expenditure, the people would be in a position to know how they stand, but these hon. gentlemen say they have a surplus, and at the same time they are running into debt, and have not money enough to meet the requirements of the country. The hon. gentleman is charging enormous amounts to capital account, much larger than were ever charged before, and he is charging to capital account works that never were charged to capital before, so that his statement is simply misleading.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The only thing misleading is the observation of my hon. friend who

has sought to convey the impression that the method of keeping accounts by the present government is different from that followed in the past. The hon. gentleman says that if we have not sufficient money to pay all our expenses, capital and revenue charges, therefore, we have no surplus. And when we state that we have a surplus after paying all ordinary expenses, the hon. gentleman says that is misleading and deceptive. Now, his speech is misleading and deceptive, because he should have stated that the accounts are kept now precisely as they have been ever since confederation. And, though the hon. gentleman makes the general statement that services are charged to capital account which were not charged to capital account before, he will not be able to substantiate that, because it is not correct. The only case where such a thing has been even alleged was that of a few thousand dollars spent for strengthening the bridges on the Intercolonial Railway which, during a few years, were charged to income by the late government. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) discussed that subject. But, even if the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite is correct it would only make a variation of about \$30,000 in the accounts. The statement that we are charging to capital services that were formerly charged to revenue is unfounded.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). The government have increased the gross debt by over nineteen millions in the last three or four years and have increased the net debt by seven millions. And yet they claim to have a surplus. The Minister of Finance admits that there are some things chargeable to capital account on the Intercolonial Railway that were never charged to capital account before.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not admit anything of the sort.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). The subject of the Intercolonial Railway expenditure was fully gone into by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). Another point is that for the year ending last June, the government had a vote as a supplementary estimate of \$2,500,000 which has not been placed before the country at all. And in the supplementary estimates for the year ending the 30th of June, this year, they have \$3,500,000, which is not being placed before the people. No doubt, it will appear in the public accounts, but it is not before the people generally—the public know very little about it. I do not say that this is done with the intention of deceiving the people, but it has that effect. The government are spending a larger sum of money than they let the public know. They profess to have a surplus. They pretend to be spending less money than they are and to put smaller votes in the estimates than they really are. As to the

expenditure of \$56,000,000, I think we have before us this session estimates for over \$61,000,000, and we must not forget that there will be supplementary estimates yet to come for the year ending June, 1901. What I contend is that the accounts ought to be placed before the people so that they will know what is being spent. The expenditure on capital account is enormous, and the government should not claim a surplus when they have no surplus; they should not pretend that they are saving money for the people when they are extorting large sums from them.

**Mr. HAGGART.** Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) remember what I want for the further discussion of the item?—the report of the engineer recommending it, the recommendation of the deputy minister; and then, I suppose the hon. minister has got an order in council for the expenditure of \$325,000, allowing him to let the contract without tender?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I will bring down all the papers.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Was this item about the quadrant pontoon gate on the Lachine Canal carried?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Yes.

**Mr. HAGGART.** As I understood from the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) there were three items reserved in the Railways and Canals with the understanding that we could have a full discussion on any item. They were the items for the quadrant pontoon gate, Farran's Point Canal, and the Welland Canal improvements at Port Colborne. As to the Soulanges Canal, I wish to inquire particularly as to the contract on locks 1, 2, and 3. As I am informed the contract was held by Mr. Archibald Stewart. The minister cancelled that contract. After the minister had delayed Mr. Stewart nearly a year by refusing to allow him to use the stone he had been authorized to use, he called him in and told him that unless he would enter into an agreement to finish the work in October, 1898, he would cancel the contract. He did cancel the contract, and then, without tender—I mean public tender. I think he asked three parties to tender—he gave the contract to Ryan & Macdonald at an advance of \$200,000. The work was to be finished in 1898, and as I understand, it is not finished yet. I want to know the condition of the work that has been done by these parties on the locks. I understand the concrete was badly done, that the locks are cracked, that some of the gateways above are giving away. I think also that the engineer in my time made a mistake in his estimate of the quantity to be taken out of the canal, and that he put a pipe in it which is entirely too small for the purpose of draining the land.

**Mr. McLENNAN.**

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** With reference to what the hon. gentleman has stated with regard to Mr. Stewart's contract, there are some things which I think are not strictly accurate. Mr. Stewart was not progressing with the work at all satisfactorily. He was not delayed a year by reason of any difficulty about the stone, I think he was only delayed about three months, and that is the time he claims he had been delayed. When I came into the department, the first difficulty that was brought to my attention, was that with regard to the stone under Mr. Stewart's contract. It was represented to me that there were objections to the stone that he was using, and there was a difference of opinion among people who had examined the stone, whether it was proper to be used in that work. The superintending engineer was entirely against the use of the stone, but after an examination into the matter, it was decided rather against Mr. Monro's contention. It was decided that there was good stone which might properly be used, but there was some which was not good, and which the engineer thought should be rejected. But it was thought not proper to condemn all the stone as unfit for use. The question of the stone being settled, then Mr. Stewart was in a position to resume the work, had he been so disposed. I do not say he was not disposed to do so, but I am willing to acknowledge that he was not able to do it. It required perhaps more means than he could command, and he could not organize the work, he could not get the plant necessary to prosecute it within a reasonable time. A long period, two or three years, had lapsed beyond the date at which he had contracted solemnly with the Crown to finish those sections, and they were not half done. At the rate he had been going on before this difficulty about the stone arose, he would have taken an eternity to finish the work. The government determined that they would have the Soulanges Canal, together with the other canals that were in progress, completed within the earliest possible date, and we were willing that Mr. Stewart should do it if he would take hold of the work and push it vigorously. We held out every inducement to him to do it, we encouraged him in every possible way, but without avail. We gave him notice that we would have to take the work out of his hands if he did not prosecute it with more despatch. He took no notice practically of our communication. It came to be a question as to whether we would give Mr. Stewart control of the whole work as to when it should be finished and how, at all events as to when it should be finished, or whether the department should exercise control; whether it should be finished in two or three years, or in ten, fifteen or twenty years. We thought we could not afford to give Mr. Stewart any control in this matter. He claimed that he had control, that as a legal

proposition, he was entitled to say when he should bring this work to completion. As a consequence of this difference of opinion, we took the work out of Mr. Stewart's hands after having exhausted every possible effort to have him continue it. When we came to the conclusion to get somebody else to undertake the work, we invited tenders from five, not three, leading contractors, the most responsible and, as we thought, the most competent contractors who were to be found in Canada. Some of them had been doing work on the canals. We made no political choice in the matter, as we felt that the main object was to get this work into active, responsible and vigorous hands, and to get it done as speedily as possible. We thought we could attain the object better by asking a limited number of first-class contractors to offer. There was ample competition, and the work was given to Messrs. Ryan and McDonell, as a result of this competition. The hon. gentleman says he is informed that the work is going to cost some \$200,000 more at the prices we pay these contractors, than at the prices we were paying Mr. Stewart. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, is in error about that. I do not carry in my mind, at the moment, how much the quantities would figure out, but I understand the opinion of the deputy is that the difference would not be half as great, and would not exceed \$70,000. That is my impression. I do not state that definitely, but I will be able to get more accurate information on the subject.

Mr. HAGGART. I remember perfectly well when I was in the department, the difficulty about the stone, when Mr. Monro was in charge. I took every precaution to see that the stone was of a good quality, and ordered the deputy to go down himself and examine it. I told him to get stonemasons, the superintendent of stonework on the Intercolonial Railway, and several other parties to examine the stone, and the consensus of opinion was that it was perfectly good for the work. I believe the stonework to be first-class stonework. But what I asked the hon. gentleman about was in reference to Bissonette Creek. I do not know whether that is on the Stewart section, but it must be very near it. There were pipes laid under it for the purpose of drainage, and what is the amount paid. Then I want to know as to the character of the work done, whether it is true that the walls of the locks have cracked? I understand that the arches above the groynes are built in such a manner that they are falling down at the present moment. As to the difference between the contracts, I understood it would amount to \$200,000. The deputy informs the minister it was only \$70,000. I would like to know the particulars, which may be given on some other items coming up in the supplementaries. I wish to know the difference between the amount which would have to be paid to Mr. Stewart under his contract, and the amount that is paid to these contractors,

who have the contract at present. I would like also to know whether the contract can be finished within the final estimate given by the department?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can answer at once, that there has been no final estimate. I understand that the hon. gentleman wants to know whether any difficulty developed in the walls built under the O'Leary contract.

Mr. HAGGART. No, I mean on the locks.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The deputy minister informs me that there is what is called a hair crack on one side of the wall. But the work has been well done. Certainly it is a most superior class of work. It is a fact that this difficulty has developed, but it is not regarded as serious. Then, in regard to the culvert I may say that it choked. The hon. gentleman said that it was projected in his day and laid down. It is not large enough, it choked, and we were obliged to pump it out. It was being pumped out when I was down there not many days ago, during the past session.

Mr. HAGGART. Who has the contract for pumping? I think it is the Collins Bay Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are Kingston people.

Mr. HAGGART. What are you paying?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The deputy minister does not recollect the amount. We are paying so much a day.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman did not say anything about the arches between the reaches in the canal. I understood that they gave way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are all right now.

Mr. HAGGART. But did they give way?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not the lock, but one of the arches.

Mr. HAGGART. Are these repairs being done at the expense of the government or of the contractor?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are no repairs being done.

Mr. HAGGART. I mean in reference to the arches and groynes. There was a falling in of the embankment too. The banks gave way on Lock No. 1, and there was a falling in of the arches between the reaches. Were the bank and groynes repaired at the expense of the government or the contractor?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At the expense of the govern-

ment, because it was the fault of our own engineer.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I have before me the speech from the Throne as it appears in *Hansard*.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Read it.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). It reads as follows:

I am pleased to say that our canal system, connecting the great lakes with the Atlantic seaboard, have been completed so as to allow vessels having a draft of fourteen feet to pass from the head of Lake Superior to the sea.

That is not the case. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals cannot at this very moment claim that it is true.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I differ with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). They are not completed. The hon. gentleman admitted a moment ago that the time of the Davis contract had been extended for one year, and that the canal was not completed. At the time that this was placed in the mouth of the Governor General there was a boom around the Farran's Point Canal and vessels were not allowed to go into it. Everybody knows that the contract of Davis & Co. has not been completed, and that the time has been extended for one year on condition that they tow vessels up the rapids with their tug. These are the conditions, and neither the right hon. Prime Minister nor the government can claim that this work is completed, or that the statement placed in the mouth of the Governor General is correct. It is a serious matter to place a statement of that kind in the mouth of the Governor General, and put it before the public, when they know well it is not true.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is directing attention to it at the wrong end of the session. He would not propose to move a vote of want of confidence at this late period of the session, when we are in supply.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). This is dealing with the canal, and it does not matter at what time of the session we take it up. We want to know what the government have to say about it. They placed this matter before the country in this way. There is not a man in the government, on the other side of the House, who will claim that navigation is completed between the points that are mentioned in the Governor General's speech.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will have to slip down and see the Governor General about it immediately.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I am not looking after the Governor General just now. It is all very well for the hon. minister to try and put it off in that way. If I were in the position that the hon. minister is of going to the Governor General and putting speeches in his mouth which are solemn assurances to the country, I would tell him the truth. I would not mislead him.

I would ask the hon. minister, in regard to the expenditure for which \$425 a day is paid, how many men there are on that work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman might allow that to stand, because I have already agreed that it will come up to-morrow.

Welland Canal—Improvements to Port  
Colborne entrance ..... \$100,000

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. minister be good enough to explain the improvements that he intends to make?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is proposed to deepen the entrance to twenty-two feet, and then to the first lock, having a channel ranging from 500 to 700 feet in width. Two piers are to be built, so that upon these piers arrangements may be made with the government by any persons desiring to build elevators. We have invited tenders, and awarded the contract for the work. The contract price, I think, when extended, will make the cost of the whole work between \$950,000 and \$975,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this outside and independent of the proposed plan of the hon. Minister of Public Works?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Quite independent of it. All that his work embraces is the breakwater a mile or so beyond.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. Minister of Public Works contemplate making any other expenditure than this?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is all he expects to lay out before another session of parliament.

Mr. HAGGART. How much will complete the work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Speaking for my own department, \$1,000,000 will cover it.

Mr. HAGGART. And how much in the Public Works Department?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I judge from discussions I have heard between the engineers and the minister that it will approach very nearly another million dollars to carry out the breakwater.

Welland Canal—Renewal of west pier at Port Dalhousie ..... \$32,000

Mr. HAGGART. Will this finish that pier?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This will finish the Port Dalhousie pier?

Renewal of docking below lock 1..... \$11,800

Mr. HAGGART. What docking is there there?

Mr. GIBSON. There is a large wharf and roadway leading from the foot of lock No. 1 right to the end of the pier at Port Dalhousie. It is not a dock in the proper sense of the term, but is the face of the wall at the entrance.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it utilized for a dock?

Mr. GIBSON. The daily steamers from Toronto and all the steamers coming in land there. It is on the government reservation below the foot of lock No. 1.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like a promise from the minister that all these contracts will be given by public tender.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the course which I almost invariably adopt.

Mr. HAGGART. We would like it without the 'almost invariably.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that any one will say that he has just ground for criticism of the letting of contracts in my department. I have striven to adhere to the contract system, although I have not always been satisfied that it was in the public interest to do so. I do not require any reminder from the hon. gentleman, because I feel that even though the results are not satisfactory in every case, it is much more comfortable for the minister to let by tender. This work is being done by tender and contract.

Mr. DAVIN. How much a yard are you paying for the concrete work here?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I really do not remember, but the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. DAVIN. I suppose we can get that information to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Lake St. Francis—To complete protection walls ..... \$9,000

Mr. HAGGART. On what principle does the hon. gentleman protect the shores of Lake St. Francis?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that I can really say whether or not the principle is a sound one. All I can say is that this was commenced in 1884, and has been continued down to the present moment.

Mr. HAGGART. Is that at the village of Valleyfield?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is on the north side.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose it was one of the promises of the Minister of Public Works when he contested Beauharnois.

Lachine Canal—To rebuild wall of basin 2..\$10,000

Mr. HAGGART. What is the matter with the wall?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand it is being completely undermined by frost.

Mr. HAGGART. Will this finish the work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I think it is going to cost six or seven times this much; but this is all we can expend this year.

Mr. GIBSON. The only piece of wall that is any good, is that which the hon. gentleman built in connection with the two bridges. All the other walls are in a dilapidated state, and if the water were taken out, they would fall down of their own weight.

St. Ours Lock—To rebuild dam and ice breaker ..... \$10,000

Mr. HAGGART. What will it cost to finish that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The \$10,000 is presumed to be sufficient.

Carillon and Grenville Canals—To rebuild guide piers ..... \$30,000

Mr. HAGGART. That is an enormous amount for guide piers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are going to build them of concrete, with stone filling.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount required to finish them?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Thirty thousand dollars.

Railway statistics ..... \$2,500

Mr. HAGGART. Why is this increased?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is increased by \$900. We are getting out a new map this year.

Mr. JOHN McALISTER (Restigouche). When was the last map got out?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In 1896, I understand.

Salaries of extra clerks, copyists and messengers ..... \$2,600

Mr. HAGGART. Who are the clerks who get the increases?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Mothersill, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Leslie, \$100 each. Then there is \$700

for a clerk to fill a vacancy caused by the promotion of a third class clerk to the second class. It appears that the demands for returns and other things during the session have increased very much, and we have not had enough to pay for the sessional service.

Mr. HAGGART. Who is the extra clerk you are getting?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know.

Mr. McALISTER. I would ask the hon. minister if he has received a petition from shingle manufacturers along the county of Bonaventure, complaining of an increase in the rates of freight, or at least an increase in the billed cars? Cars weighing 40,000 pounds were billed before at twenty-seven hundred weight, and 60,000 pounds at thirty-two hundred weight.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I received a petition and some letters on the subject and sent them to Mr. Pottinger, with the request for a report, but have not heard from him.

Mr. McALISTER. It is unfair that these cars should be billed at their full weight because the shingles are manufactured from lumber taken out of the water, and a large percentage is water. The manufacturers are paying freight on water. If the shingles were dry, they would not weigh one-half or one-third what they do when shipped green. The manufacturers are at a great disadvantage this year, because they made their season's contract on the strength of the old rate. If the new rate is imposed, they will be at great disadvantage on account of their contracts. In addition, we know there has been a fall in the shingle market lately, and the manufacturers will not be able to pay this rate and will have to ship their shingles by water. The difference in the rates amounts to \$10 or \$15 a car. This shingle industry is one of the most important on the north shore, and every encouragement should be given it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I sent the papers on to Mr. Pottinger and should have heard from him by this. I cannot understand why I have not heard from him. In explanation of the other item, if you will take the civil government vote you will find that there is not \$700 difference. The civil government vote is less this year by \$650 than last year, because we have one clerk less paid under the civil government vote, and by virtue of the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has got a great many estimates through tonight; it is now half-past twelve, and we want to get to bed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot complain very seriously of the treatment I have received.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What is to be taken up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We hope to proceed with my hon. friend's (Mr. Blair's) estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will try to have all the papers here in the morning. I am not sure I shall be able to take up my estimates to-morrow, but I will let the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) know in the morning.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Thursday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 186)—from the Senate—respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. McGregor.)

REAL PELLETIER.

Mr. DECHENE asked:

What is the pay of Réal Pelletier, who is employed on the wharf at L'Islet; by whom was he recommended for the post, and what work does he do?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to state that the name of Réal Pelletier is not known in the Department of Public Works. There was given, on October 30 last, \$1,000 for expenditure upon this wharf, under the foremanship of Raymond Normand. During the winter materials were procured for the work which, on June 6, was reported as near completion. The bills, however, have not yet been received. The acting chief engineer has telegraphed asking if Réal Pelletier is employed upon the work.

J. H. OSBORNE, UTTERTON, ONT.

Mr. McCORMICK asked:

1. Upon what authority did officers Floody and Franklin, of the Inland Revenue Department, search the premises of Mr. J. H. Osborne, of Utterson, Ontario?

2. If authorized by the department, what were the instructions given to said officers?

3. By whom was the information laid against Mr. Osborne, and what was the substance of said information?

4. Did the officers discover any violation of the Inland Revenue law on the premises of Mr. Osborne?

5. What was the nature of the officers' report to the department?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have only to repeat the information which I gave yesterday in the absence of the hon. gentleman. The department has not yet received any report from the local officers on this matter, and it is impossible at this moment to give the hon. gentleman the information which he requires. But I will call the attention of the department to it again so that we may have a report.

#### VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. **CASGRAIN** asked :

1. Has the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery received the voters' list for the locality called Pointe aux Esquimaux, in the county of Saguenay?

2. If so, on what date?

3. Has the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery transmitted the said list to the Queen's Printer, and on what date?

4. Has the said list been printed and distributed, and on what date?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). 1. Yes. 2. April 27, 1900. 3. Yes; June 21, 1900. 4. I presume the list has not yet been printed.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.—MR. BENNETT.

Mr. **W. H. BENNETT** (East Simcoe). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say that yesterday afternoon I was not in the House when the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. Stubbs) read an extract from a newspaper, in which I was credited with having stated that he attended the caucuses of the Liberal party. If I am charged with having stated that, I have only this to say, that I did not state that the hon. member attended the caucuses. I did state that he attended in the caucus room of the Liberal party, and I furthermore stated, and I have every recollection of it, that I thought the Liberal party had no more subservient supporter than the hon. gentleman, and furthermore, that he was always at the behest of the Liberal party.

Mr. **STUBBS**. I am willing to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, and I am glad he made the apology.

#### • SUPPLY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. **G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I would

like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) whether he can tell us if the appropriation powers of the government are exhausted so far as this session is concerned, or are we to look for another supplementary estimate?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Unless it shall appear that something has been inadvertently overlooked there will be no further supplementary estimate. It may be quite possible that there may be something, but I do not anticipate anything.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), if he is able to give me an answer in reference to a notice of motion which I have on the paper. My notice of motion is for :

Copies of reports, papers and correspondence with the government or any member thereof, all orders in council and statements of all moneys paid in respect of the bridge over the Richelieu River and the \$35,000 voted therefor by parliament.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry to say that at this moment I cannot give an answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). I had very little time to speak to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) yesterday about it. But, as I understood, the last time I spoke to him upon the subject, the correspondence had not been completed. I will have to ask my hon. friend to defer the matter until to-morrow and then to repeat his question.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I do not suppose that there is any objection to bringing these papers down, because they relate to a matter in reference to the expenditure of public money, and the House, of course, has a right to information in regard to it. Technically, I am barred from making the motion in the regular way, but that ought not to affect the general principle. I would also ask the government if they are in a position to say when the railway resolutions will be brought down. The right hon. gentleman told me some time ago that there would be some subsidies to railways. I would like to ask him whether he is in a position to state when they will be down, and before his making any statement, I want to say to him that this side of the House is anxious to facilitate the rising of parliament just as soon as possible, but our digestion is limited, and we ought to have, in all conscience, a little time for these immense supplies, whether emergency or otherwise, that are set before us at this late hour of the session.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I am sorry to hear that the digestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is limited. I thought, on the contrary, that it was unlimited, and that he could digest almost anything.

Mr. FOSTER. Looking at the supplies which have been set before us there is some justification for that idea.

The PRIME MINISTER. Without binding myself absolutely I see no reason why they should not be brought down on Monday or Tuesday at the latest.

Mr. FOSTER. Next Monday?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, because we will have to sit on Saturday.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Are you going to sit on Monday?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, on Saturday and Monday.

Mr. BERGERON. Dominion Day?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, Dominion Day. I think the best way of celebrating Dominion Day is to do the business that we have to do.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF THE YUKON.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, on the motion to go into supply I wish to move a resolution in connection with a matter very much discussed in this House during the present session and during the past session. It is a matter in reference to the administration of the Yukon territory. Of course, it will be remembered that at the last session of parliament a resolution was moved asking for an inquiry, which was refused by the House, and afterwards Mr. Ogilvie was appointed as a special commissioner to conduct the commission of inquiry into the matters in respect to which charges had been made. In respect to that objection was taken, at the time and since, that the scope of the inquiry was not as great as it should have been, that the time limit of the inquiry made it almost inoperative and practically useless as a means of discovering the truth of the charges that had been made against officials of the government in the Yukon and against the administration of the Yukon territory in general. In contrast with that there might be cited examples in several of the colonies of Great Britain and of the mother country as well. In Australia an inquiry was conducted, the scope of which was so ample that it was a complete inquiry. The same thing was done in connection with the charges made against trades unionism as a source of outrage in Great Britain.

Again, the inquiry into the conduct of the Metropolitan Board of Works in Great Britain was conducted in such a manner that, although no specific charges had been made by any member of parliament on his own authority, the powers of the commission were made inquisitorial, and the investigation was conducted in such a manner, as not simply to throw the burden of proof upon the persons complaining, but practically to make it a genuine commission of

inquiry, that could get at the facts. In connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway Commission, issued by the government of Sir John Macdonald, the same course was followed. On the ground that dissatisfaction existed, and that charges were made against the conduct of the government, an inquiry was ordered which was ample, searching and complete. Again, under this administration, an inquiry was made into the conduct of the person in charge of the Crown Timber Office in New Westminster, and instead of hampering the action of those who were prosecuting the charges, the utmost latitude was allowed, and the government encouraged in every way the prosecution of the investigation, so as to secure the desired results, not limiting it to one locality, but practically constituting it so that it might move about to discover any evidence that might be obtained in any part. The commission that was issued last year was extraordinary in its character. It was much more restricted in its character than was the order in council upon which it was based. The order in council, in its terms, was wide enough, but the commission, issued to Mr. Ogilvie, either bore, or was construed by him to bear, such an interpretation as to prevent him from carrying on his inquiry into anything that occurred subsequent to August 25. The consequence was that those gentlemen who represented the inhabitants of the Yukon territory withdrew from the inquiry, and that practically the inquiry failed of its results. Then, again, no provision was made for the payment of witnesses. These witnesses, for the most part, came from a great distance. They were men who had not the means at their disposal to come to Dawson and to remain there in residence. Mr. Ogilvie asked them to keep an account of their expenses, promising that he would submit it to Ottawa for consideration. Then, this matter was very much delayed. It came up before Mr. Ogilvie in February, the commission closed in May, and Mr. Ogilvie did not communicate with the government at Ottawa, so far as we know, until the month of November of that year. This commission of inquiry was conducted, apparently, judging from the report made by Mr. Ogilvie and laid before the House, in an unfair manner. In some portions of the inquiry Mr. Ogilvie laid less stringent regulations upon the questions of some parties conducting the inquiry than he did on those of others.

In other cases he rather encouraged the idea that he wished to search for evidence and to get at the facts which might lie beneath any allegation or information that was laid before him. In the course of this session information has been laid before the House, in the shape of returns and reports and papers, which goes to show that a great many acts have been perpetrated in the Yukon which were certainly irregular, and which, in some cases, have been pronounced

by the law officers of the Crown to be unconstitutional and to be arbitrary. The cases of the *Yukoner*, the *John C. Barr*, the McDonald royalty, the water front leases, and many others, have been proven, from papers laid before the House, to be cases in respect to which gross irregularity and misconduct was committed, and which would not have been committed elsewhere in Canada. That really gives ground for the feeling that in so far as the administration of the Yukon is concerned, that respect for law and order and for property, which runs elsewhere, I am glad to say, in Canada, do not prevail in the Yukon. On the whole, the results have been unsatisfactory, and although it may appear that ample evidence is in existence and can be got at, to establish the fact that there was wrong-doing, and, to effect that very proper purpose that was announced by the Premier when he granted the commission, namely: that no official should rest under suspicion, but that he should either be proven guilty or be exonerated; yet that most proper purpose has not been achieved up to the present. Now, Sir, the reply to the charges which have been made in this House at various times during this and the preceding session, practically amounts to the minister in presence, or the acting minister in his absence, giving a direct denial to these charges. They plead not guilty in fact, a plea which in court, and, probably in this parliament, certainly does not prove innocence. That plea of not guilty is practically the only answer that has been given to the charges made. Most definite statements were made and names given last year in support of the charges, and statements as to maladministration will again be made in the course of the resolution I am about to move. Several of these acts of maladministration will be cited in the resolution, and sufficient grounds will be advanced to warrant the House in calling for a searching and complete and satisfactory commission to inquire into the charges that have been made and are again made now: that the administration of the Yukon by this government, and by the officers acting under it, has not been in the public interest, and that, in the language of the *London Times*, the relations between the officials and the public in the Yukon have been everything that they should not be. I therefore beg to move:

That up to the time of the commission of inquiry into charges against officials of the Yukon district, commissions of inquiry into charges respecting corruption and maladministration of public affairs were of the widest scope, whether in England, Australia or Canada, and were of an inquisitorial and searching character, untrammelled by formal procedure or technical rules.

That the following paragraphs from a minute of the Executive Council in Victoria, Australia, approved in 1854, indicate the scope of the inquiry made in that colony into the administration of mines:—

3. Has the conduct of the officers generally in the camp at Ballarat, either during the execution of their duty or at other times been such as to inspire respect and confidence amongst the population in general?

4. Charges of corruption having been publicly advanced against the officers of the Ballarat Camp, it will be the duty of the board narrowly to search and inquire whether there is any foundation for such serious accusations, and they will specify the individuals (if any) who they believe to be guilty. Victoria, Votes and Proceedings of Legislative Council, 1854-55, vol. 1.

That the public mind in England was in 1867 exercised as to whether the trade unions were responsible for certain outrages. The inquiry ordered was a judicial and general inquiry into acts alleged by any one against these trade unions or associations. The commission was to ascertain as far as possible the whole truth about the grievances, and into the scandals which had moved the public mind. (Eng. 'Hansard,' vol. 329, p. 271.)

That the president of the said commission was the then late Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas. (Vol. 189, 1867, Eng. 'Hansard.') The composition of the commission was considered as most important, because, as was said, unless constituted in such a way as to give confidence to those whose interests were concerned, it would produce very little benefit. (P. 191, 'Hansard' above.)

That in 1888 Lord Randolph Churchill referred in parliament to the extent of the metropolitan area under the management of the Board of Works, and claimed:—That a body administering affairs so large was bound to possess, if it was to be efficient, the most entire public confidence which could be imagined.

He charged, though not formally, or on his sole responsibility as a member of parliament, that members and officers of the board had been interested in property required for public use and that parties on the board were practically paid for some of their advice given on the board. That members of the board engaged outside in professional duties, had used their personal influence inside the board in favour of the scheme submitted in which they were professionally interested.

These charges had been mainly made by newspapers. Lord Randolph Churchill also referred to a statement by a newspaper that the Board of Works was the most corrupt public body in London. ('Hansard,' 51 Vic., 1888, p. 322.)

That a Royal Commission of inquiry was appointed to inquire into the Metropolitan Board of Works and it retrospectively included everything from the foundation of the board.

That respecting the Royal Commission for inquiry into the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Sir John Macdonald stated in the House:

'It was announced in the House, press and country that there has been gross improprieties—this had been made the battleground of both parties, there had been charges and counter charges of misconduct of official subordinates, and even insinuations as well as assertions with regard to members of the government. ('Hansard,' 1880-81, vol. 1, p. 21.)

That the said commission went on to recite, 'The questions which have arisen have become the subject of discussion both in and out of parliament touching the propriety and responsibility for large expenditures connected with this work.' And again, 'That allegations have been made as to diverse irregularities and extravagancies, neglects and other derelictions of duty on the part of the officers and others em-

ployed on the said work and that sundry irregularities and improprieties have taken place in the obtaining of contracts for portions of said work and in the performance of the same,' and the commission was empowered to inquire fully and report. (C.P.R. Commission, p. 1853, 'Hansard,' 1899.)

On February 2, 1897, a Minute of Council approved of a memorandum from the Hon. Clifford Sifton, then, as now, the Minister of the Interior, in which he stated he had received such information in regard to the affairs of the Crown Timber agent in British Columbia as would appear in his judgment to require to be investigated immediately.

A commission accordingly issued authorizing Mr. Archer Martin, a barrister-at-law, to inquire into and report upon the affairs of the Crown Timber agent in British Columbia.

Upon the issue of the commission the Crown Timber agent was suspended.

On March 4, 1897, and after the issue of the said commission, the assistant secretary of the Interior Department wrote to the manager of the C. P. R. Telegraph Company, requesting that his officers at New Westminster would allow all necessary information to Mr. Martin, the commissioner, as it was desirable to check the telegraph account of the Crown timber agent.

The deputy minister, on March 6, 1897, and after the issue of the commission, and after the suspension of the Crown Timber agent, reported to the minister that: 'No definite charge was made against the Crown Timber agent.'

On March 11, 1897, a detailed statement of the contingent expenditure of the New Westminster office, from June, 1885, to December, 1896, was transmitted to the commissioner.

The Deputy Minister of the Interior on March 15, 1897, wired the said commissioner as follows: 'Investigation to be as thorough as possible.'

On March 20, 1897, the commissioner wrote indicating he had evidence against this official, and, referring to a contemplated visit to Kamloops, reported: 'I think that it would be cheaper and more satisfactory for me to go up there, where I might pick up other evidence.'

Sess. Paper No. 112. Ref. 115, New Westminster Crown Timber office.)

That an order in council of October 7, 1898, after reciting the charges next hereinafter mentioned, went on to say: 'The minister, therefore, recommends that, under the authority of Chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled "An Act respecting Inquiries concerning Public Matters," a commission do issue appointing William Ogilvie, Esquire, the commissioner of the Yukon territory, a commissioner under the said Act, to inquire into the charges and complaints set forth in the said communication, and into any other charges or complaints that any other person in the Yukon territory may desire to prefer against the officials of the government of Canada in that territory, and to report thereon, and upon all other matters incidental thereto.'

(P. 1 and 2, Ogilvie Report. Return 87, 4th Session, 8th Parliament, 62 Victoria, 1899.)

That on October 7, 1898, a commission issued in favour of William Ogilvie, Esquire, under the provisions of Chapter 114, R.S.C., to hold an investigation and to take evidence under oath with regard to certain charges made against officials of the Dominion government in the Yukon territory, in which it was alleged that many of the government officials of the Dominion government had forfeited their claim to the people's confidence and respect by their conduct and action in certain matters, and that the Gold Commissioner's office was practically closed, and has

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

been for a considerable time, to the miners who had not the means and desire to bribe the clerks in order to obtain knowledge of the record which ought to be public, and that wholesale information with regard to the unrecorded ground was conveyed to certain individuals outside the office, who obtained men to stake and record the ground in consideration of an interest in the same, and that dissatisfaction had arisen with respect to decisions in claim contests, particularly owing to the Crown Prosecutor, who, while retained as advocate of one of the contestants, was giving legal advice to the Gold Commissioner. The Dominion Lands agent was charged with serious breaches of trust and malfeasance in office, and some of the officials connected with the Recorder's office were said to be incompetent, and it was charged that hardships had been caused to many of the claim owners owing to the want of experience of the mining inspectors, and that the Crown Timber agent had granted such concessions and laid down such stringent regulations that only a few parties had the privilege of supplying cordwood for the winter of 1898-9.

That instead of the wide scope of the commissions hereinbefore referred to, it was stated in said commission that inquiry should be made into the 'foregoing charges,' which were contained in a communication dated August 25, 1898, and the said commission did not provide for any other charges or complaints as in terms directed by said order in council before recited.

That this commission did not open until the 6th day of February, 1899.

That neither the statute, as amended, nor the said commission provided for a thorough, complete and searching investigation into the frauds which were alleged, or which had taken place, or into the administration of the laws in the Yukon district, and the conduct of officials therein.

That no provision was made for the purpose of indemnifying witnesses who might be required to answer or who answered questions, the answer to which might criminate or tend to criminate them (as in Section 9 of Chapter 10, of the Revised Statutes, entitled 'An Act respecting inquiries as to Corrupt Practices at Elections of Members of the House of Commons.')

That no provision was made respecting the travelling fees and maintenance of witnesses, as in the last mentioned Act is enacted by section 11 thereof.

That no provision of any kind was made for payment of witnesses during the sittings of the commission.

That on February 22, 1899, the representatives of the miners' committee stated to the commissioner, as follows:—

'Mr. Ogilvie.—The court is now open for the hearing of charges under the Royal Commission.

'Mr. Percy McDougal.—The representatives of the miners' committee want to bring evidence to show that money was paid to gain access to the Gold Commissioner's office. We are anxious to see where the blame is attached and find out to whom that blame is due.

'Mr. Armstrong.—I wish to define our position somewhat. We don't wish to be understood as prosecutors alone in this hearing of charges. We understand that you are holding a commission to inquire into matters of public interest in this territory, and we wish to give our time and help in this investigation without any fee or recompense of any sort.

'There is a matter which I wish to call your attention to, that is the matter of expenses. You have told us there is no arrangement in regard to expenses; but I would call your attention to the fact that many of the miners, especially those residing outside of Dawson on distant

creeks, have no money whatever, and very little food, and that they have no cabins in Dawson, and no friends to whom they can have recourse ; and that to call such men into Dawson is an absolute piece of cruelty, and we are put in a position to ask these men to come and help the government to make an inquiry into matters of government interest. This seems to us an act of cruelty. I would ask you to make an order that witnesses might apply for such expenses as might be necessary for their maintenance during the times they are before the court.

'The Commissioner.—There is no authority in the commission as I told you before—nothing about paying expenses, and if I did what you suggest I might be held responsible myself. That I cannot afford.

'Mr. McDougal.—Could not the council make some provision for this ?

'The Commissioner.—No, this matter the council cannot deal with. It has only to deal with local matters. What I suggested was, that these men keep track of their expenses and put in the accounts, which will be submitted to Ottawa.

'Mr. Armstrong.—But these men have no money now ; how can a satisfactory commission of inquiry be held without paying the men their expenses ?

'The Commissioner.—If I trespass beyond the point of this commission I may be held personally responsible.

'Mr. Armstrong.—Then the only thing to do is to recognize the commission as limited and work within the limitation as best we can.

'The Commissioner.—I will help in every way I can.

'Mr. McDougal.—Is it not understood that under a Royal Commission the witnesses' fees are paid ?

'The Commissioner.—That question I cannot decide at present. We are considering that. There is no mention made in connection with expenses at all ; it is not referred to in the remotest way.

\* \* \* \* \*

'As to the matter of witnesses coming in, as I told you, I will take that into consideration and suggest that they keep track of their expenses and submit the account to me, which I will forward to Ottawa. This is all I can do.

'Mr. McDougal.—The need for relief in such cases is immediate, as I would call to your attention, a number of the men called in have no shelter.'

Report of Ogilvie Commission, p. 12-13.

That the commissioner ruled that he was limited in his inquiry to the charges in the petition, and to such facts as occurred prior to August 25, 1898.

That Mr. Ogilvie concluded his inquiry under the Royal Commission on May 17, 1899.

That it was not until November 18, 1899, Mr. Ogilvie communicated with the Department of the Interior on the subject of witnesses' fees.

That instead of proceeding as in the inquiry into the Crown Timber office at New Westminster, the commissioner conducted the proceedings somewhat after the character of a court of assize and gave notice that the charges would have to be formulated and presented so that the accused persons might receive notice of such and be prepared to defend themselves, and that as soon as he received these charges formulated specifically, he stated he would notify the accused and appoint a day for hearing the cases, that regular rules of evidence would apply and that opinion evidence would not be satisfactory to him (pages 7 and 8, Ogilvie Commission), and he referred

to parties charged as defendants (page 13, Ogilvie Commission).

That no provision was made for the conduct of the charges by counsel learned in the law, while parties implicated in the said charges were permitted to attend before the said commission represented by counsel.

That having decided that legal rules as to evidence should apply, the following incidents occurred on the investigation. Mr. Calpin was examining a witness respecting the opening and closing of Dominion Creek :—

Q. You don't know whether Captain Bliss gave that information to anybody ?—A. No.

Q. Was Captain Bliss on the council ?—A. Yes.

Mr. Calpin.—I think I should have mentioned that I bought a claim on Dominion from a person, a man who has since left the country. He said that he was given information by Captain Bliss, and says that others as well knew of it, and he met people going back ; this was before the notice was put up.

The Commissioner.—That is only a statement ; we can't take it as evidence.

(Pages 93 and 94, Ogilvie Commission.)

The commissioner was examining a Mr. Pulford and was pressing him as to the authority for his statements. Mr. Pulford having been imprisoned for not answering the commissioner.

By the Commissioner :

Q. I think that is a fair question. If he is willing to give the name of any informant, I think it is legitimate. We want to know these matters ?—A. I can't exactly tell you the name of the man who told me this matter, because I don't remember it. Not now ; I can't think of his name. If I was given two or three days to find him I could bring him into court.

Q. Have you any objection to answering what the information related to ?

Mr. Gwillim.—I object. This is hearsay evidence.

The Commissioner.—Well, if we can get a clew, what it relates to—

Mr. Gwillim.—I think the same rules of evidence should obtain here as obtain in other courts of law. You can't take what every Tom, Dick and Harry tells, nor believe all sorts of stories.

The Commissioner.—Suppose we take the trouble to ascertain what these are worth ?

Mr. Gwillim.—You might go on for a month or two if you did that.

The Commissioner.—If we hear rumours I think we might establish whether they are worthless or not.

Mr. Gwillim.—If the same rules apply in this court, with regard to witnesses, as apply in others, anything that is not evidence I object to.

The Commissioner.—In this case we will ask the witness the question though it is not a case of evidence.

(Page 126, Ogilvie Commission.)

That having written to the Minister of the Interior on February 20, 1899, a letter treated as private by the minister and not disclosed to parliament till ordered by the House in 1900, as follows :—

'The question of the withholding of McDonald's royalty has been brought up and we will have to investigate it. At the same time, this matter is a serious one : McDonald presumably owed the government some \$70,000 for royalty due, out of which only about \$2,000 was paid. Under ordinary circumstances the man would lose all his claim, but, as this was authorized by the late commissioner, of course, McDonald could not be made to suffer for his acts ; but

it will have a very bad effect on the minds of the public when it becomes known that such was done.'

'Hansard,' page 5384, May 14, 1900.

Mr. Ogilvie reported as a Royal Commission on this subject as follows:—

'You will also see that some inquiry was made into the laying over of Mr. Alex. McDonald's royalty and an explanation furnished for the same. All the evidence submitted in this connection was that furnished in the letters between Major Walsh, Mr. McDonald and Mr. Fawcett.

'There appears to have been no wrong-doing in this, at least none was made manifest, Major Walsh taking the view that it would be impossible to exact Mr. McDonald's royalty, as it would put him to considerable hardship if he was compelled to pay it, and later on, his paying it would benefit the country as much as if he had paid it last spring.'

That as a matter of form, Mr. Ogilvie did not ascertain how much McDonald owed the government for royalty nor did he give any reason for changing his opinion expressed in February, 1899, that the matter was 'a serious one.'

That it does not appear that he attempted to secure the confidential letter which Mr. McDonald wrote to Major Walsh on that subject.

That no inquiry was made into the relations of Major Walsh and Mr. McDonald, the parties to confidential correspondence, respecting the indulgence regarding royalty and the violation of the law in this connection.

That Mr. Ogilvie was connected by marriage with the Minister of the Interior, the Hon. Mr. Sifton.

That Mr. Ogilvie's salary at the time when he was appointed commissioner for the Yukon district was \$1,800, and as commissioner his salary was made \$5,000, with quarters and provisions.

That after his report as commissioner under this special Royal Commission and upon the recommendation of the Minister of the Interior, the Hon. Mr. Sifton, his salary was made \$6,000, living allowances, \$2,000, rent \$3,000, house-keeper \$720, or \$11,720 a year in all.

Shortly after the appointment of the commissioner, namely, on February 20, 1899, the commissioner advised the Minister of the Interior as follows:—

(a) 'Commissioner's Office, Y.T.,  
Dawson, Feb. 20, 1899.

'Sir,—I regret to inform you that the Royal Commission for the investigation of charges against officials has, to an extent, fallen through.

'Mr. Armstrong, chairman of the miners' committee, who drew up the memorial which led to the issuance of the commission, and Dr. McDougall, the secretary of the committee, withdrew from the investigation when they learned that the scope of the commission only included what occurred previous to August 25, the date of the memorial.'

That the acting Minister of the Interior stated in this House on June 11, 1900:

'The people of this country have heard so much about this matter that they are tired of it and they thoroughly understand that the parties who got up these charges, were irresponsible, miserable vagabonds. All of them, I understand, without exception, have left the country and are afraid to return lest they should be prosecuted. . . . And whatever irregularities may have occurred, the great majority of all these statements and charges consisted of nothing but gossip from the lowest kind of characters.'

('Hansard,' pages 7351, 7352, June 11, 1900.)

Mr. BELL (Fictou.)

That Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, having made a series of charges in this House respecting the maladministration and corruption in public affairs in the Yukon territory, beyond and independent of the charges aforesaid which were before Mr. Ogilvie, and which were not limited to the date of August 25, 1898, as in the case before the commission or to any date, the Minister of the Interior informed this House, when asking to have the request of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper for a judicial commission and a full inquiry voted down:

'We will give every fact, every alleged fact, that is brought before the government and brought before parliament, our fullest and most careful consideration. And if there is the least ground for finding that there should be any further or more complete investigation, we will provide that that further and more complete investigation shall take place.'

('Hansard,' p. 6147—1899.)

The Right Hon. Prime Minister said in the same debate:

'I will say this, speaking under my responsibility as head of the government, that if this investigation is not sufficient another investigation will be ordered. We must probe these Yukon delinquencies, so-called, to the bottom. No officer of the government must be allowed to rest under any suspicion.'

('Hansard,' p. 6360, June 29, 1899.)

That on September 2, one Robert Anderson applied to Mr. Fawcett, the Gold Commissioner, for a lease of a tract of land for the purpose of hydraulic mining—a flat through which Hunker Creek runs—for a distance of about 2½ miles.

Mr. Anderson represented that this portion had not been located by miners, it being impossible to work it by crude methods, and that hydraulic mining alone would be successful.

Mr. Anderson added:

'I therefore make this application in good faith, for the purpose of obtaining a grant or lease to that portion of Hunker Creek lying between the Troandik River and about one thousand feet below the mouth of Last Chance Creek, an approximate distance of two and one-half miles, for the purpose of conducting and operating a hydraulic mine thereon.'

That promptly on September 3, 1897, Mr. Fawcett reported to the Minister of the Interior favourably.

That on November 30, 1897, the following petition was forwarded to the Minister of the Interior:

Dawson City,  
November 30, 1897.

To the Hon. Mr. Sifton,  
Minister of the Interior,  
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—

We, the undersigned humble petitioners most emphatically protest against the granting of a two and one-half miles lease, more or less, of placer diggings on Hunker Creek, Klondyke Mining Division of the Yukon District, for hydraulic mining purposes.

The cause for this petition being the refusal of the Gold Commissioner to record our applications for the usual placer claims of 500 feet, 'it being an old creek.' As an application had been forwarded to your honourable self for the above grant of two and one-half miles, we most respectfully beg to say that this ground cannot be worked by hydraulic process, having scarcely any grade for dumping, and sixteen to eighteen feet of frozen black muck before reaching the pay gravel. We consider it very unfair to the miner and prospector, after months of hard la-

hour, and when prospects are getting a little brighter, to have to stand by and see a company monopolize a whole creek. We humbly pray your honourable self to give this matter due consideration, and most respectfully hope you will advise the Gold Commissioner of this district to accept the records of those claims as staked by your petitioners as soon as possible, in order that we may go on with development work while everything is frozen, as we can do nothing in the summer months on account of water.

Awaiting your reply, your petitioners will ever pray.

(Signed)

- D. H. Henderson, No. 3 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- C. C. Raven, No. 4 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- F. F. McPhail, No. 5 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- G. H. Tweedy, No. 6 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- T. Bordereau, No. 7 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- W. H. Boulais, No. 8 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- J. Daoust, No. 9 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- A. Manson, No. 10 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- F. D. Duffers, No. 11 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- N. Barrett, No. 12 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- L. Couture, No. 13 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- F. D. Duffers, No. 14 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- N. Traversey, No. 16 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- R. H. Fox, No. 18 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- J. Matthews, No. 19 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- F. F. Nesh, No. 20 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- B. Hammond, No. 21 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- D. Stewart, No. 22 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- E. Berrigan, No. 23 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- F. H. McNeil, No. 24 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- W. Rendall, No. 25 claim below Last Chance on Hunker Creek.
- J. A. McRanma.
- F. A. Raney.
- L. Casey.

That on January 8, 1898, the Minister of the Interior caused the application of Mr. Anderson to be noted and directed that no entries for mining claims under the lease applied for be granted.

That on January 12, 1898, an order in council was approved, the Minister of the Interior, the Hon. Mr. Sifton, 'submitting that Mr. Robert Anderson, mining engineer of London, England,' had applied for the said lease and that 'the tract applied for is a flat through which the creek runs, that it has been passed over by individual prospectors, as it is altogether too wide to prospect in search of a pay streak; that a claim of a less area than the one applied for would not justify the expenditure necessary to procure machinery and to give the experiment a fair trial,' and he recommends that the application be granted.

That on the 19th day of April, 1898, a committee of miners was informed, through Major Walsh

by the Deputy Minister of the Interior that on the representation of the Gold Commissioner 'Mr. Anderson was given a lease of these bars, and I do not see that anything can be done to cancel it, at all events in the meantime.'

That the said order in council of January 12, 1898, went on to provide as follows:—

'The minister states that he is of the opinion that it is desirable to introduce hydraulic mining in the Yukon district, and that Mr. Anderson, who is an experienced miner, should be given an opportunity to ascertain whether or not this kind of mining is practicable on the tract applied for, and he recommends that the application be granted upon the following terms and conditions:—

\* \* \* \* \*

'That the lessee shall have the necessary hydraulic machinery in operation on the ground within one year from the date of the lease, and if, during one season when operations can be carried on he fails to efficiently work the same, the lease shall become null and void, unless the Minister of the Interior shall decide otherwise.'

That instead of a lease being issued to Mr. Anderson and the conditions enforced, the area covered remained closed to prospectors under the order of the Minister of the Interior of January 8, 1898, and Mr. Anderson proceeded to England, and on December 12, 1898, cabled to Hon. Mr. Sifton as follows:—

'Have transferred benefit of Order in Council relating to Hunker Creek concession to Klondyke Government Concession Company, I authorize and request grant of lease direct to company, whose solicitors are cabling you.'

That without any other information before it, the Department of the Interior cabled on December 13, 1898, to Mr. Robert Anderson as follows:

'Belcourt advised lease; will issue to you forthwith, and sent London for your execution. Department will consent assignment to company if in proper form.'

That Mr. Belcourt, a member of parliament, cabled from London, to Hon. Mr. Sifton, on January 10, 1899, as follows: 'Anderson's Company has acted on Smart's cable that lease would issue forthwith and transfer assented to lease and assignment approved before my departure further delay will be most damaging here to Canadian interests good faith on your government at stake will expect immediate answer that lease completed.'

On January 12, 1899, Hon. Mr. Sifton cabled Mr. Belcourt that the lease was executed that day.

That on May 28, 1900, the acting Minister of the Interior informed this House that the lease which the Minister of the Interior was authorized to grant under order in council of January 12, 1898, was not granted until December 24, 1898, and that at the request of the Klondike Government Concession (Limited), the assignee of Mr. Anderson, a lease under the regulations of December 3, 1898, for the disposal of mining locations to be worked by hydraulic or other mining process, was issued in their favour on February 12, 1900, and this lease was in substitution for the one issued under the order in council of January 12, 1898, and having been asked what has been the result of the experiment referred to in the said order in council up to date the minister replied: 'No reports have been received, the department is not in a position to furnish this information.'

Mr. A. W. Taylor, formerly of Victoria, B.C., now of Dawson, wrote to Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper requesting him to ask for the papers granting the two and a half miles on Hunker Creek aforesaid. In this letter he states: 'This

property is perhaps the richest aggregation of claims in this country,' and also 'as a matter of fact the ground as applied for can in no way be hydraulised, the work can only be performed by sinking. The guise was to get same on the hydraulic property plea.'

That it has been announced in this House, in the English and Canadian press and throughout Canada that there have been and still continue to be gross improprieties in the conduct of public affairs in the Yukon and charges of misconduct of officials and assertions made with regard to members of the government.

That in addition to the statements formally made in this House during the past session the following statements are now brought to the attention of this House:

'That one J. E. Whiteside, was sent by Collector Milne, of Victoria, to Skagway, on February 24, 1898, and subsequently he was transferred for service at White Pass. He left the service on May 27, 1898.'

('Hansard' 1900, p. 6797.)

That Mr. Whiteside has since then been a member of the firm of J. E. Whiteside & Co., real estate, mining and customs brokers in Dawson.

That Mr. Whiteside has advised a member of this House as follows:

'The following few facts are given to you with the understanding that I am not seeking for political favours, but rather that it is necessary that the country should know how things were carried on both at the Summits of White Pass and Chilcoot, by the Collector of Customs, during the spring of '98, and one item I can vouch for that was ignored and pooh-poohed at the Royal Farce held at Dawson by the Hon. Wm. Ogilvie.'

I was, as you are aware, sent by Collector Milne, to Skagway, as a Canadian bureau of information to aid intending prospectors to pass through the American customs. How I performed that work I leave others to tell you, but I might say that one American gentleman from Dawson told me on his return in that I was the first official he met who was honest, and afterwards when I was in Dawson he told me I could not make money in consequence, concerning the collection of duties at the Summit of White Pass, I was sent there by Col. Steele, after I had reported to Collector Milne, in detail. I found the state of affairs just as I had reported there and in consequence of doing my duty as a customs officer, I was treated as a spy by the officers in charge; this latter fact was written by the officer commanding the post to Col. Steele, who told me of it. I numbered the entries and entered up the cash-book which was not done before. The book is now in Ottawa. There were two items entered up twice in cash-book and yet the cash balanced(?) I was never allowed to check the cash, I asked twice, but was refused. The first item that was found entered twice I altered and reported as clerical error to Col. Steele. The second I refused to alter, but it was manipulated at right by the officer commanding and his sergeant who lived in the hut—I, as a customs clerk having to live in a tent. The business method I introduced was never adopted.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the hon. gentleman say that the charge is against the officer commanding, Col. Steele?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I am reading a letter—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But, I asked the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell, Pictou) if he was saying that the charge—

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

Mr. FOSTER. No, he was not saying anything, simply reading a letter.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But I wish to ask whether, when the charge was against the commanding officer, that means Col Steele?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I am reading a letter sent to a member of the House.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Surely the hon. gentleman knows whom it refers to?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The letter speaks for itself; I cannot say as to which particular Steele. I do not know the record of the whole Steele family.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But I merely wished to ask.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I have no authority to answer. There may be a dozen Steeles for all I know. Apparently, from the facts known on this side of the House, there have been a good deal more than a dozen Steeles.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the question I asked was unfair. I was following the hon. gentleman as closely as I could, and merely wished to know to whom he referred?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I think my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) has not allowed for the fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell, Pictou) is reading his motion and cannot be asked to be interrupted in the middle of it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I merely wished to know to whom he refers; that is all.

Mr. BELL (Pictou)—(reading):

Concerning the Chilcoot Pass, I only have information from prospectors and they told me in Dawson that they never paid for one-half of goods. Invoices, &c., &c., were torn up and put away by brokers and others. I was informed a few days ago that entries were missing, invoices, and in fact chaos reigned supreme.

Concerning the administration at Dawson, it was scandalous in summer of '98. In the first place passes by the side door were given and signed in my own case by the health officer, Dr. Thompson, who is, I believe, a cousin of Mr. Hurdman, recorder of bench claims. That was ruled down by Mr. Ogilvie, as impossible, as an Indian half-breed kept the door and he could not read. The hon. gentleman was not aware perhaps that a police constable was holding the side door whilst the half-breed was at the main entrance. If the administration was so immaculate why was it found necessary to purify the office by dismissing three of the most imprudent officials, recorders of benches, creeks and another—because the public demanded it. The little paper called the 'Nugget' (so much abused by government organs) had too much truth in it to be palatable. I myself have made inquiries at a wicket in the recording office, and the recorder could not tell by his books if such and such a claim was recorded, but had to refer to a slip in his pocket for guidance as to whether the unfortunate prospector could record his claim. These are only a few of the facts. I made out a report of customs work for Major Walsh in detail and said report to be delivered to the Minister of Customs. Has that report ever reached its destination?

That one J. J. Seabrooke, writing to his father on October 16, '99, from Dawson, said :

'First the intended miner in the spring of '98, was informed by the people in Seattle that they would have to pay very little, if any, duty, as the Collector of Customs on the Summit was so loose that five dollars or ten dollars would let any one through. Seattle sent men up who brought back this information which is only too true. I would estimate that Canada had lost in customs \$500,000. Many have told me that they would have outfitted in British towns if Seattle had not advised them in reference to the slackness of the Canadian customs. The rush is over, still the bulk of trade is from the United States where it will remain until the customs are enforced. There must be a million dollars worth of machinery in here from the States. . . . I have got good authority for all I am writing.'

That one William Catto, M.A., M.B., C.M., Edinburgh, who lives in Dawson City, writes under date March 31, 1900, respecting the Yukon administration, and says : 'This administration has been nothing but a high-handed confidence game. Whatever may be the individual respectability of the members of the government, the fact remains the same. Being a stranger in Canada, I hardly know who to refer you to. But if you will communicate with the Earl of Aberdeen, I think he will satisfy you as to my reliability. It is only because it is impossible to keep silence longer that I have said a word. He also states that he has been practicing medicine and surgery in Dawson for nearly two years, and is therefore well acquainted with the circumstances.'

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). To which department was that letter sent ?

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). It is not in the department, I think.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Was it addressed to the hon. gentleman?

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). It was addressed to an hon. gentleman of the House. I am not prepared to give you the letter, I am giving the contents.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). If you are not prepared to give the letter you should not quote it.

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). The government does not always follow that rule and give the documents from which they quote. Besides, a private member is not under the same obligation. However, I have no doubt the letter can be produced if an inquiry is ordered :

Dr. Catto continues:

'Do not suppose that I have written from an alien's point of view. Though I am a stranger in Canada, I am a British subject, born in Scotland, and a graduate of two Scottish universities, and have many friends in all parts of Great Britain, who know that I would disdain to write a single word except in the interest of my country and in the interest of Canada.'

'On whom then rests the responsibility of this chaotic administration of affairs on the Yukon ? It rests on the government and its agents. Over-

come by a sense of official importance, and drunk with unmerited power, they have been capricious, unjust, tyrannical and foolish. Stirred only by motives that are despicable, they have carved their country with a pitiless hand. In doing so, they have cut the conduits of all precious currents, moral, political and economic, that are the life-blood of a community—currents that, allowed to run in their proper channels, would have been, in this case, a source of rejuvenation to Canada.'

'Any one living for some time in Dawson finds that he is not living in a social community. There is no classification of the present inhabitants of the Yukon district. They have, however, been forcibly and roughly cut into two divisions. The government, with its various rings; and the people, the armed and the defenceless, the oppressors and the oppressed, the gatherers of fines and taxes and their victims, the private dealers in monopolies and permits and the unwilling purchasers of monopolized goods; on the one side, those who sell, barter and give away not only the land, but the liberties of the Canadian people in such a manner as to raise a continual suspicion that they participate privately in the benefits they bestow; on the other side, a people compelled to pay from their own hard-laboured hands the price for which their lands and their liberties are bought and sold.'

'Such was the treatment dealt us by an administration that had renounced the commercial and industrial regulations of the country, that ignored the mining laws and the Criminal Code of Canada, and was already discredited by a great series of wholesale scandals in connection with the town site, the water front, Dominion Creek, Dominion benches, and by a host of individual affairs whose name is legion.'

'Observe how matters stand in consequence of the various changes in the mining regulations. All fractional claims, all groups of ten alternate claims, all claims that have not been prospected and represented, now fall into what is euphemistically called Crown reserve, but more appropriately known as Sifton's reserve, since the Minister of the Interior disposes of it privately as he privately determines. Has he always been careful to dispose of this valuable reserve belonging to the people of Canada to absolutely reliable friends, deservers of their country's love? Much of this so-called Crown reserve has already proved valuable. As time goes on the miners working on adjacent ground will give a prospective value to more and more of it. In the meantime, it remains idle, costing the Minister of the Interior nothing. Thousands of men in the Yukon territory are unable to find employment or ground to prospect. But they dare not touch this precious reserve, which already amounts to more than nine-tenths of the gold-bearing area of the Yukon district—a territory larger than Great Britain. What do the people of Canada think of all this being in the hands of the Minister of the Interior and his estimable friends? Think of it—all this disposed of in accordance with section 16 of the mining regulations "in such manner as may be decided by the Minister of the Interior." A variety of methods have been practiced in the disposal of reserve ground known to be valuable.'

Method No. 1.—Engineering a survey to make a full claim out of a fraction.

Method No. 2.—Compensation to a man with an alleged grievance. The man states his grievance and gets his choice of a claim in the Crown reserve. Of course, he chooses a very valuable one, and the affair is very satisfactory to every-

body concerned in the transaction. The law that safeguards a man against official errors is more than complied with. It would be cheaper for the government, but perhaps not so satisfactory to the Minister of the Interior and his friends, to give the man a straight compensation in currency on valuation of his "grievance."

Method No. 3.—Hydraulic concessions, including what is known to be a spot of rich placer ground. Without referring to the question of Yukon hydraulic concessions in general, we may state that a concession has recently been granted to include a spot that we are told prospects about \$5 to the pan, being the continuation of the pay streak withdrawn from the owners of the adjoining claim by a capricious and irrational survey. Of course, as in the case of other "hydraulic concessions," we expect to see that rich spot worked out as ordinary placer ground, and the concession sold to company promoters or allowed to lapse. If the owner of the concession does not know that rich spot, we shall be very pleased to show it to him for a half interest in 200 feet. That would be a trifle in the concession of ten square miles, since the same man owns a valuable timber concession covering that ground.

The claims in that Dominion Creek reserve were, in the first instance, illegally withheld from their locators by Walsh, who had no more power to close Dominion Creek than he had to close the Yukon district, but nevertheless ratified Fawcett's closure with his fine monarchical sweep as if he had been autocrat of Canada. The Minister of the Interior advertised these claims for sale, with the usual governmental proviso that the highest or any offer would not necessarily be accepted. This proviso, which works no injustice when we are dealing with an administration that acts in good faith, reduced the sale to such an open farce that honest business men and miners who were not in the ring, and who knew the bold proclivities of the Department of the Interior, were well aware that it was useless for them to make an offer. Notwithstanding this, the Dawson offers were far higher than those of Ottawa. But the claims were sold to a ring in Ottawa for the price of a solitary third-rate placer claim. Will the Minister of the Interior explain to the people of Canada why he accepted those Ottawa offers, and sold their ground for less than one-twentieth part of its value?

The Yukon policy of the Minister of the Interior is very simple. It is simply a policy of private aggrandizement at the expense of Canada. His plan of campaign is equally simple. It consists in a temporary suspension of law and suits his convenience and the convenience of his friends. It is a plan of campaign applicable to the appropriation of every square inch of the surface and every cubic inch of the contents of a new unappropriated country. It is applicable with equal effect to the timber of Manitoba and to the gold and timber of the Yukon. All that he has to do is to suspend the laws for a short time so as to declare a closure on the country. This has the remarkable effect of converting the country into 'Crown reserve,' to be disposed of 'in such manner as may be decided by the Minister of the Interior.'

Every saloon pays a license of \$2,500. There are ten large saloons in Dawson City. Every road-house pays a license of \$500. Say there are fifty such road-houses in the Yukon district. That would give \$100,000 in two years from saloons and road-houses. Prior to the imposition of those licenses, a large number of business houses of different descriptions were sell-

ing liquor. In the fall of 1898 they were fined \$200 each, near the time when the government came down with its most rapacious swoop of all to fill its local treasury with a universal fine on the prostitutes and gamblers of \$50 each and "costs." Every gambler pays \$56 per month, \$672 per annum. There are not less than 100 professional gamblers. That gives \$134,000 in two years from gambling.

Every prostitute pays \$56 as a commencement of the business, thereafter \$10 per month, \$176 per annum. Say there are 150 prostitutes, again a low estimate, and we have a revenue of \$26,400 from prostitution.

Meantime, the people are being openly and secretly robbed of the ground, the gold, the timber, and most of the privileges promised them in the mining regulations, and by the agents of the government, when they were booming the country to attract an army of victims to come and develop it for them.

It is reservation of alternate claims, reservation of fractions, reservation of unrepresented claims, secret appropriation of rich fractions, so-called "sale" of reserve ground to a ring of friends in Ottawa, closure of valuable creeks and miles of rivers, so-called hydraulic concessions of valuable placer ground; secret records that can be dated to prove anything; concessions of timber that compel the poor to go twenty miles in search of fuel or cut wood in jail, private sale of monopolies and permits, heavy taxes on what few natural products of the country are left for the prospector and miner, it is everything suspicious and suggestive of malfeasance, it is a politicians' feast. It is laws that are a puzzle, litigation made compulsory, capricious interpretation, disputed surveys, records that are worthless, insecurity of title, insecurity of everything, it is paralysis and general dissolution of the insane, it is the corpse of justice alive with maggots, it is a lawyer's carnival.

Public gambling is a crime in Canada. Dawson City contains at least ten large gambling saloons, in which the police are to be seen daily; but no attempt has been made to suppress gambling. On the contrary, it has been in a manner, legalized by the sanction and connivance of the police and the magistrates, who collect the monthly revenue from the tables in the shape of what they call a fine. They may call it what they please. The plain English of it is that the government runs the gambling on something better than a percentage basis, because it collects the revenue whether the house has lost or won during the month. A man from each house goes to the "sacred temple of justice," and pleads guilty for the gambling fraternity of the house, and pays \$56 per month for each of the gamblers in the house. We have heard of one house paying \$830 per month, and Mr. Marjoriebanks informs us that his monthly contribution for gambling in the Horseshoe was \$728. They wanted him to pay \$500 extra because there were girls in the house. The direct revenue from gambling in Dawson City cannot be less than we formerly stated, namely, \$67,200 per annum.

This is not all. In each saloon there are arrangements from which the government draws \$2,500 per annum in addition to the secret monopoly, for restoring the victimized miner to a state of physical and mental comfort, provided he has enough money left to pay for them. There is monopolized fire-water made in Dawson City, and called whisky, at the rate of 50 cents and \$1 per glass. There is an invitation to an exhilarating dance; and then to the private boxes with the smile and comforting touch of perfumed

ladies, dressed for their work, who order monopolized effervescent drinks called champagne, for which the miner has to pay at the rate of \$30 per bottle. Complete intoxication follows, and the miner is arrested on the charge of drunkenness. The Yukon administration, which has been robbing him indirectly throughout the whole performance, now comes forward courageously and empties his gold sack by a fine of \$30 and costs. And this is called government. And thus hundreds of young men who never saw the inside of a court-room till they came here, are decaying to slaughter in the Dawson 'temple of justice.'

Prostitution is a crime in Canada. Dawson City contains several rows of women, perhaps 150, set apart by the government, publicly engaged in that trade. The police magistrates collect the revenue from the women in the shape of what they call a 'fine.' The plain English of it is that the government runs the public women of Dawson as a source of revenue, just as it runs the gambling. Their 'medical officer of health,' a Dr. Good, in the shadow of whose acquaintance Mr. Sifton stands, and talks cheaply to the simple people of Winnipeg as if he had a parental interest in the public health of the Yukon district, goes round and collects monthly fee of \$10 from each woman, and certifies that they are 'healthy.'

The 'legal adviser' to the Yukon council recently assured us that it is not in his capacity of "medical officer of health" that the doctor visits those women. This from Mr. Clement is only an indication that the Yukon administration is losing courage.

We asked how the certificates of 'healthy' come to be signed M. H. O. after the doctor's name, and why a policeman sometimes accompanies the doctor. He said he did not understand it. We remarked that the women could refuse the doctor's visits, and might lodge a charge of indecent assault against him. 'Well,' replied Mr. Clement, 'it must be remembered that those women are liable to imprisonment at any time.'

We have a criminal water carriage system, the result of the franchise to an American colonel. How did that escape the 'medical officer's veto'? We have several deadly epidemics of typhoid fever. What has the 'medical officer' done to ascertain the source of infection? We had an outbreak in one of the hospitals this winter, but it does not seem to be the duty of the medical officer to look for a local contamination of that criminal water carriage system.

The law of Canada says you must not gamble in public; the administration says you may gamble in public, but you must not cheat a policeman, and if you are a gambler by profession, you must pay \$56 per month whether you cheat or not, whether you win or lose. The law of Canada says a woman shall not engage in prostitution; the administration says she may trade in that way; that if she does, she must contribute a share of her earnings and receive the visits of 'the medical officer of health' at his own terms.'

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Who is the author of that—I will not call it a letter—document, that the hon. gentleman read in his motion?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Dr. Catto.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Where does he profess to hail from?

Mr. FOSTER. He refers to Lord Aberdeen for a testimonial of character, so that you can easily find out for yourself.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). In the meantime, does the hon. gentleman think that is a proper letter to be spread upon the records of parliament?

Mr. FOSTER. In the meantime it is copyrighted, and will be published in England.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. That is what it is for. It is the most infamous and disgraceful letter that was ever written.

Mr. BELCOURT. How do you spell his name?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). William C-a-t-t-o. He is a master of arts, and a doctor of medicine, of Edinburgh. (Reading)

That one Robert Adams writes to his mother, Mrs. Robert Adams, Newdale, Manitoba: 'I located a good claim on Dominion Creek, and came in after a 200-mile tramp to record it, and was refused, although I was first to locate it and had witnesses to prove it, but the same afternoon a government official recorded it himself without leaving Dawson to even stake the claim.'

Alexander Clark writes from Dominion Creek, March 3, 1900, stating: 'The corruption here is something frightful.' Again, 'the officials are corrupted by the Americans. If there is a contract to be given out here, the Americans are nearly sure of it every time, and even the carrying of the mails to the creeks is given to them.'

That on March 23, 1900, it was stated at a public meeting in Dawson by Mr. Sugrue that a most corrupt and vicious system of administration was instituted by Hon. Mr. Sifton and Hon. James M. Walsh, and other officials, and has been continued, with some periodical improvements in some departments of the administration, up to the present time.

That the Yukon district has no representation in the parliament of Canada nor in the executive council for the Yukon district.

That this House is of opinion that a high judicial commission should be appointed with full and adequate powers, to be conferred by suitable legislation to fully inquire into, hear and report upon all of the said charges heretofore made, or which may be brought to the notice of the said commission during its sittings.

Mr. Bell (Pictou) having read the amendment,

Mr. Speaker having taken the amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish the House would excuse me from an hour's reading.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. But we cannot remember what is stated in the amendment.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Let the Clerk of the House read it.

Mr. Speaker having continued to read the amendment for some time.

Mr. FOSTER. Would you allow me for one moment? This will all have to be read again when we come to vote, because there are a large number of members at present in the committee rooms, and until you come to the Anderson and Catto charges, this is simply setting out what appears in Ogilvie's report. I would suggest that to save time, Mr. Speaker should commence to read from the Anderson and Catto charges.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. More time would be saved by not putting this amendment in.

Mr. FOSTER. Time would not be saved by not putting it in, and much more has to come, and it will be continued to be put in, until the government grant an inquiry.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the meantime, let it go on.

Mr. FOSTER. My suggestion was in order to save time.

Mr. MAXWELL. You were not saving much time yesterday.

Mr. Speaker continued to read the amendment.

It being One o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). Mr. Speaker, I understood from the hon. junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) last evening that he did not intend to bring up this resolution to-day; so that I had not the opportunity of listening to his remarks; and you will admit that it is almost impossible, even after having heard this long resolution read by yourself, to understand all that is in it, or even to appreciate to a small extent what it contains. I quite exonerate my hon. friend from having perpetrated upon the House and the country the placing in your hands of such a resolution. We all know that it is a legacy from the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper); and, Sir, after having heard a portion of that resolution read, I am not surprised, even though we know the record of the hon. senior member for Pictou, and what he did and said in this House last session, that he has been ashamed to face the House and the country and to place such a resolution in your hands himself. Sir, it is history repeating itself, only worse. In 1878 the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and his government were attacked by all kinds of slanders and calumnies; and the policy of the present opposition appears to be, as they are not able to criticise successfully the administration of the government, to throw broadcast the most unfounded slanders against the characters of members and officials of the government, without any regard to what is right or fair. It is my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a member sitting

on the opposite side of the House who believes that there is one word of truth in this resolution or one just reason why any action should be taken upon it. It is put forward for one purpose only; that is, because hon. gentlemen opposite are unable to find any just or fair policy with which to go to the country, they have adopted this unfair and improper—

An hon. MEMBER. Immoral.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, I may say immoral policy of throwing unfounded slanders against members of the government; and in this disgraceful resolution they are not only directing their slanders against the Liberal party and the Liberal government, but they are discrediting our fair Dominion. There seems to be no limit to the length to which these gentlemen are willing to go in discrediting and destroying the country if they can only make it appear that there is some cause for censure upon the government. On this occasion we have not had extended to us the usual courtesy which prevailed in this House in days gone by, that of furnishing the Premier, at least, with a copy of the resolution: but this thing is sprung upon us without a moment's notice, in a resolution which it takes hours to read in the House before it can be voted upon. So far as I can understand the resolution, it is a rehash of what we have heard from the hon. senior member for Pictou time and again in this House and out of it—affecting the collection of the McDonald royalty, the closing of Dominion Creek, the attacks on Major Walsh, and the Anderson concession. We have heard of these things over and over again; but in the hope that some political capital might be made out of them, they are once more placed before the House and the country. The only thing that is new is a letter, written, it is not known to whom; but if nothing were known of the person who wrote it, as soon as it is read, any person with any judgment must come to the conclusion that the man who wrote it is not only a lunatic, but a vicious and immoral character. One might well allow this discreditable document to go to the judgment of the people without a word of criticism or comment. I wish, however, to say a few words with regard to some of these matters; and I may say that neither this government nor the Department of the Interior require any suggestion from any member of the opposition to hold an investigation into the conduct of any of their officials if there is any reasonable ground for such investigation. Why, Sir, during the present year, a citizen of Dawson unknown to the minister or to any other person in the department, so far as I know, wrote to the Minister of the Interior over his own name, making certain charges against the gold commissioner, a gentleman of the very highest character whom no one

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

would believe guilty of any impropriety. But on that simple letter, in which the writer had honour enough and courage enough at least to take the responsibility of stating that he could prove certain charges—unlike the senior and junior members for Pictou, who place these outrageous statements upon *Hansard*, in resolutions, and in the press of the country, without taking one iota of responsibility for them—what did the minister do? He at once issued a commission to the judge of the territory to hold a judicial investigation; but, on looking at the papers reporting the progress of this case, what do we find?—showing how the authorities may be abused by characters of this description. This man is asked to come to court, and has to be forced by the judge to come to court. He said: 'I did not think the minister would take any notice of my charges.' The judge insisted that he should go on and show why he made the charges, and that the official should have an opportunity to exonerate himself. Even this favourite paper of the hon. gentleman, the *Nugget*, which I suppose is his organ in the district, says:

All the complainant's testimony was of a hearsay character.

So the country is put to the expense, and this honourable man is subjected to whatever disgrace there may be connected therewith, of having a judicial inquiry into his conduct. If any hon. member of this House or any reputable citizen of the country will represent to the minister that there is anything to be inquired into, it will be inquired into to the fullest extent. My hon. friend has stated in his speech—about all he did say—that the investigation held by Mr. Ogilvie was not sufficient. That statement has been made several times. I will admit that, perhaps, Mr. Ogilvie did not have the restraint upon the people in the conduct of the investigation that a judge or a court of judges would have had.

I appeal, however, to any unprejudiced person to say whether that investigation was not held by Mr. Ogilvie in such a way as to give every one an opportunity to come forward and tell anything he might know, without being hampered by any legal or technical rules of evidence? I am satisfied that the members of this House do not agree with the hon. member for Pictou that this inquiry was limited and unsatisfactory. Let me read a few extracts from Mr. Ogilvie's report to show how the investigation was conducted:

To allay as far as possible this irritation and discontent, I felt it my duty, as far as lay within my power, to investigate every statement made to me, no matter how trivial it might be, because, though it appeared trivial to me it was very serious to the one giving the information, and I may say that in no case have I yet found that anything could be proven; in fact, I may say that in a great measure the statements made, when traced to their founda-

tion, were proven to be simply hearsay, the party making the assertion generally shielding himself or herself by some one else though that some one else often proved ignorant of the whole matter.

Could greater efforts have been made by the commissioner? But what was the result? The result was, as Mr. Ogilvie points out, that the parties making charges shielded themselves behind somebody else, just as the hon. member for Pictou has done on that side of the House. They relied upon hearsay evidence, without any regard whatever to the character of the persons from whom they got their information, and I must say that I fail to understand how any hon. member of this House can, with any sense of self-respect or the dignity of his position, make statements reflecting on the good name of Canada which have their origin in such discreditable sources. Mr. Ogilvie said:

One thing soon became apparent, and that was, that whatever crookedness there might be in the office, there was a great deal of crookedness outside of it. It soon became evident to me that men were obtaining record of claims in improper ways, and in ways that were criminal. It was nothing unusual for men to resort to the gold commissioner's office and obtain record for a claim which they had never seen, though, in their affidavits of application, they swore that they in their own proper person staked out the grounds for which they had applied. This affidavit was held in contempt by a great measure of the people around Dawson, and no more was thought of perjuring one's self in that way than saluting a comrade on the street.

Well, this is the class of people that the hon. gentleman brings forward as witnesses when he asks for a judicial investigation against prominent citizens and officials of high character.

These cases, of course, seemed to the general public to imply that the officials in the gold commissioner's office were corrupt. I believe that the true explanation of a large amount of this lay in the fact that there was no privacy in the gold commissioner's office—the accommodation being too limited. Crowds were within the doors and it was perfectly easy for a bystander to hear answers to every question that was asked; the answers to these questions reaching the ears of many others than the questioner, some one of them a few hours afterwards returned to the office and obtained record of the ground described.

I wish to say here that I have not the slightest intention of defending any officials who may have done wrong. If it can be shown that any one has been guilty of wrongdoing, I would be the first to say he should be punished if any one respectable man will come forward and say he has reason to believe that any official has done anything wrong. I would be the first to vote for an investigation. But I say that these officials are entitled to ordinary fair-play.

These were held over for trial on the charge of perjury, and also for obtaining improper record. As the decision in the matter would be most important, great care was taken in the prosecution to have the cases properly presented and leave no stone unturned to secure a con-

viction if the parties were guilty. Two of the cases were tried and the individual in the first case was acquitted by the jury for the reason that the evidence did not conclusively indicate his guilt; in the second the jury disagreed, though the evidence was conclusive, and it was laid over until the next assize for retrial, and the jury disagreed again.

This shows that Mr. Ogilvie was making every possible effort to ferret out and punish any wrong-doing committed in that country :

As some of the delinquents had confessed perjury and admitted the charges made against them, the officers of the court and myself, after conference, felt that we had secured the object of our attempt.

I wish to read one or two more extracts from Mr. Ogilvie's report, so that those who have not had the opportunity of reading his previous report will know something of the character of the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite :

From the evidence submitted, I think any unprejudiced person would consider that the charges made against Mr. Fawcett on this occasion totally failed.

References have been made to the farcical nature of this investigation by the newspapers here and others.

The others include, no doubt, my hon. friends opposite.

I readily admit the charge; it certainly was farcical, but not in the way they put the term; it was farcical in this, that it utterly failed to show any ground for the accusations made, more than common rumour; and that, I regret to say, is entirely irresponsible in Dawson, perhaps more so than elsewhere.

If it would not take up too much of the time of the House, I would make further references from Mr. Ogilvie's report to show that not only did he, as commissioner, give the greatest possible latitude to every one who appeared before him, but he himself went out of his way to find out if there was any foundation at all, even for this hearsay gossip against the officials. A short time ago, when I read to the House the letter of Mr. Lithgow, the accountant in Dawson City, in which he reported upon the McDonald royalty and forwarded a statement of that royalty, I ventured to say, that if there had been any irregularity, Mr. Lithgow, as a professional accountant and an officer holding a high position in the government, would have referred to it in that letter. But, on the contrary, he made no reference to any irregularity, and we had every reason to assume that this matter was perfectly regular and that there was no foundation for the insinuations and charges made by the hon. member for Pictou. But the hon. gentleman thought differently, and the ex-Minister of Finance could see nothing but corruption and irregularities and stealing going on because Mr. Lithgow had not referred to McDonald's affidavits in his letter with the statement to the department.

I stated on a previous occasion that the Auditor General had sent an officer to the

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Yukon to investigate matters there and audit the books of account. He was asked for a statement with regard to this particular matter. And, to show how unfounded the statements of the hon. member are, I wish to read the statement of that officer. It would be well for the House and the country to know that this gentleman is, as I understand, an officer in the Auditor General's department; he was sent to the Yukon district by the Auditor General; and he was not under the control of the Department of the Interior or the government, but was an independent officer who, though I do not know him personally, I have reason to believe was perfectly competent to carry out the work he was sent by the Auditor General to do. This is his statement, addressed to the Auditor General :

Auditor General's Office, Canada,  
Ottawa, June 19, 1900.

Sir,—During the course of my inspection at Dawson during the summer of 1899, I went over the royalty affidavits in the office of Mr. Lithgow, both for the season 1897-8 and 1898-9, and noted the particulars of each affidavit. With regard to the case of Alex. McDonald, I found that he reported on seventy-four claims, as shown in the accompanying statement. Of these claims, sixty were practically unproductive, the declared output being in each case less than \$2,500, the amount of exemption allowed at that time; on the other ten claims the royalty payable amounted to \$41,490.13, as follows:

	Net output.	Royalty.
1 and 2, Skookum.....	\$10,000 00	\$1,000 00
2 above Bonanza .....	117,400 00	11,740 00
35 above " .....	21,000 00	2,100 00
6 below " .....	62,062 50	6,206 25
19 Eldorado .....	9,000 00	900 00
22 " .....	42,000 00	4,200 00
27 " .....	31,000 00	3,100 00
30 " .....	51,000 00	5,100 00
34 " .....	2,620 00	262 00
36 and 37, Eldorado.....	48,658 80	4,865 88
3 below Hunker .....	16,000 00	1,600 00
6 " .....	4,160 00	416 00
		\$41,490 13

Mr. Speaker, I am taking up the time of the House because so much has been said, and we know will be said, by way of insinuation and even bolder charges, to convey the impression that there was something wrong in the conduct of Major Walsh in relation to this matter. I think it is only right, not only to Major Walsh, but for the credit of Canada, that these matters should be made perfectly clear, so that the people may understand exactly what was done.

The royalty being calculated on a 10 per cent basis, this represents a gross output of \$414,901.30. In addition to this, the exemption on the whole seventy-four claims must be taken into consideration. If we allow \$2,500 for each claim, this represents a further output of \$185,000, or a gross output of \$599,901.30, or say \$600,000 in round numbers. This latter estimate, it must be remembered, is the maximum. The probability is that the average output of the sixty unproductive claims would fall considerably short of \$2,500.

The payments were made as follows:

In 1897-8 on claim 30, Eldorado..... \$ 4,000 00

This is part of the \$14,429 appearing in the  
Lame of W. Chappell on page H-91 of the report  
for 1897-8.

In 1898-9, on claim 30, Eldorado..... 1,100 00

Collected by H. H. Norwood from W.  
Chappell (see Auditor General's Re-  
port, 1898-9, page H-88), on claim  
35. Bonanza (see same page)..... 2,100 00

Collected by gold commissioner in  
June, 1899 ..... 34,028 13

\$41,228 13

Due on claim 34, Eldorado. of the pay-  
ment of which I could find no trace.. 262 00

\$41,490 13

In the case of claim 30, Eldorado, though the  
royalty was paid by Wm. Chappell, the affidavit  
was made by McDonald. Chappell appearing to  
be a partner of his. In last season this claim  
appears under the name of McDonald & Chap-  
pell.

When the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hib-  
bert Tupper) asked as to the discrepancy  
that appeared between the statement in the  
report of Mr. Ogilvie and the actual return  
furnished by Mr. Lithgow, the accountant,  
I ventured to suggest that the difference  
was, as is fully explained here, due to the  
fact that some of the amounts were paid  
on claims not appearing in Mr. McDonald's  
name or legal exemptions. But the hon.  
gentleman could see nothing but that some  
person had been stealing, or that some-  
thing crooked had been going on. I  
knew nothing of the account or of  
the audit that was made, except that  
there was a report. I said then, and I say  
now, that if the Auditor General's officer  
had found anything wrong when he exam-  
ined the books of the district, he certainly  
would have so reported to the Auditor Gen-  
eral; and I had the right to assume, from  
past experience, that if the slightest ir-  
regularity had been found, it would have  
been reported to the department by the  
Auditor General. For that reason, I felt  
every confidence in refusing to accept  
statements made by hon. gentleman oppo-  
site.

Claim 34, Eldorado, appears also under the  
name of H. M. Smith, who paid \$44.50 royalty.  
In this case the \$2,620 may represent the gross  
output instead of the net output.

I examined all the affidavits for royalty for  
the two years, and found no difference between  
the manner of determining the claim against  
McDonald and that followed with reference  
to the other claim-holders. The only thing pecu-  
liar to Mr. McDonald's case was his being allow-  
ed time to pay his royalty.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

J. W. REID.

J. L. McDougall, Esq.,  
Auditor General.

Now, I wish to call the particular attention  
of the House to this statement :

I examined all the affidavits for royalty for  
the two years—

We had to listen for hours to hon. gentlemen  
opposite trying to prove that there was  
something wrong because the affidavits were  
not laid on the Table of the House.

I examined all the affidavits for royalty for  
the two years, and found no difference between  
the manner of determining the claim against  
Mr. McDonald and that followed with reference  
to the other claim-holders. The only thing  
peculiar to Mr. McDonald's case was his being  
allowed time to pay his royalty.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) J. W. REID.

I think that if there ever was any doubt  
in any honest man's mind as to this trans-  
action, the case has been made so clear  
that no self-respecting person will again say  
that there was anything irregular in it.  
So far as allowing time to Mr. McDonald  
for the payment of these royalties is con-  
cerned, as I said before, so I say now—that  
when we examine the case, we find Major  
Walsh showed good judgment in taking the  
action he did. There was no chance of loss  
to the country, and it was in the interest of  
the country, on the other hand, that he  
should take that action at that particular  
time.

The next charge that we have heard so  
much about in this House was as to the  
closing of Dominion Creek. Hon. gentle-  
men opposite have tried to make it appear  
that Major Walsh did something that was  
improper or discreditable or corrupt. It  
seems unfortunate that the time of the  
House should be taken up in discussing  
these matters. But, these charges are being  
rehashed from time to time, and statements  
are made again and again concerning Major  
Walsh which are discreditable to those who  
make them, but not Major Walsh. I shall  
have to ask the House to bear with me while  
I read the report from Mr. Fawcett with  
regard to the closing of Dominion Creek  
to show how baseless are the state-  
ments that are being made. The Yukon  
being so far away, and the people  
of eastern Canada not understanding  
the conditions, they may possibly think  
there is some ground for these false  
and malicious statements which are made  
on the floor of this House, insinuating a  
partnership or some understanding between  
Major Walsh and some of the parties who  
staked out claims. It is necessary, there-  
fore, for the good name of Canada, that  
these matters should, if possible, be given  
the fullest publicity, so that the people can  
see for themselves how foundationless these  
statements are :

Commissioners Office,

Dawson, Y.T., May 9, 1900.

To the Secretary of the Department of the In-  
terior, Dawson, Y.T.

Sir,—In further reply to yours of March 6,  
file 552579, I have to forward a report that Mr.  
Thomas Fawcett, gold commissioner, made to

the commissioner, respecting the closing and opening of Dominion Creek.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
J. N. E. BROWN,  
Secretary to Commissioner.

This is Mr. Fawcett's report :

Dawson, October 3, 1898.

Sir.—As you desired some information regarding the closing of Dominion Creek and my reasons for refusing all applications for claims on a portion of that stream, after November 15, 1897; I have the honour to submit the following :

About June 17, 1897, it was reported that some one had discovered gold on Dominion Creek. A report of that kind is generally followed by a stampede to the creek, and a staking race amongst the various aspirants for claims. Some of the claims were numbered and some were staked without a number. They started to number the claims from two points. Arrivals at Dawson from Dominion Creek were just commencing at the time. I reached Dawson, viz., June 15, 1897. For a few days after my arrival I was absent at Fort Cudahy, taking over the returns, and during my absence a good many applications had been taken by Mr. Davis, the customs officer, which was turned into the office subsequently. Among these was one from Albert Fortier for the claim located as Discovery claim which subsequently was changed to Lower Discovery to distinguish it from another claim which I had accepted an application for from one Frank Beiberman, who recorded the claim as Discovery claim, the claim subsequently being described as 'Upper Discovery' to distinguish it from the claim recorded by Fortier.

This was the origin of the two Discoveries (so-called), and the people located their claims in reference to both points and numbered from both Discoveries up and down the stream. No one seemed to have any idea how far the discovery claims were apart. At the time the first staking was done the regulations were recognized which allowed sixty days from the time of staking to the time of recording, and any claims staked prior to June 15, was held for the original stake and until after the expiry of the sixty days. A great many of the claims were relocated, and persons desiring to record them were not permitted to do so because the time allowed the original locaters had not expired, but many were recorded that had never been staked, and a few were recorded by description, having been described from some tributary which joined Dominion Creek a certain distance above or below one of the Discoveries.

During the summer a great fire swept along the creek and many of the stakes disappeared entirely, and the ground was staked over again regardless of the fact that many of the claims had been recorded before. Between the two Discoveries we found some time about the end of August that Nos. 12 and 13 above Lower Discovery covered the same ground that a man claimed as No. 37 below Upper Discovery. Having recorded the ground known as Nos. 12 and 13, I refused to complicate matters by placing 37 on record. The man who claims the ground as 37 has made application for a hearing this summer, but as the owners of No. 12 were absent the hearing could not take place. Prior to that time No. 17 above Lower Discovery had been recorded, and it was subsequently found that this covered the same ground which was recorded as 34 below Upper Discovery. The contestants for this claim were heard last summer by Chief Justice McGuire, who kindly gave me his assistance in the investigation of

several of the more difficult cases which came up for hearing. The decision was in behalf of the party who claimed to have staked first, and an appeal has been taken from that decision to the Minister of the Interior at Ottawa.

On towards fall there were a good many applications for claims below Lower Discovery. Among some of the first below were claims Nos. 70, 71, 72, &c., this having been carried on for some time, we received information that these numbers were estimated from Upper Discovery, and we had previously learned that there were some fifty odd claims between the Discoveries, so it became unsafe to accept applications for number below 18 from Lower Discovery for fear that they would cover ground already covered by other numbers. About the same time several persons who had put their claims on record by description found men in possession who had recorded the same ground under some number, and several certificates which had been given had to be cancelled.

Applications, however, were received for claims further down, where there was no danger of conflict, on until word came to the office that a number of persons were over restaking the claims. That they would destroy the stakes of two or three claims; for instance, they ignored claims 3 and 4 below Lower Discovery, having removed the lower stakes of No. 2 a thousand feet, or in that neighbourhood, down stream and then staked the ground which they had created by wiping out the other claims as fractions, having reported at the office that claim No. 2 was 1,500 feet long. This was just before the middle of November when the creek was found to be rich; so, to put an end to this fraudulent work, I closed all that part of the creek which had been recorded, until after a survey could be made, as I knew that accepting any more applications would only add to this difficulty of straightening things out. No one up to this time ever thought of staking any further down this stream, and it was generally reported that anything that remained below was not worth staking and that it was nothing but a moose pasture.

I have thought it was desirable to take up the time of the House by reading this report of Mr. Fawcett's, and giving his reasons for acting as he did. I must admit that I do not, any more, I suppose, than do many other members of this House, understand all these reasons for closing up that creek. But miners and other persons interested in these matters will understand why Mr. Fawcett acted as he did, and will realize that he had no intention of committing any fraud, but his desire was solely to straighten out matters and do justice to all. As to the charge that Major Walsh consulted with others and advised the closing of the hill and bench claims, I do not think there is any dispute, after it is understood that the hon. gentleman in his charge separated the closing of the creek from the hill and bench claims, closed after the arrival of Major Walsh in that district.

Now, you will remember, Mr. Speaker, and the country will remember, the vicious attack made on Major Walsh a year ago by the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), an attack which he and the others have kept up to some extent, at least, by insinuations against that gentleman, although knowing that there is not a word of

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

truth in the statements that were made, and having in view to try to make it appear that there was some irregularity, some corruption, some scandal in the administration of the Yukon, which does not really exist. As the resolution of the junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) again reverts to this attack on Major Walsh, I wish to take this opportunity, the first I have had, of reading Major Walsh's answer to all these statements made in this enormous mass of charges that no one can understand. Hon. gentlemen smile. They know that even if there were anything in these statements, Major Walsh is not now and has not been for a long time connected with the department. These charges are made against him and against other officers for no other purpose than to try to discredit the government. I am prepared to say that not one of these hon. gentlemen would dare to go outside of this House and make the statements they have against Major Walsh and the other officials. These men would have their remedy. Do you suppose that any one of these hon. gentlemen would go outside and make the statement that any one of these gentlemen had been guilty of stealing or of corrupt acts, as officials of the government? Not one of them, because there would be an opportunity of putting their statements to the proof:

Brockville, Ont., June 4, 1900.

The Honourable  
The Minister of the Interior,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—Referring to Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper's charges made against me in the House of Commons on May 31 last, I beg to say they are false and unfounded.

I beg to call your attention to the following points:

1. Dominion Creek was closed by Mr. Fawcett on November 15, 1897, see pages 80, 81, 87, 109, Ogilvie's report.

While an attempt is made to separate the creek from the hills and benches—I fully understood the closing of creek included also hills and benches. This was opinion of Mine Inspector McGregor and myself and of members of the council. I had former for consultation, and evidently of Fawcett too, as shown by his granting permits to prospect hills and benches, which would not have been needed had creek not been closed—page 81.

See also my declaration.

2. Mrs. Koch—I did not grant this woman a permit or ask or instruct one to be given her. She was not my cook, and I only knew her from seeing her on business in the office.

See my declaration.

3. Louis Carbeno—I knew nothing about any agreement between Louis Carbeno and Louis Walsh until I saw report of Ogilvie's investigation.

I did not threaten or coerce him. See Carbeno's declaration and mine. Also Carbeno's evidence in Ogilvie's report. Does not bear out what is tried to be made out of it.

Carbeno's wages were not increased until I was leaving the country; he had a new position, with more labour.

Carbeno and Indians did this staking just before they were leaving, and all but Carbeno did leave and go out of the service.

I did not give Carbeno or any other person any information, directly or indirectly, about opening of Dominion Creek. He shows how he got word, from McBeth—see his evidence, and says he did not get word from me. I did not know myself; mistake had been made of 8th instead of 11th July in notice, till after Carbeno had left for the creek.

Carbeno's evidence shows a number of people going out to the creek. See also Cyrette's declaration, corroborating Carbeno, which declaration was made at Fort William, thousands of miles away from where Carbeno made his.

I asked Louis Walsh why he did not tell me about agreement with Carbeno, and he said he did not consider it a matter of consequence. It was just to secure himself in case he sent Carbeno money to develop a claim. The proportion is not high, in view of expense (50 per cent) of working a claim, which would leave 25 per cent each for Carbeno and Louis Walsh. Louis Walsh had known Carbeno for many years, knew he had no money, and had promised to help him if he staked any claims. Carbeno's and the Indians' claims proved to be no good.

Date of opening.—No secret was made that the creek was to be opened on 11th. Notices were put up.

As originally intended, everybody would have had to go to the office and get a permit before they went to the creek.

Owing to Mr. Fawcett's urgent letter of July 7, see page 90, the permits were done away with.

The new notice was directed to be issued, but a mistake was made in its date. See Fawcett's explanation, page 92, and my declaration. We came to the conclusion, after inquiry into the matter by myself and the mine inspector, that the date of the 8th instead of the 11th was put in the poster by some one in the gold commissioner's or printer's office, and that information as to this change was given out by this same person or persons, and this started the stampede. Latterly this was the general impression, but we could not obtain sufficient evidence to justify an investigation.

The notice I expected to see and the draft which I believe I read was that Dominion Creek would be opened on the 11th without permit, and that this would be posted on the 9th, and this is what Mine Inspector McGregor and others of council expected. Fawcett's theory, page 93, that notice was to be put up on his office on 11th, does not agree with helping to instruct Corp. Wilson, page 21, and there would have been no sense in printing notices in quantities if they were only to be put up in Fawcett's office.

The agreement L. Carbeno and Louis Walsh, page 259, shows that it is only the outfit and expenses necessary for working the claim, Louis Walsh was to furnish—not that Louis Walsh was to get any advantage from the government's expenditure in taking Carbeno to the Yukon.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) J. M. WALSH.

Dominion of Canada, province of Ontario, county of Leeds, to wit:

I, James Morrow Walsh, of the town of Brockville, in the province of Ontario, Esquire, do solemnly declare:

1. That I was formerly commissioner of the Yukon district.

2. I have read the report of certain charges made against me by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper on the 31st day of May last.

3. I say positively that I did not close Dominion Creek, referred to in said charges, neither did I give any instructions to have the same closed, nor did I know it was going to be closed.

4. The said creek was closed by the then gold commissioner, Mr. Fawcett, on or about November 15, 1897, as appears by his evidence, taken before the commission of inquiry before Mr. Ogiivie, page 87.

5. I did not know of its being closed till long after, viz., in May, 1898, and after hearing the gold commissioner's reasons for doing so, I approved of such closing. My understanding of the matter was that the closing of the creek necessarily involved the closing of the hills and benches as well. This was the understanding of the other members of the council and was corroborated by the fact of Mr. Fawcett's granting the permits.

I think it is only fair to say here, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, that after the fullest investigation, there was a difference of opinion in regard to these matters which is not material to any of the charges that are being made, or to the matter under consideration at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I intend to insist on the rules of the House. The hon. gentleman is clearly out of order. Where shall we get to in this House, if, whenever an hon. member rises, as a representative of the people, and makes certain statements, the person who is spoken of, or mentioned, shall appear by proxy here, and make a long statement in rebuttal or contradiction?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What is the point of order?

Mr. FOSTER. The point of order is this—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. If the hon. gentleman wishes to raise a point of order, he must state the point of order, and not make a speech.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow his intelligence to have proper play, he will allow me to state the point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. State your point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. The point of order I raise, is that we cannot proceed in a parliamentary way, if any hon. member of the House is to make himself the mouthpiece of every person outside who happens to be mentioned by a member of this House. The hon. gentleman undertakes to—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. I can stand here. I do not want to go on by the grace of the minister, but because it is my right to fully state my point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. As soon as there is order I will finish my point. The hon. minister

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

rises to-day and reads a letter written by Mr. Walsh, not a member of this House, contradicting every statement made by an hon. member of this House, as a representative of this House. Now, I say that this is not according to parliamentary rules, and I raise that point of order.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, I must say, that it is rather a new doctrine to lay down in this House, that a gentleman who holds an official position under the government, can have his character, which he values more than anything else, destroyed, or attempted to be destroyed, by a member of this House, and that forsooth, he is not allowed to make a plain statement in reply. The position that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) contends for, seems to be, not only contrary to parliamentary law, but contrary to that higher law of common justice which should pervade and prevail everywhere.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me, I will read from Bourinot?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Dispense, dispense.

Mr. DAVIN. It will be found at page 408. He says:

Nor is it in order to read articles in newspaper, letters or other communications—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Will hon. gentlemen give me their attention, and then they will see that there is no necessity for a guffaw, and they will see probably that that guffaw is ignorant.

Nor is it in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or other communications whether printed or written emanating from persons outside of the House, and referring to or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on the proceedings within the House.

We have had this ruled on time and again. The law of parliament is perfectly well understood, and I cannot help thinking that my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies), knows the law of parliament too well not to make us suspect that his anger is a little assumed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I was not referring to contradiction of statements made by a member of his own knowledge. I was referring to statements which members of this House choose from time to time to repeat on hearsay evidence, attacking and impugning or attempting to destroy the character of officials and others in this country. I say that if a member of this House repeats second-hand and hearsay evidence, that the person whose character is attacked has a perfect right to have his statement read by any member in this House.

Mr. DAVIN. Allow me to read the following from Bourinot, which meets that point:

During a debate on the tariff in the session of 1877, Mr. Mills referred to the opinions of Sir Alexander Galt, formerly a member and Minister of Finance. Subsequently one of the Canadian papers published a letter from Sir Alexander in answer to some of Mr. Mill's remarks; and the latter rose and proposed reading from the paper in question; but the Speaker interrupted him and questioned the propriety of this course—a decision entirely in accordance with the English rules of debate.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The issue is this: The senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and several others read statements without even giving the names—not an affidavit like this in solemn form—saying that so and so said so and so. But now because a gentleman comes into this House and makes a solemn affidavit contradicting the nameless slanders that have been hurled against him, we are not to have it read forsooth. Do hon. gentlemen opposite think that there is no redress left to members on this side of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. I have been a long time in this House, and I know, that whether it infringes on a higher law than parliamentary law: the law of morality or the right of an individual to have his case set before parliament, there is no doubt that it is out of order to contradict the statement of a member made in this House by any written document. That is a parliamentary rule which has been strictly adhered to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. One member after another on that side of the House has got up and read statements from outsiders against this man's character—

Mr. McDOUGALL. Asking for an inquiry.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Asking for nothing, but merely for political purposes. The gentlemen opposite have read statements calculated to bring disgrace on this man and his family, and his relations, and he was too much of a gentleman, and too well known to take notice of these slanders, until his friends asked him to make a statement. Is that statement not to be read in this House? The idea of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), talking about not reading from newspapers! Why month after month, we hear nothing else from him but articles from newspapers and statements of others. I am perfectly in order in reading this reply to the statements made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I find that in the statement which is being read, there is a reference to something which happened some time ago in this House. As far as that part of the statement is concerned, it is referring to a past debate, and is not in order. Once a discussion has taken place in the House, and statements made, these statements cannot be contradicted afterwards, because it would be referring to a

past debate. Consequently that particular part of the statement would not be in order. I was not here when the motion before the House was read, but as I understand it refers to certain charges against Mr. Walsh. I think it would be perfectly regular to read the statement of Mr. Walsh, defending his conduct. I find the following quotation from Speaker Denison's decisions:

When a member proposed to read a letter in the 'Times' from General Hay, Mr. Speaker Denison interposed and said that 'the hon. member had exercised a wise discretion in not doing so.' The House, however, is generally very indulgent allowing this rule to be suspended, in special cases when the conduct of a member is in question, or when it requires more information on a matter of controversy.

Mr. DAVIN. That refers to a charge against a member.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not see that there is a difference drawn there between the fact of the charges being made against a member or an outsider. I do not see much difference in that, and consequently I do not say that it would be against the rules of procedure, just to read this statement. There is another consideration. The statements which have been made have not been made on the personal knowledge of the member who has made them, but upon information from others, and consequently I do not believe it is irregular to permit the official charged to answer such statements.

Mr. SPROULE. I would remind you—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you allow me a word?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is that when a decision is rendered by the Speaker, there is only one recourse if the decision is not correct.

Mr. FOSTER. It is on that account that I wish to be clear as to the decision of the Speaker, in order that I may know of what to appeal to the House, and consequently I shall ask if I am correct in my interpretation of the Speaker's ruling. I find that Bourinot says:

Nor is it in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or other communications, whether printed or written, emanating from persons outside of the House, and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House.

Now, if I am correct, what has happened is this. The senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), in the course of the proceedings in this House—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that if he intends to appeal from the decision of the Speaker, there is no debate allowed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the Speaker a question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon member wants only an explanation from me, I have no objection to give it. But if he wants to make an appeal from my decision, he knows very well that the rule is that there should be no debate on such a motion.

Mr. FOSTER. What I want to ask the Speaker is this: Is it in the conduct of good business that I should thoroughly understand what the Speaker's decision is before I take the extraordinary proceeding of appealing from his decision?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Perhaps I did not make myself very clear to the hon. member, and perhaps I shall be obliged to repeat myself to some extent. I understood from the statement that has been made by the hon. minister that reference was made to a previous debate, and on the strength of the quotation that was made by the hon. member I said that was not regular. I understand that it was decided the other day by the Speaker, that when a statement has been made in the House, a member has no right to contradict that statement in a subsequent debate by reading a letter or something of the kind. But if I understand the present situation, it is this. A charge is made against Mr. Walsh, and a statement is read by the hon. minister denying that charge. I think, so far as that is concerned, that is perfectly regular; but so far as it might relate to a previous debate I do not think it is regular.

Mr. FOSTER. Then will the Speaker allow me to say that there is a misunderstanding between himself and me?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no charge made in the present resolution against Mr. Walsh—

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is.

Mr. FOSTER—to which Mr. Walsh can by any possibility reply by a statement that he has written on June 4, for this is June 28. The point, as it seems to me, is this, that the hon. member for Pictou on a former occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may be mistaken—

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid you are, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER—but I have given my decision in good faith, and according to that decision some charges have been made against Mr. Walsh, and the statement read by the minister is simply a contradiction of those charges by Mr. Walsh.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Speaker allow me to make a statement?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have given my decision.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I have no recourse but to appeal. I do not wish to appeal if there is a misunderstanding.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You want to slander as much as you can. It is very manly.

Mr. FOSTER. If my dear old friend would only keep quiet. The point of order was not raised as to the previous debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I wish to call the attention of the hon. member to this fact. Perhaps we do not view the facts in the same light, but I have given my decision, and I think there is only one recourse if the hon. gentleman wants to take it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the rules of the House permit the reading of this statement, and that you rule it is perfectly regular.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I may say that during the twenty odd years that I have been in this House I have not taken up much time, and I have always listened courteously to hon. members on the other side. I believe the rules of the House ought to be observed. No person pretends to say that I do not observe these rules and have not always done so; and as the Speaker has ruled that I am in order in making this statement, I hope I shall be allowed to go on without these improper interruptions. I am only glad to know that the rules of the House allow what would appear to the ordinary individual to be the simplest measure of fair-play to a person who has been so accused.

6. I arrived at Dawson City in May, 1898. Some time after my arriving there Mine Inspector McGregor reported to me that the gold commissioner was issuing permits allowing parties to prospect on Dominion Creek hill claims.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I want to ask that that portion of the resolution which makes a charge against Mr. Walsh be now read to the House. The resolution is not in my hands. I have my idea of what it is, and I think it is only fair to the House that we should know it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a rule of the House providing that an hon. member has a right to ask that a motion be read, but certainly not during the speech of another hon. member.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. It is this, that there is no charge made in the present resolution against Mr. Walsh, and that consequently—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER—the minister is out of order in reading Mr. Walsh's letter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question of order has been decided. There is no point of order now before the Chair.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I wish to say a word on the last point of order raised by the hon. member for York. I wish to say that to my mind it is improperly taken. The point of order was first raised when the minister was reading a certain statement and affidavit. Your ruling was given upon that. An irregular debate followed, and it was pointed out that the course to pursue was to appeal from that decision. No such appeal has been taken. Your ruling was in favour of the contention of the minister who is reading the statement to the House, and I would say as an old member that the House should remember what is due to this parliament and this House of Commons. We must have some semblance of order, some respect for the Chair, and some respect for the rules.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I was under the impression that this was a serious matter, and that there was a desire on the part of the members of the House that the truth should be known. I was endeavouring to give the facts, if there was any doubt in the mind of any person in the country, and leave him to judge for himself.

The creek being closed he considered this an injustice to the general public and recommended that this should be stopped. At a meeting of the council, held on May 30, 1898, a resolution was passed that locations made on a creek after it had been closed would not be recognized, and stating that Dominion Creek had been closed since the middle of November, and that it had been decided that the creek should remain closed until further notice and that the decision applied to hill and bench claims as well as to creek claims.

7. Mrs. Koch referred to by the said Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper was not a friend of mine. She was not my cook. I only knew her by her coming to the office on business. I did not give her a permit to prospect on Dominion Creek, and I did not instruct her to call on the gold commissioner to give her a permit.

As soon as I was informed that the gold commissioner had given her a permit, I immediately instructed the gold commissioner to withdraw such permit. I further instructed the gold commissioner to cease issuing permits till said creek was properly opened.

8. It is absolutely untrue that I had anything to do with the signing of the agreement by Louis Carbeno and Louis Walsh, either on the steamer 'Guadra' or anywhere else, and I did not know of said agreement till I saw it in said Commissioner Ogilvie's report.

9. I did not coerce nor threaten said Carbeno into signing any such agreement on the steamer 'Guadra' or at Salmon River or anywhere else, neither did I have any knowledge of any similar agreements made by any one else of the guides or employees with either Louis Walsh or Philip Walsh.

10. Said Carbeno was engaged to work for sixty dollars per month, and these were his wages during the time he was working for me. His wages were not raised until I was leaving Dawson City on August 4, 1898, when

he was engaged by me to work for the staff, and look after their quarters at the rate of \$100 per month. At this time cooks were receiving \$100 or \$150 per month at Dawson City.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is reading a statement from a man who is not a member of this House, in reply to something that was raised and disposed of in a former debate; and I ask your ruling.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I was under the in this resolution. It is contrary to all common sense, justice and decency that when an hon. member reads, not affidavits, but mere statements made by other people against an official of the government, the statement of that official or his explanation or affidavit cannot be read in his defence.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). This affidavit is specifically a reply to charges made in a previous debate, and in that respect is utterly out of order. It refers to a previous charge and a previous debate.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). If there is anything in the resolution before the House, it is a charge against the administration of the Yukon. That long motion which it took an hour and a half to read, and which covered all sorts of things imaginable in the Yukon, when boiled down, means simply a charge against the administration of that district. For a part of the time, Mr. Walsh was administrator there, and surely his statement should be read.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is a motion of want of confidence in the government, and is it to be held that the minister defending the department involved is not to be allowed to give an explanation of the administration of that department?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am at a disadvantage because I was not present this forenoon when the debate began. I was in the Railway Committee, and consequently did not follow the discussion which took place this morning. It is not in order to refer to a previous debate, and if nothing has been said to-day concerning the matter brought up by the hon. the acting Minister of the Interior, he would not be in order in making any reference to it, because he would be simply referring to a subject disposed of in a previous debate. I am simply giving my ruling on the general principle.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. One of the principal charges in this resolution has to do with Dominion Creek, and I am simply giving an explanation of what took place with regard to that creek. Surely, when the government is charged with irregularities and a judicial investigation is asked for with reference to this particular creek, I am entitled to read to the House the explanation of the official

responsible, more especially when the hon. member for Pictou has read the statements of most disreputable people, reflecting on the administration of the Yukon.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the matter is a subject of the present debate, I do not think it is irregular for the hon. gentleman to refer to it.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no statement in to-day's debate either remotely or directly connected with that subject of Louis Carbeno and the statement made in rebuttal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that there is a reference to Dominion Creek in the motion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. More than that, the terms of the resolution cover the whole field of the administration of the Yukon. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) has read in this House a lengthy resolution including a letter from one Catto which covers every form and shape of the administration of the Yukon, and I submit that any statement or any reply of any officer past or present with reference to that is within the terms of that motion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not think that the hon. member for Pictou could have read the resolution or he would not have submitted it to this House.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I was reading the clause with regard to Dominion Creek:

I say positively that I did not directly or indirectly inform or advise said Carbeno or any one that said Dominion Creek would be opened on the 8th July, on the contrary, the resolutions of the council and my own wishes and intentions were that the same should be opened on the 11th July, and I was greatly surprised when I was informed late in the evening that a notice had been printed and posted up stating that it was then open and that numbers of prospectors had started for said Dominion Creek.

12. Said notice, as it appears in the report of the evidence, page 90, is not in the form of the notice as shown to me, the date of the 8th July was not in it nor the diagram.

The council at a meeting had decided to cause Dominion Creek to be opened and directed notices to be given that permits to prospect would be issued on the 11th day of July at the office of the gold commissioner. Subsequently on the 7th July, the gold commissioner wrote me a letter urging that the permits should be done away with, and it was decided to act on the gold commissioner's advice, and that the creek would be opened as agreed upon on the 11th July, without permits, and the gold commissioner was requested to notify the public of this change.

13. In some way, either by error or intentionally, the 8th July was put in as the date instead of the 11th July. I say positively that the 11th July was the date I gave instructions that the creek should be opened as agreed by the council, and I was much surprised and annoyed that the mistake was made.

That the various charges made against me by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, accusing me of improper conduct in my administration as com-

missioner of the Yukon district, are false and untrue.

That the charges that while I was commissioner I was guilty of intoxication and of immoral conduct, are false and untrue.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. Last session the charge was made and debated and disposed of in this House that Mr. Walsh was guilty of certain irregularities. To-day the Minister of the Interior wants to read a statement from Mr. Walsh denying the charge made in this House a year ago, and concerning which not a word has arisen in this debate. I contend that he is out of order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If it refers to a year ago, it is not a previous debate at all.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think it is necessary for me to state the rule concerning previous debates. It is well known that a previous debate means a debate during this session and not a debate in a previous session, so that I do not think the point of order can stand.

Mr. FOSTER. It arose last session and this session as well.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If I understand this resolution at all—and I know there is nothing serious in it and that its object is simply to damage people's characters—but if there is anything in it that is intended to have a bad effect on the minds of the people, it is that there was something irregular and corrupt in the closing of Dominion Creek, and it would be very strange indeed if I were not to be allowed to read the affidavits or explanations of the men, whose names the hon. member has used in his resolution, before we are asked to vote. If the hon. member wants to know the truth before voting, he would not object to my reading to the House what Louis Carbeno and the others have to say. I would not use these affidavits were it not for the tactics adopted by the hon. gentleman of making statements based on anonymous letters and the letters of disreputable people, and I submit them to the House and the country so that they may judge whether there has been anything irregular or corrupt. If there are any people who know whether the charge made with reference to Dominion Creek is true or not, they must be Louis Carbeno and Amor Cyrette. These affidavits give a truthful statement from these people as to how the information reached them, and clearly show to the House and the country that Major Walsh had no knowledge or connection with the matter whatever. Am I not to be given an opportunity to read them?

Mr. DAVIN. Why would not the hon. gentleman give him an opportunity to go before the court of inquiry?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) this—that if he

dares to stand up in his place and make a charge against the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) or any official, he will get a committee so quick he will not know how it is done. Dare he take an honourable and manly course. Dare he say a word against the Minister of the Interior or myself concerning the insinuation against me in his speech of a few days ago, made under the shelter of the privileges of parliament. I want the country to know the character of the men who do such things. I deny, and dare, and challenge him to rise in his place and say one word upon his responsibility of the dirty insinuation that he threw out the other day against me. He knows that there is not a word of truth in it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) is a fighting minister, isn't he?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes, I am a fighting minister. Mr. Speaker, I am glad and proud to know that my public life has been such that I can stand here and defy the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) to say a word, if he dare, on his responsibility as was insinuated by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I am proud to be able to speak out, proud that I do not need to shirk any charge; and I dare any member on his responsibility to say a word against me. I am glad to submit these affidavits to the House, so that hon. members, if they wish to know the actual facts with regard to the closing of Dominion Creek may know them. To my mind, this is not a party matter: this is far above any party matter. The credit of Canada depends upon whether these statements are true or not. My anxiety is not to shield the character of Major Walsh or of any other individual, but to show that the statements made not being true are detrimental to the credit of public officials and so detrimental to the country they serve and that these men have conducted themselves as honourable men and good Canadians. In corroboration of the statement I have given to the House as to the closing of Dominion Creek, I will read the affidavit of Amor Cyrette of Fort William:

District of Thunder Bay, province of Ontario,  
to wit:

I, Ambrose Cyrette, of Fort William, do solemnly declare that I was in Dawson City during the Dominion Creek stampede; it was on Friday, July the 8th, of last year. I saw a lot of people going over the hills early in the day, but did not know where they were going. I was around the camp of Major Walsh, and we all wondered where they were going. The people continued going all the afternoon. In the evening I saw Robert McBeth, a dog-driver for the government, who returned to the camp, and said that Dominion Creek was to be open on Monday. He said he had seen the notice in a saloon down town. The persons present when he told this was Simon Valin, Louis Carbeno and myself. This was the first and only infor-

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

mation we had received of the date of the opening of the creek. We all intended staking on this creek if possible, but could get no inside information from any of Major Walsh's party or any of the officials. Louis Carbeno and myself left for Dominion Creek between eight and nine o'clock p.m. On the way Carbeno told me that Major Walsh did not know he had gone, and that he had put a man in his place till he returned. We arrived at Dominion Creek at noon of the 9th of July (Saturday) and found a man staking a claim. He was blazing a tree with a pocket knife; he had one tree already marked. I asked him what he was doing, and he said, 'Staking my claim.' I said you are too soon, Monday is the day. He said if you do not stake to-day, you will be left. I lent him my axe to cut his tree. I do not know the man's name or the number of his claim, but could go to this post at any time; it was on the left side of the creek. Carbeno and I went on the other side and staked our claims. We returned to Dawson City on Sunday. We staked about two o'clock p.m. on Saturday, July 9. Claims had been staked hours ahead of us. When we arrived the creek was alive with men, and had we not crossed over the creek, we would not have been able to stake a claim at all. I positively declare that our only information regarding the opening of Dominion Creek came through Robert McBeth only.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and knowing it to be of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act of 1893.

(Sgd.) AMORE CYRETTE.

Declared before me at Port Arthur, in the district of Thunder Bay, this 20th day of April, 1899.

(Sgd.) THOS. A. GORHAM,

Notary Public in and for the Province  
of Ontario.

(Seal.)

I understand that the signer of this affidavit is a Canadian citizen of repute. I have another document here bearing on the same point:

Dawson, N.W.T., June 23, 1899.

Major J. M. Walsh,  
Brockville, Ont.

Dear Major,—Louis arrived here on the 20th inst., and in talking with him he informed me that my evidence had been sent to the Department of the Interior to Mr. Sifton. If Louis has explained the matter to me right I must say that there is something wrong. The evidence that I gave in court did not in any way reflect on you; it would be impossible for me to make any charges against you, for I could not do this if I chose. I understand that it has been stated that you forced me to sign the agreement between Louis Walsh and I, and if any person made this statement then I can only say it is false. I cannot understand how such rumours could get out, for I never made any remarks about this agreement or anything else. Louis Walsh and I had an agreement which was in every way satisfactory to me.

I might mention, for your information, that while I was on the stand, that Mr. Fawcett did all he could to make me acknowledge that you were interested in the claims which were staked by Cyrette, Collin and myself. I told him that you had no interest whatever in mine. He asked me where I received my information from as to the staking of Dominion Creek. I

answered that I heard it in camp from one McBeth, a dog-driver. Then he asked me if I had permission from you to go out and stake. I answered 'yes.' Then he asked me if I thought it was of any interest to Philip Walsh in my staking the claim. I answered and said I did not know.

I cannot understand what reason they had in calling me, without it was for the purpose of connecting you in some way with the staking of the claim, which, in my opinion, was ridiculous.

When I left Dawson I understood the creek was to be open for restaking on Monday. I left at 9.30 p.m. Friday, July 8, 1898, and on getting over the hill I saw hundreds of people who had left before I did. John Labby overtook me at the Dome, and told me that the creek was opened, and advised me to push on. This should be sufficient to show that you had not given me any pointer.

Now, I wish to be more plain in closing this letter, and I desire to state that you had no connection, directly in any claim or interest in any property I took up, or did I on any occasion secure or get any pointers of any kind from you, and further that when the evidence which was printed in the paper here, I called their attention to the fact that it was not published as I gave it.

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) LOUIS CARBENO.

It is not necessary that I should ask that the statements of the men, or even their oaths be accepted as proving the case. The circumstances and everything connected with the matter show clearly to the House and the country that there was nothing irregular on the part of Major Walsh in regard to this matter: they show that he was in no way connected with any claim in the Yukon. I am perfectly satisfied—it is only fair to Major Walsh to say that I do not believe that he ever was or that he is now interested to the extent of one cent in any claim in the Yukon, though he held the position of commissioner for one year.

So much for the McDonald royalty and the closing of Dominion Creek. With reference to the Anderson concession, I have only this to say: I admit there were no regulations with regard to the granting of concessions of this kind, but the evidence will show that the minister was most cautious with regard to granting these concessions, and that he would grant even a small piece of ground only after careful inquiry, and having satisfied himself that it could not be worked as a placer claim. We have ascertained from further experience, that these claims are granted not only in two and a half mile sections, but in five mile sections, and in greater numbers now under the regulations; and any one can go to the department now, and without seeing the minister, but on complying with the regulations, can get similar grants to these all over the country. I, therefore, conclude that in granting this concession to Mr. Anderson, there is no foundation whatever for the charge that it was a case of favouritism, and I am pre-

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

pared to say upon my responsibility here, and after full examination of the facts, that there is not the slightest foundation in fact, or a syllable of truth in the charge, that there was any favouritism on the part of the minister of the department in regard to this matter.

Now, Sir, we come to the most discreditable and most disreputable political act that I have ever known in all my experience, and that is the placing upon *Hansard*, in this resolution, of the letter of this man Catto. I do not know personally anything about Dr. Catto, but I took the responsibility of saying that any person might know, from the language and style of his statement, that he was a man of unbalanced mind, and a vicious character. Since saying that, there has been placed in my hands a recent issue of a paper published in the Yukon, containing a reference to this man, Dr. Catto:

Dr. Catto's amendment to Mr. Sugrue's motion was as ridiculously superlative in senility as ever emanated from the brains of men who have spent many years inside the walls of asylums. Little did the Burser of 'Auld Reikie' dream that from its walls should drift into the Klondike one of his pet pupils.

Mr. McDUGALL. Is that paper edited by gamblers and prostitutes?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the hon. gentleman wants to put himself on a par with Dr. Catto, and these other low characters, I am perfectly willing he should do so. The Yukon council is created by an Act of this parliament, and certain powers are given them: and I would ask the hon. member for Pictou or any other member of this House whether any ordinance has been passed by that council in any way encouraging gambling or houses of prostitution. Mr. Speaker, this charge shows the length of degradation that some people are prepared to go, even though they have an opportunity of knowing what the facts are. I acknowledge that the Yukon council, being appointees of this government, are more directly responsible to the government for their conduct than they would be if full provincial government existed in the Yukon. But still, with regard to a great many of these matters, this parliament has granted that council power to pass ordinances and administer affairs in that district. Now, if any facts should come to the knowledge of any member of this House that the Yukon council had acted improperly, this government has power to remove them, and that would be a proper occasion for hon. gentlemen opposite to make a motion to that effect. I can assure this House that if the government became possessed of any information, showing improper conduct on the part of the members of that council, the government would not delay a moment in removing them. Now there is another matter that I regret to have to refer to, but I must do so, as it is re-

ferred to by this discreditable resolution that has been placed in your hands. A rumour did come to the ears of the minister, that the police surgeon had given certificates of health to some prostitutes in Dawson City. The first thing the minister did, on hearing that rumour, was to telegraph to Mr. Ogilvie that if anything of that kind had been done, it was immediately to be discontinued. I believe, from information I have in the department, that instead of encouraging and promoting gambling, or other social evils, Mr. Ogilvie and the other officials, have been very severe; and the hon. member for Pictou himself has read a letter contained in his resolution, showing that a large amount has been collected in fines imposed upon gamblers and disreputable characters in Dawson City. What better evidence could you have that Mr. Ogilvie and his associates are trying to enforce the laws of this country and maintain good order, than the fact that they are prosecuting the people and fining them heavily whenever they are found guilty of improper conduct? I do not think there is any city in Canada, even in Ottawa, where the hon. gentlemen live, where the municipal coffers are not sometimes enriched by fines imposed upon houses of prostitution and upon unlicensed or licensed houses, who sell liquor contrary to law. I can say that in whatever respect Mr. Ogilvie may have failed, or his associates may have failed, in administering the affairs of that country, I believe that no administrator could have enforced the laws more rigorously than he has been doing in these matters referred to. Mr. Speaker. I am sorry for many reasons, that I have had to take up so much of the time of the House in reading documents, but I have done so because I was anxious that the House and the country should know the truth with regard to these matters. Why, Sir, can you suppose for a moment, when we have thousands of good, decent, hardworking men in the Yukon, Canadians and others, that some of them would not come forward and make complaints, if there was anything particularly wrong with the administration of the laws in that district? We have hundreds of them visiting Ottawa, men of good repute, men of character, men engaged in mining and other business. Do you hear one word from these people in regard to this matter? Not a word. I challenge the opposition in this House to bring up here, on the floor of parliament, any statement made by any reputable citizen of this country in regard to any matter connected with the administration of the Yukon, and an investigation will be held at once.

Mr. DAVIN. Why do you not give it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You do not want it. You have given no reason for an investigation. Departmental investigations are going on all the time. I only repeat that I want

the people of this country to know, that, in my opinion, there has been only one object since the first day that these so-called Yukon charges started, and that was, that hon. gentlemen opposite might throw a heap of dirt in the hope that some of it might stick upon the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), or upon some of his officials, and thus create in the public mind the impression that there is something wrong in the administration of the Yukon. Little do they care how much injury they do to individuals or families; little do they care how much discredit they put upon Canada's fair name. While we are doing everything we can to bring people into this country, while we are making every effort to assist Canadian enterprises in the financial markets of the world, more harm has been done by the action of these hon. gentlemen than all the irregularities and corruption that could exist supposing they had existed for years. I know that the people of this country recognize that the hon. Minister of the Interior, in spite of all the difficulties that he has had to contend with, has administered his department in an energetic, businesslike and capable manner, that he has administered it in such a way as no man ever administered it before, honestly and capably. We find that from one end of the country to the other, and especially in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, there is no dissatisfaction as to the efficiency of the administration of the hon. Minister of the Interior.

Mr. DAVIS. There is no rebellion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. And no dissatisfaction. I know this to be a fact, because, having occupied the position of acting minister for several months, I can say that I have hardly ever had a complaint as to the way in which business is transacted in the Department of the Interior. We know that when the late government were in office people were thronging the hotels of this city and the corridors of this House asking to have their business attended to, and we know that the incompetency of that administration created a rebellion in the North-west. Referring to the charges regarding fractional claims or Crown reserves, we have a minister in charge of the department who is capable, energetic and honest, who has shown no favours to any one of his friends, and that there is no justification for these improper, disreputable and disgraceful references to the hon. Minister of the Interior. No claim was ever given to a friend of the hon. minister. Not one of these claims was ever disposed of excepting in the regular way, and on the second of the next month every one of these claims is advertised to be sold at auction. Could there be any charge made against the administration of the hon. Minister of the Interior that he had, contrary to the regulations, given to his friends or any person valuable claims, when the fact

is that every one of these claims was advertised and sold at public auction to the highest bidder? I can only repeat what I have said before, that if any member of this House will make, upon his responsibility, one charge of dishonesty or favouritism against the hon. Minister of the Interior, the fullest inquiry and investigation will be granted him.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, last year and this year efforts have been made on this side of the House to have an investigation into matters connected with the Yukon, but no speech and no motion that has been made on this side of the House has furnished such a strong reason why we should have an inquiry as the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sutherland). Now, Sir, what is the character of the speech we have just listened to from the hon. gentleman?

An hon. MEMBER. A 1.

Mr. DAVIN. What it has consisted of is in bringing forward statements and affidavits made by persons whose conduct was impugned not merely in this House, but impugned before the investigation conducted by Mr. Ogilvie. And, Sir, towards the close of the hon. gentleman's speech, what do we find? He introduces a statement from Mr. Carbeno, written to Major Walsh, in which he contravenes what he stated before Mr. Ogilvie's investigation, and also an affidavit contravening what Mr. Fawcett said before Mr. Ogilvie's investigation. If the hon. gentleman felt it necessary to produce these affidavits and statements, the affidavit of Major Walsh and the statement of Mr. Carbeno and others, Mr. Cyrette, I think was the other, does it not suggest the need for an inquiry in which Mr. Carbeno could be cross-examined? The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) knows very well that there is a great difference between an ex parte affidavit made in that way and a sworn statement made in court, or before a commission, where the person making it can be cross-examined. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down accused the hon. member for Pictou of bringing forward this matter for political purposes. Sir, what we say to the hon. acting Minister of the Interior, and to the government that is backing him, is this: A series of charges have been made which have not brought up these things for the first time. We observed the mock indignation of the hon. acting minister at the close of his speech, because a cloud had been cast upon the good name of the country in consequence of these scandals having been brought up. Who brought up these scandals? Who reiterated them throughout the length and breadth, not merely of Canada, but of Europe? You have the best correspondent of the *Times*, you have the statement of Liberal editors, of men like Mr.

Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Miller, owning a Liberal paper, so that the assertion made by the hon. gentleman that honest or honourable men never make these charges is utterly unfounded. Men as respectable as any man in this House, or as any man in Canada, men occupying good positions, men closely connected with friends of the hon. Minister of the Interior—I mean the Minister of the Interior who is on his travels—have made statements to me, but, when I have said to them: 'Cannot I use these statements?' they said: 'No.' When I said: 'Cannot I use your names?' they said: 'No.' But, they have then said: 'If there is an inquiry, and you subpoena us, we will go before the committee or the commission and make our statements.' The reason that the hon. member for Pictou has been forced to bring this matter before parliament is, that throughout the length and breadth of Canada, and throughout the empire, scandal has been brought upon Canada's name by the statements of misconduct, misgovernment, and corruption that were made in regard to the Yukon. And the acting minister commences his speech to-day by telling us that we are bringing forward these statements because we cannot make any charges against that government. Why, Sir, that government is battered and riddled with the successful charges we have made against it. And in regard to these charges that have been made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), the conduct of the government supporters shows that they are afraid of an inquiry. I am not going to say any more than I said at any previous time; I do not know whether Major Walsh has been guilty of any misconduct or not, but for Major Walsh's own sake, as well as for the sake of the government, we ought to have an inquiry, in order that we might sift the conflicting statements that have been made here. The acting minister (Mr. Sutherland), towards the close of his speech, used defiant language in regard to his motion. Why is it that he does that in the dying hours of the session? What is the use of defying us now? Suppose even that any one was in a position to come forward and make a statement on his own personal knowledge, how could we have an inquiry this session? It is out of the question. The fact is that the action of my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) has too much altogether of the element of bluff. I want to call attention for a moment to the monstrous position we are placed in here, partly by your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not impugn your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I say that in consequence of your ruling, and these matters having been brought before the House in consonance with your ruling, we have statements on the pages of *Hansard* contravening the statements made by Mr. Fawcett before the

commission in the Yukon. At page 79, Mr. Fawcett gives his evidence, dealing with Dominion Creek, as follows :

By the Commissioner :

Q. Have you got a copy of the notice ?—A. I have a copy of the notice which the council passed with reference to the issuing of permits.

Q. What is it ?—A. I will find it in a minute; it is a notice of a meeting prior to that held on the 27th of June.

Q. What was resolved at that meeting ?—A. I don't know whether it was passed on that evening or not; but I think it must have been, or, on the evening following. The date is not given but it says: 'A meeting to discuss the questions of administration. Present: Major Walsh, commissioner of the Yukon district and Messrs. Fawcett, Wade, Bliss and McGregor, T. D. Pattullo, secretary to the commissioner. Agreed, that on the opening of Dominion bench claims for location, permits to be issued to prospect the ground, after which the claims may be recorded if the work has been done to the satisfaction of the mining inspector.'

'Agreed that notice be given on Thursday, 30th inst., to the effect that permission to prospect bench claims on Dominion Creek will be issued at the office of the gold commissioner on and after 10th July, 1898. T. D. Pattullo, secretary of the commissioner Yukon district.'

The date 10th July, has been changed to the 11th.

Mr. Fawcett.—I don't know but that was the last meeting of the council.

By the Commissioner :

Q. I would like to ask you a few questions about the history of Dominion Creek; when was the creek closed—not the hills and benches?—A. The 15th day of November was the last date on which any applications were taken.

Q. What year ?—A. 1897.

Q. Why was it closed then ?—A. Just before this I had learned that a great many claims were being relocated over others that had been put on by description but the last of the group that I heard of was just below second Discovery—Lower Discovery; when it was recorded number two consisted of some three claims, and A, B and C were recorded.

Q. This was number 2A, B and C ?—A. Yes, 2A, B and C, I think, in this locality. I am speaking from memory now. That number or one of the others adjoining. The owners of the claims covering all these came in and told me of it—that the claims covered their ground. The next thing I learned was that there was no number '3' and that there was no number '2'; some one told me so. After I found that people were staking fractions over claims, which in this case as subsequently proved to be true by the survey, as, out of three full claims as applications that were recorded, there is only one fraction of a few feet. About No. 27 below Upper Discovery, the same thing was going on. When I found that this was going on, that there was no means in the office of finding out whether in staking these fractions, or even in staking the claims, that they were not staking over ground already occupied, I came to the conclusion that the only thing I could do was to receive no applications until the creek was surveyed, and that is what I did.

Q. You closed it ?—A. I closed it.

Q. The date of closure you have given; did you immediately report that to Ottawa ?—A. Yes, and also to Major Walsh.

Q. Was it endorsed by Major Walsh ?—A. It was.

Q. He approved of the creek being closed ?—A. He was called in evidence on that same point in August up in court that would have been blocked on the ground. The question was brought up and at least one of the attorneys took the ground that the creek was never legally closed, so Major Walsh was called in. Major Walsh in his instructions had power over the mining regulations, and he was called in evidence. He was asked: 'Were you aware that Dominion Creek was closed?' He said, 'Yes.' Then he was asked: 'Did you approve of it?' He said, 'Most certainly I did.'

Again, later on :

Mr. Fawcett reads from the minutes of a meeting held in the commissioner's office, Dawson City, May 30, 1898, to discuss questions of administration :

'Any locations made on a creek after it has been closed will not be recognized or put on record; this includes hill and bench claims as well as creek claims.'

'Dominion Creek having been closed since the middle of November last, it has been decided that the creek shall remain closed until further notice. This decision applies to hill and bench claims, as well as to creek claims.'

Mr. Fawcett.—I may say that this was moved by Mr. McGregor in council, and he gave as his reason for bringing up this resolution that he had told people on the creeks that the hills were not open, and said he was not going to be made a fool of, and so he presented this resolution.

Q. You were present at this meeting ?—A. I was present.

Q. Did you object ?—A. I did.

Q. On what ground ?—A. On the ground that men had gone out there under my permission and had prospected, staked their claims, made applications at the office, and their applications had been accepted, and I thought that this would simply throw them out, undoing the work I had done. It was no longer the rule of the gold commissioner; I was overridden by the council. That occurred on the 28th of May, and the creek was considered closed then.

At an earlier period, speaking of a certain lady which Major Walsh denies was his cook, he deposed :

So that this lady comes to me on the 27th of May (I think some time then) one morning after I had had information about the closing of these hills and she says, 'Major Walsh says I have to have a permit to prospect on Dominion hills, creeks and benches.' Well, I told her: I knew about no permits; I had heard nothing about any permits. About an hour after, Major Walsh came to me and said: 'I think we will issue permits for Dominion Creek hills and benches;' that was the first intimation I had had of any permits being issued. 'All right,' I said. Of course I came to the conclusion that they concluded I was about right, and to prevent a hasty stampede they had accordingly decided to give a permit to any one who came.

Well, Sir, later on we have this evidence :

Q. Well, then, were the hill sides open after all ?—A. They were open upon the publication of that notice (pointing to the notice.)

Q. What led to the issuance of this notice ?—A. There was a good deal transpired between; there was a notice posted in June notifying the people that after a certain date permits would be issued.

Q. What date ?—A. I think it must have been about the end of June, or somewhere near this; it was to have been posted on the 30th of June

or the 1st of July, stating that permits would be issued on the 11th.

Q. Have you a copy of that notice now?—A. No. The first time I noticed that notice with my name in large print was when I saw the notice posted up. My objection to the whole thing was, their considering that I didn't say anything that would seem to be in favour of my idea that there was no occasion for closing the hill sides.

Q. Was that your signature?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you issue it?—A. Well, on one occasion Mr. Pattullo came with a notice asking me to sign it; it was in relation to closing the hill sides, but I objected on the ground that I considered there was no basis for the hill sides being closed; I still maintained my objection to what had been done in council as gold commissioner, and I refused to sign the notice. Major Walsh sent and summoned me before him, and he gave me a very strong reprimand. As near as I can remember, he said: 'Mr. Fawcett I want you to understand that it is impertinent on your part to question anything that has been decided in council, and when I sent that notice for you to sign, I want you to sign it.' On the spur of the moment I signed this notice without reading it.

Later on:

Q. What was in this notice?—A. It stated that on and after 11th July that permits to prospect bench claims on Dominion Creek would be granted—for prospecting and staking, and I think there was something that applications would be accepted if approved of by the mining inspector. The evidence goes right on contradicting completely the statement made by Major Walsh, and then, when we come to the evidence sworn before the commission by Louis Carbeno, it is as follows:

Louis Carbeno, called and sworn.

By Mr. Fawcett:

Q. Where were you on the 8th of July?—A. Well, I was in camp until about 10 o'clock.

Q. Where?—A. It would be at the hospital.

Q. In what capacity were you working?—A. I was working for Major Walsh.

Q. Were you there all that day?—A. Yes, sir, I was.

Q. On the evening of the 8th of July?—A. Until evening.

Q. Where were you later on in the evening?—A. I was up Bonanza.

Q. For what purpose?—A. Going up to Dominion.

Q. Why were you on the way to Dominion?—A. Because I was informed that it was going to be opened on the 9th.

Q. Informed when?—A. About 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

Q. On what date?—A. The 8th.

Q. Where did you acquire the information?—A. I received that from one of our dog-drivers.

Q. Who?—A. McBeth.

Q. Is he here now?—A. Yes; he is an Indian.

Q. And he told you it was open?—A. Well, he didn't tell me; it was rumoured about the camp. I asked Major Walsh's brother if the creek was going to be thrown open on the 9th, and he said he thought it was.

Q. Where was McBeth at this time?—A. He had been down the street.

Q. Where was he when he gave you this information?—A. In camp.

Q. Where was McBeth?—A. He had been down the street, and he came back to camp.

Q. Was Major Walsh present?—A. No.

Q. Was McBeth working for Major Walsh?—A. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN.

Q. And he told you that the creek would be opened on the 9th?—A. He said he heard it would be opened on the 9th.

Q. That was on the afternoon of the 8th?—A. Yes.

Q. Did he tell you how he came by that information?—A. No, sir.

Q. When did you stake your claim?—A. I staked it on the 9th about 10.30.

By the Commissioner:

Q. In the morning?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Fawcett:

Q. You subsequently recorded that claim?—A. Yes.

Q. What time did you start?—A. At 10.30 on the evening of the 8th.

Q. Would anybody have any interest in giving you any information as to this creek being opened on the 9th?—A. No, not that I know of, except Major Walsh's brother.

Q. What interests had he?—A. He didn't have any interests. I suppose it was his interest, in one way, to give me information.

Q. What arrangement was there between you and Major Walsh or any of his brothers with reference to any claims you might stake?—A. There was a document drawn up between him and his brother to give me a three-fourth interest in anything I got in the country, providing he paid all my expenses, and the working of any ground I took up in the country.

Q. Would you recognize that agreement if you saw it?—A. Yes, sir.

Then the document is set forth. On page 260 you will read:

By the Commissioner:

Q. Why did you give this to Philip Walsh and not to Louis?—A. Because Major Walsh instructed me he did not want Louis' name brought into the office, and it would be just as well to have the property made over to him. I told him that it was not proper; that the agreement would not stand law, and I couldn't get anything, and asked him to make out another agreement. He argued the point, and I told Mr. Pattullo, and Pattullo drew that agreement up; he said it would be all right, and I went to work and signed it.

Q. What consideration did you receive?—A. Not a cent.

Q. What were you to receive for the three-fourths; you were to receive one-fourth instead of what belonged to you?—A. He was to look after it, and pay any expenses of any mine I took up.

Q. Had this agreement been made before you left down east?—A. We talked the agreement over, but the agreement hadn't been drawn up, and it had to be signed at the Big Salmon.

Q. Did you think at that time that this was a fair agreement?—A. I didn't.

Q. Why did you sign it?—A. Because I was in a position and I couldn't very well get out of it; I didn't want to go out of the country.

Q. If you had refused, what would have been the result?—A. I wouldn't have been permitted to go; I would have had to have gone out.

Q. What position did you hold?—A. He promised me the position I have now—cooking for the officials, and I suppose if I hadn't signed that document I would not be in the position I hold now.

Q. Who promised you?—A. Major Walsh.

Q. Do you think you would have been in the same position now if you hadn't?—A. No, I don't think I would; nothing said about that.

Q. Was there any compulsion of any kind used to make you sign that?—A. He laid in his

tent not over fifteen feet away; he knew it was wrong and I knew it was wrong.

Q. He didn't in any way try to compel you to sign it?—A. No.

Q. What reason have you for saying that you did not think you would be here?—A. I said I wouldn't have held the position I am holding now if I had not signed it.

Q. What were you doing then?—A. Cooking.

Q. How much were you getting?—A. \$60 a month.

Q. What now?—A. \$100 per month.

Q. When did you get an advance in your wages?—A. Last August; but he told me he would give me one hundred and twenty-five, then he cut it to one hundred. I said I would take the hundred and stayed in.

And later on :

Q. The government paid you wages and living expenses, so that has nothing to do with the case?—A. I think about \$40 or \$50.

Q. You would place the value of an outfit to stake a claim at \$40 or \$50. Well, before you left the camp to go on that trip did you ask Major Walsh's permission?—A. I did.

Q. Did you tell him what you were going for?—A. I told him I was going to Dominion Creek.

Q. What did he say?—A. He said yes.

Q. Did you tell him you were going to stake?—A. I did not.

Q. Do you think he knew?—A. Yes, he would not think I was going for a walk; that was in the evening about eight and ten o'clock.

By Mr. Tabor:

Q. Did any other officials go with you?—A. Yes, one, an Indian; and when I had gone five or ten miles I was joined by another Indian.

Q. Were these Major Walsh's Indians?—A. Just two of them.

Q. Who were they?—A. Two of the Cullum boys.

Q. In saying an outfit worth \$40 or \$50, what do you mean?—A. Going to Dominion Creek and coming back.

And later on :

Q. Did they transfer a three-quarter interest to Philip Walsh as you did?—A. Yes; you will find duplicates there in the recording office.

Then, on page 262 :

By Mr. Fawcett:

Q. In your examination yesterday, Mr. Carbeno, in answering one of the questions, you stated that you thought that your present position was the result of signing that agreement, or something to that effect?—A. Yes.

Q. Was there not part of the evidence in that connection which you forgot to give us yesterday?—A. I forgot to say that other papers were drawn up and I would not sign them.

Q. When was this?—A. Coming up on board the 'Quadra.'

Q. You would not sign them, why?—A. I said the papers were not legal, and would not sign them until I got legal ones. That afternoon I was called to Major Walsh's stateroom, and he asked me if I had made an agreement at Port Arthur before I left.

Q. You said you did?—A. He said, 'Why didn't you sign the papers?' I said I didn't because they were not legal. He said, 'If you don't sign those papers when this boat goes back, I will send you back on it.' That was all that was said until we got to Big Salmon, then other papers came on and therefore I signed them.

Then, on page 263 :

Q. How could that be, when the government was paying your expenses?—A. That was stated in the agreement before I left.

Q. That was understood at Port Arthur—that they were to pay your expenses to come into the country?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At at the same time you were employed as a government servant. Don't you think it was inconsistent to offer to pay your expenses if you came in as a government employee?—A. Well, I was giving the way it was agreed to.

Q. Then this lead pencil document admitted that?—A. Yes, it is in this way only. (Mr. Carbeno reads the document.)

The Commissioner.—There is no reference there for your expenses to be paid into the country. It would grant the expense of working the claim, but not the expenses in connection with your entry here.

By Mr. Fawcett:

Q. You refused to sign this lead pencil document on board the 'Quadra'?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you were told if you didn't you would be sent back?—A. Yes, sir; and I said I would not sign any until a proper one was drawn up.

Q. When you signed this at Big Salmon did it seem strange to you that it was dated at Port Arthur?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the actual date of the signature?—A. I could not exactly tell you. I think it was in June some time.

Q. Three months after the agreement had been entered into?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there any cause—was the question mentioned at all? Was it dated at Port Arthur—why not at Big Salmon?—A. Well, I didn't ask any questions; they brought in the document and I signed it, that was all. I saw the signature and I knew it came from him.

Q. Whose signature was it?—A. Louis Walsh's. His signature is on the bottom of it.

Q. Have you reason to know his signature?—A. Yes, I will swear to it.

Q. You have no reason to assign why the document was dated September 23, and executed at Big Salmon some time in June?—A. No.

Q. This agreement you entered into at Port Arthur?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. This document you refused to sign, on whose behalf was that made?—A. Louis Walsh's.

Thus you have Carbeno utterly contravening what he states here. What is the meaning of this? They are doing by indirection the very thing they were asked to do.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS.

Mr. DAVIN. When six o'clock was called, I was referring to the challenge thrown out by my hon. friend, the acting Minister of the Interior, and that challenge was broader even than the challenge thrown out in 1899 by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). I took down my hon. friend's words. He said that if any one would make a charge against the Minister of the Interior or allege that he had reason to believe the charge, and made the statement on his responsibility as a member of this House an inquiry would be given forthwith. Let me now read the challenge that was thrown out by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) on April 4, 1899. In the course of the debate on a motion of the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Bell), the hon. member

for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) had made a very long speech and a series of most grave charges against the administration of the Yukon. Mr. Sifton replied, and concluded as follows :

I challenge the hon. member for Pictou, or any man in this House, to lay upon the Table of the House the charges that he has to make and declare his ability to substantiate them by evidence, and he will get his investigation—

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN (reading)

—and I will be able to convince the hon. gentleman that makes that charge that discretion on his part would have been the better part of valour.

That is the challenge. On the 7th of June, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) took it up. He made a series of charges, taking full responsibility, placing his position in this House in jeopardy. He used very strong language on that occasion.

In addition to what responsibility attaches to the government in this matter, I am prepared, if the commission is granted on the terms suggested to abide by the results, to consider that by failure to substantiate the charges made I will forfeit my right to a seat in parliament or to hold any office under the Crown.

On page 6046 of *Hansard* he said :

But I waive all that, and in this parliament, in the face of the country—my native country—I am prepared practically for all the pains and penalties in the discretion of parliament. I am prepared for more than that; I am prepared, that great good might come out of this investigation, as great good will come out of it, and great benefit to Canada, to incur the risks I have mentioned—no small risk to a man of even of ordinary ambition, that is to be considered that he has, by failure, after taking an important step of this character, disintitiled himself to the confidence of his fellow-countrymen in any public matter, and disintitiled also to the confidence of the representative of the sovereign in connection with any matter of political preferment within the gift of the Crown.

Later on, he concluded as follows :

I say seriously, Mr. Speaker, that I do charge the government with gross neglect and incapacity, followed by a carnival of corruption in the Yukon; but bad as all the crimes may have been in that district, it will be a national scandal and a national change for this parliament to refuse a judicial commission of inquiry upon the fair and reasonable terms covered by my motion, which I have put in your hands, and the statement of which I have already read; and wish to be considered responsible therefor as stated.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. My hon. friend, I am quite sure, does not wish to misrepresent the charges made by the hon. member for Pictou. I think he will admit that the hon. member for Pictou expressly disclaimed making any personal charge against the Minister of the Interior. If he looks at the resolution then moved, even with the speech

Mr. DAVIN.

by which it was supported, he will find that the hon. member for Pictou expressly declined to make any personal charge against the Minister of the Interior. If he had made such a charge, he would have got his committee at once as he would get it now if he should make it.

Mr. DAVIN. Is not that an example of the way this question has been dealt with? I will not use any strong language. Just take the language of the Minister of the Interior :

I challenge the hon. member for Pictou or any man in this House to lay upon the Table the charges that he has to make, and declare his ability to substantiate them by evidence, and he will get his investigation.

There is not a word here said about personal charges against the minister. He said: Make your charge. It was a challenge thrown out in the same spirit of bravado as the acting Minister of the Interior displayed in throwing out his challenge this forenoon. I have seen my hon. friend in many moods, but this is the first time I have seen him in his king Cambyses vein, and I may say I congratulate him because it was edifying. He threw out the challenges; he was a fighting minister. Let a charge be made, he said, and you will get your investigation. Brave words these, but the same challenge was thrown down in 1899 by the Minister of the Interior, and when it was taken up by the hon. member for Pictou, what resulted? The hon. member for Pictou put his position as an ex-minister of the Crown, as a member of the Privy Council, as a member of parliament, in the scale, and said he was willing to stand discredited before this House and the country if he did not establish his charges. Did he get the inquiry? Does any one suppose for a moment that if I were to imitate the course of the hon. member for Pictou, I would get an inquiry. No, the hon. gentleman would slide out of it by some means. He would probably set sail for England and stay there until the session was over.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. To avoid misunderstanding, I tell the hon. gentleman, on behalf of the government, that if he is prepared to make any charge of personal wrong-doing against the Minister of the Interior, he will have his committee within ten minutes after he makes the charge.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. These be brave cheers and brave words. Here are the charges made by the hon. member for Pictou. Let me read them :

That the Hon. Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior, has been guilty of scandalous neglect, delay and mismanagement in the administration of the department in the Yukon district.

That commissions to officers in the Yukon were issued illegally and without authority.

That the chief authority in the Yukon was reposed in a man whose official record did not justify an appointment to any position of trust.

That the Minister of the Interior had made incorrect and misleading statements on various occasions in this House.

That the mining inspectors, appointed in July, 1897, were incompetent and untrained, while one was a United States citizen and uncertified captain of a whaling vessel, and the other a livery stable-keeper.

That the government appointed, on the recommendation of Mr. Sifton, officials who were incapable and corrupt, to positions requiring experience and technical knowledge.

That the Minister of the Interior had been guilty of favouritism and partiality in the administration of the Yukon laws and regulations.

That a former law partner of the Minister of the Interior, while endeavouring to induce another to join him in Yukon mining ventures, represented in writing that Mr. Sifton and the chief commissioner were also interested with him, but that their names could not appear, as he wrote, 'for obvious reasons.'

That Mr. Sifton gave to his former partner a permit or authority, contrary to law, which the latter offered for sale for a large sum of money.

That gross abuses had prevailed in connection with liquor permits.

That official favouritism had been shown to a Chicago and Seattle trading company.

That the chief commissioner and head of the executive in the Yukon was guilty of misbehaviour in office, and of other great offences, permitting favourites to violate the law by trading on the Sabbath and selling liquor contrary to the law.

That a lawyer, friendly to the minister, was enabled to charge large sums to secure the good offices of the minister in respect of liquor permits issued contrary to law.

That the chief commissioner illegally exempted individuals from the law and regulations respecting the payment of royalties.

That the Crown prosecutor appointed by Mr. Sifton, appeared before the court of the district and the gold commissioner as the paid advocate of private parties having business transactions with the government.

That the gold commissioner's legal adviser accepted retainers and fees for procuring or promising to procure grants or titles or possession of Dominion lands or mining claims.

That an officer of the government was guilty of blackmailing persons engaged in the sale of liquors and the keeping of gambling saloons.

That officials in the employment of the Canadian government in the Yukon were guilty directly and indirectly of accepting gifts, promises and considerations for their assistance and influence in procuring mining claims and other interests and information from public officers and public records, contrary to the Criminal Code.

That officials have been guilty of fraud and breaches of trust.

That official records were kept secret, so that among other abuses that prevailed was one by which, after application for a mining claim was made, the property, if found to be of value, was staked and recorded in the name of another than the first and rightful applicant.

That private fees were exacted for public work.

That a system of bribery among government officials was rendered necessary by inability otherwise to get them to perform their duties.

That blackmail by officials of persons applying for claims prevailed.

That unfair and fraudulent use was made by officials of knowledge obtained in the discharge of their duties.

That similar crimes and offences as mentioned above, pertained also to the disposal of timber by inspectors and other officials.

That grave scandals and abuses occurred in the Department of Customs and Post Office Department, as represented in the Yukon.

Now, these were the charges, and the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) assumed the responsibility of them as I have shown. And what does the government do? The government votes them down and slides off by a little excuse, such as that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) has just made. If I were to accept the challenge made and make charges such as these against the department at this period of the session—or even supposing we were at the beginning of a session—we know very well that I should be met in the same way by the acting Minister of the Interior, and, in the end, should be voted down. And it will be remembered that when it came to the vote, the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and another hon. member who is no longer in this House, three strong Liberals, revolted from the government and voted against them. And what was the reason they gave? The hon. member for Lisgar, who represents a western constituency, whose people are aware, as those of eastern constituencies probably are not, of the scandals and calamities and corruptions and misdeeds that were rampant in the Yukon, said: How can I go back and say that I was in favour of a free and full investigation, if I am not ready to vote for this motion calling for investigation? And the hon. member for Alberta, whose constituency is near the Yukon and in close touch with it, called for inquiry and punishment, but was voted down. And what have we seen? Everybody knows that the hon. member for Pictou is not a man to abandon a serious responsibility when once he has taken it upon him. Everybody knows that he is a man with the courage of his convictions. It was well known that this year he would bring forward these charges; and not only that, but it was known that others would bring forward charges against the department which my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) thinks is so impeccable, and, on whose account he, at this stage of the session, challenges us and defies us. Then, what happens? The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) goes away, and he has remained away. But the ostensible cause for his going could not have detained him up to this time. And we never learned of his spreading his wings to cross the Atlantic until the rumour crossed those waters that the closing hours of parliament were at hand. And, therefore, we have been unable all this time to examine him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He will be here on Monday, in all human probability.

Mr. DAVIN. But suppose we want to examine him about the Burrows job, how shall we be able to do it? The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) knows that the time is set for the close of the session. When the session opened, the hon. member for Picton came forward, not with the old motion, but with these charges put separately and specifically, they were again voted down and no inquiry was given. It must be remembered that what the miners urgently called for was a commission of inquiry. The miners were the first to petition. The ministers know that in their council chamber they have petitions from the miners of Dawson sent in before a word was spoken in this House, asking for a commission of inquiry.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), of course wishes to be fair. He knows that the petition was dated the 25th of August; that petition was received, I think, on the 10th of September; and within five days after that the Royal Commission was issued.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, I know that the miners asked for a Royal Commission, and a Royal Commission was given—a brother-in-law of the minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Brother-in-law?

Mr. DAVIN. A word against Mr. Ogilvie I will not say—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is he a brother-in-law? I never heard it.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, he is a close relative.

Mr. INGRAM. He is his uncle.

Mr. DAVIN. This is like the case of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). When he was asked if Gauthier was a relative of his, he said 'No.' Then he was asked, 'Is he your son's father-in-law? His answer was, 'How can I help it if my sons have fathers-in-law?' The miners asked for bread and were given a stone; they asked for fish and were given—I will not say a serpent, but what they got was of no value to them. They asked a Royal Commission and they got Mr. Ogilvie as commissioner to inquire into their charges. And Mr. Ogilvie himself has admitted that he was not equipped either by legal knowledge or ability to draw the truth out of a witness, to be a commissioner. But suppose he were the best lawyer in Canada, the scope of the commission chronologically was so limited that it could not be effective. The miners refused to go before that commission. I will take

Mr. DAVIN.

an illustration from my hon. friend's (Sir Louis Davies's) profession. If he had to argue a reference when the order of reference was improperly made out, all his legal knowledge would avail him nothing; he would go there with a cord around his neck, knowing that the decision would be against him. The miners knew that before that commission they could not establish their case. Mr. Ogilvie himself wrote and apprised the government of the fact that the commission could not be as effective as the miners desired, owing to its limited scope. And he suggested, as I remember, that the scope of it should be extended. But that was never done. The commission reported. And what do we find here to-day? The acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) finds it necessary to come here with affidavits, the testimony of witnesses whom we cannot cross-examine, one of Louis Carbeno, contradicting point-blank what we find in the report, and one of Walsh contradicting the sworn statement of Fawcett. Does not this show conclusively that the commission could not bring out the truth in regard to these charges? What was needed at the beginning of the session, this commission having notoriously failed, was that we should have a judicial commission of inquiry that would sift these charges, charges of robbery—

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. DAVIN. What is braying over there? To sift these charges of misconduct to the utmost—that is what we needed. Now, that commissioner on whom the hon. gentleman builds his defence of the government, had originally from the government of Canada, \$1,800 a year; he got as commissioner of the Yukon, \$5,000. After he sends in this report he gets \$6,000 a year; he gets \$3,000 a year besides, and he gets \$720 a year besides—the whole amount he receives is \$11,000 a year. Was a man in the position, being a relative of the Minister of the Interior, and further, being an officer of that minister, and further, being in a position to be rewarded by that minister, as he was rewarded—was he in an independent position to pronounce judgment on the man whose conduct was assailed? Remember that all the charges of incapacity came to the minister at Ottawa. Why was the administration of the Yukon rampant with corruption? Because the heelers, the sluggers and the pluggers of the party, the confidants and the familiars of the Minister of the Interior, were swarming around him like bees round a sugar barrel; and they thought, being at that distance, they could do what they liked and make a vast haul; because they were like the ministerial father who created them, they were on the make, and the very moment they went up there they were determined to make as big a haul as they could. I say here that the people of Canada feel—and all the indignation of the acting Minister of the Interior will not drive that

feeling from their minds—that the Minister of the Interior himself, from the very moment he took that great office, has been as determined to be fruitful and multiply, in the sense of adding to his worldly wealth, as any minister, forgetful of his duty—

Mr. DOMVILLE. That is false.

Mr. DAVIN—ever could have been. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Interior is coming back after having been absent from this House and this country. I say that in the face of this matter, and in the face of other matters, his absence from this House is itself a thing from which the people of Canada will draw their own conclusions. In reading these affidavits, the acting Minister of the Interior was trying to counter-vail, as far as he could, the impression that has been made on the people of Canada; but, I tell him that the conduct of the government in shrinking from any inquiry is of itself a kind of confession of guilt that alone has made such an impression that it will take more than the efforts, great as they are, successful as they are, of my hon. friend the acting Minister of the Interior to remove.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). I doubt very much if the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) has given a moment's careful consideration to the obligation and duty which one member of this House owes to another member and to the House, I doubt if he has given a moment's thoughtful consideration to the honour, the good name and the fame and credit of Canada, when he undertook to repeat in this House the fould, dirty and violent insinuations of men who are either scoundrels or lunatics, contained in the letter which he has read to us this afternoon, and which I can qualify in no other terms than scandalous and infamous. If the hon. gentleman has given that subject a moment's careful consideration, then, I must say that his conception of his duties and of the respect that is due to this House, is one that I cannot approve, and I believe very few men in this House will agree with him. Now, it seems to me that party politics have got to a very sad pass when, in order to reap a doubtful party advantage, men will come into this House and repeat the wild, violent and grossly malicious talk indulged in on the street, in bar-rooms and in gambling dens. Sir, I protest against it as a member of this House. I must say that I was anything but edified this afternoon when I saw hon. gentlemen opposite listening to the vile stuff, which was read with evident delight and amusement. I do not propose to say anything more on that branch of the resolution; the acting Minister of the Interior, in a speech full of information, full of vigour, full of patriotism, resented these foul charges, and I think, in a clear and conclusive manner, vindicated the administration of the department.

Now, I want to refer to a subject mentioned in the resolution, with which I am somewhat familiar, and upon which I want to give the House the benefit of my knowledge. But, before doing so, I would ask the hon. member for Pictou if, in mentioning my name in connection with the Anderson matter, he intended to make any charges against myself, and if that was his intention, I would like to know what the charge is.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The hon. gentleman has the resolution in his hands, he can read, I think. He has the advantage of having heard that read twice, and if his understanding is so defective that he cannot discover the meaning of the reference to himself, I am sorry to say that I cannot help him.

Mr. BELCOURT. I put a very fair and polite question to the hon. gentleman, and I got from him a very rude answer. I suppose the answer was rude because the hon. gentleman had no other answer to give, and he has made up in rudeness what he was lacking in information. I have read very attentively the resolution which is before me, and it is quite evident, so far as I can see, that no charge is made, and I suppose no charge was intended. But, I want to tell the House what I know about that particular matter. Mr. Robert Anderson, as described in the resolution, is a mining engineer from Sweden. Mr. Anderson went into the Yukon country in the early part of the winter of 1898, with the object of putting to profit the experience he had gained in mining in Australia and in South Africa; and he went out prospecting in the Yukon District. He discovered this ground at the lower end of Hunker Creek. It is a flat about two miles in extent, lying very low, which was discarded and passed over by every miner. All the claims on Hunker Creek were then staked out, and this part of the creek was discarded and passed by as of insufficient value to be staked as placer claims. Mr. Anderson prepared a petition, in which he represented to Mr. Fawcett, the gold commissioner, that this ground was not susceptible of being worked as an ordinary placer mine, and he made application for it in order that two miles of it might be worked under one management, as it required large and expensive machinery. Mr. Fawcett made a recommendation to the Minister of the Interior, and Mr. Anderson came to Ottawa and applied to the hon. Minister of the Interior for the claim. The firm of which I am a member acted as solicitors for him. An application was made to the hon. Minister of the Interior, and the hon. minister recommended to council that the grant should be made. I want to point out to the House the particular conditions upon which that grant was made. One of the conditions of the order in council was that machinery should be put upon the ground sufficient to work the property within one year, and

another was, that failure to work the property during any one year would entail the forfeiture of the whole claim. Mr. Anderson proceeded to England, and if there is any charge in this resolution of the hon. gentleman it is that Mr. Anderson went to England and sold the claim there. If there is anything at all in this long and tedious resolution in the nature of a charge about the Anderson matter, it is that Mr. Anderson was given a concession which he was allowed to sell in England. I fail absolutely to see how and why this is reprehensible in any sense. Mr. Anderson went to England, and from the time he got the order in council, in January, until December, he looked about to procure the capital necessary to work this property. He associated himself with some of the best men in London, and it was found that in order to work the claim to advantage it would require the formation of a company with a capital stock of £350,000. These gentlemen that I have referred to formed a company and subscribed between themselves £55,000. Where is the harm in that? Is there any hon. member in this House who would say that one individual could have found money sufficient to work a property of that kind? No one individual could have found £5,000. We want to procure all the capital we can legitimately secure to assist in the development of that country. Surely there is nothing wrong in that. I know from personal knowledge that this company has expended on that property at least \$150,000, and I know from personal knowledge that these gentlemen who put up their money to the amount of £55,000 or £60,000 have not yet received a single cent in return. They have put very expensive machinery on the property, and the claim would have remained unworked if these gentlemen had not put their money into it. The complaint made afterwards by some miners, when they found that Mr. Anderson had obtained the claim, is the usual complaint of disgruntled and disappointed miners. They had passed over this property and would have nothing to do with it, but the moment that Mr. Anderson discovered that it could be profitably worked, these men protested. That is the history of the Anderson matter, and I know, of my personal knowledge, that these facts cannot be controverted. I have had considerable to do with Yukon affairs, and I know from experience, professional and otherwise, that this is a most difficult country to govern, for reasons which are well known to this House, amongst them those of distance and of difficulties of communications; but there are reasons well known to professional men, and which become apparent the moment any one is in any way connected with the professional affairs of that country. Quite recently the hon. acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) was called upon to decide an appeal from the gold commis-

Mr. BELCOURT.

sioner's office. In that case the gold commissioner had declared that an entry which had been obtained by a man named McGregor, of a certain claim, had been obtained fraudulently. It was said that he had not staked the claim personally, and that he had obtained a fraudulent entry. There were nine or ten witnesses heard before the gold commissioner. They went before the gold commissioner and swore that McGregor had not been personally on the claim and that he had not staked the claim in person. As a result the gold commissioner was compelled to take the claim away from McGregor. McGregor appealed to Ottawa, and the appeal was heard here. A man named Stone, an adventurer, a solicitor from somewhere in the United States, and a man named Stanford, who was his pal, made affidavits which were sent to Ottawa, and which were presented when the appeal was heard. I will read a few paragraphs from these affidavits to show the House what kind of people are gathered in that country and how difficult it is to administer that country. Let me read one or two paragraphs from the affidavit of Stone. This is an affidavit made by Stone, on February 17, 1900. He says:

3. My evidence was untrue, in so far as it differed from the evidence of the defendant McGregor as to his personally stating the said creek claim No. 2, Magnet Gulch.

4. The said McGregor, the defendant, did stake said claim No. 2 on March 12, 1898, as sworn by him in his evidence given before the gold commissioner on the hearing of this protest, and I was personally present and saw the said McGregor stake the said claim.

This was one of the men who went before the gold commissioner and swore that McGregor had not staked the claim at all.

6. My evidence given before the gold commissioner, where it differs from the above, is untrue. The evidence of all the other witnesses called on behalf of the plaintiff, where it differs from the above, is also untrue.

10. The plaintiff's whole case was worked up by myself and the plaintiff and her said husband, with the assistance of Walter Stanford, also a witness called on behalf of the plaintiff. All of the witnesses were obtained by myself with the assistance of said Stanford, and all the evidence, in so far as it goes to show that the defendant McGregor never went to the above claim No. 25, below on Bonanza, on March 12, 1898, and all evidence which states or implies that said defendant McGregor remained in my cabin upon claim No. 25, and that I went alone to Magnet Gulch, is untrue.

12. The evidence of every witness called on behalf of the plaintiff was manufactured by myself, assisted by M. J. Kelly, the plaintiff, E. L. Kelly, and Walter Stanford. Said evidence was often rehearsed before the trial in the gold commissioner's court, at the plaintiff's cabin in Dawson, and in her presence.

These are the kind of people, some of them, at all events, that are in that country. I want to read one or two paragraphs from the affidavit of Stanford:

3. The evidence given by me on said protest, where it stated that on March 12, 1898, the day

the defendant McGregor staked the claim in question, the witness Stone and McGregor came out of the cabin upon No. 25 below on Bonanza, and spoke for a few minutes, and that the defendant McGregor returned to the cabin and said Stone then went up Bonanza, was untrue. The said McGregor did not return to the cabin, but accompanied the said Stone up Bonanza.

4. The evidence given by me before the gold commissioner on the said protest, where I stated that I followed the said Stone up Magnet Gulch and saw him writing on a stake upon No. 3, was untrue. I did not follow the said Stone up Magnet Gulch, nor did I see him writing upon the lower stake of No. 2. I did not see either Stone or McGregor after they left the cabin upon No. 25, and started up Bonanza Creek, until they returned together late in the afternoon of the same day.

5. I never saw Stone write upon any stake on Magnet Gulch, either on claim No. 2 or No. 3 on said March 12, 1898, nor was I with Stone upon said Gulch on that day.

6. With reference to the evidence of all the witnesses called on behalf of the plaintiff, such evidence was obtained by said Stone and myself. All such evidence, in so far as it goes to show that the defendant McGregor did not go above claim No. 25 below on Bonanza on said March 12, 1898, and in so far as it states or implies that said McGregor remained in our cabin upon said claim No. 25 below on Bonanza, is untrue.

11. The plaintiff's whole case was worked up by myself and said Stone, and the plaintiff's husband and the plaintiff herself. All of the witnesses were obtained by myself and said Stone, with the assistance of the plaintiff and her husband.

12. The evidence of every witness called on behalf of the plaintiff was manufactured by the said Stone and myself, assisted by the plaintiff and her husband, and said evidence was often rehearsed before the trial in the gold commissioner's office at the plaintiff's cabin in Dawson.

It would not, I imagine, require much evidence of this sort to satisfy hon. gentlemen that in addition to the other difficulties of administering the Yukon, this kind of thing renders the administration all the more difficult. To my mind the foul and violent language of the letter incorporated in the amendment constitutes the best answer to the wicked and wanton charges made and is a sufficient refutation of the statements it contains. In my opinion the administration of the Yukon for the last four years has been remarkably successful. The department took charge of a new country, the conditions of which were absolutely unknown; it had to be governed at a great distance from Ottawa; there were large interests at stake, calling for most careful attention; people came there from all quarters of the world, most of them not British subjects, and they had to be looked after very carefully. All this made the administration of the Yukon difficult. I have had some personal experience of the Department of the Interior professionally and otherwise since I came to Ottawa, and, in my judgment, the department has never been more efficiently and more progressively administered than it has been by the Hon. Mr.

Sifton. It has not only been efficiently administered, but it has been administered so as to be productive of the best results. The experience of the Minister of the Interior, his hard work, his untiring energy, have brought about in his department results which are a credit, not only to himself, but to the government, and to the country as well. I imagine that the success of his administration is the chief reason why hon. gentlemen opposite are so vicious when the department of Mr. Sifton is up for consideration. There is no other way to account for the fact that an hon. gentleman like the member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), who, I believe, is a mild and genial gentleman, would forget himself to the extent he did this afternoon, in reading the foul, infamous and scandalous letter to which we were obliged to listen.

Mr. T. D. CRAIG (East Durham). I am sure we must all be edified by the lecture given us by the member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), on political partisanship and morality, and so forth. Hon. gentlemen supporting the government have imputed a great many motives to the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and to the junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), for having brought this matter to the attention of the House. They have declared that the motives of these gentlemen are entirely political, and that their object is to injure the Liberal party. Well, what is wrong about that? For five years I listened here to speeches made by the Liberals when in opposition, and the whole object of these speeches was to injure the Conservative party. It made no difference whatever whether there was any foundation for the charges which the Liberals then made, so long as they thought they could impress the people of the country with the idea that the Conservatives were as bad as they said they were. However that may be, these gentlemen opposite have no right to attribute any but the highest motives to the hon. gentleman from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). He has been obliged to leave for home, but he has gone to a great deal of trouble to collect these facts and to place them before the people of Canada. I admit that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) took up a great deal of time last session and this session, in making these charges. But gentlemen opposite have no reason to complain of that, because if the government had been willing in the first place to grant a commission to investigate these charges, as they should have done, then all this time would have been saved. What we ask on this side of the House is, that a Judicial Commission shall be appointed by the government to investigate these grave charges. What is and what was the answer of the government to that demand? First of all, the government said to us: Take the respon-

sibility of making definite charges on the floor of this House, and then we will give you a commission without five minutes' hesitation. Judging from that statement of the government, it looked as if there was nothing to conceal and it sounded well to have it published in the newspapers of the country. But what happened? The senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) did make his charges, and he made them as definitely as charges could possibly be made. He charged the Minister of the Interior with mismanagement, and he charged most of the officials in the Yukon with mismanagement, and in some cases with corruption. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) told the government that if he could not prove these charges before a Judicial Commission, he was willing to retire from public life, but did the government grant a commission, as they promised? Not at all. They called on their followers to vote down the demand for a commission of inquiry, and to-day they turn round and offer the lame excuse, that what they wanted, was for some one on this side to make a personal charge against the honesty of the Minister of the Interior. That indeed was a strange request from the government, and it is not at all necessary, in my opinion, to justify the issue of a commission to investigate the grave charges formulated. We have charged mismanagement. We have charged that officials appointed by the Minister of the Interior, have been corrupt, and that he has retained them in office. We have charged these officials with bribery. We have charged that there has been favouritism towards friends of the government; we have charged that a partner of the Minister of the Interior received favours from him; surely these charges are definite enough and surely they are brought pretty close to the minister. What a humiliating position for the government to take in a grave matter of this kind. The acting minister (Mr. Sutherland) was very indignant at the junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), for making these charges to-day, because he said they would injure the country. Why, the acting minister (Mr. Sutherland), must have been blind and deaf for a year or more, if he does not know that these charges have been made in the public press, and as for any injury which might come from publishing them in the English press, does he not know that the correspondent of the *London Times* made the charges in that influential journal, and that they were circulated all over England. Why, Sir, if the government did what was right, instead of casting imputations on the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) for making these charges here, and giving the government an opportunity to deny and investigate them, they would congratulate him on the service which he has rendered to Canada. Not only did the *London Times* make these charges, but a Mr. Miller, of Pembroke, a supporter

of the Liberal party, went to the Yukon, and wrote a letter to his newspaper, in which he made serious charges against the officials of this government. What happened to him? His motives were not impugned. He was silenced by getting a government appointment. That of itself looks rather suspicious.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am rather surprised that when these grave charges were made by the hon. senior member for Pictou, the government did not at once appoint a judicial commission to investigate them, and why? Because if a judicial commission had investigated these charges, and it had been proven that the officials of the government had conducted affairs in that country properly, the result would have been not only that the government would have been vindicated before the country, but that the hon. member for Pictou would have been discredited, and, according to his own declaration, would have lost his seat in this House, and any chance of promotion in official life in this country. He took that risk when he made these charges; he offered that challenge to the government; but they were not ready to take it up. What is the effect on the public mind of this country? I know that if I were not in parliament, and read these charges, and saw that the government refused to have them investigated, but were satisfied to stand up in this House and deny them, not on their own evidence, but on the evidence of the very officials who were charged, I would begin to think there was something seriously wrong. The acting Minister of the Interior reproached the hon. junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) with making these charges on hearsay evidence. I maintain that everything the hon. gentleman himself has said to us to-day, is on hearsay evidence, and hearsay evidence of a less credible kind than that on which the hon. junior member for Pictou based his charges; and why? Because the letters and affidavits which he read are from the very parties accused. I can easily imagine a man who is accused, being heard on his own behalf; but I am not willing to accept his evidence as final and conclusive. I want to place him on trial; and we wanted to place these men on trial before a judicial commission. The acting minister says: 'I do not want to place these men on trial, if they say they are not guilty, I do not want to investigate any further; I am satisfied; and I think the members on the opposite side ought to be satisfied too.' Well, we are not satisfied, and we do not think the people of the country will be satisfied. I have no doubt there are men so partisan that they will accept anything from their own side; but the great mass of the people want to know the truth; and when they read these charges, they will say: 'We think there is something in these charges, and why should not the government have them in-

investigated by an independent judicial commission? What is the reason they are not willing to do so?' I suppose we may be told there is the cost. The cost does not amount to anything in a matter of this kind. They talk about the fair fame of Canada. If they want to vindicate the fair fame of Canada, they should grant this judicial commission, and have this investigation. The fair fame of Canada would be vindicated, if it were shown that everything was right. If it were proved that these men were guilty and they were punished, then the fair fame of Canada would be vindicated. But when we find very serious charges definitely made by a member of high standing in this House and in the country, it will not do for the government to say: 'We know where these charges come from; they are made for political effect, and we will not have anything to do with them; if they wish to make a charge against the honesty of the Minister of the Interior, let them make it, and they will get a commission in five minutes.' We do not propose to do any such thing. We make charges against officials who have not conducted the administration of affairs honestly. But if the government are not going to grant this commission, they can vote down the resolution, and the people of the country will have to judge for themselves who is right and who is wrong.

Mr. JAMES DOMVILLE (King's, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, when a man goes into a business of some kind, such as lecturing, I suppose he has to put in the time with something. I never was a paid lecturer myself, and that is perhaps the reason why the House is not bored with me all the time. Had I gone into that profession, I suppose I would have been so influenced by the *cacoethes loquendi* that I would have found it necessary to talk all the time. After sitting here for five months, it is like playing football at one time of the year, and cricket at another time. We have had a great blowing off of wind, a lot of eloquence. Some of us will be able to go home and point to what we said in parliament. Nobody cares one iota. Some gentlemen will attack the government for this, that and the other. The people will not believe them. They will say, you have, no doubt, made that statement in the House, but you were in a peculiar position there; you got free postage, free paper, and free advertising through *Hansard*, which you could not get in any other way—the press would not take it up. Gentlemen here—I presume it is within the rules of the House to say gentlemen, although hon. members is the correct expression, and not gentlemen—take advantage of their position to damage the country with their speeches. After five months, cannot we get down to a little common sense in this House? This is not a political idea at all. I could take the gentlemen on the other side of the House, and label them like the horses I saw running in Toronto the other

day: No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, No. 4. One jockey had a blue jacket with white stripes, another a red, another a green. Could we not get all these men together, and put them in the Railway Committee room, and let them talk to one another, fling their hands about, and throw themselves at the Speaker; could we not confine them there, and let them do what they want, so that we could get on with the public business? The opposition have a right to say what they like. They are here to fill a position; that position is an honourable one; they have been destined by the people of this country to go into opposition and stay there. They had not been there more than a few months in 1896, when they tried to impress the country that they were the right men for the government, and that the country had no right to put them out, and they have been trying to do it ever since. Why not let the people of this country judge for themselves? Do not be too precipitate; allow the cake to cook; do not want to get back so quickly. I see my hon. friend from York looking at me, why should they not take him back to King's County at the next election? The people there do not want him, but still he might go down and try his chances. But he did not elect to try that county at the last election, but went away to York with his carpet bag and secretary, and his secretary's carpet bag. If we were to go into all these charges, where would we stand?

Mr. CLANCY. On your head.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) laughs. Would he like to have charges made against him? Would the hon. member for York like to be charged, and some more gentlemen on that side? No, but there is a clique in this House, like a little school association in a country district, quite willing to fling charges broadcast. They will not stop at any kind of wild charges in the hope of putting the government out.

We hear a great deal about the Yukon from gentlemen who have never been there and know nothing about it except what they have crammed from books in the library. Some of these hon. gentlemen make quite good speeches on the Yukon, which shows great industry on their part collecting other people's ideas. The art of stealing somebody's brains is one which is brought to a great stage of perfection in this House. I know a number of hon. gentlemen who have done very well on it. It may be all right to steal other people's brains, but I have tried to view this matter from the standpoint on which the great public will look at it. Here is the Yukon territory. Probably I know as much about it as anybody in this House, and more than most of them. People went in there from all parts of the world trying to win gold—not brass. And what were the conditions? Food was scarce. We had to

see whether we could get food enough to keep the people alive. The American government sent reindeer out there and devised many plans to supply food for American Alaska.

Mr. PRIOR. Emergency food.

Mr. DOMVILLE. My hon. friend from Victoria says 'emergency food.' I have seen the day when the hon. member would have been glad to eat it. We were dealing with a country where it was very difficult to lay down any hard and fast lines as to what should have been done to keep things right. Take these charges. Why should Col. Steele be charged, by implication if not by fact. Col. Steele is at the front, in South Africa. We see by the telegraphic despatches how gallant a part he is taking in the struggle there, but still he must come under the condemnation of hon. members opposite because they want to make a point against the government. Is there nobody on this side of the House that can be credited with any decency, and have the opposite side a monopoly of all the virtues and decencies? I am addressing myself to the leader of the opposition, the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) to-night. I ask him why he should indulge in this business of throwing stones. He ought not to forget the adage that applies to certain people to whom such a practice is likely to be dangerous. Do you suppose for a moment that the good common sense people in Canada are going to take any stock in these charges? No, they will glance over them in *Hansard* and ask each other: What are these people gammoning about? And they will not be slow to draw their own conclusions, which will be simply this, that a certain set of gentlemen who were in power many years and who feel that they were unjustly turned out of power, want to get back again, against the will of the people, and think, by the use of such sophistical charges, to induce the people to send them back. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that that fly will catch on? No, Sir. When you throw your fly for a salmon and you have hooked your salmon and then lost him, you have to sit at your pool quite a long while and put on another fly before you can attract the salmon again. You must try a new fly—a dark fly on a bright day and a bright fly on a dark day. You have to try something the fish will take. These hon. gentlemen opposite have not got the right fly yet. My hon. friend from York knows they have not. They have the spider but not the fly.

Why should they attack Major Walsh? Major Walsh is no personal friend of mine, and I have no particular feeling in his favour except from seeing him in the Yukon and believing he should have somebody in this House man enough to stand up and defend him. Major Walsh is not a man you could attack with impunity outside or in the

Mr. DOMVILLE.

corridors. He can take his own part anywhere except in the precincts of parliament, but here he cannot do anything because those who attack him are too well protected. I would say to these hon. gentlemen to bear in mind the advice in the Book to which we all ought to give more study: 'Let him that is without sin throw the first stone.' If Major Walsh has been injudicious, if he has made mistakes, why should he be attacked here, where he has no opportunity to defend himself? I say that such attacks are unmanly and cowardly. As to Mr. Ogilvie, and his connection by marriage, I know nothing about it, but I do know this. I come down to the 29th section of the complaint. There is a charge beginning here, 'gambling is a crime in Canada. What is gambling? Is it putting a chip on a roulette board and seeing what you will get, or is it getting stock in a mine in order to get other people in to pay for their stock, when you get yours for nothing? My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) looks at me. I thought perhaps he would ask me some questions. We read here that saloons in Dawson are a secret monopoly from which the government gets money. That is false, and everybody knows it. Then we are told of houses of ill-fame. What do they know about this, Mr. Speaker? How do they get the information? Have they been there? The answer is that they have not, because they are here. They have not been there, but they have been here. Is there any community that we know of where there is not something wrong? Why is everything made an excuse for throwing dirt at the government? They have been four and a half years in power, and in that time the country has made greater progress than at any other time. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) talks of scandal—we have scandal from him all this session. Statements in these charges are attributed to Dr. Good. I know him well; he is a thorough gentleman, and would not say anything but what he thought was right. But, on the other hand, he is a most prejudiced Conservative. But why not take the evidence of people here who have been in Dawson? Everybody went into that country. I have a boy who came from Dawson after selling a property there. After he left, they took out on that property the biggest nugget ever found in the Yukon—seventy-seven ounces of gold. Mr. Speaker, they might as well have said the government had given him that property, and that he had got this big nugget out of it. Unfortunately, he did not get it. It would be better if we could get down to some other basis on this whole matter. Let us recognize the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite, led to-night by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) want to get into power. Let them make a square fight on that plea. Let us get all these charges set

before us, then give us, say until to-morrow, and take a vote on them—and let us go home to our families, those of us who have families to go to. These hon. gentlemen should remember that those against whom these charges are made have feelings, and the members of their families, and their friends had feelings. Is it right that they are to be slandered, that every man in that country is to be tasked as a rascal? Hon. gentlemen opposite speak as if they had made that country. They did not do anything for that country. It is very much as in the case of South Africa—they had a great deal to say, but none of them went there. All this talk of scandal, whatever may be its object, has the effect of injuring Canada. Why should it be continued? We have been here for nearly five months; and why cannot we agree to disagree, and not continue this talk of scandal which will cause our country to be unfavourably judged abroad? Hon. gentlemen opposite think they will put the government out of power on this Yukon question. But the whole thing is exhausted, and nobody takes any stock in it. Would it not be better if we could unite to show the world that above our desire to get into office we have pride in being Canadians, and that when a Canadian is struck at we will defend him. Let us unite to build up the Yukon country. It is but a gamble at the best, because we do not know what will come out of it. We should unite to bring credit to our country rather than infamy. Because, after all, it is the people who send this cabinet here, and who keep this party in power. The people may be wrong, and the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) right—I have no doubt he knows more than all the people of Canada, and thinks himself quite fit to lead them, to dictate to them. But would it not be better if he and his friends would seek to advance the reputation of their country instead of casting slurs upon public officers who are not able to defend themselves. Instead of trying to cause the world to look upon Canada as corrupt from top to bottom, let them seek to have Canada regarded as a country of pure men and pure women.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). Most of the matters that are mentioned in this resolution have been fully dealt with by the acting Minister of the Interior; and I think the House will agree, I think even the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution and the hon. gentleman who seconded it, will agree that there has been put into your hands in the shape of a resolution one of the most disgraceful documents that was ever read in parliament. If those hon. gentlemen thought it was necessary that certain things should be alluded to, there was another way open to them, they could have availed themselves of the opportunity without reading the letter from that man in its full text,

they could have made the points which are contained in it in language which, at any rate, would not have so much disgraced the public records of this country. But they thought differently, and they have put upon the records of this House that which any one would be ashamed to read in the presence of any gathering of gentlemen, and they have asked this House to endorse it. Well, I do not need to go into that matter any further. It seems to me, as the acting Minister of the Interior has said, that the language of that letter is the language of a man who is not perfectly sane, indeed I think it would be charitable to him to take that view, for if we take any other view you have to come to the conclusion that he was wholly vicious.

But there is in this resolution a charge against the North-west Mounted Police in their capacity as officers of the Customs Department, to which I wish to allude, and with the permission of the House I will read that portion of the resolution, and make some comments upon it. I must express my surprise at the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), a gentleman who in times past has been pleased to say that the members of the North-west Mounted Police were men of honour, men of character, now saying by speech as well as by his vote—for I suppose he will vote for this resolution—that these men are corrupt and unworthy of holding their positions. If he takes the position that Inspector Cartwright, Inspector Strickland and Major Steele are corrupt men—

Mr. DAVIN. No.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. Yes, he has sanctioned this, or will do so if he votes for it. If he charges these men with corruption the force will take note of it. I will read you what is said with reference to that:

That in addition to the statements formally made in this House during the past session, the following statements are now brought to the attention of this House—

Reiterated when these men are away fighting for their Queen in South Africa.

That one J. E. Whiteside was sent by Collector Milne of Victoria to Skagway on February 24, 1898, and subsequently he was transferred for service at White Pass. He left the service on May 27, 1898.

(‘Hansard,’ 1900, p. 6797.)

That Mr. Whiteside has since then been a member of the firm of J. E. Whiteside & Co., real estate, mining and customs brokers in Dawson.

That Mr. Whiteside has advised a member of this House as follows:

‘The following few facts are given to you with the understanding that I am not seeking for political favours, but rather that it is necessary that the country should know how things were carried on both at the summits of White Pass and Chilkoot by the collector of customs during the spring of 1898, and one item I can vouch for that was ignored and pooh-pooed at

royal farce held at Dawson by the Hon. Mr. Ogilvie.

I was, as you are aware, sent by Collector Milne to Skagway as a Canadian bureau of information to aid intending prospectors to pass through the American customs. How I performed that work, I leave others to tell you, but I might say that one American gentleman from Dawson told me on his return in that I was the first official he met who was honest, and afterwards, when I was in Dawson, he told me I could not make money in consequence. Concerning the collection of duties at the summit of White Pass. I was sent there by Col. Steele after I had reported to Collector Milne in detail. I found the state of affairs just as I had reported there, and in consequence of doing my duty as a customs officer, I was treated as a spy by the officers in charge. This latter fact was written by the officer commanding the post to Col. Steele, who told me of it. I numbered the entries and entered up the cash-book, which was not done before. The book is now in Ottawa. There were two items entered up twice in cash-book, and yet the cash balanced. I was never allowed to check the cash; I asked twice, but was refused. The first item that was found entered twice I altered and reported as clerical error to Col. Steele. The second I refused to alter, but it was manipulated at night by the officer commanding and his sergeant, who lived in the hut—I, as a customs clerk, having to live in a tent. The business method I introduced was never adopted.

They solemnly put this down as a charge upon which they want a judicial investigation. This man Whiteside says:

Concerning the Chilkoot Pass, I only have information from prospectors, and they told me in Dawson that they never paid for one-half of goods. Invoices and so forth were torn up and put away by brokers and others. I was informed a few days ago that entries were missing, invoices, and in fact chaos reigned supreme. Concerning the administration at Dawson, it was scandalous in the summer of 1898. In the first place passes by the side door were given and signed in my own case by the health officer.

I made out a report of customs work for Major Walsh in detail, and said report to be delivered to the Minister of Customs. Has that report ever reached its destination?

That is with reference to Mr. Whiteside. Then there is another gentleman who gives evidence:

That one, J. J. Seabrook, writing to his father on October 16, 1899, from Dawson, said:

'First, the intended miner in the spring of 1898 was informed by the people in Seattle that they would have to pay very little if any duty, as the collector of customs on the Summit was so loose that \$5 or \$10 would let any one through. Seattle sent men up who brought back this information, which is only too true. I would estimate that Canada had lost in customs \$500,000. Many have told me that they would have outfitted in British towns if Seattle had not advised them in reference to the slackness of the Canadian customs. The rush is over, still the bulk of trade is from the United States, where it will remain until the customs are enforced. There must be a million dollars' worth of machinery in here from the States. . . . I have got good authority for all I am writing.'

That is all that is contained in this document with reference to the administration of the customs in the Yukon.

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. DAVIN. Where is the charge against Col. Steele?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will tell the hon. gentleman where the charge is. These gentlemen who were acting for the customs in the spring of 1898, are here charged with looseness of method, are here charged with being responsible for a loss of revenue, and this Mr. Seabrook states that the customs of this country have been defrauded for \$500,000, and that these officers were approachable if you would only give them \$5 or \$10 each.

The officers in charge of these passes were Inspector Cartwright and Inspector Strickland.

Mr. DAVIN. I venture to say that these gentlemen would welcome an inquiry.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We will see whether Inspector Strickland will welcome the hon. member for Assiniboia back when he votes for this resolution. When he votes for this resolution he goes the length of saying that the word of this man Seabrook, whom no one knows, is sufficient to damage the character of Inspector Strickland, that he justifies the charges against Inspector Strickland. I do not think much of this man's statement.

Mr. DAVIN. Nor do I.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Every hon. gentleman on that side of the House who votes for this resolution endorses this statement of this man Whiteside, and every hon. gentleman stands here as charging Inspector Strickland and Inspector Cartwright, men who stand high in this country—

Mr. DAVIN. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Do they not stand high?

Mr. PRIOR. They do not stand any higher than Mr. Whiteside.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is the hon. gentleman's opinion of the officers of the North-west Mounted Police. Let him place this stigma on the men who are away in South Africa, who have volunteered for the defence of the empire, let him place them in that position if he chooses.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder, louder.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am speaking sufficiently loud for hon. gentlemen to hear. I want to speak sufficiently loud that the country will hear. I want the country to judge whether the word of Whiteside is to be taken against the word of two officers who stand high in the estimation of their fellowmen, and the hon. member for Assiniboia dare not deny that they stand in the highest rank amongst the citizens of Canada. I think the hon. gentleman will not deny that Col. Steele occupies a position of prominence in this

country. When Lord Strathcona made that munificent offer to send 500 mounted troops to help to fight for the Queen in South Africa, he selected Col. Steele as the man to lead these men. Col. Steele was the superior officer of Inspectors Cartwright and Strickland, who were doing duty on the Summits, and when this man Whiteside preferred his charges, Col. Steele had an investigation of these charges, and he reported that there was not an atom of truth in them. If the hon. member for Assiniboia votes for this resolution he will vote that Col. Steele's word is not to be taken against the word of Whiteside, but that the word of Whiteside is to be taken against the characters of two of the finest officers in this Dominion. Well, it has been proved before their superior officer that the statements of this man were untrue. More than that, Col. Steele reported the result of his inquiry to the collector of customs, than whom there is no man in the service of the Customs Department who stands higher in the estimation of my predecessors in office, and in the estimation, I venture to say, of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior), than the collector of customs in Victoria.

Mr. PRIOR. What about him?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The collector of customs in Victoria says—

Mr. PRIOR. Do not get excited.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not getting at all excited. I do not deny that I am a little indignant that the best men in this country should be slandered, Mr. Speaker, by resolutions put into your hands and put upon a page of the history of this country. Collector Milne, in a report in reference to this man Whiteside, states:

Re Charges by John E. Whiteside.

Collector Milne, Victoria, June 8, 1898, reports:

This person has been writing some disagreeable things about the North-west Mounted Police, which no one would give the slightest credence, as Inspectors Strickland and Cartwright are both highly honourable men, and I believe they have endeavoured to do their duty under trying circumstances.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) express his belief in the statements of Whiteside?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I suppose he will. He will, if he votes for the resolution, and so will any one who votes for that resolution, as he is evidently prepared to do. I suppose that the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) will not be prepared now to vote for this resolution after his remarks. It says that this man Seabrook, whom nobody knows, wrote a letter to his father, in which he said that \$500,000 had been lost to the Customs Department.

Mr. DAVIN. When did I say that?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Tonight.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I did not.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, the hon. gentleman virtually said so. Here is this man Seabrook, that we know nothing about, who makes this absurd statement that \$500,000 has been lost to the Customs Department, and that men like Inspector Strickland and Inspector Cartwright, who were in charge of these posts, could be induced, by \$5 or \$10, by certain parties, to allow these goods to go through. On the mere statement of a man like that the hon. member for Western Assiniboia says that Inspectors Strickland and Cartwright ought to be delighted at the opportunity of having an investigation to prove that this man lied in reference to them. Does he not know now that this man lied? Does he believe that he did? I ask him if he believes Seabrook. If he does not, why does he make a charge of this kind? If he does not, he has no right to vote for this resolution. I have nothing more to say in reference to the Department of Customs. I have given the House the facts, the resolution may go before the House, and those who are willing to take the responsibility of backing up these unsustained charges against these men, who stand high in the estimation of their fellow-countrymen, who are risking their lives in the service of their country, and who are bravely doing their duty, take upon themselves a responsibility that involves a course which I, for one, cannot endorse.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to lay the report from Collector Milne, and the other report from which he quoted, on the Table of the House.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, I will lay the extracts I have quoted from on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I want the report from which the hon. gentleman has quoted. I do not want simply a line taken out from it. I want the whole report.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman will find this a little stronger than I put it. I thought I would lead hon. gentlemen, perhaps, into this.

Bennett, N.W.T., June 28, 1898.

To the Controller  
North-west Mounted Police,  
Ottawa.

Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 25th ult., re Mr. Clute, I have the honour to point out that the customs officers previously sent to this country from Victoria made a point, from the date of their arrival, to endeavour to ruin the reputations of the officers of the North-west Mounted Police stationed on the Summits.

One John E. Whiteside was sent up from Skagway, for what purpose I know not, unless

it was to obtain private information on the merest hearsay.

He wrote some of the most atrocious letters that I ever read—false, vile, officious emanations from his own disordered brain.

A good deal of correspondence has passed between myself and Collector Milne with reference to letters of this sort, and he appears to have placed no credence in these false reports, but I would respectfully suggest that he be called upon to send through his departmental head to the hon. the Minister of the Interior copies of all letters on this subject which have passed between him and the said Whiteside; also copies of all letters between him and other parties in reference to this matter.

I have looked into every accusation which has been made, and find out that there is not an atom of truth in any of the charges.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) S. B. STEELE,

Supt. Commanding Upper Yukon District.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister referred to a report from Collector Milne, and made statements with reference to it. The House is entitled to that report as well.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not that with me; I have an extract from it here.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to have the ruling of the Chair on that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not objecting, but I cannot give it to you, when I have not got it here. This is the extract given by the Commissioner of Customs, which I read.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take up very much time in the remarks that I shall make with reference to this motion. The Minister of Customs, who has entertained the House to a most excellent hustings speech of the pattern which he most approves, and to which I suppose he is much wedded as an instrument of power in his canvassing tours; has not, however, by that hustings speech, gone at all to the kernel of the matter which we have been discussing, or ought to be discussing here to-day.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I thought I got pretty near the kernel.

Mr. FOSTER. You will have to have some correspondence with the Minister of Militia and Defence, before you get near an honorary 'coloneley,' but there are plenty of them going around, and the hon. gentleman may live in hopes. The answer of the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) to the statement of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell), and to the resolution which he submitted to the House, was rather an answer in a peculiar way to statements which had been made in previous debates and in previous years, and it was an answer consisting chiefly of statements, with some affidavits, from gentlemen who do not belong to this House, and who took that method of

contradicting statements which had been made by members of this House in previous debates. Now, Sir, we had the Speaker's ruling on that, and we had to bow to it. But, I think I will be supported in this by all level-headed members of this House when I make the statement that it is not a proper way to try charges which are preferred on the responsibility of a member, and as to which the member when he makes these charges gives the evidence by which he proposes to support them, and asks for a proper commission to adjudicate upon them; I say that there are not many members in this House who will support the proposition, that a sufficient answer to these charges is to refuse a judicial commission, and to attempt to refute them by affidavits and statements made by the parties who are accused. No person will maintain that a trial conducted in that manner can be considered a sufficient trial. One of the rights of a member in this House is to make, consistently, with what he considers his duty to the public interest, any statements and draw the attention of the government to these statements. He is not obliged to prove the truth of the statements to which he calls the attention of the government, but it is sufficient for him, in the discharge of his whole duty, if he believes that they form a substratum upon which to challenge the attention of the government, and upon which to ask for an inquiry in order that the truth may be known. That is a fair position to take. No lawyer who takes up a case to be carried before a legal tribunal, is absolutely certain of all he proposes to prove, but he satisfies himself that he has fair and reasonable evidence, and upon that he goes to trial, and upon that evidence, sworn and tested by cross-examination, his case stands or falls. Every member of the House will, I think, agree with me, that you do not have to call a minister a thief or a rogue in order that the government should take some notice of the charges that you make as to the condition of that minister's department, or the methods of his administration. It is one thing to charge a minister with stealing the public funds, or with any other crime known to the criminal calendar, but it is quite another thing to charge that the department is being maladministered, and to demand that the charge shall be looked into before a proper tribunal. To-day the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland), and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), put up an admirable piece of bluff, it has been said, when in this the last of the fifth month of the session they said: Bring down your charges of personal dishonesty against the Minister of the Interior, and you shall have your commission within fifteen minutes. Why, Sir, have we come to this pass in the carrying out of responsible administration, that a government will sit secure on the Treasury benches, having confidence in its following

Mr. PATERSON.

behind it, and will refuse to investigate before a competent tribunal any charges that may be made with reference to the administration of the different departments of government, provided that you stop short of charging the minister with actual thievery and subordination in his office. Has it come to that? They ask us to make our charges. Why, Sir, for two years charges have been made in this House in the most responsible way. I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), or any other minister: If the charges preferred by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper had been put before a Royal Commission and had been proven, could the Minister of the Interior have retained his seat in this House as a member of any government in this country? There is a simple way of testing it. A man may be a minister in a department; he may not have stolen the public money, but he may have so erred in his administration; he may have by negligence, culpable or otherwise, made it possible that his department has been, in its administrative details, full of everything that is against the best interests of the country; but the very moment that is proved against the minister, that very moment he must shoulder the responsibility; and if he is culpably negligent, no cabinet can keep him within its confines, and no electorate will condone his offence. Make your charges, they say. The charges have been made here by a responsible member of this House over and over again; and the reputation, the place and future prospects of that member in this House and in this country have been pledged upon his being able to prove those charges or his not being able to prove them. No more responsible and definite charges have ever been made in this House against the administration of any department than have been made by the senior member for Pictou against the Department and the Minister of the Interior. And, Sir, for two years the hon. member for Pictou has been making those charges, and he has been adding to them evidence upon which he proposes to prove them, until the great accusation against him has been that he has taken up too much of the time of the House, that he has been too prolix, that he has run too much into detail, that there is so much of it that it confuses the mind. But that the charges were not definite, that they were not backed up by the hon. gentleman's reputation, his place in this House as a member, his future as a public man in this country, no one on either side of the House can for a moment assert; and after two years have passed by, and the ministry individually and collectively have refused to give him the simple machinery he has asked for, a judicial commission, now at this, the end of the fifth month of the session, after that hon. gentleman has had to go from the House, these gentlemen get up and declare in stentorian tones, 'Make your

charges, and you shall have your commission inside of fifteen minutes.' Why, the thing is so transparent that I wonder that gentlemen lose five minutes in making such a transparent bluff as that. What were the reasons why these gentlemen should have given an inquiry? What have we been treated to since the first of these rumours, the first of this information, the first of these charges began to percolate from the distant regions of the Yukon into every portion of Canada, every portion of the empire, yes, and every portion of the globe? What has been the attitude of the ministry? That they courted a fair inquiry? That they were willing that the whole light of day should be thrown on this matter? That they were favourable to the fullest and freest investigation? No, Sir, nothing of the kind; but from the very first, led by the Minister of the Interior, they have joined hands together, and stood as a steady and firm phalanx against any attempts to break through that line, and let in the light of day. That is not a healthy sign in public life. I do not think any government in a constitutional country has ever taken a position of that kind and persisted in it, when members of equal respectability and equal prominence in the country have staked their whole political reputation upon the charges they have made, and have asked for an inquiry. Oh, but, says some one, they gave an inquiry. What did they give? An inquiry such as was asked for? An inquiry such as would command the confidence of the country? No, Sir. The best that can be said about it is that they put on perfunctory and partial official inquiry—that and nothing more. That is not what is asked for. That was not the efficient machinery for trying these charges, which any government that did not fear the results would have been glad to have given—the fullest inquiry before a judicial commission. But that is exactly the kind of inquiry which these gentlemen up to this hour have refused to give. And yet, for two years testimony after testimony has been accumulating, and has gone into every quarter of this country and through the empire to its widest bounds, all going to show that maladministration was rampant in the Yukon territory, and that the fair name of Canada was being smirched when it should have been kept pure and undefiled. These gentlemen get up now and, in tones of thunder befitting a hustings, they declare that the opposition are smirching the fair name of Canada. In what way, Sir? Has a single member of this House originated any rumour, any report, any statement with reference to the Yukon administration? Not one. They have simply brought to the attention of this House the statements, the rumours, the information, the charges, the accusations which have been crowded upon them from the people who have been in the Yukon territory, have lived there and have come

out. It is a part of a public man's duty to see that those accusations which are widely spread, in which after investigation he believes there is truth, are brought to the attention of parliament, to have them inquired into by a competent authority, and that is simply what the opposition have done. They have endeavoured to fulfil their duty and their whole duty; and again I go to the record and I say that no more important charges, charges more definitely made, and more thoroughly backed up by prospective evidence, have ever been brought against the administration of a government than those which have been laid on the Table of this House month after month during the last two years; and if hon. gentlemen opposite were so solicitous for the fair fame of Canada, they would have at once given the inquiry in order that the fullest investigation and the fullest publicity should be given to the facts of the case. What have the hon. gentlemen to fear? Did they fear the expense of such an investigation? They have not shown themselves as being so rigidly economical in the matter of commissions as not to be able to afford the money to carry on a judicial investigation in this case. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent by these gentlemen on commissions; so that that could not have been the reason. The country always has money for the purpose of looking into charges that affect the fair fame, the public service, the best interests of the country. Were they afraid of the results? If they were not, why did they not assent to the investigation? Why did they not welcome the evidence? Why did they treat every man who had his quota of his experience and his observation with reference to the maladministration in the Yukon, as if he were a malefactor, an untruthful man, a disreputable man, a man who had no claim to their credence or confidence. That is the way they have met every one of these allegations, no matter from what source they have come. If they even deigned to notice them, they have thrown them away with the statement that the men who have made them are disreputable and unworthy of confidence.

We have had examples of that to-day. Hon. gentlemen have risen on the other side, and in their desire to prevent investigation and discredit any attempt at investigation, they have not hesitated to condemn men of whom they know absolutely nothing, and of whom they have confessed here to-day that they know absolutely nothing. But they go on the general assertion that these men must perforce be disreputable and unworthy of confidence, if they dare to make any charge against the administration in the Yukon. That is not a creditable position for hon. gentlemen opposite. They could afford the money for an investigation. If they had nothing to fear they would be benefited as

a party by it. If there was nothing to these charges, if everything were right and proper, the fair fame and name of Canada would have been best cleared and kept pure the wide world through, and it was a duty that these gentlemen owed to Canada herself that there should be a sufficient investigation into that district in order to show up the facts of the case, and disprove these charges and allegations which these hon. gentlemen declare to be wanton and unfounded. Why then have we not had an investigation? Have not investigations been granted under circumstances of less definiteness and particularity? What happened in 1896? The Dominion elections had been held. In Manitoba they were over, and they were scarcely over before a private individual wrote down to the then prospective Premier of this country saying: I have a strong suspicion that there has been wrong practiced in the elections in Manitoba, and I want to make my suspicions good if possible. I ask you to promise me that out of the Dominion treasury you will come to my aid and enable me to trace out my suspicions. Am I overstating the case? Not one whit. What was the reply of the prospective Premier of Canada? I wish you God speed in your work, and I hope you will unearth the iniquities in the province of Manitoba, and to help you to trace out your suspicions, I will pledge you that the Dominion treasury will stand at your back and meet your expenses. And on that pledge of the present Premier, Mr. Clifford Sifton set his police at work, put on his myrmidons, and for month after month he traced the lines of his suspicions through the byways, and concessions of the different districts in Manitoba, and at last ran up a bill, which the Dominion government paid, of some \$20,000. And what was the result of it all? One single conviction, and that of a man who was more the party's own tool than the confederate of his political opponents. Have I overstated that case? I defy any man in this House to dispute the substantial accuracy of my statement. Why was that done? Because Mr. Sifton, not then a member of this parliament, not a minister of this government, but a private individual in the province of Manitoba, scented a very substantial advantage for his party, and the Prime Minister to be, scented a very substantial advantage to his party if these suspicions could once be proven; and so the two of them joined hands and the Dominion treasury was put under contribution. What for? For a party advantage, as we believe, but give them the benefit of a higher motive, and what was it? It was to vindicate the purity of the electorate in the province of Manitoba.

Now, here is a case, not a case originated by Mr. Sifton or by any member of his party, but one that comes from the four-quarters of Canada, it is the consensus of

statements and rumour and charges and accusations that things are wrong, and very wrong, in the Yukon district. It is taken up by correspondents in the Yukon, investigating on the spot, and in papers like the *London Times* is given voice to in no doubtful terms. All over this country, and throughout the British Empire this spreads and spreads, it comes to the ears of members of both sides of the House. Hon. gentlemen from that side travelled up to the Yukon and investigated affairs in the Yukon themselves. Whilst there, they were shaking their heads and saying: It is very bad, but when they come down here, they sit behind the government benches, and if they say anything at all, they say: Oh, it is a difficult place to govern. The distances are very long out there, and after all things were done about as well as they could be. They are quiescent, there is no party advantage to be gained by them, they have no keen and burning desire such as Mr. Sifton had in 1896. They sit still and are quiet. But on this side members also have had these charges brought to their notice. They have made investigations, and have risen in their places in parliament and stake their reputation and future on these charges, and they ask for what? Take your lowest ground, the Sifton ground in 1896, and for mere party advantage we will say—but it is a fair thing to take in party warfare—to make these charges to prove that the people opposite, who claim to be righteous and perfect governors, are guilty of maladministration. Why should not the Premier of this country come to the support of those who make the charges, on their own reputation and responsibility, with a portion of the public funds, in order to enable them to prove the charges or enable the government to show that the charges were unwarranted, and thus get the advantage in this House and country. Let us go a little higher, let us take a higher view—and I think we are capable of taking that higher ground on this side as well as hon. gentlemen are on the other side. Suppose that it be conceded for a single moment by hon. gentlemen opposite that the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is actuated by a desire to see that good government should be carried on in the Yukon, and that maladministration shall cease, and the interests of the public service and the fair name of Canada be advanced—grant for a moment that that could be the motive which is in the hearts of, and minds of the Liberal members, then we come before this House on higher ground, and on this higher ground and for this higher purpose, we ask that a competent board of jurisdiction be appointed in order that we may try those charges and purify the administration in the Yukon.

Why should they not have the right to do it? When hon. members are animated with a desire of that kind, speaking for the

electorate of this country, what right have the government to step in and prevent them from securing an adjudication upon these matters from a competent commission of inquiry. Granted—whether the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland), can or cannot believe it—that we are acting here from a sincere, though you may say a mistaken belief, as to what should be done with reference to the public life of this country, and that we want to test these charges and prove them, if they have not been proven, and have them disproved, if they can be disproved—why, in the name of all that is good in government, should the administration refuse to use a little of the people's money to carry out this investigation, and so enable us to perform our public duties? That is the plea I put, and I believe it is a fair plea, and one the people of this country will recognize. But for two years we have been trying to get a tribunal before which we could bring these charges, and so, from our point of view, do something to purify the public administration and the public service—trying, from our point of view, to clear from the fair name of Canada the foul blot that rests upon it by implication, if nothing more, on account of the administration of the Yukon. And two years have passed, and we have not been able to gain the paltry favour from this government, of a competent board of inquiry before which to take our charge and have them proven or disproven. I do not think that the government has treated the country right; I do not think they have done their duty to parliament; and I believe that amongst the electorate there will be a very large proportion who will agree with me on that score.

I do not wish to take up too much of the time of the House on this point, but I want to allude to the kind of side issue raised by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). He stood up in this House with all its intelligence—so much of it as is left—around him, and endeavoured to convince himself, first, and the members of this House afterwards, and the country, I suppose, if he could, that there was a charge preferred against an absent soldier, a commander in the Canadian forces, now doing battle in South Africa. How he laboured. How he raised his voice. How he thundered. And yet how hollow it all was to any one who sat back and thought for a moment of the circumstances of the case. He himself, when he ventured to read the proof he had—it is a pity he had not read it before he thundered—found that no charge was made in any form or manner against that absent commander of the Canadian militia in far distant Africa. But the hon. minister thought he was on the hustings, and that he could, for a moment, sway the popular mind by appealing to a prejudice of that kind. He forgot that he was a responsible minister amongst thinking

men, and in a parliament which pretty well gauges that kind of effort. I venture the statement, and not for a moment will any one in this House attempt to deny it, that not in any single line or word, was there a charge, either by direct accusation or by imputation, against Colonel Steele. The hon. minister (Mr. Paterson), tried to fasten it upon members on this side of the House, in his large and generous way, that they swore to the truth of every statement made by Whitesides, by Seabrook, and by the others whose information was contributed to the House, the attention of the House being drawn to it.

Mr. BRITTON. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), state whom hon. gentlemen opposite do charge in connection with the administration of the Yukon?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a fair question, and I will answer my hon. friend. We charge, first and foremost—and have from the first—the Minister of the Interior, as the responsible head of that department, for everything that has gone wrong in the administration of the Yukon. Is that constitutionally right?

Mr. BRITTON. It seems to me that the constitutional practice of this country is for the parliament of this country to determine whether the minister is acting right or not.

Mr. FOSTER. And it is exactly upon that ground that all these resolutions have been moved. The fallacy in the argument so often used, the fallacy in my hon. friend's (Mr. Britton's) implied statement is this: That we want a commission of inquiry in the Yukon, to try the minister. Nobody ever ventured to suggest that. Let us come down to common sense ground. When, in any charge that has been made in this House, have we asked that a commission of inquiry shall be instituted to try Mr. Clifford Sifton, and pronounce judgment upon him and punish him accordingly? Nowhere. All that we have asked—and I call my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) now to witness—is that a commission of inquiry should be appointed to investigate the facts of the alleged maladministration in the Yukon and report to this House; and when that report is received, we will try the minister. Is not that constitutional? There is no other way. But I would appeal again to the hon. gentleman from Kingston. Here we are, the members of this House. Granted—I suppose I shall have to ask it to be taken for granted—that we on this side have just a little sincerity and are in earnest in this matter; granted that we believe there has been maladministration in the Yukon, is it not clear that we are simply powerless to judge of that maladministration in quantity, in degree or in distribution? We could not appoint a commission here to adequately investigate

Mr. FOSTER.

the facts, because that commission would sit here, 3,000 miles away from the Yukon. The only way you can do is to send some delegated authority into the Yukon, hold your investigation there and report to this House. That is all we have ever asked. And how futile it is and how insincere it must be for any hon. gentleman to obstruct a motion of this kind on the ground that we ought not to try the minister by a commission of inquiry. No. This House is the competent and the only competent authority to try the minister, outside of any criminal or civil action against him. This House has authority to try the minister, but the House would be foolish to try him, without first getting information. And how shall we get the information? By affidavit from Mr. Walsh? By statement sent in from Mr. Carbeno? By having affidavits read in this House, with no opportunity for analysis or cross-questioning? The only way is by judicial inquiry and the reporting of the facts to this House. Why should we not have it? No man in this House has given attention to affairs in the Yukon, has followed events there, has talked with the people who have been there, lived there, and come out, without feeling that there has been much, in the Yukon, that was wrong. I will give you all the latitude that is right for distance, difficulty in government, and I am generous enough to make a large margin for small peccadillos and for negligence owing to these circumstances. But over and above all that, it is for the public weal, it is in the interest of good government, that we should look into these matters, have them inquired into by a competent authority and reported to this House, and then be in a position to pass our judgment upon the information thus gathered. No man free from party bias will dispute the correctness of that position. Now, why can't we have it? We have judges enough, we have money enough, we have time enough. Why can't we have an investigation and have the facts reported to this House? I do not think anything can be validly urged against an investigation except it be that the ministers have joined hands in a circle, and they stand as one phalanx against any attempt to make an investigation into the charges that have been made of maladministration in the Yukon.

Now, Sir, need I go back any further to refute the argument attempted to be made by the Minister of Customs, that when we prefer these charges we must become sponsors for every bit of information and prospective evidence that is given to us? Some gentleman, in speaking, said: Then if you do not know that they are true, and if you do not absolutely believe in them all, why do you come with them before parliament? Why, Sir, where would you get inquiry in the world if you went on that basis? You go on the reasonable basis of such statements and information as you may have

been able to get, and after conning it over you come to the conclusion that there is a reasonable prospect that you can prove your case on that evidence. Then you go before your judge and your jury, and you do the best you can to sustain your case. If you gain it, justice is promoted; if you lose it, justice is equally promoted; and whether you gain or lose, much is done for the good name of Canada and for the service of Canada. But is it illogical and absurd to think that every bit of information must be vouched for, must be sworn to, must be known to be absolutely correct by the gentleman who brings it to the attention of the House.

Now, Sir, I do not know Mr. Catto, what gentleman in this House does? Does the acting Minister of the Interior know Mr. Catto? What right, then, has the acting Minister of the Interior to pronounce Mr. Catto, a man he does not know, whom he has never seen, and perhaps never heard of until to-day, a disreputable character, a lunatic and a crank? Does not that show a rather prejudiced mind? Is it not of a part with all that has been done by the ministry, who close their ears and close their eyes against any statement made with reference to their administration of the Yukon? But surely no reasonable man will get up in this House and declare that a man whom he does not know, concerning whom he has no information, must forthwith be a lunatic, a disreputable character and a crank, because he writes a letter giving his experience of a year and a half in that district. Mr. Catto tells you who he is. He is a surgeon of the University of Edinburgh, he is widely known, he says, in Great Britain. He gives a reference which is of the highest, and he writes a letter. You may say that some parts of that letter have extreme statements, but that is not a letter written by a lunatic or a crank. I want to say this to the House, that many of the statements made in this letter are in perfect consonance with statements that have been made to me by gentlemen whom I believe, who had lived in the Yukon, and who have talked with me with reference to the way matters have been carried on there. Now, let the Minister of Marine and Fisheries take his pen, and dip it in ink and write down this query: Why does he not tell the name? Well, and when I tell the name what good will it do? I am told that the man is a lunatic, a disreputable character and a tramp. When the name is not told, they are aggrieved; when the name is told, they are indignant because you bring such disreputable men to give information.

Now, let us for a moment be reasonable, let us go over the points that I have mentioned to-night, and let each member of this House call them to mind and say whether we have made out a fair case for an inquiry. Now, I want to say this one word to the government, that things are going

on within the domain of the Yukon government, under the sanction of an irresponsible council made up of paid officers appointed by this government and from the responsibility of whose acts the government cannot for one moment disassociate themselves—which, if they were known to the people of this country, would bring a blush of shame to every household in the land. Now, I make that statement upon what I have heard personally from men who have lived in the Yukon, who have told me those things, and I make it as corroborated by the statements which are sent down here from the Yukon itself in the moneys collected, the revenues which are used by that irresponsible council in the Yukon. It is not a nice subject to talk about, but it is a fact to-day which burns itself into the mind of any man who gives attention to these things, that the Yukon council, in this expenditure of \$250,000 which they are making totally irresponsible to any one, which they are making during this year, are gathering most of that money from vice and from the liquor traffic, both of them in their most awful and most repulsive forms.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries ventured the opinion in reference to it that this government must not accept so much responsibility. Talk about fines as much as you like. There are fines and fines, and there are fines which are simply the authorised official license for what is carried on in the places that are fined. I make the statement to-night from the information that I have that the system of fines, so-called in the Yukon, on these two things does not embody fines which are to suppress the malefactor, or to suppress the vice, but it embodies fines which give the official sanction of the Yukon council to all the gambling and all the vice that are carried on under the public protection of that council. Now, Sir this is somewhat serious. The hon. Minister of the Interior can get up and say: I am not responsible for that. How? Why not? The hon. Minister of the Interior at one time said: I will not issue any permits, and he can go out to the country and say: Not a dollar's worth of liquor goes into the Yukon under my permit, but, he can write to Mr. Commissioner, he can give him the sole issuing of permits, and when any one applies to Mr. Sifton here, Mr. Sifton can write him a letter and say: I have handed that all over to the commissioner in the Yukon: apply to him and get your permit. That is what was actually done. The hon. Minister of the Interior can say: I am not responsible for what you would call simply fines, but which act in the way of an official approbation of what is carried on under them. I have nothing to do with them. This is done by my paid officials up there constituted into the council. But, the hon. Minister of the Interior and this government are actually responsible. Who else is responsible? By a contrivance of that kind shall the minister

and the government escape their responsibility? I trow not, and I do not think that the people of this country, and I do not think the parliament of this country will consent to any doctrine of that kind. Now, Sir, put on your investigation if you dare. Put on your judges, let them go into the Yukon, let them investigate all the charges, and I am prepared to say, from the knowledge I have, that their report will somewhat astonish the hon. gentlemen sitting on the front benches in reference to just these three things and these three things alone—drinking, gambling and vice.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has appealed to me a number of times.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I hope you will be reasonable.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do not object to the appeal by any manner of means to express my opinion upon certain phases of his argument, and I may say here to the House that I rise with the greatest confidence on this occasion to answer the challenges which the hon. gentleman has from time to time made. I did feel a very great degree of pain and sorrow this afternoon at the painful spectacle which was exhibited by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) when he had to read a statement of the most extraordinary character, which he evidently had not mastered, and for which he was not prepared to take the responsibility. The hon. gentleman who read that statement this afternoon evidently read it without a previous knowledge of what its contents were, and he had the prudence, for which I had to admire him, to take care that in no way, or sense, parliamentary or legal, did he commit his good name or good fame to any statement in that resolution. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Foster) has asked with a great deal of oratorical warmth if the government are prepared, in the face of these charges, to grant an investigation. Sir, there is no hon. member in this House who knows better than the hon. gentleman that there has been no parliamentary charge made, that the resolution has been purposely and carefully drawn so as to avoid making any parliamentary charge. I listened to the reading of the resolution by the hon. member for Pictou, and I noticed the absence of those words which heretofore have always been considered necessary when a charge is preferred by an hon. member on his responsibility in this House. For fear my ears had deceived me I insisted upon that resolution being read a second time by the Speaker, and then I took the resolution myself and read it over carefully. I wanted to find out whether it contained two things. I wanted to find out in the first place if there was a member of this House who assumed the responsibility for making one state-

Mr. **FOSTER**.

ment in that resolution. I wanted to see if the phrase, the formula which has been crystallised now and well understood that: So and So on his responsibility, makes the following statement was in the resolution. That was absent, and there was more than that absent. There was absent that without which no charge is worth a rap, that the hon. member making it believes upon his honour, as a member of this House, that if he is granted a committee he will be able to prove the statement that he makes. Is there an hon. member on that side of the House who is prepared to take the responsibility of saying either that he believes these charges to be true or that he believes, if he is granted a committee, he will be able to prove them? Not one. The hon. senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who drafted the resolution went away to British Columbia without moving it in the House, and left it to his junior colleague. He did not take the responsibility. Whether these statements were in it originally or whether they were cut out there was not a word, when the hon. junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) moved the resolution, stating that he believed one word in it or that if the committee which he asked for was granted he believed he could prove one single statement in the resolution. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) talks about parliamentary precedent. I remember when he was, if not the leader of this House, some years ago, at any rate, the Finance Minister, and a leading member of the Conservative party. I remember when the present Judge Lister brought his charges against the then Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) in connection with section b, which hon. members who were here ten, twelve, or thirteen years ago, will remember when the hon. gentleman, not only brought his charges and brought them on his responsibility as a member of the House, but stated that he believed if he was granted a committee, he would prove their truth, the first man to rise up and refuse a committee was the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Foster). When the late Speaker, Sir James Edgar, preferred his charges against the hon. ex-Postmaster General, now the member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), and stated his charges seriatim, not stating a lot of hearsay, but stating the conclusions which he drew and which he said he could prove if granted a committee, the first man to get on his feet to refuse a committee was the hon. gentleman. He comes here to-night, Sir, with a long list of statements, to not one of which he dares to commit himself; for not one of which he dares to become responsible, and he eliminates from the resolution the one cardinal statement which is absolutely essential, namely: That he believes he can prove this to be true if he is granted a commission.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose these words were added, would a judicial committee be granted?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then, my comment to the extent I have made it, would be unnecessary, but it would not alter the fact that my hon. friend voted down the resolutions I refer to. What is the use of asking what I would do if the words were there? They are not there. They carefully abstained from putting them there. The merest tyro in parliamentary constitutional law knows the form to be adopted in such resolutions, but the essential words to which I refer were carefully eliminated and eliminated for a purpose. What have we in this resolution now before the House? We have, first, three or four pages of a rehash of what the writer believes to be constitutional law, referring to precedents of Great Britain, to resolutions moved by Lord Randolph Churchill, and to something about the board of works. The first five pages of the resolution is a brief which the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) intended to speak to when he addressed the House. He then goes on, not to make charges on his responsibility, but to make certain statements with reference to Major Walsh, and with reference to other old matters which occurred some years ago in the Yukon. Up to that point I may remark that every one of these statements has been already investigated. When my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) asks across the floor of the House with all the fervor which he assumed tonight: Why does not the government grant an investigation; I tell him that so far as three-fourths of this resolution is concerned the investigation has been held, and the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) read from the report this afternoon. With two or three hundred pages of evidence before these gentlemen opposite, have they dared to arraign the Minister of the Interior, or this government, or any member of this government on that sworn testimony. Where is the charge against us? Where is the resolution saying that under this evidence we have been guilty of malfeasance or wrong-doing. They had a commission; that commission took evidence; that evidence has been in the hands of gentlemen opposite for over twelve months, and they have not dared to formulate a resolution of condemnation against us founded on any part of that evidence. They say they want a judicial inquiry. What is the matter with the inquiry made by Mr. Ogilvie? Was there a man in this country of experience; was there a newspaper of standing that did not come forward to add its testimony to the fitness of the appointment when Mr. Ogilvie was selected. Was there not a perfect chorus of approval throughout the country when Ogilvie was appointed, that we had got

the right man in the right place? And why was that? It was because Mr. Ogilvie had been for ten or twelve years mixed up with these miners; he was one of themselves, he knew their habits and customs, he was conversant with the way in which they liked to give evidence; he knew how to get at the facts from them better than a judge could, and I say that his appointment was not only approved of by friends of the government, but it received the stamp of approval from every newspaper and public man in this country. Mr. Ogilvie held his court. Did he establish cast-iron rules of evidence, which prevented the truth from being obtained? No. On the contrary he said: I will not bind myself by these strict rules of law which judges in the court are bound by; I will not refuse even hearsay evidence; my object is to get at the truth in whatever way I can, and therefore, I will give extra latitude to those who come before me; I will invite them to give the names of the witnesses, and I will give them blank forms and fill up summonses for all whom they seek to have before this commission. I will sit *die in diem*, or I will adjourn to suit the convenience of these men.

Mr. DAVIN. Could he pay them if they came from a distance?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) read this afternoon the statement that Mr. Ogilvie was not aware whether he had that power but that he would report the facts to the government at Ottawa, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) knows very well that there was not much pay required, as I will prove from the circumstances of the case. I call the attention of the House and the country to one or two significant facts. Why was that commission appointed in September, 1898? It was appointed because a large number of miners had formulated a memorial to the government making certain charges against the officials in the Yukon. That memorial was dated the 25th of August, received by the government on the 10th September, and on the 13th or 14th of September the order in council passed appointing the royal commission. Not an hour was lost. That royal commission was appointed to inquire into the charges which had been formulated in the petition to the government, dated the 25th of August. Complaint is made now that we did not enlarge that commission to inquire into charges which might be preferred subsequent to the issue of the commission. I believe that when we issued the commission of inquiry into the allegations made by the complainants we were doing all that was required. We never dreamt, nor was it asked of us to give a commission of inquiry into future charges. I say here that the scope of that commission was all that

any honest man could desire, because it embraced every charge direct or indirect which had been made to the government by the miners of the Yukon. Turn if you will to the plain unvarnished report made by Mr. Ogilvie as the result of the holding of that commission. He sent 300 pages of the testimony of witnesses, taken under oath, and I will trouble the House, to listen to his report as to the manner in which the inquiry was held:

The charges against the officials in the Yukon territory led you, sir, to issue a royal commission to myself to conduct an investigation as to the truth or falsity of these charges.

Intimation of such appointment was conveyed to me through a private source by the last incoming mail before winter set in last year, but I did not receive official intimation of it for some months after, and the delay of the arrival of the commission itself, and, further, of the arrival of the legal adviser, prevented any action in that direction until the month of February.

As soon as I possibly could, I held a sitting in the court-house at Dawson. This was intended to be simply a preliminary meeting for the purpose of arranging with the public how and where the business should be conducted. This sitting passed off very quietly and agreeably. The public were invited to present any views they might see fit at this meeting. I stated particularly that my one desire in connection with this investigation was to have such a complete and full examination that there would be no reason for any discussion after its labours were concluded, and I invited all those present to make any charges or to give the names of any witnesses they had any reason to suppose would be able to give any information of importance.

Notices were printed calling on the public generally to submit charges and furnish names of witnesses in support of their charges. Every aid was offered and it was guaranteed to any one who might wish to submit any charge, that the investigation would be as full and complete as possible.

The papers of Dawson discussed the matter pretty fully and invited the public to respond to the invitations sent out. The 'Nugget' especially called on all those who had any statements to make or evidence to offer, to 'come forth and do it, or for ever after hold their peace.'

It touched at considerable length on the importance of the investigation and the serious nature of the charges which had been made; and invited the public most earnestly to attend to the matter at once.

The editor of the 'Nugget' (Mr. George) saw me once or twice, and I offered that gentleman every aid in my power to have the investigation made as full and conclusive as possible. He was furnished with blank summonses signed by myself, in which he could fill the name of any witness he saw fit; all I asked him to do was to acquaint me with the name of the witnesses, the charge in connection with which they were summoned, and the date when they were expected to reach Dawson. I offered the same privilege to any one who might wish to act in the same way.

The first sitting of the investigation was held in the court-house in Dawson, on February 22, and continued from time to time until all the charges which had been submitted were disposed of.

The sittings were then adjourned until the arrival of Messrs. Waite, McGregor and Nor-

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

wood, whose names had been brought in as guilty of malfeasance.

They arrived in the month of April, and another sitting of the commission was held soon after their arrival.

The evidence submitted at these sittings and my report thereon have long ere this been printed, and I simply wish to put myself on record here as showing that my one desire, and I am quite sure the desire of the other officials in connection with the investigation, was to have the truth established. To this end, every possible facility was offered complainants. They had the fullest and freest opportunity of examining all the witnesses; and, after I had examined them myself, I would invite any one in the court-room to ask the witnesses any questions they might see fit, deeming it expedient that the public generally should have the opportunity of asking such questions. On a few occasions this request was responded to and a few questions asked; but, generally, the witness was examined by the party who summoned him and myself, the public seeming to take no other interest in it than attending and occasionally laughing at the expense of the witnesses and at the questions asked by some of the complainants, whose object, it appeared to me, from many questions asked, was to play to the galleries and attract a little public attention. During the course of the proceedings, the utmost latitude was allowed every one, and I think I can say without fear of successful contradiction that, in an ordinary court of law no such procedure as was allowed in this case would obtain for one second. I was remonstrated with by several, in regard to the latitude I allowed complainants, but my reply was that it was better to do this than appear as restraining the course of justice. As these people, I was fully impressed, had made statements which they could not substantiate, I felt it incumbent on me to allow them as much liberty as possible, in order that they might convict themselves. This, I might say, proved to be the case; but instead of placing the blame where it properly belonged, many of them still persisted in stating that the charges were true, and, in discussing it, took a very one-sided view of the evidence presented, drawing from it conclusions which they were certainly not warranted in doing. My belief now is that the sittings of the commission were rather a disappointment to those who asked for it. It swept from under them their vantage ground, that is, the possibility of being able to make statements which they did not expect to be called upon to prove.

In order to get out of this they took advantage of what is termed the limitation of commission; that is, no charge made after August 25 could be entertained. As has been stated in my report, submitted along with the evidence, I induced the complainants to take up one charge made after that date, that is, the Kelly-Miner case. Of course, oaths could not be administered to the witnesses in this case, but they agreed that they would make a statutory declaration to their evidence. This was done in one or two instances, but to have done it in every case would involve so much delay that it was deemed desirable to abandon it and send the evidence out as it was.

From the evidence submitted, I think any unprejudiced person would consider that the charges made against Mr. Fawcett on this occasion totally failed.

References have been made to the farcical nature of this investigation by the newspapers here and others; I readily admit the charge; it certainly was farcical, but not in the way they put the term; it was farcical in this, that it

utterly failed to show any ground for the accusations made, more than common rumour; and that, I regret to say, is entirely irresponsible in Dawson, perhaps more so than elsewhere.

Considered from a proper and honourable standpoint, the investigation certainly resulted farcically; but the term 'farcical' does not apply to the honest endeavours of the officials connected with it to have it conducted properly and have it as conclusive and reliable as possible, under the conditions.

Now, Sir, I have read every word of the report made by Mr. Ogilvie as to the manner in which that inquiry was held, and I am within the judgment of this House, when I say that if a scintilla of wrong-doing has been proved in that great book of evidence which has been brought here, it is the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite to bring it forward or for ever hold their peace. If these gentlemen cannot prove from these pages any of the charges, then they have a right to come forward and say that the limitation of August 26, prevented the investigation of charges arising after that date which they now formulate; and I, as a member of the government, tell them that if they formulate any charge or series of charges, regarding matters that occurred after August 26, which have not been investigated, a Royal Commission will be issued, and those charges will be probed to the bottom, and the truth established, no matter what it costs. We gave that pledge last year, and we repeat it now. But we will not allow these gentlemen to make wild, declamatory charges in the House which have no evidence to justify them, and then, playing to the galleries, to submit a resolution which they have not the pluck or the courage to say they will assume the responsibility for.

Now, Sir, we have heard read in this House, a letter which my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) designated as obscene and scurrilous. Sir, I wonder if that letter went through the post office, if it could not be stopped by the Postmaster General as an obscene and scurrilous communication. It is not the kind of letter that should find a place on the records of this parliament. It is a disgraceful effusion—disgraceful to the man who wrote it, as it would be to the gentleman who moved it, if he knew what was in it, which I doubt very much. This man, they say, is an M. D., and was a resident of Dawson all along. Does his name appear among those who came before Mr. Ogilvie and made a charge? His name is not in the record. Did he dare to go before Mr. Ogilvie, and on his oath, attempt to prove one single statement he has made in that letter? He did not; and I ask sensible, honest, honourable men opposite me, what weight can they attach to the effusion of a man who is termed a madman, and who had the opportunity to go before the court, established by the Royal Commission, and make his charges, but skulked behind the doors of

his office, and did not say a word about them? I say it is disgraceful that a man should shirk the responsibility of making his charges on oath, and should then make scurrilous statements in a letter which not a member of parliament dares to take the responsibility of. There are charges made here which were not made before Mr. Ogilvie. What are those charges? It does not require one moment of my time to refer to them, because they have been criticised and thoroughly dissected by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. The charges are that two trusted officers of the government, Inspector Strickland and Inspector Cartwright, were guilty of malfeasance in office, when in charge of the custom-house at the Summit—and that these men were in a conspiracy with their subordinates to rob the public exchequer of this country—that men whose characters hitherto have been above reproach or suspicion, became petty sneak thieves, who were not above taking a five-dollar note or a ten-dollar note for robbing the government which they were sworn to serve. That is the charge made here. Is there a man who believes it to-night? Why we had here produced in this House—fortunately we had it at hand—the investigation made by Colonel Steele, their superior officer in charge, and he pronounced that every charge embodied in this resolution is a malicious falsehood, and yet these charges which Colonel Steele declared to be false, after a full investigation into them, are going to be voted on as prima facie proof by every hon. member who supports this resolution.

Mr. DAVIN. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How dare my hon. friend attempt to shirk the responsibility of the vote he is going to give. I will read the charges from page 21 and we will see, after this letter is read in connection with this investigation and report of Col. Steele, which has been laid on the Table, how many men are prepared to get up and say that Col. Steele has lied in his report and that these men are thieves and scoundrels. Here is the report of Col. Steele. Whiteside is the man to whom my hon. friend gave a certificate of character.

Mr. PRIOR. What are his initials?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know, he is called Mr. Whiteside. This is what he said:

I was, as you are aware, sent by Collector Milne to Skagway as a Canadian bureau of information to aid intending prospectors to pass through the American customs. How I performed that work I leave others to tell you, but I might say that one American gentleman from Dawson told me on his return that I was the first official he met who was honest, and afterwards when I was in Dawson, he told me I could not make money in consequence. Concerning the collection of duties at the summit of White Pass I was sent

there by Col. Steele after I had reported to Collector Milne in detail. I found that state of affairs just as I had reported there, and in consequence of doing my duty as a customs officer I was treated as a spy by the officers in charge. This latter fact was written by the officer commanding the post to Col. Steele who told me of it. The inspectors were Inspectors Cartwright and Strickland.

Mr. PRIOR. I do not care who they were.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman may not care, but the parents and the wives and relatives and friends of Inspector Strickland and Inspector Cartwright care for their good name and fame and credit which never yet was attacked. Never yet in this House or country has any one dared to cast a slur on any member of Sir Richard Cartwright's family. So far as we are concerned, we do not require Col. Steele's report to know that the statements of Whiteside were lies, because the mere fact that he made this charge against Inspector Cartwright was sufficient to convince us that the man was a liar.

Mr. PRIOR. He is no more a liar than the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—(reading).

I found the state of affairs there just as I had reported, and in consequence of doing my duty as customs officer I was treated as a spy by the officers in charge. This latter fact was written by the officer commanding the post to Col. Steele, who told me of it. I numbered the entries and entered up the cash book which was not done before. The book is now in Ottawa. There were two items entered up twice in the cash book and yet the cash balanced.

And a query is put.

Mr. PRIOR. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman endorses it.

Mr. PRIOR. Hear, hear. I do, I know Mr. Whiteside.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman endorses this falsehood.

Mr. MAXWELL. I know Whiteside to be absolutely unreliable.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. An hon. gentleman sitting in this House, as a colleague of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, says he believes that his son was guilty of stealing and falsifying the accounts. That is what Whiteside says, and I have no hesitation in pronouncing that statement to be as infernal a lie as ever emanated from any source. No man bearing the honoured name of Cartwright was ever a thief or a liar. I feel sorry for the hon. gentleman to-night, and I am confident that he will not find a

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

man on that side of the House, and certainly not in the province of Ontario, who will back up his libel against the Cartwright family.

I was never allowed to check the cash. I asked twice but was refused, the second I refused to alter, but it was manipulated at night by the officers commanding and his sergeant who lived in the hut.

Here we have charges of thievery and manipulation and falsification of accounts, which, Col. Steele says, are pure falsehoods from beginning to end, and yet there is one man in the opposition who has the hardihood to stand up and say that he believes in these charges, in spite of the records of Inspectors Strickland and Cartwright, in the face of their past history, and in spite of the investigation and the report of Col. Steele—in spite of all this, we have an hon. member on the opposition benches declaring his belief that Whiteside's lies are true and that these men, against whom he makes his charges, are infamous scoundrels. I am glad that this debate has taken place. I am glad that we have a distinct issue which hon. gentlemen opposite will have to meet. They cannot escape that issue now, and I have still faith that the manly instincts of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) will prevent him from following the hon. member for Victoria into the lobby and endorsing the charges of this man Whiteside. Will that hon. gentleman brand Inspector Strickland and Inspector Cartwright as thieves and falsifiers of accounts? Will he say that Col. Steele made a false report? Is he ready to denounce and to destroy the character of any man in the community if he can thereby gain a paltry party advantage. If that be the case, things have come to a dreadful pass.

Mr. PRIOR. They have.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am glad to-night, deplorable as the spectacle is, the hon. member for Victoria, stands there alone, and I am sure that the morning's reflection will convince him that he has made the mistake of his life when he endorsed these charges, pronounced by Col. Steele to be a tissue of lies, and has taken a step which he will regret to the last day of his life.

We did not know what the meaning of this was. We asked the hon. member who preferred the charge who was the Col. Steele referred to, and he told us he did not know, that there might have been ten or twenty Col. Steeles for all he knew. But the hon. member for Victoria knows. He knows that Col. Steele is the commander of the Strathcona Horse now in South Africa, and he knows the meaning of it all. He knows who the man that made the charge was, and he alone endorses it, and he calls on his friends to rally around him and endorse it, and I will be curious to see how many will follow him into the lobby.

We had another charge made the other day. We had the charge made that there was something wrong in the dealings of the officials with Mr. McDonald, the lessee of the Dawson water front. That matter was discussed the other night by my hon. friend from Guysborough, but since then we have had the acting Minister of the Interior coming in here—with what? With the report of an independent commissioner appointed by the Auditor General, over whom the government have no control at all, and that investigator reports that he has investigated—

Mr. CLANCY. No, no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman must have been asleep.

Mr. CLANCY. I was awake.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Did he hear the hon. member read the report?

Mr. CLANCY. I heard it all and the whole House heard it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is so eager to jump to a conclusion that he will not wait until I have finished my sentence. We have a report from the man sent by the Auditor General, that he investigated the affidavits accompanying the payments of royalty, and he found that the payments of royalty and the affidavits tallied in every case, and that the same course was pursued with reference to Mr. McDonald as was followed in the case of everybody else. He reported that the amount was correct to the dollar. I would insult the intelligence of the House by reading the report the second time. It is there on the records. This is one of the old charges and this report of Col. Steele's deals with a new charge.

The only charge we have not investigated before is this charge about the liquor dealers and prostitutes in Dawson City. It is not a savoury subject to deal with, and I do not propose to deal with it at length. The hon. member for York made, at any rate, the oral charge, although it is not in the formal resolution, that a large portion of the revenue of Dawson City are derived from the fees in these matters. Why, the hon. gentleman knows well that if ever there was a remorseless prosecutor of these people, it is the man who today administers affairs in the Yukon. Why is there a large sum of money in the exchequer of Dawson City? Because these people have been remorselessly fined, because every violation of the law brought down the penalty of the law. If the exchequer there is full of money from this source, it is because the officials of the government were obeying the law, and fining the people who were disobeying the

law. I would ask the hon. gentleman what fault he finds with that? Does he desire that Mr. Ogilvie should let these people go, that the law which says they shall be punished shall be evaded, or its violation winked at? If Mr. Ogilvie had refused to put the law in motion and had not exacted the fines, I could understand my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) holding the government responsible for vice stalking abroad in that city. But, if, on the contrary, as the facts show, Mr. Ogilvie has prosecuted and almost persecuted these liquor men and these women from day to day, from week to week, and from month to month, and filled the treasury with the fines he has imposed upon them, I ask why do hon. gentlemen complain? Sir, I remember when the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) was speaking, he referred to one of these charges made by this man Catto, namely, that some order had been given to one of the officials there to the effect that these women should be countenanced by the officers of the law. What was the conduct of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton)? Did he accept it quietly and take no action? No, Sir. As quickly as the telegraph could flash an order, he directed that they should cease countenancing vice, and that order was obeyed. He did not wait to consult his colleagues in the government; he knew one and all they would be with him. He flashed his order by wire, and that order was obeyed, and, so far as vice was concerned, it was dissociated from the government and the officers of the government. As a member of the government, I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to say in plain language, that either the Minister of the Interior or any member of the government in any way countenanced vice or improper practices. If they cannot do that, let them hold their peace. Hon. gentlemen evidently think these light charges to prefer against a government. We do not so regard them. The men in this government hold their character above everything else in this world; and, thank God, so far, they have been able to maintain them. But if hon. gentlemen opposite have a charge to make against us, we are ready; let them make their charge and in five minutes they shall have their committee of investigation. But let them not go through the farce of throwing on the Table of this House a series of letters, which they will not take the responsibility for, and which they will not dare to say they can prove if a committee is granted.

The other charge was dealt with by my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), and no further word from me is required on that subject. I have followed, as far as I could, the remarks of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), and I have but a word or two more to say. I would call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that while an attempt was made in these letters placed before the House, to blacken the

character of men who had hitherto stood high in the opinion of their fellow countrymen, the moment they sent here sworn affidavits to meet these charges, every desire was manifested by hon. gentlemen opposite to prevent them being read. It was all right that foul, infamous charges should be made upon the floor of this House against Major Walsh and other men, and placed upon the records of the House; but, when Major Walsh said: Give me a chance to say whether the charge is true or not, for one hour hon. gentlemen fought against it, contending that not a word should be said in reply to the charge. We do not decline the responsibility for the action of the municipal body in the Yukon. We say that when they had powers granted them by parliament, we were responsible for the way in which they exercised those powers, because the men were appointed by us. And we say that more than once, when they unwisely exercised the power given them, and attempted to grant permits improvidently, we cancelled the permits they had granted, and withdrew the power from them. My hon. friend (Mr. Sifton), who is not here now, but who will be here in a day or two, has watched closely and critically the actions of this municipal body, for which he is responsible; and whenever he has known them to go astray, he has checked them. He is a man who rules. He rules because he is a man with a strong mind and a firm hand. Attempts are now made to blacken his character in his absence. But there is not a man who stands higher in the regard and the affection of his colleagues than does Mr. Sifton. I have been as closely, if not more closely, associated with him in the administration of his department, than any other of his colleagues, and I can say, in his absence, what I would not say if he were here—that a truer and better friend does not live, and I am sure an honest man does not live. I have consulted with him day after day on many matters, including these fractions of mining claims, concerning which charges were made. I knew of hundreds, and even thousands, I may say, of applications that came pouring in to him from people all over the country, from people who thought they could get a pull or a cinch, or gain some favour in some way, in regard to these fractions. But he was firm; he was inexorable. In not one single instance did he deviate from the path of honour. He acted, as I knew he would act, faithfully to his country, faithfully to his Queen, and faithfully to his colleagues.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I do not expect to detain the House more than a few minutes, and during those few minutes, I shall not imitate the example of the hon. minister (Sir Louis Davies), who has just taken his seat. I do not think that an hon. gentleman with a good case need show so

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

much heat. But the energy of the hon. gentleman was in proportion to his want of logic, and was evidently intended to draw attention from the actual case, as it was put here to-night. There might be some excuse for some hon. gentleman in this House making such an exhibition of themselves as the hon. minister made of himself to-night. But he is a gentleman of high standing, and a good lawyer, an old parliamentarian, there was no need for any exhibition on his part.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the noise is so great that I fear I cannot make myself understood. I can say that in the short time I have been in this House, I have never shown discourtesy to any member; I have not been one to interrupt or make undue noise. I do not know whether they select me particularly for attentions of this kind, but I can say this conduct does not become those who are guilty of it. I am only going to occupy the time for a few moments to direct attention to what the hon. minister has said. The very first thing he said to-night, was that these charges were not made in a parliamentary manner. Now if the hon. gentleman is going to be a stickler for form, does he really say that it is sufficient reason for denying the investigation, that the charges were not brought in proper form?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has quite misapprehended my argument. It was not that the matter of form was wanting, it was that the matter of substance was wanting.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman said more than that, he said that the charge was not put in parliamentary form. Now he says there was no substance. Does he mean to say and to repeat that the charges were not made in the most specific manner?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, I say they are not made in a specific manner at all. I say that the parliamentary rule is that anybody making a charge must state that he makes it on his responsibility as a member, either believing it to be true, or that if granted a committee he believes he would be able to prove it. Both these essentials are wanting in this resolution.

Mr. CLANCY. In substance those essentials are both present in the resolution. If the hon. gentleman is prepared to lay down one rule for this side of the House and adopt another rule for himself, then he is quite right. What was the ground work upon which these charges were made? They were made according to a procedure followed and sanctioned by the hon. gentleman who is endeavouring to explain it away just now; they were based upon action taken by the very gentleman whose conduct is under criticism, namely, the Minister of the Interior. Before he became Minister of the Interior he was granted all the means of

having an investigation in Manitoba. The hon. member for Pictou has declared in the most unmistakable manner that if he is granted similar means he will undertake to prove the very charge that is being made. The hon. gentleman says: Give us the names, you must be able to state in advance the particular persons and the particular charges in detail, you must prove your case in advance. Now, I put this question to the hon. gentlemen opposite: Are you going to lay down one rule for Mr. Clifford Sifton before he became a member of this House to investigate charges, and to lay down another rule in a similar case after he has become a member of this government? In the Manitoba case one rule was meted out to him, and to-day a different rule is meted out to the hon. member for Pictou, and to the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. No hon. member on the opposite side has dared to rise and put the two cases side by side and say that there should not be given the same means in the one case as in the other.

Mr. MAXWELL. Did the senior member for Pictou approve of what the Minister of the Interior did in that case?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman thinks now it will be necessary to approve of that course. If the hon. gentlemen carried it out and approved of it themselves, they are bound by their own action. It matters not what we have thought on this side of the House. Nothing could be more idle than for the hon. gentleman to ask a question of that kind—do we approve of it.

Mr. MAXWELL. You did not approve of it, though.

Mr. CLANCY. It is not necessary I should offer an opinion one way or another. But the hon. gentleman had power to act and did act in the one case, and they failed to act in the other case. Now, the hon. gentleman made an argument upon the Lister charges and he sat down without saying that Mr. Lister had had an investigation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, the resolution was voted down.

Mr. CLANCY. Then it was the Edgar case I had in my mind. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman was loud in his protests against that. If the hon. gentleman spoke from the bottom of his heart, if he believed he was right then, is he right now? Is not that a fair question? The hon. gentleman cannot be right in both of them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, because an investigation was granted, a royal commission was issued.

Mr. CLANCY. No royal commission has been issued in the sense asked for at all. I am sure hon. gentlemen on this side of

the House need not fear to have what the hon. gentleman read from that report go to the country. I ask him if that is a dignified report. Is it creditable to any hon. gentleman? The hon. gentleman made another statement here to-night, that Mr. Ogilvie's appointment was heralded with gratification from one end of the country to the other, in every newspaper. Was it heralded because he was appointed for that particular purpose or for other purposes? Was Mr. Ogilvie's appointment approved of by the newspapers because he was appointed for holding that investigation on a royal commission, or was the appointment approved of for other reasons? I ask the hon. gentleman that question, because he made his argument upon it. He gave the House to understand that after Mr. Ogilvie had been appointed to investigate, the newspapers from one end of the country to the other approved of his appointment. I think the hon. gentleman did violence to his memory, for I never heard of a newspaper that approved of such a thing.

Mr. MAXWELL. The leader of the opposition was the first man in this country to recommend that Mr. Ogilvie should be appointed as commissioner in the Yukon territory.

Mr. CLANCY. That is just what I wanted to draw attention to, that the newspapers approved of Mr. Ogilvie's appointment as commissioner to the Yukon territory and not for the purpose of holding an investigation. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries declared, or gave us to understand, that the newspapers from one end of the country to the other applauded the appointment of Mr. Ogilvie for a single purpose, for the purpose of holding that investigation. I have no hesitation in saying from the statements of the hon. gentleman himself and from what he has read from the reports, that Mr. Ogilvie did hold a farcical investigation.

Now, what was done there? He said that these witnesses are irresponsible persons. Let the hon. gentleman investigate and see whether they are irresponsible or not. What do we do to punish crime in this country? How far do we go under the law to punish crime? We take people out of the jail and the prisons of the country, we take prisoners into court, those who have confessed themselves to be guilty of crime, and men's liberties have been imperilled by taking these very persons in the province of Ontario to prove the guilt of people accused of crime. Is that not an answer to the hon. gentleman who, when a serious charge is made, takes the ground that we should not employ the ordinary means of investigation. It is an easy thing to stand up in this House and discredit people. I do not know whether these people have good characters or not, but when a serious charge is made it is not fair-play to say that those who have made these statements are unreliable

persons. That will be proved afterwards. It is a serious thing that an hon. gentleman should get up in this House and cast an imputation of that kind upon a man's character. What did Mr. Ogilvie do? Did he put the law in motion? No, but he said: I am going to hold an investigation at which people who desire to give evidence may do so. I would like to know how much crime could be punished, in the city of Ottawa, for instance, if the judges or magistrates were to give notice that they were going to investigate any charges brought forward. No crime would be punished. We have no evidence that he put the law in motion or that there were any independent officers appointed to search out crime in that country. A more bald and idle proposition was never made in any country in the world. There were no law officers to put the law in motion. Mr. Ogilvie was the officer who should have put the law in motion. It was a most farcical investigation from start to finish, and that Mr. Ogilvie found everybody innocent was the most natural thing under the circumstances. That he should find that there was not a single charge proved was what everybody expected. Hon. gentlemen opposite took good care not to instruct Mr. Ogilvie that the witnesses should be paid. If they were anxious to ferret out crime they would have exhausted every means of searching out crime in that country. No such provision was made because hon. gentlemen opposite did not want crime to come out. Nothing could be plainer than that, and that was the natural thing to expect. Now, I promised that I would not detain the House, and I am just going to say that I do not think the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries did himself justice when he was trading upon the character of a very estimable gentleman's family in this House. I did not think he did the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) very much good. I do not think he paid him a very high compliment. If his family is innocent, and I do not charge any guilt against it, I say the greatest justice he could do to the hon. gentleman's family would be to grant this investigation.

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Has there not been an investigation?

**Mr. CLANCY.** There is no man in Canada to-day who can disregard public opinion and declare that his family is pure and innocent. There has been no attack made on the family of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. If there have been any insinuations made against the hon. gentleman's family they were made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It was in bad taste and wholly unnecessary and did not bear at all upon the case. The case is that Mr. Whiteside is sent up there. He declares: I went up there on instructions

**Mr. CLANCY.**

from the collector at Victoria. Then, he went to Col. Steele, and Col. Steele sent him on a mission. The hon. gentleman has said that a charge has been made against Col. Steele. No charge has been made against Col. Steele. Mr. Whiteside says: I went to certain places, and I was treated as a spy there. What proof is there that he was not treated as a spy; they may have thought that he was an interloper or a dangerous man. Whether they treated him as that or otherwise, does that indicate that he was not an honest man? I do not know whether the charge which has been made is well founded or not against this gentleman, but the hon. gentleman cannot disregard public opinion and he cannot forego the demand for a searching investigation. What is their position? Nothing short of saying to the public that the charges must be all proved before an investigation will be granted. That is the same as saying that you want a man to prove a negative position. It is no negative position. While the hon. gentleman boasts that they had an investigation held under Mr. Ogilvie I would like to point out that some important things came out. Has it not been shown that the officials of the government had disregarded the law? Have they ever been reprimanded or dismissed? So long as the hon. gentlemen opposite continue in the course they are taking now they are inviting, they are permitting, they are aiding and abetting all sorts of crime in that country. It is not a question of the life or fate of a minister. There is more in it than that. Hon. gentlemen may think that is the sole question at issue. Have they thought of the condition of the country? No, they are defending a minister, and they are endeavouring to save his political life. There is infinitely more in it than even the life of a minister or of the life of the government of the day. There is the interest of the country at stake. Hon. gentlemen are standing between the people of the country and justice, and they are taking a course which can only result in the encouragement of crime. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) had declared that there was a class of crime going on there, that license fee had been paid by the way of fines, and he replied that that was not so. He declared that the public exchequer was full, and that the public administration there was against crime.

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I said that that was the statement of the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster).

**Mr. CLANCY.** The hon. gentleman declared that crime had been punished because there was a full treasury.

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** No.

Mr. CLANCY. It was only a sort of punishment intended to encourage the continuance of a full treasury.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Can you tell me any city in Canada where such crime has been put down?

Mr. CLANCY. It would not be put down in the city of Ottawa in which we live now if we did not imprison those who are engaged in it. We would have a large revenue from it. You do not get revenue in our great cities from that class of crime, for in this part of Canada it is suppressed with a firm hand. If the hon. gentleman's logic is good, then prosecution avails nothing. Does he mean that prosecutions increase crime? Does he deny that the assertion of the law minimizes crime? It would seem that he did from his argument. On the whole, our Canadian cities are moral. I am not prepared to say that there is no immorality, but, anyway, Yukon methods are not applied for its suppression, and so long as the public treasury is filled from gambling houses and houses of bad character, so long will immorality be encouraged. From the very beginning of this business, gentlemen on this side of the House have made a fair demand and have been fair in their criticisms. If the government believed there was room for the unsatisfactory investigation they did make, is it not a reasonable request on our part that there should be a proper judicial investigation into all these charges?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I failed to catch who it was who sent Mr. Whiteside out there.

Mr. CLANCY. I know nothing about Mr. Whiteside, but I am informed that the collector of customs at Victoria sent him there.

Mr. PRIOR. And he says he has the utmost confidence in him.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Prior) says that Mr. Whiteside is a gentleman of respectability.

Mr. MAXWELL. If he knew him he would not say that.

Mr. PRIOR. You do not know him as well as I do. He is a gentleman.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell) is very courageous to insinuate that against Mr. Whiteside, under the privileges of the House.

Mr. MAXWELL. I insinuate nothing. I say that the man is absolutely unreliable, and that is plain enough.

Mr. CLANCY. We can quite understand the frame of mind of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maxwell), and how readily he can uphold crime. We can see how steadfast he is in wrong-doing. I would not insinuate that any person was guilty of a crime, but I say that there is the appearance of crime

in the Yukon, and for the credit of Canada, and for the credit of the ministry, an investigation should be held before a proper tribunal.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is Mr. Whiteside yet in the employ of the government?

Mr. CLANCY. I am not dealing with Mr. Whiteside in any sense, and the question is, therefore, not pertinent. I state here that the charges made as regards the Yukon are shocking; so shocking that if they were made upon the responsibility or the irresponsibility of even a criminal, the government would not be justified in withholding investigation. It is all very well for these gentlemen opposite to say that they are trumped-up charges, but if that is the only defence offered, then the greatest criminal could escape punishment if, before his trial, you refused to proceed because you thought the charges were not well founded. The public suspect, and have every reason to suspect, that the reason investigation is denied is to save the government or to save a minister. I repeat, that the good name of Canada is involved, and if they want to maintain our country's fair name—about which they appear so solicitous at times—they must grant a judicial investigation. No matter what the fate of the ministry or of a minister may be, it is the duty of a government to see that Canada is protected in her standing before the eyes of the world. No one knows better than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that under our constitutional system it is not necessary to charge direct crime against a minister. Under our system of responsible government, the minister must be punished and held responsible for the acts of his subordinates, and more than once men have been driven out of public life in Canada for matters about which they had no knowledge, but for which the country, and justly so, had to hold them responsible. I again state that it is of the utmost importance, for the preservation of the good name of Canada, and of the utmost importance for the credit of the government, that there should be a proper inquiry into these charges before a judicial commission.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). I would not take up a moment's time in answering the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) were it not that I want to refer to something that was said before. It goes without saying that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) gave us bad constitutional law and rotten theology that had nothing to do with the matter before the House, in his effort to assume the role of a man who is able to teach the House morality. Let us see where we stand. Last year we had the denunciations of the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) about the Yukon, and he was so answered on the floor of this House that it took him a year

to recover from the shock. This year he comes forward with four distinct want of confidence motions. In the first place, he desires that the government should be defeated because the collector of customs in Dawson had kept \$5,000 to pay the wages due to the men on a certain ship. In his second motion he asked that the government should be defeated because the collector of customs had valued a vessel at \$10,000 that was valued by the appraiser at Ottawa at \$25,000. In his third motion he asked that the government should be defeated because they rented, at \$30,000 a year, a certain property, the next highest bid for which was \$24,000, and the other bids going down to \$2,500. Lastly, he asked that the government should be defeated because Major Walsh saw fit to permit the royalty in a certain case, due in 1898, to remain unpaid until 1899. That is the whole of the charges of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) this year. Then, he gathered all the garbage that he could collect, he strung out the most infamous letters one after the other, and he left the unsavoury task of reading them to his decent junior from Pictou (Mr. Bell). There is no man in this House who felt more chagrined at having to do that than did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell), but his generous soul felt that he must do it to oblige his senior in the county.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, that is a very personal remark, and I think I am entitled to say this much, at least, that it is a most ungenerous and most unfair—I would almost say an indecent statement, only I am not entitled to reply.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I merely say that I do not believe the hon. gentleman would of his own motion read that resolution which he read this afternoon—he is too generous and kindly a man to do so. I can understand that the senior member for Pictou, being in this thing, would want to see it through. Now, let us collect the evidence, especially as to the statement made with regard to the collectors of customs at the Summit. Two respectable men are branded as thieves, as liars, as perjurers.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think there is a word of their names there.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Oh, no, because their names are not there, hon. gentlemen opposite think they can escape the consequences, but they were the only men there. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot get out of that. They have got to take it, and take it for the whole North-west and the whole mounted police. That is the statement made about these two officers; and it is further proved that the matter of this very letter which is now taken as the basis of the accusation against these men, was heard before Col. Steele, who went fully into it, and who branded this man as a liar; and against that the only opinion we

have is that of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior), who says this man is a gentleman, and he would believe him. But on the other side we have the evidence, which is just as good, of the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell), who says that what Col. Steele says about this man is the truth.

Mr. PRIOR. He knows nothing about it.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I think he knows as much as the hon. member for Victoria. I do not think that hon. gentleman is possessed of supreme wisdom or knowledge. I ask the hon. member leading the opposition, in all sincerity, if we ought to inquire into the conduct of decent, respectable men—men of character not only when in the mounted police force, but when acting as customs officers. Suppose I made a statement about two hon. gentlemen opposite who always had a good character, based on what some person told me about them; and suppose a gentleman as honourable as the two hon. gentlemen about whom I made the statement, informed me that the man who had spoken to me told lies about these two hon. gentlemen, would he say that ought to be the subject of an inquiry? We must draw the line somewhere. The truth of the matter is that these so-called Yukon charges, based on statements made by people who were ashamed to give their names, have so run out this session that this is the dying gasp. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that they have had defeat after defeat on the statements they made. There was not the least possible vigour thrown into the discussion of this resolution; members fell asleep under it; and but for the speech of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), the monotony of it would not have been relieved. They know that this thing is dead. But a man from Dawson City writes a letter, and says so and so. Now, I know something about Dr. Catto. I know, for example, that he had to be protected at a public meeting, and was ejected as a man not fit even to be there. I know more than that; I know that he made statements about certain officials at Dawson, particularly Dr. Brown, and when a writ was issued for his arrest for slander, he crawled before the commissioner and begged him not to arrest him, confessing that he had lied. When a decent man makes a statement, his name is not given; but when a scalliwag, like Dr. Catto, does so, his name is given—Dr. Catto, a failure professionally, a failure as a miner, a failure as a man; an agitator out there, who is looked upon with profound contempt; a sort of a cross between an imbecile and an agitator. That is the man whose letter is the foundation of the greater part of this charge, a letter which is disgraceful to any human being to write, and disgraceful to any man to bring before this House. I was very much

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

charmed when my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance assumed the moral role. It was a sight to make the gods weep; his heart-strings were struck. I tell him that there is less crime in all the directions he indicates in Dawson, in proportion to its population, than there is in the majority of the cities of Canada. Everybody knows that where miners congregate there will be more or less drinking and gambling and other things; but, there is a better observance of Sunday, for instance, in Dawson than you will find in many of the cities of eastern Canada—no drinking, no gambling nor anything else. The regulations are carefully observed in Dawson, and I can bear testimony of Mr. Ogilvie as one of the most severe men against wrong-doing of any kind. There were fines collected. I could understand hon. gentlemen opposite if they said that licenses were granted, and that there was a partnership with the officials in crime; but there is no such thing. The fines are large, because everything done in that country is done on a large scale, so far as money is concerned. Nothing is thought there of a fine of \$100, where a fine of \$2 or \$3 here would be considered large. I heard of gamblers there who were fined \$100, \$200 and one even as high as \$700, and sent to jail besides. Hon. gentlemen can understand that in this way the fines would reach a very large amount. The fact is, that today there is not one-twentieth of the gambling or drinking in Dawson that there was before. The people there are very busy. I admit that, just as when sailors, who have been on a long voyage, come into port, so when miners, after their winter's work or after their wash-up, return to the city, there will be a considerable amount of drinking and gambling; but so far as the Yukon council is concerned, the law is carried out more vigorously than in the majority of cities in eastern Canada. Consider that the statements contained in that letter will be put upon the records of this House for all time. As the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) expresses it, they will be embalmed—and what an odor there will be about them—on the records of this House. Is it either dignified or proper or does it conduce, either in the older provinces of the Yukon, to the betterment of the country, to take that course? I can understand a direct statement being made of a direct case, and such a statement ought to be made if any such case exists; but this lengthening out, this attempt to gather in by a drag net process everything criminal that ever the heart of man conceived, every crime that ever was committed, and everything undesirable that might happen in all the varied cities of the world put together, in the hope that something may be caught, shows the plight to which these hon. gentlemen are reduced. I ask in all seriousness if ever the like was seen before; and

if it is necessary to expand the indictment to such a length. I submit that is the best evidence that there is no case to be inquired into. There may be things out there, as there are here, that we do not wish to see. That I do not deny, but the same statement might be made of every village, town and city in the country. But these hon. gentlemen thought that by this expansion upon the record, the case would appear to be so enormous—to use an expression which we sometimes hear in this House—that the people would think it was simply monstrous; that they would think that the gigantic length of the resolution was some indication of the magnitude of the crime, and that the quantity of words used, and the extremely voluminous sentences would indicate at once that there is something terrifically wrong going on in that district. Why, the amount of paper used is out of all proportion to the population of the Yukon. I venture to say that to read or listen to the number of words contained in this motion would kill half the people in Dawson, had they the misfortune to be compelled to read it or listen to it to the bitter end. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will be kind enough not to read that resolution again, because it may be the end of some of us if we have to listen to it. Was it necessary to cover so many sheets of foolscap to show the alleged wrong-doing in Dawson. No, Sir, I never saw anything like it. It is neither business nor according to parliamentary usage. One thing more. I want to draw the attention of the House to this fact, that from the day the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) made his first statement here, with the exception of Catto's letter—and that refers to nothing new—there has not been a single word coming from the Yukon of any wrong-doing. It is very extraordinary, if these statements were correct, that we do not find that this mass of crime, which is alleged to have existed in that district at that time, has not been perpetuated. We do not hear of any wrong-doing in Dawson now, and when we have the statement of the hon. member for York that crime is still rampant there of the very worst character, crime of that description which degrades men more than anything else, it is very extraordinary that nothing has since come to light to give colour to the charges made by these hon. gentlemen. How does it come that for the last three years, since that commission closed its proceedings, not a single case of wrong-doing has come to light? You would suppose that these newspaper correspondents, who are so fond of writing, would have found some new material to write about. One would hardly imagine that in those three years such a reformation could have taken place in the Yukon that these correspondents have not been able to succeed in finding something new with which to startle the public. Are

we to assume that all these wrong-doers have left the country, and that such a change has taken place that, for the last three years, not a single case of wrong-doing has taken place? The fact is that any one going into that country will discover that while of necessity there could not have been at the outset the same order observed and business carried on in the regular way in which it is conducted in the older provinces, on the other hand, with the knowledge gained by experience, business is conducted in a more regular manner, and everybody is satisfied.

In the absence of Sir Richard Cartwright, I want to bear this testimony in favour of his son.

Mr. DAVIN. Who makes any charge against his son? What nonsense!

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Every one does who votes for this resolution.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). That is a sore point with hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not believe that any one of them read this resolution or knew anything about it until it came down. I do not think that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) could have read it because he still looks as healthy as he always has done, and I do not see how he could preserve his usual healthy appearance if he had read it.

Let me point out this fact. I remember meeting a gentleman from Seattle, who had gone into that country under the impression that things were conducted there as they were in similar localities in the United States. I met him in Skagway, and speaking of the Yukon he said: When I came to this country direct from the United States, I thought that the official placed on the summit there, with nobody to watch him, and with the official to whom he has to make his return a thousand miles distant at Victoria, I would have no difficulty in dealing with him, and I had no hesitation in offering him a bribe of \$200 in cash. But to my surprise Inspector Cartwright merely smiled, and just went on entering everything at its full value. He taught me my first lesson, and I never made a similar attempt afterwards. There is the experience of a gentleman who had admitted that he would have no hesitation in resorting to bribery if he thought that he thereby could have accomplished his object.

So far as Inspector Strickland and Cartwright and Major Walsh are concerned, there is not a man, woman or child in the Yukon who will not unhesitatingly say that three better men never went into the country. Major Walsh's name is such a household word for everything honest and honourable there, that I believe there is not a man in that country who would not contribute to pay him an addition to his salary in order that he might remain in the country.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

Hon. gentlemen opposite may think that they are making a point, but I venture to tell them that no attempt to revise the corpse of the Yukon so-called fraudulent charge can ever restore it to animation. It died a year ago when the Minister of the Interior gave his reply, and the attempt now to resurrect that corpse and make it presentable before the electorate is doomed to failure. The fact that the Yukon is doing so well as it is, the fact that the gold increase there is larger this year than it has been in any other year, the fact that there is not a single hint of any wrong-doing there, even by those who would like to believe these charges, is sufficient to show how unfounded they are. It would be absurd to suppose, if there is any foundation for these charges, that that carnival of crime should have suddenly ceased. Why, there are men in Dawson City to-day who never heard of the charges made in this House until they read the speech of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). The thing was never spoken of except by a few agitators, men for example, like the editor of the *Nugget*, Mr. George, and a few others—the worst of them have left the country—and some professional perambulating agitators like Catto. They are attempting to make a living on that, and not in the best interest of the country.

One word about the Minister of the Interior and I am done. Despite all that hon. gentleman opposite may say—and I am glad the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), at least, set himself right with regard to that—from beginning to end, this has been an attempt to kill the Minister of the Interior. No matter what name it may have come under, though nominally directed against one man or another, the whole attempt was against the Minister of the Interior. Why, because it was discovered that the Minister of the Interior was not a man who could be manipulated, he was not a man who would grant anything in the Yukon except what was fair. Because, moreover, he came from the western country and was making for himself a reputation. That reputation has been eloquently spoken of from the point of view of the government; may I say a few words from the point of view of a member of the House? While all the ministers have the attachment of members on this side of the House, there is not one of them toward whom we feel more warmly than towards the Minister of the Interior. No man in the government has given more ardent, undivided attention to the business of his department than the Minister of the Interior has done. Consider what he has accomplished. Here was a new country, for which a system of government had to be provided down to the smallest rules and regulations. The marvel to me is that he did not break down with the weight of

business resting upon him. Previous Ministers of the Interior had nothing to do except with the North-west Territories—and the work was nothing in comparison with that which the government undertook in the Yukon—and yet they did not do it well enough to prevent the people rising in rebellion. The work of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) stands as a monument to his labour, an honour to the government and an honour to the party under which it was done. There is no man in public life in Canada who deserves better of this parliament and the people than the Minister of the Interior. It is idle for hon. gentlemen opposite to think that they can strike him by subterfuge. The people of this country like a fighter, and the Minister of the Interior is a fighter. I think he is a fair and even generous fighter, and for such a man the people of Canada have nothing but generous thoughts. His work there was well done. Major Cartwright, Inspector Strickland and Col. Steele were the best types of the mounted police in the Yukon, and saying that is to say that they were the best types of the best class in Canada. When they went into the Yukon with all its opportunities, they stood firm, they did not touch a dollar, but had the soldiers' instinct to carry out the law to its full extent, finding their reward in gratifying the soldier's pride in doing what is right and fair.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) include Major Cartwright and Major Strickland in that 'hear, hear.'

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Then, there will be one less vote to-night, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is honest. These men went their and did their work, whether in summer or in winter, and I am very sorry that—

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough) please state what charge is made against Major Cartwright or Inspector Strickland?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). They have been stated a dozen times. I know that hon. gentlemen opposite want to get out of it now, but they cannot. They want the benefit of the charges, but they would like to avoid the responsibility of them. However, the demand was for a commission to inquire whether the officers at certain points could be bribed with \$5 or \$10, that they manipulated the accounts, that they perjured themselves in making false returns—and the two officials who were there at the time were Mr. Cartwright and Mr. Strickland.

Mr. HAGGART. I listened to the charges, and I never heard that.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? From

the way the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough) is treating these charges, it is evident they have substance in them. But, did not the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries state that there was no substance in the charge—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not state that there was no substance in the charge. I stated that the words which ought to be there but which were not there, were not mere matters of form, but matters of substance.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Lest there be some misunderstanding, I will read the charges:

I was, as you are aware, sent by Collector Milne to Skagway as a Canadian bureau of information to aid intending prospectors to pass through the American customs. How I performed that work I leave others to tell you—

Whenever you find a man prefacing his remarks with expressions of modesty, look out for him. But, he does not leave others to tell us; he goes on:

—but I might say that one American gentleman from Dawson told me, on his return, that I was the first official he had met who was honest, and afterwards, when I was in Dawson, he told me I could not make money in consequence.

Here is an honest man for you. 'For he himself had said it, and it is greatly to his credit.

Concerning the collection of duties at the summit of White Pass. I was sent there by Col. Steele after I had reported to Collector Milne in detail. I found the state of affairs just as I had reported there, and in consequence of doing my duty as a customs officer, I was treated as a spy by the officers in charge. This latter fact was written by the officer commanding the post to Col. Steele who told me of it.

That letter could be written only by Major Cartwright or Inspector Strickland. These were the inspectors who were there.

I numbered the entries and entered up the cash book which was not done before. The book is now in Ottawa. There were two items entered up twice in the cash book, and yet the cash balanced.

That is theft.

I was never allowed to check the cash. I asked twice but was refused. The first item that was found entered twice I altered and reported as a clerical error to Col. Steele. The second I refused to alter, but it was manipulated at night by the officer commanding and his sergeant who lived in the hut.

There is forgery against those two men.

And I, as a customs clerk, have to live in a tent.

There is the meanest kind of forgery.

The business method I introduced was never adopted. Concerning the Chilkoot Pass, I only have information from prospectors, and they told me in Dawson they never paid for one-half of the goods.

There is a man who was collector of customs so reporting on his oath.

The invoices were turned up and put away by brokers and others. I was informed a few days ago that the entries were missing, in fact, chaos reigned supreme.

That is the character given to Major Cartwright and to Major Strickland. And he added afterwards that half a million dollars was lost. Now, the half a million dollars could only be lost by the act of these two parties, and they either got the half a million dollars and had it in their pockets, or a lesser sum.

Mr. DAVIN. Are these officers' names mentioned there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The responsible Minister of Customs has said that these were the officers in charge.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). You cannot get away from it, it was on the summit where these two officials performed all that ; and with the exception of the member for Victoria, no man has said that the unattested letter, not sworn to, from the man that made that accusation should be taken against the character of these two officials.

Mr. DAVIN. Does the hon. gentleman assert that any one voting for the inquiry endorses that letter ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Certainly, because it is the thing that was put before this House on which to make the motion, and the hon. gentleman cannot vote for a part of it and leave another part out. If there are things there that the hon. gentleman does not believe or dare not vote for, why does he not simply move a resolution for a general inquiry ? It would be just as reasonable. But when it comes to details in that particular case, backed up by the report of Colonel Steele, who investigated the very substance of that letter, and the statements made in it, and who pronounced them a tissue of falsehoods, are you going to vote for it, notwithstanding all that ? The hon. gentlemen are jurors, and they are going to say that all that is true ; otherwise they should have been wise enough to see that the parts they did not like, were eliminated. But they gulped it down greedily, as they do anything relating to the Yukon, without inquiry.

Now, the North-west Mounted Police need neither apology or vindication at my hands. Let me say this about those men. The life of a soldier is of such a character as of necessity, makes him a more honest and straightforward man than others. Take a sober soldier of good character, and you have a man who will honestly fulfil his duties better than any other man. Now, let me make a suggestion to the hon. gentlemen opposite. I feel sure that while this motion might be considered light reading in the days of Hilpa and Shalum, at the present time, when only three score and ten constitute our term

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough).

of life here below, it is too short to read resolutions of this length, nor do I think it fair in the junior member for Pictou to take up so much of the valuable time of men who have other work to do. Let them formulate charges specifically and of sensible length, state that on the evidence they possess, they are able to prove certain charges, when that is done we will have something substantial. I say the people of Canada are proud of the Yukon. There is no brighter page in our history than the history of the Yukon so far. There was a time when men were rushing in there in crowds from the south, many of them who had neither character or reputation, men whose only boast was that they had killed their man, they went in there by hordes, and these police kept them in order. Now, order prevails everywhere. I say Canada is proud of them, and Canada is going to treat the hon. members opposite, who make these unfounded charges as somebody else has said they ought to be treated. An hon. gentleman gets up and says : I was informed by a man I met on the street, who told me he was informed by a man he met in a shop, who told him the man in the shop was informed by a man who was out hunting, that the man who was out hunting had informed him that he had heard from a man up the creek, that somebody had said some weeks before, that there was something wrong in the Yukon. What will be thought of evidence like that ? The Yukon is all right, and hon. gentlemen cannot hurt it. I venture the prophecy that hon. gentlemen, within five years, will be exceedingly sorry, that, without thought or consideration, and with an utter lack of evidence, they attempted to smirch, for political purposes, the character of a territory like the Yukon, instead of cheering the men who have gone into that country and of helping them, forgetting even their shortcomings, to make it, as it is now and will be in the future, one of the brightest parts of the Dominion of Canada.

House divided on the amendment (Mr. Bell, Pictou).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Beattie,  
Bell (Pictou),  
Bennett,  
Bergeron,  
Cargill,  
Carscallen,  
Clancy,  
Clarke,  
Cochrane,  
Dugas,  
Foster,  
Ganong,  
Gillies,  
Haggart,  
Henderson,  
Ingram,  
Kaulbach,

Kendry,  
LaRivière,  
Macdonald (King's),  
MacLaren,  
McAllister,  
McDougall,  
McInerney,  
McNeill,  
Marcotte,  
Martin,  
McIntague,  
Morin,  
Prior,  
Sproule,  
Taylor,  
Wallace, and  
Wilson.—34.

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Beith,  
Bell (Prince),  
Blair,  
Bourbonnais,  
Britton,  
Brodeur,  
Brown,  
Bruneau,  
Calvert,  
Campbell,  
Casey,  
Costigan,  
Cowan,  
Davies (Sir Louis),  
Dechêne,  
Demers,  
Dobell,  
Domville,  
Dupré,  
Ellis,  
Ethier,  
Featherston,  
Fielding,  
Fisher,  
Fortier,  
Fraser (Guysborough),  
Fraser (Lambton),  
Frost,  
Gauthier,  
Gauvreau,  
Geoffrion,  
Godbout,  
Harwood,  
Hutchison,  
Johnston,

Landerkin,  
Lang,  
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),  
Lavergne,  
Livingston,  
Macdonald (Huron),  
Mackie,  
McClure,  
McGregor,  
McGugan,  
McHugh,  
McIsaac,  
McLellan (Prince),  
McLennan (Inverness),  
McMillan,  
Madore,  
Malouin,  
Maxwell,  
Meigs,  
Mignault,  
Merrison,  
Parnalee,  
Paterson,  
Proulx,  
Puttee,  
Rogers,  
Ross,  
Rutherford,  
Savard,  
Somerville,  
Stenson,  
Sutherland,  
Talbot,  
Tolmie, and  
Tucker.—70.

## PAIRS :

## Ministerial.

## Messieurs

Davis,  
Snetsinger,  
Christie,  
Scriven,  
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),  
Gibson,  
Charlton,  
Fitzpatrick,  
Lewis,  
MacPherson,  
Macdonell,  
Fenny,  
Graham,  
McMullen,  
Lemieux,  
Mulock,  
Logan,  
Comstock,

Hale,  
Reid,  
Roddick,  
Blanchard,  
Tupper (Sir Charles),  
Corby,  
Tisdale,  
Casgrain,  
Poupore,  
Rosmond,  
Roche,  
Osler,  
Richardson,  
Caron (Sir Adolphe),  
McLennan (Glengarry),  
Powell,  
Maclean,  
Tupper (Sir Charles  
Hibbert),  
Robertson,  
Hodgins,  
Hughes,  
Gilmour,  
Davin,  
Earle,  
Menk,  
Bell (Addington),  
Craig,  
McCormick,  
Chauvin,  
Mills,  
Guillet,  
Pope,  
Quinn,  
McCleary,  
Robinson,  
Ferguson,

Champagne,  
Edwards,  
Burnett,  
Belcourt,  
Angers,  
Oliver,  
Copp,  
Borden (King's),  
Hurley,  
Dymont,  
Fortier,  
Flint,  
Sifton,  
Legris,  
Carroll,  
Bazinet,  
Monet,  
Préfontaine,

## Opposition.

## Ministerial.

## Opposition.

Semple,  
McCarthy,  
Gould,  
Wood,  
Martineau,  
Desmarais,

Broder,  
Klock,  
Seagram,  
Kloepfer,  
McIntosh,  
Moore.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. HAGGART. I was paired with the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), but I find that he has another pair, and I have made a mistake as to the vote. I vote 'yes.'

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman was not in when the question was put.

Mr. GIBSON. I desire to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) has a standing pair with the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Lewis).

Mr. POUPORE. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Gibson) is correct. I supposed that the hon. member for Albert was in the House and I voted, but otherwise I would not have voted.

Mr. DUGAS. I understood that all pairs were done away with.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose the House desires to resume work in committee at this late hour, and I beg, with the permission of the House, to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be taken up to-morrow ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yukon.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will be here to-morrow, and if he is we will take up some of the Bills standing in his name and then go into supply.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) if he has brought down the papers in reference to the Galops Canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think the papers are all ready. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to ask that I should lay them on the Table of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. I want to see them so that I can read them over.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The probability is that the estimates of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) will be taken up to-morrow morning.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.10 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, June 29, 1900.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## EMERGENCY RATIONS.

**Mr. FREDERICK D. MONK** (Jacques Cartier) moved :

That the report of the select committee with respect to the purchase of emergency rations for the use of the Canadian troops in South Africa, together with the minutes of the proceedings, the evidence taken and the exhibits filed before the said committee, be printed forthwith, and that Rule 94 be suspended in regard to said report.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. N. A. BELCOURT** (Ottawa). **Mr. Speaker**, I want to give informal notice that the consideration of the report of the select committee on the emergency rations might possibly be taken up on Monday. With the consent of the House, I would like to have an understanding as to whether it is agreed to take it up some time on Monday. I would suggest after three o'clock.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). Monday after 8.

**Mr. BELCOURT**. Monday, after 8; will that suit the convenience of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) ?

**Mr. MONK**. That will be all right.

**Mr. G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.) Does the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) agree to that ?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No, we will have to see the report printed first. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has just moved that the report be printed, which is quite proper, but before we fix any time to discuss it we should have the report in print.

**Mr. MONK**. I understand it will be printed by that time.

**Mr. BELCOURT**. I am under the impression that the report is practically printed now.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Then, if the right hon. leader of the House wishes to see it, probably he will look at it to-day, and we can settle the time to-morrow morning or to-night.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. We will settle it to-morrow morning.

**Mr. MONK**. Would it not be possible to settle it now ?

**Mr. FIELDING**.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No, wait until to-morrow morning.

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The **PRIME MINISTER** moved :

That when the House adjourns this day (Friday) it stands adjourned until Saturday at 11 a.m., and that the order of proceeding on that day be the same as on previous sitting days.

**Mr. B. M. BRITTON** (Kingston). **Mr. Speaker**, I suppose it as well in speaking to this motion now, as at any other time, to present the views of quite a number of members in reference to sitting on Monday. It was announced by the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that it would be necessary to have a sitting on Monday, and I would ask now if it would be possible that the matter might be considered and the announcement be made that we should have Monday as a Holiday. I am quite aware of the urgency that exists now after such a very long time spent in session here, but, still, I cannot help thinking that not very much progress would be made by a session on Monday. Arrangements have been made by a great many hon. members, to my knowledge, from conversation with them, so that they cannot be here on Monday. It is the family day, and it is the day that we regard as a holiday. If it is consistent with the duties that we owe to parliament to have that as a holiday, I should be glad if the right hon. leader of the House and the government would consider the matter.

**Mr. E. G. PRIOR** (Victoria, B.C.) If there are Ontario and Quebec gentlemen who cannot be here there will be a sufficient number of members from British Columbia and maritime provinces present to take their places, because they cannot get home. We will guarantee to carry on the work. I do not see why we should be kept here a day longer than is necessary. I have not been home since the 28th of January.

**Mr. J. V. ELLIS** (St. John City). **Mr. Speaker**, I do not care so much about Monday, but I think there should be some let-up to the work. So far as one can judge from the past there will be three weeks of this session yet. Members cannot stand the work that is imposed upon them. I was called out at ten o'clock this morning to attend a committee, after sitting up until one o'clock this morning, and then I have to attend the sittings of the House. We cannot stand these long hours. It seems to me that there should be an agreement on both sides of the House to limit all speeches to ten minutes for the remainder of the session, and there be one night off so that a man could get a clear night's rest.

Mr. T. D. CRAIG (East Durham). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in support of the view of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton). I think this House should not sit on a day that is kept as a holiday all over this country as Dominion Day. It is a national holiday, and the only national holiday you have in this country. There have been differences of opinion about other questions, but I think we should all agree in being Canadians. We talk about urgency and all this sort of thing but after all the urgency does not amount to so much, when we can spend days making long speeches on both sides of the House. It is not confined to one side of the House. If matters are now so urgent, why did they not become urgent long ago? They have only become urgent in the last few days of the session, but this is no reason why we should sit on Dominion Day. Those who may be here in the future may always expect to have long sessions, and it may happen that Dominion Day will always come during the sessions, and the same plea will be put forward. I wish to enter my protest against sitting on Dominion Day, because this is our national holiday, and, after all, one day is not such a serious matter that we should decide to sit on that day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The answer to the view put forward by my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) has just been given by the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Prior). Those hon. gentlemen who have made arrangements to be away on Monday can, I should think, fulfil their engagements. I must rely on the precedents of the past, both under Sir John Macdonald and Sir John Thompson, to sit on Dominion Day if the business of the House requires it. I believe I voice the universal wishes of the House when I say that we should make every effort to bring the session to a close as quickly as possible. Whether the speeches are long or short must be left to the good taste and judgment of the House, and if the speeches are long it is all the more reason why we should not lose a day. I am sorry to say that the government cannot agree with the views of my hon. friend, and that we will sit on Monday.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Whilst we would be glad to meet the views of the First Minister, in my opinion there will be a strong feeling against sitting on Monday throughout the country. In Sir John Thompson's time we did sit on Dominion Day, but so strong was the feeling against it that my recollection is that the House did not sit after six o'clock in the evening. I am sure that throughout the country there will be a very strong feeling against this Canadian House of Commons sitting on Dominion Day. I wish the Prime Minister would permit us to regard Monday as a holiday.

Motion agreed to.

## SPEECHES OF THE HON. MR. TARTE IN FRANCE.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the First Minister to a matter to which I alluded some days ago; that is with reference to the reports of the speeches made by Mr. Tarte, the representative of Canada at the exposition in Paris, and which have since then been somewhat fully reported in the press. At that time the right hon. gentleman who leads the government stated that he was in communication with Mr. Tarte, and I think in reply to a suggestion from myself he proposed to take cognizance of the reports of that gentleman's speeches, and at a later date give the results of his investigation to the House. Since that time the reports of Mr. Tarte's speeches have become very particular, and I think there can be very little doubt now as to their authenticity, more especially as they receive constant insertion in *La Patrie*, which is, as is well known, the personal organ of the Minister of Public Works. I think the government ought to be able to tell us whether they approve of such utterances as these or not. Mr. Tarte is there as the representative of this country, not of any section of it. He is the representative of this government, and he is supposed to voice the position of this government and of the country in his utterances, which must necessarily be more or less official. I notice that some of the right hon. gentleman's own papers have expressed the same views as I am expressing to-day, and that takes it out of the category of simply a party matter. I read from the Montreal *Herald*, the government organ in that city, as follows:

It is difficult to know what idea Mr. Tarte intended to convey to his Rouen audience when he informed them that the French Canadians have remained French, that 'we are more and more French; we are more French than we were twenty years ago, aye, we are more French than we were one year ago.' But whatever meaning may have been intended, it is still more difficult to understand what possible motive could have prompted these and other expressions in the same speech. One has to remember, what it is charitable to hope he himself did not, that the speaker is the representative in France of a British country, that he is a minister of the Crown in this British colony, and that, whether he is right or not about Canada, or even North America, ultimately becoming French in the majority of its population, just at present there is in Canada a considerable majority of English-speaking people, and that he is in France to represent these even more than the minority from which he springs.

That is a statement made from a quarter which is not hostile at all to the government. I think the matter is a serious one, and I hope to hear from the Prime Minister that he has under the circumstances—as they appear to be undoubtedly—peremptorily ordered Mr. Tarte to return home.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I informed the House on a former occasion that I had received a communication from Mr. Tarte, complaining that his speeches were not properly translated. I have been in communication with him ever since, and I have asked him, if possible, to send me the reports of his speeches which he approved. Every man who is asked to speak in public knows—and my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) himself, who is a public speaker of great eminence—knows very well that it is impossible to expect that any man should be held responsible for the speeches which are placed in his mouth by newspaper reports. The reports of the present day are too speedily made out to ensure accuracy in every case. Mr. Tarte, if he is anything, is a loyal British subject. Everybody knows that. He has never disguised his views upon this matter, and it is not later than the 24th of this month that something authentic came from his pen in the message which the French Canadians now in Paris sent Her Majesty the Queen assuring her of the loyalty of her French Canadian subjects. This ought to be an answer to the inferences which may be drawn, and which are drawn, from some expressions alleged to be used by Mr. Tarte, but which I doubt his having uttered in the sense, at all events, that is attributed to them. If Mr. Tarte said that the French Canadians were more French this year than last year, I do not exactly understand what is the practical fact which has made us more French this year than last year. We are just as much French this year as last year, and just as much last year as we were before. We are French by birth; we are French by origin; we certainly have the pride of our origin; I have, for my part, the pride of my origin; and I will never disguise it. I will say it in every assembly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. But whilst I have the pride of my origin, and whilst I pride myself on belonging to a chivalrous race, I take it that it is a further evidence of loyalty to the Crown under which we have received the liberties we now enjoy. I do not believe that Mr. Tarte meant anything else, and until I have received the official correspondence which I expect from him, with an authentic version of his speeches, I am not prepared to admit that Mr. Tarte meant anything else but that. Mr. Tarte spoke with some pride of his race, and he had reason to do so. He spoke perhaps with greater hopes of it than I have myself. He expected that the French Canadians would become the most numerous race in this country. That is a very laudable ambition, and I do not think that any one would blame him for that. For my part, if I did entertain the hope that the French race would become the most numerous, I

Mr. FOSTER.

would be but paying a tribute to the well known fecundity of my race; a tribute, however, which I am afraid to say will not be fulfilled.

We shall endeavour to maintain our own. We have no sources of recruit from the other side of the Atlantic; our resources are within ourselves, and I am sure my hon. friend opposite will not object if in that way we try to become more numerous than the race to which he belongs. For my part I cannot find any fault with Mr. Tarte's expectations. I do not know that he meant anything more than that. Whatever he may have meant, I claim this for Mr. Tarte, that if there is a man who has the pluck and courage of his convictions, it is he. He never scruples to declare his views. Perhaps the expression he has used may be tortured out of its real meaning, but I am not prepared to admit that that expression meant anything else than that the French Canadians are loyal to their origin and take a pride in their origin, and that they are loyal to the British Crown as well. If that is all Mr. Tarte meant, I am quite prepared to stand by him.

Mr. FOSTER. If I may be allowed a word, I would be very sorry indeed to take away from my right hon. friend and his compatriots the store of future joys which are opened up by the ambition to which he has alluded; and I certainly cannot but wish for himself and all his compatriots the greatest success in that peculiar field of endeavour. While allowing him that laudable ambition, and in so wide and pleasant a field, I still think that the hon. gentleman, as leader of the government, has not quite treated as he should do what seems to be a rather serious statement made by a representative of the Dominion government. I do not wish to bind public men down to newspaper reports of what they say, which are often extravagant and sometimes incorrect; but at the same time I think the circumstances show that the main features of these remarks are not attributed to Mr. Tarte with inaccuracy. I think they bear all the marks of being substantially true, and as such I think the right hon. gentleman is scarcely dealing fairly with the country if he approves of such statements from a man in such a representative capacity.

#### WRECK OF THE SCOTSMAN.

Mr. M. K. COWAN (South Essex). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to say that I have placed in the hands of the Clerk of the House a notice of an address asking that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries bring down all papers that may be in his possession concerning the wreck of the *Scotsman* off the coast of Newfoundland on the 22nd day of last September. There was a formal investigation

held in the Admiralty Court of Quebec, on the 23rd, 24th, 25th and 26th of October, 1899, before W. H. Smith, Wreck Commissioner; and in view of the fact that a large number of Canadians were on board of that vessel and lost both life and property, it seems to me that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ought not to have any objection to bringing down what papers may be in his department. I do not want the private correspondence which may have passed between private individuals concerning their personal losses, but I would like any correspondence that passed between the steamship company and the department, together with the evidence taken and the finding of the Admiralty Court, to be laid on the Table for the benefit of the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I gather from my hon. friend's statement that he has placed a notice on the paper for these papers. Recognizing the period of the session which we have reached, I do not propose to take advantage of the fact that he cannot reach his motion in the ordinary course so as to have it formally made in the House; and the moment I see his motion and learn exactly what he wants, I will give instructions to have the papers looked over, and will have those which can be brought down prepared and laid on the Table.

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Post Office—Mail service..... \$2,297,000

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before the details of the post office estimates are gone into, I want to call the attention of the Postmaster General and the House to a matter of some importance which we discussed partially on another occasion. I refer to the nonpayment by the Postmaster General of expenditure for the carrying of the mails, and the practical substitution of other departments for his own in these expenditures, taking for himself the total revenues of the post office and charging to other departments tens of thousands of dollars for the carriage of the mails which should have been charged to his own department. Now, this is important in more ways than one; and last year, when we were going over the estimates, I pointed out the absolute necessity of the expenditures for carrying the mails being borne by the proper department, that is, the Post Office Department. And I think that the Postmaster promised me on that occasion that the vote which was then taken, I think, for the Yukon service—not the post office service,

but for the general Yukon service—would be distributed, so that the amount of money which was properly chargeable to the post office should be thus charged, and consequently we should have a fair means of estimating the revenue and expenditure and the financial results of that department. That, however, I am sorry to say has not been done, and we come to the present year with a state of things something like this, that very heavy carriage expenses of the mails have been assumed by other departments whilst the Post Office Department has escaped.

No one will dispute that every department is responsible for its own expenditure and should undertake its own work and pay for it. If we are not to conduct our business on that basis, we will simply have a state of chaos as regards all comparative and proper considerations with reference to the different services of the country. We have had some very extravagant and persistent claims made by the Postmaster General himself with reference to the diminution of the deficit in his department. But it is a very easy matter to cultivate a surplus, if you can get some other department to take a large share of the expenses off your shoulders, while at the same time you keep the revenues. It may be said that the revenues in 1896, 1897 and 1898 from the Yukon were not large, but that does not in the slightest degree affect the principle. In this country, every department takes the bitter with the sweet, the lean with the rich, and the Post Office Department must bear the expenses of its non-productive as well as to enjoy the profits of its productive areas. But what has happened? From an examination conducted before the Public Accounts Committee, I find that in 1896—that part of 1896 which was administered by the present government—the post office carriage into the Yukon district and out of it was so light that, according to the comptroller of the North-west Mounted Police, a man could carry it in a despatch bag. During that year the Post Office Department paid for nothing, with the exception of the transport of 65 pounds of mails, for which it paid \$100. A contract was entered into in that year which it is well to take note of, as showing the costs which would have been incurred from any regular carriage of the mails. According to that contract, the cost incurred was \$600 for the transport of 65 pounds of mail, which is about \$10 per pound. Misfortune dogged the footsteps of the carrier, the mail was lost, and in the end he received \$100 as compensation. I call attention to the fact, as showing the cost of carriage in that year. However, the fact is this, that in 1896 we may dismiss the mail carriage into and out of the Yukon, because it was very light; but whatever expenses were incurred in that year were met by the Post Office Department only to the extent of \$100.

When we come, however, to 1897, a distinct change takes place. Under instructions, the comptroller of the mounted police arranged for posts and undertook to carry the mails into and out of the Yukon during the season of navigation by at least a monthly service. To that end posts were established, and the general paraphernalia of carriage was gathered together and put into operation. It was an expensive proceeding, and not altogether successful, in so far as the regular carriage of the mails was concerned; but I find that, outside of the two boats which carried the mails around by the sea route and river route at a cost of \$750 and the North-west Mounted Police Department, there did go out from Skagway monthly mails during the season of which I have spoken. Very few of these got through regularly to Dawson. Generally speaking, the majority of them, owing to the circumstance of putting in the troops, supplies and the like of that, which took precedence—the majority of the mail bags so carried in remained near the river during the remainder of the winter and spring, and were, when navigation opened, carried down to Dawson. But the fact remains that the North-west Mounted Police, under instructions, I presume, from the Post Office Department, undertook to establish and did establish posts and the necessary paraphernalia for carrying the mails once a month up as far as the river, and some of them through to Dawson, and the remainder, near the river, were carried in the spring up to Dawson at their own costs and charges. Not one single dollar of all the expenditure to which the mounted police was put in 1897 for the carriage of the mails, has been charged to and recouped by the Post Office Department. It is impossible to estimate what was the increased cost to the North-west Mounted Police body, but it is not impossible to estimate what it would have been to the Post Office Department, if it had undertaken the carriage of the mails and had performed that carriage in just the same way as it was done by the mounted police. The cost would have amounted to something like \$10 per pound for everything that went in and out during that season.

We now come to the year 1898. In that year the North-west Mounted Police branch had the sole charge of the mails.

Early in the autumn they made their arrangements, sent in what paraphernalia was necessary, took the mails and carried them fortnightly during that season into Dawson and its neighbourhood. And, not counting anything but the extraordinary expenses that the North-west Mounted Police Department was put to for the carriage of mails, the estimate made of the expenditure entailed on that department for the season, as given by Mr. White, the deputy head of the department, is the sum of \$47,400. And he made the estimate, which he considers a reasonable one, that if the Post Office De-

partment itself had established these posts and put on the machinery necessary for carrying the mails, that department could not have done the work at a less expenditure than \$100,000 for the season. Now, will the House believe—but it is true—that not one single dollar of that expenditure of the North-west Mounted Police branch for the carriage of the mails has been debited to or paid by the Post Office Department? It has all been charged up to mounted police, and appears in our public accounts as part of the expenditure of that branch. I do not suppose there is any man in this House who will, for a single moment, deny that that modified and partial charge of \$47,400 incurred by the mounted police, calculated upon the basis of the extraordinary work they did solely and entirely to carry the mails, is a charge which the Post Office Department should liquidate, and which should appear in the expenses of that department. But this is not all. I find that the Department of the Interior in 1898-9 paid \$3,000 for carrying mail bags—something over 1,500 pounds in all—into Dawson, at the rate of \$2 per pound. This is also significant as showing the cost of the independent service, if the Post Office Department had undertaken that service itself. The Department of the Interior was in position to perform this service at a less cost than the Post Office Department if it had taken it up at first hand and done the work outright. With \$47,400 paid by the mounted police and \$3,000 paid by the Interior Department, you have a sum of \$50,400 altogether—even at the reduced rate—which is properly chargeable to the Post Office Department for the carriage of mails into and out of that north-western country during the season of 1898-9. If you take any fair estimate of the year preceding, I think you will have to admit that the cost for that year would have been just about the same. Therefore, arguing from that basis, there is a charge of at least \$100,000 which has been paid by other departments for the sole purpose of carrying the mails into and out of Dawson, not a single cent of which has the Postmaster General assumed or the Post Office Department paid. Now, I say that is not right in a financial point of view; it is not right in a comparative point of view; and the Postmaster General is entirely precluded from boasting of his large surplus in any of these years until he has subtracted from the revenues of his department, as recorded in his books, the amount of money which has been incurred for carrying his mails into and out of the Yukon. I cannot conceive any reason why the Postmaster General and the Finance Minister, in the interests of sound book-keeping and proper financial administration, have allowed a state of things like that to exist; more particularly, considering that last year, the attention of both these gentlemen was called to it, and that they promised

that an equitable distribution of a joint vote should be made in order to make that book-keeping right and distribute those burdens as they should be distributed. If this system is carried on in the different departments of the government, what confidence can we have in the records of any department. There comes out annually a report under the seal of the Postmaster General, in which the people of this country are told: Here is what the post office service cost the country last year, and here is what the post office business brought into the treasury of the country last year. But when you come to take a proper view of it—which no man outside can do, because he is not conversant with the facts—you find that in 1898 alone another department shouldered more than \$50,000 of the expenses of the Postmaster General's department for carrying mails into and out of the Yukon. On a fair basis of estimate—and it can only be estimated—for 1897, I think you can count that at least \$100,000 has thus been manipulated, and wrongly manipulated, and a false and distorted view of this department and the other departments as well has been given to the country. Why should any man in the country, when taking stock of the North-west Mounted Police service and what it does for the country, and what it costs, be put into the false position of charging up to the mounted police service \$100,000 which is properly chargeable to the post office service? If hon. gentlemen are going to keep their accounts in that way, it will be very difficult for the people of this country to have any confidence at all in the published reports of ministers. Now, I have placed this matter fairly before this House, and I shall await with interest the reply of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). I refer him to the report of the Public Accounts Committee, in which the evidence is given on which I have made the statement I have just had the honour to lay before the committee.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) toward the close of his observations, appeared to give an explanation of his indignation of what he called a manipulation of public accounts. He appears most anxious, if possible, by this method, to prevent the public drawing the proper and legitimate inference as to the administration of the Post Office Department, thinking that in this way he may discredit the accounts of that department. He pretended to be anxious to have a full and fair display of the receipts and expenditure on the records of the department, in order that a proper comparison might be made—I suppose between the administration of the post office under the present government and that under the previous government. If it is comparison he wants, is it not fair, considering that the late government had practically no Yukon service

to maintain, that the accounts of the Yukon service should be separated so that there can be a comparison of the same services in the same parts of the country. But the hon. gentleman forgets his own record, and I am surprised, in view of the reminder I gave some time ago, that he should again assume such an attitude as he has assumed to-day.

I told him when we were in committee the other day that his own government, when they were opening up the North-west, charged only a part of the expenditures to the Post Office Department, for carrying mails into the North-west, but a very large portion of the cost of carrying the mails into the North-west Territories when they were being opened up was deliberately charged not to the Post Office Department, but to the Indian Department, to the North-west Mounted Police, and to the Interior Department. His government for years maintained that principle. The hon. gentleman knows that I told him that two weeks ago, and here he gets up to-day with professed indignation, because we were doing the same as his own government did, and more fairly, because you find nothing in the departmental returns showing that his government made known to the public, that they were charging the post office mail service in the North-west Territories to other departments, you find no reference to it whatever in the post office reports, whereas as regards the expenditure for mail service in the Yukon on which the hon. gentleman has specially dwelt, it is most explicitly set forth upon the Postmaster General's report for the year 1898-9.

Now, let me for a moment say that in order properly to compare the administration of the department over which I have been permitted to preside for the last three years or more, with the administration of that department under the late government, it is far better for the purposes of comparison that the Yukon service should be dealt with separately in order that service for service may be compared. But I am not saying that in order to withhold from the public the true position of the matter, because even if it has happened that the Auditor General, or whoever adjusts the public accounts, has not chosen to carry into other accounts, the cost of the Yukon mail service, at least the Post Office Department has made it perfectly clear in its annual report, what it is costing the country to carry the mails, and the exact receipts and expenditures in respect to the Yukon service are fully set forth upon the Postmaster General's report presented to the House this session. Now, if you want to compare the Yukon service with the Yukon service, we might separate the accounts for the services of old Canada from those for the Yukon, and compare the administration of the Post Office Depart-

ment in the Yukon by the late government and by the present government and compare the administration of the service throughout the rest of Canada by the two respective governments, and in that way a fair comparison of these two services can be made. Let me give an illustration. The hon. gentleman alludes to the Yukon mail service under his government. Let me briefly show what sort of a mail service in the Yukon that they boast of, and see how much of the administration of the Yukon mail service has gone into the Post Office accounts. I propose to indicate the sort of mail service in the Yukon that they carried on, and to discover, if possible, how much public money was ever expended upon the Yukon by the Post Office Department.

The first attempt of the late government to establish a mail service in the Yukon, was in September, 1894, when they appointed postmaster, Mr. C. H. Hamilton, who happened to be the manager of a steamship company, and they arranged with him to carry the mails in and out of the territory by his steamers, between Seattle and the ports on the lower Yukon. The first arrangement of this kind was carried into effect in July, 1894, and it continued with some degree of intermittence for some years afterwards. Under that arrangement with Mr. Hamilton, he was not to be paid anything for the service, and nothing was paid by them to him. In 1895, the hon. gentlemen's government placed the conveyance of those mails in the hands of the North-west Mounted Police. Is the hon. gentleman aware of that fact? In 1895, the North-west Mounted Police, under the late government inaugurated the system of carrying the mails in and out of the Yukon; and point if you can to any one item of expenditure which the late government included in any account to show that the Post Office Department was ever charged with any services of that kind rendered in the Yukon by the mounted police. The hon. gentleman's government inaugurated it, they established the basis on which this was done, they allowed it to go on, perhaps in a greater volume; and ultimately as soon as it was safe to do so I terminated it, and obtained the services of private contractors. They attempted also to organize a mail service through Captain Healey; the hon. gentleman has alluded to that service. They arranged with him to take a mail in from Juneau, sixty-five pounds. The hon. gentleman says it costs \$600. Was there any of that \$600 charged by the hon. gentleman's government in the post office accounts? Does the hon. gentleman pretend that any portion of the moneys paid for that service was ever charged to the post office accounts during their administration? Why, Sir, their attempt to get a mail in there in that way was an absolute failure. The man neglected or abandoned his work for months and months, and it remained for the

Mr. MULOCK.

department under my administration to pay the cost of recovering that mail, and the expenditure for it, went not into the hon. gentlemen's accounts when they were in office, but it went into the post office accounts of the year that we assumed office. So you fail to find any expenditure by the late government in the post office accounts in respect of the Yukon mail service, unless it may be a paltry sum of \$100 or so, here and there. The late government arranged with a Mr. Moore, in the spring of 1896, to carry in certain mails, and just as in other cases, they did not pay Mr. Moore, and left the accounts unpaid. You find that they never charged the carrying of mails by Mr. Moore in the report of the Postmaster General for 1896. What did they do with it? They left that uncharged, because they left it unpaid, and it was for the department under my administration to pay their accounts, and we charged it in the accounts of the Post Office Department.

Now, I admit that we utilized the North-west Mounted Police, and I admit it was in the interests of the taxpayers to do so. It was an economical mode of establishing that service, it was the only effective mode, and it was necessary, therefore, if we wanted to maintain the service, that it should be so conducted. For the sake of a comparison, I admit, that the comptroller of the mounted police fixed on the sum that the hon. gentleman named, the sum of \$47,400, as the cost of the police for carrying the mails in 1898-9. I would further say for the sake of a comparison, taking the gross expenditure by the police and taking the gross revenue, the difference of the expenditure over the revenue for that fiscal year amounted to \$58,503.78. Add to it, if you like, the \$3,000 which were said to have been paid by the Department of the Interior, and you get \$61,503.78 as the total amount which could by any possible means be carried into the post office accounts for the year 1898-9. If you do carry this \$61,000 into the accounts for the year 1898-9, it would just by that much and no more have altered the results. I appeal to the judgment of this House whether the hon. gentleman is justified in making such observations as he has made to-day, and as he has made on a former occasion as to the manipulation and cooking of accounts in this department. I refer the House to the Postmaster General's report for the year closed June 30th, 1899, page xiv, which contains the information which the hon. gentleman says has been withheld from the public. This is the kind of statement which he calls manipulating and cooking:

The post office revenue for the Yukon and Athlun districts for the year amounted to \$10,846.61.

And it gives the points at which the sums making this total were collected. Then,

under the head of 'Expenditure—Yukon and Atlin districts,' the report proceeds to say :

The expenditure, including the sum so fixed as the value of the services of the North-west Mounted Police, amounted to \$69,350.39, the cost thus exceeding the revenue by \$58,503.78.

Under the head of 'Financial Operations,' it says :

The financial operations of the year ended June 30, 1899, not including the revenue and expenditure in respect of the service in the Yukon and Atlin districts as above mentioned (the same being above set forth), have resulted—

And then follows the statement. There it is placed in unmistakable language. It shows plainly on the face of it that it is an explicit statement of the gross revenues and expenditures last year in respect to the Yukon and Atlin service, and it distinctly declares that these different items of revenue and expenditure are kept apart where they may be seen. Here they are placed where they may be read and understood by any one who desires to understand them. The report then proceeds to give the financial results of the service for the rest of Canada. As if that was not a sufficient reference to the revenue and expenditure of this service, you again find on page 4, under the head of 'Revenue and Expenditure,' the gross revenue and the net revenue of the department for the year in question, and at the foot is an item to the effect that :

Revenue of the Yukon and Atlin districts (\$10,846.61) not included.

I should like to understand on what authority the hon. gentleman said that we had included in these accounts the revenue from the Yukon and that we had excluded the expenditure. I call his attention to this, and I challenge him to make good his statement. It is without foundation ; it is not correct. I again repeat my remark, as, perhaps, the hon. gentleman was not paying attention. Page 4 of this report gives the revenue of the department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899, below which is found this foot-note, to which the hon. gentleman's attention is called :

Revenue of the Yukon and Atlin districts (\$10,846.61) not included.

Then, if we turn to the expenditure column on the same page, we find that the total expenditure for the year is also given, and below the statement is this foot-note :

Expenditure on account of Yukon and Atlin services not included.

What deception is there in that? What cooking of accounts is there shown? I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that we are keeping a separate account of the Yukon and Atlin services, of the revenue and expenditure, and that we are incorporating it as a separate account in the

Postmaster General's report. If the hon. gentleman thinks that the fat and lean of the service are not taken together all he has to do is to add \$58,503 to the expenditure, and he has the actual total according to his contention. If he desires to test our actions and those of his own government by the practice that he established in the Yukon and handed down to us, the best way to deal with our accounts is the way in which they appear on the face of this book here. The hon. gentleman is extremely solicitous on occasions about my department, and I am proud of it. I am not quite sure that it is deserving of his attention, but since he is so ready to point out how accounts can be manipulated, permit me to ask what explanation he can offer to the country for not having placed, in the Postmaster General's report, or in the public accounts, the fact that he had incurred liabilities and debts in the Post Office Department, amounting to no less than \$680,000, which were not paid when his government left office, which were in excess of every parliamentary appropriation, and which the hon. gentleman himself must have known existed? A debt existed at the commencement of the fiscal year 1895 of over \$600,000, representing obligations due, and instead of the hon. gentlemen opposite coming down to parliament and frankly reporting the proper expenditure of the department for the year, he simply withheld that information from parliament, took a lump sum vote, and when June 30 expired, when the vote for the next year's services became payable, when they could draw upon it, they reached into the appropriation made by parliament for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1896, and paid with it over \$600,000 which they should have paid in the previous year. Not only so, but they came down to parliament after that transaction with their estimates for the year 1896. They maintained the service throughout the year 1895-96, and they reported to parliament what they wanted for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1896. By that time their concealed expenditure, the amount which they had incurred in liabilities in excess of the appropriation, had grown from being \$616,712.99 at the commencement of the fiscal year, to such an extent that when they went out of office they left unpaid liabilities amounting to \$685,447.03. For some years, I believe, that sum had been accumulating. It cannot be believed that it was the result of two or three years' management. I think it is fair to assume that it had been accumulating for years. If so, what excuse can the hon. gentleman give for the sort of accounts which he presented to parliament year after year, and which he presented in the years 1894-5 and 1896? After I took office, I found the expenditures of the department suddenly, in the early part of my tenure

of office, within the first two or three months, showing very large proportions, and being unable to understand how such an expenditure could be justified in view of the short time that I had been in office, I employed two expert auditors, who spent months to try and find out what was the matter with the accounts of the Post Office Department. We have their findings in a report signed by them, W. H. Cross and W. F. Munroe.

That report of theirs was embodied in the first report I had the honour to lay on the Table of parliament. The accuracy of that report has never been challenged. On the contrary, parliament recognized its accuracy and my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) had to come down to parliament and ask for a vote of \$685,000 to pay these unpaid bills of the Post Office Department which the hon. gentleman never honoured with a place in the public accounts during his regime. The hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Foster) is most solicitous lest the public may give some little measure of credit to the government for the administration of the Post Office Department, and he and his friends seem most anxious to try and explain away the why and the wherefore that we do not have such enormous deficits now as in the good old times when they held the purse-strings. The other evening the hon. gentleman from Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) endeavoured to give an explanation of the decreased deficits, and much as I would desire to do so I cannot credit him with any degree of accuracy or thoroughness. He gave an explanation why the expenditure of the Post Office Department since I have taken charge of it was much less than in former days, and his explanation was, that I withheld from the civil service increases of salary amounting to \$74,217, and that this answers to that extent for any betterment of our accounts. I will point out to the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) where he fell into an error. To arrive at the sum of \$74,217 he took the amount expended for salaries in the last year of his administration, and the amount expended for salaries in the year 1898-9, and deducting one from the other he found a balance of \$74,217, and so he jumped to the conclusion that the lesser expenditure in 1899, was accounted for by withholding increases from the staff. It did not occur to the hon. gentleman that that decrease in expenditure might have come about by other methods, and as a matter of fact it did, and I will just explain to him how it was. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that I did not recommend every one in the post office service for increases, but we did exercise a wise discretion having regard both for the needs of the service and the needs of the taxpayers who pay the salaries of those in office. We did not withhold \$74,217 of increases of salary from them, but we did

withhold a small sum. Let me point out to the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) that if every one on the outside staff had received every possible increase of salary, he could have been eligible for from the time we took office until the year 1898-9, it would only have amounted to the gross sum of \$19,087.16 in excess of what they were actually paid. When, in speaking on a recent occasion, the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) said that we withheld from the outside staff \$74,217, he was astray to the extent of \$55,000 out of the \$74,000, and therefore three-fourths of his statement was an error as I have explained. The reason why we did not pay so much money out in 1898-9, as he did, was that we had a much smaller staff. There is no great mystery about it. I will give my hon. friend the figures: When the hon. gentleman left office the number of the staff in the outside service was 1,610, and in 1898 the number had fallen to 1,486, and for the year just closed the number has fallen still further, namely, to 1,473. In other words, the number of our outside staff after three years was 137 less than it was during the regime of my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron). By this reduction of staff we will be able to account for over an economy much exceeding the \$74,000. I might also add, Mr. Chairman, that there were other ways by which economy was practised. For example, I found when I took office that a very great degree of improvidence had been displayed in the letting of mail contracts, and the particulars of which were summarized in the preface to the supplementary report which I submitted to parliament in 1897. The first page of that report contains the following:

In explanation of this supplementary report, it may be proper to state the circumstances which called for it. Shortly after entering upon my duties as Postmaster General information reached me from persons who had tendered for mail services, but who had not been awarded the contracts, to the effect that their lower tenders had been passed over and the contracts awarded at higher prices, and I accordingly called upon the officers of the department to produce and enter in a register all tenders so passed over.

This was accordingly done, when it appeared that tenders for 330 services had not been considered when the contracts were awarded, and in upwards of 100 instances the department, at the time of awarding the contracts, had received tenders to perform the services at lower rates than those at which the contracts had been awarded. Most of such contracts were renewals of existing contracts. In numerous cases, contracts were renewed many months in advance of the time when they would in ordinary course expire. These various methods prevailed, to a great extent, in the year 1895-6. As these investigations appeared instructive as illustrating the serious extent of the loss to the treasury by the renewal of contracts without tender, a statement was prepared showing the dealings of the department with the mail contracts during the last year of the administration of the late

government, from which it appears that 1,416 contracts had been made during that year, and that of these 598 had been let without tender. That is 42½ per cent in number of all the contracts entered during such years were let without tender. In looking at the aggregate of the amounts for which these contracts had been made, the results are even more striking. The total of these amounts was \$856,953.14, and of this sum the contracts let without tender amounted to \$457,952.70, or 53½ per cent of the whole.

There is a statement of the particulars showing among other things that during the last year of my hon. friend's administration of the department he let over 100 contracts at higher prices than the prices at which he had tenders to perform the services then in the department, and that in many instances contracts were let without his even opening the tenders to see what was in them. I may say that in re-letting these contracts, which were so improvidently let by my hon. friend, we did so at prices, obtained by tender, which resulted in a saving to the country of the sum of \$415,740. It is not very difficult to understand how our accounts are better balanced and so nearly in equilibrium when I point to items of this kind. I would ask my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) who, I believe, has taken a great interest in education and in the elevation of the standard which is to be the example of young men, to say whether he thinks the method I have indicated was a correct method of dealing with public contracts. It appears to me that he must have been unaware of these transactions, or they would not have received his sanction. Now that I have called his attention to them, I trust that when he again addresses the committee he will express his unqualified disapproval of them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General whether he states that new contracts were let without any tenders being called for, or whether he refers to contracts which had been let by tender, but were continued without tender under the law and under the practice of the Post Office Department ever since it has been in existence. If that be so, it changes the question completely, and that is a point which the hon. gentleman in fairness should state.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I refer as the foundation of my statement to the printed particulars which have been on the files of parliament for three years. The hon. gentleman will find all the details to make good my statement in the supplementary report of the department presented to parliament in the spring of 1897. I know that in the Post Office Act authority is given to renew contracts. That is a perfectly proper provision, and I am not directing my remarks against any proper exercise of that authority. The cases I

referred to were those in which contracts were entered into in some cases by way of renewals without calling for tenders, in some cases without regarding tenders that were called for—over a hundred cases in which lower tenders were passed over and higher tenders accepted, resulting in a loss of \$415,000 to the people of Canada.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The point I want to get at is whether in the 330 cases in which the hon. gentleman says tenders were disregarded, they were existing contracts which were continued without calling for new tenders. That is the law and the practice, as the hon. gentleman knows.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understand that the law gives to the minister the right to renew, under certain circumstances, without calling for tenders. If he renews a contract without calling for tenders, he assumes the responsibility of being justified by parliament in that renewal. In three hundred and thirty cases, the hon. gentleman chose to assume that responsibility. In one hundred other cases he chose to disregard the lower tenders that were in the department, and let the contracts at higher amounts. I took those cases in which he acted improvidently. I took the three hundred and thirty cases, where he had renewed without calling for tenders, and the one hundred cases where he had passed over lower tenders, and cancelled those contracts, and put them all up for public competition, and in every case awarded the contract to the lowest tenderer qualified to perform the service, with the result that we saved to the country \$415,000. That, at all events, the country will understand as one method whereby the expenditure may be brought within a measurable distance of the revenue.

I propose for a moment to allude to the record of the late administration in the matter of annual deficits. The financial success or failure of the Post Office Department depends upon whether or not a faithful, careful regard is had to details. The post office administration is essentially one of details, and any laxity in matters of detail will have a serious effect upon the general result. I know of no other department of which that can be so truthfully said. We have eight thousand or nine thousand small contracts, representing an aggregate of the best part of a million dollars a year, and the least wastefulness on each contract aggregates a large sum. We have 1,500 employees, and if you choose to add a few hundred, as a careless minister may, you can unnecessarily increase expenditure, and so all along the line a faithful regard for detail is absolutely essential.

Taking the net revenue and the net expenses of the department from 1889 to 1896, when the hon. gentleman left office, what do I find? I find the following:

Resumé of the financial statements of the Post Office Department for the last ten years, and the rates which the deficit bears to the revenue in each year:

Year.	Revenue.		Expendi- ture.		Deficit.		Ratio of Deficit to Revenue.
	\$	cts.	\$	cts.	\$	cts.	
1889...	2,220,503	66	2,982,321	48	761,817	82	34·31
1890...	2,357,388	95	3,074,469	91	717,080	96	30·42
1891...	2,515,823	44	3,161,675	72	645,852	28	25·67
1892...	2,652,745	79	3,316,120	03	663,374	24	25·01
1893...	2,773,507	71	3,421,203	17	647,695	46	23·35
1894...	2,809,341	06	3,517,251	31	707,920	25	25·20
1895...	2,792,789	64	3,593,647	47	800,857	83	28·68

In 1896, the year the late government left office, not counting the enormous debt that was left unpaid, but simply what they did pay, they expended \$700,907 in excess of all the post office revenue collected, or in other words 23 per cent more than the revenue. We then took office. These hon. gentlemen had established a degree of expenditure that could not be curtailed all at once, but nevertheless at the close of the next fiscal year, 1897, the deficit was only \$586,000, or 18 per cent of the annual revenue. Never since 1899 had the percentage of expenditure been as low as it was in 1897.

We then come to the year closing the 30th June, 1898, and the deficit that year was \$47,602, or 1·35 per cent of the net revenue. It was in that year, when I came to the conclusion that by good management it was possible to make the department self-sustaining; that the public interests and the condition of the department fully warranted us in entering on a policy of reduction of postage which has since been so happily carried into effect.

Take the year closing 1899, although the country had enjoyed six months of this reduced postage, the deficit was only \$398,000, or 12 per cent of the net revenue. Let me give the figures in detail for the years I have just mentioned :

Year.	Revenue.		Expendi- ture.		Deficit.		Ratio of Deficit to Revenue.
	\$	cts.	\$	cts.	\$	cts.	
1896...	2,964,014	23	3,665,011	30	700,997	07	23·62
1897...	3,202,938	42	3,789,478	24	586,539	92	18·31
1898...	3,527,809	69	3,575,411	99	47,602	30	1·35
1899...	3,182,930	92	3,581,848	71	398,917	79	12·53

Take the whole of the period from 1889 until the late government left office, the lowest percentage of expenditure as compared with the revenue was 23 per cent. And if you take the expenditure of the department for 1898, and wish to ascertain what according to the methods of hon. gentlemen opposite, the deficit would have been—take their best year, the year 1895, when their expenditure was 23 per cent—of their net revenue, and apply that measure to

Mr. MULOCK.

our administration of 1899, and you will find that our deficit for 1899 ought to have been, according to that method, \$823,740.40. But instead of that, it was but \$47,602.30.

It being One o'clock, the Committee took recess.

The Committee resumed at Three O'clock, o'clock.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Before recess, in answer to a question by my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), I gave what I thought was an explanation of a point he raised, namely, as to the meaning of a paragraph in the preface of the supplementary report of the Post Office Department in 1896. The hon. gentleman wanted to know the meaning of the following words: 'It appeared that tenders for 330 services had not been considered when contracts were awarded, and, in upward of one hundred instances the department, at the time of awarding the contracts, had received tenders to perform the services at lower rates than those at which the contracts had been awarded.' I gave my hon. friend the most favourable version of what I took to be the meaning of the reference to 330 tenders. I thought this referred to 330 cases where the hon. gentleman had exercised his right as Postmaster General to renew a contract without tender. But, on inquiry, I find that I gave him too favourable a reply. I find that the facts are that in the case of 330 contracts, he had received tenders, but did not open them, and the contracts were made without reference to these 330 sets of tenders; and also, that when the tenders were opened, it was found that a certain number of these tenders were for prices much lower than the amounts at which the contracts were let. I endeavoured to illustrate the policy of the department since the present government took office in regard to this department, and I think the illustration I gave will fairly enable the public to understand that our policy was to administer the department on proper business principles, with a due regard to efficiency and to the interest of the taxpayers. The carrying out of that policy, begun in the summer of 1896, warranted the conclusion which was reached within less than eighteen months, that, by the continuous employment of these methods, the department might reasonably expect, within a short time, to be a self-sustaining department, and it would be the part of wisdom at the earliest moment to endeavour to establish a lower rate of postage not only within Canada itself, but also between Canada and Great Britain and the British possessions generally, and between Canada and the United States. As soon as the government reached the conclusion that it was to the interest of the country, at the earliest possible moment, to bring about these freer

postal facilities—for the lower the rate the freer the facilities—it became my duty to study somewhat the utterances of hon. gentlemen on the subject generally, with the view to forming an opinion how far it would be wise for us to proceed. One great question that had been attracting public attention for a length of time, the question of reduced postage within our own country—the domestic letter rate as it is called—had been discussed both inside and outside of parliament. I began to study the subject, if I may say it, by referring to the official records, among them the report of the Postmaster General for the year 1893. In that report, I find the following opinion expressed by my predecessor with reference to this question. I quote from page xxvi of that report :

Whilst the department is thus being assailed on one hand by those who consider that its revenue and expenditure should be more nearly equalized, it is at the same time being urged to reduce to 2 cents an ounce the postage on letters, the inevitable result of which would be so large a reduction in the revenue, and as a necessary consequence so vast a discrepancy between the revenue and expenditure as to materially cripple the operations of the department for years to come. That this is no mere hasty assertion, unsupported by facts, may at once be demonstrated. The lowest estimate of the effect of a reduction to 2 cents in the rate of postage is a loss of revenue of at least \$750,000, which, even if postage on newspapers were reimposed, by which an additional revenue of \$100,000 would be obtained, would still leave a deficiency of \$650,000, which, added to the present amount, would make \$1,250,000 a year to be provided by parliament over and above the revenue, and what Postmaster General could be expected, in the face of such a deficiency, to entertain propositions for additional expenditures to improve the service, however necessary they might appear.

That was the deliberate opinion of the government in 1893. In 1894, Mr. Coatsworth, then member of this House for East Toronto, a supporter of the government, moved the following resolution :

That it is expedient to reduce the general rate of postage on letters from 3 cents to 2 cents.

Referring to *Hansard* of 1894, page 2206, I find that the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) is reported as expressing himself as follows:

The proposition of my hon. friend would represent a loss to the revenue, not of \$650,000 per annum, but of \$800,000. . . . Without attempting at all to discuss the financial question, I think we shall all admit that by reducing the tariff we have been relieving the people of some of their obligations, and, therefore, it seems to me this is hardly the moment when any of the friends of this country, or any who wish well for its future, should expect the government again to reduce the revenue by \$800,000 more.

My hon. friend in these remarks, had reference solely to the domestic rate. He an-

icipated a loss of revenue of \$800,000. He did not appear to consider at that time the loss of revenue from the reduction of the Imperial rate, because, at a later period, he intimated that if we reduced the letter rate from Canada to England—I presume he meant to the colonies as well, though I do not know that he said so—such reductions would involve a further loss of revenue to the extent of \$100,000. That is, his estimate was that the reduction of the domestic letter rate and the reduction of the Imperial rate would mean an annual loss of revenue of \$900,000. In 1896, the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), at that time the Finance Minister, in his budget speech, delivered on January 31, 1896, said :

In the Post Office we have an increased estimate of \$240,780, which is a large increase. The demands for the opening up of new lines, and for greater frequency and greater thoroughness in the delivery and despatch of mails, are continually pressing upon the Post Office Department, and a large expenditure has necessarily to be made if we are to keep at all even with the requirements of the times, which we are bound to do. There is now a deficit of somewhere near \$800,000 between the total receipts and the total expenditures of our post office service, and this, I fear, makes the time somewhat distant when, what otherwise might be fairly asked for, can be granted, that is, a reduction upon the rates of postage in this country. Considering the large extent of country, the sparseness of the population, and the great expense necessarily imposed for carrying letters and papers in our North-west and in other parts of the country, there is no doubt that the carriage of letters, newspapers and parcels in this country is cheaper, for the population, than you would probably find it in any other country in the world.

That was the opinion of the ex-Minister of Finance as expressed in the last budget speech he ever delivered in this House.

Well, Sir, the government came to the conclusion, notwithstanding these unfavourable opinions, that the untoward results anticipated would not follow. When in 1898, parliament was asked to authorize the government to reduce the domestic letter rate from 3 cents to 2 cents, I expressed the opinion that, whilst there would be a temporary loss of revenue amounting to about \$650,000 a year. I regarded that loss as but temporary and believed that in a reasonable period of time, about three years, the revenue would recover the position it had prior to the reduction. It will be for those who study the fact to say how far that prophecy has been fulfilled. We reduced the postage on domestic letters on January 1, 1899. A week before that, the letter rate from Canada to Great Britain and a good many of the British possessions had been reduced from 5 cents to 2 cents.

On the 1st of January, 1899, we also reduced the rate from 3 cents to 2 cents on letters passing from Canada to the United States, and thus we may say, commencing on that date, we had three reductions, these

three different classes of reductions all influencing the revenue at the same time. A few days afterwards the leader of the opposition, addressing a public meeting on the 14th of February, 1899, at Clinton, with reference to the action of the government in reducing the letter rates in Canada, expressed himself as follows :

To the large banking institutions and important mercantile interests, who are wealthy, do an enormous amount of business, and write a great many letters, the reduction of postage is a very important thing. But I have yet to learn that the mass of the women of Canada will relish to have to pay on the tea they drink—tea which was made free by us—in order to put money into the hands of the bankers, commercial men and other wealthy classes.

Again, Sir, since this session began, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) expressed himself as follows :

But to come back to the reduction of postage from 3 cents to 2 cents, I say, there again, it does not apply impartially. Whom does it benefit? The great commercial houses who write to Bombay, to China and Japan for the purposes of their trade. The farmer does not write any more letters than he used to, but he has to make up, out of his hard earnings, the difference between the 2 cents and the 3 cents, and the 2 cents and the 5 cents.

My hon. friend is not only opposed to the reduction from 3 cents to 2 cents in Canada, and to the reduction from 3 cents to 2 cents to the States, but also to the reduction from 5 cents to 2 cents to Great Britain and her colonies. He proceeds to say :

It is the poor man who has to pay that. The wealthy men and the wealthy houses who have to communicate for their own purposes with the great commercial centres of the world write their letters, whether they pay 5 cents or 1 cent, and to make up for the loss of revenue the poor man, who writes one letter a month, or two letters a month, has to put his hand into his pocket and contribute the amount necessary to make up the difference between 2 cents and 3 cents, the postage which formerly existed. I have stated that I was in favour of reducing the postage from 3 cents to 2 cents if we could have afforded to do so. I met a gentleman in England, Mr. Henniker Heaton, when I was Postmaster General, and we discussed the whole question. I admitted that it would be a good thing to have one rate of postage for the whole empire, but I said Canada could not afford it, as we would be losing \$800,000 revenue a year.

Now, Sir, those were the encouraging words, some of them, prior to our taking the step we did, and some of them discouraging statements made since. Now, let us fit these prophecies and statements to the facts as disclosed by the revenues of the Post Office Department since the reduction, and see whose judgment was right and whose judgment was wrong. The hon. member for Three Rivers and his friends opposite, seem to agree, and I will not quarrel with them in their figures, that the reduc-

tion in question would involve an annual loss of revenue of \$800,000 on the domestic letter rate and \$100,000 on the Imperial rate. Well, we had all these reductions in force for six months in 1899 from the first day of January, or practically so—the Imperial rate went into force a week earlier. They were in force for six months of the last fiscal year. If the hon. gentleman's prophecies were correct, they involved a loss for the six months of \$450,000 of revenue, being one-half of his total estimate of the year's loss of \$900,000. Well, Sir, the hon. gentlemen opposite put themselves on record as saying that the department could not be carried on, no matter what the rate of postage was, without the loss of at least \$800,000 a year, as when they were collecting these higher rates. Accordingly, if you add to their uniform annual deficit approaching \$800,000 a year, in round numbers, a deficit which they had for many years, if you add to that the \$450,000 loss of revenue from reduction in postage for the half year ending 30th June, 1899, which amount we left in the pockets of the people, not exacting from them the higher postage of the previous regime, but the lower rate of our time, leaving this \$450,000 in the pockets of the people—it would add to the deficit of \$800,000 for the year 1899 and make it \$1,250,000. Now, I do not care whether the contention of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), that this \$57,000 in the Yukon should or should not be estimated. I give him any crumb of comfort he can take from that. But take the Postmaster General's Report, as laid upon the Table of the House, and what does it show? It shows that for the fiscal year ending 1899, notwithstanding the fact that we left \$450,000 money in the pockets of the people which they at a higher rate would have taken out, it shows that instead of our deficit being \$1,250,000 for the year, or even the \$800,000 which they always had, the people enjoyed that reduced rate for one-half of that year at an expenditure of only \$398,917.79 in excess of revenue. Why, Mr. Chairman, if you double the deficit of last year, it would not give you \$800,000, and it thus means, comparing administration with administration, that the people get their reduced rates at no increased cost of taxation. The deficit of \$800,000 in our predecessors' time would pay for a deficit of \$800,000 in our time, and give the people reduced postage as well. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say that it is quite easily understood that when a reduction in postage takes place it is attended at first by a substantial loss of revenue; but as the days go by the revenue increases. I am a believer in the theory that the cheaper you make these charges the more you encourage the use of the service, and it is a narrow policy, I think, to maintain high rates if these high rates have

the effect of diminishing the use made of the postal service. Now, let me tell you what the result of the financial operations of the department was for the fiscal year 1899. Permit me to say for the comfort of those desponding people who thought we should have always an annual loss of \$800,000 or \$900,000 a year because of the reduction in the rates, for the comfort of those gentlemen who have so little confidence in the resources of their country, let me tell them how the revenue for the eleven months of this fiscal year compares with the revenue for the eleven months of the fiscal year under the higher rates. Taking the eleven months of the fiscal year of 1897-8 and comparing them with the eleven months of this present year, what do we find? We find that the increased gross revenue for the eleven months of 1897-8 amounted to \$4,051,489; and for the eleven months of this current year it was \$3,716,092, or a gross decrease of \$335,397. If the decrease for the month of June should be continued rateably with the decrease for the previous eleven months of this year, it will show that the gross loss of revenue from these reductions, instead of being for this year, as hon. gentlemen opposite expected, \$900,000, does not even reach \$350,000.

I am gratified to be able to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the reductions have been steadily marked by growing increases in the revenue. Whilst the gradual decline of loss has not kept actual step with each month—that is, some months showed more and some less—still, there has always been a downward movement in the loss. That is to say, there has been an upward movement in the revenue. At the earlier stages of this reduction, the loss, month by month, was quite what was anticipated, and even a little more.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him? Where has the chief gain been in revenue?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Montague) permit me to deal with this point first? During the earliest periods, after this reduction was in force, our monthly loss of revenue embraced such sums as \$80,000, which represents, perhaps, \$1,000,000 a year, if maintained uniformly throughout the year. But such months were exceptional, and month after month the revenue has been growing and has been getting nearer to what it was in the corresponding months under the higher rates of hon. gentlemen opposite, until, at last, in the month of May, just closed, the revenue was only \$4,386 less than in the month of May, 1898, when the higher rates prevailed. This means that we have practically recovered the loss of revenue brought about by these reductions. I cannot give the revenue for the month of June

as it has not yet been made up. It will not be made up until the 16th of July. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) asks me how these increases have been made up. If he will turn to the Postmaster General's Report he will find it stated there that there have been very considerable increases in the number of domestic letters. I am told that there has been a discontinuance, to a very large extent, of the practice of sending unsealed printed, etc., letters which formerly passed at one cent, but which, when sealed up, paid 3 cents. Under the reduced rate, namely 2 cents, many people who formerly sent letters open, circulars and so on, now, under the reduced rate, seal them. I am also told that the cheap letter rate is attracting people to the use of letters instead of post-cards. This is the information I have received from Mr. Stanton.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Where can that information be found in the report?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think, if the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) will turn up the report, he will find a falling off in the number of postal cards issued.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What I want to get is something for the purpose of comparison. Has the hon. gentleman taken two years some time during the decade previous to the 2-cent rate being adopted, and two years since, and compared the increase in the letters carried?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will kindly renew his question, I will think it out in a moment. I wish to answer one of his questions first. The hon. gentleman asked me some of the sources of increased revenue, and I was giving them to him. I will give him another.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, but—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman permit me? I want to finish my sentence first. I was answering the hon. gentleman's inquiry, and I propose to mention another source of revenue under this new policy of the government, and I am sure that what I am about to announce will be most gratifying to every member of this House and to every citizen of Canada. Although it may not mean a very great increase, it means a substantial increase. I refer to the revenue derived from letters from Canada to Great Britain, and those British possessions which have come under the new inter-Imperial penny rate. When the 2-cent rate had been in force some fifteen months I requested the secretary of the department, Mr. LeSueur,

an old and experienced officer, one in whose judgment and integrity every one can place the utmost confidence, to have an account taken and to inform me, if he could do so, to what extent the correspondence despatched from Canada to Great Britain and to British possessions, had been affected by the reduced postage. Perhaps I cannot do better than read his letter on the subject. He informed me of the result at the time that it was known, and yesterday I asked him if he would put it in writing. He has addressed to me the following letter :

Ottawa, June 28, 1900.

Dear Mr. Mulock,—In reply to your inquiry as to the effect of the reduction in the rate of letter postage from Canada to Great Britain and those British possessions which adopted the reduced intra-Imperial penny rate which took effect on December 25, 1898, I have to say that, from a careful count made of the correspondence despatched from Canada to Great Britain and such British possessions, I am able to state that the amount of postage which is now being collected on the correspondence in question quite equals, and probably exceeds, what was being collected at a corresponding period prior to the reduction of the postage.

This implies, I need hardly observe, an increase of 150 per cent in the volume of correspondence forwarded.

Faithfully yours,  
(Sgd.) W. D. LeSUEUR,  
Secretary.

The Hon. William Mulock.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He does not give the figures.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the information is most gratifying to hon. gentlemen. I have read all he has given me. My hon. friend (Mr. Montague) desires to know in what other way the revenue has been increased. I refer him to the Postmaster General's Report, and if he will kindly turn to the portion of it which gives an estimate of the letters sent for the year, he will there find a statement showing the estimate of the increase in the number of domestic letters.

I have just one word more to say, and it is generally in reference to the operations of the department for the fiscal year 1899, and the fiscal year 1896. I make these comparisons representing, as they do, the last fiscal year under this administration for which we have accounts, and the last fiscal year of the late administration. I give now a comparison in the work and cost of the department during these two years. In 1899 there were in operation in Canada

9,420 post offices, and in 1896 9,103. We increased the number of post offices by 317, or an increase of 3½ per cent. In 1899 the number of savings bank offices was 838; in 1896 it was 755. We increased the number by eighty-three, or an increase of 11 per cent.

In 1899, we had 2,640 offices engaged in the issue of postal notes. This is an entirely new branch of the service, established about two years ago. There was no such convenience in olden days.

In 1899, there were 142,141 accounts in the savings banks of the post offices, and in 1896, there was 126,442, or, in other words, during these three years, there was an increase of 15,699.

We have increased the number of money order offices from 1,310 in 1896, to 1,779 in 1899, an increase of 469, or an increased percentage of nearly 26 per cent.

The amount of money orders issued by this department in 1899 exceeds the amount issued in 1896 by \$1,386,136.79, or an increase of over 10 per cent.

Those who may think that we have cramped the service in other respects will have their fears allayed when I mention the increase in the mileage. I have pointed out the increase in the number of post offices; the increased work done in the Post Office Department, and now I beg to say that, for the fiscal year beginning 1899—the fiscal year covered by the accounts now under discussion—we are carrying the mails 1,438,095 miles more than they were ever carried in any previous year.

As to the volume of general mail matter, of all kinds, which passed through the post office during the fiscal year just closed, and comparing with it the volume during the fiscal year 1896, we find that the total number of articles of all kinds carried in the mails during 1896 was 177,178,130, while during the fiscal year of 1899, the department carried through the mails 228,024,900 pieces, or an increase in three years of 50,846,770 pieces, equal to an increase of 28½ per cent.

Now, Sir, as to the revenue during these periods. The annual revenue for the year closing in 1896, under the late administration, was \$2,964,014.23, but during the last fiscal year, notwithstanding the loss of this \$450,000 in reduced postage, we did so much more business for the less money that the total net revenue of the post office was \$3,182,930.92, or a net increase of revenue in 1899 over 1896 of \$218,916.69. The following table gives the precise figures :

Mr. MULOCK.

## COMPARISON OF WORK AND COST—1896 AND 1899.

	No. of Post Offices.	No. of Saving Bank Offices.	No. of Postal Note Offices.	New S.B. Accts Open.	No. of Postal Notes Sold.	No. of Money Order Offices.	Value of Money Orders Issued.	No. of miles the mails are carried annually.	No. of Articles of all Kinds Carried in Mails.	Net Revenue.
							\$ cts.			\$ cts.
1899.....	9,420	838	2,640	142,141	471,407	1,779	14,467,997 41	31,989,778	228,024,900	3,182,930 92
1896. ....	9,103	755	.....	126,442	.....	1,310	13,081,860 62	30,551,683	177,178,130	2,964,014 23
Increase...	317	83	2,640	15,699	.....	469	1,386,136 79	1,438,095	50,846,770	218,916 69
Per cent...	3½	11	.....	12½	.....	35½	10½	4½	28½	.....

Or a net increase revenue in 1899 over 1896 of \$218,916.69.

	Crst.
1899.....	\$3,581,848 71
1896.....	3,665,011 30
Decrease.....	\$83,162 59

This increase in the work, and consequent increase in revenue represents an enormous amount of work done by the department in 1899, as compared with the work done in 1896. I hope it will be gratifying to hon. gentlemen opposite; at all events, it will be gratifying to the taxpayers of Canada to know that this increased service, representing, probably, an increase of 25 per cent in additional postal facilities to the public, has been obtained, not with a deficit of \$800,000 a year as formerly, not by a rapid increase, it is true, but at a cost of \$83,162.59 less than was spent by the late government in performing the post office service in 1896.

With reference to the future of this department, I join with others in very modestly venturing into the realm of prophesy. It can hardly be called unwarrantable for me to state what I think is the immediate future of the Post Office Department. I consider that within a month or two the revenue of the Post Office Department will be equal to what it was when it reached its highest point under the higher rates of postage. I do not think there is any possible doubt upon that point, because for the month of May it was within about \$4,000 of the highest amount reached in any corresponding month of May on the higher rates. In spite of what may be said to the contrary, these cheapened rates have brought the post office nearer to the people of Canada, and not merely the bankers and the commercial men, and the men who write to China, Hong Kong and Japan—not merely those, but the masses of the people have availed themselves of the cheaper rates, as can be found by the returns in the Postmaster General's Report, from the humblest post office in Canada. You will find the same steady

growth in the rural post offices as in the city offices. If it were only the wealthy that were taking advantage of the extra facilities now offered by the Post Office Department, we would find an enormous increase in the cities and we would find an enormous decrease in the country. That is not the case. The total revenues from the city offices is about one-third of the total revenues of the Post Office Department, and the increase keeps pace fairly between one and the other, so that from the increase in the city post offices we can make an estimate of what would be the increase in the rural districts. It is an entire error for any hon. gentleman to assume that the reduced postage has not been fully taken advantage of by the humblest people as well as by that class for which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) thinks we should not be solicitous. The post office is an institution for the masses, and we are bringing it nearer and nearer to them every day by cheapening the rates, increasing the post offices, extending the facilities. In no better way can you bring it within their reach than to make it cheap and accessible to the poorest in the land. The post office is intended for the poor as well as for the rich, and the masses of the people have recognized our policy of giving cheaper postage, and have profited by it to their own advantage and at no loss to the service itself. I have very carefully studied the matter month after month since the reduction; indeed, I might say, that from day to day I have watched it at every point, the outgoing of stamps and the revenues from every part of this country, and I say here, unqualifiedly, that a careful analysis of the revenue from all parts entirely disproves the contention that the reduction of postage does not enure to the benefit of the poor

as well as of the rich. And, Sir, having thus brought the post office within the reach of the masses as well as of the classes, we shall have a much more rapid growth in its revenue, which will enable it to become a prosperous, if not a self-sustaining department. I say here, that when this fiscal year we are now entering upon closes—the fiscal year of 1900-1901—the post office will show, under good management, a surplus, if you choose to work it for a surplus, or it will show a greatly increased service out of the legitimate earnings of the Post Office Department. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this result will satisfy hon. gentlemen that we have not been unmindful of the best interests of the country in the policy that has characterized the administration of this department under the present government.

Mr. FOSTER. I propose just to take up for a very short time, the points of divergence between the hon. Postmaster General and myself, and then turn him over to my hon. friend at my right (Sir Adolphe Caron) with reference to the details of the post office business. The Postmaster General did not stay long on the burning ground which I opened up for him this morning. It was too hot for his feet, and he left it as quickly as he could. But while he did stay there, he made a lot of assertions which he could not prove, but he did not in the slightest degree dispose of the charge which I made, of cooking and manipulation of the post office accounts. He first went off on the ground that it would be perfectly fair and right to eliminate the lean and barren ground of a newly-opened district from the receipts and expenditures, in order that you might have a fair comparison. Well, Sir, that has never been attempted in the administration of any department of the government before. They have had to take the greater with the less, the long with the short, the barren with the rich: and I do not think my hon. friend will find a single man behind him who will follow him in that lead, by which he keeps the receipts for himself and shoulders the expenditures upon another department. That is what the hon. gentleman has done. He has not denied it; he cannot deny it. Here are the public accounts; that is where we go for the records, and not to any footnotes hidden away in the hon. gentleman's own report; and I challenge him to show one single dollar of these expenditures of 1897, 1898, 1899, which go into the sum total of the Post Office Department, as shown in the public accounts. But these public accounts show the \$10,000 of revenue, which he got out of the Yukon postage business. In other words, in the public accounts, as they go to the country, he takes credit for the revenues, but he sedulously and carefully refrains from taking to himself the debit of costs. These are borne by the Department of the North-west

Mounted Police. The hon. gentleman knows it, because in his own report he states in one footnote that the expenditures in that country during 1898-9, were about \$69,000; but in the public accounts, these expenses are not included in the expenses of the Post Office Department. My hon. friend may call that what he likes; I call it a manipulation of the public accounts; I call it going before the people of this country under false pretenses; I call it taking a mean and paltry advantage of \$10,000 of revenue for the Post Office Department in one field, and shouldering upon a companion department all the expenses of the Post Office Department in the same field for a single year. My hon. friend has not cleared up that point. Nor has he cleared up the other point which I made, that last year he promised this House, that he would make the apportionment, and he has not done so. I find in his own report that he acknowledges that the services in the Yukon during that year, including a fixed sum for the services of the North-west Mounted Police, cost \$69,350.39, the cost thus exceeding the revenue by \$58,503.78; and this morning, in his address to this House, he acknowledged that there was a deficit of \$58,503, as between working expenses and revenue in the Yukon mail-carrying service for 1898-9, which was shouldered by him upon the North-west Mounted Police department in the public accounts. The hon. gentleman may call that what he likes; but in plain English it is simply presenting the public accounts to the people under false pretenses. The hon. gentleman started out with a *tu quoque* argument. He said: 'You taunt me with having a post office service for the Yukon paid for by the North-west Mounted Police, and you did the same thing.' Well, I had his own Deputy Postmaster General on oath before the Public Accounts Committee, and I will read the answers I got from him, and which I have no doubt are correct. First, the Postmaster General said that in 1895, 1896 and 1897, the government had the mails carried into the Yukon, and did not pay for the service through the Post Office Department. Then he said there were three contracts, one for sixty-five pounds, at \$10 per pound, with a man named Healy, and two others with a man named Moore, at \$600 each. Now, mark what the Deputy Postmaster General said:

Q. Previous to that period is there any record of weights in the department?—A. Not of any definite service. There were isolated services.

Q. What are these?—A. In 1896 there were sixty-five pounds sent in by a man named Healy, for which he was to receive \$600.

Q. That contract was made by whom?—A. By the Post Office Department.

That part of the Postmaster General's charge falls to the ground, if the information sworn to by his deputy minister is correct. His charge was that we were guilty of doing the same thing that we were charging

against him, and his deputy minister on oath, declares that the contract was made with the Post Office Department. Well, we shall see as to the payment :

Q. Was he paid that?—A. No. He lost the mails at Chilcoat Pass in December and they were not recovered until the following spring.

Q. That was sixty-five pounds for which you were to give him?—A. \$600. He carried it as far as the Chilcoat in 1895, where the mail was lost, and it was afterwards found by a miner who was going in the following spring, and who carried it to Dawson, for which he was paid \$100.

So that not only was the contract made with the Post Office Department, but of course the payment, such as it was, was made by the Post Office Department.

Q. That is one item—any others?—A. Then Mr. Moore, who carried two mails, he made two trips at \$600 a trip; he took them in in 1896.

Q. How much did he take in per trip?—A. There is no definite statement of the mail, although Mr. White assures me that it was about sixty pounds.

Q. Each trip?—A. Yes.

Q. When was that?—A. They were carried in June and July, 1897, for which he was paid.

I think that is probably a mistake for 1896, which is mentioned before.

Q. Any others?—A. That is all the special trips.

Q. That is all the information you have in the department with reference to trips, weights and amounts paid?—A. Yes, for the special trips.

Q. Two sums of \$600 each and one of \$100 were paid by the Post Office Department?—A. Yes.

Q. Charged in their account?—A. Yes. Then there was another trip made by Mr. Mahony in 1897.

That was in 1896. That also was made by the Post Office Department.

Q. And after looking over the records, these are all you could find?—A. These are all of the special contracts made by the Post Office Department.

Q. And those that were not special contracts you have in your statement?—A. Yes.

Q. And after looking over the record, these are all you could find, these are all of the special contracts made by the Post Office Department, and those that were not special contracts you have in your statement?—A. Yes.

There is the testimony of the Deputy Postmaster General, and it is directly contradictory of the statement made by the Postmaster General this morning.

The hon. gentleman went on, leaving this charge which he has not disproved and which stands as clearly as anything stands, namely, that he had got the work done for him to the tune of about \$50,000 in 1898-9, and a large sum in 1897, the year preceding, as to which you can only make an estimate, looking at the conditions and circumstances, that he charged that to another department, and took good care to take to his own department whatever revenue came from the

postal matter which was thus carried leaving this charge he went on to say, in a 'tu quoque' style of argument, you talk about keeping accounts, why there was a balance of \$600,000, which I found in the department when I came in to administer it, that was due on the preceding year and there was no vote to cover it, and it had been the practice in the department to pay the last quarter of the preceding year out of the vote which was taken in the succeeding year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said nothing about the last quarter.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman said that there was about \$600,000, which, after July 1, 1898, had no vote in that year just past.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not 1898.

Mr. FOSTER. Any year. 1895 then, we will say that there was \$600,000 after July 1, 1896, which had no appropriation for the year just then past to cover it. That is the statement the hon. gentleman made. There are several things to be said about that. In the first place, the hon. gentleman endeavoured to create the impression that these were concealed accounts. Not in the least. Every bill, every account, every voucher went through the regular processes of the department and was ultimately paid and then went through the audit by the Auditor General. There was no concealment of any single bill or voucher, and everything was paid and audited according to the usual processes of the department and the Auditor General. Where is the concealment? Where is the cooking of accounts? But, I tell you what did take place and what took place for a long number of years in that department. The accounts of the last quarter of every year, falling due on June 30, ran into the succeeding year before they could be adjusted and paid. A certain lapse of time, half a month or three-quarters or a month passes before these bills are in, and the practice has grown up in the department of running that balance of the last quarter of the preceding year into the next year and paying it out of the appropriation for the succeeding year. You can find fault with that system if you please. I would be inclined to find fault with it myself because the proper system is that each year shall cover its expenditure by its own proper vote, and that matters shall be closed at the end of the year. Only a few days ago, we had to vote in this House the sum of \$75,000 over expended in the Immigration Department alone, for which they have no vote, and the minister had to come down and get a supplementary vote to cover the expenditure which had not been authorized, which had not been estimated for, and consequently had to be met simply and solely

by a supplementary vote. That was the practice in the department and that balance of \$400,000 or \$500,000 or \$600,000, ran over and was paid out of the succeeding year's vote. At the end of the next year, the same thing was repeated. I do not say that that is the best method to adopt, but that was the method which became the practice in that department and it was the practice which obtained while I was there. But there was no concealing of cooking effects. Nothing of the kind. Every item came out in its proper course, went through the auditing and investigating branch of the department, was paid in the regular way, and came to the audit in the regular way under the Auditor General. So much with reference to that. I am not going to go into the details of the hon. gentleman's long speech with reference to the Post Office Department. I will leave that to my hon. friend the member for Three Rivers, who is more conversant with it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend did not deal with that part of my observation in which I stated that his administration in 1895, utilized the North-west Mounted Police for the Yukon service.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to deal with that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, and I will mention other matters at the same time. He did not deal with another statement I made, namely, that the late government had conducted portions of the mail service for many years in the North-west Territories and charged the cost of those services to the Department of the Interior, the Indian Department and the North-west Mounted Police, in three equal parts.

The hon. gentleman pretends that because the accounts for the \$680,000 of over due bills were in the department and passed in the regular way to the Auditor General, there was a full statement of them upon the public record of the government. The hon. gentleman is contending that the public accounts shall show all the expenditure and the revenues in the year charged and credited to each particular department, will he explain why he did not charge against his department the \$680,000, owing at the end of the year 1896, for which there was no parliamentary appropriation? If he can not, will he show any place in the public accounts that discloses to the public that there was owing and outstanding for past services the sum of \$680,000 by the Post Office Department.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is quite insistent in his demands that I shall answer his statement, which I am quite willing to do, and I would like to have equal courtesy on his part in answering the charges I prefer against him. What was the first question? It was that in 1894-5, the Yukon

mails was sent up into the Yukon at the cost of the mounted police.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said 1895

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, will my hon. friend read over the statements which was made by the comptroller of the mounted police, in which he will find what I quoted this morning, namely, that up to and including 1896, the mail matter which went into the Yukon was so small that it could be carried in a small despatch bag, let him read the statement of my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) that we made an arrangement for sending the mail from Seattle at no cost at all to the department, and the statement of the Deputy Postmaster General that the contracts which were made in 1895-6, were contracts made with the Post Office Department and paid by the Post Office Department. And I think it is an absolutely fair statement to make, that for 1895 and 1896, and the first part of 1897—certainly for 1895 and 1896—it was stated to have been contracted for by the post office and paid for by the post office. Very little mail, if any, went into the Yukon, and that was at no cost to this government. I questioned Mr. White particularly with reference to that, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) can satisfy himself on that point by a perusal of the evidence. That mail, up to 1897, was mail which absolutely cost nothing to the government outside of what was paid by contract with the Post Office Department, and the fact that it was so very small was a reason why it cost so little. The steamer carried the mail in its despatch box, and nothing was paid for it.

Now, the hon. gentleman raises a point as to the North-west service. He says that in the early part of the North-west Territories administration the same thing was done, that the mail carriage was charged up to the department which had their work in the North-west Territories, and were carrying on their operations there. I cannot speak by the book with reference to that. The Postmaster General might have brought down the particulars that we might have had something tangible to speak about. But, it must be noted that, in the early development of the North-west, the mails that were carried were almost entirely the mails for the benefit of the departments interested in the North-west, and, consequently, they were a fair charge upon those departments. As soon as the population began to come in and the necessity for the carriage of letters for the public had to be satisfied, the cost ought to have been charged to the Post Office Department. Whether it was or not, I do not know; but I am inclined to think that if you investigate it you will find that it is as I have stated. You may take a copy of the public accounts and you will find

Mr. FOSTER.

that every year's statement of the expenditure of the Post Office Department includes everything that was paid for as being of the service of that year, even though the amounts were held over or paid out of the next year's appropriation. Consequently, there is no manipulation, no falsifying of the public accounts. If it was paid after July 1, 1896, it would still go into the accounts for the fiscal year of 1895, and would appear among the expenditures of 1895—because, as the hon. gentleman knows, the period of four months is allowed after the beginning of the fiscal year for the adjustment of accounts. So, whatever was contracted for service given during the year, even though the account was not adjusted for four months afterwards, was charged to that year, and goes into the public accounts as being an expenditure for that year. And I do not think it possible that creditors of the government would allow their bills to go unpaid for year after year—that seems to me an improbable thing, considering the usual course of creditors.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). I feel sure that it was a matter of very great gratification to every hon. member on this side of the House, as well as to some on the other side, to hear the magnificent presentation that the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) made of the handling of the department over which he presides with so much ability and with so much satisfaction to the people of this country. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has tried to criticise. He says that the government surely would not refuse to acknowledge their indebtedness and to meet their accounts. He evidently has a very short memory. When the present government came into power, in 1896, they were compelled to pay accounts that had been standing over, that were not acknowledged and that were not provided for, amounting to somewhat over a million of money. These accounts were gathered from the different departments, put in the estimates and flung in the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they sat dumb—they dare not get up to challenge the correctness of the accounts. But they had never provided for them. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) forgotten that the very newspapers on file in the reading-room remained unpaid for, some of them, for twelve years, and the accounts were not provided for? And why? Because hon. gentlemen opposite wanted to hide their responsibility from the people, to keep it hid until after the elections, when they would consider the idea of acknowledging their indebtedness and paying what was honestly due.

Since the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) commenced to make his statement, I got under my eye the supplementary report that he issued in 1896. That report tells a tale

the most marvellous I ever saw in a blue-book. Let me give a few of the items. Here, for instance, is the case of the mail service between Albert and Marysville :

In this case a contract was made for \$300 per annum, and at the time the contract was authorized there was a tender in the department for \$265 per annum. The action of the department resulting in a loss of \$35 per annum, or \$140 for the full term.

Here is another, the service between Appleton and Carleton Place :

This contract was renewed without tender at the rate of \$195 per annum, notwithstanding the inspector's report that a lower rate would be obtained if the service were put up to tender, and that at the time a tender of \$15 less was in the department. The loss was \$60 for the full term.

Here is another—Arthur and Fergus :

This contract was renewed without tender for \$190 per annum, while there was in the department a tender for \$149.50 per annum.

A tender lying before the eyes and under the thumb of my hon. friend the ex-Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron) to perform the work for \$149.50 less for the term of the contract. Then, again, there is the service between Athlone and Tottenham :

This contract was made without tender for \$300 when there was a tender in the department for \$197 per annum. When this fact was brought to the attention of the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) he cancelled the contract at \$300 per annum and awarded it to the lowest tenderer at the rate of his tender, \$197 per annum.

The net saving by cancelling that contract and taking the lowest tender was \$412 for the term the contract had to run. Let us look at a few more. At Avon, Putnam and station, the contract was let without tender for a period ending the 31st of March, 1896, for \$350 per annum, though there was a tender in the department for \$310 per annum to do the work, involving a loss of \$200 for the time the contract had been let in that way. Then we have another, Ayton railway station. This contract was renewed at \$140, while there was a tender in the department under the eye of the ex-Postmaster General to perform the work for \$100.94. Then take another, Barrie and Midhurst. This contract was let without tender for \$160 a year, while there was in the department a tender to do the work for \$130. But the hon. gentleman renewed the contract at the higher rate and refused to open a tender at a lower rate. Then take Belleville and Tweed. This contract was let without tender for \$666.70 per year, while there was a tender in the department to do the work for \$600, resulting in a net loss to the country for the four years of \$266.80. Then take Bluevale and railway station. This contract was let without tender at the rate of \$139 per annum, while

there was a tender in the department to do it for \$93.90, resulting in a loss of \$45.10 per year, and during the contract period of \$180.40. Then we have the notable contract in connection with the transfer of mails at Brockville. In that case Mr. Cavanagh, who had the contract for the sum of \$406, got appointed afterwards transfer agent, and as he could not perform double duty, it became necessary to give the contract to somebody else, and it was put into the hands of his brother, an engine driver living at Smith's Falls, fifty miles away. Still he drew the payment and got for the double service \$806 per year. He performed both services and he drew all the money. I will now confine myself to Ontario. Now, we will take another case, Caldwell and Caledon, and Caledon and railway station. This contract was awarded without tender, though the inspector was of the opinion that a lower rate might be obtained. The contract was cancelled and new tenders were invited by the present Postmaster General, resulting in a saving of \$85 per annum, or \$720 altogether. Then we have the case of Centerville and Tamworth. In that case the contract was let for \$207 per annum, while there was a tender in the department to do the work for \$175 per annum. Then there is the case of Combermore and Mayworth. This contract was let without tender at the rate of \$190 per annum, while there was in the department a tender to perform the work for \$148 per annum. In this way a sum of \$190 was lost during the contract period. Downeyville and Omeme. This contract was let without tender for \$160 per annum, while there was in the department a tender to perform the work for \$140 per annum. Erin and railway station. This contract was let without tender for \$50 per annum, while there was in the department a tender to do it for \$38 per annum. Erinsville and Napanee. The contract was let without tender for \$475 per annum, while there was in the department a tender to perform the work for \$400 per annum, resulting in a clean loss of \$300 during the four years. Then you have the case of Gravenhurst and Affington. This contract was let without tender at \$138 per annum, while there was a tender in the department to do it for \$118. Humber and Weston. This contract was let without tender for \$300 per annum, while the department had before it a tender for \$240, resulting in a clean loss of \$240. Then you have Janetville and Pontypool. This contract was let without tender for \$440 per annum, the amount of the highest tender, while there was in the department a tender for \$340 per annum. There were seven tenders in the hands of the Postmaster General for less than the amount at which the contract was let. Then Kemptville and Millar's Corners. This contract was awarded without tender at \$172 per annum, the department having can-

celled the acceptance of a tender at \$150 per annum for the same service. A large saving was also effected there. This was the condition in which the present Postmaster General found the department when he took over its administration. Leaskdale and Sunderland station. The contract was let without tender at \$271, while there was a tender in the department for \$249 to perform the work, resulting in a loss of \$88 for the contract term. Lindsay and railway station. This contract was renewed without tender, and the result was a clean loss in the four years of \$298.56, which would have been saved had the lowest tender in the hands of the Postmaster General been accepted. Loch Garry and Maxville, Maxville and railway station. This service was let without tender for the term ending 30th September, 1892, at \$494 per annum, and there was a tender in the hands of the Postmaster General to do the work for \$300. The loss in that case was \$967 for the contract term.

Mountain and Vancamp.—This contract was let without tender at \$140 per annum, while there was in the department a tender for \$99 per annum, the loss involved being \$164 for the contract term.

North Keppel and Owen Sound.—This contract was let without tender at \$275 per annum, while there was a tender in the department for \$229 per annum, the loss involved being \$184 for the contract term.

Rockford and Railway Station.—This contract was let without tender at \$145 per annum, while there was in the department a tender for \$110 per annum.

Seaforth and Railway Station.—This contract was let without tender at \$187.80 per annum, while there was in the department a tender for \$125.20 per annum. The loss has been \$250.40 for the contract term.

Snyder and Railway Station.—This contract was made without tender at \$125 per annum, the department cancelling the acceptance of a tender for \$105. The transaction involved a loss of \$80 for the contract term.

These are simply a few items that I have pointed out.

Kincardine and Port Elgin.—This contract was renewed without tender at \$617 per annum, notwithstanding the statement of the inspector, who was instructed to report on the question of renewal, that there were others who desired to tender for the service. In view of the facts, the present government cancelled the contract and invited tenders, the result being that a contract has been obtained at the rate of \$398 per annum, and a saving effected of \$219 per annum, or \$876 for the contract term.

That simply refers to Ontario. I beg to read the following correspondence in relation to Hockley and Mono Centre contract :

Ottawa, January 25, 1894.

Dear Sir Adolphe,—I inclose you a communication that has been addressed to me by our warm friend who resides in Orangeville, Ont., Mr. J. S. Leighton. You will observe that what he says about the contract for carrying the mail between Hockley and Mono Centre, that is again

being tendered for by Mr. Caldwell. If you can renew this contract to Mr. Caldwell at the old figure, I shall be very much obliged. Kindly drop me a line saying what you can do, and return the inclosed letter.

I am, faithfully yours,

N. CLARKE WALLACE.

Hon. Sir A. P. Caron,  
P.M.G., Ottawa.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Is that one of the letters marked 'private'?

Mr. McMULLEN (reading):

(Inclosure.)

Box 104, Orangeville, Jan. 22, 1894.

Dear Sir.—Mr. R. Caldwell has sent with this mail a tender for renewal of contract for carrying the mails from Hockley to Mono Centre. This tender is the same as the contract he already had.

I understand the parties who are tendering against him are McCarthyites, and they deserve nothing at the hands of the Dominion government. Mr. R. Caldwell is and always was a thorough Conservative.

Yours very respectfully,

J. S. LEIGHTON.

N. C. Wallace, M.P.,  
Controller of Customs.

If hon. gentlemen will turn to page 320 of the supplementary report of the Postmaster General, they will find the following results which were disclosed when the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), came into office in 1896:

	No. of Contracts.	
	With Tender.	Without Tender.
Ontario .....	321	180
Quebec .....	148	108
Nova Scotia .....	120	124
New Brunswick .....	45	83
Manitoba and North-west Territories .....	67	31
British Columbia .....	16	52
Prince Edward Island .....	101	20
Total .....	818	598

That was the condition of the department, as far as letting of contracts was concerned, when the hon. Postmaster General came in. Now, I say that he deserves great credit for the manner in which he has cancelled many, I might say, all of these contracts, and made new contracts.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Would my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen), allow me to put a question to him? The hon. gentleman has mentioned, I think, 500 contracts as having been let without tender?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, 598.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I want to ask the hon. gentleman whether his statement is that the contracts which he alludes to, were let without any tenders having been asked for, or if he means to say that the contracts referred to were contracts con-

tinued and renewed, which had been originally let upon tenders having been asked for?

Mr. McMULLEN. I am prepared to say to my hon. friend in reply to his question, that in the majority of these 598 cases, there were in his department, at his fingers' ends, tenders for sums very much less than those at which he renewed these contracts.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman does not wish to reply to the question.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am going to reply if the hon. gentleman will allow me. I admit that the department renewed contracts, but I am not charging my hon. friend with having simply renewed contracts for period after period. I am charging him with renewing contracts while there were in his department tenders to do the work at very much less.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. How many?

Mr. McMULLEN. I am charging him with having withdrawn advertisements on the suggestion of political supporters, and of having refused to open tenders, in order that he might be permitted to renew contracts.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I deny it.

Mr. McMULLEN. You say you deny it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Postmaster General read case after case to-day, and I was amazed. I got this return and went over it, and I was very much surprised to find the condition of this that existed. It is a matter of amazement that any person who undertook to serve the country in the capacity of a minister of the Crown, could justify the condition of things that existed during the time that the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) was in office. In every case that I have read out to-day, in which he renewed a contract, there was at the time in his department a tender to do the work for very much less, but notwithstanding that fact, he renewed these contracts. I do not say there were tenders in all of the 598 cases to which I have referred, but I say that if you go over the report you will find that in the majority of the 598 cases, there was a tender within his reach to do the work for the country at a much less sum. Notwithstanding that, for the sake of satisfying his political friends and of meeting their requests, he renewed these contracts and shut his eyes to the fact that he could have saved the country money, by accepting these tenders in place of renewing the old contracts. I had a case with the Postmaster General myself. I admit that it is a very hard thing to cancel a contract say for \$5 less. A very esteemed friend of mine had a mail

contract which he got by tender from the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) for \$60. Tenders were advertised for by the present Postmaster General and another man tendered to do it for \$55. I thought it was hardly worth while to change it for five dollars, but the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) had laid down the principle that in every case where the lowest tenderer gave security to perform the work he would get the contract, and so he took the contract from my friend and put it in the hands of an opponent who did the work for five dollars less. Can the ex-Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron) cite a single instance where he ever did a thing like that?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, we will surround him with roses if he gives us an instance where he ever cancelled a contract to save \$5 to the public treasury. When my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) took office he found the Post Office Department in a rotten condition from garret to cellar and he has purged it of its rottenness and put it in an honest, clean statesmanlike condition. Today the country is reaping the benefit of his administration and I am certain the people will acknowledge his services when he goes before them at the polls.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Would the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) tell me what is the postal revenue from newspapers for the eleven months of this fiscal year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can only give an estimate; it is perhaps \$80,000 or \$90,000 for the eleven months.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think it is close on \$100,000, but, however, that estimate will do for my purpose. The hon. gentleman from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has been rather severe in his criticism and rather unfair, because he dealt with matters and made deductions from them without stating, and without knowing, the circumstances and the conditions surrounding each case. I can tell him that when I was Postmaster General the contracts that were given without tender were old contracts which were renewed, but for which tenders were called for originally, so that they were not in the sense he means, new contracts. In the rather long resumé which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) gave of the work of the post office since he came into power, he said there were quite a large number of contracts given without tender, but he should have told the House and the people of this country that these were not new contracts, but were contracts which had been renewed; tenders being called for in the first instance. I can say further, that so far as my recollection goes, no contract was ever renewed without a certificate from the post office inspector that the price was

Mr. McMULLEN.

fair and reasonable, and that the service had been satisfactorily performed.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) exact that certificate in every case where there was a renewal.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In every case.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then that is a very serious reflection upon the inspector, because the minister had in his own office tenders offering to do the work at 25 or 30 per cent lower than the contracts were renewed for.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) shows how unfair his whole argument is. How can we discuss the reasons why the inspector recommended to renew a contract without knowing the identical contract referred to and the reasons why the inspector recommended it. Any man who has been in that department knows how many different things have to be considered in the letting of contracts. In many cases the first contractor had carried out his work to the satisfaction of the department and I called for tenders and new tenders were often sent in at a lower rate. But when it became a question of getting security from the tenderer to carry out that work or when the inspector had to ascertain whether or not the tenderer was capable of carrying out the contract; very often it was found that the new tenderer was unable to do so, and we had to fall back upon the original contractor. That occurred time and again and I have no doubt that the present Postmaster General knows of instances where the contracts were not given to the lowest tenderers because it was found impossible to get security, or the inspector was unable to satisfy himself that the man was in a position to do his work satisfactorily.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will give the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) one case. Take the contract from Belleville to Tweed. Before renewing the contract the department had notice from the inspector that there was a strong desire in the district that it should be put up to public tender, but in the face of that statement from the inspector, the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) renewed the contract.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That again proves nothing at all. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) reads a statement from the Postmaster General's Report, but if that question were investigated, I would have the inspector to examine and cross-examine, and I would find out the reasons why the officers who were advising me recommended that this contract should be renewed.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? He has

made a statement with reference to the inspectors. Here is the case of a contract in the district of Saskatchewan that was held by the firm of Leason & Scott for a great many years. A gentleman of the name of Stovel, of the town of Prince Albert, offered to perform the work for \$2,200 a year less than the amount paid to the old contractors.

Mr. BERGERON. That is not a question.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman said the inspectors had not reported in favour of the new tenders because in some cases the parties tendering were not able to carry out the work.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I allowed the hon. gentleman to put a question, but I did not expect him to read to the House the report of the Postmaster General until I had finished the few remarks which I have to make. I am going to reply to the question of the hon. gentleman. That was a case which was strongly recommended by the inspector, because it was considered, rightly or wrongly, that Leason & Scott were the men most capable, indeed the only men capable, of carrying out the contract at that particular moment. Now, I claim that the manner in which these questions are dealt with is misleading and unfair, because every case should be considered upon its own merits. If there is any charge of maladministration in the department, let it be investigated, but let every case be specifically brought down, and let us go into the circumstances under which these renewals or contracts were given. The hon. Postmaster General this morning stated that contracts were let while hundreds of tenders were left unopened in the department. This is my answer to the point I wish to make. In case of a renewal, after notice had been given for some time, it may have been that tenders were sent in which were not opened. I am not saying that such was the case; I am not aware of any such case; but I am putting it as it was explained to me by my officers when I occupied the position now occupied by my hon. friend. It is possible that some of these tenders may not have been opened when the old contract was continued or renewed; and if so, the reason was that the department had considered the matter and decided upon renewing the contract and disregarding the tenders which had been sent in. Now, Sir, I find it extremely difficult to judge from the report of the Postmaster General the exact state of the department. In my time we had schedules which showed exactly the position of different matters connected with the department, such as the postal exchanges between Canada and Great Britain, or between Canada and China or Japan. All these schedules have been omitted from the hon. gentleman's report, so that it becomes almost impossible to make a compara-

tive statement. I see no great or material reduction in the number of employees. For instance, in the inspector's branch of the outside service, between 1899 and 1900, I find a difference of only two. In the railway mail service I see an increase of twenty, so that I do not see how the hon. gentleman can have economized very much. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance has spoken of the manner in which the Yukon accounts were treated. I fully agree with him, and there cannot be a man in this House or in the country who will deny this one fact, that the hon. Postmaster General has taken the revenue from the sale of postage stamps in the Yukon territory, while the cost of the service has been charged to the mounted police. The hon. gentleman spoke of the mounted police carrying on the postal service of the Yukon in 1895. In that year, as my hon. friend from York has said, the service could not have been organized, for the simple reason that there was no mail service at all. The whole of the mail was carried in a small leather bag thrown across the shoulders of a man who was riding. But look at the change. As soon as the wonderful wealth of the Yukon region became known, hundreds and thousands of people went there, and it became an absolute necessity to organize the postal service. It is impossible for a miner to be without communication, with the outside world. His business requires that he should be in communication with the men who advance his money or furnish him with his supplies. He requires rapid and constant communication, and if it had been possible to have a telegraph service instead of a postal service, at whatever cost, the miner would have had the more rapid system.

Well, the hon. gentleman could not plead ignorance. He knew that the country was filling up, and what did he do? Did he organize a service and show in the public accounts the amount he was paying to carry on that service and the amount he was receiving from it? He did not. But, he put all the disbursing work on the Department of the Interior and kept the revenue from the mail service of that country. When we used the mounted police in the North-west and charged the expenses against the various departments, the hon. gentleman knows well that the mail matter carried was really the mail matter belonging to those departments operating in that country. The Hudson Bay Company had their own postal service, and it was only shortly before the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when the country was filling up with immigrants, that we organized a postal service, the expense of which we charged against the Post Office Department, and the revenues from which that department was credited with. So that, there is no similarity between the two cases. In the one case, the hon. gentleman, knowing that it was absolutely necessary to have a postal service in the Yukon, credited his department with the revenue

and charged the expenditure to the mounted police.

The hon. gentleman made this statement, that when he took charge of the department, he had the books audited by two competent auditors, and found that the amount of \$600,000 had been left over from the previous year and was not included in its expenditure. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman—and that is a fact which can be easily verified—that the accounts of the year were closed every year. The hon. gentleman may have any number of commissions to investigate the matter, but he will find nothing different from what I have said, that every year the accounts were closed, and the amount of \$600,000 indicates the deficit for that year, but had nothing to do with any transactions belonging to another year. Of course, I heard of this commission—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was not a commission, but two auditors.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have tried to find out, but in vain, how much that investigation cost the department. I do not know whether it is to be found in the public accounts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly, it was paid by the department in the usual way, and must be in the Auditor General's Report for 1896-7.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It would not be under another head, such as 'commissions'?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never saw it in the Auditor General's Report, but do not see how he could have made a proper audit without putting it in.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I come now to the increase in the number of letters, which the hon. gentleman ascribes to the change of policy in reducing the postage.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not intend to advance the claim that the total increase in correspondence is due to the reduction of postage. I only said that that was one of the contributing causes.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I quote now from the hon. gentleman's own report:

This change has been accompanied by such marked and continuous increase in the number of domestic letters as to warrant the conclusion that the loss of revenue consequent on such a reduction will soon be overcome.

I find that the percentage of the increase in letters posted in 1899 over the number mailed in 1896 was very nearly 7 per cent, and the increase in 1899 over 1898 was 11½ per cent, so that this marked and continuous increase amounts really to 4½ per cent above the normal rate.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The reduction was only in force for half a year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I give the figures as I find them. The hon. gentleman must see that the increase has not been such as to

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

warrant him in stating that within a short period the deficit can be overcome by the additional amount of mail matter. When the reduction took place in the United States, one of the reasons urged was exactly the one advanced by the hon. gentleman, namely, that the increase in the number of letters written would make up for the loss of revenue. But, such did not prove to be the case. Experience showed that the result was not what had been anticipated, and the hon. gentleman knows that there has been a deficit ever since, whereas there had been a surplus before the change took place.

Now, I want to refer to the hon. gentleman's claim to having affected a great saving. I propose to take the figures from the blue-books, and to ask the hon. gentleman how he can come to the conclusion that the saving has been so much larger since he has occupied his present position. I find that a comparison of the statements contained in the reports of the Postmaster General for the years 1896, 1897 and 1898, shows the following expenditure:

	Stage or other vehicles or by hand.	Steamboat service.
1896 .....	\$847,080	\$79,218
1897 .....	347,660	83,734
1898 .....	765,660	84,743
For Railway Mail Service—		
1896.....	\$1,285,383	
1897.....	1,350,786	
1898.....	1,352,257	
For Salaries (Outside Service)—		
1896.....	\$1,249,402	
1897.....	1,250,609	
1898.....	1,175,185	
Total Expenditure—		
1896.....	\$3,665,011	
1897.....	3,789,478	
1898.....	3,575,411	

The reduction of the total expenditure for 1898, compared with 1896, was \$89,600. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has not given me what I would like very much to have, an estimate of the amount of money which was economized, that is, not expended, through the action of the department in not paying to the clerks the annual increment, which, according to my belief, they were entitled to—an increment of \$50 for some members of the service, and of a smaller amount for other classes, such as the letter carriers. I estimate that amount to be \$74,217. I admit, the hon. gentleman this morning said that the reduction was not only by the non-payment of the annual increment, but that he had contributed to that reduction in expenditure by reducing the staff. As I have previously stated, I am not able to find where the staff has been so considerably reduced as to make any considerable change in the figures from which I have stated. The saving, I believe, has been by refusing to give the officers this annual increment, which I claim they were entitled to, and

which I believe, if they were to go into a court of law that court would compel the government to pay.

Mr. TAYLOR. And also by starving the mail service in the country.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. And as my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) remarks by starving the mail service in the country. The hon. gentleman made a statement which surprised me when he said that he believed that in the near future the Post Office Department would be a self-sustaining department. I hope for the sake of Canada, and for the sake of the hon. minister, if he remains there, that it may be so. But it is impossible for me to believe that in a country like Canada with enormous distances, with a population going into our extreme northern and North-west regions, such an expectation can be realized until our population is much denser than it is. We are only beginning to open up these vast regions, and every year the population there will become greater, requiring more expenditure. The reason why the postal service in Great Britain is so much more economically carried on than it is here, is that the distances there are so small and population so dense. In almost every part of Great Britain the letters are delivered four or five times a day; letter carriers go from house to house and give a most efficient service at a smaller cost than we can hope to reach in this country.

Then the hon. Postmaster General forgets that in making up his revenue he has had the advantage of the new issue of postage stamps. I know two people who paid a thousand dollars each for postage stamps to distribute among their friends in the old country. How can we find out what is the revenue from that source? I have looked through the returns, but have found no statement of it. I compute it at \$250,000 or \$300,000.

Mr. CLANCY. More than that.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It may be more; I am quite certain it is not less. I think the hon. Postmaster General should have taken parliament into his confidence, and should have stated what he received from the sale of these postage stamps. The reason why I refer to this is that when I was Postmaster General a proposition came to me from stamp collectors, that if I would make a new issue of stamps, the sale of stamps would more than pay for the new issue of stamps. I also asked the hon. gentleman, when I rose to address the House, what revenue he had derived from the postage on newspapers for the eleven months of this year. Hon. gentlemen know that under the peculiar circumstances of this year, with a war in South Africa, the sale of newspapers has been enormously increased. My opinion is that the Postmaster General took a retrograde step when he re-

imposed the postage on newspapers. In a democratic country like Canada, the newspaper is the mental food of the people, and is one of the means, the only means in very many instances which people who are not blessed with much money have of informing themselves upon the events of the day, and of what the country is doing, and how it is getting on. But, even if it were right to reimpose this tax, it has not been impartially reimposed. I estimate that the revenue from this source would be about \$70,000 a year. I have heard since that it would possibly be less, say \$60,000. But the point I wish to make is that a year when the government can boast of a surplus of seven millions, is hardly the time to reimpose a duty upon newspapers, and to force the reading public to pay that tax. Probably the hon. gentleman reimposed that tax for the purpose of making up the deficit caused by reducing the Imperial postage from 5 cents to 2 cents. The hon. gentleman has quoted from the *Hansard* some remarks of mine made in 1895 or 1896, where I stated that I believed, while we could not do too much to assimilate our postal rates to those of Great Britain and the large self-governing colonies, I believed that Canada at that time was not rich enough to permit of such reduction in the revenue. I looked into the matter very carefully at that time, as I was about visiting London, and my officers estimated that the loss of revenue would be \$800,000 per year, without considering the imperial postage.

Now, Sir, I stated that the hon. gentleman must have derived a large revenue from the imposition of postage on newspapers, and he should have given us some idea in his report, or in the blue-books, of the amount of money received under that head for the eleven months.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman will find the figures at page xi for the current year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It says here the total amount of revenue realized from the postage for six months ending June 30, was \$22,154.41. Well, the hon. gentleman knows that there has been a great increase in the circulation of newspapers by the war in South Africa, and that is the reason why the statement remains unaffected that was made by the department when I was Postmaster General, and when we removed the postage from the newspapers, so that the people might have them cheaper. But, contrary to the position we had taken, the hon. gentleman imposed a duty, which has given him a large increase in revenue. Let me say that I think the postage on newspapers has not been applied in an impartial manner. I find that the newspapers in the city of Montreal pay nearly one-half of the whole tax. What is the reason of this circumstance? I cannot understand why there

should be so large a proportion of the whole tax raised from Montreal alone. I think the hon. gentleman should publish a list of the papers which pay this postage. At present we are really in the dark. We do not know whether the hon. gentleman imposes that postage impartially on papers who are friendly to the government, or whether he does not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course I recognize that information of that sort should be made public, and when some time ago I laid a return upon the Table, in obedience to an order of the House, some of the newspaper proprietors complained that we were giving publicity to their business. Still, if the House thinks it ought to have the information, it can order it to be given. At present, however, I have not the slightest objection to giving the information to any member of the Privy Council, to satisfy himself.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is quite satisfactory to me, but it does not explain away my objection. How is it possible that the revenue from that source is \$70,000 only? If Montreal pays one-half of the amount, and if all the other papers paid in proportion, there ought to be a much larger revenue than \$70,000. Now, I take the position that when we removed the postage from the newspapers, the people of Canada got the benefit by making the circulation of the press freer; and now when the hon. gentleman comes down with a surplus of \$7,000,000, he proceeds to re-impose a tax on newspapers, a proceeding which seems to me contrary to the principles of a liberal and progressive government, as the hon. gentlemen opposite claim to be.

Now I want to refer to the position taken by the government in refusing to pay the annual increase of \$50 to their clerks. When I spoke on a former occasion, I told the hon. gentleman that I would submit to him the reason why, in my opinion, the \$50 cannot be withheld from the civil servants. Section 18 of the Postal Inside Service provides:

The minimum salary of a first-class clerk shall be \$1,400 per annum, with an annual increase of \$50, up to a maximum salary of \$1,800.

Now, hon. gentlemen will remark that is how the law says that the civil service shall be paid. It states that the minimum salary of a first-class clerk shall be \$1,400 per annum, 'with an annual increase,' which must mean that added to the amount which he receives will be an increase of \$50 a year until the maximum of \$1,800 is reached. Until he gets \$1,800 he is entitled to an increase of \$50 per annum, and the law, to be still more precise, goes beyond that, and indicates the only reason why a man would not get such an increase.

The increase of salary of any officer, clerk or employee, authorized under this Act, for the then current year, may be suspended by the

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

head of the department for neglect of duty or misconduct, and may be subsequently restored by such head of the department, but without arrears.

That is a very important matter. I have called the attention of parliament to this once before; I renew my remarks upon it on this occasion when the estimates are being discussed. I say, according to my judgment and to my reading of the law, that these clerks are entitled, under the Act, which constitutes the department of the hon. Postmaster General, to receive that increase. I think if the hon. gentleman consented to give a fiat to any of these employees the courts would decide, as I read the Act, that they are entitled to receive the amount of money which has been without reason kept from the members of the civil service.

Now, in regard to the estimates, I wish to say just a few words as to some points which have struck me and in regard to which we require some information. I see under the head of 'Mail subsidies' an increase of \$23,466.77. I do not wish, at the present moment, to go into these estimates, because it would be inconvenient, possibly, at this stage of the discussion, when the statement of the hon. Postmaster General is more immediately under consideration. But, when the estimates come up they may be taken up separately in the order in which they come, and then we may get all the information. I merely wish to say that this increase of \$23,000 seems to be an anomaly. Every man in Canada knows that the mail service between Great Britain and Canada is very inferior to what it used to be, and if it is inferior why should there be this increase? I want to tell the hon. gentleman that it is impossible to look into that matter, and I have looked into it very closely, without being struck by the want of careful attention given by the government to a service, the importance of which to Canada cannot be exaggerated. I see that the contract between the government and the Elder-Dempster Line terminates with the close of St. Lawrence River navigation in 1900. I want to call the attention of the committee to the contract entered into by the hon. gentleman with a very inferior line and to the manner in which it was carried out; and I propose to question the hon. gentlemen who are in charge of that branch as to whether they have treated Canada properly in not using their authority to put an end to a system which is detrimental to Canada and which is ruining our commercial reputation abroad. The contract calls for an eight-day service between Moville and Halifax.

When time exceeded, evidence to be given by contractor as to cause of delay.

I have taken that out of the return which the hon. gentleman was kind enough to bring down during the absence of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Rich-

ard Cartwright). I want to know if, whenever there has been any deficiency in carrying out that clause of the contract, any evidence has been given by the contractor as to the cause of delay. The contract time has been adhered to only twice during the term covered by the return. The return covers the whole of last year and part of this year. I want to show the hon. gentleman how this line is being run and why it is that we should pay more money to these contractors than we gave to the Allans and the Dominion Line when they were doing the service, is something that I cannot understand. In round figures the Allan and Dominion companies received \$125,000 per annum under their contract, while the Elder-Dempster Line receives \$150,000, making an increase of \$23,466. The hon. gentleman knows well that we were fiercely attacked, when I was Postmaster General, because we provided the Allan and Dominion Lines with a tender at Rimouski. Hon. gentlemen said: That is included in the contract of the Allan and Dominion Lines, and we should not be put to the cost and inconvenience of keeping a tender at Rimouski to perform the service which these lines undertook to perform. But the tender at Rimouski is still kept. That is one of the terrible mistakes of the late government that was not remedied by hon. gentlemen when the spirit of reform was blowing over this government. One voyage of the *Ashanti* occupied 19 days, 16 hours and 30 minutes; one voyage by the *Yola*, over 14 days; two voyages by the *Lake Huron* and *Lake Superior*, over 13 days; one by the *Lake Huron*, over 12 days; two by the *Lake Ontario* and *Etolia*, over 10 days, five ranging between 9 days and 10 days and five between 8 and 9 days. The average time of the Allan and Dominion Lines was less than 10 days. That was the average time of the service carried on by these lines. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), in speaking of the Allan and Dominion Lines, said that they refused to make a terminal port in Canada. I think, for a reason that I know well, that the hon. gentleman was mistaken in his statements. I recollect well that Mr. John Torance, of Montreal, speaking on behalf of the Allan Line, as well as of the Dominion Line, told me that they had for some time recognized that they had to abandon going to any other terminal port than one in Canada. They carried the mails to Halifax and went to St. John during the winter of 1898-9 at a heavy sacrifice and a lower price than was paid the Beaver Line the previous winter for a service so unsatisfactory that it was taken from them. In consequence of the service being so unsatisfactory letters were nearly all sent via the United States to New York.

Let me point out the great disadvantage under which we labour. We are paying \$150,000 a year for carrying the mails from

Great Britain to Canada, and would you believe it that nearly the whole of the Canadian mail matter is now being carried by American bottoms to New York, and is sent to San Francisco, across the United States, while we are subsidizing the Elder-Dempster Line at a cost of \$150,000 a year, subsidizing steamers on the Pacific Ocean, and have as we know spent an enormous amount of money to build the Canadian Pacific Railway across the continent. All this enormous expenditure is wasted because of the fact that nineteen days is consumed in carrying our mails across the Atlantic, so that the merchants have to send all their mail matter by American ships. Surely this system cannot continue. It would be far better to abolish the subsidies altogether. If we are going to leave it to the Elder-Dempster Line which takes nineteen days and nine hours to cross the Atlantic Ocean, it would be just as satisfactory to give it to sailing vessels. The service still continues extremely unsatisfactory. I was in Montreal the other day, and I found that the *Lake Superior*, of the Elder-Dempster Line left Liverpool on May 29, and passed Cape Ray at two p.m. on June 11, while the *Parisian* which left Liverpool on May 31, was in Quebec at noon on June 9. It must be remembered that the new and best boats of the Allan and Dominion Lines are chartered by the Imperial government to convey troops and supplies to South Africa, and if we had these new vessels on the Atlantic service the time of the Allan and Dominion liners would be reduced considerably. I quote from the *Free Press* of June 7. the following despatch:

London.—The Hon. William Mulock, Postmaster General of Canada has written to Mr. Henninger Heaton to express his satisfaction with the operation of the ocean penny postage. Owing to an increase of nearly 150 per cent in the volume of mail, the revenue under the penny rate now equals the old revenue under two pence half-penny rate.

It would be very interesting to know how this information was obtained. I know of no means of ascertaining whether the number of letters have increased or decreased unless every letter is actually counted. If this has not been done, I do not know how the calculation was made, and I want to know who has gone into this actual count if there has been a count, and when and where it has been done. To show the difference between the old and the new system it would be necessary to count the letters when the five cent rate existed, and to count the letters since the new rate has been introduced. The Postmaster General will agree with me in that. I think I am perhaps absolutely correct in making the statement that nearly the whole of our mail matter is carried by American ships, in consequence of the poor Canadian service, and I should like to know how much is due to the United States post office for transit rate. We pay the United

States land transit rate for conveyance of British mails over United States territory, and sea transit rate for carriage of mails by sea from New York to Liverpool. This is information which we should have before we can intelligently discuss these matters. Before we can give the Postmaster General credit for all the improvements he claims, we must have all the information which I have set out so that we may know whether his claim is valid or not. Again I wish to refer to the time taken by the steamers of the Elder-Dempster Line. There is a penalty attached to that contract for not conveying the mails within the time specified. I want to ascertain whether the time has been broken, except in two voyages to the extent of nineteen days and sixteen hours instead of eight. I want to know whether the contractors were called to account, whether they explained the delays, and whether the penalty has been imposed. Now, Sir, with regard to the tenders of which the hon. gentleman has made so much, I wish to say that I never interfered with a contract, in regard to calling for tenders or renewing, or in any other way, without acting on the advice of the officers who had charge of that branch; and it would have been impossible to do otherwise. As the hon. gentleman has stated, there are 9,000 post offices in Canada, and in some instances the service had to be divided among two or three or four people, according to the distance to be covered; and it is unfair to charge that these contracts were given without tenders, without bringing down the identical contracts referred to, so that we might see the conditions and circumstances which induced the officers of the department and myself to do as we did. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) read a letter from the Hon. Clarke Wallace. I hope that is not one of the letters which were marked 'private and confidential,' and which, among civilized people, are always recognized as private. It seems to me that if a man values his character as a gentleman, he will not break the secrecy of a letter marked private even to fight an opponent. The parliament of England has been called a club of gentlemen. If means of that kind are resorted to in a parliament representing the growing importance of this Dominion, it will not be to our credit, and will not be regarded by others as doing any credit to those who have used such means to fight an opponent. Those letters were marked private, and they were private to all intents and purposes. I do not know under what circumstances they got into the hands of those who used them; but, by whatever means they obtained them, their own personal honour should have induced them to respect them as private. When the information which I have asked for comes down, it will be easy for us to discuss the matter from the standpoint of the relative merits of the two administra-

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

tions of the Post Office Department, the present one and the one that preceded it.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). The hon. gentleman has made the statement that so far as he knew he acted in each case on the advice of the officers of his department, and, therefore, I presume he wishes to leave the impression on the House that he was not personally responsible. But, I wish to point out, that being the head of the department for the time being, he had to assume the responsibility for everything done in that department. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the renewal of the contract held by Messrs Leason & Scott was made in the public interest and on the advice of the officers of his department. Messrs. Leason & Scott had that contract for, I think, ten years. They had several contracts in the North-west Territories; but the contract I allude to is the one for carrying the mail between Saskatoon and Battleford, a distance of ninety miles, for which they received over \$7,000 a year. When that contract expired, it was renewed without tenders being called for. Now, I understand that all the letters found in this blue-book were found on the files of the department, and they are, therefore, public property. Before this book was issued at all, this whole matter was public property in the district of Saskatchewan, because, after the renewal of this contract with Messrs. Leason & Scott at \$7,000 a year, a gentleman named Stovel, in the town where I live, wrote to the Postmaster General of that day and offered to do this work and give a better service for \$5,000 a year. I wish to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that Mr. Macdowall, the member for Saskatchewan at that time, wrote a letter to the Postmaster General of that day, which appears in this book, recommending that this work be given to Mr. Stovel, because he offered to do it for \$2,000 a year less than Messrs. Leason & Scott. Now, we will come to the post office inspector at Winnipeg, Mr. McLeod, who, the hon. gentleman said, recommended that the contract with Messrs. Leason & Scott be continued at the old figure. Here is what he said when the matter was submitted to him:

Sir,—I return herewith the letter from C. R. Stovel, of Prince Albert, in which he offers to perform a semi-weekly service between Battleford and Saskatoon, making the trip each way in thirty hours in summer and forty-eight hours in winter for \$5,000 per annum.

Regarding the standing of Mr. Stovel, the postmaster of Prince Albert, in a letter dated the 10th ulto., informs me as follows:

'Mr. Stovel is quite capable of conducting such a service, and also there appears to be no doubt as to his responsibility. I think you may safely conclude that he is well qualified in every respect.'

Notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Stovel offered to do this work for \$2,000 a year less, that the member for the district, Mr. Mac-

dowall, recommended that it be given to Mr. Stovel, and that the post office inspector in the city of Winnipeg stated that he was able to carry out the work, we find that the contract was again given to Messrs. Leason & Scott, at over \$7,000 a year.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

### AFTER RECESS.

#### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 93) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Servis Railroad Tie Plate Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)

Bill (No. 185) to authorize the sale of the Yarmouth Steamship Company's property to the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Flint.)

### SUPPLY.

(The House resumed in committee.)

Mr. DAVIS. I do not propose to take up much of the time of the House. I am sorry the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) was not present, as I propose to continue my reply to some statements he had made before the Speaker left the Chair. The hon. gentleman said that while he was at the head of the Post Office Department, he never gave his consent to the renewal of a contract without having a favourable report from the officials of his department. I drew his attention to the fact that he had not a report from these officials in favour of renewing the contract with Leason & Scott, and yet he renewed it at the old price. There was a party who offered to do the work for \$2,000 a year less, and that party had the recommendation of the member for the district, and also of the post office inspector at Winnipeg, and yet the contract was given to the old firm at the old rate, without even calling for tenders. It appears, however, that Mr. Daly, then Minister of the Interior, wrote a letter to Mr. White, the then Deputy Postmaster General, in which he asked that the old contractors be allowed to continue the work at their former rate of \$7.043 per year. I also find that a gentleman by the name of Davis, who then represented Alberta in this House, also wrote to the Deputy Postmaster General recommending a renewal of the contract with Leason & Scott, and apparently these two recommendations outweighed the recommendation of the member for the district.

After the present Postmaster General took charge of the department, this contract was cancelled and tenders called for in the regular way, and the work was taken for something like \$1,800 a year. There was

therefore, a clear saving of at least \$5,000 a year on that little contract alone. Calculate that during the ten years when Leason & Scott had the contract, and you will find that it makes a total of \$50,000 public money wasted by the late government on this one item alone.

We are told by some hon. gentlemen on the other side that the service is being starved at present. Well, if taking away the contracts from contractors who were getting three times for the work more than it was worth, is starving the service, then I admit the charge. There was something very strange in the way that particular mail contract to which I have referred was manipulated. There were rumours about the streets of Prince Albert that the contractors were going around the stores and purchasing moose and deer heads and everything of that kind to ship to the department, I suppose to try and influence certain of the officials to give them the contract at the old rate. And in view of the fact that the contract was renewed with Leason & Scott at \$2,043 more than other parties offered to do the work for, and that in spite of the recommendation of the member for the district and the post office inspector at Winnipeg, the statement made by the hon. member for Three Rivers that he never renewed a contract, except on the advice of his officials, falls to the ground.

There are hundreds of cases in which tenders were received, and yet the old contractors were allowed to continue the work at higher rates. There is the case to which the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) referred this afternoon, the case of the mail service between Hockley and Mono Centre. Tenders were called for. The tenders for that service were as follows:

Robert Deadman .....	\$300
Samuel Fleming .....	348
Robert Moffit .....	350
Nelson Montgomery .....	388
Robert Colwell .....	400
James Stenson .....	420
W. J. Hunter .....	448
R. Turnbull .....	448
Robert Caldwell .....	370

There were, in all, nine tenders received lower than the contract price. If the department was conducted on business principles, one of these gentlemen would have received the contract, their tenders being lower and there being nothing to show that they were not perfectly competent to do the work. But this is not done, and we find the cause in some of the letters that are published. Here, for instance, is a letter written by Mr. J. S. Leighton, a gentleman who was interested in the old contractor. It is dated January 22, 1894, and addressed to N. Clarke Wallace, who was then controller of customs:

Dear Sir,—Mr. R. Caldwell has sent with this mail a tender for renewal of contract for carry-

ing the mails from Hockley to Mono Centre. This tender is the same as the contract he already had.

I understand that the parties who are tendering against him are McCarthyites, and they deserve nothing at the hands of the government. Mr. R. Caldwell is and always was a thorough Conservative.

I never knew that because a man was a McCarthyite, he should be deprived of his rights as a citizen, or that he should be refused the right to tender for a mail contract. Now, if Mr. Leighton had written this letter to the Postmaster General, or the Deputy Postmaster General, we should not have thought it worthy of such special notice. But this letter was written to Mr. Wallace, who was then not a member of the cabinet, but controller of customs. Mr. Wallace incloses this letter of Mr. Leighton with one of his own, written to the Postmaster General of that day (Sir Adolphe Caron), as follows:

Ottawa, Jan. 25, 1894.

Dear Sir Adolphe,—I inclose you a communication that has been addressed to me by our warm friend—

Our warm friend—

—who resides in Orangeville, Ont., Mr. J. S. Leighton. You will observe what he says about the contract for carrying the mail between Hockley and Mono Centre, that is again being tendered for by Mr. Caldwell. If you can renew this contract to Mr. Caldwell at the old figures, I shall be very much obliged. Kindly drop me a line telling me what you can do, and return the inclosed letter.

I am, faithfully yours,  
N. CLARKE WALLACE.

That is to say, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) incloses this letter of Mr. Leighton, thus agreeing in what Mr. Leighton says about the McCarthyite, and asks that the contract be given to this party at the old figure. The only reason given in either of the documents is that the other gentlemen who tendered were McCarthyites and the old contractor was a thorough-going Conservative. According to the views of the ex-controller of customs (Mr. Wallace), it is evident that a person who happened to be a McCarthyite was not entitled to consideration at the hands of the government of which he was a member. In other words, one who did not feel inclined to be chained to his chariot, was to be ostracized and not allowed to have any rights. On the next page, we have the ex-Postmaster General's (Sir Adolphe Caron's) letter:

Ottawa, Jan. 27, 1894.

My dear Mr. Wallace,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 25th inst., inclosing a letter from Mr. J. S. Leighton—

Thus he acknowledges that he has read this letter, and the views expressed in it as to the McCarthyites—

—recommending the renewal of the contract of Mr. R. Caldwell of the mail service between Hockley and Mono Centre.

Mr. DAVIS.

In reply, I beg to say that, in accordance with your recommendation, I have authorized that this contract may be renewed for a further term.

Yours faithfully.

ADOLPHE P. CARON,

According to the documents, this action on the part of the hon. gentleman who was then Postmaster General, must have been taken on account of what was said about McCarthyites, because there was no other reason given why the contract should be renewed, except that the old contractor was a thorough Conservative, and the other tenderers were McCarthyites, and the country had to suffer on account of that.

There are many other cases in this book very much the same, not only in Ontario, but throughout the Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific—hundreds and hundreds of cases where there were tenders in the department to do the work at lower rates than those at which the contract was actually given, and the correspondence shows that this was done often on the recommendation of the members from the district in favour of the old contractor. In other words, the department was run on the principle: 'If you do not see what you want, ask for it.' Here, for instance, was the case of Brockville. A gentleman named Kavanagh had the contract for carrying the mails on the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Grand Trunk Railway, and was getting something like \$406 a year. But he was not satisfied. He thought he ought to have somebody to watch him—I suppose he had a feeling that he was not doing the work properly, and should have somebody to see that the work was done well. As shown by the hon. member for North Wellington, this same man was appointed transfer agent; and for a long time, he was paid \$406 for carrying the mails across the platform from one train to another, and he got also \$400 a year as agent, to watch himself. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron), says he depended on the officers of his department, and so we should not blame him. But it is apparent that the Post Office Department was run in a very loose manner, when such things could take place. If the Postmaster General and his officials were aware of what was going on, and took no means to stop it, they were to blame; and if they did not know, they were to blame—they can take either horn of the dilemma they please.

I may say, in conclusion, that the people of this country are well satisfied with the way the Postmaster General has run his department. He has wiped out an enormous deficit of \$700,000 in four years, and has given us penny postage, not only throughout Canada, but practically throughout the empire. Hon. gentlemen say that the reduction of postage does not benefit the labouring classes and the farmers, but I contend that it is a benefit to every person.

Moreover, we have a better service from one end of the country to the other than we had before. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), says that the service is being starved. I must say I have never heard any complaints on that ground. The Postmaster General deserves great credit for carrying on his department in a business-like way. We do not hear of any Brockville cases, or any Leason & Scott cases, since he took charge of the department. Hon. gentlemen complain that private letters were published. I do not know whether they are private or not. Those letters were on the public files, and therefore I say they are public property, and any person in this country had a right to see them if he asked for them in the way provided. So I say there is nothing here to show that the business of the Post Office Department under the hon. member for Three Rivers was conducted in a business manner. There is no use in him trying to defend it in face of the letters over his own signature and over the signature of scores of members in this House asking for the contracts to be renewed.

Mr. T. D. CRAIG (East Durham). I have no disposition to protract the proceedings of this House, but the fact is that members on this side of the House are compelled by members on the government side to do a little talking in order to defend themselves. One would imagine, coming into the House, that we were trying to get the estimates through and that the government side were trying to keep them back. I am rather surprised to see members like the hon. gentleman from North Wellington, the hon. gentleman from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), taking up so much time in talking when the Postmaster General is anxious to get his estimates through. In fact I noticed the Postmaster General tried unsuccessfully to get the member for Saskatchewan to refrain from making a speech. Under these circumstances I do not think the opposition can be blamed for placing their side of the matter before the public. I am glad to know that such an impartial paper as the *Montreal Witness* has a little piece in it talking about prorogation being postponed owing to the attitude of the opposition. Well, I shall be very glad if the *Montreal Witness* will take note of the proceedings today and say that prorogation will probably be postponed owing to the attitude of the government members. We do not want to stay here much longer, we have been here too long already; and I would just take this occasion to say that this session has not been prolonged by the opposition. I have an opinion that the sessions will generally be long from this time out, as the country is growing, and we have so many eloquent orators coming here from the west, on both sides of the House.

Now, the Postmaster General is trying to put his estimates through and the members on this side of the House have criticised them, but they have done it fairly and moderately. And what reply do they get? Members on the other side get up and read out of a book containing letters of Conservative members to the then Postmaster General, and try to make political capital out of it, making stump speeches in the House. Now, that is a nice sight for the country to look at, and it shows, to my mind, what a desperate condition the government side are in when they cannot let this side of the House alone on any one occasion, but must continue raking up all these old matters. Now, Mr. Chairman, there are two or three of my letters in that book, and I am not ashamed of those letters. They are very short, and were written to the Postmaster General asking if he could see his way to renew certain contracts—there is nothing wrong about that—and I am glad to say the contracts were renewed. Why did I ask them to be renewed? Because they were fair contracts, because the price was not excessive, because the work was well performed, and because the people in the neighbourhood were perfectly satisfied with the men who had the contract, and satisfied that they should get the renewal of it. There was no agitation for a change, nobody wanted a change that I know of. These men had been carrying on these contracts for some time, some of them had horses for that purpose, and another man was dependent upon them for his living. Was it not right, therefore, that I should ask the Postmaster General to renew these contracts? I am not ashamed of what I did, and if our party was in power I would do it again, if the contract was a fair contract. The law expressly provides that the Postmaster General should have power to do that.

Now, a great deal has been said in this House which I hold is very apt to mislead the people. It has been said that these contracts were given without tender. Now, I absolutely deny that. I was going to say that it is not true, but I say that is not a correct statement of facts. The true statement of the case is this: These contracts were made on tenders being put in for them, and when these contracts expired, on the recommendation of somebody, probably the member for the constituency, these contracts were renewed because they were considered fair and in the interest of the public. They were renewed under the advisement of the officers in the department as having been well carried out. Now, I would ask what objection there is to that. It is all very well for members of the Liberal party to say that they have not done so and so. No, they have not done some of these things because they have been in power only a short time. If they should happen to remain in power for a good many

years I will guarantee that we shall find them doing the same things that they are criticising to-day. They have only been in power about four years, and the contracts made at that time have not expired yet, some of them, they have had no opportunity to do these things. But I really believe, from what I know of a great many of them, that they would do the same things they are condemning the Conservative party for doing, and I would not blame them for it, provided the contract was fair. The way this matter came up is this: The Postmaster General claims a great deal of credit for saving over \$400,000 on these mail contracts. I have just this remark to make, that this \$400,000 was taken out of the very men that could not afford to lose it, out of poor men. The expression has been used, 'starving the mail service.' I do not know as that is true, but I know that some of these contractors are about half starved, and their horses as well. Men have been compelled to put in low tenders in order to get contracts, and I will guarantee that some of them are sorry they got the contracts, because they cannot afford to carry them on. I do not think the Postmaster General has a right to take as great a sum as \$400,000 out of these men in this way. For my part, as a citizen of this country, I would rather these men should get fair pay for doing the work than to have the country credited with \$400,000 taken out of their pockets, and I believe that is the feeling of the people. This \$400,000 is practically taken out of the pockets of these mail contractors in order that the Postmaster General should have credit for this revenue.

Now, there is one letter from myself in that book recommending that Mr. John Caldwell should have his contract renewed for collecting letters from the letter boxes in the town of Port Hope. I find on referring to the Postmaster General's report that this man had to make two trips a day. It is said in the Postmaster General's report that there were twelve trips a week, but there were thirteen trips a week. I know he made two trips every week-day, and one trip on Sunday night. The first trip commenced at ten o'clock, and he had to travel four miles and a half on that one trip before he got home again, and collect from about five or six boxes on each trip. He made another trip beginning at nine o'clock at night. Now, what exorbitant sum did he get for making each trip? That is the way to look at this matter. I want to mention that to show that I was perfectly justified in recommending that this contract should be renewed. He received the munificent sum, for travelling four miles and a half and collecting letters from these six boxes, taking them to the post office and then going home again, I suppose, of 30 cents each trip. Well, now, I do not think

Mr. CRAIG.

any member of this House would be willing to undertake the job at that price.

Mr. PRIOR. Why did he take it?

Mr. CRAIG. I suppose he took it because he had nothing else to do. This man was a tailor by trade and he found that sitting on the bench gave him dyspepsia. The doctor told him that he had to take outdoor exercise. He got this contract and everybody was perfectly satisfied with the way he did his work. The man is dead now, so that it does not make much difference what we say about the contract. He received thirty cents for each trip of four and a half miles. This trip had to be made no matter what the weather was like, whether it was raining, or snowing or blowing. He received what he considered a very small compensation. He thought he should have more. I got that contract renewed for him, after which another man got it. I do not know whether I got it renewed for the other man or not. Now, the contract has been let by the hon. Postmaster General for a smaller sum. Of course there is a saving to the country, and the hon. Postmaster General takes credit for having saved fifty dollars. But, as a citizen of this country, I do not want to make money in that way for the country. I suppose the hon. Postmaster General feels compelled to accept the lowest tender, but I would be very glad if he did not have to accept the lowest tender when the price was far too low for a man to live upon. I take another case. There was the case of the service between Port Hope and Elizabethville where the service involved a daily trip of thirty-two miles. The man who had the contract had to keep two horses, using one horse one day and one horse the next day, and he travelled the distance every day whether it was dry or wet or warm or cold. What did he get? My text now is 'improvident contracts,' because the hon. Postmaster General used that term. This is what I would call an improvident contract. This man had to travel with his horse and buggy thirty-two miles every day to fulfil his contract. He had to get his dinner, to feed his horse, and he drew one dollar and fifty cents for making that trip every day in the year. Yet, the hon. member for North Wellington can stand up and talk about letters in that book asking for a renewal of these contracts. I would write a letter like that any time for the renewal of such a contract. Another man has the contract now, and he gets one dollar and thirty cents a day. The Postmaster General has saved to the country the large sum of seventy dollars a year. I do not want to save money in that way for the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I know a man who took a contract in my section recently, and he carries the mail thirty-two miles every day for one dollar a day.

Mr. CRAIG. I would just expect that from where the hon. gentleman comes. I suppose he thinks that is quite enough for the man too. I have no doubt he is praising the hon. Postmaster General so much because he gets work done for one dollar a day. If the hon. member for North Wellington is satisfied with that, I am not satisfied.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Craig) was saying that the amount paid to the man to whom he referred was very low, and I was pointing out that there are other people who do the same work for less money. My hon. friend is very liberal. I do not know that he is as liberal with his own funds as he is with the funds of the public.

Mr. CRAIG. That is very flattering to me. I do not know what reason the hon. gentleman has to make that remark, but I do not see what point there is in any remark the hon. gentleman has made. While I am saying that one dollar and thirty cents a day is paid under this contract, and asking the House whether that is sufficient for a man who is travelling thirty-two miles a day, he gets up and says it is not too little because in my part of the country there is a man who does the same work for one dollar a day. I do not want to live in the hon. gentleman's part of the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. We do not want you either.

Mr. CRAIG. The hon. gentleman will not find that the workmen of the country will approve of the doctrine which he enunciates in making that statement, and I would be glad if the people of the country would remember that the hon. gentleman thinks that when a man is getting one dollar a day for travelling thirty-two miles he is well paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not say so. You are putting words in my mouth.

Mr. CRAIG. It can stand right there as far as I am concerned.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). If he offers to do it for that should the government pay more?

Mr. McMULLEN. Hear, hear; that is the point.

Mr. CRAIG. There is some common sense in that question. That is the difference between the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for North Wellington. I am very glad that the hon. Minister of Finance has asked me that question because that is a question to be considered and it is a question that I was coming to. I do not think the government should give contracts at such starvation rates. I would like, if the hon. Minister of Finance and his colleagues could find some way of overcoming that difficulty.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will have to amend the Act first.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not think the country wants that sort of thing. The reason I speak of it is that the Postmaster General is taking credit for it.

Mr. McMULLEN. You do not know what the country wants. That is the reason you are there.

Mr. CRAIG. That is just like the hon. gentleman exactly. A remark of that kind is just about his calibre. We have to get used to him. I repeat what I have said that I do not think the country wants money saved in this way. I am criticising this because I do not think the hon. Postmaster General should take credit for such contracts as I have referred to, and which I would call, improvident contracts. I do not say that there were not some contracts made which were not improvident under the late government, but I think if we look through the record of the Liberal party since they have been in power we will find some improvident things done by them. I am not justifying everything done by the late government or by the Conservative party, but I do not know why you should find fault with these contracts unless there was something wrong about them. I am satisfied to leave it to the people of the country, to the fair-minded people, the liberal-minded people to say whether they think one dollar and fifty cents a day is too much for carrying the mails thirty-two miles. There is one thing that I would say in answer to the question of the hon. Minister of Finance and it is this: we have heard something about a resolution introduced into this House to provide that contractors do not sub-let contracts in such a way as to oppress workmen, and that the current rate of wages shall be paid. That has been considered a very important resolution. It says:

That every effort should be made to secure the payment of such wages as are generally accepted as current in each trade for competent workmen.

This is the resolution that the hon. Postmaster General has introduced into this House and it strikes me as being very strange that the very man who introduces this resolution, wanting the House to declare that the government should see that contractors pay their men the current rate of wages, should wish to take credit for compelling men to do work at starvation wages, at almost Chinamen's wages.

Mr. PRIOR. A Chinaman would not do it for this price.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not think he would. If the government are really in favour of the resolution which they have brought into this House, they should be willing that under those contracts a man should earn fair wages. I have no objection to the Post-

master General trying to make the postal service self-supporting, and as far as it goes he deserves credit for that, but I do think that he should not boast of making money out of these small mail contractors. I believe these men are very foolish to tender at so low a price, but I do not think the government deserves much credit for getting the work done at far less than what would be ordinary fair wages. Economy is all right, but the government is certainly not economic in other ways. The estimates this year amount to nearly \$60,000,000, which will afford, no doubt, great pleasure and gratification to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) when he thinks about it and rolls it over in his mind. After all, \$60,000,000 is a pretty nice little sum for a country like this to spend in a year. If the government want to be economical they can turn their attention in other directions, and not try to be saving at the expense of these poor men throughout the country. It may be that some of these contracts were let at too high a price, but I guarantee that in almost every case mentioned in these letters the price paid was a fair price and nothing more. That is my opinion, but the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) may think differently. I can easily imagine that a man who thinks \$1 a day good wages for a workingman would think \$1.50 a princely remuneration for him.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who do you refer to? You have a very bad habit of making insinuations.

Mr. CRAIG. Why, I am making no insinuation at all. I state very plainly that the hon. gentleman upheld a dollar a day as being fair pay for a workingman.

Mr. McMULLEN. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. CRAIG. Then, why do you not complain about the Postmaster General paying such small wages?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not a question of wages; it is a question of contract.

Mr. CRAIG. But, the Postmaster General is taking credit for saving \$400,000 out of these poor hard-working men.

Mr. McMULLEN. How would you do it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. Address the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG. Let the hon. member for North Wellington keep cool. He made a long speech this afternoon, and he might let me make my little speech without interrupting.

Mr. PRIOR. He is jealous.

Mr. CRAIG. I hope he is not jealous of me. If I thought he was I would sit down at once. I hope we will hear the last in

Mr. CRAIG.

this House of gentlemen quoting from these letters and trying to make the people of the country believe that improvident sums were paid to these poor men for carrying the mails. I am willing to leave it to any fair-minded farmers or workingmen in Canada, as to whether they do not think that the contract prices paid for mail carriage by the late government were only fair and reasonable.

Mr. FOSTER. The Postmaster General states in his annual report that a certain expense was incurred for carrying the mail into the Yukon. Is that money, and also the \$3,000 paid by the Department of the Interior for carrying the mails, to appear in the public accounts as the proper expenditure of the Post Office Department or not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have nothing to do with the making up of the Public Accounts book, nor do I know the form of procedure in connection with it. I do not know why there was not an apportionment of it in that way. So far as my own department is concerned, I felt that I was doing my duty by giving instructions in my department that when the amounts were ascertained they should be chronicled in the Postmaster General's Report. Probably the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is technically correct. Is it the Auditor General who makes up the Public Accounts book?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Finance Department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It took many months for us to obtain the balance of the accounts from the comptroller of the North-west Mounted Police, and probably the Public Accounts book was prepared before we got the figures.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought the statement made by the Postmaster General last year settled that. His statement then was, not that he was going to put a note in the Postmaster General's Report saying that this expense was incurred by another department in doing his work. My criticism was that the post office work was charged to another department, and I asked that in the distribution of the accounts the charge should be properly made. Now, the Postmaster General thinks he has done his duty—no; I do not think he thinks he has done his duty.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the Postmaster General thinks he has done his duty by simply putting a paragraph in his report stating that so much was incurred in carrying mails into and out of the Yukon by the Interior Department. I think it is incumbent upon every department to do its own work, as I think it is incumbent upon every man to pay his debts. What would you say, if the

Inland Revenue Department having had a certain amount of money appropriated for it, persuaded the Customs Department to carry on part of its work at an expense of \$50,000, and then have it entered up against the Customs Department vote? If one department can do this, so can another, and then what confidence can we have in our public accounts? I am not debating this in a partisan sense, but as a simple financial transaction, and I do not think the Postmaster General has risen to that point of view.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) must know full well that there was no desire in the slightest degree to misstate the financial working of the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General's Report shows the whole transactions in connection with the mail service. The account for the Yukon mail service and the account for the mail service for the rest of Canada is given, and the simplest child could add them up. The whole information is in the Postmaster General's Report, so that he who runs may read. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) may be technically correct.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not talking of technical matters, I am simply speaking of a question of fact.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is wonderfully precise in exacting something from others which he never performed himself. There is no use of our threshing out the old subject again. I can only repeat that what he is so severely criticising to-day, he and his government did yesterday. If he starts in that way, I might ask him what he is going to do about his accounts. Is he going to have the government tear up those books and issue new ones? He understands the situation perfectly well; and with his intelligence and his experience, knowing that everything has been done in good faith and was intended in good faith, that everything is frank and above-board, and stated in print over and over again in my report, I fail to see what good purpose he accomplishes, though he may continue in this course. I therefore repeat that if he presses his point, perhaps he would include his own transactions and ask generally how you are going to deal with such cases. They did not begin under my regime, but in the hon. gentleman's time.

Mr. FOSTER. I will try to reason with my hon. friend in another way. He is an honest man in his own transactions, and he would no doubt admit that the same line of definite statement ought to be pursued with reference to public transactions as with reference to private transactions. Suppose, for instance, that he was carrying on a business, the proceeds of which were so much and the expenditure so much; and

every year he sent out to the shareholders of the business a statement of the receipts and expenditures, showing consequently the profits of the business. Now, suppose he had persuaded some one else who was carrying on an entirely different business, to allow him to reap a certain percentage of profit from his own transactions, while that other person shouldered \$50,000 worth of work which belonged entirely to his own company. When he makes his statement to his shareholders, is it an honest statement if he gives the revenues and withholds the fact that he has not paid for the \$50,000 worth of work which was the proper work of that company? There is an easy object lesson for even the Postmaster General.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Not the same, though.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I am very glad the Postmaster General finds some one else to stand by him in that. Now, I will try and give an object lesson to my hon. friend who thinks this is not the same. When any one wants to find the results of the work of the different departments, he takes up the book in which the government purports to give the public accounts of the country. He looks in that book and he finds that the Post Office Department in the year 1899 had a revenue of so many millions of dollars, and on the next page he finds that the Post Office Department expended for the postal services of the country so many millions of dollars. He puts these two columns of figures side by side and strikes a balance, and says that the post office of Canada in its workings, as shown by the public accounts of the Dominion, has a surplus or deficit of so much. Now, does the Postmaster General think it is fair that these public accounts, purporting to give the condition of his and the other departments, should bear a falsehood on their face, that, so far as his department is concerned, they should be \$50,000 out of the truth, because another department which was not constituted for that purpose, which had no vote for that purpose, and ought not to have spent a single dollar for that purpose, has taken \$50,000 worth of the burden of the work, and has paid for it out of another and altogether different vote? Does the hon. gentleman think that is good book-keeping or honest book-keeping? Again, I quarrel with the other phase of it. When parliament was asked for a vote for the mounted police, it was asked for a well-known vote for a well-known service, and it gave the vote. Now \$50,000 of the vote for the mounted police has been taken and used for postal services. If that can be done in the case of these two departments, I want to know where the limit is. When we give a vote for Inland Revenue, is the government to apply \$50,000 of that vote to carry mails into the Yukon? If the money can be used for one department, it can just as well be used for another; and

I quarrel with the action of the government in taking \$50,000 of the vote which was for the mounted police service and for that alone, and using it to carry mails in and out of the Yukon.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Did you not do that?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend does not seem to have any view at all of a question solely on its merits. If he is accused of committing a murder, he does not seem to think that any crime is laid at his door provided he can look at anybody else and say, 'You did the same.'

Mr. McMILLAN. Then, your own language is the strongest condemnation of your own conduct at the time you were conducting the affairs of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, have we come to this, in this House, that an old and I believe respected member of the House should keep his hat on and talk across the House.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is a strong argument you are using.

Mr. FOSTER—and without asking your permission to speak, or addressing the Chair? It seems to me you are growing oblivious to your duties as the hon. member is growing oblivious of the rights of a member of the House. But now we will go on with the argument after this good-natured interruption. I want to carry the question still further. I want to ask whether or not, when the Minister of Railways comes down to this House for a vote for railway purposes, and gets his vote, he is justified in taking \$50,000 of that vote, and using it for carrying the mails into the Yukon or anywhere else, and then letting the accounts show that his expenditure for railway purposes and railway purposes alone was \$50,000 more than it actually was. What right have the government to take away these votes from the purposes for which they were granted and devote them to an entirely different purpose.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This money was devoted to the purpose for which it was voted.

Mr. FOSTER. The money for the North-west Mounted Police, I take leave to say, was not voted for any such purpose.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I beg your pardon.

Mr. FOSTER. The money for the North-west Mounted Police was voted for the services of the North-west Mounted Police.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And for this mail service, by express provision.

Mr. FOSTER. On a general vote last year on which this same principle came up, I asked that that diversion of public money

Mr. FOSTER.

should be stopped, and the minister pledged himself to this House, that he would see that the proper distribution was made, and that the Post Office Department was charged with that which was its due. The Post Office Department has not been charged with a single cent of this \$50,000 which was paid for by the other departments. If the hon. gentleman claims that his deficit for 1898-9 is \$398,000, he states it \$50,000 less than he should. The hon. gentleman knows it. He knows that \$50,000 was expended in carrying his mails to and from Dawson and the Yukon. He cabbaged the revenue and flaunts that in the face of the country, but he takes good care not to assume the legitimate charges of his department. We ought to have an answer from the government, as to whether they propose to carry on this kind of playing fast and loose with the parliamentary appropriations, and fast and loose as well with any kind of reliable book-keeping.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I really do not know how many times the hon. gentleman has to be reminded of the facts, but I will once more remind the committee, at all events, and then leave the subject. He has said that for the year 1898-9, I carried in the general revenue of the post office, the receipts from the Yukon. I have already told the hon. gentleman that he is deceiving himself. In my report it is distinctly stated that the revenue from the Yukon is not included in the revenue of the post office service. On page xiii. of the report, the hon. gentleman will find the following:

Mails were also conveyed at about fortnightly intervals between Log Cabin and Atlin. The total value of the services so rendered has been fixed by the comptroller of the North-west Mounted Police at \$47,400.

And page xiv.:

Revenue—Yukon and Atlin District.  
The post office revenue for the Yukon and Atlin districts for the year amounted to \$10,-846.61, collected at the different points as follows:

Atlin .....	\$ 748 15
Dawson .....	9,411 28
Lake Bennett.....	637 18
Log Cabin .....	50 00

The expenditure, including the sums so fixed as the value of the services of the North-west Mounted Police, amounted to \$69,350.39, the cost thus exceeding the revenue by \$58,503.78. The financial operations of the year ended June 30, 1899, not including the revenue and expenditure in respect of the service in the Yukon and Atlin districts, as above mentioned, have resulted in a deficit of \$398,917.79.

And then, on page 4, we get the gross receipts and the net receipts, and the gross expenditure and the net expenditure, for the year, with the exception of the revenue and expenditure from the Yukon. And at the foot of that statement, there is this note:

Revenue of the Yukon and Atlin districts (\$10,-846.61) not included.

We simply divided the revenue and expenditure into two separate accounts, because it is much fairer, for the purpose of comparison, to separate the Yukon from the general post office service, and compare that portion of the Dominion service administered by the Post Office Department up to 1896, with the same portion administered since 1896. How is it the hon. gentleman only realizes now that I am dealing with these expenditures in this way. Does he not know that we voted that money to the Northwest Mounted Police, to be expended by them in supplying a postal service to the Post Office Department? The expenditure was perfectly proper. There was nothing illegal in it. On the contrary, it was in entire harmony with what took place in the House. The only question that could arise is as to the book-keeping, but there can be no question about any misspending the public money, which the hon. gentleman seems to argue there has been.

But if the hon. gentleman is inclined to be critical as to what is accurate book-keeping, will he be good enough to explain how it is that when he went out of office he had used up the whole parliamentary appropriation for carrying on the mail service to June 30, 1896, and had left unpaid accounts, up to that time, for the same service, amounting to over \$680,000. He laid on the Table in the spring of 1896, a statement of the assets and liabilities of Canada, and the cost of administration for the fiscal year closing June 30, 1895, and yet at the commencement of the fiscal year of 1896, there were \$616,000 of unpaid liabilities from the former fiscal year, which did not appear in the hon. gentleman's statement. I do not say that he was intending to conceal these accounts, but I say it was a lax practice. The hon. gentleman did not disclose this indebtedness in his statement for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, to which it properly belonged, but the moment he entered upon the fiscal year of 1896, his government took \$616,000 out of the appropriations for that year to pay accounts that were due in 1895. Does the hon. gentleman call that honest, straightforward book-keeping? He should remove the beam from his own eye before finding fault with the mote in his brother's.

Mr. FOSTER. We will talk about this mote first. I do not intend that the hon. gentleman shall get away from a point in question until it is settled, and afterwards I am quite willing to explain to him, as I have done before, the matter he last brought up. Now, I am dealing with the post office revenue and expenditure for the fiscal year 1898-9, not for the current year. So, we are not concerned with the vote taken in this House last session for the current year which is just now about to conclude, nor for the wording of that vote. Let me take the hon. gentleman's own report first. He says

that he has done all that is necessary when he has made certain notes in his report, when he has divided the Yukon and Atlin districts off from the rest of the post office field, and has declared that the receipts of that portion were \$10,000, and the expenditures were \$69,350. Having done that, he thinks he has effectually settled the question as to the book-keeping either in its principle or in its honesty as making a complete representation to the country of what took place in his department. I do not think that is a very satisfactory answer. He goes on directly afterwards and details the financial operations. Financial operations of what? Of the Post Office Department.

The financial operations of the year ended June 30, 1899, not including the revenue and expenditure in respect of the service in the Yukon and Atlin districts, as above mentioned (the same being above set forth), have resulted in a deficit of \$398,917.79.

This is the deficit the hon. gentleman sets before the public as being the deficit that has arisen out of the administration of the post office in this country. In his departmental report, he says: 'not including the revenues or expenditures from the Yukon.' But when he is giving to parliament and the country an account of the operations for the year and adding up receipts and expenditures and deducting one from the other to find out his deficit, why does he not give the whole operation? What justification is there for him dividing up the field and leaving out the portion of the field which, when left out, favours his own peculiar method of calculation? To-day, I followed the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) when he was making his speech; and he will find it reported in *Hansard* that he talked of the deficit for this year as \$398,000. The deficit of his department, is \$398,000 plus over \$50,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is all stated.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not stated. Nor did the hon. gentleman state that in the speech he made here to-day. Nor will it be stated to the country, nor is it stated in the public accounts which people go to learn the operations of every department of the government. In the public accounts which the people look to—and I challenge the hon. gentleman to deny it or disprove it—that \$10,000 and over is included in the revenue, while in the expenditure of the post office as shown in the public accounts that \$50,000 is excluded. There is one simple answer to a statement of that kind—that these public accounts give the Post Office Department and the Postmaster General the benefit of \$10,000 of the revenue which is included, and they give equally the benefit of over \$50,000 which is taken off his expenditure. And every country in the world which puts out comparative statistics, every man in the

country who goes to the public accounts to find out what the operations of the department are, is misled by the statement, because the accounts do not show the actual results. I take exception to the hon. gentleman boasting that his deficit is only \$398,000 when his deficit is \$50,000 more. But, if, at any time, he happens to be taken up in making that statement, he will bring out his post office returns from his coat pocket and say—there is a paragraph which tells you with reference to the Yukon and Athin district that there is \$10,000 of receipts and \$69,000 and over of expenses that are not included in the deficit I have been talking about. Now, the hon. gentleman is a business man, and he knows as well as he needs to know anything, how the public accounts ought to be run so far as such matters in connection with the Post Office Department are concerned. What right has he to divide the field when he makes his general summing up? He can divide the field into five hundred different sections if he likes. But when he comes to summing up, he does not give a fair representation of the facts if he does not give every cent of income and every cent of outgo. And so he seeks to stand before the country with \$50,000 less of deficit than he ought to have, than he would have if he shouldered the responsibilities proper and germane to his own department, and which he pledged himself in this House that he would have properly distributed. I believe the North-west Mounted Police actually made up the calculations, either at the request of the hon. gentleman or of his department, in order that the settlement might be made. But the hon. gentleman has not paid his bills, and he is sailing about with an advantage of \$50,000 to himself and his department. Now, dear knows, no one wants to take away from the Postmaster General anything to which he is entitled. Let him have the benefit of his operations in the Post Office Department—no one grudges him that. But, surely he does not want to take an unfair advantage; he does not want to go before the country in a false position. The British post office collects all these statistics and publishes them in an abstract and sends them to every quarter of the globe. In doing so it publishes a statement in regard to the post office of Canada that is false to the extent of \$50,000. Why is it false? Because, in summing up the details of receipts and expenditures in the public accounts, the Postmaster General had put \$10,000 of receipts as being from a certain section and has sedulously withdrawn from his proper expenditure over \$69,000 of the expenses in that locality. He cannot possibly stand up and say that that is right for himself or for the government. It is not right, and everybody knows it. I challenge the hon. gentleman to go to the estimates that were brought down for the year 1898-9, and show any authority given by this House to

Mr. FOSTER.

the North-west Mounted Police to use this money appropriated for their purposes to the carrying of mails into the Yukon. We should be all confusion, chaos, if we were to divert votes solemnly given for certain purposes and expend them for purposes not authorized by parliament, in order to lighten the burden of certain departments and enable them to make a favourable showing before the country. It is not fair to either department from which you filch, nor is it fair to the department in whose interest you filch. We have a certain clear standard and principle upon which we make parliamentary appropriations, and that has been certainly violated in this respect.

Now we come to another point that my hon. friend has stated over and over again. He says: Why did you not in the early times of the North-west do the same thing? Well, my answer is, first, that I was not Minister of Finance at that time, nor Postmaster General. But that does not affect the principle. What I would like the hon. gentleman to do is, to give us the figures with reference to how the accounts were kept in those early days in the North-west. I agree that if for the general public a post office service was put on in the North-west, the payment for that service should be debited to the Post Office Department alone. I am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman will find, if he makes this investigation, that it can be explained as I explained it this afternoon, that the burden was borne by the post office the moment the burden became in the public interest. Now, I take up the other point. How unfair of the hon. gentleman to state that six or seven hundred thousand dollars of debts owing by the Post Office Department for the year 1896 were cooked, or manipulated, or concealed. The contracts were running, made according to law, properly signed, and properly in force, and under these contracts the mails were being carried. As the quarters came round the payments were made for the department and the accounts went into the Auditor General. You come up to the quarter ending June 30, 1895, and the department finds that the money necessary to pay the bills is not provided for, that is before the accounts are payable.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, they were payable in June.

Mr. FOSTER. The accounts are technically due on the 30th day of June, but no contractor's accounts, scattered as they are all over the country, could ever be collected and paid until sufficient time elapses for the processes necessary for payment. So that for these services which are performed up to June 30 and are owed for then, the department cannot pay until the accounts have time to come in and are certified, are examined, are ordered to be paid, and cheques are drawn therefor. So that, about July 20, and along to the end of July, these accounts

get into a shape when they can be paid. Where is the concealment? Where is the manipulation? Where is the desire to keep anything out of the public accounts? When the time comes for payment, the Post Office Department has its vote, not for North-west Mounted Police work, but for its own post office work for the year 1896, and it pays the bills which run over from 1895 out of the vote for the very same kind and class of service under the Post Office Department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It never was voted for that.

Mr. FOSTER. It was voted for the contracts for carrying the mail, contracts which run generally for three years, and it is voted for those self-same contracts in that respect. Where is the concealment? Where is the manipulation? Where is the keeping of these off the public accounts? When do they get into the public accounts? They cannot get into the public accounts until they get into the departments, are paid, are audited by the Auditor General, which is some six or eight months after the last fiscal year is ended. Who kept them out of the public accounts? Were they kept out of them? Every dollar of the expenditure for 1898 is in the public accounts and debited to its proper year of 1895. But, says some one: The bills were left unpaid, some newspapers were not paid for twelve years. That is a silly argument. There is not a department in existence to-day but has some back bills running and claims upon them, may be, for twenty or thirty years. And you will not have to scan these present estimates long to find that bills which have been running for many years have been taken up and passed by the present government and included in these estimates. But there is no concealment. Every dollar of the service which was contracted for in 1895 was paid and was charged up to 1895, and if there was a dollar that was not paid it was on some contested claim which, for some reason, was not admitted. The whole head and front of the offending was simply what I have explained this afternoon, that the practice had grown up in the Post Office Department on account of these running contracts, for various reasons, whatever they may be—I am not saying now they are the best of reasons, but that was the practice—the last quarters bills were paid out of the succeeding year's vote. Condemn it if you like, say that there ought to be enough money left over from the appropriation of 1896 to pay every dollar that was incurred in 1896, and you are on correct ground. But it is a practice which, although it is allowed, is violated in certain cases, violated in this, violated in the hon. gentleman's time every year since they have been in office. They have been criticised for violating it, and rightly so, as every government should be. As I said this afternoon, the

immigration department itself actually spent and was debtor for \$75,000 more last year than was authorized, and the hon. gentleman had to come down here just a day or two ago and get a vote in order to pay what had actually been spent. That is an instance of the service of one year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). For the service of the present year.

Mr. FOSTER. Last year the Minister of Finance got for his colleague the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) so many hundred thousand dollars and not a cent more. His colleague the Minister of the Interior, without parliamentary appropriation and authorization, spent \$75,000 more than that, and the Minister of Finance had to come down and ask parliament to be good enough to make his vote larger. That was spent outside of the appropriation. So, in 1895 \$600,000 was spent more than the appropriation for that year, and in pursuance of the long practice of years. Where is the concealment? Where is the manipulation? Condemn the principle of running over from one year to another, if you please, I will not quarrel with you for that. But, you say that there is concealment, or manipulation, or an endeavour to run things along so as not to pay for electoral reasons. The hon. member for North Wellington said that a wonderful example of this was the newspaper bills which had been allowed to run for twelve years, and he said that it was intended to pass the elections and then they could be paid as if, in twelve years we did not have three or four elections. There must have been another reason than that. So, again, I ask that the post office expenditure shall be shouldered by its own department, and that the public accounts shall certify to the people when they read them, that they are the representation of the receipts and expenditures for each service which they purport to represent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is extremely anxious that the public accounts shall contain a full statement of the affairs of this country.

Mr. FOSTER. A fair statement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A fair statement and a full statement. I admit that the public accounts should show the affairs of every department, and should show the liabilities of Canada of all kinds. What did the hon. gentleman do? It is not enough for him to say that these accounts were in the department, that they had been passed in various ways by various officers. He is contending that nothing short of everything being set forth in black and white, in the public accounts, will meet the requirements of the situation. Let us take him on his own ground. On June 30, 1895, you wound up the fiscal year, having spent every appro-

priation of parliament for that year for the post office, and you owed in addition to that \$616,000. On June 30, 1895, or a few days afterwards, you closed up your accounts, and you printed your public accounts. You say that the public accounts are entitled to show the full state of affairs in the country. Where do you find, on the face of these accounts, in any shape or form, an acknowledgment that you still owe \$616,000? You did not put it on the face of the public accounts; you put it nowhere except you say that it was in the department somewhere in the shape of accounts, receipts and vouchers.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. Postmaster General allow me to ask him a question? Where did he put, on the face of the public accounts that \$41,952 that he asked this House for to cover last year's expenditure on June 30?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am discussing another point: I will come back to that. The hon. ex-Minister of Finance is claiming that nothing but a full and frank statement of the affairs of the country, on one book, one volume, the public accounts, will meet the requirements of the situation, so that the general public may take that book and ascertain the condition of the affairs of Canada. He issued that volume shortly after the close of the fiscal year of 1895, and from cover to cover, neither in that book nor in any departmental book, will you find an acknowledgment, a hint, or a suggestion of any kind of an addition to the liabilities of the country of \$616,000. You cannot find it anywhere, in any record, except in the pigeon holes of the Post office Department.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman want an answer?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will complete my statement, and then let the hon. gentleman give me his answer. On July 1, or very shortly afterwards, he took the money that parliament had voted for the work that was to be performed from July 1, 1895, to July 1, 1896, to carry the department on for that year, he took \$616,000 of that money, misappropriated it, mis-spent it, misapplied it, in violation of every principle of responsible government, in payment of accounts that had been unpaid, and which had never been made known to parliament. Parliament never voted money for 1895-6, to be expended in paying the liabilities of 1894-5. That is what the hon. gentleman did. This afternoon I was inclined to pass it by with only an observation, and the more so because the hon. gentleman himself, admitted, as he seems to admit even now, that what had taken place then, was extremely irregular. He speaks of it as being a bad practice. I do not think you could conceive of any worse practice than to take an enormous sum of money out of the

appropriation for the current year, and apply it to a purpose for which parliament had never voted it, and of which parliament had no knowledge. If the hon. gentleman has so great a respect for the public accounts, then let him try to justify his own practices. That not only happened in that year, but my opinion is, and the report of the auditors who made the investigation, is that it happened in several preceding years, and if it did, what is the conclusion? The deficits which appeared on the face of the public accounts for several years prior to the hon. gentleman's leaving office, are absolutely unreliable deficits. There were altogether these unpaid accounts amounting to \$685,000 and this \$685,000 has to be either applied to the last year of their transactions or spread over prior years. If they had honestly closed up all their accounts each year, if they had paid their full liabilities out of the vote for the year, then, their expenditure would have appeared \$685,000 greater, either included in one year, or distributed over the many years in which this expenditure had taken place.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). According to the hon. gentleman's argument, the amount for the post office was voted for the year 1894-5, and the expenditure that was to be met, was for the year 1894-5. Besides the amount voted by parliament, the whole receipts of the post office were at the disposal of the Post Office Department. The accounts were all closed at the end of every year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), is enunciating a new doctrine. I think if we were to take the revenue of the post office which the law says shall be paid to the Receiver General every day, to form part of the consolidated revenue fund of this country, and spend it to carry on the affairs of the department, we would very soon hear from the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster).

Mr. HAGGART. What I say is the fact. The hon. gentleman must know that there are lots of funds which are not paid into the consolidated fund.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A certain portion of the fund realized from the sale of postage stamps goes to the postmasters. Out of that, in the first place, the postmasters are entitled to take the cost of selling the postage stamps, but it is only a portion.

Mr. FOSTER. All you get is the balance.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly. There is only a portion that accrues to the Crown. There is a contract made with these officers, that out of these funds, they are entitled to take their percentage, but the balance belongs to the Receiver General, and it cannot go out of the Receiver General's

custody, except by the authority of parliament itself.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Postmaster General is mistaken. It was only the deficit above these results that was voted by parliament every year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that is a new doctrine. What I wish the hon. ex-Minister of Finance to explain now is why he did not carry that \$685,000 into the public accounts. I will submit to the committee that in dealing with the affairs of Canada it is not simply one book you take, but you must read all our blue-books together; the one is more or less supplementary of the other. The Postmaster General's report sets forth frankly and fully the whole transactions of the Post Office Department both in respect to the Yukon and in respect to all the rest of Canada. It is far better, in order to an intelligent comparison of the administration of the post office under the present and former regime, that there should be that separation of accounts, so that a true comparison may be made. The whole statement appears on the face of the Postmaster General's report, so that the public can know fully the whole transaction. I do not propose to know the technical way in which the public accounts are kept. I do not compile that book. I compiled my own book and I suppose it is for others to compile theirs. I would tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that I do not think his description of what takes place at the close of the fiscal year is correct. When the accounts for the fiscal year are due for the services up to the 30th June, the Auditor General keeps the accounts open in some way because it is not to be supposed that when the first of July arrives, that therefore we cannot include in the accounts of the fiscal year just closed, payments made after the first of July. The test is that the payments to be made in a certain year must be in respect to the services performed for that year. I have not yet been able to understand from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) why he did not include in his public accounts the expenditure for the fiscal year in which these liabilities occurred. He has not yet explained what he did with that \$685,000, and why he did not put it plainly on the face of the public accounts. Not one trace of it was to be found in any public accounts until the two auditors had investigated the affairs and made the discovery, and my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) reported the matter to parliament and got a vote to clear off these legacies which the hon. gentleman left.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall have to labour a little while longer with the Postmaster General, and I am going to start on the first point by a sort of shorter catechism method. Q. Who is responsible for the administration of the post office business of

this country? A. The Postmaster General. Q. Did the Postmaster General administer the post office affairs of Canada in 1898-9? A. He did. Q. Did he take all the revenues, and were all these revenues returned into his receipts? A. Every dollar of them. The only exception is that referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart), namely, that the local postmasters are paid out of the sale of postage stamps and the balance thereof is all that comes into the consolidated fund. Q. Did the Postmaster General get \$10,000 odd receipts for the Yukon service? A. He did. Q. Did it go into the consolidated revenue fund? A. It did. Q. Was it credited to the Postmaster General in that fund? A. It was. Q. Did the Postmaster General have postal service carried on into and out of the Yukon for that year? A. He did. Q. How much did it cost? A. \$69,000. Q. Has he paid the bills? A. No. There cannot be anything more conclusive than that. If the Postmaster General did not pay the bills, who did? The North-west Mounted Police paid the bills. The Postmaster General acknowledged the debt, but he has not paid it. He grabbed the \$10,000, but he let some other department do the work and shoulder the \$60,000 of expenses, and he has not paid the bill. So much for that. Now, the hon. gentleman says that \$670,000 of the year 1895, never appeared in the public accounts—though I am such a stickler for the public accounts showing the exact arrangements for the year—and was not known until the year thereafter, when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had to come down and get a vote. I tell the Postmaster General that he is entirely wrong.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I spoke of the year 1895.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, we will take the year 1895. Every contract that was running and every service that was performed for the year 1895 up to the 30th June of that year, was a debt owed by the Post Office Department. Before the Public Accounts for the year 1896, which show the statements for 1895 were put into the printer's hands by the Finance Department, every one of these accounts for 1895 that were adjustable were adjusted, were paid for, and appear as paid for in the 1895 statement. After the financial year is over time has to be given to close the accounts. The time used to be four months; now it is two, and in that time all these accounts come in, through their proper routine, are shown to be correct if they are correct, are paid, are then audited by the Auditor General, and every one of them goes into the public accounts of 1896, which is a statement of the matters for the preceding year. Every dollar of this went through that process and is shown in that preceding year. What did the Postmaster General find? He found that the practice in the department was, of paying out of the

vote for the succeeding year the over-balance for the preceding year. For that same year for which the balance was over-paid in 1895, a similar amount went to pay for 1894. The Postmaster General asks: Can anything be conceived worse than that? I will tell him what can be conceived worse. The post office vote is given for the post office work, and the Postmaster General can go to-morrow to the Auditor General and consult with him and he will find that the Auditor General practices this: That with regard to the same department and the same kind of work, the vote that is given by parliament for one year can be drawn upon to pay for the bills of the preceding year until the last bill is paid. That is well known and acted upon. What would be worse than paying for the post office service out of the post office vote? I will tell you what would be worse, paying for the post office work with money which was appropriated for an entirely different purpose. That is what the hon. gentleman has done. That is all there is to it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think my hon. friend has answered the question. Let me try the shorter catechism method, but in a much briefer form. Was there on the 30th of June, 1896, a sum of \$680,000 due to various parties in the Dominion of Canada for postal services? Yes, there was. There is no dispute about that. Was it paid within the year ending the 30th of June, 1896? No. Are you obliged to pay your accounts for the year before the 30th of June? No. Is there not a reasonable time allowed for payment? Yes. Allowed to the Post Office Department as well as to others? Yes. Did the Postmaster General, within that reasonable time which is allowed after the close of the year, pay that \$680,000? No. Then, it was not paid at all within that period? No. Then it remained as a debt due on the 30th of June, 1896? Yes. Did it appear in any blue-book of Canada as a sum due? No. Then there was concealment, inasmuch as there was \$680,000 due to citizens of Canada, and not a scratch of the pen in the public accounts to show it. I think my hon. friend will see that, applying the shorter catechism, his method of arguing can be turned very effectively against himself. There is no peculiarity in the treatment of the post office accounts different from that of any others. There is a reasonable time allowed after the close of the fiscal year. We admit at once that you cannot get from contractors their accounts by the 30th of June. My hon. friend assumed in his argument that this money was not paid at that time because it could not have been paid. Such is not the fact at all. There will possibly always be small sums—

Mr. FOSTER. Let us be clear on this, if my hon. friend will allow me. Does he

Mr. FOSTER.

mean to say that on Monday morning he will this year have every bill contracted by the Post Office Department for this service paid?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, certainly not. Parliament does not expect the Postmaster General to pay these accounts by Monday morning. It allows a period of one month or two months, varying under certain conditions—a reasonable and sufficient period—in which to collect these accounts and pay them. Although they may be paid on the last day of July, they can be and should be charged to the fiscal year ending the 30th of June. Therefore the argument that these accounts could not be paid because they could not be paid on the 30th of June is entirely fallacious. Nobody expected them to be paid on the 30th of June. They were due on the 30th of June, most certainly, and if they had to be paid afterwards, there was nothing wrong in saying that there were debts actually due by that date. It is very desirable—and to that extent I agree with my hon. friend's argument—that the public accounts should, for purposes of comparison, show the same in one year as in another year. It is very desirable that we should pay within the fiscal year all the accounts for that year. The closer you can get to that the better your fiscal system, and I do not think the Auditor General would be as wide and liberal in his interpretation of the law as my hon. friend would contend. But while I admit that that is desirable, I think my hon. friend presses much too far the distinction between departments. He appeals to my hon. friend the Postmaster General. He said: 'I appeal to him as a business man. If he were conducting the affairs of a company, and were to charge to that company a large sum of money for services rendered by another company, would that be fair and honest?' No, it would not be, because there are two distinct interests. But in this case, as between the North-west Mounted Police and the Post Office Department, the distinction, except for purposes of comparison, is very much like the distinction between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did you have any, then?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because it is well to get the accounts in the fullest detail. But there is the greatest difference in the two cases. In the case of the private parties, there would be actual dishonesty in charging to one company the services rendered to another. But it is an account as between your right-hand pocket and your left-hand pocket, affecting the same paymaster, and surely it is a very trifling question whether or not this account is charged to the Post Office Department or to another department.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, what is the use, and what confidence have we in appropriating by Act of parliament a particular sum of money for a particular service ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It seems to me that if the hon. gentleman has a quarrel, it is not with the Postmaster General, but the Department of Mounted Police. We have appropriated a certain sum of money for the purposes of the Department of the Interior and for the purposes of the mounted police. Let us see what happens. The mounted police, an organized body, is able to render a service to another department of Canada. Let us take another illustration. Suppose one of the steamers owned by the government of Canada, as represented by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is sent out on the coast to seize a smuggler, and the smuggler is brought in. Are we going to say that it is a vital error if the Customs Department is not charged with that particular service ? Is it not all done for the government of Canada ? It would be a convenience, I grant, if you could in every case charge to each department the proper sums for services performed by that department ; but there will always be cases, I suppose, in which that will not be done. My hon. friend has admitted that in his own time it was not done in all cases in the Yukon ; but he pleaded that it was to a very small extent. He said : Would you defend a case of murder on that account ? In the eyes of the law there is no difference between murdering a baby and murdering a grown man ; and if my hon. friend wants to be exceedingly technical, the objection can be taken to his conduct in the past in reference to this very Yukon mail service. Suppose the Minister of Railways should, in managing a railway, neglect to bill the Postmaster General for carrying the mails, wherein would the public interest suffer ? My hon. friend the Minister of Railways would not have as good a balance sheet, and the Postmaster General would have a little better one.

Mr. FOSTER. How nicely they could work in with each other.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But my hon. friend has not met the question. Wherein would the country suffer the smallest possible loss if a thousand dollars more were charged to the Railway Department and a thousand dollars less to the Post Office Department ? I am not arguing that it is not desirable to keep these accounts as separate as possible.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman's argument is good, there is no necessity for keeping them separate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So far as causing the loss of one cent to the taxpayers of Canada is concerned, the question is not one of importance at all. For pur-

poses of comparison, for purposes of convenience, for purposes of statistics, it is quite desirable.

Mr. FOSTER. Only statistics ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So far as the pockets of the taxpayers of Canada are concerned it does not affect them one hair's-breadth, and the hon. gentleman knows it. The hon. gentleman is trying to magnify a purely technical question as to whether one service is performed by one department or by another department of the government, both of these departments representing the same treasury and the same taxpayers. I say again, I do not minimize the importance of having these accounts separate ; but when parliament voted a certain sum to the mounted police, the question is whether the mounted police applied that money to its proper service. The hon. gentleman says that the post office is not the proper service. Well, if the mounted police, a well-organized body, could render assistance to the Post Office Department, and did so, and if the adjustment of the accounts between the two departments was not completed and given effect to until a later period, my hon. friend may well call attention to the fact, but he magnifies the importance of the question when it is the same paymaster, as I have pointed out. He asks, can there be anything worse than this department failing to pay another department for work done by that other department ? Yes, there can be. It is bad enough that the Postmaster General has neglected to pay the Prime Minister, as the head of the mounted police, a certain sum for work done by the mounted police for the Post Office Department, but it is much worse not to pay an outsider to whom the money is really due, and that was the case with my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. We are at poles asunder on this point. Take the year 1894-5. Here were your mail contractors who, on June 30, 1895, had performed their services and sent in their bills, does the hon. gentleman say that these bills were not paid until 1897, and that these contractors were kept out of their money for a whole year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, but I say that there seems to have grown up a practice of not paying these people until after a sufficient time has elapsed to keep the money out of the accounts for the year in which the services was done. They had to wait for a sufficient time, to prevent these moneys appearing in the accounts of the year in which they were due. Let us by all means give the hon. gentleman the benefit of the plea that such a practice had grown up, but the fact still remains that at the close of 1895, there was \$616,000 or thereabouts due for the mail service of Canada. The bills were not all in, but they came in

a little later, but instead of being charged up to the year 1895, they were charged to the year 1896.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In 1895, at the close of the year, there was \$616,000 due for services performed within that year. That money was not paid within that year, or within the period after the close of the year contemplated by law, and consequently was not charged in the expenditure of that year, but was paid out of the appropriations of the following year, and the public accounts up to June 30, 1895, certainly did not show that that sum of \$616,000 was due by the Post Office Department for mail service performed in that year. My hon. friend may say that the practice of that kind had grown up, and I give him the benefit of it, but that does not alter the fact.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend says that the North-west Mounted Police are a faithful body, and it was there on the field and consequently could help the department, and he draws the inference that it could help the Post Office Department without any expense to itself. But that is contrary to the evidence given by Mr. White, the comptroller, under oath before the committee. Here is the evidence :

Q. From October 1, 1898, until May, 1899, what estimate have you made of the cost of the mail service to your department, as an incidental part of the service?—A. \$47,000.

Q. On what basis did you make that estimate?—A. On what I estimated to be the number of men employed. You see, we had the posts and buildings as part of the regular system, and I estimated the number of men who were employed extra and specially for this work and the number of dogs.

Q. You took no account of what you called equipment expenses, that is, the expenses of posts and the like?—A. Not of the posts, but of the men and the dogs.

Q. But as to the equipment of posts and the like, you made no estimate of what proportion the post office would have to pay with reference to that?—A. No, sir.

Q. And you included none of that?—A. No, my estimate was made up as follows—

He then goes on to give the details. Therefore his estimate was made simply on the extraordinary expenses and without including anything for the equipment and posts—just the men and dogs, their pay and their feed, that he had to employ for the sole purpose of carrying the mails. So that, to all intents and purposes, it was simply the mails that were carried and paid for out of an appropriation not intended for the mail service at all.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand the Minister of Finance to say that the accounts of the Post Office Department for 1895, which were not paid until 1896, were not charged in the Postmaster General's statement in the expenditure for 1895.

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe not. In each year, as a consequence of an old practice—which the ex-Minister of Finance is not prepared to say was a good practice—a sum of money due for the last quarter of one year was paid out of the next year's appropriations.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no doubt about that, but the point I make is this. In the statement of the expenses and receipts of the Post Office Department, every one of these accounts was balanced to the end of the year, and in the statement made to the public they were all included although not paid.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the Postmaster General's report ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But the hon. member for York says we have no right to consider that report, but only the public accounts issued by the Finance Department. That is his quarrel with my hon. friend to-day. My hon. friend the Postmaster General has given this Yukon matter fully in his own published departmental report, but the hon. member for York says that is concealment and deception.

Mr. HAGGART. The Finance Minister made this further statement. He said that an amount due in 1895, but paid in 1896, was not charged in the accounts of 1895. If my memory serves me right, all these accounts were balanced at the end of the year, and the receipts and the expenditure for each year appeared in the statement of the Postmaster General, although certain accounts may not have been paid until a couple of months later.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is cutting the ground from under the feet of the hon. member for York, because the hon. member for York says you have no right to consider the report of the Postmaster General. He says that when the public want to know the revenue and expenditure of a department they do not go to the departmental report, but to the Finance Minister's statement, which shows the revenues received and the amounts expended. That is the only statement my hon. friend from York is willing to consider. My hon. friend who has just spoken is correct, but he can only be correct by accepting the report of the Postmaster General, and saying that the financial statement and the Postmaster General's Report should be read together. That is exactly what my hon. colleague says, but what the hon. member for York says is deceptive.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is altogether wrong. I repeat this statement, which I have already made a dozen times, that for the services of 1894-5, rendered up to June 30, that year—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not fair. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows that this is not fair. When he dwells on that phrase 'rendered up to June 30 of that year' he knows that is not the way the accounts are actually paid. There is a further period allowed for the adjustment of accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. I never said anything else. If the hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) will hear me out he will see that there is no disagreement between us on that point. What I was arguing was, whether the incurred expenses of 1894-5 are, in the public accounts, entered up in that year, 1894-5. Is not that it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes—well?

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there was \$675,000 or so not adjusted within the delay left in 1896 for the adjustment of accounts of the previous year, and, consequently, they did not go where they should have gone—into the column for 1894-5—but went into the column for 1895-6. Now, he is wrong. And I have only to cite the figures to prove it. According to the public accounts, the post office expenditure in 1894-5 was \$3,594,000. Now, if there was \$671,000 in 1895-6 left over from the previous year, we do not find it, because the expenditure for 1895-6 was \$3,665,000, or only \$60,000 more than the year before. The statement I make is, that every dollar chargeable to 1894-5 appears as having been paid in the expenditure for that year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not in the inner circles of the Post Office Department, and I am bound to take the information as it reaches me from the minister; and his statement is entirely at variance with that of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). The hon. gentleman tries to show that he is correct, and to prove it says that the expenditures of 1895-6 were about the same as those of the previous years, and, therefore, could not have included \$680,000 carried over from the previous year. But, surely he is not serious. He knows that in each of these years there was paid in the new year a large sum of money which properly belonged to the old year. If he means to say that the public accounts for 1895 included the payment of all services rendered up to June 30, 1895, all I can say is that that is entirely at variance with the statement of the Postmaster General—and, I believe, entirely at variance with the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. The Postmaster General's statement is made under a misapprehension. If that amount was carried over, find it in the public accounts, if you can. There is in these years only the difference of \$50,000 or \$60,000, the ordinary accretion that takes place. I make the statement that every dollar that is due on the service of the Post

Office Department for any one year, so far as it can be adjusted in the time allowed—there may be some odds and ends that cannot be adjusted—appear in the public accounts of that year. It makes no matter whether they are paid out of the succeeding year's vote or out of that of the year in which they accrue.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) state that the accounts ending June 30, 1895, include the payments of all postal services rendered by contractors and others up to June 30, 1895?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly, that is the statement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a marvellous statement to make, and one not in accordance with the facts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is true, if you go on the basis of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. FOSTER. You can call it robbing if you like. But the Auditor General will not call it that. Even if we do take out of the succeeding year to pay for the past year—which I have admitted was the practice in that department for twenty years—that does not alter the fact that every dollar for the services of that year—barring small items unadjusted—appears in the column for that year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) endeavours to make good the accuracy of his accounts for 1895 by paying for that year out of the appropriations for 1896 which never were appropriated for that purpose. At the close of the fiscal year 1895, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) issued a balance sheet setting forth the assets and liabilities of the Dominion of Canada on June 30, 1895, and I have that balance sheet in my hand. On one side appear the liabilities, including not only the public debt of Canada, not only the trust funds, but every dollar that is recoverable from the Dominion of Canada as a debtor—moneys owing to depositors in the post office savings banks, moneys owing to contractors, and to all other creditors. On that date, the hon. gentleman's government owed for unpaid accounts in the post office, \$616,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They did not owe a cent, he says.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But, they did; the money had been earned from the Dominion, the liability had accrued and was due on June 30, 1895.

Mr. FOSTER. When was the balance sheet issued?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was issued as a representation of the state of affairs up to June 30, 1895.

Mr. FOSTER. As adjusted afterwards.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no such qualification here.

Mr. FOSTER. You could not issue a balance sheet any other way.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no such qualification. If the hon. gentleman could disregard \$616,000 and fail to place that in its proper place, he would fail to recognize \$6,000,000 in the same way.

Mr. FOSTER. Monday will be July 2. On July 2, if my hon. friend's (Mr. Mulock's) contention is right, the Post Office Department will owe some \$600,000 or \$700,000, which it will not pay until some time in August—or perhaps later. It will not be due until some time in August, perhaps the middle of August.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And yet you will issue the balance sheet. Now is that balance sheet for the 30th of June last in actual existence?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The money has been voted to pay that liability, and to the extent that there is money in the treasury to pay those liabilities it is not necessary in this balance sheet to take cognizance of the liabilities that are going to be paid with that money.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not a liability as long as it is going to be paid.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is a liability on the 30th of June.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I stand a good deal better than I thought.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman knows full well, and he cannot get out of this position, that on the 30th of June, 1895, there had accrued \$616,000, and the hon. gentleman did not have one dollar of an appropriation to pay it. Now, I want to know why he did not put that \$616,000 on this balance sheet as a liability of Canada?

Mr. FOSTER. Because to have put it there would have been a thing which is wrong. What few accounts for the year have come in have been paid, have been audited by the Auditor General, and the balance sheet cannot be made out and never is made out until that adjustment has taken place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not if the accounts have been paid out of the next year's appropriation. That balance sheet does not show a penny of the expenditure of the country after the 1st day of July, except for the services of the past year.

Mr. HAGGART. The balance sheet and the statement made by my hon. friend are the same as were made in 1893-4-5. Here is what the statute requires:

Mr. MULOCK.

A report of the finances, receipts and expenditure of the post office of Canada for the year ended on the 30th day of June previous, in the form of a general account current, showing on the one side the whole amount of balances due to the department from postmasters or others at the time up to which the then last report was made, the whole amount of postage that accrued within the year elapsed since such last report, and any and every other item of revenue or receipt; and on the other side of the account, the charges and expenditures incurred by the department within the said year, of every kind and nature, showing in separate amounts the charges for mail transportation, for salaries and commission and allowances to postmasters, for printing and advertising, and for incidental and miscellaneous items of expenditure, showing also the balances remaining due from postmasters and others at the close of such year; and showing in the shape of a balance what the result of the operations of the department is for the said year, whether the revenue exceeds the expenditure, or the expenditure the revenue, and in either case, to what amount.

So what I said was perfectly correct, that in that statement made by the Postmaster General the balance showed the amount due at the end of the fiscal year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is talking of the Postmaster General's Report.

Mr. HAGGART. I am talking of the statement that was made by the Minister of Finance that at the end of the fiscal year there was no appropriation, or no charge of these amounts appeared in the Postmaster General's account.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that. The hon. member for York has been contending that we must conduct this discussion with regard to statements in the public accounts. He has refused to allow my hon. friend to bring in his own departmental report as bearing on the question at all; and if my hon. friend is not to be allowed to bring in his departmental report and to read it in with the statements in the public accounts, how can the hon. gentlemen opposite ask to do the same thing?

Mr. HAGGART. But the ex-Minister of Finance was arguing further than that, that the accounts that have been paid and the accounts that have been received have not entered into the public accounts at the end of the year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He rules out the post office report altogether.

Mr. HAGGART. No, he was stating that in the public accounts the cash that was paid out is not shown. There was \$69,000 paid out, and \$10,000 received, and he was complaining that it did not appear at all in the public accounts.

Mr. FOSTER. The \$10,000 received does.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But the hon. gentleman knows that the money that was paid out shows in the public accounts,

but it does not happen to show in the Postmaster General's department. It shows as against the government of Canada, as a part of its total expenditure, and the only point was that it has not been shown as against the post office vote. The ex-Minister of Finance is contending that every dollar that is expended by one department for another department must be shown as against that department. It is impossible to do that, it is not done, and only ought to be done in large sums. The hon. member ought to know that the mounted police have rendered service to a number of departments. The mounted police does work for the customs in the prevention of smuggling; it is not charged against customs, therefore, the Minister of Customs is to be charged with deception. The mounted police does work for the administration of justice in prosecuting and looking after criminals; it is not charged against the Justice Department, therefore, the Minister of Justice is to be charged with deception. The mounted police does work for the Interior Department in the protection of timber; it is not charged against the Interior Department, therefore, the Minister of the Interior is to be charged with deception. The mounted police does work for the Post Office Department; it is not charged directly against the Post Office Department, therefore, the Postmaster General is to be charged with deception. Well, now whether my hon. friends the Minister of Justice, or the Minister of the Interior, or the Minister of Customs, may be open to the charge, the Postmaster General cannot be open to it, for he has taken the trouble to put in his own public report a declaration that a portion of the service which is charged in the public accounts to the mounted police, really is a charge against his own department. The hon. gentleman may send the Minister of Justice to Coventry, or the Minister of Customs, or the Minister of the Interior, each one of whom has filched—that is the word used by the ex-Minister of Finance—has filched some service from the Mounted Police vote, but though they may be sent to Coventry the Postmaster General cannot be, because he has come in and shown in his own public report exactly the facts of the case.

Mr. FOSTER. I never expected that a Minister of Finance in this country would take the position that the hon. gentleman has taken just now, a position which is subversive of all good book-keeping and of all honest presentation of the facts with reference to the departments. He satisfies his own conscience, and tries to satisfy some of his followers by telling them: Why, we must do little services for each other, little neighbourly services, and no one is picayune enough to follow out every little service that is given. But the argument which has been held by the Minister of Finance here to-night is a most vicious

argument with reference to financial methods and with reference to Dominion book-keeping. A Minister of Finance ought to stand for clearness and definiteness of accounts. Every Minister of Finance in the past has done it. I do not think you can find, looking through the past, any Minister of Finance holding that position here in this House. The very moment he does it, that very moment he invites all kinds of cross work, and confusion inevitably ensues. If you carry that principle out, what is the use of having any departments at all? Now this is not a small matter. The Minister of Finance himself will admit that this is a grave matter. There is no doubt about the service, no doubt about the amount, it is a large amount, and yet they have not included it in the public accounts where it ought to be, and consequently it is not a fair presentation of the case. I had hoped that the Minister of Finance would say that that item of \$47,400, and the \$3,000, and the \$750, which are plain, and have been agreed to, will be transferred to the post office account, as they properly should be, where they will take their rightful place. He cited the position of the Customs Department and the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Well, they do help each other, but they keep their accounts as distinct as they possibly can. They undertook to run the steamer *Constance* in the St. Lawrence River, each paying part of the expense. They tried to do it in that way for a time, but it was unsatisfactory, and at last, one department took over the vessel and paid the whole of the expenses. There is always that adjustment. If the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals carries post office bags for the hon. Postmaster General, he charges him on approved rates just the same as if the service were performed by the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway. Is it a mere matter of book-keeping? Is it a mere technical matter? What is it that the people watch? They watch the improvement in the administration of the country on different lines. They are intensely interested in knowing whether the public works are productive and to what extent they are productive. It is essential that the service of every department shall be complete and independent in itself. If the Railway Department carry mail bags for the hon. Postmaster General they must receive credit for it. It does not make any difference in the end; it all comes out of the people's pockets or goes into the people's pockets, but, from the historic and administrative view in showing that each department is managed in a way to produce growth and progress it is desirable that the accounts of each department shall be separately kept and that each department, so far as it is possible, shall come face to face with its own history. That is not merely a technical matter. It is a matter which runs into the very warp and woof of the country's

progress, so far as the administration is concerned. There may be cases of a few dollars where work is done which is not worth adjusting, but there is no excuse for it in reference to large items.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My hon. friend and I, I am afraid, are surprising each other to-night. Although it is very desirable that every one should have correct opinions it is of very great importance that we should be correct in matters of fact. When the hon. gentleman, in answer to the question I put to him, alleged that the public accounts issued by the Finance Minister's department for the year 1894-5 included all the accounts of the Post Office Department in full payment of all the services rendered to the department up to the 30th of June, 1895, I am bound to say that I felt a shock. If the hon. gentleman would submit his statement to any officer of the Post Office Department who knows the facts, he will tell him that the statement he has made is absolutely **monstrous**.

**Mr. FOSTER**. I am not going to be responsible for anything but what I said. I said that there might be fringes and small accounts and the like of that. I made the statement I did, believing it to be true, and I still believe it to be true.

**Mr. E. G. PRIOR** (Victoria, B.C.). I want to call the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to a resolution that I have received from the council of Cumberland, B.C. That point is not represented by any hon. gentleman in this House, owing to the resignation of **Mr. McInnes**. However, these gentlemen have seen fit to send me the following resolution :

Corporation of the City of Cumberland, B.C.

Copy of a resolution passed at a council meeting held on the 28th day of May, 1900.

Whereas, the present manner of carrying mail to this town and surrounding country is very unsatisfactory and inconvenient for the transaction of business. The time between the arrival of the weekly mail by steamer on Tuesday and the departure of the return mail is too short. The overland mail on Saturday is too slow for business convenience; and whereas, there are two other regular steamship trips to Union wharf every week, namely, on Thursday and Saturday, when mail might be conveyed quickly and directly from Vancouver and Nanaimo; therefore, be it resolved, that this council of the city of Cumberland, B.C., respectfully urge the post office officials to cause mail to be carried to this place on Thursday and Saturday by the said steamship.

Moved by Alderman W. B. Walker, and seconded by Alderman W. W. Willard.

I can only say that I do not know anything of the facts, but, this motion has been sent to me, and I thought it my duty to lay it before the committee. I trust the hon. Postmaster General will give it that due consideration that he generally gives to matters which I bring to his attention.

**Mr. FOSTER**.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. This is the first I have heard of the matter. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman (**Mr. Prior**), who has brought it to my attention and I will see that it receives proper consideration.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON**. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if these temporary employees who are to be permanently appointed, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, will receive larger salaries than they would now be in receipt of, if they had been permanently appointed when they first entered the service, or do they have to pass the required civil service examination?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I find that in the service there are a good many persons appointed temporarily, some of them by the late administration and a few by my administration. I think most of the temporaries were appointed under the former regime. I want to make them permanent, if possible, without their suffering the loss of salary. It appears, according to the Auditor General's construction of the Civil Service Act, that if a temporary employee is in receipt of a salary in excess of the minimum salary paid in the class to which he might be appointed permanently, and if he should be transferred to the permanent list, he would have to accept the minimum salary of the permanent class. Suppose that a temporary clerk gets \$700 and we desire to appoint him permanently as a third-class clerk, the Auditor General holds that his initial salary would be \$400 and that he would lose the extra amount that he gained while he was temporary. I wish to avoid that, and when this Act, which is before the House, is passed, men who are only temporary and who are made permanent will retain the amount of salary which they are getting.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON**. Have they passed the civil service examination?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Of course, the Civil Service Act must be complied with.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON**. But the hon. gentleman says that the Civil Service Act is not complied with. He says he is going to make a distinction in favour of those who may be permanently appointed, but who were appointed temporarily, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. That has only reference to the salary. It has no reference to the requirements of the Civil Service Act.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON**. Well, that is a very important matter.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Does my hon. friend press for requiring temporaries

to begin at the lowest salary when they are transferred from the temporary to the permanent class ?

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I am not called upon to lay down a policy. The hon. gentleman is in power. Here is the statement in the hon. gentleman's estimates :

Salaries and allowances, including in this amount the salaries of present temporary employees who are to be permanently appointed at their present salaries, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

I ask the minister if these employees will be receiving a larger salary than they would now be in receipt of, if they had been permanently appointed when they first entered the service and had passed the civil service examination ?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** No person will be transferred from the temporary class to the permanent class, unless he has passed the civil service examinations, as required by the Act. As to the salaries, it is intended by this to transfer them from the temporary list to the permanent list, and they shall take from the temporary to the permanent list whatever salaries they enjoyed when on the temporary list. The minimum salary of a third-class clerk is now \$400. If a temporary clerk should have \$500 and he is transferred to the third class permanently, he shall carry that salary with him, and have \$500 as a third-class permanent clerk.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** Does the hon. gentleman think that that is just to permanent employees who have been there for years ? It may happen that the new man transferred from the temporary list will get a larger salary than the man who has been on the list for a long time. The temporary clerk may have got increases which the other did not.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** That cannot be because in no case will you find temporaries receiving increases under the same circumstances that they have been held from the permanents.

**Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey).** I think it may be possible that a temporary clerk will be receiving a larger salary than a permanent clerk. Suppose the minister denies a permanent clerk his statutory increase, and the temporary clerk gets it ; what would occur then ?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I do not think there is any such case as that.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** But it may occur.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** This proposal has reference to no individual, and it will chiefly benefit a number of old temporary employees that I found in the service and have continued, and whom I would like to make permanent. I think that a greater

number of them were appointees of my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron), and all are to be treated in the same fair way by me. Those who are deserving of being put on the permanent list, I shall put on the permanent list.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I do not wish to prevent the temporary clerks from receiving all the justice they are entitled to. I fully understand that the Postmaster General has no particular person in view, and I am not speaking from a personal standpoint, because I have no particular man in view myself. However, it would appear that a temporary clerk might have a larger salary than a permanent clerk under the circumstances pointed out by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule).

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I do not think there is any such case in the service.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** But the principle is there all the same.

**Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin).** I have already called the attention of the Postmaster General to a large number of temporary mail clerks who have been in the service for a number of years, and still remain temporary. I understand that this provision will make some of these permanent, and if that is the case, I will heartily support it, because these gentlemen are first-class officials and are entitled to be permanent clerks.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram), is right. When the measure is passed, I intend to go through the service, and take all the temporary clerks (already the various officers have been asked to report upon them), and every one in the temporary service who is reported as being worthy of being transferred to the permanent service, will be transferred.

**Mr. INGRAM.** Hear, hear.

**Mr. PRIOR.** That is what the hon. gentleman is going to do ?

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** That is what I intend to recommend to council.

**Mr. PRIOR.** I call the attention of the minister to the case of two temporary clerks in the Victoria post office, who passed a qualifying examination in 1895, and I ask the minister to take their case into consideration and to see that they are put upon the permanent list. There is nothing against them ; on the contrary, they are excellent men. I presume the hon. minister will ask for a report from the postmaster on these two officials.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** Yes.

**Mr. PRIOR.** In this connection, I would refer to the question of giving holidays to the temporary clerks. Is there any chance for these men to have holidays, the same as

the permanent clerks? At present when the permanent clerks are away on their holidays the temporary clerks have to do their work and they get neither extra remuneration nor holidays.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That cannot be altered until they are transferred to the permanent list. The Auditor General requires a certificate that every clerk, (unless he is permanent), before he draws his pay, shall have been actively at work. That is the Auditor General's construction of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. PRIOR. I presume that the Postmaster General intends to put on the permanent list, letter carriers as well as third-class clerks.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I intend to go through the whole list.

Mr. E. COCHRANE (East Northumberland). I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General, if there is a permanent clerk in his department who has been employed for several years, and who is only drawing \$400 now. I think it is a humiliating position for a man who has been a permanent clerk for a number of years to see a new man brought in at a higher salary, as under the new law a temporary clerk can be brought in at a salary of \$800 a year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The salaried clerks, whether temporary or permanent have received the same treatment in the way of increase. They run along *pari passu*.

Mr. COCHRANE. So that the grievance would not exist in the Postmaster General's post office department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think so.

Mr. COCHRANE. It has always appeared to me that it is putting a man in a very humiliating position to have a new man brought into the service and placed over his head so far as salary is concerned.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. Postmaster General will remember that in 1897 and 1898, he failed to give the statutory increases to the clerks and letter-carriers in the Victoria post office, which I suppose was also the case in other post offices. Last year I asked him if he could not see his way to pay those men the amount kept back from them during those two years. It is a serious matter to them, as their salaries are small, and I would ask him if he could not see his way to pay them what I consider back pay long overdue. With regard to the provisional allowance, what rule is there for paying that on the Pacific coast, in Manitoba and the North-west? Who are entitled to receive it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. All who receive \$800 or under.

Mr. PRIOR.

Mr. PRIOR. Is it not a fact that the second-class clerks in the Winnipeg post office have for some time been receiving the provisional allowance?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The late administration granted a provisional allowance to the clerks in Manitoba to the amount, I think, of ten per cent on their salaries; and that applied to clerks in receipt of from \$800 to \$1,250. When increasing the provisional allowance, I did not interfere with anything above \$800, but increased it to clerks in both British Columbia and Manitoba and the Territories who were in receipt of \$800 or less. I increased it from ten per cent, which it was, to \$15 a month.

Mr. PRIOR. How about the second-class clerks in receipt of \$1,200 in British Columbia?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not make any reference to them.

Mr. PRIOR. Why should you give the provisional allowance to the second-class clerks in Winnipeg, who are in receipt of \$1,200 a year, and not give it to second-class clerks in British Columbia where the cost of living is much greater?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am afraid I must ask my hon. friend, who was a member of the government under which that arrangement was made, how it came about. When I took office, I found an arrangement to pay the clerks of the Winnipeg post office on a certain scale, which did not apply to the British Columbia clerks. My hon. friend was a member of the government when that was in force; I do not know whether he was when the regulation was passed. However, I did not interfere with the arrangements which I found in existence.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to have some explanation, as this is the first I heard of it. I received a letter the other day stating that the second-class clerks in Victoria post office did not receive a provisional allowance similar to that received by clerks in the Winnipeg post office, and stating also that the railway mail clerks are to receive this allowance from July 1. I would like to ask if this is correct; and if the railway mail clerks are to receive it, why not the second-class clerks as well? Can the hon. gentleman promise that he will pay it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot promise that, because that depends on the government and upon His Excellency as well as upon me. The provisional allowance applies to all who are receiving \$800 or under, whether mail clerks or others. As to those receiving salaries above that rate, I suppose that if they had good claims, my hon. friend's government would have recognized them. I really never heard of the matter before. The hon. gentleman asks

me to explain a thing which his government did or did not do.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to bring down the information showing when this order was passed? I cannot recollect any discrimination being made in favour of Winnipeg when I was Postmaster General.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I will bring it down.

**Mr. PRIOR.** There is a manifest distinction made between the second-class clerks in Winnipeg and those in Victoria, and I do not think that ought to be allowed to continue. Whatever the last government did, I do not think there can be any excuse for the hon. Postmaster General not altering it when his attention is drawn to it. I would therefore ask him to promise that he will take it into consideration and have this wrong rectified.

**The POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I will promise to take it into consideration, but until now that the matter has been brought to my attention, I never heard of it.

**Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg).** As I understand the matter it is that you gave a provisional allowance of \$10 a month, supposed to be based on the extra cost of living in British Columbia, and in the centre, Manitoba, you gave only 5 per cent? In Manitoba they got 5 per cent additional allowance. But 5 per cent on a small salary amounts to very little, and, of course, if any extra allowance was required to meet living expenses, it is these men with small salaries who require it the most. In Manitoba the additional allowance has been made \$10 per month, the same as on the coast, and it seems to me that that is a very fair arrangement. There is no possibility of contradicting the statement that living west of Lake Superior is dearer than east; and although there are some things which make living dear on the Pacific coast, there are other things that are cheap, but which are dear in the centre of the country—such things as fuel, \$10 per ton for coal in Winnipeg and \$6 for wood. That makes the necessities of life in Manitoba come very high, and when they had only 5 per cent increase, on a salary of \$400, that only made \$20 per year, which was not enough. But now that they are getting \$10 per month additional allowance, that makes \$120 a year for the low-salaried as well as the high-salaried men.

I would like to draw the attention of the committee to some matters brought before the Postmaster General in Toronto a few months ago by a joint committee of the Trades and Labour Council and the letter carriers of that city, the latter acting for the letter carriers throughout the Dominion. They embodied their ideas and requests in the form of a circular, which they presented to the Postmaster General, and which are well worthy of his consideration.

There are some things fixed in the public mind, and it makes no difference what is said in this House or in the papers, you cannot eradicate them. There is one thing which I was surprised to hear some hon. gentlemen in this House trying to belittle, and that is the penny postage. It is certainly the opinion of the public that the penny postage is a first-class thing, one that was wanted, and which has given satisfaction to the whole country. It has brought the Post Office Department nearer the people, and the promise of the Postmaster General that probably inside of a year the receipts of the department will equal the expenditure is one particularly acceptable, because it gives rise to the hope that the department will be enlarged and take control of the telegraph lines as well. That is what the people require, and I should like to see at an early date, and the people are glad to see the department being run more on popular lines, because that leaves them to hope that some day we will find that department extending in the direction I have mentioned.

At different times during the session hon. members have discussed what they call the tax on newspapers. I do not know what warrant there is for the use of the word 'tax' in that connection at all. It is not rightly called a tax because it is nothing more than a toll, and the newspapers ought to expect that they shall pay a fair amount for the business done for them by the department. But there is a discrimination now that ought to be wiped away. All the newspapers should be put on an equal basis and pay a fair rate for the service rendered by the department. I have no sympathy for this cry against what is called a tax on newspapers. It is inconsistent for hon. gentlemen to talk about that as a tax and not say a word about what really is a tax, namely the customs duty on paper.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Why do not your friends take it off?

**Mr. PUTTEE.** I am speaking for myself. Coming to the resolutions of the joint committee at Toronto, let me read them to the House:

1. That on joining the service, prior to 1896, letter carriers were led to believe and informed that statutory yearly increases would be made in their salaries until the stated maximum was reached.
2. That all carriers from whom the statutory increases were stopped be now compensated and that they be placed on the same footing as if the annual increases had not been discontinued—the amounts due the men varying from \$90 to \$180.
3. That owing to the general prosperity of the Dominion during recent years, the cost of living has increased very much; that wages in all branches of labour have also largely advanced, as they continue to advance, to meet the increased cost of living, higher rents, &c. The carriers therefore respectfully ask that 20 per cent be added to present salaries, and that the salaries be payable semi-monthly instead of once a month, as at present.

4. That by reason of the general increase of population in the several cities of the Dominion, and the consequent increase of mail matter, which has more than doubled in that time, the carriers are very much overworked, the present staff being no greater in most offices than it was in 1894, and in some cases the staff is even less; that for the last ten years there has not been a new route made in the city of Toronto, while the population has increased some 25 per cent, according to the city directory, within the past six years; that the carriers suffer very much through this condition of affairs, both physically and mentally—physically because of the oftentimes very heavy loads to be carried; mentally from the strain consequent upon the performance of duties entailing both mental and physical force of no small amount; that in many cases men have to put in ten and a-half to fifteen hours to complete a day's work.

5. That an increase be made to the staff in the several offices in keeping with the present requirements prevailing in the service, so that every man would be allowed three weeks' holidays, the carriers being the only persons in the service who suffer in this respect.

6. That all employees on the carriers' staff who have served the six months' probation be appointed to the permanent staff, so that they may be entitled to the regular increases and holidays. Many now in this service for years have been denied this privilege, and these men lose their pay in case of sickness or other disability.

7. It is respectfully submitted that reasonable living wages ought to be paid letter carriers. By 'living wages' is meant wages that will enable the recipient to live in a healthy, decent house, adequate in size for an average family; to supply his wife and family with sufficient food and clothing and a certain amount of domestic comfort.

In conclusion, you are respectfully prayed to order that in cases of grievances complained of on the part of or on behalf of the letter carriers, and as to which it may be deemed necessary or expedient to make further inquiry or investigation, reasonable opportunity may be afforded them, personally or through representatives, to be heard in their own behalf, and that so appearing or being heard shall not operate to the personal detriment or ultimate loss of prestige or employment of any one speaking for or on any deputation on behalf of the letter carriers.

I believe these are very reasonable requests and deserve very close attention and consideration. The joint committee think that the cost of living has increased in Canada, and that, therefore, following the practice recognized in most other lines of employment, the salaries should correspondingly be increased. I think that that is a fair request to make. The other day the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) told us that on the Intercolonial Railway wages had been increased to the extent of \$175,000 because the cost of living has increased. I think it is only right that the post office employees, more especially the mail carriers, should be considered as entitled to an increase on that same ground.

Then there is the question of the adequacy of the staffs of the post offices. I do not know about the conditions in Toronto. Of course, I would not deny that in any place where there were more men found

than necessary to do the work, it was right and proper to cut these men off. But, we must not get down to a cheese-paring basis. There are different classes of cities in this country. There are cities whose population is so nearly stationary that you can nearly determine what staff they need, but there are others whose growth is more or less rapid. But, surely, in any business, the idea is to keep the working staff up to the demands made upon it. I do not know about Toronto, as I say, but I believe it is a fact that the city has increased 25 per cent, while the staff has not increased. There are other cities that have grown rapidly, and yet the same staff is serving them as served the smaller population. That is not business, nor is it fair dealing toward the people who do the work. It is also a reasonable request that the staff should be large enough to allow the men to get their proper holiday. I find complaint in many cases that the men cannot take their holidays, though they are entitled to three weeks. In some places, at all events, when one of the employees is sick, his time is stopped. But the staff is supposed to do the work, and does do the work in the sick man's absence. If he is temporarily employed and his salary is stopped, his sickness costs the country nothing; but, by stopping his salary, the country is the amount of his salary ahead. Then, the matter should be looked into of giving temporary employees permanent positions as soon as possible. It is not fair that men should be kept on the temporary staff for years and denied increases which they would get if they were appointed to the permanent staff. It is a fact that some post offices are undermanned, and that is the reason why some of the men cannot get their holidays. Then, as I say, if a temporary man is off on account of sickness, his salary is stopped, but nobody is put on in his place. In Ottawa, I believe, a couple of letter carriers volunteered to go to South Africa, and the country is very generously paying their salary. But then, nobody else is put on in their places, so we are able to do a generous thing very cheaply to ourselves. I hope the Postmaster General will give the representations of the Toronto committee—they are men who are thoroughly posted in these matters—fair consideration, and, at all events, grant as many of their requests as can be granted. I would urge particularly the granting of the last request. These men are an association, they have communication with one another throughout the country, and when there are matters—such as must come up at times—concerning which they wish to lay their views before the department, they should be allowed to do so through proper committees without it being counted to their detriment by the department.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Would the Postmaster General

be kind enough to tell me what is paid for the services between Balgonie and Loon Creek; if Loon Creek is served from Balgonie; and if not, what is paid between Fort Qu'Appelle and Loon Creek?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. If the hon. gentleman will take the Postmaster General's Report for this year he will find under the head 'North-west Territories,' a list of the contracts in force there. In reply to my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), I would say that if he will be good enough to give me a copy of the memorial he has, I will see that every one of the suggestions or requests will receive most careful consideration. I think I have already received a communication of that kind, and some of the matters have already been dealt with. I am not aware of any post office in Canada that is not sufficiently manned to allow the clerks and letter carriers having their statutory holidays. It is not because of the insufficient manning that temporary clerks are not allowed holidays, but because of the ruling of the Auditor General as to the meaning of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I wish to say a word or two with reference to the somewhat discursive debate we have had. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), in the speech he made—which is a campaign speech—claimed credit for a small deficit as compared with previous deficits. He claimed that his deficit was \$398,000. There cannot be the least doubt that there has been great advance and great expansion in this country. It has been a time of great commercial activity since the hon. minister took charge of the Post Office Department; and, necessarily, in keeping with what we naturally expect, there has been progress entirely independent of whoever was in charge of the department, the effect of which was to lower the deficit. If we examine the facts, we find that we have to add to his deficit \$68,000 that he has got from the police department. Then, from what my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) says it is only a toll on newspapers and not a tax—though I do not know the difference between a toll and a tax—the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) will have got, I suppose, in the year ending June 30, 1899, some \$90,000. He shakes his head. He said he would receive \$90,000 for the eleven months of this year. What would he say he would get for the year ending June 30, 1899?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I think I said it was about \$22,000.

Mr. **DAVIN**. That would make his deficit \$488,000. Add the \$10,000 earned, for which he takes credit; that makes his deficit, speaking by comparison, \$498,000. I find that my hon. friend from Winnipeg has voiced a complaint that I believe is widespread with regard to the man-

agement of the department. The Postmaster General, while, as a member of the government and a member of the House, comes forward with motions and measures to adjust wages and to secure fair wages, and while he denounces the sweating system, he has introduced, as suggested by the speech of the hon. member for Winnipeg and the speech of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and, in fact, by his own explanation of how he has lowered the deficit—he has introduced into the management of the Post Office Department a kind of sweating system. Here we have the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), a supporter of the government, who complains of the way the letter carriers are treated. The member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and myself, in a previous session, gave expression to the demands of those letter carriers.

Now, reference has been made to the fact that letters have been published in the Postmaster General's Report in 1897. In publishing private letters he did a thing that I have no doubt he has regretted since. He took a lot of private letters that he found in the Post Office Department, and he flung them broadcast before the public. I do not think that any harm has been done to the writers of those letters, but surely the hon. gentleman, when he reflected on his conduct, must often have had honourable pangs for having taken a course somewhat remote from the code of gentlemanly honour. In a previous session reference was made to a letter of mine regarding the service from Balgonie to Loon Creek. There is nothing I ever did that I am more confident was just and in the interest of the public than when I wrote on the 18th of May, 1895, to the member for Three Rivers, then Postmaster General, urging him to renew the contract with W. Cockwill, for carrying the mail from Balgonie to Loon Creek, a distance, speaking from memory, of between 35 and 37 miles. He had to make fifty-two trips a year, and for this service he received \$125. During six months of the year he had to make those trips when icy winds were sweeping over the trail, and often when blizzards were blowing, and the life of that lad was in danger. Nothing more bold or heroic can be done on the field of battle, has been done in South Africa, than was done by that lad in driving from Balgonie to Loon Creek in great winter storms. I find the tenders are set out here, and the late Postmaster General is reproached with not having accepted the lowest tender. I find that E. Edmonds' tender is \$90; the tender from another is \$94, and there is one from A. Meier for \$175, and he gave the contract for \$125. I have no hesitation in saying that the Postmaster General, if he had let that contract for \$90 a year, might have been characterized as a slave driver, as an unjust man, false to the instincts of the people of Canada, for the people of Canada do not

want their servants to be cut down to wages below living wages. Now, if the late Postmaster General had made reductions in these contracts proportionately to the difference between \$125 and \$90, it would of course have enabled him to reduce the deficit by probably from \$150,000 to \$200,000. So that if you take into account the \$68,000 from the mounted police, the \$22,000 received in taxes on newspapers that did not accrue to the former Postmaster General, the \$10,000 earned in the Yukon; if you take into account the annual increment, but especially if you take into account the sum saved by grinding down the employees, if you take that sweating system into account, you would be face to face with a practical deficit just as large as the deficit of your predecessors. If he has accomplished a reduction, he has accomplished it in ways that will not meet with the approval of the people of Canada. Certainly keeping the offices short-handed—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What offices?

Mr. DAVIN. The member for Winnipeg has spoken of offices where they are short-handed, and my hon. friend beside me says they are short-handed at St. Thomas. I do not want to specify the offices from which I have had complaints. If you take into account all these things, and the cost of living of the contractors who have tendered at a lower rate, you have a sum of \$200,000 accounted for. Then, you have the \$68,000, which appears it is true, in the Postmaster General's Report, but, when he goes to the country he boasts that he has reduced the deficit. So that the deficit to-day, on the same plane of comparison, is from \$700,000 to \$800,000. The hon. Minister of Finance, when arguing across the floor with the hon. ex-Minister of Finance, argued altogether about book-keeping, but the very point that led to the discussion was ignored, namely, whether or not the hon. Postmaster General was appearing before the country in borrowed plumes. I am and always have been well satisfied with the step taken in the direction of 2-cent postage. I am satisfied, notwithstanding that my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) says that he is not. I do not think that there has been any concerted opposition or antagonistic criticism of that step from this side of the House. There has been criticism, but I do not think that the step has been regarded with very strong aversion on this side of the House. For myself, I was satisfied with that step, and I was perfectly certain that in taking that step it would be followed by advantageous consequences. But, it was open to the criticism that was made, and which has been made here now. It is a fair criticism, that it does not redound to the advantage of the mass of the people so much as it redounds to the advan-

Mr. DAVIN.

tage of a large and important section of the people whose interests and whose prosperity are part and parcel of the prosperity of the country. But, it does not directly redound to the advantage of the mass of the people. It does not, for instance, redound greatly to the advantage of the farmers of the community. It does not redound greatly to the advantage of the artisans of the community, but I am not blind to the fact that the farmers and artisans are benefited in the end if any large section of the community has its prosperity enhanced because there is a solidarity in any great community, the result of which is that you cannot benefit any large portion of the community without benefiting all.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do not the farmers and mechanics write letters?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) asks that. I think they do. Yes; it is a profound remark. I have heard, at least, that they do. I have heard that; yes. Before I sit down I must make a comment on the extraordinary spectacle we have seen here, not merely in regard to the estimates of the hon. Postmaster General, but in regard to other matters of public interest. I think we all want to get away, that we all want to close up, but when the hon. Postmaster General comes forward with his estimates, what do we find? He has to make a yard and yard long speech, evidently intended not for this committee, but for the people—a campaign speech. While the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) was speaking the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) went up to the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) and placed before him this volume of the Postmaster General's report for 1897, pointed out the letters, especially these Leason letters to him, and evidently inspired him to make a speech. It was clearly going to be a long debate, because we had also the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), a supporter of the government, getting up and making a speech that certainly was not conducive to the despatch of business. Some change or other came over the dream of the government, if there is any solidarity in the government, and if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was really acting for the government, because when the hon. Postmaster General came back from dinner, he came to our side of the House and said: Here now, let us have no more speaking; let us have these items passed. I have made my speech; the hon. member for North Wellington has made his speech; something has been said by the hon. member for Saskatchewan, but now let us have no more speaking. Well, as we were anxious to get through and to close up, we said: Very well, that is all right. Then he went up to his supporter and henchman from Saskatchewan and asked him to dry up. But, no, Sir, not for Joseph.

The hon. member for Saskatchewan defied his leader and went on and gave us an edifying speech that no doubt some hon. gentlemen listened to with great delight, going over the same old speech that he made when first this improper report of the Postmaster General came out. It appealed to his congenial mind, and he gave us that speech over again with the same eager ardour as he had done before. The spectacle is one that I commend to the attention of the public because it is as certain as anything can be that it is consonant with the spirit that has been animating hon. gentlemen opposite from the beginning of the session to the present, that their object is not to close up. Their object is not to finish or to despatch the business, and we are the witnesses now that the government is its own obstruction.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the hon. Postmaster General a question. I think he stated that in the vote taken last year an expenditure was authorized in the Mounted Police vote for assistance in the way of mail service. I would be very glad if he would point that out. I have gone very carefully through all the items, and I cannot find it. I find items for the North-west Mounted Police, and I find items for the police in the Yukon. I do find a strange thing here considering the fact that the hon. Postmaster General has put this service on the mounted police. In the vote for the year ending June 30, 1899, he has himself taken a vote amounting to \$103,900 for the post office in the Yukon. Does the hon. Postmaster General know how much of that he spent in 1898-9?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman is a little mistaken. My recollection is that in the supplementary estimates for 1898-9 I included an item of perhaps \$103,900, which included the sum of \$75,000, which was an estimate of what we might have to pay to the mounted police.

Mr. FOSTER. For post office work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think so. I moved in committee that we should reduce the item by \$75,000, and stated that the North-west Mounted Police had been performing the service for the season, that when the accounts were got in there would be an apportionment, that it was included in an item in the supplementary estimates voted to the North-west Mounted Police, and in connection with that vote of \$384,000 you will find a memorandum to the effect that there is included in that certain expenditure on mail service, and that the amount when it is ascertained will be adjusted.

Mr. FOSTER. The recollection is that that was put in when it was passing through the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was in the statute.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I would call the attention of the Postmaster General to the condition of the mail service in the town of Sydney. We have had a great increase in population in that town during the last year, and there is a great deal of complaint about the condition of the mail service there. While there is a large post office in the town of Sydney, and while that post office was fitted up when it was erected, sufficiently to give the necessary accommodation, yet the increased population, and the fact that the increase has taken place suddenly, consisting as it does largely of strangers, make it difficult for the postmaster to perform the duties required of him in the delivery and assortment of the mail. Nearly all the mails come in between the hours of 6 o'clock and 11 o'clock in the evening. The larger portion of the increased population of the town consists of workmen who are employed during the day time, and who can only go to the post office for their mails after working hours, in many cases it being impossible for them to go even then. The promises for a further increase of population are very great, and I would point out to the Postmaster General the necessity for making a postal delivery over a large portion of the territory where the people live, and where the town is extending. About this time last year Sydney had a population of between four and five thousands, but now the population is between ten and twelve thousands. We are likely to have within another year a population of possibly 20,000. Under such conditions I would like to impress on the Postmaster General the necessity for immediately instituting a postal delivery. It is necessary because the greater portion of the population are working-people, who are unable to come for their mail in the daytime, and when they come in the evening the townspeople are congregated in the post office waiting for their letters. The mails coming in by train at the present time are a little earlier than formerly, so that the whole community is crowded around the post office during the evening hours, and often not more than half of the people can get their letters. This has been the case for months, and the people living at some distance from the post office found it necessary to suggest that there should be branch post offices established within a mile or a mile and a half of the central office. The town post office is a very good building, erected only a few years ago, and with some improvements it could be made to serve the requirements of a large town. To my mind, the expense of establishing a postal delivery would not be any greater than the expense of establishing branch post offices and having a mail service between them and the general post office. The additional convenience to the public of a mail delivery would be very great to that class of people who cannot go to the post

office during the daytime. I do hope the Postmaster General will take the matter into his serious consideration at an early date and ask for a report from his inspector on the present condition of things. I have no fault to find with the present postmaster so far as he is able to discharge the duties devolving upon him, but the conditions are such that he cannot improve on what he is doing now. I hope the Postmaster General will ascertain what can be done; first, to improve the facilities within the post office building which are susceptible of considerable improvement, both as to sanitary arrangements and as to the fittings, and secondly, with regard to the establishment of a postal delivery. As it is now the mails come in in the evening, before eight o'clock. In the morning, when the post office opens the men have to go to work, and cannot return to the post office before the following evening. A man cannot get his mail that day. He must go to his work early in the morning before the post office is open; he must do without his mail all that day, and when he goes the next day for his mail he cannot get it, because of the congested condition of business in the office. I hope the hon. gentleman will give me some assurance that he will ascertain the present condition of things, and see whether he cannot provide a remedy.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am glad to know that Sydney is progressing, and that its future seems so assured. We have already had some representations in the department with regard to this same condition of affairs. A short time ago it came before me as acting Minister of Public Works, and I had some increased accommodation provided to enable the postmaster better to discharge his duties. The Post Office Department also made arrangements whereby the postmaster could increase his staff; and should the population maintain the proportions which my hon. friend anticipates, in the near future, the matter will have to be considered somewhat in the light of his suggestion. I am not able at this moment to give any promise as to what will be done, but I promise that the matter will be referred to our officers and a careful report obtained, and that the department will give the matter its best consideration.

Mr. McDUGALL. May I ask the minister whether any request has been made for a post office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. McDUGALL. Or for the establishment of other post offices in the neighbourhood?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Would it not be the most economical way of getting over the difficulty to provide two or three deliveries?

Mr. McDUGALL.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I could not say off-hand. I will have to obtain a report.

Mr. D. D. ROGERS (Frontenac). I am loath to get up and talk at this hour of the night, and I would not do it but that the case is urgent. Hon. gentlemen opposite have often accused the government of being very extravagant, and I am surprised at their inconsistency, because when the government do attempt to practice a little economy, these hon. gentlemen call them to account for it pretty severely. When the civil service is under discussion, they make great complaints about the different officials not getting statutory increases. They make out that the poor fellows are too hard wrought and do not get enough pay; and pressure has been brought to bear on the government to such an extent that their pay has been increased in very many instances. I do not see on what just grounds these increases can be claimed. I am sure the Postmaster General has no dearth of applicants for positions. I am sure that when a position becomes vacant, there are a score of applicants for it. If the work of the civil servants is so laborious, and they are so hard driven, no person would ask them to stay. It is a matter that is regulated by supply and demand. I know that some gentlemen do not agree with me in that, but they look at the question from a city standpoint. When I heard the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) speaking about the overwrought letter carriers in the way he did, I wondered whether he represented an agricultural constituency or not, and I wondered how the toiling masses, whom he represents, would feel if he talked in that way to them. It is their labour which pays for all the rest. Why cannot the men who represent the farmers get up and say a word for them? I am sure there are enough men in this House representing the cities to speak for them, without one who represents an agricultural constituency doing so. I do not like to put on a poor mouth for the farmers, but I am sorry to say that the circumstances compel me to do so. I have no doubt that many of the farmers' sons would be glad to take a place as a letter-carrier. Of course, they have an independent spirit, and they like to remain at home; but I feel that the farmers should receive more consideration. Then, why is a plea not put in for the country postmasters? I spoke on their behalf last year. I say it is ridiculous that they cannot get more pay than they do. I wonder how the constituents of the hon. member for Western Assiniboia would take it, if they knew that he was appealing on behalf of the letter carriers, and did not put in a word for the country postmasters in his own constituency. People in the cities are far better paid than people in the country. Again, as regards the mail carriers in the country, it is marvellous how cheaply they do their work. But what

is the remedy? The tenders come in, and if the government did not accept the lowest tender, the very man who put it in, would make the greatest cry against them. The very fact that people tender so low for this work, is an evidence of how little reward the toiling masses in the country get for their labour. I can see no remedy for it, except what is in their own hands. As regards the revenue, the privilege of free postage for newspapers was abused by many people using the mails for sending circulars and other things for advertising purposes. I am glad to hear that that abuse has been curtailed to a certain extent. I have heard very little complaint from the newspapers in that regard. The reduction of the postage to two cents I thought very hard on the people in the country who did not use the mail very much; but I am glad that it is operating so successfully. If it cost merchants, lawyers and other professional men who use the mails, a good deal, several hundred dollars, or \$1,000 a year for postage, I wonder who pays for that? If any of these firms pay \$1,000 more in postage, they add that on to the prices of their goods, and it is the plodding masses who pay in the long run.

I hope that the Postmaster General may in the near future see his way clear to pay the country postmasters a little more than he does. It is almost impossible, in some cases, to get any one to take charge of the post office. In many instances a man will only take charge of a country post office to oblige his neighbours, and I have known of localities where the neighbours raised a subscription among themselves to pay the postmaster sufficient for the work he performs.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has made so pathetic a speech that I am moved by it, but it is rather amusing to find that he and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), who are both such ardent friends of the toiling masses, are not able to agree in this House but seem always to meet each other at the cross-roads. The hon. member for Winnipeg wants the mail clerks to get additional pay for their work, and in that I think he is quite correct, but the hon. member for Frontenac objects. He says that the employees in the service of the country are too well paid and that there is no one here to raise a voice for the toilers of the country. I will leave those two gentlemen to settle their differences, but it is about time that they should be able to see eye to eye, and be able to agree that while one man may be engaged as a labourer in one quarter and another employed at a different kind of labour in another quarter, both are representative of the toiling classes and both ought to be fairly paid for their work. I was not aware until I heard the speeches of these hon. gentlemen that there were any hon. members who came to this House for the purpose of depriving the man behind the

plough of his wages, on the one hand, and of propping up an unduly paid official on the other hand. It is a new doctrine to me that an hon. gentleman who poses as a leader of the agricultural class should feel bound, in order to prove that the agriculturists are underpaid, to show that men in other positions are overpaid. We had to-night, in reply to the statement that men were performing mail service in the country for less than half what it was worth, for instance that a man drove the mails thirty miles a day for one dollar and thirty cents, the answer of the hon. member for North Wellington that a man was performing a similar service in his constituency at the rate of one dollar a day for himself and his horse. I asked the hon. member for Frontenac what he thought of that and he replied: Oh, that was a contract. Well, I say that a government which seeks to get its work done for less than a fair wage is not an honest government. I say that a government which trades upon the necessities of the people is not an honest government. And I say that to cut down the expenses of the public service in such a way as that is not commendable to the minister or the government. The people of Canada can afford to pay reasonably for the work they require to be done. If there have been cases where men were paid too much, the contract should be cancelled, but if a man is carrying out his contract at a moderate rate, that contract should be continued and not be let to another man who will take starvation pay.

The hon. member for Frontenac complains that the country postmasters are underpaid, and so they are, but if we take some of the surplus money that is going to great commercial corporations, in which the farmers have no part, and give it to the postmasters instead, will the hon. gentleman accept that solution? But he will support this government when it beggars the people who are doing the mail service.

Mr. ROGERS. Why did you not preach that doctrine before to-night?

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend never made that pathetic appeal until to-night. Where does he stand? He applauds the government for having beggared those who were already beggared and who were doing the mail service for less than half what it was worth. I know of a case where a man was carrying the mails thirty-four miles a day for one dollar and twenty cents, and yet that contract was right. If the Postmaster General wants to build up a reputation for getting the mail service done very much cheaper than before, by taking such means as this, he has a good deal of assurance to slip in between the employers of labour and the employed, and say that the labourers should be fairly paid. He should first apply that principle to his own administration. It is a piece of mockery for the hon. gentle-

man to bring in legislation looking toward the protection of working people, and then seek to starve people who already have too little. But, hon. gentlemen opposite see no inconsistency in that. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) thinks it very proper that a man who works under a contract should work for half nothing. Suppose that a neighbour of his hired a man for half of what he was worth—that would be a contract, but would it be fair? Suppose he took advantage of a man's condition, would it be fair? The Postmaster General, in these cases, simply takes advantage of these people's position. Everybody knows that the man who has a small mail contract has an equipment which, if he loses the contract, is of very little value to him. And so, though any one with an ounce of judgment knows that he is doing the work for less than it is worth, he will cut the price still further even rather than risk the greater loss. In 1896, the service on the whole was performed for much less than it was worth. But the Postmaster General boasts that he has reduced it by \$4,000. If he thinks there is any credit in that, let him claim it.

Mr. FRASER (Lambton). Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) opposed to the contract system? Would he not have tenders called for?

Mr. CLANCY. It is a proper system to call for tenders where tenders are necessary. But, can a tender be necessary when a man is already performing a service for half of what it is worth? What is the object of a tender? It is simply to prevent services being paid for at too high a rate. By putting up the contract to tender, the Postmaster General may find a person who is less wise even than the man who is already performing the service for less than it is worth. But, no government should secure any service for less than it is worth, any more than they should seek to deprive a workman of his fair day's wages. There are no two sides to a question of that kind; it is simply common sense and justice. If the Postmaster General seeks a reputation for a policy of this kind, let him enjoy it, the sweet sleep in which he is now lost. But the country is not asleep. I do not agree with my hon. friend who says that the reduction of postage under existing circumstances is a thing to be commended. I do not put it on any narrow ground, but upon the broadest ground. We in Canada cannot for some time look forward to being able to have a surplus together with an efficient system properly covering our territory. Our territory is so wide, the distances to be covered are so great that the service must always be expensive. Therefore, you can only have a reduction of the postage rate at the expense of some reduction of the service, either in range or in efficiency. The hon. member

Mr. CLANCY.

for Frontenac made an appeal for one class, but I hope he will go a little further and demand the same justice for all who serve the public, whether in the city or in the country.

Mr. PUTTEE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) a question. Does he wish us to understand that those who carry the mails have no other revenue than what they get for that service, or do they get any other revenue? Is not the carrying of the mail with them usually a part of a business? Would the hon. gentleman lay down the proposition, that because a train carries the mail, we should pay the whole expense of that train?

Mr. CLANCY. These people get nothing from the government except what is stated here. The country is filled with railways, and country stages do not enjoy the patronage they once did. Yet, they have to carry the mail, though there is no other service to be performed in connection with it. If the men carrying the mail had other means of living, is that a reason why he should be grateful to the government for reducing what they pay him? He might as well say that a man in the post office in his own city, who had a little house of his own, should get less pay than a man who had to rent a house.

Mr. PUTTEE. I am informed and believe that most of these contracts in rural districts are taken by men who have some other business to do in connection with them, and are therefore able to take the contracts at a price below what they would be willing to do them for otherwise.

Mr. J. G. RUTHERFORD (Macdonald). I could not understand what the hon. member for Bothwell was driving at, but if he want some legislation to protect these poor contractors against themselves, there would be something in what he said. There is no doubt that while, as the hon. member for Winnipeg has said, there may be some cases where a man is driving a stage, and in that way obtains remuneration outside of the mail contract, there is no doubt that a large proportion of the mail contracts throughout the country are paid for at ridiculously low rates. That, however, is a matter that cannot be remedied by legislation. As long as people will tender for these contracts at these low rates, there is no way in which it can be prevented. There is no doubt that improvements are taking place in the mail service in rural districts in other countries. For instance, in the United States there is a rural mail delivery, and that is brought about in some districts where it would appear to be impossible, and still the service is actually carried out at a profit; that is to say, it costs less to deliver letters to the farmers in many rural districts than it does to keep up a post office. That is

done by taking the post office to the farmers instead of the farmers going to the post office. There is no doubt that as settlement increases in this country some improvements of that kind may be introduced. There is another matter I would like to mention. A large number of rural postmasters are, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), ridiculously underpaid, so much so that it is becoming difficult to get people who are respectable and responsible to take charge of these offices. If the offices are closed the community suffers a great loss. At the same time the remuneration is so small that it is almost impossible to get suitable people to take these offices. In rural districts in many cases, the man who has the post office has also a contract for carrying the mail, and in that way he makes a little remuneration from both sources. But in small post offices along the lines of railway there is the same complaint, that the remuneration is far too small. I have already, during this session, alluded to the advisability of the government taking over the telegraph system. I am sure if the telegraphs in this country were owned, as they are in the old country, by the government, the rural postmasters would get a very large increase to the small remuneration they now receive. I think this is a matter that ought to be considered by the Post Office Department. While I have no stones to throw at the administration of the department at present, while I consider it is a great credit to the Postmaster General, and to the government, and gives excellent service to the country, still there is no condition so perfect that it will not stand improvement. I think in some of these respects it would be well for the Postmaster General to consider the advisability of adopting new means of distributing the mails through the country.

Mr. CLANCY. On page N-39, of the Auditor General's Report, I see an item, D. F. Burke, arrears of salary as postmaster at Burke's Falls, Ont., from July 1, 1878, to June 30, 1896, \$316. How does that arise?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Without remembering the details, I remember the claim being made that a postmaster was entitled to a larger sum than had been allowed him for a certain period of time. The matter was inquired into, and it was found that he had not been receiving the salary to which he was entitled. I looked into the matter myself and I can assure the hon. gentleman that he was well entitled to it.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman a report from the inspector?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have all the information in the department, and I am sure the hon. gentleman would be quite satisfied if he was acquainted with it.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what is meant by another item I find here, W. G. Milligan, clerk in the post office, Toronto, travelling expenses to New York and Philadelphia, and return, ninety-eight dollars?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I sent Mr. Milligan to visit certain cities in the states for the purpose of studying the question of the utilization of street railways for post office purposes. He inquired into the matter and made a report. He is a very excellent man.

Now with regard to the Halifax vote, I would say for the information of *Hansard*, and for the satisfaction of the Auditor General, how the Halifax expenditure is to be divided. The amount is just the same, but there is a little rearrangement of the staff: One postmaster, \$2,800; one assistant do, \$1,800; eight second-class clerks, \$8,300; fifteen third-class clerks, \$9,890; twenty-four letter carriers; including three temporary employees, \$12,680; one messenger, \$600; total, \$36,070.

Mr. J. V. ELLIS (St. John City). Is there much increase to the number of letter carriers of the Halifax post office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. An increase of three.

Mr. ELLIS. I want to make this observation. The receipts of a post office do not appear to indicate in any way the amount of work done by the letter carriers, and I object to the statement that they are an indication of the number of letter carriers that should be employed. The city of St. John is like Rome, built upon seven hills, and a letter carrier there has a great deal more work to do than a letter carrier in Toronto.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no doubt of it.

S. J. Carter, temporary clerk in dead letter office at Winnipeg, a provisional allowance to meet the exceptional cost of living in Manitoba, from July 1, 1899, to June 30, 1900, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$120

Mr. CLANCY. My recollection is that S. J. Carter appears in the main estimates for \$120.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will explain that. S. J. Carter is a member of the inside service in the dead letter branch who was moved from Ottawa to Winnipeg. We control the dead letter branch. For departmental reasons we have not transferred the dead letter men to the outside service. We want to control them so that they will feel that they are under the control of the central office. Mr. Carter did not come in under the vote of a provisional increase for the outside service.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this to cover services in the past and a portion of the year when he was not in Winnipeg?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, Mr. Carter was removed from Ottawa to Winnipeg, and was there during the whole of the year 1899 and down to the present time. We have a vote in the supplementaries for the outside service. This is a provisional allowance which covers his case as a member of the inside service.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not objecting to the item, which is a very small sum, but I want to be clear about it. I understand that this vote is covered in the main estimates for 1900.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is nothing in the main estimates for this same period. We have voted this provisional allowance for the outside service for this current year, but we did not vote it for the inside service. Mr. Carter is in the inside service though residing in Winnipeg, and there is no vote giving him a provisional allowance for this year. The vote in the main estimates is for next year. If the hon. gentleman will allow it to go through without discussion, and if he finds that what I say is not correct, I will make it right.

Mr. PUTTEE. Is there any immediate or future prospect of the hon. Postmaster General appointing some one to take charge of the Winnipeg post office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The matter is under consideration. I have had some recommendations and some applications. It has not been possible yet to deal with the matter, but I hope to be able to do so very shortly.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if he can explain why there is so much difference between the salaries of the postmasters at Quebec and at Victoria. I understand that they are paid according to the revenue they collect. In Victoria, where they collect \$48,000, the postmaster gets \$2,000, and the assistant postmaster \$1,400. In Quebec, where they collect only \$41,700, the postmaster gets \$2,200 and the assistant postmaster \$1,600. I see that the hon. gentleman has in his estimates an item of \$100 which is an increase for the assistant postmaster at Victoria, but I do not see why he cannot make it \$200 and make his salary the same as that of the assistant postmaster at Quebec. In Halifax, I find that they collect a revenue of \$55,000, and the hon. Postmaster General is asking for a vote of \$400 to enable him to increase the salary of the postmaster there to \$2,800. It does not seem to me that that is treating us in a proper way. There must be some reason for this.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The salaries of postmasters are fixed by Act of parliament, and the schedule of the Civil

Mr. MULOCK.

Service Act sets forth what they are. There is provision for increasing them where there is an increase of revenue, but it is not compulsory. I have not altered the salary of the postmaster at Quebec or Victoria. In reference to the increase of the assistant postmaster's salary at Victoria by \$100, that is the increase which he is entitled to. It is a matter of discretion, and it is a matter which has been considered.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). I think probably it will take less time tonight if I ask the Postmaster General a question concerning a matter I propose to bring to the attention of the House than if we were to allow it to lie over until there is a fuller House. I do not wish to consume very much time. I refer to the grievance that is complained of on the part of some people in respect to the cancellation of mail carriage contracts which has formed the subject of the discussion this afternoon and evening. I am informed, and I believe the information is correct, that a year or more ago application was made to the hon. Minister of Justice to test the legality of the cancellations in the courts of the country. Notwithstanding the fact that application has been renewed again and again, no action has been taken upon it. These people believe that they have rights, and in my opinion they certainly have rights. It is not a matter that is entirely free from doubt, but I think the great bulk of the legal opinion is that the cancelling of these contracts was entirely wrong. If there is anything like a fair case for contest the fiat should issue. We might as well have no Act granting a petition of right if any member of a department, when he feels that his action is going to be brought up for review before a court of law and there is a possibility of his action being condemned or shown to be illegal, can stand in the way of the issue of a fiat. It is a very serious matter, and I think that such a denial of justice should not be tolerated in this country or in any other country. If the hon. minister is satisfied that there is no case, why does he not make his report and have the fiat refused. This may be a doubtful case, these people are responsible for the costs, the matter can be tried out in the Exchequer Court thoroughly, judgment given, and the question decided. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there are quite a number of people who are very anxious to have the legality of the cancellation tested, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) is simply denying them an opportunity of doing what every British subject should be entitled to do—that is, to have his rights brought before the courts and adjudicated upon. I would like to know why he has refused to make his report, and why the fiat has been denied these people.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not refused to make my report. I have

given my views to the Minister of Justice which is the same as making a report, and the Minister of Justice agrees with me that there is no merit whatever in these applications and no legal or moral claim. In these cases attempts were made to secure moneys illegally and contrary to what we think are good morals. There does not appear to be any good moral foundation for the claims.

Mr. POWELL. That may be so in the estimation of the Minister of Justice, but I can assure the Postmaster General that he is wrong about there being no legal claim.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Nor any moral claim.

Mr. POWELL. I will give him a case where there is a good legal case and a good moral claim in my judgment. I know a gentleman named Rye Wry, in the county of Westmoreland, who went to considerable expense to fit himself for the carriage of mails from a place called Jolicure to a place named Aulac. The Postmaster General cancelled his contract. There was no change whatever made in the service. The construction of the contract is that the Postmaster General can cancel it where there is to be a change of service, but where the contract has been legally entered into an arbitrary power does not rest in him. Now as respects the merits of this case. This gentleman suffered damage. The Postmaster General after cancelling the contract called for tenders. He got a tender that was lower than Wry's tender. But when he called on the party to give bonds and sign the formal contract the party found he had taken it at so ridiculously low a figure he would not do it, and the Postmaster General had actually to pray by letter that Mr. Wry should continue his contract. In the meantime he had disposed of his means of conveyance and refused to enter into an extension of the contract at his old figure and the contract virtually went begging. That is one of the contracts which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) cancelled, and for which he took a great deal of credit. I am not attacking the general policy of having these contracts let by public tender, for my own view entirely accords in that respect with the view of the Postmaster General. But where a contract is made between the government and a party, that contract should be most sacredly observed. It is absurd that the government should play the part of a bully and repudiate a legal obligation, and because it has in its hands the power to deny a man any damages, to assert that power regardless of law and regardless of justice. I have no hesitation in saying that not only in my opinion but in the opinion of dozens of other legal gentleman, the action of the Postmaster General was entirely unwarranted and entirely illegal.

Mr. DAVIN. The claim of the rural postmasters for higher salaries is one that ought

to commend itself to the Postmaster General. The mail services rendered at present in my constituency are rendered at rates that seem to be ridiculously low. In a small post-office called Condy, north of Regina, I was amazed when I heard of the small amount that was paid for carrying the mail from the post office to the railway. It is true that in the North-west as well as in Ontario, as mentioned by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), it is sometimes very difficult to get a postmaster to do the work. From Moosejaw to Pioneer only \$70 is paid; from Moosejaw to Wood Mountain, 129 miles over a trail in a country not settled \$150 is paid. In my own constituency between Cottonwood and Pence, two trips, \$130 is paid. I find that in Manitoba very much larger sums are paid in proportion. I would urge on the Postmaster General to consider the remuneration of country postmasters and to direct his attention to the North-west Territories and compare the amounts that are paid for transportation of mail in the North-west Territories with the amounts paid in Manitoba.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will do so.

Mr. POWELL. I want the Postmaster General to make his report, on the cases I have mentioned, to the Minister of Justice and if the Minister of Justice will not grant his fiat let these people know.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will make a formal report.

Mr. POWELL. I will leave it to any member of the government. There are gentlemen here; I appeal to the Minister of Railways; I appeal to the Solicitor General; I appeal to supporters like the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), that if there is a fair case against the government in respect to these matters, the fiat should of course go and have it tested in the courts. I am satisfied, from what little attention I gave to the matter a year ago, that they have a good case; and why not grant them a fiat.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to remind the Postmaster General of a petition that was laid before him some weeks or months ago from the inhabitants of the island of Boulardarie, in the counties of Cape Breton and Victoria, and I would like to ask him if he has arrived at any conclusion with regard to it. They petitioned for increased mail service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to inform the hon. gentleman, but I will have a note made of the matter.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is a very important service, and these people have a very strong ground of complaint. They have simply a semi-weekly service running parallel within a few miles of a daily service, over a long stretch of country. The extra

cost of giving them a tri-weekly service, which they want, would not be very great.

Expenditure of the mail service in the Yukon district ..... \$75,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was voted for that service \$38,870, and this amount added will make the total for the Yukon mail service for the current year, \$113,870.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the total revenue for this year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have not yet got it, but I do not suppose it will be very much different from that of the previous year, namely, \$10,000.

To complete the payments for post office service to June 30, 1900..... \$31,473

Mr. CLANCY. What is this for?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The particulars are as follows: Increased cost of mail bags and mail locks, \$2,250; increased cost of commissions to postmasters on savings bank business, \$3,500; increased cost of labour at Vancouver and Winnipeg, \$3,500; amount short on railway mail service, \$21,623; to pay salaries, at \$300 a year each, of four railway mail clerks to replace those on duty in South Africa, \$600. It is quite impossible at the commencement of a fiscal year, to fairly anticipate the expenses to the end of the year of a postal service like ours, which is expanding in all directions.

Galops Canal enlargement ..... \$104,000

Mr. HAGGART. What are the quantities taken out for which Gilbert Brothers were paid this immense amount of money, nearly 288 days at \$425 per day?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). If the hon. gentleman will look at the contract which he has in his hand, he will see that there are two divisions in it. There is survey work and taking out loose rock, for which the company were paid \$425 per day. Then there is the moving of the solid rock for which they were paid \$8.40 per yard. The contract for which this is an extension, and which had been made with Davis & Co., varied from this in this respect, that Davis & Co. were allowed \$9.50 per yard for that portion of this work. We improved upon that contract to the extent of \$1.10 per yard for all the class of work, including at the higher price. These people engaged to do the whole work at the lower price. We had estimates from time to time of the work, which I will give to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HAGGART. Give me the quantities under the first contract for removing down to grade, for which \$425 per day was paid. What was the quantity moved down to grade?

Mr. McDUGALL.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The papers do not show the quantities removed. We had a man who remained on the work and saw that the plant was there in continuous daily operation. They were not paid according to the quantity they got out, but per day, so that all we looked to was to see that they kept constantly at work. They would naturally get out very much more one day than another, but as long as they kept constantly at work, they earned their \$425 per day, and we did not require any return as to the quantity removed, the same as when paying by the yard. I have a memo. of the total amount paid. For all work done under this contract, the total number of days was 288 at \$425 per day, which amounted to \$122,595. There is rock excavations on the south side of the channel, \$8,752.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the hon. minister is not aware that for taking their work down to grade, Mr. Gilbert was paid in full before, and yet he is paying \$425 a day for a survey vessel.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. HAGGART. I have read carefully the contract, and it states there was a grade line before, and that any material found above that grade line he was to excavate and was to receive \$425 a day for this survey. Last year there was paid \$103,734, and other payments \$112,986, making on the whole over \$216,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is double the amount actually paid.

Mr. HAGGART. I have it here in the Auditor General's report. The amounts are for actual working hours, 244 days 8 hours at \$425, \$103,734; paid in 1897, \$32,710; paid in 1898-9, \$42,430; paid in 1899-1900, \$26,550, and a drawback of \$11,296.11, making in all \$112,986, which added to the other amount makes over \$216,000. And the minister estimates that it will cost \$100,000 to finish it. Mr. Gilbert is getting a fair price for excavating the material in the rapids, \$8.40 a yard, and was paid for taking it down to grade. And now he is receiving this large amount without contract or tender for the carrying on of the work. It is true that some time ago, when I was Minister of Railways and Canals, these barges were employed for the purposes of sounding. When the bill came in, I ordered the engineer in charge to discharge the barge at once, after fifteen or twenty days of work, because I thought it an imposition on the government, and that the amount paid was largely in excess of anything they were entitled to. This is said to be a renewal of an offer made in 1892. It was an offer made in 1897. The effect of this is to pay these parties for what they have already been paid for—to dredge this down to grade.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I read from the last estimate received for the whole work up to the 31st of May, 1900, duly certified. That shows that the total value of the work performed by the Messrs. Gilbert Bros.' Engineering Company up to that date was \$131,848.31; drawback to be retained \$13,188, net amount due \$118,660. That is for the use of all plants required for the testing and so on at the rate of \$425 a day. Here are the original estimates.

Mr. Haggart. If the hon. minister will refer to page R-105 of the Auditor General's report, he will see the figures I have quoted.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think the hon. gentleman has misunderstood the Auditor General's report. It agrees with this entirely, and shows a total of \$112,986.

Mr. Davin. Then there is \$104,000 yet.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That \$104,000 is for the full work. It is a vote asked to pay estimates of what the parties are entitled to for the current year on the work of the canal.

Mr. Davin. How much have Gilbert Bros. been already paid, and how much is due them?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The total amount is \$131,841, that is the gross amount earned. They have been paid \$118,000, with a drawback of \$13,000.

Mr. Haggart. When I was in office I employed the same parties to make soundings of the whole channel, and a report of the work was made to the department. The report was, that the work which they had contracted for had been completed, except a small part. I think there was an arbitration about it, and the arbitrators were awarded the full amount of their claim to Gilbert & Co. The explanation the minister offers of the expenditure on the Galops Canal, of this latter item, cannot possibly be an explanation. It is an explanation of the things above the \$103,000. That sum was paid, part in 1897, part in 1898, and part in 1899, and the whole amounts to \$112,986.80.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Now the hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. Haggart. What is the amount due them at present?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Nothing, except the drawback. The total amount is \$131,148.

Mr. Haggart. The excavation part of this is \$8,750. That is about 1,000 yards taken out. The price was \$8.40 a yard; and the balance of \$103,734 is for a survey.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That does not form any part of the work done by the day, for which he receives \$425 per day.

Mr. Haggart. I state that Gilbert & Co. have been paid for all the work done to grade line, and that there was nothing for them to take out of the channel unless boulders that had been washed in by the rapids. They have been paid in full for all the excavation that they did over and above their other contract at \$8.40, and that for merely surveying it there has been a payment made up to this date of \$103,000.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think the hon. member has forgotten the explanation that I made to him the other day. If there had been no material lowering of the water everything would have gone on all right; and the arrangement which he refers to as having been made in 1892, under which they agreed at their own expense to remove all rock in situ above the contract grade line, would have been sufficient for the purpose, and we would have had no further trouble. Our engineers' report was that they could not get the seventeen feet, that the permanent lowering of the water compelled them to excavate deeper in order to get the seventeen feet of water, and, therefore, we had to continue the arrangement which had not only been recommended by Mr. Rubidge, but which had previously been strongly recommended and adopted by the late chief engineer, Mr. Trudeau. We did it upon the same terms and arrangements, except that, as I understand, the price which had formerly been agreed to be paid to the Davis Bros. was reduced as respects a large portion of their work, from \$9.50 to \$8.40.

Mr. Clancy. In the statement the hon. gentleman gave us to-night, are the sums due the contractor and earned up to a certain time, of which the hon. gentleman holds a statement in his hands? How much of that is at the contract price of \$8.40 a yard, and how much of it is for doing surveying?

Mr. Haggart. The hon. minister makes the statement that the original contract provided for a depth of water of seventeen feet, and that on account of the lowering of the water, a new gradient had to be provided for, and that he had a different contract. There is no such thing in the contract. The contract is to carry the work down to the original grade.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

Mr. Haggart. I beg your pardon. You will see that there is no deepening beyond the original contract grade.

Mr. Clancy. Perhaps, while the hon. gentleman is looking up that matter, he will

tell me if he has a report of the engineer for what becomes practically a new contract.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, it has been read this evening. I have Mr. Rubidge's report, that owing to the lowering of the water, it was necessary to do additional work to get the channel:

The offer of the Gilbert Brothers Engineering Company of May 31, 1897, to supply all necessary plant for the purposes of survey, and of removing the alleged obstructions in the channel, is practically a repetition of the offer of October 22, 1892, made at the suggestion of the late chief engineer, Mr. Trudeau, with a view to act upon my previous reports recommending that a properly equipped dredging and blasting plant should be stationed in the channel, as being, in my opinion, the only means of making a satisfactory test and survey of the bottom, and at the same time of being prepared to remove any description of material which might be discovered above the original or contract grade.

It was reported to me in the first place that there was this additional lowering of the grade to be made. There was not seventeen feet of water there. Dr. Ried, before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) left the department, insisted that they would not have a channel of that depth, and it was ascertained by sounding, that Dr. Reid was right. Owing to some cause, whether it was the action of the water or of the ice, a large amount of obstruction got into this channel after it was supposed to have been cleared out. I think a very great amount of the obstruction consisted of boulders and rocks. I am advised that the officers of the department do not know to what might have been properly attributed the placing of these obstructions in the channel. These came there and they had to be removed.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Has the hon. minister a report from his engineer, stating that the channel became filled up for some reason unexplained?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The engineer speaks of the necessity of removing the obstruction, which was above the original or contract grade. There were obstructions and the deputy minister tells me that the officers do not know whether it is attributable to the action of the water alone, or of the ice. The channel was obstructed, the obstructions required to be removed, and in addition to that, the grade had to be lowered, owing to the permanent falling of the water.

Mr. **HAGGART**. There is no such thing in the contract.

Mr. **DAVIN**. How much had the grade to be lowered?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. About a foot.

Mr. **CLANCY**.

Mr. **HAGGART**. The minister's contention is that for \$425 a day, Gilbert & Son were to work down to the grade line, and he states that the line was lowered on account of the lowering of the water. What I say is that they were paid for the grade line, that there is no condition at all in the contract as to the grade line being changed, but that if there is anything found above the grade line, the line which they were paid for, the line that Mr. Rubidge certified before that they had excavated down to, there is no condition that they had to go below that.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They have to give seventeen feet of water.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Not at all. There is no provision at all in the contract.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Seventeen feet of channel would be the depth, and the grade would be at the end of the seventeen feet.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Not at all. The very contrary is stipulated in the contract. The contract reads:

And whereas, the said assignment has been executed and deposited in the said Department of Railways and Canals, and the said cash security has been put up as required by the said order in council, and the said E. E. Gilbert & Sons were required by Her Majesty to enter into a covenant on their part to finish and complete the said contract;

And whereas, the said covenant was entered into on the 11th day of July, A.D. 1882, and is deposited in the said Department of Railways and Canals;

And whereas, the said E. E. Gilbert & Sons contend that they have completed the said contract;

And whereas, it is alleged that there are obstructions on the bottom of channel through the said Galops Rapids above the original or contract grade—

So that, they are only dealing with the original or contract grade:

—the nature of which is, however, undetermined.

The nature of which was undetermined. There was no condition at all, except in regard, perhaps, to the boulders which might have been washed in from the rapids above. They had been paid in full for the excavation down to the grade line, and there is no requirement in the contract at all that they shall be paid on account of the lowering of the water in the canal, and any deepening that is done under the other contract, for which they received \$8.40 a yard for the work done. They have been paid \$123,000, or, as it is in the Auditor General's Report, \$112,000. They have been paid for surveying, \$103,000; and for excavation, \$9,000.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is not correct.

Mr. **HAGGART**. That is absolutely correct.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There is the moving of the obstructions.

Mr. **HAGGART**. What obstruction?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They were to furnish a channel as soon as possible.

Mr. **HAGGART**. They had to get down to the grade line in order to give the necessary depth of water, on account of the lowering of the water in the St. Lawrence, and they have been paid for that. They have a contract for that at \$8.40 a yard. The other vessel is only a survey vessel. With it they have to sound the channel, and if any obstructions are found above the grade line, they are to remove them, for which they receive \$425 a day.

Mr. **HAGGART**. He is getting \$425 a day for three years—

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There have been only 248 days during the three years for which this plant has been employed. Mr. Rubidge believed it necessary to use this plant to remove certain obstructions which had been discovered; probably some of them come in each season. The deputy tells me that is what Mr. Rubidge alleges. You have to have a careful examination of this channel every year, particularly until we get our canal finished. It won't do to run any risks about that. The contract which I have read speaks of the original contract grade, meaning thereby the grade that was fixed according to the original contract, but which, by reason of the fall of the water, was not found sufficiently deep to give the channel required.

Mr. **CLANCY**. This gentleman is the assignee of the contract that was let originally to other parties, and he took it at the lower rate of \$8.40 a yard. He stands precisely in the position of the original contractor.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. None of that portion of the work has been paid higher for than \$8.40 a yard.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Has the minister the report of the engineer describing the new work?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have explained to the hon. gentleman that there was a permanent lowering of the water.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Where is the report about the lowering of the water and the work to be done in consequence.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The engineer states here, as I have read, 'in view of the permanent lowering of the water.'

Mr. **HAGGART**. Surely the minister is in a position to know the number of yards which are required to be removed under this contract for \$425 a day.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They were not removing by the yard for the \$425.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I know that perfectly well, but suppose he was widening the banks for which he was receiving \$8.40 a yard, how would the minister know whether he was widening the bank above the original contract unless he had a correct diagram of what was to be removed. There must be some report in the department of the number of yards that were to be taken out under contract.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There was no taking out by the yard.

Mr. **HAGGART**. He was taking out by the contract for \$8.40 a yard. There are two contracts—one for lowering the grade a foot and for removing the boulders, for which the minister alleges the contractor is to receive \$425 a day.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No. Whatever rock excavation was required to be made, which was not known at the time this contract was entered into, was to be paid for at the rate of \$8.40 a yard. But for the other portion of the work, wherever that plant was required to be used, it was to be paid for at the rate of \$425 per day of 12 hours.

Mr. **DAVIN**. On what basis was the calculation made to pay \$425 a day? It seems to me that is an enormous sum, and the ex-Minister of Railways tells me that no such sum was paid before.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not know what was paid before, but the superintendent engineer reported to the chief engineer that that was a proper price. I will read from the order in council the description of the plant which they were to furnish:

The minister further represents that this offer, the acceptance of which is advised by the superintending engineer, comprises the supply, equipment and use of the undermentioned plant, together with the help necessary for its proper working, viz.:

One large spoon dredge and the 'torpedo' drill scow.

One large tug.

Two dump scows.

Two flat scows.

One hauling scow, equipped with engines, drums, wire ropes, &c.

One floating boarding house.

Anchors, &c.

The government to pay for the services of such plant \$425 per day of twelve hours; time to commence when plant is in position as designated by the engineer in charge. The length of time that the plant is to be so employed to

be determined by the Department of Railways and Canals, and the arrangement to be cancelled at any time on three days' notice.

Down to this moment we have not had the recommendation of the superintendent engineer nor of the chief engineer that it would be prudent or wise to terminate this agreement. We can make no better arrangement, and we shall continue to use this plant as often as it becomes necessary, at all events until we get through with our main canal. Until the canal is finished, there is no way of getting down except by means of this channel.

Mr. HAGGART. Do you not know that there is a lock near the middle of the Galops Canal by which it is possible to go up or go down ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was going to read the rest of the order in council :

The said company are to have the use free of charge of such chain and wire rope belonging to the government as may be on the ground, and was used by the company in their previous operations, as contractors for said works.

Any rock found in situ above the original contract grade line to be removed by the said company at their own expense.

Should it be required to still further improve the channel by deepening and widening, the company will perform such work of drilling, blasting and dredging as may be ordered, for the sum of \$8.40 per cubic yard for rock necessarily excavated.

During the progress of the company's operations, vessels are not to be allowed access to the channel without such notice as will secure immunity for the company's plant.

The minister recommends, in view of the fact that this channel, costly at it was, remains of little or no practical use in its present condition, and that the Gilbert Company were the original excavators of the channel, a class of work which, by reason of the rapidity and depth of the waters, is one of peculiar difficulty, and calls for the exceptional experience which they possess; further, that the plant referred to, as to be used for the work, has been specially built for working in such waters, that the said offer of this company be accepted, and that he be authorized to enter into definite contract with them accordingly. The price above fixed, \$8.40 per cubic yard, to cover all cost of removal and deposit of excavated material.

Mr. DAVIN. Does the hon. minister know how many yards of dredging have been taken out ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We kept no account of the loose material taken out.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman is aware that there was a previous contract to pay for that by the yard.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not for the loose material.

Mr. HAGGART. There was upon the old contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was no such contract.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, yes, there was.

Mr. DAVIN. What progress has been made in this work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I like to see the intense interest this subject is exciting in the member for Assiniboia. I am gratified to find an hon. gentleman at his time of life beginning to study up these matters, but it is rather late in the session to start instructing him in the A B C of this kind of work.

Mr. DAVIN. Nevertheless, as a member of parliament and as an elector and a citizen of this country, I am interested in this matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am pleased to see the interest aroused in the gentleman on this subject.

Mr. DAVIN. It may strike the hon. gentleman himself that after all, as he himself is only a student in these matters, we have for that reason to cross-examine him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have a work here from which the hon. gentleman will get much more information and he would get it much more comfortably.

Mr. DAVIN. Still it is only from the hon. gentleman we can get information in this House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why cannot you read the report.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman could tell me more about flour than about canal work. What progress has been made in the clearing of the channel or is the work to go on indefinitely ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Whenever it is necessary for the safety of the channel, we propose to have the necessary plant there to make it all right.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it to go on indefinitely ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Just as long as the difficulties continue.

Mr. DAVIN. Four hundred and twenty-five dollars a day for a dredge strikes my uninstructed mind as an enormous sum.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is at the disadvantage of not knowing anything at all about the matter.

Mr. DAVIN. And the hon. gentleman is under the disadvantage of not having the politeness that usually belongs to a gentleman in his station.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has given no information about this expenditure of \$104,000, item 36.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the amount of money which we require to pay the bills that are now due or will be due on the 30th June for work done under the contract. If we had foreseen that the work would have progressed as near towards completion as it has, we would have put another \$100,000 in the main estimates for the year.

Mr. HAGGART. Will this finish the Galops Canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think so.

Increased accommodation at Halifax, Inter-colonial Railway ..... \$5,000

Increased accommodation at Halifax, Inter-colonial Railway, along line ..... \$67,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to meet such items as the land at St. Eugene for further station yard accommodation, for putting in water service at Boisdale, in the county of Cape Breton, for completing the upper flat of the offices at Moncton, for putting in a tank at St. Leonard Junction, for extending the station at River du Loup and also St. Valier, and for buying land at Sydney. Also for putting in new semaphores at a number of places and telegraph and signal stations, also for a station at St. Sylvester, for dwelling houses at George Station, and other works of that description.

Mr. HAGGART. Why do you charge all those to capital account ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are entirely new.

Mr. HAGGART. Why charge to capital account the increased accommodation at your offices and semaphores and scales ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The station at Moncton has been paid for out of capital and was contracted to be paid for out of capital. The vote was obtained before we came in and we are completing the upper flats.

Mr. POWELL. Does the hon. minister refer to that building, being built out of capital ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a very large building—the Moncton station. We are fitting up offices in the third flat. That building was charged to capital.

Mr. POWELL. This must refer to the general offices—there is no third flat in the station building.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, this refers to the general offices.

Mr. POWELL. Let me call the attention of the hon. minister to the thorough absurdity of this. Here is a very large building which was put up to replace a small

building. It was built entirely out of revenue. And now, to fit up the third story, the expense is to be charged to capital. Could a more perfect illustration of the means taken to make a good showing for the present management be given than this ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that the building was built out of revenue.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to know on what principle the hon. minister charges a tank to capital. He is very frank in telling other people that they are ignorant, but it seems to me that he himself is rather ignorant as to how accounts should be kept himself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see any objection to charging an entirely new structure to capital.

Mr. DAVIN. A tank ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, a tank. The tank at St. Leonard Junction is costing \$2,200. At Boisdale the water service is costing \$4,400. It is not the same as though we were repairing it merely. Tanks originally were built out of capital.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There was a tank at Boisdale before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am told by the deputy minister that they are establishing a gravitation system there.

Mr. POWELL. We are not speaking of a scientific system of railway book-keeping, of course. I admit that the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway and every other railroad that I have looked into—and I have read something about them—pursue the policy the hon. minister is pursuing as respects capital account, but not to the extent that he does. That is, they charge betterments to capital. As a method of scientific railway book-keeping, that is all right. But the point is that the hon. gentleman is changing the system of book-keeping, and taking credit for what the comparison of figures shows as though the changes had been made in the road and its business instead of in the system of book-keeping. The hon. minister's deputy is beside him, and I would ask him to ask his deputy if my statement that the general offices are built out of capital is not correct.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If it is correct, I will let that item stand, and will find out the facts. I was under the impression when I saw the item, that it was connected with the station building. I know that that was built out of capital. If the other was not, I think the point is well taken and would say that this should come out of income.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman's deputy will tell him whether my statement is correct or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the deputy says that it is correct.

Mr. POWELL. Further, I can show the hon. gentleman the reports of the engineers on that road from 1880 down, to prove to him that almost all the items he has included in this \$67,000 are of a character similar to those that have hitherto been paid out of revenue.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That may have been so at times, just as it is with us now.

Mr. POWELL. No, what I mean is that as a general thing, they were charged to income; and I could convince the minister of that if I wished to take up the time, which I do not. There are charges for sidings here. Before the hon. gentleman assumed the management of this road, there were sidings up to four and a half miles long built and charged to revenue. Last year this remarkable change was made in the system, and there was a siding of a mile and a half, one-half of which was charged to capital.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Should not these things be charged to capital?

Mr. POWELL. I suppose as a form of correct book-keeping they should be charged to capital. But these things are all turned against the old management and in favour of the new management for political effect.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry to see the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) dismiss so lightly the subject of a scientific system of book-keeping for this railway. I think it is important that we should get into a scientific method. The distinction between items that should be charged to revenue and those which should be charged to capital ought not to be difficult. Whatever improves the road or extends the road, gives you a big building where you had a small building—whatever increases the value of the property, I should think should be charged to capital. I think we have everything to gain by adopting a scientific system. If it has been the custom in the past to charge some of these things to revenue, let us frankly acknowledge that in any comparison that we make. But I do not think we ought to get away so lightly from the scientific method of book-keeping. Here is a large and expanding property, no doubt there will be extensions in various directions, and we might as well try to get down to a scientific system of book-keeping between revenue and capital on the Intercolonial Railway now as at any time. We had a case given one day when some items for strengthening bridges had been charged to revenue whereas they are now charged to

capital. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Railways, has pointed out that, in the previous cases, the amounts were insignificant, while in his own case the amount required for betterment of bridges was so large that it could not be met from revenue.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Finance evidently was not in the House before 1896, because he would have heard statement after statement made by the then opposition that there should be no capital account at all on the Intercolonial Railway. I have heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce state again and again that the capital account should be closed long ago on the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did you say so then?

Mr. HAGGART. I did, and charged to capital account only large extensions like the purchase of property at St. John and Halifax. All these amounts that the hon. gentleman charges now to capital account, my instructions were to charge them to revenue. The opposition insisted that the capital account on the Intercolonial Railway should be closed. It is time it should be closed, it is better for both sides of the House that it should be closed, that there should be no humbugging and cooking of accounts as there is now. The hon. gentleman will perhaps come down with a surplus next year of perhaps \$150,000 over last year. Over \$300,000 of that amount ought to be charged to the annual revenue account of the year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would not be in any other railway.

Mr. HAGGART. In some railways it is not charged. Every betterment that is of a permanent character is charged to capital account on most of the railways. No substitution of one locomotive for another is charged to capital account; but if there is an increase of locomotives on ordinary railways it is charged to capital account. But there was a contention that the capital account of the Intercolonial should be closed altogether. It prevents cooking reports, it prevents cooking surpluses on the Intercolonial Railway, as there evidently will be this current year beginning on the 1st of July; because there has been an expenditure of \$335,000 on what is alleged to be capital account except two items, including equipments of stations, rolling stock, grain elevator at St. John and grain elevator at Halifax. Now, if a grain elevator at Halifax is burnt down and another one is put up, it is absurd to say that it should be charged to capital account. The Minister of Finance says we can point it out when the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway come up and that we can say that it should be charged to revenue instead of capital. But that makes very little difference. Now the Min-

Mr. BLAIR.

ister of Finance, in his own interest, and in the interest of the government, should take my advice. It will assist him in council, for I suppose he must have a great deal of trouble in resisting all these items that appear in the estimates. He should insist on carrying out the promise of his party when they were in opposition.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I will reduce that by \$7,000, and call it \$60,000. Let me say, however, that it is not a reasonable suggestion to say that we should close the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway. You might as well say we should close the capital account of the canals, I wonder how many people the hon. gentleman will get to sympathise with him in Ontario where we have been spending two or three hundred thousand dollars every year for the last eighteen years in operating canals. Why should we close capital account there? We are keeping it on naturally. Of course there will be developments on the canals and developments on the railroads. It is impossible to realize the extent of the demands made on the Intercolonial Railway during the current year, and what the demands are going to be for a year or two to come in the way of extensions of all kinds. It is impossible to talk about making those extensions out of income. Last year we put down 120 miles of sidings, because we could not run our trains otherwise. We have not half of them down yet. We are hauling a greater number of cars, and the trains are larger. There is not an item which I have included in this estimate, so far as I know, nor in any of these estimates, as to which corresponding items were not charged to capital account by the hon. gentleman. For instance, snow fences, to which he takes exception. These are not renewals but fences upon entirely new ground. You put in a new water service where there has been none before, that is a fair charge against capital. What the member for Westmoreland said a moment ago is correct, that there were no doubt items of a similar kind that were paid out of income during the former regime; there are items of the same kind paid by the government out of earnings. But the test of the question is this: Take the items of the whole expenditure in respect of all these works that are included in the classes that I named the other day—does that amount exceed, or fall below, or where does it stand as compared with the similar expenditure previously? That is the way to make a comparison. Additional trains and cars and additional sidings are required to meet the increased business, and it is necessary that these things should be done altogether. You cannot dilly dally and spread the whole thing over a long term of years. The expenditure, I hope, will be over in a very little while and there will be

no need for making material additions to the capital account.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What improvements are to be made at Boisdale station?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There is nothing in this vote for any further improvement than that of the water service.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is there any proposition to make any improvement in the station at Boisdale?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not at this moment carry the facts in my mind. We have some supplementary estimates, but I do not recollect what is proposed.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is the hon. minister aware of the fact that medical men, who attended patients who lived and died in that station, reported that the station was unfit to be occupied?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, I am not aware of that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is he aware that medical men have made the statement that three deaths at least have occurred in the station caused by the unhealthy condition of the station, and that the present station-master has been put there and kept there by the minister against the recommendation of medical men?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**: Neither I nor the deputy minister has ever heard any such thing.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The information is in the department.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Well, I have not heard of it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is a cruel thing, if not worse, for the department to put a station-master with his family in a station under these conditions. The station-master was degraded, sent there from a higher station, where he received a higher salary.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There is no difference in the salary.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is a difference in the salary.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, the hon. gentleman is in error.

Mr. McDOUGALL: There are several dollars per month difference in the salary received at that station and at the station from which he was transferred. I make the statement, knowing what I am saying, that the station master does not receive

the same salary that he received at the station from which he was transferred. I refer to the case of Mr. Petrie. He was station-master at Grand Narrows, where he received \$3 a month more salary than he does at Boisdale, and he received other perquisites owing to a difference in the classification of the station that he does not receive now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That has nothing to do with it at all.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It has something to do with the position of the station-master. What I complain of more particularly now is the action of the management in insisting on keeping the station-master, his wife and family in a station under the conditions that I have referred to. In the name of everything that is fair, I make this protest against continuing it any further, and I say that the minister is guilty of one of the worst acts that a minister could possibly be guilty of if, when he becomes aware of the fact that the station is not in a fit condition for people to live in, he does not at once take steps to put that station in a proper condition.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, I think we cannot go any further to-night.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will take a few more items.

Mr. DAVIN. No, it is ten minutes to three, and I have to be here at eleven o'clock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So have I. We have made no progress at all. We must pass a few items.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Before these items pass, I want to get some information from him in regard to the principle upon which he has built a number of sidings along the line of the Cape Breton Railway during the past year.

Mr. POWELL. I suggest to the hon. minister that it would be better to work a reasonable time.

Mr. McDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) It was understood that we should not sit after twelve o'clock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not made any progress.

Mr. POWELL. Here is an item that might, under ordinary circumstances, give rise to a great deal of discussion, but it is passing through without much discussion. If he is going to try to force things and to compel people to sit here after three o'clock in the morning there will be no progress made.

Mr. McDOUGALL.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not want to be unreasonable.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman is being unreasonable. I appeal to him. I have no disposition to detain him by asking for unnecessary information. There is a little information I would like to have in respect to this item. The passing of the estimates would be greatly expedited by allowing it to stand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There will be plenty of opportunities for discussing the question of sidings, because there is provision for sidings in the supplementary estimates for the current year.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman was good enough to say that he had repeated things that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House could not understand. There are some things in this report which I cannot understand. I have a report here, made by some one, unsigned; I do not know whether it is by Mr. Rubidge or not. It is headed 'St. Lawrence district, engineer's office, Cornwall, June 12, 1897.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is Mr. Rubidge's report.

Mr. CLANCY. He makes reference here to having made a former report.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is away back in May.

Mr. CLANCY. I ask the hon. gentleman to give us the report at the next sitting of the committee. I want to be clear on the subject, and I am sure the minister will see that it is not an unreasonable request.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman wants the previous report that Mr. Rubidge mentions there, and we will get that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are all, I suppose, anxious to make some progress, and I find in the supplementaries for the coming year a number of items on any one of which all this can be discussed. I would suggest that this item pass, and there will be ample opportunity for full and free discussion on the supplementaries. Everything can be said then that could be said to-night.

Mr. HAGGART. It will take me half an hour on the small item of \$846 to Mr. Jones. You can pass them all but that.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, no. I want to say something about snow fences. The mind of the country is agitated on the subject of your book-keeping.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will promise you ample liberty on the supplementary estimates.

Mr. DAVIN. No ; no more items to-night.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) does not bow to the reasonable suggestion made by his leader, why, then, we will have to see it through.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If the minister is prepared to go on, I want some explanation with regard to the cost of sidings along the Cape Breton division of the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will get the information.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I want the information now. Surely the minister does not want to pass a vote for sidings without the information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can tell the sidings, if any, this vote is for.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman is not going to bluff me. This item will not go through until I get the information, and now is the proper time to get it. What are the sidings on which this money is being spent ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by bluff, and I think he could use more appropriate language. He first asked what was the cost of all the sidings on the Cape Breton branch ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I asked what were the sidings that were to be put in for this money.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can tell you that there are no sidings to be provided for in this vote.

Mr. DAVIN. Are we to understand that this is the kind of treatment that we are to get, that after the government arranges that the committee should rise, they change their mind and propose to go on? I do not think that the Minister of Railways, by attempting to browbeat the House, will facilitate matters.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. DAVIN. As my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) has suggested, let the last item stand, and let it be understood that we will have the right of full discussion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly, that is a fair proposal.

Mr. McDOUGALL. And I will get the information I asked for on the last item ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. In order that the minister may have no excuse—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman had better not lecture.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I merely want to state what I want. I want the amount of expenditure on all sidings that were put in between Point Tupper and Sydney during the last eight or ten months.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will have to telegraph for that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is no need for telegraphing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows better than I do ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I want to know which of these sidings were put in at the expense of the government and which at the expense of the individual. I refer to two sidings, within a mile of the River Denny station ; extension of the siding at Grand Narrows ; two sidings near Christmas Island ; three sidings at Boisdale, one siding at Long Island, one siding within two miles of the Shuncadie station, one siding at George's River, one siding at Leitches' Creek, one siding at Ball's Creek, one siding at Sydney Forks, and one siding at about a mile from Sydney town.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I assent to the proposition that these items pass except one.

Mr. HAGGART. I wish that one of the items be reserved, with the understanding that upon it we can discuss all the items.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very well, let it be so.

Resolutions reported.

#### JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolutions :

That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts and to provide as follows:

That the salary of the chief justice of the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories shall be \$5,000 and of the five puisné judges of the said court each \$4,000 per annum.

That the salary of an additional judge of the Territorial Court of the Yukon territory shall be \$4,000 per annum.

That the salaries of seventeen puisné judges of the Superior Court of Quebec, whose residences are fixed at Montreal or Quebec (including the judge to whom the district of Terrebonne is assigned) each \$5,000 per annum.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) asked me to express his desire that this should stand until he can be present.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have an arrangement about that. The understanding

is that the resolution should pass through committee to-night and be concurred in to-morrow; and then I shall introduce the Bill, and we shall have the whole discussion on the Bill on Tuesday, when the hon. member for Montmorency comes back. I will require to amend the second paragraph of the resolution by changing 'five' to 'four,' puisné judges.

Motion agreed to, and resolutions considered in committee reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What are you going to take up at the next sitting?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Election Bill, and after that possibly the railway estimates.

Mr. CLANCY. I must protest against the proposition to take up the election Bill on Saturday, as there are some important matters in the Bill which several members who will be absent desire to discuss.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The only object I have is to get the Bill passed, so that it can go to the Senate.

Mr. J. G. RUTHERFORD (Macdonald). I protest against the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell. (Mr. Clancy), as one who has been here for five months. It is simply disgraceful, the way members who live near Ottawa go home on Saturdays, and then expect the business of the House to wait to suit their convenience.

Mr. CLANCY. I think that is an uncalled for remark. I have only been home once since I have been in Ottawa. I do not know that I have accomplished as much as the hon. gentleman, but I think I have shown as good manners.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.10 a.m., Saturday.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, June 30, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he has yet had time to get me these papers with reference to the Richelieu bridge.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I spoke to my colleague, to the Min-

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

ister of Railways, about that, and he tells me that the correspondence between the department and the Auditor General is still going on. Under the circumstances, the papers could not be brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask whether or not the money has been spent?

The PRIME MINISTER. The subsidy paid?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not aware that it has. I think some has been paid which is not disputed.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there must be some papers completed, and I think they should be brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will take a note of that.

### SUPPLY BILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I move that the House do receive report of Committee of Supply. This is for the purpose of facilitating the passing of an item in the estimates which is very urgent. The item is the \$900,000 to cover the working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for the current year, which expires to-day. I have mentioned the matter to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), who sees no objection to taking this vote separately from the general supply Bill.

Motion agreed to, resolution read the second time and concurred in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 188) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending June 30, 1900.

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

### ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 133) to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I am sorry that this Bill has been treated in the way it has been, because the House came to an agreement that the Bill was to be taken up on Tuesday last, when those members who were interested in it were present and were ready to take it up. That day passed without the Bill being taken up,

and we are taking it up now at a very disadvantageous time. At the same time, the date of the session is such that it is rather difficult to make a protest, which would involve delay; but if there is any other business which the government have ready, I think they might go on with that.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I understand that the Bill has been pretty well threshed out between the legal members on both sides of the House, and after taking the committee stage to-day, my hon. friend, the Solicitor General, will be ready to leave the third reading of the Bill till Tuesday.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I understand that there was an agreement last night that this Bill was not to be taken up to-day.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No, quite the reverse.

Mr. **JAMES CLANCY** (Bothwell). Last night at the adjournment I requested that the Bill be not taken up to-day by reason of some members who take a great interest in the Bill being away, and I understood the hon. Solicitor General to assent to that.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). It is very desirable that we should have all the assistance we can upon a Bill of this kind; but a great many of the clauses which were held over are really acceptable to both sides of the House, because they are clauses which have been incorporated into this Bill from the Election Act, which has been in force for some time; and they are held over simply for the purpose of having certain explanations. If we come to an agreement on both sides that upon the motion for the third reading of the Bill any amendment may be brought up and discussed, we may make some progress. With reference to some of the amendments suggested by the hon. member for Montmorency, he and I have practically come to a conclusion. The other sections might be considered, and if there is any dispute about them, we might hold them over till the third reading.

Mr. **CLANCY**. That is another question. I understood the Solicitor General last night to assent to the proposition that the Bill should not be taken up to-day, for the reason I have given. The Bill is very general in its character, and this is a stage at which we can more conveniently and more quickly reach a conclusion on any matters which may be standing for solution. I hope the hon. Solicitor General will not insist on going on with the Bill, for while some suggestions were made, we do not know what they are.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. It seems to me that with the exception of the hon. member for Montmorency, we have here now practically all those who have taken any interest in the Bill.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) is not here, and the two members from New Brunswick, who took a special interest in it, Mr. Powell and Mr. McInerney, are neither of them here. But the main point seems to be that when a day is set for the consideration of a Bill, it ought to be taken up then, and if something else intervenes to prevent that, another day should be set. The hon. member for Montmorency informed me that he will be back here on Tuesday, and the government will be just as far ahead if they set the Election Bill for that day, and dispose of it then.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. It is desirable that this Bill should be sent to the Senate as early as possible. It has been put off two or three times at the suggestion of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. **A. B. INGRAM** (East Elgin). If it is determined to postpone the Bill till Tuesday, I would suggest that the amendments agreed upon by the Solicitor General and the hon. member for Montmorency be stated by the Solicitor General, so that we may consider them till Tuesday. I am satisfied that some of us from Ontario will not agree to some of the amendments proposed by the hon. member for Montmorency. They are too radical for us.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). There were quite a number of amendments suggested to certain clauses by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the Solicitor General reserved these to consider whether he would agree to the suggestions or not. It will take us all morning to get through with these clauses, without touching the suggested amendments of the hon. member for Montmorency. If we do not do that, it will take two days to get through with this Bill, if I can judge by the time spent upon it already.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I want it to be clearly understood that the fault is not with the opposition. We had agreed to take up the Bill on Tuesday, and we were ready to take it up then, but the government did not bring it on. The only point to consider now is, whether it is better to put the whole thing off till Tuesday and then go on with it till we finish it.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I would suggest that we go on, and if there is any clause which any hon. member desires to have stand, we might let it stand till Tuesday.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Has the Bill been reprinted with the amendments?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. No, not that I am aware of.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Then we are quite at sea. I do not see how we can consider an important Bill like this, with all these changes, without having it reprinted.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. When the Bill leaves this committee, that is the time to reprint it.

6. If a person declared ineligible by paragraph (a) or (b) of the next preceding section is nevertheless returned as a member, his election and return shall be null and void.

2. If a member of a provincial legislature, notwithstanding his disqualification as in the next preceding section mentioned, receives a majority of votes at an election, such majority of votes shall be thrown away, and the returning officer shall return the person having the next greatest number of votes, provided he is otherwise eligible.

R.S.C., c. 11, s. 11 ; c. 13, s. 2.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. This clause is exactly as it is in the old Act. It was held over at the request of the senior member for Halifax, who wanted to understand the reason for the difference between the disqualification in the first and second paragraphs, that is, why a person who is declared ineligible by paragraphs *a* and *b* for corrupt practices should be treated differently from a person who is a member of the provincial legislature. I do not see any reason for the distinction, but it has existed many years. The only reason probably is that a member of a provincial legislature would be publicly known as occupying a position which disqualifies him for a seat in the federal parliament.

On section 12.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. This section stood over because it was pointed out that paragraph *h*, which reads as follows :—

Persons who have been convicted of an offence under the provisions of the Criminal Code, 1892, or any amendment thereof.

Would disqualify a person who had been convicted simply of a common assault.

Mr. **CLANCY**. How few persons would know, in the appointing of those officers, what the Criminal Code means. I think we should not raise disqualifications unless it has been found in the past that a great evil exists. A man might be disqualified, under this section, for a very slight offence, such as a common assault.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. It would be very difficult to draft a clause to allow for that point without allowing for too much.

Mr. **INGRAM**. We should aim to have as good men as possible in these positions, and if a man has been guilty of a criminal offence he should be excluded.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I think we all agree upon the point. But the difficulty is to get some form of words that would distinguish those who have been guilty of serious offences from those who, while they have offended against the criminal law, have done nothing to bring a stigma upon their names. If

Mr. **CLANCY**.

a man has been merely guilty of a tu'penny-ha'penny assault, there is no real reason why he should be disqualified. But the difficulty is to frame the clause.

Mr. **J. G. H. BERGERON** (Beauharnois). I do not know whether it has been provided for, but I see that among those who are disqualified from being returning officers are members of the Queen's Privy Council, members of the House of Commons and so on, but I do not see that members of the North-west council are excluded.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. The Bill does not apply to the North-west Territories, as now amended. It was originally intended to apply, but that has been changed.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The Premier has promised to give representation in this parliament to the Yukon district. I think it would be well to put the members of the Yukon council on the same level as you do the members of the provincial government in this respect.

Mr. **NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN** (West Assiniboia). I venture to suggest that that would not be necessary, because this law as at present framed, could hardly be made applicable to the Yukon. When you wish to give that district representation you will have to do it specially, as you will need to do for the North-west Territories.

Mr. **A. McNEILL** (North Bruce). What has been decided with regard to this subsection 8, as to persons who have been convicted of an offence under the Criminal Code. I understand that it is not intended to exclude a man who may have been guilty merely of some petty offence.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. The effect of the Bill, as it stands, would be to exclude those to whom my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) referred. I, naturally, like to stand by the Bill as it is, but I would not object to amending it so as to cover the point raised. We might amend it to read :

Persons who have been convicted of an offence under the provisions of the Criminal Code, 1892, or any amendment thereof, punishable by more than two years of imprisonment.

As I say, I prefer to have the clause as it is than have it that way.

Mr. **McNEILL**. I would rather have it as it is than have it that way.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I am afraid, though the clause as it is seems objectionable, the amendment could be even more so.

Mr. **FOSTER**. It excludes persons who have been guilty of an offence under the provisions of the Criminal Code, 1892, or any amendment thereof. How far would that go back? If a man is convicted before 1892, would this cover his case?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, any offence against the criminal law. No, I think I am mistaken. It would be applicable to convictions before 1892.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no purging effect in the date 1892. This would admit a man who had been guilty of a most serious offence before 1892, but it would exclude even the least offender after that date.

Mr. BERGERON. Make it a 'criminal offence,' without mentioning the date.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The old fellows have pretty well died out.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How would it do to make it read 'persons who have been convicted of an indictable offence.' That would relieve the person charged with minor offences, which can be tried under summary conviction.

Mr. BERGERON. That is better.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I move that the section be amended to read 'persons who have been indicted of an indictable offence.'

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). If this were adopted, and yet one were to act as a returning officer who had been convicted of an indictable offence, what would be the result to the candidate?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It would have no results; it would not affect the candidate.

Mr. SPROULE. It would not affect the election?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the person so acting, though disqualified, be amenable to punishment?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, he would be punishable; and I am not sure that the person who would appoint such a man, with knowledge, would not be liable to the penalty also. But it will have no effect on the election.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond, N.S.) I would ask the attention of the Solicitor General to subsection g:

Persons who have been found guilty by the House of Commons or by any court for the trial of controverted elections or other competent tribunal, of any offence or dereliction of duty in violation of this Act or of the Act to disfranchise voters who have taken bribes, being chapter 14 of the Statutes of 1894.

I would like to know how the Solicitor General interprets that clause. Would persons that are proved guilty of a contravention of the electoral law in any province be disqualified under this section?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, he must have committed a violation of this Act.

Mr. GILLIES. I interpret it as the Solicitor General does, that these persons so disqualified under the local Act are not included in this section. I think the section should be enlarged so as to include any persons found guilty of violation of any provincial Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What the hon. gentleman means to say is that we should make the provisions of this section applicable to those who are disqualified by reason of some infringement of a local Act so declared by a provincial court.

Mr. GILLIES. Quite so.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This has been the law for a great many years, and I do not know of any special case which would justify us in making a new departure. The number of disqualifications covered by this Bill is already very considerable.

Mr. GILLIES. I know in my own province of persons having been fined \$200 or \$400 and disfranchised from voting for five years. Now, the provincial Act is just as sacred as any Act we are passing here, and why should not a disqualification under the provincial Act disqualify them under this Act?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That would be opening the door very wide.

Mr. GILLIES. The Act then would read in this way, for instance: 'Persons who have been found guilty by the House of Commons of having violated the Controverted Elections Act in any one of the provinces of Canada.' That would include that class of offenders who violate the provincial Acts.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My difficulty is not so much with the phraseology of the section which would be required to meet the point suggested, as with this aspect, that it might leave the provinces to determine that for a trifling infringement of the local election Act a man might be disqualified. It is wiser for us to keep control over these disqualifications.

Mr. McNEILL. I cannot take the view of the Solicitor General. After the discussion we have had on section 8 in the case of a man convicted of an offence so serious that he is disqualified by a law of the province in which he lives, to say that that man shall be permitted to act the part of a returning officer under this Act is, I think, going altogether too far. The hon. gentleman will scarcely suggest that the provincial authorities are likely to disqualify a man altogether unless he has been guilty of some offence that should disqualify him from acting as returning officer.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see any ground or principle upon which such a case should not be included. The government itself, in adopting the provincial basis, has justified the good sense of each provincial legislature.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would remind the hon. gentleman that while we accept their franchise we do not accept their disqualifications. We have made special provision against that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is evidence that this parliament had sufficient faith in the provincial legislatures to entrust them with the duty of saying who should be the electors for this house. We may safely assume that our provincial legislatures would not disqualify a person except for grave offences, in fact I think provincial legislatures are apt to be a little less strict on election matters than the Dominion parliament. But coming to facts, what a scandal it would be if you were not to preclude from this section a man who for an offence against the Franchise Act in a province had been convicted and disfranchised. I cannot see that there would be any harm at all, and I see there would be a great good if you would add such persons to the list of those who are disqualified.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I draw attention to the words 'dereliction of duty.' Don't you think we would be going very far if we were to include a man who has been guilty of dereliction of duty and violation of a local Act? We have not allowed in the past the provincial legislatures any right to disqualify.

Mr. FOSTER. There can be no conviction which would disqualify a man except it be a conviction in a province which arises out of due process of law. But what a terrible outrage it would be if these men who have been convicted under a local Act, in a local court, of these serious offences, should be allowed to act as returning officers for Dominion elections.

Mr. CLANCY. Independently of where the offences are committed, I presume the object of the subsection is to prevent undesirable persons from acting?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Those who have no regard for the Election Act ought not to be allowed to administer it.

Mr. CLANCY. Therefore, whether such an offence be committed in a local or Dominion election, it really makes no difference. They are undesirable persons in either case. The point seems to me an important one, and I think that such persons, no matter whether in Dominion or provincial elections, should be excluded.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the hon. Solicitor General will take that into consideration.

Mr McNEILL.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think we might make the exclusion applicable to persons guilty of offences under the local Acts.

Mr. INGRAM. The amendment should be drawn so that it would not only include persons who have been convicted, but persons who are liable to convictions.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You cannot do that.

Mr. INGRAM. In Ontario we know that several men have committed offences. There is no question about it. It has been proven, but no court has declared them guilty of the offence. How are you going to prevent these fellows from acting? What about Bole, for instance, a man who has not been convicted?

Mr. CAMPBELL. What about your returning officer in London?

Mr. INGRAM. What is the matter with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell). Does he want to have Bole up in his constituency?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) has been unjustly accusing Bole. I see by the morning papers that he is perfectly innocent. The *Citizen* says so.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries recognizes him.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How would this amendment meet the views of my hon. friend? Insert after the words 'in violation of this Act,' the words 'or of any offence in violation of a provincial Act relating to elections, conviction under which shall disqualify the person convicted from being so appointed for the purposes of a Dominion election'?

Mr. GILLIES. I would suggest to the hon. Solicitor General that it would be very much more simple and much clearer if the subsection were made to read as follows:

Persons who have been found guilty by the House of Commons, or by any court for the trial of controverted elections, in any of the provinces of Canada, etc.

That would cover the point in its entirety, and this Act would be applicable to all the provinces.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) will allow me to draw his attention to the section, he will see that his suggestion will not include all we want. If we adopt that suggestion, it will then read:

Persons who have been found guilty by the House of Commons, or by any court for the trial of controverted elections, in any province—

You omit the words 'or other competent tribunal,' because a man might be found guilty of an offence by a criminal court.

Mr. GILLIES. The words 'or other competent tribunal' would follow.

Mr. FOSTER. I have just been reading over the amendment proposed. The amendment reads as follows: 'or of any offence in violation of a provincial Act relating to elections.' Why not stop there? That covers it all.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I suppose the hon. gentleman will agree that I should adopt this amendment as it now stands, and if it is necessary to change the phraseology it may be done upon the third reading.

Mr. SPROULE. There might be a difficulty, inasmuch as the provincial Act does not prevent these parties from acting as deputy returning officers.

Mr. BERGERON. It would apply if they have been found guilty in any court of an offence against the Electoral Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. By an election court or a competent tribunal.

Mr. SPROULE. But there are cases in which a commission have, on the evidence presented to them, determined that these parties are guilty. They should have no right to act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What would be the extent of their commission?

Mr. SPROULE. A commission of inquiry have determined that these parties are guilty.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not know about the scope of their inquiry. Inasmuch as they are not in a position to mete out punishment, I do not think they would constitute a competent tribunal within the meaning of the section.

Mr. SPROULE. They are not in a position to mete out punishment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL moved:

That after the words 'in violation of this Act' in the 34th line, the following words be inserted: 'or of any offence in violation of a provincial Act relating to elections'

Motion agreed to.

On section 13.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester) moved:

That section 13 be reconsidered.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MORIN. The section reads as follows:

No person shall be appointed deputy returning officer or election clerk or poll clerk who is not a resident of the electoral district within which he is to act.

That part of it is all right. I would like to have added to it, that no person shall be appointed a deputy returning officer or election clerk unless he is twenty-one years of age and has the right to vote.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is a very good idea.

Mr. SPROULE. The words 'duly qualified elector' would cover it.

Mr. MORIN. The reason why I make this suggestion is that we had, in my election, in 1896, a young man acting who was only eighteen years of age, and who could administer the oath just like a justice of the peace. He had the right to swear voters, although he had no right to vote himself. He had no property. I think before a man has that power he should be an elector, instead of having boys and women meddling with elections.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I admit that it would be very undesirable to have ladies acting as deputy returning officers, but I can see no reason why, if a young man, eighteen years of age, is otherwise qualified, he should not be allowed to act as returning officer.

Mr. MORIN. He was not qualified; he was only eighteen years of age, and he never had a cent in his life.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. With us if a man is not twenty-one years of age he is not qualified.

Mr. MORIN. A man should be twenty-one years of age and own some property. This person was not twenty-one, and he owned no property.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. Solicitor General accept the words 'duly qualified elector'?

Mr. SPROULE. Why should he be there if he is not an elector of the district?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think this is as far as we can go conveniently at the present time. It seems to me we will be limiting it too much if he has to be twenty-one years of age and have property. Take the case of a law clerk.

Mr. SPROULE. He would not require to have property under our manhood suffrage, but he must be of a certain age.

Mr. FOSTER. What constitutes a resident?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. A man is a resident where he has his legal domicile.

On section 14.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I was requested on this clause to consider why a professor in a university, college, high school or academy should not be liable to act as returning officer. It is quite evident that it would be extremely inconvenient if such a gentleman were obliged to act.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they free to act?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They can do so if they wish, but there is no legal compulsion on them to accept.

On section 21,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I move that the following subsection be added :

The instructions referred to in subsection 1 of this section shall contain the forms of the oath referred to in sections 65, 66 and 68 of this Act, and in the case of returning officers in the province of Prince Edward Island, they shall be accompanied by the sections of the provincial law relating to the qualifications of voters.

Instead of allowing the matter to remain discretionary, as it is now, with the returning officer to amend the form of oath, this amendment provides that we shall prepare the form of oath beforehand, and that it shall form part of the instructions sent out to the deputy returning officers so as to take all the discretion away from them with reference to this oath. I think that meets the difficulty raised by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. INGRAM. You will include the form of oath in the schedule ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have not made up my mind as to that.

Mr. INGRAM. We must insist on that, because we are about to have courts of revision in the province of Ontario, and unless you have the form of oath you are working in the dark.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will see the inconvenience that would result from the adoption of his idea. The Act is one of general application necessarily, and the form of oath will be, to some extent, dependent upon the changes in the provincial law. If, therefore, we adopt a form of oath, the provincial law might change the form of oath to be used when the elections take place. Under the present system, the form of oath will be part of the instructions and can be varied at each election according to the provincial law.

Mr. INGRAM. That will occur for all time to come, so long as we have the present franchise law. The question of the oath is one of the most important things that comes up in the court of revision.

Mr. G. V. McINERNEY (Kent. N.B.) I would call the attention of the Solicitor General to what appears to be an anomaly in this clause, when you compare it with section 22 of the Act. In section 21, you order the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to transmit the list, and in section 22 you say that the officer shall get the lists from the custodian.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. For the purposes of an election there may be two custodians, namely, the Clerk of the Crown

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

in Chancery, to whom the lists have been transmitted by the local officers, but in the case of the lists that have not been transmitted, the local official who remains in possession of the lists will also be the legal custodian of that portion of the list that has not gone forward. I have amendments to sections 21 and 22, in connection with which I have had the advice and assistance of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and these amendments will, perhaps, meet the points raised by my hon. friend (Mr. McInerney).

Mr. A. C. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I wish to say that Mr. Martin, who had special charge of the amendments relating to Prince Edward Island, was not aware that the Bill was coming up this morning, and is not present.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The amendments were taken up ; we gave a whole day to them, and most of them were accepted.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The section is so amended that the form of oath for Prince Edward Island is sent out in the instructions to the returning officer, and the section is made applicable to the whole Dominion ; while the sections of the provincial Franchise Act are restricted in their application to Prince Edward Island. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), suggested that we ought to have the form of oath inserted in the schedule of the Act, because he said that for the purposes of revision it would be necessary to have it before the revising officer. As I understand the Ontario Act, the form of oath to be used for the purposes of revision is the form in the schedule to the provincial Act. The amendment which we will make to this Act will have no reference whatever to the revision.

Mr. INGRAM. But you will find that we have certain electors qualified under the Dominion Franchise Act who are disqualified under the provincial Act. If it is impossible to insert the oath in the Act so as to make it applicable to Prince Edward Island, I would suggest that you might meet the case of the province of Ontario, by inserting the oath of the election law of the province, with such changes as are necessary to make it applicable to Dominion elections.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The trouble about that is, that the form of oath might be changed at the next session of the local legislature.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you will have to call a special session of this parliament to change your law accordingly.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think it will be a sufficient safeguard to have the form of oath issued in the instructions to

the returning officers, under the sanction of the Governor General.

**Mr. CLANCY.** There seems to me to be no reason why we should give any power of legislation to the Department of Justice. If we place in their hands the form of oaths and so on, we practically to that extent give them the power of certain classes of legislation. I do not think that should be done. I think we ought to know what the oaths are. It is a grave thing to say that the legislature may change these in a year; but it is not so grave as to take the other view. So far as the province of Ontario is concerned, I feel very strongly that these forms of oaths should become part of the schedule of the Act, and I hope my hon. friend will consent to that.

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** As the Bill was introduced, it provided that the provincial form of oaths, with certain changes, should be made applicable to elections for the House of Commons. Objection was made to that, that it was impossible to leave it discretionary with the deputy returning officers to make those changes. In order to meet that objection, which was a good objection, it is provided that the form of oaths shall be prepared under the sanction of the Governor General in Council, and be made part of the instructions to be issued to the returning officers. That is the amendment suggested. My hon. friend is not satisfied with that, and suggests that the form of oaths should be made part of the schedule to this Act. If we do that, you will have incorporated into this Act a form of oath which may be changed before the election takes place; that is the difficulty. My hon. friend has this guarantee, that the form of oath is not to be changed at the discretion of the Minister of Justice, or the Department of Justice—I quite admit that he has no right to have any confidence in that department—but it is to be prepared under the sanction of the Governor in Council who already, under the law, as we have had it in force for many years, has the right to draft the instructions to the deputy returning officers. He has already got the right to go so far as to draft the instructions which are to be sent to the returning officer, and this simply gives him the right to re-draft the forms of oath in force in any province, so as to make them applicable to Dominion elections.

**Mr. CLANCY.** It is absolutely necessary that the people should be acquainted with the form of oath, and that it should not be thrust into the hands of the election officers at the last moment.

**Mr. McINERNEY.** I agree with my hon. friend. It is quite elementary that in an Act of this importance the form should be included in the Act.

**Mr. E. COCHRANE** (East Northumberland). It appears to me that it would be a

dangerous thing to have the form of oath changed and no one know anything about it until the instructions are given the returning officer.

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** The oaths to be used are, with the exceptions of those in the schedule of our own Acts, those already in force in the provinces and which are accessible to every one. The change is to be limited to the form of the oath so as to make it applicable to the Dominion election, but the substance remains the same. It is inconceivable that any change would be made as would have the effect of altering the substance.

**Mr. COCHRANE.** Why not put a clause in the Act making the provincial oath applicable to the Dominion election?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** We have done that, but we are giving power to make certain changes in the form.

**Mr. McNEILL.** This is an evidence of the confusion in which we involve ourselves by giving away our franchise. However, I suppose that is past praying for. What I would suggest is that we should adhere to the form of oath which is prescribed by the provincial authority at the time of the passing of this Act; and, if any change be made, let us change our Act. Let them dictate to us—we are their humble servants now with regard to our franchise.

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** I understand the hon. gentleman to say that we should approve a form of oath and make that part of the Act, and that form should remain in force until we amend it following an amendment by the provincial legislature. But if we adopt a form of oath and a session of the legislature is held during which an amendment is made to the Election Act and the form of oath is modified, and there is no session of the Dominion parliament before an election to modify our schedule, what position should we be in then?

**Mr. McNEILL.** My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) knows as well as I do that the whole thing is in confusion; but the way I suggested seems the simplest way out of the difficulty. He will see the great weight of objection raised to the other suggestion, namely, that we should not have a form of vote in the schedule, but should use that established by the province from time to time. The result would be, as my hon. friend will see, that the party that happened to be in power at the time would have the advantage of knowing beforehand what the alteration in the form of oath would be. I quite see that there are objections to the suggestion I made, but it is, after all, a case of weighing objections and determining which proposition is the least objectionable. It seems to me that the objections are more serious in importance to

the proposal that the deputy returning officer should be aware and the electors should not be aware until the very last moment as to what the change had been. That is a much greater objection than the objection that our oath would differ for the time being from that provided by the provincial legislature.

**Mr. CLANCY.** I am not going to enter into a discussion of the wisdom or unwisdom of adopting the franchise of the province. We must simply try to meet the difficulties as well as we can. Here is the point I wish to have explained. We adopt the provincial franchise, which, in Ontario has as one qualification, residence in the district. Suppose a person lives outside the electoral district of Bothwell as it is for the Dominion purposes, but within the provincial electoral district, can he vote under that oath?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** The words to be construed are those in the oath under which the voter swears he is a resident 'in this electoral district.' That would be the district for Dominion purposes.

**Mr. CLANCY.** We cannot consider alone the oath a voter takes upon election day, but we must remember also the machinery we have for placing voters upon the list. Take the case of a man placed upon the list and resident in a municipality, he moves from one place to another in the same local electoral district, but out of the same Dominion electoral district. Now, this man had a right to vote in the local election, and the question comes up now, after he has become disqualified, if we are to carry out the essence of the local franchise Act, whether he could still vote in the local, but we want to prevent him from voting in the Dominion, because he is not in the same electoral district for the Dominion. The oath does not meet that case, nor does the Act meet it. I would ask the Solicitor General to let that section stand until three o'clock, so that we may be able to give it further consideration.

It being One o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at Three o'clock.

On section 21,

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.** The question is on the amendment of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick).

**Mr. CLANCY.** I desire to make clear what my contention is. In the first place, we must keep in sight entirely the Ontario Franchise Act and all the machinery leading up to the preparation of the voters' lists, and finally, to the voter voting. We have no Dominion voters' lists in any shape or form. We have no Dominion franchise in any shape or form under the authority of any Act of this House. Therefore, we must be

entirely guided by the rights of voters under the provincial franchise. Now, the voter comes up to vote and his right to vote depends not upon any Act of this House by an oath or otherwise, but, as complying entirely with the provisions of the Ontario franchise. I am speaking entirely from the point of view of the layman, but it seems to me that no oath prescribed by this House can alter his status as a voter at Dominion or provincial elections. What is the essence of the voter's right to vote? First, to be placed on the assessment roll, next, to be placed on the voters' list, and next to vote at a provincial election. All these Acts must be read one into the other and must be read as one Act, although they may be separate in many instances. If that be the case, if he complies by way of residence with the spirit of the local franchise Act, if he fulfils all the conditions of the local Act, then, no oath by the mere fact of his being a resident of another electoral district for the Dominion, but which is within the electoral district for which he is entitled to vote under the provincial Franchise Act, will prevent his right of voting at any election either for the Dominion, which has adopted that franchise, or the local. It seems to me to be perfectly plain that any person who is on the voters' list and is still a resident of the electoral district under the authority of the Ontario Franchise Act cannot, by an oath be prevented from coming forward and voting. What is the oath? The oath is that he is a resident within the electoral district. What is the meaning of the oath? The meaning of the oath, based on the franchise of the province, is, that he is within that electoral district for the province and nothing else. It can have no other meaning. You may read another meaning into it, but it is only reading a meaning into it. I take it that the Election Act has absolutely nothing to do with a man's right to vote. That is entirely to regulate other matters. But, when the voter is on the list and is still in the electoral district for local purposes no oath will alter his condition as a voter at either a provincial or a Dominion election, the Dominion having accepted and adopted the provincial franchise as the franchise for the Dominion. We have no franchise for the Dominion except by adoption. We have a franchise for the local, and it must be a condition of every man's right to vote under local existing circumstances that the local Act cannot be altered in the slightest sense for the Dominion. Take the case of where a man has complied with every condition and has voted at a provincial election. He is met with the oath and told: You cannot vote at a Dominion election because you do not live in the electoral district. His answer is: I have not altered any of the conditions affecting my right to vote. You have adopted the franchise of the province and you have not in any way altered my status as

**Mr. McNEILL.**

a voter. My condition has not been changed in any sense whatever, and if I have a right to vote in provincial elections, then, by the mere adoption of the Act, you have not altered my status and I have still a right to vote. If we are going to alter it to suit all the conditions, let us make it perfectly plain what the conditions of the voter are. There is no doubt, in my opinion, and it is only the opinion of a layman, that, if a man has the right to vote, the mere adoption of the Franchise Act, simply changing the oath to suit each electoral district, does not alter the status of the voter, and he has still a right to vote.

Mr. SPROULE. As I interpret it, it would mean that the electoral district mentioned in the oath for a Dominion election would mean the electoral district for an election to the House of Commons, while the electoral district mentioned in the oath for a local election would mean the electoral district for a local election.

Mr. CLANCY. No, no.

Mr. SPROULE. Although these are the same words, but coming from a different source, they must be applied to the sort of election which is being held.

Mr. CLANCY. The elector is deprived of his vote. He is still in the electoral district for the local. Surely it is not the intention of the Act to disfranchise the voter. From the fact that it has remained part of the local electoral district under the franchise which you adopt you cannot alter the status of the voter. If the voter has a right to vote at a local election he still has a right to vote at some election. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) catches the point I am endeavouring to make, that you cannot and do not change the status of the voter. He still remains and has complied with every condition of the franchise you are adopting. You are taking away his right, which is not the intention of the Act you are adopting. You are running at cross purposes when you are adopting that Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand that you are speaking in regard to revising the voters' lists?

Mr. CLANCY. No, that is another thing.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, at an election for either House I do not see why the words would not apply to the electoral district in which the party is voting.

Mr. INGRAM. We have an explanatory clause at the beginning of the Bill, which describes the meaning of the words 'electoral district,' as follows:

The expression 'electoral district' means any place or territorial area in Canada entitled to return a member to serve in the House of Commons.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) does not catch my point at all.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman will give me time I will explain it. The hon. gentleman says that you are taking away the status of the voter. Nothing of the kind. If the elector has the right to vote in Ontario he must be a resident of the electoral district.

Mr. CLANCY. It says that he must be, and the meaning of it is that he is, a resident of the local and not of the Dominion.

Mr. INGRAM. It means that he must be under the Dominion Elections Act and under the Dominion Franchise Act, applying to the province of Ontario, for instance, he must possess the qualification of being a resident of the electoral district. It is perfectly plain to me, and if a man moves from one municipality which is in the electoral district to another, but outside of the Dominion electoral district, he disfranchises himself. We do not disfranchise him. He disfranchises himself under the law.

Mr. WALLACE. Suppose he remains in the same Dominion election district?

Mr. INGRAM. Then, he is entitled to vote. He still continues to be a resident of the electoral district. For the life of me I cannot see how you can make it plainer than it is.

Mr. CLANCY. Let me suggest a case. Suppose he moves out of the local electoral district he could vote neither in the Dominion nor local election.

Mr. INGRAM. That is right.

Mr. CLANCY. If that be so, it is because he has violated, not the Dominion Act, but the local Act that we adopt and which we cannot change so long as we adopt it.

Mr. INGRAM. We are incorporating in this Dominion Act all the conditions that apply to a voter who comes forward to vote in a local election. We ask him in the oath if he has been continuously a resident in the electoral district and if he is now a resident in the electoral district. It is the same oath as in Ontario, and what more could we do?

Mr. CLANCY. I am not cavilling about the oath at all, but about the right of the voter to vote. I have not evidently been able to make myself clear. It is perfectly apparent that for the reason that he has not changed his condition in the least he should be entitled to vote.

Mr. INGRAM. Has he not moved from one municipality to another?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, but he is still within the electoral district that entitles him to vote. We are not pretending to give him

a vote. All that we do is to adopt such rights as he has under the Ontario Act, and which he will have under our own Act. We ought to settle that question now one way or the other.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this amendment be adopted?

Mr. CLANCY. No, no; we cannot rush this.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) will agree with me that there is no possible chance for rushing anything.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said, the Ontario franchise is residential manhood suffrage, subject to registration. If he is on the electoral list, he must in addition prove that he is a resident if he is challenged. If between the time that the electoral list is prepared and the polling day he moves into another district, he disqualifies himself from voting by his own act. He has no more rights under the Federal than he has under the local law, his position being absolutely the same in both cases. I cannot possibly explain it better than my hon. friend from Grey has done.

Mr. CLANCY. The Solicitor General is too good a lawyer not to see my point. My right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, I am sure, sees it. If we adopt the local franchise for the Federal elections, the man must be deprived of his vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Residence is an essential to his right to vote, and if he has no residence in the electoral district for the Dominion he has no more right to vote there than he would have in a local election.

Mr. CLANCY. But the man has not moved in any sense that affected his right to vote in the local. He has not invalidated his right to vote in the provincial elections because he still remains in the local electoral district.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then he has the right to vote.

Mr. CLANCY. Then you are altering his right to the franchise.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You do not.

Mr. CLANCY. You do by the oath.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not at all.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose a man leaves one municipality that is within the electoral district, and his name is left on the list, and he goes to another in time for the court of revision, and is placed on the voters' list there, would not that give him the right to vote as a resident?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) appealed to me a moment ago if I did not see the point he makes. But it is plain that both sides of the House are against him, and therefore, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) might be satisfied that he is wrong and that the others are right.

Mr. CLANCY. I am perfectly certain that there will be a good deal of confusion as to the right of the voter in the case I have mentioned.

Mr. WALLACE. I would ask the Solicitor General whether he has made provision for the vote of the volunteers in South Africa.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Their absence will not affect their position. If they are on the list they will be entitled to vote.

Mr. WALLACE. I am quite sure that I am safe in saying that there are several hundreds of the volunteers who have come of age since they went to South Africa.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. At the suggestion of the member for West Elgin (Mr. Ingram), the provision is made that those who were qualified to vote, and who were on the list, will not be disqualified by reason of their being absent in South Africa.

Mr. WALLACE. But I am putting another question altogether. I am asking: Will those who have come of age since they went away and who, if they had been here would have been qualified to vote; will they be qualified to vote in the Dominion elections?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If they are on the list they have the right to vote. But if they are not on the list, then as it now stands, they would not have the right to vote.

Mr. WALLACE. But I say they are not on the list, and cannot be.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are absolutely in the same position as any other resident in Canada.

Mr. WALLACE. Take the case of my own son, and I know that hundreds of others are in the same position. He came of age on the 7th of May, 1900, and he cannot be put on the voters' list because he is not in Canada. What are you going to do in a case like that?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) to mean, that assuming the case of a man who was not qualified by reason of his age to vote at the time he left the country for South Africa, but becomes qualified during his absence, and not being a resident, an application cannot be made for him to be put on the list. That is the difficulty. That difficulty has not been considered, but it is

proper to consider it. When the Bill is taken up again, I will be able to say what I shall do in that case. The provision now in contemplation is, that those now in South Africa who are qualified to vote shall not have their right to vote impaired by reason of their absence. This difficulty occurs to my mind with reference to the making of the provincial list. We cannot, by our legislation, say who shall have a right to vote under the provincial laws. For instance, if the provincial law requires that a man must be a resident in order to vote, we cannot say that if a man is not a resident he has a right to be put on the list.

Mr. WALLACE. You have done that in other cases. You have declared that men who are not eligible by the local laws shall be eligible to be put on the Dominion list. Therefore, having established the principle that you are not bound by the franchises of the provinces, but may add other names, I say you should follow the same principle in this case with reference to those who are away in South Africa and would have acquired the right, if they were here, to have their names put on. I am sure there are hundreds who will come under this description, and they are of the very class of young men who should not be disfranchised.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The very objection which the Solicitor General has expressed in regard to the power of this parliament to enact legislation to overcome the difficulty indicates the great inconvenience of the federal parliament having its franchise in the hands of the local legislatures. The case which has been referred to is that of a man who, under the sanction of the federal government, has gone to South Africa to fight the battles of the empire; and the hon. gentleman says, very properly, that having handed over our lists to the local legislatures, we are not able to tell them who shall or shall not be put on those lists. If we had kept the matter in our own hands, we could have provided that the men who are fighting in South Africa, and who are qualified to the fullest extent, should be put on the list of voters. But now, the franchise having been handed over to the local legislatures, they dictate to us who are to be put on our lists and who are not to be put on. I think it is one of the great inconveniences and objections to the system which has been adopted.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend has not overlooked the fact that this inconvenience existed from the time of confederation up to 1885, and also in the most intense form at the last general election, when we voted on lists four years old.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They were our own lists.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. However imperfect they were, we recognized the baby. I presume.

Mr. WALLACE. My attention has been called to the first section of Bill No. 8, proposed by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram). I think that would exactly cover the case. Is there any objection to incorporate that in this Bill?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That matter has been considerably discussed between the hon. member for East Elgin and the Department of Justice, and we have come to the conclusion that we must make provision for those in South Africa who have the right to vote, so far as their absence disqualifies them from voting; but, the difficulty which we have not been able to cover is, the right to put on the local list those who have not the right to vote under the local law.

Mr. WALLACE. I think section 1 of the Bill of the hon. member for East Elgin covers both cases.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is my hon. friend aware whether any change has been made in the provincial Acts in that respect? Of course, it would be much more convenient to have that provision made in the law relating to registration than in this law. In my own province we had to consider cases of a similar character, and I remember devising a clause for our provincial Act, which was afterwards incorporated in the Dominion Franchise Act, providing that wherever residence is a matter of importance, the time spent by mariners or fishermen at their occupation away from home or by students at institutions should be counted. I suggested that that provision should be extended to the men in South Africa, and possibly it has been done in my own province. I do not know whether or not it has been done in the province of Ontario.

Mr. WALLACE. It was not.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When we reach the clause bearing on that point, we will consider the suggestion of the hon. member for West York.

On section 32,

Mr. A. MARTIN (East Queen's, P.E.I.) I wish to call attention to sections 19 and 20. The Solicitor General and the Minister of Marine have laid it down that under this Act there is a fine imposed for any wilful act or omission in violation of it, but there are certain protections thrown around the voter in the Prince Edward Island Act which are not provided in this measure, and which will not be in force unless we make this measure extend to certain clauses in the Prince Edward Island law. For instance, in that law there is a provision preventing the returning officer from allowing any one to interrupt the polling by addressing the electors or by any other mode of proceeding. I would suggest that after the word 'Act' in section 19, the following words be added:

'Or in the Prince Edward Island of the provincial law.' That would punish the election official who refused and neglected to perform, not only any of the obligations required of him by this Act, but also required of him by the Prince Edward Island law.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I considered carefully what my hon. friend has said. These suggestions were adopted some time ago, and I would not like to change them now. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should propose his amendment on the third reading and we then would consider it. By this measure we do not pretend to adopt all the provisions of every provincial Act, but only such provisions as are necessary in consequence of our having adopted the provincial franchises.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) I would like to bring before the House a point with regard to the difference between the provincial lists and federal lists. In some portions of British Columbia, and I believe in some other parts of the Dominion, the boundaries of the provincial electoral districts do not coincide with those of the Dominion electoral districts. In my constituency, for instance, the lines cut off two or three corners of different provincial districts. Who has the authority to make up the lists according to the residence of the voters? When I get my lists, I find that they include the names of hundreds of men who are not in my constituency, though they properly appear on the provincial list. I suppose other gentlemen have the same condition of things in their constituencies.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The returning officer, under section 8 of the Franchise Act, will, in that case, get from the local authorities the lists and divide them according to the constituencies for Dominion purposes.

Mr. PRIOR. But, if that was left to the returning officer, it would be done only a day or two before the election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He has to do it immediately. This question has been discussed at length. It is the law now, under section 8 of the Franchise Act, passed two years ago.

On section 23,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When we last considered this clause, it was decided that we should make an amendment to provide that no polling division should contain, if practicable, more than 200 voters. I propose to add to the section, that 'so far as possible, no polling divisions shall contain more than 200 electors.'

Mr. McINERNEY. Does not the Franchise Act make it 300?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Section 7 of the Franchise Act provides that there

Mr. MARTIN.

shall not be more than 300, or less than 200. I think perhaps it would be better to follow the language of that Act. I move that after the words 'Dominion election,' in the 38th line, the following words be added: 'as far as possible no polling division shall contain more than 300, and, when practicable, not less than 200 qualified electors' names.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). In the last Scott Act election that took place in New Brunswick, there was an enormous amount of trouble as to the polling divisions. In some there were as many as a thousand votes. The Liberal papers, such as the *Transcript* were much stronger in their denunciations than Conservative papers. Under the law as it stood before the Franchise Act—I think it was Mr. Blake who had to do with it—the sheriff divided the electoral list territorially into small sections. That did not work too badly. Under the local Franchise Act, the sheriff grouped them together in a district, and that could be done without very much trouble. But, when there are a thousand votes to be polled in one polling place, it is often very riotous, particularly when there is a good deal of drinking going on.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Have you polling divisions under provincial statute?

Mr. POWELL. Some polls are practically the whole parish. In some cases they are subdivided. In Sackville, for instance, there are two polling subdivisions, one with about 900 and the other with about 200.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Powell) remembers that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) drafted section 7, especially to meet the New Brunswick case, and I understood that it was drafted in accordance with the provisions of the local Act.

Mr. POWELL. It was, but in the last Scott Act election, it was very bad. I do not wish to take up time, but if it could be done without too much trouble, I would be glad to see an amendment in that respect.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would suggest that my hon. friend draft an amendment to meet the point, so that we may see exactly what he proposes.

Mr. McINERNEY. Is there a time fixed within which the returning officer has to make the divisions provided for under this section?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. 'Forthwith,' is the term used.

Mr. McINERNEY. Has he to put them in his proclamation?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will look at section 24, subsection c, and also the form 'E,' he will see how that is provided for.

On section 24,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In order to make the point taken by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., (Mr. Costigan) clear, I propose to add after the word 'him' in subsection c these words: 'Including those fixed under the next preceding section.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. INGRAM. Considerable discussion has taken place as to the propriety of creating half a holiday on Dominion election day so that working men generally may have an opportunity to go up and vote. One reason for this amendment is to prevent intimidation as far as possible, and in the next place, to give all electors an opportunity of voting. I presume in case of a half holiday being provided for it would have to be done by proclamation by the Governor General in Council. I would propose an amendment to read like this:

Declaration of a half holiday on said day where a poll is demanded.

I have an amendment to amend form 'E' of the schedule as follows:

In case a poll should be demanded there shall be a half holiday in the forenoon of said polling day in accordance with a proclamation to be issued by His Excellency the Governor General regarding the same, and all persons shall govern themselves accordingly.

One advantage of adopting this half holiday would be to prevent personation. We all know that personation is indulged in more in the forenoon than it is in the afternoon, for the reason that workmen go to their work in the morning at seven o'clock, and usually do not get an opportunity of voting until the noon hour. Personators make a practise of personating that class of electors in the forenoon because the advantages are greater than in the afternoon. I have no objection to making a full holiday on election day, if that is thought desirable, but at least I desire to see a half holiday proclaimed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. From my standpoint I do not think it is desirable to have a holiday on election day, that is a whole day. I would point out that an amendment has been suggested by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) to section 52, that in all cities and towns having a population of 10,000 and over, the poll should be open at seven o'clock in the morning. My intention is not to go quite so far as the member for Montmorency, but to make a provision that the polls should be open at eight o'clock in the morning, and by that means give the workmen an opportunity of voting in the morning. We can consider that question when we reach section 52, but certainly at present I do not think that we can give a half holiday. It would cause an interference in arrangement between the employer and his employees.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think that the evils the Solicitor General fears are likely to occur. In the province of Ontario we have the civic elections all over the province on New Year's Day, which is a public holiday, and no trouble has ever arisen therefrom. On the contrary it is on that day that the largest vote is polled. I would strongly urge, not a whole holiday, but at least that some part of the day should be given up during which every voter should be free and independent of his employers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Do you propose that he should be paid for that time?

Mr. WALLACE. I am not so particular about that. My idea would be that the day's work for all classes should end, say, at two o'clock in the afternoon, and that the rest of the day should constitute a full day's work.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The difficulty there is that we would be interfering with contracts in the provinces. Of course I recognize that we have a right to declare a holiday.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But why compel a master to pay men for hours that they do not work? That is the point.

Mr. WALLACE. Then let the day's work end at two o'clock, and let the question of compensation be adjudicated upon in other ways. I think it is of the utmost importance that the elector should have the privilege of voting freely on that day and should be given sufficient opportunity to do so. Every one in this parliament has had experience of the difficulty of getting men out to vote. In some cases this difficulty is with the employer, and in other cases the employee has difficulty in getting away from his work where, perhaps, he has charge of running machinery. It is inconvenient to workmen to rush them all up to vote between the hours of twelve and one. One hour is little enough for a man to get his dinner. There is always a great difficulty, and I say that we should fix some hours in the day. I am not particular which hours are selected, but it looks to me as if from two o'clock to six o'clock would be the most convenient time for electors, and the most suitable for business, workmen losing as little time as possible in order to record their votes. I would strongly urge the necessity of setting apart some time when men could stop work, and go and record their votes. It is necessary that something should be done. The evils are growing year after year. With such a large amount of machinery, men cannot leave their machines long enough to go out and vote. A large number of people say: We cannot let our men go out. The men, perhaps, are on the other side of politics from their

employers. Every member of parliament has met with these difficulties, and we would be acting not only in our interest, but in the interest of the free and independent electors of the country, by affording them some opportunity for recording their votes. This is not a party measure, because it works both ways. I think it is a very great satisfaction to every member of parliament to know that every vote in his constituency has been recorded, or that the employees in his constituency have been given an opportunity of going out and recording their votes. We are legislating on this very matter, and here is a way to meet the difficulty which has been an acknowledged difficulty, which has been one of the great troubles of members of parliament, candidates and organizations, because they have been unable to bring out the vote on election day, owing to the inability of men to get away from their employments. Let us set apart a time, say four hours during which no employer or combination of any kind shall prevent an elector from recording his vote and doing his duty. It is a solemn duty that I think every person should be compelled to perform. I almost believe in compulsory voting. When you confine the franchise to a quarter or one-fifth of the population you should compel them to perform their duty. You have declared that it is the duty of every man to record his vote, and you have given him facilities for doing so, but you have stopped short of giving him an opportunity of getting out to record his vote without being under the thralldom and control of his employer or any other controlling influence. The employer has no right to prevent any man from having an opportunity of walking up to the polls and recording his vote.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I agree with a good deal that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has said, and I suppose most of the committee would like to attain the object he has in view. But, there are difficulties, some of which are inherent to the subject-matter, and the others arise out of our constitutional limitations which surround this subject, and which make it somewhat difficult equitably to carry out this idea. The idea of compulsory voting is one which deserves consideration, but the idea of compulsory idleness, and of compelling tens of thousands of workmen to remain idle for half a day is a different thing. If the hon. gentleman says that he does not propose to compel them to remain idle, but that he proposes to compel the masters to pay them when they are idle, then, he is infringing a provincial law.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not propose to do that.

Mr. WALLACE.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Then, if the hon. gentleman proposes to compel the workmen to remain idle without pay, he will find a mighty protest coming from the workmen of this country who cannot afford to give up half a day and lounge around the streets.

Mr. WALLACE. Let them work from seven in the morning until two in the afternoon. There is no half day lost then. They are working seven hours out of the nine hours that constitute a day's work, and therefore, there would not be more than a quarter of a day lost.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. You have not the power in this parliament to declare what shall be a day's work. In so far as anything incidentally necessary to voting is concerned, we have the power to legislate upon that. But, when you propose to say that a man shall not work for half a day, and that he shall be paid, you are infringing on a provincial law. Now, there is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says in regard to the desirability of workmen having an opportunity to record their votes, but, I think that might be better considered when we come to take up the suggestion of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). The idea is to so fix the polling hours that a workman shall have the right and privilege of going up and polling his vote without interfering with his hours of labour. We do not want to compel any man to remain idle, and we do not want to compel the master to pay him when he is idle. If you compel the workman to remain idle, or if you compel the master to pay him when he is idle, you will do an injustice to either one or the other, which I do not think this parliament would be willing to do. I think, when we consider the amendment of the hon. member for Montmorency, because this difficulty only applies to large cities, we can meet the situation.

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot see that we are compelling workmen to remain idle or that we are compelling the employer to pay them if there is a proclamation issued that there shall be a half holiday. There are many shops and factories that would not close up because employers and men would mutually agree that the men should have time to go out and vote. I have known, in some cases, manufacturers to close up their works for a few minutes and say to the men: Go out and vote, and then come back to work. The idea of the proposal before the committee is to compel employers who will not allow their employees to go out and vote because they will vote against their personal interest, to have an opportunity of going to the polls. If the government declares a half holiday, and any employee wishes to go out and

vote, he may do so. I do not say for a moment that we should compel the employer to pay the workman when he is idle, and I do not think that the workman would want anything of the kind.

Mr. PRIOR. Is there not a penalty now applicable to an employer who prevents his employee from voting?

Mr. INGRAM. There is, but it is disregarded.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The proposition is to declare a half holiday, the workman losing his pay?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, if he wishes it.

Mr. POWELL. Declaring a public holiday would not help the thing at all. It is not bound to be observed. It has only to be observed by public officials, but it would not interfere with private contracts between employer and employee.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). There has been a pretty general feeling expressed that there should be some definite free time provided in which men could poll their votes. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has given notice of an amendment providing for the opening of the polls at seven o'clock in the morning. I have also on the Notice paper an amendment proposing to extend the hour of voting in cities of ten thousand and over, to eight o'clock in the evening. We are both trying to get at the same result, to get some free time on election day. Opening of the poll at seven o'clock, as the hon. member for Montmorency proposes, or at eight o'clock as the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) proposes, does not give the required freedom. I do not think it would be advisable even because it would be completely unnecessary to open the poll at such an hour in the morning as either of these suggested. It seems to me that the object would be better accomplished by extending the hours of polling in cities of over 10,000 to eight o'clock in the evening, the same as is done in Great Britain. It appears to me that the suggestion for a half holiday is far better than either of these proposed amendments. I do not think the morning would be the preferable time to make the half holiday, because it is the hardest time to get it observed. But when the Governor General or the lieutenant-governors in this country proclaim a holiday, I have noticed they are pretty generally observed, and I believe that would be sufficient. I am sure that such a half holiday would be well observed at first, and afterwards it would be as generally observed as our half holidays usually are. That is as much as I expect to get. There are some places where employers do not want to give their men an opportunity to vote, and if a half holiday were proclaimed,

their intention would be obvious. If the employer refused to give the half holiday under such circumstances, it would make the employer's object very plain, and not many men would like to be known as doing such a thing as that. I believe we should include in the Act that a half holiday should be given on election day. If we cannot get that, the amendment to extend the hours to eight p.m. will, in my opinion, be better than to extend the hours in the morning.

Mr. FIRMAN McCLURE (Colchester). I would be inclined to agree with the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), that workmen should have an opportunity to vote in the evening, but from my knowledge of the conduct of elections in the maritime provinces, I would not be in favour of a half holiday on election day. I do not think there is any grievance there, as to people not having an opportunity to vote. My experience is that on election day, in our villages and towns, very good order is observed, and I am afraid that might not be so if a half holiday were declared. I think the evils resultant from a half holiday would be greater than the benefits that would be conferred.

Mr. A. T. WOOD (Hamilton). I am opposed to anything in the shape of a half holiday on election day. The fact of the matter is, that in large cities, such as I have the honour to represent—

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that?

Mr. WOOD. The hon. gentleman knows it very well. He has spent many a happy day there, but, perhaps, he would not be so cordially received now. As a matter of fact, there is scarcely any manufacturer in Hamilton who is not quite willing to allow his men the right to vote, but, to stop the whole machinery of all our works for a day would be a great inconvenience. I presume the matter could be arranged in some different way than by shutting down the machinery in all our large manufactories in the Dominion. In my opinion, it would be a great mistake to have a half holiday on election day.

Mr. WALLACE. I am surprised to find from all parts of the House such objections to the stoppage of mere machinery. Election day takes place once every five years.

Mr. McCLURE. The by-elections may take place every year.

Mr. WALLACE. My contention is, that if a man works until two o'clock in the afternoon, he has performed, we will say, seven hours work, and that might be regarded as a day's work, which in the ordinary course would be ten hours. To say that three hours less than an ordinary day would interfere with the manufactories of the country once in five years, so as to let the citizens of Canada perform their most sacred duty of voting, is, to my mind, absurd. The Liberals contend that if the full

vote of the people were given they could swamp the Tories, and we on this side contend that if the full vote were polled the Liberals would have no chance to be in power. Therefore, both political parties must be in favour of the idea of getting out the full vote, and there is no political reason opposed to the proposition now before the House. Some people go so far as to say it should be compulsory to vote, and if we provide that every voter shall have an opportunity to vote and discharge his solemn duty, I do not see what objection there can be to it. We who have run elections know the difficulty there is to get men to leave their work in order to go to the polls, and if we give them an opportunity of doing so, I do not see how any one can object to it.

Mr. G. R. MAXWELL (Burrard). We can all agree with the hon. member (Mr. Wallace) that we should do everything in our power to get the full vote polled. I will give my own experience. In 1896, there was a pretty general feeling among the manufacturers of this country that the success of the Liberal party would be detrimental to their interests, and the fact that many manufacturers were opposed to their Liberal employees voting was one of the difficulties I had to contend with. I, therefore, sympathize very strongly with the proposition to give the workingmen a full and free right to record their votes. At the last provincial elections in British Columbia the poll opened at eight in the morning and closed at eight in the afternoon, and so far as I have heard, that gave every satisfaction to the workingmen. I think I am right in saying that the workingmen of British Columbia polled a larger vote than they ever polled before in that province.

On section 38,

Mr. INGRAM. This has to do with the withdrawal of a candidate. I suggest that that be amended by providing that the candidate shall have forty-eight hours after his nomination within which to withdraw. I see no good reason why a man should go to the polls when he has not the slightest idea of winning the election. If he intends to withdraw, every person should know it within forty-eight hours after the nomination, and the country should not be put to the expense of printing ballot papers, etc., just for the fun of the thing.

On section 41,

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to know whether it is proposed to furnish the candidates with copies of the Act and instructions, as well as the officers. I think the candidates should be supplied as well as the officers.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that each candidate is to be supplied with twenty copies of the electoral list. Does that apply

Mr. WALLACE.

also to the registration list, which is not returned until the eve of the election?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If the lists were prepared in time, of course, the candidates would be entitled to them. The Franchise Act provides that copies of the electoral lists shall be furnished to each candidate.

Mr. INGRAM. Take a constituency in which there is a city with registration, while outside of the city there is none. Does the government furnish twenty copies of the registration list as well as the electoral list outside?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not find provision for the point raised by the hon. gentleman.

On section 48.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I want to draw attention to an amendment suggested by my hon. friend from Montmorency. He suggested that section 48 be amended by adding thereto:

The ballot papers shall be bound or stitched so as to form a book and be numbered on the counterfoils by the printer from No. 1 to 350.

Mr. POWELL. The difficulty is this: That in most country printing offices, there is no numbering machine.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in that.

Mr. POWELL. Could not the ballots be printed in blank at the office here, and numbered with the numbering machines and then sent loose to the local returning officers to have the names of the candidates printed in the blanks?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The difficulty would be that if the ballots are to be numbered, they must be stitched together in a book, so as to have the numbers consecutive, and the names cannot be printed in while they are stitched.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is a suggestion made by my hon. friend from Montmorency and it is my duty to submit it to the committee. I understand what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) wants, and, if my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) objects to it, perhaps I can explain it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My objection is that I do not see how it can be carried out. There are hon. gentlemen here who know a great deal more about the printing craft than does the hon. member for Montmorency, and they say that in most cases it will be impossible to carry out the suggestion. This is an objection which should carry weight.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. But I cannot see why it is impossible to carry out the suggestion. The suggestion is that the

ballot papers should be bound or stitched so as to form a book, and numbered on the counterfoil by the printer from 1 to 250. The difficulty seems to be that they may not have a machine to print the numbers consecutively.

Mr. FOSTER. How long would it take a man to number them?

Mr. R. HOLMES (West Huron). If I may be allowed a word. I can speak so far as the Ontario ballots are concerned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HOLMES. I suppose I am an authority on that. The Ontario ballots are supplied by the department at Toronto and numbered on one side, and the reverse side, of course, is blank. These ballots are sent to the printing office in county town where the election is to be held or to some other printing office and they are printed on the face with the name of the respective candidates and the name of the riding. The Dominion government could print in its own office beforehand a large number of ballots, and put them up in pads of say 250, numbered seriatim. That would not be difficult, it would not entail much labour. The printing here could be done at any time. Any country printing office would be able to print them, but every country office would not be able to print them with numbers seriatim. It would be a simple matter to have the ballots prepared at any time and kept in stock here, and then, as they are required, send them to the returning officers with instructions to have whatever printing needs to be done in the locality.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the number to be put on the ballot?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, on the counterfoil; it is simply to know that the returning officer accounts for all the ballots he receives.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the Solicitor General thought out the form of ballot to be used?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will adhere to the form published in the schedule. If there is any objection to it, I would like to know what it is. The disc has not proven a success.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the difficulty is not in the disc so much as in the fact that in the form 'L,' the voter is given instructions as to voting, but there is no illustration of the form of ballot used as it should be marked. If the form of ballot were published for the instruction for the guidance of voters put up in the polling booth, the elector would see exactly how he is supposed to mark his ballot. The form of ballot given in the schedule offers too much scope for collusion.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In what respect does it offer more than the disc?

Mr. INGRAM. There is too much blank space about the name. We know that it has been the practice to some extent in some districts to direct a voter to mark his ballot in a given way—for instance, to put the cross under or over a given initial of the candidate's name. Finding a ballot marked in that way you know pretty well that the voter has voted as he agreed to do. Say there are only three votes arranged for in each of the forty polling divisions—that gives 120 votes which you can pay for and be pretty sure that the goods have been delivered. This allows too great scope for bribery. If it were provided that the disc ballot should be used and that the voter should put his cross in the disc, there would be less chance for that kind of thing.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) is aware, that with the disc ballot, it has been held that if the cross is in the white space around the name of the candidate, it is a good ballot. There is thus as much chance for the practice he refers to in the disc ballot as in the other. What I propose is to provide that the voter shall put his mark in the space to the right of the candidate's name.

Mr. INGRAM. Very well, make it so that the ballot shall be good only when it is marked in the space to the right of the name.

Mr. PRIOR. Why not have the disc?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We have had some experience with the disc and have come to the conclusion that it is practically unworkable.

Mr. McNEILL. I would suggest to the Solicitor General that there should be a light perpendicular line to the right of the name on the ballot, and the ballot to be marked outside of that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. At first sight that suggestion appears to me to commend itself. Then we might amend that section which provides that the cross should be put to the right of the perpendicular line in the question.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Cochrane), says they had that in the Ontario ballot at one time, and found it did not work.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, and it was held by the judges on a recount that no matter which side of this line the cross was put, it was good as long as it was inside the white space.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understood the Solicitor General to say in connection with these ballots, that they should be numbered from 1 up to 250. I understand the law provides that you can have a polling subdivision containing 300 names.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The intention is to have the books in convenient form so that if there are 300 votes, you give two books instead of giving only one. From 1 to 350, would make the book too bulky. It is simply a matter of convenience for the deputy returning officer.

Mr. ELLIS. How are these ballots to be numbered? In countries distant from cities where there are no numbering machines, by whom are the numbers to be put on? Are they to be written, and if so, by the returning officer, or the deputy, or by whom?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The amendments provide that they are to be numbered by the printer. He can number them by a machine or otherwise.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the conclusion as to the class of the ballot we are to have?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I intend to advise the form of ballot we have in the schedule, with the understanding that we are to amend section 70—if that is the section—to the effect that the cross shall be to the right of the name, and in the instructions to be issued, provision will be made also that the cross will be to the right of the name.

On section 60,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Subsection 2 refers to Prince Edward Island, and I want to make it conform to the words of the Island statute. I propose to add, after the word 'district,' in the 40th line:

Mr. McNEILL. I would suggest to the Solicitor General—I do not know whether this is the best place to do it—the advisability of having the counterfoils initialled, not only by the deputy returning officer, but by the agents of the candidates. That will prevent what is alleged to be so often done, the bringing in of a ballot which is really a bogus ballot, and substituting it for a properly initialled ballot at the time of voting. It would make it much more difficult to perpetrate fraud.

Mr. SPROULE. If there were three candidates, and in some cities, where they run together, there might be five or six candidates, you would have to put the initials of the agents of all these candidates in one column, which would be very inconvenient.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (reading):

Every elector qualified to vote for the electoral district in which he resides shall vote in such district in the electoral division, or in case such electoral division is subdivided, in the polling district thereof in which he resides and not elsewhere.

In connection with this I wish to point out that I omitted to mention to the Soli-

Mr. COCHRANE.

tor General that the following should be added to the section, being the section of the provincial Act:

Every elector qualified to vote in an electoral district in which he does not reside, shall vote in the electoral division, or in case the electoral division is subdivided, in the polling district thereof in which the property on which he claims to vote for such electoral district is situated and not elsewhere.

I am following the phraseology of the provincial Act to avoid difficulty.

Mr. MARTIN. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will tell us where the clause, as it stands, falls short?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no provision made in the Bill as to where a non-resident shall vote.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 52,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Before we proceed further, I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that I omitted to state that the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) suggested that we should amend section 52 by adding subsections 52a and 52b. His amendment was that 52a should be added, which provides: That in cities or towns having a population exceeding 10,000 souls, the polls should be opened at seven in the morning, and from that hour until nine in the morning, workmen, artisans, and employees being voters, should have the precedence in voting. That is the suggestion.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. How could you distinguish? A man might come up and say he was an artisan, and the discussion over whether he was or not would take more than an hour to settle the question.

Mr. FOSTER. That could be arranged by the government making a table of precedence.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would not undertake to legislate as to that. I think, however, the time has come when all interested in the workingman's vote should deal with that difficulty.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to see the time of voting advanced in the morning by at least one hour. I do not see why they should not commence at eight o'clock. I know it would be very convenient in a great many cases.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. For my part I should like to see the rule adopted which provides that the polls should be open at eight in the morning and remain open until eight at night.

Mr. McINERNEY. There is an objection to beginning so early in the morning, and that is the difficulty of getting your agents at the polling places so early.

Mr. PUTTEE. It is absurd to bring in some of those amendments providing for the right of the workingman to vote. If the polls open at seven or eight in the morning and remain open until eight or nine in the evening, that would settle the whole business.

Mr. SPROULE. If you open as early as eight in the morning, some of those connected with the elections would have to start out the night before.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Nine o'clock is early enough.

Mr. INGRAM. I think nine o'clock is quite early enough, considering everything.

Mr. McALISTER. The objection to the present hour is, that in my county there are quite a number of electors who have a vote in Bonaventure County, and if the poll opened at eight o'clock they could take the train to Bonaventure to record their votes, otherwise they could not.

Mr. ELLIS. What about the principle of one man one vote?

Mr. McALISTER. Surely he could have one vote in the province of New Brunswick and another in the province of Quebec?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think the poll should open before nine o'clock. If the poll were opened before seven o'clock, when the workingman goes to vote, there would be some argument in favour of it. But, to open at eight o'clock would not be any better than the present hour, so far as the workingman is concerned. We find that it is very difficult to get our agents to the poll before nine o'clock, winter and summer. If there is one reason that can be given why the poll should open at eight o'clock rather than nine o'clock, I would be in favour of it, but I do not see that it would help any section of the community. To keep the polls open until eight o'clock at night is a very good suggestion, but the rascalities which have been exposed recently as taking place between nine o'clock in the morning and five o'clock in the afternoon are such that the temptations would be increased if you keep the poll open after five p.m. and until eight p.m. You would have the people interested subject to a strain of twelve hours, and as they would have to obey the demands of nature in getting their meals, the keeping of them for so long a time at a stretch in the polls would exhaust them physically and mentally, and the opportunities for wrong-doing on the part of those who wish to commit wrong would be increased. I believe that if you allow the workingmen to get off at three o'clock in the afternoon it would be a far better way. That would not be too much to ask in five years.

An hon. MEMBER. Four years.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, I am ready to predict it will only be four years this time.

Mr. SPROULE. If I hire a man to do a certain amount of work for the day, I do not see you can interfere with the contract by declaring that he shall not work after three o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I think the right thing is to leave it as it is, so far as country districts are concerned, but in cities to have the poll kept open, as it is in England, till eight o'clock. At present, the workingmen have only the dinner hour. I would like to have every workingman perfectly independent, so that he could put in his honest day's work, and then have those two extra hours in which to record his vote without being under any obligation to his employer.

Mr. WALLACE. Give the opportunity to everybody.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). In the country districts it would be absurd.

Mr. INGRAM. To cities of what size would you apply that?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). That would have to be a matter for consideration. I am only speaking for the principle. Some twelve or fifteen years ago it was adopted in England, and now nobody would think of going back on it. It was tried in the local elections in British Columbia, and proved a success.

Mr. CLANCY. Is there a general complaint in cities?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I do not know that men do complain, but I do know that men have been put to a great deal of inconvenience. A large number of employers give their men a couple of hours at noon in which to vote; but the men have to depend on the clemency of their employers to get that. I want the employee to be perfectly independent.

Mr. McNEILL. While the proposal of my hon. friend has much to commend it, I am very much afraid it is a dangerous proposal to make at the present time. I think it would give an opportunity for fraud and corruption at the very time of the day when it would be most difficult to discover it. There is a great deal of force in much of what my hon. friend has said; but I should prefer to see an arrangement made such as that proposed by the hon. member for West York, by which the men would have from three o'clock.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). This parliament cannot do that. It is a matter of contract.

Mr. McNEILL. I cannot imagine that this parliament has not the power to deal

with a matter of that kind. My impression is that an employer cannot prevent his employee going to vote.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. He can dismiss him if he does.

Mr. McNEILL. Do you mean to say that this parliament has not power to deal with a matter of that kind?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do.

Mr. McNEILL. I should like to get the opinion of the Privy Council on the question whether this parliament has not the right to make a regulation to enable the citizens of this country to discharge the highest function they possess.

Mr. WALLACE. I think that is the root of the whole matter, that this parliament has the power to enable a citizen to perform that duty. What do we do with regard to hotels? We do not grant the hotel-keeper a license; the local legislature grants him his license, and all his powers and privileges; but the Dominion parliament comes in and tells him that he must close his hotel from six o'clock on the morning of election day till seven o'clock on the following morning.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). That is his contract, when he gets his license.

Mr. WALLACE. It is nothing of the kind. He makes no such contract.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. That comes under the general power to make laws for the good government of the country.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). That is part of the contract—that they can make any laws governing him.

Mr. WALLACE. The local legislature, in giving him a license to sell liquor, may impose any conditions they choose. One of the conditions they impose is that he shall not sell liquor on the day of a provincial election. They do not say that with reference to a Dominion election. We have that power ourselves, and we require every hotel keeper, in the interest of good government, as the hon. First Minister says, to close his hotel on election day. Is it not equally in the interest of good government that every man in this country shall have the right to vote and the opportunity of voting?

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman for Guysborough placed great stress on having the polls kept open in cities of a certain size until eight o'clock in the evening. But we know that taking the small cities as a portion of the electoral district, the people know pretty well how the vote has gone outside, and when they have had an opportunity of counting that up at five o'clock, they are placed in the position of being

Mr. McNEILL.

able to report to the cities that the vote has gone a certain way so that those interested in the cities may do their best to carry the election the other way. In British Columbia, the law applies to the rural parts as well as to the cities so that the case is different there.

The proposition of the hon. member for West York is impracticable. You may have the power to create half a holiday or a holiday, but cannot go beyond that, and the only way to get over the difficulty would be to declare a holiday or half holiday and let the people use their own discretion whether they will enjoy it or not.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. We must come to a conclusion on this, and there is a good deal to be said on both sides. On the whole, I think the law has worked in this respect pretty satisfactorily. It is not perfect, but I have not heard very serious complaint, and until better advised we should leave the law as it is.

The committee rose and reported progress.

#### JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Resolution respecting the judges of provincial courts read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish it to be understood that in carrying this resolution there is no assent to the principle on this side.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I will move the House into committee on the Bill on Tuesday when the members from Quebec will be present.

#### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 189) to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

#### ADJOURNMENT—IMPERIAL DEFENCE.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). I beg to call attention to an item in the *Globe* of yesterday morning concerning a matter of very great importance, namely, the proceedings at the great conference now being held in London, and which is attended by delegates from all parts of the empire, dealing with trade matters. The cable despatch reads:

The Montreal resolution in favour of a conference on Imperial defence and suggesting a uniform ad valorem import duty as the best method for all portions of the empire to contribute, was carried, there being only one dissentient.

The House will see that at that conference the principle of preferential trade was approved with only one dissentient.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 5.50 p. m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, July 2, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, before you proceed to the Orders of the Day, I want to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals for some papers in regard to the Galops Canal channel. I see he is not in his place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). If the hon. gentleman asks the question, I will draw the minister's attention to it when he comes in.

Mr. CLANCY. I want the offer of the Gilbert Bros. Engineering Company of the 26th September, 1892; the offer of the same company of the 22nd October, 1892, the 31st May, 1897, and the 12th June, 1897; the offer of E. E. Gilbert & Son, which was amended by the offer of the 22nd October, 1892; the offer of Mr. Gilbert or his company to add a torpedo drill scow to the list of the plant; the recommendation of Mr. Rubidge, the superintending engineer, of the acceptance of the offer of the Gilbert Bros. Engineering Company to reduce the bottom of the canal to the original grade or any further depth required; the contracts with the Gilbert Bros. Engineering Company—there must have been two of them; reports of Mr. Rubidge previous to the 22nd October, 1892, that a properly equipped dredging and blasting plant be placed in the channel; also, the date of the letter of Mr. Rubidge.

## CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 176), to incorporate the South Shore Line Railway.—(Mr. Flint.)

## TIMAGAMI RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. McHUGH moved:

That the first amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 118) respecting the Timagami Railway Company be disagreed to, because the person named in the amendment is unknown to the promoters of the said Bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the Senate placed the name of a director in the charter without the consent of the promoters.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a good name?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is a good French name—Chabot.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. McHUGH moved:

That the said amendment be disagreed to, for the following reasons:

277½

1. Because it would render it utterly impossible for the promoters of the Bill to make adequate financial arrangements for carrying out the scheme, owing to the great engineering difficulties that would have to be encountered in the construction of a railway between the points named in the measure and Lake Timagami.

2. Because a feasible line has been already surveyed between Sturgeon Falls and said lake—as shown by the surveyor's report—thus connecting the settlements in that section of the country lying north of the Canadian Pacific Railway with the thriving and rapidly growing town of Sturgeon Falls, where good markets will be found for such produce as the settlers may be able to dispose of, instead of connecting them with the unimportant and still unincorporated village of Verner.

3. Because the promoters have reasonable assurance that capital can be obtained to construct the railway provided the Bill is passed in the original form asked by the promoters.

4. Because the said promoters have already had a charter for two years with a starting point 'at or near Verner,' and have found themselves unable to induce capitalists to invest their money in the construction of a railway on that proposed line.

5. Because it is of the greatest importance to the settlers of that section of the country that they be provided with a railway at the earliest possible moment.

Motion agreed to.

## ST. JEROME, CHICOUTIMI WHARF.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.) asked:

1. Did Louis Desbiens, of St. Jérôme, in the county of Chicoutimi, sell lumber for the building of the wharf at that place?

2. If so, how many pieces, or feet, and at what price?

3. How much per day did he get for the board of M. Blais, engineer and builder of the said wharf, and what is the total amount paid him under that head, or payable to him in virtue of accounts rendered?

4. Have any other sums of money been paid to him, or are any such sums to be paid him, in virtue of accounts rendered; if so, to what amount and for what?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. Yes. 2. 769 feet tamarack, 9 x 10, at 7 cents, \$53.83; 2,811 feet tamarack, 10 x 14, at 12 cents, \$337.32; 4,403 feet tamarack, 10 inches diameter, at 7 cents, \$308.21; 188 feet tamarack, 8 inches diameter, at 5 cents, \$9.40; 20 planks, 12 x 9 x 3, at 30 cents, \$6.00; total, \$714.76. 3. \$1.00 per day for thirty-two days; \$32.00. 4. \$75.00 for timber.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.) asked:

1. How many persons named Gauthier were employed in the construction of the wharf at St. Jérôme, in the county of Chicoutimi?

2. What is the total amount paid to each of them and for how many days?

3. How much was paid per ton for the stone used in the said wharf?

4. What price was paid for the iron used in the work, and from whom was it bought?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. Four. 2. Ludger Gauthier, 8 days,

at \$1.00, \$8.00 ; Arthur Gauthier, 22 days, at \$1.00, \$22.00 ; Johnny Gauthier, 22 days, as carpenter, at \$1.50, \$33.00 ; Anastase Gauthier, 9 days, at \$1.00, \$9.00. 3. \$6.00 per toise. 4. 6 cents per pound ; from Joseph Singlelais.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Macdonald, King's, P.E.I.) asked :

1. Did one Joseph Bilodeau work at the wharf at St. Jérôme, in the county of Chicoutimi ?
2. If so, how many days, at what price, and in what capacity ?
3. How much money was paid him out of the grant for the wharf, and for what service ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. Yes. 2. Twenty-nine days, at \$1.50 per day, as driver, with use of his own horse and cart. 3. \$43.50.

**PORTS OF ALBERTON AND TIGNISH.**

Mr. MARTIN asked :

The number of wagons and carriages entered at the ports of Alberton and Tignish, in Prince Edward Island, for the fiscal years 1897, 1898 and 1899, to include buggies, farm wagons and bicycles. The value of each and the amount of duty paid ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). In reply I beg to say :

**ALBERTON.**

Fiscal years ending 30th June.

	1897.	1898.	1899.
Farm wagons .....			
Other carriages—			
Number .. .. .	1		
Value .... .. .	\$20 00		
Duty collected .....	10 00		
Bicycles—			
Number .... .. .		2	1
Value ... .. .		\$35 00	\$21 00
Duty .. .. .		10 50	6 23

**TIGNISH.**

Farm wagons.....			
Other carriages .....			
Bicycles—			
Number .... .. .		5	
Value ... .. .		\$157 00	
Duty .. .. .		\$47 00	

**THE ALIEN LABOUR ACT.**

Mr. PUTTEE asked :

Has the Department of Justice recently ordered the deportation of some workmen from the town of Welland, Ont., to the United States ?

If so, was the deportation ordered under the provisions of the Act to restrict the importation and employment of aliens ?

Were such workmen citizens of the United States ?

If not, what were the grounds of such deportation ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Department of Justice gave orders to put the Alien Labour Act in force in the town of Welland against certain workmen imported against the law from the United States. The government is not aware if they were American citizens or simply aliens under the American law.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

**ELECTION ACT—AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION.**

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 133) 'An Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to the Election of Members of the House of Commons.'—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 64,

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) What is the meaning of subsection 4 of this section ? It reads :

If in any polling division whereby (or under) the provincial law no list of voters is required or provided, he is found qualified, he shall be entitled to vote.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). This is intended to apply to Prince Edward Island. There are no provincial lists there. When a man makes an application to vote, he is required to produce his qualification, and the returning officer decides whether he shall vote or not.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). According to subsection 3 :

If the elector's name is found on the list of voters of the polling district, of the polling station, he shall be entitled to vote.

But in Ontario and British Columbia we have men on the voters' list who are residents in other parts of the Dominion, and therefore not entitled, under the laws of these provinces, to vote. I would suggest this amendment :

That the following words be added : Except in any provinces where manhood franchise is in force, when such voter shall be subject to the provisions of the Manhood Franchise Act in such province.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I propose to introduce the following amendment, which will, I think, meet the case. It will make the clause read as follows :

If the elector's name is found on the list of voters for the polling district of the polling station, he shall be entitled to vote subject to provisions hereinafter mentioned.

That is to say, subject to the provisions with regard to the oath as to residents. Then I intend to amend subsection 5, so as to make it necessary that the oath shall be taken as to residence.

Amendment (Mr. Fitzpatrick) agreed to.

On subsection 4.

Mr. A. MARTIN (East Queen's, P.E.I.). I think we should strike out the word 'found' in this subsection.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot agree to that.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not see that there is any necessity for this word in the clause. In Prince Edward Island judicial powers are conferred on the returning officer. Either a voter is qualified or not qualified.

But to provide that if he is found qualified may make his vote dependent rather on the returning officer than on his qualification. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) seems to object to the amendment. The extraordinary powers conferred on the deputy returning officers in Prince Edward Island may be a great advantage to his party. I move to amend that this word 'found' be struck out of that section.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think the finding of the returning officer would be at all conclusive. If he happens to be wrong, if the returning officer allows votes that he should not allow, they are thrown out on the recount. I do not think there is serious objection to that word. If the returning officer decides that the vote is to go in subject to the objection and it is recorded it can be made the subject of scrutiny by a judge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I would make this remark upon all these Prince Edward Island sections. We set apart one day entirely for their discussion and the committee decided them finally, as I supposed, and what is the sense of going over again the same discussion on the same points? In this case if a man comes up to vote on a statute labour certificate he must produce it, and the returning officer must say whether it is such certificate or not; therefore, he must 'find' whether the man is entitled to vote or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Supposing he has not the statute labour certificate, are you going to make the partisan returning officer the judge, without evidence, as to whether that man has a right to vote?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That has always been the case. I have seen hundreds of cases where a man comes up with a wrong certificate. The returning officer says to him that he has not the proper certificate, and the man is turned back.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose he comes up with none.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then he cannot vote; the law says he cannot vote.

Mr. MARTIN. Suppose he comes up with the right one and the returning officer says he cannot vote?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You cannot help that, on a scrutiny the man's vote would be put in. But I never knew in my experience of a returning officer rejecting one improperly.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is it that gives this certificate?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The road overseer.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose the road overseer objects, or refuses to give the certificate?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is a penalty.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a wonderful condition of things. In the first place, the man comes up, and there is no list, and he must have a certificate from the road master. The man shows the certificate, and the partisan returning officer may say, I do not recognize that certificate, I will not allow you to vote. If he does not have that certificate the deputy returning officer may say, 'Well, I think this man is all right, I will let him vote.' If he has no certificate at all, but says he has done his work, but has lost the certificate, then the partisan returning officer fixes the right of the voter there and then, without any process of law.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was the law from 1873 to 1882, and it worked admirably. We never had any complaint.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that it goes beyond Prince Edward Island. In unorganized districts in Ontario where there are no voters' lists, that power is given there as well. There is no statute labour qualification. Statute labour is not done there. The hon. gentleman will see that in a case of that kind it is a very extraordinary power to give a returning officer. It seems to me that a man's rights would not suffer by striking out the word 'found.' Unless it can be shown that you would deprive a voter of his vote, or that you would lay the foundation of having bad votes put in I do not think this very exceptional power should be granted. But, it does not affect these matters one way or the other. That would work out very badly where the conditions might be different from what they are in Prince Edward Island. There is no reason for retaining that word.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I can hardly believe that this clause will be kept in this Bill. It seems to me a most extraordinary thing that you should give to a partisan deputy returning officer the power of a judge. He decides the right of the voter without any evidence being brought before him. It is impossible that we should retain that clause in the Bill. There is no reason for it. It is antagonistic to every principle of common sense and of justice when you are going to permit a partisan deputy returning officer to exercise the powers of a judge without even imposing upon him the rules that a judge must follow before giving a decision, namely, that he shall have evidence produced before him.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Every man has to subscribe to an oath. The deputy returning officer can reject the vote under the present system, so that he is a judge, now.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not to the same extent.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On the island the law simply works like a charm.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not know where the charm comes in. It seems the most extraordinary proposition I ever heard of.

Mr. MARTIN. The system in the island works well at present, but some of the penalties imposed on the deputy returning officers have been eliminated from this Bill. When I proposed, a few days ago, to remedy that, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was the first man to jump up and say that these safeguards should not be inserted in the Bill. I would like to know if the Solicitor General can tell me why the word 'found' should be there. The intention is to confer these extra judicial powers on a partisan deputy returning officer, a man who is interested in the success of one party in the election and to enable him to say that a man has a vote whether he has or not. The penalties imposed upon the returning officer which are included in the provincial statutes have been omitted from the Bill. I think the aim is clear from the first clause in this Bill, to the last clause, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, is to give extra judicial powers to deputy returning officers. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows it, and when this clause came up he had only to shake his head gently at the Solicitor General to cause the Solicitor General to subside. I do not think legislation should be carried on in that way in the House. I asked the hon. Solicitor General to give me a reason why the word 'found' is there, and he cannot give me any except one, to confer upon the deputy returning officers powers which they have no right to have. I make this statement from my experience not very long ago in Prince Edward Island. I called the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries the other day to what took place in the province where a deputy returning officer told a voter, although he was prepared to swear that his qualification was good, that he had no vote. This is aimed at backing up such a deputy returning officer as that.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call the attention of the Solicitor General to another clause, No. 69. Look at the situation which may arise. Here is a partisan returning officer; we will suppose that he is a Duncan Bole, or any other man.

Mr. INGRAM. That is struck out.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is struck out.

Mr. FOSTER. If it were not it would be a most terrible business. But, I cannot find that there is any penalty for a man rejecting a vote.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes; in sections 19 and 20.

Mr. FOSTER. Neither of these touch this case.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes; there is the obligation to receive the vote.

Mr. FOSTER. But in these cases you give the person upon whom you put this obligation the right to decide, and if he decides there is no other person who can decide. If he decides neither of these two clauses would apply to him. I think the Solicitor General will have to try and reconsider something to make this matter somewhat parallel with the position in other parts of the country, because he will see what a power this is giving to a partisan deputy returning officer. He actually makes the vote and he is actually held outside of any penalties at all, because I think the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will agree that this will not touch the decision of a deputy returning officer as to whether a man should put in his vote provided the deputy returning officer gave his decision in good faith and believed he was right.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman had the Prince Edward Island Act before him and understood it he would see, that whether the Act is right or wrong, this section is absolutely correct in its phraseology. I explained all this before, and we are only going over this again and again. If a man comes up to vote on a statute labour certificate I have shown that the returning officer and the deputy returning officer, under the provincial law, are made judges. The deputy returning officer must determine whether this is a proper certificate or not, and if the man takes the oath and the deputy returning officer rejects his vote improperly he is liable to a penalty.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that penalty?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If he comes in to vote on real estate he is asked: Is it leasehold or freehold? He is asked: What is the description of your land, he has to give it, and the deputy returning officer has to decide.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose he does not present a certificate, does the hon. gentleman say he cannot vote?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course he can not.

Mr. INGRAM. Then what is the meaning of those words in the section, 'Or in

case such certificate or receipt cannot be produced he shall take the oath in such case prescribed.'

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. That is in case the certificate is lost.

Mr. **INGRAM**. Then if the certificate is lost and he is willing to take the oath he can vote.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Certainly, in that case, but suppose he produces the wrong certificate.

Mr. **INGRAM**. Who is to determine that?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The deputy returning officer.

Mr. **E. COCHRANE** (East Northumberland). I do not see any penalty in this clause against the returning officer whom you make a judge.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I do not make him a judge. I take the law as it has stood for fifty years.

Mr. **COCHRANE**. That is no argument. Why, the biggest old Tory on this side of the House would not say that he would legislate in that way. I am sure the most hide-bound Tory here would be willing to amend a fifty year old law if it was wrong.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. We are not making the law.

Mr. **COCHRANE**. Then if we are not making the law here we have had a great deal of talk for nothing. The absurdity of the thing is that you have no penalty provided against a partisan deputy returning officer whom you make a judge.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No, you do not.

Mr. **COCHRANE**. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries shakes his head, but it is the easiest thing in the world to do that. It is no answer at all to an argument, for the minister to shake his head. Here you make a man a judge, you clothe him with power to accept or reject a vote and you provide no penalty against him, if he does wrong. You give him all that power and you place him above a penalty. The hon. minister's shake of the head will not get him out of that difficulty.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I want to ask the Solicitor General this. Does the provincial penalty which applies to a deputy returning officer in a provincial election, apply to the deputy returning officer who acts under the Dominion law in a Dominion election?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. No.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Very well. If I am right that sections 19 and 20 apply no penalty against the deputy returning officer who makes the decision, and if the Solicitor General is right, as he no doubt is, that the

provincial penalty is lifted from off him, then there is no penalty. What is the use of the Minister of Marine telling us that there is a penalty under the provincial law, when the penalty under the provincial law is clearly inoperative.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I was simply asked the question: if there was a penalty under the provincial law.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The Minister of Marine gave the House to understand that the returning officers could be fined. Now we discover that clause 20 here does not provide a penalty against him, and that the penalty under the provincial law is wiped out. You give under this Act, the deputy returning officer the powers amongst others.

It shall be the duty of the presiding officer to prevent all unnecessary delay; no person shall be permitted to interrupt the poll by addressing the electors; for avoiding the needless factious questioning of voters the deputy returning officer can make provisions.

You see what powers you put in the hands of a partisan returning officer. Suppose I were representing one of the candidates, and I wanted to question a voter as to whether he has a vote or not; then for avoiding needless factious questioning of the voters the deputy returning officer, who is a judge, can waive me aside and stop the proceedings on the ground that I am guilty of factious opposition. If a deputy returning officer has in mind to be the least arbitrary, he can stop any questioning at the poll with a view to getting at the qualifications of the voter. I ask the Solicitor General if I am not right that this procedure in Prince Edward Island applies to the deputy returning officers in the Dominion election?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. Yes.

Mr. **POWELL**. What clause of our Act incorporates that?

Mr. **FOSTER**. It is not incorporated, but that is the power the provincial law gives to the deputy returning officer, and our Act clothes the deputy returning officer with these powers. If these powers are the powers of a deputy returning officer in Prince Edward Island where there is no list, and if the penalties of the provincial Act are taken away, and if sections 19 and 20 provide no penalty, then the elector is simply there at the mercy of the deputy returning officer.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I would like to know from the Solicitor General what clause in our Act gives the deputy returning officer in Prince Edward Island the powers that have been referred to by the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster).

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. In the province of Prince Edward Island a man who comes up to vote, not being on the voters'

list, is obliged to prove he is qualified under the provincial Act, and in order that he may establish his right to vote under the provincial Act, it is necessary for him to conform with the provincial law. You have a dozen clauses in the Act to provide for that. The point that is taken by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) as to the question of the penalty, is one that ought to be considered. If in the exercise of the duty assigned to him a deputy returning officer, acting in perfect good faith, should happen to reject the vote of a person who was qualified, of course there would not be any penalty against him, but if a man deliberately decides to reject the vote of an elector who is qualified, of course he would come within the operation of sections 19 and 20. Let me draw the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to this. Take section 6 of the Franchise Act. It is there provided that no person who possesses all the qualifications generally required by the provincial law to entitle him to vote at a provincial election, shall be disqualified from voting at a Dominion election merely by any provision of the provincial law disqualifying him from having his name on the list of voters, &c.

So that a man might be entitled to be on the provincial list were it not for the fact that he is the holder of an office under the Dominion government. Suppose a man's name is on the list, and he happens to be a deputy returning officer, or some other disqualification arises, and when he tenders his vote it is objected to by one of the scrutineers; and suppose he answers the questions put to him in such a way as to show that he is disqualified. The returning officer is obliged, in the exercise of the powers conferred upon him, to find him disqualified or qualified, as the case may be. That is a necessary right inherent in the position he occupies.

Mr. CLANCY. Would it be any the less his duty to act in the manner the hon. gentleman has just described if the word 'found' were left out, or would it be more? We wish to avoid putting extraordinary power into the hands of the returning officer to do more than his duty.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This simply defines what he must do. It does not give him any power in the world.

Mr. A. C. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) If it does not give him any power, what is the use of leaving it there?

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). There does seem to be some point in the objection urged against the word 'found.' The duty of the returning officer ordinarily is ministerial and not judicial.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When an objection is raised, what duty does he perform?

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. POWELL. The ex-Minister of Finance is urging that the duty of the returning officer be left ministerial, whereas the Bill makes it judicial. If his duty is merely ministerial, his action is subject to correction or he is subject to a fine if he acts in an improper or illegal manner. If his act is judicial, it stands as an absolute bar; for his decision in a matter that is within his duty under this section, is absolutely final. There is no opportunity nor provision for appeal. If you attempt to question the decision of the returning officer by way of a petition, you must fail. What the ex-Minister of Finance asks for is that the voter, if found qualified, and takes the necessary oath, shall be admitted to vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That would be contrary to the provincial law.

Mr. POWELL. If the provincial law is a perfect absurdity, that should not stand in the way. Because they have had an antiquated Franchise Act in Prince Edward Island for fifty or a hundred years, is Canada to be saddled with it to all eternity? I never heard such an argument. I suggest that the duties of the returning officer be left simply ministerial and not made judicial; that is, if the elector has the necessary qualifications, answers the necessary questions and takes the necessary oath, he shall be admitted to vote. By the terms of this section, as it now stands, I have no doubt, you make the returning officer the judge of the voter's qualification, and if he decides wrongly on one or a hundred votes his decision is final.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I look on that argument as absolutely absurd, if the hon. gentleman will permit me to say so; because the law expressly provides that on a scrutiny all these things can be gone into.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has stated that, but I do not agree with him.

Mr. POWELL. I challenge the hon. gentleman to show me a solitary provision under which they can be gone into.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman surely knows what he is talking about. Under the Controverted Elections Act, they not only can be gone into, but I have seen them gone into in a hundred instances. I never heard a lawyer suggest that on a scrutiny, you could not go into the question of the validity of the votes polled.

Mr. POWELL. I have already conceded that in ordinary cases you can; but you put a provision in here by which you cannot.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. This does not alter the law at all. The hon. gentleman assumes a certain conclusion, and then argues from it. The hon. gentleman chooses to sneer at the law of Prince Edward Island. We are not here altering the law of Prince Edward Island. We have adopted the principle that the provincial franchises shall prevail. That principle has always worked admirably, there has never been any difficulty about it, and it will work admirably now.

If a man wanting to vote does not produce his road certificate the returning officer shall reject his application. He will act in like manner if the man refuses to answer the question or to take the oath. That law has worked admirably, and I do not believe that the word taken exception to in any way modifies the powers of the returning officer, but I think it is desirable, because it defines just what the law is.

**Mr. POWELL**. The hon. minister goes further than allowing the deputy returning officer simply to reject an application to vote if the applicant refuses to answer the questions or to take the oath. He allows him to reject the vote even if the man does comply with these conditions. He allows the returning officer to be the judge.

**Mr. FOSTER**. On the contention of the Minister of Marine himself, the word is not necessary, but only desirable. In that case, since we on this side object to it in toto, and since he himself says it is not necessary, why not strike it out?

**Mr. HAGGART**. What we object to is giving the deputy returning officer judicial powers when his powers are simply ministerial. If a party chooses to take the oath and to answer the questions, the deputy returning officer ought not to have the power to reject his vote.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. When there is no list, as is unfortunately the case in Prince Edward Island, the powers of the deputy returning officer must be ex necessitate quasi judicial. That is the provincial law, and we cannot change it. I am willing to reduce the powers of the deputy returning officers to a minimum and make their duties ministerial as far as possible, but I cannot consent to introduce, in the case of Prince Edward Island, a principle we have not applied elsewhere.

**Mr. COCHRANE**. It is a new doctrine that we are adopting the election law of each province. What we are doing is adopting the franchise of each province, but not its election law, and we are not interfering with the franchise of any province by restricting the duties of returning officers to merely ministerial acts.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON**. I cannot understand the contention of the hon. gentleman

that the question under debate is one affecting the franchise. The franchise is the right to vote, and with that we have no desire to interfere, but this is a question of giving judicial as well as ministerial power to the deputy returning officers, and that we do most strongly object to. If you give a deputy returning officer the power to reject a man's vote, even if he takes the oath and answers the question, you may give a partisan official the control of an election. And besides, you do not provide any penalty in the case of an abuse of such power.

**Mr. FOSTER**. I want to press the point again, that there is no penalty against this officer, as you have taken away the provincial penalty. I think that we will all agree that there should be some penalty provided; but, under sections 19 and 20, which have been referred to, the only provision is that the penalty should be recoverable if he is guilty of any wilful misfeasance or wilful violation of the Act. But his duty is to give a decision when the case of an elector comes before him. And, if he gives a decision, he is free from all penalty.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Well, what does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) want?

**Mr. FOSTER**. I want the deputy returning officer in Prince Edward Island to be ministerial in his duties, the same as in every other part of this Dominion. And, having that established, I want a penalty against him as against every other officer in the Dominion.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) need not get so angry about it—

**Mr. FOSTER**. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) need not think I am angry because I am in earnest. But, if anything could make a man angry, it would be a provision such as this, when it is the evident purpose—

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. But will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) puts one construction upon it and the Solicitor General puts another.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Well, I will leave it to the Solicitor General; he is fair-minded. Will the Solicitor General say that if a voter comes before the deputy returning officer and he gives his decision, then, under sections 19 and 20, he can be held guilty of wilful misfeasance and subject to a penalty? If he can, I am wrong.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. I do not agree with the theory that has been expounded, that the duties of the deputy returning officer are merely ministerial. That, to my mind, is absolutely wrong. He is called upon to exercise quasi judicial func-

tions, for instance, in the choice of the oath, and other conclusions that he comes to. I quite see the force of the objections raised by the hon. gentleman. But I would, naturally, be guided in these matters relating to Prince Edward Island by those who know more about Prince Edward Island than I can pretend to know. It is suggested to amend both sections 19 and 20 to make them applicable to offences against the local law as well as against this Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I will ask the Solicitor General—has he any objection to striking out the word 'found'?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not bound to come to a decision on that point.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no objection myself.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we should accept the Solicitor General's idea, that sections 19 and 20 be amended to provide a penalty and to strike out the word 'found.'

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no necessity for both.

Mr. McINERNEY. I would suggest that this question as to the word 'found' might be settled, and there would be no necessity for dealing with the other.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think so, and I am willing that we should do it and get on. This is the third day that has been taken up in useless discussion. It almost seems as if hon. gentlemen opposite were talking against time.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I move that the word 'found' in this section be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 72,

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Chairman, we should not pass over sections 61 and 63. Those sections were allowed to stand according to my Bill as it is marked.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Sections 61 and 62 have been carried.

Mr. McNEILL. You are not passing over section 70?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 70 has been carried.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to call the attention of the Solicitor General to a point with regard to section 70, to which I referred in discussing the matter with him the last time the measure was before the House. I think that it would be advisable that this clause should be amended to provide that not only shall the initials of the deputy returning officer be placed on the counterfoil, but the initials of at least two of the agents of the candidates, if present.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

I think that would be a wonderful safeguard against corruption. It would make it much more difficult to substitute a bogus ballot for the real ballot. I would suggest that the clause read somewhat in this form:

The vote shall be given by ballot, and each elector who is entitled to vote shall receive from the deputy returning officer a ballot paper, on the back of which such deputy returning officer and the agents of the respective candidates, or at least two of them, if present, shall have previously put their initials.

Motion to reconsider section 70, agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I fear that would lead to unnecessary complications and difficulties. If you have two of the agents present to put their initials on in addition to the returning officer, it would take up too much time. In addition to that, the agents may change two or three times during the day.

Mr. McNEILL. I would say an agent of each candidate, where there are only two, placing his initials upon the ballot paper, would be sufficient for the purposes of identification. We know that one of the most prevalent sources of fraud is the substitution of a fraudulent ballot paper in place of the proper ballot paper, and the difficulty has always been to trace that. The fear has been that there may be collusion between the deputy returning officer and the agents of one of the parties. Now if you have the initials of the agents, or two of them, upon the ballot paper in addition to those of the deputy returning officer, it will make such a substitution of the ballot paper absolutely impossible.

Mr. A. SEMPLE (Centre Wellington). It appears to me this would lead to an endless amount of confusion. The cases are exceptional where any trouble has been found when votes are taken on the day of election. In the contest in which I was engaged in 1896, there were four candidates in the field, and their agents would require to initial the ballots if the proposed amendment was carried out, and it would lead to a great deal of confusion and waste of time, as many agents are poor men and slow of doing writing of any kind.

Mr. CLANCY. The suggestion seems to me to be a fair one, it is only for the purpose of identification. It does not make any difference so long as the initials of any two of the persons present with the deputy are on the ballot paper. There is no party advantage in it either one way or the other.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). No one objects to the desirability of having additional identification of the ballot by the signature of others than the deputy returning officer, but it has been urged that it is going to cause delay. Suppose it does, is it going to prevent any body from voting in that polling subdivision? I have been in polling booths, and I can safely say that

the officials have not been worked half their time on the average. If 200 ballot papers are to be initialled by two men who are sitting at the table—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If there are four candidates, or six candidates?

Mr. WALLACE. Suppose there are four candidates as in the county of Pictou, for instance, they are running in pairs, and the same scrutineer acts for two, there are only two scrutineers there. Suppose there are six, they would run in three pairs. Suppose there are three men to initial a ballot paper, it is only going to take half a minute.

Mr. R. HOLMES (West Huron). So far as its operation in towns is concerned it would involve a great deal of extra time. Would you initial before they are in the batch or after they are taken out? Suppose they are initialled after they are taken out, what is to prevent an agent substituting another ballot?

Mr. WALLACE. There are three men each watching that ballot paper, besides the man who is signing his name on it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not want a ballot paper to be handled by more than one man or two men at the outside.

Mr. FOSTER. It would not take up much time. There are two agents, we will say, and the deputy returning officer, and they have their ballots for that poll. There will always be ten or fifteen minutes in the polling place during which time these gentlemen could put their names on the ballots and the matter of the deputy returning officer and two others signing them would really not take up any time necessary for voting. You would have the additional safeguard. I do not think there is any danger to be feared from the deputy returning officer and one agent from each side handling the ballot in so far as it is necessary to put their names on the counterfoil.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is not the counterfoil, but the ballot.

Mr. ELLIS. The other day we agreed that the ballot should be numbered.

Mr. CLANCY. Not the ballot, but the counterfoil.

Mr. ELLIS. It does not make any difference. It is hardly worth while to load up the ballot with all that work when the identity is absolutely safeguarded by this numbering.

It being One o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. Solicitor General absolutely refuse to have the initials of the two agents go with those of the deputy returning officer in section 70?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think that will be absolutely unworkable. How-

ever, it might be possible to bring about what is desired. I presume that what is wanted to be got at is the absolute certainty that the ballot which you give to the elector is the ballot he brings back for the purpose of being deposited. That clause has been adopted, but I have been considering the question as to whether or not we might find a better substitute for that which my hon. friend proposes. Suppose you have a ballot with two counterfoils, both of which counterfoils shall bear the same number. Take a ballot with the number 100, for instance, having two counterfoils, one at each end of the ballot, with the number of 100 on each counterfoil. Then, the deputy returning officer will take off the first counterfoil when he gives the ballot to the voter, and when the voter comes back, he has to bring back the ballot with a counterfoil having the number 100 upon it. You will then be absolutely certain that the ballot comes back that the deputy returning officer gave to the voter. I would like time to consider that.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I will not raise the question now. I think that will be very useful.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It strikes me that it would, but I will have to consider it.

On section 79,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) proposes the following section as 79a, in lieu of this section:

In case, through accident or irresistible force, riot, removal of documents, or other cause of a similar nature, the nomination cannot be held, or the voting cannot commence at the hour fixed, or is interrupted before being closed, the returning officer, and the deputy returning officer, in so far as it concerns either, shall adjourn the nomination to the following lawful day at the same hour, and day by day if necessary, until the nomination of candidates is fully held; and in case of the voting, it shall be resumed on the following day at the hour fixed by sections 52 and 52a, until it has lasted eight hours or ten hours, as the case may be, so that all the electors who wish to vote may have had the opportunity of so doing.

Mr. FOSTER. There should be no objection to that, I suppose?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think it is somewhat objectionable in form, and there are also other objections to it. I have not accepted it.

Mr. INGRAM. Neither would I.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We talked about leaving discretion in the hands of the returning officer, but this amendment would certainly give him a great deal of discretion.

Mr. FOSTER. You make him take it at the next legal day.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You would allow him to determine whether there is a riot or an obstruction.

Mr. FOSTER. Have we had any case ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There was a case of irresistible force in the local election in Russell, where, on account of a snow storm, they had to postpone the election. There is a provision in the Ontario Act to meet that.

Mr. INGRAM. There was another case in East Middlesex, where they ran short of ballots. I do not know of a single case where we had any such difficulty as this mentioned in the amendment, and a few persons might put their heads together, and kick up a riot in order to postpone the election. I think we are better without the amendment and that it should be allowed to drop.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think so too.

On section 80,

Mr. INGRAM. I think this section is very incomplete. Our present system of closing the poll and taking the ballot is not a proper system, in view of the methods adopted by parties in some elections. There should be plain and candid instructions laid down to the deputy returning officers as to how they should count up the votes. We know well that it was in counting up the ballots that the switching took place. I have already moved an amendment to provide against this and unless it is accepted by the government now, I cannot move it until the third reading.

Mr. WALLACE. Read your amendment.

Mr. INGRAM. The amendment I propose is as follows :

That section 80 is repealed, and the following substituted therefor:

'80. Immediately after the close of the poll, the deputy returning officer shall, in the presence of the poll clerk and the candidates or their agents—and if any of the candidates is neither present nor represented by an agent, then, in the presence of such candidates and agents, if any, as are present, and of such electors, not exceeding three, as are at or around the polling station and willing to attend—proceed to examine the state of the ballot papers and count the votes in the manner following: He shall, before opening the ballot box, ascertain how many persons have voted and how many ballot papers should be in the ballot box, and shall carefully count the number of unused ballot papers and of spoiled ballot papers, and shall afford opportunity to the persons present to ascertain whether all the ballot papers are properly accounted for; after having so done, and not before, he shall open the ballot box and examine the ballot papers to ascertain that they are the ballot papers which he supplied, examining his initials on the backs, and shall count the whole number of ballot papers in the box to see that the number corresponds with the number of persons who voted, doing all this as far as possible, without opening out the face

Mr. FOSTER.

of any of the ballot papers or discovering or disclosing for whom any ballot paper is marked; and should the number of ballot papers found in the box exceed the number of persons who voted, he shall, if possible, ascertain and reject such as were not supplied by him. After having so done, he shall open and examine both sides of the ballot papers and count the number of votes given for each candidate, exposing to the view of those allowed to be present the face of each ballot paper, and, when so requested, affording them opportunity for thorough inspection of any ballot paper; and in so counting he shall reject all ballot papers which have not been supplied by the deputy returning officer, all those by which votes have been given for more candidates than are to be elected, all those which are not marked with a black lead pencil in the white space opposite the name or names of the candidate or candidates, all those upon the face of which there is any cross elsewhere than in the said white space or spaces, all those upon any part of which the voter has intentionally placed any mark with anything other than a black lead pencil, and all those upon which there is any writing or mark by which the voter could be identified, other than the numbering by the deputy returning officer in the cases hereinbefore provided for.'

The reason I move that is so that the deputy returning officer shall have no power to dictate to the scrutineers, as was done in West Elgin, where the deputy returning officers refused to show the face of the ballot to the agents. There is nothing in our Act at present providing that the agents can see the ballots. This amendment leaves the deputy returning officer no alternative but to count the ballots in the presence of the candidates, or their agents, so as to allow a proper inspection.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have made provision for that in the concluding words of the first paragraph, of section 80: 'giving full opportunity to those present to examine each ballot.'

Mr. FOSTER. Would the Solicitor General have any objection to adding these words in line 31: 'he shall sign his name thereto in the presence and in full view of'?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not see that they are necessary, but there is no objection to them.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was an amendment suggested on the other side of the House, which I think should be adopted; it is to insert, after the word 'shall,' in the second line of section 80, the words: 'first place all the spoiled ballots in an envelope and seal it up, and shall then' count the number of voters, &c.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. WALLACE. With regard to the proposed amendment of the hon. member for East Elgin, I think there are many fea-

tures in it that should be adopted, but it appears to me there is too much manipulation of the ballot paper.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think so. We have adopted, I think, the chief features of my hon. friend's amendment. Before we leave section 79, we ought to fix the minimum penalty for the returning officer who commits an offence. It is proposed to make the imprisonment not less than one year and not more than five years, and the fine not less than \$100 and not more than \$1,000. The penalty for others is a fine not exceeding \$500, or imprisonment for not less than six months, and not more than two years. We make the penalty larger for the official than for others.

Mr. FOSTER. One hundred dollars is too small for the returning officer. Make it \$500.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We will make the minimum \$300.

Amendment (Mr. Fitzpatrick) agreed to.

On section 82,

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend promised to consider some means of preventing the ballot boxes being tampered with. This provides that the envelope containing the ballots shall be received by the deputy returning officer and shall be marked with the signature of any agents present in the polling station who are willing to do so, by writing their signature across the flap thereof. Why not give the right to add a seal?

Mr. INGRAM. I would suggest that the following words be added to the section:

Such agents shall also fix their seals if they desire to do so.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I shall accept that amendment.

Mr. McNEILL. Subsection 4 provides that the ballot box shall be locked and sealed with the seal of the deputy returning officer, but we know, as a matter of fact, that those seals become broken in the handling of the boxes, and we ought to provide a more effective means of sealing.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How can you arrange to prevent the seals being broken?

Mr. HAGGART. Why not put on a lead seal, as is done on freight cars?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If a man wants to do what is wrong, he will do it, and I do not see that the suggestion is any solution of the difficulty.

Mr. McNEILL. As the ballot boxes are now, the seals may be broken without blame being attached to any one, but if you so arrange that when the seal is broken there is good ground for suspicion, the case will be different.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would really like my hon. friend who has originated the idea to exercise his ingenuity in devising an amendment.

Mr. McNEILL. Later on I will suggest one.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Of course, I do not bind myself to accept any suggestion.

Mr. COCHRANE. The section provides that the ballot boxes shall be delivered by the deputy returning officer to the returning officer or the election clerk or to one or more persons specially appointed for that purpose by the returning officer. Under this section, the returning officer may appoint a couple of persons who will travel around the constituency collecting the boxes and stay over at some hotel at night with the boxes all lying in the bottom of a wagon. That is a very loose way of handling these boxes. Why should they go out of the hands of the deputy returning officers at all until delivered to the returning officer?

Let us see how it will work. For instance, two men appointed under this section start out and go travelling around all over a large riding. They get half way round the riding and stop at some village over night. The ballot boxes have been jamming round in the wagon or sleigh, and the seals are broken off, and in what condition are they? Does the Solicitor General think that is a safe way to take care of the ballots of the electors of a riding? I suggested that it would be better to have the returning officer appoint a place in the centre of a riding to receive the ballot boxes on a day named, from the deputy returning officers and not allow them to be transferred into the hands of the second man at all. Keep them in the care of the deputy returning officer until the returning officer appoints a day and place where the deputies shall deliver the ballot boxes to him. I am sorry that human nature is made up on the lines it is, but we know that when they will do such things as they have done, it is just as easy to tamper with the ballot boxes and the ballots after they leave the deputies' hands as at any other time.

On section 83,

Mr. INGRAM. I move that subsection 5 be added to this section to read as follows:

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary, all ballot boxes in any city or county towns, as described in this section, shall be returned to the returning officer or the election clerk within three hours after the close of the poll, and such person or persons shall, on delivery of the ballot box or boxes to the returning officer or the election clerk, take the oath as prescribed in form "BB" of this Act.

The reason why I say 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary' is because subsection 4 of this section says the ballot boxes shall be returned forthwith. That would apply

to rural sections of the country, whereas this amendment would apply to cities and towns. Take the city of Ottawa for example. I can see no reason why all the ballot boxes should not be returned at eight o'clock in the evening. There are a large number of divisions in this city in which there are less than 200 votes polled during the day, and there is no difficulty of counting these within one hour, and so there is no reason why the ballot boxes should not be returned to the returning officer at night. That being done, there is no possibility of the deputy tampering with the ballot box or any person on his behalf. They would all be placed in charge of the returning officer and be perfectly secure. It is a fact that in nearly every case where ballot boxes are tampered with, it is not while they are in the possession of the returning officer, but it is generally while they are in the possession of the deputy returning officer.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is a good deal of merit in the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, but we have got to make a law which will be applicable to conditions that are unforeseen now and that may occur. With reference to returning them within three hours in cities and towns, I think there would be objections to that. I have known cases where the deputy returning officer was not able within three hours to return the box because of trouble in counting the ballots. With reference to the other suggestion that the deputy returning officer should himself bring the ballot boxes back to the returning officer, accidents may occur which would make it impossible for him to do so, for instance he might be sick, and many other contingencies might occur. The provision is made here that the ballot box is to be returned either to the election clerk or to one or more persons appointed by the returning officer. I think the difficulty suggested by the hon. gentleman has arisen in consequence of the insertion of the word 'collect,' that is to say, a man should be appointed to go around and collect the ballot boxes. I think we had better drop that amendment. That amendment was introduced merely for the purpose of satisfying the Auditor General that it would be wise on the ground of economy to have this provision. I think the economy would be misplaced, and that we had better leave the responsibility as far as possible upon the officials. We will omit the word 'collect,' but I cannot go any further than that.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose the count is concluded in two hours?

Mr. FOSTER. 'Forthwith' enables them to sleep with the ballot boxes over night.

Mr. CLANCY. The practice has largely grown up with the deputies of keeping them over night, and the law is disregarded in that respect. If you fix the limit of time

Mr. INGRAM.

and say that 'forthwith' means within two hours, something will be accomplished.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We have got rid of the word 'collect' in the 49th line after the words 'or receive.' That was an amendment suggested the last time the section came up. It was intended to insert the word 'collect' after the words 'or receive,' but that would have opened the door to these difficulties.

Mr. McNEILL. But, these difficulties now exist without the word 'collect.' The hon. gentleman should have the obligation resting on the deputy returning officer, and he could insert some words providing for an emergency, such as sickness.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This has been the law for such a long time that I would like if my hon. friend would point out in what respect it has failed of its purpose up to the present time.

Mr. McNEILL. There has been a great deal of improper work going on in connection with elections. I think, from the very fact that these ballot boxes were entrusted to an individual who goes around the riding collecting them and who may leave them over night at a tavern. That is how the matter is worked, and that is what we want to do away with.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That would occur in the case of a deputy returning officer.

Mr. McNEILL. But, in the case of a deputy returning officer he is responsible for it, and the responsibility rests upon one individual.

Mr. FOSTER. There is always the temptation to hand it over to somebody.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is the returning officer who appoints the deputy returning officer who has the responsibility of appointing other persons.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the hon. Solicitor General believe that it would be better to put the whole responsibility on the deputy returning officer or the election clerk?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In the case of the illness of the deputy returning officer it would be impossible for him to deliver his box to the returning officer.

Mr. INGRAM. In my own city where intelligent professional men acted one deputy returning officer retained his box all night, although the returning officer's office was open and not over three blocks away. In another case a man came in and gave his ballot box to the clerk in a hotel and asked him to look after it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then he failed in his duty, and ought to have been punished.

Mr. ELLIS. Would it not be well to make a deputy returning officer mail his return by registered letter, as it is provided for under this Bill, for the candidate himself, to the returning officer, so as to guard against the difficulty that might arise where the ballot box does not turn up at all, and let that return be the return that the returning officer should count?

Mr. COCHRANE. I am satisfied that the clause works out differently from what the Solicitor General intends it should. Why would not this clause be all right by striking out the words in the 49th line, 'who shall receive the same?' It works out just on the line that I have indicated, and instead of the ballot box being delivered by the deputy returning officer to the returning officer, as a general thing it is not delivered in that way at all. It is delivered to the persons named, and I say that is false economy. If that clause is put in at the whim of any official for the sake of a little economy, I say it is false economy.

Mr. JOHN COSTIGAN (Victoria, N.B.) As I understand it this is a new feature in the law, giving the power to a returning officer to appoint collectors of the ballot boxes. We have, so far, held the returning officer and the deputies responsible. The returning officer in rural constituencies in which there are a great many polling places, in my experience, would arrange with a deputy returning officer, in returning his own ballot box, to collect the ballot boxes from other deputy returning officers, so that there would only be one mileage to pay. If there is no other reason than the reason of economy to appoint a collector of ballot boxes outside of the returning officer, it is not a sufficient reason to change the law, because it would not result in a greater economy than can be practised under the present system, as one deputy returning officer can bring in the boxes from an entire district.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think the question of economy should enter into it. Whether it costs \$10 or \$20 is a small matter. What I was not able to get over was the difficulty suggested by the Solicitor General. Supposing, on the night of election, there were fifty or sixty deputy returning officers of whom, perhaps, three or four might be ill and could not come to the city. Their ballot boxes must be returned.

Mr. COCHRANE. Let the clerk go after them.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The clerk would not be able to go to fifty or sixty polling places.

Mr. COCHRANE. He could go to three or four.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But the law does not intend

that the returning officer shall go around and collect the boxes. Suppose the deputy returning officer is ill or is unable to come in, then, the returning officer has to send for the box.

Mr. FOSTER. It is general here. It becomes a collector's business.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not to be done except in cases where the deputy returning officer is unable to come in with his ballot box.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Well, then, how can provision be made to meet that otherwise than is proposed here?

Mr. HOLMES. I think if you leave that clause as it is, a good many would take advantage of it and send their boxes in by anybody.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They cannot do that.

Mr. HOLMES. Suppose you stop at the words 'who shall receive the same?'

Mr. WM. MCGREGOR (North Essex). There is no doubt that the present system is not right under which you have people collecting these boxes. In 1891, in my constituency, the returns were not sent in for two weeks because the returning officer said he had no power to go to any great expense in the matter, and he allowed the deputies to send in the boxes whenever they thought necessary. I would be for providing that the deputy returning officer himself, or the clerk who acted with him, should bring in the boxes. Some of the boxes in my constituency laid around for several days in stores, and one was in a cigar store for two weeks. This gave the deputy returning officer the chance of coming down to see the city and bring the boxes with him.

Mr. FOSTER. I believe the whole responsibility should be thrown on the deputy returning officer. It may be that one or two deputies may be ill, but that is a day that the deputy returning officers do not propose to get ill if they possibly can avoid it. They should have the responsibility of delivering these boxes to the returning officer or to the clerk.

Mr. MCGREGOR. And to deliver them at once.

Mr. FOSTER. Forthwith, of course. In the case of illness, the deputy returning officer should give the box to some properly appointed person to whom he would administer the oath.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The deputy returning officer is supposed to be a very responsible man, and the deputy is not supposed to part with

the box except to the returning officer, or to some person specially authorized by him. If you give the deputy returning officer the privilege of giving the box to any one he likes, I would be afraid of some of those ballot boxes.

Mr. FOSTER. You narrow it down to the special case of where the deputy returning officer is ill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If they want to do wrong, I am afraid there would be a great many ill.

Mr. COCHRANE. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries should not make that insinuation. If the returning officer is a responsible man, he should not appoint a deputy who is not responsible. There would not be the difficulty the Minister of Marine and Fisheries sees in it. When this duty is confined to the deputy, or to his clerk, or to the man he may appoint, it is a great deal safer to have men perambulating about the country with forty or fifty ballot boxes and having no control over them.

Mr. McINERNEY. I think this clause as it stands is pretty near as good as you can make it. The returning officer is here made the responsible party and when the deputy returning officer is unable to return the box the returning officer assumes the responsibility of appointing a man to collect it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You know who to look to in that case.

Mr. McINERNEY. Certainly. You look to the returning officer who is responsible for the man he appoints. That is far better to my mind than allowing the deputy returning officer to pretend he is sick and send the ballot box down with Tom, Dick or Harry; some perfectly unknown man. The provision as it is now, is I believe as good as you can make it.

Mr. COCHRANE. My hon. friend (Mr. McInerney), has not read of the transactions of some returning officers in Ontario when he makes that statement. I would be sorry to say that the deputy returning officers are irresponsible men. If the returning officer does his duty he will not appoint a man as deputy who is not responsible, and, therefore, the deputies would be as responsible as he himself is.

Mr. McINERNEY. Neither would he appoint a man to collect the boxes who is not responsible.

Mr. COCHRANE. Under the present system it is not alone when a man is ill that the returning officer sends out a man to collect the ballot boxes, for in my riding it continuously happens that the ballot boxes are never attempted to be returned by the deputies at all. The privilege is given to

the returning officer now, and he avails himself of it; I will not say for pecuniary purposes, but it allows the returning officer to appoint who he sees fit to gather up the boxes, and he takes the financial end of it himself. There is great danger in allowing a man to start out and travel around a large constituency gathering up ballot boxes, when the seals are often broken. Sometimes these men stay over night in towns and villages, and leave the boxes around. The deputy returning officers are not going to be all sick on election day, so that that argument falls to the ground, and if the returning officer does his duty and appoints good men, then the deputies are just as responsible for one box as the returning officer is for forty boxes. If you put a fine from \$300 to \$500 on the deputy returning officer, his responsibility will be just as great as if you put a fine of \$1,000 on the returning officer.

Mr. LOGAN. The suggestion might be a good one in a compact constituency, but what would my hon. friend do in a constituency like Algoma, which is about a thousand miles in length, or the district of Burrard, B.C.? Would he have fifty deputy returning officers travelling from 500 to 1,000 miles? I think we had better put the responsibility on the returning officer.

Mr. McNEILL. Why not, in case of sickness, impose the duty upon the deputy returning officer at the nearest polling division?

Mr. GILLIES. There is an evident desire on the part of the committee to minimize the chances of having the ballot boxes tampered with. I would suggest that in the event of the illness of the deputy returning officer, parliament should nominate the poll clerk as the person by whom the ballot box should be returned to the returning officer.

Mr. INGRAM. I think this section is as good as we can make it. If the deputy returning officer cannot act, the clerk is the person who assumes charge of the poll-book and ballot box.

Section agreed to.

On section 90,

Mr. INGRAM. This section provides that a deposit of \$100 must be put up in case of a recount. In the province of Ontario there is no deposit required; but, if the majority is fifty or under, there may be a recount, while, if it is over fifty, there cannot be a recount. If there is a desire to have an increase of the deposit in Prince Edward Island, I have no objection; but, I certainly object to applying the same rule to the province of Ontario. The system in the province works well, and I think it would work equally well in the Dominion. I do not see why we should have one rule for the province and another for the Dominion. I would, therefore, move that from

and including the words 'and if the applicant,' in the second line on page 23, down to the words 'to be elected,' in the tenth line, be struck out, and also subsection 11.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is the law now, and I would not like to alter it.

Amendment negatived.

On section 90,

Mr. POWELL. This section provides the grounds for a recount, but, it seems to me, there is one omission. A deputy returning officer may have counted the votes properly, but in totalling up the column and making his return to the returning officer, he may have made an error in the addition, and that should be a ground for a recount.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have here the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), which I propose to add to the section: 'Has made an incorrect statement of the number of ballot papers cast for a candidate.' That amendment meets the difficulty.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 107,

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) proposed several amendments to this section, which are found in the Votes and Proceedings of June 4. For instance, 107a prohibits the selling, or giving in exchange, or supplying gratuitously to any person any quantity of spirituous or fermented liquor, except in certain cases to the sick.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think it is practically impossible to accept that, I do not think it could be made workable.

Mr. FOSTER. That is pretty drastic.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. 107b, proposed by the hon. member for Montmorency, prohibits the bringing into the limits of the electoral district on polling day, or on the day previous, any spirituous or fermented liquors, but with this provision:

This provision shall not affect the sale, carrying, delivery or purchase of spirituous or fermented liquor, made in good faith and in the ordinary course of affairs, by a merchant or trader; provided that the cases, casks, bottles or envelopes containing the said liquor be not opened, broken or unclosed during the days above mentioned.

The trouble there is that it will make the offence depend on the action of the person who made the purchase, who breaks the seal, for instance. A man may sell in perfect good faith and be free from blame, but if the person to whom he sold breaks the seal, then the seller becomes liable. That seems to be an objectionable principle in legislation.

Mr. INGRAM. As regards 107d, we find it difficult in rural sections to get places for committee rooms except in hotels. By adopting this amendment it will shut us out altogether from hotels.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We must not defeat the object that we have in view by making the law so stringent that it cannot be operated.

Mr. INGRAM. By adopting this we will be opening the door for corruption wider than it is now. Because a person can go to any place and offer to hire a room if the owner will vote for his party. He may hire forty rooms in forty different polling subdivisions on the same conditions, and by that means secure forty votes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I call attention here to section 96, subsection 5, which provides that no candidate, clerk, agent or other person shall communicate at any time to any person any information as to the number on the back of the ballot paper given to any voter at a polling station or attempt to ascertain the number on the back of any ballot paper. There are two sections of the Act to which that must not apply, because the number is put on the ballot paper in order that this information may be obtainable, as in Prince Edward Island, section 67 of this Act, where a man's vote is objected to, and because of that a number is put on it corresponding with the number in the book. It is put on for the purpose of enabling the agent there to tell the candidate that number so-and-so was objected to. It is put on in order that he may be identified. This provision which prohibits any information being given, must not extend to that section, otherwise the object would be defeated. There is another section 74, regarding the case of an elector in whose name another person has previously voted. If somebody has voted in my name already and I come up and want to vote, I make an affidavit in form V, that I am the person entitled to vote, whereupon a ballot is given to me and a number corresponding with the number is entered in the ballot book. It is necessary that information should be given in these two cases as to the number, and I propose to add to subsection 5, which prohibits any information being given:

But this provision shall not apply to ballots marked under the 67th or 74th sections of this Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to ask the hon. Solicitor General if he would consider the advisability, in section 72, of providing that these numbers on the counterfoils shall be seen not merely by the deputy returning officer, but by the agents?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, by everybody. The intention is that it shall

be known to those who are present and who are interested in the vote that a certain ballot brought back by the voter is the ballot which has been given to him. It would be dealt with as openly as possible.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman will introduce words providing for that?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is the amendment I propose. Of course, the adoption of the amendment will depend entirely upon the information I receive from the Printing Bureau as to whether it would be possible to print the ballots here and send them out through the country so that there will be nothing to do but put the names on them. Then, we will be absolutely certain that we will have a uniform ballot printed on a uniform class of paper.

Mr. POWELL. If the hon. gentleman is going to apply to the Printing Bureau I would like to say that the hon. member for St. John's City (Mr. Ellis) made a suggestion which struck me as being particularly good. His suggestion was, and it would seem to be very easy for the printer to put some mark on the paper while he was printing it which could not be imitated.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The idea of having coloured paper is also a valuable one, because it would prevent a person seeing how the cross is marked. Of course, all that depends on what information we get from the Printing Bureau.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we would get on more quickly if we were to leave these amendments until the hon. member for Montmorency comes and give him an opportunity of bringing them up.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I communicated with the hon. member for Montmorency by wire and asked him to be here to-day. I was sorry to hear that his wife was so ill that it would be impossible for him to come, and that he has gone down to the country with her. How would it be to have the Bill go through, and then on the third reading, if the hon. gentleman proposes any of these amendments, he will have an opportunity of explaining them with the understanding that we might go back into committee and take up some of them, because, I am sure, we cannot adopt them all.

Mr. INGRAM. The other day we went over these proposed amendments, and some of them are pretty well agreed on. One hundred and eight was agreed on.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) proposes this amendment:

Section 107e. Each candidate can have only one place paid for in each polling subdivision for his election committee, under penalty for each contravention to a fine not exceeding dollars and an imprisonment of months in default of payment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) rather objects to 107e.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is proposed to insert in section 108 after the 11th line the following subsection:

(i) Every person who immediately previous to or during an election and by reason thereof, with a view of promoting and securing votes or of interfering with the freedom and sincerity of the electors or the electorate, causes temporary work to be performed by electors whom he employs and pays:

Every elector who participates in such work becomes incapable 'ipso facto' of voting at such election and incurs a penalty of dollars and an imprisonment of months in default of payment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It strikes me that this is very hard lines on an elector who is employed for a day or two and who does not know anything about it. He simply goes and works for a man and he loses his vote in consequence. Every elector who participates in such work becomes ipso facto incapable of voting.

Mr. INGRAM. It is to stop this kind of thing being done where a man says: I will give you so much a day, and so on.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is proposed by the hon. member for Montmorency to replace the proviso at the end of section 108 by the following:

Every person shall be guilty of bribery and shall be punishable accordingly:

Who to induce a person to allow himself to be nominated as a candidate, or to refrain from becoming a candidate, or to withdraw, if he has so become:

(1) Shall give or lend money or any valuable consideration whatever, or shall agree to give or lend, or shall offer or promise to try to procure for such person or for any other person, any money or valuable consideration whatever, or

(2) Shall give or promise any office, place of employment, or shall agree to give or procure, or shall offer or promise, or shall promise to procure or endeavour to procure such office, place or employment for such or any other person.

Mr. INGRAM. This is a proper provision to put in this Act, because it is not a proper thing for a man to be put into the field for the purpose of defeating one or both of the candidates named by the other parties. Is it not a fact that sometimes men are used for the purpose of defeating one party or the other? There ought be something put in this Act which will make it unlawful to have bogus nominations. A man who is bribed to come out for the purpose of defeating one or other of the candidates should be guilty of unlawful offence.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This amendment, if adopted, might reach a case which we certainly ought not to punish. Take the case of a young man who offers himself as a candidate and he is assisted

by his father ; that would be perfectly legitimate. Take the other case of a young man who has political aspirations and his father or his mother do not wish him to run, or even a friend, and they give him some consideration to abstain, the young man ought to be in a position to accept such inducement. There certainly should be some provision, however, to prevent a man being induced to withdraw in order to permit some one else to be elected ; because that is the worst kind of fraud.

Mr. INGRAM. A man may be nominated and it is known that he has no possibility of election, and he may be bribed to withdraw.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There are certainly some cases of that kind which ought to be met, so as to prevent a fraud being perpetrated on the electors. Of course a poor man might want some of his friends to pay his legitimate expenses, and that could not be prevented. Under paragraph 2 of 108a, he would be prevented from doing that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A good many candidates are obliged to borrow money to put up their deposits.

Mr. INGRAM. I am afraid that will be particularly the case after this session.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL I would suggest the following amendment as 108a :

Every person is guilty of bribery and punishable as provided in section 108, who, to induce a person to allow himself to be nominated as a candidate, or to refrain from becoming a candidate, or to withdraw, if he has so become, gives or promises any office, place or employment, or agrees to give or procure, or offers or promises to procure or endeavours to procure such office, place or appointment for such another person.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). It would be a great deal better to let that section alone. I think we are getting on dangerous ground right here. The genius of our election law should be to assist the people to bring out candidates and not put difficulties in the way of their coming out. To put in anything in the Act that would make it a stumbling-block for a man to present himself as a candidate, would be altogether wrong. I know the case of an election where his friends went to a man and said : If you run it shall not cost you 10 cents, and they got enough money to pay his deposit, and the man won.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The committee are unanimous that the proposed amendment, so far as it prohibits a poor man from receiving his aid to pay his deposit, should be struck out. The provision which we are aiming at is to prevent a man being nominated, and then fraudulently withdrawing. I would, however, agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Puttee), that we had better leave this clause stand.

On section 112,

Mr. INGRAM. I think a specified term of imprisonment for intimidation should be inserted in this section. Therefore, I move:

That section 112 is hereby amended by striking out all the words in the said section after the word 'shall' in the 18th line, and substituting the following therefor: 'be liable to a penalty of \$200 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour, or to both.

There are complaints of intimidation, and the House has seen fit not to adopt a half holiday or a holiday to give men an opportunity of voting without intimidation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What the hon. gentleman is aiming at is already provided for. The section says that the offender is guilty of an indictable offence, which, under the Code, makes him liable to imprisonment for any term up to five years.

Mr. INGRAM. It may be for only a week or a month. I think we should state the period of time during which he shall be imprisoned.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If you do that you withdraw all discretion from the presiding judge, and visit the same penalty on a man who commits a venial offence as on one who commits a grave offence. You thereby simply ensure that he shall not be punished at all.

Mr. POWELL. As the section stands, I think the only penalty imposed is the \$200 fine. We must remember that the criminal law is construed very strictly.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What construction would my hon. friend put upon the term 'indictable offence' ?

Mr. POWELL. There are dozens of instances in the Code in which a person is said to be guilty of an indictable offence and is punished by summary conviction. You cannot punish for a statutory indictable offence, such as this offence is, as you would in an ordinary common law case ; you must take the punishment which the statute provides. Did this come within the common law, the \$200 fine might be cumulative ; but as the section stands, I think this is the only punishment that could be inflicted. I would like to have the opinion of the Solicitor General on that point.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think we might add to the clause, instead of the word 'also,' the words 'in addition to the penalty thereby incurred.' That would make the forfeiture of \$200 provided by this special Act an addition to the punishment of the indictable offence provided in the Code.

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

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Would the informer get part of the penalty?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

On section 125a,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have an amendment to propose to be called section 125a:

All placards, posters, publications and printed matter whatever placarded, posted or distributed during an election, having connection therewith or referring thereto, shall visibly bear on the face thereof the names and addresses of the printers and publishers thereof, and whoever prints, publishes, placards or distributes any such printed matter without such names and addresses as aforesaid, is liable to a penalty not exceeding \$500 or imprisonment not exceeding twelve months, in default of payment.

This is intended to prevent the publication of scurrilous or defamatory matter.

Mr. FOSTER. You are passing this and when passed it becomes law—and I suppose there are millions of copies of printed documents of one kind or another already issued and sent out through the country, left in the hands of the committeemen and so so, ready to be presented to the electors as soon as the election is announced, and, in many cases, without any printer's name upon them. This literature has been sent out by both parties and will be distributed throughout the country for the coming election. Many copies, no doubt, will be posted—many of those adornment—object lessons, showing the repudiation of Grit promises—have already been printed and stacked up somewhere to be put on the boards.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Personally, I think it should be confined to defamatory or malicious matter. This section proposed would cover anything—for instance, the report of a speech in parliament handed by one elector to another during an election. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has good ideas, but I cannot agree with this proposal.

Mr. INGRAM. The night before an election where a strong feeling among the people is in one direction, some document may be issued—

Mr. CAMPBELL. A roorback.

Mr. INGRAM. Exactly a roorback—trying to convince the people that one candidate has gone counter to this thing that the people so much favour. No respectable printer or publisher would print a document of that kind if his name had to be put on it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I agree with the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram). Perhaps the present section is too broad, but if we could devise some form of words to meet this case it would be well to do so.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose we ask the Solicitor General to take that into consideration and frame a section designed to prevent the circulation of false and defamatory matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Then, 125a stands.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think it would be well that we should go through the Bill as we have and leave these amendments untouched at present. They do not fit in with the Bill as it is, and it will be necessary to recast almost every line to make them fit in.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the Solicitor General going to have the Bill reprinted before the third reading?

Mr. FOSTER. That was suggested by the Prime Minister.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think there would be some trouble in getting it done in time. If my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) would look at the Bill he would see that the amendments are not so many.

On section 147,

Mr. INGRAM. This is a section which should be amended. The present way of paying returning officers is altogether wrong. His fees are according to the number of polling subdivisions. The way it is now a premium is offered to the returning officer to create a large number of polling subdivisions in which only a few votes may be cast, and still the candidate requires to supply agents at every booth. In Toronto there are subdivisions where there are only five or six votes cast, and it is outrageous that a candidate should be obliged to provide officers at each one of these booths. Take the city of Ottawa. There are far too many subdivisions, as the hon. member for Ottawa will bear me out in saying. If there are thirty polling subdivisions in an electoral district, the returning officer gets \$60, and he gets \$2 for every additional subdivision he creates. The result is that he creates more than are necessary, and thereby throws upon the candidates a great deal of extra trouble and upon the country a great deal of extra expense. Some means should be adopted by which we could pay a lump sum to the returning officer in cities, while in districts of vast area such as Algoma and in British Columbia, the remuneration of the returning officer might remain on the same basis as at present.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is a great convenience to people in cities to have a reasonable number of polling stations. So far as my experience goes, the number has not been excessive. The returning officer has a great deal of work to do and gets very little for it, so I do not think we should endeavour to diminish his fees. I really do not know

of any case in cities where an unnecessary number of polling divisions is established.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. As I understand it, a polling division is created for not less than 200 nor more than 300 voters. Therefore, I do not understand how such cases could occur as those mentioned by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) where there are only five or six votes in a polling subdivision. I never heard of any such cases myself, although I have represented a city and also a large rural constituency. I never heard of a subdivision being created for a less number of voters than is specified by law.

Mr. INGRAM. The law is now that if there are over 300 voters you should establish an additional polling booth. There may be a partition, on one side a subdivision for names from A to H, and on the other side of the partition one for names from H to Z. If there is one additional in either partition, do you mean to say that the returning officer shall establish an additional polling booth and have \$2 additional? The hon. member for Three Rivers says he never heard of a polling division having only six, or eight, or nine votes. As a matter of fact there are many such. We find in the city of Toronto there is one with six votes, another with eight and another with nine.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What election is that?

Mr. INGRAM. That is the plebiscite. But it does not make any difference, the same thing would occur in Toronto in any other election.

Mr. MCGREGOR. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Who says no?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I do.

Mr. INGRAM. If he can produce one voters' list in Toronto that does not contain a few diversions like this, I will resign from this House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is it not a fact that under the provincial law you have polling subdivisions?

Mr. INGRAM. We have.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Well, then, the returning officer is bound to take these.

Mr. INGRAM. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I notice that the fifth section, subsection *b* of the Franchise Act, provides that the polling subdivisions shall be those established at provincial elections. Our Bill provides that where there are no polling subdivisions, the returning officer shall subdivide the electoral districts into as many polling subdivisions as he deems necessary.

That seems very reasonable. If the province has subdivisions he adopts those, but if there are no subdivisions he makes a subdivision with the limitation that there must be less than 200 and not more than 300 electors as far as practicable.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It works all right.

Mr. INGRAM. It works all right for hon. gentlemen opposite, but not for us. Hon. gentlemen opposite have the inside track on the information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) say that in Toronto there are polling subdivisions that have only six or eight votes?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can understand that in a rural division, where people have to drive a long way, it might be necessary to have a polling subdivision with less than 200 votes, but not in a city. There is certainly a convenience in giving people every facility to vote, but there is another object, and it is to prevent people gathering in large numbers in any one place which is always a temptation to disorder. I think one of the greatest improvements in our election laws is the increasing of the number of subdivisions, so that the number of people at any one place is hardly large enough to get up a row.

Mr. HENDERSON. My recollection is quite distinct that there are polling places in Toronto where there are not more than five or six votes polled. This occurs in the business districts of the city. Business men live in other portions of the city, and they are on the list where they live and not where they do business.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These are established by the provincial law.

Mr. INGRAM. I want to show the hon. Finance Minister the number of voters on the revised voters' lists in each polling subdivision—six, ten, twelve, and so on.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Take the voters' list.

Mr. INGRAM. That is the voters' list. Suppose you were going to have an election to-morrow, that would be the voters' list.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That must be under your returning officers. The next time it will be ours, and we will have that fixed right.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Franchise Act, fifth section, subsection *b*, provides that:

The polling divisions shall be those established by or under the laws of that province for the purposes of provincial elections within the territory comprised in the electoral district for which such election is held.

We are supplementing this by making a provision which states, that wherever no

such polling subdivision exists, the returning officer shall divide the electoral district. Wherever there are subdivisions the law provides that you shall adopt them. So that, my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) sees that he must be wrong on that point.

Mr. INGRAM. In the province of Ontario under the Ontario law the rule is 200 voters to a polling subdivision, and in my own city there will be fourteen polling subdivisions, but, under this Bill, it gives us the right to have 300. You would not pretend to say that because there are more than 200 voters in a polling subdivision for local elections you would establish another one. You provide for polling subdivisions to be set apart and to be put in the proclamation. We are not in a position to say how many votes there are in a division, so that we could not strike the number in a division exactly, because our registration is not completed until almost the day before the election takes place. According to our Bill, if there were 900 voters there would be three subdivisions to be made. That is the distinction between the Ontario Act and our Bill, and that is the reason why they have fourteen subdivisions in my city, whereas, we might only have six polling subdivisions, divided from A to H, H to M, M to Z, and then, the polling booths are all in one building.

Mr. MCGREGOR. There is another reason, and that is, that it is so difficult to get men to go to the right poll. If the local election takes place at one poll and the Dominion at another, it is quite difficult for men to find out where to vote. Voters should know exactly where they should vote each time an election comes on. I am strongly in favour of the law as it stands.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman is in favour of paying the deputy returning officer a premium for creating a lot of polling subdivisions.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We will not do it now. We will have not less than 200 and not more than 300 voters in each subdivision.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would like to have an assurance that there is no trouble about the minimum number of voters in a subdivision. There are many rural subdivisions where you cannot have 200 people voting at one place. The Bill says that the returning officer shall, as far as practicable, subdivide so that there will be not less than 200 and not more than 300 voters in each subdivision. That is all right as respects the maximum, but there must be in some parts of the country subdivisions in which there will be less than 200.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is perfectly plain.

Mr. INGRAM. Under the Municipal Act in townships in Ontario they have certain

polling subdivisions. Under this Act they will still have these polling subdivisions and know where to vote, because the returning officer in creating the polling subdivisions has that fact before him. But it is in cities where registration occurs that the difficulty will arise and where we will be offering a premium to the returning officer to make a lot of subdivisions.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is not a very heavy premium.

Mr. INGRAM. In a city like Toronto it is a big premium.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Before we touch the forms, I would like to go back to section 72. We agreed upon something the other day, and we have all forgotten it. We agreed to amend section 72 by inserting in the sixteenth line, after the word 'vote' 'and to the right of such name or names.' That is, the voter must put his mark to the right of the candidate's name.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If that was agreed to by the committee, I am not going to press strongly any objection of mine. But everybody who has had to do with elections knows that in every polling division there are five or ten voters who will persist in making their crosses under the name or in the name, or some where else in the space marked off for the candidate's name than to the right. The Supreme Court has held that a ballot so marked is good. I understand the Solicitor General wants to run a line down the ballot after the names, and provide that the voter must make his mark to the right of that line within the space after the candidate's name. But, so long as it is perfectly clear who the voter is voting for, which is the case when the cross is within the space containing the candidate's name, why not leave that ballot good? The proposal to have a broad black line between the names of candidates is an excellent one. No question can arise then as to which side of the line the vote is marked upon. It would be better, it seems to me, to allow the ballot to be good if the cross is put anywhere within the space containing the candidate's name.

Mr. McNEILL. No, no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am very strongly of that opinion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is six o'clock, and we had better not dispose of that question now. I believe we can devise a form of ballot that will leave only one space to make a mark in. I have had an inspiration on that, which I have sent to the printer. I will not guarantee that it is right, but I think it is worth considering.

It being six o'clock, the committee took recess.

## AFTER RECESS.

(The House resumed in Committee.)

On form 'G' (oath of attestation of the nomination paper),

Mr. McALISTER. Section 35 provides that the returning officer shall require the person, or one or more of the persons, producing a nomination paper to make oath before him, whereas form G provides that the oath shall be taken before a justice of the peace. I would move that the words 'justice of the peace' be struck out, and the words 'returning officer' substituted.

Amendment agreed to.

On form 'L' (directions for the guidance of electors in voting).

Mr. INGRAM. I would suggest that the form of ballot be inserted in these directions, so that there would be no mistake about it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is a reasonable suggestion, and I accept it.

On schedule 2,

Mr. PUTTEE. Is that note increasing the fee in Winnipeg to be put in there?

Mr. ELLIS. I have no objection to it, but I think it is a great mistake to legislate on the idea that Winnipeg is more expensive than other places. I do not think there is any reason for that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It seems to me that we should not distinguish between Winnipeg and the other great cities.

Mr. PUTTEE. It has been usual to do so by order in council.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not know it was because Winnipeg had to receive a double fee that it was left out so long.

Mr. PUTTEE. They refused to give it this time. As a matter of fact you cannot get a constable there for \$1 a day. The candidates have to get their friends to act as constables.

Mr. FOSTER. You can get some Doukhobors down.

On schedule 3,

Mr. FOSTER. What is the effect of this amendment that you propose there?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This will put Manitoba on the same footing as the other provinces. The only thing remaining now is as to the provision for the soldiers in South Africa, and the form of the ballot.

Mr. POWELL. I submitted to the Solicitor General the other day the following amendments to section 79:

(g) Who being a deputy returning officer, fraudulently puts otherwise than as authorized by section 70 of this Act, his initials on the back of any paper purporting to be or capable of being used as a ballot paper at any election, or

(h) Who without being authorized by the returning officer prints any ballot paper or what purports to be or is capable of being used as a ballot paper at any election, or

(i) Who being authorized by the returning officer to print the ballot papers for any election, fraudulently prints more ballot papers than he is so authorized to print, or

(j) Who, except for the bona fide purposes of this Act, has in his possession or gives or otherwise disposes of to any person any paper being or purporting to be, or capable of being used as a ballot paper at any election, or—

The Solicitor General pointed out that subsection a. of section 79, was in conflict with some of these provisions; apparently it is, but I think really they deal with different matters. Section a in the Bill reads:

(a) Forges, counterfeits, fraudulently alters, defaces or fraudulently destroys a ballot paper or the initials of the deputy returning officer signed thereon.

That contemplates meddling with the ballot after it is put in the box.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think so.

Mr. POWELL. My amendment goes further than that, and it bears on what might be done before polling day, for the purpose of perpetrating a fraud.

(g) Who being a deputy returning officer, fraudulently puts otherwise than as authorized in section 70 of the Act, his initials on the back of any paper purporting to be or capable of being used as a ballot paper at any election, or

That would meet the case of the returning officer who was in league or fraudulent collusion with parties outside, to assist in putting fraudulent ballots in the box. They get his initials on the ballots, and take them outside, and these bogus papers are brought in.

(h) Who without being authorized by the returning officer, prints any ballot paper or what purports to be or is capable of being used as a ballot paper at any election, or

(i) Who being authorized by the returning officer to print the ballot papers for any election, fraudulently prints more ballot papers than he is so authorized to print, or

It does not include those which are destroyed in the process of printing. The words 'except for the bona fide purposes of this Act,' you will readily see protects the printer; and any man who outside of that fraudulently has in his possession any ballot paper, is liable to punishment. It is by means of having these ballot papers outside to distribute among the voters, that a great many frauds are perpetrated. I think when the Solicitor General looks into the matter, he will see there is no collision between the sections as they stand here with the exception possibly of subsection b: 'Without authority supplies a ballot paper to any person.' That is included in the one marked J, but I think, as mine goes further, it had better take the place of it. Suppose the printer is authorized to print 350, and he prints 400, he would be liable; but

I will put in the word 'fraudulently' so that he would only be liable in case he printed them with fraudulent intent. The last clause I do not think should be qualified by that term :

(j) Who, except for the bona fide purposes of this Act, has in his possession, or gives, or otherwise disposes of, to any person of any paper being or purporting to be, or capable of being used as a ballot paper at any election, or

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows that in most districts, we have a form of ballot printed in all the newspapers for the instruction of the electors, and this might be taken to cover that.

Mr. POWELL. They can put on it 'this is simply for the purpose of instruction.' I would call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this fact, that it is absolutely necessary, by some very stringent measure to stop the circulation of these ballots. Fraudulent manipulation will take advantage of it. If you give any loophole at all, they will come in and perpetrate the fraud. The printers can guard themselves by putting on the face of it these words: 'This is for the purpose of instructing voters,' so it does not purport to be a bona fide ballot paper at all.

Mr. McNEILL. If we have concluded with the consideration of the Bill, I would mention to the hon. the Solicitor General, that he promised to allow me to make a suggestion with regard to sealing the ballot box. I would also mention to the hon. gentleman that I propose to endeavour to draft something which will, if possible, impose a mechanical difficulty upon the deputy returning officer in reference to some of the frauds that have been discussed.

Committee rose and reported progress.

#### SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals if he is prepared to give us the papers I asked for in regard to the Galops Channel. I handed the hon. Minister of Finance a list of them at the morning sitting.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I received the memo. and gave it to the deputy minister who is getting the information. He will be here very shortly and I have no doubt he will have it.

Lake St. Louis Channel—Forming channel \$10,000

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) What is to be done here?

Mr. POWELL.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is practically to clean up the bottom of the channel and finish it.

Lachine Canal—Dredge vessels ..... \$2,000

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). What is that for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Two additional dredge vessels.

Mr. FOSTER. One thousand dollars each?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of vessels do you get for \$1,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are scows or barges. We require to keep a number of these on hand.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you get them built? Do you call for tenders?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are built, sometimes by our own men, and in the cases where we have them built by others we generally call for tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. Will these be built by tender and contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know whether we will build them ourselves or build them by tender and contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Where do you build them?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. On the canal wherever they are required to be used.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you shops there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I guess so.

Mr. FOSTER. You guess so?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have them on all the canals.

Grenville Canal—Enlargement ..... \$5,000

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have the explanation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The contractors have completed the work. They have been paid \$87,150. There was an appropriation in 1899-1900 of \$7,155, and we require \$5,000 more to complete the payments under the contract.

Farran's Point Canal—Enlargement .... \$140,310

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have the explanation of that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We require this amount to pay what we will owe at the end of the month for the work that has been done on the Farran's Point Canal. The canal con-

struction company's estimates already passed amount to \$65,335, and the drawback is \$12,000. An estimate has come in and others will come in which we think will absorb this amount, perhaps not all, because, when this estimate was made three or four months ago, we judged that there would be that amount of work to be done. I am not quite so sure in regard to it now, but we cannot tell exactly what the amount will be. We may not require it all perhaps, but we may come very close to it.

Mr. POWELL. How much has been spent on that work up to date?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Including drawback the contractors have been paid \$78,000.

North channel, forming ..... \$208,700

Mr. FOSTER. Give us the explanation of that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This amount is somewhat larger than we are going to require. This case is somewhat analogous to that I have mentioned. It is because when we made up our estimates we expected there would have been \$208,700 required during the current year. We are not going to require that amount. The most that will have been earned will be \$170,000. I am proposing to reduce this vote by \$38,700, which will make the vote \$170,000. The estimate down to November, 1899, was \$92,331. We judged when we made up the estimates that there would be required up to May, 31, \$34,000, which, added to previous expenditure, would make \$127,000, and that by June 30, the balance would be required. We find that we will require only \$42,000 to pay the estimate due, which will make \$170,000.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). What is the total expenditure and the amount that will be required to finish the work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There has been paid to the contractors up to March, 1900, \$703,480, and the expenditure in connection with engineers, &c., has been \$718,984.

Mr. POWELL. Who was responsible for commencing the work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was strongly recommended by the engineer of the department.

Mr. POWELL. When was it commenced?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In 1897.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been spent on it so far?

Mr. POWELL. \$718,984. The only object of this work is apparently to save dis-

tance, and I would ask how much distance has been saved?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman. It was very strongly recommended by the engineers.

Mr. HAGGART. There is \$1,100,000 spent on the work, and how much besides for the range lights?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. \$1,000, which will be charged to income account.

Mr. HAGGART. I again enter my protest as I did when this vote first came up. I say it is entirely a useless work. There is no necessity for it at all. There is a deep enough channel on the American side right down to the top of the rapids, and this expenditure of \$1,100,000 will make it no better, or as good a channel as the one we have already.

Mr. POWELL. Is it any deeper than the old channel?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. POWELL. I passed through it two or three times. I do not think at the most distant point it is a quarter of a mile shorter than the old channel. I could understand the advantages of a straight channel if it was going to save any distance.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It gives you a very direct course.

Mr. POWELL. But the other is not a circuitous course.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not by any means a very direct course. This north channel gives us a splendid waterway and a direct entrance into the canal. It has certainly very many advantages over the other, and it was very strongly recommended by the engineer. I brought down last year or the year before, the reports of the engineer giving his reasons for constructing this channel. Mr. Rubidge, who has exceptional knowledge of the St. Lawrence canals, recommended it very strongly, and his reasons were fortified by the chief engineer of the department.

Mr. POWELL. Because you save the quarter of a mile would be no reason why this channel should be built at such an immense cost. If there were obstructions in the way of navigation in the old channel, and it would be cheaper to construct this new channel than to remove them, there would be a good reason, but I am told there are no obstructions in the old channel which is a wide and a good channel.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not half as good as this channel.

Mr. POWELL. But the same argument would tend in favour of dredging every river and making a straight line from the source to the mouth.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If you consult the shipping men they will tell you that it is most important to get a direct entrance into the mouth of your canal, and the old route and the American channel does not give you that. When you are doing such a work it is very desirable that you should make your improvements sufficient to give you an adequately wide channel for all purposes. There can be no question as to the advantages of this new channel over the old. The engineers and the shipping men are in favour of it. I do not pretend to have any expert knowledge of it myself, but the officers of the department very strongly recommended it. It has been discussed in parliament and money has been voted for it on three different occasions. The sum which is now being asked for is nearly sufficient to complete the work.

Mr. POWELL. The object is to get a direct entrance to the canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and a wider channel.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of that channel?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One mile and a quarter.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of the old channel?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Following the United States channel?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is about a mile longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have the correct mileage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy tells me it is a mile longer, and the old channel would be two miles and a quarter, according to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I am told by people who have gone through there that there is very little difference between the two channels in length or in depth of water, and that the only difference is that the new channel is if anything more direct. A million and a quarter of dollars is an immense amount of money to spend in making a gain in directness to a very small extent comparatively.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief engineer says the old channel is about a mile longer, and according to the engineer's estimate it would cost more to deepen the old channel than to do

Mr. BLAIR.

this work. Of course, there is only a depth of nine feet in the other, whereas we are now getting fifteen or sixteen feet.

Mr. HAGGART. Notwithstanding the statement of the deputy minister, I beg to differ with him entirely as to the distance. From Prescott down, I do not think there is a difference of one-sixteenth of a mile. As to the depth of water being only nine feet, that depth is confined to one little point as you turn around the island, and the recommendation to the department, if I remember rightly, was that either that point should be removed or the north channel deepened. I stated to the engineer that under the Treaty of Washington we had as much right to navigate the American channel as the Americans, and I refused to entertain the proposal to deepen the north channel or even to incur the expenditure for deepening that little portion around the point, although that might be necessary. I am aware that it is a fad of the engineer, Mr. Rubidge to have the north channel deepened, and that he has recommended it to the minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What was the superintending engineer's estimate of the cost of deepening the old channel?

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, it was in the neighbourhood of \$200,000, and the deepening of the north channel, instead of being \$1,500,000, was less than half that amount. Even if the north channel is deepened, I believe that nearly all the vessels going down, certainly those going down the Galops Rapids, will go by the American channel, and will not use the north channel at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman had these estimates before him, and if the chief engineer's memory is correct, the hon. gentleman is very much at fault. The engineer's estimate of the cost of dredging the channel to 200 feet in width was over \$750,000. The shipping men and the newspapers complained that that would not be wide enough, and we met their expectations by widening the channel; and I think there has been no more popular change made in the St. Lawrence channel than the adoption of this new route. The hon. gentleman was averse to entertaining the recommendations of the engineer, but he stands almost alone in that respect. He will not find a shipping man on the river who does not prefer this channel instead of the other. In the other case, there is a sharp turn to get into the mouth of the canal, whereas here you have a wide channel giving the necessary depth and a straight course right into the mouth of the canal.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the minister is not aware that above the Galops Rapids

there was a contract let for the deepening of the channel to sixteen or seventeen feet, the contractors being W. Allan & Co; and the only part to be deepened was that little part from the Galops Rapids to the mouth of the Galops Canal. Nearly every vessel that goes down will not go through the north channel at all, but will go down through the American channel and through the Galops Rapids.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is absolutely wrong. They will do nothing of the kind. The shipping men say directly the reverse of what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not proposed to deepen the water from the north channel to the Galops Rapids, so that if the vessels go down the north channel they cannot get into the rapids. Any vessel going down the rapids will naturally use the American channel.

St. Lawrence River—Gas buoys..... \$37,160

Mr. FOSTER. Are these in the canals or along the St. Lawrence River?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are not in the canals, but in the channel wherever there are any obstructions, and are for the purpose of guiding ships through the channel into the canal.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the custom of the Department of Canals to provide all these lighting arrangements along the line of the canals and the river stretches leading to the canals, or is it done by the Marine and Fisheries Department?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have been required to do it. I think that there is no fixed rule, but an overlapping of jurisdiction as between the Department of Railways and Canals and the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Public Works in many of these things sometimes takes place. This is a very necessary vote. We require to put down twenty-four gas buoys. We have been erecting lights in some places on the reaches between the canals, but my department has not erected all the lights on the whole of the St. Lawrence system.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you any division of territory by which the Department of Railways and Canals undertakes the lighting of the canal system, including the river stretches between these on the St. Lawrence River, and the Department of Marine and Fisheries takes charge of the other lights. On the lakes, of course the Marine Department has always had charge of the lights. It would seem as though the navigation and aids of navigation were entirely in the hands of the Marine Department, and the question with me is whether there is not a confusion of jurisdiction between the departments.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no conflict of jurisdiction. I do not know whether a conflict of jurisdiction might not possibly arise, but none has arisen. These buoys have to be placed, and we have assumed the expense of providing the necessary lights for the reaches between the canals.

Mr. HAGGART. Where are the buoys to be placed? The Marine Department has charge of the whole buoy system from Kingston to Prescott. I cannot understand where the hon. gentleman is going to place twenty-four gas buoys between there and Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You cannot run on the river at night without lights. As to where these buoys are to be placed, they are located on the plan, and I will lay the plan on the Table so that the hon. gentleman can see for himself. I do not carry in my mind the names of points along the reaches where these buoys are to be placed.

Mr. POWELL. Will the maintenance be expensive?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, these gas buoys are very cheaply maintained. They are a new description of buoys. Last year, or the year before, was the first time they were used on this continent, and they were used by the United States government. I decided last year to procure some of them and sent an order to England, which is the only place where they are manufactured. We found that the United States government had preceded us with an order for some ninety odd.

Mr. POWELL. They have them on the river too?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. We could not get them last year, but are getting them this year. They are not all here yet, but we are getting them as rapidly as they can be furnished.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (Three Rivers). The hon. minister is not *au fait* with the progress of Canada when he says that these gas buoys have only been known here since last year. They were introduced here several years ago. We have them between Quebec and Montreal, and we have them at the Traverse and all through the St. Lawrence River. They have been there to my knowledge five or six years at the very least. I cannot understand where these buoys are going to be placed, and I think that really we are not receiving the full information we are entitled to.

Mr. WM. MCGREGOR (North Essex). In the Detroit River the American government have placed seven or eight of those gas buoys, and there is not a buoy equal to them. In introducing them on the St. Lawrence, the minister will be doing a good

work. On the Detroit River, in about twelve miles, the American government have placed seven of those buoys, and they have twelve other lights which they keep themselves and each one of which is in Canadian waters. Our Canadians have the same use of them as the Americans, and the Americans keep them at their own expense, at a cost of \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year, a large proportion of which is met by subscription outside the government.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that the lighting of the channels along navigation belongs to the Department of Marine, and I do not understand why the Minister of Railways takes it up. But, if he is taking up the lighting of that portion of the river, he must be prepared to give us the details, just as the Department of Marine does. He must know where they are to be placed, and should tell us, and also where he gets them and the price.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman wants to know the precise points where they are to be placed, I will have a plan of the channel laid on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They cost \$1,570 each, so this sum of \$37,000 will pay for twenty-four. The buoys the member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) speaks of must have been of a very inferior quality. These have recently come into use, they are being put down by the American government, and are better than any that have been used heretofore.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not pretend to be an expert in these matters, but I would like to refer the hon. gentleman to his colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. When these gas buoys were introduced into the St. Lawrence River I have heard the Minister of Marine and Fisheries praising them up as being a great improvement, and I have no doubt they are. The hon. gentleman, if he refers to the estimates of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, will see that these buoys are laid down every spring and the cost of laying them down and filling them appears in the estimates. Now it would be hardly fair for the Minister of Railways and Canals to accuse his colleague of the Department of Marine and Fisheries of introducing an inferior article. But, I never heard before of the Department of Railways and Canals undertaking the work of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in introducing these lights. I have always understood that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was charged with the duty of looking after the lighting of our rivers and our lakes. I want to say also that if the hon. gentleman will consult his colleague he will find that the buoys on the River St. Lawrence were imported from England, and they

Mr. MCGREGOR.

were supposed to be the very best that could be obtained for the purposes for which they were intended. If they are not, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have to explain why he imported an inferior article and allowed his colleague to steal a march on him and get a better article than he has introduced on our rivers, where the navigation is as important, if not more so, than it is on the Galops Canal where these lights are supposed to serve.

Mr. MCGREGOR. This is a new patent, this is a different light from the light the minister is speaking of.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Does the hon. gentleman know much more about it than I do ?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Yes, I do.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Then I would like the hon. gentleman to do better than the Minister of Railways and Canals, and to give some explanations to the House that the minister cannot give.

Mr. HAGGART. I think we will have to ask this item to stand over until the minister can furnish us the explanation.

Soulanges Canal—Construction ..... \$263,000

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman just explain what this is for.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This amount will be required in order to pay up the estimates upon the contractors' work down to the end of the last fiscal year. We have been short on our estimates, and quite a number of the contractors have been short therefor in their payments. I will give a statement of the details that are payable out of this sum. \$70,000 are on progress estimates. Drawbacks after November and December: Poupore & Fraser, \$1,467.05; C. H. Raynor, \$6,059.09; Rogers & Taylor, \$386.15; Manning & McDonald, section 9, \$1,989.88; do, section 13, \$3,978.05; Archibald Stewart, \$16,693.48; James Battle, \$2,592.76; Bellhouse, Dillon & Company, \$735; Andrew Onderdonk, \$7,105.51; M. J. Hogan, \$20,094.21; Dominion Bridge Company, \$1,752.40; Ryan & McDonell, \$50,960.16; Charles H. Raynor, (culverts), \$4,355.06; J. and R. Miller, \$482.19; Dominion Bridge Company (stone sluices), \$5,694; Manning & McDonald (dredging), \$998; Canadian General Electric Company, \$7,533.26. Total, \$132,879.25.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that finish it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, that is required up to the end of the last fiscal year.

Mr. FOSTER. How much more will it take to finish it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It will cost altogether \$6,400,000 to finish the canal.

Mr. FOSTER. How much more besides this vote?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. With the estimates we are now considering, and the amounts heretofore paid, and what we are asking for next year, there will be \$4,799,000. The balance will be required.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister please tell how he could make such a mistake in his estimate last year? He did not tell us then that it would require any such amount as \$6,400,000 to finish the work. And he was to have had it completed last fall. Intending to complete it last fall, he surely asked for all that would be required.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is hardly worth while for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), to repeat that statement. He will fail to find that I made any such statement as that I expected to finish the canal last fall. We expected the canal to be sufficiently advanced towards completion to furnish a fourteen-foot channel through. But that is vastly different from saying that the canal would be completed—there is a great deal of work to be done before it is all finished. But the canal already furnishes a practicable fourteen-foot channel, that vessels can use, and great numbers of them are going through.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the work that yet remains to be done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a great deal of dressing and lining up, and also sodding. The masonry has by no means been finished, nor has the lock work.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it being used now by vessels going up and down?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, by any number of them.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister must not say that I attributed a statement to him which he did not make. He said practically the canals would be finished last fall, except the Galops Canal, and they might have to fall back upon an arrangement they had made with Mr. Davis for a year for that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is another thing altogether.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, it is stated from the speech from the Throne this year, that the waterway had been completed and a fourteen-foot navigation—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, no. If the hon. gentleman will read the speech from the Throne, he will find it says that the canals are sufficiently completed to enable us to provide a fourteen-foot channel. They are not finished in the sense of all the work being done.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister can give us, in any case, the estimated cost of the Soulanges Canal, as commenced, and whether it will be completed within the estimate—or how much it exceeds the estimate?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was started under the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Haggart's) administration, and probably knows the estimate made when it was started.

Mr. HAGGART. A minister should not come to the House, asking votes for supply without being ready to give the estimated cost of the work under consideration, and also the expenditure upon it. He should have those figures ready.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I told the hon. gentleman what we estimate the cost will be.

Mr. HAGGART. I am asking what the department estimated to be the cost of completing the Soulanges Canal, and how it turns out in comparison with that estimate. Surely that is a question I am entitled to have answered.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) called upon me to say what was the estimated cost of the canal when it was commenced. I suggested that he would probably have that information, as he commenced the canal, and I did not, I have given what we have estimated the cost to be, on completion, \$6,400,000. If he wants to know what it was estimated at under the late administration, I will look up the information and give it to him.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not remember it myself. But that is information that a minister should have on every item. I never ventured to explain my estimates as a minister without having from the department the estimated cost and the actual expenditure on every work. Here are the words from the speech from the Throne.

I am pleased to say that our canal system, connecting the great lakes with the Atlantic seaboard, has been completed so as to allow vessels having a draft of fourteen feet to pass from the head of Lake Superior to the sea.

Mr. MCGREGOR. You are both right.

Mr. FOSTER. At least, we are having a very interesting commentary on the claim made by the Prime Minister last August. The right hon. gentleman, in the course of his peregrinations through Ontario, took occasion, at one or two of his large meetings, to claim the whole credit for the canal system, not only for the origination of it, but for its prosecution. And the opinion he expressed and the impression he left on his audience, was that these large expenditures of money were caused by the fact that his government had taken up the canal system, and whereas the Liberal-Conservatives had simply dawdled over the work

from the time of Mr. Mackenzie down, and had done comparatively nothing, the present government had been bold enough to spend the money and complete the system. And the statement was made over and over again, that by the end of last year's navigation, the canal system would be completed so as to afford a fourteen-foot passage for all vessels.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. So it was.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Here is one canal unfinished, and it was put into the mouth of the Governor General when the House was opened, in the speech from the Throne, that the system was completed. Here is one of the portions of the canal system upon which \$1,200,000 has been spent, and the minister is asking for millions upon millions of dollars to complete this very system which we were told last autumn had been completed and wonderful glory and praise were reflected upon this administration for taking hold of that system, spending money on it and completing it, that there was no dawdling about it, that it was no longer in embryo, but that it was now an accomplished fact. Well, it is not an accomplished fact. The hon. gentleman is spending millions and millions of dollars yet. I have listened to many explanations by the minister, but if I have ever listened to a lame explanation, this is one.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman refresh his memory by looking back at the explanations made by his friend on his right (Mr. Haggart), when explanations were given by him on the estimates, and he will see how elaborate and detailed they were. He can make a comparison.

**Mr. HAGGART**. I suppose the hon. gentleman has no objection to letting the item stand until he can get the estimated cost of the construction of this work?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have the most decided objection to letting the item stand for such a purpose, because I have given the estimated cost three or four times. I have told the committee that the estimate cost of this canal from beginning to end is \$6,400,000.

**Mr. HAGGART**. This is the actual cost. What I want to get is the estimated cost by the department before the work was undertaken.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That you ought to know; I was not there.

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**. Shall this resolution be adopted?

**Mr. HAGGART**. No, it will not be adopted until we get the estimated cost. The

**Mr. FOSTER**.

hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will please explain some things in connection with the Soulanges Canal which I intend to deal with. There was a quantity of lime—you cannot call it cement—from Thorold, put in there. It was contrary to the advice of the engineer, because the engineer reported to me when I was at the head of the department that it was not fit cement to use in the construction of locks. Notwithstanding the advice of the engineer, I think the hon. gentleman paid some \$20,000 for this cement. It was a pity that such cement should have been used in good work of this kind. The engineer was examined before the Public Accounts Committee and said that the material was not fit to use. I would like to know what was done with the \$20,000 worth of Thorold cement that was purchased.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The question of Thorold cement has been the subject of a couple of debates in this House, and it cannot be that the hon. gentleman is desirous of obtaining information on that subject, because he already knows all about it. He knows that a contract was made with the company in Thorold for a quantity of their cement. I stated to the House that the cement was procured on the recommendation of persons who had used it. It had been used on the Welland Canal, and it had been used by Mr. W. B. Thompson, who had the highest opinion of its quality and value, and by other engineers, and on the strength of these opinions, and desiring to favour a home industry, I gave the Thorold company an opportunity of tendering with others for cement to be supplied on this canal. It was to stand a certain test the same as the other cements. It was tested and stood the test. We had it tested not only down on the canal, but up here by the expert in the Public Works Department, and it stood the test. There seems to have been a very serious defect in a portion of the cement furnished, because, after some of it had been put into the construction it failed, and we discontinued the use of it.

**Mr. FOSTER**. What was done with it ultimately?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We did not take any more, and we did not pay for any more.

**Mr. FOSTER**. What became of what you did take?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. A portion of it went into the work.

**Mr. FOSTER**. What became of the other portion?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I suppose the other portion is lying there yet.

Mr. FOSTER. And the whole cost of it was \$28,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we paid no such money as that.

Mr. FOSTER. How much ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not over \$22,000 or \$23,000. We paid no \$28,000.

Mr. FOSTER. You paid \$22,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We refused to pay any more, and a suit is now pending in the Exchequer Court upon the question of our liability.

Mr. FOSTER. Which the minister will not defend, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Which the minister will defend, and is defending.

Mr. FOSTER. Not with much vigour ; that is a very favourite device, you know.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend may think that. I am not very much concerned about what he thinks. I say it will be defended. The cement was not of the quality that these gentlemen undertook to furnish us. A portion of it was not, at all events.

Mr. FOSTER. And what it happens to come to is exactly this, that the minister went against the advice of his engineers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, against Mr. Munro's advice as testified before the Public Accounts Committee. He makes a contract for \$20,000 worth of cement, which is useless, very little of which has gone into any kind of work, and when he is asked about the rest he states that it is lying there, and there is no doubt about it that the minister is here. We have lost about \$4,000 on the emergency food, which presents itself as about as scaly a thing as has ever been before this House, and here is \$22,000 which the minister, a tyro, who knew nothing about it, who went against the direct testimony and advice of his engineers in charge of the works, spent, \$22,000, not of his own money, but of the people's money which is thrown into a sink hole and allowed to lie around as rubbish. He comes and says it is not much of a matter because, when I say it is \$28,000 he says that it is only \$22,000. It does not matter ; in this carnival of expenditure, \$22,000 is nothing. What is the total amount of the claim pending in the Exchequer Court ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have in the department estimated that the gross amount that will be paid for this cement will not ex-

ceed \$17,000. We have a deposit which we have refused to surrender, and we have a drawback which amounts to something over \$5,000, so that \$17,000 will be the amount that will have been paid for the cement. A considerable portion of that has gone into use in the back works of the locks, and while the gross loss is more than it should be, I do not imagine it will be more than five or six thousand dollars. It is entirely incorrect to say that all the engineers of the department were opposed to the use of this cement.

Mr. FOSTER. My only charge was that Mr. Munro, the engineer in charge of the work, was absolutely opposed to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Munro had a very decided opinion against the use of any cement made in Canada. He also had a very decided opinion against Stewart being allowed to take stone out of a certain quarry. While he is an excellent engineer he has strong opinions upon many questions in which other engineers do not agree with him. I took it upon myself, supported by engineers' opinions, to decide against Mr. Munro as regards the stone.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it an engineer of your own department or of the Department of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Railway Department.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman certain ? My recollection is that it was the engineer of the Public Works Department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The engineer of the Public Works Department expressed no opinion to me upon the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. That came out in the evidence.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what came out in evidence. I say that Mr. G. W. Thompson recommended the cement very strongly, as it had been used on works on which he was in charge on the canals.

Mr. GIBSON. The whole of the Welland Canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The whole of the Welland Canal, I am told, was built with the Battle cement. I can tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Coste never expressed any opinion to me.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not Mr. Coste. The minister has made all this palaver and he has not yet told us what claim is made in the Exchequer Court.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The claim is made for the cement they furnished and which we declined to pay for. They are suing for the

return of the deposit and for the additional cement that was furnished beyond that which we paid for.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What does it represent in figures ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know exactly what the figures are. They have not got along so far in the suit as to furnish the items.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister tells us that they have gone before the Exchequer Court and that they have not named the amount of their claim.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I refer to their petition of right.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister still persist in saying that they simply asked the Exchequer Court to give them back their deposit, and something for the cement without stating how much ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose they also ask damages on their contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it usual to put a claim before the Exchequer Court in that indefinite way without mentioning the sum claimed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The petition does not give the particulars of the claim. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is evidently speaking of something he has no experience about. The petition usually sets the claim out in a general way and the particulars will have to be furnished later.

Mr. FOSTER. Seeing that I know nothing about it and that I am so anxious for information, will the minister tell me how many barrels of cement he bought, what was the price per barrel and what is the amount already paid.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell you.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman bring down the information ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I find that the Premier, speaking at Bowmanville on October 16, last year, said :

To Alex. Mackenzie is due the policy we are now following. He commenced to deepen the Welland Canal.

Which is not true.

He deepened it to a depth of fourteen feet.

Which is not true.

But for eighteen years afterwards the work went on at snail's pace.

Which is still less true.

The Conservatives did practically nothing with these works, but when we came into office we

Mr. BLAIR.

undertook, and successfully, to complete them in three years.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) thinks it was completed in three years, but the Minister of Railways is asking us for millions to complete it this year, and on one link of the Soulanges Canal he has still to spend \$1,200,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all. It was estimated that it would take \$6,400,000 to cover the whole cost from beginning to end. Our present appropriation in the main estimates brings down the total amount to \$4,800,000, and, of course, there is a very considerable sum which will be due that will not come in until the final estimates. There are drawbacks and all that which we cannot tell what they will amount to now. The total will not exceed the estimate of \$6,400,000.

Mr. FOSTER. And you spent \$4,800,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I explained to the committee that there will be considerable money necessary for lining up the canals, sodding it, making the roads, coping, and electric light and all that, and there is some dredging to be done.

Mr. FOSTER. When does the hon. gentleman think that canal will be completed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The sum stated by me to the committee as the amount paid, \$4,800,000, was only what was paid to the contractors. I did not fully state the whole amount paid, however, because the expenditure up to the 30th of June, 1899, including payment outside of contractors is \$5,098,259, and from the 1st of July to the 1st of December, 1899, \$330,743.88.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman was nearly \$700,000 out in his first statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is all.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the way we get information. If we did not persist in getting the minister to his feet after the greatest trouble, parliament and the country would not know that \$700,000 more had been paid than the minister stated. We have not yet the answer from the minister which he started to give as to when the system would be finished.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief engineer's opinion is, that the work on the Soulanges Canal will be entirely finished by the end of the present year.

Mr. FOSTER. And it will cost how much ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will not pay the final esti-

mates at that time; but it is estimated that when the final estimates are paid it will have cost \$6,400,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Surely the Minister of Railways must have misapprehended the question put by the hon. member for York when he asked what was the claim made against the department by the contractors for the Thorold cement. The hon. gentleman knows that no claim can be made before any court of justice without the claimant stating what his claim is. The hon. gentleman is quite right in stating that particulars as to the way in which the amount was made up would be filed in court after the action was taken out; but, the hon. gentleman, as head of his department, must know what amount of money is being claimed by the people who furnished this cement, which could not be utilized except for bad work which never would be seen after it was finished. I do not see how we can discuss this matter until we know that. The hon. gentleman has paid a certain amount of money to contractors who undertook to furnish cement against the opinion of Mr. Munro, the engineer in charge of these works. The hon. gentleman says he was advised by some persons. Who are the persons who can advise him better than the man who possesses his confidence as Minister of Railways? If Mr. Munro did not possess his confidence, the hon. gentleman would have withdrawn him from the superintendence of the work. Mr. Munro stated before the Committee on Public Accounts that he advised that the cement should not be used, and the hon. gentleman stands up in parliament, as representing that great and important department, and says, 'I was advised to use it by persons who have used it on other canals.' The hon. gentleman has not disclosed the names of these persons. But, Mr. Munro advised against its use, and the best proof that he was right is the fact that the hon. gentleman is being sued to-day, and that he cannot utilize the cement which Mr. Munro condemned. Hon. gentlemen sitting on either side of this House are not going to be satisfied with the statement that the hon. gentleman is sued by contractors and does not know what he is sued for. Of all the extraordinary propositions I have ever heard that tops everything. If the hon. gentleman comes here in his responsible position as Minister of Railways and Canals and tells us that he allows an action to be taken out against his department without knowing what that action is, and whether the claim is for \$100 or \$100,000, I say he is not properly advised. If it were an action against himself, before he would go into it he would know what the action was brought against him for; but he should be more particular still when he is representing the people of Canada in one of the largest departments of the government. The question which I wish to put, and to which I insist on get-

ting an answer, as far as I can do so, is: What is the cause of the action between the contractors who furnished the cement and the Department of Railways and Canals? What is the amount claimed? What is the amount acknowledged to be due by the department? And what is the amount which the Department of Railways and Canals refuses to pay to these contractors? That is a plain question, and I am perfectly certain that the hon. gentleman would have answered it sooner except that he must have misapprehended the question put by my hon. friend.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has asked me to state for what Battle Bros. are suing the government. I have stated before, and I cannot do more than repeat it, that the Battle Company are suing the government for the drawback, for the price of the cement for which they have not been paid, and for damages for non-completion of contract. That is the scope of their action. He called upon me several times and also wrote to me to pay them the amount of drawback and to authorize the payment of the balance of the cement they had furnished. I have not the particulars of the amount and the number of barrels, but I may say that I declined to entertain their demands, because they had misled the department by supplying the article they did. Later on, some five or six months ago, they applied to me, through their solicitor, to be granted a fiat for a petition of right, and I consented and signified my consent to them and the Justice Department. I have not yet seen their petition, and the government may have not yet been sued, but the Department of Justice has been furnished by my department with all the papers relating to the matter. I know that the Messrs. Battle claim \$5,000 on rebate and deposit and the balance of the quantity of cement for which they were not paid and also damages, but I cannot state what amount of damages they seek to recover. The hon. gentleman desires me to look up the papers in the department and find out what accounts they have rendered for cement, and I will gladly do it, but the chief engineer does not recall the amount nor do I, and I do not see any occasion for the tone in which the hon. gentleman has referred to me. When it is said that this cement was ordered against the opinion of the superintending engineer of the St. Lawrence Canal, that is not correct. On the contrary, he expressed no opinion to me as to this particular order. After some of the cement had reached him, I learnt that he said we ought not have had any of it, but I was in possession of a certificate from Mr. Munro expressing the highest opinion of the quality of that cement, and the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), I think, remembers to have seen the certificate too as well as

Mr. W. D. Thompson's certificate on the subject.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am sorry that my hon. friend considers that I have referred to him in any other way than I should have for the purpose of eliciting information, but I would state, if he will allow me to put those questions—which I do not consider are questions to which a minister representing a department should object—I would ask what is the amount of the drawbacks that the contractors claim. Before the hon. gentleman made up his mind to grant the fiat, he must have known what claim they were making.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They claim damages and a return of the deposit and the rebate.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The minister's explanation is not of much value. He says they claim the amount of drawback.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They claim the drawback and deposit both.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The deposit would probably amount to \$5,000 on a contract of that extent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not so much. The chief engineer does not recollect exactly nor do I.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is unfortunate, when the estimates are submitted to us and we require information in order to be able to vote intelligently, that the hon. gentleman cannot recollect any of the details and that his deputy should not have furnished him with all the particulars required.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not asking for any estimate to pay this bill.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, but before the hon. gentleman's estimates can be intelligently discussed, it is important for us to know how it comes that he is expending \$25,000 upon cement which was condemned by his own engineer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I spent no more than I spent last year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman could not, because he is being sued by the gentlemen who furnished this cement which he refused to receive and which he should have received, upon the advice of Mr. Munro the superintendent. I have elicited the information that the deposit and the drawback amount to about \$5,000. Of course, I think that the hon. gentleman should tell me what the amount of the deposit was.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman expect me to carry in my recollection the speci-

Mr. BLAIR.

fic amount of deposit of every contract entered by my department?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not insisting on that and never did. The hon. gentleman cannot be expected to carry all those figures in his head, but it is not necessary that he should. You have books and records; you have a deputy—and the hon. gentleman has in his department a deputy who is the equal of any other in the government. I never expected the hon. minister to carry all the figures in his head or to come here with more information than would naturally be called for by the fact that he stated that an action was being taken against the department by the men with whom he had contracted for that cement. These figures must have struck him, and they must have been easily remembered, and I want to know the amount that is claimed. I do not know what the deposit was, but I do not think the deposit and the drawback could be covered by \$5,000—I think it must be more. We are entitled to know the amount claimed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not suggesting that this is information the hon. gentleman is not entitled to. Any information, no matter how minute or how little it could have been anticipated, the hon. gentleman is entitled to ask. I will not question his right to it or attempt to withhold it, if it is in my possession. But I do not think he is serious when he suggests that I should remember—

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I said it was not necessary that you should remember.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman said the figures were sufficiently striking for me to remember.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No—the ground of action.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know the ground on which claimants are proceeding, but I cannot give the amounts claimed until the claimant has stated it, and I have not received information from the Department of Justice yet that they have so stated it. I cannot even say that he has obtained the fiat yet. I only know that they started to take proceedings. And, so far as my opinion was concerned, I was willing that they should have a fiat to prosecute their petition of right. The hon. gentleman cannot get the amount of deposit or drawback at this time with greater positiveness than I have given it, as I do not recollect the amount, nor does the chief engineer, whom I have consulted. If the hon. gentleman wished information on this subject, the least he could have done, as a matter of courtesy, was to have let me know, so that I could have brought the papers and all the information. He cannot expect that the minister or deputy

minister will come here with all the papers referring to all the multifarious matters dealt with by the department—my office cannot be transported here bodily. It did not occur to me that this subject was coming up again. All the information was given last year, and the case is the same as it was last year, unless the suit has been started. But I am willing to repeat the information, and would have brought it with me if the hon. gentleman had sent me a memorandum telling me what he required, as some hon. gentlemen have done with regard to matters in which they were interested. Hon. gentlemen willing to treat an opponent with fair-play or even gentlemanly consideration would let the head of a department know that they wished matters of this kind dealt with, so that he might bring the information desired.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am sorry that my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) should accuse me of being discourteous. I have been a long time in parliament, and have never been accused of that heinous crime before. The questions I asked were made necessary by the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Blair's) own want of information in answering the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart). I do not wish to take up time unnecessarily, but I think I am right in saying that before the hon. minister (Mr. Blair) agreed to give a fiat, there must have been negotiations between the claimants and himself, and that the fiat was given only because the parties were too far apart in the amounts that one offered and the other was willing to accept. If he had not known the amount that was claimed, he could not have decided whether to give them a fiat or not. I believe the hon. gentleman is right in not recognizing their claim, as he agrees, for once, with his engineer. But all I wish to know is the amount that they were claiming, and I do not wish to confine the minister to the exact figures. When we are discussing a matter affecting the public, every member of parliament who represents the public has a right to know from the ministers how the people's money is being expended. I say to the minister: You have a difficulty with the contractors. I am not blaming the hon. gentleman, nor can I blame him, because I do not know what the facts are. I want him to tell me what is the difference between himself and his contractors. We know about the deposit and the drawback. Now, what is their claim for damages? Is it \$20,000, is it \$50,000, or does it approach towards \$100,000? That is surely a question to which the hon. gentleman can reply. I do not ask him to give me any exact amount, but I want to know what the claim of these people is. When the fiat comes from the hands of the Minister of Justice the particulars will be filled in court giving details of that amount; but the amount must have been given to the hon. gentleman before

he made up his mind to reject or accept that proposition.

Mr. WM. GIBSON (Lincoln and Niagara). We had a good deal of discussion last year when this Battle claim came up. If I remember rightly, the Battles supplied a certain number of barrels of cement. The cement was to be put to the standard required by the government, and after they began to deliver bad cement the government very properly, through their engineers, refused to accept any more, and consequently it was not allowed to go into the work. The hon. member for Three Rivers is very anxious to know whether the claim of these gentlemen is \$100,000 or not. I may say that I have had several letters from these people, they live in the adjoining county of Welland, and I am familiar with their works. I have used a great deal of their material, in fact I have used perhaps fifty or sixty thousand barrels of their cement from time to time. I believe the difference between the amount retained by the government on the unpaid cement thrown on the contractors' hands, is something between \$5,000 and \$6,000, altogether \$28,000 would be their claim, of that, \$2,800 would be their percentage, and the difference between that and the amount unpaid would represent a sum between \$5,000 and \$6,000.

Now, I want to point out to the committee the impression that seems to exist about the character of this cement. As a matter of fact the conditions of this work are entirely different from those of any other work that has ever been done by the government. The government in this case is supplying the cement, and in consequence, if there is any loss at all, or if the government has used a cheaper cement, the country is getting the benefit. I want to say here that notwithstanding what has been said about Mr. Munro and his opinion regarding the cement used upon the Soulanges Canal, under Mr. Munro's superintendence, from Port Dalhousie to the summit level at Allsburg, and upon every lock upon the present Welland Canal, both when it was built originally to twelve feet as well as afterwards when it was increased to fourteen feet, every inch of masonry was built with Thorold cement, and the cement was burned in the same kiln and ground in the same mill in Thorold. I want to say this, that after the government decided to increase the balance of the Welland Canal to fourteen feet depth of water, the old coping had to be removed and the back of the ashlar had to be cut down in order to increase and carry up the wall to its full height. I want to say that after an experience of two years, while there was no trouble at all in removing the stone from their position, there was great difficulty in removing the cement. A man could practically carry in a bag his whole day's work. It had to be taken off with drills from the

back of the work, so good was the cement. So I say the government deserves credit for not accepting the cement after the contractors began to supply bad cement.

But I want to point out to the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), what he did when he was Minister of Railways and Canals. On the Sault Canal the specifications called for Portland cement to be used in nearly all the works, and when that hon. gentleman was Minister of Railways and Canals, according to the testimony of Mr. Hugh Ryan, who is now dead and gone, answering under oath questions I put to him, he admitted that thousands of barrels of cement were used, and he bought it at a \$1 to \$1.25. The hon. gentleman allowed him to use Thorold cement where Portland cement was contracted for, and for which the contractors would have had to pay \$2 to \$3 per barrel.

Mr. HAGGART. If that is the statement, I will give it at once a direct denial.

Mr. GIBSON. I have to accept the hon. gentleman's denial, but I am in the judgment of the House and of the country that you can take up the report—it is printed in the blue-books of parliament—and you will find that Mr. Ryan and Mr. Haney, particularly Mr. Ryan whom I questioned for hours on the subject, finally had to admit that thousands of barrels of Thorold cement were used upon the canal. The way that question came up was this: In the accounts that were brought before the Public Accounts Committee, when that matter was under investigation, I called attention to the fact that Thorold cement was being used, and then when I cross-questioned him as to where he put all these barrels of cement, he said he put it on the work. I questioned him as to the number of yards that this number of barrels of cement would represent, and finally I got him down to say that under ordinary work one barrel of cement would build three yards of masonry, so that over a thousand barrels of that Thorold cement that was used would represent 3,000 yards of masonry. But in the retaining walls case he would not admit that, but finally he admitted under oath that it would at least build from one to two yards, so that whether he made it of almost pure cement or not, the fact remains that the contractors on the Sault Canal were paid prices for masonry to be built with Portland cement and were allowed to use Thorold cement, the very cement that the hon. gentleman is condemning to-night.

Now, in the St. Clair tunnel at Sarnia, 10,000 barrels of this very same Thorold cement were used in the brick-work of the lining of the tunnel, and that brick-work is to be seen to-day. Every piece of work that was built upon the canals was built with that Thorold cement, and I want to say that with the exception of parts of the work that may have been cracked by vessels

Mr. GIBSON.

running up against it, there is not a flaw in the masonry of the Welland Canal from lock No. 1 to the aqueduct at Welland. I may say that after an experience of thirty years in Canada I would sooner use fresh-made and fresh-ground Canadian cement to the imported Portland cement, and I will give my reasons for it. Unless you get the imported article direct from the kiln, direct from the manufacturer, it is liable to lay in England or Belgium or whatever country it is exported from, perhaps for years. When it arrives in Montreal it may lay there all summer, may lie there perhaps in storage for another year, and that cement cannot be used then. No man can tell anything about it until it is put where it is to be used. I say that thousands and tens of thousands of barrels of Portland cement are sent from Belgium or from Germany, cement that is not better than mush after it is put into the work.

Now, so far as the Thorold cement is concerned, I think that the government acted wisely in the matter. They used the article as long as it was up to the standard of the specification required by the government, and the moment that it failed, the government very properly stopped using the cement. The Battles blamed the government. This is their side of the story; they say that the government did not take proper care of the cement that was left over during the winter. Last year the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) laid great stress on the fact that the cement had turned hard. I will say to the hon. gentleman, in all fairness and frankness, that that is the best evidence you could have that the cement was good, because if it does not turn hard, it shows that there is no cohesion to it. The Battles claim that the cement was not well taken care of. However, I think the government have kept back 10 per cent of the amount that was unpaid at the time the cement turned out badly. Instead of the government being criticised by the hon. member for Lanark, they ought to be commended for doing what they have done. An inferior article was not accepted from the contractor; the government bought the cement and supplied the contractor with it. It was not the interest of the contractor to destroy or save cement. Whatever amount of cement the contractors required, the government supplied them with it. After an experience of thirty years, I can say, that, to-day, in Canada, there is no better native cement produced than the cement made at Thorold. There are circumstances under which cement may be inferior and that is, if these gentlemen in working the Thorold quarries, take the outcroppings of the quarry, the cement will be inferior, as the rock from exposure will have lost all its hydraulic qualities, but if they tunnel the cement rock out between the bed-rock of limestone layers, they will produce an article that gives good results, and that

will compare favourably with any foreign Portland cement as long as it is finely ground according to the specifications made by the government. I am here to say that Thorold cement will stand the test with any foreign cement that may be brought into this country.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman made a statement which I intend to correct at once. I was not at the head of the department when Mr. Hugh Ryan took his contract for the Sault Ste Marie Canal. Under his first contract he was entitled to use Thorold cement.

Mr. GIBSON. Not a pound.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not so?

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. HAGGART. It is so, Sir, except for the face work on the canal. He was entitled to use it for the other work. Hugh Ryan came to me and stated that as this perhaps was the last work he was going to complete in his lifetime, he was anxious that it should be a credit to him. He told me he could use this cement, but he would rather put in other cement, at the same cost, in order to turn out a piece of work which would be a credit to him in after life. He stated that this material was not fit to use. The material was changed for that work. The hon. gentleman states that this is not true. It is true; it is within my own knowledge. It is an imputation against the department, to say that they paid for any work which was built of Thorold cement at the price for other cement, which the contractor did not use in the work. I do not think there is any evidence of that kind, but the material was changed. Instead of using Thorold cement for building that work Portland cement was put in. There are a great many reasons why Portland cement is the best, which are known to Mr. Munro, and to every engineer of the department. There are certain differences between Portland and Thorold cements and certain peculiarities attaching to both. Thorold cement has not the tension or the crushing power, and when used in building a work, it sometimes expands and contracts when it is forming. As good cement as there is in the world is perhaps the Milwaukee cement, but it lacks the tensile or crushing properties. In order to test it, they put in into little glass vials, and if the vial cracks it is useless on account of lacking tensile or crushing properties. Perhaps the best engineers in the world in the construction of public works, use that kind of material. They are the United States engineers who constructed the Sault Ste. Marie Canal on the American side. The consequence was that the work expanded, and there were cracks in it. There is no cracking in our work at the Soo. When I went over the work on the St. Lawrence canals, I found the contracts

had been entered into by which contractors were allowed to use Battles' cement and cement from the Rathbun's works in Deseronto. I tested the work with the deputy of my department. In a great many cases, the cement was found to be very little better than sand. It did not set, it did not harden, and it was of no use. On consultation with the engineers of my department I came to the conclusion that it was not material fit to be used in the magnificent public works of Canada, and that Portland cement was the best cement to be used. Most of it is got in Holland, but some of it in Denmark. The different engineers on the construction works had all the apparatus for testing it. When I heard that the hon. gentleman had bought this Thorold cement for the purpose of using it on the Soulanges Canal. I told him to take the advice of his engineers, because every honest engineer and every honest contractor will tell you that Portland cement is better than Thorold cement. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson), says that some work on the Welland Canal was done with Thorold cement, and he says that the results are as good as on any other work. The hon. gentleman, as he has stated, knows that there is only one vein in the rock which has the peculiar qualities necessary for making cement. If they mix it with limestone or surface rock, it renders the cement perfectly useless. Every contractor on works knows that. The old Welland Canal and a great portion of the new Welland Canal were built with Thorold cement. The contracts allowed the contractors to use it. Mr. Page thought so highly of it, that he allowed the contractors to use it on the St. Lawrence canals, and a large quantity of it was also brought down in bulk from Deseronto. What is the consequence? The work is all cracking, so far as the cement is concerned. I believe that Mr. Rathbun is trying to make cement on the same principle as Portland cement is made. The safest plan to follow, is to have four or five barrels tested, to ascertain the tensile and crushing strength, how long it takes to harden under water and whether it expands and contracts. No matter what cement is furnished the government, they ought to see that it is of a character equal to Portland cement.

Mr. GIBSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) will surely admit that different results will be achieved from the same cement used by different contractors, and that it might be more the fault of the contractor, who puts too much sand in the cement, than the fault of the cement itself. I have seen masonry taken down about which there was no cohesion at all, and which was supposed to have been built forty years ago by honest men. There was nothing in it but sand; there was no cement at all. Cement is not going to be condemned because a man puts in a lot of sand.

As far as the expansion and contraction is concerned, surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) knows, a school boy knows, that if you put water on lime it will swell up, it is the same with cement; it remains swollen. Rock expands and contracts, a large bridge will expand and contract. As to Milwaukee cement, about which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) speaks, I can tell him that I bought Milwaukee cement for the purpose of building the approaches to the St. Clair tunnel on the American side, but I got better results from the Thorold cement, and I preferred paying 40 cents a barrel duty to have that Canadian native cement brought to the American side. I do not think any gentleman here will give me credit for being so very patriotic at the expense of my own pocket, but I did it for business reasons and I was satisfied at the results obtained in using the Thorold cement in preference to the Milwaukee. Of course, there are a variety of makers in Milwaukee as there are in the old country. In this case the contractor had no advantage, because the government provided the cement, and it was a matter of indifference to him so long as the work stood. As to the settling qualities of cement, surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) knows that quick-setting cement is not a good cement. Good cement should be such that the stone might be lifted at least once, and with most of the Portland cement it is too quick setting. For all practical purposes I would not want better cement than the Battle cement.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman speaks about my knowledge, but I can tell him that he has not the knowledge of a boy as to the testing of cement. It does not expand after being put into the glass tube. The ordinary manufacturer tests the contraction or expansion in a little glass phial, and every manufacturer of Portland cement sends you the tools to test the expansion and contraction and explains the method in which it should be done. I have seen too much of that to learn anything from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) in respect to it. Where did he get his information, that I allowed Hugh Ryan to use Thorold cement when the contract was for Portland cement, and that I paid him for the latter? That statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) is, to say the least of it, incorrect. I contradicted him before in reference to that, but still he repeats it. I did nothing of the kind. Under the first contract Mr. Ryan could have used the other cement, but I changed it, and if a payment of the kind alleged has been made by the department it is a payment made without my knowledge, and the officer who did it should be discharged by any government.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) misunderstood me. The cement was bought by Mr. Ryan and paid for by him and not by the government.

Mr. GIBSON.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) stated that I allowed Mr. Ryan to use Battle's cement when he had a contract for Portland cement, and that I paid him for water lime obtained at Thorold at the price of Portland cement. That statement is entirely unfounded, and there is no evidence to sustain it. If Mr. Ryan was paid for it it was not to my knowledge.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) is entirely mistaken. What I said was, that he allowed Thorold cement to be used in the Sault Canal without any reduction in the contract price, for which there should have been a reduction made, and that the contractor was benefited to that extent.

Mr. HAGGART. What I state is, that the original contract was for Thorold cement, and that the contractor was entitled to use it, but I changed it to Portland cement because I thought it was the better. Any statement to the contrary is unfounded.

Mr. SPROULE. My recollection is that it was not the Thorold cement he used, but part of the Owen Sound cement and that made at Deseronto. It was distinctly provided in the contract that for a certain number of inches in depth the face should be of Portland cement, and the backing of the other cement where it was not exposed to the atmosphere. He stated that he did not use a single barrel except Portland cement for the facing, as his contract called for.

Mr. HAGGART. That was the original contract.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the minister give a statement of the quantity purchased from Battle Bros.; how much of it was in barrels and how much in sacks; how much in barrels and how much in sacks has been used and what disposition has been made of the balance.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will do so.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a little bit of information that I would like to get from the minister. Was it on this canal that the trouble took place with reference to Mr. Archie Stewart's contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That contract was taken away from Mr. Stewart on the ground that he was not finishing it in time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He was not getting on with the contract at all.

Mr. FOSTER. To whom was that contract given?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To Ryan & Macdonell.

Mr. FOSTER. How will the cost of Ryan & Macdonell's contract there compare with Stewart's ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About \$75,000 more.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they finished yet ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Pretty nearly.

Mr. FOSTER. How soon will they finish ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They will be entirely through this season.

Mr. FOSTER. At what time was Stewart's contract for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Stewart's original contract expired in 1894 ; the chief engineer tells me a year earlier than that. In 1897 it was taken out of his hands.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister took possession of Mr. Stewart's quarry under the plea that he had a right to take it. How much has he had to pay for that little bit of business of his ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Whatever was done in connection with that was done through the Justice Department. The lawyers who were concerned in the suit which Mr. Stewart brought against the Crown were of opinion that it was doubtful whether or not the Crown had the rights which they claimed, and that Mr. Stewart would be likely to recover damages from the Crown in respect to it. Mr. Stewart placed the amount of damages at a very high figure ; but that branch of his case was, on the advice of his solicitors and counsel, concurred in by the Department of Justice, settled.

Mr. FOSTER. For how much ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are various details connected with it ; but the amount of damages that were settled as representing the quarry was \$20,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the whole amount of costs and damages ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I forget the exact amount.

Mr. FOSTER. Over \$30,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, not as much as that.

Mr. FOSTER. What part of the dispute between the hon. gentleman and Mr. Stewart still remains to be settled ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The claim made by Mr. Stewart against the Crown for damages for not being allowed to complete the contract, on the one hand, and a counter claim made by the Crown against Mr. Stewart for not complet-

ing it, on the other hand. That is still before the Exchequer.

Mr. FOSTER. So that the sum total of the hon. gentleman's management in this respect is that when he came into power he sat down on Mr. Stewart—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I beg your pardon.

Mr. FOSTER—took away his contract, gave it to another firm for \$75,000 more, with little, if any, amelioration in the speed. Then he seized Mr. Stewart's quarry in the idea that the Crown had a perfect right to take it ; a suit followed, and as a result the hon. gentleman was advised to settle the question of damages, which has cost the country somewhere between \$35,000 and \$37,000, and the remaining part of the suit remains yet to be settled. That may eventuate in one way or in another ; but the hon. gentleman's self-sufficiency and his idea of taking everything into his own hands have resulted in the first place in the country having to pay \$75,000 more for the performance of the work, and in the second place in a payment of some \$35,000 or \$40,000 by the people for damages and costs in simply half the suit instituted by Mr. Stewart. That is another most excellent result of the hon. gentleman's management.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman would only employ his imagination a little more actively, he might make a much more imposing statement than that. I do not see why he is so modest. My self-sufficiency, as he calls it, had nothing to do with the matter. There was no self-sufficiency in the case at all. I took no steps in connection with the taking of the contract from Mr. Stewart until I was advised strongly by the official staff of the department as to the need of it, and by the Department of Justice as to the proper method to pursue in connection with it. The hon. gentleman must know that the time for the completion of Mr. Stewart's contract had long expired before 1897—three, if not four years. The contractor had received instructions from his chief (Mr. Haggart) that he need not go on with the work ; and the fact that he had such instructions is apparent from the sworn statement made by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals in this Stewart case that the ex-Finance Minister had strongly insisted that there should not be any expenditure on these canals—at all events that it should proceed very moderately and slowly, and that the contractors were notified not to hurry at all, but to take their own time. When the change of government took place, the government came to the conclusion that at the rate at which these contracts were being performed many years would necessarily elapse before there could be any

means of utilizing these canals or before the shipping people of the country would have a 14-foot channel for the purposes of navigation. I think I am speaking within bounds when I say that at the rate of progress which prevailed during the three or four years previous on the Soulanges Canal alone, it would be fifteen years before that work would be done.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the imagination now ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the fact ; there is no imagination about it. I can show figures in verification of the statement I make. When we came to the conclusion that the work ought to be pushed vigorously and be completed at an early date, we called upon all the contractors. Mr. Stewart being one of the number, to push the work actively. Mr. Stewart was in some little difficulty in regard to the stone ; through no fault of his, he lost two or three months of time, and we were prepared to allow him a fair compensation for the delay which ensued from the superintending engineer forbidding him to use any stone from that quarry. After that trouble was settled, Mr. Stewart expressed his willingness and ability to push the work vigorously. He made some request to us to allow him something out of the drawback so that he could take the work up, and I met his wishes in every possible shape and form. I tried to so arrange the matter that he could complete the work. I was very loth indeed to take it out of his hands. I had the very best feeling towards Mr. Stewart, and I felt very confident that he would be able to finish his contract. He promised me that he would undertake it and would do it, but he did not do it. When I spoke to him later about the time the work ought to be done, he told me that he was not under any obligation to finish it, but would take his own time that he had consulted counsel, and that they had advised him that after he had been allowed by the government to pass by the date fixed for the completion of the contract, he practically had it in his own hands, and he was going to hold up the whole question of the completion of those canals to suit his own whim and caprice. That is the position Mr. Stewart took. All this matter was gone over before the court. I gave evidence upon it myself ; other members of the government who were present and heard the discussions gave evidence ; the chief engineer gave evidence. Mr. Stewart was treated with every possible consideration. I made every suggestion to him that a man could make with the view of enabling him to go on and complete the contract. I even suggested that he had better get some strong financial man to go in with him. He refused to do that, because he said he should have a higher price than he was

Mr. BLAIR.

getting under his contract to complete it. After we took the contract out of Mr. Stewart's hands, we invited five or six of the leading contractors to tender upon the work. They did so, and the tender of Manning & Macdonald was the lowest.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister bring down—he fought shy of the quarry claim—a statement of the total claim, and the expenses which resulted from his unfortunate assumption of power ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As far as the minister is concerned, there was no assumption of power at all with respect to the quarry. What was done was done through the proper department of the government. If there was any error, it was not an error of the minister or his deputy. These legal proceedings for expropriation were all taken in the usual and proper manner, and I do not see why the hon. gentleman persists in making these statements when he does not know that they are correct.

Mr. HAGGART. Did I understand the hon. minister aright that, under the new contract entered into with Ryan & Macdonell, he only pays something like \$70,000 extra.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy says \$75,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I may as well inform the hon. minister that he need not bring down the original estimate of the cost of the Soulanges Canal because I find that the department furnished me with an estimate, which I gave to the House a couple of years in succession. The canal was to have been built and completed for \$4,750,000. Now it is going to cost \$6,400,000. I do not now see the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) here. I suppose he is hunting up that evidence which, he said, was given before the Public Accounts Committee with reference to cement. I have the evidence here and would like him to show me anything in it to confirm his statement.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). I understand the ex-Minister of Railways to have cast some reflections on the cement made by the Rathbun Company. Whatever they may have done a good many years ago, so far as I am informed, they make first-class cement now, and the government are using it largely, which they would not do if it were not first class. I do not know whether that was a slip on the part of the ex-minister or not, but I would like him to put it right.

Mr. HAGGART. I thought I had put that right. The Rathbun Company were manufacturing at that time what is called water-lime cement, which certainly was an inferior article. They have given up its manufacture altogether, and are now making cement upon

the same principle as the Portland cement, which is probably equal to the Portland cement. What I was protesting against is the use of what is called the waterlime cement which the Rathbun Company had been manufacturing at the time I mentioned. Such cement should not be used at all in public works that require a first-class article.

Mr. CLANCY. I understood the hon. minister to say that Mr. Stewart's quarry was taken from him on the advice of the officers of the department and the mode of procedure taken was according to the advice of the Justice Department. Then after the quarry had been taken over, the Justice Department decided that the Railways and Canals Department had a doubtful right, if any, to take it over.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was not so much the taking of the quarry but the way it was taken. It was taken in such a way as to exclude entrance upon the quarry and prevent the contractors from making use of the portion which we did not expropriate. There was some difficulty about the way in which the expropriation was made, and later the Justice Department gave the opinion that it was doubtful whether Mr. Stewart would not be able to recover damages on account of the way in which proceedings were taken.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems rather extraordinary that after expropriation proceedings had been taken on the advice of the Justice Department, the Justice Department should have doubts as to the procedure followed. The Justice Department decided one way first and then another way, and we have had to pay a very large sum of money.

Culbute Canal—Damages to land and expenses ..... \$3,500

Mr. FOSTER. How long is that going on ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These are the balances due for the flooded land, caused by the Culbute dam. I do not know how long it has been going on. I presume that these claims were in the department when I came in or many of them.

Mr. FOSTER. To whom are these to be paid ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To the following individuals: Mrs. A. McFarlane, \$200; George Rose, \$60; Hon. G. Bryson, \$1,000; Wm. Flood, \$450; Jas. McGuire, \$50; F. & W. Anderson, \$100; D. T. Bertrand, \$150; Theo. St. Denis, \$20; B. Smith, \$300; Bishop Hennesy, \$100; John Flood, \$475; Jos. Bonnie, \$75; Philip Gervais, \$225; Victor Lechance, \$130.

Mr. HAGGART. On what basis did you give these damages ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have been settled and awarded by valuers. We have had three valuers on this work. Most of these amounts were examined and valued during the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Haggart's) term of office.

Mr. HAGGART. These claims were all valued and the report was acted upon by the department, I believe, and the parties paid in full. Then the dam was taken down so that no more damages could have accrued—I think I gave orders to have it taken down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has been partly destroyed.

Mr. HAGGART. Did these damages accrue before 1895? If so, why were they not included in the report of the parties sent out to find out what the damages were ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These damages accrued before the removal of any part of the dam. Many of these items were reported to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) or his predecessors by those sent to make a report and valuation.

Chambly Canal—

Drainage works at St. Johns..... \$500

Wall at Ste. Thérèse Island..... 550

— \$1,050

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to change that item regarding Ste. Thérèse Island. When these estimates were made up we thought we could get the work done in the year for which these estimates were appropriated, but we could not do so. I would like to have this changed so as to read 'for general repairs.' Otherwise I shall have to have a supplementary estimate.

Mr. HAGGART. What drainage works are you doing at St. John ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is work upon the sewer there—we are digging out a sewer.

Mr. HAGGART. Why ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have had to do it.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the extent of the work ? Does this cover the cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimate of the whole thing is \$18,507. This is an old item, and this \$500 will complete the work.

Mr. HAGGART. I remember that they tried to get me to do it when I was Minister of Railways and Canals—it is to build a drain under the canal. But they did not succeed. It is the same principle as the drain from the Lachine Canal into the St. Lawrence.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You started that.

Mr. HAGGART. No, I refused to do it. I do not know on what principle this is granted. Is it because the government erected the locks in the town?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The town must be drained, and if you block up the sewer—

Mr. HAGGART. But if I remember rightly they could get into the river without any such expenditure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this drain, how long is it, where does it start and where does it end? If we get that information, we shall understand the case better.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not recollect how long it is, nor does my deputy. However, it is a long ditch, following along the canal some distance. There is no manner of doubt, I think, that the canal does obstruct the drainage from the town.

Mr. HAGGART. Is not part of the drain that is being constructed at right angles to the canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it runs right across it. But you have to run alongside the canal for some distance.

Mr. HAGGART. I can understand the government being responsible for that portion of the drain which puts the municipality to the cost of building in order to get to the river. I can understand them building that part of the drain that went under the canal, but what business have they to construct any portion of that drain leading to it at right angles?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It runs along parallel with the canal for a considerable distance, I cannot say how far, it is an open ditch. Then, it crosses under the canal and afterwards runs directly to the river.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister bring down a plan of that, so that we can see how it does run? The cost is \$18,500 altogether.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the final estimate.

Mr. OLANCY. I presume the town contributed a large sum towards the construction. I would like the minister to say how much, and also by whom it is to be maintained, and the whole cost of the work. The minister can give us that information also.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can say at once that the town does not give anything towards this portion which we are constructing.

Mr. HAGGART.

Railways and Canals—Salaries of extra clerks and copyists other than those who have passed the civil service examination, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$700

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is owing to the demands upon us for preparing returns and other information during the session of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. But there is a general vote of \$5,000 that parliament gives every year to pay for bringing down extra returns. The hon. gentleman has not been so expeditious or so voluminous in his returns this year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have been very voluminous.

Mr. FOSTER. Why does not the hon. gentleman take from the vote given for that purpose as other ministers do?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Whatever the general vote has been, it has been absorbed long before we had a chance to get any portion of it.

Mr. FOSTER. In employing assistance, why do you not take those who have gone to the trouble, in accordance with our law, of having passed the civil service examination?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Most of the staff we employ for doing extra work are people who have been employed for many years. In other cases, where you employ them for only a short time, you cannot always pick up those who have passed the civil service examination. This vote is to pay some who have passed and others who have not.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are you employing for whom you have to make this exception?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think Miss Grant has not passed, nor Miss Leseur.

To apply a system of electric lighting to the Governor General's car, worked from the axle ..... \$1,400

Mr. HAGGART. Did you try that principle to find out whether it worked well or not? I think they had it on the Canadian Pacific Railway and they have abandoned it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is in error, they have not abandoned it. There was at first some difficulty about getting it to work, but I think recent experiments have satisfied the Canadian people that it can be done. In the States they tell me they have perfected the appliance so that it works satisfactorily. Mr. Shaughnessy has put it in his car quite recently.

To pay Ralph Jones half interest at 6 per cent on \$38,915.37, amount reported by commissioner on Oxford and New Glasgow Railway claim respecting 'hard pan' of Stewart & Jones contract, No. 6 \$847 50

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The amount voted a year ago, was payable to Messrs. Stewart & Jones. They were members of the firm who had the contract in respect of which this claim has arisen. But when we were ready to pay the amount we ascertained that Mr. Stewart was unwilling to have any portion of it paid to Mr. Jones, as there was some trouble between them. In consequence we could not pay a portion unless we paid it all, and we would not pay it all unless both of the gentlemen agreed in the payment of the whole. Since then the matter has been referred to the Department of Justice, and they have advised that under the circumstances it will be proper for us to take a vote for half the amount payable to each. We have therefore taken a vote for half the amount to Mr. Jones. We can settle very well with Mr. Stewart for his share, on adjusting certain matters which are still pending between himself and the department.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this the interest on the hard-pan claims?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is the interest on the amount awarded against the Crown on a hard-pan claim.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the minister intend to pay interest to the other parties?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, I think that is in a different position altogether.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the difference?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We recognized our obligation to pay Stewart & Jones the amount of their claim. This claim was referred to the judge of the Exchequer Court, and he awarded \$38,915, which was paid after it was voted by parliament. The firm asked payment of interest on this amount from the time the award was made until the payment was made, and it seems to me to be reasonable that interest should be allowed. In respect to any other 'hard pan' claims which have been pressed upon us they are pressing for the interest from the time they allege the amount was due, or when they say the estimate ought to have been allowed down to the time that payment was made. This is interest on the \$38,000 from the time the award was made until the payment was made.

Mr. HAGGART. This was entirely a matter of grace. The Crown, legally, was not liable to pay any of these people anything. They abandoned their legal claim, and it was submitted to the Exchequer

Court. The award of the court was a mere matter of grace, and not a matter of right. I think that the minister ought to be very careful in opening up the question of the payment of interest after the award of the Exchequer Court, because all of these claims will come in for similar treatment.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am not going back to all these claims.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is now paying interest from the time the Exchequer Court made the award. It was not a judgment of the court. It was simply a submission to the court to find out what, under the circumstances, was due to the parties under these 'hard pan' claims, and as a matter of grace, an amount is put in the estimates to pay them. If you are opening up the question of interest then every other man who has a claim will have as much right as Jones & Stewart.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am not opening up the question of interest.

Mr. HAGGART. You are paying Mr. Jones interest on the amount of the award, \$38,000, that accrued between the time that the Exchequer Court award was made and the time the amount was paid to Stewart & Jones.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Then why is not every other person who had an award from the Exchequer Court entitled to interest just the same as these parties from the time of the award until the time the money was paid to them? They have just as much right equitably, legally and morally, to their interest as Jones & Stewart.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not think we could very well refuse to pay interest from the time the award was made until they received their money.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister mistakes my contention. My contention is that there was no legal claim paid to these people, that it was not a submission to the court that could be enforced by the court, that it was merely a finding for the information of the Crown, and that under this finding, as a matter of grace, the Crown paid this amount. Every one else who received payment under the award is as much entitled to interest from the time the award was made until they received payment as Stewart & Jones. There is another thing. This amount was voted last year to Stewart & Jones. The affairs of Stewart & Jones are at present in liquidation before the court. The court has appointed a receiver for the indebtedness that is due to Stewart & Jones. This amount has no business to be taken

out of the control of the court and given to an individual. The receiver, under the direction of the court, is entitled to receive all sums which may be payable to Stewart & Jones. You propose by this to pay to an individual a sum of money to which he has no right morally, legally or in any other way. If there is a payment to be made, and the firm are entitled to that payment, let it be paid to the firm. It should be disposed of as the court directs. It is at present at the disposal of the court, and whomsoever the court says is entitled to receive it, let the court have the disposal of it. Evidently the intention is to get past the court, but I do not think you will accomplish your object, because you cannot take out an injunction against the Crown. There is nothing to prevent you taking out an injunction preventing an individual who is entitled to it, taking it from the Crown and putting it in his own pocket, otherwise than as the court directs, and there is no object in making a payment to one member of a firm that is entitled to a payment from the Crown. In so far as making that payment of interest to the parties who are entitled to it is concerned, I think this is a very objectionable form of putting it in the estimates.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). Mr. Chairman, I think, perhaps, there is a legal point which is worth considering in connection with this item. If this is a debt due to two persons, and if you assume to pay one man his half, I do not see on what principle you do not pay the other man his half.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection to paying the other man his half.

Mr. BRITTON. One can hardly conceive of such an exceptional case, because there are two members of the firm, and you put into the estimates an amount to pay one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The other man has an unsettled act. If he is ready to receive it we are ready to ask parliament for the money.

Mr. BRITTON. That does not seem to remove the apparent difficulty of paying half. This certainly would be the legal effect of paying half; if there is a debt due to two persons and you pay one man half and he gives you a general release for half, it would certainly release the whole debt. That is a well known fact. The debt is simply one owing to two persons, and any one person can take half of it and release the debt. It seems to me an exceptional position, and one that ought to be inquired into.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend is apparently not much impressed with what has been stated by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways

Mr. HAGGART.

and Canals (Mr. Haggart). That hon. gentleman has pressed very strongly on the committee the view that this is a gratuity.

Mr. BRITTON. That is another matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I agree that it was a matter of grace in the first instance, whether this claim should be recognized; it was recognized, and it was afterwards set up with a good deal of reason and justice, that interest should be paid, after the judge gave his award. It may ease the conscience of my hon. friend, when I tell him that this vote is not asked for without the Justice Department, after careful consideration, advising that it was a proper vote.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Will the minister now give me the information he promised a few nights ago with regard to the expense of the sidings?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not in a position to furnish the information. There will be a number of other items upon which the hon. gentleman can bring the matter up. The first moment that I am in possession of the information, which I have not yet received from Moncton, I will furnish it.

Mr. FOSTER. We intend to have a general discussion on some of those items. They were left over for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not this one.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It was promised that we should have an opportunity for free discussion on this item.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no question of sidings here.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does the minister state that in this item of \$67,000 there is nothing for sidings?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No sidings in Cape Breton at all.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Some are being built now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot help that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does the minister tell me there is nothing in this vote No. 30, to pay for sidings?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I have stated that there was nothing for sidings in Cape Breton.

Mr. McDOUGALL. From what sources does the minister get the money to pay for these sidings?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If there are any being built now, the money would come from two or three

sources. It would come from the ordinary revenue account.

Mr. FOSTER. But it must be voted before you can spend it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon, we spend out of earnings. We spend money out of our general vote for the purpose of keeping up the road, undoubtedly.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister of Railways pretend to say that the receipts for the Intercolonial Railway for one year can be dipped into by him and spent as he pleases, without an appropriation of this House?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what you did say.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said nothing of the sort. This year we got a vote amounting to something like \$4,500,000, taking into account the supplementary vote, for expending on repairs, and maintenance and all other purposes connected with the Intercolonial Railway. If we are building any of these sidings in Cape Breton, we are doing that either out of our revenue vote, or we are doing it by arrangement with private persons who have asked for them, and who put up the money upon the customary conditions. There may be a vote in the main estimates, which is being expended now. There is nothing in these present supplementary estimates for sidings in Cape Breton.

Mr. McDOUGALL. On what conditions are those sidings put in for private persons?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The private individual makes a deposit of such amount as will cover the cost of the rails, and the cost of the work. One of the conditions which govern the arrangement is, that as fast as the earnings for the use of the sidings comes in, it is credited upon the deposit, and the amount of the deposit is paid back when the whole deposit is absorbed if it ever is. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall), has an application of his now in, which I sanctioned not so long ago, in which he asked for a private siding. I presume he has heard of it. It is in accordance with the usual conditions which govern these things, and there are a great many sidings which are built in the course of a year upon the terms which I have mentioned.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What the minister refers to is a deposit simply covering the rails that are advanced by the department, and when a certain amount of business is done over these sidings for which rails are used, the government returns the money deposited. The money exacted from the per-

son is absolutely for the use of the rails, and according as the business is done over these rails, the man who does the business with the railway gets his money back.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what I said.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Why, then, should any vote appear in the estimates for a purpose of that kind?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That only applies to private sidings. We are building sidings that are not private sidings.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then what sidings are included in this \$67,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have looked it over very carefully, and there is nothing in the item of \$9,600 which applies to any sidings in Cape Breton. If there are any being put in there now, other than the way I speak of, they must come out of this year's appropriation.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The item I asked information on was the item of \$6,700, and I find a separate item of \$12,500 for sidings.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was speaking of the item of \$9,600. That does not include any sidings in Cape Breton, though there are some sidings in it—one at Killam's, one at River Savage, one at Granton, and one at Barnaby River.

Mr. FOSTER. Why does the hon. gentleman have two estimates—one for increased facilities along the line, out of which he builds sidings, and another item of \$12,500 specially for sidings? Does he not see that he is making his estimates blind? He is taking \$18,000 odd for sidings.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. In the item of \$9,600, there are a number of other things provided for. I suppose it would have been as well to put the sidings all in one vote.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Are any portions of these sidings, for which this money is voted, built by private individuals?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. None. These are public sidings.

Mr. HAGGART. As the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) has the evidence of the Public Accounts Committee, I would like him to point out where it is stated that Hugh Ryan was paid by me the price of Portland cement for water cement which was used in the Sault Ste. Marie lock. Will the hon. gentleman point it out? If not, I shall be obliged to read evidence directly contrary to the hon. gentleman's statement. There were about a hundred questions asked by Mr. Gibson before the committee. One of the last was the following:

I suppose the engineer, then, kept a correct account of the number of barrels of Portland cement used?—I don't know that.

Have you your account charging that?—We have not.

You have not put in your bill yet?—We have not put in our bill. We asked payment for it, but did not get it.

Mr. GIBSON. The statement I made is correct. The hon. gentleman said that according to the contract Mr. Ryan was justified in using native cement, and that, on account of his anxiety to make a better class of work, he voluntarily offered to use Portland cement instead of native cement. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page 2159, he will find the following :

Did you use Portland in the backing?—We did, a great deal. We did it under positive orders from the chief engineer.

Why?—Because he considered it a great deal better than the other.

Why did he allow you to use any Thorold at all if he thought the other was better?—I cannot tell you that.

But you were willing to take his orders and use Portland cement, although it cost you twice as much money, or 80 per cent?—We were told we would be paid for it.

You were told you would be paid for it?—Yes, sir.

You expected to be paid extra for that?—I did not know it would be extra. I expected to be paid for that cement.

That is what I said; and if you look further down you will find that there were about 34,000 barrels of native cement used in the Sault Canal for backing and retaining wall. In some cases they used it partly for face work and partly for backing.

Mr. HAGGART. The particular point between the hon. gentleman and me was, that he stated that I had paid for water cement from Thorold at the price of Portland cement.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken as to that. What I did say was, that he allowed them to use the native cement without making a reduction from the contract price, and the hon. gentleman said that Mr. Ryan voluntarily offered to do the balance of the work with Portland cement. As a matter of fact, there were about 60,000 or 70,000 barrels in all used, and in that evidence Mr. Ryan says that when the chief engineer asked him to finish the balance of the work with Portland cement, he expected to be paid for it as promised, and further on he goes on to say that notwithstanding that, the native cement was used right along as formerly.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman withdraws the statement he made, that I allowed Mr. Ryan to use Thorold cement in the construction of the locks and he was paid for it as if he gave Portland cement, it is all right. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Ryan has stated in his evidence that I had paid for Thorold cement the price of Portland cement in the locks. I said

Mr. HAGGART.

there was not a word of foundation for that statement, and that Mr. Ryan never gave such evidence.

Mr. GIBSON. He gives it at the top of page 118.

Mr. HAGGART. He was not paid at all. He put in a bill for cement at the time he gave his evidence, and he swore that then there was no settlement with him.

Mr. McDOUGALL. When will the hon. gentleman give the information about the siding he promised the other day?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Before we get down to the other railway items in my estimates, I hope to be able to hear from Moncton by telegraph. Let the present item pass, and there will be ample opportunity for the hon. gentleman to bring this matter up.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what the position was with regard to that siding?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman's application was for a siding at Sydney, and I gave the order that he should have the privilege of getting a siding there on the usual terms.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is, make a deposit equal to the value of the rails?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have had several cases, and the usual conditions are to make a deposit to cover all the costs.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not complain of any rule or regulation of the Railway Department that is made to apply in the same way to everybody, but what I complain of is, that in cases that I had with the department myself, I did not receive the same treatment as other individuals did.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would the hon. gentleman not prefer to wait until I have all the information before we discuss this?

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is important there should be some discussion about it so as to put the hon. minister on the right track. He is putting in sidings at the expense of the country for private individuals on private property, which nobody will use except those who own the property. I refer to the siding at a place called Big Beach, within two miles of Shunacadie station. The siding was put in on the railway property, but there is no public access to it, and there is no public business there. I am told that up to last week, although the siding was put down in May, there was no business done at it except that two empty cars were put there two days ago. More than two months before that siding was put in I made application for one where I had a large quantity to ship from, having made

my deposit, the work of putting in the siding was began, but before it was completed the men who were putting in my siding were taken away to put in a private siding. Where the minister made a mistake was in putting in the siding I refer to as a public siding when it was only required for private purposes. That is not all. Last winter I had to put in a siding at a place on the River Dennis, within a mile from the River Dennis station, where I had a mill. I made application for permission to put in the siding to connect my mill with the railway, and I was asked to make a deposit equal to the value of the rails. I put up the deposit and spent between \$400 and \$500 on the siding. The public are using that siding to-day. But, because a man who wanted to compete with me in the same line of business made application to the minister for the privileges of putting in a siding the minister granted it at the expense of the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You meant he made application to the department, not the minister?

Mr. McDOUGALL. The application must come to the minister. Mine did, but the application of my neighbour evidently did not. I find that when I have to do business with the railway authorities, my application must be referred to Ottawa, but it appears that that is not necessary in the case of other people. I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not find fault with the hon. minister for putting in a siding in the neighbourhood of my work, if all were treated alike. But, a few days ago, for purposes of repairs to the railway, some people came and loaded eight cars on my siding and travelled twenty-eight miles for the privilege of doing it. And I find my private sidings not only used for the public convenience, but for the government convenience. My applications must go to the minister to see if he can tax me more than other people pay, as in this case. Now, I do not complain of having to pay, if he will treat everybody the same way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) is getting pretty pair play.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to know how? The minister is carrying out his plans fully. After putting in these sidings at heavy expense and having secured a rate on freight taken from these sidings, when the minister found they were put in at my expense, he put up the rates from fifty to eighty per cent—in one case even up 100 per cent. The result is, as any business man would expect, that the business has been destroyed. The people to whom I was supplying a large portion of the material refused to take it. And so, I have no return from the money I have put into

sidings, and the railway loses the business as well as I do. The railway was making money out of the rate first given.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not a bit of it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I beg the hon. minister's pardon. If they were not making money out of that rate, why do they do the same class of work for one-third the rate for other people? Why does the hon. gentleman carry coal from Sydney to Ferrona, from Springhill to Montreal, at very much lower rates—one-quarter the rate in some instances? Why does he carry flour for my hon. friend from Kent, Ont. (Mr. Campbell) at a very much lower price from Montreal to the maritime provinces, if my rates did not pay? The first rates paid the railway very well, and the hon. Minister of Finance admitted the other night that complaints were made about these rates—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Other people wanted to get the same rates the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) was getting, and we would not give them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Why not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because the rates were too low.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Minister of Finance admitted the rates charged me were good rates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said that I believed the complaints of discrimination and injustice on the part of the railway were without foundation.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then the rates were all right?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All the rates may have been too low. I am not going to discuss that—I know nothing about it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The rates were put up, and now I have no business, and the railway has not the business, which shows that the rates are too high, so high that they are prohibitory. Inquire from other railway corporations, and you will find that the rates given in this instance are in keeping with those charged by other railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS. Not at all.

Mr. McDOUGALL. A contractor I met the other day told me he had to pay half a cent a ton a mile for sending the same kind of material over the road that I have to pay 2, 2½ and 2½ cents for. Surely other people engaged in that business have an opinion that is worthy of attention. But the fact is the minister's friends wanted to prevent me doing business, and they found a minister who was willing to carry

out their wishes. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he had application for another siding near the town of Sydney within a short time?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, I remember only one.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. There is a siding being put in within a mile of Sydney for a private individual, and it will be a very strange thing if application was not made to the minister for it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. How long since?

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. Within the last two or three weeks.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. A good deal of time often elapses between the receiving of an application and the putting in of a siding.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. The necessity for this siding arose very recently. The siding was being proceeded with a few weeks ago, about the time that I applied for a siding at Sydney. I am surprised the same rule would not apply to every case of the same kind. I am informed, and I believe I am credibly informed, that that siding is being put in for a private individual at the expense of the railway, while the minister decides that I have to make a deposit for my sidings, and have to pay everything.

Mr. **ANGUS McLENNAN** (Inverness). The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) secured his siding in the county of Inverness by simply coming up to Ottawa and interviewing the officials, and possibly, the minister. The fact remains then that shortly after his trip to Ottawa his sidings were in course of construction for the benefit of the hon. gentleman's business. As for the department discriminating against the hon. gentleman's business, I have an application for the firm of John McLean & Sons, of Cleveland, within a few miles of where the hon. gentleman has his siding—

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. How many miles? Is it not ten?

Mr. **McLENNAN** (Inverness). I cannot determine exactly. It is in the county of Inverness. Anyway, I made application to the Minister of Railways and Canals one year before that. And it was only in May last, three or four weeks ago, when these gentlemen had deposited their own money and paid every dollar of the expense that the siding was put in. These gentlemen are friends of mine, they are Liberals, and it took them about fifteen months to get a siding at Cleveland, a few miles from where the hon. gentleman has built his siding, and without any reference whatever to me, and in the most quiet and expeditious manner. Indeed, I do not know what the Department of Railways and Canals are going to do for the hon.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**.

gentleman to please him, unless indeed they hand over to him the whole track. With regard to the matter of rates also, I have some letters from Port Hastings, one of the terminals of the Intercolonial Railway in Cape Breton, where an increase of 100 per cent was made in the rates some weeks ago. I may mention the case of R. J. McDonald, Esq., brother of the gentleman the hon. member for Cape Breton the other day referred to, who represents the county of Inverness in the local legislature, and whom he considered very highly favoured by the Department of Railways and Canals. I have a letter in my desk from Mr. McDonald, in which he complains that freight charges went up 100 per cent in the case of small parcels and 50 per cent in the case of those of larger bulk. A neighbouring gentleman of his who is conversant with railway rates also complained in behalf of other interests in Port Hastings of the increase of rates. These gentlemen are Liberals. One of these letters I handed to the department, and I do not know what they are going to do with the matter. But I cite these instances to show the hon. gentleman and the House that he cannot complain of the Department of Railways and Canals as discriminating against him in the slightest. With regard to the sidings, I can assure him that a Mr. McLean, a strong Liberal, doing business there, desired that I should appeal to the Department of Railways and Canals for a siding at a place called Malagawatch, within a short distance of the hon. gentleman's siding. It was found his siding was so near that locality that the department would not listen to the idea. I may also mention another fact regarding the running of freight trains over the Intercolonial Railway in the island of Cape Breton. That road was built thirteen years ago. The hon. gentleman was in parliament at the time, and he and his associates then representing the island, all of whom supported the Conservative government, permitted the government to use old rails in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway in the island. These rails are there to this day, and it is only at this session of parliament that the Minister of Railways and Canals is taking steps to secure a vote to replace those old rails with steel rails.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. Were the former ones steel?

Mr. **McLENNAN** (Inverness). My impression is that they were composed for a considerable part of rust, perhaps some iron or steel. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that they were old rails, and I can assure him also that if I had a seat in this House at that time I would have uttered a vigorous protest against the discrimination practised by the old government against the island of Cape Breton. It was a most unjust and humiliating discrim-

ination. The five members representing the island at that time permitted the government to truck old rails across the Strait of Canso and use them for the only line of railway in that island. With regard to the rolling stock and the increase of traffic on the Intercolonial Railway traffic has increased at least ten-fold during the past year, and the Minister of Railways and Canals has asked for an appropriation to renew that track. Neither the hon. gentleman nor any other private individual can expect the Department of Railways and Canals to clog the business of the road to accommodate his or their private business. I say again that two or three private individuals doing business along that line are practically asking me at this moment to intercede with the department for the privilege of building sidings along that railway, and I feel loath to do so until the vote now going through will be available to put the track in proper shape so that trains and traffic will sweep along the line at a vigorous pace, and thus remove the congestion of traffic which the snail-pace that has hitherto been maintained, has created.

Mr. McDUGALL. The rails that were put down on that road thirteen years ago were steel rails, but if the government had listened to those gentlemen who were then in opposition, they would have put down wooden rails, because we were told over and over again by them that the road was never going to do any business. However, we made our complaints to the Department of Railways and Canals, and we were told that the rails were suited for the traffic; possibly they were, they served the purpose anyway up to a recent date when it was found the traffic was getting too heavy. It is only a few weeks ago that we had a fight in this House, and we heard a howl raised from the town of Sydney and the board of trade against the department sending old rails down there to replace those that are on the road now. Some of those were put in. The minister denied that any old rails were being put in on the Cape Breton part of the road to replace the old ones that were there before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I hope to get money enough to put new ones along the whole line.

Mr. McDUGALL. It was decided that rails were somewhat heavier than those now on the road were to be taken off that portion of the line between Truro and Moncton and were to be brought to Cape Breton, and several car-loads of them were brought down and the operation of putting them down was begun. I saw them being put there after the minister made his statement. Now with regard to the siding, it is fifteen miles away from the siding of which I spoke as having been put in at my own expense. The hon. gentleman forgot to state that the

government put in a siding within 1,800 feet of my siding, at public expense.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is a public siding.

Mr. McDUGALL. Why should that be public more than mine? Mine is used by the public the same as the other. How can it be public when the government has not given an inch of ground for it?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Do you not charge for your siding?

Mr. McDUGALL. I do not charge for it yet, but I presume I will have to some day. If the government is going to run opposition to me by giving a siding to my neighbours I will have to do something to live. What I complain of is that one party should be treated differently from another. Why should this siding be put there at all and why should it be built at the public expense.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). The public use it.

Mr. McDUGALL. This is a siding they put in at the expense of the public and it is only 1,800 feet from mine. The public are using both.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Do you find any fault with the public?

Mr. McDUGALL. I find fault with the government after having paid for mine.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). If the hon. gentleman had had patience he would not have required to have built one but he could have used the public siding.

Rideau Canal staff ..... \$267

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved:

That the item be reduced to \$120.

Motion agreed to.

Intercolonial Railway ..... \$900,000

Mr. HAGGART. I do not understand how the minister managed the two payments on the Intercolonial Railway, \$900,000 there and \$350,000 on revenue account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We did not get through with the payments. We had not enough to pay; we were short one-half of last month.

Mr. HAGGART. You put through a Bill to meet it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but it is not through the Senate yet.

Lachine Canal—Dredge vessels ..... \$2,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to change this item to 'general repairs.'

Amendment agreed to.

Prince Edward Island Railway..... \$20,000

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals if a deputation was here some time ago from Prince Edward Island representing the employees of the Prince Edward Island Railway, asking for an increase of wages to bring them up to the rate paid the same class of employees on the Intercolonial Railway, and if so, what has been done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We had a call from a gentleman representing the employees on the island, and they maintained that there was really a difference between the rate of wages paid on the Intercolonial Railway road on the mainland and on the Prince Edward Island road, which was unreasonable and unfair. I forwarded their application with a memo. of their general statement to the department at Moncton, and they advised me that there is not the unfairness in the slight difference between the rates paid on the island and the mainland which there appears to be. However, the subject is receiving consideration at my hands, and I intend to take it up as soon as the session is over. It is maintained at Moncton that it costs more for the employees to live on the mainland than on the island. Whether that statement is correct or not I cannot say, but that is the impression that obtains at Moncton.

Beauharnois Canal ..... \$26,850

Mr. HAGGART. Do you intend to keep up the repairs on that canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I am going to withdraw \$25,000. I move that the item be reduced to \$1,650.

Motion agreed to.

Unprovided items, 1898-9..... \$73,166 66

Mr. HAGGART. What are the items in the Auditor General's Report?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is not an appropriation of money, but it is a ratification which takes place every year of certain odds and ends of expenditure which the Auditor General sets forth and which we always cover by a vote.

Mr. CLANCY. Would the Minister of Railways and Canals bring down to-morrow the papers which I sent him a memo. of this afternoon. If we have them we will get through more quickly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have them here, except the contract. I want to make them complete, and I will give him the papers personally to-morrow. They are original copies, and he will have to take care of them and return them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. HAGGART. What business will be taken up to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think there is an understanding that the Bill relating to judges will be taken up to-morrow morning; if not some other business. In the afternoon the day is set apart for the prohibition matter.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Tuesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, July 3, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### IMPERIAL DEFENCE AND PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

Mr. ALEXANDER McNEILL (North Bruce). As I find there has been a misunderstanding in some quarters of an observation I made to my right hon. friend the other night, on a motion to adjourn the House, I wish to make a brief explanation. I stated then, with reference to the resolution which was carried by the great trade conference now assembled in England, that its result meant the adoption of the principle of provincial trade by all the delegates assembled, with the exception of one. I am assuming, of course, that the report of the meeting of that conference in the *Globe* is correct. As there has been some misapprehension about the matter, perhaps the shortest way for me to explain to the House exactly the import of the resolution thus passed—which is really one of the most important events, in my judgment, that has taken place in the history of the empire—would be to read a few words that I said on a similar resolution which I had the privilege of introducing into this House in 1896. I said that we had passed two resolutions in the House—the first in favour of preferential trade—

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend is hardly in order.

Mr. McNEILL. I will not be a moment, and do not want to move the adjournment of the House. The second resolution was a resolution in support of a proposal to give armed assistance, in case of need, to the mother country, and I proceeded to explain the resolution I was then introducing in this way. (That was after I had read the resolution in favour of preferential trade):

The second resolution I need not read, because it is in the memory of all hon. members, and by it we pledged ourselves, when the occasion arose, to do our utmost for the defence of the empire. The House has therefore solemnly and formally pledged itself to these two princi-

ples : In the first place to the principle of Imperial reciprocity, or preferential trade within the empire ; and in the second place, to the principle that Canada is prepared to make substantial sacrifices for the defence of the empire. The resolution which I had the honour of placing in your hands a moment or two ago, Mr. Speaker, is of this nature, that it proposes to use this preferential trade, which is so much desired by the colonial part of the empire, as an instrument for producing the means of Imperial defence. It does so in this way : The resolution proposes that Great Britain and the other members of the empire shall impose a small preferential duty on all foreign products imported by them, not imposing any duty, so far as this matter is concerned, upon English or colonial products, upon products raised within the empire. Therefore, so soon as England agrees to this proposal and places a duty on foreign products imported into her markets and allows our goods to enter free, we at once have preferential trade, and, just in proportion to the amount of the duty thus imposed, do we have a greater or less amount of preferential trade. I hope that is clear to hon. gentlemen, because I know some members did not realize that this was in reality a resolution in favour of preferential trade as well as a resolution in favour of Imperial defence. So soon as these duties are imposed by England against foreign countries and our goods are allowed to go in free, then at once we have preferential trade with England. This proposal, Mr. Speaker, is not mine.

It was a proposal of Mr. Hoffmeyer, and known as the Hoffmeyer scheme. I wished to make that explanation, because there was some misunderstanding the other day, apparently, and since, as to the exact import of the resolution which was carried in this great conference, and I think the House will agree with me when I say that, if the report of the *Globe* be correct, and if it be true that in this great meeting of delegates, representing the chambers of commerce of all parts of the empire, this resolution was carried with only one dissenting voice, it is one of the most important events that has occurred even in this year of important events in connection with the empire—this creative era for the empire.

#### INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before the government orders are called, I would like to ask the First Minister if he has yet come to any decision with reference to the papers regarding the Richelieu bridge.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I can only repeat that there is correspondence going on at this moment between the Department of Railways and Canals and the Auditor General, and it would not be convenient to bring the papers down until the correspondence is completed.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these of a private nature?

The PRIME MINISTER. Not that I know of.

Mr. FOSTER. That ought not to apply to the correspondence with reference to the company and the payments to the company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There is no correspondence with the company that I know of going on. There are discussions and so forth pending between the department and the Auditor General. The matter has not by any means reached a conclusion yet, and until we conclude upon the negotiations pending, we cannot very well bring down the correspondence.

Mr. FOSTER. The correspondence is of two kinds. You are in controversy now with the Auditor General, which is not finished ; but the previous part of the correspondence, which refers to the payments and the conditions, and everything like that, the reports of the officers, surely can be brought down. Surely, that is not controversial, and can be brought down, if the minister—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I prefer not to bring down anything until the whole business is through.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is not treating the House fairly. This money has been voted by the House and spent by the government, and the House is entitled to know it at any time, to have the correspondence with reference to it. If there is any row on with the Auditor General that has not been fought to a finish, I do not insist on that part coming down. I have not yet received any of those returns which I, in confidence, handed over to the Prime Minister.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have the report ready, and will lay it on the Table. It is sent to me with a note from the Secretary of State, saying this return is complete except the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. FOSTER. And when shall I have that?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will try to get that also.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) if he has the report yet respecting Corporal Courtney ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Yes, the papers came to the department yesterday. I asked the deputy minister to look over them carefully and make a report. I hope this afternoon to be able to give the information the hon. gentleman wants ; and if not this afternoon, to-morrow.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—EMERGENCY RATIONS.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask if the Minister is ready to set a day for the discussion of the emergency food report?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier.) It has not been printed, so far as I know.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Yes, it has been printed and distributed.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. We will fix a day to-morrow.

Mr. **J. B. MORIN** (Dorchester). I desire to ask the Prime Minister if he would be kind enough to have printed in French the proceedings of the emergency food inquiry?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. That does not require any order from me. It is in the power of the House to do that, and I think the officers are attending to it already.

#### RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. **G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.) Yesterday or to-day was the limit fixed for bringing down the railway resolutions. Are they ready?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). They will be brought down to-day.

#### COMPANIES' CLAUSES ACT.

On the order being called for the second reading of Bill (No. 183) to amend the Companies' Clauses Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Mr. **G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.) This Bill is not printed, and I do not think we should take it up before it is printed. At any rate, I do not think we shall make any progress by taking it up now. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) is not present, but he will be here in the course of the day, and he particularly wishes to be present during the discussion of this Bill. I spoke to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) with reference to it last night. He may not have seen the First Minister since then.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). I do not remember that the question was raised as to printing.

Mr. **FOSTER**. No, the question was as to going on with the Bill this morning.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I understood there had been an agreement between the hon. member for Montmorency and the Solicitor General—

Mr. **FOSTER**. No.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There was ; I was a party to it myself.

Mr. **FOSTER**. My version of that is, that there was an agreement with the Premier under which this Bill was to come up on Friday, and the hon. member for Montmorency was here on that day, but the Bill was not brought up. He is away, and is kept away by illness in his family.

Mr. **JAMES SUTHERLAND** (North Oxford). He has been away nearly the whole session.

Mr. **FOSTER**.

Mr. **FOSTER**. He has not been away as much as the hon. gentleman's superior, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who has not shown his face here at all.

Mr. **SUTHERLAND**. But he did not ask for any delay on his account.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I do not think it would be well to push the Bill under the circumstances. I am sure there is no arrangement between the Solicitor General and the hon. member for Montmorency for this morning.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. My recollection is quite the reverse. Of course, I would willingly oblige my hon. friend from Montmorency. I know he is away because of illness in his family, and I certainly sympathize with him in that respect. I have a very distinct recollection that some day was set, although I am not so sure as to the day. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will remember that there was a day fixed.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Friday.

#### PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 11) to amend the Pilotage Act.

Mr. **G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.) What is the state of this Bill?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) will remember that after it came out of committee a desire was expressed to have the Bill reprinted. I did have it reprinted, but at the request of hon. gentlemen from time to time I did not bring it on.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What does it do with reference to this court?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. It leaves it where it was in committee. It provides for the court, and if after, the Admiralty Court is established, it transfers the jurisdiction to the Admiralty Court.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

#### INSPECTION OF GRAIN IN MANITOBA.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (141), respecting the grain trade in the inspection district in Manitoba, be read a second time. He said: I would like the attention of the hon. members for the North-west to these amendments. Most of them are purely formal. In section 38, subsection 1, leave out the words 'what grade or,' after the word 'report.'

Mr. **G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.). They seem to leave out the word 'grade' all through. How does that affect the Bill?

The PRIME MINISTER. I could not give the information to the hon. gentleman. I submitted the amendments to the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) and he approves of all of them.

Amendment concurred in.

The PRIME MINISTER. At the end of section 37 a new subsection is added called 37a :

37a. It shall be the duty of the owner, lessee or manager of every elevator now or hereafter equipped with grain cleaners to clean the grain before it is weighed, when so requested to do.

2. Persons interested in the weighing of any grain at country elevators shall have free access to the scales while such grain is being weighed. The net weight of the grain so cleaned shall be specified on the face of the certificate given the seller by the purchaser.

3. The proprietor, lessee or manager of any elevator failing to comply with the provisions of this section shall be guilty of an offence under this Act.

I move this amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand it, that does not make it obligatory that the owner, lessee or manager of an elevator shall be equipped for cleaning, but in case they are equipped then when requested they shall clean the grain. Is there any provision for a charge for the cleaning of the grain ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Must they clean the grain at their own cost and charges ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a certain recognized fee for cleaning the grain.

Amendment concurred in.

#### HILLSBOROUGH RIVER BRIDGE AGREEMENT, P.E.I.

Bill (No. 182) respecting the construction of a branch railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour, was read a second time; and House resolved itself into committee thereon.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Chairman, this Bill is introduced in substitution of chapter 4, 63 Victoria, in reference to the arrangement between the government of Prince Edward Island and this government for the construction of the Hillsborough River bridge. Under the Act of last session, the Minister of Railways was authorized to enter into an agreement with the government of Prince Edward Island in the following terms :—

The Minister of Railways and Canals may enter into an agreement with the government of Prince Edward Island, providing that the bridge to be constructed over the Hillsborough River shall be so constructed as to be adapted and suitable as well for the purpose of a public highway as for the purposes of railway ; and before entering into any contract for the construction of such bridge the government of Prince Edward

Island shall undertake and agree to contribute the sum of twelve thousand dollars a year as its share of the cost of the construction of such bridge, which contribution shall be deducted half-yearly from the subsidies and allowances payable to the said province ; and the Minister of Railways and Canals may, in such agreement with the government of the said province, provide for the regulation and control of the said bridge and of the highway traffic thereon.

These were the terms which were imposed last year upon the government of Prince Edward Island, and it was presumed that they would be accepted as satisfactory by the government of that province, although we had no final or definite arrangement with them to that effect. According to the estimate which we had made of the cost of the bridge, and according to what we conceived would be the charges incidental to its operation and maintenance, we concluded that \$12,000 a year would not be an unreasonable sum to exact from the island, in consideration of our undertaking the work. Since, however, as a result of the revision of the plans and of a consideration of the circumstances likely to arise, we felt that we would ask parliament to authorize a revised arrangement reducing the amount which we would call upon the island government to pay in respect to their contribution somewhat, and we have placed in this Bill a schedule of the new agreement as it is entered into and as it awaits the sanction of parliament before it becomes binding and obligatory upon the parties. We have proposed to reduce the amount of the contribution by the government of the island from \$12,000 to \$9,750, and we arrive at the amount in this way : Our original estimate of the cost of the bridge was that it would be between \$800,000 and \$900,000. We felt that, under the circumstances, we could ask the government of the island to pay us interest on one-half of the cost of the bridge, on the round sum of \$800,000, 3 per cent upon half of which would be \$12,000. This is the way that we arrived at the contribution of the island government. In revising the plan of the bridge, we have reduced the cost somewhat. Our estimate of the cost of the bridge now is \$750,000. The interest upon that amount, at 3 per cent, would be \$22,500, and on one-half of it the interest would be \$11,250. We have arranged with the island government, subject to the approval of parliament, to allow \$1,500 off that, the island government undertaking, on their part, to pay all the expenses of watchmen upon the bridge, all of the guarding and protecting, to provide whatever lighting is required, and also to keep for all time the roadway, the highway and the foot and passenger way, excepting between the rails of the railway, which we have to replank and renew as may be required. In consideration of these conditions, we have felt that it would be proper and reasonable to make the allowance to them which I propose here, and I ask parliament to ratify

this agreement, under which they will contribute \$9,750 a year in the same manner as was proposed in the original contract.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) What guarantee can the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) give us that his estimate of \$750,000 will finish the structure? We have samples every year of these estimates and of the large difference between the estimate and the actual cost of construction. The first estimate was between \$800,000 and \$900,000. The hon. gentleman, in order to reduce the amount to be paid by the province, places the estimate at \$750,000. In regard to the \$1,500, I think that is a fairly good arrangement, because the local government undertakes to take care of the roadway up to the approaches of the bridge, and the passenger roadway across the bridge, the Railway Department simply looking after its own track and the space between the tracks. But trouble will arise when the construction goes on and the hon. gentleman finds that it will take more than \$750,000. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman must be very well convinced that he can finish the work within that estimate, or he ought to make a sliding-scale arrangement providing for interest on one-half of the amount, less \$1,500 for the annual services to be performed by the local government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman asks me what guarantee I can offer to him as to the correctness of this estimate. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would state what are the general guarantees which accompany the estimates of officers of the government. I know of no other guarantees to offer him. The original calculation of the engineers was based upon a somewhat different structure, and a somewhat more expensive structure than the one we now propose. They were in favour of a double span arrangement in place of the single span contemplated at present. The engineers say that \$750,000 will be enough to enable us to complete this bridge, particularly as the maximum price in iron and steel has been reached, and there is some evidence of a downward tendency. I think the figures will not be found to be under the mark, as we know that engineers are not infallible.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that based on the cost of iron two or three months ago?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is based on the cost three or four months ago.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be the maximum cost.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a downward tendency in prices. There is no doubt that the arrangement to require the island government here to pay the interest on one-half the cost is an arrangement which, to say the least,

Mr. BLAIR.

is not unfavourable to the government of Canada. It was contended by those who represented the government of Prince Edward Island that we ought not to have insisted on so large a proportion. They said: You have to build the bridge anyway for the purposes of your railway, and it would be more reasonable if the Dominion government were only to exact what would be a proper proportion of the additional cost by reason of the highway. I argued that proposition with the representatives of the island government, and they ultimately acceded to our terms, and I think that our claims at all events are not unfavourable to the government of Canada, while, I am not prepared to say that it is an arrangement which is unduly favourable to Prince Edward Island. The estimates of the engineer have been made with care, and I think the best thing we can do is to accept them as we have been in the habit of doing heretofore.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). How long will the bridge be?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. With the approaches, it would be nearly three-quarters of a mile. It is not a very long bridge. It is not as long as the bridge at Fredericton, which is 2,700 feet.

Mr. POWELL. The water is very deep there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The abutments are much more expensive and better.

Mr. A. MARTIN (East Queen's, P.E.I.) Would the minister tell the committee the difference between the bridge he proposes to erect now and the bridge which he proposed to erect last year: the difference in the length and in the width?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no difference in the length. It was proposed in the original plans to put up double trusses, but now there is only a single truss, with the one opening, and the track is laid down a little to one side of the middle, and the main road is on the other side.

Mr. MARTIN. Do wagons pass over the same track as the railway, or is there a partition between.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no partition. We do not propose to allow wagons upon the bridge when the locomotive is moving. We propose to have the gate shut and the general public excluded from the bridge while the trains are crossing. That is considered the safer plan to adopt.

Mr. MARTIN. We should have the plan of this bridge here, so that we may know something about it. The plan we had last year was a much more preferable plan than this one, because there will be great

delay for wagons while the trains are crossing. Will the minister tell me when this change was made and the present plan adopted?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Last fall.

Mr. **MARTIN**. I may be wrong, but I understand that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) went through the southern section last autumn with a plan different from the plan which we now have before us.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). Not much; a very slight difference.

Mr. **MARTIN**. In that plan there was a separate track for wagons, besides the railway track.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. No.

Mr. **MARTIN**. I know the Minister (Sir Louis Davies) went there, and he said he spent three days' hard work in finishing the plans.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Can the hon. gentleman make that statement of his own knowledge? Was he present?

Mr. **MARTIN**. I heard it from gentlemen who were there.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Oh, yes.

Mr. **MARTIN**. I understand that this new plan was only completed last April, but the Minister of Marine, in some mysterious way, had it last fall and heralded it over the length and breadth of the district as the result principally of his own labour. I wish to point out that, under this Bill, the province of Prince Edward Island is paying a heavier proportion for this bridge than it would have paid for the bridge of last year. I do not think that any engineer would make an estimate that last year's bridge could be completed for anything like a million dollars. The bridge last year was nearly half as wide again as this one, and it would have cost \$1,250,000. Prince Edward Island's share of the last year's bridge would be \$12,000 a year, but its share for this bridge, which is to cost little more than one-half, will be \$9,750. The minister told us that the estimates for the bridge last year was a million dollars.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. He did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. **MARTIN**. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) had better be easy. I have got the answer here under my hand.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Read it.

Mr. **MARTIN**. Here it is:

Q. What is the estimated cost of the bridge now proposed? What was the estimated cost

of the bridge proposed to be built under section 2 of chapter 4, Statutes of 1899?

A. The estimated cost of the bridge now is \$750,000. The original estimate was something less than a million dollars.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Hear, hear.

Mr. **MARTIN**. That, I suppose, might mean \$999,999—which would be only one dollar less. According to the estimates of the engineer submitted last year, the bridge could not be built for anything like a million dollars. The bridge now proposed to be built is a cheaper bridge, for which the province has to pay \$9,750 a year, representing a capital of \$300,000 or \$400,000. I see it is provided in this Bill:

The provincial government shall use all necessary means for the protection and safety of all foot-passengers and persons using the highway portion of the said bridge.

The provincial government is not only to provide for the lighting of the bridge, but for the safety of foot-passengers, and when I tell you that the passage-way for wagons is the same as for trains, you will see that the danger is very great. I asked the minister the other day whether it was proposed that the Dominion government should provide the necessary means for the protection and safety of foot-passengers and others using the highway portion of the bridge, and he said he could not answer the question; but this very Bill says that the provincial government shall provide the protection. Why could not the Minister of Railways at once say that the Dominion government would not provide that? In this matter the government are driving a very hard bargain indeed with the province of Prince Edward Island. I think the Dominion government should afford the necessary protection for foot-passengers and other persons crossing that bridge. If the provincial government are to do that, it will be an additional burden put upon them while they are already paying a very large sum, although they should not be called on to pay more than the difference between \$750,000 and \$650,000.

Mr. **JOHN HAGGART** (South Lanark). I would suggest to the Minister of Railways and Canals that if my hon. friend has given a correct description of the proposed bridge, he had better go to a little more expense and build a proper bridge, on which the tracks can be separated from the highway for horses and foot-passengers. It may involve more expense, but it will be better by all means to have a bridge that would fully accommodate the public according to modern ideas; as he is trying to bring the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway up to that standard.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. So far as foot-passengers are concerned, they have a proper path at the side of the bridge, perfectly separate from

the part for horses, unless they choose to go on it. As to its not being a first-class bridge, we have it from the engineers that it will be the best bridge that can be built. The question of having the tracks separate from the highway for ordinary traffic was considered, and plans were submitted on that basis; but the cost was so enormous that we could not accept them. I am satisfied, however, from the explanations which the chief engineer gave to me, and from a thorough examination of the plans, that the bridge will meet all the wants of the people.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If there were a great deal of railway traffic over this bridge, so much as to impede the vehicular traffic, I would agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart). There may, perhaps, be two trains a day each way, and it would be scarcely reasonable to expend a large amount of money for the purpose of laying a separate and independent track under these circumstances. We have a number of instances under our eyes in which, perhaps not railway trains to a great extent, but cars use traffic bridges right within the limits of this city. We have cars passing and repassing every two or three minutes of the day, and they are not found to interfere, to any great degree, with the use of the bridges for other purposes. I am free to confess that there was an uncertainty in my mind as to what the cost of this bridge would be. The engineers made an estimate when the price of iron was a good deal lower than it subsequently became. When the question came up last year the price of iron was very much increased, and I feared that the cost of the structure would be appreciably augmented. Things are looking more favourable in that regard, however, and I feel confident that the engineers' estimate is not wide of the mark. The bridge will be first-class in every respect, and I am sure the people will be getting good value for the money they are contracting to pay under this agreement.

Mr. McDUGALL. It is proposed to have a draw in the bridge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. McDUGALL. What depth of water is there where it is proposed to have the draw?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is very deep water.

Mr. MARTIN. After all, there has been a deception practised on Prince Edward Island in connection with this bridge. I attended a series of meetings last fall at which this project was thoroughly discussed. The Attorney-General, who was running an election at the time, said that the first proposal to build a bridge, on which

wagons and trains would have the same passage-way, was insufficient, and it had been decided to build a bridge with separate ways for wagons and trains. Now it is proposed to build a bridge which will be dangerous to the public, while the task of affording protection for foot-passengers and other passengers will be thrown on the provincial government at an annual cost of \$9,750 for all time to come. The province could itself put up a bridge sufficient for the traffic for foot-passengers or wagons for a much less sum, involving a much less annual charge than what we will have to pay under this Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Have you had any engineer's report to that effect?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. I understand they can put up a bridge there for \$250,000 or \$300,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who is the engineer?

Mr. MARTIN. I am not aware, but I think that calculations have been made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What engineer reported that?

Mr. MARTIN. I am not aware that I named the engineer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman pledge himself that any engineer ever made that statement?

Mr. MARTIN. Will the hon. gentleman tell me who was the engineer that drafted this plan? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries appears to have spent three of the hardest days' work he ever did in making it, if we believe what he said in Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He was the chief engineer of the Intercolonial Railway, and the hon. member never made before to-day, any such statement as he has just made, either directly or indirectly, or anything at all like it.

Mr. MARTIN. Had the hon. Minister of Marine this plan down in the province of Prince Edward Island last year?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I had the plan on which the Bill was introduced last year, signed by Mr. McKenzie, the only plan which had been made up to that time.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That bridge will not carry the hon. gentleman over.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We will see.

Mr. MARTIN. I am going to put the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a question. He said he was three days at Moncton finishing that plan.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I never made any such statement.

Mr. **MARTIN**. Had you the plan down in the province?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Certainly.

Mr. **MARTIN**. And it was finished last October. Now, the hon. minister has been there three days. I suppose he will not deny that he was there anyway, whether three days or two days, and they had time in that period to finish the plan. How long would it take a draughtsman to finish that plan?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I would not like to make any calculation. It would depend on the draughtsman.

Mr. **MARTIN**. At any rate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could not have it last October in Prince Edward Island. I make this statement: The province is called upon to pay annually more than it should have to pay for the construction of a highway bridge. I think I would withdraw a good deal of my opposition were that clause struck out, throwing the responsibility on the provincial government of protecting foot-passengers crossing the bridge. If there should be any mishaps, the island would be saddled with the damages. I think that the Dominion government should assume the responsibility for accidents. Though I object entirely to the plan of the bridge, I think that if this clause were struck out, I would be more disposed to accept it.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman forgets that there are proper trackways on each side of the bridge for foot-passengers. When trains are crossing, no foot-passengers or horses are allowed on the bridge. There is a track for foot-passengers outside the bridge, so that there is no danger to any foot-passengers at all, unless they choose to go on when the train is crossing, contrary to regulations.

Mr. **MARTIN**. Vehicles and wagons travel on this bridge on the railway track and every one does not know when a train is to pass. If the provincial government is to make provision for the safety of those people, that will entail much larger expense than the hon. minister imagines. There is another thing, I do not see the necessity of having two tracks for foot-passengers. In place of having two tracks for foot-passengers, if you had one sufficiently wide and a separate track for vehicles, that would be a great improvement. On some of the bridges in this city there is only one track for foot-passengers, and there is quite as much traffic

on those bridges as on the one proposed. However, I cannot expect to carry my point, but all I can do is to call the attention of the committee to it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I must express my surprise at one statement of the hon. gentleman, and that is that a highway bridge could be built across at this site for \$250,000. I cannot think that that is possible. There is, after all, very little difference between the cost of the abutments of this bridge, and those of the highway bridge, and that is a portion of the cost of a highway bridge, which forms very much the larger share. The cost of the iron or steel trusses for highway purposes, is not much less than their cost for railway purposes. I venture to say, with confidence, that instead of a highway bridge costing only \$250,000, it could not be built in that depth of water and in that place, having regard to the conditions existing, for less than half of a million dollars—that is a durable and permanent structure.

The hon. member did not persist in making the statement, but rather withdrew it, that there had been an engineer who had passed on this work and given such report. I do not think he could have seen the report of any engineer on the subject, bearing out the hon. gentleman's contention. He cannot name the engineer, does not know who he was, and is trusting altogether to hearsay. I venture to affirm that no engineer of experience or standing has ever made such an investigation or given any such report.

Mr. **MARTIN**. The argument of the Minister of Railways and Canals turns against himself. He says that a passenger bridge could not be built for less than half a million dollars. At that rate, the Minister of Railways and Canals could not build an ordinary railway bridge for less than half a million of money.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think so.

Mr. **MARTIN**. If a passenger bridge would cost half a million, I suppose that a railway bridge could not be built for less than \$650,000. In that case the cost to the province of Prince Edward Island would be \$100,000. But the minister saddles the province with \$9,750 a year, representing a capital of \$350,000, or more than three times as much as they should pay.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) has strayed away from the question I put to him. I asked him the name of the engineer who made that report. He evades that question. He has heard merely of such an engineer—

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Or created him out of his own imagination—

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not like to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) invented a statement or imagined what he asserted; but, at best he has been relying on some report which he has never verified. It is quite true it would cost half a million, as the hon. gentleman said, to build a highway bridge. It is possible it would cost \$100,000 or \$150,000 more to build a railway bridge. But does the hon. gentleman think it reasonable that the matter should be estimated on that basis as to the cost the island should pay? I do not think so. We might as well say to the government of the island: You want a highway bridge here and it will cost you half a million to build it; and there is no reason why we should pay more than the difference between the cost of the passenger and the railway bridge. The fact is, we have combined our interests. We wish a railway bridge, but not more probably than they desire a highway bridge. We say: We will come as nearly as we can to dividing the cost; we do not want to be unreasonable or exacting; as you are the smaller government we will give you the benefit of all doubts, and we will give you your highway bridge for much less than you could build it for yourselves. That is beneficial to both parties.

**Mr. MARTIN**. It is evident there is no use in discussing this farther. The hon. minister says that I run away from his question; he evidently runs away from mine; and it is very cleverly done too. He has not taken into consideration the fact that the province is not the prime mover in this matter. The Dominion government is building this railway, and has to connect with the capital of the province. He cannot alter that, he cannot reverse the facts by merely saying that the province wants a traffic bridge there. They are taking advantage of the fact that the province wants a passenger bridge to make them pay three times as much as the putting on of the traffic part of the bridge costs. But the minister has put down his foot, and has the approbation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) who stands godfather to everything done by this government in the province. But I am afraid that it will not be very satisfactory to the people of Prince Edward Island.

**Mr. A. C. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.)** Even though this is late in the day, I am glad to see the Murray Harbour branch railway going on. I regret to see, however, that the government have not seen fit to carry out the policy of their predecessors with regard to the Murray Harbour branch railway as well as other railways in the island—

**Mr. McLELLAN**. That is not to build them at all—that was their policy.

**Sir LOUIS DAVIES**.

**Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.)** The policy of the late government was to build the Murray Harbour branch road, the East Point branch road, the New London branch road, the West Point branch road—all the branch railroads asked for in the island, and at less money than the government are going to spend now.

**Mr. McMULLEN**. That was an election policy.

**Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.)** It was a policy on which they are not ashamed to go back to the people. If the present government had carried out that policy, every one of those branch roads would have been built to-day. And, there is no doubt in my mind but that the Hillsborough bridge would have followed in due order. I am not opposed to the Murray Harbour branch road; I like to see every one of these roads built. There are other sections of the country that require a branch road as much, and perhaps more than those that will be served by the Murray Harbour branch. One of these is the eastern section of my own county, Elmira. If a few miles were built there, it would accommodate a more intelligent, a more industrious and a better-deserving people than almost any other portion of the island. It would benefit them particularly because they are cut off from railway communication, and, besides, they have no harbour communications to ship the great quantities of produce and fish that could be drawn from that section. I am glad that the branch roads are at least inaugurated, and I trust that every one that has been proposed will be carried to a successful issue.

**Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York)**. We are told on good authority that all these branch lines could be built for the money that is to be expended on this bridge. The minister tells us that this bridge is being built to accommodate two trains a day each way, or it may have been only two trains a day—let us say two a day each way. It looks to me like an enormous expenditure for that purpose. Some estimates make it as high as a million and a quarter dollars, and the lowest estimate is three-quarters of a million dollars, and the latter estimate would leave the work lacking the necessary facilities for vehicular traffic and for passenger and railroad traffic. So that we may estimate an expenditure of a million and a quarter dollars. We have the statement of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Martin) that this bridge, as well as a number of branch lines could have been built within the estimate made for this bridge alone. If that be the case, and we have the statement of a responsible member of parliament for it, I think the government should revise their plans and come down to this House with a scheme that would carry out the building of branch lines and of a railroad bridge

sufficient for the purposes, all for the same sum they are spending now for the construction of a bridge alone.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

#### CRIMINAL CODE (1892) ACT AMENDMENT.

House proceeded to take into consideration a message from the Senate amending the first amendment, and disagreeing to the third and fifth amendments made by this House to Bill (No. 137)—from the Senate—further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Senate has made certain amendments to the Criminal Code to which I now desire the attention of the House. It is not the intention of the government to accept these amendments, and I will state the reasons why we do not concur in them. The first amendment made by the Senate, to which I draw attention, relates to the time of the coming into force of this Bill. The Bill as it left this House had a provision that it should come into force on the 1st of January next instead of, as is usually the case with Bills, when it is sanctioned by the Governor General. In this respect we follow precedent established when the Criminal Code was introduced for the first time: it did not come into force on the day it was sanctioned but on a fixed date, a considerable time afterwards, if I remember right, several months, if not a year, in order to enable the public to become acquainted with its provisions. The Senate has amended the Bill in that particular, providing that the law shall come into force on the 1st of September, 1900. Well, we are within seven weeks of the 1st of September, and, obviously, the date is too short. So I move that this House disagree with the Senate in said amendment. I may say the reason given by the Senate for their amendment is that it is desirable that amendments made in the criminal law of this country shall go into operation on the earliest possible date consistent with the due publication of its provisions. I move that this House do disagree with the said amendments for the following reasons:

Because, though it is desirable that the amendments made in the criminal law of this country shall go into operation at the earliest possible moment, it is equally and still more imperatively desirable that the public should become familiar with the changes made in the criminal law before they become operative.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.). Are there any very important new features in the Criminal Code Amendment Bill which would give force to the hon. gentleman's contention that a longer time should be allowed?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think so, one especially.

Mr. FOSTER. That with reference to the lottery business. If it could be disassociated from the other features, and if there were no other very startling improvements, my view would be that the very earliest date possible should be fixed in order to put an end to the pernicious system of lotteries in certain parts of the country. Could the hon. gentleman say whether at the outside there were any other revolutionary changes in the Bill?

Amendment rejected.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is one at least very important amendment to the criminal law, the next one to which I shall draw the attention of the House, and which is of the character suggested by my hon. friend a moment ago. The House passed this amendment to the Code, in section 359a:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment who, in incurring any debt or liability, has obtained credit by means of false pretenses or by means of any other fraud.

This is a new departure in the criminal law. A man who obtains credit by means of false pretenses is put on the same footing and treated in the same manner as a man who obtains money by false pretenses. This is a wide departure in the criminal law, and creates a new offence, and I think it would not be inconsistent with our duty that such an important departure in the criminal law should be suddenly sprung upon the public. The reasons given by the Senate for their amendment are these:

(a) The proposed section 359a would offer great injury to perjury on the part of vendors;

(b) It would give a creditor, who claimed or asserted that there had been a false pretense on the part of the purchaser, an opportunity to practically coerce such purchaser into giving such creditor an undue preference over his other creditors;

(c) It would injuriously interfere with the ordinary and long-established methods of conducting business between vendors and purchasers;

(d) No act should be declared a statutory crime where there is a substantial doubt as to the desirability of such declaration.

The House will see that the reasons given by the Senate are merely reasons of expediency, I do not believe that they go to the root of the matter at all. In the commercial world, and in the present stage of civilization, business is carried on very largely on credit and on the basis of mutual confidence, and it may be said with great truth, that the time has come when an offence committed by a man to obtain credit should be treated exactly in the same manner as an offence committed by a man to obtain money, obtained in both cases by means of false pretenses. I propose:

That this House doth insist on the said amendment for the following reasons: Because it would be in the public interest to punish,

and if possible, to prevent a form of fraud which is becoming of frequent occurrence.

Motion agreed to.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. The fifth amendment made by the Senate, to which I desire to call the attention of the House, is this. We have made an exception in section 520 of the Criminal Code to prevent illegal combinations, in favour of workmen who may combine for the legitimate defence of their rights, which is as follows :

Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to combinations of workmen or employees for their own reasonable protection as such workmen or employees.

That is to say that workmen acting under these circumstances for the legitimate protection of their rights are exempt from the operation of the clause. The Senate has omitted that clause.

The Senate has disagreed to the fifth amendment for the following reason : Because the Trades Unions Act, chap. 131 of the Revised Statutes, gives the necessary protection to combinations of workmen, and because there does not appear to be any substantial reason why any class of persons should be exempted from the operation of section 520 of the Criminal Code.

All this was familiar to us when we passed this Bill, but we thought it was due to workmen that we should introduce this further restriction against the operation of the law. I beg to move :

That this House doth insist on said amendment for the following reason : Because this amendment seems to be essential to combinations of workmen for the legitimate protection of their rights.

Motion agreed to.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I beg to move :

That a Message be sent to the Senate acquainting their Honours with the reasons of the Commons for insisting on their first, third and fifth amendments to Bill K (No. 137)—from the Senate—entitled an Act to further amend the Criminal Code, 1892.

Motion agreed to.

#### COMPANIES CLAUSES ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 183) to amend the Companies Clauses Act, was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee thereon.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Shortly, what is the purport of this Bill ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). It is to permit companies, other than insurance companies, to change their head offices when they shall see fit without coming for special legislation. I think it will be found that there are sufficient safeguards and checks thrown around it. It is provided that it is only to be done

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

with the cordial assent of the shareholders of the company. The Bill contains several provisions which, I think, will be found sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. BERGERON. Does this apply to every company ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. It does not apply to insurance companies, and in the case of any company which has, by its own legislation, dealt with the question, we do not disturb it, but where legislation is silent on the question, any company may change its head office provided it can get the general approval of its shareholders.

Mr. HAGGART. It does not apply to railway companies ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. No.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). This is a Bill which was originally introduced by the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) which came before the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, and which received a good deal of consideration there. I think it has now come down from the other Chamber.

Mr. HAGGART. It is harmless.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

It being One o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

#### PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That item 81 on the Public Bills and Orders be now made the Order of the Day and proceeded with.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Flint :

That this House has affirmed the principle that the prohibition of the liquor traffic is the right and most effectual legislative remedy for the evils of intemperance, and has also declared that as soon as public opinion would sufficiently sustain stringent measures, it was prepared to promote such legislation.

That the plebiscite of 1898, wherein a majority of the votes polled throughout the Dominion, including substantial majorities in all the provinces but one, were ascertained to be in favour of such legislation, as well as satisfactory evidence from other sources, shows that such measures will be thoroughly supported by the people of Canada.

That this House is now of the opinion, in view of the foregoing facts, that it is desirable and expedient that parliament should, without delay, enact such measures as will secure the prohibition of the liquor traffic for beverage purposes in at least those provinces and territories which have voted in favour of such prohibition;

and the motion of Mr. McClure in amendment to the main motion, and the motion of Mr. Parmelee in amendment to the same.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). Mr. Speaker, though I exhausted my right to speak on the original motion which I introduced, the introduction of the amendments has given me the right to again offer a few remarks. One can scarcely imagine that it is over two months since the short debate we had upon the resolution which I introduced early in the session. The time has passed very rapidly, a great deal has been done in the interim, and through the courtesy of the right hon. the leader of the government, I am again privileged to have this motion brought before the House for debate, and I trust a vote. On my own part and that of my friends, I desire to express our sincere acknowledgment to the leader of the House for thus giving us the opportunity we have desired. Had there been any disinclination on the part of the Prime Minister to have this question again up for discussion, it would easily have been within his power to have simply declined the request which I and others made to him. To the request made him by us, the right hon. gentleman gave the most willing sanction, and, consequently, we have before us to-day the original resolution and the two amendments which have been moved. I desire to repeat something that I said in the previous debate, because, notwithstanding my statement then, and notwithstanding that I stated the same thing in a previous session, I find that even so intelligent and fair a disputant as the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig), either purposely or for the sake of argument, has misunderstood my position and the position of those who are responsible with me for the motion upon which these amendments are based. No one who has at all followed the discussion of the prohibition question in the Dominion Alliance meetings and elsewhere, can pretend for one moment to intimate, that although the legislative committee of the Dominion Alliance, and myself as their humble representative here, take any lower position on the general question of prohibition than that it is desirable that it should be extended to the whole Dominion of Canada. That is the basis of the proposition, not only of that alliance, but also of the constituent bodies which it represents. And, although for the sake of securing additional support, and for the sake of meeting the views of men who are friendly to prohibition, but who doubt the advisability of the application of it to the whole Dominion, we have accepted a position somewhat short of that; yet, it is certainly unfair and not strictly according to the facts of the case for any assumption to be made, either for the sake of debate or otherwise, that we take any different position from that of favouring total prohibition for the whole of Canada. That is the fundamental platform of, I believe, nine-tenths of the prohibitionists throughout the

Dominion. It is both reasonable and fair and entirely consistent with a belief in that doctrine, that a prohibitionist should advocate something short of total prohibition, if by that means he can secure a verdict in its favour and secure a measure that will meet the views of those friends of temperance who doubt the practicability of a full and sweeping measure of prohibition. That is the position we have taken. Consequently, not only in the first debate which we had upon a similar resolution last session, but in the previous debate this session, I stated that I would myself support the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure), because it expresses my own personal and political views upon this subject, and I propose, if that amendment is reached, to support it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why did you not move it?

Mr. FLINT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) asks me why I did not move it, and I will give him the reasons. The reason I did not move that resolution is this. I have had the honour, in an early session of the late parliament, to second a resolution of similar purport moved by Mr. Jamieson. At a later session of that parliament I had the honour, as representative of the Dominion Alliance, of moving the same resolution myself. In both these cases the resolutions were defeated by the action of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and they were sidetracked by an amendment. At a later date, the representatives of prohibition in the Dominion Alliance, when the result of the plebiscite was announced, finding that many who were heartily with them on the main principle throughout the country, and even in this House, thought that the situation was somewhat changed owing to the fact that in the second largest province of the Dominion there was evidently a strong popular feeling against prohibition, then, in order to meet the views of these friends of prohibition, and in order to bring forward a resolution which would appear to the minds of those more practical than the resolution providing for total prohibition, we decided upon the introduction of the resolution which I have had the honour to move. A great deal has been said, both by the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Taylor) and the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and others, because the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure) and the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmelee) have availed of their parliamentary privilege of moving an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think that the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has said anything about it this session.

Mr. FLINT. I mean the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster). They seem to see in this fact some alarming appearance

of conspiracy. That legislative committee of the Dominion Alliance, made up to a large degree of members of this House, had decided to bring forward a resolution providing for the enactment of legislation which would lead to prohibition in such provinces as would support, and have supported, prohibition principles, they seem to think that there was something which looked like a conspiracy because some others were not satisfied with that standpoint, and desired to move the straight-prohibition resolution which my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. McClure) is responsible for. Then, again, they see great signs of some kind of a dark conspiracy against the freedom of parliament or the liberties of the people, or something else, in the fact that the hon. gentleman from Shefford (Mr. Parmalee) should move an amendment expressing his opinion that the plebiscite did not warrant immediate action on the part of the government. These three propositions represent, emphatically and clearly, three different phases of opinion upon this subject, and it is not merely the privilege but it is the duty of any hon. member who differs from the stand taken by his colleague, to move such an amendment as will better express the opinions which he and those who follow him will support. The fact that substantially the same amendments were moved last session as this session is also made a great deal of by hon. gentlemen opposite. These propositions represent three clearly defined strata of thought and desire upon the subject, and it gives the House abundant opportunity for dividing along these lines. As the amendment of the hon. gentleman for Shefford was last before the House, I desire to make a few remarks in connection with it. The basis of the amendment is this: That the plebiscite of September, 1898, does not warrant immediate action in favour of prohibition. In my resolution I refer to the plebiscite, not as a reason or as a basis for legislation for the provinces, but simply as one of the arguments, one of the evidences that such a resolution, if carried into effect by this House, would be supported in these portions of Canada at which it aims.

I have not, either in resolutions or in public speeches, taken the ground that the result of the plebiscite by itself afforded an argument for immediate action in the way of total prohibition throughout the Dominion of Canada; and I think those who take the ground that it does not, simply by itself, afford a conclusive reason for such action, take very strong ground indeed—ground which it is very difficult to argue against. But I contend that that evidence of popular sympathy with prohibition, taken in connection with the merits of the principle itself, in connection with our knowledge of the history of this question, and in connection with the feelings and wishes of the people of the country generally, amply

proves that wise prohibitory legislation would be well supported by the people of this country, if enacted into law, and is a strong argument in favour of such action by this House. The evidence I would adduce in that direction, first, that afforded by the action of this House in itself, and the attitude of hon. members on both sides of this House. I have been here a great many years, and have taken part in all the discussions on this very interesting subject; and I have yet to hear the first argument brought forward in the House against the principle of legislative prohibition in Canada. And notwithstanding the enormous amount of agitation which has been going on in the country through the various organizations devoted to this subject, I ask hon. gentlemen candidly to state when and where they find any organized opposition, or any deliberate line of argument taken against the principles which these organizations, societies, and individuals have been endeavouring to carry forward. Is it not a strange fact that, although there is no doubt a large amount of objection to the practicability of legislative measures enacting prohibition, no public man of any eminence, no journal of any great standing, no social or religious or other organization, has taken direct ground against the principle of prohibition? And flowing out through all these channels into the parliament itself, we find, as I have recited in the resolution which I have placed on the Order paper, that parliament itself has emphatically on more than one occasion stated, without objection or opposition, that in its opinion, the most effectual legislative remedy for the evils of intemperance, would be a stringent measure of prohibition.

Consequently we find that either the outspoken or the secret objection to the principle of this resolution, is the question as to whether popular opinion or electoral opinion is sufficiently strong to sustain parliament in enacting and carrying forward such a measure. And this is a ground with which I do not find fault. It certainly is a large and debatable question; and those who have been brought up in the atmosphere of temperance and prohibition, and have mingled with the strong advocates of this measure, may, perhaps, be more carried away with the idea that public opinion is enthusiastically in favour of it, than those who mingle with that class of our citizens who look with distrust, not only on the principle itself, but on the supposed popular opinion that would support it. In all the discussions on the question in this House, it is assumed to be fundamental that there should be a strong popular support that would stand by any administration that would enact prohibition, and by any course of subsidiary legislation that would necessarily follow its enactment. Otherwise in a wave of enthusiasm, perhaps carried forward by a wave of popular applause, a mea-

sure might be adopted which, after that wave of feeling ebbed backward, might be left unsupported; and the subsidiary legislation necessary to sustain the law would be either not forthcoming or would be very weak in its character, and many of the evils which prohibitory legislation is designed to do away with, might return, in perhaps greater force than ever. We all admit the force of these objections; but a careful consideration of the history of this particular agitation would convince any fair-minded man that the elements and the influences and forces which would impel parliament to enact the law, would also support parliament in enacting such other legislation in regard to taxation and otherwise as would be necessary to make such a law effective.

A line of argument has been taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, largely to the effect that the government has all the responsibility of this matter and parliament none; and in connection with this phase of the subject I have been attacked to a certain degree, on the allegation that I have used my little connection with this matter, as a source of embarrassment to previous administrations. Now, I desire to eliminate as completely as possible from the discussion of this question, my own personality, and treat it entirely on an impersonal basis. But sometimes one is obliged to defend himself, and I call attention to the fact that on no occasion did I, as a member of the legislative committee on this question, take any action which was not the result of the careful consideration of that committee, and which had not the approval of the temperance bodies of the country, and was not calculated to embarrass the government of the day as little as possible. Even so well informed a member as the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), the leading whip of the opposition, was so oblivious of the history of this question in the last parliament that he, no doubt thoughtlessly, at all events, without a basis of fact, said I had introduced this matter on going into supply, which a careful search of *Hansard*, will show to be incorrect. Why did I not move on going into supply, had I desired to make use of this important question, which attracts a large amount of support, whether a majority or otherwise, to embarrass the administration to which I was opposed? Simply because I held then, as I hold now, that it is a question too important and far-reaching, too high, if I may so speak, to be made use of for mere party purposes. And I may say, so far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, that not only have they refrained from making use of the question in that way, but they have, I think, gone a great deal further in their utter abstention from taking an active part in promoting this question, than they should

have gone. I refer, of course, to those who proclaim themselves, in season and out of season, to be strong prohibitionists. I looked in vain, this session, to find any hon. gentleman on the opposite side, to assist us in framing a resolution which would catch the ear and the support of parliament. They prefer, I presume, to stand in the background and criticise and find fault with those who bring forward these resolutions and amendments, in the hope that some advance vote may be taken by parliament, which will strengthen the prohibition sentiment in the country and lead ultimately to some wise legislation on the subject. They stand back and criticise and make use of their votes for the purpose of embarrassing the situation rather than defend the cause which they profess to hold so much at heart. This is not the attitude that prohibitionists should assume. I think that they should assist hon. members on this side to pass such a resolution as would meet with general acceptance and smooth the way for any government or party to carry the required legislation into effect.

We have these three divisions before us. In the first place, we have those who believe that the present situation is satisfactory, that the plebiscite and it alone is to be made the argument either for or against the enactment of a prohibitory law, and they may be disposed to support the last amendment moved. But I think that that is a very narrow and prejudiced view to take. There are many reasons why the plebiscite was unsatisfactory. It was unsatisfactory to every temperance man in the country. Many who are in their hearts favourable to prohibition are open to censure for not having risen to the opportunity furnished by this administration and come forward and declared their position. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmalee) takes the ground that the plebiscite was not a warrant for the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law. A great many of the most wise, experienced and devoted temperance advocates in the country have taken similar ground, but the bulk of those occupied with this question have maintained that if it was a warrant for not having a general prohibitory law affecting the Dominion, at any rate it was a sufficient ground for the enactment of prohibitory legislation which would give substantial prohibition in those provinces and territories which declared themselves in favour of such legislation. There is much merit, I believe, in that position, and if I could not secure a vote in favour of total prohibition throughout the Dominion, I would heartily welcome the support of hon. gentlemen on both sides to a lesser measure, which has much to commend it in the fact that by passing such legislation enabling each province to absolutely suppress the liquor traffic within its own bounds, we would not only have the traffic greatly

decreased but the prohibition made effective within limits where popular opinion is manifestly on record in its favour.

Another argument is this. We know that a strong feeling against prohibition throughout the country is due to the fact that a large amount of our revenue is derived from the various taxes levied on spirituous and malt liquors, and if these taxes were cut off at one blow, many of the financial interests of the country would greatly suffer. But if prohibition could be adopted section by section, if each province rose to the emergency and declared its willingness to adopt prohibition within its own borders, it will be easily seen that the cutting down of the revenue would be gradual and no sudden revolution in our financial position could possibly take place.

But if the House should come to a conclusion that it is better to vote solidly in support of the amendment of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure), that course would meet with my hearty approval. I recommend those who are with me on this great question not to accept the amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmalee), and I trust that the result of this debate may be such as to encourage the government to take some forward step on the question, which so deeply interests such a large number of the most intelligent, loyal and patriotic people in our whole Dominion.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). For my part, I desire to give my reasons to the House and the country for the vote I am about to give. We know the history of this question. We know that the government, when they were in opposition, in solemn conclave in the city of Ottawa, in 1893, determined that a vote should be taken before any steps were taken towards enacting a prohibitory law. That motion was made by the present Minister of Agriculture, and I know that he made a speech pledging his party to abide by the decision of the people on that vote. The people have given their decision. We are told by the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat, that this is a most interesting question and he repeated that half a dozen times. Why, that was not the language he used a few years ago. He then said it was a question that was vital to the interests of the nation, that it was necessary for Canada's future. But to-day we have the milk-and-water member for Yarmouth saying that this is a very interesting question, and that is all he can say. Why, it is as important a problem to-day as in the years gone by. I am opposed to shilly-shallying with any question, and like the British practice of meeting questions as they come, fairly and squarely, and deciding upon them. My own opinion is, if we are to have prohibition, we should have it with compensation to those affected, and if I get the opportunity, I will move an amend-

ment to that effect, but I am precluded from doing so now. I propose to move, if I get the opportunity, that the following words be added to the amendment:

That fair and reasonable compensation be made to hotel owners and keepers and other interests financially affected by prohibition.

That would be a reasonable proposition. We are told by temperance advocates that the hotel-keeper and the hotel-owner and those who are engaged directly in the liquor business have no right to compensation from the government. We are told that they have only a license for one year, that they got that license knowing that at the end of the year it can be taken from them. But I contend that that is not the bargain made with the hotel-keepers. A man is asked to put up a hotel and stables in order to provide accommodation for travellers. We will suppose that the hotel-keeper gets a license. He does not go to all this expense because he has been promised a license for one year, but under the implied bargain that, if he keeps his hotel according to the regulations, if he obeys the law, the license will be continued to him. He would not dream for a moment of going to that enormous expense for a year's license, running the risk of its being taken away from him without compensation at the end of the term. Now, in addition to that, let us consider this privilege that is given him a selling whisky. A gallon of proof whisky that has been kept two years so as to come within the regulations does not cost more than 20 cents. But the Dominion government puts a tax upon it of \$2.25, more than ten times the price of it. Then, along comes the local government and imposes a license fee upon the man who is to sell the whisky—and a pretty large license fee too. Then comes the municipal council, and they impose another license fee upon him, besides putting onerous restrictions upon him—that he shall not sell within certain hours, and so on. I am not finding fault with these restrictions. The effect of all this is that these three governments, Dominion, provincial and municipal, say to the hotel-keeper: Put in your \$12,000 or \$15,000 of capital in providing a building with all accommodation of stables, and so on, to make it suitable for a hotel; we will put in no capital; and, if prohibition is adopted, all the loss will fall on you, and not a dollar on us. I say this would be most unjust to the man who has made such an investment—to practically confiscate his property. His property, which has cost, say, \$15,000 and, with a license is worth \$15,000; but, without a license it will be worth perhaps even less than \$5,000. Therefore, I say, it is the duty of this parliament, if they pass prohibitory liquor law to give compensation to those interested and whose property is in effect confiscated by that law. But the prohibitionists will say:

Mr. FLINT.

They do all this at their own risk. But this is not a fair way to look at it. Justly considered, these governments are partners in this business, and one of the partners should not bear all the loss. If this traffic is an iniquity, then, the governments are partners in an iniquity. Even as it is, the governments have an advantage over the other partner. The Dominion government, for instance, demands its tax of \$2.25 per gallon before the liquor leaves its control. The prohibitionists tell us that the cost to this country of the liquor traffic is, say \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 per annum. Some put it as high as \$50,000,000. But, suppose we put it at \$20,000,000, what would it cost to give compensation to these interests. A computation was made some years ago that all these interests could be bought out for \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000 per annum. The interest on that would be about \$300,000 a year. That is, at a cost of something over a quarter of a million dollars you could save this \$20,000,000 which, we are told, is squandered in liquor. There never was such an investment in the world—for a quarter of a million you would save \$20,000,000 each year. There is another feature to it. Suppose that under the conditions I would propose, there is a hotel premises worth \$15,000. When a prohibitory liquor law is carried, that property is valued by competent and disinterested men, and they decide that without the license, it is worth just half the money—\$7,500. Let the government then take a mortgage on the property for \$7,500 with the condition that if liquor is sold on the premises they will foreclose the mortgage for \$7,500. That mortgage will remain for five years, or whatever term may be decided upon, and, if liquor be sold on the premises during that term, the government will foreclose the mortgage for \$7,500. What would be the effect? You would have every hotel-keeper in this country assisting you in enforcing the law, for he would be very sorry to risk the loss of \$7,500 by selling a glass of whisky. Therefore, he comes to the assistance of the government to carry out a prohibitory liquor law. His neighbour might, perhaps, be tempted to sell liquor, having no such restrictions placed upon him. But the hotel-keeper will naturally say: If I am not allowed to sell liquor, with all the appliances I have, I will take mighty good care that my neighbour shall not sell it. So, you would have the hotel-keeper assisting the constituted authorities to carry out the law, instead of being in violent antagonism to it, as he would otherwise be, because he would have a grievance, and would not only feel that grievance, but would make his friends feel that he had it, and would enlist their sympathies against the law. Instead of assisting him in breaking the law, his neighbour and friends would do all they could to assist in maintaining it. So, as a mere matter of

business, as a matter of investment and protection, as a matter of assistance to the government in carrying out the law, this method would be of a most invaluable adjunct to help in making prohibition a success.

Then there is another proposition moved, as I understand it, by the hon. member (Mr. Flint), who has just sat down—prohibition by provinces. A more insane proposition never was made to a deliberative assembly. They propose that the province which stands in the very middle of the most densely populated part of the Dominion shall be excepted from the prohibition law, the other provinces having given substantial majorities in favour of prohibition. This proposition means that the province of Quebec will be made the centre from which liquor will be taken to every province in the Dominion. The thing is utterly unworkable. Before you can make a prohibitory liquor law workable you have to have two great machineries of the government in active assistance, that is the Department of Customs and the Department of Inland Revenue. We have a cordon of customs officers all along the borders of the Dominion. We have under these a power, as the Minister of Customs says, which reaches every part of the Dominion. We prohibit the importation of liquor except under certain conditions, and the general importation is prohibited, the whole force of the Customs Department with all its admirable machinery is exerted to prevent the importation of liquor. In a case of provincial prohibition you could not use the Customs Department at all, this great force would be utterly worthless. Then you have the machinery of the Inland Revenue Department to watch against the manufacture of liquor in this country itself; we have the Customs Department to prevent importation, and the Inland Revenue Department to prevent the internal manufacture, we have the admirable machinery of both departments to carry out prohibition. Sir, without those two adjuncts prohibition cannot be made a success, and to attempt to apply prohibition to the provinces would be utterly ridiculous and absurd, and would bring the temperance cause into contempt and put it back in this country for twenty years. More than that, we have to consider this question on the broad principle that the Dominion is one country. We took a vote of the whole Dominion to ascertain whether the Dominion was in favour of prohibition or opposed to it, and the people declared in favour of prohibition. But we are told that the province of Quebec has declared against it, therefore we cannot have prohibition. The province of Quebec may declare against protection, any other province of the Dominion may declare against protection as some of them did, but it became the law of this country. Did we hear any one say: Oh, here is the province of

Prince Edward Island which declared against protection, and therefore the protective policy of 1878 must not go into force in that province. Such an idea is so utterly absurd that it only has to be stated to secure its condemnation. We are one country, we are a Dominion, and the same law that prevails in one province should prevail in the others. If a prohibitory law is right it should apply to every province and every portion of this Dominion. More than that, the Dominion has declared in favour of prohibition. But the province of Quebec has declared against it, we are told. Well, we know the people there kept on voting day after day. I think the election was held on September 28, and two days after, the next day in fact, the result was known in every province of this Dominion except Quebec; we had pretty accurate figures to know how the other provinces had voted on prohibition. But we could not hear from the province of Quebec. I was living in Quebec myself at that time, and the next day we could not hear any definite news. We waited day after day, and without getting any definite figures we saw the majority against prohibition kept getting larger. I think that if they had waited a week or two more the province of Quebec would have piled up a majority against prohibition that would have defeated it throughout the whole Dominion. But they had apparently got to the length of their tether and had to come out with some kind of a statement.

Now, I am told, and I believe that it is absolutely true, that there is no more temperate province in this Dominion than the province of Quebec. The right hon. the First Minister can give us a general idea on that question, and I think he will affirm the proposition that the province of Quebec is perhaps the most temperate, practically the most prohibitory, of all the provinces in this Dominion to-day, the province where the people are less given to the excessive use of liquor than the people in any other province. Therefore they are not opposed to temperate habits. When I was in Quebec I was told of scores and scores of parishes and municipalities lying side by side where not a single liquor license was issued. So it could not have been opposition to the principle of abstinence that moved the people to vote against prohibition. Under their own local law hundreds of municipalities refuse licenses. So we must look for some other reasons to know why the people of that province gave such an enormous majority against prohibition. These other reasons I am not going to inquire into to-day, because it would perhaps be somewhat irrelevant to do so. But whatever they may have been in that province, if we are going to have an effective prohibitory liquor law we cannot get it by separate provincial action. You may do that up in Manitoba where the province is isolated, but you cannot do it in

the province of Quebec, you cannot do it in the province of New Brunswick, nor in the province of Nova Scotia. You may make a provincial law prohibiting the sale, prohibiting the issue of licenses, or giving licenses and hedging them around with severe restrictions. But you cannot prevent a citizen of Ontario from buying a keg of whisky, or a jug of whisky, or a barrel of whisky and bringing it to his home. Therefore any Act of that kind would fail in its purpose.

I repeat that if you are going to have a successful prohibitory liquor law, you will need all the force of public sentiment to back it up, you will need all the force of the Customs Department to prevent its importation, and of the Inland Revenue Department to prevent its manufacture; and, as I contend in the way I have indicated, you will have the powerful hotel-keeping interest to back it up also. I realized this fact myself in years gone by when I had an interest in the hotel business, and when the advocacy of this scheme would have looked like the advocacy of my personal interest. I have not that interest to-day, and therefore I am free to argue in favour of what I think is a feasible business proposition, and one which if carried out will assist in making a prohibitory liquor law effective. It is a great undertaking, it is one which requires all the machinery of government to make it effective, as well as the force of public sentiment behind it. Everybody in this House will admit that a prohibitory law requires to be backed up by a strong public sentiment. Now, I have indicated a way by which one of the strongest sentiments could be enlisted in behalf of prohibition, that is the interest of those who are in the business themselves. I have indicated a plan which could be put into motion at an expenditure of only about a quarter of a million dollars per annum, as against the twenty millions, or thirty millions, or forty millions which we are told the liquor traffic is costing this country to-day. I hope that the amendment to the amendment will be voted down. I hope, if this House reaches the motion made by the hon. member for Yarmouth, they will quickly vote it down because it is only a humbug resolution. It would accomplish no good purpose and no one knows it better than the hon. member for Yarmouth. It comes up here year after year, and the same little scene is enacted; one proposes provincial prohibition, another Dominion prohibition, and another is opposed to prohibition. We had that same scene enacted last year, and by the same individuals too. They went through the same farce then and the people of this country are humbugged in this way. All interests have been humbugged. The liquor interest and the prohibition interest have been deceived by the government. They said, when asked to adopt a prohibitory

measure : No, go and find out what the opinion of the people is. What for? For the purpose of befooling them or giving them honest legislation in conformity with the pledge made? Go to the province of Manitoba and you will find that a Conservative government there made a pledge that when they came into power they would give the people the measure of prohibition that a provincial government could give and they have carried out their promise, as Conservative governments always do.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, I do not care whether the promise is a good one or not, every pledge they have made to the people has been carried out, and the pledge they made on that occasion has been carried out. But, the record of the Liberal party is the very opposite of that and no more flagrant attempt to deceive the people could take place than in regard to this one question of prohibition. So, I say it will be one of the nails in the coffin of the present government when they go before an enraged and indignant people who have been befooled and hoodwinked. They promised that the will of the people would be carried out and they have failed in this matter as in many others matters to carry out the will of the people. I say for myself that I believe that the proposition I have made would be a wise one to adopt. I have not an opportunity of moving it now, but if the opportunity does occur for me to propose it I shall move it, because, although the temperance man may say: I am opposed to having anything to do with the liquor business at all, you cannot get away from it. You have to do with it now. You are a participator in it now either through the Dominion government or the local government or the municipal council. Every portion of our government is a partner with the hotel-keeper in the liquor business and it takes the greater part of the profits. I do not care how strong a prohibitionist or temperance man you may be you are in partnership with the liquor interest. This would disassociate from it, and this would be carrying out a prohibitory measure in a way that would be desirable and in a way that would be fair to everybody.

Mr. PETER MACDONALD (East Huron). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to enter upon a general discussion of this subject now, but I wish, before the vote comes on, to place myself on record and to give my views on the question now before the House. None of the resolutions before the House contains fully my views upon this question, and therefore, I will have to express myself in a way in which my views can get upon record. Probably, it would be just as well for me here to give a short synopsis of the history of this question for a number of years, and I will give it in a very few sentences. I think that I am in a position, being a

temperance man, myself and in favour of prohibition for the last forty years, and having had to do with the history and results of this agitation, to express an opinion upon it. You will remember that during the early years of the sixties a wave of temperance sentiment passed over the country which caused the temperance people to flood the parliament of that day with a large number of petitions praying for a prohibitory liquor law. Parliament, in its wisdom, did not deem that the temperance sentiment was sufficiently strong to give them a prohibitory law on that occasion, but it did not withhold everything from them. It gave them the Dunkin Act, which enabled the temperance men to use that as a stepping stone to some further progress, and the Dunkin Act in its day did a great deal of good in cultivating temperance sentiment throughout the country. During the early years of the seventies another wave of temperance swept over the country and petitions signed by hundreds of thousands of the electorate and others came before parliament for its consideration. They urged parliament to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate this whole question and to visit the United States and ascertain how the prohibitory liquor law worked in those states in which it had been enacted. The Royal Commission which was appointed did so and reported back to this parliament. After receiving and considering the report parliament was still of the opinion that public sentiment was not sufficiently strong to warrant parliament in deciding upon a prohibitory liquor law. But, it did not refuse the temperance people some help in their agitation to secure the ends they had in view and the result of the commission was the enactment of the Canada Temperance Act. The Canada Temperance Act was received again as a stepping stone, a point upon which the temperance people gathered all over the country, and although it was not what they had expected, still, it accomplished a considerable amount of good throughout the length and breadth of the different provinces. At one time it covered a large portion of the province of Ontario and also of the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and did a great deal of good. In the early years of the nineties another wave of temperance sentiment passed over the country, and every person here knows that during these years hundreds of petitions came from the different provinces and that petitions came from the legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick praying parliament to pass a prohibitory liquor law. It was contended in this House, that, notwithstanding these petitions, notwithstanding the large number of signatures they contained, the sentiment in the country was not sufficiently strong to warrant this parliament in giving to the people of the Dominion a prohibitory liquor law. Some contended that a plebiscite

should be taken, and many eminent men in this House argued that a plebiscite should be taken to test the sentiment of the country. That was argued both inside and outside of the House. The Liberals, in convention assembled, in 1893, promised that if they came into power they would submit a plebiscite to the people of the country and give them an opportunity of testing the sentiment which many said was very strong in the country. In 1896 the Liberals came into power. In 1898, as you know, the promise that they had made in 1893, was fully redeemed. A plebiscite was taken, and taken in a way that no objection could be urged to the method of taking it by any person whatsoever. There was simply a 'no' or a 'yes,' against or in favour of prohibition. It was taken at a time when no other question was under consideration, leaving the elector free to decide in regard to this matter. We found, after the vote was counted that only 44 per cent of the electors on the voters' lists of the Dominion voted, that only 22½ per cent voted for prohibition, that 21½ per cent voted against prohibition and that, even excluding the province of Quebec, there were only 27 per cent who voted in favour of prohibition. Now, that vote proves to my mind, at least, that the temperance sentiment of this country is not sufficiently strong to maintain and carry into execution the provisions of a vigorous prohibitory liquor law and that therefore we would place that matter in the hands of the people in advance of the principle which must be exercised to make it a success in Canada.

I take that position, not because I argue this question from a political standpoint at all; I take that position in the interests of temperance itself, for unless we have a strong sentiment in favour of it; a sentiment that will prompt people not only to vote, but to action; prompt persons who will give the money to assist in carrying out the law; prompt men to risk something of their own individuality so that the law may be carried out; I am of the opinion that the enforcement of prohibition would be difficult if not impossible. I may be mistaken, but I believe that we have not yet arrived at a time in the history of this country, when that position is sufficiently strong to give the people a general prohibitory law. In view of this, I believe the government was perfectly justified—I say it advisedly after giving the matter thought—in not introducing a prohibitory liquor law, based on the vote given on September 28, 1898. Therefore, so far as the principle of the amendment to the amendment is concerned, I am in very great accord with it, but yet, I believe that although we cannot go as far as the temperance people would like us to go, and as far as I would like to see us able to go, yet the temperance people expect something at our hands. In 1860, they received the Dunkin Act, although par-

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron)

liament could not go the length of prohibition. In 1878, they received something which was a stepping-stone to further effort in the Canada Temperance Act, and now they look to parliament to receive something more, so that the temperance people may have a point around which they can rally and push on to greater efforts. I, therefore, believe that a resolution, similar to the one I shall read later, would meet, to a very large extent, the views of many of the temperance people, particularly those of the province of Ontario. The representatives of the temperance people of the province of Ontario, believe with me, that the government would not be justified in introducing a prohibitory liquor law at this present time. I can give you the names of two of the leading members of the Dominion Alliance in support of this. One is Mr. Spence of the city of Toronto, than whom there is no better temperance man in Canada. He told me that his opinion was that the government could not introduce a prohibitory liquor law, basing their expectation for support on that plebiscite vote of 1898. Dr. MacLaren, who, I believe, at one time was the president of the Dominion Alliance, acknowledged to me that he was disappointed, as I was, in the vote that was given in 1898, and that he believed that the temperance people of this country could not expect the Dominion parliament to give them total prohibition all over Canada, based on that vote. Therefore, when two men who have given consideration to this question for a lifetime, two men who were pointed to as the leaders of the great Dominion Alliance, which was supposed to represent the temperance people, at least, of Ontario; when they expressed themselves in that way, and in my opinion expressed themselves wisely and correctly; I believe that we would not be carrying out even the sentiment of the temperance people, if we introduced legislation that they believed not to be in the interests of temperance principles at large. Therefore, if I had an opportunity of moving another amendment, which I have not, at the present time, my amendment would be in the following words, which would contain my views upon the question. I shall read it now, and perhaps, later on in the discussion, I may succeed in getting a vote upon it:

Whereas, at the plebiscite of 1898 only 22½ per cent of the registered electors of the Dominion voted for prohibition; that in the provinces and territories, excluding Quebec, only 27 per cent of the registered electors voted for prohibition; that these results show that there is not an active prohibition sentiment sufficiently pronounced to justify the expectation that a Dominion prohibitory law could be successfully enforced, and therefore, in the opinion of this House, it would be unwise, in the interest of temperance, to pass a prohibitory law at present.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will notice that that is very largely the amendment to the amend-

ment, which is now before the House. I could not vote for that amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Parmalee) alone, although it contains a part of my views. I am still under the impression that something further should be done, so as to curtail to some extent, at least, the influence of the drinking habit throughout the length and breadth of our country, and if I get an opportunity, I propose, if I am in order, and if the amendment to the amendment is carried, and becomes part of the original motion, I will take the opportunity of moving that the following clause be added thereto:

But inasmuch as it is desirable that legislation be enacted having in view the further restriction of the liquor traffic, it is therefore expedient in the opinion of this House, that the Canada Temperance Act be enlarged in its scope, and the provisions for its administration perfected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the enlargement of the Canada Temperance Act would mean as I understand it, that we might include a group of counties in its scope: any number of counties, which the province may deem necessary, or indeed the whole of the province. Take, for instance, Prince Edward Island. Suppose the Canada Temperance Act was enlarged, they could include under it, the three counties of which the province is composed, and in reality have the principle of prohibition in all that island. So with the other provinces. In that way, I think we could accomplish the end which my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) has in view. I believe it would meet the reasonable expectations of the temperance people at the present time and give them a foothold for further effort, in order to cultivate and develop the sentiment, so that in a few years the sentiment might be sufficiently strong to demand of the Canadian parliament, with power and influence, the passage of a general prohibitory law for the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. T. DIXON CRAIG (East Durham). The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) stated that the resolutions moved by him in the last parliament, were defeated by the Conservative members, and were side-tracked by amendments proposed by us. I am not prepared to admit that, Mr. Speaker. I would point out that if any amendments were proposed from this side of the House, they were supported very largely by gentlemen in the Liberal party as well. In fact, the question was not a party one, and I am not surprised that the Conservative government was not prepared to grant prohibition before the plebiscite was taken, when I find that the Liberal government is not prepared to give prohibition after the plebiscite was taken. Let me ask the hon. member (Mr. Flint), this question. If the prohibition resolution was side-tracked by gentlemen in the Conservative party at that time, who is side-tracking the resolution to-day? No amendment has been moved to the resolution

of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) by any member on this side of the House; but we find two amendments moved to-day, one by the member for Colchester (Mr. McClure), and the other by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmalee). I merely mention this to show that, after all the disclaimers of the hon. member for Yarmouth, there is a little politics left in him still, because he is trying to place the responsibility for this matter on the Conservative party. I am not at all disposed to accept that responsibility for the Conservative party, because I do not consider this a party question at all. It has been used politically, no doubt; it has been used, I admit, by men in both parties. I think, however, that it has been used more largely by members of the Liberal party, to injure members of the Conservative party, than otherwise.

The hon. member for Yarmouth went on to say that no gentleman in the Conservative party had assisted in framing a prohibition resolution; but that, in fact, the members of the Conservative party had always tried to embarrass the government on this question. I do not know anything about that; but I do not know what gentleman on this side of the House has been asked to assist in framing this resolution. I have not been asked myself, although I took a somewhat prominent part in the discussion of the question in the last parliament as the seconder of the resolution of the hon. member for Yarmouth. I presume this resolution has been placed in the hands of the hon. member for Yarmouth by the Dominion Alliance, to be moved in this House. I find no fault with that; but, the hon. gentleman has no reason to complain that members on this side have not assisted in framing the resolution.

The hon. gentleman went on to say that the position which I took, that the vote on the plebiscite was not sufficient to warrant the enactment of a prohibitory law, was supported by a great many prominent temperance men in the country. We know that is the case. They held, and hold to-day, that the vote was not large enough to warrant the government in introducing a prohibitory Bill. But, he went on to make a statement which I do not agree with; that is, that the bulk of the temperance workers in the country think it is sufficient to justify provincial prohibition. I do not agree with that at all. I think that the question of provincial prohibition is used just for the purpose hinted at by some speakers, of giving the temperance people something. They feel that the government are not warranted by the plebiscite vote in enacting prohibition for the whole Dominion; and they say, we must give the temperance people something; if not, they will be disappointed. I do not agree with that. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) wants to go a little further; so, he has suggested an amendment to enlarge the

scope of the Canada Temperance Act. I do not think there is anything in that at all. I do not think the real temperance workers of the country who understand the question want anything of that kind at all. They want prohibition for the whole Dominion. I admit that there are some who do not want to let the temperance people of the country imagine that all their efforts in voting for the plebiscite have gone for nothing; and so they say, we must give them something just to satisfy them that that is not the case. If we do not give them something that will be effective, what is the use of giving them anything at all? We do not want anything but a genuine prohibitory law that will be carried out. After all, what would be the effect of provincial prohibition if it were enacted? The effect, I suppose, would be to give all the manufacture and most of the sale of liquor to the province of Quebec. I do not know that we want to make Quebec the centre for the manufacture of liquor, from which it could go to every other part of the country. As was pointed out by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), provincial prohibition could not prevent liquor going from one province to another; it could be sent to any one who ordered it. So, I hold that that would not be effective prohibition at all. It might have some little effect, but I doubt very much whether it would have any.

Now, in thinking over this matter of prohibition, I believe that what is wanted more than anything else is perfect honesty and sincerity on this question. While I am not going to say that the members of this House are not perfectly sincere and honest on the question, still I think we are sometimes a little open to suspicion in that direction. Members get up and talk in this House in order to please a certain portion of their constituents. There is no fault to be found with that, I suppose; but, after all, it would be a good thing if every member of this House would state, honestly and sincerely, whether he thinks the country is ripe for prohibition or not. We have found that it is pretty hard to get a straight, honest vote on this question. I have no fault to find with members who vote to please certain constituents of theirs who have strong views on the question. They are thinking about getting votes, which is quite natural; but, on a great question of this kind, I think politics should be eliminated altogether. I admit that that is pretty hard to do, when one side is contending so strongly against the other. I do not pretend to be more honest than other people, but sometimes I may appear to be more foolish for expressing my straight, honest convictions. I was thought foolish when I said that I thought there should be a majority of the voters on the list in favour of prohibition before the government should pass such a law. I may have been foolish in saying that; but it was my honest conviction, and

I think the majority of the members of this House, if they expressed their honest convictions, would say the same thing. It may be said, you cannot get a vote of that kind. Well, if we can never get a vote of that kind, we shall never get prohibition. There are three things necessary for an effective prohibitory law. The first is to have the people strongly in favour of it. Another requisite is to have the parliament in favour of it. The people may be in favour of it, but the parliament may not have been elected on that question. The third requisite is, that you must have a government in favour of it, too. What are the conditions to-day? It is all very well for people to talk of the country being ripe for prohibition. First of all, take the government: Have we a prohibition government to-day? I do not need to go over the individual members of the government. The Premier does not pretend to be a prohibitionist. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) does not pretend to be a prohibitionist. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), from the same province, does claim to be a prohibitionist. I do not know about some of the other members of the government; I am not going to take them all one by one. I think, perhaps, I might mention the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), whom I notice looking at me; I do not think he pretends to be a prohibitionist either. I want the people of the country to look at this very fact, that to-day we have not a prohibitionist government; and even if we could manage to get a law passed, and if the people were in favour of it, if we have not a government strongly in favour of prohibition, the law would not be carried out, and would not be effective. I take that ground. I want those who favour prohibition to notice, first of all, that we have not a prohibitionist government in office. In the second place, I do not think we have a prohibitionist parliament. It would take rather long to go over all the members, but I am confident that you would not find a majority of them in favour of prohibition. You may, however, find out what they feel about prohibition at the present time. I will go a little further and say, judging by the plebiscite taken in 1898, the people are not in favour of prohibition. So I hold that we have none of the conditions which are necessary to secure effective prohibition. We have not a prohibitionist government or a prohibitionist parliament, or a prohibitionist people. Therefore, I do not see that there is any probability of getting prohibition just at present.

I hold that a prohibitory law, unless backed up by the people and strictly enforced by the government, would be an evil instead of a good. It would be a bad thing to have such a law placed on the statute, unless it were enforced strictly by the government, and backed up by the

sentiment of the people. I know that there are strong temperance people who say: Give us a law. But what is the use of giving a law unless you can enforce it. It would be a perfect farce, and instead of doing good would put temperance sentiment back twenty-five years. Unless there is a strong sentiment in the country in favour of such a law, and unless we have a government that will enforce it, it would be utterly useless for parliament to pass it.

At present Canada is, after all, a temperance country. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has said that the province of Quebec is a temperance province, but let him go all over the country, and he will find that the whole country is very temperate. This we owe in a great measure to temperance workers. The country owes a great deal to the men and women who have done temperance work, and done it for nothing. They have seen that laws were made by legislators, and that these laws were enforced, and have fought against any relaxation of such laws, and have cultivated and fostered, in every way, the temperance sentiment of the people.

I have received a circular from the Order of Good Templars, now meeting in Ottawa, asking me to vote against Mr. Parmalee's amendment, and for Mr. McClure's amendment. And in the event of Mr. McClure's amendment being defeated, to vote for Mr. Flint's resolution. I have very great respect for the Good Templars and all temperance workers. If I take a side, I take the one adopted by them, but at the same time, for the reasons I have given, I regret that I cannot vote as asked by that circular. I intend to vote for the resolution of the member for Shefford (Mr. Parmalee), because it expresses the sentiment which I hold, and that many temperance workers hold, namely, that the plebiscite, taken not long ago, did not show that the country is in favour of prohibition, and does not warrant a prohibitory law being introduced by the government. I am glad that the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) agrees with me in that view, and I suppose that if he cannot get his amendment adopted, he will vote, as I intend to do, for the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). At this period of the session, when time is so precious, and we are all anxious to close the proceedings of parliament, I do not propose to speak at length, but it is perhaps advisable, since it happens that I am the leader of the House, that I should give the view which, in my opinion, ought to prevail on this occasion. Of course, I do not pretend to do more than give my own individual opinion. The question is not a ministerial one, though it is one on which the government took a certain course some few years ago.

While in opposition, we pledged ourselves to take a plebiscite and give the people an opportunity to pronounce on the question of prohibition. I think that we have fully carried out that pledge. We submitted a question to the people to be answered, exactly as the friends of temperance, who did us the honour to communicate with us, wanted it put. On that question the people pronounced. The result of the poll is well known to everybody, and I need not go over it again.

Since that result was obtained, I took the position that public opinion—although there was a slight majority in favour of prohibition—still had not spoken in so certain a voice as to make it advisable to enact a prohibitory liquor law at this stage.

That is not the ground, however, on which this question ought to be placed. I would be sorry to put the vote cast on one side against that cast on the other. It is preferable to look at the vote cast in favour of the idea which the advocates of prohibition had in their minds, and, in some respects, that vote might be claimed to be large, although it did not amount to 25 per cent of the whole electorate. But under the circumstances, I came to the conclusion that at this stage public opinion was not so far educated on the question of prohibition as to make it advisable to enact a prohibitory law.

After the discussion in the House this session, I can say that the position which the government then took is fully justified. We have, in the first place, not an unanimity of opinion among those who profess to be prohibitionists. We can see very distinctly three or four different opinions which prevail. In the first place, there is the view of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) that the vote polled at the plebiscite does not justify the enactment of national prohibition, but would justify the enactment of provincial prohibition, or in other words, of a prohibitory law to apply to those provinces which pronounced by a majority in favour of prohibition.

Another view has been given to us by my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. McClure), who on this question is a stalwart, who does not admit any compromise, and who is in favour of absolute prohibition throughout the Dominion.

Then we have the view of my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig), to whom I must give the credit, if he will take it from me, of having spoken on this question always consistently and honestly. He is in favour of a prohibitory liquor law, but he is also of the opinion that the time has not come for the enactment of such a law.

We have had the opinion also of my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace), to the effect that a prohibitory law would be advisable if it were coupled with a new feature that has never been seriously discussed in this country, namely, of afford-

ing compensation to all interests that would be financially affected by it.

Mr. FOSTER. That has been often discussed.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, academically, but never seriously. It has never been put before the people as a concrete measure to be acted upon. But academically it has been discussed time and again.

Then we have the view of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) to the effect that the time has not come for the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law, but that the cause would be best promoted by perfecting the Scott Act.

All the gentlemen who have spoken, and whose opinions I have given—my hon. friends from Yarmouth, Colchester, East York and West York, and East Durham. are all pronounced prohibitionists. They all believe in an effective measure of prohibition, but they entertain widely different views as to the conditions and the manner in which it could be brought about at present. Under the circumstances, I am more than justified in claiming that the government rightly interpreted the verdict of the people when they decided that the time had not come for the enactment of a prohibitory law.

To-day we have three propositions before us, but I may say that practically we have only one. So, I may say, we have only one proposition before us, practically, and that is the proposition of my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). I think I may put aside the motion of my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. McClure). I do not believe that at this time this parliament would be prepared to pronounce in favour of so radical a measure as the immediate enactment of a prohibitory liquor law. So, practically the only proposition placed before us is the proposition from my hon. friend from Yarmouth. And his proposition is to enact a prohibitory liquor law to affect the provinces that have pronounced in favour of prohibition—that is, all the provinces except the province of Quebec. Now, for my part. I have no hesitation in saying that, in my judgment, no more dangerous legislation could be placed upon the statute-book. We must look at it from a higher point of view than the mere point of view of prohibition. First of all, I may say, there is grave doubt, according to some of my hon. friends better versed in the law than I am, that such a measure would be unconstitutional, it would be against the very letter of that law which forms our charter as a Dominion. But let us set aside that view of the case, and suppose that we have the power to enact such a law. Would it be advisable, in the interest of the whole people of Canada, that the parliament of Canada should commence to legislate upon sectional lines? Could there be a more dangerous principle to introduce into legislation than that we should

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

not legislate upon broad national lines applicable to all parts of Canada, but simply upon lines applicable to certain sections of the community. We are a divided community; we are divided in religion, we are divided in race, we are divided in education—we are divided in many ways. Should not legislation rather tend to promote unity than to increase the cleavage that already separates us? I think that if we are to make this a nation, our policy must be to go forward and never to go backward. Of course, I respect the sentiments of those of my fellow-countrymen who are in favour of prohibition. Many of them have made it the object of their lives, have devoted their best efforts and a great portion of their means to reform this unfortunate habit and to promote the cause of mankind at large. But it seems to me that this is not the paramount duty which weighs upon us as Canadians. The paramount duty which rests upon us as Canadians is to make one country of the existing diverse elements. But if we were to enact such a statute as that favoured by my hon. friend from Yarmouth, what would be the condition of things? You would intensify the lines of cleavage. For instance, you would have the manufactories of spirits and other liquors concentrated in the province of Quebec, and that province would be the great centre from which would radiate the liquor traffic. I do not know that my province would suffer much by that. I think that, if I wished to be sectional, I might say that, and if the people of Quebec were to have that condition of things—if the great distilleries and breweries of the country were to be transferred from where they are to the province of Quebec—I do believe sincerely that the province of Quebec might profit a good deal by that industry and trade. But, I lay aside that view, which is not one worthy to take into consideration or to be discussed. But, if we had the manufacture of liquor concentrated in one province and this to be done by law, I do not think it would be a healthy sentiment that would follow, or that it would promote the proper development of our country. So, it is of no use to resort to any questions of expediency in that matter. We must face the question fairly—either the country is ready for prohibition or it is not. If it is ready, the people will have it when they want it; if not, let us act accordingly. For my part, I have come to the conclusion that the country is not ready for prohibition, that there is no such strong and vigorous sentiment in the country in favour of prohibition as to make such a law effective. And, if you were to put on the statute-books a prohibitory law which was not effective, instead of conferring a benefit, you would impose a curse upon the people.

You must remember that the question of temperance is largely one of education. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace)

paid a well-deserved tribute to my native province. I do not wish to make what may seem an invidious comparison between one section and another; I do not believe that the people of the province of Quebec are better than my fellow-countrymen of other provinces. But, I think I can fairly claim that the province of Quebec is at least as temperate as any other province, and, in some respects, I can claim that it is more temperate, because there is more actual prohibition to the acre in the province of Quebec than in any other part of the community. For, as the hon. member for West York said, you can go for miles and miles on the road along the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal, and stop at any public house, and you cannot get a glass of liquor. You could not get it under the law or even against the law. But, while that is the case, the people are not in favour of restricting themselves by law against having liquor if they want it—it is a question of the education of the people. I think we can all be proud of the progress that has been made by the cause of temperance in every part of Canada. Compare what we see about us to-day in this year of grace 1900, with what we know to have been the condition forty years ago. There is no comparison—it is not the same country or the same people. If I may give my personal experience—perhaps the House will permit me to state what I have stated elsewhere—between 1893 and 1896, it was my privilege to address more than two hundred meetings in all parts of Canada, from one ocean to the other. And, in these two hundred meetings I never saw a man under the influence of liquor, except in three places. This is a condition of things which, I believe, could not be matched in any other part of the world—certainly not in any other part of America. All this is an evidence of what can be done by education, by causing better morals to prevail among the people and a better system also to prevail. But though this is all true, I do not pretend that we have reached the millennium. What can we do further to advance the cause of temperance? For my part, I am not a prohibitionist. My hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig) alluded to that. I have nothing to hide about that; I do not want to sail under false colours. But, I claim, with all modesty, that I am a temperate man. I think I can claim also, that, though I do not pretend to be a prohibitionist. I am as much a temperance man as if I were a prohibitionist. I do not say that by way of argument, but as saying that the duty of promoting the cause of temperance rests upon all classes of men. Temperance is prohibition, but temperance may exist apart from prohibition. But, I say this only to remind the members of the House that, in the case of temperance, we have made great and steady and continuous progress, as you can see not only in the com-

munity at large, but in every part and section of the community. But, there is still something to be done in favour of temperance. My hon. friend (Mr. Craig) stated that this was not a prohibition government. I do not pretend that we are. But, I think we can pretend that we are a temperance government, and ready to help in the cause of temperance if we are called upon to do it.

Now, how can we help the cause of temperance? In 1878, Mr. Mackenzie put upon the statute-book, the Canada Temperance Act. I believe it is to the credit and to the memory of that thoroughly honest and good man that in so doing he rendered a great service to the cause of temperance. The Act which he put upon the statute-book is not perfect, it never was perfect, and, perhaps, as time went on some defects in it were shown to exist which could be remedied and the Act made more effective. If the friends of temperance think that by perfecting that system so as to make it more workable it would be more effective in promoting temperance, I think it would be the duty of the government to give effect to that wish. But, I am not sure, from the remarks which we heard a little while ago, that this would be the unanimous wish of the friends of temperance and of the friends of prohibition. But whether that be so or not, if the friends of temperance should signify their desire in that way, I can say for my part, and I think I can speak on behalf of my colleagues, that the government would be willing to respond. Looking at the question in all its aspects, I do not see that any better method can be devised at the present time to promote the cause which we all have at heart, whether we are prohibitionists or not. I think I can say for every man in this House that at heart he is willing to promote the cause of temperance, to support legislation that will make it more general and to advance it in every possible way. This can only be done, first of all, by education, by systematic education, and then by legislation following the advance of education. That is one method by which temperance can be promoted, but it is not by one section of the community trying by legislation to be wiser than the rest of the community, or to be better than the rest of the community. Legislation should only follow in the path of instruction, and that being a true principle, I do not see any other method we can adopt in order to promote the cause we have at heart. These are the sentiments which I entertain personally upon this question, and I venture, in all humility, to present them to the good judgment of the House.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I do not propose to take up much time of the House at this late stage of the session in discussing this question. We would have been in a better position to give proper consideration to the question if the kindness of the Premier had been shown in giving us an

opportunity at an earlier period in the session. This has been kept, with other important questions, to the very fag-end of the session, and with conditions under which it is impossible to give fair and full consideration to any measure. However, I do not think it was ever supposed, since the introduction of my hon. friend's motion, that anything else but a perfunctory consideration would be given to it.

Now, I propose in the first place to vote against the amendment to the amendment, and I will tell the House the reason why. I do not believe in its conclusion, because I do not believe in the premises upon which the conclusion is based and from which it is drawn. The conclusion is drawn from this basis :

That whereas only 23 per cent of the registered electors of the Dominion of Canada voted for prohibition, that in the provinces and territories, excluding Quebec, only 27 per cent of the registered electors voted for prohibition, that these results show that there is not an active prohibition sentiment sufficiently pronounced to justify the expectation that a prohibition law could be successfully enforced, and therefore, in the opinion of this House, such a prohibitory law should not be enacted at present.

Now, I take the ground, and I think I am perfectly justified in taking it, that the result of the plebiscite vote in 1898 was by no means, judged on the ground of the total vote that came out and having in view those who did not come out, an indication at all of the strength of the prohibition and temperance sentiment in this country, and I will tell this House why. In the first place, this country, in several of the provinces, had had enough of prohibition plebiscites. Plebiscites had been held in the different provinces and enormous majorities had been given for prohibition. In most of those provinces, after these enormous majorities had been given, the people had to sit back and contemplate this fact, that notwithstanding the large majorities given in favour of prohibition, no effective result came of it, there was no accordant government action. The people had grown tired of plebiscites, they had seen them result, not in any effective prohibition, but taken merely as an indication of the strength of the temperance or prohibition vote. Very well, you cannot repeat that thing over and over again and get the people to go into these mimic battles with any kind of vigour. After several provinces of this Dominion had been polled by plebiscite votes, the people came to the conclusion that they had gained a fair view of the state of prohibition or temperance sentiment, as shown in the votes that had taken place. So that when the plebiscite was promised by the Liberal party in their platform of 1893, and when effect was given to it in 1898, it was like warming up cold porridge, it was looked upon by a great many temperance people, as well as by others, as simply a repetition

Mr. FOSTER.

of the old method of taking a plebiscite from which nothing was to result. I think I know pretty well the force of temperance sentiment throughout this country, I think I know pretty well the fervour and the strength with which the real temperance and prohibition sentiment went into the work of the first plebiscites in the different provinces, and when I compared the feeling and the fervour then with the listlessness of the effort which was made in the Dominion plebiscite, I think I saw the lesson and read it, as every observing and intelligent man could. The plebiscite of 1898 was discounted by the previous prohibition plebiscites, and it was no fair test at all of the depth, or the strength, or the distribution of the temperance or prohibition sentiment of this country. Therefore, I say that the small number of persons, comparatively, who came to the vote in 1898 is not to be taken as an indication of the breadth and the strength of the prohibition sentiment in this country. So, any conclusion which rests upon that, as the amendment to the amendment rests upon it, rests upon false premises, and I am not going to accept that conclusion, because I do not believe in the premises which are laid down. Neither am I going to take my conclusion from the premise, which is unfair in this respect, that it is drawn from the small percentage of the temperance voters who came out under these adverse circumstances and polled their vote. So, I say that is no indication at all of the temperance and prohibition sentiment in this country.

But this resolution is based entirely upon that as the only and sole indication. I say that behind that 27 per cent, and behind that 23 per cent, which is made the basis for rejecting a prohibition resolution, or any further action in this matter by the hon. gentleman who moves the amendment to the amendment, there is the great body, not numbered, not counted, but which every independent observer in this country knows is sound in sentiment, and believes in prohibition, and in advanced legislative measures, but which did not, for one reason or another, come to the poll and vote. Among the reasons, and the chief reason why they did not vote, was that they believed that nothing was to come out of the plebiscite which was granted. But, any one listening to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who spoke so fully on the question which is before the House to-day, and I find no fault with the tone in which he treated it, could not help but wonder what would have been the effect on the electorate of Canada if, before the 1896 elections had come on, the right hon. gentleman had gone before the electorate and had spoken in the self-same tones as those employed by him to-day. Now, I have a quarrel with the government, and with the right hon. gentleman, because he did not act in an open, honourable and square way with the elec-

tors of this country, and I propose to show why I think he did not do that. The right hon. gentleman will not stand up here to-day and say that he did not know the sentiment of the province of Quebec in 1896 or in 1898, just as well as he knew it after September, 1898. The hon. gentleman has reasoned in a circle. He has declared that prohibition cannot be given in sections, which means, that so long as Quebec is unfavourable to prohibition, there can be no hope of prohibition in this country. I say that if he could read the public sentiment of his own province aright, as I have not the least doubt he could, when he promised the plebiscite, when he led the people of this country on by the promise he made, that, if, in the end, he could go around every portion of the circle and stand where he did to-day, and argue on the great national principle that you should not have piecemeal and sectional legislation, he knew that he was just as safe and sound in 1893, in 1896 and before the vote was taken in 1898, on that principle, as he was to-day. But, is there not a different tenor in his speech to-day from that which characterized the pledges given by him and by the hon. Minister of Agriculture in the campaign leading up to the election of 1896? Is there not a different flavour? Is there not a different tendency? Is there not a complete and perfect contradistinction between the speech that has been delivered by the right hon. gentleman to-day, and the answers he made and the speeches he delivered upon it when he was in the country in the election contest preceding June, 1896, as open and plain a contradistinction as it is possible to conceive of? What was the resolution of the party, and why was it put forward? If the resolution had in it any life, it was not simply a poll of sentiment. If the resolution had in it any life, it was not simply that an opportunity would be given for people to come up and say 'yes,' or 'no,' without there being any results to follow. The power of the utterance in 1893, as the power of other utterances which were made by the Prime Minister himself after 1893, was meant to have the effect, and it did have the effect in this country, of bringing to his side in force, that life and strength and power of sentiment which inclined towards prohibition as the ultimate aim and in the possible hope that such a state of things would be brought about in reference to temperance in the several provinces and in the Dominion at large. There is no doubt about that, and every sentence which the right hon. gentleman uttered and every answer which he made was so much food, so much sustenance to that hope and that desire amongst the temperance and prohibition people of this country. There can be no doubt about that. Why, we have only to read some of his answers. There is no need for me to read all his platform utterances. To say as some hon. gentlemen

do, that all that was meant was to give the people a chance to poll their votes and to register the yeas and nays, is to read all the life and all the sense out of it. If it was simply a register of the people, and had been so stated, I would like to ask the temperance people and the prohibitionists of the country how many prohibition votes would have been counted at the different polls held in the Dominion? Whatever life and strength there was in the movement, was the strong hope, buoyed up by the utterances of the platform and buoyed up by the promises and speeches of the right hon. gentleman, that, if a majority voted in favour of prohibition, accordant action would be had, and the result would be the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law. If the right hon. gentleman had gone upon any one platform in the country then, and made use of the statement he has made here to-day before the facts which have since transpired were known, would not all hope and all strength have gone out from that movement? Nobody would have gone to the polls. And so, I say my complaint, and I think it is a fair complaint, for all temperance people, and all people in this country to make, is the lack of candour that was evinced by the government, and by the right hon. gentleman in the whole proceeding. When we tried over and over again to get the hon. gentleman to say whether or not he would apply any other constitutional rule to the question, than that which was applied to other questions that went before the electorate of this country, we never could get him to say that any other rule would be applied. In speech after speech, and in answer after answer, all that the right hon. gentleman would state, either by implication, or by open plain English, was that the will of the electorate in this respect, as in all other respects in this country must rule, and that the government must bow to it. There could be no other interpretation. Now, my complaint against the right hon. gentleman and against his government is this: Why did he not tell the people candidly where he stood, and where his government would stand, before asking them to enter upon the turmoil of a Dominion contest, and poll their names for or against the prohibition of the liquor traffic? Why did he not say to the people of this country whatever he had decided upon, namely, that they must get two-thirds of the votes of those who come up and vote; or they must get a majority in votes of all the eligible names on the lists? If you do that, then, I will consider that it is mandatory, but unless you do that, I must consider that my government, if we are put into power, will not be called upon to act. That would have been in accordance with the right hon. gentleman's position now. What is his position to-day? That the temperance cause is too sacred to be imperilled by putting a law, for its enforcement in this way, upon

the statute-book, unless you have the strong, abiding, and overwhelming majority of the people behind it. Was that any less true in 1893, in 1896, or in 1898, than it is to-day? Had the right hon. gentleman any doubt of it at that time? Not in the least. When he brought that measure before this House of parliament, he was questioned as to whether he would apply any other rule of interpretation than the majority of the polled votes.

Why did he not give open and candid expression to his opinions then, and say to the electors: Previous to the contest my opinion is that before we can march forward in the line of legislation such as you propose, you must show by a two-third vote of the electors polling, or by a majority vote of the total on the list that the deep and abiding sentiment of this country is in favour of the measure which you ask us to enact. If the hon. gentleman believed then as he believes now—and who can doubt it—that it would not be for the national upbuilding of this country that we should enact prohibition so long as there was one single province which was strongly opposed to it, why did he not make the statement then as he does now? That would have been a guiding post to the electorate of Canada, and we would have known what of the future by an examination of the position that the right hon. gentleman and his party took. My complaint is that all of this was kept back, that none of this candid dealing was had with the electorate, but that on the other hand that every statement was so veiled, so couched, so admirably adapted to the purpose that it led the people on to the hope that the right hon. gentleman and his friends proposed to give the people a fair chance to make their voice known, and that if the will of the people as expressed at the polls was in favour of prohibition, then the government must abide by it. It is not necessary for me to read all the statements made by the right hon. gentleman in order to prove that. One or two will be sufficient for the purpose of clearness. The resolution which was moved by Mr. Fisher, the Minister of Agriculture, was heralded as a step forward in the vindication of the noble cause of temperance, and not a mere registering piece of machinery. That resolution went to the people. I remember sitting on a platform with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) in Ottawa, after the campaign was opened. Speaking on the same platform with him, I in all my innocence led myself and the people of Canada into somewhat of a trap, because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher), speaking at that initial meeting of the campaign, declared: Now, if you want prohibition vote for and carry this plebiscite. There was no reservation that I could hear as to its being necessary to have a clear majority of all the names on the list, and you will have pro-

hibition. Nothing of that kind. There was nothing about voting so that there will be a majority in every province, and then you will have prohibition. There was no reservation of that kind. What he said was: Here is the opportunity; there is the Premier's measure; now, gentlemen, if you want prohibition, vote for and carry the plebiscite. And I, speaking afterwards, said: That settles it; here is a member of the government, the right hand man of the Premier himself, and he has told you openly and plainly that if you want prohibition what you have to do is to vote for and carry this plebiscite; that is capable of only one interpretation, namely, that if we get a majority of the vote polled then we shall have the consequent action of the government. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) made no word of dissent before that audience, and no word of dissent was made by him to that statement of the case during the whole contest. That plebiscite resolution went out to the country and many earnest and honest men took it up, and were greatly exercised about it, and the Premier was often criticised, and I must say that nowhere does that—I will not call it shining talent, but that peculiar talent of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—nowhere was it so admirably shown, if that is the proper word with which to characterize it, than in the manner in which he met these earnest and honest, and Christian inquiries. I shall only select one or two. In the city of Winnipeg he was met with the universal question as to what this meant, and as to what would be done, and his answer was:

He would pledge his honour that as soon as the Liberals came into power in Ottawa they would take a plebiscite of the Dominion, by which the party would stand, and the will of the people would be carried out, even were it to cost power for ever to the Liberal party.

What opinion would be formed by any auditor in that assembly listening to the Premier's fervent utterance and the utter abandon with which he placed his own political fortunes and that of his party in the scale, and was willing to abide by the result. The fine spirit with which he pledged his honour that as soon as the Liberals came into power they would take a plebiscite, and not only take a plebiscite of the Dominion, but they would take a plebiscite by which the party would stand and the will of the people would be carried out even if it were to cost power for ever to the Liberal party. I was not there, but any one who was there, and any one who can imagine what took place must have almost felt the thrill of the fervid spirit and sentiment which permeated that assembly when that unequivocal promise of the leader of a great party was given to the assembled auditors and to the electors of the Dominion. Could there be any but the one straight conclusion to be drawn

from that answer? Suppose that the right hon. gentleman had been perfectly candid then with the people of Winnipeg, and had added to his statement by saying: Yes, I am going to grant you a plebiscite because I want you to be put in a position to be polled as to how many say 'yes' and how many say 'no,' but I am not going to follow it up by consequent action unless there is a majority polled of the total number of names on the electoral lists. Fancy the right hon. gentleman supplementing his promise by that statement. Why, it would have been as if half the ice from the Arctic Circle had suddenly been let in to that earnest and fervid assembly. The Prime Minister did not say that, but he meant it. In his own mind then, he had the agreement that he had made with the leaders of his party, which he did not disclose until the vote had been polled, the agreement to wit: that there was an arrangement, a mutual agreement between the leaders of the party and the leaders of the temperance people in the party, that unless there was a majority of the total number of names on the electors list polled, that he would not consider the people's voice mandatory, and that unless there was such majority that then there was to be no more heard of prohibition in the ranks of the party from that time forward. Suppose my right hon. friend had spoken in that way to the people of Winnipeg as a supplement to that promise; would the people have taken the same conclusion from the hon. gentleman's remarks that they did? No, it would have been the exact antithesis. The Rev. Mr. Huxtable, who did a giant's work for the Liberal party, though he is not a giant in stature, on the sole ground of his hope for the completion of what he held dear, the enactment of a prohibitory law in this country through the agency of my right hon. friend and the Liberal party, asked him the question as well; and what did my right hon. friend answer? He said:

The Liberal party has pledged itself in convention at Ottawa that whenever in power it would take a plebiscite on the liquor question as to whether the people want a prohibitory law or not. The answer is not in my hands; it is in the hands of the people; and according to their answer, such legislation they will have at the hands of the government.

Suppose that after Mr. Huxtable had sat down bubbling over with joy and hope at the hon. gentleman's answer, the hon. gentleman had said: 'Oh, Mr. Huxtable, wait a moment. I have to tell you that unless you get a majority of all the voters on the voters' list polled in favour of prohibition, there is a secret agreement by which we are not going to enact prohibition, the leaders of the Liberal party have entered into that agreement, and promised that in that case we shall hear no more of prohibition in the party from that time forward.' What a cold douche that would have

been to the Rev. Mr. Huxtable, and how little work the reverend gentleman would have done for the right hon. gentleman and his party at the polls. To the deputation from the Methodist General Conference the right hon. gentleman said:

If the plebiscite meets with the support of the majority of the people, those who find themselves in the minority will have to concur in the verdict of the majority.

What does any listener understand by the majority and the minority when you are talking about elections—about something to be decided at the polls? Is it not the constitutional practice in British countries, always in this country, that when you speak of the majority in the face of an election, you speak of a majority of the voters who come out to poll their votes? No other possible idea could be taken from the right hon. gentleman's answer than the one which was meant to be taken, that if a majority of those who come out to the poll voted in favour of prohibition, then the will of the people should be carried out. I want to quote only one other statement, for fear it may have escaped the memories and might be contradicted by some gentlemen. Here is the language of the right hon. leader of the government as to that secret agreement:

Let me say this. When we put that plank in our platform there was an implied agreement between the members of the party who believed in prohibition and those who did not believe in prohibition. The implied agreement on the part of those who did not believe in prohibition was that if the voice of the people spoke unmistakably, if it could be shown that the great majority of the electorate were in favour of prohibition, then those who did not believe in it would square their views to those of their brothers, and would work honestly for the success of that policy. On the other hand, there was an engagement on the part of those who believed in prohibition that if the voice of the people on the subject should not be of sufficient strength to warrant the adoption by the party of the policy of prohibition, they also would square their views to those of their brothers, and we would hear no more of that question in the ranks of the party.

Now, that is a strange statement. There is nothing wrong in that agreement, provided it were made open to the people who were to be affected by it. If that agreement had been made open to the electorate before the vote, there could be no fault found with it; it would have been open and above-board. But this is not mooted to the people of this country until after the fight is fought, until after the poll is held and the opinion of the people as expressed at the polls is taken. That is not said until after all the effect which it should properly have on the electorate is rendered impossible by the fact that already the conclusion has been drawn at the polls. Being further pressed, the hon. gentleman said in this House:

Moreover, there was not a man living who expected at the time the plebiscite was taken that

the duty would be imposed on the government of introducing a prohibitory measure unless at least one-half the electorate recorded their votes in favour of that policy.

That was the opinion of the hon. gentleman then. He would not give the country the benefit of that opinion. That opinion was an authoritative one, because if he were elected, he would be in a position to fashion the action of the government and of the dominant party in this country. It was not an opinion held by A, B or C, as to which it did not matter very much whether it were made public or not; but it was the opinion held solidly by the dominant factor in the party—the coming head, if he were successful, of a government which would have the determination of the question. It was the opinion of the leader of the party, and hence the opinion which dominated the party; and if the hon. gentleman had been willing to put his party squarely before the people, he would have said: ‘If we come into power, mind you, we must have at least one-half the total electorate in favour of prohibition before we can be expected to fulfil the wishes of the prohibitionists of this country.’ It is because of this complete concealment that I think the people of this country have something to complain of. What is the hon. gentleman’s last word to-day to the temperance people and prohibitionists, to whom he held out this promise for five long years, and many thousands of whom followed him because of that promise? To those people who believed that his utterances were candid and thoroughly true, that they were all that he meant and expressed his whole position on this question, he comes to-day and gives his last word, and what is it? ‘It is true, I led you on; it is true, I got your votes; it is true, I am in power largely because of that; and now, at the end I tell you that so far as I and my party are concerned, you may lay down all hopes of national prohibition from me or from my party, so long as I rule and govern with my party in this country.’ Why? He has stated here to-day the unalterable opinion, as he thinks, of the province of Quebec, as being opposed to putting the restriction of prohibition upon themselves. I will not quarrel with the opinion of the people of Quebec, if that is their opinion. Although I have my own beliefs and hold them strongly, I am not at all so illiberal as to deny to other people their beliefs on this or any other question; and I am not so illiberal either, as to say that I am totally and absolutely right, and that these people who think differently are totally and absolutely wrong.

I have learned enough in the short years that I have lived to know that we need to be very liberal and very charitable in our judgment of the opinions and beliefs of our fellow-men, but I do say this, that when the right hon. gentleman comes here to-day and states what he believes to be the unalterable opinion of his province and then takes

his position on the principle that you must, if you have prohibition at all, have a complete national prohibition, and you cannot have it by sections, he speaks the last word to the prohibitionists of this country, and tells them plainly: Abandon all hope, ye who entered under my banners in 1896. What does the right hon. gentleman state? He states that prohibition is an impossibility in this country, so far as he reads the signs of the times. He stands up here in 1900 and says the most he can promise to do in aid of the cause is, if the people will all agree and say that they want it, to re-furbish the Scott Act. That is the position that he takes. If he had been candid, he would have taken that position in 1896, and the people would not have been deceived, and there would not have been that period of turmoil which has resulted in nothing—in worse than nothing. I say that the fact that a plebiscite was ordered without the wish, without the asking, without the willingness of the temperance people of this country,—the very fact that it was ordered and made imperative, and carried out under the existing conditions has had the effect of retarding the cause of prohibition and temperance in this country. I think there can be no doubt that harm has resulted from it rather than good. I might take time to amplify that statement, but I simply state what appears to be an incontrovertible proposition.

The hon. gentleman says to us: Temperance people do not agree. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) asks one thing, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) asks another, the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig) asks another. I cannot find any two of you agreeing, and therefore there is nothing I can see that can be done even in the way of a step forward in legislation such as was taken in 1878 by the law then passed.

But just in passing, let me say that my hon. friend was altogether wrong when he declared that the question of compensation had not been argued in this House. It has, on the contrary, been argued in this House over and over again. Resolutions have been moved and defeated over and over again, and the right hon. gentleman’s own colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), I remember, as well as myself, at one time in the course of the debate on this question, took very strong grounds against the principle of compensation. Why, in 1887, on page 948 of the *Hansard* and subsequent pages, the right hon. gentleman will find one of those interesting debates on this question which he had better read in order to bring his memory back to the facts as they actually occurred.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to speak longer. Let me state my own position. Of course, I have the right to speak, as my hon. friend from North Well-

ington (Mr. McMullen) admits, but I do not hope to argue with him with any idea of changing his views, because he is joined to his idols, and I suppose will not forsake them. I do not disagree from the proposition, but entirely agree with it, that in order to make any drastic legislation effective in this country, you must have an active sentiment in its favour. I have had, ever since I have been a temperance advocate, often to come face to face with that view of the question as to whether the temperance sentiment was strong enough and numerous enough, and really active enough to sustain the weight of a complete prohibitory law. I may have one opinion and another hon. gentleman may have another, but I have settled down upon this as the principle upon which you can go, and I think the only one. I have no faith in plebiscites, as an authority binding upon parliament, or indicative of the force that you can draw on for legislation afterwards. You may have a plebiscite and obtain a strong majority in the country binding nobody, and then you have a general election and elect 213 members, and you do not have one of them bound by that plebiscite. You do not have any accordant action except so far as there may be that influence which the general opinion may exert on the members elected. Plebiscites are good and effective machinery to a certain extent, but I think we have obtained all that was good of them in that respect in this country and I do not think we need any more of them. They are good as indications to a certain extent, but do not bind a party or a single individual. The people ought to have, as a free people governing themselves, just what they want, and the only way we can know what the people want is by the expression of their representatives elected and sent here by the people themselves. So far as my view of plebiscites is concerned, I do not think they will be useful in the future whatever they may have been in the past. If ever prohibition is enacted in this House, it will be enacted because at the polls the conviction will be so strongly enforced by the voters, that they will send a majority of members to this House to enact and carry out a prohibitory law. Unless that is done, no resolution, no general plebiscite will have practical effect. Whether that day is near at hand or not, I do not know. I have prophesied with reference to that so often that I dare not prophesy any more; but in this much I am glad to agree with my right hon. friend, that the advance in temperance and sobriety has been most marked in this country, and also, that the Dominion to-day occupies a very proud position as respects sobriety in comparison with any other country in the world. But we cannot go through this country and shut our eyes to the fact that there is an incalculable amount of misery yet in this country, which is caused by the evil that comes

from the sale and use of intoxicating liquors, and I believe that, in so far as you can remove any of that misery, you are making a purer and a stronger and a better people and a better nationality as well. I believe that temperance legislation must follow the force and advance of temperance sentiment in the country, and that the only place we can look for that to be thoroughly registered is in parliament, by the representatives of the people, chosen to register the wishes of the electorate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Upwards of a year ago, shortly after taking the vote in the form of a plebiscite, the government, through a letter addressed by the right hon. the Prime Minister to a prominent temperance advocate, declared its position in relation to the results of that vote. That letter declared that in the judgment of the government, the time for prohibition had not arrived, that the vote given in favour of prohibition was not large enough to show the existence of that overwhelming opinion, which in the judgment of the government was necessary for the passing and enforcing of a prohibitory law. I have had, since that time, ample opportunity, as other hon. gentlemen in the House have had, of observing the trend of public opinion. At the time, of course, I assented to that view, that the judgment of the government was wise and prudent; and all that I have heard since, and all that I have since observed, has led me to believe that that was a sound conclusion and that the government has reached a correct judgment. I have had the opportunity of discussing the question personally with many prominent temperance men. I have had the opportunity of discussing the question on the public platform in my own constituency, which is one of the strongest prohibitionist constituencies in the Dominion of Canada. And, in the light of all that observation, whatever it may be worth, I am confirmed in the opinion I then formed, that the public opinion of Canada does not now desire the passing and enforcing of a prohibitory law; that a large part, I might even say the greater part, of the temperance men of Canada—certainly of my own province, which I know best—do not desire the passing of such an Act, and do not believe that the passing of such a measure would advance the great cause they have at heart. Therefore, inasmuch as the resolution of my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Parmelee) is simply in line with the policy the government has previously supported, I am prepared to cast my vote in favour of that resolution and against the propositions of my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) and my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. McClure). The hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig), who spoke so fairly—and I am sure we all felt that he spoke, as he always does, with thorough honesty on the question—said that this ought not to be a party

question. I concur in that view. But, unhappily, many hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to make it a party question, and have tried to make political capital out of it; and, so far as they have tried to do that, I shall be justified in making reference to what they said and to the position of the government in relation to the question.

My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), in the speech which he has just addressed to the House, though in moderate terms, made what I would hardly be wrong in calling a party speech. He endeavoured to show four things—first, that the government, or the Liberal party, in its convention in 1893, had promised a prohibitory law; second, that the government at the time of the passing of the plebiscite Bill had promised to enact a prohibitory law if the majority of votes cast should be favourable to it; third, that the Liberal party is a particularly anti-temperance party; and fourth, that the Conservative party is more favourable to prohibition than the Liberal party.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) does not wish to put these propositions into my mouth. If he will allow me, I will say that the first is a proposition which I never even thought of stating, because what was promised by the Liberal convention in 1893 was not prohibition but a plebiscite. I could not have said anything else. With reference to the third and fourth proposition, I never uttered anything of the kind; and with reference to the second, I took it as an inference of course, that if the majority voted in favour of the plebiscite the government's promise extended to the proposing of legislation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the tenor of my hon. friend's (Mr. Foster's) speech was in line with what I have stated; and I hope to be able to show from the public records, that on each and every one of these points he is absolutely wrong. My hon. friend says here to-day that what was promised in the convention was not prohibition but a plebiscite. But when hon. gentlemen behind him go through the country, that is not the statement they make; but the statement is constantly made that this government had pledged itself to the enactment of the prohibitory law. That statement has been made many times, as evidenced by the public press and the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite. But my hon. friend rises in his place to-day and says that the government did not promise prohibitory law, but it did promise a plebiscite. I am glad to have his frank admission here; and we might as well have on record exactly what the words of the plebiscite were. I can speak with some knowledge of what the attitude of the Liberal party was in 1893. I was present as a delegate to the convention, though not then a member of this parliament. I had the honour to be chairman of the committee that formulated the platform. Members of the convention who had sugges-

tions to offer as to what they desired to have the platform express were asked to send in their suggestions. Various suggestions were made, and among them one that the Liberal party's platform should contain a plank declaring in favour of prohibition. This the Liberal party, by its committee, declined to do, for reasons which it is not necessary to enlarge upon here. The general view was taken that public opinion was not ready for the enactment of prohibition. But temperance men were there who, if they could not obtain a declaration in the platform in favour of prohibition, desired that some steps should be taken in the direction of what they believed to be a righteous end; and, when they could not get a prohibition plank, they expressed a desire to have a plebiscite plank. I do not say that was all the temperance people wanted. I have said that many of them present wanted the insertion of a prohibition plank; but, failing that, they desired a plebiscite plank.

Mr. FOSTER. Was not this the expression made use of by Mr. Spence—that if they could not get a prohibition plank they had better have half a loaf than no bread?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is excellent philosophy, which the world at large accepts. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has attempted to convey the impression that the temperance people did not want the plebiscite. I have said frankly that the temperance advocates favoured a plank in favour of prohibition. But it is a fact, as every one present at that convention knows, that they were pleased to have the plebiscite, regarding it as a forward movement. The words of the resolution are as follows:

That whereas public attention is at present much directed to the consideration of the admittedly great evils of intemperance, it is desirable that the mind of the people should be clearly ascertained on the question of prohibition by means of a Dominion plebiscite.

Let it, then, be distinctly understood—and it is of importance, in view of the fact that when we leave this House at the close of the session, we must go before the people from time to time, in various parts of the country, to discuss the issues of the day—let it be understood and no longer disputed that the Liberal party in convention, the only way by which it can lay down its platform, did declare that it was in favour of ascertaining the mind of the people, but it never declared that it was desirous of passing a prohibitive law; on the contrary, it declared, by refusing to pass a prohibition plank, that it was of opinion that public opinion had not then advanced sufficiently to justify such a measure. The Liberal party declared for the plebiscite to ascertain the mind of the people, but they did not consent to insert in the platform a plank in favour of prohibition; and, whenever it is said, either in this House, or out of it, that the Liberal

party in 1893, promised the enactment of the prohibitory law, that is a pure fabrication.

Now, the next point was that the Liberal party, by the plebiscite, gave some promise to the people. The adoption of the plebiscite, after all, was not a new principle. It was new in the width to which it was applied; but the principle of settling the liquor question by direct vote of the people is not new. Under the legislation of most of our provinces, provision is made that licenses may be granted only as they are favoured by a certain proportion of the electors—that is that legislation on this subject by the province or by municipal councils should not be without limits, but that you should, to a certain extent, invoke the aid of public opinion before a license is granted. You say that a license should only be granted when such a proportion of the electors petition in favour of it. After all, the plebiscite was only an extension of that principle, a recognition of the right of the people to be consulted by a direct vote upon that question, which was regarded as separate and apart from the ordinary questions of government. So we come to the time when the Plebiscite Bill was brought into this House.

The hon. gentleman said this afternoon, again and again, that there was a great lack of candour on the part of the government with regard to the purpose of that Bill. He said that if the government had only told the people fairly and squarely that they did not intend to recognize a mere majority of voters as being entitled to rule in this matter, that would have been a fair and candid thing; but inasmuch as they did not do that, inasmuch as they were guilty of a complete concealment, inasmuch as they concealed in many ways the views which the government entertained, then the people of the country were misled, and they never knew until after the plebiscite was all over, that a majority of the votes cast at the poll was not to prevail. That is the substance of the hon. gentleman's argument. I said I hoped to establish that, in that as in other things, the hon. gentleman was mistaken. Now, it happens that if there is to be any dispute as to the views of the government on the question, we can turn to the public records, and show conclusively that every temperance man in Canada, when he was called upon to cast his vote at the time of the plebiscite, knew that there could be no prohibitory law, unless there was a strong public opinion manifested as a result of that vote. There was no concealment. The question was considered, and was dealt with in the Senate.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, the arrival of six o'clock interrupted an address which I intended to

be quite short, for I can assure you that at this stage of the session, I have no desire to make any extended remarks. At the moment when you left the Chair I was dealing with the question of the passing of the Plebiscite Act in the session of 1898, and particularly with that part of the speech of the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) in which he somewhat severely arraigned the government for what he was pleased to call their complete concealment of the views expressed subsequently as to the effect of the vote that was to be taken. The hon. gentleman laboured to make it appear that at the time the Plebiscite Act was passed, the electors of Canada were led to believe that if, as a result of the vote, a majority of the votes cast should be in favour of prohibition, then, the government would proceed to enacting a prohibitory law. Does any one suppose, the hon. gentleman asks, that any temperance man in Canada would have gone to the poll and cast a vote in favour of prohibition if he had not been led to believe that a majority of the votes then cast would prevail. I suppose the hon. gentleman, who, I am sorry to see is not present, would admit, as we all admit, that the prohibitionists of Canada are among our most intelligent people, that they are, as a rule, men of education, men who take a keen interest in public affairs, men who watch the proceedings of parliament closely, and who certainly watched very closely the proceedings of parliament in relation to this question. In the light of what the hon. gentleman said this afternoon, he would be surprised to learn, although he must have known it before, but must have forgotten it, that the statement he made that the government had concealed their views as to the effect of the vote was entirely inaccurate. It happened that while that particular phase of the question was not much discussed in this House the question was pressed home to the ministers of the Crown in another branch of parliament, and I am permitted by the rules of parliament to refer to this matter for the purpose of quoting a declaration made by ministers of the Crown on the part of public policy. In the Senate this question of the effect of the vote that was to be taken under the Plebiscite Act was brought to the notice of ministers of the government and the views which prevailed then were elicited. I find, quoting from the Senate *Hansard*, 1898, page 1139, that an hon. member of the Senate (Mr. Perley), brought this question directly to the notice of the government. He said:

I should like to ask the government, now that this vote will be taken in the same manner that members are elected to the House of Commons, whether that implies a majority of the votes cast will, if in favour of prohibition, decide the matter. A member of the House of Commons is elected by a majority of votes. Now, I understand this election is to be on the same principle.

That is the question which was presented to the ministers in the other Chamber by Mr. Perley. Now, I shall quote the answer of Mr. Scott, Secretary of State :

No. The only resemblance that it bears to the House of Commons election is that the electoral districts are the same, but certainly the result does not carry with it the consequences that a bare majority in the House of Commons carries. A majority of one may carry in the House of Commons, but I do not think the government would be quite justified in passing a prohibition Bill if the majority was so narrow.

Clearly showing that the principle of the enactment of a prohibitory measure upon a majority of the votes to be cast at the plebiscite was not admitted by the government, as stated at that time. The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills) also spoke on the subject, and I quote his statement of the policy of the government. He said :

My hon. friend will see this, that the object of taking a vote is not to shirk responsibility in the matter. It is to ascertain public sentiment, and whether that public sentiment is strong enough, in case the government should submit such a measure, to sustain the Bill. Now, the vote polled might be very small, so small as to be no indication, taken by itself as a simple majority vote, of what the public sentiment was. The public sentiment might be gathered from the indifference of the population rather than from their active approval of prohibition; and the action that is to be taken upon the vote will certainly depend in a large degree upon the interest the people take, and the extent to which the voting population come out and support a proposition in favour of prohibition.

Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) laboured this afternoon at some considerable length to make out that the government had concealed their views on the subject, and that the electors who favoured prohibition went to the polls with the full and complete understanding that if a majority of votes should be cast in favour of prohibition a prohibitory law would be enacted. The language I have quoted from two ministers of the Crown shows that that question was fully and fairly considered and that the statements made by these two members of the government were the very reverse of what the hon. member for York to-day assumes to be the ministerial position. Now, I shall quote what another hon. Senator (Mr. Ferguson) said, in dealing with this question :

There is to be no prohibition unless the majority is overwhelming.

That was the view taken by an opponent of the government at the time the Plebiscite Act was passed. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that I should point out that the whole ground of the hon. gentleman's contention this afternoon, that the government led the public to believe that a prohibitory law would be passed if it should appear that a mere majority of votes were

cast in favour of it, is cut away, and that the position of the government was the very reverse of that which he assumed it to be.

Now, although I do not need to dwell upon the plebiscite itself, or the result of the plebiscite, a passing reference must be made to it. There were cast in favour of prohibition 22½ per cent of the electors on the roll; there were cast against prohibition 21½ per cent and 56 per cent of the votes was silent. The hon. gentleman referred again and again to the statement of the Premier that the will of the people must prevail. That, Sir, is good Liberal doctrine; the will of the people must prevail, but not the will of 22½ per cent of the people of Canada upon any question, and surely, above all things, upon a question of this character, which requires a very strong public sentiment. We should have a very strong public opinion to enforce any such law. I put out of sight the question of Quebec, which has been frequently referred to. I do not for a moment go so far as some hon. gentlemen may be disposed to go as to the effect of one province having a strong view against the other provinces, on a particular question. I think in a country like ours, with so many diversities of interest, if one province should have, on any public question, strong views at variance with the views of the majority on that question, that grave consideration, that moderation, that conciliation, that due regard to the wishes and views and to the prejudices which may prevail in that province, no matter what province it may be, should be exercised by the majority; but if all these things have been considered, if due allowance has been made for all these conditions, which should have consideration, if the majority of the people of the Dominion, as a whole, should agree upon any public policy for the welfare of the Dominion, then, I say that the people of the province forming the minority ought to feel it their duty to accept and adopt the views of Canada, which must be carried out. But, for the purposes of the present argument I want to leave out the question of the Quebec vote, and I will leave out the question of the vote against prohibition. I rest my view of the question upon the vote cast in favour of prohibition, and that vote being only 22½ per cent of the electors on the roll, I think we may fairly say to the strongest temperance man in Canada that it does not represent the overwhelming public opinion which is necessary for the enforcement of a prohibitory law. I have said that in reference to a law of this kind it is particularly desirable that you should have a strong public opinion behind it, and in that I am merely echoing what has been said by a number of hon. gentlemen. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), this afternoon, used almost the same language when he said, that, in a case of this kind, it would be folly to attempt to pass a prohibi-

tory law unless you had a very strong public opinion behind it. I might refer to the illustrations of that which are afforded in the counties which have adopted the Scott Act. In the lower provinces a very large proportion of the constituencies are under the Scott Act, but I am afraid that hon. gentlemen representing those constituencies will have to say that in some instances the Scott Act is not very rigidly enforced. It is one thing to vote for prohibition and it is another thing to enforce the law. In the operations of the Scott Act I am sure that every hon. gentleman who has any experience with that Act knows that there are many cases in which we have carried the Scott Act with an overwhelming vote, and where you find that there is no real public opinion for the purpose of enforcing the law. That is particularly true of all legislation dealing with the social habits of the people, such as this. I know that some respected temperance friends will be found saying that it is just as easy to enforce a prohibitory law as it is to enforce a law against robbery or murder. That is a very common saying, but I believe the experience of every hon. member who has thought over the matter will show him the difference. There are certain crimes in the eyes of the law which are also crimes in the eyes of society, and there are certain things which, although they are crimes in the eyes of the law, are not universally looked upon by society as crimes. I suppose that in any one of our towns, if a leading man, a deacon or an elder of the church, were going along the street and saw a thief robbing his neighbour's shop, he would at once alarm the police and would give evidence against that man and have him punished. But, if in the next block he should look into the window and see the license law violated almost openly he would pass by on the other side, and he would not go to the magistrate's office and give his evidence and prosecute the offender. In the one case there is a public opinion which supports the law; in the other case there is a weak sort of opinion in favour of the law, but there is really no zeal in the enforcement of it. The view held by a great many is that of the man who was asked if he were in favour of the Scott Act, and he replied: I am in favour of the law, but I am against the enforcement of it. There is a great deal of that feeling in the Dominion of Canada. There are a great many people who in an indifferent way are prepared to say they are in favour of prohibition, but it is another thing to get them to put their hands to the plough and to support the zealous temperance men who want to enforce the law. Therefore, I say that it is of particular importance that you do not attempt to pass a law of that character, unless you have the strong public opinion of the community behind you.

I have pointed out that there could not have been any misunderstanding as to the attitude of the government, such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) referred to. The attitude of the government most distinctly was not that a prohibitory law would result from the approval of prohibition by a bare majority at the polls. The attitude of the government was that the vote was taken to test public opinion, and that the action to be taken would depend largely upon the volume of public opinion that might be manifested in favour of the Act. I say that this not only was a reasonable and a sensible view, but it was the view which the temperance men themselves took at the time. There was no deception; there was no misunderstanding. Turn back to the files of the temperance papers at the time of the plebiscite, and you will find frequent articles calling upon the electorate to come out in strength to vote, telling them distinctly that if they did not poll a strong vote they could not expect their cause to succeed. I have a distinct recollection of an article, it was not an editorial, written by a correspondent in the *Wesleyan*, published in Halifax, one of the strongest temperance papers in Canada. I refer to this because it is in my own province and came under my particular notice. That article was an urgent appeal to the electors of Canada who favoured prohibition to cast a strong vote, and it pointed out that if there was a weak vote in favour of prohibition the temperance people could not expect the government or parliament to pass a prohibitory law. That was the attitude of the temperance people generally. I am informed that a very prominent temperance advocate of the province of Ontario, Mr. Buchanan of Hamilton, editor of the *Templar*, made a tour of the maritime provinces during the plebiscite, and I am told that at every meeting he addressed in the lower provinces he warned the temperance men against the dangers of a small vote, and he pointed out distinctly that if the vote in favour of prohibition was small they could not expect that a prohibitory law would be enacted. That, I repeat, was the ground taken by the advocates of prohibition generally. There is, therefore, no foundation for the statement, that there was any misunderstanding or any concealment whatever as to the attitude of the government, and I say further, that there was no misunderstanding whatever amongst the temperance men as to the consequence of the vote. They understood that if there was a small vote there would be no prohibitory law. When the result of the plebiscite became known, I think I am correct in saying that the vote was a great disappointment to the active zealous temperance men of the Dominion who did think that the prohibition sentiment of the country was much stronger than it proved

to be. After the result of that vote became known many of the leading temperance men throughout the Dominion recognized that in the presence of such a vote it would be unreasonable to look to the government to pass a prohibitory law. Every hon. gentleman who has followed the discussion can, I am sure, mention the names of distinguished temperance men who took that view. Among others, I remember the attitude taken by the Rev. Dr. Potts, a very distinguished Methodist divine, whose loyalty to the temperance cause is beyond question. He was reported in the press, right after the plebiscite vote, as having said:

The Rev. Dr. Potts said that in his opinion the vote polled for prohibition was not large enough to warrant a demand for the enactment of a prohibitory law.

No one will question the loyalty of Dr. Potts to the temperance cause. Men may differ from him, but no member in this House need be ashamed to stand on a temperance platform and to say that he decided in this matter in the same way as such a prominent temperance man as the Rev. Dr. Potts. My hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig), was frank enough to say (and in that he but repeated a former statement), that he did not believe there was any justification for a prohibitory law in the light of the vote that was passed. My hon. friend (Mr. Craig) went further, and with perhaps a little severity—I will not say who was hit by it—he said that such was the general view of the hon. members of this House, though they were not all going to vote that way. I believe, however, that his is a fair and reasonable view, and my hon. friend (Mr. Craig) is a distinguished temperance man. Mr. J. S. Robertson, secretary of the Canadian Temperance League, is quoted as having said:

I do not think, in view of the smallness of the majority, that the government would be justified in legislating on the lines of prohibition. . . . Looking at the matter from a Dominion standpoint, and as a citizen, I certainly think that the government should not attempt a prohibitory law.

Only last week a very distinguished Baptist minister, the Rev. Dr. Goodspeed, of Toronto, formerly of New Brunswick, addressed the Baptists at a convention in the lower provinces. I read in the papers a very brief report of the discussion, and Dr. Goodspeed is credited with the remark that if he had stood in the place of Sir Wilfrid Laurier after the plebiscite vote he would not have felt justified in pressing the enactment of a prohibitory law.

We thus, Mr. Speaker, have the evidence, that the view which the government took of this matter, while it may not be the view of all temperance men—and I do not pretend it is—is the view of many of the

best temperance men in Canada. I think it is a fair and reasonable view. I have said, Sir, that there has been an effort made by some hon. gentlemen to make this a political question. I regret it, but we cannot ignore the fact that such an attempt has been made. Now, it would probably be fair and reasonable to make this a party question if either the one party or the other in this country were in favour of prohibition, but I do not say that, inasmuch as neither political party is prepared to declare, as a part of its platform, that it will enact a prohibitory law, then the question should not be one of a party character, and it should form no part in the discussion of party issues.

I believe, Sir, that in my own constituency, in my province generally, and throughout Canada, there are many hundreds of good temperance men who will not view this matter just as we do. They are men who would place the cause of temperance above every other cause, and who would leave the Liberal party in a moment and join the Conservatives if the Conservatives would fairly and squarely and honestly adopt a prohibitory policy. But while that is true, while these men are quite prepared to abandon their affiliation with the Liberal party if they could join a party which would give them prohibition, I am here to say that they are much too intelligent to be led astray by anything which has come from hon. gentlemen opposite.

My hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig) said very fairly that this was a matter in which people should be candid. I agree with him. We want candour and frankness. We know where the Liberal party stand. The leader of the Liberal party, in his public letter, has declared, and we his colleagues and nearly all his supporters accept it, that the policy of this government is not to enact a prohibitory law at present, believing that the condition of public opinion does not justify the enactment, and would not render possible the enforcement of such a law. That is the position of the Liberal party. Now, what is the position of hon. gentlemen opposite? If they insist that this is to be a party question, then we have a right to know where they stand upon it. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) who is now present, in his speech this afternoon did not give us much information on that point. I must confess, after having listened to him somewhat attentively, that I really do not know at this moment whether he thinks we now ought to pass a prohibitory liquor law. If we are to have candour and frankness, I would be justified in asking him to say frankly, does he believe now that there should be passed in Canada a prohibitory liquor law? My hon. friend exercises his right of not answering. I am not complaining; my hon. friend has a right not to answer; but I am calling his attention to

the fact that in his speech this afternoon he did not give us any information on that point.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), who is now absent, has not given us any intimation during the present session of his view on this question. He has been discreetly silent. But he was not always silent. We have some information as to the view of that hon. gentleman. He was in the old country when the plebiscite took place. When the results were telegraphed over, the hon. gentleman was interviewed by a reporter of the *London Daily News*, and I have a newspaper clipping containing a portion of that interview. It was immediately after the taking of the vote in September, 1898:

'I suppose, Sir Charles, it may be taken for granted that the recent plebiscite has for the present put prohibition in Canada out of practical politics?'

'Quite so,' Sir Charles Tupper replied. 'The result of the plebiscite is a serious blow to the prohibitionist movement. The diminution of the prohibitionist vote, as compared with the provincial votes of a few years ago, will certainly be used as proof that the demand for the prohibition of the liquor traffic has declined.'

'Such experience as Canada has had of prohibition has not been very encouraging, has it?'

'There has been only one real general attempt at prohibition in a self-governing province, and that was in New Brunswick. There it utterly failed, and it resulted, not in the destruction of the liquor traffic, but in free trade in drink, with all legal restrictions removed. The people were glad enough to repeal the law and go back to license.'

That is the only utterance of the hon. leader of the opposition on the question of prohibition, and I do not imagine that any hon. gentleman will say that it indicates that he has any desire to see a prohibitory law enacted in Canada. Two other members of this House were recently called upon by a temperance organization down in my own province to define their position as to the enactment of a prohibitory law, and what was their answer? Unfortunately they did not see fit to say whether they wished to have a prohibitory law enacted at present or not. Both of those hon. gentlemen, the two hon. members for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper and Mr. Bell) declined to say whether the Conservative party favoured a prohibitory law or not; but they did say that they were prepared to punish the government which had violated its promises to the prohibitionists.

Well, I have shown the House, if it was necessary to show it, that there has been no promise made by this government or by the Liberal party on the question of prohibition which has not been fulfilled in its letter and its spirit. But I want to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite, who wish to make capital out of this question, that the people of Canada are too intelligent to allow the question to be monkeyed with.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are going to have that candour which my respected friend from East Durham thinks is so important. They have demanded of this government a declaration on the question: Are you prepared to support a prohibitory law, or are you not? They have had a full, frank and square declaration that this government is not prepared to enact a prohibitory law in the present state of public opinion. And if there is any man on the Conservative side who wants to get the votes of any Liberals on that issue, he must show those Liberals that the Conservative party have a platform on the question of prohibition and are prepared to do the thing which the Liberal party are not prepared to do. The gentleman who put the question to my hon. friends the members for Pictou was a Conservative, a clergyman, and a son of a much-respected member of the legislature of Nova Scotia who sat there in my day in opposition to me. This gentleman, Conservative though he was, refused to accept the answer of those gentlemen, but in a public statement has said that they must face the issue and state their position fairly and squarely; and I think that is a fair request. We on this side have stated our position; and, I repeat, if any Liberal elector of Canada is to be led off on that question, he is going to be intelligent enough to ask the opposition: What is your policy on the question, and where have you proclaimed that policy openly, publicly, in such a way that we can bind you to it?

Although prohibition cannot be enforced now, I am not going to say that it never can be attained. I was much impressed by what was said this afternoon by the right hon. leader of the government and by the hon. member for York as to the great progress which has been made in the temperance sentiment of the country. Unquestionably each one can testify that in his day there has been great progress in that direction. It is not long since drunkenness, if not fashionable, was tolerated in respectable society. Happily, that is no longer the case; but any man who drinks to excess in any social circle will be reminded of the fact. I remember a large public gathering in my native city some years ago—an old Scottish society, proud of its history. They were having a banquet, and the secretary brought up one of the volumes of its history and read from it an account of a banquet held a hundred years before. After reading the names of a number of prominent men who attended the banquet, he read a record of the number of bottles of wine that were consumed. By actual count there were three bottles to a man; and the secretary, after reading this item, said: 'Mr. President, in that day, it was three bottles to a man, but things have so changed now that we would consider it a very lavish allowance if we had three men to a bottle.'

Well, that incident, taken from the records of an ancient society in my province, fairly illustrates, in its own way, the great change that has come over the drinking habits of the people. No doubt to-day, while there is still much evil arising from the habit of drinking, while the evils of intemperance continue, there has been a vast improvement, and, I think, it would not be too much to say that the people of Canada, as a whole, are among the most temperate people on the earth. Therefore, the men who have laboured so long to bring about this good result have much reason to thank God and take new courage; and the only way in which they can continue doing successful work, is to go on in the old way of educating the people and thus bring nearer the time when a public opinion will have been created that will enable a prohibitory law to be enforced. Until that moment comes, I am speaking the views of many honest fair-minded men of Canada, when, I say, that the cause of temperance would not be advanced by the passing of a prohibitory law at the present day.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I do not intend to speak in the name of the opposition, but as my hon. friend did a moment ago, I wish to say a few words to express to the House the ideas that have come to my mind when listening to the debate this afternoon. To-morrow, when the people interested in this discussion read in the papers all the philosophy or sophistry that we have had this afternoon, they may come to the conclusion that this is the last time we will hear of prohibition in this parliament. My experience does not go to show that that is the correct view. We heard of prohibition twenty years ago, we hear of it to-day, and we shall hear of it again.

Another thing that struck me, is that after all, the coming of this government into power, may not have been an unmixed evil, because under the Conservative administration there sprang up a number of fads. There was the Patron fad, which was a side issue, and there was the agitation for prohibition by people, some of whom were sincere and others who went into it for the political capital they could make out of it. What was the result? Session after session we had gentlemen getting up in parliament and speaking in favour of a prohibitory liquor law. Some of them, no doubt, were very sincere in their opinions, but others probably had only a political object in view. The result was that one day the late government—and I may say that hon. gentlemen opposite to-day are not a great deal worse than those who preceded them in this respect—the late government, not wishing to take the question by the horns made a diversion. They thought that after all, hearing this prohibition advocated session after session, there might be something in

Mr. FIELDING.

it, so they appointed a commission to go around the country, and find out whether the people wanted such a policy or not. This commission was composed of men who enjoyed the respect and esteem of both political parties. Their work cost the country about \$80,000, and they made a report, and we might then have thought that surely that was the end of the matter. But no, hon. gentlemen opposite who were then preparing a platform on which to appeal to the country, put into that platform the question of a plebiscite. The prohibitionists, many of them, then said: Well, there is a party of honest men, there is a party which has been in opposition twenty years, and expects to come into power, and it is going to give us prohibition, because it has promised to have a plebiscite taken, and abide by the result. The prohibitionists said, we have a majority in every province, it is true, but we have not succeeded in getting prohibition, because the constitution was against it, but when the government calls for a plebiscite throughout the whole Dominion, if the result is in favour of prohibition, we shall have certainly a law prohibiting the liquor traffic. This gave renewed hope to the prohibitionists in the country, and there is no doubt that a great many voted for hon. gentlemen opposite, because they expected the plebiscite would give them what they desired.

The hon. the Minister of Finance, in a very clever way, explained, that in the Senate two or three men had asked the government whether it would require a simple majority of the votes, or, if not, what majority it would require in order to warrant the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law, and Mr. Scott replied to Mr. Perley in the Senate, that the same rule would not govern in the case of the plebiscite as in the case of an ordinary election. Although in an election, one vote of a majority would be sufficient, in the case of the plebiscite, a larger majority would be required. Let me tell the hon. Minister of Finance, that this is the first time I heard of this reply, and if that be the case, how many people in the country heard of it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is hard on the Senate.

Mr. BERGERON. No, but I think that the opinion of my hon. friend to my left (Mr. Foster), is the proper one, namely, that the people of the country were under the impression that if the majority of the vote cast in the plebiscite, was in favour of prohibition, the government was pledged to give it to us, and the people went to the polls under that impression.

We have heard the speeches of my hon. friends opposite, and I may say, they are the very same speeches that their opponents gave expression to twenty years ago. It was agreeable to me this afternoon, to hear my right hon. friend, in his quiet, calm way,

express the opinion he did; but if he had expressed that same opinion when he was in opposition, we would probably never have heard of prohibition again.

We have three propositions before us. I do not want to say anything against my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), because I am convinced—and I say it in all sincerity—that he is honest in his views. Although it has been said that he might have brought on his motion at the commencement of the session, or proposed it as a vote of want of confidence in the administration, still I accept his reply, believing in his sincerity, but I want to ask him whether he did not know before, and whether he does not know now, that the proposition he makes, is purely and simply impracticable. It is impracticable for the reasons given by the right hon. the First Minister. How could we enact a law in the House of Commons of Canada for six provinces, and leave one province aside? We cannot do it. So that, while believing in his honesty, I say that he has submitted a proposition to the House which cannot be put into effect. The second proposition is that of my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. McClure). The issue he submits is a straight one. I do not say that there was a conciliabule in advance among these three hon. gentlemen who have submitted proposals to settle the question, but it is unfortunate that we should not have an opportunity of voting on the straight question, but be called on to vote on a side issue. The motion of the member for Colchester is a straight one, and I would say to the Minister of Finance, that if he cannot make a party question of this matter, there is one thing he can do, and that is let us have a straight vote on the motion of the hon. member for Colchester; and if members of parliament will only have the manliness to explain their vote to the electorate, we will not be called on to vote again on this subject.

My hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Parmelee), brings on a side issue, which will probably carry the majority, as such side issues always do on this question. We have never seen a vote taken purely and simply on this question, whether the people are in favour of prohibition or not—but have always had some side issue, such as that brought in by the hon. member for Shefford, which will carry the majority vote, and that will be the end of the matter, until in some other session, somebody else rises and proposes something else.

The hon. Minister of Finance spoke of a plebiscite being taken in some other places; but, at least, he will admit that it is not English. I do not think there is any example in England of a plebiscite being taken. The taking of a plebiscite is a party question, it is a party trick, if I may use the word, to gull the people into believing that the party proposing it are in favour of doing a thing, but affording an excuse for not

doing it. When they called for the plebiscite in the different provinces, did they not know that whether the answer was yes or no, they could do nothing, that the constitution of Canada stood in the way? But what is being done in Manitoba? Hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that Hon. Hugh John Macdonald, whether he is Conservative or Liberal, is doing what might be done by any leader who wanted to be sincere. He has brought in a prohibition law for the province. Why? Because it had been talked of in the province and had been promised by both political parties. Though he does not believe in it as a moral force, though he does not think that prohibition will bring about temperance, still, as a way of settling the question, he is bringing down a prohibition law for the province of Manitoba. The second reading, I believe, was passed to-day. In this parliament we have been, purely and simply, playing football with this question, and the honest prohibitionists will know what they can depend upon from politicians sitting in this House. Speaking for myself, I say I do not believe in prohibition; I believe in temperance, and I believe in good licenses and good laws; but I do not believe you will obtain what you desire, the advancement of the cause of temperance, by the help of prohibition. We have some small examples in our own country. We have heard of the Scott Act being enacted in different counties, and sometimes carried by a majority of two thousand one year, and, three years afterwards, defeated by a majority of two thousand. In the county of Brome, represented here by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), they had the Scott Act, but after all the work done by my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher), on the hustings and everywhere, in favour of prohibition, the county of Brome, if I am not mistaken, defeated the Scott Act by over six hundred votes. It only shows that you cannot maintain a cast-iron law of this kind. This parliament should leave matters in the hands of the local legislatures, which are called upon to enact the license laws; and the better laws they enact, the better it will be for them and for the Dominion. The Finance Minister tells us of a deacon seeing a thief stealing something at once informs the police and has him arrested, but if he sees men drinking out of hours or sees liquor served in contravention of the law, he does nothing. Why is that? It strikes me that that deacon, or whoever you may call him, acts as we are doing in this House—he is afraid of public opinion, instead of doing his duty like an honest man. In speaking, I speak for nobody but myself. But, I say the honest people of this country will be thoroughly disgusted with the House of Commons if we go on discussing this question as we have been doing. Let us face the question, discuss it and decide it in a manly way. We are not here to be subject

to caprice, but to teach and to make public opinion. Let us take up the question proposed by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure), and vote on it according to our consciences and our best ideas. We shall be judged by the people; and whatever the judgment, it will bring here a House of Commons that will either enact prohibition or refuse to enact it, and thus settle the question.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I had not intended to say anything except to make a few remarks on the constitutional question. But the rather singular speech of my hon. friend the acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Foster) induces me to make a few remarks on the position that he and his party occupy. I regret that his speech assumed a party character. It was painfully evident to everybody who listened to him that the speech was an attempt to put his opponents in a false position on this question, without defining his own. I repeat what the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) said, that we stand in the awkward position that, with the exception of the stand taken by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), the opposition, through their leader, had not declared what their policy is. The acting leader of the opposition has condemned the government for not introducing an immediate measure of prohibition consequent on the plebiscite vote; but he has not stated whether, if he were in our place, he would introduce that measure; or, if the whirligig of time should bring its revenges, and he should come into the government again, whether he is prepared to adopt prohibition as a plank in his political platform. I have no right to assume that he has changed the opinions he so fairly and emphatically expressed in this House some years ago. I remember some years ago he moved a resolution in this House affirming the principle of prohibition to be the correct principle. The then hon. member for Cardwell, Hon. Thomas White, moved an amendment to that resolution to the effect that effect should be given to that principle as and when public opinion was ripe for it. The words were:

And the House is prepared, so soon as public opinion is sufficient to sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation, so far as the same is within the competency of the parliament of Canada.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) approved of that rider being added to his resolution. Subsequently, another amendment was moved by the hon. member for Shelburne, Mr. Robertson, to the effect:

That this House is of opinion that the public sentiment of Canada calls for immediate legislation to that end.

And my hon. friend the acting leader of the opposition voted for that amendment and

Mr. BERGERON.

for the immediate application of the principles of prohibition. Time went on, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) gained by experience larger information, and his opinions became more formed. And when, some years afterwards, he stood in a more prominent and responsible position, in the year 1891, he made a public confession and recantation of his principles on that question. I am not going to make any charges against him for so doing. I hold it is a high moral act for a man, and one to be commended, if having honestly changed his opinion he has the courage to stand up and say so. If I quote what the hon. gentleman said, it is to show what his political principles on this question were, and I assume that, after having stated them there, they are the same as he announced in the year 1891. He said:

I propose to do what is honest and fair on this question, and I will make an honest confession before this House to-night. The only inconsistency which has been urged against me is that on one occasion I voted for immediate prohibition when Mr. Robertson, of Shelburne, brought that up as an amendment. I did it, and I did it in a moment of weakness. I did it, not because I was convinced that the country was then ready for immediate prohibition, but because I felt that the lash was raised outside of that criticism and that anathema which would be hurled against me if I did not vote for immediate prohibition, and I voted for it. There is my candid confession. Take it, and make what you please of it; but from this time forth I propose to do what I consider to be right and honest, and I will do nothing further and nothing less.

Therefore, the hon. gentleman, in 1891, proclaimed that he was recanting the vote which he had given in favour of immediate prohibition, and he went on to give the reasons why, reasons which I think did credit to himself and to the position which he was then taking. Now, assuming that the hon. gentleman stands in that position to-night, that he is not in favour of immediate prohibition, that he has seen reason to change his views, that he has recanted again, and is back again where he started from in 1884, then I will ask him to say so, because it will relieve my mind and the minds of a great many temperance men in this country. Is the hon. gentleman prepared, if he was in power to-morrow, to introduce a measure of prohibition of the liquor traffic throughout the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. BERGERON. That is an argument, he is not in power. You are in power, why do you not act?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The ex-Minister of Finance, the leader of the opposition, does not answer. He has a perfect right not to answer, but the public will take note of the fact that he has been challenged to answer. I do not wish to press the matter further than it ought to be pressed. I have

read his recantation in 1891, in which he stated that he voted for immediate prohibition in a moment of weakness. I say if he has changed his mind upon prohibition again, and if he is now prepared to vote for it, having recanted again, I shall be very glad to hear it. All I have to say is that the people of this country who have been treated to so many moral lectures by the hon. gentleman, and the government who have been lectured for inconsistency upon the question, certainly have a right to know. The earnest people throughout this country do not want this question shilly-shalleyed with. Could anything be straighter or plainer than the government policy which has just been announced by the Minister of Finance? Could anything be plainer, or straighter, or more honest than the declaration made by the Prime Minister to the delegation that waited upon him after the plebiscite vote had been taken? Did not everybody in this country know exactly what the position of the government was? Could anything be plainer, or straighter, or clearer than the government policy announced by the Hon. Mr. Mills and the Hon. Mr. Scott when that Plebiscite Act was passing through the Senate? Could anything be plainer or straighter than the declaration made by the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig) when the Plebiscite Act was passing through this House, when he stated in presence of the government that nobody would venture to act upon the plebiscite unless at least 50 per cent of the electorate voted in favour of it? Nobody dissented from that. I will say that while the Liberal party called for that plebiscite—and I will show in a moment why they called for it—there was not a man in this House who believed that any government, I care not whether this government or their opponents, would venture to place a prohibition Act on the statute-book as the result of a plebiscite unless there was a majority of the whole electorate voting in favour of prohibition.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the minister how he has ascertained how many voters there are?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The lists show that plain enough.

Mr. WALLACE. Will he permit me to give an example from the west riding of York? At the last general election there were 6,713 votes polled out of a total number of names on the voters' list in West York of 18,911, or nearly three times as many as were polled at the Dominion election. That shows that you cannot get a majority at a Dominion election, although there were three candidates at that election, there was a hot canvass all round, and the largest vote ever polled was at that election in 1896.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman selected a case to suit himself, no doubt.

Mr. WALLACE. My own constituency.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It does not affect the argument I am making at all, an argument which must commend itself to his mind, and that is that in legislation of this kind, before you can act you must be satisfied that public opinion is right in favour of it, and you cannot be satisfied that public opinion is right in favour of it unless they express themselves at the poll, and you cannot have that expression of opinion at the polls if you take it at a general election mixed up with a great many other questions; but you must take it divorced from all other questions, so that you can have a yea and nay vote upon that particular question.

Now, I want to show hon. gentlemen opposite, who think that plebiscite plank was adopted in the convention of the Liberal party in 1893 as a political dodge, why that platform was adopted. I have read from the journals of the House in 1884 the resolution which was then adopted, when the House of Commons pledged itself that as soon as public opinion was ripe on the question of prohibition and so expressed itself, they would adopt prohibition. Then again in 1884 and in 1889—this question was cropping up always—the House of Commons again voted:

That in the opinion of this House it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors except for sacramental, medicinal, scientific and mechanical purposes, when the public sentiment of the country is ripe for the reception and the enforcement of such a measure of prohibition.

That was the form of the resolution adopted in this House in 1884, and in 1889, and at several other times. Then the question came up from the temperance people everywhere: How are we to know when public opinion is ripe? Parliament keeps on saying: We will do this when public opinion is ripe. When is it to be ripe? And the Liberal party said: There is only one way of doing it. If you mix it up with other party questions, with the thousand and one questions on which political parties go to the elections, you will never ascertain whether public opinion is ripe or not. We are prepared to test whether it is ripe or not, we are not committing ourselves one way or the other, we simply proclaim as a plank in our platform that we will have a plebiscite on this one question divorced from all other political questions, and we will find out what public opinion is. Now, we found out what public opinion was. I have not heard yet one man from the other side of the House rise up and say that he believed that plebiscite vote showed that public opinion was ripe for the passing of a prohibition measure.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? If another plebiscite vote were taken, and if over 50 per cent of the votes were cast in favour of it, and the province of Quebec, as was the case in 1898, was against it, would he then bring in a prohibition law?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is a very fair question, and I will give the hon. gentleman an answer. In 1891, when I went through an election in my own county, I was waited upon by leading prohibitionists there and was asked to give a pledge, and I gave a pledge. Here is the pledge which I gave then, after this advanced resolution had been placed upon the books of the House of Commons, that when the country was ripe for prohibition they would get it. They said: When do you think it is ripe? Are you prepared to pledge yourself? This is what I then said, and what I hold to now, without wishing to bind any of my colleagues. It was signed by myself and my colleague then running in that election:

In our opinion, the true and only way of reaching a practical legislative conclusion upon the important subject of prohibition is (by submitting it to a vote of the people at an election to be specially called for the purpose.

Let the people vote yea or nay on the question of prohibition, pure and simple, disentangled from all party politics or other issues.

If the result of the vote shows a majority of the electorate to favour prohibition of the liquor traffic, then the government for the time being must introduce legislation to carry out the people's verdict, and if elected, such legislation, by whomsoever introduced, will have our hearty support.

Now, I think my hon. friend will do me the justice to say that nothing could be plainer than that declaration of my views that I gave then and that I give now. But unfortunately the plebiscite vote when it was taken showed that instead of a majority of the electorate being in favour of prohibition there was only 23 per cent of the electorate in favour of it. Therefore, it did not come anywhere near the point, in my humble judgment, that was necessary to justify me in acting.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to ask the hon. gentleman one more question. This time I will make the vote larger. Suppose that 75 per cent of the electors of the Dominion were in favour, and the province of Quebec would be opposed to it, would he then introduce a prohibitory law?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not going to deal with academic questions. I am dealing with practical facts. No such a vote as that has been given. We have not got the vote. We have not got 50 per cent, nor 40 per cent, nor 30 per cent. I repeat what I said before, that I have failed to witness any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who has declared in his honest judgment that the vote was

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

sufficient to justify the government in bringing in a prohibitory measure. Now, I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to a very worthy speech which I remember to have been delivered in this House many years ago by an apostle of prohibition in this country. I have had the honour of a seat in this House from a time away back in the early 80's and in the session of 1884 this question of prohibition was discussed. I remember Sir Leonard Tilley, who was one of the oldest and most consistent temperance men in this House, delivering a speech on this question. He was then, I was going to say, gray with years. At all events, he was then a very elderly gentleman and with all the experience he had gained as a minister of the Crown in New Brunswick and as a minister of the Crown in the Dominion, with all his experience as a leading temperance man of fifty years' standing he gave these views to the House:

As early as 1855 I introduced into the legislature of my own province one of the most stringent prohibitory Bills that was ever proposed in any legislature or parliament in the world. Previous to the introduction of that Bill we had, as we thought, educated the people of New Brunswick to the point that such a law, if enacted, would be supported and sustained by the people. Reference was made by the hon. mover of this resolution to the number of petitions presented to the House of Commons in 1877; and if my memory serves me, in the province of New Brunswick, as far back as 1855, we had more signatures to petitions presented to the legislature of that province in favour of prohibition than were signed to the petitions presented to this House from the whole Dominion in 1877. They were brought into the House in the size of rolls of carpet by the hon. members who presented them. We thought that we had educated the people of that province up to such a point that if a prohibitory law was passed it would be enforced. We had three-fourths of the people of that province signing petitions in favour of prohibition. That law was passed by the Lower House by something like two-thirds majority, and it passed the Upper House by nearly the same majority; and it was passed because of the strong arguments and facts presented, and because of the statistics we had collected as to the effect of the traffic in New Brunswick from 1852 to 1855, and which were so convincing that men who differed from us in opinion gave us their support, and enabled us to carry the measure by the majority stated. That law went into force on the 1st of January, 1856.

Then the hon. gentleman described with very dramatic effect the consequences which ensued upon the coming into force of that Act. It remained in force for four months, and then such chaos was brought about in New Brunswick that the governor of the province insisted on having dissolution that the government might go back to the people and ascertain whether the people were in favour of the law or not:

We were thrown into an election, and very many of those who had signed the petition went back on us; they voted against this law, and a majority were returned to vote in favour of its repeal. Under these circumstances, and

believing as I do now, that if public sentiment is not sufficiently educated to sustain a prohibition law, the passage would do harm instead of good, instead of abandoning anything by accepting the original resolution, even as amended, I hold that if this motion be carried the cause of prohibition will have made a great step in advance.

I again quote further on :

I am not quite sure but that some hon. gentlemen who voted against this proposition to-day did not then vote for the proposition moved by Mr. Ross. That, however, does not matter at present. I believe in prohibition; I believe it will yet come in Canada; but I believe it would be the greatest injury to the permanent success of prohibition were there such a law enacted to-day, because I know, from the experience of the past, that it could not be successfully carried out. I have the courage of my convictions, and am prepared to vote for the principle of prohibition, but I have also the courage of my convictions when I say that the country is not yet sufficiently educated to enable that principle to be successfully carried into operation.

Further on, he says :

I speak with the experience I had thirty years ago, and have had ever since 1856. When the convention was held in Montreal, I was written to by one of the leading friends of temperance asking my opinion. I was unable to be present, but I wrote a letter in reply, which letter Mr. Ross read at a convention held in Ottawa. What was the opinion I then expressed? I stated that if they decided to submit the proposal to the popular vote—

I ask particular attention to this :

—they should not suggest less than a three-fifths vote, because, if carried by a bare majority and without public sentiment behind it, the law would fail and the cause of temperance would be damaged instead of benefited.

Then again :

I say that I will be prepared to record my vote on any occasion in favour of prohibition, when we can say honestly that the public sentiment of Canada is so strong that we will be in a position to enforce it. But from my experience of what has taken place in the past, I cannot help being convinced that we are not to-day in that position. If a prohibitory law were enacted to-morrow, I am satisfied it could not be enforced, and nothing could do more damage to the cause of prohibition than the enactment of a law, followed by its non-enforcement and ultimate repeal.

Here, an apostle of temperance, in a speech to the House of Commons in 1884, after all the experience that he had acquired as Premier of New Brunswick, after he had introduced a law into the legislature, after the legislature had been petitioned to pass it by a larger number of petitioners than had ever presented petitions to the House of Commons from the whole Dominion of Canada, says that a law was passed when they thought they had public sentiment behind them, that four months afterwards it had to be repealed, that irremedial injury to the cause was done, that the cause was thrown back almost half a century, and he warns us that if we attempt to enact legislation of

this kind unless there are three-fifths of the popular votes behind it, it will fail. These wise words fell from the lips of Sir Leonard Tilley, and when we find that instead of having three-fifths we have only 23 per cent of the votes of the electorate polled in favour of prohibition, how could any one say that we have such a strong public sentiment behind us as would justify the government in the passage of such a measure? I stand here and I repeat again, and if I am wrong I desire to be contradicted, that I have not heard any hon. gentleman in the opposition ranks take the responsibility of saying that he believed the vote was sufficiently large to justify the government in introducing a prohibitory law.

Now, I desire to pass from that phase of the question and to just say a word of two upon the constitutional aspect of it. We have three propositions before us to-night. One is the proposition of my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). He asks the House to affirm what on the face of it appears to be a very fair proposition. He says that we have a large majority vote in all the provinces excepting the province of Quebec, and asks us to apply the principle of prohibition to Quebec because public sentiment is not ripe in that province for it, but asks to apply this principle to the other provinces which have voted largely in favour of it. Now, on the face of it there appears to be something pretty fair in that proposition. It has been shown by some hon. gentlemen that practically the proposition would not work out. But what I stand up to argue is not that it would not be practicable but that we cannot pass the law. Constitutionally, we are forbidden to pass any such law as this, for one, two, three, or four provinces of the Dominion, omitting any other province. The power of legislation on this matter is contained in the 91st section of the British North America Act. The 91st section gives us two different kinds of powers, one, the power to legislate for the peace, order and good government of Canada, always provided that in legislating under that power we legislate in relation to matters not coming within the class of subjects that are to be exclusively dealt with by the legislatures of the provinces. So that, while we might pass any law on a subject that the first part of section 91 gives power to legislate on; that is in regard to the peace, order and good government of Canada, we cannot do it if such legislation necessarily invades those subjects which have been assigned exclusively to the provinces to legislate upon. In another part of the section there are twenty-nine different classes of subjects upon which we have exclusive legislative authority, unlimited by any powers which the provincial legislatures have. In other words if we legislate upon any of the enumerated subjects referred to in section 91, we have plenary powers

as a parliament, no one can call our legislation in question; the courts cannot say it is ultra vires. But the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have determined in the liquor prohibition appeal of 1895, that we have no power to enact prohibition under any one of the twenty-nine classes of subjects assigned to us under the 91st section. It was argued that we had the power under the clause No. 2, for the regulation of trade and commerce, but the Privy Council determined positively that we had not that power, and that if we attempted to enact prohibition we would have to enact it under the general powers given under the first part of the section 'for the peace, order, and good government of Canada.' Then the question came up: Have the provincial legislatures the powers to enact prohibition? and hon. gentlemen will remember that there were a number of specific questions asked the Privy Council in that regard. They were asked:

Has the provincial legislature jurisdiction to prohibit the sale within the province of spirituous, fermented or other intoxicating liquors?

A substantial answer was given to that question and it was said: They had the power. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council held that the provincial legislature of Ontario had power to re-enact the 18th section of 53 Vic. in that province, an Act to amend the Liquor License Law Act, which was tantamount to prohibition, giving the municipalities power to enact prohibition. The Privy Council has declared therefore that the provincial legislatures have power to enact prohibition within the bounds of their respective provinces. That being the case; and if the provinces have power to pass prohibition, it does seem to be perfectly plain that we had no power to pass any such legislation for part of Canada only, under the general power to legislate for the peace, order and good government of Canada, nor have we any such power under any of the enumerated class of subjects which the 91st section of the British North America Act refers to us, and under which we have plenary powers to pass legislation.

Now, with respect to the particular point which my hon. friend (Mr. Flint) has embodied in his resolution, I want to call his attention and the attention of the House to what the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council said with reference to our power to pass partial prohibition. On page 363 of the Liquor Prohibition Appeal case, I find the following:

It is not impossible that the vice of intemperance may prevail in particular localities within a province, to such an extent as to constitute its cure by restricting or prohibiting the sale of liquor, a matter of a merely local or private nature, and therefore falling prima facie within No. 16. In that state of matters, it is conceded that the parliament of Canada could not imperatively enact a prohibitory law adapted and confined to the requirements of localities

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

within the province where prohibition was urgently needed.

Proposition No. 1, is therefore, that in the province of Ontario it does not lie in our power to pass prohibition for any one section of that province. That is a power which belongs exclusively to the province itself, and if you attempted to enact prohibition with regard to one county or one group of counties in the province of Ontario you would be distinctly legislating ultra vires and your legislation would be declared void.

Then as regards the whole province itself, they went on to lay down a similar proposition. They say:

The old Temperance Act of 1864 was passed for Upper Canada, or, in other words, for the province of Ontario; and its provisions, being confined to that province only, could not have been directly enacted by the parliament of Canada. In the present case, the parliament of Canada would have no power to pass a prohibitory law for the province of Ontario; and could, therefore, have no authority to repeal, in express terms, an Act which is limited in its operations to that province.

That is a judgment which comes from the highest judicial tribunal in this country, and if it be correct it would prevent this parliament from adopting the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Flint) or adopting legislation based upon it. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council say: You cannot pass prohibitory legislation with respect to a portion of a province; that is a matter which belongs entirely to the province itself; nor can you pass prohibition with regard to one province alone. Of course, it follows as a consequence that you cannot pass prohibition with regard to two provinces or three provinces. You can only pass prohibition when you are assuming to act under the general power given you in section 91, of legislating for the peace, order and good government of Canada as a whole. When we are asked to adopt legislation by my hon. friend (Mr. Flint):

That this parliament should without delay enact such measures as will secure the prohibition of the liquor traffic for beverage purposes in at least those provinces and territories which have voted in favour of such prohibition,

my hon. friend sees he is asking us to adopt legislation in direct opposition to the express law laid down by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1895. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint) does not want us to do that. That being so, we are referred back either to the amendment which is proposed by the hon. gentleman from Colchester (Mr. McClure) or the amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member from Shefford (Mr. Parmalee).

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Would the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) allow me to ask him a question before he leaves that part of his argument. Do I understand him to say: That the Privy Council held in

the liquor prohibition appeal that it would be beyond the powers of this parliament to pass a law prohibiting the sale of liquor in certain portions of the Dominion?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Yes.

Mr. **MONK.** For instance, to prohibit the sale of liquor in the Yukon or the North-west Territories or in two or more provinces.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I did not suppose that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) would have raised a doubt about it. Our powers with respect to the North-west Territories are somewhat different. I will repeat what I have stated. The Privy Council determined that by no one of the twenty-nine sections under which we have exclusive and plenary powers to legislate, could we enact a prohibitory law. The regulation of trade and commerce did not give us the right to pass a prohibitory law. No other specific subject assigned to us gave us that right. It is only under these specific subjects that we have the plenary power to legislate. If we legislate at all on prohibition we must legislate under the section giving us power to legislate for the peace, order and good government of Canada. In that way we are restricted, because we have only power to legislate for the peace, order and good government of Canada in relation to matters not coming within the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the legislatures of the provinces. Therefore, if we attempted to legislate under that clause and invaded provincial jurisdiction, our legislation would be void. It is laid down by the Privy Council in language which cannot be misunderstood that we have no power to enact a prohibitory law with regard to any particular portion of a province. We have no power, in the words of the Judicial Committee, to pass a prohibitory law for the province of Ontario, and therefore we have no power to pass it for the province of Ontario plus the maritime provinces.

Now, we come to the proposition of my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. McClure). While he offered his proposal as a thorough, out-and-out prohibitionist under all circumstances, he admitted that he could not expect a man who is not a thorough prohibitionist to vote for it in the face of the plebiscite vote. He admitted that the plebiscite vote did not justify his proposal, but he introduced it, because he was a prohibition man under all circumstances. He did not care whether the plebiscite vote was 33 per cent, or 13 per cent. The hon. gentleman is honest in his convictions, but I do not suppose he expected that a majority of this House would follow him.

We are then brought down to the proposition of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmalee) and that proposition is strictly in consonance with the policy which

the government, through the Prime Minister, laid down after the plebiscite vote was taken, and it is one that commends itself to every honest right-thinking man in this House or out of it. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance read some remarks from such experienced, well-tryed temperance men as Rev. Dr. Potts and others, in which they scouted the idea of the plebiscite vote justifying the enactment of a prohibitory measure; and I am quite satisfied that all thinking temperance men are convinced that if an attempt were made to pass a prohibitory measure on that vote, the attempt would be a failure, and would throw back the temperance cause twenty years. I am satisfied myself with the proposition of my hon. friend from East Huron; and if the amendment now before the House is carried, and if, when it becomes the substantive motion, my hon. friend moves to add to it clauses, providing that the Scott Act shall be amended so as to make it more effective, he shall have my hearty support. I will vote in favour of all legislation calculated to promote the cause of temperance, and because I believe my hon. friend's suggestion to be in that direction, I will vote in favour of it.

Mr. **A. C. BELL** (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I would not have taken part in this discussion, were it not that I understood the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), to make a reference to myself. I would ask him to inform me, if I was the person to whom he made that reference?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** I did make an allusion to the hon. gentleman and his colleague, as having had certain questions put to them by a gentleman interested in prohibition.

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). I thought I was the person referred to, and I merely wished to be sure. My hon. friend rather misrepresented the position I took. I am entirely in favour of one of his propositions, that is, that this prohibition question should not be made a political question in the sense of the parties using it as a means of obtaining power. My hon. friend, if I am not mistaken, said that the members for Pictou had declined to answer definitely, as to their course on this question, while expressing themselves as perfectly willing to do everything to defeat the present government. If that was what the hon. gentleman said, he certainly misrepresented my statement. I was asked by an elector of my county, a very respectable man, and a personal friend, if I would pledge myself to vote in favour of prohibition, at any and at all times, entirely irrespective of party considerations. That is, to my mind, rather an extraordinary demand to make. A representative in this House has to consider a great many questions; and to ask him to pledge himself absolutely to a fixed line of conduct with reference to a particular public

interest, is rather too much; and my reply to the gentleman, who asked that question, was the following telegram:

In my opinion, prohibition can be dealt with only by the government. Until proposed by the government of the day, all action in parliament is subject to suspicion of insincerity and uselessness. The advocates of prohibition outside parliament can best show their sincerity by active opposition to the government which has openly violated the promise made to them.

I suggested to this gentleman outside of parliament what I thought he should do, if he were sincere; but I do not say that I would attack the government for its action; neither will I, nor do I intend to do so. I regret to say, that this matter of prohibition, in fact, the whole temperance question, has been very largely used for the purpose of embarrassing the government of the day. I am inclined to justify that action, in so far as strenuous, earnest temperance men are concerned; but I do not think either party should contribute to that work at all. It is to my mind, perfectly proper and right that earnest, thorough-going advocates of temperance reform, who go the length of prohibition, should use every means in their power to carry their views into effect. They can only do that work through pressure brought to bear on the government of the day. The opposition is powerless. Absolute prohibition of the manufacture and trade in intoxicating liquors in Canada, is a measure of such enormous importance and extent, that it can only be dealt with by a government; and we can see that this government, powerful as it is, is unwilling to touch that question at this moment—is afraid to touch it, and I shall not say improperly afraid, because the interests involved are so immense and far-reaching. But in so far as an effort is being made in the parliament of Canada to use the temperance question as an issue in politics, I think the responsibility for that course rests very much more largely on the government side of the House than on the opposition side. So far as my recollection goes, before I had the honour of a seat here, this question, when introduced into the parliament of Canada, was generally introduced by a supporter of the Liberal party.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not so. It was formerly introduced chiefly by Mr. Jamieson, a member of the Conservative party.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). He was, I suppose, acting as the representative of the Dominion Alliance. But I think I am not wrong in stating that in this parliament, as in the county of Pictou, this question has been more frequently used as a party instrument by the Liberal party than by the Conservative party. Take the experience of this parliament. A plebiscite Bill was introduced by the government. Twice since that plebiscite took place, and twice since the government decided not to take any ac-

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

tion on that vote, this question has been revived in this House. In each case, it was revived by supporters of the government and not by supporters of the opposition. There has been no effort on the part of the opposition to introduce this question for the purpose of embarrassing the government or gaining any party advantage whatever. It is not and shall not be a party question. The issue to-day is between the government and the prohibitionist party. If the government have not kept faith with that party, that party has a perfect right to direct its strength to the purpose of defeating the government. If the prohibitionists are in earnest, if they hold strong convictions upon what they consider a great reform, they should exact from the government that it shall keep faith with them, or else use the weight of their influence and vote against the government. But if the prohibition party is satisfied with such excuses as are made by the supporters of the government and do not hold the government to account, that party must lie under the charge of having failed to prove its sincerity. It is not for us to press this issue in the House, and we have not attempted to press it, but it is for the party in favour of prohibition to condemn the government if they do not do what is right.

The Minister of Finance argued very ingeniously that the government gave ample notice to the country of its purpose. But, he did not make out a very substantial case. He cited two utterances made, not in the Commons, not by leading members of the administration in this House, but in the Senate. And these were not the only utterances made on behalf of the government. If they were, there might be some force in the contention that these gentlemen in the Senate expressed the views of the government; but we all recollect that when the plebiscite Bill was introduced, both at its first reading, and more particularly at its second reading, efforts were continually made by the opposition to draw an expression of opinion from the First Minister as to whether or not he intended to introduce legislation if the plebiscite showed a majority vote in favour of prohibition. But that question he evaded. He was pressed over and over again, and finally the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) interrogated the First Minister as follows:

For the sake of clearness, we want to know just where we stand. The hon. gentleman has said that whatever the will of the people is, he will carry it out. That is one version. I want to ask him if that means that if there is an affirmative vote for the principle, my hon. friend will straightway, at the next session of parliament, we will say, introduce a Bill to carry out the will of the people.

The Prime Minister replied:

It means nothing of the kind. It means that the government, when they have the will of the people before them, will take such steps as will give effect to the will of the people. There is a question of revenue to be considered;

there is also a question of compensation to be considered. There are different questions which will have to be considered.

That answer is certainly not clear and not satisfactory as a straight and definite reply to a definite question. I do not find any fault with the Prime Minister for making the statement in the way he did. But, when the Minister of Finance rests his case upon two utterances made by members of the government, having their seats, not in the Commons, but in the Senate, and when we have the declaration of the Prime Minister, which I have just read, standing on the records of parliament, made in reply to a question put by the hon. member for York, the Minister of Finance entirely fails to prove that the government gave sufficient notice to the country to make the people understand clearly that it was not the intention of the administration to introduce prohibitory legislation upon a mere majority vote.

After the vote had been taken and the question was brought up in parliament, then the views of the government were fully developed. After the First Minister had decided not to introduce prohibitory legislation, the views of the government were absolutely and clearly developed, and learned for the first time on any competent authority, that what the government considered necessary was a clear majority of the voters on the electoral lists. That is the course the government have decided upon, and it is not the duty of the opposition to interfere with that now. We are not responsible for the government of Canada or for prohibition or for anything else. We are here merely to do our part as a constitutional opposition. We are here to watch the legislation of the government, to oppose it where we think it is injurious, and to modify it when necessary, and improve it as far as we can. But this prohibition issue is one between the government and the prohibition party. So far as I am concerned, I have not the slightest desire to take any step whatever to injure or embarrass the government on this question. It is purely a question between the government and the prohibition party, and to that party the government must account for its policy. There is a great deal more that could be adduced to show that the government did not take the trouble to satisfy the people beforehand as to its views. Take, for instance, the speeches of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), who took a prominent part, from 1893, when the convention at Ottawa was held, on this question, and we find a great many statements made by him which will not bear the construction that the government required a clear majority of the voters on the lists before it would introduce prohibitory legislation. In the *Montreal Witness* of February 25, 1897, I find the following :

Notable indeed was the address which the Minister of Agriculture delivered, and unmis-

takably did he arouse the enthusiasm of the temperance workers. The tone throughout was one of great hopefulness, and when he made the ringing declaration that if the temperance people all over the Dominion rose to the occasion and won the plebiscite, a prohibitory law would follow, and the drink traffic would be killed, the applause was loud and long-continued.

Later on, the Minister of Agriculture said :

Let this be well understood. In previous plebiscite campaigns the issue was local; this was Dominion; it was largely a dealing with theory and principle, it was well understood by temperance people, it was understood by the liquor trade that whatever the result of the plebiscite, legislation would not follow upon the vote.

Now, let this vital difference: if the temperance people won in this campaign a prohibitory law would follow, and the liquor traffic would be killed in this country.

And in the records of the same speech made by the Minister of Agriculture we find the same statements made in different form. There is in that speech nothing to indicate that the government had made up its mind to require more than the constitutional majority at the polls. We know now that that was not so. We know by the statement made by the Premier that the matter had been discussed with his colleagues and a conclusion reached. The point made by the hon. member for York, N.B., was that the government had not made that point clear to the people; that there was an understanding which he described, properly enough. I think, as a secret understanding, that the prohibition party in the government should abandon that work and join hands with the others if they failed to secure a large majority of the people. But I say that to a certain extent, the active temperance people of Canada may consider themselves aggrieved. And this is purely a matter for their own determination. It may be that they were not deceived; it may be that they understood the matter thoroughly, and that they went into the campaign and carried on the fight for prohibition in this plebiscite knowing that what they had to work for was a two-thirds majority. We do not need to determine that; the active temperance workers know, each for himself, whether that was his understanding of the case or not. He knows what he understood the government to be proposing; and if he feels that the government has done him wrong, the question is one not between this party and that but between the government and the temperance people of Canada. The temperance leaders are earnest and intelligent men, and the remedy is in their own hands. To my mind, there is a great deal of strength in the position taken by the government. They say, and who can deny the statement, that legislation designed to bring about social reform, a measure, which, for its enforcement, requires active police interference, could not be carried out unless it had the moral support of a clear

majority of the people. In that respect, they enunciate sound views. And they are right when they go further and say that such legislation, if introduced and not carried out, is not only not good, but positively injurious. So far as I am concerned, I think my reply to the Minister of Finance leaves me in a proper position. I say that if the government will introduce prohibitory legislation in this House, it becomes a serious matter and one to be voted on seriously. But when resolutions are introduced in this House by private members, or any succession of them, there is every reason for the temperance men in Canada to fear that an effort is being made to humbug them, to deal with them unfairly. The subject is too great to be dealt with by a private member. As to the declaration that it seems singular that the opposition has not declared its policy, it is not often that an opposition feels it necessary to declare a policy, though sometimes it does. The whole issue in this case depends on what is the popular opinion in Canada. The Prime Minister has spoken of the province of Quebec. I am happy to say that in the county of Pictou the same is true. You may travel in that county, as the Prime Minister says you may in the province of Quebec, without finding an opportunity for the purchase of liquor either by open or secret sale. Temperance principles have extended so that it is a community, to a large extent, of total abstainers. Still, there are a large number of people in favour of prohibition, men who believe that the interest and welfare of Canada largely depends on the carrying of that measure. And, to such people, I think it will be evident that if they wish to carry their views into effect—to secure a prohibition policy for Canada, it will be necessary to succeed in selecting a body of representatives who are in favour of prohibition. The analysis of this question made by the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Craig) was exhaustive. That hon. gentleman said, that, in order to secure prohibition, we must have three things: First, a government in favour of prohibition; second, a parliament in favour of prohibition; and third, a people in favour of prohibition. But first we must have the people in favour of prohibition, and then a legislature in favour of prohibition will be elected, and when that is accomplished, you will soon have a government that will propose prohibitive legislation. And if the people who are in favour of prohibition to-day are anxious to introduce this reform which is a very great change in our system, I believe that they must continue to do that work that they have done so successfully for the last thirty or forty years—they must continue to advocate temperance principles, they must introduce the teaching of it in schools, they must bring up the young to believe in temperance, until finally we may

Mr. BELL (Pictou).

see a majority of constituencies in Canada whose people are in favour of prohibition. When that day comes, you will have a legislature in favour of prohibition and a government will lead them that will uphold prohibition, and then the administration of such a law can be carried on with success. I regret that this should be made a party question. But I am glad to know that, so far as that is concerned, the opposition is more clear from blame than is the government. I think it will be found that the Conservative party has not attempted to utilize this question to defeat their opponents. The issue that will come, as I have said, is between the earnest temperance workers and the government. If the temperance men are dissatisfied with the treatment they have received, they will so express themselves, and it is not necessary that this political party should interfere in the matter. This is too important, too great a question to be dealt with on party grounds; and I hope that, so far as the party I am associated with is concerned, every effort will be made to avoid making a subject of this character, an instrument of political success.

Mr. J. H. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I have already spoken on this question, and I do not intend to traverse the same ground a second time. I merely wish to refer to the constitutional point raised by the leader of the government. The hon. leader of the government has been very severe in his criticism of the motion moved by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). He opposed it on two grounds—first, that it was class legislation, and second, that it was unconstitutional. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) followed in the same line. I do not hesitate to say, that, from the standpoint from which these hon. gentlemen have viewed the question, they are perfectly right in their criticism. At the same time I say they have entirely misinterpreted and misunderstood the motion of my hon. friend from Yarmouth. If the proposition of my hon. friend from Yarmouth had declared that wherever the vote in any one province, at the last plebiscite, was largely in favour of prohibition, then this parliament should pass a prohibitory law for that province in accordance with that vote, I would say that such an act on the part of the federal parliament would be unconstitutional. And why? Simply upon the ground that this parliament can only deal with the traffic in intoxicating liquor by a statute whose provisions shall extend uniformly over the whole of Canada—over the province of Quebec as well as all the other provinces. If otherwise the criticism made by the leader of the government of class legislation would also be justified.

I did not have any hand in drafting the resolution of the hon. member for Yarmouth, but I had the honour of seconding it, and

therefore I may be in as good a position as any one else to interpret it. Now, what does that resolution mean? Let me illustrate and explain. The Scott Act was passed for the whole of Canada, it was applicable to Quebec, to British Columbia, to Prince Edward Island. That was an Act which gave to the people in a particular city or county a right to vote upon this question, a right to have legislation brought into force and the traffic prohibited within a certain area. Now, that is exactly the principle sought to be applied by my hon. friend from Yarmouth. He proposes to extend the principle of the Scott Act to a province. The Dunkin Act applied to a small municipality, the Scott Act to a county, now the proposition is to extend the area of operation to a province. The proposition is not, as interpreted by the leader of the government, that this parliament shall pass a law for one province alone or for all the provinces excepting Quebec, but the proposition is to pass a law for the whole of Canada, one that may, if the people choose, become operative in Quebec just as in the other provinces. Just as the Scott Act is operative over the whole of Canada, so my hon. friend from Yarmouth proposes a law which shall be operative over the whole of Canada. That is not class or sectional legislation, nor is it unconstitutional—it is the very reverse. The proposition is that a province shall stand as a unit in the same position as a county, that a number of voters in a province, say one-fourth shall first sign a requisition, then the government will call an election, and a prohibitory law would come into force if a majority of the people voted in its favour. You can see, Mr. Speaker, that is an entirely different proposition from the one that was in the mind of the leader of the government and in the mind of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In my opinion the proposition of my hon. friend from Yarmouth is a practical and reasonable step in advance—a step which if taken will bring us measurably nearer to the total prohibition of the liquor traffic throughout the Dominion of Canada. It is a proposition which I think all practical temperance reformers should have no hesitation in supporting.

Now let us look at the suggestion of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), a proposition to which two members of the government have already given their adhesion. What is that proposition? Why, Sir, if you examine it you will find that with slight variations, it is a proposition identical with that of my hon. friend from Yarmouth. There are two elements in the proposition. The first is to extend the principle of the Scott Act, to give it wider scope. That is the same proposition as the one put forth by my hon. friend from Yarmouth, only it is wider and goes further. It may include two or three or more counties within one area, it may include two or three or more provinces within one area.

At any rate, it is a proposition farther reaching than that of my hon. friend from Yarmouth. So the proposition to which the government have virtually declared their adhesion is substantially that which has been enunciated by my hon. friend from Yarmouth. Now, there is another element in the proposition of my hon. friend for Huron. He says that not only shall the scope and area of the Scott Act be extended, but that its provisions shall be made more stringent and efficient. That is exactly what my hon. friend for Yarmouth and myself have all along contended for, namely, that the provisions of the Scott Act, under the new condition of things should be made more stringent and efficient than they have been. It is because these two propositions of the member for Yarmouth and the member for Huron are in substantial accord that I am in favour of the proposition of the member for Huron and am prepared to vote for it. If the proposition of the member for Shefford (Mr. Parmalee) stood alone without any undertaking on the part of the government as to future legislation, I say distinctly that I should vote against it, because it would indicate that the government did not intend to take any action, that it simply intended to justify its past conduct and leave temperance legislation coldly alone. Since, therefore, the government, through the right hon. gentleman and through the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, have indicated that they are prepared to go the length of accepting the proposition of the hon. member for Huron, then I am prepared to extend my support to the government under these conditions.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). I intend to make but one remark to the House on this occasion. During the plebiscite campaign I was called upon by my constituents to give a pledge as to what I would do in parliament on this question, and I gave a pledge to vote in favour of national prohibition. I propose to-night to vote for the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. McClure) in favour of such national prohibition, and thus carry out the pledge which I gave to my constituents. At this late hour I do not think I can add anything to what has been said, and will simply content myself with giving this reason for the vote I intend to cast.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Before the question is put, I may say just a word or two. My position on this question has already been so clearly stated before the House and the country, that I need not waste any time this evening in restating it. There are one or two things which have arisen in this debate upon which I would like to say a word or two, and I shall be very short. In the first place, I must congratulate the House upon the tone of this debate. It has, I think, shown a clearer conception and given a more con-

cise expression of the views of those who represent the people of the country at large, upon this question of prohibition, than we have had in any debate heretofore upon the subject. The chief point in the discussion raised by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, seems to be that the government have been derelict in their duty in not following the plebiscite by the introduction of prohibitory legislation. They take this ground, because they say that the government and the Liberal party pledged themselves to such a course. I take issue directly upon this. The pledges of the Liberal party have been clearly defined by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I will not go into that subject further than to say that in the first place, there was certainly no secret understanding of any kind whatever amongst the members of the Liberal party in regard to their position on the plebiscite vote, and it was put as clearly as we could before the public, that the result of that vote would be a guide to us in any step that might be taken in regard to prohibition. The result of the plebiscite vote was such that the government believed that they were not called upon to introduce prohibitory legislation. That is the position of the government and of the party. I fail yet to find what is the position of anybody else contrary to this position. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island has challenged the hon. member for York, N.B., as to his view. He has not given it here to-night. No hon. gentleman on the floor of this House here, today, or on any other occasion since the plebiscite vote was taken, has undertaken to say that the result of the vote would justify the introduction of prohibitory legislation. No person in a responsible position in the country has said so. If you examine the resolutions of the Dominion Alliance, you will find that while they demand prohibition, they have not taken the ground that the plebiscite would be a justification for that demand. On the contrary, not only such leading representative men as have been quoted here to-night, but leading officers of the Dominion Alliance have acknowledged publicly and privately that they do not base their demand for prohibition on the plebiscite vote. What is the resolution of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmalee)? It is clearly and distinctly a review of the results of the plebiscite vote and it states that these results show that there is not an active prohibition sentiment in the country sufficiently pronounced to justify the expectation that a prohibition law could be successfully enforced; therefore, in the opinion of this House, such a prohibitory law should not be introduced. So far, in this debate upon these various resolutions, nobody has undertaken to deny that fact. Nobody has stated that these results do show that there is an active sentiment in the country, sufficiently pronounced to justify the expectation that a prohibitory

Mr. FISHER.

law could be enforced. How is it that anybody in this House can venture to vote against this resolution which is a statement of the condition of affairs, and a conclusion drawn from that condition of affairs which nobody in this House has attempted to question or deny? Under these circumstances I would have hoped that this resolution would have been accepted unanimously by the House. But, certain hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have indicated that they are not going to vote for this resolution. I take it that their views and opinions can be voiced by the utterances of those hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House. The hon. junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), has just spoken, and he has alluded to a question which was put to him in his own county, a question which was answered by himself and by his colleague in the representation of that county (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). This is the question that was put to the hon. gentleman:

If elected to next parliament will you pledge yourself to vote for and advocate prohibition in every way practicable, irrespective of party considerations.

The hon. senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) replied as follows:

I will oppose the only government that has violated a promise to abide by the result of a prohibition plebiscite. I respectfully decline to consider the matter of further pledges until prohibitionists at next election resent the deception practiced upon them by the present administration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Hon. members opposite endorse that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am glad to find them on record in that way. I am glad to find that they are treating this question not irrespective of party considerations, but solely to make by it, an attack on the present government, making of the prohibition question a catspaw and football to further their own party ends. The hon. junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) in reply to the question, said:

Prohibition can be dealt with only by the government. Until protected by the government all action in parliament is subject to suspension. The advocates of prohibition outside of parliament can best show their sincerity by active opposition to a government which has openly violated a promise made to them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Again hon. gentlemen opposite endorse these sentiments. We have here expressed the programme and the platform of the Conservative party in this House, and I believe of the Conservative party in the country.

We have had these declarations and we have also had the declaration of the hon. gentleman who is now acting leader of the opposition in this House (Mr. Foster). Some few months ago that hon. gentleman attended a political meeting in Richmond. I have not, at the moment, the quotation from the report of the hon. gentleman's speech, but I remember very well the circumstances of it. He was asked by a gentleman in the audience: What is your position, Mr. Foster, on the temperance question? His reply was in this sense—I have not the exact words, but the reply was in this sense: When the temperance people have shown their sincerity, by punishing the present government, I will tell them what I will do.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Hon. gentlemen say 'hear, hear.' I am glad to have this declaration on record, and I am glad to see what is their view and their object in dealing with this whole prohibition question. I am glad to find that they are not in sympathy with the views of the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig), but that they are prepared to make a football of this question, to treat it as a matter of party politics, and that they are prepared to make it a means of serving their own ends in the political fight. What does this mean? It means that they have no platform on this question, and that they are not prepared to do anything. Does it mean that? No, not quite, because we have one declaration made here to-night upon this question, not from the leader of the party, not from his first lieutenant who, to-night, is acting as leader of the party, but from his other lieutenant, who sits on his right in this House, who represents the Conservative party in the great province of Ontario, and is the leader of the Conservative party in the province of Ontario, I allude to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). What is the declaration of that hon. gentleman? He says that he is prepared to move in amendment to the amendment, that a fair and reasonable compensation be made to the hotel-owners and the hotel-keepers and other interests that are financially affected by prohibition. In other words, the hon. gentleman is committed to the principle of compensation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Some hon. members say 'hear, hear.' I find that there are other hon. members on that side of the House who are committed to compensation in this country, and who are ready to commit their party to it. I am not going to enter into a discussion of the question, because, as was said, by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, some years ago, I discussed that question in full, I made

a declaration upon it, I stand on record, and to-day I abide by that declaration. We have this extraordinary condition of affairs now, that the only leader of the Conservative party in the House who has made a declaration upon this question and who has done anything else except shrink behind an attack upon the present government, has declared that he is in favour of compensation to all who are financially affected by prohibition. This seems to me to be a very clear indication of the position as between the two parties. I will not go into other details of the matter. I am satisfied that the question to-day is just in this position. The temperance people of the country were given an opportunity of declaring at the polls their position upon this question. The temperance people of the country to the extent of 22½ per cent of the whole number of names upon the lists went to the polls and declared themselves in favour of prohibition. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) has undertaken to say that this was not a true or full expression of the temperance vote. He referred to former plebiscites, and he undertook to show that in the plebiscite of 1898 the temperance people did not go to the polls as they did in former plebiscites, because they were disgusted with the idea of a plebiscite. I find that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is very incorrect in that. I find that in Nova Scotia, just about the same number of people voted in 1898 as in 1894. In Ontario a much less proportion did vote, but we must remember that in the Ontario plebiscite of 1894 some 12,000 women voted, whereas, in 1898, the women were not on the voters' lists for that plebiscite. In Prince Edward Island there were actually more voted in favour of prohibition in 1898 than in 1895; and in Manitoba, there were nearly as many voted in 1898 as there did in 1892. Therefore, that comparison does not bear out the argument which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) made. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) undertake to say that the temperance people, given this opportunity of voting, given this opportunity of declaring themselves at the polls, were either so indifferent or so lukewarm that they did not think it worth their while to declare their principles at the polls. I do not believe that that was the case. I am satisfied, in my own mind, that the honest and sincere temperance people; the people who were ready to make some sacrifice for the cause they were advocating, and the people who have their hearts sufficiently in this question to be willing to aid in the passage of the law, and who would probably be willing afterwards to aid in the enforcement of the law, went to the polls and declared themselves. When I find that the number of those who were willing to do this, and did do this, was only 22½ per cent of the whole vote—or, as I prefer to put it, and as I think is a fair way—about one-

third of the whole vote which is usually polled. When I find, again, that about one-third of that vote which is usually polled went to the polls and declared themselves distinctly against prohibition, and when I find again that one-third of the vote which is usually polled were either so indifferent or were so doubtful as to the expediency of prohibition, that they deliberately declined to go to the polls and declare themselves at all, I say, as I said last year, that it was clearly shown that there was not, and that there is not in Canada to-day, a sufficient force of public opinion, a sufficient force of temperance sentiment and of temperance electorate behind the prohibition movement to justify the introduction or the passage of a prohibitory law. That is the policy which this government assumed; that is the position which this government has taken, and I feel, as a public man entrusted with certain interests of the public, that it is the only position which I could occupy. It is the only position which I could assume, and I am, therefore, perfectly satisfied, and I have it more thoroughly enforced upon me since I spoke in this sense before, that in taking this position we have at the back of us the great mass of the temperance people of this country who appreciate and understand that the position which we have taken is in the best interests of the country and is in the best interests of temperance and prohibition as well. I am, therefore, satisfied that the present attack on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite on this matter will fail of its object, and that the inspiring cause of that attack will be seen through and appreciated at its proper value by the electors of Canada, and that this government will be sustained upon this question, as it is certainly going to be sustained upon the other questions which are before the people of this country.

Mr. A. C. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) Before the vote is taken, I want to say that I shall express the views of my constituents in opposing the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmalee) and voting in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure), which goes straight for prohibition. I may say that, so far as I know of members on this side of the House, I do not believe that hardly one member here knows what the other member's opinion is about the matter. Every man is free on this side of the House to do what he thinks proper, and that is the position I am going to take. I hardly think that as much can be said with regard to the untrammelled action of the government supporters on this question.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). I did not intend to say anything on this question, but in view of all that has been said in the debate, I do not think that I should give a

silent vote upon it. I believe that my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) was about right when he said that both sides of the House were blamable, inasmuch as they were making political capital out of this matter. I remember very well that when the Liberals were on this side of the House, they did all they could to make political capital out of it as against the Conservative government. I remember especially the line taken by the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills), and I recollect very well how, more than once, he, in a way that seemed to be altogether improper, dragged in the party aspect of the question. I do not want to dwell upon that view of the question, but I wish to say that I feel some diffidence as to my course in reference to this question. I have been one of the strongest advocates for the plebiscite. I believe in that in legislation of this kind it is not possible for us to proceed wisely or safely, without obtaining some knowledge of the views of the people upon it. We have accepted the principle, both in the Dunkin Act and the Scott Act, that before such legislation should go into effect the people should be consulted. And if it was right to take the vote of the people before the enforcement of legislation of that character which is not nearly so far-reaching as total prohibition, how much more necessary was it to take a plebiscite with regard to the latter question. I have always advocated that course before my friends in my constituency, and that is why I desire to say a word at the present time. I have stated very openly to my friends that if a plebiscite were taken, and if the people pronounced themselves distinctly in favour of prohibition, I would be prepared to do all in my power to aid in carrying out the wishes of the people in that regard. Although I am not myself a believer in prohibition, still I think it is a question that the people should decide for themselves. I am now face to face with the fact that a plebiscite has been had, that the vote has been taken, and what am I to do? I ask myself this question: If, when I made that statement to my constituents I had been asked by any one: Will you support prohibitory legislation if the vote recorded in favour of prohibition be not more than 23 per cent of the total voters of the country?

I would distinctly have stated that I would not support such legislation; and I can do nothing else now. I venture to say that my hon. friend from Yarmouth, earnest prohibitionist though he is—and I am sure that he is perfectly sincere in his advocacy of prohibition—if he had been asked that question in the House before the plebiscite was taken, would not have ventured to say that on a 23 per cent vote of the electorate, the government of the country should have enacted prohibitory legislation. I do not think there is any prohibitionist in the

House, unless he is more extreme than any one I have knowledge of, who would at that time, have taken that position. That being the case, I find myself obliged to vote for the amendment to the amendment. I would have preferred to see that amendment in a slightly different form. I would rather it had read: 'that these results do not show that there is an active prohibition sentiment sufficiently pronounced, in place of saying, 'that these results show that there is not an active prohibition sentiment.' But that is not a sufficiently grave variance from words which I think ought to be employed to justify me in opposing the resolution. I feel so strongly the position I have taken in reference to the plebiscite and the statements I have made in regard to it that I confess I had a feeling that I should have liked to support something in the nature of the proposal of my hon. friend from Yarmouth; but I would be precluded from doing so by the words of the resolution itself, even supposing the statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the other statement made by the right hon. leader of the government had not been made, because the words of the resolution conflict altogether with my view, that the results do not show that there is an active prohibition sentiment sufficiently pronounced to justify the expectation that a prohibition law would be effectively enforced, whereas his resolution says that the results, as well as satisfactory evidence from other sources, show that such a measure would be thoroughly supported by the people of Canada. These are tremendously wide words, wide enough to include the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that the people of the province of Quebec shall be excluded from the people of Canada, and no one can say that the people of Quebec would thoroughly support a prohibition law. Even on that ground I could not support the resolution of my hon. friend; but the argument presented to the House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to my mind at least, settles the question, that the Privy Council has laid down in the most express terms that this parliament cannot enact such legislation as the hon. member for Yarmouth suggests—that it would be ultra vires of this parliament. Therefore, under the circumstances, I shall support the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FIRMAN McCLURE (Colchester). Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say a word more on this question; but as an amendment has been moved to my amendment, I wish to say a word of explanation. I shall vote against the amendment to the amendment for perhaps different reasons from those which animate some other members of this House. I find that that amendment contains these words:

That these results show that there is not an active prohibition sentiment sufficiently pro-

nounced to justify the expectation that a prohibition law could be successfully enforced.

I agree largely with the views expressed upon that point this afternoon by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) when he said that the plebiscite vote did not thoroughly express the prohibition sentiment of this country. I do not know that I go with him as to the reasons for his opinion; but I certainly do feel, and my experience in that campaign confirmed me in that position, that that vote did not properly express and represent the temperance sentiment of this country. Therefore the prohibitionists today are free to advocate the measure upon its merits and the plebiscite is no answer to their claim upon this parliament for a prohibitory liquor law. I dissent entirely from the proposition of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) that this is a quarrel between the temperance people and the present government. This government is not and never was a prohibition government. I took a part in the plebiscite campaign in many counties in my own province, and I do not know how other prohibitionists may have viewed the question, but at all the meetings which I attended and where I spoke, the position I took was that this government was not a prohibition government; that I knew of no government and no party in Canada which was a prohibition government or party; but that if the people voted strongly enough in favour of prohibition, they could mighty soon make a prohibition government out of it. I do not believe the recorded vote was sufficiently strong to warrant this government in passing a prohibitory liquor law, if there was no other sentiment in the country than what was represented by that vote. If, therefore, this government rely wholly upon the results of the plebiscite vote, if they are prepared to take the position that that vote directly represents the prohibition sentiment of this country, then they are right in their conclusion, and there is no breach of any promise or pledge ever given by them. But if I am right, and if the hon. member for York is right, that that vote does not properly represent the prohibition sentiment of this country, then the question is still an open one. It is not a question between this government and the temperance people, nor between the opposition party and the temperance people. It is a question that has not become a party issue at all; and I regret that so much of the time of this House should be taken up in discussing the position of the different parties upon the question. Perhaps, I have sinned in that respect myself. I humbly apologize if I have. It is to be regretted that this question should be made a party issue at all, because neither party has any policy on the question, and the prohibitionists of this country are back where they were before the plebiscite was taken. They are face to face with the bald issue: is prohibi-

tion desirable in this country or not? If it is, then they can get it by electing prohibitionists to this parliament who are prohibitionists in principle, and not party prohibitionists. That they have not done yet, and until they do that, all they can do, and all that I can do, is to advocate the principle, and I move the adoption of the principle here. I stand by that principle; I believe in it. Despite all that is said to the contrary, I believe that the enacting of a prohibitory liquor law to-day would be a great benefit to this country. In that opinion I do not stand alone, nor is it the ignorant or the uncultured portion of the community who have awakened to the conviction that, in spite of the vast interests, in spite of the moneyed interests against it, in spite of the thousand and one considerations that enter into it, the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law, while it would not bring about a millenium, while it would not completely destroy the drinking habit, would be infinitely above and beyond the paltry compromises we have made with this thing which we declare to be an evil which we license by our laws, and which we allow to break through the law in every way it can. I believe that the dealing of the government and of both sides of this House with the liquor question is a cowardly dealing. It is the conduct of people who are not prepared to take a manly stand. I believe it is cowardly to go on passing year after year legislation we do not believe in and then do not enforce. The only way to settle the question is to force the issue. Either the liquor traffic is a thing that should be protected or prohibited by law. To-day it is neither. I accept no compromise on this question. I believe in absolute prohibition. I want to see the question decided by a majority, and therefore move this resolution and refuse to accept any amendment, because I do not consider that the plebiscite was any fair expression of the temperance sentiment of the country.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS (Russell). The very statement of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, Mr. Speaker, is proof that this country is not prepared for prohibition. He makes the statement that if the country is in favour of prohibition it will send members here who are prohibitionists. That the country has not done so up to the present is the best evidence that it is not in favour of any such policy. In so far as I am concerned, I may say at once that I am a teetotaler and have been all my life and always expect to be. I believe that prohibition would be the most valuable thing to Canada, if it could be carried out, that Canada could possibly have. I believe that, at a low estimate, it would be worth at least \$100,000,000 annually to the people, and I am not one of those who believe that the revenue of the country would be im-

Mr. McCLURE.

paired at all. On the contrary, it would be largely enhanced because the purchasing power of the people would be so very much greater than it is to-day. I am always prepared to vote for temperance. I am in favour of temperance, and free trader that I am, while prohibition is an attack upon that principle, the case is one in which perhaps that principle should be violated for the general good of the people. True it is an attack on the right of the individual to eat or drink what he pleases, and that sort of legislation is obnoxious to me on principle. But when I consider the evil that is done to innocent men in Canada by the drinking habit, when I consider the fact that our penitentiaries and jails are filled by convicts who owe their degradation to the liquor habit, when I consider the fact that this curse of liquor has imposed upon the people of Canada the burden of maintaining all these institutions, which largely owe their existence to the liquor habit, and when I consider, further, the fact that our asylums are largely filled by the victims of this same habit, then I must conclude that the principle so dear to me of free trade should be abandoned when dealing with this evil. But it is a moral question which requires a moral reform, and it would be most detrimental, in the interests of the prohibitionists themselves, to the cause they so ardently advocate, to pass a prohibitory law until the people of Canada are prepared to put it into effect. It is my firm conviction that the men who are advocating prohibition in Canada to-day are killing the very thing they desire to carry out. In so far as this question is concerned, there is a great deal of education yet to be given the people, and if those who are devoting themselves to this question, would confine their efforts to the advocacy of the cause of temperance, to educating the people to temperate habits, and prepare them for a prohibitory measure, they would do a great deal more good than they can possibly accomplish by the course they are now taking. The Dominion Alliance, it is my firm conviction, has done more to retard prohibition in Canada than to advance it. The matter of compensation I take no stock in whatever, but if I believed that Canada was prepared for prohibition, there is no man in Canada who would more heartily support prohibition than I would. I am a strong believer in prohibition, but I do not believe in passing a prohibitory Act until we have a far greater assurance than we have now that the people are prepared to put it into effect. This is a large country. We have various provinces, peopled by different nationalities holding different views, and we also border on a large country for a very great distance; and if we were to enact a prohibitory law, we would open wide the door to smuggling and other kindred abuses. Therefore, until we have the people educated up to the point of being strong support-

ers of such a measure, it would not be in the interests of the people to pass it. But there is no doubt, as the last speaker has said, that when the sentiment of Canada is prepared for such a measure, the electorate will return to this House members who will see that it is enacted and enforced. Let us have an election to-day or next year or the year after, and I think it is safe to say that the people will not return a majority of members to this House in favour of prohibition. It would therefore be perfectly idle and childish and foolish to enact any such measure until the people are prepared to have it enforced.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). The subject of temperance has been so fully and ably discussed from the pulpit, at temperance gatherings, in social circles, in the press, and in such a variety of ways, that I feel it would ill become me to engage in a dissertation upon this subject now, when discussing the merits or demerits of the resolution, or motion submitted by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), or any amendment thereto. Suffice it to say that the deleterious effect of the use of alcoholic drinks—except as a medicine—no matter how used, whether in moderation or otherwise, has its devastating results, and will earlier or later cast its dreary shadows, and leave its sadening footprints on the sands of time, with bitter remorse and disquietude, to him or her who engaged in the first use of it, and continues the same as a part of their nature. I would not speak so feelingly on this subject, nor yet so certainly of the ill effects of alcoholic drinks as a beverage, had I not seen the deplorable condition it had brought persons to in every position of life, from the youth in his teens, who had fallen a victim, as well as the hoary haired of four score and upwards, to say nothing of the many families it has rendered homeless, and reduced to penury and abject want. But does it stop even here? No, in many cases it ends in crimes of the most heinous kind, and ultimately lands the party in a premature and untimely grave. The germ of all this evil is in social drinking, so common to many, which means the impairment of mind and body, whereby brilliant prospects have been, and still are daily blighted, and hopes blasted, all brought about from the want of a sober inquiry, as to what is the ultimate effect? Where is it going to land us? and what can be done to correct the evil and the use and abuse of the article? One thing is very certain that the evil can not be remedied by permitting Quebec, as is proposed, to remain outside of the operation of any prohibitory Act, and have her, geographically placed as she is, in the centre of this fair Dominion to be a rum shop for the supply of the objectionable article to the rest of Canada.

I say the proposition is unfair in principle, unconstitutional, and should not be entertained for a single moment. I am bold to state that the resolution submitted by my hon. friend, the member for Yarmouth, has in my opinion, but one object in view, and that is to side-track—so to speak, the national prohibition vote, and thereby let down the government, as its supporters consider in an honourable manner. But I am inclined to believe, they have made a leap in the dark, which will land them in disfavour with the temperance party, who are unwilling to accept this as an apology for the government's unfulfilled pledges, and broken promises to carry prohibition into effect if a majority at the polls pronounced in its favour.

I consider the worst kind of deception was practiced by the government, as they not only pledged the temperance party previous to the late election to carry out their wishes, if they received their support and were placed in power, but they extracted from the pockets of the people a sum in round numbers of about \$200,000 to pay the expenses of the plebiscite vote, which had they explained and not deceived the people could have been saved, and appropriated to a better purpose. It is very truthfully said: 'The tree is known by its fruit,' and hon. gentlemen opposite, when the next appeal is made to the people at the polls, will have to be judged by their acts, and not by their promises or professions.

We should be as sensitive to crooked ways in politics, as in our every day private life, and should carefully see that honest principles should dominate the conduct of public men and their acts, and should unhesitatingly say alike to the canting hypocrite and the unscrupulous intriguer as politicians—'we have no place for you.'

The government certainly have treated the temperance people of this country in a most disgraceful manner. After hon. gentlemen opposite making prohibition one of the planks of their platform, and having promised that should they carry prohibition, they would advance legislation, I say to be true to their professions and promises, they were in duty bound to carry it out. But we find they are politicians first, and prohibitionists afterwards. No person objects to a prohibitionist being a politician, but I do object, and I am sure the country will object to having the leader of the government profess one thing, whereby to ride into power, and after reaching the goal of his ambition, to repudiate his pledges, and refuse to carry out the wishes of the people.

The temperance party would certainly expect better treatment at the leader of the government's hands, than to be fooled in this way. But the temperance party console themselves that they did not stand

alone in this connection, as other pledges were broken by them, and other people disappointed, in fact this disappointment is widespread from ocean to ocean. They promised to remove every vestige of protection, instead of which on some articles they increased the tariff, and surrendered to the enemy, horse, foot and artillery.

They promised retrenchment, instead of which they have greatly exceeded the late government by leaps and bounds in increased expenditure.

They promised free trade, instead of which protection and taxes are greater now on some of the commodities used by the poor man than under the late government.

They promised civil service reform, instead of which they increased in some cases the salaries of civil servants, and the number of cabinet ministers, without any reform.

They promised purity at elections, as an answer as to whether their promises were carried out in this respect, all I need do is to remind them of the service the 'machine' did for them in the counties of West Elgin, West Huron, Brockville and others, in the stuffing of the ballot boxes. But I need not go away from my own home to discover chicanery, deception, trickery, and fraud, as it was found in my own county (Lunenburg) in the last local election, when a cabinet minister was defeated by seventeen, but on a recount and by a manipulation of ballots—the ballot boxes having been in the hands of the sheriff—the ballots were by some person so changed, as to give the cabinet minister the seat. This matter of deliberate robbery of the people's just rights I brought before the government three years ago, and several times since, and gave them an amusing episode on the subject, but no recognition was taken of it. Dearly would I like retributory justice to have its course in this case, but I suppose I must patiently await the time for that to come about.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture, it will be remembered, was the champion of the temperance cause, and the party who introduced the resolution for the plebiscite vote, observed this deception practiced in his own province of Quebec when the vote was taken on September 27, 1898. Take, for instance, the county of Megantic, in poll No. 5, we find seventy-seven votes on the list, and every vote polled, a most unusual occurrence. The same presented itself in several of the other counties, all having voted whose names appeared on the list, save, perhaps, one or two. But the most startling revelation presents itself in the district of Quebec Centre—vide page 201 of report of prohibition plebiscite—where it is found there were in poll No. 25, 101 voters on the list, and 105 actually voted, four more than were on the list. Take Quebec West, No. 1 poll, where there were 115

voters on the list, and 116 actually voted. Take Beauharnois, poll No. 17, where there were 118 voters on the list, and 119 actually voted. Now, with deception in practice such as I have just detailed, how was it possible to get an honest verdict, and, forsooth, this is the province hon. gentlemen opposite propose to have stand exempt from the operation of any prohibitory enactment, or, in other words, they propose to make it an exception, and become the rum shop for the rest of the other provinces of the Dominion, for the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks.

I have little hope that this movement on the part of my hon. friends opposite will meet with favour in the country, or with the advocates of the temperance cause, for the reason that I believe it will prove to be unworkable as well as unconstitutional, and I feel the government have a right to satisfy themselves on the subject, and give their opinion to this House, instead of showing their unwillingness to assume the responsibility themselves, preferring rather to have a supporter of theirs, a private member, take the risk and leave them—the government—open to act as they please.

We had a temperance plebiscite vote, it will be remembered, some few years ago, in the province of Nova Scotia, on the eve of an election, brought about under similar auspices, and with similar results, which was a dodge or an incentive to carry the Liberal party into power, and it worked in their interest and did carry them there, but nothing more was heard of prohibition from them after they got there, and I believe this is intended for the same purpose now, as we are told we are on the eve of a general election and the government want the temperance vote. If the government were sincere in the professions of temperance two years ago, the first step they made in the wrong direction, and for which they are held responsible, was not in sending troops into the Yukon district to preserve law and order, but in the granting of permits for the transport of liquor into that country, and the actual granting of saloon licenses for the sale of the article on its reaching the Yukon district, and pocketing the fee. A means, first, to craze the temperament and minds of the settlers, and thus create strife, as well as crime, and then, as a mockery, to have a paid force sent there under arms to quell disturbances that, peradventure, might arise. The Minister of the Interior, like the Minister of Agriculture, poses as an apostle of temperance, and as the chief of his department, is supposed to show his principles by his acts. Let us view his own report, and see as to how far evidence from this source will bear him out in support of his temperance proclivities. We find that permits for liquor were issued within a year for over 120,000 gallons, as verified by the following :

**Whisky for the Yukon.**

Permits Issued Within the Year for Over 120,000 Gallons.

Since July 1, 1899, liquor permits for the Yukon district have been granted by the Department of the Interior at Ottawa to the amount of 2,027 gallons and one barrel. During the same period, nine permits were issued by Commissioner Ogilvie under subsequent authority from the Minister of the Interior for a quantity of 46,950, a total of over 49,000 gallons, besides permits for 72,600 gallons issued by Mr. Ogilvie.

Had liquor been kept out of that country, I am possessed of the opinion that no armed force would have been needed, and the money so expended could have been applied to a better purpose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to come back to the plebiscite vote. It is contended we have no right to coerce the province of Quebec, which is an absurdity, as in reality it is really attempting to coerce us, since the last general election by assuming the control of affairs in this Dominion. On any question where parties are called upon to vote, and where some decline to take any action, or to exercise that privilege, it has always been held that they consent to the decision of the voting majority.

We have 213 members constituting this House of Commons, and 81 members in the other Chamber—the Senate—but, by a rule, or the rules of parliament, twenty form a quorum in this Chamber, and fifteen in the other Chamber, but a majority in either House can conduct, vote and control business. Is not this, I would ask, a ruling precedent sufficient for hon. gentlemen opposite to follow?

Does not this rule, or principle, hold good in all elections, whether they be organized societies, civil, provincial, or federal? The rule or principle is precisely the same, and certainly should be upheld with regard to the temperance plebiscite.

In conclusion, I desire to say that I support the amendment as submitted by the hon. member for Colchester.

House divided on amendment to the amendment (Mr. Parmalee).

**YEAS :**

**Messieurs**

- |                  |                        |
|------------------|------------------------|
| Bazinet,         | Kloepfer,              |
| Beattie,         | Landerkin,             |
| Beith,           | Lang,                  |
| Belcourt,        | Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), |
| Bell (Prince),   | Lavergne,              |
| Bennett,         | Legris,                |
| Blair,           | Livingston,            |
| Borden (King's), | Macdonald (Huron),     |
| Bourassa,        | Macdonell,             |
| Bourbonnais,     | MacLaren,              |
| Britton,         | McCarthy,              |
| Brodeur,         | McDougall,             |
| Brown,           | McGregor,              |
| Bruneau,         | McGugan,               |
| Burnett,         | McHugh,                |
| Calvert,         | McIsaac,               |
| Campbell,        | McLellan,              |
| Carroll,         | McLennan (Inverness),  |
| Casey,           | McMillan,              |

- |                       |              |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| Champagne,            | McNeill,     |
| Clarke,               | Malouin,     |
| Corby,                | Marcel,      |
| Costigan,             | Marcotte,    |
| Craig,                | Mignault,    |
| Davies (Sir Louis),   | Monet,       |
| Davis,                | Monk,        |
| Dechêne,              | Morin,       |
| Demers,               | Mulock,      |
| Douglas,              | Parmalee,    |
| Dugas,                | Paterson,    |
| Dupré,                | Fenny,       |
| Dyment,               | Pettet,      |
| Edwards,              | Préfontaine, |
| Ethier,               | Prior,       |
| Featherston,          | Ratz,        |
| Fielding,             | Rogers,      |
| Fisher,               | Rosamond,    |
| Fitzpatrick,          | Ross,        |
| Fortier,              | Savard,      |
| Fraser (Guysborough), | Seagram,     |
| Fraser (Lambton),     | Semple,      |
| Frost,                | Snetsinger,  |
| Gauthier,             | Stenson,     |
| Gauvreau,             | Stubbs,      |
| Geoffrion,            | Sutherland,  |
| Gibson,               | Talbot,      |
| Gilmour,              | Tolmie,      |
| Harwood,              | Turcot; and  |
| Johnston,             | Wood.—98.    |

**NAYS :**

**Messieurs**

- |                |                       |
|----------------|-----------------------|
| Bell (Pictou), | Macdonald (King's),   |
| Bergeron,      | McAlister,            |
| Carscallen,    | McCleary,             |
| Christie,      | McClure,              |
| Clancy,        | McCormick,            |
| Cochrane,      | McInerney,            |
| Copp,          | McLennan (Glengarry), |
| Domville,      | McMullen,             |
| Flint,         | Martin,               |
| Foster,        | Maxwell,              |
| Gillies,       | Meore,                |
| Gould,         | Morrison,             |
| Graham,        | Oliver,               |
| Gillet,        | Powell,               |
| Henderson,     | Puttee,               |
| Hodgins,       | Richardson,           |
| Ingram,        | Rutherford,           |
| Kaulbach,      | Taylor,               |
| Klock,         | Wallace, and          |
| LaRivière,     | Wilson.—41.           |
| Logan,         |                       |

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr Russell), has not voted.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am paired with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). If I had not been, I would have been bound by my pledge, to vote against this amendment.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Parmalee) agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is now on the original motion as amended.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS (East Assinibola). Mr. Speaker, seeing that the rules of the House preclude my hon. friend from East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) moving this addition to that which is now the main motion, I beg to move, seconded by the hon. mem-

ber for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) that the following clause be added to the main motion :

But inasmuch as it is desirable that legislation be enacted having in view the further restriction of the liquor traffic, it is therefore expedient, in the opinion of this House, that the Canada Temperance Act be enlarged in its scope and that the provisions for its administration be perfected.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. FOSTER. What is exactly the purport of the motion that you have just put, Mr. Speaker ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The motion which has been affirmed by the House, is that, for the amendment of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure), the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmalee), is substituted, which affirms that the vote on the plebiscite does not warrant the enactment of a prohibitory law. Now, it is proposed to add this amendment which has been handed to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion is on the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmalee), and on the question of the substitution of it for the original motion of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint).

The PRIME MINISTER. The question before the House is on the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) in amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Parmalee), which has just been carried by the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the main motion, as amended, and this amendment proposed to be added thereto by the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas).

Mr. FOSTER. We should have an explanation from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Douglas), as to what he means by the word 'enlargement.' In what way is it to be enlarged ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I did not offer any remarks in connection with the motion, for the simple reason that I thought the Canada Temperance Act was so well understood having been so long before the public, that it was scarcely desirable to enter into any explanation. Many of us know something of its defects, and we believe that it requires some changes made in it, so as to make it effective.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What is the enlargement ?

Mr. FOSTER. If we are not going to simply play, we want to understand for what we are voting, and we want to know as well, if the House adopts this amendment to the motion, what is meant by it ? We

Mr. DOUGLAS.

have already been discussing to-night a series of actions in the last three or four years, many of them undertaken without full understanding, or with a misunderstanding on the part of the people, as to what they meant, and we were asked to vote on generalities. The Canada Temperance Act is an Act which can be under certain conditions adopted by any county or city, and if it is adopted by a county or city under those conditions, it absolutely prohibits the sale of intoxicating liquors. It does not, however, affect the manufacture. Now, this motion is that there should be an enlargement of the scope of the Act. What does it mean ? Are we to vote on this without knowing anything at all as to what the mover means or what the right hon. leader of the government means, because if this means anything, it means responsibility, and it means that hon. gentlemen are to introduce a Bill to carry out what this House shall affirm, if this House carries this amendment. We would like to know what we are voting upon, and in what particulars the Scott Act is to be enlarged in its scope. Is it to take in a province ? What is it to do ? Surely we will not be asked to vote upon this amendment without any explanation. It is most indefinite.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). As I foreshadowed this amendment in the few remarks I made this afternoon, I may say a word in explanation of it. This afternoon, when I made a few remarks, I said that I intended to bring in an amendment at this juncture. What I mean by enlarging the Scott Act is this: At present it is confined to a single county, and by the enlargement of its provisions it might embrace two counties or five counties or any number of counties just as the temperance people thought they could control. In the province of Prince Edward Island all the counties could be united, and so far as that would take place it would be provincial prohibition there. That is what I mean by enlarging the scope of the Scott Act. Now as regards perfecting the Scott Act ; every one knows that the machinery for carrying it out has always been defective. The prohibitory provisions of the law are very nice to read, but there was no machinery to carry them out, and you will remember that if Sir Oliver Mowat had not used the machinery of the License Act to enforce the Scott Act, it would have been a total failure. The enlargement which I mean by the resolution is, that groups of counties of any number may be brought under the action of the Canadian Temperance Act, and as to the means of carrying it out, I propose that the machinery for that purpose shall be perfected and made better than it has been.

Mr. R. R. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I may say that the county of Glengarry is differently situated from the other counties

in Ontario, inasmuch as it borders on the province of Quebec, and if Quebec is allowed to continue the sale of intoxicating liquors, we will have all the evils of illicit sales in the county. I voted against the amendment to the amendment, and I am now prepared to vote for the original amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McClure) which is an honest, straightforward declaration for prohibition. As the government led the people to believe they were going to give them prohibition, the government should carry out that promise by voting for the amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McClure). I intend to do all that I can, not to outrage the good faith of the people. I go further, and I say that if the Conservative party were in power, (a fact which will very soon come to pass), and if the Conservative party made a pledge to bring in a plebiscite as the Liberals did, and if the vote should be in favour of prohibition, then if I stood alone I would vote in favour of carrying out the pledges and promises made. However, I have no fear that when the Conservatives give a pledge on any matter of policy, they will refuse to carry it out. I am opposed to the Scott Act. My experience is that it has not been a success, and I have a few figures here which will show the opinion of the people of Ontario as to how it worked. In 1884, in the united counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, 61 per cent of the vote polled was in favour of the Scott Act, but four years afterwards when the vote was again taken 63 per cent of the vote went against it. In 1885, in the county of Kent, 68 per cent of the vote polled was in favour of the Scott Act, but four years afterwards 61 per cent of the vote was against it. In Elgin, in 1885, 69 per cent of the vote was polled in favour of this Act, and four years later 76 per cent of the vote polled was against it. In Lambton, in 1885, 74 per cent of the vote polled was in favour of the Scott Act, but in 1889, 62 per cent was against it. In Middlesex in 1885, 71 per cent of the vote polled was in favour of the Scott Act, but in 1889, 64 per cent was against it. In Westmoreland, N.B., in 1879, 84 per cent of the vote polled was in favour of the Scott Act, but in 1888, 60 per cent voted against it. Let me tell the hon. gentleman from Colchester (Mr. McClure) who moved this amendment in favour of prohibition, what was the record of the Scott Act in his county. In 1881, there voted in favour of the Scott Act 88½ per cent of the vote polled, but in 1889, 96 per cent went against it. That is the very best evidence in the world to show that the Scott Act was a failure and members in this House know it. There was no license under that Act, but there was more liquor disposed of than under license, young men and old carried bottles and flasks around in their pockets and got intoxicated upon the streets, and where there are five

hotels now there were twenty or thirty places selling liquor illegally. Hon. gentlemen opposite have made pledges about prohibition to the people of the country, and if they refuse to carry them out they, and they alone, are responsible, and the people of the country will, I have no doubt, hold them strictly to account.

Mr. GEO. E. CASEY (West Elgin). The explanation given by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) has not removed the objection that this amendment is utterly vague. It is out of the question to ask the House to vote for a vague declaration that the Canada Temperance Act ought to have its scope extended and ought to be perfected in various ways. If the government feel like amending or improving that Act they will introduce a Bill to that effect. If any member wishes to amend or improve it let him introduce a Bill; but to ask the House to vote for a vague statement such as that contained in the amendment is not very flattering to our intelligence. The explanation which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) has given as to his own view as to what should be done, does not make the amendment less vague. It only amounts to a statement that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) were managing the matter, that is the way he would do it. I do not think the explanation improves the case at all. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) would propose to group counties which temperance people, meaning the prohibitionists, think they could carry for the Scott Act. I absolutely oppose such a scheme as that. I believe it is a gerrymander of the worst kind. I do not propose to give the least countenance to the idea that the country should be gerrymandered by grouping counties to please the prohibitionists or any one else. As to the machinery of enforcement it will be for the House at some future time, when there is a distinct issue before it, to say whether they are willing to undertake the expense of maintaining a very large corps of officials with a view of enforcing the Canada Temperance Act. I do not think the House is at present in a mood to go in for any such thing. My hon friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) has voiced the universal sentiment of the people of Ontario in saying that we have found the Canada Temperance Act as it stands to be useless and worse than useless. I do not think anybody is prepared to fall back on it as a relief, failing other means of prohibition. I do not wish to prolong the debate, but it was necessary that somebody, and just as well as not some old member, should put this view of the case briefly before the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, the Canada Temperance Act, whatever may have been its defects, and we know it is not free from blemishes, has given a reasonable

satisfaction to certain portions of the community. It was enacted for this purpose, it was accepted as such, and it has been maintained as such. At the same time, almost every session Bills have been introduced with a view of amending and improving that Act. For my part, holding the opinion I do, I do not know that I might not agree with my hon. friend, that it is perhaps not the most desirable legislation; but that is a question on which we can all afford to sink our minor differences. If the Canada Temperance Act is, as it is undoubtedly, satisfactory to a large section of our countrymen, I do not see why it should be derided. I think it should rather be supported and perfected, and made more workable in the counties which choose to adopt it. So far as the amendment of the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia is concerned, if I had the drafting of it, I do not know that I would have put it in exactly the same language that he has used; I do not know that I would suggest the idea of grouping counties. But, for my part, I am prepared to accept the amendment with the idea of perfecting the Canada Temperance Act.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). Mr. Speaker, I think we are losing sight of the fact that in two provinces already prohibitive laws have been adopted, and if we amend and perfect the Canada Temperance Act, it will have to be with the understanding that it does not apply to those provinces, because we shall be interfering with local legislation. I think perhaps it would be better for us to wait until we see the result of the legislation which has been adopted in those provinces; and, later on, if that legislation is found unworkable, then we may ourselves adopt any legislation which would cover the whole Dominion. We are legislating for the whole Dominion, and by re-enacting some provisions of the Canada Temperance Act we will perhaps interfere with local legislation.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. Speaker, as one who has introduced several Bills for the amendment of the Canada Temperance Act, some of which have been adopted and become law, and others of which have not been reached in the course of legislation and have been dropped, I desire to make one or two observations with regard to this amendment. Last session I placed a Bill on the Order paper for that purpose, which was not reached for final discussion. This session I have a Bill which the Premier kindly intimated I might have an opportunity before the close of the session of going on with and endeavouring to have adopted. Owing to my name having been connected with these measures, I have been, during every session in which I have had the honour of a seat in parliament, in receipt of a large number of communications containing drafts of Bills and suggestions of amendments to the Canada Temperance Act in those districts where it

has been adopted. To a large bulk of these I have not had the time nor the opportunity to give the attention which they deserved; and knowing the hostility with which technical points and points open to discussion were received from a private member in most instances, I put off bringing them forward. In those districts where the Canada Temperance Act has been operative for the last ten or twelve years, it has been fairly successful, and those who are favourable to the Act in those districts are puzzled to know why this opposition and distrust towards the Act exists in other parts of the country. There is no doubt that it does exist, and it is to a large degree due to certain defects in the Act. We have seen recently the great ability with which the Department of Justice, as represented in the House by the Solicitor General, has carried through a large number of intricate amendments to the election law; and I think that unless we have the assistance of the government, particularly of the Department of Justice, in amending the Canada Temperance Act, so as to strengthen its provisions here and there, and to provide for that large number of cases in which the decisions of the courts have shown it to be to a certain degree unworkable, it will be difficult or impossible for us to get the Act perfected or improved. If the House would adopt this amendment—though it is not particularly germane to the resolution which I brought up—I think it would be a source of great encouragement to those counties and those districts where the Canada Temperance Act is in force.

Mr. McNEILL. Will my hon. friend permit me a moment? What is troubling me is the fact that this proposition is not to amend or perfect the Canada Temperance Act, but to enlarge its scope.

Mr. FLINT. I presume that the idea underlying the phraseology of the amendment is that the Canada Temperance Act might be enlarged to take in a whole province or certain groups of counties; but the point I have in mind is the perfecting of the machinery of the Act. For instance, one of the suggestions made to me from more quarters than one is that the officer who enforces the law should not be a local officer, but an officer under the control of the government of Canada, and that the expense of enforcing it should rest upon this government rather than upon the local authority. I trust that if I have an opportunity of bringing forward one or two slight amendments to the Canada Temperance Act at a later stage of the session, they will be fairly discussed. I approve, as far as it goes, of the suggestion made in this amendment, although it is not particularly germane to the great question of prohibition which I have endeavoured to bring before the House.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, if this were merely a proposal to amend the Can-

ada Temperance Act, I think it would be a matter to which we ought to give the most serious consideration; but, to my mind, as it is now presented to the House, this vague, bodyless amendment may mean the application of the Scott Act to a province or to a county, we cannot tell what. I think it very little less than an insult to this House to ask us to adopt an amendment of that kind. I will not stultify myself by supporting any such proposition. I am asked to vote in the dark on something I know nothing about, and say that I approve of it. Such a vote I will never give.

Mr. CRAIG. I never heard of any such amendment being demanded by the temperance people in connection with the subject of prohibition. It is all very well for the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) to say that he has some amendments to make to the Canada Temperance Act. If he has, let us treat those amendment definitely and know what they are, but the idea of asking us, after we have declared that the vote on the plebiscite does not warrant prohibition, to vote for an amendment calling on us to enlarge the scope of the Canada Temperance Act is an absurd proposition. There is no connection between the two subjects. What effect will this amendment have if carried? I am down on all humbug in connection with this temperance question, and this is nothing but arrant humbug. It is a very small hole to crawl out of it and nothing else. I do not know anything about the hon. member's motives, who proposes this amendment, but he has voted for a motion declaring that the plebiscite vote was not large enough to warrant the government in introducing a prohibitory Bill. Why not stop there? But he is not satisfied with that, and wants now to do a little for the temperance people. If he wishes to enlarge the scope of the Canada Temperance Act, let him introduce a Bill for that purpose, and this House will consider it, and if the amendments he proposes are satisfactory, no doubt the Bill will pass. But to ask an intelligent body like the House of Commons to vote in the dark that they will enlarge the scope of the Canada Temperance Act, without knowing in what way it is to be enlarged or being given any details whatever, is a piece of absurdity. Suppose this case, here are three counties, two of which are in favour of prohibition, and one is opposed to it. We might enlarge the scope of the Canada Temperance Act so as to take the vote of the three counties together and compel the one opposed to prohibition to be subjected to that law, in order to oblige the other two. Can we imagine this House agreeing to anything of the kind? I do not think that the temperance people will support the hon. member in this.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I think they will.

Mr. CRAIG. The hon. gentleman evidently thinks that he knows what the temperance people want better than we do on this side. But I think differently. As a temperance man, I consider this amendment as nothing less than an insult to the temperance people. I am satisfied with the vote I gave and am not ashamed of it, and I do not want to minimize it in any possible way. I want the temperance people to know that I voted that the result of the plebiscite did not warrant the government bringing in a prohibitory law. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) has voted in like manner, but he is not satisfied because he does not want to stand on a square principle, but wants to bring in a little side wind which he thinks may bring to him some little political support.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think my hon. friend has fairly considered the proposition before the House. Heretofore my recollection is that he has always spoken and voted in favour of every measure in which had for its object the perfecting of existing temperance legislation.

Mr. CRAIG. I am in favour of every such measure still.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Although the Scott Act has not been adopted in many counties of Ontario, or, if adopted, has been repealed, still that Act is the only temperance legislation in force in the maritime provinces. It is in force in many of the counties, and in some of them it has been in force almost from the time the Act was brought into operation. But there have been complaints from year to year that this Act was defective, and that it requires improvements in its working details.

Mr. CRAIG. Why have the government not introduced a Bill to make it effective?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For many reasons. They are only learning what the demand of the temperance people is in that regard. The hon. member no doubt knows that my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) has introduced a Bill to supplement the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, but has not been able to reach it, as many Bills introduced by private members have not been reached. In many points the Scott Act requires amendment. The Bill of the hon. member for Yarmouth, I notice, enlarges some of its provisions and increases the penalty for breaches of the Act, which is in the direction the temperance people seek to have it amended. He seeks also to have a clause inserted enabling search warrants to be executed, the inability to do which was found a very grievous objection, and he makes other important amendments.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not see what this has to do with the question before the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has everything to do with it. It shows that there are grave defects in the Act in the opinion of this House, and he wants an opportunity to bring these before the House. If this amendment carried, the government will be bound to give him such an opportunity.

Mr. FOSTER. Any man has that opportunity.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As a private member he has no possible opportunity to bring a Bill before the House and carry it this session, because the government business monopolises all the time. If the House agrees in the proposition, that the circumstances of the case require amendments to be made to the Canada Temperance Act, that would be sufficient to induce the government to give a portion of the government's time to that purpose.

Mr. LARIVIERE. When you give the hon. gentleman an opportunity to bring in his motion, could you not give him the same opportunity to bring in his Bill?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not objecting to his having the opportunity, but I am pointing out why there could not be any possible harm in affirming the proposition. The other day in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, a very serious decision was given by one of the judges, affecting the working of the Act, as to the power of some magistrate to sit in cases under the Act at all. If this resolution should pass, that would have to be taken up and considered carefully. This Bill of the hon. member for Yarmouth is only one of a series of Bills, and if the motion is passed, it will be the duty of the government to give every opportunity for the discussion of these various amendments.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot see that I can consistently accept this amendment. Were I to vote for it, I would be voting that prohibition is abandoned altogether. If it is thought necessary to amend the Scott Act, that can be amended without passing this amendment at all, and therefore, I cannot consistently accept it.

Mr. FOSTER. I consider that it is little less than an insult and treating this House with contempt to ask it to pass a resolution that an Act now upon the statute ought to be improved and amended. You might as well take up our time in bringing up resolutions that the Criminal Code ought to be enlarged and improved, or that the Representation Act or any other Act should be enlarged and improved, and besides the resolution is so indefinite that it

gives no direction at all. If any law ought to be enlarged and improved, in the opinion of any member, he has the right to bring in legislation to that effect, and the House will discuss his measure and vote upon it. That is one ground why I oppose the amendment—because I am not going to consume my time, and I do not think it is proper to consume the time of the House in voting on such meaningless, foolish and indefinite propositions. In the second place, the argument of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), has more force than he gives it, owing to the conjuncture of the two propositions. In the first place, the House has voted that the country is not ready for a prohibitory law, and on the top of that comes this proposal that we should enlarge and improve the Scott Act. It means, to my mind, the seal set upon the deliverance that prohibition is dead and buried, and that this is to take its place and to hold that place for the future. On these grounds I propose to vote against this motion.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had considered, for a moment, I do not think he would say that prohibition is being displaced by this amendment. We have just voted that at present the country is not ready for prohibition. This amendment comes after that and declares that we have an Act already on the statute-books and we should improve it. Speaking as a lawyer, I believe that the Canada Temperance Act ought to be amended. But that amendment ought not to be in the hands of a private member alone. I think we should have the assistance of the government and of the opposition. I believe no Act was ever passed in which so many different decisions have been given; and one of the difficulties we have experienced in Nova Scotia in the enforcement of this law, was these diverse rulings of the court. I believe we should do all we can to amend that Act to make it workable, and this resolution is to affirm that.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I desire to occupy the time of the House for only a few moments, to explain my position on this very peculiar amendment. I confess I am at a loss altogether to comprehend its meaning. We have within the last half-hour declared that a prohibitory law should not be enacted at present. What are we then going to amend the Scott Act for? What are we going to enlarge its scope for? Are we to be asked to enlarge the scope of the Scott Act, so as to make its terms more liberal to those who sell liquor? That must be the meaning of it. If prohibition is entirely wrong and should not be enacted at present, is it the intention of hon. gentlemen to relax the clauses of the Scott Act, and give more freedom to the manufacture and sale of liquor, than has been given heretofore. To be consistent, I fail to see how

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

the scope of the Scott Act can be altered in any other way. Now, I feel very much as the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) does on this matter. It seems to me purely childish to introduce the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). I doubt very much whether the hon. gentleman in his inmost conscience feels that he has squared himself for the vote he has given. I have not the slightest doubt that when he goes west, he hopes to square himself with the electors of Assiniboia. That is the intention of the hon. gentleman—it is simply a squaring measure, not to improve temperance legislation—that is far from his intention. His whole desire is to find a hole to crawl out of, and he has found a small one—and it takes only a small one for a man of his size to crawl out of. When he thinks over this to-morrow morning, he will be the most serious man in this House. I have no hesitation in saying I will vote against this resolution. The people in western Ontario, I think have had all the Scott Act they want. I believe that is the universal verdict. There is not a single county in which it was brought in force, that has not repealed it. You may joint two counties together, or even more but, what better off will you be. We have had sometimes four or five counties together with the Scott Act in force, and still it could not be made to work, so unsatisfactory was it; and the first opportunity the people had, they repealed it. I am bound to come to the conclusion that the only object of this amendment is not to help temperance legislation, not to help the temperance people in their efforts to secure prohibition, but simply to find a miserable little hole, that some hon. gentlemen can crawl out of.

Mr. McCLURE. While I believe in the enlargement and improvement of the Scott Act, in order that those counties that have seen fit to adopt it, may have an effective law, I cannot vote for this amendment. There is no doubt that, as regards the maritime provinces, there is a demand among those counties that have the Scott Act, to have it improved. I would vote for the proposition if it stood alone; but if I vote for it as it stands now, I have to endorse the motion of my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Parmalee), and I cannot do that.

Mr. A. H. MOORE (Stanstead). I think the temperance people of Canada will be very much surprised to find their work of so many years culminating in this abortion of a resolution brought forward by the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). I have also been surprised at the statement of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), that they considered the Scott Act has been satisfactory. How can it be considered satisfactory, when, in the province of Ontario, after having been adopt-

ed in twenty-five counties and two cities, in every one of them it has been repealed, and in the province of Quebec likewise, every county which adopted it after a practical trial has repealed it. The Scott Act is discredited all over these two provinces; and the only place where it is adopted and enforced, is in the lower provinces, where any Bill with the name of prohibition to it would be observed by the people there. The government is in the position of a shoemaker who went to a new locality and set up business. The first day they brought him a pair of shoes to be resoled; the next day they brought them back for new heels and a new vamp. The next day he advised them to get new strings and have a new pair made. The government had better let us have a new Bill which can be better enforced, if they want to satisfy the temperance people of this country.

Mr. WM. McCLEARY (Welland). If subterfuge, deceit and cunning were measured to their lowest depths, I think there could not be found such hypocrisy and shame as that which so thoroughly characterizes the attitude of the government, and of certain gentlemen behind them, on this temperance question. I had always understood that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) was taken into the cabinet as the advocate of the great temperance organizations in this country, notwithstanding the fact that when the Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) came into Ontario he told us that he had taken him in because he was a farmer, that he had found him as David of old was found by the prophet in his father's sheepfold, so this gentleman was found in the furrows of a corn field, a hardy son of toil, to represent the farmers of Canada; but, he was generally supposed to represent the temperance element. The House has already been told to-night of the manner in which he broke faith with the temperance people in that convention of 1893, when he entered into an arrangement in consequence of which it was impossible to carry out the views of the temperance people. I will not pursue that point any further. I want to show the hypocrisy and the cunning underlying this whole question as they have been exhibited by this government. Now, the amendment proposed by the member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), fathered by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. McDonald), and I presume, handed around from one member to another to see what support it could get on the other side of the House, is just another illustration of the hypocrisy with which this question has been treated by the government and their supporters, for the most part. The hon. member for East Huron told us that the Scott Act in Ontario had to be managed by the machinery of the Mowat administration. Why, Sir, every temperance man in the province of Ontario knows what took place when the Hon. Mr. Mowat and his government appointed a

man to enforce that law. Everybody remembers the celebrated correspondence that was made public between a certain Mr. Lang, and the gentleman who was appointed chief inspector, Mr. Manning, under the Ontario government. When he was written to by Mr. Lang asking him to make a more rigid enforcement of the Scott Act, as otherwise the temperance people would go back on the Liberal party, what was Mr. Manning's reply? His reply was: It is impossible for me to suit the two ends of our party. While you are insisting on a severe enforcement of the law, I am advised, on the other hand, that a more stringent enforcement would be detrimental to the interests of the Mowat government. And still the hon. gentleman asks us to-night to commit ourselves to this miserable subterfuge for a temperance law, the Scott Act, to be enforced by political hacks, as it always has been in the province of Ontario. I have no hesitation in saying that I shall vote against this miserable subterfuge that has been put up in order to afford a pretext by which some gentleman can go back to their constituents and say that they were in favour of temperance to a certain extent, because they voted for this resolution to enlarge the Scott Act.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Douglas).

**YEAS :**

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Johnston,
Beith,	Lang,
Belcourt,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bell (Prince),	Lavergne,
Bourbonnais,	Legris,
Britton,	Logan,
Brown,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bruneau,	Macdonell,
Burnett,	McGregor,
Calvert,	McGugan,
Campbell,	McHugh,
Christie,	McIsaac,
Costigan,	McLellan,
Davies (Sir Louis),	McLennan (Inverness),
Davis,	McMillan,
Dechêne,	Maxwell,
Demers,	Mignault,
Douglas,	Mulock,
Dupré,	Parmalee,
Dyment,	Paterson,
Featherston,	Penny,
Fielding,	Fettot,
Fisher,	Préfontaine,
Flint,	Ratz,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Rutherford,
Fraser (Lambton),	Semple,
Frost,	Snetsinger,
Gauthier,	Sutherland,
Gauvreau,	Talbot,
Geoffrion,	Tolmie,
Gibson,	Turcot, and
Gould,	Wilson.—65.
Graham,	

**NAYS :**

Messieurs

Beattie,	Macdonald (King's),
Bell (Pictou),	MacLaren,
Bennett,	McCarthy,
Bergeron,	McCleary,

Mr. McCLEARY.

Blair,  
Borden (King's),  
Bourassa,  
Brodeur,  
Carscallen,  
Casey,  
Champagne,  
Clancy,  
Cochrane,  
Copp,  
Corby,  
Craig,  
Dugas,  
Edwards,  
Ethier,  
Fitzpatrick,  
Foster,  
Gillies,  
Gilmour,  
Guillet,  
Henderson,  
Hodgins,  
Ingram,  
Kaubach,  
Klock,  
Kloepfer,  
LaRivière,  
Livingston,

McClure,  
McCormick,  
McDougall,  
McLennan (Glengarry),  
McMullen,  
McNeill,  
Malouin,  
Marcil,  
Marcotte,  
Martin,  
Monet,  
Monk,  
Moore,  
Morin,  
Morrison,  
Oliver,  
Powell,  
Prior,  
Puttee,  
Richardson,  
Rogers,  
Rcsamond,  
Ross,  
Savard,  
Seagram,  
Stubbs,  
Taylor, and  
Wallace.—64.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the names be read. One hon. member was marked on both sides.

Mr. SPEAKER. His name was dropped off.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) did not vote.

An hon. MEMBER. He is paired.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no pair for this.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am paired with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). If I had not been, I would have voted against this amendment.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no pair for this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Tie.

Amendment (Mr. Douglas) agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is now on the main motion as amended.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before this motion is put, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he considers this majority will be sufficient to warrant him in taking action?

Motion (Mr. Flint), as amended, agreed to.

**ADJOURNMENT.**

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought we were to have the railway resolutions to-day?

**DEATH OF HON. ARTHUR DICKEY.**

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). My hon. friends, I am sure, will join with me in what I have to say before the

House adjourns. We should not fail to take note of a very sad event which has occurred to-day in my own province of Nova Scotia, which has resulted in the loss of one of our most distinguished citizens, who, for many years occupied a seat in this House and who filled the important position of Minister of Justice. I refer to the Hon. Arthur Dickey, who was drowned to-day near Amherst, in the county of Cumberland. Many hon. gentlemen who sit here to-night had the pleasure of being associated with him when he was a member of this House, and I am sure that I but state their views when I say that he was a gentleman who invariably enjoyed the respect and esteem of hon. members on both sides of this House. My own personal recollections of association with that gentleman are of the most agreeable kind, although they include occasions when we met as opponents on the public platform. In his professional life, in his public life, in his life as an enterprising citizen, in every relation of life, the Hon. Arthur Dickey was universally esteemed, respected, and, I might say, loved. He was a cordial friend and a generous foe. I am sure that no man who has passed out of the public life of Canada for a long time will be more sincerely mourned or more deeply regretted. I am sure that every hon. member who knew him, either personally, or only by reputation, will join with me in expressing to his family our deepest sympathy on the occasion of his untimely death.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I am sure I cannot but say, for myself, and for hon. members on this side of the House, that we feel very much the shock of the news of the untimely and sudden end of the gentleman whose name has been mentioned, and we feel very much as well the loss we have suffered. I re-echo every word that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has said in reference to the deceased gentleman. I made his acquaintance first in 1882, and from that time forward until the election of 1896, I was more or less intimately associated with him in public life, and I may say as well in the interchange of that friendship which springs up between persons, more especially those working in the same party, and with the same political aims. I may say that Mr. Dickey was a very high-minded man. His code of honour was high, and though he was a strong opponent, he was also a fair-minded opponent. I do not know any member of this House who dealt with public questions, or treated his opponents in the House, with greater fairness than did Mr. Dickey. To us, on this side of the House, who have been more intimately associated with him, his loss is one which it is hard to repair. Not only in the line of public work and in connected with the party to which he belonged do we mourn his loss, but we mourn his loss from a larger and higher point of

view. Men endowed as Mr. Dickey was, with strong intellectual power, cultured, high-minded and of high motives; when they leave the scene of action, especially at such an early age, their departure is a great loss to the country as a whole; a great loss to the public life of Canada. I join with my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) in voicing the deep regret with which we have heard of the death of our friend, and I join him also in a tender of sympathy to those who are bereaved in the home and friendly circle, of a man who was a kind father, a most devoted friend, and who in the circle in which he moved, held the respect and had the love of all those who knew him well.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). I am sure it will bring great solace to the family and friends of the late Mr. Dickey, when they learn of the words that have been spoken to-night in the parliament of Canada. I speak of the deceased as a friend, as one who was a political opponent of mine, but of whom I can say that no more honourable man ever lived than Arthur Dickey. I have known him since my boyhood days; I have known him as a fellow-member of the bar; I have known him as a very near neighbour; I have known him as a political opponent, as I have said, but I have ever known him as a dear, personal friend. I cannot do less than to express the great and profound sorrow I feel at the loss of one who for many years has been a close friend of mine, and who in the course of our political strife never permitted a single unkind word to escape his lips. I can think of nothing that he has ever done or said in political life, that did not stamp him as a man of the very highest character. My heart goes out to-night to the sorrowing widow and children, and to the aged father, who now at the age of four score and ten, mourns the loss of a son who was a bright star in the political and legal firmament of the province of Nova Scotia, and of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood that the Premier promised that the railway subsidies would be brought down to-day?

The PRIME MINISTER. They will not be ready before to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. What business shall we have to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER. We will take up the Election Bill, the Conciliation Bill and the Railway Bill.

Mr. MONK. Would the right hon. gentleman fix a day for the discussion of the report of the Select Committee on the Emergency Rations?

The PRIME MINISTER. Agreeable to my hon. friend, we will be able to take that up on Thursday morning.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1 a.m. (Wednesday.)

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 4, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## YUKON—PRESERVATION OF GAME.

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 190) entitled 'The Yukon Game Preservation Act.'

Mr. FOSTER. What is this?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Ogilvie and the council report that it has been found that the Act that now applies, that is, the Territories Game Preservation Act, is not applicable to the condition of affairs in the Yukon Territory. It is intended, under this Bill, to give the council some power, by ordinance, to amend that Act and make it suitable for the condition of affairs.

Mr. PRIOR. I suppose this does not preclude miners and prospectors from shooting deer.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It might preclude some of the kickers my hon. friend (Mr. Prior) has heard about.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## ST. GEDEON MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. Has the contract for carrying the mail between the railway station and the post office at St. Gédéon been renewed since July, 1899?

2. If so, were tenders called for; if not, why not, and on whose recommendation?

3. If not, what action did the Postmaster General take on the expiration of the contract?

4. What price is now paid for the said service; and is the said price higher, or lower, than that stated in the contract?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) has given me the answer, which is as follows:—The last contract for the mail service mentioned expired on the 31st March last. Since that date the service has been carried on under a temporary agreement by the former contractor on the same terms and conditions, pending inquiry as to the arrangements for the continuance of the service. The price is 19½ cents per trip, the same as was paid under the contract.

## HILLSBORO' BRIDGE—PROTECTION OF FOOT-PASSENGERS.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

Does the Dominion government provide for the protection and safety of all foot-passengers and other persons using the highway portion of the Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

proposed Hillsborough bridge, in Prince Edward Island?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The agreement with the provincial government provides, I believe, for all necessary protection.

## BRANCH RAILWAY LINES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. MARTIN asked:

1. Has the government received any petition for the construction of a line of railway in Prince Edward Island from a point between Royalty Junction and York station to Covehead and thence to Rustico? If so, how many?

2. Is the government aware that this line was included in a resolution proposed by the Minister of Railways on April 21, 1899, for the building of certain line of railways in Prince Edward Island therein mentioned?

3. Has the government received any other petitions praying for railway extension in Prince Edward Island? If so, how many; from what sections, together with the points each petition asks to be covered, and the number of names attached to those petitions?

4. Is it the intention of the government during this parliamentary term to take any action for the survey or construction of those proposed lines of railways?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The Department of Railways and Canals received two such petitions only. 2. Presuming that the hon. member means the resolution proposed on April 21, 1896, my answer is that the line mentioned is included in the resolution. 3. Yes, 14 petitions—(1) Charlottetown to Murray Harbour through Murray Harbour, District of King's County, and in Belfast and Fort Augustus, District of Queen's County, 583 names; (2) Charlottetown to Murray Harbour through Murray Harbour, District of King's County and in Belfast and Fort Augustus, District of Queen's County, 422 names; (3) Charlottetown to Murray Harbour through Murray Harbour, District of King's County and in Belfast and Fort Augustus, District of Queen's County, 142 names; (4) Charlottetown to Murray Harbour through Murray Harbour, District of King's County and in Belfast and Fort Augustus, District of Queen's County, 173 names; (5) Charlottetown to Murray Harbour through Murray Harbour, District of King's County and in Belfast and Fort Augustus, District of Queen's County, 107 names; (6) South Port to Murray Harbour, 5 names, senators and members; Harmony Station to Murray Harbour, 5 names, senators and members; Royalty Junction to Covehead, thence to Rustico, 5 names senators and members; Emerald Junction to Stanley Bridge, 5 names, senators and members; Summerside to Richmond Bay, 5 names, senators and members; O'Leary Station, Prince County, to some point on western coast between Brae and Cape Wolfe, North Wiltshire to Victoria, 5 names, senators and members; (7) Wiltshire to Vic-

toria, 1 name for and on behalf of inhabitants of district; (8) Summerside to Richmond Bay, 1 name for and on behalf of inhabitants of district; (9) Emerald Junction to Stanley Bridge, 1 name for and on behalf of inhabitants of district; (10) South Port to Murray Harbour, 1 name for and on behalf of inhabitants of district; (11) Royalty Junction to Rustico, 1 name for and on behalf of inhabitants of district; (12) Murray Harbour Branch crossing the country at head of Vernon River, 194 names; (13) Murray Harbour Branch to pass close to Grand View and Murray Harbour Road, 100 names; (14) Murray Harbour Branch with terminus at Machan's Point, 60 names.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.). Do I understand the hon. minister to say 'Harmony to Murray Harbour'? If so, that must be a mistake.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It must be 'Harmony to Elmira.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It reads here 'Harmony Station to Murray Harbour.' This is the way the answer is furnished to me. If it is important I will have it verified.

#### GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND STEAM SERVICE.

Mr. GANONG (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

How many tenders have been received for steam service between Grand Manan, New Brunswick, and the mainland? What are the names of those who tendered, and what was the amount of the several tenders? Has the contract been awarded? If so, to whom? What are the conditions of the contract?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Tenders were advertised for in March last. There were but two tenders received—one from Messrs. Hugh Cann & Sons, for the sum of \$6,500, the steamer to be the *Malcolm Cann*, or they would continue the service as at present performed with the steamer *Latour* for \$4,000 per annum; the other tender was from Messrs. E. Gaskill, W. E. Tatton, and Frank Ingersoll, for the sum of \$10,000, including \$2,500 appropriated by the province of New Brunswick. Neither tender was accepted. Negotiations were entered into with a view to securing an improved service at a more reasonable figure, resulting in an offer from W. E. Tatton for a service four times per week in summer, and twice a week in winter, for the sum of \$5,000, in addition to the amount appropriated by the province, which offer has been by telegraph accepted, conditioned that a satisfactory steamer be furnished. The contract has not yet been executed.

#### I.C.R.—SAND CASTINGS AT RICHMOND, N.S.

Mr. BELL (Pictou)—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What were the names of the parties who tendered for green sand castings for Intercolonial Railway at Richmond, Nova Scotia, and what were amounts of the several tenders?
2. What proportion of cast iron scrap, and at what price, was to be taken in payment?
3. To whom was the tender awarded when last invited in current year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The names of the parties who tendered for iron castings required on the Eastern Division of the Intercolonial Railway, and the amounts of the several tenders, with the proportion of cast iron scrap to be taken in payment are: Robert Brown & Sons, \$2.30 per 100 lbs.; will take equal quantity of scrap and allow \$16 per ton of 2,000 lbs. Oxford Foundry and Machine Company, \$2 per 100 lbs.; will take half the value in scrap at \$14 per ton. Fraser Bros., \$1.62½; will take equal weight of scrap at \$16 per ton. Jas. Hillis & Son, \$2; will take cast scrap in payment at \$15 per ton of 2,000 lbs. W. P. McNeil & Co., \$1.60; will take equal quantity scrap at \$15 per ton. The contract was awarded to Fraser Bros., the lowest tenderers, though Fraser Bros' price of the castings, it will be observed, was 2½ cents per 100 lbs. higher. They offer \$16 per ton for an equal weight of scrap as against \$15 offered by W. P. McNeil & Co., which makes Fraser Bros' offer more favourable.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to say to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that I have not received the returns with reference to the one delinquent department, that of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) thinks he will be able to get it to-day.

#### THE CASE OF GEORGE HARRIS.

Mr. FREDERICK D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the government if the case of George Harris has been investigated. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) consented to look into this case some time ago. I had this case under consideration at the beginning of the session. George Harris is a Canadian by birth, who was living in Prince Edward Island—at present, residing in Montreal.

He was arrested by an officer of the Newfoundland government at Sydney, P.E.I. on a charge of smuggling. The arrest was effected without legal formality, he was actually taken by force over to Newfoundland and there, under an agreement, he pleaded guilty and suffered rather a long imprisonment. He brought his case to my notice and I wrote to the Minister of Justice about it at the beginning of the session. Rather than bring the case to the notice of this House I thought it better to confer with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who was familiar with it, and knew the family of this Mr. Geo. Harris. He is a man of good standing, and I believe the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has looked into his case, and as we are approaching the end of the session I would like to know if he has come to any decision in regard to the request this man makes.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I may say that the government of Canada received a petition from Mr. Harris praying that this government would interfere in his behalf and claiming redress for wrongs done him by the Newfoundland government. That petition was accompanied by a voluminous mass of papers. We communicated with the Newfoundland government, of course we had to do so through the Colonial Office. All the papers were forwarded to the Colonial Office by despatch of the 26th of July last, and the matter was forwarded by the Imperial government to the government of Newfoundland. The government of Newfoundland through its Attorney General, sent a reply to the Colonial Office and the Colonial Office, on the 29th of August last, 1899, acknowledged receipt of our papers and forwarded on to the government here the reply of the Attorney General of Newfoundland. I may say to my hon. friend that in forwarding these papers they expressed the following opinion in a paragraph of the despatch :

While not desiring to express an opinion on the merits of the case, I may say that I think it would be well if your ministers could see their way to let the matter drop.

This was signed by the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain. Under these circumstances, and with that strong expression of opinion from the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, no further action has been taken.

#### **CORPORAL COURTNEY, 'A' BATTERY.**

Mr. **GEO. TAYLOR** (South Leeds). Before the Orders of the Day are called I would again ask the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden), what he is going to do with reference to Corporal Courtney? I see by this morning's paper that the question was raised yesterday in the Imperial House of Commons in London.

Mr. **MONK.**

In the House of Commons to-day Samuel Woods, member for Walthamstow, questioned the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain in regard to Corporal Courtney, of 'A' Battery, Kingston, being reduced to the ranks because he refused to distribute beer to his men. The Colonial Secretary in reply stated that he had no information on the subject. The Imperial government has no right or desire to interfere in a question solely concerning one of the self-governing colonies.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). A very satisfactory answer, I think, indeed. I may say to my hon. friend that I expected the deputy minister here this morning with the papers. He has not come, but I will be ready to make a statement on the question within twenty-four hours, at any rate. The matter is of some importance, and I think it is only right that I should carefully consider it before making a statement to the House. There is some question as to whether the papers are such as should be laid on the Table of the House. Some of them are confidential, I do not say they are all so, but I think I should carefully look into the matter before making a statement.

#### **TRADE RELATIONS WITH TRINIDAD.**

Mr. **W. H. MONTAGUE** (Haldimand). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to call the attention of the government to a despatch which I see in the papers stating that the negotiations between the United States and Trinidad as regards reciprocity have practically failed. Does the government intend taking any steps to renew the negotiations between Canada and Trinidad.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). We received no formal notification. A certain time must elapse, I think, before the matter can be considered as final, although I believe the fact is as the hon. gentleman has stated.

#### **ELECTION ACT—AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION.**

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 133) to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 69,

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick). In pursuance of an arrangement made at the last sitting of the committee I have drafted an amendment to the statute which will take the place of section 69, to provide for the votes of those who are now absent in South Africa. The amendment reads as follows:—

Notwithstanding anything contained in any Act of parliament or in any Act of a provincial legislature, no person otherwise qualified to vote at an election of a member to serve in the House of Commons should be disentitled to vote at such election by reason only of his having been absent from Canada or any province of Canada, or from the electoral district in which such election was held, while serving with or attached to any corps despatched from Canada for service in the present South African war, whether as an officer, non-commissioned officer, or private, or in any other capacity, or while serving Her Majesty in any military capacity or acting as a war correspondent in connection with said war.

2. From any oath which any such person tendering his vote at such an election may be required to take, there shall be omitted any statements as to residence which such person cannot by reason of such absence as aforesaid truthfully make, and there may be added to any such oath the following paragraph:—

‘That you were a member of the corps known as \_\_\_\_\_ and served Her Majesty as an (officer, non-commissioned officer or private, or otherwise, as the case may be) in connection with the South African war

or,

That you served Her Majesty in connection with the South African war in a military capacity as \_\_\_\_\_

or,

That in connection with the South African war you acted as a war correspondent \_\_\_\_\_ and that you were in consequence absent from Canada from the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ to the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_.

This is the form of oath they may take. Up to the present I have provided that those who are absent from the country, but whose names are on the list, should not be disqualified by reason of non-residence within the prescribed time previous to the election. I intend to go further than that and to add this clause which will provide for those who have become qualified and who would have been on the list if they had not been absent in South Africa. The following is to be added as subsection 3 to proposed section 69:—

3. If the name of any such person is not upon the list of voters, and it might have been put thereon had he not been so absent, such person shall nevertheless be entitled to vote upon his offering to take, and taking if so requested, before the deputy returning officer or other person in charge of the polling station, in addition to any oath he might otherwise have been required to take, omitting statements as to residence and as to his name being upon the list which he cannot by reason of such absence truthfully make, and the paragraph prescribed in subsection 2 being added thereto, as well as the following paragraph:—

‘That you were qualified to have your name upon the list of voters at the time such list was prepared, except for the fact of your absence from Canada as aforesaid.’

Mr. WOOD. Would that include those who are engaged in the postal service?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In any service in South Africa connected with the contingent.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would it include the Red Cross service, which is not a military service?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes; because it is in connection with the military service, ‘whether officer, non-commissioned officer, or private, or in any other capacity, or while serving Her Majesty in any military capacity.’ That would cover everything. As a result of this amendment all those whose names are on the list and who would be disqualified as a result of their absence in South Africa will be entitled to vote; further, those who were not on the list but who would have been qualified to be put on the list had they been in Canada at the time the list was made, will be qualified to vote by giving the affidavit.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). What about their place of residence?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They will have to make application within the district—

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Where they resided last?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In the case of their being on the list they will, of course, have to go to the polling booth of the place where the list is, and in the other case they will be obliged to go to the booth of the polling place for the list of which they would have been entitled to be had they been in Canada.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Suppose they had arrived at Quebec, would they all have a vote in Quebec?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No; I think not.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). Would the hon. Solicitor General be inclined to extend the words a little and make them apply to soldiers serving Her Majesty outside of Canada at the front? I do not want to press the matter; I only suggest it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is for a special case, and I think we had better limit it to that case.

Mr. McNEILL. I only thought of the offer that had been made to serve in China, but I do not desire to press the matter.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this clause 69?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That will be substituted in lieu of clause 69 which is struck out. I am coming now to the question of the ballot paper.

Mr. BERGERON. Are all the other clauses passed?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes; I want to deal with the promises I made the other day to make certain changes.

The suggestions which I made the other day was that we should have a ballot paper with two counterfoils attached, on both of which would be placed the same number with the initials of the deputy returning officer so that when the deputy returning officer gave a ballot to the voter he would detach from the ballot one of the counterfoils bearing a certain number which he would place upon the table. Then, the elector would go into the secret chamber and bring back his ballot. The deputy returning officer would then ascertain if it bore a number corresponding with the number on the counterfoil that had been detached previously to the elector going into the secret chamber. That would have been an ideal ballot, but a ballot of this sort cannot be prepared, especially in country places. I sent to the Queen's Printer to ask if he could prepare such a ballot, and he said that he had not the machinery at the present time which was necessary to enable him to make it. It will be necessary for him, he says, to build a machine and to experiment with that machine so as to be absolutely certain that he would have an accurate ballot and that there would be in all cases the same number on both counterfoils. In view of that fact I intend to suggest—and it is a suggestion I got from the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding)—that we should keep the ballot we have now provided for in the schedule. We shall provide that these ballots before they leave the hands of the returning officer to be sent to the deputy returning officer shall be stamped by a stamp which shall be furnished to the returning officer, who shall stamp each ballot so that it will be absolutely certain that the ballot which will reach the deputy returning officer will be the ballot coming from the returning officer, in that way restricting the responsibility for the ballot in each electoral division to the returning officer himself and holding him liable for it. We provide that this special stamp shall be sent to him by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and severe penalties are provided for any person who shall use that stamp or be found in possession of the stamp other than the returning officer. I will just read the section so that hon. gentlemen may see what it is:

Every ballot paper furnished by the returning officer to the deputy returning officer shall be stamped by the returning officer with a stamp to be furnished to him for that purpose by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the stamp shall be so placed that when the ballot paper is folded by the voter the stamp can be seen without opening it.

Of course, necessarily, provision has to be made for stamping the ballot in such a way that the deputy returning officer can identify the stamp as well as his initials without violating the secrecy of the ballot.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. McNEILL. That is certainly an improvement, but it is not to my mind nearly so satisfactory—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As the other.

Mr. McNEILL. Not nearly, and it is not so satisfactory as allowing the scrutineers to initial the ballots.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I may be permitted to say something about that. Take the case of scrutineers initialling the ballots; we would not unnecessarily complicate the machinery so as to prevent the Act from being put into operation. You have the initials of the deputy returning officer, you have two candidates, you add the initials of two scrutineers so that there are three sets of initials on the back of the ballot papers, and it occurs to me, with the knowledge I have of the way that the ballots are initialled in country parts, it would be practically impossible to carry out the intention of the Act, because the intention must be that when the ballot paper comes back to the deputy returning officer he would be in a position to examine it and ascertain that it was the ballot handed out by him. He will be able to verify that fact by the initials. But, suppose there were three sets of initials on the back of the ballot paper; he has to examine them all and take such precautions as will enable him to examine all these without violating the secrecy of the ballot. If he is not going to be able to do that in the case of two candidates how would he be able to do it in the case of four candidates where you would have eight initials?

Mr. McNEILL. The proposal is that there should not be more than two who would initial, the scrutineers who would initial the ballot. That would be three initials altogether.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If there are three sets of candidates, as there may be, it would be difficult to put into practical operation.

Mr. McNEILL. It is quite unnecessary that more than two of the scrutineers should initial the ballots. It is merely for the purpose of identification.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Who would be entitled to do it?

Mr. McNEILL. Any two of the scrutineers.

Mr. SPROULE. They would quarrel over it. In regard to this proposition which has been made by the hon. Solicitor General, is it intended to have just one stamp in each electoral division which shall be sent to the returning officer?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the returning officer stamps all the ballots beforehand?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes; the returning officer sends the ballots to each deputy returning officer, but before he sends them out to the deputy returning officer they must be stamped.

Mr. SPROULE. What provision is there for sending them to the returning officer?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We have adopted the provision suggested by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), that they should be stitched together and numbered.

Mr. POWELL. They are still to be numbered?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No; except they are numbered consecutively.

Mr. SPROULE. This is entirely in the hands of the returning officer, and if he is a bad man he might do as he likes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). You cannot have any election law, or any other law, which will not depend, to some extent, upon the honesty of somebody. I ventured to give this suggestion to the Solicitor General from the experience of the province of Nova Scotia. There the returning officer is usually the sheriff, and the sheriff has an official stamp which he uses on the ballots before he issues them. It may be that we are innocent people down there and are not accustomed to the wiles of the wicked world, but in the province of Nova Scotia I never knew of a bogus ballot being found in a box. The deputy returning officer hands the voter a ballot marked with the sheriff's stamp and the ballot which he puts in the box must have that stamp on it. It is proposed that a stamp shall be furnished to each returning officer and that he shall stamp his ballots as in the case I refer to. The stamp will be an inexpensive affair and can be quickly got ready, and I presume the returning officer, being a temporary official, will have to return it to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery when the election is over. It will be a serious offence, punishable by heavy penalties, for any one except the returning officer to have this stamp in his possession.

Mr. E. COCHRANE (East Northumberland). Will a different stamp be given to each returning officer?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I presume a stamp will be given to each returning officer with probably the name of the constituency on it, but all that is a matter of detail.

Mr. COCHRANE. The people of Nova Scotia may be very honest, as the Finance Minister said, but I draw his attention to the statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce: 'That Nova Scotia was the wet and the dry nurse of boodlers.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. What he said was that it was the wet nurse of certain particular boodlers.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). In addition to the stamp will the returning officer put his initials on the back of the ballot as before.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Undoubtedly. This will be an additional precaution.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think that is a bad suggestion at all. Of course when the election is over that stamp will be returned to the returning officer. What guarantee is there that the stamp will not go astray, or that the ballot will not be stamped when they are sent to the deputy returning officers. Of course, as the Finance Minister said, we have to trust some one, but we have been deceived before and we are doing this in order to take every precaution. What penalties has the Solicitor General provided with regard to this?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have provided a penalty for any person who forges or uses any stamp furnished to the returning officer for any purpose other than the stamping of ballot papers pursuant to section 41, or who not being a returning officer, has in his possession any such stamp.

Mr. BERGERON. Suppose a person goes to a returning officer's house and finds the stamp lying around and stamps a number of ballots and takes them away?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He would be punished for having them in his possession.

Mr. BERGERON. But the returning officer?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You would not punish a returning officer if a person goes behind his back and uses the stamp.

Mr. BERGERON. The law should provide that the returning officer should take good care of the stamp.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You could not punish him for that.

Mr. McNEILL. I want to make the admission to my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) that I think he has been particularly fair and particularly anxious to get this measure framed as it ought to be. But I want to call his attention to this: that this is simply handing the electorate over body and bones to the returning officer. It is all very

well for the Minister of Finance to say that we must trust some one.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. But you have all the present guarantees.

Mr. McNEILL. The reason why we are legislating now is that we are distrustful of these people and we are doing every possible thing to prevent fraud.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. At the present time you have no guarantee except the initials on the back of the ballot, but in this case you have the additional guarantee of the stamp.

Mr. McNEILL. I understand that, and I think it a decided improvement that has been suggested by the Minister of Finance. But I say that we have within our reach something that is very much better and which makes it absolutely impossible to substitute a ballot; that is allowing two of the scrutineers to put their initials upon the back of the ballot paper. The objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is that it would not be possible for the deputy returning officer to identify the ballot without exposing it. Here is a ballot in my hand folded, and it may be written all over the back and I can see everything on the back without exposing it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If I were anxious for secrecy I would not fold my ballot paper in that way.

Mr. McNEILL. But it is often done, and you are going to supply a thick coloured paper.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). I think there is very grave objection to the amendment suggested by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) for this reason, that an agent could make a ballot easily recognizable by signing his name in a peculiar way.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). The fact of the number in the poll-book opposite the name of the voter being placed on the counterfoil will give the deputy returning officer an opportunity of knowing how a man votes, whether he destroys the counterfoil or not. He can easily retain in his memory the man's number in the poll-book, and by holding up the ballot paper between himself and the light he can easily see how it is marked. Should he fail to destroy the counterfoil then there would be no doubt about it. Many times deputy returning officers fail to even initial the ballots, so they might neglect to destroy the counterfoil.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If he can do that, you do not require the number.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As I understand it, the ballots as they come from the printer

are to be numbered in sections. How is that to be done?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are to be numbered either by the aid of a printing machine or by hand.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If they are numbered by a pen or a pencil, what particular safeguard will there be?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The ballots will be stitched together, say in quantities of one hundred, and numbered consecutively from 1 to 100. The stub which the returning officer shall retain in his possession will account for each ballot used. In addition to that, the number on the counterfoil will correspond with the number opposite the name of the voter in the poll-book.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). As I follow the discussion, it seems to me that if you have to furnish a stamp for each returning officer, which I suppose, when returned, will be destroyed so that it can not be used again, the expense involved will come very near that of a perfectly working mechanical contrivance which will both register the vote and the count, and I fancy we shall come to that before very long. As I understand the ballot proposed, we shall have all the safeguards existing at present in voting, together with the additional one of having all the ballots stamped by the returning officer with the stamp provided for him. There is only one other suggestion which I would make at this stage, that is one which has received some discussion in the papers. It is that paper for the ballots be provided by the government, such as bank-note paper which cannot be counterfeited, and that each candidate's name be printed on a separate ballot paper, and the ballot papers for the different candidates be put in a wrapper and furnished to the voter. The ballot which the voter selects is put into the box, and the others in the wrapper are returned to the deputy returning officer and by him destroyed.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). Would it not be an easy matter for the sheriff, as a returning officer, to issue those ballots indiscriminately unless there was a check against him on the counterfoil? Should not every counterfoil have a number when it goes into the hands of the sheriff, so that he can be followed, in case of dishonesty, and instead of destroying those counterfoils, would it not be right for him to retain them?

Mr. McNEILL. If we have an honest returning officer the proposal of the Solicitor General is a most admirable one and will guard against dishonesty on the part of others, after the ballots have left the returning officer. But if we are unfortunate enough to have a dishonest returning officer we are not safeguarded at all. My hon.

friend will agree that the placing of the initials on the back of a ballot paper will make it impossible to have a substitution of this kind.

I just wish to put the case to him again, and do not want to say anything more about it. But I want to ask with reference to this other matter. I think we are all agreed that the double counterfoil is a most admirable check. But the hon. gentleman has explained that it would take some time to provide and try the machine. I would suggest to him whether it might not be well to have such a machine provided; and, if there be time to use the machine before the election, to have that system adopted. We could make an alternative provision in the Bill.

Mr. J. V. ELLIS (St. John City). As I understand it, ballots are to come from the printer in pads numbered, is that right?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. ELLIS. And how are they to be stamped by the returning officer? How can he stamp them on the face?

Mr. FOSTER. They are only fastened at one end, like bank cheques in a book.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). I was a returning officer myself once, and speaking from experience. If the returning officer has to stamp the ballots for a large constituency—say, 20,000 ballots—he must have some compensation for doing so. It will take a smart clerk two or three days to do the work. In that case I will move, that in addition to the compensation already provided for the returning officer, he be allowed for stamping the ballots on the back with the official stamp, actual time used, not exceeding \$6. I suggest here \$6, but that can be discussed. If this is not accepted, I shall move it as an amendment at the proper time.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) asked the Solicitor General if it was the intention to have the stamp issued to the returning officer afterwards destroyed. I suppose it is not intended to be used in one election after another. It would be better to have it destroyed and not leave such things lying about.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is intended to provide that the stamp shall be returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, with the poll-book and other things that the deputy returning officer has to send back. I have ascertained that these stamps will only cost 75 cents each.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think what is still more important than the stamping is the quality of the paper. Though there is legislation prescribing a certain quality of paper, that quality is not used. Those who

examined the ballots that were shown in the Committee of Privileges and Elections will remember that the paper was not half the thickness of what the law required. The only way to get over that is for the government to supply the paper to the officer who is to have the ballots printed. It is not necessary to have a specially manufactured paper, but a quality of paper should be chosen and supplied by the government. If the printing is left to a newspaper office, they will put it on cheap paper, just as sure as we are sitting here, and if you have cheap paper, you have opportunities offered to those connected with the polling to see for whom the vote is cast.

Mr. BERGERON. That is a good suggestion, and I would just add a word. Though it may be true that in some constituencies lying at a distance from Ottawa it is not possible to supply the ballots within the time allowed, could we not name in the Bill the constituencies within reach from Ottawa which could be so served, leaving the ballots for the outside constituencies to be printed where it is found convenient?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not prepared to go as far as my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron), but, after consulting with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), I think we ought to accept the suggestion that the paper should be sent out.

Section 79 reconsidered.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I propose to add the following paragraphs to clause 79, between paragraphs *e* and *f*:

Forges or counterfeits any stamp for the stamping of ballot papers under section 41, paragraph (h).

Uses any stamp furnished to a returning officer under that paragraph for any purpose other than the stamping of ballot papers pursuant to the said paragraph.

Not being a returning officer, has in his possession any such stamp or any counterfeit or imitation thereof.

Mr. BERGERON. I suggest that you add: 'Is guilty of an indictable offence, if he is a returning officer, deputy returning officer, or any other officer engaged at an election, or' anybody else. Here you are only indicting some of them. A gentleman at large would not be touched at all. He might have his pockets full of those papers.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If he is a gentleman at large he comes under the second part of the penalty. Now, to meet the suggestion of the hon. member for Haldimand, I propose to add as paragraph 4, the following subsection to section 48:

The paper required for the printing of ballot papers shall be furnished to the returning officer by the Queen's Printer when the writ for the election is transmitted to him.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Solicitor General had better add to that 'and the returning officer shall have the ballots printed on said paper.'

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. 'The paper required for the printing of the ballot papers shall be furnished.' I think that covers the idea. The paper on which the ballot shall be printed shall be furnished by the Queen's Printer.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that all the amendments you propose to the ballot paper?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the Minister of Finance to say the other day that he had a proposition about the ballot paper.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was so anxious to see progress made with this Bill that I did not intend to ask the House to reconsider the form of ballot. I have no doubt the form of the ballot, as it is in the present Bill, is good enough for persons whose intelligence can be relied upon, but we know that persons will sometimes put their marks in all sorts of places. The ideal ballot would be a black ground with white letters giving the name of the candidate, and a white square or white disc for the mark of the voter. If there were ample time so as to get the ballots printed at headquarters and distributed, that would be quite feasible; but I am assuming that you have to adapt your ballot papers to the facilities of a country printing office, so that you can scarcely hope to reach your high ideal. My idea was to come as near as possible to it, by reducing to the smallest possible limits available the white space, having as much dark ground as possible, and as limited a white space as possible within which the mark was to be made. With that in view I have prepared a form of ballot. I do not think it is important enough to spend much time over it. I will send three or four copies over to my hon. friends. If the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram), had not called attention to it, I did not intend to mention it, because I wanted to get on with the Bill.

Mr. INGRAM. I think this is one of the best suggestions that we have had yet. The aim is that the voter cannot make his mark anywhere else than in the white space.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not approve of the suggestion. I undertake to say there will be five or six voters in every polling booth who will make their mark outside the space allotted. It seems to me after all is said and done, that you have got already as good a ballot there, with the broad line, as you could possibly have.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. INGRAM. The door is wide open to fraud in that form. There is no way of marking the ballot there, and any man that is fool enough to mark his ballot in there, ought to lose his vote.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think this is an improvement. The member for Elgin means that in this form proposed by the Minister of Finance, the voter is bound to make his cross in the white space.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not that he is bound to do it, but that he would have an inducement to do it, he cannot possibly put it anywhere else.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend means that he can hardly do otherwise, it is merely restricting the space where he will be bound to make his mark. I have figured it out here, and I find forty ways by which the voter, if he wants to tell somebody outside how he can do it, can do it on this ballot.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If he can do it in forty ways on this, he will do it in sixty ways on the other.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have another amendment to section 79:

(g) Who being a returning officer, fraudulently puts otherwise than as authorized by section 70 of the Act, his initials on the back of any paper purporting to be or capable of being used as a ballot paper at an election, or

(h) who, with fraudulent intent, prints any ballot paper or what purports to be or is capable of being used as a ballot paper at an election, or

(i) who being authorized by the returning officer to print the ballot papers for an election, with fraudulent intent prints more ballot papers than he is so authorized to print, or

Mr. SPROULE. Is there anything in the Act providing that the number of ballots printed shall be proportioned to the number of electors? Otherwise, the number might run short as in some cases in the west. We generally print a supernumerary batch, so that the supply will not run out.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We print the number required for each subdivision, and the printer will be required to give an affidavit of the number he has supplied to each returning officer. I want to make another amendment in reference to printed matter which we spoke of the other day. I have recast the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), 125*a*, so as to restrict the scurrilous matter that is printed during an election. It is for the purpose of meeting what I understood to be the sense of the committee when we last discussed the subject:

Any printed matter whatsoever placarded, posted up or distributed during an election and having connection therewith or reference there-

to, and which contains matter of a defamatory or scurrilous character, shall visibly bear on the face thereof the name and address of the printer and publisher thereof, and every one who prints, posts, publishes or distributes any such printed matter is liable to a penalty of dollars, or imprisonment for months.

I think the object was to punish any man who prints scurrilous stuff. The amendment of the hon. member for Montmorency would have been suitable, but for a remark made by the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster), to the effect that a great portion of the electoral matter to be used is already printed and distributed in the country.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency). That could be met by saying that any publications that had been distributed before the law came into force would not come under the operation of the law. If any member, during the session of parliament, chooses to send out to his constituents matter before the election comes on, it would not be matter under this law. By such a proviso in the law this inconvenience could be got over. But, the amendment, as drafted by the Solicitor General, defeats the object that I had in view completely, and defeats the object they had in view in England when they passed this law exactly as I have placed the amendment before the House.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Would my hon. friend point out the English law? I have not been able to find it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Who is to judge of what is scurrilous or defamatory? Is it the man who publishes it or the court? Then, sometimes in the opinion of somebody matter might be defamatory, and still it is not defamatory in the mind of the man who publishes it. For instance, if I publish matter which I believe to be true, and it turns out not to be true, and to be of a defamatory character against my opponent, and if I do not put on the printer's name, when it comes before the court I will be liable to be fined \$500 for not having put upon this matter the name of the printer, and I will also be liable to prosecution and fine because I have published something defamatory of my opponent. The object of the amendment is that nobody can, during an election contest, in the heat of the contest, distribute among the electors matter which he would not distribute if he had to put upon the matter his own name or the name of the printer. I would not like to take any example which would not be tasteful to hon. gentlemen opposite, but in the election of 1896, if anybody had had to put upon the pamphlet, or the printed matter, which went out against the Conservative party about the purchase of rifles and guns, his own name or the name of the printer, such stuff

would never have been distributed throughout Quebec as was distributed. I only take this as an instance without wishing to bring anything controversial before the committee at this time. There were other such publications distributed, which, no man would put before the country if he were obliged to sign them or to put to them the name of a responsible printer. It is that which I am trying to have suppressed. I am trying to have matter put before the public upon which the electors can exercise their honest judgment, and not have them read a lot of rubbish that no man would think of placing before them at ordinary times. If you say that it is to have the printer's name upon it, and that it has to be defamatory matter, there is no one to judge of its character before it comes before the court, and the whole object is defeated. The provision which I have suggested is not more in our favour than in favour of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is simply asking that the electors shall be able to judge as to the merits of the two parties on statements which are worth something.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I drafted this amendment to meet the objection made by the hon. member for York, N.B., in which I thought there was considerable force, but I now see that the amendment as drafted is absolutely worthless. The objection of the hon. member for York, N.B., was that if we adopted the amendment of the hon. member for Montmorency, all the printed matter, placards and posters which had been distributed in a number of constituencies up to that time, and which did not bear the printer's name, would be rendered valueless. There is a great deal of printed matter already prepared by both parties, and sent out to be distributed upon which the name of the printer does not appear, so that, if we adopted the amendment in the form introduced by the hon. member for Montmorency, all that matter would be reached, and it would nullify, to a very large extent, the work that has been done in this direction. It is for the committee to say whether they want to adopt such an amendment or not, because this is not a matter upon which I have a fixed opinion. I admit that the amendment that I have suggested is not one of any value, and I therefore beg to withdraw it.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. INGRAM. Could there not be some section drafted to meet the case of roor-backs?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) draw some amendment which he thinks will meet the case, and which we will consider on the third reading of the Bill. If there is any merit in it we will have the Bill referred back

for the purpose of adopting it, but I prefer that we should get the Bill through the committee stage.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall I report the Bill?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Mr. Chairman, before you report the Bill I would like to say that my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has promised to provide for adopting either standard or solar time, because, in our province half of the returning officers follow solar time and the other half follow standard time. In some cases it may lead to fraud, because, a poll is either opened before the time, or it is closed after the time. I think we should have some provision fixing the time.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I promised to draw an amendment to meet that difficulty. The amendment which I have prepared is:

Any reference to a particular hour in the day shall be taken to mean such hour according to standard time.

My hon. friend, however, will see what that will lead to. Take the constituency of Brandon, for instance, which will be divided in two. One polling booth in one constituency would have one hour and another polling booth in the same constituency would have a different hour. I cannot understand exactly the suggestion made by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis).

Mr. ELLIS. In St. John where standard time is used we do not really use the time of our standard. The railways carry a time along with them and we take the time of the eastern standard when we are really in the Atlantic standard. That is the difficulty. You would have to define the standard as a certain time.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I believe that the Act should be definite, and it should state if it is the solar time that should be followed. By inference that is the law, but it is not practised and it leads to fraud in certain cases, because the polls are opened before the hour and are closed after the hour very frequently.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The true remedy would be to prepare a Bill carefully drawn which would be made applicable to all cases relating to matters under federal control. I have such a Bill as that partly drawn, but of course it has to be submitted to experts to give proper definitions. In the absence of that I presume we will have to take the ordinary time used for ordinary purposes in the district.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. In the city of Winnipeg, there is twenty-six minutes difference between the solar and the standard time, and if such a Bill as the Solicitor General

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

suggests is passed it would settle the very important question as to the closing of banks. The banks follow the standard time and it is certainly unfair that certain parties should be shut out from a bank to pay their notes before the real hour has arrived. If a general Act were made applicable it would settle that very important question as well as others.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The ordinary expression 'Standard Time' will not settle the question. The expression 'Standard Time' is really misleading. There is a railway standard time and in my own province there is a standard time which is not railway time, and it is not solar time. There is a convenient time adopted by the whole province, and it is fixed by law. What I suppose we all desire is that the time should be the ordinary usual time for business purposes in the district.

Mr. McNEILL. I call the attention of the Solicitor General to section 72. When we were last speaking of the ballot with the two counterfoils, there was a provision introduced into the section declaring that the ballot should be subject to inspection by the scrutineers. Is that still to apply to the ballot?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no change in section 72 at all.

Mr. McNEILL. I propose to amend the section so as to make it read:

And shall then, after removing the counterfoil, immediately in the presence of the electors and still keeping the ballot paper in full view of those present, place it in the box.

The Solicitor General seemed to approve of that amendment. It is intended to prevent what unfortunately has been so common lately, namely, the deputy returning officer stealing the true ballot and substituting a false ballot.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I mean to adopt with reference to section 72, the same provision we adopted on the suggestion of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Ingram) with reference to section 80, namely, that we shall deal with the ballot going into the ballot box in exactly the same way as when it is taken out. Would it not do to say:

And in full view of those present, place the ballot paper in the box.

Mr. McNEILL. I could in full view put the ballot into the box, but I could conceal it for some minutes before putting it into the box. What you want to provide is that the ballot shall not be concealed for one moment but that it shall be kept in view of those present and placed in the ballot box in that way. Will the Solicitor General accept these words:

Still keeping the ballot paper in full view of those present.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am willing to go very far to accommodate my hon. friend as he knows. How would it do to make it read this way :

And shall then, in full view of those present, remove the counterfoil immediately, and in the presence of the electors, place the ballot paper in the box.

Mr. BRITTON. If you are going to adopt that suggestion, would it not be better to keep the ballot where it may be seen by all ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think it would meet the idea to make it read : 'And shall then, in full view of those present, remove immediately the counterfoil and place the ballot paper in the ballot box.'

Mr. KAULBACH. I think it would be well to leave the words, 'and in the presence of the elector.'

Mr. McNEILL. These frauds in Ontario were committed exactly in accordance with the words suggested by the Solicitor General, in full view of those present. The words I suggested were : 'And still keeping the ballot paper in full view of those present.'

Mr. KAULBACH. The Solicitor General will see that he omits the most important and essential part.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is absolutely no difference between the suggestion of the hon. member for North Bruce and what I have done.

Mr. McNEILL. The words suggested by the Solicitor General were complied with by the deputy returning officers who committed the frauds ; but, if they had been obliged to keep the ballot paper itself in view of those present, they could not have committed the frauds.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I want to add after the word 'counterfoil' in line 20, the words, 'and the stamp placed thereon by the returning officer.' That is to say, after the voter comes back, the returning officer shall examine, not only the initials, but the stamp as well.

Mr. McNEILL. We have here no safeguard against such frauds as were committed in Ontario in the substituting of one ballot paper for another. This Bill, as it is now, permits those frauds to be committed exactly as before.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will venture to say that there is not another hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who will read the Bill and make that statement.

Mr. McNEILL. I think there is. One hon. gentleman has already said that the essential part has been left out.

Mr. McINERNEY. I think it would be better to leave in the clause the words, 'and in the presence of the elector.' The elector may have gone out.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The elector is to remain there for that purpose. If there is any doubt about that, I can make it clear.

Mr. INGRAM. The trouble is that the elector does go out, and does not see the ballot put in the box.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We will make it read : 'in full view of those present, including the elector.'

Amendment of the Solicitor General agreed to.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend the other day asked me to suggest to him some means by which the ballot box could be securely sealed, and I promised to do so. I would suggest that there be provided a stout paper box, which could, if necessary, be lined with linen, somewhat in the form of the small model which I show, into which the ballot box could be dropped. The cover could then be closed, and any number of seals could be put on the fastening. Therefore, I would suggest that the fourth subsection of section 83 be amended to read as follows :

The ballot box shall then be locked and sealed with the seal of the deputy returning officer, and shall be placed in a stout paper cover of the form and description set out in the form— which cover shall be sealed by the deputy returning officer and any agent of any of the candidates desiring to do so.

Then, in the last line, the following should be added :

And such person or persons shall convey and carry the ballot boxes with the utmost care and in such manner as to preserve from injury the covers of the same and the seal or seals affixed to the covers.

Mr. SPROULE. I am afraid that the defect in that Bill will be found when the ballot boxes are taken, as they often are, in a sleigh or wagon, fifteen or twenty of the boxes being put together. The shaking and rubbing together of the boxes would affect the paper covers, and, in case of rain or snow, they would receive injury. Sometimes, in case of rain or snow, they are covered with horse blankets.

Mr. McNEILL. We can provide a paper-cover of a very strong description. We can form an idea of the kind we can provide by the envelopes furnished for registered letters, lined with canvas or light cotton material. The duty is imposed upon these men of seeing that the boxes are properly looked after. My hon. friend suggests the propriety of allowing the ballot boxes to be collected and carried by one person, and

what these people have to do, who take charge of the ballot boxes, is to carry them safely and securely. Even if it takes them a little longer to carry them safely, they have to take the necessary time. Surely you are not going to allow all this fraud to go on simply for the want of taking proper precautions to prevent it. If these people are instructed to carry the boxes safely, they can do it. If they are in the habit of covering them with covers that are not waterproof, we ought to provide them with covers that are.

Bill reported.

It being One o'clock, the House took recess.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

#### JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 189) to amend the Act respecting the judges of the provincial courts.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorancy). Mr. Speaker, I intend offering a few remarks before the motion is put to the House. One part of this Bill, and an important part of it, provides for an increase in the number of judges of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec. The argument that is put forward here is not that the increase is necessary, but more that the provincial legislature of Quebec having voted that the number of judges in the province of Quebec should be increased by three, this House is bound to vote the salaries of the increased number of judges. Now, I cannot accept that as an absolute proposition of law. It seems to me that it is not founded on the constitution which governs us; there is nothing in the Constitutional Act which says that if provincial legislature increases the number of judges, we here are bound to vote the salaries of the increased number of judges, whatever that number may be. I take it that an understanding should be come to between the two powers, the provincial and the Dominion, upon this very important subject. There should be an understanding, so that the administration of justice in the province should be carried on with efficiency and in such a manner as to satisfy the general needs of the public; but I cannot agree to the proposition that whatever number of judges it pleases the provincial legislature to make in a province, we here are constrained to vote the salaries of those judges, even though it may be patent to the House that the increase in the number is altogether abnormal, not required by the administration of justice in the province, or even almost ridiculous. I desire, for a very few moments, to call the attention of this House to the existing system of the province of

Quebec. This system was inaugurated as far back as 1857, so hon. gentlemen will see immediately that, from its very antiquity, it cannot be up to the necessities of the present time. There are ten judges now appointed for the district of Montreal, plus a judge for the district of Terrebonne, who all reside in Montreal, and who administer justice in the judicial district of Montreal. There are four judges appointed to administer justice in the district of Quebec. Then, there are sixteen judges for the rural districts, that is, for those districts outside of the districts of Quebec and Montreal. This makes a total of thirty-one judges of the Superior Court for the province of Quebec. The judges in the city of Quebec and Montreal receive \$5,000 a year each, except the chief justice, who receives \$6,000 and the acting chief justice in Montreal, who also receives \$6,000. In the rural districts, the judges receive \$4,000 a year, except the judges for the district of Gaspé and the district of Saguenay and Chicoutimi, who receive \$3,750 each, I believe. Now, more than half of the work of the whole province of Quebec is done in the district of Montreal. This can be easily proven by the statistics, and I believe that nobody will contradict the statement. But what do the statistics show as to the rural districts outside of the city of Montreal and Quebec? I call the attention of the House particularly to this point. The Superior Court has jurisdiction for the recovery of all sums over \$100 in the cities of Montreal and Quebec, and over \$200 in the rural districts. I refer to the official statistics taken from the *Official Gazette* of Quebec, and published every year, and furnished to the department of the Attorney General by the different prothonotaries and clerks throughout the province of Quebec. These statistics will show to the House that it is absolutely ridiculous to use an expression which it is not at all too strong—to increase the number of judges in the province of Quebec. These are the figures of last year, showing the number of contested cases and the number of judgments given in contested cases. I take the figures of last year, because they are very little different from any for the last ten years:

Name of District.	No. of con- tested cases.	No. of Judgments
		in con- tested cases.
Arthabaska .....	39	24
Beauharnois .....	20	25
Chicoutimi & Saguenay	47	33
Gaspé .....	19	10
Iberville .....	31	32
Kamouraska .....	45	42
Richelieu .....	18	28
Rimouski .....	15	17

Now, if hon. gentlemen will take these figures and analyse them, they will see that the judges who preside in these districts, have really not enough work to occupy their

time for two months in the year; they have not enough to employ themselves usefully for the country. This system, as I said before, was established in 1857. At that time, in the province of Quebec, means of communication were very limited, and it was necessary to bring about what was called the decentralization of justice, to establish courts in the rural districts far from the great centres, so that judges might be brought nearer to the people and litigants should be able to obtain justice at as small a cost as possible. But, to-day, circumstances have changed enormously, and one of the best evidences that the system is behind the age and that it is not now required in the Province of Quebec. To show that the existing system is not thought essential to the good administration of justice is that of the sixteen rural judges, whose residences are fixed in the chief towns of rural districts, seven reside in the district of Montreal, or the district of Quebec. That is to say, more than half of the rural judges—without protest, so far as I can learn from the litigants in the districts in which they should reside—reside either in the city of Quebec or the city of Montreal. The judges who reside outside their districts, and their places of residence are as follows:

Delorimier, Joliette, Montreal.  
 Ouimet, Richelieu, Montreal.  
 Taschereau, Terrebonne, Montreal.  
 Lemieux, St. Francis, Quebec.  
 Choquette, Arthabaska, Quebec.  
 Pelletier, Beauce, Quebec.  
 Larue, Rimouski, Quebec.  
 Lynch, Bedford, Knowlton.  
 Lavergne, Ottawa and Pontiac, Ottawa.  
 Langelier, Montreal, Quebec.

Now, the question is, what is the proper remedy for all this? How would it be possible to have a fairer distribution of the work among the judges, so that those judges in Montreal should not be overworked, and the gentlemen who administer justice in the rural districts should have more work to do? I am not complaining of the rural judges, because they themselves are the first to say that they have not enough work, and they hope that some system will be found by which they may be able to give more of their time to the administration of justice. On a previous occasion, I told the House that some years ago, while occupying the position of Attorney General of the province of Quebec, I brought in a Bill in the legislature, designed to effect a reform; but that Bill did not pass. Although this Bill did not meet with the approval of the electors of the province of Quebec or of the legislature, there must be some other means by which a more equitable system of work could be devised, by which the judges of the rural districts would have a sufficiency of work to occupy their time at least half the year. I do not for

an instant advocate the centralization of the administration of justice in the city of Montreal, or the city of Quebec. In the first place, such a measure would never carry, and in the second place, I do not think that it would be for the general advantage of the province. But if it were possible to bring a certain number of the rural judges to live in Montreal and Quebec, and to administer justice in those two cities, and also to go on circuit in the rural districts, it seems to me that it would be one means of remedying the evil and the abuse which exists to-day. I have heard advocates, those who reside in the rural districts themselves say, that it is an inconvenience to them—to say no more—to have the same judge presiding always at the courts in the rural districts. They would like to have a change. Of course, judges are human, and they are but men; and they have their biases and their preferences. But, I believe that the rural barrister, even would like it if some system could be inaugurated by which the judges would sit in the rural districts by rotation, and thereby remedy the evil of the members of the rural bar having to go before the same judges all the time. In practice, I may say, this was done to some extent, till 1898, and it seemed to work well. Hon. gentlemen who are familiar with the system in the province of Quebec, know that there is an Appellate Court, which is called the court of review, consisting of three judges of the Superior Court.

This court sits at Montreal for the districts which are attached for that purpose to the district of Montreal, and it sits in the district of Quebec for those districts which are attached for that purpose to the district of Quebec. Until 1898, the judges from all parts of the province took part in the deliberations of the Court of Review. They came from different parts of the province to sit in review of the judgment which had been rendered by their confreres of the Superior Court, either in the city of Montreal or in the city of Quebec, and it seemed that this system worked very well. In 1898, the Attorney General, seeing that the system which exists now in the province of Quebec could not last much longer, seeing that it was defective, introduced and passed a law in the legislature of Quebec by which he specifically allowed the judges from the rural districts to sit in the Court of Review. This statute is 61 Vic., chap. 20, and the first section reads as follows:

Articles 20 and 21 of the Revised Statutes are amended by adding thereto the following:

The judges of the Court of Review are to be taken from among all the judges of the Superior Court of the province, at the discretion of the chief justice or of the acting chief justice, as the case may be.

The judges of the Court of Review are to be taken from among all the judges of the Superior Court of the province, at the dis-

cretion of the chief justice or of the acting chief justice, as the case may be. Then, as I say, judges from all parts of the province sat in the Court of Review. It had two good effects. First of all it gave the judges of the rural districts more work to do, and satisfied them, because they themselves complained that they had not enough to do, that they were becoming rusty, because they were called upon so rarely to sit and to judge cases coming before them. But unfortunately, I think, in the same year, by statute 61, Vic., chap. 52, section 8, the Solicitor General introduced a law here which rendered the law passed by the province of Quebec almost inoperative by requiring certain certificates to be delivered to the judges who now sit in the Court of Review, thereby almost preventing them from coming up. Since then the judges in Montreal especially have had not only to accomplish their duties as judges of the Superior Court sitting in the first instance, but have also had to sit in review. Now the cases in the Court of Review in Montreal are of an enormous number. The judges sit there on an average six and seven days in a month in the Court of Review, reviewing the judgments which have been rendered by the Superior Court. This takes up not only the time during which they have to sit as judges in the Court of Review, but the hon. gentleman will see that it also takes up much of the time which they would otherwise be able to devote to deliberating on cases which they have heard in the first instance. Now in the session of 1899, by the provincial Act, 62 Vic., chap. 19, section 1, the number of judges in the province of Quebec which had been up to that time thirty-one, which was thought to be too great a number, was increased to thirty-four. The Hon. Mr. Archambault, in proposing the law in the legislative council where he is leader of the government, made the remarks which I will read. The hon. gentleman will see that these remarks are of great interest to this House in showing that if a proper understanding had taken place between the government now in power and the government of Quebec, between whom I believe great sympathy exists, the provincial authorities would not have resolved to increase the number of judges. If a proper understanding had been come to by which the judges could have been brought to the cities of Montreal and Quebec to administer justice there, going into the other districts by rotation to sit in circuit, it would not have been necessary for this House to vote the salaries which we are now called upon to vote. Here is what Mr. Archambault said in the legislative council answering the leader of the opposition Mr. Chapais :

He (Mr. Chapais) may rest assured that I urged the federal authorities to apply the law of the last session;

Mr. CASGRAIN.

That is the law of which I have just spoken by which these rural district judges were authorized to sit in the Court of Review.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Would the hon. gentleman point out how we can affect that law in any way ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I think the hon. gentleman has affected it by the law which he passed here in 1899, by which Mr. Archambault himself thought that the provincial law had been rendered inoperative, that is, by the federal statute, 61 Vic., chap. 52. I have not got the Act here, but I will proceed to read what Mr. Archambault said, and the hon. gentleman can take what consolation he may find in the remarks of the Attorney General :

He may rest assured that I urged the federal authorities to apply the law of the last session, but I have become aware that instead of applying it, they have done nothing but prevent its operation by the provisions of the statute they passed at the last session of the federal parliament. We have, in this matter, two powers face to face, but they must come to an understanding. The provincial legislature makes known its needs, to Ottawa belongs the task of applying a remedy. I have been unable to obtain the desired remedy, so I have taken another means. In presence of the statute which I propose to pass, the federal government will see that the remedy lies either in the law passed last year and in the provisions tending towards the same end, or in the law of this year; it will then decide as far as I am concerned, my responsibility will be covered.

Now, Mr. Archambault says: I proposed a law during the session of 1898, by which I empowered the judges of the rural districts to sit in review, thereby, as I thought, relieving the judges of Montreal and Quebec of the work which bears so heavily upon them, and at the same time giving the rural judges more work to do. But, he says, after I passed that law, the federal parliament passed another law which renders my law inoperative in that it imposes upon the judges that come to sit in review certain restrictions and certain conditions which they will not accept. Now the Solicitor General says: Is it because I asked the judges to send in honest accounts for their day's labour that they considered this such an evil that it rendered the law inoperative? Now, I do not think my hon. friend can say that the accounts which have been heretofore presented to the government were dishonest accounts. Some of the judges may have had a misconception of the law on the subject, but it seems to me that, excepting in one or two cases, such a law as this was not necessary to put a stop to what had been, I am free to admit, an abuse. However, the judges say it is impossible for them to comply with the conditions which that law of 1899 imposed upon them, that it is against their

dignity, and they refuse to do it. They simply say: Well, we will sit at home, we will not perform the duties which we were called upon to perform by the law of the Attorney General. Be that as it may, there is something wrong here. On the one hand you have the Attorney General of Quebec who says: The remedy lies in the law which I passed in 1898; and he says also: But my law was rendered inoperative by the law which was passed in the Dominion parliament. I gave the Dominion authorities a remedy and they do not choose to accept it; now, the only thing I can do is to fall back on the increase in the number of judges. By the remarks of the Attorney General, which I have just read it will be clearly seen that he himself thinks that it is not necessary to increase the number of judges in the province of Quebec, and everybody in that province is of the same opinion. But nobody will tackle the question. Now, seeing the friendly relations which exist between the Dominion authorities and the provincial authorities, it seems to me that they could come to an understanding by which the number of judges instead of being increased could be decreased, and still the evil which exists, especially in the city of Montreal, would disappear.

Now, the increase in the number of judges, it seems to me, gives rise, firstly, to an unnecessary increase in the expenditure of the country by \$15,000 a year, but that is not the worst evil. It virtually renders permanent a system which everybody in the province of Quebec says is behind the times, and which should be radically amended. Again, I say, I am not at all in favour of the centralization of justice, but there are means, and I am sure that the hon. Solicitor General will be able to devise means by which the judges who administer justice in the rural districts will have more to do, and the judges in cities less to do. Then, there would be a fair equilibrium established between the work of the judges in cities and the work of the judges in rural districts. Just let me read to the House an interview given to one of the papers some time ago by one of the rural judges in the province of Quebec, Mr. Justice Cimon, of the district of Kamouraska. Mr. Justice Cimon, as every hon. gentleman who has sat in this House, and as every one who has practiced before him, knows, is one of the most distinguished judges in Quebec. He sat in the district of Joliette, and also in the district of Montreal, and he gave the greatest satisfaction. He is a man who has administered justice in large cities and in his own district, but he is obliged under the law to remain in his own rural district, although he has only forty-five contested cases in the Superior Court in a year. That is work which a man could do in one or two months, and when I say two months, I

am putting it at the utmost limit. I am sure he could do it in one or two months, which leaves ten or eleven months of the year during which he has nothing at all to do, and, as Mr. Justice Cimon says, he gets rusty. An interview was published in *La Presse* some time ago in which Mr. Justice Cimon discussed the question. I am reading this interview because it puts my own views before the House in a better shape than I could do it myself:

In order to force a judge to reside in his district there must be the fulfilment of this condition, that there shall be enough work in the district to give reasonable occupation to the judge. If he has nothing, or almost nothing to do in the district, why keep him there? The judge desires nothing so much as to be kept busy. He would like to have work all the time, but unfortunately the judge for the district of Kamouraska has not enough work to occupy his time for one month out of the twelve.

And he is one of the judges in the rural districts, who has most to do.

He is, therefore, idle for eleven months. Is he to be shut up in his chambers at the courthouse doing nothing but gazing at the blank walls for eleven months in the year?

Some say that the presence of the judge in the district is a guarantee for the morality of its inhabitants. . . . I would like to know what guarantee of public morality, or what counter-poison for socialism, the presence of the judge furnishes in the district when he has almost nothing to do, and has to keep promenading around like one who is lost so as to while away the time.

Some time since I heard a story about the late Judge Thomas J. J. Loranger, of Sorel, and I think it worth repeating.

You are aware that Judge Loranger was one of our most intellectual men, a worker and a 'savant.' He was judge for Sorel, where he had not enough work to occupy a reasonable part of his time. Notwithstanding his literary works, and although he wrote law books, months elapsed without his knowing what to do with himself. So that, to get some distraction, to make time pass more fastly, he would start in the morning, with a book under his arm, would walk along the Queen's highway, because there is no other distraction in the country—would go up towards the concessions, stopping where he got a fine view of the landscape or could rest under the shade of some trees, reading, then resuming his walk until the evening brought him home again.

Well, the people who saw him doing this said: 'Do look at our judge, he must be mad.'

It is essential, if the judge is to be expected to administer justice soundly, that he be kept reasonably busy; if he is not, his mind and his judgment are sure to suffer, and in the long run the litigants will be the losers.

It must not be forgotten that in most of the rural districts, the judge must abstain from taking any share in any commercial or other enterprise, or in any business or co-operative associations which are organized in the district, because he would be apt to be accused at any moment. He must, very often also, deprive himself of social relations. This all goes to show that if he has not in the district enough judicial business to occupy him, what can he do, and why shut him up in his district? Is

this not an unreasonable state of things? Why not give him some other occupation?

This puts the views of the judges of Quebec before the House, and it also crystallizes the views that I have to offer to the House upon the subject. There is no doubt of it, as Judge Cimon says, when a judge is not kept reasonably busy, his mind and his judgment are sure to suffer, and in the long run litigants will be the losers. He is deprived of almost any intercourse or deliberation with his fellow judges. He is taken away from the large libraries which are to be found in the centres, and although he can, with the limited means at his disposal purchase books, he is still deprived of the advantage of consulting those great works which he would have if he lived in a centre. The increase in the number of judges from thirty-one to thirty-four in the province of Quebec will simply have the effect of keeping in existence a system which has long been antiquated, and which should disappear from the statutes of Quebec. I cannot blame the hon. Solicitor General very much for this state of things, because I know it is a very difficult subject to handle; but, it seems to me, that, with the ability that characterized my hon. friend, and with the friendly relations which exist between the governments of the Dominion and the province, the government could well come to some understanding with the provincial ministers by which this system would be changed and the evils that flow from it, both for judges and litigants, would be made to disappear. The matter of least importance to my mind is the increase of \$15,000 a year that the passing of this law will entail upon the Dominion treasury. There is another evil, and it is this: Everybody knows that the salaries paid the judges in the province of Quebec and other provinces, and especially in the cities of Montreal and Quebec, are totally inadequate to the needs and wants of the judges and to the social standing which they occupy in these cities. I will leave it to anybody who resides in Quebec, or Montreal, to say whether these judges who occupy the high and distinguished positions which they do should be expected to live upon \$5,000 a year. In the city of Montreal the first thing that a man has to do in the position of a judge is to pay \$1,000 a year rental. The last time the salaries were readjusted was in 1872, when the salaries of judges in cities were fixed at \$5,000 a year. Anybody living in these cities will tell hon. gentlemen who live elsewhere that it is absolutely impossible for a judge to sustain his rank and live up to the dignity that appertains to his position on a salary of \$5,000 a year. If you compare the salaries which other men get, occupying situations which are not at all to be compared with the situations which judges occupy, you will see that they are getting \$10,000,

\$15,000 and \$20,000 a year. Take bank managers, take managers of railways, and not the largest railways either, take managers of insurance companies and large business houses; they all have salaries which are far beyond the paltry \$5,000 which our judges are getting. If this law is passed and the number of judges is increased to thirty-four, I say that it will be impossible, for a number of years to come, to change the system, because, when a resolution is presented to this House increasing the salaries of judges, this House will say, as it has said before: You have too many judges of the Superior Court in Quebec. As long as you have thirty-four judges of the Superior Court in Quebec it is impossible to increase their salaries to any sum adequate to meet the necessities of the case. The legislature of Ontario passed an Act in 1868-9 adding an additional \$1,000 a year to the salaries of judges in that province, and if I am not mistaken all the judges in the High Court of that province received \$5,000 a year under the federal statute. The preamble of the Ontario Act reads as follows:

And whereas, under the altered circumstances of the country—

Remember, that was away back in 1868.

—and the increased expense of living, it has been found that the judges of the Superior Court are inadequately paid; it is therefore enacted that there shall be paid for the year 1869, and for every other year thereafter out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of this province annually, to the president or chief justice of the Court of Error and Appeal, and to each of the judges of the Superior Court of Law and Equity in this province the sum of \$1,000.

The province of Ontario saw that the salaries of the judges were absolutely inadequate, and so the legislature passed this Act; although, in my opinion, they did so unconstitutionally. The province of Quebec has not seen fit, or has not been able, to follow the example, so that the judges in our province are on an unequal footing with the judges of Ontario as regards salaries, and I venture to say that the Quebec judges, especially those in Montreal, do more work than the Ontario judges. The last readjustment of salaries in the province of Quebec was made in the year 1873; a very long while ago. We have the evidence of men high up in the financial and social circles in Montreal and throughout the country that the cost of living, especially for those in the position of judges, has increased by 30 per cent since then, and yet the salaries of our judges have remained the same. I shall give to the House some figures which will show what the other colonies pay their judges, and by comparison hon. gentlemen will see how inadequately Canadian judges are paid. Of course, I base no argument on the handsome salaries paid to judges in England, because England

is a richer country, and can better afford it. The following will show the salaries of the judges in the different countries :

Schedule of Salaries.

England.

Lord Chancellor .....	£10,000	say \$50,000
Lord Chief Justice .....	8,000	40,000
3 Lords Ordinary in Appeal, each .....	6,000	30,000
28 Judges of first instance, each .....	5,000	25,000

Ireland.

Lord Chancellor .....	8,000	40,000
Chief Justice .....	5,000	25,000
Chief Baron .....	4,600	23,000
2 Bankruptcy Court Judges, each .....	2,000	10,000
Admiralty Judge .....	1,200	6,000
11 Judges, each .....	3,500	17,500

Scotland.

13 Judges receive £49,000 among them, or an average of .....	3,800	19,000
---	-------	--------

In England.

Fifty-seven County Court Judges, each £3,800, say \$19,000, and travelling expenses.

Twenty-seven Metropolitan Police Magistrates : senior, £1,800, say \$9,000 ; remainder, each, £1,500, say \$7,500.

Colony.	Popu- lation.	Chief Justice.	Puisne Justice.
Victoria .....	1,104,288	\$17,500	\$15,000
New South Wales.....	1,042,919	17,500	13,000
Queensland .....	387,463	12,500	10,000
South Australia .....	318,308	10,000	8,500
New Zealand .....	649,349	8,500	7,500

In colonies not possessing the full powers of responsible government, but which have in most cases an elective assembly, the salaries are as follows :

Colony.	Popu- lation.	Chief Justice.	Puisne Justice.
Jamaica.....	580,804	\$10,000	\$6,000
Barbadoes .....	171,860	5,000	None.
Trinidad .....	189,566	9,000	"
Mauritius .....	369,302	8,750	\$6,000
Hong Kong.....	215,800	12,000	8,160

It will be seen that even in the smaller colonies, with a population much less than ours, the chief justices and the judges receive much higher salaries than do our Canadian judges. This question has come before our public men already, and it has been discussed in this House. I shall read the remarks made by Sir John Macdonald in 1883. He said :

There is a feeling among the bench and bar in Ontario that the incomes of leading counsel have so much increased in consequence of the increased wealth of the country, that the salaries at present paid to the judges are insufficient to induce leading counsel to retire to the quiet and dignity of the bench. I believe, also, the same feeling prevailed in the city of Montreal among the professional and commercial classes there, that the judges are not sufficiently remunerated to secure the best talent for the bench.

The difficulty the government have in dealing with the question is, that the moment they deal with the salaries of the judges in any one province, there arises a corresponding demand, although the same necessity may not exist, from all the other provinces. This is the difficulty which the government felt, and this together with other circumstances of a temporary nature, with which I need not trouble the committee, prevented the government coming down with any measure during the present session.

In answer to the suggestions of my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I will say that the government intend to address themselves during recess with a view of studying the pressure and the reason of the pressure that exists in the province of Ontario and in Montreal, and is brought to bear on the government in this relation, and will come down with some general scheme next session.

It will be seen that in the year 1883 the government was impressed with the necessity of increasing the salaries of our judges. In 1892, Sir John Thompson said in this House :

I was asked yesterday evening to state what would be done with item 9 respecting judges' salaries. I regret to say that we do not see our way to bring those resolutions forward this session. It is my expectation that the government will bring them forward and ask a vote upon them at an early period next session. In the meantime, it is intended that some representations shall be made by the government to the provincial governments of some of the provinces, with a view to improving the judicial system. If it meet the pleasure of the House next session, as I hope it may, the salaries of the judges will be made as the resolutions have indicated.

Therefore, in 1892, Sir John Thompson saw the pressing necessity for increasing the salaries of the judges, and he said, and rightly said, that he would interview the provincial authorities to see whether the existing system in the different provinces could not be ameliorated so that it would be less difficult for the federal government to bring down a measure dealing with the question as a whole. It is a fact that the late Sir John Thompson and myself had several interviews upon the subject. As a result of our discussions, I had the honour to introduce a Bill in the legislature of Quebec which had the hearty support of my hon. friend the Solicitor General.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It never got beyond its second reading.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No. Such a change as that was undoubtedly an important one, and I could not expect that when I brought down the Bill for the first time, in 1894, that it should pass at that session. I could not even expect that it would pass in 1895, but all that time public opinion was becoming impressed with the idea that the system which prevailed in the province of Quebec was not up to the times. At a meeting of the members of the bar from all parts of the province that I convened in Quebec, there was only one dissentient

voice amongst the members of the rural bar against the proposed law, because when it was explained that the Bill in question would not at all interfere with the decentralization of the judges, that the court-houses would exist just the same in the chef-lieu of the rural districts, that the prothonotaries, clerks and other officers would still retain office, and that the judges would go from Montreal and Quebec to administer justice, then they understood that the measure was not at all attacking the system of decentralization, and that it was simply a measure calculated to enable the judges of the rural districts to occupy their time, and by which the congestion of affairs in the city of Montreal would be relieved.

I am not going to say that that plan was the best plan; I am not going to say that it is the plan that should have been adopted; I am not going to press upon the House my views on that question. It was only put before the House in a tentative way so as to draw from the House and from the people of the province their views as to the best way of doing away with an abuse which everybody knew existed; and if the agitation had been kept up by my successors in office, and especially if this government had impressed upon them that they would not vote the salaries of an increased number of judges before the system had been changed and ameliorated, I am sure that the Attorney General of Quebec, who is a progressive and very intelligent man, would have been able to come to some understanding with the authorities here by which a measure of relief satisfactory to everybody would have been provided. Before leaving this subject, let me read to the House some other extracts from speeches made, not by members of parliament, but by disinterested parties, showing that those who come to this country are impressed with the idea that our judges are not sufficiently paid. As far back as 1878, Lord Dufferin, who was certainly an independent judge of such questions as these, and who, when he spoke, only spoke because he thought he was doing his duty, and was giving good advice to the people of Canada, at the opening of the Toronto exhibition, spoke as follows:

With regard to the independence of the judges, I will say nothing; notwithstanding what has been done elsewhere, I do not think that the Canadian people will ever be tempted to allow the judges of the land to be constituted by popular election. Still, on this continent there will always be present in the air, as it were, a certain tendency in that direction, and it is against this I would warn you. And now that I am on this topic, there is one further observation I am tempted to make in regard to the position of the judges. I should hope that as time goes on, as the importance and extent of their work increases, and as the wealth of the country expands, it may be found expedient to attach somewhat higher salaries to those who administer the law. Pure and righteous justice is the very foundation of human happiness, but

remember it is as true of justice as of anything else, you cannot have a first-class article without paying for it. In order to secure an able bar, you must provide adequate prizes for those who are called to it. If this is done, the intellectual energy of the country will be attracted to the legal profession, and you will have what is the greatest ornament any country can possess, an efficient and learned judiciary.

Again, Lord Russell, when he visited this country in 1896, spoke at Montreal, on September 2 of that year, as follows:

I have sometimes thought that in the case of the judges charged with the great and responsible duty of the administration of the law, the state did not recognize sufficiently the position that these judges fill.

Even in England it is true to-day that in the cases of nine out of ten appointed to hold office in the Superior Courts, they have to make great sacrifices in taking a seat on the bench. I do not mean to say that the payment of judges should approach the very great incomes of the leading individual members of the bar, but I venture to say that, in England and here, where the independence of judges and the high respect in which they are held is undoubtedly high, the remuneration and position of the judges ought to be such as to attract the ambition and desire of the best men in the profession. It certainly does so in this land and in England, to a great extent; but there is a great discrepancy between the incomes of the leading members of the bar and those of the great body of the judges on the bench. I think, in the interests of the community, not merely in the narrow interests of the profession, that the position should be looked up to as an elevated one, worthy of the noblest and highest ambition.

Just before leaving this country, Lord Aberdeen, without being prompted by anybody, at a banquet given to him in Ottawa, repeated the same sentiments, saying in no uncertain terms that he considered that the judges of this country were insufficiently paid, and he tried to impress upon his hearers, among whom were several distinguished gentlemen, including, I believe, the right hon. leader of the House, the necessity of paying the judges salaries which would be adequate to the high positions they occupy and the great duties they have to perform. It will be said by some who generally look on the lawyers with disfavour, 'How is it that so many lawyers seek for a place on the judicial bench if the salary is inadequate to the position?' I think that is not at all a proper criterion by which to judge of the salaries which the judges deserve. It is well known that after a man has spent twenty-five or thirty years in the exercise of his profession as a lawyer, the most wearing profession a man can follow, having upon his shoulders, not only his own cares, but those of his clients, who bring to him their difficulties of every sort—I say, after a man has exercised that noble profession for twenty-five or thirty years, he is worn out, and it is not surprising that he should seek some repose. Men who follow other pursuits generally

amass sufficient fortune to enable them to live in retirement in their later years. Not so with lawyers. It is well known that lawyers, though they make large fees, generally spend all they earn, and after they have followed their profession for twenty-five or thirty years, they have not the retiring allowance which every other man, be he farmer, merchant, or railway magnate, enjoys. To put my remarks in small compass, I say, first of all, that it is absolutely unnecessary to increase the number of judges in the province of Quebec. It is imposing upon the budget of the people of Canada a permanent increase of \$15,000 a year, and it is perpetuating in the province of Quebec a system which everybody admits to be an antiquated system, and which everybody says ought to be radically changed; and it is preventing, for a great many years to come, a consummation which everybody desires—an increase in the salaries of the judges, to put them on an equal footing with those who occupy correspondingly high and important positions in the state.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am entirely at one with my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) as to the necessity of increasing the salaries of the judges. I entirely agree that in this country the judges are very inadequately paid, and I am prepared to state at the present time the salaries of the judges are not at all proportionate to the fees earned by men occupying leading positions at the bar. However, we are not called upon at the present time to deal with that question. The only question we are called upon to deal with is whether or not there exists a necessity for the appointment of three additional judges in the district of Montreal. I notice that the hon. member for Montmorency was content to speak of the judges in the province of Quebec, saying that they were sufficient in number to perform all the duties assigned to them under our system. With that statement I have absolutely no quarrel. The great majority of our judges in the province of Quebec are, to say the least, not overworked. But, there is a condition of things existing in that province for which this government is not responsible, over which this government has no control, and for which this government can provide no remedy.

The organization of the courts in the province of Quebec, as in all the other provinces, is a matter exclusively within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature, and we cannot interfere with them directly or indirectly. We cannot say, for instance, that in the province of Quebec, there shall be a judicial district which shall comprehend certain territory, or that two districts shall be combined into one, that all the judges shall sit in the cities of Quebec and Montreal, and then go from these cities out to the different portions of the province for the purpose of exercising

their duties. We have no control over that. We have to take the system in existence in the province of Quebec, which we did not create, over which we have no control, and which we cannot remedy, and we have to apply our statutes to that system.

My hon. friend says that in the province of Quebec there are too many judges, but he did not say that there were too many in the district of Montreal, or that there were sufficient in that district, or that we were acting improvidently in appointing these three judges in addition to those already there. He did not say a word about that, but was content to travel over a subject not in dispute here at all. Dealing with the question of organization of the courts, he said that if the Dominion government had an understanding with the local government, we possibly might bring about a condition of things, which would make these additional appointments unnecessary. But my hon. friend tried his hand at that in 1894 in the legislature of that province, and he then had the co-operation of some of those who sat in opposition there at that time. He had myself, for instance, and I did all I could to help him to bring about a change in the condition of things existing in the province of Quebec. But the government, of which he was a member, would not back him up, and his Bill never got a second reading, notwithstanding the fact that he was Attorney General of one of the strongest governments in that province, speaking from the standpoint of numerical majority.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Quality too, I hope.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I leave that for my hon. friend to decide. He was one of those who knew most about it, and was glad to leave. He was on the inside, and I was not. But my hon. friend tried to remedy the conditions and introduced legislation with that purpose, and he failed. He never got his Bill beyond a second reading. The only one who stood up in the Quebec House to support my hon. friend was myself.

How can we remedy that condition? My hon. friend could not do it, and I say that there is no government that has been in existence in the province, in my time at all events, that ever could remedy the existing condition of things there, and I do not believe that in the near future we shall see any government in that province which will be able to change our judicial system because to that system our people are wedded—the system of decentralization, a system under which the judges are supposed to live in the districts in which they are assigned, and in which they are to perform their duties under the patents appointing them. If they violate the law and live else-

where, they ought to be brought to book for it.

My hon. friend was good enough to read a criticism on our judicial system given by Judge Cimon, as to the propriety of which I have nothing to say. I leave it to the House to say whether a judge is the proper person to criticise a judicial system with which he is intimately connected. But Judge Cimon was not quite fair in his criticism. He said that he only performs one month's work in the year. That is his statement. But on looking at the Auditor General's Report, I find that he received \$384 for travelling expenses and living allowance while he was supposed to be performing his duties in a district other than the one to which he was appointed.

Mr. BERGERON. Because he had not enough work at home.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not discussing the question whether he had or not, but whether or not he should say that he had simply one month's work in the year.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In his own district.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. A man who is appointed a judge, has, as a rule, or is presumed to have, sufficient moral sense to appreciate the fact that he has to give, in return for the salary he receives, a certain consideration to the state. When Judge Cimon accepted the position of judge in the district of Fraserville, he knew probably that he would not be called on to perform duties exceeding one month's work.

Mr. CASGRAIN. He was not appointed to the district of Kamouraska, but to the district of Joliette, and all the time he was in Joliette he sat in the district of Montreal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He went to Kamouraska of his own free will, and should not have gone there if he did not expect to have duties to perform while he was there.

My hon. friend says that we could bring about a remedy if we were to make the judges of the country parts come to Montreal and sit there.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Live there.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Or live there. But will my hon. friend say now how we can do that? What influence have we over the decision of any such question? How can we interfere directly or indirectly with that? He was content to say that we prevented the judges from going to Montreal because we passed legislation a year or two ago, providing that a judge who would go from the district to which he was appointed, should establish, to the satisfaction of the Department of Justice, that he went from his district at the re-

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

quest of the chief justice of the court to which he belonged, and also that when he left his district to go to any other place in the province for the purpose of exercising his judicial functions, he should charge so much per day for living allowance, and not do, as the judges had been doing previously, charge three days for one. That is to say, a judge under our system is entitled to receive \$6 a day for living allowance, but they were in the habit of charging three days for one. We put an end to that, and why should we not? Why should we allow the condition of things to continue that did exist, under which a judge residing in Montreal, supposed to be performing his duties in Montreal, charged for more days than there was in the whole year at the rate of \$6 per day for travelling allowance.

An hon. MEMBER. Why did you pay him?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We did not pay him, he was paid before we came in, but we changed that condition, and it is to prevent such an abuse that we passed the law my hon. friend complains of. Why should such a condition be allowed to exist? It is not because we made a change of that sort that a judge is prevented from going from one part of the province to the other, if it is necessary, in the due performance of his duties, that he should.

I can say that, in so far as Montreal is concerned, you cannot have the duties that the judges ought to perform, performed with only eleven judges. There is more business done in the Superior Court of Montreal than in the whole High Court of the province of Ontario. There are more writs issued out of the Superior Court of Montreal than out of the High Court for the whole province of Ontario. Moreover, I want to draw your attention to this, that in the month of March last, the Superior Court of Montreal had to sit in six different divisions. There were 236 cases inscribed in that court in that month, and of these 236, notwithstanding the fact that we had in Montreal the assistance of three judges from the country parts, there were only 121 of these cases disposed of, leaving an accumulation of arrears in that one month of 115 cases. Are you going to allow that condition of things to continue? Is it not time that we should endeavour to bring about a change by increasing the bench in that particular district, so as to give litigants the speedy justice to which they are entitled, because speedy justice is just as essential to the proper administration of public affairs as sound justice. My hon. friend does not say that there is no necessity for the increase in Montreal—he has not ventured to say so. He knows that it is necessary to make a change, but the only remedy he suggests is the bringing in of the country judges. He says that the

appointment of these three judges is going to be a burden upon the country. Does he know what it costs to bring in the country judges?

Mr. CASGRAIN. About \$3,000 or \$4,000.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We have in the estimates this year no less than \$16,000, to provide for the travelling expenses of country judges who go about from one district to another.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Not to Montreal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Take it outside of Montreal. I venture to say, that outside of Montreal, with the exception of the members of the Queen's Bench, there is not \$1,000 expended for travelling expenses.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Oh, yes there is.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There cannot be. But let the proportion be what it may, we ought to endeavour to bring about such a condition of things as will enable us to have judges in the districts who will administer justice for the benefit of litigants, who will administer, as I have said, prompt justice; and give to an important centre like Montreal the attention from a judicial point of view that it deserves. In the province of Quebec, the Attorney General and the law officers have taken upon themselves, with the knowledge they must have of the necessities of the case from the standpoint of the judicial organization of the province, to secure the passing of this legislation, putting it upon us to provide the additional judges. But, not only have we that, but we have the bar of the province of Quebec represented by the general council passing a unanimous resolution drawing the attention of the government to the fact that these three judges ought to be appointed, and ought to be appointed at the earliest possible moment. Therefore, as I say, there has been no objection that I have heard to the appointment of the additional judges for Montreal; the only objection is that it would be better if we took judges from other portions of the province and assigned them to the district of Montreal, instead of allowing them to live, as they do now, in the country districts. But this is a matter, as I say, over which we have no control and for which we can provide no remedy. The remedy my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) tried some years ago to bring about, when he was Attorney General of the province of Quebec. But he could not succeed, and I know he would be honest enough to admit that it could not be done now by any government in the province of Quebec. I would like to say to my hon. friend from Montmorency also that this Bill that he introduced provided for the appointment of forty-seven judges, that is, twenty-six district court judges, fifteen Superior Court judges, and six judges of the Court

of Queen's Bench as they are now. At present, there are thirty-seven.

Mr. CASGRAIN. But it was perfectly understood at the time that the district judges would receive only \$2,000 a year each.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I believe my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) gave up his whole case at the beginning of his remarks, when he declared that he was under the impression that there were enough judges in the province of Quebec, but that we here in this parliament could do nothing—that owing to the way in which the administration of justice is organized by the local legislature, it was a matter beyond our province. Now, we also contend that there are enough judges. We favour, as he has said he does, an administration of justice in the province of Quebec which shall be as perfect and as speedy as possible. But our contention is that it is useless to add \$500,000 to the consolidated debt of Canada, which would be the practical effect of adding \$15,000 a year to our annual expenditure. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) says that the local legislature organizes the administration of justice, and that we are called upon to appoint the judges and pay them. But, if we are called upon to appoint the judges and pay them, surely we are entitled to see how our money is spent. He asks how we can increase the number of judges in the district of Montreal, as the local legislature has not done it and will not do it. But my hon. friend will remember that in 1892, the very same demand was made upon the government for the increase in the number of judges in the district of Montreal. At that time, as now, more judicial work was done in the district of Montreal than in all the rest of the provinces.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. And you appointed a judge—Judge Curran.

Mr. BERGERON. No, he replaced another judge. The answer of Sir John Thompson was: I will confer with the Attorney General of the province of Quebec. And so he did—he conferred with my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) who at that time filled that office. And my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) brought in a Bill in the local legislature. That was a good Bill, and my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) himself, who was then in the legislature, supported it. But he says that that Bill did not reach a second reading. But what did that mean? It meant that the local government was not strong enough to carry this measure—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It meant that public sentiment against it was too strong.

Mr. BERGERON. But if this matter had been kept before the public since 1892, the present provincial government, which is friendly to this administration, would have been stronger on that subject, and Mr. Archambault, the Attorney General of Quebec, would have been able to bring forward the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) and carry it through the legislature, and we should not be called upon to increase the debt of Canada by \$500,000 in this way. There are enough judges now in the province of Quebec, and my hon. friend the Solicitor General knows it. He says it costs \$16,000, to bring the judges from the country to sit in the district of Montreal. That is denied by the hon. member for Montmorency, who says that it costs only about \$7,000. But if you do pass this Bill and appoint the three new judges, saddling the country with this additional debt of \$500,000, you will still bring in judges from the country.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I desire to say, and to say deliberately and after reflection, that if that occurs, the gentleman who is charged with the supervision and control of the judges in the district of Montreal will not be performing his duty. The chief justice ought to see to it, that it shall not be necessary.

Mr. BERGERON. But, I say it will be done; and I will tell my hon. friend the Solicitor General why. The moment you appoint three new judges, you will have two or three of the present judges starting on leave of absence for the benefit of their health or do something of that kind; you will have the same number of judges in Montreal as you have to-day, and you will have to bring in judges from the country. There was some difference of opinion between the Solicitor General and the hon. member for Montmorency as to the law the Solicitor General brought in in 1898. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) asks what difference it made. He had forgotten that the legislature of Quebec had changed the law with respect to the courts and declared that three judges of the Court of Review are taken from the Superior Court at the discretion of the chief justice or acting chief justice. That is, the acting chief justice could, if he wished, bring three judges from the rural districts who, with all their learning and all their abilities have not work enough to do. What effect had my hon. friend's (Mr. Fitzpatrick's) Bill on this? Why, it purely and simply put a stop to this practice. Under clause 8, his Bill—an Act further to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts—passed in 1898, it is provided that no travelling allowance shall be allowed to any judge requested to sit in review under section 1, of chapter 20, of the Statutes of 1898, of the local legislature of Quebec, unless it is certified by the chief justice or judge discharging the duties of chief justice in the

Mr. BERGERON.

district that the attendance of such judge was, in his opinion, necessary. It is the last part of clause 8:

But no travelling allowance shall be granted to any judge requested to sit in review under section 1 of chapter 20 of the Statutes of 1898 of the legislature of Quebec, unless it is certified by the chief justice or the judge discharging the duties of chief justice, in the district, that the attendance of said judge was, in his opinion, necessary.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Is there anything improper in that?

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend will admit it has this result: Every time the judges of the city of Montreal say that they are in a position to sit as a Court of Review, they would rather so sit than sit in the lower court the whole day. It has deprived the rural district judges of sitting on that bench, something which they look upon as an honour, because it broadens the field of their operations. Now, it takes three judges in Montreal to do this every month, and deprives the other courts of the district of Montreal of the work which these three men would do, while at the same time there are three other judges in the country who are probably doing nothing. So I think my hon. friend himself, by bringing in this amendment in 1898, has impaired the work which should be done by the judges of the district and the city of Montreal.

Now, before we embark in this expenditure, I think we might as well have the opinion of a man who knows something about the administration of justice in the province of Quebec, I mean Sir Melbourne Tait, Chief Justice of the Superior Court in Montreal. In 1897, at the opening of the court, addresses were presented to Sir Melbourne on the occasion of his receiving the knighthood, and in replying to those addresses, he thought it was his duty to give his opinion about the administration of justice, and if the House will bear with me, I will read it, because I think it is important that hon. gentlemen from the other provinces should know what he said:

You will perhaps allow me to say a few words regarding the administration of justice in this district. It will be generally admitted that, to be effective, it should be prompt. Of course, this does not mean that there must always be a judge ready to try a case, for that is not always possible, but it does mean that it must be so kept up that cases may be heard within a reasonable time after they are inscribed.

You are all aware also that the business before our Superior Court has enormously increased, owing, no doubt, to the great growth of the city, and its wonderful expansion as a commercial, railway and shipping centre. I have not verified the fact, but it has been authoritatively stated that more than half the legal business of the province is done here. Without going into details on this point, I might refer, for instance, to the great amount of work thrown upon the Court of Review by being created a court of final resort in city expropriation and

municipal cases, and by the change in the law granting an appeal direct from that court to the Supreme Court of Canada, and to Her Majesty in her Privy Council. In fact, it is only necessary to glance over our legislation of late years to see that the intervention of a court or a judge is now required in a great many more cases than formerly. It is also to be remembered that in this province in 99 civil cases out of 100, the judge has to decide the facts as well as the law.

Apart from this district, there are ten others in what may be called the Montreal review division, presided over by nine judges, one of whom is authorized to reside in Montreal. I believe that, with the exception of the district of St. Francis, the judicial work of those districts does not nearly occupy the time of the resident judge, and in view of the great increase of it in Montreal, it appears to me that the time has fully arrived for a readjustment of judicial labour, so that it may be fairly and equally distributed.

While it is right and proper that justice, civil and criminal, should be administered in each district, I do not know of any paramount reason why a judge should be required to reside in any of these districts, with the exception of St. Francis, and perhaps of Ottawa.

A new judge has since been appointed in the district of St. Francis.

In the former the work is too heavy for one judge, who has seven circuit courts to attend, besides the one at the 'chef-lieu'; in the latter, the judge has under his charge the district of Pontiac. In every other district a judge can leave Montreal in the morning and reach the 'chef-lieu' in time to open a Superior Court. We have judges who render us assistance, who leave their districts in the morning and return to their homes the same afternoon. I think that all of them except those serving in the two districts which I named, might with great benefit to the administration of justice, reside in Montreal, and the work be done from the city under the direction of the chief justice. Nothing but good could result from the close association and conference between the judges such a state of things would bring about, and amongst other benefits, uniformity of practice would be established. deliberation in review cases would have the constant assistance of these judges in the work here, where it is much required, and the result would be a much fairer distribution of labour. Moreover, I believe that such a change instead of retarding the work in the country districts, would give it a fresh impetus. I should be glad, indeed, if, as an experiment, a few, at any rate, of these outside judges, who live nearest to Montreal, could be brought here to reside, and the work of their districts be attended to in the way I have suggested.

It is true that there are some thirty circuit courts apart from those at the 'chef-lieus.' I think, however, that it would be quite possible to have these satisfactorily attended to by the Superior Court judges from Montreal if necessary, but I am strongly of opinion they should be relieved from sitting in the circuit court in the country parts, as they have been relieved from doing in this city. In all other provinces except Manitoba, the judges of the Superior Courts are not called upon to administer justice in the inferior courts. As the law now stands, the circuit court at the 'chef-lieu' of each district has only jurisdiction in cases under \$100, while in the counties it has jurisdiction up to \$200. The proportion of cases between \$100 and \$200 cannot be very large, and I think that no injustice could result from reducing the

jurisdiction of the county courts and increasing the jurisdiction of the district magistrates, so as to enable them to take all the work of the circuit court. If it is not desirable to alter the jurisdiction of the court, then the jurisdiction of the district magistrates might be enlarged so as to cover all cases therein, subject to the review that now exists.

I believe that the adoption of these suggestions would improve the administration of justice in this section of the province. Under whatever system we may work, we shall always require your hearty co-operation, and having had your valuable assistance in the past, we feel we may confidently rely upon it in the future.

This was addressed principally to the judges of the country districts who were present at this ceremony. Now, my hon. friend from Montmorency has said something which will strike the mind of anybody, whether a lawyer or not. You have in one district the very same judge, he has been there for years and years, he does not mingle with his colleagues, and he makes a kind of jurisprudence of his own. There have been cases, that I know very well, where the judge has established a jurisprudence. The lawyers who have kept records of his judgments for twenty years, go before him and cite his old judgments, and they generally, of course, win their case. The other parties take their case to review, and as the jurisprudence has been greatly changed during that period, his judgments are reversed. This makes cost and no end of litigation. By the system proposed by the hon. member for Montmorency—and which is not at all opposed by the Solicitor General, because he himself supported it at the time, in the local legislature of Quebec—judges would go around, and that would be better for the lawyers and better for the litigants.\* Now, let me give an idea of how justice is administered in some parts of our province. We had a criminal court in Beauharnois this spring. I do not know whether the House is aware that lawyers acting for the Crown in the rural districts of the province, are paid \$20 a day. Of course they try to get along as fast as possible, every one will understand that! There was a term at Beauharnois some years ago when my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) was Attorney General, and it amounted to such a figure that he decided that there would be no more terms, and there were no more for eight or ten years. But, there has been a change of administration in Quebec. A lawyer from Beauharnois of the same political colour as the Quebec government decided that it was necessary to have a criminal term, and such a term was commenced on the 8th of March and finished on the 27th of April. There were twelve grand jurors summoned and present. They proceeded three days and their work resulted as follows:

True Bills.

James N. Prior, for attempted murder.

John Black, for assaulting a peace officer in the execution of his duty.

Emanuel Provost, for escaping from prison.

That is not regarded as a crime in Beauharnois. There is a good story told about the Beauharnois jail, that I may repeat. It is told of the late Col. Prud'homme, of the 64th Battalion. He allowed the prisoners to go out every day to work, so that when they left the jail they would have a little money, but he required them to be back at 8 o'clock at night. He closed the door at 8 o'clock at night and if they were not there they could not get in. One night a poor fellow came back after 8 o'clock and after he had bruised his hands rapping at the iron door. Col. Prud'homme came and asked: 'Who is there?' 'It is I,' replied the man. 'Why didn't you get back at 8 o'clock?' 'I met a friend from home,' the man replied. 'We had a glass of beer together, and I could not get back in time.' 'Well,' the Colonel replied, 'You cannot get in; you will have to sleep outside. I will teach you to come back in time.' Since then Col. Prud'homme has been superceded by another man who proceeds in another way, still. When Shortis was arrested in Valleyfield the authorities did not leave him in jail there, but they took him to Montreal.

Joseph Hebert, for assault, causing actual bodily harm.

Alexandre Gagnier, for inflicting grievous bodily harm.

J. A. Brault dit Lachance, for obtaining possession of valuable security by false pretenses.

Joseph Gauvreau, for arson, two indictments.

Onésime Genereux, for arson.

Wilfrid Boissonnault, for arson, two indictments.

Emanuel Provost, for stealing from the person.

Alfred Johnston, for escaping from prison.

James Sharpe, same offence.

Achille Hebert, for aiding to commit rape.

Patrick McLaughlin, assault causing actual bodily harm.

Euclide Bougie, for rape.

Joseph Martin, for assaulting an officer.

Joseph Sand, for assault.

These are the cases which were brought before the grand jury.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is quite a number.

Mr. BERGERON. My right hon. friend had better wait a moment, and he will see how these cases resulted. It is easy to make out a case before a grand jury. There were no bills found in the following cases:

Louis Simpson, Adelard Lebœuf, Ulric Leduc, Ovila Lamarre.

There were two panels of petit jurors summoned, the first one of forty-nine, and the second of fifty. The petit jurors were discharged on the 27th of April. The costs of the term will amount to more than \$7,300, besides \$1,000 earned by the Crown prosecutor. The result of the term can be summed up in this way:

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What has that got to do with the proposition before the House?

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. BERGERON. This shows how justice is administered there, and until you confer with the Quebec government and get justice administered as it should be administered, you are not entitled to ask this parliament to increase the cost of the administration of justice in Quebec by \$15,000 a year. James N. Prior, a young man seventeen or eighteen years of age, accused of having attempted to murder the station master at Huntingdon, pleaded guilty. He said: I was mad. I did shoot, I did not strike him. I am very glad, but I am guilty. That would have prevented him from being placed on trial, but the Crown prosecutor sent down to him his son, a lawyer, and another lawyer by the name of McAvoy, who went and said to him: You are an imbecile. Plead that you are a fool. Thereupon he changed his plea, pleading that he was insane. Doctors were brought from Montreal to examine him. The case lasted three days, and they found out that he was the most intelligent man in the court. But, the Crown prosecutor drew \$20 a day. All this took place before a judge of the Superior Court who listened to it, and never said a word. Prior was condemned to four years in the Reformatory School at Sherbrooke.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Who was the judge?

Mr. BERGERON. Judge Belanger.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When was he appointed?

Mr. BERGERON. In 1873. I am giving you the result of the term. Prior was sent to the Reformatory School at Sherbrooke. Hebert, for the shameful offence which all the district knows, got six months in the Beauharnois jail. There was a man with an accusation against him which was one of the very worst that could possibly be brought against any man. Joseph Herbert got one month, Patrick McLaughlin, ten days, and Onésime Genereux three months, and that is all. The late Mr. Loupret, who was the magistrate of Beauharnois and Iberville, could have disposed of all these cases in two days at a cost to the province of \$50.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman show where the responsibility is on the provincial government because these men did not have a summary trial?

Mr. BERGERON. I say the Quebec government is responsible for the whole thing.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is a nice thing for a lawyer to say.

Mr. BERGERON. I stand by my opinion.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What about the Criminal Code?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not care about the Criminal Code. This is the administra-

tion of justice. Of course, I know this is not the place to discuss the question of the expenses which has to be borne by the local government, but I say, when we are called upon here, in this parliament, to vote money to increase the expenditure by \$15,000 a year, it is well that these facts should be put before parliament, and I can only repeat what my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) has said, that it is a useless expenditure. I have heard some lawyers say: You are not going to oppose an increase in the number of judges in Quebec? It is for Quebec and we might as well have two or three more judges. We are here for the purpose of watching over the whole interests of the country. We know the reason for these increases. It is purely and simply to get rid of two or three politicians who are in the way. It is to make places for three politicians and nothing else. Before I sit down I wish to say one word in regard to a statement which was made by the hon. Solicitor General. When the hon. member spoke a few moments ago about the charges which were made by judges he referred to money which was paid to judges in the old times. When they charged for three days they did so under the law which was established in old times. Of course, owing to railways and other means of communication which we now have, journeys which judges have to make do not take so much time. But in the old times a judge would leave Montreal to go to Richelieu; it took one day to go, one day holding court and one day to come back. The law was not changed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How about St. Hyacinthe and Montreal?

Mr. BERGERON. That was under the same old law, and my hon. friend would not think that he should have discarded the law and charged less. Some of the right hon. gentleman's own friends are scandalized at the administration of Justice there, and I quote the following from the *Huntingdon Gleaner* of the 22nd of March:

The conducting of this court being thus made the subject of public discussion, we feel it our duty to express regret at seeing it dragging on in a way that we thought had become obsolete. It has been three weeks in session, yet only four cases have been disposed of. This is a serious matter to jurymen and witnesses, apart from the consideration of cost to the province. Farmers who work from dawn to dark are kept dancing attendance on a court that does not sit on an average of five hours a day.

That shows that the administration of justice in the province of Quebec has to be remodelled. The Attorney General of the province of Quebec and the government of Quebec have done nothing and are doing nothing—some one advertised the other day to know whether the government was alive or not—and why do they not remodel the administration of justice in that province? If they did they would find that there were

enough judges in the province of Quebec and we would not be called upon to appoint three more. I move:

That this Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) has shown that there is room for improvement in the administration of justice in the district which he has the honour to represent. If it be true, as he said, that the most intelligent man in the court was the man in the dock, and that he showed his intelligence by asking to be sent to jail, then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is giving a very poor certificate to the intelligence of the people who sent him here.

Mr. BERGERON. The man in custody was not from my county.

The PRIME MINISTER. But, you said he was the most intelligent man in the court.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not want words put in my mouth that I did not use. The doctor who examined him said that he was the most intelligent man there.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well, the doctor from Montreal who examined him declared that he was the most intelligent man in the court, and I can understand now why my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) has been returned to this parliament.

Mr. BERGERON. You were there, and you know differently.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) says that the administration of the law is lax, because a certain young man who was arranged for attempted murder pleaded guilty, and was induced by the Crown to withdraw his plea for a plea of not guilty. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain), who has been Attorney General, will not find fault with that. If the Crown prosecutor, with the permission of the court, would suggest to the prisoner to withdraw his plea of guilty and substitute one of not guilty, especially where there was a question as to whether the man was in possession of his faculties, that is a thing which happens every day in all courts of criminal jurisdiction.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all. He was induced to withdraw his plea.

The PRIME MINISTER. That might be quite proper. There was a case the other day in Manitoba where the prisoner pleaded guilty to an indictment for murder, and there was the greatest difficulty in coming to a proper understanding of the case as to whether the sentence should be commuted or not commuted. Every one knows this practice prevails in courts of justice, and if that is the only point against the administration of justice in the district of

Beauharnois, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) has not made much of a case. But, let us come to the merits of the question. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron), following the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), says that the number of judges in the province of Quebec is already too large, and that opinion is shared, to some extent, by the Solicitor General. It is so many years since I practiced my profession that I cannot venture an opinion on the subject, but, I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) make such a statement. I hold in my hand a Bill introduced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) which most certainly increased the number of judges in the province of Quebec. Apart from the Appellate Court, which is a court of six judges, there are thirty-one judges of the Superior Court and three judges of the circuit court of the province of Quebec. Some few years ago the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) introduced a Bill which proposed to displace the present system and replace it by a superior court and a district court. Those two courts were to discharge the work which is now done by the Superior Court and the circuit court.

Mr. CASGRAIN. And the district magistrates, and all criminal proceedings.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well. Under this Bill there would have been in the Superior Court fifteen judges, and in the district court twenty-six judges, making forty-one in all. To-day there are only thirty-four judges, and I am not aware that there are more than four or five district magistrates, so that my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) proposed to increase the number of judges. I do not find fault with his proposal, and I think, perhaps, he was right. I would have supported the Bill of my hon. friend, not because it increased the number of judges, but because it provided a different judicial system from that now prevailing. Anyway, it shows there is not much in his point about there being too many judges. In the province of Quebec, all the duties which are assigned, both to the Superior Court and the circuit court, are discharged by Superior Court judges, with the exception of the district of Montreal, where there are circuit court judges. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) provided in his Bill that the duties of the Superior Court should be discharged, not by thirty-one judges that we have at present, but by fifteen, and that the other duties which appertain to the circuit court and are of a non-contentious character, requiring speedy deliberation, should be discharged by the judges of the district courts. The object of the Bill was to have a residential judge in each district to discharge these minor duties, and that the judges of the Superior Court residing in Quebec and Montreal could travel from district to dis-

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

trict to hold court, as is done in the province of Ontario. For my part, I would have been quite favourable to that system, because I think it is preferable to our own. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) knows that his views did not prevail, and the views entertained by the Solicitor General did not prevail, and the views which I now announce would not be acceptable either. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) knows that the people of Quebec are extremely tenacious of their laws. Perhaps there is no population to-day in the world, certainly no population on the continent of America, which is more tenacious of its laws and its customs than are the people of the province of Quebec. That is a national characteristic, and, on the whole, it is a very wholesome characteristic. It is a characteristic of which, no doubt, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) feels proud; at all events, I feel proud of it. There is, then, this tenacious disposition of the people of Quebec to maintain their laws without amendment, even though thinking men consider them obsolete, and a fit subject for reform. My hon. friend from Beauharnois asks, why is there not an agitation over this? Why does not the provincial government of Mr. Marchand introduce a law similar to the law which the hon. member for Montmorency introduced when he was Attorney General of the province of Quebec? Precisely for the same reason which compelled the hon. member for Montmorency to withdraw that law, that is to say, because public opinion was not behind it.

Mr. BERGERON. It is because you are too weak.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is engaged in politics. Why does he not go to the province of Quebec and preach a crusade on this subject?

Mr. BERGERON. It is not my business.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, why does he speak in the way he does here?

Mr. BERGERON. Because it is my business to speak here.

The PRIME MINISTER. We are powerless here to amend the law; it can only be amended in the province of Quebec; and my hon. friend will not amend it here, nor will his friends, for the simple reason that public opinion will not sanction its amendment. The people of the province of Quebec are wedded to their system, and they will not depart from it, whether it is for the best or not.

Mr. BERGERON. Why do you not lead public opinion?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no doubt that the politicians and the government of the province of Quebec are made on the same pattern as all other men, and it is natural for them to try to follow and please public opinion. If public opinion had

sanctioned the changes introduced in 1895 or in 1892, there is no doubt they would have prevailed; but public opinion would not countenance them. My hon. friend says that the present government should invite negotiations with the provincial authorities. I am not revealing a secret, when I say that my hon. friend has given a piece of advice which we have followed already. I have been in communication with Mr. Archambault, the present Attorney General of the province of Quebec, and I suggested to him the very same thing. Last year I stated, what I state to-day, that so far as my own personal opinion goes, I prefer the system which was introduced in the Bill of my hon. friend from Montmorency, to the system which exists to-day. I say so openly and without hesitation. But the present Attorney General of the province—I will not say what were his personal views—stated as his political opinion, that it would not be possible to induce the legislature of the province of Quebec to depart from the present system. The people of that province are so wedded to their system of judicial decentralization, that they will not have justice administered in their midst by any other judge than a Superior Court judge. So long as that is their preference, there is no use of fighting against it. For my part, I do not hesitate to say, speaking with the fullest sense of responsibility—and perhaps my words will be heard in the province of Quebec—that I am not in favour of the present system, that I think it ought to be reformed; but, even though I had the honour of occupying a seat in the legislature of Quebec, my voice would be just as powerless as the voice of anybody else, to induce the people of the province to change their principles. I am surprised at hon. gentlemen opposite refusing to recognize the principle which is inscribed in deep letters on every page of the history of the province of Quebec. It is well known that it is a motto of the French Canadian people to stand by *nos institutions, nos lois*. They have their laws and their customs, and there is no use of telling them: 'Your system is antiquated.' They will answer: 'It is good enough for us, and we want to keep it.' Under such circumstances I want to know what are we to do? My hon. friend comes here and preaches reform. Let him go to the provincial legislature and make his views prevail there, and then he can come here.

Mr. BERGERON. Why do you not refuse?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman says, why do we not refuse to carry out their views? This is the high politics of hon. gentlemen opposite. Refuse to carry out the laws of the province of Quebec; substitute your own judgment and your own will for the judgment, and the will of the people of the province of Quebec; tell them

that they do not know their business, that they are all wrong, and that you will rule them with an iron hand, and force them to have a different system upon which they base their faith. If these are the views of the hon. gentleman, they are not my views, nor the views of this government, and I hope they are not the views of this country. Refuse to carry out their laws? Why, Sir, that would be a fine system to bring about anarchy in this country. If we were to engage in controversy with the provincial authorities on matters of this kind, what would take place?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Suppose they asked for three times the number of judges they are asking for?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a question which it is very easy to answer. If you can satisfy the members of this parliament that a law passed by the local legislature is absurd, tyrannical, unjust, and a shock to common sense, then certainly we could not follow it. But I put it to my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague): When the legislature of any province exercises its will and judgment on a question which is under its own jurisdiction, I am sure that my hon. friend would not say that we should ignore the legislature and refuse to carry out its will and intention. There is in our constitution a fatal defect, if I may say so, in this respect, in that it provides that the provincial legislature shall organize the courts and determine how many judges shall be appointed to administer the law in the province, but places upon this parliament the burden of fixing and paying the salaries of those judges. My hon. friend will admit that this is a very extraordinary provision. It is a failure in our constitution; but there it is, and we cannot help ourselves. When the constitution has placed the power in the local legislatures to organize the courts, we must follow their judgment, unless we are prepared to say that they have acted in bad faith, or from improper motives, or in a way so absurd that it cannot be defended. If any legislature could be shown to have acted in that way, I, for my part, would be prepared to take issue with it; but unless something of that kind is shown, I do not think that this parliament has any right or jurisdiction to substitute its will or wisdom for the will or wisdom of the local legislature. These principles, I am sure, will commend themselves to the judgment of every man in this House. What is the position to-day in the province of Quebec? The people of that province have their system, they cling to it, and what is the objection made to it? The only objection is that it provides for a greater number of judges than are really necessary—that there are to-day a sufficient number of judges to administer the law, but that they are so distributed, that some of them in the city

of Montreal have too much to do, while others, in the rural parts of the country, have too little to do. I am free to say at once that everybody knows that. Everybody knows that in the district of Montreal the judges are overworked, and that is the very reason why we want to make the provision we are now doing. It has become an imperative necessity to have more judges in the district of Montreal. Then, it is stated that other judges have not sufficient work. That may be also. It may be that there are judges who could do more work than they do at the present time.

But, I do not know of any system you could devise which, considering our immense territory, will provide for a proper equalization of the work among the different judges. We cannot devise any system under which a certain number of judges will not have more work to do than others. That is inevitable, but my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Cargrain) says that the evil could be remedied if he were to provide that the judges who now reside in the rural districts should reside in the cities of Montreal and Quebec. But that is a change which the province of Quebec is not prepared to accept. That province does not want to do away with the system of having residential justices in all the districts. That system they have a right to retain, and it is one in favour of which there is a good deal to say, though it may be attacked from different points of view. I said a moment ago that I had a conference with my hon. friend the present Attorney General of that province. The law to which we are giving our sanction was passed by the Quebec legislature in the session of 1899. I represented to the Attorney General the views which I hold. I said that in my opinion it would be preferable to have a different system, but the Attorney General told me it was impossible for his or any government to change it or to have a reform of the kind proposed carrying out, at present at all events. What took place in the Quebec legislature when this law providing for three additional judges was introduced? The party to which my hon. friends from Beauharnois and Montmorency belong is represented on the floor of that legislature; and if I am correctly informed, the law providing for three additional judges in the district of Montreal was passed without being challenged by the opposition at any of its stages.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There was a long debate.

The PRIME MINISTER. But there was no division. I have not the debate which took place in the legislative assembly, but I have that which took place in the legislative council where both parties are represented in about equal numbers. There the discussion was confined, on the part of the opposition, to one member and one alone, Mr. Chapin. He protested against the law

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

but did nothing more, and the Bill was passed without division through all its stages.

Under such circumstances, when the Conservative party on the floor of the Quebec legislature did not raise their voice against this law, but accepted it, does it lie in the mouth of any man in this House to say: I protest against it and want a reform adopted by the Quebec legislature. We must take the facts as they are. It will not be denied by my hon. friend from Montmorency or my hon. friend from Beauharnois, or any other member from the province of Quebec, that the condition of things in Montreal to-day is such that it is imperative—not only useful but absolutely imperative—that we should have three new judges in that district. I have here a resolution adopted on June 3, 1899, by the bar of the district of Montreal which was placed in my hands by the bâtonnier, and which reads as follows:

Minutes of the Council of the Bar of Montreal,  
June 3, 1899.

It was proposed by Mr. N. Charbonneau, seconded by Mr. L. H. Archambault, Q.C., and resolved:

That the federal government be memorialized to immediately appoint three judges, authorized by the statute of last session of the Quebec legislature, the pressing condition of the legal business of this district demanding such appointment, and that the following gentlemen: the Bâtonnier, the Syndic and Mr. C. B. Carter, Q.C., be delegated to interview the federal government in connection with this matter.

This matter was further discussed at a meeting of the general council of the bar of the province of Quebec, on June 10, 1899, and a resolution unanimously adopted calling on this government to give effect at once to the provincial law increasing the number of judges. I do not know whether my hon. friend from Montmorency was present at that meeting or not.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I was in England at the time.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, he has had many opportunities since of putting his views before the bar of the district where he practices, and I am not aware that he ever in Montreal offered any opposition to the appointment of these three judges. If I had my own way, I would have a different way of treating this matter; but after the conference I had with the Attorney General of the province, I came to the conclusion that there was nothing else to do but conclude that we should not refuse to adopt the views of the province of Quebec, speaking through its legislature.

The objections made are not made upon the merits of this law, but simply upon the condition of things which prevails in that province. Well, this is not the place to have those views regarding that condition prevail. The proper place is upon the soil of the province itself; but so long as the people of the province of Quebec continue in their present way of thinking, so long as they

choose to adhere to the present system, there is nothing for us to do but comply with their wishes.

I have not a word to say in reply to the last kick, if I may so call it, administered by my hon. friend from Beauharnois, when he said this was simply intended to make room for politicians. If there had been nothing else in this but the question of patronage, why was not that position taken on the floor of the Quebec legislature by the party to which my hon. friend belongs. Why did they not bring up then and there the argument that this was simply a measure to provide for politicians? Such objection as that, I do not propose to discuss.

This government has nothing to do with this provincial law. It was not passed at our suggestion. We made all the representations we could in order to induce the provincial government to change its law, but that government is responsible as we are, it is a popular government as we are, and there, as here, the will of the people must prevail; and in view especially of the fact that this law is imperatively demanded by the condition of things prevailing in the city of Montreal, there is nothing to do, in my humble judgment, but pass this measure providing for the salaries of these judges.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The reasons given for the appointment of three more judges by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) do not commend themselves to my judgment. He admits that there is a sufficient number of judges in the province of Quebec to do the work, but unfortunately in one district the judges have too much work to do and in the other districts too little. Then, I would suggest that the First Minister should consult with his friends and get them to reduce the number in the districts where the judges have too little work and remove those judges to the districts where there is too much work. The right hon. gentleman says that might be a very good thing to do if we could control the situation, but we have nothing to do but obey practically the demand of the local government. In other words, if the local government chooses to map out districts, no matter how ridiculous may be these districts, or how little work there may be for a judge in any one of them, it is an order for us to appoint the judges and provide their salaries.

I do not think the hon. gentleman could claim that if this were carried to the point where it would be a burning scandal in the administration of justice, he would be justified in following out the principle he lays down. If I rightly understood the information given us to-day, it has nearly reached that point in Quebec. One judge, we are told, tried forty-five cases in a year, and forty-two were decided; another judge tried only eighteen cases, and another only

fifteen cases in a year. Is the Premier of this Dominion powerless to join with his friends in Quebec to promote a healthier public sentiment. We are told that a Bill to change this state of affairs was introduced in the provincial legislature, but was not passed. But in how many cases in the history of legislation have Bills been introduced not only once or twice, but five and six times, and at last been accepted and made law, in many cases to the benefit of the people. We have surely not reached the condition of things in Canada under which the right-thinking representatives of the people in the Dominion, and in the province cannot join to educate public sentiment so as to bring about the change of an effete and expensive system. The First Minister says that this system is effete, but public sentiment does not favour a change. But if the public men representing these people will intelligently and assiduously devote themselves to the task, they can bring about a change in public sentiment; and public men are derelict in their duty if they do not try to educate public opinion so as to bring it into accord with wisdom and common sense. The Prime Minister said, that the question is whether the provincial government have passed a law mapping out more districts or making a demand for more judges, and if so, it is our business to obey, no matter how ridiculous it may be. But some are unkind enough to say that the action of the provincial legislature may be dictated by consideration of political exigencies. We know that in the province of Ontario, the legislature passed a law providing that no junior judge should be appointed in a county of less than 80,000 population. But as soon as the Conservative party left office in the Dominion, and the political friends of the majority in the Ontario legislature came into office here, they repealed that law, thus opening opportunities for the appointment of their friends to office. It may be that in this case the legislature of Quebec has been actuated by a similar motive. The hon. member for Montmorency said that the salaries of the judges were too small. I want to say one word with regard to that. I do not know whether I properly understood the situation or the work that the judges do, but the hon. member (Mr. Casgrain) said that some of these judges had not work enough to keep them busy for more than one or two months in the year. And yet they get \$5,000 a year—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is absolutely inaccurate. The judges in the districts of Quebec and Montreal work harder than any judges I know of.

Mr. SPROULE. A judge who has forty-five cases to try in the year must be very hard worked indeed, and so must the judge who has only eighteen cases in a year.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is putting words into my mouth that I never used. I did not mean to say that the judges who now had only fifteen or eighteen cases to deal with should have an increase of salary. What I said was that the law should be so remodelled that the judges should have more work and be entitled to larger salaries.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to attribute that to the hon. member for Montmorency, because I know he did not make such a proposition. His proposition was, to my mind, in the right direction. If you would more equitably distribute the work of the administration of justice, and if you work your men harder and then give them higher salaries, I would not object. But, if men have only one or two months' work in the year, surely it will not be said that the present salary is not sufficient. I look at the judges and ask myself what are they made of. They are made out of common lawyers, many of them out of lawyers who have sat in this House year after year with us; and I have seen these men one after another elevated to the high and responsible position of judge. In all the various affairs of life where I have seen them brought into contact with other men, they do not appear to possess any higher intelligence or greater judgment than the average of the professional classes of the country. But in almost every other line of life a man taken from those classes would regard \$5,000 a year as a very fair salary; and yet this is said to be a paltry salary for a judge. If I were to mention the names of some hon. gentlemen who have been taken out of this House during the last twenty-one years and put upon the bench, and if I were to endeavour to show to the people where they are known that they are not well enough paid at \$5,000 a year, I would be laughed at. They would put these men alongside of other men and compare their earning powers, compare their intelligence, and they would say that these men were not above the average intelligence, that they would not compare more than favourably with men in the higher walks of commerce or professional life. There are plenty of men to be found in the country who are working for salaries little more than one-half what judges are getting at the present time, and who are certainly their equal in ability and intelligence. Now, the minister admitted that the system is antiquated, but he said our people are wedded to it and we cannot change it. I want the people to understand that the proposal made by the Solicitor General means a permanent tax on the people of Canada of the interest on half a million dollars, because \$15,000 a year would pay the interest on half a million dollars at the rate we are paying interest on our public debt at present. Therefore, it means a permanent

Mr. SPROULE.

increase to our public debt of half a million dollars. And for what purpose? Not for the purpose of providing judges to do work that cannot be done by judges already appointed, but for the purpose of pandering to what the Prime Minister calls an antiquated system, thereby acknowledging that we have not the moral courage to back up public sentiment in asking the local legislature to change the system. I say it shows the weakness of this administration, a weakness that no government should be willing to admit. But the right hon. gentleman frankly admits it, and I admire him for his candour, though I cannot admire him for his courage. I am prepared to vote for the six months' hoist, because I say it is becoming a burning scandal that this effete and antiquated system should be continued any longer, and all because we have not the moral courage to go to the province of Quebec and try to educate the people to send men to the local legislature sufficiently intelligent and wise to devise a system more in harmony with the spirit of the age, and more in harmony with the principle of economy which should guide all our administration of public affairs.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). The hon. gentleman says that the appointment of these three judges means an increase of half a million dollars to our public debt. Now, he would be right if the present judges did not get an extra allowance for sitting in Montreal. Judges that are appointed to districts outside of Montreal, when they sit as judges in Montreal, get \$6 a day and they get their mileage.

Mr. BERGERON. No mileage.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am right. The hon. gentleman does not appear to know Quebec law at all. He said to-day that the Quebec government appointed the judges. He surely knows better than that, he is not so ignorant of the modus operandi of government as to say that the Quebec government appoints the judges.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not say that.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, you said so, I appeal to the House if you did not say so. The Quebec government makes the districts and this government appoints the judges. Now, the hon. member from Grey (Mr. Sproule) said this measure would increase the public debt by half a million dollars. He knows that the judges that are appointed to districts outside of Montreal, when they sit as judges in Montreal, get, besides their salary, \$6 a day and an extra allowance for sitting as judges in Montreal. Now, the judges appointed under this Bill will simply get their salary, and no extra allowance, and no extra mileage.

Mr. BERGERON. No mileage at all.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** That is all right. The hon. gentleman supported a government for years and years that allowed a system to exist whereby the judges appointed to districts in Quebec were permitted to live in Montreal in violation of the understanding when they were appointed that they should live in their districts. But they lived in Montreal, and when they discharged the duty as judges in Montreal they actually drew mileage to Montreal from the district where they were appointed, and they charged three days instead of charging one.

**Mr. BERGERON.** You are all wrong.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** I tell the hon. gentleman that I am right. He does not know what he is talking about, and he talks about a great many other things of which he knows just as little as he does about this, and that is not very much. I have a perfect recollection of the discussion that took place in this House, and I say that judges were appointed in Quebec to outside districts who, in place of living in their district in accordance with the terms of their appointment, lived in Montreal. Because it is understood that judges should live in their district for the convenience of the administration of justice, so that if a man wants to get an order from a judge, or take certain proceedings, he may be able to find the judge in his district. But in place of doing that, the judges lived in Montreal, and when they were called upon to perform the duty of judges in Montreal, they actually charged mileage from the district to which they were appointed, and they charged a day travelling from that district into Montreal, and a day travelling back from Montreal to their district.

**Mr. BERGERON.** No.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** The hon. gentleman will persist in denying it.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Will you allow me one word?

**Mr. McMULLEN.** No, I will not give you a word because it is evident the hon. gentleman is so muddled over the whole thing that it is no use listening to him. I won't try to educate the hon. gentleman.

**Mr. BERGERON.** You cannot do it.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** I honestly admit it would be a very serious task to educate the hon. gentleman. But I say that he sat in this House as a supporter of a government that permitted that condition of things to exist year after year.

**Mr. MONK.** Will the hon. gentleman allow me one word? The case referred to by him, I think, he does not fully understand. Perhaps he alludes to the case of a judge who was allowed to reside in Montreal, that is to say, his residence there was tolerated by the government for reasons given by him, and thought to be sufficient

by the government. But during vacation he was called upon regularly by the chief justice of the court to take the place of other judges in Montreal, and he charged for that.

**Mr. BERGERON.** No mileage.

**Mr. MONK.** No mileage. Here was a judge appointed for a rural district, and was receiving \$4,000 a year. The judges, upon the arrival of summer, leave the city of Montreal for a well-deserved rest. This judge is called upon and he receives \$4,000 a year to remain in Montreal to replace the judges there who are all gone, and who receive \$5,000 a year. Under the circumstances, I leave it to my hon. friend to say whether he is entitled to the extra allowance.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** My hon. friend (Mr. Monk), did not happen to be in this House when this question was taken up some years ago. We had a full discussion of the whole question, and I must say that it was most humiliating to the bench to think that there were men sitting upon the bench who, for the purpose of putting money into their own pockets, were charging mileage that they were not entitled to. My hon. friend just like the rest of the lawyers in this House, undertakes to speak in behalf of the bench. I was amused at the address of my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), this afternoon. There is never a time that the question of the judges' salaries is up, but you find every lawyer from Quebec, getting up to defend the increase in the salaries of judges. I presume that those from Ontario would be willing to do the same thing. Lawyers evidently are willing to cultivate the higher regard and respect of the bench. I presume that is the reason, as I cannot explain their action in any other way. The hon. member for Montmorency this afternoon lauded the bench of Quebec, and compared the bench of this country with the bench of England in order to prove that the judges of this country should have their salaries increased. I agree with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that the judges of this country are well paid, and the best evidence of that fact, is that whenever a judgeship becomes vacant, you will find even the best talent in the country anxious and willing to take a position on the bench if they can get it. I have no axe to grind with the bench, nor do I desire to reflect upon it. There is no doubt that we have a most creditable bench, and that there is no country that can boast of a better or more independent bench than we have in Canada. Taking it as a whole, I believe we pay our judges ample salaries. The hon. member for East Grey, speaking in reference to a statement that had fallen from the right hon. Prime Minister, thought that the government should reduce the number of judges. I am positively certain that if the present government in their wisdom,

decided to take a step in that direction, we would have a unanimous protest from the other side of the House: This is done for a political purpose. You have a political feeling of bitterness against those men who have been placed on the bench by the old government, and this is for venting political spleen on the men who have been put in these positions. I think the hon. member for East Grey would harp as loudly and as long upon that string as any other man in this House. Who is responsible for the condition of things in Quebec, if there are too many judges? We must surely accept the statement which the hon. Solicitor General made this afternoon. He has given the number of cases in Montreal that have been tried and that yet remain to be tried, which shows the necessity of more judges being appointed for that district. But, in Quebec, it is the provincial legislature that appoint the districts, just the same as the legislature in Ontario do. The government of Ontario create the districts and it is the duty of the government here to provide a judge for a district when a district is created. It is not the duty of this House to sit in judgment upon what a province may do. They are responsible before the people for what they have done, and I do not think it would be at all in keeping with our constitutional system that the government of the Dominion should say: No, we will give you no more judges; we consider you have enough. It is all very well to remonstrate with these people against increasing the expenditure, but I do not think that it is within the province of the government to say: You shall not have another judge. After all, when we come to consider the number of judges and the salaries that are paid, I do not think it costs this country as much per capita for officials of that kind in Quebec, as it does in Ontario. I notice that in Ontario we have seventy-four county court judges, and fifteen High Court judges, making eighty-nine altogether in Ontario. In Quebec they have only thirty-nine judges, or half as many as we have in Ontario. If you will add up the salaries which are paid the county court and Superior Court judges in Ontario, and divide them by the number of inhabitants in Ontario, and do the same with the thirty-nine judges they have in Quebec, I think you will find that it costs as much, per capita, in Ontario as it costs in Quebec, if not more. Quebec is not acting unreasonably, I think, in view of that condition of things. If Quebec has demanded of this government a larger number of judges proportionate to its population, than Ontario or Manitoba has, it is not asking anything out of the way, because the hon. Solicitor General has presented a very clear case. I think it is right and proper that these appointments should be made. I dare say that the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), would prefer that this Bill should be left over. I dare

Mr McMULLEN.

say that he earnestly and anxiously hopes that his friends will come to power after the elections, and he would not have the slightest objection to passing this Bill then, because they would get three Tories appointed in place of three Reformers.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the whole case. You are giving the whole case away now.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would not be at all surprised if that is the reason for his opposition.

Mr. BERGERON. You judge other people by yourself.

Mr. McMULLEN. I dare say my hon. friend would not object to being made one of them.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not looking for a position.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), made a reference to the action of the Ontario government in first passing a law to prevent the appointment of judges and then rescinding that law. The object of the Ontario government in passing that law was to provide against increasing the expenditure by the appointment of judges, if there was not work for them to do. Perhaps my hon. friend is not aware, as I am, that the bar of the counties where there were no junior judges, remonstrated with the government on the very great inconvenience that was experienced. When the judge was away on division court work, they had to gallop all over the country to get certain orders signed, and the bar protested against that condition of things. As the result of these protests from the bar, the Act was changed by the Mowat government, and it was not done because the Reform party were in power or anything of the kind.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY (North Simcoe). This is a matter on which, perhaps, the lawyers in this House might be heard, and speaking for the province of Ontario, I agree with the hon. member for Montmorancy (Mr. Casgrain) that the judges in this country are not paid as they ought to be.

Mr. McMULLEN. Another lawyer.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, another lawyer; and because a man is a lawyer is, I suppose, no reason why he should not have an opinion on this question. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen), in his business, has, probably, provided himself with a competence which will see him through the rest of his life, and he has, no doubt, frequently consulted a lawyer to advise him on certain points in making that competence which he now enjoys. I have represented to the government the claim of the judges of Ontario that they should receive some further allowance, and I am sorry it is not provided for in this Bill, because there are certain districts in the province of Ontario in which the judges are overworked, and where they are

not, in my judgment, paid a sufficient salary. I am unable to see this matter in the same light as the Prime Minister, because I think that this parliament should use its own judgment in viewing this matter. The Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), all say that there are sufficient judges in the province of Quebec to do all the work if the judges were only properly distributed. It does not seem to me to be germane to the issue, whether the per capita payment to the province of Ontario is greater than the per capita payment in the province of Quebec. If we have a judiciary necessary to carry on the administration of justice in the province of Ontario, that is what the country demands, and if, on the other hand, we have a judiciary sufficient for the administration of justice in Quebec, it does not matter whether the salaries of such judiciary exceeds the other or not. If the scandalous state of affairs exists in the province of Quebec as stated by the member for Beauharnois, this is not, in my judgment, the place or the time for ventilating it. If the administration of justice is so ludicrous in that county as was depicted by the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron), it is high time that in his own province and in his own legislature it should be inquired into. I am happy to state that I know of no such state of things in any county or judicial district in Ontario, and I venture to say, that if such a state of affairs existed there, it would not be twenty-four hours before it would be thoroughly investigated. In our province, the legislature does endeavour to distribute the work among the judges. By virtue of increasing the jurisdiction of the division courts and the county courts, they have lightened the labours of our Superior Court judges, so that the condition of things which existed some years ago does not now exist. Our Superior Court judges are not overworked as they were in days past. If the legislative assembly of the province of Quebec did likewise, if they increased the jurisdiction vested in the lower courts and thus lightened the labours of the judges of their superior courts, they might distribute the business in such a way that they would not have to increase the number of judges. If we agree to appoint as many judges as the legislative assembly of Quebec demands, we will never have that revision and reform in that province which it seems to be the opinion of both sides of the House is absolutely necessary. If, on the other hand, we say to the province of Quebec: We cannot accede to your request to increase the number of judges, because we understand from the lawyers of your province that you have sufficient judges if you distribute the work properly; then I think the matter would soon right itself. If the district of Montreal has not got a sufficient judicial

staff, then, by reason of the agitation which would spring up of itself, it is likely that the legislative assembly of Quebec would be bound to take action. The legislative assembly of Ontario was bound to take action, and I, therefore, submit that we should not accede to the request to increase the judiciary of Quebec, in the face of the fact that it is conceded on the floor of this parliament that there are sufficient judges in that province to do the work if the legislative assembly will only properly distribute it. That is the position I take. I take it in no spirit of antipathy to the province of Quebec. When I heard the statements of the Solicitor General, and of the hon. members for Montmorency and Beauharnois, I came to the conclusion that it was my duty to support such an amendment as that now before the House.

Mr. A. MARTIN (East Queen's, P.E.I.) I have not very many criticisms to offer to this Bill, but I believe that when a change is made as regards the salaries of our judges, it should take a wider scope than to confine it to the North-west Territories. The discussion this afternoon shows that the salaries of judges in Canada are altogether inadequate. This Bill only provides for a portion of the difficulty, and that being the case, it is advisable that it should not be proceeded with until a measure covering the whole ground can be introduced. It was only last year that I heard the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) call attention to the very low salaries paid to the judges in Prince Edward Island, and when I mention to the House that two of the judges of the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island only get \$3,200 each, and the chief justice only \$4,000, as compared with the \$5,000, \$6,000 and \$8,000 paid in the other provinces, it will be seen that there is good reason for increasing the salaries of our judges in the province of Prince Edward Island. I did expect that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would have backed up what he said in this House last year. He told us then that the salaries were so low in Prince Edward Island that some fees which properly belonged to the province had to go to subsidize the salaries of the judges, and he expressed a wish to have that remedied. I am astonished that his ardour has cooled, and that he has allowed this Bill to be introduced without one provision for Prince Edward Island. There is not a province in the Dominion where the judges are paid such low salaries as in Prince Edward Island. Men who have devoted the best years of their life to the study of the law, men of the highest ability, men who are the equals of the judges in any other part of the country, are obliged to serve their country in Prince Edward Island for \$3,200 a year, when from \$5,000 to \$8,000 is paid to judges in other provinces. I think it is an

anomaly, and I protest against it. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who brought up this subject a few years ago, is not going to humbly back down and submit to the dictation of the Solicitor General. The province of Prince Edward Island is also mulcted of fees which properly belong to that province in order to subsidize the salaries of the judges. That was a claim also set up by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I did not intend to speak on this subject. I thought the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would have been sufficiently alive to the occasion, so that I would not have to stand up for the legal profession and the judges of Prince Edward Island. But the task has been imposed upon me, and I think I have done my duty in calling attention to the matter.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). It seems to me that this is a bigger question than some hon. members regard it, and it ought to receive the serious consideration of the hon. members who are now moving the six months' hoist. Under the constitution the provincial legislature has the right to constitute courts, to say how many judges shall preside over those courts, and to institute the procedure necessary for carrying on business in them. In this case the legislature of Quebec have in its wisdom established courts in that province. I do not profess to know much about the system there; I do not profess to be able to compare its merits or demerits with those of the Ontario system; but I learn from statements which have been made to-day that the people of that province are wedded to their system and are not prepared to change it at present; and if they were prepared, it would not be for us to force any change upon them. It has been said by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that this is a case in which there ought to be a conference. The First Minister has said that he has had a conference with the Premier of Quebec on this very subject, and that conference has not resulted in anything. It seems to me that this parliament has a right for a time to refrain from appointing judges or voting money for the salaries of judges appointed; but the question just now is whether in the legislation which is under consideration the legislature of Quebec have acted in good faith. If they have, I do not think this parliament has any right to take the legislature or the province of Quebec by the throat and say: Notwithstanding the fact that under the constitution you have the right to pass the Act you have passed, we are not going to give effect to that Act. Under these circumstances I submit that we ought to give effect to it, and it might be a very serious matter if we refused to do so on any such grounds as have been presented to the House to-day. I quite appreciate the argument which has been advanced by

Mr. MARTIN.

the hon. member for Montmorency as to the division of the work. I have no doubt that difficulty will adjust itself later on. These evils may continue year after year; but when attention is sufficiently called to them, they are righted sooner or later, and in a way that is satisfactory to the people. Attention has been called both last session and this session to the unequal distribution of work in the province of Quebec, and that very fact will force the provincial legislature to do something to bring about a proper adjustment of work. But in the meantime, as we are called upon to enact this legislation, it seems to me that we ought to respond to the call.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS.

Mr. BRITTON. I think it would be a very great pity if any line of cleavage should be adopted in a matter of this kind, and there should be the least collision between the parliament of Canada and any one of the provincial legislatures in reference to a matter such as this. The system, although it might seem objectionable at first, of having the appointing power vested in one body and the creating of the position vested in another, still the more one looks into it the more he can find to approve in it and to conclude that it is a very wise plan. The provinces are interested in not creating more courts than are actually necessary for the business to be done because they have to bear all the expenses of court-houses and officials and the maintenance of the courts, except in so far as the salaries of the judges are concerned. That gives them a direct interest in not doing anything merely for the sake of creating places for persons who have to be paid by the Dominion; and even if you could suppose the local legislatures capable of being influenced by any such motive, I think there are counterbalancing motives which would prevent any wrong being done.

My hon. friend from East Grey said that when the Conservative government was in power a law was passed preventing the appointment of junior judges in the different counties. That is quite true, but I do not think that there was any such motive underlying that legislation as that implied by the observations of my hon. friend. Then he said that as soon as the Liberals got into power in Ottawa, that law was repealed. That is not quite correct. It was repealed with reference to one county, perhaps two, but I do not recollect more than one, and the law is still in force in Ontario. I can point to counties where there used to be junior judges and where now junior judges cannot be appointed. In Leeds and Grenville they had two judges, Judge McDonald and Judge Reynolds. Judge Reynolds died, and the Ontario legislature has never attempted, so far as I know, to cause the appointment of a junior judge in these

counties. So that my hon. friend is not correct in stating that the law was repealed, although in one instance, the county of Lambton, which is a very large county, a junior judge can be appointed.

So far as the administration of justice is concerned and the conduct of business in the courts, it seems to me, that while the work may not be properly distributed, it cannot be said, when we consider the amount of work done in the province of Quebec, that there is a very large expenditure compared with the work done. In Ontario we have fifteen High Court judges, including the judges of the Court of Appeal and those of the divisional courts and seventy-four county and district court judges, as in addition to the counties, there are two or three districts over which judges are appointed, and in some of these there are junior judges and district court judges. There are eighty-nine in all. Well, there are only thirty-nine judges all told—judges of the Court of Appeal, Queen's Bench and circuit court—in the province of Quebec. In the Montreal district alone, in 1898, there were 5,000 writs issued, whereas in the whole of Ontario there were only 3,028 issued from the High Court. Of course, the number of writs does not of itself indicate the amount of business that necessarily is done, but it is the only means we have of making a comparison, and when we make this comparison, we find that the expenses of Ontario are greater in the administration of justice, according to population, than in the province of Quebec. I think, therefore, that the Bill before the House is a very proper one.

The Quebec legislature have so legislated that it becomes necessary to appoint three Superior Court judges in order to properly maintain the courts. It is their business to provide the courts and it is ours to maintain these courts, and unless it can be shown that there is some collusion, some legislation for an improper purpose—and I cannot conceive of any such motive influencing an honourable body like a provincial legislature—it is our duty to pass the legislation necessary to give effect to what they have done. I shall therefore vote in favour of this Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I desire to call the attention of my hon. friend from Montmorency to the form of the motion now before the House. This question has been discussed almost entirely as if the Bill had reference only to the appointment of additional judges in the province of Quebec. But that is not the case. The section which relates to the provision for salaries for the new judges in the province of Quebec is section No. 1, but the second and third sections provide for that which is absolutely necessary and about which there is no difference of opinion in this House. Those are the sections providing for the salaries

of the chief justice in the North-west Territories and of an additional judge in the Yukon territory.

Mr. FOSTER. You are not increasing the judges in the North-west.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, we are providing simply for a chief justice and giving him the ordinary allowance of a \$1,000 extra, which is given in all the provinces for his position as chief justice. In the Yukon we are providing for the salary of an additional judge.

Mr. FOSTER. Is one not enough?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly not. They ask for three judges, and I understand their best legal authorities say there ought to be three. I am sure that if the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) were here, he would take the position that three is necessary. But the government have determined that two are absolutely essential, and section 3, provides for the salary of the second judge in the Yukon.

I only rise to ask my hon. friend from Montmorency whether this motion is not premature.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I did not make the motion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I know, but my hon. friend is an ex-Attorney General of the province of Quebec, and may be supposed to have some influence with his hon. colleague in determining in the manner in which the motion should be brought before the House. The motion to give this Bill the six months' hoist is entirely indefensible, because the Bill itself does not deal with the feature alone to which exception is taken, but also with that which nobody disputes, and that is the desirability of making provision for the salary of an additional judge in the Yukon territory. If the six months' hoist were carried, we would be declaring that we would not grant the salary for an additional judge in the Yukon and the salary for the chief justice in the North-west Territories, and that I am sure no hon. gentleman on either side desires to do. I would therefore suggest whether it would not be better to withdraw the motion and take advantage of the rules to test in committee the particular question on which hon. gentlemen opposite differ from the government.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I did not move the motion and have no control over my hon. friend from Beauharnois who is not here. The remarks I made were specially addressed to that clause of the Bill which concerns the province of Quebec and none other. I did not propose to speak at all for the other provinces.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) The strong objection I have to the whole thing

is the indefensible conduct of the government in bringing down legislation like this at this hour of the session. It is one of a piece with any measures, which we have had submitted to us, and the time has come when we must protest against it. We are in the sixth month of the session, we have nearly one-half of the estimates yet to go through with. In the supplementary estimates there are \$7,300,000, and more than 800 items. And a large proportion of these, I judge from simply scanning them, make one feel that a member does not do his duty unless they are looked into, and looked into very carefully. And yet, in the face of all this, the government leave important legislation like this until the dying hours of the session, when the Chamber is denuded of three-quarters of its members, and asks us to come to conclusions on such questions as those here involved. That is one reason why I seconded the six months' hoist, and it is a reason why I believe that this course ought to be followed in the case of every measure which has been unduly delayed which the government brings down at such a period of the session.

But I am opposed to the addition of the three judges to the judiciary of Quebec for reasons that I stated in 1898. And now, in 1900, those reasons seem to me just as strong as they did then. We have the admission of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), we have the admission of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself that there are enough judges in the province of Quebec at this moment to do all the judicial work of the province, and to do it thoroughly; and that the whole difficulty is a difficulty of distribution and of allotment of duties. Now, when the Prime Minister and the Solicitor General both admit that—and they admitted it plainly to-day, as they admitted it in 1898—they give away, it seems to me, the whole case, unless parliament must submit to the doctrine that we are simply here to vote the people's money to carry out any disposition that any provincial government may choose to make of its judicial work. So far as I am concerned, I am not going to refine about the constitution or anything of that kind; but I am going to say that it is not common sense to subscribe to that view; and as one member of this House I have never subscribed to it and do not propose to do so. The debate has been a fairly illustrative and instructive debate, in one direction at least. I do not know whether the House fairly took in the argument made by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who leads the government or not; but if they did, I think that even this House, in the fifth session under the right hon. gentleman's leadership must have been mildly surprised at the ground he took. What was the ground taken by the Prime Minister? It was that you

Mr. FOSTER.

must submit to the ill dispositions and poor distribution, the bad method of arrangements with reference to the judicial service in the province of Quebec. And why? Simply because it is old, and because, as the right hon. gentleman said, there was a sentiment amongst the people which would rather keep it as it is—not that it was right, but that it was popular. For these reasons, the right hon. gentleman did not think that this House had a right to interfere in the only way in which it can interfere—and I would not call it interference—it has no right even to interpose in any case, provided you have the two conditions, that the people are wedded sentimentally to decentralization in certain points, and that it is unpopular to take any position to thwart them. I think that is the worst ground that could possibly be taken. That would decide completely and in advance against every improvement and amelioration in the state of the country. But it is illustrative of the policy of the right hon. gentleman. In one breath, he admits that the judicial material is quite sufficient, if it were well distributed to do the work; and, in the next breath, he says: I would not interfere with it, because it would not be popular to do so. That throws a great light upon every move the right hon. gentleman has made since he began to lead this government. The protective principle is wrong; but the right hon. gentleman found before he had been in office three months that it was not popular to interfere with it. His convictions of right and wrong disappeared before his fear of what he thought would be an unpopular move on his part. I think there is a better ground to take than that—the ground taken by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain); namely, that an effort should be made and should be continued until it is successful for the improvement of what the Solicitor General himself, as spokesman of the government in reference to these matters, readily admits to be a bad system, improved. The right hon. gentleman admits that it is bad, but he proceeds to cure it in what way? By putting up another bulwark to that system by the appointment of three more judges to an already overburdened judiciary. Would these additions strengthen or weaken the system? Would they make it more easy or more difficult in the future to remedy what is admitted to be an evil? Everybody sees that the moment the leader of the government admits the doctrine that you must not interfere with this because there is a sentiment in its favour, and then appoints three judges who, if the work were properly distributed would be entirely unnecessary, saddling the taxpayers with another burden—the moment that is done by the right hon. gentleman, he adds his whole power and that of his party to the maintenance of what he

admits to be a bad distribution of the judiciary of the province of Quebec. Now, does he mean to teach in this House that we who are the guardians of the people's money, who are the trustees for the expenditure of the taxes of this Canadian people, are simply here at the beck and call of wrong sentiment or party interest in any province, and that when they please, for their own purposes, to make judgeships, no matter how unnecessary, we have nothing to do but to register their opinion in that respect, and provide the money? In stating that, you state what any one would admit to be an absurdity; you must reach a point in going in this direction where you must interfere or interpose by refusing to grant the salary. If you admit that you have the power and the right to do so, the only point to determine is whether this is a case in which that salutary interposition shall take place, and in which the influence of parliament shall be directed toward the improvement of conditions which are admittedly bad.

We are now paying about \$820,000 or \$830,000 a year for the administration of justice in the Dominion of Canada, over \$50,000 more than was paid in 1896, when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. And my contention in 1898 was, and my contention is now, that there is sufficient money voted, and more than sufficient, to raise the salaries of the judiciary of this country very appreciably, and do the judicial work of this country without increasing the expenditure, if only a proper distribution of the work were made.

I do not think we will ever come to a proper distribution until this House comes to the conclusion that the pressure of judicious interposition at least must be put on to the powers that be, as a weight towards remedying this thing. I say that in the province of Prince Edward Island, in New Brunswick, in Nova Scotia, in Quebec, and I believe in Ontario, you have judges falling over one another. Judges ought not to be overworked, but there is no danger of judges being overworked when you have such large numbers appointed to the judicial offices in these provinces that I have named. It may be true that some of the judges are overworked, it may be true that in the city of Montreal itself, the resident judges are overworked, but that ought not to be a valid argument. In the province itself there are judges that are not doing a month's work in the course of a whole year, and presumably competent judges. That ought not to be an argument for adding three more judges, it ought, rather, to be an argument for a proper distribution of the judicial work.

Now, what has happened? In the sixth month of the session, directly before a general election, a rush is made, without grappling with the difficulty of the judiciary of the whole country through, without attempt-

ing to grapple with it in the province of Quebec—a rush is made to vote the people's money and to make places for three of the partisans of hon. gentlemen opposite. The time is inopportune, the principle upon which the thing is put is a bad one, one which the Solicitor General and the Premier himself are compelled to acknowledge to be faulty, in so far as the basis is concerned upon which they are making the appropriation, that is the distribution of the judicial work in that province. Now, those are the grounds why I am opposed to this. We are sitting here now from eleven o'clock in the morning until twelve or one o'clock the next morning, with the idea that we ought to rush the work through. I am beginning to have great sympathy with the remark made the other day by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis), that we might as well revise this hurried method of business, and make up our minds to sit here, if necessary, for another month or a month and a half, and do the work like men. I appeal to the right hon. gentleman, and to the Solicitor General, and to every member of this House, whether, in the Election Bill, which we have just hurried through in these last hours of the session, any kind of workmanlike deliberation was bestowed upon it? I sat here to-day and watched the progress of that Bill, and there was not a single condition of sound and sane legislation which remained to this House while that was going through. And yet there was a measure which these hon. gentlemen knew was to be brought in. It should have been ready at the very earliest moment of parliament. But laying that aside, it has been in its proper dress before this parliament for over two months and a half, and yet it is left to these exciting, restless, disturbed and meagre conditions, which surround the last week or ten days of a session, the rump of a parliament, so to speak, to bring that Bill down and to put it through its given stages. Every one knows that it was mere haphazard, uncertain, and altogether unsatisfactory work. So far as I am concerned, I am quite willing to vote for putting this measure over. The argument of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that you should not move the motion because, along with one very objectionable feature, there are one or two that might be allowed to pass, does not appeal to the good sense of the House. Why did the hon. gentlemen opposite mix up the bad thing with good ones? If they would bring down a good measure, it would get through with ease, after proper discussion. But to mix up a very bad thing with one or two good ones, then ask us to pass the whole, is hardly sound doctrine.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). I do not think there is any objection to the clauses with reference to the Yukon and the North-west Territories. But knowing nothing about judicial matters, I listened to the debate this afternoon, and did not see

any reason why we should pass this Act, so far as Quebec is concerned. It is provided by the constitution, as has been pointed out to us, that the legislature shall say how many judgeships there shall be, and this parliament shall vote the pay, and the government appoint the officers. Now, that had a purpose in it, and I think the purpose was to hold the legislatures in check to a certain extent, in regard to the creation of too many of these offices. The hon. gentleman told us this afternoon, that he had had negotiations. I know how difficult it is to negotiate with one's political friend. The hon. gentleman's friends are now in power in Quebec, and he has had negotiations with them. But, of course, while I do not charge for a moment that party interests would prevail entirely with the hon. gentleman, still to a certain extent he would be influenced by the party interests of his friends in the province of Quebec. I think that the hon. gentleman has made it almost impossible for this parliament, without great objection, to pass the Act, when he has admitted what has just been said by the member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster). We take the argument of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), it was all concentrated in the last two or three sentences which he gave to the House. He took great pains to show us that there were not more judges in the province of Quebec, proportionately, than there were in the province of Ontario. Now, that argument was unnecessary, because it was not a question of whether there were enough judges to do the work. That had been admitted by the Prime Minister and by the Solicitor General.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thought the hon. gentleman tried to persuade the province of Quebec not to pass this legislation?

The PRIME MINISTER. I preferred the other system.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understood him to say that there were sufficient judges, at least, the Solicitor General did say there were quite sufficient judges to do the work. Therefore, the whole argument of the hon. member for Kingston drops to the ground. It is only a question of the distribution of the work. Now, how are we going to get that effective system, which the right hon. gentleman says he desires to obtain? We will never get this ineffective system remedied until this parliament steps in and says: Your system is defective, you must change your system and you must distribute the work properly; these men who are already appointed are being paid, you must allow them to consume their time in doing this work before we appoint extra judges.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that this parliament is to decide what is to be the judicial system in the province of Quebec?

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, I say, with the Prime Minister, that the system of the distribution of work there is entirely defective, so defective that he tried to prevail upon the local authorities to have it changed. I say he was not in a position to prevail upon them, because of his party friends being in power, and party exigencies coming up. But what I say is that it is a defective system, and we ought to exercise our influence to have it remedied, and the only way to do so is to hesitate before we appoint new officers at the beck and call of the provincial legislature, and pay them by vote of this parliament, as we would have to do.

Now, coming from the province of Ontario, as I do, I know something of the work which the judges in that province do. While I do not think they are exceedingly busy, I do not think you would possibly find a judge of the High Court of Ontario who only tries from eighteen to forty-two cases in one year, and I say that a system under which a Superior Court judge receives the annual salary of a High Court judge and only tries eighteen cases in one year is a system that this parliament ought to make a very great effort to change and that I would hesitate before consenting to increase the number of judges.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You would have to change the British North America Act.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is sticking out for a constitutional point. I am not saying that we should introduce a Bill to change that system, but I think that the province of Quebec, if properly reasoned with by the government in power, will not persist in asking for new judges when judges are lying around idle, because, a man is idle who gets \$4,000 a year for trying eighteen cases.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. \$3,500 a year in some cases.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Only in one case, I am told.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, in two instances it was thirty-nine.

The PRIME MINISTER. You are all wrong there.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am taking the figures of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton); thirty-one cases, an hon. gentleman tells me. However, you have men getting \$3,500 a year for trying eighteen cases.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is not correct. No one can say that there are only eighteen cases.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am taking the figures stated here to-day. The figures were given by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Gasgrain).

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is not correct.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How many were there? Some forty, some forty-two, some eighteen and some nineteen. We will say thirty cases tried by one judge; here is more than \$100 paid to a judge for trying a case, which, on the average, does not last over half a day, I will venture to say. It is an extraordinary thing to me for the government to bring in a Bill of this kind. There can be no question whatever that there are sufficient judges if a proper distribution of the work had been made. What proper distribution may be brought about if the government of the day will only exercise their influence on the government of the province of Quebec. There is no need of taking them by the throat; there is no need to step outside of the constitution and say: We will pass a resolution as to the judicial system of Quebec. Not at all. We can exercise this power that the constitution intended we should exercise, namely, a supervising influence without the creation of these judgeships, and it is a mighty strong supervising influence when you say: You may create the judges, but the parliament of Canada has to vote the money by which the judge shall be paid. I do not understand how any one can go back to his constituency and say that we did right in voting these judgeships. The Solicitor General was compelled to admit that there were a lot of judges in Quebec. The Prime Minister said to the province of Quebec: You had better change your system, but they said: We must go on under our old system. It is an old, antiquated, out of date system.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is a system the province of Ontario wants to come to.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But, we must, under the constitution, vote this money and create these judgeships which the Solicitor General admits are not necessary. While I support the clauses in regard to the North-west Territories and Yukon most heartily, I will vote against the other.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). Mr. Speaker. I want to enter my protest against a portion of the remarks made this afternoon by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). I was considerably surprised at the description of the state of affairs relative to the administration of justice in the district from which he comes. One hon. member on this side of the House who spoke in reference to the subject, inferred from the remarks of the member for Beauharnois that the state of affairs so described was general throughout the province of Quebec. I did not think that any one in this House would, for a moment, have seriously concluded from the remarks of the hon. member for Beauharnois that the extraordinary state of affairs which he had des-

cribed as existing in Beauharnois was general in Quebec. It is possible, even likely, that many people throughout the country will also draw the same inference from the remarks made by the hon. gentleman. As a member of the bar of the province of Quebec, and as one who has had considerable experience before the bench and with the bar of that province, I desire to enter my solemn and earnest protest against the insinuation, or the inference which might be drawn from the statements of the hon. gentleman. If the administration of justice is what he says it is in the district of Beauharnois, I think the hon. gentleman has been very derelict in the performance of his public duties in not bringing to the attention of the authorities the conduct of the judge who presides there. The administration of justice in the province of Quebec will compare favourably with the administration of justice in any other province in Canada, and I can speak with some knowledge in reference to the province of Ontario at least. Now, I cannot, for one moment, understand what motive could have impelled the hon. gentleman in speaking so disparagingly of the bar and bench of the province of Quebec. He is a member of that bar himself. He poses in this House and before the country as one of the leaders of the Conservative party in that province. I do not think that the electors of Quebec will feel very grateful to the hon. gentleman for the very unseemly remarks he has made concerning the bench and the bar of that province. Now, I propose to say a few words in reference to the Bill itself. The hon. gentleman for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) told us that the system in Quebec is old, antiquated, and he used some other adjectives.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was quoting the language of the Prime Minister.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not think the Prime Minister said the system was bad or antiquated.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, obsolete. He said that it was bad and that he had tried to get it remedied.

Mr. BELCOURT. It was the hon. gentleman who said the system was bad and antiquated. To show that there is a wide difference of opinion in regard to this question, I would like to quote to to this question, I would like to quote to the hon. member for Haldimand from a very high authority in the Conservative party, Mr. Mousseau, who at one time was Attorney General of Quebec, who was successively in several ministries in Quebec, and was Secretary of State at Ottawa. As Attorney General of Quebec the administration of justice in that province must have come under his notice. Speaking in this House in 1881 on this subject, he said:

It had been suggested that judges should be brought in from the rural districts to sit in Montreal. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has thought him sufficiently wise to give advice, and to tell the Quebec bar, government and people what they should do. One government has, however, anticipated him, and have declared there is no effective remedy except that of appointing two additional judges, one to the Superior Court and the other to the Court of Appeal. The hon. leader of the opposition has sought to discuss the question from a Quebec standpoint; but he may claim his patriotic zeal with the reflection that other people more conversant with the object are already at work; that the judges are endeavouring to find a remedy, and the government of Quebec has already applied a remedy. With all these persons there is combined sufficient talent to bring about a proper remedy. Some other parties hold that the number of judges is sufficient, but that they should be compelled to reside in Montreal—that eighteen or twenty should reside in that city—and that they should be sent out every three or four months into the rural districts.

Later on, another member of this House, Mr. Cimon, in discussing the antiquated, the bad and the otherwise qualified system in the province of Quebec, had this to say:

What is the conduct of those judges who should remain in their districts? They take up their residence in the district of Montreal. With the system which they have adopted of preventing the transaction of business in the rural districts, there is nothing to be surprised at if that business should be so small, especially when one sees a judge who lives in the district of Montreal, and who should be residing 500 miles further off, in the district of Gaspé, on learning that proceedings have been instituted in his district, hastens to send money to the plaintiff in order to avoid going down to his district.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will the hon. gentleman tell me who that judge was that Mr. Cimon referred to?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Judge Cimon?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Not at all. He was not a judge then.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He was dealing with the iniquities that would result from the system you seek to introduce.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What year was that in?

Mr. BELCOURT. 1881. The answer to the hon. gentleman is, that I do not think the gentleman's name would change the nature of the offence, if offence it is.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Give us the name.

Mr. BELCOURT. I said it was Mr. Cimon.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Give us the name of the judge who did that. It was not Judge Cimon, anyway.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not know what Cimon it was, or whether it was Simple Simon or not. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. BELCOURT.

that a great deal of this discussion is outside the question. The province of Quebec, has, after all, the matter in its own hands, and must decide for itself what system is best. We have no jurisdiction in the matter, and I submit that we have no business even to express opinions about it. It is entirely within the jurisdiction of the local legislature. So long as the legislature of Quebec says that they require these judges for the administration of justice, and call upon the Dominion government to appoint them, it seems to me that it is wasting time to discuss in this House whether the judicial system in the province of Quebec is a good or a bad system. We have nothing to do but to carry out the wishes of the competent authority in this matter, just as we would carry out the wishes of the province of Ontario or any other province which would express its wishes in the same way as the province of Quebec has given expression to them.

The PRIME MINISTER. I wish to make a personal explanation. I stated this afternoon that the system in the province of Quebec was antiquated, but as to the system proposed some years ago by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), I wish to say to my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), and my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague), that if the system of my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) had been adopted, it would not decrease the number of judges, but would increase the number.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. There will be thirty-four judges in the province of Quebec doing Superior Court and circuit court business if this Bill is adopted. But, under the measure of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) there would be fifteen Superior Court judges and twenty-six circuit court judges, making forty-one judges conducting the same business that now will be done by thirty-four judges.

Mr. CASGRAIN. You do not count the district magistrates.

The PRIME MINISTER. They are not paid by this government.

Mr. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Maison-neuve). This question is of the utmost importance to the province of Quebec, and especially to the district of Montreal, and it is my duty to offer a few remarks to the House. I hold the same view as my colleague from the city of Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), in that I am much surprised that the amendment now before the House should be moved by a member of parliament from the province of Quebec, or from the district of Montreal, or any district contiguous to Montreal. I cannot explain the action of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) in any way, shape or form, because if the

hon. gentleman were at all aware of the opinions of the bar of Montreal, he would know that it is the unanimous sentiment there that this law should be passed. I do not know how the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) could see his way to ignore that opinion in the district of Montreal, and to antagonize the wishes of those who are practising law there. It is admitted that the want of more judges in Montreal has been felt for a great number of years. It is so well admitted that the ex-Attorney General of the province of Quebec (Mr. Casgrain) sought to find a remedy for it. But, although the government of which he was a minister had an overwhelming majority in the legislature, he found that the chances were that his government would be in a minority if he pressed his Bill. I remember the facts very well. The hon. gentleman brought his voluminous Bill in at the end of one session, and after the second reading he left it over to be studied between that session and the succeeding one. At the second session the Bill did not go further than the second reading, and the hon. gentleman dropped it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It went beyond the second reading.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Anyway, it was never passed, although the hon. gentleman had a majority supporting him. If I am well informed, there was not a minister who spoke in favour of it among his own colleagues.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There were two.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Be that as it may, the Bill did not pass, because the sentiment in the province of Quebec, of both Liberals and Conservatives, was against it. At the general elections which followed, the hon. gentleman's party was badly beaten at the polls and a new government came into power. The new government had the experience of what had taken place in the two sessions previously, and of the poor success that the Attorney General had in trying to pass his law to decentralize the judicial system of the province of Quebec. I do not say that the Bill was not one which should not pass, with certain amendments. But, what is the use of trying to convince the people in favour of a remedy which they will not accept. The present government of the province of Quebec faced the difficulty in a practical way, and they brought in a Bill saying, that in view of the statistics of the different judicial districts, they believed there was need for three more judges in the district of Montreal. That law, which was submitted to a legislature composed of a majority of Liberals, did not even go to a vote; that is to say, it was adopted unanimously.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I hold in my hand the Journals of the legislature of Quebec, and they contradict the statement made by my

hon. friend (Mr. Prefontaine). The Journals say :

The Order of the Day being read for the second reading of the Bill from the legislative council, entitled an Act to amend the law respecting the constitution of the Superior Court, the Hon. Mr. Robidoux moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Marchand, and the question being put that the Bill be now read a second time, the House divided, and it was resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There was no division. Some one may have called 'carried on division,' as we do here sometimes, and that does not mean very much, if you have not the courage to ask for a vote. Anyway, there was a good remedy: The Bill could have been rejected by the legislative council—because, as you are aware, we have a legislative council in the province of Quebec in which there is a majority of Conservatives; but the Bill passed the legislative council. So that, we have good reason for saying that the universal sentiment of the province of Quebec, Conservative and Liberal, is in favour of the appointment of these three additional judges for the district of Montreal. Now, this law was passed in 1898.

Mr. CASGRAIN. 1899.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. 1898.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I suppose the hon. gentleman will not correct the Journals of the House. The Bill was passed on the 22nd of February, 1899, 62 Victoria.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. But that session was begun in 1898, and we therefore, call it the session of 1898. There is no use of playing upon words. The session began in November, and ended in the latter days of January. The Act was passed the session before last.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The session began on the 12th of January, and ended on the 10th of March.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That does not make much difference; it was the session before the last session of this parliament. I stand corrected; but I mean that there was a session of this parliament before the law was taken into consideration at all, and it was during that time that the government of the Dominion tried to come to some understanding and made inquiries as to the necessity of passing the law. The result was that the provincial government issued the necessary proclamation, and this law came into force. Now, the law being in force, how are you going to get over the difficulty? Have we in the province of Quebec under the constitution the right to pass a law to regulate the administration of justice in our province? If this point is admitted, and the government have taken means to ascertain whether the law was necessary or not, on what ground can this parliament say to the province of Quebec,

You are in need of three more judges in the district of Montreal to administer properly the judicial business of the district, but you shall not have them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This government had no right to inquire whether it was necessary or not.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They did inquire in this case; they took extra precautions, and they ascertained that it was necessary. But that is not the question. I put the question fairly and squarely. Suppose the business of the province of Quebec should become so important that double the number of judges we have now would be necessary, and the people of the province should say, We want more judges; would any one on the other side of the House pretend that the parliament of Canada should say to the province of Quebec. You shall not have these judges; you shall not have the administration of justice as the people of the province want it. This is exactly the question as it stands now. The people of the province of Quebec in their local legislature have expressed their opinion in such a way that it cannot be misunderstood; this government, after full inquiry, have satisfied themselves that these additional judges are necessary, and I do not understand how some hon. members on the other side can assert that they are not necessary. It is always disagreeable to make comparisons; but it is admitted that in the province of Ontario there are seventy-four county judges and fifteen High Court judges, whereas in the province of Quebec we have thirty-one judges. I admit that we have in the district of Montreal three circuit court judges, who dispose of over 17,000 cases per year. They accomplish this work by sitting in rotation, two judges sitting in different divisions at the same time. It is admitted that these judges are overworked. There are always cases waiting to be inscribed and tried by these circuit court judges.

Mr. BRITTON. As the hon. gentleman is correcting me in regard to the number of judges, it is as well to have it right in making a comparison. I understand that in the province of Quebec there are six judges in the Court of Appeal, thirty-one Superior Court judges, and three circuit court judges. So that I was correct.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I did not mention the judges of the Court of Appeal. The eleven judges of the Superior Court in the district of Montreal have had to try during the last three or four years, on the average, 5,000 cases a year, whereas, if I am well informed, the whole number of cases in the province of Ontario is below 3,500. It stands to reason that these eleven judges are overworked. I will mention only one fact, without going into other details, that during the month of March, 1900, 231

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

cases were inscribed in the Superior Court in the district of Montreal. During that month six judges sat to try those cases, and only 121 were disposed of, so that there remained over a hundred cases which were not tried and had to be left over to another term. And this has been going on for the last three or four years. Under these circumstances, I think that the people of the province of Quebec are the best judges of the situation; and when they enact a law which they have a right to do under the constitution, and come before this parliament and ask that this law should be put into effect, it certainly does not belong to any member from the province of Quebec to say that it should be delayed for six months more; and it is very unbecoming of members from other provinces to say to the province of Quebec. You do not know what you are about—because that is what it means. It is a very cavalier way to dispose of a Bill, to move the six months' hoist; and hon. gentlemen have lost sight of the fact that there are parts of this Bill which affect the Northwest Territories and the Yukon territory; but I have not to defend those parts of the Bill. I think it is perfectly clear to any fair-minded member of this House that the province of Quebec has expressed itself in favour of this resolution, and that the district of Montreal will suffer greatly if this legislation is deferred any longer.

While I do not want to belittle any other city in the Dominion, you must bear in mind that the great railway companies have their principal offices in the city of Montreal, that the principal banks of the Dominion have their head offices or largest branches there. that it is there that the largest amount of duties is collected from inland revenue and otherwise. It stands to reason therefore that there should be in that city a vast amount of business which ought to be disposed of as quickly as possible. Well, if you do not furnish the necessary judicial system, it will be not only the district of Montreal that will suffer, but the whole province of Quebec, and the whole Dominion, because in many of the cases before the courts in that city, interests are at stake from other provinces, connected with the large enterprises that have their principal offices there. Under the circumstances, why should the other provinces think that they are wiser than the province of Quebec in this matter? They should pause and consider the question purely and simply as a business proposition and nothing else, affecting the interests, not of a particular district or province, but of the country at large. If the judicial system of the province of Quebec is antiquated, if it is not perfect, well the people by degrees will come to understand that. They are generally intelligent enough to understand these things in that province. They have shown in the past that they can govern themselves. When a particular government

does not please them they change it. When men are trying to impose themselves on public opinion in that province, they are called down, and the province has done that many times. This is not a political question.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put him a question? What objection has he to a judge from the district of Iberville, or Beauharnois, or St. Hyacinthe, or Bedford, coming into Montreal to sit there and administer justice?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. None whatever. That is done every day, and it cost last year \$16,000 to pay the travelling expenses of the judges from those rural districts who came and sat in Montreal.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Would you not remedy the evil?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. At present the chief justice has the power to call them. He cannot force them, but he can call them to come.

Mr. CASGRAIN. And they do come.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Some do. Some are very anxious to come; they even stay in Montreal so as to have their three days at six dollars a day for travelling expenses, rather than live in their own districts. Others do not care to disturb themselves and leave their district. Some judges, who are supposed to live in outside districts, are actually living in the city of Montreal and drawing travelling expenses. Last year the amount was \$16,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Anyway it has been established to the satisfaction of the people of Quebec that this system of calling in rural judges to the city of Montreal and making them sit on cases there does not work satisfactorily, and they want more judges. The statistics are there to show that more judges are absolutely necessary. There is no party question at issue. It has been whispered that this motion was made because we are on the eve of general elections, and the party opposite hope to steal a march on the party in power by preventing the passage of this law, which they would pass themselves willingly if they should come here in a majority at the next parliament. But surely these politicians ought to set themselves above such party considerations.

Mr. FOSTER. As my hon. friend did on behalf of the government, in the appointment of a harbour master in Montreal.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not see the point. If there is a point, I would like to see it. Whether the judges are appointed by this government or the government that succeeds does not matter very much, when you consider the interests of such a large district as that of Montreal, which involve

interests affecting the whole Dominion, and when also you consider the important question of principle involved. When our constitution gives each province the right to decide what justice it shall have, surely the parliament of Canada should provide the means for giving a province the proper men to administer justice to the satisfaction of the people of that province.

I do not wish to go any further and discuss what affects the North-west Territories as well as the Yukon. As regards the North-west Territories, the matter is one more of administration than anything else; but as regards the Yukon district, I may say that I have letters from high authorities there who say that there is not a sufficient number of judges in that district at present and that it is absolutely necessary to provide what is lacking. Anyway that is a matter which does not interest me very much, but I desired to state my views as regards the province of Quebec and the district of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that there is something in the point made by the Minister of Marine, and although the mover of the motion is not here, I believe that if he were he would be willing to withdraw the motion and renew it on the clause to which it really applies. I would therefore ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. That cannot be done.

Amendment negatived on division.

Motion agree to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee thereon.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Solicitor General might make a statement as to why an additional judge is to be appointed in the Yukon.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The only information I can give is that representations have been made by the judge who is now in the Yukon, Judge Dugas, and also Commissioner Ogilvie, to the effect that one judge is not able to attend to the business accumulating in that territory.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any report?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There are these representations, but no other report, to my knowledge.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the representations?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are to the effect that the business has increased to such an extent that the one judge, who has to administer civil and criminal justice, and also to perform the duties of a High Court judge and magistrate, cannot undertake the work.

Mr. FOSTER. The Solicitor General will see that, while he may have information to base his action upon, by his own admission, that information is meagre, and the House has absolutely none. When you go to the extent of doubling the judiciary in a district, the House is at least entitled to a fair representation of the reasons for so doing.

The PRIME MINISTER. I was under the impression, and I think it will be found correct, that it was notorious that the people of the Yukon had asked for more than one new judge. But, if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has any doubt as to that, I will undertake, on the third reading, to have the correspondence on the subject.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a word with reference to a statement made by me in the early part of this debate concerning the action of the Ontario legislature in connection with the appointment of judges. I made the statement that in 1896, they passed a law forbidding the appointment of a junior judge in any county where there was not a population of 80,000 or over, and afterwards, when their friends came into power here, they amended that law so as to make it possible to appoint a junior judge in such counties. That was, as I understood, practically contradicted by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton). I think he admitted that they made one exception. I wish to read the clauses of the Acts to which I refer, so that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) and this House may see that I was by no means so far astray as the hon. gentleman seemed to suppose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think that that is a question that can be raised under section 3, which we are now considering.

Mr. SPROULE. I am merely referring to a statement I made. I suppose that when the motion is made to report the Bill, I could make my statement. I was merely about to read the section I referred to. In the Statutes of Ontario, 1896, chap. 19, section 15, is the following :

In the case of any county or union of counties having a population not exceeding 80,000, for which there are at the time of the passing of this Act two judges, and hereafter one of them dies, resigns his office or is removed therefrom, there shall thereafter be but one judge of the said county or union of counties, and there shall be no appointment of another judge in the place of the judge so dying.

That made it impossible, as I said, to appoint a junior judge in any county having less than 80,000 inhabitants. In 1897, immediately after the present government came into power—for they came into power in 1896—that Act was amended by the following :

If any commission issued to a junior or second judge in and for any county or union of counties since the said County Courts Act, 1896, was

passed, or if any such commission which may hereafter be issued, states or recites that the population of such county or union of counties exceeds 80,000, the fact so stated shall be conclusively assumed—

—whether it is so or not. It only requires that it shall be stated in the commission, and it is to be assumed to be correct, even though the statistics disprove it.

—and shall not be controverted; and the appointment, authority or jurisdiction of the judge appointed thereby shall not be open to question on the ground that such population did not at the time of such appointment or issue of such commission, or at any time thereafter, exceed 80,000.

That applies to the whole province, and, therefore, gives them the power, by merely stating in the commission that there is a population of 80,000 in the county, to make the appointment. It goes further and says :

This section shall not apply to any county in which is situate a city, and for which county a junior judge has been heretofore appointed, nor to the counties of Grey, Renfrew, Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, Ontario, Bruce, Simcoe, Huron and Victoria and Haliburton.

I leave it to the House to say whether that does not include practically the whole province, just as I said.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to have the honour of being the chief justice in the North-west ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The present senior judge, Judge Richardson.

Bill reported.

#### COPYRIGHT ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 167) to amend the Copyright Act.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thought the Minister of Agriculture was willing that that Bill should go to a special committee.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It has been to a special committee, and the report of that committee was laid upon the Table yesterday and read. It is printed in the Votes and Proceedings, page 749.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have a short statement as to what conclusion the committee came to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the conclusion is as well expressed in the report of the committee as I could express it. As I explained when this Bill was introduced and referred to that committee, it is founded on a request from the Canadian Authors' Society, approved by the Canadian publishers, and endorsed and supported by a resolution of the Manufacturers' Association of Ontario and of the Printers' Union.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Motion agreed to, Bill considered in committee, reported; read the third time, and passed.

#### SUPPLY—ABROGATION OF COASTING LAWS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Before you leave the Chair I beg to move a resolution, which I will afterwards read, in reference to what is commonly known as the abrogation, in the fall of last year, of the coasting laws by the government. I have before me a return moved for by the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) dated September 7, and a careful perusal of that will show that very few reasons apparently were placed before the government for such action. I now transmit it to the House to show upon what grounds the government should and could have based such important action. In a memorandum dated the 16th of October, 1899, amongst other things it is stated:

The action of the government in permitting American vessels to coast in Canadian waters was taken with a view to assist the building up of Canadian shipping, and upon that point there has been great diversity of opinion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has always been a matter of regret that Canadian shipping has in the past number of years been greatly handicapped for many reasons. First, owing to the coasting laws which exist in the United States and some similar ones which existed in Canada, it was found there was a large percentage of American vessels doing a maritime trade. In the first place, during the summer months, American vessels have a large trade in carrying ore from points on Lake Superior to points on Lake Erie. Unfortunately for the Canadian vessels under the coasting law they were prevented from engaging in that trade, and as there was no ore trade from the northern Canadian lakes to any points below, Canadian craft were of necessity forced to tie up at the docks during the best part of the summer months, while American vessels were at that period of the year having most remunerative rates. However, despite the handicap upon Canadian shipping, some gentlemen in the province of Ontario from time to time saw fit to invest their money in that enterprise. It is to be regretted that so far there has been upon the great lakes so few Canadian vessels. I may refer to the case of Haggerty and Grasett, vessel owners of the city of Toronto, who owned two very fine vessels doing a Canadian trade, namely, the *Algonquin* and the *Rosedale*. Though they have been the owners of these vessels for ten or twelve years, they have not seen fit to invest in any other boats, owing to the

fact that during the summer months so little trade was in sight for Canadian vessels. In addition to these gentlemen I have named, there is what is known as the Kingston Transportation Company, which own several very fine steamers, but these it is reported have been eking out a very precarious existence for many years past. Now with the output of grain from the North-west it was expected that Canadian vessels would find at least, a remunerative trade, and last fall, when freights were fairly high, to the consternation and dismay of Canadian vessel owners they found that on the 14th of October the government had issued this proclamation which permitted American vessels to come in and encroach upon their trade. I cannot just now recollect the rates which prevailed at that time, but my impression is that the rates from Port Arthur to Fort William and from Chicago to ports on the Georgian Bay, had been from 4 to 6 cents. Immediately upon the issue of this order that American vessels were permitted to engage in that trade, freights tumbled to 2 and 3 cents a bushel. Now, there is not in this return a single statement of fact which will prove that the government had before them any representations from American vessel owners or from those who might be interested in the ownership of grain which they wished to have delivered at points in Canada from Fort William. On the face of the report it would seem that it was the intention that the handling of grain should be confined to grain that was to be taken down to tide water. Not only did the government permit a number of American vessels to engage in the carrying of grain from Fort William to Canadian points for export to Great Britain or other countries, but they also permitted them to carry grain to Canadian points from Fort William, which was for domestic use in Ontario and in other parts of the Dominion. Now, what was the result? The result was that, at first, there was the tumbling in rates which I have referred to, but later on, as we know by an answer made by the hon. Minister of Customs in the House to an inquiry made by himself, only seven or eight American vessels availed themselves of the privilege afforded by this order in council. The damaging part of it, was that once it was announced that American vessels could come in and participate in this trade, the rates were broken, although it appeared that otherwise, very little advantage was taken of them. It is stated in the report, that this order was sent forth on October 20 to the different collectors of customs. A protest was made by the marine section of the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto, and they pointed out the detrimental effects that would ensue, and which have ensued to Canadian shipping interests, if this course was carried out. Despite this protest the government saw fit

to carry on the regulation, the result of which was that great damage was done to Canadian shipping interests. In the whole report, as brought down, there is not a single word to show that there was a request made by any person for this order, except a request made by Mr. Conmee, for the purpose of permitting hay to be carried from Manitoulin Island to Michipicoten, where a line of railway was being constructed and afterwards it was stated in a despatch from the collector of customs at Sault Ste. Marie, that the privilege was not taken advantage of. So that, in the report, I submit, there is nothing before the House to show that any request was made by any Canadian vessel owners, or any American vessel owners, or by any owners of grain, whether American or Canadian. In view of the immense tonnage of the lakes, owned by Americans, and in view of the fact that throughout the summer season they have a large and remunerative trade, while Canadian vessels have been practically tied up, the government should not have put them in a position of coming into competition with Canadian vessels. No guarantee has been given to the trade, that the order in council of last season will not be repeated in future seasons, and it is fair to infer that this course will be followed in other seasons, so long as hon. gentlemen have control of the affairs of the country. That probability has been strengthened by the action of the government lately, in respect to permitting American tugs to tow logs in Canadian waters. An explanation has been given by the hon. Minister of Customs, in answer to a question put by myself, in regard to an order which had been given. The hon. gentleman then stated that Hall & Co., of Sarnia, had been constructing, at that point, a large saw-mill, and that they had been permitted to tow logs from some point in Canada to Sarnia. What is going to follow in respect to the towing of logs? To-day we have on the Georgian Bay, gentlemen of means and enterprise, who have invested their money in large and expensive tugs. They have put money into these tugs, with the expectation that there would be an observance of the coasting laws of this Dominion. They expected that they would have the same rights guaranteed to them, as have been guaranteed in the past, and that the trade would be their own. But, in the example that has been given us in the case of Hall & Co., of Sarnia, it is only fair to infer that they will not have that guarantee, because the hon. Minister of Customs, who gave a very guarded answer in reply to my question, said, that from time to time—I do not pretend to give his exact words—each case should be considered on its own merits. It is manifestly unfair to Canadians who have invested their money in large and expensive tugs, when they are prevented and when they have always been prevented, from going over to

the American side to engage in wrecking, and the towing of logs from one American point to another American point, to allow American vessels to come over here and participate in the trade with Canadian vessels. If this is going to go on, we can only bid farewell to the hopes of Canadian vessel and shipping interests, of men who have put their money into tugs for the towing of logs, unless the ministry through one of its members, will give a positive assurance to the owners of Canadian tugs, that, for the future, there shall be no breaking in upon the coasting laws and that Canadian tug-owners shall have the rights that are theirs in Canada, and which are denied to them in the United States. What was the result of this order in council in reference to grain vessels? It is stated in the memorial of the marine section of the board of trade, and I know it was a fact, that during last season, Mr. Booth, for reasons best known to himself, declined to contract with or to charter Canadian vessels, although he had in his employ during the season of 1899, some five different American vessels, shutting out from the trade between American ports and Depot Harbour Canadian vessels which ought to have had a share of the trade. Everything that was prophesied by the marine section of the board of trade has transpired. They stated that this request was made by Mr. Booth for the reason that he had on certain vessels an option to purchase, that he wished to put these vessels into the Canadian coasting trade, and that he wished to avoid paying the customs duties, by turning them from American into Canadian bottoms. The *George Orr* and the *Albert H. Orr*, are the names of two of the vessels referred to, by the marine section of the board of trade, or, are the names of two vessels which, to my personal knowledge, were in this trade and, I believe, that Mr. Booth, guided by the action of the government last year, proposes that these vessels shall participate in, and control the coasting trade this year. They will likely come into a similar trade this year, and Mr. Booth will then have these vessels entered as Canadian vessels from which the customs duties, had they been payable, would have amounted to \$160,000. I assume that this fall a proposal will also be made to the government by Mr. Booth, similar to that which was made by him to the government last fall. When the fall trade is looming up, when the Canadian vessel owners are going to have their harvest, because no harvest is theirs during the summer months, barred as they are from the ore trade in American waters, by the coasting regulations of the United States, an injury will be done to them if American vessels are to be permitted to come in and compete with them for this trade. During the summer months, Canadian vessels are not allowed to go into the ore trade or the large coasting trade that is being done from

Mr. BENNETT.

Buffalo to Chicago, and if Canadian vessels are to be debarred from the only trade which is left open to them, which is the trade that may ensue between Fort William and ports on the Georgian Bay and Port Colborne, their interests will suffer. Now, the experience of the Canadian shipping business, is that it has been very uncertain in the past. The trade has been limited, owing to the coasting laws of the United States, and if the government propose to allow American vessels to come in here this fall, as they did last fall, if they propose that there shall be a continuance of the precedent which has been set, of permitting American tug-owners to come in and employ their tugs in Canadian waters in direct violation of the coasting laws, then one thing is inevitable, and that is that Canadian owners of vessels will have but one alternative left.

For the future they must build no vessels, but on the contrary they must see that the Canadian bottoms are turned into American bottoms. Mr. Booth had this advantage last fall and if the government concede it again this fall then Canadian vessel owners will be brought into direct competition with the American fleet of large vessels carrying 250,000 or 275,000 bushels each, which, of course, can carry at cheaper rates of freight than the Canadian vessels which at present have only a capacity of 75,000 or 80,000 bushels. I know that the Conlon Bros., of Thorold, purchased an American schooner called the *Danforth*, changed her to a Canadian registry believing that the Canadian coasting laws would be observed by the Canadian government, but in their case they were sadly disappointed. I regret that the government saw fit to make this change last fall, and I trust that in future so long as they may remain in power, they will not repeat that mistaken policy, but will regard the Canadian coasting regulations as jealously as they have been regarded in the past. I therefore beg to move, seconded by Mr. Ingram:

That all the words after the word 'That' be left out, and the following added instead thereof: 'by section 2, chapter 83, Revised Statutes of Canada, it is enacted:

No goods or passengers shall be carried by water, from one port in Canada to another, except in British ships; and if any goods or passengers are so carried, as aforesaid, contrary to this Act, the master of the ship so carrying the same shall incur a penalty of \$400; and any goods so carried shall be forfeited, as smuggled; and such ship or vessel may be detained by the collector of customs at any port or place to which such goods or passengers are brought, until such penalty is paid, or security for the payment thereof given to his satisfaction, and until such goods are given up to him, to be dealt with as goods forfeited under the provisions of the Customs Act.

That by order in council, dated October 16, 1899, the government authorized that vessels of the United States be permitted to carry cargoes between Fort William or Port Arthur, in the province of Ontario, and any other port in

Canada, either way, during the remainder of the present year, 1899, on the same terms and conditions as are applicable to Canadian vessels, forbearing to institute suits for penalties or forfeitures on account of the nationality of such vessels while so employed.

That by the action of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries of November 20, 1899, this permission was interpreted to apply to the carriage of grain for domestic use.

That by departmental permission, given on the advice of the Hon. R. W. Scott, acting Minister of Customs, the order in council was further extended to include the carrying of hay between Manitoulin Island and Michipicoten Harbour, in the province of Ontario.

That these actions were illegal, and, so far as appears from the evidence submitted, were based on no information sufficient to warrant the suspension of the law in the public interest.

That the conduct of the government in the above recited particulars was unjustifiable from a constitutional point of view, prejudicial to the transport and shipping interests of Canada, and merits the condemnation of this House.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I suppose it will be generally admitted that, inasmuch as under the United States coasting laws our Canadian vessels are not permitted to engage in their trade, it would only be fair and reasonable that as a general rule, and as a matter of principle and practice and custom, we should preserve our Canadian coasting trade for our Canadian vessels. That is the principle which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) in making his motion, laid down, and I certainly am not prepared to dissent from it. Nevertheless there may be exceptional cases which would justify a departure from the rule. In each of these cases, of course, the matter must be considered on its merits and if good and sufficient reasons be found, the government would be justified in refraining from enforcing the law. There are offences against the laws of Canada with reference to which any citizen may begin a prosecution, and there are other offences for which the prosecution can only be taken by the responsible officers of the Crown. It is necessary to bear the distinction between the two in mind, because it seems to be implied that the responsible officers of the government, being charged with the prosecution of these offences, may under exceptional circumstances exercise their discretion as to whether or not they shall prosecute. So, it sometimes happens that the very letter of the law may not be obeyed and yet the government of the day may refrain from prosecution. While we all acknowledge that the Canadian shipping interest is a very important one, yet the grain producers of the west, who are interested in cheap transportation, are entitled to some consideration. We are endeavouring by large outlays of public money to cheapen transportation between the wheat fields of the great west and the sea, and it is well to keep that in mind when discussing this question. Last autumn a gentleman from Winnipeg, Mr. Smith, came to

Ottawa representing the grain interests, and he made strong representations that owing to the then condition of the grain and shipping trade there was every probability that the Canadian vessels available would not be able to handle the trade for the remainder of the season, and that unless some exceptional step was taken to provide additional transportation, a large volume of the grain trade would be diverted from the Canadian route.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What was the date of the visit?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot give the date of the visit, but it would be shortly before the passing of the order in council which is dated October 16. I did not meet the gentleman myself, but I understand that he met some of my colleagues and made those representations. The question was whether that trade should go to Buffalo, and Canadian interests not in any way profit by it, or whether under the exceptional circumstances it would be well to permit it to be carried in American bottoms in order that we might at least have the advantage of having it pass through Canadian channels, giving employment to the various interests connected with the shipping at our Canadian ports. That was the view presented to the government, and assuming the information to be well founded, it seemed to be a very sound view. It was represented to us that all the Canadian vessels that were available were receiving employment. Believing the view presented to us to be a sound one, the government passed the following order in council on October 16, 1899:

On a report dated October 14, 1899, from the Minister of Finance, stating that British and Canadian shipping on the lakes above Montreal appears to be insufficient at the present time for moving the grain cargoes to be transported from Fort William to Ontario lake ports and thence by rail through Canada to tide-water.

That under the coasting laws, United States vessels are not at present permitted to engage in this traffic between two Canadian ports.

That for want of available British and Canadian tonnage a large portion of this grain traffic is likely to be carried from Fort William to Buffalo, and thence by United States railways or vessels to the seaboard.

That it is desirable to promote the movement of the said traffic along Canadian routes to the seaboard, and to assist the building up of Canadian shipping on the lakes by encouraging the permanent movement of the grain traffic through Canadian channels.

The minister therefore recommends, pending an increase in the lake shipping now entitled to participate in the coasting trade, that vessels of the United States be permitted to carry cargoes between Fort William or Port Arthur, in the province of Ontario, and any other port in Canada, either way, during the remainder of the present year (1899) on the same terms and conditions as are applicable to Canadian vessels—forebearing to institute suits for penalties or forfeitures on account of the nationality of such vessels while so employed.

Mr. FIELDING.

The committee submit the foregoing recommendation for Your Excellency's approval.

The report in question was made by myself as Minister of Finance owing to the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), to whose department the matter properly belonged, was at the time absent from the city. The reasons for the action taken are set forth in the order in council. It was the opinion of the government at that moment that unless we granted this concession to American bottoms the probability was that a large volume of the trade which might come through Canadian channels would pass our doors and be carried to Buffalo.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman tell us how many bushels of grain were at that time in the Port Arthur and Fort William elevators?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot tell my hon. friend. While this was the representation made on behalf of the grain interests in Winnipeg, which I understand were represented by this gentleman, it was in harmony with the representation made, if I remember correctly, by the Montreal Corn Exchange during the previous season, when it was represented to the government that there was a probability of the lake shipping under the Canadian or British flag proving insufficient to handle the great volume of trade likely to come down. My hon. friend says that the effect of this order in council was to break the freight rates. I did not understand him to say that the vessel owners did not still receive a fair and profitable freight rate; but what I did understand him to say was that they might have obtained a larger rate but for the passing of this order in council. So that, according to his own argument, the people, whoever they might be, who were interested in the handling of the freight from the west, were receiving the advantage of cheap transportation as the result of the government's action.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, the point was this. During the summer months, American vessels are engaged in the ore-carrying trade, which is the most profitable trade. As there is no ore trade for Canadian vessels, they are practically tied up during the summer months. Therefore the American vessels are able to carry cheaper in the fall than Canadian vessels, and the object of Canadian shippers was to build ships so that they would have that trade to themselves. I believe that the rates between Fort William and other Canadian points have been practically higher than the rates between Chicago and Buffalo.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was going on to point out that this order in council bears on its face the evidence of its

exceptional character. It does not attempt to lay down any general rule for future guidance. It simply says that in view of the representations made, for the particular purpose in view, and for that particular season, or only a part of the season—because the season was far advanced at the time—this privilege was granted. As it turns out, only a very small quantity of grain was carried under it. I have not the figures, but I am informed that only two cargoes of grain were carried in American vessels under that order in council. We claim that the policy of the government in the matter was a good one; but even if we admit my hon. friend's argument that it was a mistaken policy, it could hardly have had very serious results to the Canadian shipping trade when that was the case, and that fact ought to go to show the House that the matter should be treated as exceptional. Shortly after the order in council was passed a deputation waited on the Prime Minister—who, not knowing that this matter was coming up to-night, is not present—and presented substantially the same arguments as the hon. member for East Simcoe has advanced to-night; and my recollection is, though I speak subject to correction, that the Prime Minister, while giving in general terms the reasons for the government's action as I have given them, stated that he regarded the case as a very exceptional one, and he did not think that the government ought to grant these privileges without bringing the matter before parliament and having the authority of legislation. If I am correct in my recollection of what the Prime Minister said to the deputation, then, no action is necessary on his part or on the part of the House to prevent the granting of these privileges. Now, I think that the reasons set forth in the order in council will go far to show that the circumstances presented to the government did justify the step that was taken. In any event the results were not material; and as there was no probability of the trade by American vessels being carried on very extensively, I think there is hardly any danger of Canadian shipping interests being affected in any degree by any step which the government took or are likely to take in this matter.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Might I ask if the government took any steps to ascertain whether the representations made by Mr. Smith as to the scarcity of American ships were well-founded or not?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The government believed them to be well-founded, and they were in harmony with similar representations made on the part of the shipping interests on the Corn Exchange of the city of Montreal, which, of course had no interest in the matter other than the general interest of promoting Canadian trade.

Mr. CLARKE. The reason I ask that question is that immediately after the order

in council was passed, a large deputation representing the shipping interests of the upper lakes and the forwarding interests of Kingston waited on the government to protest against their action.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the deputation to which I have referred; and, in view of the statement made by the Prime Minister, I do not think there is any probability of the precedent then established becoming a dangerous one. I do not go so far as to say that under no circumstance will the government agree to forbear from a prosecution for penalties under this Act. That would be too broad a statement. But, in general terms, it is not the desire of the government to deny Canadian tonnage the reasonable protection it is entitled to under our coasting laws. Only in rare exceptional cases will the government be justified in permitting any departure from them. So much for the question of privileges granted for the carrying of grain.

On the question of the tug to which my hon. friend referred, that also was an exceptional matter, and I may leave my hon. colleague the Minister of Customs to deal with it. But it was an exceptional matter, a case where the owner of a tug, doing business both in the United States and Canada, had taken steps to obtain a tug in Canada under Canadian laws, and while that tug was being completed, he asked for temporary permission to bring his own tug across and employ it for a short service in Canada. In granting that permission, I do not think there is anything that hon. gentlemen need excite themselves to any extent about. But that branch of the question I would prefer leaving the Minister of Customs to deal with, as he knows more about it than I do, and can give explanations to the House if necessary.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). I am sure the House will be delighted with the mild and meek manner of the Minister of Finance in answering the resolution and speech of my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). We have been plainly told that there is no necessity for discussing the question, from the government standpoint, at any length, because all the reasons are in the minute on which the order in council was based. But, the fact is, that in that minute there are no reasons at all. There is not a single reason given why the government should have performed the illegal, the un-Canadian act, they did when they inflicted this injury on the Canadian shipping interests. The hon. minister deals with it in a very light manner, but I would tell him that this government, accustomed as the people are to seeing it do extraordinary things, never did an act which shocked the business interests of Canada more than when they passed this order in council. The hon. gentleman's speech—what is it? It is, if you come to boil it down, practically an admission that they did

wrong. They did it under the advice of a certain gentleman, to whom I shall refer in a moment, and they promise that if we do not say much about it, they will not do it again. That is just about the explanation made by the Minister of Finance of the action taken by the government, absolutely illegal and un-Canadian, upon a most important matter. We have been told that this is a business government, yet here we have the great shipping interests of Canada in the balance, and we have one man coming down to the city of Winnipeg, no doubt for absolutely selfish interests, making certain representations to that government, and we have that government going off—

An hon. MEMBER. At half-cock.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, not at half or quarter cock, but at one-eighth cock. We have them, without making a single inquiry of the great interests concerned, taking this illegal, un-Canadian course. Why did they do that? Simply because a certain Mr. Smith came down from Winnipeg and made these representations to the government. Who was Mr. Smith's conductor when in Ottawa? He was in close consultation with the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). This is the work of the Minister of the Interior, and not of the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance makes the representation and the recommendation, but the work is the work of the Minister of the Interior. It was the Minister of the Interior who was in charge of Mr. Smith who made these representations to the government, absolutely un-Canadian in their character, absolutely against the best interests of Canada, and it was the Minister of the Interior who went west and boasted that he had succeeded in securing this great boon. What was the boon that he had secured? As he said, it was one that would reduce freight rates to the west. But that was not done. What does the Minister of Finance say? His further statement is absolute evidence of the fact that Mr. Smith was making misrepresentations to the government at the time. My hon. friend here interjected a question: When were these representations made? They were made in September. What were the representations? That too much grain was in the elevators to be carried by the Canadian vessels then on the route. But, how much gain was in the Canadian elevators in September? I venture to say scarcely a bushel.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say September.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The order in council was passed early in October.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was reported on the 14th and passed on the 16th of October.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We can conclude that about the end of September or the first of

Mr. MONTAGUE.

October these representations were made. Probably they were made on the 13th.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They might have been.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Indeed it might, because this government does things in a great hurry sometimes when it wants to. We have had tenders submitted in the morning and the contracts let in the afternoon, and no doubt it is quite probable that when the government heard the representations of Mr. Smith on October 13, they granted this enactment, this illegal concession, on the 14th. What is the argument of the Minister of Finance? He said: Well, it did not do much harm anyway, there was no grain carried except a couple of cargoes. Is that not the best possible answer to the representations of Mr. Smith? Mr. Smith was misstating the facts to the Canadian government. He was misstating the facts when he said that the Canadian vessels were not able to carry the grain. There were plenty of Canadian bottoms to carry the grain, and the government know it as well as we do, and the act of the Canadian government was an un-Canadian one, because it had the tendency to cut down the prices of freights and to cause the unfair competition that my hon. friend from East Simcoe pointed out. But what did the government do then? Will the Minister of Finance tell me that they had any right to do what they did? I wish the Solicitor General were here to get his opinion on the question. The government had no more right to pass that order in council than to pass an order in council abrogating any other statute on the statute-books. I have here the consolidated statutes of the Dominion, and in the particular statute dealing with this matter, there is a circumstance stated, the existence of which would justify the government in passing such an order in council. We have here in the Coasting Trade Act the declaration that when any other country shall give Canadian bottoms the right to do a portion of its coasting trade, this government has the right, by order in council, to open our coasting trade to the vessels of that country. Let me read the clause; it is clause 5:

The Governor in Council may from time to time declare that the foregoing provisions of this Act—

That is the provisions which are cited in the resolution now in the Speaker's hands.

—shall not apply to the ships or vessels of any foreign country, in which British ships are admitted to the coasting trade of such country and to carry goods or passengers from one part or place to another in such country.

If the United States had agreed to give us a portion of their coasting trade, the government had a perfect right to do as they did. They had a legal right to do it. I say to the Minister of Finance that not only was that an un-Canadian act, but it was an act for which there was not the

slightest trace of authority in any of the statutes of Canada; that it was an absolutely illegal act on the part of this government—and the hon. gentleman knows it as well as I do. What did they do it for them? It seems that the government are willing to violate every law when the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) brings pressure upon them or the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) holds up his finger. They knew that there was no law for it, and yet they were willing to go back upon a Canadian policy, a policy upon which this parliament had expressed itself time and time again, and which this country had supported time and time again; they were willing to go back upon it illegally, to act at the instance of a friend of the Minister of the Interior who came here without any information, who came to make the bold statement that it would be better in the interest of the freight of the west, as there were not sufficient Canadian bottoms—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All that the government did was legal.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. minister show me the clause of the statute authorizing it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has quoted the statute, I have no doubt correctly. But what the government did was to agree to forbear prosecuting for the penalties, and that is all that the order in council covers. That being so, the act of the government was perfectly legal, though the hon. gentleman is quite correct in quoting the statute. But it has no force or effect unless prosecution is undertaken by the government; and when the government agree to forbear prosecution, their act is not an illegal act.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Technically, the hon. minister may be right. He may have found a way to get around it. But there are very few statutes that the government could not get around in some such manner. But the hon. gentleman will not say that it was ever intended by parliament to give power to the government to allow United States vessels the right to participate in our coasting trade without getting something in return for it. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he thinks that the Act anticipates such a thing?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It does not generally; but there are actions under our coasting laws and our fishing laws which are not legally permissible, but which are done and which could be prosecuted for if the government saw fit.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Let us take two phases of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Fielding's) answer. The government, in the first place, distinctly gave permission to American bottoms to participate in our coasting trade—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. By declaring that they would not prosecute.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Quite so. Therefore, under the clause of the statute, they did what was absolutely illegal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I differ from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague).

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is not a lawyer, and neither am I—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But we can read.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, and we can discuss this matter with perfect freedom. But the hon. gentleman does not deny that they gave this permission and they had no right to give permission.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What the government did was to declare that they would not prosecute for the penalties, and they had the right to do so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think if the hon. gentleman reads the order in council, he will see that the government did more. Here is the wording of that order:

The minister therefore recommends, pending an increase in the lake shipping now entitled to participate in the coasting trade, that vessels of the United States be permitted to carry cargoes between Fort William or Port Arthur, in the province of Ontario, and any other port in Canada either way.

The law says distinctly that this shall not be allowed unless they get some reciprocal advantage from the United States.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has forgotten to read the words of the order in council:

—forbearing to institute suits for penalties or forfeitures on account of the nationality of such vessels while so employed.

That is all that the government could do, and that is all that they did.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But the main fact is that the government of this country gave the American bottoms this permission, and in addition to giving them permission, they declare that they would not prosecute them under the Act. The wording does not make any difference. The grave question is not a technical violation of the law, the grave thing is a departure from the well-understood Canadian policy which should never have been departed from without the gravest reasons. Now, what does the Minister of Finance say? He says that it is quite true that the Americans should be excluded as a general rule, but that there are exceptional circumstances which call for exceptional treatment. Now, will the hon. Minister of Finance tell us the exceptional circumstances?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thought it had done so. I think the order in council tells you.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And, pray, why was the order in council passed because of exceptional circumstances? Will the hon. minister tell us the exceptional circumstances which caused the government to pass the order in council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think they are set forth in the order in council itself.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The order in council sets forth that they have received information that the Canadian vessels are not capable of carrying the grain. Who gave them that information? Mr. Smith. Who is he? The Minister of Finance does not know. What inquiries were ever made by the government? The Minister of Finance does not think that any were made. What did Mr. Smith tell them? The hon. gentleman could not tell us. Were any statistics given by Mr. Smith as to the amount of grain in the elevators, and so on? Was the great shipping interest of Canada consulted? I wish to ask the Minister of Finance whether he thinks that by his bald statement that information was given to the government that it would be of advantage to the Canadian trade to pass this order in council distinctly doing away with the effect of this good Canadian law, he is giving sufficient information to the House to make it believe that a special case had been made out justifying the doing away with the effect of the law and justifying the giving of this advantage to American bottoms. Surely, the Minister of Finance does not pretend to say so—no member of the government would pretend to say so. The Minister of Finance would admit, I think he has already admitted, that only under special and most extraordinary circumstances should such an Act as that be abrogated by order in council, and let me add after the most careful inquiry has been made by the government of the day. And yet, we have the government acting upon information from one man, and a man who knew nothing, apparently, about the circumstances. They passed an order in council which might have materially interfered, which probably did materially interfere, with the shipping trade of Canada, without ever consulting the shipping trade. I submit to this House that when such representations were made to the government of the day, it was their bounden duty, before passing such an order in council as this to take cognizance of the fact that to inquire into all the circumstances, and, by means of getting the fullest information from all the shipping people of Canada, especially from the large interests involved. And the government should only have acted after, upon the very fullest information, they were decided that the policy which they adopted was a proper policy to pursue. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) tell me that they did take

that pains? Will he tell me that they took any pains whatever to inquire whether they were going to injure the shipping of Canada seriously or not? They took no pains, they simply did the thing off-hand on the representations of Mr. Smith, whose representations according to the hon. gentleman's statement were shown to be wholly without foundation.

Now, what brought them to their senses? The Minister of Finance, in a very mild manner has told us that a protest came. I notice that my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood) is not present. He was here when the discussion on this resolution began; he is not here now. If he were here, he would be able to tell the manner of the protest which was made by some of the shipping interests of Canada. And he would say that the protest which was made was not nearly so mild as the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance here to-night. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) very well said that Canadian shipping has recently taken heart by reason of the increased production of grain in the North-west Territories, and we have had men investing their money in the business. Among others was the hon. member for Hamilton, who is a very wealthy gentleman. He and other wealthy citizens of the province of Ontario had combined together, had formed their company, and had sent their agents to order their ships. Some of those ships were ordered; but these gentlemen awakened one morning to find that the government of Canada had turned the coasting trade of Canada over to United States bottoms. They came down here and interviewed the government, and what did they tell the government? The Minister of Finance probably knows. They told the government this: You keep that order in council in force and we will see that you do not remain very long to keep it there. That was the answer the government got from these people. They were investing their money as a Canadian company for the purpose of doing Canadian trade, and they protested most vigorously against the action of the government in this matter. Sir, I say that the government performed not only an illegal act, but a distinctly un-Canadian act, for which there was no possible reason and for which there was no possible justification under the sun. They did it under pressure of a gentleman who had special influence with a member of the cabinet, and they did it without making an inquiry as to its probable effect upon Canadian interests. It is on a par with some other work of the government, especially their work in connection with free corn, which was protested against by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) whose speech is well remembered in this House. I say it is on a par with the un-Canadian work in several particulars; and I will add

Mr. FIELDING.

that they never performed an act which was more un-Canadian and which met with stronger condemnation from the people of Canada than this very act, which was absolutely illegal and un-Canadian at the same time.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). In my judgment there were only two reasons which could justify the government doing as they did. These were: If the freight rates were extraordinarily high for the handling of grain, or if there was a block which would likely result to the detriment of the grain trade of the west. We expected that the Minister of Finance would explain that phase of the question, and that he would have shown the House that the carriers of grain were asking too high freight rates, and that therefore there was a justification in opening the door to the Americans to come in, or that the elevators were filled at Fort William and Port Arthur, and therefore, unless some additional assistance was given to move the product of the Northwest, serious harm would result. But the minister did not vouchsafe to tell us that either of these conditions existed. It is true, he said that it did result in lowering the freight rates a little, but he did not say that the freight rates were unreasonably high before. I ventured the question: What amount of grain there was in the elevators at the time, and the hon. gentleman said he was not aware of how much grain there was. Therefore, it appears that they took no trouble to ascertain whether there was danger of a blockade or whether the freight rates were too high; but at the suggestion of some person, that order in council was passed on the 16th of October which allowed the Americans to participate in a trade that belonged to Canadians. Although it resulted in lowering the freight rates a little, it may be that at that time there was not much grain handled by American bottoms. But although the Minister of Finance did not tell us what the reasons were, the press of the country was loaded up to tell the people that it was owing to the danger of a blockade at Fort William and Port Arthur that this concession was given. That is the reason given to the press, and I noted particularly at the time, that the information was given out, I believe by the vessel owners of Canada, that there was only something like half a million or three-quarters of a million bushels of grain lying in these elevators. Now, any one who knows the capacity of these elevators will understand that there was no danger of a blockade with that small amount of grain. The hon. gentleman also stated in justification that the act was not illegal. But the statutory law says that this cannot be done unless we have a reciprocal concession from the United States. We did not have that reciprocal concession, yet the minister pretends to tell us that

they have authority by order in council to override a statute law. Well, I think that contention will not be sanctioned by the best lawyers in the House. The minister says: Oh, we told them that we would not prosecute them, but the order in council told them as well that they would have the right. What kind of a right? What kind of a right was he giving them? Was it a legal right? It must be assumed that it was a legal right, because otherwise they had no right at all to come in and enjoy a portion of that trade. Therefore, they were giving an illegal right, and in addition they were assuring the people who would come in and violate the law, that they would not be prosecuted. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance what the position would have been, provided some private individual prosecuted?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I pointed out a distinction. In offences of this character a prosecution can only be instituted by the government, thereby implying that the government has some measure of discretion and must take the responsibility of acting.

Mr. SPROULE. If that be the case, so much the worse for the government, because while no other party had the power to stop them doing this illegal act, the government were willing to wink at the violation of the law to satisfy their own purposes for the time being. For these reasons, I think they acted very unwisely. They have deterred men who contemplated investing capital in the building of vessels for that trade, from doing so; they naturally say there is no security that the trade will be kept for them in the future, there is no guarantee that the same thing may not be repeated next year or the succeeding year, whenever some one may come up and represent that it is desirable that these concessions should be granted.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). The question under discussion with regard to the permission of American vessels to participate in the Canadian coasting trade is one of great importance, and the position taken by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is in the abstract a correct one. The Canadian navigation laws were, of course, passed for the protection of a great Canadian interest; and it is very true that exceptional circumstances only would justify the government, either in granting a permission to foreign vessels to engage in this coasting trade, or in stipulating that they would waive prosecution of a violation of the provisions of our coasting laws. I think, however, that in the case under discussion, reasons can be assigned which will fairly justify the government in the action that has been taken, if the circumstances were of the character which I suppose they were. My hon. friend from Simcoe, in re-

ferring to the permission given a tug to tow timber this spring, made that a grievance in connection with the issuing of the order in council permitting the transportation of grain from Fort William and Port Arthur to Parry Sound harbour. With reference to permitting a tug to perform this labour, I happen to know something about that matter, and I think the government were fully justified in the action taken in that affair, at least. The firm of Edmund Hall & Son, of Detroit, were constructing a mill at Sarnia, in the province of Ontario. To proceed with the construction of the mill, it was necessary to bring down a large quantity of piles from a point on the Georgian Bay to prepare the foundation of the mill, and work on the mill could not be proceeded with until these piles were brought down. It was not necessary for them to tow logs, as they were not ready for logs then. It was necessary to bring this timber down for the construction of the mill. This firm were converting one of their two tugs into a Canadian bottom, which they were unable to have ready for Canadian register for about a month. They had another tug, which was an American tug, and it is a matter of very great convenience to parties engaged in the timber business, and who have more than one vessel, to have one of Canadian and another of American register. This firm made an effort to secure the services of a Canadian tug, but they were unable to do so. It happens that at this season, all the Canadian tugs have been fully employed, and that there is more business for them than they can perform. Edmund Hall & Son found themselves unable to secure the services of a Canadian tug, and they found that if they had to wait until they had their tug ready for register as a Canadian vessel, it would involve the delay of more than a month. So, they made application to be permitted to use their own vessel in bringing timber belonging to themselves, for the purposes of the erection of their mill in Canada. The granting of this favour simply meant that the mill would have been in operation one or two months earlier than would otherwise have been the case, and as the mill would employ a large number of men, great advantage would be derived by the town of Sarnia. The member for the riding (Mr. Johnston), was exceedingly anxious that this favour should be granted to Edmund Hall & Son, and he came here with representations from this firm which were, in my opinion, sufficient justification for the government in taking the course they did take. I think if the government had refused, as they were at first disposed to refuse this request, they would not have been acting on business principles, and they would have inflicted a hardship on a firm that was investing a large sum of money in Canada. By granting the request, they were doing no injury to any Canadian ship-

ping interest, because the firm were unable to obtain the services of a Canadian vessel, all being profitably employed. I fully justify the government in the course they took under these circumstances. There were good reasons for doing it, and there is no reason for criticism of their action in this respect.

In regard to the order in council of last October permitting the carrying of Canadian grain by American vessels, between Canadian ports, the case, of course, is perhaps, not quite as clear as the case to which I have referred. There can be no doubt whatever about the first case, while in this case there might be room for doubt as to the propriety of the course pursued by the government. I think the government were acting in the matter of granting the privilege of transporting Canadian grain from Fort William and Port Arthur to Parry Sound, in the interest of Canada, just as thoroughly in that case as in the one I have referred to. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), says that there were two justifications possible for the course pursued; one, a congestion of grain in the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and the other a scarcity of shipping for the transportation of grain. Now, the representations made to the government, I believe, were, that there was a congestion of grain and a scarcity of tonnage. The very facts of the case upon the surface, show that it was particularly a case of emergency. The order in council was issued on October 16. The season of the transportation of grain from Lake Superior ports had very nearly reached its close on October 16, and if there was any considerable quantity of grain awaiting shipment at Fort William and Port Arthur, and it was desired by the shippers that this should reach Montreal, or the seaboard, before the close of navigation, it was a case of emergency, because there were only three or four weeks of navigation left. If it could be shown that vessels could not be secured for that trade, that would have been sufficient justification for the government in the course they pursued. We have other interests besides the vessel interest to consider. We have spent an enormous sum of money in improving our means of communication for the purpose of securing a portion of this western grain trade. We have the interests, not only of the Canadian vessel owners, but the interests of the great Canadian railway line of Mr. Booth from Parry Sound harbour to Montreal. Mr. Booth very naturally wishes to secure the carriage of grain for his line, and if he found that he could not secure for his road the business that it was capable of performing, without securing the services of a greater tonnage than was available under Canadian register, the interests of his road required that this concession should be made. The keenest competition exists between this route and the route by way

of Buffalo. A very large proportion of wheat from Manitoba and the Canadian North-west Territories had hitherto gone by way of Buffalo, and the question of facilities for the carrying of this grain, and the question of freight rates would govern, whether the Americans would monopolize this trade, or whether Canadian roads should get a portion of it. The question is a much broader one than as to whether two or three Canadian vessels were cut out of cargoes. It is a question affecting the Booth road, and it is a question affecting the farmers of the North-west. They are interested in lower freight rates, which they acquired by the operation of this order in council. The benefits which have resulted from this action of the government, have accrued to the road and accrued to the settlers, and no great damage has been inflicted on the owners of vessels whose vessels were furnished with all the business they could do.

Mr. BENNETT. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton), assume that the grain was in the possession of the farmers or of the elevator owners or grain dealers. If so, there was no benefit to the farmer, because the grain was then in the hands of the grain-dealers as represented by Mr. Smith?

Mr. CHARLTON. The question of facilities for the transportation of grain to the seaboard is one affecting the interests of the grain producers of the North-west, and it has been asserted by the hon. member for East Grey, and by others, that there was no plethora of grain in the elevators. If he is correct, the grain was coming down for shipment from the west, and probably a good deal of it had not come down, if the elevators were not full. If it was desired to secure a portion of that trade which our transportation lines desired to secure, it was necessary to provide facilities for transporting that grain from Fort William to Parry Sound.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman said that the season was nearly over on Lake Superior at that time.

Mr. CHARLTON. I said it was. I say it was a case of necessity that we should be able to obtain the tonnage required to send that grain to the seaboard. Then, it was asserted by the hon. member for East Simcoe that Mr. Booth was really the owner of these vessels. That is the case, and Mr. Booth had these American bottoms for the reason that it was profitable to him to own vessels that could engage in the American coasting trade as well as in the Canadian trade. They were in point of fact for all practical purposes just as much Canadian property as if they had been on the Canadian register. It is and has been a common thing in the United States, for Americans to own vessels that are sailed under the British flag for the

reason that you cannot make American bottoms out of these vessels unless by Act of Congress. There is so much difficulty about doing this, that Americans have held a large amount of tonnage for years past under the British flag and these vessels are to all intents and purposes American vessels. Their management is in American hands and they are American vessels truly and really, although nominally sailing under the British flag. This is probably the case reversed of the vessels under discussion. Mr. Booth is their owner; he has bought vessels suitable for the trade; he requires vessels of large and heavy tonnage to do the business, and such vessels are not numerous. This concession was therefore made to a Canadian, and the profits accruing, went to Canadians. This is a feature of the case which has not been dwelt upon, and perhaps has not been considered by our friends who are condemning the action of the government. It is possible the government made a mistake; I do not know as to that; but I am certain that the motives of the government were perfectly correct; and that they imagined that they were acting in Canadian interests. It was not an un-Canadian Act as the hon. gentleman from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) says, because I believe the government considered that they were doing something that was in the line of promoting the best interests of our country. They were making a concession that would enable the grain to be moved from Fort William and Port Arthur to Parry Sound Harbour, that otherwise could not be moved. They were making a concession that would secure for the Canada Atlantic road a large amount of business, and they were making a concession which ensured the laying down of that grain in Montreal, for shipment from that port instead of from Buffalo. The question as to what route the grain will take depends upon the facilities and the cost of transportation, and unless we can afford to give reasonably low rates and all necessary facilities by the Canadian route, we will lose that trade. A great many interests have to be considered besides the interests of a few vessel owners. Under all the circumstances I believe the government were justified in the course they took, and I am certain they thought they were acting in the best interests of Canada. I cannot imagine that any very great disaster would be inflicted upon Canadian interests by securing for the Canada Atlantic Railway a larger amount of business, by securing for the vessels which sailed from Montreal a larger amount of tonnage, and by securing for the settlers of the North-west a more prompt transmission of their grain to the markets and lower rates than they would otherwise be called upon to pay. While I hold that it is our duty to protect Canadian interests very closely, yet it is possible that we may take a narrow view of these things and make an error by neglecting to survey the

whole field, and to take into consideration all the interests that are involved—not only the interests of the various vessel owners, but the interests of the railway, the interests of the transportation companies, and the interests of the farmers who furnish the freight. When we consider this whole question from a broad business-like statesmanlike standpoint, we perhaps will not feel so much like condemning the action of the government in this matter as we would if he viewed the case from the narrow standpoint which my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett), who moved the resolution evidently views it from.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). While I sympathise with the shipping interests of Canada, yet I must point out that the interests of the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west are worthy of consideration. I presume that the majority of the members of this House are aware that every bushel of wheat placed in the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur depreciates in value about six cents when stored there over the season. In other words, the farmers lose six cents a bushel on their wheat if it is not sent to the point of ocean shipment before the season closes. The change in the coasting laws was made in the interests of the farmers of the North-west. The hon. gentleman from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has devoted a good deal of his time to devising means for transferring the wheat of the west through Canadian channels to the sea-board, but I can tell him that the action of the government in this respect was well calculated to attain that object. I do not see the difference between allowing an American vessel to take a cargo of wheat from Port Arthur to Buffalo, and allowing the same vessel to carry it to Parry Sound where it will furnish work for Canadian labour. If there is any difference it is all in favour of Canada, because it lowers the freight to the farmers of the west, saves them the depreciation on their wheat which would result if stored in elevators, and at the same time remunerates Canadian labour for handling that wheat at our own ports. I agree with the hon. gentleman from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that a vessel carrying 250,000 bushels can carry it at a cheaper rate than a small vessel, and every cent that is saved in that way benefits the producer of the wheat. From our point of view in the North-west, the action of the government was most commendable, in suspending the coasting laws last fall and enabling the grain to be shipped to England.

Mr. R. R. DOBELL (Quebec West). I wish to say a word on this question because I think that both the members for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) treated it rather extravagantly. We need not discuss the general principle involved because we admit at once that while we gave the per-

Mr. CHARLTON.

mission we regarded it as a special occasion under extreme circumstances, and we never intended to continue or extend that provision for any length of time. That liberty was granted for reasons that have been clearly set forth by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). We all know that on October 16, the season in Lake Superior is rapidly drawing to a close and we were told, and I believe it is true, that Canadian vessels could not be obtained at the time. I do not speak with certainty, but I have the recollection that nearly all the Canadian craft had been engaged up to a certain period which expired about the time we gave this permission.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) try to verify that information?

Mr. DOBELL. We did not, but I believe it will be found that that statement was correct. I felt some sympathy myself in the matter, but I often think that these extreme rights when held too rigidly may be turned into wrong. I will give an instance of that. About three years ago we had a number of steamers chartered to load cargoes at Three Rivers, and unfortunately they all arrived at the same time. All the schooners and barges and bateaux that we could get around Three Rivers, and Batiscan and Louisville could not load these steamers within the time agreed on. I found a number of American barges, seventeen altogether, lying alongside the wharf. I at once gave orders to commence loading them, and send them to the steamers. The customs officer at once stepped in and said, 'Do you know what you are doing? You are breaking the law.' I did not know that I was breaking the law. I at once telegraphed to my colleague and asked for permission; but I was not fortunate enough to get permission, and I could not load the barges. They were lying idle alongside the wharf, the steamers were waiting for cargoes, and we had to pay demurrage on those steamers because of the navigation laws. After an experience of that kind, I think you will agree with me that it is not wise to hold too rigidly to one's rights. I do not think I need say more to show that this matter has been exaggerated. It is the only case in which permission of that kind was given, and I believe we had good reason for giving it. When you call it un-Canadian, you should remember that while it may have prejudiced the condition of Canadian lake craft, it was of great advantage to a large corporation, and helped to fill up the steamers at Montreal. It was not an unmixed evil.

Mr. FOSTER. Were there many cargoes sent?

Mr. DOBELL. No, I think sufficient for two lake steamers. The time was very short. I think it is quite evident that the government should always have power to

grant a permission of that kind if we use it with discretion and care. If not, we are subject to criticism; but in this case I think there was good ground for extending the privilege.

Mr. JOHN McMILLAN (South Huron). Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this question to pass without making a single remark, because the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) stated that the action of the government in this case was on a par with their action in taking the duty off Indian corn. What has been the effect of removing that duty? In the three years since that duty was taken off we consumed 15,000,000 bushels of Indian corn, which was equal to over 420,000 tons. That feed was worth \$11.50 per ton. We have, in consequence, sold an equal quantity of oats, which is worth \$17.98 per ton. So that we have a profit of \$6.48 per ton as the result of using the corn and selling the oats, or a clear profit of \$2,500,000. If the action of the government in allowing American coasting vessels to come into this country to carry part of the grain between Canadian ports resulted in as great a benefit to the people of this country, I hope many actions of that kind will be taken by the government; because I hold that the government never conferred a greater benefit on the farmers and the cattle and hog feeders of this country than by taking the duty off corn. The only argument used against it is that we should get barley admitted free into the United States; but the Americans refuse to grant that, and were our government on that account to withhold from the farmers of this country the enormous benefit of bringing corn into the country free of duty?

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). I want to say a word or two before this matter is disposed of. I was one of the deputation that waited on the government after it was known that this order in council had been passed, as the Kingston Transportation Company own two of the largest and most expensive steamships carrying grain from Lake Superior to Kingston, and of course they were very much interested in anything that would interfere with their trade. When this order in council was known they felt very keenly about it, and they joined with other vessel owners in interviewing the government and protesting against its continuance. The deputation was very large, being composed of men from Hamilton, Toronto, Kingston and Montreal. The interest of Montreal might seem to be rather against the protest that was being made; but in this instance they thought they were more interested on the whole in the carrying trade as done by Canadian bottoms down the St. Lawrence, so they joined in this movement. From information we got as to why this order in council was made, we came to the conclusion beyond a doubt that misrepresenta-

tions had been made to the government, and that in the hurry of the moment the government had acted upon those misrepresentations. Because, as has been properly said, it was late in the season, and anything that was to be carried had to be carried at once, because it was within two or three weeks of the time when the last vessel would go out of Montreal. So they had to act promptly if they acted at all; but the investigation led us to ascertain that not very much harm had been done. But the deputation desired that the order in council should not continue, and we were promised that an inquiry would be held and that if misrepresentations were found to have been made, the matter would be set right. I do not know when the order was rescinded.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It expired at the end of the season.

Mr. BRITTON. If a mistake was made, it happened that it was made at the very best time for Canadian vessel owners, because last year was exceptional for the carrying trade on the lakes. There were good rates prevailing until the fall, and perhaps that very fact made vessel men more anxious and excited about the matter than they otherwise would have been. They had been suffering for years from low rates, and now, when an opportunity offered in which more money could be made, they felt that the order in council was directly against their interests, and at the earliest moment protested against it.

The government acted with the very best intention, but I feel perfectly satisfied that there were misrepresentations made on two material matters. First, as to the quantity of grain in Port Arthur waiting for shipment, and, second, as to the insufficiency of Canadian tonnage to carry that grain. There were vessel owners on the deputation, who said that they could not get a cargo at Port Arthur, there was so little grain to be had, and they were obliged to go to Duluth. That showed that there was, at all events, no insufficiency of Canadian bottoms to carry the grain. Owing to these misrepresentations made by interested parties, very likely, as the hon. member for North Norfolk has said, by Canadians owning American vessels, this order in council was passed. In the interests of Canadian vessel-owners, it does not seem to me to make any difference whether they have to meet the competition of American bottoms owned by Canadians, or owned by Americans. Our Canadian vessels cannot carry between two American ports, and these American vessels can carry more grain than can Canadian vessels; and that being the case, it is very unfair that a Canadian, either in his own name or that of a company incorporated on the other side, or a friendly American, can own American vessels and put them in competition with Canadian vessels. They had had good reason, therefore,

for protesting against the order in council, and while we acquit the government of any desire to prejudice Canadian vessel-owners in this instance, but acted under misrepresentations, they ought to guard in the future against allowing themselves to be deceived in this way to the prejudice of Canadians.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) If it had not been for one remark made by the Minister of Finance, I should consider that the government had been properly punished already in having had their conduct shown up in a very undesirable light in this parliament and the country as well. We have had the mild castigation which has just been administered to them, and rightfully too, by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), and the singularly weak excuses that were made for this action by the hon. member for Quebec, without portfolio, and the Minister of Finance himself. The Minister of Customs, of course, thinks discretion is the better part of valour, and when he is in a tight place and fighting has to be done, he would rather go and whisper to his hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and get him to jump into the breach and take the load off his shoulders, of making an apology for the government, which had clearly committed, not only an illegal, but a wrong act. But what the Minister of Finance said was that he would do it again, and that is the grave part of the matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend quote the words?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. He said: I will not promise, not to suspend the law, but will only suspend it in exceptional instances.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Those are not the exact words.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not given the exact words, but the substance, and that is the grave part of this transaction, aside from the utterly illegal act which the government committed. The Minister of Finance tried to contend, in the first place, that the government did not break the law. But, let us hear what a colleague of his said, who is not a layman but a lawyer. I find that in the memorandum, signed by Mr. Drummond, the Governor General's secretary, the following:

The undersigned has the honour, by direction of His Excellency the Governor General, to draw the attention of the ministers to the Privy Council minute No. 2252, and that His Excellency, having consulted the hon. David Mills, Minister of Justice, as to the legality of the above mentioned minutes, was informed that the order is distinctly a nullity.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER (reading):

And that it assumes a power which it does not possess.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRITTON.

Mr. FOSTER. Namely, to cancel an Act of parliament. That is exactly what the order in council has done. It has cancelled an Act of parliament.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It could not cancel an Act of parliament, and, therefore, did not do it.

Mr. FOSTER. It assumes to cancel an Act of parliament; and so far as the Act contemplated was concerned, it did suspend and practically cancel that Act of parliament.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He said it was a nullity and could not do anything.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as the action which the government meant to legalize or permit was concerned, it did. There is evidence, I think, quite as good as the evidence of the Minister of Finance. The exact wording of the law has been read. The law says that United States vessels shall not be allowed to carry between Canadian ports. The order in council says that they shall, and gives permission for them to carry between these ports. There is an exact contradiction. The statute says they shall not carry; the order in council says they shall be permitted to carry. There is no need of arguing that any further. That is a complete contradistinction, and it is as plain as can be. The order in council goes further. It promises these men that it will not only give them permission to carry between Canadian ports, but will abrogate the penalty. They are promised that if they take advantage of the permission, they will not be prosecuted. That is a thing no government has a right to do, but which this government has done, and the gravest point about it is this. The only security that we have in this country for life and property is the security given to us by the law. The legal enactments of the country are the charter for our actions and our liberties. Depending upon the law, the different industries and interests of this country make their plans and ply their business, and I think one of the gravest things, outside the attempt of the government to break and nullify the law and suspend an Act of parliament, is the sense of insecurity which is imported into the business of the country by the knowledge that there is a government in power which, of its own mere will, whenever it suits it, will abrogate the law and take away the charter and the security which these interests enjoy. What statement did we get from the Minister of Finance to-night? We got the statement that the government would not promise not to do it again, but we got a bolder statement even than that from another member of the government, but in another place. When brought to book about this action, he boldly announced, as a principle upon which the government would act, that it did break the law and would

break it again when the government considered that necessary for the good of the people. Laws are inconvenient; but they are made for the general good, and if they pinch an individual, that is not argument why the law should be abrogated by an executive who have no more power to abrogate a law than they have power to enact a law. They did assume to do it. Now, the strange thing about it is the apologies we hear—for not a man has risen on the other side but has made an apology. The hon. member of the government without portfolio (Mr. Dobell) said he had no certainty in the matter of the information, but only a recollection. Information was acted upon, said the Minister of Finance; but the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) said there was no attempt made to verify the information. What! A government will deliberately break a law on which the shipping interests of the lakes depends for their security, for their trade, and will do it on no basis of certainty, but only on ex parte information which they did not attempt to verify. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) said there was reason for haste, and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said the same. But the hon. member for Kingston will see, if he goes through these papers, that on the 26th of May, when it was mooted that there might be some action of this kind on the part of the government, the board of trade of Toronto acting on behalf of the carrying interest sent down a memorandum of which the following is one clause:

The council considers their action—

That is the action of the corn exchange, favouring the admission of American vessels.

—to be a menace to our marine interests, and while they do not believe that the government of Canada would consent to the perpetration of such a confiscation of national rights, yet it has had a bad effect upon the present carrying trade and to the capital invested in shipping.

That was sent to the government on the 25th day of May, and on the 26th of May the Premier acknowledged it and said that the matter would receive due consideration. So that, from the opening of navigation, the government were asked to pause in any contemplated action of this kind, and they had that summer to look into the matter. But, in the end, they did not look into the matter; they simply took the representation made to them casually, assuming it to be true. But that is not the course a government should take, in cases of this kind especially. What they should have done was to verify their information. And, if they had made the first move toward the verification of it, they would have found that it was without foundation, a fact that was afterwards proved so absolutely to the government that the Prime Minister himself, in answer to the delegation, said

that if they had had the information earlier which was given to them by the delegation, this action would not have been taken. But another point is that these Canadian carriers on the lakes have hard competition. It has been stated by the hon. member for Kingston that they have to compete with American vessels that have a varied trade, and whereas our shipping men have to take the lean without very much of the rich, the American shipping men have chances at a trade which has much richness in it, and the smallest proportion of the unprofitable. Under these circumstances the Canadian shipping interest should receive at least so much consideration at the hands of the government that the government would take the trouble of seeking to find out the facts before taking action against that interest. But without seeking to verify that information, the government passed this order in council which delivered a staggering blow at this interest. And every man who has anything to do with these interests knows that it not only has brought trouble at present, but it may continue that trouble for a long time. As I said before, they have to make preparations for this carrying trade. Contracts have to be made ahead for the building of vessels. The deputation that came down showed to the government by incontrovertible evidence that contracts were on the eve of being made for the building of lake vessels for this trade, which orders were immediately cancelled when this action was taken by the government. And, even up to this date there is still uncertainty. Shipping men have no pledge that the law will be observed; and they have the statement of Mr. Scott, a member of the government, that this government is prepared to break the law whenever they think it would be in the public interest, and they have the statement of the Minister of Finance that he will not promise not to break the law again. Without pushing this matter, I think that, on fair grounds, the case is a grave one; I think that the government did what no government ought to do, except in matters of grave national concern or overwhelming public interest. In such cases they may take the responsibility of going contrary to the law; but if they do they should come before parliament at the earliest opportunity after it meets, state their case and get indemnity from parliament. In no other way can we have confidence in this country that the laws will do what they are always supposed to do—guard the rights which they are made to protect. The government have done what they have no right to do; but I am obliged to say that their action is in line with much of what they have done in less grave matters but of a similar kind. This is not the first time they have made themselves superior to the law; this is not the first time they have undertaken to abrogate and suspend

the operation of the law. They have done it over and over again; and I think it is a dangerous principle to be imported into an administration that the executive of a country can ever consider themselves superior to the laws of the country. They govern under the laws and are superior to none of them. If great peril arises or some great national question demands action which is not sanctioned by the law, some overwhelming public interest which must be provided for while parliament is not in session, the government may, after careful consideration, act without the law for the moment. They must take that responsibility. But they must come to parliament at the earliest opportunity as I said before, and get the sanction of parliament for what they have done.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I wish only to make one remark, as the hon. gentleman has made an allusion to me. He says that I maintained a discreet silence in this discussion. The Minister of Finance candidly told the House why he spoke in reference to this matter, stating that it was because he was the one who prepared the report to council. I think I was not in the city myself at the time. I merely wish to point out the positions taken by several hon. gentlemen opposite to show how inconsistent they are with each other. In the first place, they tell us this action was wholly un-Canadian and totally illegal. Their next proposition is that the government are greatly to blame because they did not make inquiries to ascertain what quantity of grain was up there. Now, if it is wholly un-Canadian and wholly illegal, why should the government go to any trouble to ascertain whether grain is there or not? The very fact of the hon. gentlemen opposite saying that the government should have inquired into this, shows that they themselves believe it is not illegal, that it is not un-Canadian, and that it would have been justified if the circumstances had been different. Now as to its being illegal, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has been upon the Treasury Board in past governments; did he not permit these coasting laws to be set aside under his regime? Will he say that permission never was given to violate them? Will he say that was not done more than once, more than twice? Why does he lecture us now? He talks about its being illegal, but he knows that under the Audit Act certain power is given to the Treasury Board to do this, though that power is not to be used in a careless manner. It is an extraordinary power which parliament has put in the hands of the government, but parliament has thoroughly recognized the fact that circumstances may arise in business when parliament is not in session, under which the government ought to be in possession of that power, giving them sufficient discretion, in the interest of the coun-

Mr. FOSTER.

try, to do certain things and to waive certain penalties.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman does not say that was a legal justification?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will the hon. gentleman, who was a member of a government, say that he never waived penalties?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman say—

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not want to be catechised by the hon. gentleman. He makes his speeches and then rushes from the House, runs away every time. He would have got his answer if he had been here, it has been discussed in the absence of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman asked me a question, will he allow me to answer him? First, I must know what the question is. He has been saying that under the powers given in the Audit Act certain things have been done by governments, and his question to me was whether we had ever acted under those powers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Before he mentioned that, he asked if you had ever taken exceptional action in permitting violation of the coasting laws.

Mr. FOSTER. I can answer his question very frankly and absolutely. The government of which I was a member never undertook to abrogate the coasting laws, and never did.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Never allowed an American vessel to coast, to go from one port in Canada to another?

Mr. FOSTER. Never went outside of our powers such as are given under Act of parliament. But what the hon. gentleman did was to abrogate an Act of parliament, which he had no power to do.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman has not answered. I ask him now again, because I feel persuaded it was done time and again—but I speak subject to correction—

Mr. FOSTER. Then you do not know anything about it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Don't I. The hon. gentleman does not know anything about it. But would he say that he never did it.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly we never did it, never attempted to abrogate the coasting laws.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Or did what was practically the same as abrogating the coasting laws, if an order in council was passed on the recommendation of the Treasury Board allowing an American vessel to trade from one port to another in

Canada, as was done in this case? Did not he do that?

Mr. FOSTER. Cite an instance.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Does the hon. gentleman mean to deny that as a member of the Treasury Board he has not time and again, not only with the coasting laws, but with other laws carrying penalties, used his power to mitigate those penalties?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes, often and often.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Ah, it comes out.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman better be fair.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will be perfectly fair, but I will not allow the hon. gentleman to try his schoolmaster tricks and lecture me.

Mr. FOSTER. A little schoolmaster training on him will not do him any harm. The hon. gentleman has not been well trained.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. gentleman dare not let me answer his questions.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. When the hon. gentleman rises as a gentleman to address a question or a remark to me, I will be pleased to answer it, but I am not disposed, in the middle of my speech, to allow the hon. gentleman to get up and attempt to read me one of his little lectures about the length of the sessions, and about the length of the speeches. Now, if he will permit me to tell him so, he could say all he wants to say in one-tenth of the time that he takes up now in saying it, and if he wants to give me a rebuke he could do it in two or three words without standing up and taking five minutes and interrupting me in my speech. The hon. gentleman is fast losing the position he had in this House as a debater, he is becoming wearisome, tiresome to his own followers. Now, I am speaking in love and friendship for the hon. gentleman, because I recognize him as a man of ability, but he is deteriorating marvellously in that respect. A friend of the hon. gentleman remarked to me a little while ago on this very failing of the hon. gentleman, lamenting how he has deteriorated in that direction, using so many words to express a thought. I know that he holds any views that I may express to be of very little value, I know that he holds that I do not understand public questions, and therefore, the time that I use in pointing that out to him is wasted. However, I am sensible that other people do not care what his opinions are in reference to me at all, so we could save all that time. But the hon. gentleman now admits that as a member of the Treasury Board

time and again he has waived penalties and forfeitures that the laws have imposed.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to answer him now?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, now you are a gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. I am always a gentleman. But we will not discuss that question. As a member of the Treasury Board I have done, with the other members of the Treasury Board, what the law expressly allows the Treasury Board to do, and nothing more, and when the law allows it that is legal.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Certainly, so we are entirely at one. The hon. gentleman has spoken about these coasting laws without any reference to the Audit Act at all. Now, he is admitting here, as I understand him, that acting under the Audit Act as a member of the Treasury Board, he has time and again waived penalties and forfeitures which the law allows him to do.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that is legal.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Then this is legal. The coasting laws do not allow any one to do it, but he did it time and again under the Audit Act, and thus the hon. gentlemen would exercise their powers under the Audit Act in forbearing to collect the penalties that the law prescribes. So we have the hon. gentleman doing precisely time and again what this government has done; and while I have not the circumstances before me, as I would have had if I had known that this matter was coming up to-day, I think I could find from the records of the department more than one instance where these gentlemen, in the very case of these coasting laws, have given permission to an American vessel to act in contravention of our coasting laws. I have not got the circumstances, and I will not say so positively, but I am confident I could find such cases if I had time to look them up. But my firm belief is that I could find instances where that was done. The Audit Act was passed for that very purpose. Take the case that the hon. member brought up of the tug that these people in Sarnia employed. That is the reason why this power is given to a government. Here is an American firm coming over to invest hundreds of thousands of dollars in a Canadian town, to build up a great Canadian industry in the town of Sarnia.

They came to me and they said: We are going to erect a large mill at Sarnia, we are going to become residents of Canada, we are going to establish a large plant in Canada, it is necessary for us to get a quantity of pine in order to construct the wharfs for our mills, we have searched, and it is impossible to get a Canadian tug, we have

tugs of our own, we are going to bring one of our tugs over here, we are going to rebuild her and bring her under Canadian register, but it will take a month before we can get it done, we cannot get a Canadian tug, there is only one tug on the upper lakes available, and she belongs to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), he will not let us have this tug for a month. I asked him, and he said no. 'No, I cannot let you have it for a month.' He said, 'I do not think you can get a Canadian tug.' Under these circumstances permission was given to this American company to tow these piles to Sarnia to enable them to proceed with the work of constructing their mill. There was no Canadian tug available and no Canadian interests was injured. No Canadian tug could be got anywhere. Under circumstances like that, permission was given, and under circumstances like that I have no doubt that there are many instances in which hon. gentlemen opposite did the same thing. But, I wish to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that they have taken a very illogical position. They say that the action of the government is utterly un-Canadian and illegal, and that before the government made such an order as this it should have ascertained that there was really the quantity of grain in the elevators at Fort William that there was represented to be. If our action was utterly un-Canadian and illegal, would the inquiry which these hon. gentlemen say we ought to have made have affected the question in any way? I think the position of hon. gentlemen opposite is utterly illogical.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) has endeavoured to make an argument on what he says is an illogical position on the part of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, in that they have said that the action of the government was illegal and un-Canadian, and that the hon. gentleman had not taken the trouble to make an inquiry. Does the hon. gentleman think that is a good argument?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think it is a bad argument on your part.

Mr. CLANCY. I am talking about the hon. gentleman's argument. If the hon. gentleman could have shown any justification for being illegal and un-Canadian, it would have been the justification of necessity, but he never inquired as to the necessity.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What was the use of inquiring about the necessity if it was illegal?

Mr. CLANCY. It might have furnished some justification. The hon. gentleman was not only in an illegal and un-Canadian but in an unjustifiable position. I am only

Mr. PATERSON.

showing that the hon. Minister of Customs cannot hope to make a case out of that.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), referred to the case of Hall & Son, which I cited.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to reply.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not mention that case on its merits, but I mentioned the case of towing on the lakes owing to the fact that owners of Americans now decline to enter into contracts with Canadian tug owners for towing on the upper lakes because there is an expressed intimation that they are to be permitted to tow in Canadian waters as it is fair to assume that the government propose to permit these American tug owners to tow on the upper lakes and they will receive the statement that this is to be done for the balance of the season.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Bennett).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bennett,	Macdonald (King's),
Bergeron,	MacLaren,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McAllister,
Casgrain,	McCleary,
Clancy,	McDougall,
Cochrane,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Dugas,	Marcotte,
Foster,	Martin,
Gillies,	Montague,
Gilmour,	Moore,
Gillet,	Morin,
Henderson,	Prior,
Hedgins,	Seagram,
Ingram,	Sproule,
Kaulbach,	Taylor, and
Kloepfer,	Wilson.—32.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bazinot,	McClure,
Beith,	McGugan,
Bell (Prince),	McHugh,
Blair,	McIsaac,
Borden (King's),	McLellan (P.E.I.),
Bourassa,	McLennan (Inverness),
Brodeur,	McMillan,
Calvert,	Madore,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Malouin,
Demers,	Parmalee,
Dobell,	Paterson,
Domville,	Pettit,
Ellis,	Préfontaine,
Fielcing,	Proulx,
Fisher,	Puttee,
Fitzpatrick,	Richardson,
Fortier,	Rogers,
Fraser (Lambton),	Ross,
Geoffrion,	Rutherford,
Gould,	Semple,
Landerkin,	Sutherland,
Lang,	Talbot,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tolmie,
Logan,	Tucker, and
Macdonald (Huron),	Turcot.—51.
Mackie,	

**PAIRS :**

**Ministerial.**

**Opposition.**

Davis,	Hale,
Sretsinger,	Reid,
Christie,	Roddick,
Featherston,	Carscallen,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Gibson,	Corby,
Charlton,	Tisdale
Lewis,	Poupore,
MacPherson,	Rosamond,
Macdonell,	Rocche,
Penny,	Osler,
Scriver,	Blanchard,
Mulock,	Beattie,
Russell,	Borden (Halifax),
Wood,	Clarke,
Graham,	Wallace,
Stenson,	McLean,
Casey,	Klock,
Burnett,	Davin,
Marcil,	LaRivière,
Flint,	Mills,
Livingston,	McNeill,
Belcourt,	Monk,
Tarte,	Haggart,
Campbell,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Edwards,	Powell,
Dyment,	McCormack,
Britton,	Cargill,
Cowan,	Hughes,
Hurley,	Craig,
Hutchison,	Earle,
Maxwell,	Pope,
Frost,	Quinn,
Morrison,	Robinson,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Bell (Pictou),
Somerville,	Bell (Addington),
McCarthy,	Ferguson,
McMullen,	Robertson,
Elfton,	Kendry,
McGregor,	Broder,
Lavergne,	Ganong,
Harwood,	McIntosh,

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Cornwall Canal—

To pay Gilbert Dredging Co., interest. \$ 22,388  
 Enlargement ..... 141,400

\$163,788

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The item of interest is on an amount of \$48,000 which was found to be due to the contractors for work done on their contract on the Cornwall Canal, and which was held in abeyance. The original claim amounted to \$59,918, and it was finally adjusted at \$48,000. The amount was due on October 1, 1891, and this sum is the interest up to July 1, 1900.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Was the claim settled as the result of a lawsuit?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They did not come to a settlement until last year.

Mr. BERGERON. Who decided the settlement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The amount was practically settled by the engineers of the department. The capital amount will be paid out of the current vote, as we had not funds available at the time the settlement was arrived at.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). There must have been some arbitration about it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was no arbitration about it. Under the contract, the chief engineer has the final settlement of these matters.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the minister the engineer's report?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the department has.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We must have that report. The minister cannot expect us to pass an item of \$58,000 without the engineer's report.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not now asking you to pass \$58,000, but \$22,000. The claim that was presented by the dredging company was in the first place \$9,550 for plant, which remained idle for a long period in consequence of the stoppage of work upon two full sections and two part sections of the Cornwall Canal. This work was suspended during the consideration of the question, whether or not the Sheik's Island dam would be taken up. The dredging company were kept for two years waiting until it should be finally decided whether or not they should go on with their contract. They undertook to remove their plant, away back in 1890, but they were not allowed to do so by the department, which has the plant under its control.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When did they present that claim?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Just as soon as the department decided that the work would not go on. In 1891 the question first arose as to whether they would be permitted to continue their contract, and they were kept in suspense for two years.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Payment was refused, was it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is the hon. gentleman sure?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was no settlement in the matter.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** I am informed that the department refused to pay it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** There was no decision on it at all.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Is the minister sure about that?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I am sure there was no final determination upon it. The impression of the officers of the department was against the claim, for the reason that they thought that this with other items had been covered by the settlement that had been arrived at previously, but which was found not to include any of the items in this claim at all.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Have you the report on that?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Mr. Rubidge made a report upon it which, if the hon. gentleman desires, will be brought down. There was another item of \$11,377 for reinforcing the banks. That was gone into by the superintending engineer and by the chief engineer.

**Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.)** When?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That was not really gone into until last year.

**Mr. FOSTER.** Was it never gone into before?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** None of the items, the chief engineer says, were really gone into until last year.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Were they not practically refused by the department?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** They were not paid, but they were not refused payment on the ground that the items themselves were incorrect or improper. The delay in non-payment was due to the opinion that was entertained by the officers of the department that a large portion of these items had been covered by the payment made and the settlement arrived at some time previously.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** When was that payment made?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The payment was made with respect to that, on April 19, 1894.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** There were vouchers, of course?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Yes, certainly. I will read the vouchers when I come to deal with the Gilbert Dredging Company amount. I will now give the items of the claim. For plant, \$9,550

**Mr. BLAIR.**

was claimed, and \$7,900 was allowed. The item for reinforced banks was allowed at \$11,250. An item for old stone from culverts, \$10,500 was allowed.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** What does that mean?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Under their contract they were to take out the old stone from the culverts, and they were to be allowed so much for taking out the stone, and they were to own the stone and were to be entitled to use it on the works after it was taken out. The canal was not unwatered, and therefore they did not get the stone out, and were not paid for taking it out; but they had to get other stone, and they were allowed what would be a fair price for the new stone, \$3.50 a yard.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** How many yards?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** About 2,000. The next item is for loss on account of the canal not being unwatered, for which \$13,111 was claimed, and \$11,958 was allowed.

**Mr. FOSTER.** What was their loss on that account?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** The contract authorized the contractors to have the canal unwatered in order that they might do the work which could only be done advantageously, when the canal was unwatered. The department refused to allow the unwatering, so that the contractors had not the opportunity of doing the work at the time or under the advantageous conditions which they would otherwise have had. There were reasons in the public interest which I presume led the department to decline to have the canal unwatered according to the right of the contractor, and of course the department necessarily had to make good to the contractor any loss he sustained by reason of that refusal.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** What work was retarded or made more difficult by the non-unwatering of the canal?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** They had to dredge what they would have otherwise have done dry.

**Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell).** Was there any season of the year fixed in the contract when the canal was to be unwatered?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Yes. The contractors applied for permission to unwater the canal, and the department refused.

**Mr. MONTAGUE.** Where was the extra cost of the work on account of the non-unwatering of the canal?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** They made up a statement very

carefully, and satisfied the engineer. They had masonry work to do.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much masonry?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman. If he wants to know that—

Mr. MONTAGUE. We want to see the contract. The hon. gentleman has no particulars at all. He has simply a statement that the contractors filed a claim.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman wants that, I think it would be as well that we should postpone the further consideration of this item until I can get it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has not explained what the item of \$22,388 is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is for the interest from October 1, 1891, to July 1, 1900.

Mr. BERGERON. How did the interest run from 1891 to now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The claim, if it was a proper claim, was due on October 1, 1891. It continued from that date until the present unsettled. It has now been settled. The contractors have been allowed \$48,146, and the interest from October 1, 1891, to July 1, 1900, amounts to \$22,388, and in my opinion there could not be a more equitable settlement of a just claim. It would be just as well that I should get all the papers and give a plain history of the whole transaction.

Mr. BERGERON. What we want to know is how the Gilbert Dredging Company were not settled with in 1891—whether they asked for so much and their demand was refused, and how afterwards it came to be granted and we have to pay this interest.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have said already that the reason the claim stood over so long was because it was the opinion in the department that most of these items, if not all, were covered by the adjustment which took place on the date I stated a while ago, on April 19, 1894.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How did that opinion come to be reversed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because it came to be looked into. The engineer of the department went into the claim, and they came to a conclusion as to what they thought was a proper amount to be paid if the claim had not been settled by the adjustment of October 19, 1894. That was practically the question which came before me and upon which I had to decide. I took a decision and am quite prepared to furnish the committee with the evidence on which my decision was

reached. If the hon. gentleman wants all the details, I am prepared to stay here for a week in order to go into the matter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We are just as willing as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. This is really a very peculiar matter. These contractors have been contracting with the government a good many years, but in 1891, and in 1892, delays took place and they made a claim against the government. It does not stand to reason that these men could have had a claim against the government for \$40,000 \$50,000 or \$60,000 without pressing it upon the department. Then comes the information that in 1894, their claims were decided upon.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is an assumption on the part of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. The officers of the department were of that opinion, and their opinion ought to be allowed a good deal of weight. From 1894 to 1896, the late government was in power, and it is not reasonable to suppose that these men did not press their claims during that time. We come to 1900, and then the hon. gentleman makes a settlement by which \$70,000 was paid these contractors. That gives us ground for saying we must have all the information with reference to that settlement. It is not the first of these old claims that comes up.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And it will not be the last.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt; but we must be careful to have a proper explanation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is entirely within his right in asking for an explanation, and if a satisfactory explanation cannot be given the item ought not to pass, all I ask, however, is that the hon. gentleman will not jump to conclusions and draw inferences until he is put in possession of the facts. I have started out with the intention of furnishing all the information and furnishing it in a way in which it will be intelligible, if I am permitted to do so. When I mention what the items of these claims are, the hon. gentleman wants me to go into the minutes and details, which will confuse everybody unless the essential, important facts are first presented.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The essential and important facts are two. First, what is contained in the contract; and second, what settlement was made in 1894.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). What are the items of the principal, the \$48,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Here are the items:

	Claimed.	Allowed.
Plant idle .....	\$ 9,550	\$ 7,900
Reinforcing banks .....	11,377	11,250
Old stone in culverts.....	10,500	10,500
Lost by failure of government to unwater canal .....	13,111	11,958
Stone torn .....	2,464	1,766
Flooding .....	250	250
Preparing to start abandoned work .....	54	*
Balance due on unwatering.....	1,000	1,000
Filling behind retaining walls.	420	420
Wages to yearly employees.....	3,600	1,500
Backing to dimension stone used in repairs .....	5,470	*
Moving dredges .....	1,020	1,020
Working on the road.....	700	588
	<u>\$58,918</u>	<u>\$48,146</u>

\*Not allowed.

The contract entitled the contractors, according to their contention, to be paid for the loss of profits which resulted to them from the abandonment of the work which had not been done. That subject was taken up by the department, and a basis upon which that claim should be adjusted was agreed upon, and that claim was settled by awarding the contractors \$29,350. That was on April 19, 1894, and they gave the following receipt:

Received from Her Majesty the Queen the sum of \$29,350, in full of all claims in respect of the abandonment of parts of sections 5 and 8 and the whole of sections 6 and 7, and of the abandonment of the aforesaid sections on the Cornwall Canal of the Gilbert Blasting and Dredge Company against Her Majesty the Queen, as per letter of March 12, 1894, of A. Ferguson, Esq., their solicitor, as per order in council of March 28, 1894.

(Sgd) GILBERT BLASTING AND  
DREDGING CO.

(Per P. H. Gilbert),

Then Secretary and Treasurer.

Witness, A. Ferguson.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does not the hon. minister think that that meant an abandonment of claims of all kinds?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it meant only the claim arising out of the abandonment of the work. I say unhesitatingly that, in my judgment, and I have no doubt of it at all, it did not mean the abandonment of all claims.

Mr. MONTAGUE. From 1894 to 1896, was any claims made by these people?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were being preferred—yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They will be brought down to—they must have submitted a claim.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Undoubtedly, their claim was \$59,000. This is the letter of Mr. Ferguson, of March 12, 1894:

Mr. BLAIR.

March 12, 1894.

To the Minister Railways and Canals.

Sir,—With reference to the several interviews I have had on behalf of the Gilbert Blasting and Dredging Company with you and your deputy minister, on the subject of the claim of the company for loss of anticipated profits on the works of section 6 and 7 and parts of the works on sections 5 and 8 of the Cornwall Canal, the carrying out of which has been dispensed with by your department, as appears by letters dated February 24 and March 6, 1893, I am instructed by the company to say that they will accept the offer made to them by your department of 15 per cent of the value of the estimated work remaining to be done on said sections and so dispensed with, calculated at the prices for such work as shown in the contract between Her Majesty and the company. The value of said work at said prices upon which said percentage is to be calculated being \$190,000 or thereabouts, as stated by the officers of your department to the company. The claims, if any, of the company in respect of or arising out of works actually done will, of course, remain to be dealt with apart from this settlement.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) A. FERGUSON.

And on the basis of that letter, the government paid and took a receipt from the company for \$29,350. It must be apparent that the claim that arises for the loss of prospective profits would not, on the face of it and in the absence of the most conclusive evidence, cover claims for work done. And I have learned since coming into the department that 15 per cent is the rate which is universally recognized as the value put upon loss of anticipated profits. The value of that work was made up by the officers at \$196,000—that is where you get your \$29,000. You cannot find in that anything to cover the re-enforcing of the bank, for the loss resulting from their being prevented from taking out the old stone in the culvert and using it in the new work, for the loss resulting from the failure to allow the canal to be unwatered for the filling, for the balance due on unwatering, for the filling behind the retaining wall, for the removal of the dredges—all of which had accrued due, and not one of which could possibly be identified with the expected profits for the abandoned work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Other sums were paid to them in connection with this work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They did very considerable work and money was provided for them in the estimates from time to time. These were not things that would come into the estimates, and, at all events, were not paid. There is no pretense that the company paid for these things. And if they are reasonable claims they must be paid.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Under these circumstances, can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) explain how the department came to think that nothing was due?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not know that the engineer looked into the matter very carefully, but his opinion was that the \$29,000 covered everything. I confess I did not look into it at as early a period as they had a right to expect I would do, for it stood between three and four years. I, perhaps, had a little prejudice against the claim, because it had been standing, and because of the opinion of the chief engineer. But, they asked me to give them an opportunity to present their case, and when they presented it they impressed me. I think, if a man has a claim against the government and he satisfies me that it is a fair, correct and honest claim, it is my duty to say so.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Against the report of the engineer ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The engineer, when he came to look into the papers and consider them and heard the view which struck me with regard to the matter, came to the conclusion that he was wrong.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Did the chief engineer recommend the payment of \$29,000 ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Undoubtedly.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Then, he had in his mind that that covered everything ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The engineer settled and agreed upon 15 per cent, and there was not so much settlement about it, because 15 per cent is the customary rate. The engineer of the department determined the amount of work which would have been done under the contract if it had gone on, at \$196,000. When I spoke to him about the claim of the Gilbert Company, he was of opinion that it had been covered by the previous settlement of \$29,000.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Did everybody in the department think so ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I did not ask all the clerks in the department.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. The hon. minister need not get angry about it. I wanted to know the opinion of those who had anything to do with this claim.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The matter was one for the chief engineer. Of course, there was the outside engineer, Mr. Rubidge. I do not know what his opinion was on the question, I have never known that he expressed one.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. The first settlement was made on the report of the chief engineer ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I presume so.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Then, we ought to have that report.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. If there is a report of the chief engineer, we will certainly bring it.

Mr. **POWELL**. Where is provision made for the payment of the \$48,000 ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is to be covered by the vote here. The \$141,000 would include that with the final estimates.

Mr. **POWELL**. The \$141,000 really ought to be divided, it is misleading.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, the payment is to be made for the work under contract on the canal, a general vote is always taken for all this.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. What work is that ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The work of building the canal. If we had had the money a year ago it would have been paid before this. The \$141,000 is divided as follows : To pay Wm. Davis & Sons, final estimate, sections 1 and 2, \$16,000, new work to build regulating weir and protection to north bank, \$15,000 ; to pay Wm. Davis & Sons, final estimate, section 3, \$20,000 ; Wm. Davis & Sons, final estimate, section 4 and guard lock, \$18,000 ; Wm. Davis & Sons, final estimate, Shieks Island dam, \$5,300 ; Gilbert Dredging Company, final estimate, section 5, \$1,600 ; Gilbert Dredging Company, section 6, \$1,600 ; to pay claims, Gilbert Dredging Company, sections 5, 6, 7 and 8, \$49,000 ; to pay for guard pier for guard lock, \$6,000.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I think the member for Westmoreland is right in saying that in a case of that kind it is only fair to state definitely what is paid to Gilbert & Co. for a back claim. The idea you get when you ask a vote for the enlargement of a canal is that it is for work that is going on this year. But this is for a claim that was going on in 1891 and subsequently.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman must understand that these items do not represent work that was done this year. When you are closing up, it takes years to get your final estimates finally settled, to have them made up. We have had quite a staff employed in preparing final estimates for the Cornwall work. You will see from the items I have read that all the contractors upon the Cornwall Canal are only getting their final estimates paid this year. There are items that stand over in every contract.

Mr. **FOSTER**. This claim is largely for prospective profits, is it not ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. How can the hon. gentleman ask me that question seriously after what I have stated? I have repeated over and over again that the \$29,000 paid in 1894 settled the question of prospective profits. It must be three or four years since the Davis's struck a blow on the Cornwall Canal, yet the final estimates have only been made up this year for the work on that canal, and they are not all finished yet.

**Mr. CLANCY**. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that when a settlement was made for the \$29,000 the claims were before the chief engineer?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, and the superintending engineer.

**Mr. CLANCY**. That the settlement made for the \$29,000, to the mind of the chief engineer, covered all that.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. He was of the opinion that the payment of that amount covered everything.

**Mr. CLANCY**. And these claims were before him at that time?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

**Mr. CLANCY**. I understood the hon. gentleman to say they were.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. member misunderstood me because as a matter of fact they were not before the department at the time. The statement which I have of the matter is to the effect that after the settlement of the \$29,000 the contractors advanced their claim for the \$58,918. So it could not have been before him then.

**Mr. POWELL**. They were really before the department, but the settlement of the claim was in abeyance.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. You will see from the letter of Mr. Ferguson that they had not presented any claim, reserving their right to present a claim arising out of work actually done.

**Mr. MONTAGUE**. Is the hon. gentleman sure these claims were not before the department at the time of the \$29,000?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am so informed. I have a statement now in my hand from my deputy to that effect.

**Mr. MONTAGUE**. How could the deputy have thought that these claims were included in that statement?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. He supposed in a general way that the whole business was closed up. I

**Mr. FOSTER**.

must confess that I could not see sufficient ground upon which to base that conclusion, but he told me the reason why he had not looked more favourably upon the matter, and having the view which he had that the claim was already disposed of, when these gentlemen came from time to time, as they did to me, I felt it would be a waste of time probably for me to go into the matter. I put it off from time to time until this very last year. They asked to be allowed to state their case, which I did.

**Mr. MONTAGUE**. Does not the minister think it peculiar that the chief engineer would still remain under that conviction that the whole matter was settled. According to the minister's statements this company were pressing this claim all the time, and yet the deputy minister still held to the view that it was all settled in the old settlement.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I cannot say that I regarded it as so exceedingly strange because these people were still doing other work for the department. They had large transactions continuously with the department, and they naturally expected that the matters would be settled ultimately, and they did not press it as they would have done if they had closed up their business with the department and did not expect to get any more work from it. They were urgent enough with me since I came into the department, and I presume they were pretty urgent before.

**Mr. MONTAGUE**. I see the chief engineer nodding that they were quite urgent before the hon. minister came into the department.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

**Mr. MONTAGUE**. Does the chief engineer mean to say that the whole thing was settled, although these urgent representations were being made constantly? I have too much faith in the chief engineer for that.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have stated the facts as I know them.

**Mr. FOSTER**. In the adjustment the minister made of these claims were they referred to the engineers and officers of his department for analysis and report?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, the superintending engineer in my presence discussed these items with me.

**Mr. MONTAGUE**. Had there ever been reports before from these officers?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No. The superintending engineer made no report until I came in.

Mr. FOSTER. I mean after the report upon which the 1894 settlement was made. If you bring that report, and then bring the report upon which this settlement was made we will have the information before us.

Mr. POWELL. Were the remaining items of the \$41,000 disputed items?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I do not think they were. These came in under the final estimate in the ordinary way.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item will stand.

Carrying out the regulations concerning the health of employees under the Public Works (Health) Act, 1899 ..... \$5,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think that this item ought to be dropped.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). This is an item for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Act passed by parliament last session, for the preservation of health on public works. In accordance with the provisions of that Act, regulations were passed in January last to provide for the preservation of the health of employees on these public works. It is absolutely necessary that these regulations should be carried out. Without a small sum of money at the disposal of the government, it is impossible to carry out these regulations, or to provide for the performance of the necessary work under the provisions of the law. It is necessary that there should be a superintendent of the health of the employees on public works, and that certain provisions should be made in regard to the kind of accommodation to be provided by the contractor for employees. Under these regulations, contractors are obliged to provide necessary hospital accommodation, medical attendance, isolation accommodation in cases of contagious diseases, and it is necessary to have a superintendent to see that these provisions are carried out. It has been found on public works, particularly in the case of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, that some employees have come to an untimely end, owing to the prevalence of contagious disease, and that they have not been properly looked after by the contractors. It is to provide against occurrences of that kind that these regulations have been passed and it is necessary to provide for the proper enforcement of the regulations which I have mentioned.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. gentleman had better let the item stand, as there will be a good deal of discussion upon it. It is simply a question of appointing an officer. So far as preventing disease on public works, with an inspection costing \$5,000 is concerned, it is simply nonsense. If the hon. gentleman is going into the protection of public health on public works, he will require a vote of \$10,000 at the least.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think my hon. friend has not thought the matter out at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman tell me whom he proposes to appoint?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What officers does he propose to appoint?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The regulations require that there shall be a superintendent.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much does the hon. gentleman think he should be paid?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not quite sure. He will have to be paid a salary which will be sufficient to enable us to secure the services of a proper officer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. \$3,000?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think about that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then you have \$2,000 left.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, and then the superintendent has to pay his travelling expenses, as he will have to go to different works throughout the country. It may be that under certain circumstances, he will have to have an assistant to remain on particular works for a length of time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman sees that he will require a great deal more money than this. The only object of this is to put another government employee on the road.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The amount of money that is asked, I think, will be sufficient for the purpose of carrying out these regulations. The actual expense in regard to provisions, hospitals and sanitation has to be provided by the contractors. But at the same time for the purpose of seeing that this work is properly done, a certain amount must be at the disposal of the department. Suppose that the hon. gentleman's statement is correct, and that we will pay an official \$2,000, \$2,500 or \$3,000, I think the amount would be sufficient. The general superintendence of the medical part of this work will be in the hands of the Director General of Public Health, whose expenses will be paid out of this vote, in visiting public works where his presence may be necessary. With this vote there will be a proper supervision to see that the arrangements are enforced. I think this sum is sufficient for that, and by no means too large.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I can tell the minister that in the province of Ontario we do not want his Act. We have the very best system of public health so far as the boards

are concerned, both local and provincial. The greatest care is exercised by the boards of health, and they have the fullest authority. So far as Ontario is concerned this is absolute nonsense. The minister does not need to appoint any officer at all. He has Dr. Montizambert, and this is simply in order to create an office for some henchman of the government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No protection of the public health in this Dominion can be undertaken for \$5,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The object is not to look after the public health of the Dominion, but only the health of employees on public works. The object of the government is absolutely for the protection of the workmen and not for the purpose of creating appointments. As a matter of fact so little is that considered, that I have not the faintest idea to-day who the employee or employees may be. His duty will be to see that the provisions under these regulations are carried out on public works in the wilder portions of the Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. Would you send him to the Yukon?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We might if the Dominion were carrying on a public work there.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where in the wilds of Canada are these public works now being carried on?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are public works being carried on in the North-west Territories.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the minister mean that in the North-west Territories civilization has not sufficiently advanced to take care of the health of men there just as well as in Ontario?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What about the poor fellows on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That was not a government work, and this Act would not apply to it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It would. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) has not followed the terms of the regulations.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, let us have these regulations.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were published in the *Canada Gazette* on the 31st January last, and they have been within the reach of every hon. gentleman who chooses to look at them. The law was passed last session, and is on the statute-books of the country. There has been no-

Mr. MONTAGUE.

thing sprung upon the House or upon the hon. gentleman. He has had abundant opportunity of finding out everything in connection with the vote.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am decidedly opposed to this vote, because I think it is absolutely useless. The minister had better let it stand until we look into the matter more fully.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) is rather unreasonable, considering the time this resolution has been before the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman will not lose anything by letting it stand.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have no objection, but at the same time it is the last item in my main estimates, and I have twice asked that it be taken up. It was deferred before at the request of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague).

Mr. MONTAGUE. I want to look up the regulations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You have been away so much that you do not know what has happened.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have not been away. Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, it is not carried; and we will stay here and see about it now. Was the *Canada Gazette* distributed to the members?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are not in the habit of distributing the *Canada Gazette* to any one.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) is just a little too cute. That is altogether too small for the parliament of Canada. Regulations like these on which you ask a vote from this parliament should be on the Table of this House for members to see.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have never been asked for until this eleventh hour of the session. If the hon. gentleman had asked for a copy of the *Canada Gazette* he would have had it at any time. The regulations are now before the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The minister will save time by letting the item stand.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have no objection to letting it stand if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) wants to make an investigation regarding it, because I am quite satisfied that when he inquires into it he will be quite satisfied with it.

Committee rose, and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.25 a.m. (Thursday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, July 5, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—THE EMERGENCY RATION.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa), in moving that the report of the select committee appointed by this House to inquire into the purchase of emergency rations for the use of Canadian troops in South Africa, be adopted, said: Before dealing with the report itself I want to deal with several matters, some of which are personal to myself, and some of which refer more particularly to the Liberal members of the committee appointed to investigate this matter. During the course of the investigation I was singled out for considerable abuse by certain members of the committee, and by the press throughout the country which supports those gentlemen. I was charged with sundry crimes and offences, amongst others with endeavouring to curtail the investigation, with endeavouring to block it, and to prevent the truth from seeing the light of day. I was charged with being an unruly, ignorant and despotic chairman, and I was also charged with being ignorant, young and incapable, unsophisticated, and so on. As to the latter charges, of course, they have not prevented me from sleeping; nor did the other charges worry me much. I noticed that the charges became louder and more frequent according as it became more and more apparent from the evidence taken before the committee that the hon. member who made these charges (Mr. Monk) had signally failed in proving them. The charge to which I refer was levelled not only against myself, but against the Liberal members of the committee. I want to say here that all charges of that kind were absolutely without foundation, the insinuations were groundless, and there was no reason whatever to find fault with either the chairman or any Liberal member of the committee. Every facility was given to the hon. gentlemen to bring all the witnesses they chose, to hear all the evidence they desired to bring out, and to produce all the documents they could think of. The committee sat every day from half-past ten in the morning until eleven or twelve at night, and it did its labour with a great deal of celerity. Any one who will read the voluminous report of the evidence printed will see that it did its work well, that it did it thoroughly, and that it afforded every facility to every member to have a complete and thorough investigation.

There were one or two points upon which I did not agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) as to the con-

duct of the proceedings. I did, as I claim I had a right to do, both as a member of the committee and as its chairman, express my views on the subject, and I did so with firmness, and I think I may say with moderation. I did not, and do not now agree that the position of chairman of this committee should be reduced to the narrow and ridiculous limits which at one time the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, if he will pardon me for saying so, in rather an offensive manner, tried to assign to it. I did not agree that this committee was called upon to hear evidence concerning and to pronounce judgment upon rations in general, and to say what constitutes a bad or a good ration, and what a good or a bad ration should or should not contain. When it was attempted to prove what is the emergency ration in use in the British, in the French, in the German, or in any other army, when it was attempted to make this select committee an advertising medium for Hatch's Protose, for Bovril, for the 'Kleberbrod biscuits,' and for other various concoctions, I objected, as I conceived it my duty to do, and tried to keep the inquiry within the limits assigned to it by this House. When it was attempted to make witnesses give their opinion concerning the alleged negligence of the minister in reference to the matter under consideration, I claimed, as I do now, that that was the province of the committee alone, and that witnesses should not take the place of the committee in pronouncing such judgment, that the committee alone were competent and required to give their opinion and render a judgment upon the matters involved in the charge. These are, I think, the only two points upon which I then differed with any members of the committee. Upon all other points I endeavoured, as far as lay in my power as chairman, to afford every latitude, and to the best of my humble ability to assist the committee in every way in conducting this investigation. A great deal of irrelevant and immaterial evidence was introduced, as any member who has read the evidence will readily conclude. It was my right to prevent, or try to prevent, this immaterial or unnecessary evidence from being introduced, but I did not do so, I allowed the hon. gentlemen who went all over creation, every latitude and every facility. For instance, we had evidence to show what percentage of proteids is contained in all kinds of food, we had interminable evidence on that point. I could, if I had chosen, have prevented, or tried to prevent, evidence of that kind, because it was absolutely foreign to the charge, it was absolutely outside the limits of the inquiry.

Now, with reference to the charges, I was much surprised to hear the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who is a lawyer, who is a professor of one of the universities of this country—I am reminded that the hon. gentleman is a professor of constitutional law and that makes the matter all the worse

that he should have come before the committee and enunciated the most astounding proposition of law which I ever heard. I leave every member of this House, be he lawyer or layman, to judge for himself of the utter ridicule of the proposition of the hon. gentleman. When the relevancy of certain evidence was discussed, and I reminded the hon. gentleman that the committee was confined to certain limits, and was bound by the order of reference, the hon. gentleman boldly, not once, but half a dozen times, asserted that as a member of the committee he had a right to ask any witness any question on any subject that he chose. That is the proposition which the hon. gentleman started out with in this investigation, that is the proposition upon which he acted, and to which he pinned his faith and his conduct all through.

At the risk of being a little tedious I want to remind the hon. gentleman of some of the principles which govern matters of this sort. I want to quote to my hon. friend what Bourinot says at page 510, as to the right to depart from the order of reference in matters of this sort :

It is a clear and indisputable principle of parliamentary law that a committee is bound by, and is not at liberty to depart from, the order of reference. This principle is essential to the regular despatch of business ; for if it were admitted that what the House entertained, in one instance, and referred to a committee, was so far controllable by that committee, that it was at liberty to disobey the order of reference, all business would be at an end ; and, as often as circumstances would afford a pretense, the proceedings of the House would be involved in endless confusion and contests with itself.

Again, at page 378, May lays down the rule in very few words, but in very clear language :

Like committees of the whole House, select committees are restrained from considering matters not specially referred to them by the House.

Now, that is in reference to the position taken by the hon. gentleman. Then, we had another astounding proposition from my hon. friend, and that was concerning the duties of the chairman of a select committee of this sort. My hon. friend pretended that as chairman of that committee I had nothing else to do with the committee but to sit there, listen to the evidence, and if he, or some other gentleman, got, perhaps, a little bit too noisy, I was to be allowed to say, in a very meek and mild manner, 'order.' or use some such expression. That was about the role that the hon. gentleman wanted to assign to the chairman of the committee. Now, I want to remind the hon. gentleman of some of the elementary principles that should govern the duties of the chairman of a select committee of this House. If he will permit me, I will cite to him what Bourinot says on the subject, at page 503 :

It is the duty of the chairman to preserve order and enforce the rules. Committees are

Mr. BELCOURT.

regarded as portions of the House, limited in their inquiries by the extent of the authority given them ; but governed for the most part in their proceedings by the same rules which prevail in the House, and which continue in full operation in every select committee. Every question is determined in a select committee in the same manner as in the House to which it belongs. . . . The rules that govern the conduct of members in the House, should govern them when in the committee. . . . Members of the committee, however, should observe the rules of the House itself when they address the Chair.

Then, again, at page 251, in reference to the deciding of objections concerning the evidence, there is the following :

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) will allow me, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman's remarks would be quite in order if we were moving for a committee, or if we were discussing what its powers should be, but to go into this long discussion as to the rights of the committee—

Mr. BELCOURT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will have the right to reply. I have a perfect right to say what I wish to say. I am perfectly in order.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend—

Mr. BELCOURT. If the hon. gentleman wants to ask a question, I am prepared to answer.

Mr. FOSTER. I will ask the hon. gentleman a question, if he will take his seat.

Mr. BELCOURT. What is the question ?

Mr. FOSTER. The question is this ; as to whether he thinks it is in order or whether it is productive of speed and celerity, that, instead of making his motion for the adoption of the report and discussing the report, he should take up a long time in discussing the powers and duties of the committee ? That is the question I would like to put to him in the interest of the despatch of business.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am one of the few men in this House to whom the reproach cannot be addressed of taking up the time of the House unnecessarily, and it comes with very bad grace with the hon. gentleman who has interrupted me.

Mr. FOSTER. We will know exactly how to go on.

Mr. BELCOURT. Referring to the duties of the chairman of a committee of this sort, Bourinot, at page 251, said :

In case a member objects to a question on any ground, he must state his objections, and the Speaker will decide.

If the rules concerning this subject are applicable to select committees, then it is clear by this authority, that the chairman of the committee had the right and the duty to decide objections to the evidence when they were taken by any member of the com-

mittee. The hon. gentleman might have allowed me to finish without interrupting me, because this was all I had to say on these points. I want now to deal with the report itself. I think the first thing that ought to be done is to ascertain what was the matter which this committee was requested to investigate and report upon. The whole question was whether the food which had been tested at Kingston was the food which had been supplied to troops in South Africa. That is the whole question, the whole point, the whole case, and there is nothing else involved in the charge. It is true that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has thought fit to write about three pages of printed matter; he has padded and added to his charge ad libitum, but the whole gist of the case was whether the food supplied to the troops in South Africa was the food which had been tested at Kingston. In order that there may be no dispute about this, or any further question, I am going to leave it to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) to say whether that was the charge, whether there is anything else in the whole matter. When the subject was under discussion in this House on June 6 last, *Hansard* shows that the following took place :

The PRIME MINISTER. No, but the name of the purchaser who made the charge.

That was in answer to an interruption.

But now, I go one step further. Mr. Devlin sold a certain quantity of food for which he received \$4,600. He gave the Department of Militia a sample of the food which he sold. The Department of Militia analysed it—

That is evidently an error; the Prime Minister evidently meant the Department of Inland Revenue.

It was found to be accurate, it was found to be proper, and if that same food has gone to South Africa there is no complaint to be made.

These are the words made use of by the Prime Minister. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) interrupted him and said :

That is the whole point.

Whether the food tested at Kingston has gone to South Africa, and if so, there is no complaint to be made.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the whole point.

But now, let us see what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) himself said in the House as to the charge :

If I must now declare positively what my charge is, I will do so. I am satisfied from the statements that have been made from the other side of the House this afternoon, that the food supplied to our troops in South Africa was not the food tested at Kingston—that is my charge. Who are the guilty parties I do not know. I will refer to that presently. But I do charge that the food tested so carefully at Kingston, under the direction of the military authorities, was not the food, not one ounce of it, that was given to our troops in South Africa. That is the charge I now make, and I make it with

the full sense of my responsibility as a member of this House—

That is what the hon. gentleman said himself. He defined the issue, he clearly stated his charge, he definitely took his stand, and declared positively, in clear and unmistakable language, that that was the charge and the whole charge. As I have shown, the hon. ex-Finance Minister agreed with him, and declared positively that that was the charge. That is what the committee was called to investigate and to report upon. What are the facts shown by the evidence before the committee? I will refer to them briefly.

Dr. Devlin and Mr. Hatch, who were partners, in the winter of 1899 applied to the Minister of Militia to sell him some of this food for his department. They offered to carry on a test at Kingston on some of the men of the Royal Canadian Artillery, and the test was carried on and was declared to be highly satisfactory. I want hon. members to remember that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk), in making the charge, distinctly lays it down as indisputable, that the food which was tested at Kingston was of a highly satisfactory character and that it fully answered the purposes for which it was intended. That is the basis upon which my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) started, and that is the basis upon which this matter must be considered. Later on, I think in October, 1899, when the first Canadian contingent was being sent out, Mr. Hatch asked the minister to give him an order to supply the troops going to South Africa with some of this food. The minister did not think well of the proposition, and he refused to entertain it. Hatch, therefore, made an offer in October, which was not accepted. In December or January following, the offer was again renewed, this time, I think, by Dr. Devlin. Several visits were paid to Ottawa in order to induce the minister to give an order for the second Canadian contingent, which was about to leave. The minister at that time, as is shown by the evidence, had received reports from South Africa that the troops were being put to long and forced marches, that their rations had been cut down, and that there was considerable suffering on the part of the soldiers. The minister, with a laudable desire of helping our men in the field, with the desire of giving these men some additional food to rely on in case of emergency, considered the proposition which was made to him and which he had up to that time refused to entertain, namely, to supply the Canadian troops with some of this food. The Minister of Militia at that time, as every one knows, was an extremely busy man, and he had, perforce and in the usual way, to leave the matter to one of his officers, and so he called in the general director of medical affairs, who, it will be admitted, was the best man in his department

to have charge of a matter of this sort. The minister acquainted Dr. Neilson with the proposition which was made, and left the whole matter in his hands. Dr. Neilson was one of the gentlemen under whose supervision the test at Kingston had previously been made in March, 1899. Dr. Neilson knew from his own knowledge the quality of this food and whether it was susceptible of rendering assistance to our men in the field. The only recommendation, and the minister made that a distinct condition—an imperative stipulation—which the minister made to Dr. Neilson was that the food to be supplied to the troops was to be of the same character as the food which had been tested at Kingston and found so satisfactory. Dr. Neilson, to whom the matter was referred and who was fully aware of the nature of this food, then carried on the negotiations with Dr. Devlin. Dr. Devlin produced two samples, which were left with Dr. Neilson, accompanying the tender made by him. Dr. Devlin offered to supply a certain quantity of rations at a certain price. The negotiations were carried on between him and Dr. Neilson, and the contract was made. A great deal has been said before the committee to the effect that the contract was entered into with undue haste, that proper consideration was not given to the subject, and that in that respect the minister or some officer of the department was guilty of negligence. The House must remember that this was on the 4th January, and that the troops of the second contingent were to leave Halifax on the 20th of the same month. If the food were to be supplied, the contract had to be entered into at once, because from the time that Dr. Devlin was notified of its acceptance to the time the food had to be put on board the transport at Halifax, it left only eleven days remaining. One condition of the contract which I want to lay particular stress upon was, that Dr. Devlin undertook that if he failed to deliver the whole of the rations at Halifax on the day fixed, the contract was to be null and void, and he was to lose every cent which he had expended for the purpose of carrying out the contract. That is an important element in deciding whether the price that was paid by the government for the food was too high a price, considering the quality of the food. The food had to be put up in tins, it had to be packed in a certain way, it had to be shipped to Halifax and put on board the steamer before January 20. The evidence shows that Dr. Devlin delivered the goods in Halifax on the day appointed by the contract. On January 25—and I imagine hon. gentlemen opposite who were on the committee will lay some stress on that part of the evidence—on January 25, 1900, Mr. Hatch wrote a letter to the minister, claiming that the food in question was not the food which had been tested at Kingston, was of inferior quality, and was practically worthless. These gentlemen op-

Mr. BELCOURT.

posite have tried to make a great deal out of the fact that the minister did not acknowledge this letter, and it has been stated—untruthfully, I claim—that the minister took no action by reason of the receipt of this letter. I submit that the minister did take action, and the evidence discloses that at the very moment he and his officers were taking the necessary steps to ascertain if Dr. Devlin had performed his contract. The analysis which was made subsequently by Mr. Macfarlane, the government analyst at Ottawa, was one of the results of the receipt of this letter by the Minister of Militia. It was partly because he had this protest on the part of Mr. Hatch that the food was not what it was represented to be, that the minister afterwards ordered or sanctioned the analysis of the food by the officers of the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How long after the protest was received?

Mr. BELCOURT. The letter was written on January 25; I suppose it was received on the 26th or 27th, and the analysis was ordered on February 2, four or five days after the receipt of the letter.

Mr. CASGRAIN. By whom??

Mr. BELCOURT. The analysis was made by Mr. Macfarlane.

Mr. CASGRAIN. By whom was it ordered?

Mr. BELCOURT. It does not appear by whom it was ordered, but the letter asking for the analysis was from the Militia Department, and from Mr. Benoit, who was in charge of the samples, which he had taken from the consignment at Halifax. But, Sir, the best answer to Mr. Hatch's letter is the answer that Mr. Hatch's letter was not true. The food which was supplied to the Canadian troops was the food, or rather food of a similar kind and quality, as the food which was tested at Kingston. I submit that by the analysis which has been produced, it is proven clearly and conclusively that the food which was supplied to the Canadian troops was absolutely identical in character and quality with which the food was tested at Kingston.

The analysis of the Department of Inland Revenue showed that the sample upon which the contract was made contained 16 per cent of proteids, and that one of the samples taken from the consignment at Halifax and brought to Ottawa by Mr. Benoit, the secretary of the department, showed 16.18 per cent of proteids. This analysis is confirmed in every particular by the analysis of Dr. Ruttan. Dr. Ruttan was given three samples to analyse and he analysed three samples—I, N and E, sample I being a sample of the food which was tested at Kingston, N a sample of the food which was delivered at Halifax, and E a sample of the food which accompanied the tender of Dr. Devlin. Now, what was the result of the analysis of Dr.

Ruttan? That the food which was tested at Kingston, sample I, contained 13·17 per cent of proteids. That sample was sent to the Department of Militia previous to the test being made at Kingston, either by Dr. Devlin or Mr. Hatch, it does not appear which. It was contained in an envelope bearing the handwriting of Mr. Hatch, and was preserved by Mr. Benoit and kept in his drawer in the department until the time of this investigation. We have the uncontradicted evidence of Dr. Neilson that that sample was sent to the department by the very one who proposed to have the test made at Kingston, and before it was made.

Mr. ELLIS. Is that clearly established beyond peradventure?

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes, clearly established beyond any doubt whatever.

Mr. ELLIS. No.

Mr. BELCOURT. My hon. friend cannot say that unless he would say that the evidence of Dr. Neilson is unworthy of all belief. If he says that he must brand Dr. Neilson as a perjurer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MONK. Dr. Neilson says the absolute contrary.

Mr. BELCOURT. Dr. Neilson produced the envelope containing the food which was presented to him previous to the test, and on which it was proposed to have the food tested at Kingston.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What page?

Mr. BELCOURT. I have not the page. I assert, and I am willing to leave the case to stand on that, that Dr. Neilson stated positively that that envelope contained a sample of the food which was received previous to the test at Kingston, and which contained some of the food upon which the test was to be carried on. Now, what did the analysis of Dr. Ruttan show? That one of the two samples taken from the consignment delivered at Halifax contained 15·37 per cent of proteids, and that sample E, a small tin can which was left at the department accompanying the tender of Dr. Devlin, contained 18·01 per cent of proteids. So we have the food tested at Kingston containing 13·70 per cent, the food delivered at Halifax containing 15·37 per cent, and the sample furnished by Dr. Devlin at the time the contract was made containing 18·01 per cent. This proves conclusively that the food given to the troops going to South Africa was of a quality equal if not superior to that tested at Kingston and that contracted for; because the whole case is whether the food which Dr. Devlin delivered to the department was the food which was contracted for. If he delivered the food which he contracted for, there is not a tittle of foundation to the charges brought by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

and his whole case completely fails, and tumbles to the ground. As a further corroboration of the evidence of Dr. Ruttan, we have the analysis of Mr. Hersey of Montreal. Mr. Hersey, through Mr. Hatch, analysed a sample of the same food, taken out of the consignment to the soldiers and which was bought from Dr. Devlin or from Mr. Lyons, of Montreal by an agent of Mr. Hatch. Mr. Hatch wrote the letter of the 25th of January, and caused somebody to go to the store of Mr. Lyons, a druggist, where this food was put up, to purchase a can of it. A can similar in all respects to the cans sent to South Africa was purchased, and 75 cents was paid for four ounces. Hon. members will see at once that the retail price of this food in Montreal, as sold by Dr. Devlin, was \$3 a pound. This can was sent to Mr. Hersey, he analysed it, and it was found to contain 17·55 per cent of proteids. That was a sample of the same food as that delivered at Halifax. As against this clear and conclusive evidence, what have we got? We have nothing but a statement made by Mr. Hatch as to what the food tested at Kingston contained. Under oath Mr. Hatch stated that the food which had gone to Kingston to be tested on the soldiers there contained 50 or 60 per cent of proteids. We have nothing but his bald statement to that effect. He admits that that food was never analysed, and he admits that it is impossible to state the exact quantity of proteids in any food except by chemical analysis. Now, I submit that Mr. Hatch's statement cannot for one moment be accepted by this House, because it was flatly and most clearly contradicted by the witness Muir, who, as it appears by the evidence, is a political friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, a member of the Sir John A. Macdonald Club of Montreal. He testified that at the time the test was being carried on at Kingston, he had several conversations with Mr. Hatch concerning this food, and that in one of those conversations Mr. Hatch told him that the food sent to Kingston contained, not 50 or 60 per cent, but only 15 per cent of proteids. Mr. Hatch did not think proper to come and deny that statement; so that whatever propositions, whatever arguments hon. gentlemen opposite may choose to lay before the House, they are confronted with this uncontradicted evidence of Mr. Muir. And that evidence corroborates Dr. Ruttan's analysis with a very slight difference. It was shown in evidence that it was almost impossible to have two analyses of the same food exactly agree, because the percentage of proteids in a small portion of the food may be different from the percentage in another portion taken from the same can. The proteids do not mix with the other constituents of the food in exactly the same proportions in every component part. So that we have the evidence of Mr. Muir and

that of Dr. Ruttan corroborating each other, and establishing beyond peradventure that the food supplied to the troops was the same food of a quality not only equal but actually superior in quality to that which was tested at Kingston.

With reference to the price paid, I repeat that it is shown in the evidence that the retail price of this food in Montreal is \$3 per pound, and it was sold to the department for \$2. Hon. gentlemen opposite will tell the House that the price paid was too high because Dr. Devlin had made a customs entry at Montreal valuing the stuff he brought in at 30 cents per pound. But it is equally true that the foods which Mr. Hatch imported for the purpose of the Kingston test were also entered at the customs in Montreal. At what prices were these foods imported by Mr. Hatch entered?

Mr. CRAIG. Is that in the evidence?

Mr. BELCOURT. Certainly.

Mr. CASGRAIN. No.

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes; it is in one of the exhibits printed in the appendix. It will be found in a statement produced by Mr. White, collector of customs in Montreal, and if my hon. friend wishes it, I will read it to him.

Mr. McNEILL. It would be a great advantage to those who were not members of the committee, and enable us to follow the discussion very much better if the hon. gentleman would refer us to the page of the evidence.

Mr. BELCOURT. Page 276. This is the statement produced by the collector of customs at Montreal, in reply to an order of the committee asking him to furnish a statement containing all the entries of emergency rations, and so on, entered for customs duty at Montreal during the years 1899 and 1900.

Statement of the importations of emergency rations by Hatch & Co., at Montreal, during 1899-1900. Entry 19262, country of produce, Germany; description, other bread stuffs; net weight of goods, eighty pounds; price per pound, 2½ cents; value, \$2; amount of duty paid, 40 cents.

May 26, 1899, entry No. 97259, imported from Germany, bread stuffs, 275 pounds, 21·46 cents.

June 9, 1899, No. 11242, imported from Germany, other bread stuffs, 25 pounds, 28 cents per pound.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Will my hon. friend allow me a question? Is it not a fact that Mr. Hatch swore that these matters were what he called dilutants, that is stuff in which he put the protein, but not the protein matter at all?

Mr. BELCOURT. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. Mr. Hatch said that the dilutants were got from Fraser & Viger, Montreal, and were not imported. But that does not make much difference. I am answering the argument which I knew is going to be advanced, that because Dr. Devlin en-

tered this food in the customs at 30 cents per pound, that shows conclusively that the price was too high. But that argument will not stand because Mr. Hatch imported himself these same foods and entered them in the customs at 2½ cents, 21 cents and 28 cents per pound. Mr. Hatch does not say that his food is only worth \$2 per pound. On the contrary, he is selling it in Montreal at \$5 per pound, and later on, as the evidence shows he offered, after this contract was entered into, to supply the Minister of Militia with his food, and Mr. Hatch's price was \$2, with a discount of 10 per cent, provided a large quantity was taken. The customs' entry made by Dr. Devlin, in the light of Mr. Hatch's evidence, and of the entries made by him as shown above, will not in any way prove that the price paid is exorbitant.

I have dealt with the principal points of the evidence as briefly as I could, and I want now to refer to a portion of the minority report. That report bears on its face the stamp of unfairness and injustice to the Minister of Militia.

Mr. McNEILL. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? He said that the director of the stores had stated that this powder was inclosed in an envelope addressed by Mr. Hatch.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not say that.

Mr. McNEILL. Then my hon. friend does not say so?

Mr. BRITTON. Dr. Neilson said that the writing on the back of the envelope was, in his opinion, Mr. Hatch's handwriting.

Mr. McNEILL. What I find here is this statement—

Mr. BELCOURT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to go on? He has no right to interrupt. I say that the report of the minority cannot possibly be accepted, and before leaving that point, I wish to protest against the conduct—I will not say of which member of the committee, as I do not know who committed the indiscretions and the breach of faith. The report of the minority was handed over to the press against the agreement entered into among themselves by the members of the committee. The morning after that report was submitted to the committee, it appeared in the Conservative press, contrary to the agreement I have referred to. But aside from that agreement altogether, to have handed that report over to the press, was a distinct breach of the privileges of this House.

The report of the minority cannot be accepted, if for only two reasons. It is stated in that report that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), was prevented from proving how the money borrowed by the contractor was paid or chequed out. That is absolutely without foundation, it is a gratuitous assertion which is not only un-

Mr. BELCOURT.

founded, but actually and clearly disproven by the printed evidence. There is absolutely nothing in the evidence to warrant such a finding. On the contrary, the evidence shows clearly that such a finding is not only untrue, but deliberately malicious. Let me refer to the evidence, and I will not trouble the House with many quotations. On page 154, in the examination of Mr. Ramsay, the manager of the Merchants Bank of Canada, in Montreal, he gave the following evidence. He had previously sworn that some \$1,600 had been borrowed by Mr. Lyons, in order to enable Dr. Devlin to carry out his contract :

By Mr. Monk :

Q. Do you know how it is chequed out, this sum of \$1,600 ?—A. I don't.

Q. Do the books of the bank show how it is chequed out ?—A. They don't. They would show that certain—the books of the bank would show that a certain sum of money, the proceeds of these notes, went to the credit of Mr. John F. Lyons. They would show that certain cheques of \$100, \$500, \$50 or whatever they may have been were paid. They would not show to whom payable or to whom paid. The vouchers would be returned to Lyons in the ordinary course of business, that is to say, the cheques. I could not give you the information.

Does it follow from that, that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was prevented from finding how the money was chequed out? Mr. Ramsay himself says: 'I could not give you the information.'

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt)—

Mr. BELCOURT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) will have an opportunity to answer me.

Mr. MONK. I will ask the hon. gentleman to read—

Mr. BELCOURT. I will read what he wishes if the hon. gentleman will sit down.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. member for Ottawa allow me to ask him a question? Will he read from page 153, where we endeavoured to enter into that question?

Mr. BELCOURT. I will finish what I have, and then I will read page 153, if the hon. gentleman wants it.

Q. But we would know conclusively how the money went out. The money from melting these notes, we would know what amounts went out, would we not ?—A. Yes, if you could identify the amounts with this matter under investigation.

Q. I mean, Mr. Ramsay, at the time of melting or discounting these notes he had no money to his credit in the bank, that note would have been put to his credit, and the payments out of that amount of \$1,200 would show in what proportions that was paid out, although it would not show to whom it was paid ?—A. It would only so far be right, inasmuch as other transactions were taking place and other moneys were doubtless standing to the credit of the account and some was standing to the credit of the account before these notes were discounted.

Q. But you do not know ?—A. I think my impression is correct in that respect.

By Mr. Clarke :

Q. When these notes were discounted they were passed through Lyons' account ?—A. Yes.

Q. And he chequed them out ?—A. Just so.

By Mr. Russell :

Q. But you cannot appropriate any cheques to this discount or to any other credit or deposit he had ?—A. Certainly not.

That is the manner in which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was prevented from learning how the money borrowed by the contractor was paid or chequed out, which the report presented to this House by the minority deliberately says he was so prevented. That statement is based on a falsehood—it is based on no evidence; it is a statement which is absolutely contradicted by the evidence. Now the hon. gentleman asked me to read at page 153. It is true I did take objection that it was not possible for the manager of the bank to see how this \$1,600 had been appropriated, and I did not consider the questions asked were relevant to the inquiry, and one having the slightest knowledge of the manner of recording banking transactions in all our banks would know that the manager of the bank could not possibly tell from the books if these moneys were appropriated to this contract of Dr. Devlin—or how it was expended by Devlin or by Lyons. At page 153 is the following :

Mr. Monk.—Well, I must state to the committee that I desire to ask this witness to file and produce before the committee an extract from the bank books showing how this sum of \$1,200, and the further sum of \$400 was expended. I brought up this witness for this purpose. I want to prove that the bank advanced \$1,200 and afterwards \$400 to Dr. Devlin, and how these two sums amounting to \$1,600 went out of the bank, how that was chequed out, and to whom it was paid as far as the witness knows. That is the danger and I think it is germane to this inquiry.

The Chairman.—I suggest you ask the witness whether he can or not.—

'Whether he can or not.' That is the kind of objection that these gentlemen take so much offence at. Was that the act of an unruly and despotic chairman? Does that justify the gratuitous and malicious assertion of this minority report that the members of the committee were prevented from proving how this sum was expended? I simply asked that the hon. gentleman should first ask the witness whether he could or could not state how this money was paid out.

Question objected to by Messrs. Campbell, Russell and Britton.

The Chairman.—I rule, I do not think it is material; I do not think it is necessary; I do not think it is pertinent to the inquiry.

But these gentlemen had held a club over my head too often, claiming that I was ruling out evidence unfairly. I was not willing to allow them the slightest pretext for attack, which I knew they would be slow in taking, and I took it upon myself

to put the question to Mr. Ramsay and got his answer, as follows :

By the Chairman :

Q. Do you know how that money was expended?—A. I don't.

What more conclusive evidence does the House want of the unfairness, maliciousness and injustice of the report of the minority?

Now, in another particular, the report of the minority shows itself absolutely unfair, unreliable and worthless; and that in suppressing, deliberately suppressing, all reference to the analysis made by Dr. Ruttan of the food tested at Kingston. In the minority report, these gentlemen took the greatest care to eliminate every particle of evidence which established that the food tested in Kingston contained only a fraction over 13 per cent protein. On the other hand, the attempt is made to lead the reader of the report to infer that the food tested at Kingston contained a much larger percentage of protein than than shown by the analysis of Dr. Ruttan. For these two reasons, the report of the minority stamps itself as unfair, unjust and altogether unworthy of serious consideration.

Now, I wish to remind the House that it was never contemplated by the minister or any officer of the Department of Militia, that this food was to be relied upon exclusively by the troops in South Africa. It was distinctly stated that, because of the forced marches which the troops were engaged in, and because the rations were being cut down by the British authority, the Minister of Militia wishing to furnish something that would be of additional assistance in the case of need in the field, recommended the purchase of this food as an addition to the rations to be supplied by the imperial authorities. There is nothing in the evidence to show whether the food sent to South Africa has been found satisfactory in the field or not—there was no evidence submitted to the committee on that point. The only evidence we have—and I give it for what it is worth—is the evidence that has appeared in the newspapers in the form of letters received from South Africa. In those letters it appears distinctly that the soldiers who have used the food found it a wholesome food and one on which they could, on occasion, rely with confidence.

Mr. DAVIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman if there is any evidence that the soldiers in South Africa used this food?

Mr. BENNETT. No, they are all alive.

Mr. BELCOURT. Only the evidence which can be got from letters received from men in the field. I mention that for what it is worth—there was no evidence before the committee. There is no complaint of the food, and what evidence we have from men in the field shows that it was found satisfactory.

Mr. BELCOURT.

Mr. McNEILL. Do the letters received refer to the emergency ration?

Mr. BELCOURT. So I understand. If you read Dr. Neilson's evidence, you will see that he states so distinctly.

I do not wish to take up more time than is necessary, but I must refer to paragraphs 17 and 18 of the charges made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). He states distinctly that the food supplied by Dr. Devlin was entered in Montreal free of duty under the direction of the government. Now, the evidence is absolutely to the contrary. The officers of the Department of Militia were applied to for a permit or certificate to allow these goods to be passed without duty, but the department refused to give it.

The collector of customs at Montreal, on his sole responsibility, allowed these goods to come in without paying duty. Now, I cannot for a moment conceive how the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, knowing the gravity of that charge, knowing the consequences of making an accusation of that sort against a colleague in this House and a minister of the Crown, could possibly have made that charge, how he could have deliberately sat down and wrote the statement contained in paragraph 17. A simple examination of the books of the customs-house in Montreal, or two minutes' conversation with the collector of customs there, would have satisfied him that the charge was absolutely without foundation, that no dues were collected by the collector at Montreal, not on an order of an officer of the department, but simply on his own responsibility. With reference to the next paragraph, paragraph 18, the hon. gentleman alleges that the price of the goods, \$4,600, was paid before the goods were delivered. There again, the simplest inquiry from the officers of the Department of Militia would have satisfied the hon. gentleman that that charge was without the slightest foundation. The goods were contracted for on January 4; an application for payment was made some time towards the end of the month, after the goods were delivered. The department refused to pay for the goods until an analysis was made by the Inland Revenue Department, and until it was shown that the food supplied was of the same quality as the food tested at Kingston and the food contracted for by Dr. Devlin. The analysis was ordered on February 2, and it was only twelve days afterwards, and when these samples had been analysed by the official analyst on February 14, that the goods were paid for. The hon. gentleman could have discovered that by merely going into the office of the minister and asking him or any of the officers of the department on what date these goods had been paid for, but he did not take that precaution, and, in order to make political capital, in order to injure an opponent, a minister of the Crown, he deliberately puts it down in writ-

ing, when the slightest inquiry on his part, even an examination of the papers brought down to this House would have shown how foundationless the charge was.

Now, I was taunted before the committee with being a self-elected chairman. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, on one or two occasions, in language which was any thing but friendly and parliamentary, called me a self-elected chairman, referred to me as 'this man,' this self-elected chairman.

Mr. MONK. I beg to contradict the hon. gentleman, I never used any such expression.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Nor did I.

Mr. BELCOURT. With reference to that, Mr. Speaker, the position was this: I was the last member of the committee to arrive at the meeting on the morning we organized. I understood from my colleagues then that it was their desire I should act as chairman, and when the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) proposed me as chairman, I did not vote one way or the other, I simply allowed the motion to go without voting. Now, I say that to be taunted with being a self-elected chairman, with taking that position with the intention of blocking the inquiry, was a most unfair charge, and it came with extreme bad grace and bad task from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who, in this matter, was prosecutor of this charge, counsel for the prosecutor and now poses as an impartial judge.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have done with dealing with this report. I think the report of the committee is one which will commend itself to the good judgment of this House and of the country, and I have no doubt that it will be adopted by the House. In my opinion all the evidence shows a laudable desire on the part of the Minister of Militia and Defence to give our troops in South Africa an additional food; and in this connection I want to remind hon. gentlemen that Dr. Ruttan himself stated before the committee that this was a good and wholesome food, and likely to be useful.

Mr. CASGRAIN. He did not say it was likely to be useful.

Mr. BELCOURT. He said it was a good, wholesome food. The Minister of Militia and Defence, with a laudable desire to give our soldiers in South Africa something upon which they could rely in case their ordinary rations gave out, made this contract with Dr. Devlin. I am not very much concerned whether the price was twenty-five cents or fifty cents more than it should have been, though I do not think the price was very exorbitant when we consider the circumstances under which the contract was made, and the short time which the contractor had to procure and deliver the goods. But, supposing the price was high, I say that the Minister of Militia

and Defence will have rendered a good service to our brave boys in South Africa if that food proves effectual in saving them from suffering, if it will in the slightest relieve them of the many hardships which they are now undergoing, whilst they are covering themselves with glory; if it is effectual in saving only one life, even two dollars a pound would make it a cheap food. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has wholly failed in proving his charges against the Minister of Militia and Defence. He has brought them without reflection, he has brought them lightly, without a proper sense of the duties that one member of this House owes to another, that one citizen of this country owes to another, or to a representative of the Crown. He has done so without seeking any information, but with only a morbid desire—a desire which is shared by a number of hon. gentlemen opposite—of finding some mud which he can throw at gentlemen on this side of the House. The general elections are approaching, and those gentlemen are in need of a scandal, and they think if they can discover some kind of a scandal, no matter how baseless, no matter how small, it is going to help them. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and his friends opposite that they will have to try again. They have not got in this matter of the emergency food rations anything like a scandal, they have not got any cry upon which they can get any votes, because I believe the electors of Canada have made up their minds as to the value of the charges made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier against the Minister of Militia and Defence. They have seen how baseless, how unjust, how unfair and how malicious these charges are in so far as they concern or in any way relate to the Honourable the Minister of Militia. I therefore beg leave to move the adoption of the following report of the select committee:

The committee beg leave to present the following as the result of its inquiry and as its second and final report:—

1. That the gist of the charges against the Minister of Militia is, that having had experiments made at Kingston with a certain article of food, the basic element of which consisted of proteids in certain proportions, which experiments demonstrated the utility of the food as an emergency ration, the Minister of Militia negligently allowed a different and inferior article to be supplied to the troops in South Africa.

2. The official analysis of the food supplied to the troops shows that it contains 16.8 per cent of proteids. The sample forwarded to the Director General of Medical Affairs, as and being a sample of the food on which the test at Kingston was to be made, is found on analysis by Dr. Ruttan to contain only 13.7 per cent of proteids, and Mr. Hatch, by whom the food for the tests at Kingston was supplied, is proved by evidence which he has not contradicted to have admitted to Mr. Muir, of the firm of Torrance & Muir, of Montreal, that it contained only 15 per cent. There is no other evidence as to the actual

constituents of the food supplied at Kingston excepting the direct statement of Mr. Hatch, which the committee feel justified in wholly rejecting, first, because it is in conflict with the evidence afforded by Dr. Ruttan's analysis; secondly, because it is in conflict with his own admission, proved by uncontradicted evidence and made to Mr. Muir at a time when he had no motive to misrepresent the facts; and thirdly, because on cross-examination he admitted that the food used at Kingston had never been analysed.

3. The committee, therefore, find that the food tested at Kingston and that sent to South Africa were substantially the same article, the slight difference between them, established by the analysis, being in favour of the food sent to South Africa. This was in accordance with the directions of the Minister of Militia, who had expressly stipulated that the food to be furnished to the troops should be the same as that tested at Kingston. The execution of this order was necessarily and properly left with the officials of the department. The medical director became absolutely responsible for the adoption of the standard sample supplied by Dr. Devlin as being equal in every respect to the food that had been used by him at the test in Kingston, and the goods furnished were not paid for until it had been ascertained by actual analysis that they were equal to the sample by which they were sold. The statement made in the charge that they were paid for before they were delivered is wholly without foundation, as the delivery was made at Halifax on the 19th and 26th of January, while the payment was not made until the 14th day of February.

4. The charge of negligence, founded on the alleged omission of the Minister of Militia to take any action on the letter from Mr. Hatch of January 25, alleging that the food sent to South Africa was not the same as that used in the Kingston test, is equally without foundation.

The minister had understood that the standard sample in the office was a portion of the actual supply used at Kingston and when, in response to his inquiries, made after the receipt of the letter, he learned that steps were being taken to compare the sample with the food actually supplied, he had done all that was called for by a similar letter, as he has sworn to numerous other complaints from disappointed applicants for contracts.

5. As to the price paid for the food, it is to be considered that it was a proprietary article, involving in its production a trade secret and supplied under circumstances of great urgency, which exposed the contractor to all the risk of having the whole product thrown on his hands without a market for his goods, if any one of a number of contingencies should prevent him from delivering them within the eleven days at his disposal.

The ingredients of the food supplied, so far as they consisted of materials imported from abroad, were entered for duty at thirty cents a pound; the imported materials that entered into the food prepared by Mr. Hatch, as shown by the return of the collector of customs, submitted under order of the committee, were entered by him all the way from two and a half cents per pound, to twenty-eight cents per pound, which is the highest price shown for the ingredients by any of the evidence before the committee. Yet, Mr. Hatch's selling price, according to his offer to the Minister of Militia, was substantially the same as that of Dr. Devlin, and it is in evidence that the retail selling price of Dr. Devlin's food was three dollars a pound.

6. The committee find that the food supplied at Kingston was not used as an exclusive ration,

Mr. BELCOURT.

and that the medical director did not approve of that food or recommend the purchasing of similar food by the government with a view that it should be depended upon as an exclusive ration. It was meant to be supplementary to other rations to be supplied, and the labels on the goods actually furnished contained distinct notice that it was not to be exclusively depended upon but requires to be supplemented by other food constituents.

7. As to the statement that the substance brought in from the United States was, under the direction of the government, allowed to pass without payment of customs dues, the committee find the same to be wholly without foundation. The collector of customs at Montreal allowed the first lot to go out of his control without payment of duty, upon the undertaking of the importer to produce a certificate from the Militia Department. No such certificate was produced and yet several days afterwards a second lot was allowed to go out, also without payment of any duty. The committee considers that the action of the collector, in allowing the first lot to pass without payment of duty was excusable under the circumstances and on the representations made to him by the importer. In allowing a second lot to pass without the production of any certificate for the first lot, and in wholly failing and neglecting for nearly six months either to collect the duty or to report the facts to the Minister of Customs the committee considers his conduct wholly indefensible.

8. The committee finds that the Minister of Militia in supplying our soldiers with the food in question, acted with a laudable desire to lessen the hardships they should have to endure on account of forced marches and scarcity of rations, by giving them a supply of valuable food put up in small and convenient packages, easily carried and which as indicated in the instructions issued to the medical officers of the transports, was not to be regarded as a substitute for other food, but to be available as 'a light and compact ration' 'of great value' 'on occasions when extraordinary exertion is called for.'

The committee for the reasons set out is of the opinion that the said Frederick D. Monk has failed entirely to prove his charges against the Honourable the Minister of Militia, and that the said charges were based on a misconception of the facts and upon authority which slight investigation would have shown to be wholly unreliable.

All which is respectfully submitted, together with the minutes of the proceedings of the committee, the minutes of the evidence and all the exhibits.

N. A. BELCOURT,  
Chairman.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that all the words after 'That' in the main motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor:

After due consideration of the report of the proceedings had by the select committee appointed to inquire into the purchase of emergency rations for the use of the Canadian troops in South Africa, of the evidence adduced and of the exhibits filed before said committee, this House is of the opinion that there can be no doubt from the evidence adduced that long before January, 1900, the products of Henri Hatch were well known to the department and to the Minister of Militia himself and that these were the only foods which up to the beginning of January, 1900, were ever mentioned to the department or the minister in connection with emergency rations.

As far back as the summer or fall of 1898, Henri Hatch forwarded to Dr. Neilson, director general of medical service at Ottawa, samples of protein vegetal, which at that time was already called and known by the name of 'Hatch's Protose,' although this name was only registered at a later date.

In October or November, 1898, according to Dr. Borden's statement, Dr. Devlin, at the Windsor Hotel, in Montreal, introduced Henri Hatch to him as a food specialist (Dr. Borden's evidence, p. 34), and Hatch swears that at the said interview, the minister thanked him for having sent samples of his food to the department and promised to test it at Kingston or St. John on living soldiers (Hatch's evidence, p. 50). Subsequently in December, 1898, or January, 1899, Henri Hatch had a long interview with Dr. Borden in the cars on the train from New York to Montreal, when again the subject of conversation was exclusively Hatch's product and the test which was to be made of it at Kingston.

As will be seen by the record, Henri Hatch on October 16, 1899, wrote a letter (Exhibit 10) to the Hon. Dr. Borden, and on the 25th of the same month, another to Dr. Neilson (Exhibit 31) in relation to his food; these letters are written on paper bearing the heading 'The Hatch Protose Company,' were received by the persons to whom they were addressed, were official communications and as such filed in the Department of Militia.

On October 24, 1899, the Minister of Militia signed and caused to be sent to 'The Hatch Protose Company, 10 Richmond Square, Montreal,' a letter thanking the latter for their offer of emergency rations, and declining it.

Dr. Neilson swears that as far back as February 15, 1899, he was in correspondence with Henri Hatch and that on that day the minister sent me a letter and some other matter which he received from Mr. Hatch. This referred to protein vegetal and there was an analysis of this substance and testimonials concerning this substance. . . . It was an analysis made at McGill by Prof. Ruttan.

(Neilson's evidence, p. 112.)

The copies of the affidavits sworn to by the five soldiers who tested the food in Kingston, which are of record and which are reprinted in a pamphlet entitled 'Protose,' manufactured by the 'Hatch Protose Company,' all refer to the food tested under the names 'Hatch Protose Powder,' 'Hatch's Protose Bread' and 'Hatch's Protose Biscuits'; these copies and the said pamphlet were filed in the department shortly after the test at Kingston and were seen by the minister (Borden's evidence, p. 38, and exhibits 15, 40, 47, 48, 49 and 50).

The pamphlet in question (Exhibit 15), is an advertisement of 'Protose,' describes and praises its principal qualities, contains divers certificates from persons who used a food described as 'Hatch's Protose' and also a report addressed to Henri Hatch of an analysis dated June 3, 1898, of Henri Hatch's Protein Vegetal by Dr. Ruttan, of McGill University, Montreal, which showed the excellent qualities of the composition both as to strength in proteids and digestibility.

From the several interviews between Dr. Borden and Henri Hatch, the letters received by the former from the latter and written by the Minister of Militia, the documents produced and the whole circumstances established in evidence, it fully appears that the Minister of Militia was perfectly right when he stated in the House on June 5th instant that 'the name of the food was 'Protose' ('Hansard,' p. 6988); it is also evident from the foregoing that it was well

known that Henri Hatch was the sole manufacturer thereof.

Secondly. Before the first contingent sailed, the agent of Bovril, Limited, offered to supply emergency rations to the Department of Militia, but was told the government were not purchasing any. The price of the Bovril emergency ration is \$4.10 a dozen cartridges, each cartridge containing 8 ounces, which makes 6 pounds to the dozen or 70 cents a pound. On two other occasions, the manager of Bovril, Limited, interviewed the Minister of Militia, before the sailing of the first contingent and Dr. Neilson, before the sailing of the second contingent and offered to supply emergency rations, but was informed that the government were not purchasing any.

Thirdly. The evidence shows that on January 3, 1900, one Dr. Devlin, of Montreal, caused to be printed at the 'Herald' Job Printing Office, in the said city (see evidence of Sharp, p. 154, and exhibits No. 17 and 18), a certain label of which the label on exhibit 5 is a reproduction and which reads as follows:—

'Vitallin Vegetable Proteid food. Three days rations for a soldier. One-half ounce to an ounce every four hours, four times a day, mixed in water at temperature not lower than 70° Fahrenheit. Beef tea, milk, light broths or soups. Take three or four biscuits to a meal or half a pound of bread per day. On this diet, with tea or coffee, Canadian soldiers have lived in perfect health 21 to 30 days.

'Vitallin Co., Montreal, Canada.'

The sample tin containing the powder and which is marked exhibit 5, was shown by Dr. Devlin to Dr. Neilson and upon the assurance by Dr. Devlin that 'Vitallin' and the protein vegetal tested at Kingston were identical, Dr. Neilson recommended it to the Minister of Militia to be used as an emergency ration. On the same day, without any further inquiry or investigation, and without any analysis to show the identity of the food on the sole assurances and representations of the contractor, the Minister of Militia approved Dr. Neilson's recommendation and the department thereupon gave an order to the said Dr. Devlin for 2,333 pounds of the substance to be divided into 7,000 tins, representing 5 days' rations for each man of the second Canadian contingent. The reason assigned by the minister for supplying the said contingent with the said rations, was in his own words as follows:—'Later on experience showed, by the telegrams received in this country, I think in December, that hardship had been experienced by troops, some of our own, on long marches, because they ran out of food, of the regular rations supplied by the Imperial government, the army authorities, and it was then suggested that it might be advisable to supply a small quantity of extra rations. It was to be understood that these rations were not to displace any supplies of the Imperial government, as a matter of fact, they did not displace any supplies of the Imperial government, that is to say our troops who were provided with these rations would go into the field with everything that the Imperial government would supply under any circumstances and which they supplied to our own troops, and in addition carried this emergency ration in case the ordinary supplies gave out, so that they would have something to rely on.'

(Borden's evidence, p. 32.)

The substance furnished to the Department of Militia was subsequently put into 7,000 tins by the said Dr. Devlin at the drug store of one John T. Lyons, situated at the corner of Bleury and Craig Streets, Montreal, which tins were labelled as follows:—

'Emergency rations, Vegetable Proteid Powder.

'One ounce or two tablespoonfuls four times a day in beef tea, milk, broths or light soups or water at a temperature not lower than 70° Fahrenheit. Take with powder three slices of bread or four or five biscuits, tea or coffee. 'Vitallin Co., cor. Craig and Bleury Streets, Montreal, Canada.'

(Exhibit No. 4.)

Fourthly. The said tins were put into large wooden boxes labelled 'Vitallin' (see Capt. Benoit's evidence, p. 217) shipped to Halifax, the said John T. Lyons going to Halifax with the boxes. It is not clear whether the rations in question were sent to South Africa in two batches or three, but from the evidence and documents your committee infer that they were shipped on January 20 and 27 by the ss. 'Pomeranian' and 'Laurentian.' Captain Benoit, secretary of the Department of Militia, who was at Halifax at the time, secured two tins from the boxes for his own satisfaction and without any instructions to that effect (see his evidence, p. 216) and filed them in the department on February 2 with a recommendation to have the contents analysed to see whether the food was similar to sample. The said rations could not have reached South Africa before February 20.

The sample brought back from Halifax by Capt. Benoit, and the sample furnished to the department with the tender, were subsequently analysed by Thomas Macfarlane, chief analyst of the Inland Revenue Department, and found to contain, the former 16.88 per cent of protein or nutritive substance and the latter 16 per cent. The report of the said analyst states that 'since the average percentage of proteids in wheat is 12, it does not appear that this proteid powder is a very concentrated food or is entitled to its name, or has a food value equivalent to \$2 per pound.'

This report was filed in the Department of Militia on February 12, 1900, and the department thereupon, on the 14th of the same month, paid the said Dr. Devlin the sum of \$4,666, being at the rate of \$2 per pound, upon the powder supplied to the troops.

Your committee was deprived of the evidence of the said Thomas Macfarlane, because, as was stated, he was then on the high seas on a voyage to Europe.

Fifthly. On January 25, 1900, Henri Hatch sent to the Minister of Militia a registered letter, which the latter admits he duly received; the terms of this letter are as follows:

The Hatch Protose Co.,  
10 Richmond Street,  
Montreal, Jan. 25, 1900.

Your Excellency.—I just happen to hear of a large purchase of 'protose' food from Messrs. Devlin & Lyons, of this city, for the Canadian contingent. If such is the case, I consider it to be my right and duty to inform you that such a supply can only rest upon a poor and fraudulent adulteration of my 'Protose,' as it was done without my knowledge and has nothing in common with the product tested in Kingston last spring. This will be easily detected by analysis of the food supplied, to which end I intend to take the necessary steps in order to protect my interests. A sample of mine could, of course, have been easily obtained from any druggist, but the articles, if already supplied, are not mine, and cannot be identical with those used at the military test. This I thought advisable to bring to Your Excellency's knowledge, for any emergency.

Your humble servant,  
HENRI HATCH.

Mr. MONK.

To His Excellency Dr. Borden,  
Ottawa.

Your committee are of the opinion that this letter, bearing upon a contract made with the Department of Militia and concerning a purchase of emergency food to be supplied to the troops, was of its nature a public document. It does not seem to have been filed in the department by the minister, nor does he seem to have mentioned its contents to any one except to Dr. Devlin, the contractor, on or about the date of its reception, and to the deputy minister on or about the date of June 17 inst. (See Col. Pinault's evidence, p. 10; Dr. Borden's evidence, p. 40.)

Your committee desire to call the attention of the House to the following facts: The sample filed with the tender was called 'Vitallin,' it was labelled 'Vitallin,' and stated to be manufactured by the Vitallin Company, corner of Craig and Bleury Streets, a company which has no legal existence; it was accepted on the sole assurance and false representation of the contractor that it was identical with the food tested at Kingston, which was known under the name of 'Hatch's Protose,' manufactured by the Hatch Protose Company; it was to serve as an emergency ration, so that failing all other food, it was something for the soldiers to rely on; it was never examined, tested or analysed before shipment; it was denounced by the manufacturer of Hatch's protose on January 25 as poor and fraudulent adulterative, it was shown by analysis by the official analyst on February 12 to contain but 16.18 per cent of proteids, and not entitled to the name of concentrated food; it was nevertheless paid for and shipped for use by the troops, and no intimation had been given up to June 6 instant that it was worthless as an emergency ration.

Sixthly. A quantity of the same food, or 'Vitallin,' which was thus shipped to South Africa, was purchased from the said John T. Lyons in February last and analysed by Milton Hersey, analytical chemist of Montreal, and found to contain but 17 per cent proteids (see report of Mr. Hersey, exhibit No. 25). On June 18 inst., Dr. Ruttan, professor of chemistry at McGill University, analysed two samples of the food sent to South Africa, and handed to him by Dr. Neilson; he states in his evidence he found in one 15 and a fraction and in the other 18 and a fraction per cent of proteids. That material containing 16 per cent of proteids does not contain the proper proportion of proteids such as one should find in an ordinary full diet (Ruttan's evidence, p. 167), that soldiers doing fairly active work would require about a pound and three-quarters, between a pound and a half and a pound and three-quarters, in order to get sufficient proteids. The usual amount, as based upon experiments which have been carried on for a good many years, is 20 grammes of nitrogen, which would correspond to about four and a half ounces of protein for a day's ration, for a day's food.

'Q. Four and a half ounces of proteids?—A. 4½ ounces of proteids.

'Q. Pure proteids?—A. Pure proteids.

'Q. Well, that being the case, how many ounces of pure proteids necessary for sustenance did you find in one day's emergency ration of this stuff?—A. Well, 16 per cent of 4 ounces. If a man takes 4 ounces it would be 16 per cent of four ounces.

'Q. Well, then, on this four ounces it would be impossible for soldiers to subsist to do efficient work?—A. Not on that alone.

'Q. Well, what is your opinion of an army emergency ration of 4 ounces containing 16 per cent proteids?—A. I consider it would not be sufficient.

'Q. It is an insufficient ration?—A. An insufficient ration.'

(Ruttan's evidence, pp. 166 and 167.)

That the 'Vitallin' supplied by Dr. Devlin was absolutely worthless as an emergency ration is thus absolutely established by Dr. Ruttan and his evidence upon this point is corroborated by the report of the chief analyst of the Dominion government and by the testimony of Mr. McGill, assistant Dominion analyst, and of Mr. Milton Hersey, whose reputation as an analytical chemist is widespread.

Your committee beg to point out the following facts which are conclusively established by the evidence and which although not all material and essential to the subject-matter, yet throw light upon the whole transaction.

The food furnished by Dr. Devlin was imported by him from the United States in large Saratoga trunks, each containing two bags of substance resembling broken biscuit. Where the substance was purchased, what was really paid for it, what were its component parts it is impossible to say with any degree of certainty, for the following reason:—During the morning session of Tuesday, June 26, at about 11.30, Dr. Devlin, who has followed all the proceedings of the committee with the greatest interest, suddenly absented himself; at the session beginning at three o'clock of the same day, the chairman read to your committee a letter addressed to him by Dr. Devlin stating that he wished to be heard. Your committee waited for him till four o'clock, then adjourned until eight when the chairman read to your committee another letter from Dr. Devlin stating that since writing the first he had received a telegram from New York requiring his presence there to obtain information regarding the subject-matter of the investigation and asking the committee to adjourn until Friday, June 29 instant; this your committee, taking into consideration the fact that Dr. Devlin had had every opportunity of making a statement from the very beginning and also the fact that it was necessary to report to your honourable House at this session of Parliament, unanimously rejected Dr. Devlin's proposition. Your committee is of opinion that Dr. Devlin never intended making any statement, and that he used the means above recited for the sole purpose of inventing an excuse for his non-appearance on the witness stand.

As appears by a report filed by the collector of customs six of the trunks above mentioned and one package or bag were brought in as ordinary checked baggage by Dr. Devlin, stopped at the customs and subsequently released by the collector at Montreal on the representations made by Dr. Devlin and the said Lyons that the contents were imported for the militia of Canada and that they would procure from the proper authorities a certificate to that effect, which they failed to do; the duty was paid on June 20 instant, the day the collector appeared before your committee, by two unaccepted cheques, one for \$80—signed by a certain Mr. Egan and the other for \$60—by the contractor and drawn upon the Merchants Bank of Canada, where the local manager, Mr. Ramsay swears he never had any account. Twelve trunks were subsequently taken to the grinding establishment of N. G. Edson & Co., no account or explanation was given or offered of how the other six trunks had passed the customs nor do they seem to have been regularly or legally entered; the substance was ground at a cost of \$23, it was then taken to the drug store of the said John T. Lyons where it was packed in 7,000 tins and labelled as aforesaid and shipped to Halifax, in charge of the said Lyons.

All the witnesses who were questioned on this subject, Messrs. McGill, Hersey, Ruttan and Hatch, swear that emergency rations must be packed in air-tight receptacles; the samples of the British army rations submitted are packed; the food in question was packed in non-air tight and non-water tight tins such as are used every day for holding ordinary paint and white lead (see evidence of Ruttan, p. 170).

As to the cost of production of the substance, assuming Dr. Devlin's estimate of the value, 30c. per pound, as sworn by him on the entry of 900 rounds left in warehouse, to be correct, although there is much doubt on this point, as Dr. Devlin repeatedly refused to give Collector White an invoice or bill from the producer (White's evidence, pp. 82 and 85), your committee find the following:—

2,333 lbs. at 30c. per lb.....	\$ 699 90
Cost of grinding.....	23 00
Cost of tin cans, 7,000, \$25 a thousand..	175 00
Labelling.....	12 00
Customs dues for which unaccepted cheques were given .....	140 00
Labels (not paid)....	.....
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>\$1,049 90</b>

If to this sum are added \$300 for travelling expenses, carriage, &c., in connection with the contract, the result would be that after expending \$1,349.90 the contractor realized a profit of \$3,316.10 on an emergency ration which the evidence establishes beyond controversy to be worthless as such.

Your committee are unable to say what disposition Dr. Devlin made of the money so received by him from the government for the reason that when the local manager of the Merchants Bank of Canada, Mr. Ramsay, was under examination and after he had established that part of the moneys had been advanced by the said bank on a promissory note signed by Dr. Devlin and endorsed by Lyons, he was prevented by objection taken and sustained, to proceed to state to the committee to whom the said money had been chequed out.

In connection with the exclusion of certain evidence your committee beg to draw the attention of your honourable House to the fact that Henri Hatch left with the committee certain bread, biscuits and powder which he swore had been made for the Kingston test and which he offered for analysis; on three different instances it was suggested and strongly pressed that the said samples should be analysed, but such analysis was nevertheless not made. On the other hand, Dr. Neilson swore that before the Kingston test, he received from Dr. Devlin two samples, one containing powder marked half strength and another powder marked full strength; he also swears that up to a late date he had in his office samples of the proteid bread and biscuits used at Kingston; he got Dr. Ruttan to analyse the powder marked half strength, the said powder he says had laid inclosed in an ordinary paper envelope in a drawer of his desk for a period of a year and a half, but he states also that the powder marked full strength and the samples of bread and biscuits brought from Kingston had disappeared, he cannot state how, and could not be submitted for analysis.

Your committee beg leave to report and make the following recommendations:

1. That under the circumstances disclosed by the evidence the contract of January 4 last for the supply of emergency rations to the Canadian contingents, was entered into with undue and unnecessary haste by the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Tenders were excluded, sufficient inquiry was not made and the sample offered by the contractor was not properly examined.

The committee recommend that in the matter of purchase of concentrated foods for troops on active service, samples be secured and analysed before contract and full security required.

2. The emergency food supplied by the contractor was totally unfit for the purposes intended and an imposition was practised upon the department. The contractor is certainly civilly liable to the government. He seems furthermore to have committed an infraction of section 14 of the Adulteration Act, chap. 107, R.S.C., as amended by 53 Victoria, chap. 26, section 1. He violated section 448 of the Criminal Code, 1892, by offering for sale an article bearing a false trade description as defined by subsection 'c' of article 443 of said code.

3. After the warning contained in the letter of the 25th January last, quoted in the reference, and the report of the 12th February, 1900, by Chief Analyst Macfarlane, the Department of Militia should have disallowed payment of the \$4,666 which was made on the 14th February. The minister should have immediately communicated with the Canadian contingent

On the whole your committee find that the Minister of Militia and Defence and the Department of Militia were guilty of culpable negligence in purchasing and providing the Canadian soldiers with an article totally unfit for the purposes for which it was intended.

In this connection the committee recommend that the military authorities in South Africa be given immediately, by cable, the benefit of the report of the chief analyst.

Mr. Speaker, this committee, as hon. members are aware, has attracted widespread attention throughout the country, far more attention, I venture to say, than any of us dreamt of when these proceedings were entered upon. It is a healthy sign. It is an indication, in the first place, that public opinion in this country is in a healthy state, in a proper state for the appreciation of public questions; it is an indication that throughout the country there is a heartfelt feeling for the troops which we have sent to South Africa. There is also another reason for the great interest which has been manifested in the proceedings of the committee, and it is that the facts brought out by the investigation are so simple and so easily understood. No amount of sophistry will alter these facts. Most of them are admitted. The facts that are not admitted are amply proven, and no difference of opinion can possibly exist as to the appreciation of these facts. I will endeavour very briefly to go over these facts, in a tone, I venture to expect, slightly more judicial than the tone adopted by my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt). At this advanced stage of the session, public opinion being absolutely formed in regard to these facts, I would not enter into a discussion of the facts were it not that I entertain the hope that at least a majority of this House will not concur in the report which has been submitted. Whatever may be our opinion as to the responsibility of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence

Mr. MONK.

(Mr. Borden), I trust that we will find a majority in this House not prepared to whitewash the contractor as to whose conduct I will have a few words to say. Let me say one word in regard to the emergency ration. An emergency ration—it is always a dangerous thing to attempt to define—it is, as I understand it, a highly concentrated food, light in weight, containing a large amount of nourishment, packed in such a manner as to be preserved indefinitely, which the soldier can carry with him when he is away from the base of supplies or when the supplies utterly fail him. There is no question that this is the character of the emergency ration. It is not an ordinary food. It is what the troops carry with them when they enter upon the campaign, but the emergency ration is utterly different, as we have it in evidence before the committee. The troops that went from England to South Africa had the ordinary supplies of soldiers, but they had in addition over \$1,000,000 worth of emergency ration. There is a sample of this ration before the House at the present time. It is a highly concentrated food, packed in air-tight, convenient cans and entirely different from the ordinary ration. I need scarcely tell the House that every nation in the world has an emergency ration of some kind. They have it in France, they have it in England, they have it in Germany, in Italy, and in the United States, each bearing the characteristics that it is highly nutritious, easily carried, and susceptible of being preserved indefinitely. We have no manufacture in Canada of such a ration. We have not been called upon to carry on wars on any extensive scale. Now, let me refer to some facts about which there is no doubt whatever. My hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) found fault with some of the propositions which I ventured to sustain before the committee. I think he is wrong. My hon. friend took up the position as chairman of the investigating committee, that he was not there merely for the purpose of preserving order, but when I, or some other members of the committee, charged with this investigation by the House, equal in every respect to himself, save that we were not acting as chairman, judged fit in the pursuit of that investigation to ask a question of a witness, he assumed the position which he subsequently maintained that he had the right to rule the question out, that he had the right to say: You will not ask that question.

Mr. BELCOURT. I never said anything so silly as that.

Mr. MONK. I differed from him on that point, and I laid it down as a proposition that so far as the question was pertinent to the reference every member of the committee had the right to ask any question he chose. I went further, and I think

I was right ; I said that I thought we were not bound by the ordinary rules of evidence. I submitted to the committee this consideration, which I intend to submit to the House, that the committee might have been composed, not of lawyers, but of laymen, men who were not professional men, and one or two professional men only, and I asked : How could it be pretended that the members of this committee were bound by the rules of evidence which they knew nothing of ? However, what I now submit to the House is this consideration upon the facts, to which I am about to refer that where a witness, entirely credible, against whose character not one word has been uttered, presents himself before the committee and swears to a fact, that fact is proven unless he is contradicted. Taking that as a basis, and I think it is a reasonable basis, what do we find ? We find that Mr. Hatch is a food chemist, that he has invented and manufactures a food which is rich in sustaining substance, which has great sustaining strength, and that he manufactures that food in three different degrees. His food is all over the country. It is to be found in Montreal and here, in Ottawa, in many of the drug stores. Let any hon. gentleman step down to St. Luke's Hospital, take some of this food and have it analysed in its three different strengths. The first strength is 85 per cent of sustaining substance ; the second, or medium strength, is 45 per cent ; and the third, or lowest strength, is 30 per cent. These foods are used as prescribed by the doctors. If my hon. friend, or anybody else, is anxious to prove that this food was merely a fake what had he to do ? He had merely to step down, secure some of this food and have it analysed. None of them dared to do that, because it is well known that this food is used everywhere, that it is used in all the hospitals throughout the country, and that it is a highly sustaining food.

Now, Sir, a few words of information : One pound of the first strength of proteids is equivalent to five and three-quarter pounds of meat ; is equivalent to fourteen and a half quarts of milk, and contains the same amount of sustaining substance as one hundred and two eggs. I deem it necessary in the discussion of a question such as this to give to the House the benefit of this information, which we ourselves lacked when we began to investigate, and which is not generally known.

Mr. FLINT. Is that in the evidence ?

Mr. MONK. It is in the evidence, because Mr. Hatch produced a label which he placed upon all the packages which he offers for sale, and this information is given on the label.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Is that proof ?

Mr. MONK. I will deal later with the question as to whether that statement on

the label is well founded or not, but I am giving it to the House as information at the present time. I have stated that the ordinary diet of man contains anywhere between 2 per cent and 18 per cent of nutritive substance. This will be new to many members of this House, as it was to me when I entered on the investigation. That is what you generally find in what you eat every day, and the moment you go beyond that limit, the moment you take up an article of food which contains 30 per cent or over of proteids or nutritive substance, you are touching something out of the ordinary run of food. This food which is given out to the public, used in all the hospitals, for sale in the principal drug stores in Montreal and elsewhere, how is it known ? It bears a registered name. It is known as Protein Vegetal or Protose. It was never known under any other name. This food is manufactured by one man only in the world, and that is Hatch himself, who makes it in Montreal at a known address, where he has his laboratory. That is important ; it is in the evidence of Hatch, and it is uncontradicted. It is important that the House should know—because I will refer presently to the conduct of other witnesses—that Mr. Hatch came up as soon as summoned by a telegram from the chairman, that he gave his evidence in a straightforward and honest manner, that he is a man who does not speak English fluently, his being a foreign tongue, and I will have occasion presently to refer to that. It is important that the House should know that the contractor, Devlin, whose name has been so often mentioned in connection with this investigation, knew of these facts, and none knew better than he. He knew that the composition of this food was the secret of this chemist ; he did not know the formula of the chemist ; he knew he was the only manufacturer of the food, and he knew that apart from Hatch himself, the chemist and the inventor of the food, no man could give the contractor that article. If any hon. gentleman has doubts upon that point, which I deem important, they have only to refer to page 259 of the report, and what will they find ? They will find there an agreement entered into by Mr. Hatch and a capitalist of New York whom Dr. Devlin had introduced to Mr. Hatch, and by that agreement it was intended to form a company with a capital of \$50,000, and it is specifically stated that Hatch, who is a poor man, was to furnish to the company his formula—and he was to be given a valuable consideration for it—but the agreement states that until the company is in operation the inventor of the food was to keep secret his formula, and only when the company was formed—which it never was—was he to reveal the secret of the manufacture of this food. The secret formula, therefore, was practically Hatch's share in the company. Now, Sir, it is also proven, and it is uncontradicted, that Hatch was introduc-

ed to the Minister of Militia by Dr. Devlin, and he was introduced as a food specialist having the secret of the manufacture of this food. He had three interviews with the Minister of Militia; interviews of a purely business character, having reference to this food, and having a two-fold object, namely, the test of the food at Kingston, which he asked the minister to make, and the supply of this food to the government of Canada. Hatch states that he sent three samples of the food—and his statement is uncontradicted—to the Minister of Militia or to Dr. Neilson, for the department.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the hon. gentleman give us the evidence for that?

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman will find it in the evidence of Hatch.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot.

Mr. MONK. It is proven by Hatch that he sent these three samples, one of 85 per cent, one of 45 per cent, and one of 30 per cent.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Will the hon. gentleman give the page where that is stated?

Mr. MONK. I will look it up and give it to my hon. friend at the recess. He sent these three samples, and these three samples have disappeared. It is an extraordinary, and it is a singular thing, that in this matter, everything that Hatch furnished has disappeared.

Mr. BELCOURT. Oh.

Mr. MONK. Everything he furnished has disappeared. The samples he sent, the food he sent to Kingston, all have disappeared. I really think there was no great object to be obtained by that, because it was quite easy to go into any store and get a sample of this food, if, as gentlemen opposite contend, it was of no value at all and contained only 13 or 16 or 17 per cent of proteids. But, it was deemed that a very strong argument could be built up on the fact that the samples have disappeared. I wish the House to follow me when I state that it is proven, and not contradicted, that this man Hatch furnished all the food that was eaten by the soldiers at Kingston. There is no question on that point whatever. Hatch took four pounds of the food every day from his laboratory to the train at Montreal, and he either expressed it to Kingston or else he gave it to the pullman car porter.

There is no question that the four pounds of food brought up to Kingston, were consumed the next day by the soldiers. There is another point which makes it important for the members of the House to carefully scrutinize the conduct of this contractor. This man Hatch, the manufacturer of the food and the sole possessor of the secret of its preparation, employed Dr. Devlin as his

Mr. MONK.

agent to oversee the test at Kingston. I refer to that particularly, because whatever opinion one may have as to the conduct of the contractor, there is no doubt that he basely betrayed the interests of his principal. Well, what happened? The agent employed to watch the test at Kingston, followed the test, and after the test brought to his principal, the affidavits of the soldiers, as was his duty, because his principal had sent him there as his agent, and had paid all his expenses; and if hon. members will read those affidavits, they will find that the soldiers swear positively that the food they had at Kingston was Hatch's protose, and was known by no other name. The affidavits, were no doubt, drawn up by the agent himself, and the only kind of food to which they refer, is Hatch's protose. With regard to that test, I will only say this: I am not a military man, but it seems to me, that proper care was not taken in the department at the time that test was made. Whatever may have been the value of the test, if I had to conduct it, even as a civilian, I would have conducted it with far greater precaution; but it is a regrettable fact that though this food on which so much depended, was sent every day to Kingston, the officials there never saw fit to keep some samples of it. However, that is outside of this inquiry. This is also uncontradicted, that at the time of the war this man whose food was successfully tested, wrote to the department, reminding the department of that test, and asking them if they required any of that food for the soldiers, and he received an answer, as every other tenderer did, that there was no food to be bought for the soldiers. There were other tenderers who interviewed the Minister of Militia himself, and their evidence is in the record. It is proved that the agent of the Bovril Company which supplied, I believe, over \$750,000 worth of emergency rations to the British army in this very war, in regard to which rations not one complaint has been made, interviewed the Minister of Militia, and was told, as Mr. Hatch was, that there was no food to be purchased. Another witness, Mr. Besserer, swears positively to the same effect—that he interviewed the Minister of Militia, that he came to the department time and again, to find out if he could not supply food which had been tested by the Geological Department, and found satisfactory, and was turned away with the statement that no food was to be purchased. Hatch also swears—and this is a fact admitted, and a most important fact, when we come to consider the conduct of the minister—that he wrote the letter of January 25. And let me say at once that the specious argument that this letter was merely the letter of a disappointed contractor, will not go down with the public. If you take the trouble to read that letter, and consider the surrounding circumstances, you will see that it is not the letter of a dis-

appointed contractor. Here is a man whose food has been tested, the only food which has been tested in this country; and what does he tell the Minister of Militia? Does he complain that he did not get the contract? Does he say that he has been dealt with unfairly? Nothing of the sort; but he does what is the duty of any man under the circumstances. He says: 'I am informed that the department is purchasing a food which purports to be my food, and I deem it to be my duty, and my right, to warn you that you are being imposed upon, to tell you that it is not my food which is being supplied to you.' The House will see the importance of this, when we come to consider the assurances given by the contractor to the department. He says: 'I inform you that this is not my food, and that I intend to take proceedings for the violation of my rights.' Is this the letter of a disappointed contractor? By no means. It was a letter which it was not only this man's right, but his duty to send to the minister.

It being One o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. MONK. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I was adverting to the evidence, uncontradicted evidence, of certain facts which preceded the contract. I was more particularly speaking of the evidence given before the committee by Mr. Hatch. I think that a most unfair, I will even go the length of saying a most cruel, remark was made by the chairman of the committee (Mr. Belcourt), in moving the adoption of the report this morning, as to the conduct of this witness. I am not charged with his defence. I never met him until after I brought this matter up in the House, because the information on which I proceeded was given to me by a most reliable physician, practicing his profession in the city of Montreal. But when the hon. gentleman said that the witness did not dare, or at any rate did not see fit, to come back and contradict the statement made by the witness Muir that his food only contained 15 per cent protein, he made a mistake. When the witness Muir, to whose testimony I will presently refer, had been heard, I moved at once in the committee to have Mr. Hatch recalled, and he was telegraphed to, upon that motion being adopted, by my hon. friend, and he answered that he was ill and could not leave that evening, but would come up the following morning. He was ill—I am now speaking of facts not revealed in the evidence, but which I am free to state in this House—he was ill in consequence of absurd threats made to him by parties in the city of Montreal. He had been threatened that his laboratory would be seized by the government, that all his papers would be taken away, and that he would be subjected to harsh treatment;

and I am bound to say, because I desire to be frank in the matter, that I am convinced these threats did not come from the government, but the contractor. Of that I am absolutely certain, so that had it been necessary to hear the witness on this point, there can be no question but that he was quite willing to come before the committee.

Mr. BRITTON. Should that committee try this case by the evidence given before the committee or on what the hon. gentleman says the witness would say?

Mr. MONK. Unquestionably I will answer my hon. friend on that point. We are dealing only with the evidence, but I have thought it only right to state what I think is just, as regards this witness, who came here willingly, and who, I think, gave his evidence so frankly, that I do not think it was right he should be attacked here in this way. But of course, as a lawyer, and even in any capacity, there is no doubt we must judge this case on the evidence produced. The witness was intimidated. That I state to the House.

Mr. BELCOURT. What evidence have you of that?

Mr. MONK. I believe it if the hon. gentleman does not, and I have it from the witness himself. I am aware that this subject occupying the attention of the House has been treated in some quarters with great merriment, and it has, I frankly admit, a comical side. That a body of men whom we all admire, moved by the highest motives, imbued admittedly with admirable courage, should be prepared to travel 7,000 miles to engage in the cruel business of war, and that at the same time a man—and of all men a medical man—should come up to Ottawa, rush through a contract with the government, take his satchel, go down to New York, and come back with twelve trunks containing broken biscuits, have them ground and stuffed into little pots, which are generally used to hold paint, and hand these over to this group of men as an emergency ration,—all this opens a boundless field to a clever caricaturist.

Mr. BELCOURT. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? I would like him to tell us where there is any evidence of this food having been ground biscuits.

Mr. MONK. I will answer my hon. friend this important question as I proceed.

Mr. BELCOURT. Is there any evidence of that?

Mr. MONK. Abundant, but unfortunately not completed because this traveller with the Saratoga trunks never judged fit to give us any information. But apart from that picture which is a curious one, and a ludicrous one, there is a serious side

to the question. A joke is not a genuine joke if it entails serious consequences, and I think hon. members will admit that this joke, if joke it was, did entail such consequences, because we have on the other side of the picture men who very naturally would start out on a day's march over the broken veldt, each with a can of this stuff, feeling confident, and rightly confident, that on it they could subsist comfortably during the entire day. And then we have the picture of the men who undertook that march, falling exhausted after their mid-day meal, and unable to fulfil the important tasks assigned to them.

There is a most important uncontradicted fact, proved by this witness, and that is what Mr. Hatch stated with great candour to the committee, namely, that he had remnants of the Kingston food. He produced before us two boxes in which was bread powder, remnants of biscuits, and he said that accidentally he had kept in his possession some of this food which had been tested at Kingston, and he said, what is of more importance, that he had brought it up with the desire that the committee should subject those remnants of that food to an analysis. It was moved in the committee that they should be analysed, but that motion was voted down by the majority of the committee. And I will point out to you, Mr. Speaker, what seems to me of paramount unfairness, that whereas there were analysis made of everything that the committee had before it, everything produced by the officers of the Department of Militia, strange to say this demand to have analysed what the witness swore positively—and upon this point he was not contradicted—were remnants of the Kingston food, was rejected. I think that if this House and the public, couple that most unjustifiable refusal with the fact that this man's food was all over the country and could have been procured and analysed at any stage, and was not analysed, the conclusion will be that there was on the part of some people an absolute fear of having a genuine analysis made of this substance and of finding out the truth.

Another fact which is uncontradicted, and which I desire to point out to this House as showing the bad faith of the contractor, is this one. The House will find it in the evidence of Mr. Hatch. On the 15th January, while this contract was being carried out, Dr. Devlin, who had acted as an agent of Mr. Hatch, who knew all about this food, was in Mr. Hatch's office—with whom? With a New York capitalist endeavouring to conclude an agreement for the formation of a company, and upon that occasion, although he was a long time in Mr. Hatch's office and conversed about the formation of that company, he never mentioned that he had a contract at that moment with the Dominion government for \$4,660 to furnish the Dominion government

Mr. MONK.

with the food which had been tested at Kingston. That, I think, is of the greatest consequence.

While I am on the evidence of Mr. Hatch, I may point out, in answer to a question put to me this morning by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), that the percentage of protein in the Hatch food is adverted to in Mr. Hatch's testimony at page 62. And what Hatch says there, hon. members may read. He says 85 per cent of proteids on one side; 30 per cent for the lowest percentage on the other. He says: I made it my business to see that the soldiers at Kingston always had an average of 60 per cent in the food furnished them. I may state here, in a general way, that, although I have not had time to read—nor would I read, even if I had time—from the evidence to maintain every statement which I make to the House, if on any point to which I refer I am mistaken and my statement is not borne out by the evidence, I shall be happy to retract; because what I desire in this matter, is that the House, as my hon. friend said, should know the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

There is another significant fact, though not of paramount importance—still a fact not to be lost sight of, and that was that the important letter of the 25th of January received no answer in acknowledgment from the Minister of Militia. At the time of the Ottawa fire Hatch wrote to the Minister of Militia offering his food as a donation for those who suffered from the fire, and to that letter he received no acknowledgment whatever. There is also the fact that he wrote to Ottawa offering gratuitously his food for the Red Cross Society in South Africa, and to that letter, I think I am safe in saying, from the evidence, there was no answer either.

Mr. BRITTON. There was an answer by Dr. Neilson. He was referred to Dr. Ryerson, head of the Red Cross Society.

Mr. MONK. It may be so. Now, we must not be led astray on the questions of percentage of proteids. As shown by the evidence of Mr. Hatch, and amply corroborated by the evidence of a man of the highest authority—I refer to Professor Ruttan—when you speak of 16 per cent proteids in a food, as Professor Ruttan says, you speak of a diluent. What does he mean by that? He explains that a diluent is an element which you use to reduce the strength of the food in proteids. Proteids in crude and original shape contain 100 per cent of nutriment; but, as Hatch explains, under the direction of a physician it may be necessary to reduce that strength anywhere from 80 per cent to 30 per cent; and any food which contains 16 per cent has enough dilution, and has no unusual value whatever. As the witness states: I buy my diluent anywhere: I buy

them from Fraser, Viger & Co., grocers; I import them from the States. There is nothing at all astonishing to anybody who understands this matter in the fact that there are entries in the custom-house showing importations by Hatch of the value of from 2½ cents to 12 cents a pound, for diluents are not worth more. If hon. members will take the trouble to inquire, they will find at their grocers various foods such as Farina and shredded wheat; and in the States there are a great number of foods containing that 16 per cent of proteid which is of no special value. Have we not here in the province of Ontario a food called Pease Méal, prepared under a Scotch formula, which is very good for breakfast—and indeed at any time—and which contains 28 per cent of proteid? And what is it worth? I think it is 10 cents a pound—probably less. Therefore, there is no special value in a food containing 16 per cent of proteids—that is what you find in any ordinary daily diet.

I have adverted to the facts preceding the contract; let me speak as briefly as possible of the contract itself. On the 3rd of January, Devlin went to the *Herald* office—this is in the evidence of Mr. Sharpe—and he got two samples, one of a large label and one of a small one. He wrote out himself what was to be printed on these labels—page 259 of the report. And what did he write? Did he write his own name, something which would show that those who prepared this food were ready to assume some responsibility? By no means. He gave a fictitious title, and he gave as the address of the manufacturer of the food, which evidently at that time he had the intention of supplying to the government, a wholly false and fictitious address—The Vitallin Company, corner Craig and Bleury Streets, Montreal. This he gave to the printer on the 3rd of January, when there was no contract, and he gave a false address. I cannot insist too much on this as being an element to guide hon. members in appreciation of this matter. This company is not to be found anywhere in the City of Montreal or in the province of Quebec—it has no existence whatever. On the 4th of January, the day following, Devlin came to Ottawa, bringing with him a tin can containing a substance—a very ordinary substance with 16 per cent of nutrition in it—and in Ottawa he interviewed three persons, the Minister of Militia, the director general of the medical staff, Dr. Neilson, and the deputy minister. Dr. Neilson tells us in his evidence that he was struck with this label upon the larger can, and he told Devlin: This is not protein vegetal, this is not Hatch's protose, this is not the substance tested in Kingston. This is a fact of paramount importance, which is uncontradicted and about which there is no doubt whatever. What did Devlin tell him? He told him: It is absolutely the same thing,

it is identical with the food tested in Kingston. And he gave as a reason for the change of name that it was for commercial purposes—that in commerce that name was a more suitable one. And, feeling that, unquestionably, this was a matter of importance, Dr. Neilson wrote a recommendation, and that recommendation was to the effect that he recommended that the soldiers be supplied with protein vegetal—not with anything connected with the Vitallin Company; and hon. gentlemen will read that he recommends this food because it has been fully tested in Kingston, and is a highly concentrated food. Armed with this recommendation, obtained under the representations that I have just stated, Devlin goes to the minister and closes the contract there and then with him. But, subsequently, in preparing his tender, he does not refer at all to Neilson's recommendation, but offers to supply the troops with vegetable proteid powder according to the sample—a worthless food. The whole thing is settled, evidently, according to the evidence, in about twenty minutes.

With this order, Devlin leaves immediately for the States, he must have left on the following day. After a very short interval of time, he returns from the States with twelve trunks. Upon this point we have the evidence of the two men who ground this substance, after it was brought in from the States. Of these twelve trunks, I have no doubt whatever, that he must have passed six through the customs-house without paying any duty. There are only six trunks accounted for, he must, therefore, have got these six trunks through the customs-house without explaining to the officers, that this substance was dutiable, or in some way or other he got them through without paying any duty. Now, as regards the other six trunks, there is nothing in the evidence to show that he paid duty upon them. I have no doubt that any man reading the evidence would come to the conclusion that he never paid any duty, either upon the other six trunks, and the one packet which the customs-house officer noticed. Long after this investigation was begun, he gave two cheques to the collector of customs. One of these cheques was by Dr. Devlin himself, and one was on the manager of the Merchants Bank, and the manager tells us he never had any account in that bank. However, these trunks attracted the notice of the customs-house officer.

Now, I would say this to the House, although by no means charged with the defence of the collector of customs at Montreal, that I think the report contains a very unfair reflection upon the conduct of that gentleman. What are the facts? This man, a medical man known in Montreal, came to the collector and exhibited to him a document from the Militia Department which satisfied him—these are the words of Mr. White—that what was in the trunks was

imported for the use of the Department of Militia. There was something more, he exacted from the doctor an assurance that he would get a regular certificate, such as provided by the regulations of the department, from the Department of Militia, and Devlin promised him to obtain the certificate. There was hurry, there was urgency, there was no time to be lost, and under these circumstances the contractor was allowed to take out the trunks without paying duty. Therefore, to say that the conduct of the collector of customs was wholly indefensible, seems to me a very unfair reflection upon that officer.

Once the twelve trunks were in Montreal, they were brought to the manufacturing druggist, and there the contents were ground into a powder. One of the witnesses, Mr. Hatch, and I think another also, stated that they had heard of a proteid powder being made into biscuits, but nobody ever heard of a proteid biscuit, a most expensive article, being ground into powder. There are proteid biscuits manufactured in Europe containing as much as 80 per cent proteid, but nobody ever heard of a proteid biscuit being ground into powder, because it loses a great deal of its strength. However, the stuff was taken to this man and pulverized; and I speak in the judgment of the medical men in this House—although there is nothing on that point in the evidence—in saying that food of this kind is very subject to bacteriological changes, and the mere fact of bringing it in in that loose way from Montreal, leaving it at the station, and taking it to a mill to be ground, is proof that this man Devlin had really no consideration whatever for the parties for whom he was preparing this food.

Well, on February 14, the contractor was paid. Great stress was laid by my hon. friend upon the fact, as he says, that I alleged in the charges, that the payment was made before delivery. But if hon. members will refer to *Hansard*, they will find what I really said in the House; what I said was that I had reliable information that payment was made, if not wholly, at least in part, before delivery. But I stated specially that if payment was not made after delivery the government was far more seriously at fault, because then payment had been made after the department was fully aware that this food had no value. I think the case would be far better for the government, if payment had been made before delivery, because the government had then no proof whatever, that this man was actually perpetrating a fraud upon the government. When he was actually paid, the government had in its hands, an analysis made by its own official, which analysis revealed that there was nothing in this food beyond an ordinary diet, that it only contained 16 per cent of nutrition, that it was not, in the words of the analyst, a highly concentrated food, and that it had not the value of \$2

per pound. It was after having received this statement from its own officer, that the government, without any question, paid this man. Now, let me state to the House what grounds I have for saying that this amount was paid before delivery. This man Devlin, the contractor, is notoriously insolvent. He is not a responsible man, and it was assumed that he could not pay even the travelling expenses which he was put to, in order to get this food, and hand it over to our troops, without a sum of money being advanced to him. When I attempted proof through the banker, who had advanced the funds, the small amount necessary for carrying out this contract, I was prevented by my hon. friend. But what did I pretend? I pretended that I had alleged in the charges that the contractor was irresponsible. Hon. members have only to refer to the charges to see that there is a specific allegation that the contractor was irresponsible. How do you prove before our courts, as a general rule, that a man is irresponsible? Why, the very first witness examined usually is his banker; and when I attempted that proof, that ordinary proof of his insolvency, I was estopped by the majority of the committee, upon the ground that I could not enter into an examination of the doctor's private affairs. I will state to this House that I had another motive. I believe that the conduct of this contractor is wholly indefensible; but, I will say, in justice to him, that I believe he is not the only man concerned in the rake-off of profits in this transaction. I believe that in certain respects he has been sinned against, and that there are men whose names do not appear in this report, who have participated in the fraud which he practiced upon the government. It is probable that had I been allowed to make this proof, many of these facts would have come out, and guilt would have been brought home to the parties behind this man who profited by these transactions.

What did we have as to the value of the food? I am of opinion, and there is not a man in this country who is not of that opinion, that this food was what the manufacturing chemist, what Mr. Capelli, and I think, Mr. McGill, said was broken biscuits. I believe that this food was purchased in a clandestine manner in the United States as the refuse of a biscuit factory, and that belief is upheld by the evidence. Broken biscuits are not worth 30 cents a pound. They are worth considerably less. The minority in the committee assumed, as to the value of the food, the value that was put upon it by Dr. Devlin himself after this inquiry began, and he had gone to the customs officers to cover up his tracks and make entries of these goods. We took his own value—30 cents a pound. That is as to the value in money. Now, as to its value as a food. Mr. Macfarlane, the Dominion analyst, states in his certificate

that he does not understand why a value of \$2 a pound is set on this food. Mr. McGill corroborates the evidence contained in the certificate. Mr. McGill entirely upholds in his evidence the charge which is of very great importance that this food was improperly packed. The man who made the cans told us that they were ordinary paint cans. Prof. Ruttan also upholds that charge. The cans were neither air-tight nor water-tight and all the witnesses agree that this powder, whatever it was, even if it was ground biscuits, was most susceptible to the assimilation of moisture. Mr. Hatch states, of course, that his food, is always sterilized and packed in air-tight receptacles. As to the necessity of proper packing he is also corroborated by Mr. Hersey, an analyst of high standing in Montreal, and corroborated by Prof. Ruttan. Prof. Ruttan says these are ordinary paint cans and that food packed in such cans is liable to absorb moisture, and there is no question that with these troops marching through the fields in South Africa and sleeping out at night with these foods, unless they were properly packed for such an emergency as that, damage would result. Upon that point the charge is amply sustained, and it is a serious charge because, even if it were the best of food, being improperly packed, it would be useless to the troops. We had a sample of the British army ration, and the witness who produced that sample showed that it was packed in an air-tight tin and that upon the sample there was a direction that the tin is not to be opened except expressly upon the order of an officer. In respect to the value of the food Prof. Ruttan stated that the result of the studies of professional men as far back as we can trace them shows that four ounces of nutriment, of proteids, are necessary for a man daily, and he says, as a consequence of that, this food, containing only 16 per cent, instead of carrying one can for one day, a soldier would have to carry nine or ten cans to be properly fed for one day, if indeed, his digestion could stand the contents of nine or ten cans, and if he proceeded upon a five days' march and relied for his sustenance upon emergency rations, he would have to have fifty cans in his kit. The House will see at once that this food was not at all what it ought to have been. Prof. Ruttan swears that it is an insufficient ration. If hon. gentlemen will look at the evidence they will see that he is asked: Do you say that it is an insufficient ration? He says: Yes it is. As against that we have nothing but the evidence of Sergeant Cotton. I do not know how many hon. members of the House were present when he was before the committee, but the evidence of Dr. Neilson himself shows that it amounted to practically nothing. He delivered the certificate to Dr. Devlin before he had ever tried the food, and he took beer while he was taking the

food; in fact, there was nothing in his evidence. Dr. Devlin's food was not subjected to a proper test. Hon. members who concur in this report have insisted very strenuously, just like wrecked sailors upon a raft, eager for a chance of being relieved, that there was an envelope containing something that was tested in Kingston, and that it contained only 13 per cent of nourishing substance. There is nothing whatever in that. In the first place, I will ask hon. members if they think it is probable that this man who manufactures an 80 per cent food would have sent, as a sample to the department, a food, or powder, containing only 13 per cent. As regards the origin of this envelope there is the greatest obscurity. What does Dr. Neilson say? He, on being examined in the first instance, said that he had preserved none of the food tested at Kingston. Gradually, as the case became more desperate, he began de novo before the committee and produced this envelope. What does he say as to this envelope? At page 116, Dr. Neilson says:

I must say here that when the experiments took place at Kingston, Mr. Devlin put in my hands some samples of protein vegetal such as he used in that bread. The bread was the means of conveying this protein vegetal.

By Mr. Monk:

Q. Was this in Kingston?—A. Well, before he went to Kingston he sent me samples of protein vegetal, full strength, and protein vegetal, half strength. I kept these samples, and I have them yet, at least not all; I have not the protein vegetal, full strength, but I have samples of the one marked half strength. When the subject of Dr. Devlin's tender was being considered, I compared this protein vegetal, half strength, with the contents of that tin.

At page 118, Dr. Neilson, in answer to Mr. Clarke, continued:

Here are the remains of the first sample; I said two samples had been sent to me of the protein vegetal.

By the Chairman:

Q. Used at Kingston?—A. Yes. It is written here on the back of it 'protein vegetal,' not in my writing.

By Mr. Monk:

Q. Whose writing?—A. I don't know, sir, but it resembles a little the writing of Mr. Hatch; it is in the original envelope, and is called protein vegetal, one-half strength, and I marked there that I received it in March.

At page 119:

By Mr. Clarke:

Q. Was this a private package you are submitting here?—A. It was sent to us as a sample.

Q. Of what?—A. Of protein vegetal, one-half strength.

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** The hon. gentleman is not reading as it appears in the printed book, but it may be all right.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Word for word. He is going to other pages.

Mr. MONK (reading) :

By Mr. Monk:

Q. By Dr. Devlin?—A. I think it was, perhaps it was Hatch. I don't know.

If hon. members will read on they will arrive at the conclusion that this man does not know exactly where he got this envelope. Perhaps it was from Dr. Devlin; perhaps it was from Mr. Hatch. It was certainly not the food sent by Mr. Hatch to Kingston. He had it in his drawer with a lot of postage stamps and other matter for over a year. Are we going to hang our decision on this important matter on such evidence as that? When we have a witness, a manufacturer whose goods are all over the country and who comes and says: My food contains such and such proportions of nutriment, and I sent a sample of my food to Kingston and asked them to analyse it; no, no, we will not analyse it, but we will go upon this envelope.

Permit me to refer, as briefly as possible, to the conduct of the Minister of Militia. It appears from the evidence that he closed this contract at once. There was no delay. There were other tenderers; there were those who furnished supplies to the British army, and whose rations had never been complained of from time immemorial, but the Minister of Militia closed the contract with Dr. Devlin immediately, and it does not appear that the minister ever asked the contractor whether this was the food tested at Kingston or not. The minister wrote 'approved,' and the whole thing was settled in a few minutes. According to the minister's own evidence, he had before him the recommendation of Dr. Neilson that the food to be furnished should be the same as that furnished in Kingston, but the minister does not appear to have asked this contractor, who suddenly appeared before him on January 4, whether this in reality was the same food. Not at all; he closed the bargain in a moment. Then, on January 25, the minister received a letter from the man who had been expressly recommended to the department by Dr. Neilson—because Dr. Neilson in his letter recommended the minister to take the food tested in Kingston—and that letter solemnly warned the minister that he had been imposed upon. What should have been the conduct of an ordinarily prudent man on the receipt of that letter? I do not hesitate to say that it was the duty of the minister to answer that letter. I assert that it was the duty of the minister, when he received that letter, to walk to the room of his subordinates and to say: Is this true or is it not; we must have this sample examined; we must find out if the allegation contained in the letter from the supplier of the Kingston food is true or not. Had I received such a letter, Sir, even from an anonymous correspondent, I would have taken that precaution. I do not hesi-

Mr. MONK.

tate to say that had I received such a letter from a convict in the penitentiary, writing over his own name, I would have provoked inquiry. But, the minister, having received such a letter from the manufacturer, who had been introduced to him by Dr. Devlin as the only maker of this food, the duty of the minister was to act at once. What did the minister do? I am right in saying that the letter was suppressed; it was never filed in the department; it was never brought to the knowledge of any one except Dr. Devlin, as the minister himself tells us. Here was Dr. Neilson, upon whose recommendation the contract had been made, and he never heard of the letter. Here was the Deputy Minister of Militia, who had prepared the documents to carry out the contract, and he never heard of the letter until the Sunday before the day we commenced our investigation. The letter was not on file, and it was suppressed. We have it on the uncontradicted testimony of Capt. Benoit, who went to Halifax to see the shipment of this food, that he brought back two cans, and that he, in the month of February, asked that an analysis be made. It was this witness who initiated the analysis made by Mr. Macfarlane. The minister never asked for the analysis. The analysis was made, and the minister does not even seem to have heard of it. In fact, if I mistake not, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) stated that he heard of that analysis for the first time when the question was brought up in the House. Therefore, on receipt of this letter—which gentlemen on the other side call a querulous communication from a disappointed contractor—the minister took no steps whatever, and he did not even acknowledge the receipt of the letter. And, Sir, that analysis being in the department, and being, as I submit, an absolute condemnation of this food, the Minister of Militia never thought it fit to communicate the startling revelation brought out by that analysis to the troops in the field. He could have telegraphed to Halifax; he could have telegraphed to Cape Town, he could telegraph to-day and it would not be useless. The men who have to depend upon this insufficient ration, upon this food which is not concentrated, this food which is of no value; the men who are in the field to-day while we are quietly sitting here; the brave soldiers of Canada who are most interested in the results of that analysis of the food, know nothing about it. And, Sir, at the present moment, while I am speaking, some of our soldiers may be departing upon a march without any other food but this broken biscuit, which is of no value whatever for their sustenance. Is this House going to say that such a condition of things is right? If it does, Sir, mighty as is the power of this parliament, there is an appeal to a higher tribunal, to the public opinion of this country. It would only have been fair and right and just and

prudent, that the soldiers in the field should be warned that this food was not what it was represented to be, and it was the duty of the minister to give that warning. It is his duty to do it to-day. It is his duty so long as detrimental results may ensue from dependence upon this food. Although we all hope that the war is practically over, yet while there is a guerilla warfare in South Africa, it is more than probable that on many occasions the soldiers may have to make use of this ration, believing that it is all which the label on the can says it is, when in reality it is of no value whatever. Now, Sir, there are two recommendations in our report, which, if the motion of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) is adopted, will be brushed aside by this House. One of these recommendations is, that henceforth when food is purchased for our troops on active service, that food should be analysed beforehand, and ample security procured from the contractor. Is the House going to say that this is an unwise recommendation? There is another recommendation which is of greater immediate importance, and that is, that the substance of Mr. Macfarlane's report should be communicated to the troops in South Africa. Is the House going to brush that recommendation aside also? Is the House going to pronounce that our soldiers in South Africa will not be informed of the valueless character of this as a concentrated food? We have before the committee the result of the analysis of Mr. Macfarlane, and the further evidence of Mr. Hersey, and no reasonable doubt can exist in the mind of any man that this food is not what it purported to be. I moved in committee that an interim report be made to the House, and that the House order simply that the results of Mr. Macfarlane's analysis be communicated to the military commandant or to the authorities in South Africa, in order that they should be on their guard about this food. That motion was voted down—not immediately, but upon an amendment prepared, after consideration, by my hon. friend from Kingston, which amendment shows that the fat of the food is not of any great value, is not concentrated, which is admitted. But, that amendment vetoed that wise recommendation contained in my motion; and this House will assume a very grave responsibility before the country if it decides that the knowledge which we all have to-day shall not be conveyed to the parties most interested in the composition of this food.

Now, Sir, as to the remarkable conduct of Devlin, the contractor, I have not very much to say. But does it not appear strange to the members of this House that this contractor should come up here; follow the investigation stage by stage; attend almost every meeting except a couple, when he was absent in Montreal to get witnesses; follow eagerly and assiduously the proceedings, continually prompting my hon. friends with questions—questions which to

my mind were merely calculated to embarrass the witnesses; and, when he saw the inquiry coming to a close, should disappear? We were meeting at two o'clock in the afternoon, and he sent a letter to the committee asking to be heard. The man was in this building at the time and till five o'clock that afternoon. He left by the evening train after six. His letter was read, as everybody on the committee was agreeable to hear him. I say—and I place myself in the judgment of this House—that the duty of this man was to appear on the first day and ask to be heard, instead of allowing us to prove all the facts to which he could testify. Well, Sir, we waited most of the afternoon—at any rate, over an hour. He did not appear. He was in the House, but he could not be found. We adjourned till eight o'clock in the evening. He did not appear in the evening, but sent a letter stating that he was most anxious to be heard, but that he had to leave for New York, and asking for an adjournment till Friday. No member of the committee proposed that that extraordinary demand should be complied with.

Mr. BERGERON. What did the chief justice say?

Mr. MONK. The chief justice himself was rather surprised; and, as we were anxious that this matter should be finished before the end of the session, we dispensed with the evidence of this man. He therefore, left for New York—but I mistake; he did not go to New York. He went to Montreal, and, with an imprudence which is scarcely conceivable, began interviewing the newspapers, writing letters, and stating that he was dying to be heard. This reminds me of the memorable scene in Macbeth, where Lady Macbeth travels about her castle at night asleep, under the watch of her physician and her attendants, and exclaims: 'Out damned spot! All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand.' And I say to this House that all the interviews, all the letters, all the affidavits in the world will not remove the very painful impression created by this man who was so anxious to be heard before the committee.

Mr. DAVIN. Could not the medical doctor minister to a mind diseased?

Mr. MONK. No, nor could he pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow. There was a witness, Mr. Muir, who came before the committee, and as to whose evidence there can be no question. He is a most respectable man, well known in Montreal, and he stated that Mr. Hatch had told him after the test in Kingston that the food supplied there contained only 15 per cent of proteids. I wish to say in regard to the evidence of Mr. Muir, that I think it is the unanimous opinion of the committee that he stated the truth and nothing but the truth; but how

can we reconcile that extraordinary statement with the statement made by Mr. Hatch under oath, that he supplied a concentrated food for the test at Kingston containing an average of 60 per cent of proteids? Why should he go uncalled for, and state to this man that this food really amounted to what we know is nothing but a diluted food? There are many explanations which will suggest themselves to lawyers of experience and to men of the world. There must be some mistake. Gentlemen who heard Mr. Hatch testify before the committee will bear me out in saying that English is not familiar to him. We had often to repeat questions in order to make them clear to him. He is an Austrian. His English is pretty fair, and his French pretty fair; but it does not take more than two minutes to see that English is not his language. Therefore, it is possible that when he was saying 15 per cent he thought he was saying 50 or 60 per cent. However, the crucial point is this. This man Devlin never manufactured any food before, and I venture to say that unless he is singularly favoured by Providence he will never manufacture any again. The other man's food is there; anybody can get it; and we all know that it would be absurd for him to say that he fed people with 15 per cent food. Mr. Hatch told me, when he revealed to me that he was threatened—the House may believe me or not as it chooses: 'I am very anxious to go up to Ottawa. Mr. Belcourt occupies a house there. Let him or the members of the committee, if that is according to parliamentary rule, look me up after having searched me, in Mr. Belcourt's kitchen, and give me three hours; and, with the ordinary things used in every-day life, I will turn out a food containing over 80 per cent of proteids. This is a fair test, and if there is another man in the country who can do the same thing, I am ready to be confounded.' So that, after reflection, it was considered that it would be really useless to bring this man back merely to state that there was a misunderstanding on the part of Mr. Muir, and I think that was a wise decision of the committee in order not unduly to prolong its sittings.

Now, one word more as to these charges. I have stated to the House that I believe public opinion upon this question is formed; nor would I have taken up so much of the attention of this House had it not been that I feel that the House would go very far if it whitewashed, as this report purports to whitewash, the conduct of the contractor. As regards the conduct of the Minister of Militia, the facts are not complicated; they are admitted, and the public can form their own opinion. Hon. members and the public can form their opinion, but is it right, I ask this House, that we should state positively by our verdict that the conduct of

this contractor was honourable and proper and all that it should be? It is this point to which I wish to call the attention of the House, because the condemnation of the contractor, of course, as hon. members will see, has no political consequence whatever. But I say it would be very regrettable that we should adopt a report declaring to the people that this contractor is above reproach. It is pointed out in the draft report made by the minority that the contractor is civilly responsible to the government. I appeal to hon. members who are lawyers if we have not evidence in this book—evidence which could be produced before a court of justice—that this contractor solemnly guaranteed to Dr. Neilson that the food was the very same as that tested in Kingston, and the government had, at that time, in its hands, a pamphlet saying that this Hatch's protose was over 60 per cent protein. Is there a lawyer who will say that if the government saw fit to take a civil suit against this man, they would not have the evidence at hand to enable them to obtain a condemnation in damages against him, useless as that might be. Let any one consult the Adulteration Act, and the question is really under what section of the Act this man does not come—not under what section he does come. I leave it not only to lawyers, but even to laymen, whether under the provisions of that Act, he is not clearly criminally responsible. Did he not furnish to the department, on the 4th January, a can on which he had caused to be printed these words: 'Upon this food Canadian soldiers have subsisted thirty days'? Was this true or not? And if untrue, is he not criminally responsible?

I am grateful to the House for having listened to me so patiently, and I regret having taken up so much of its time. Let me say one word regarding myself personally. In a very extended debate, which hon. members can consult, and which took place in 1892, when our late lamented Speaker, Sir James Edgar, made charges in this House, it seems to have been generally recognized that a man who brings charges in this House and fails to substantiate them, is not for that reason debarred from sitting in this House. Sir John Thompson said that that was the popular but a mistaken impression. It may be a mistaken impression theoretically, but it is my opinion that that impression is correct, and let me say that I do believe that a man who rises in this House and makes charges which an investigation shows to be frivolous is not deserving of a seat in this House. Had I any doubt as to the facts established in this case, I would deem it my duty, if this majority report is adopted, to resign my seat in this House; and I think I will find an emphatic echo among many members of this House when I say it would be perhaps an advantage to retire, under such circumstances, from a life which is filled with

burdens and which is so thankless, but I do not consider that the charges made by me were frivolous. I do consider that any man who carefully goes through that report must, whatever may be his political opinion, arrive at this conclusion that this contractor, under circumstances of great meanness, perpetrated a gross fraud upon the Department of Militia, that he is a man evidently unscrupulous and without a proper sense of what is due to the people of this country; and that being my conviction, of course irrespective of the verdict which is always a doubtful one, which the electorate may pronounce on my conduct with respect to these charges, I do not consider that the outcome of this investigation is of such a nature that I ought to give up my seat in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier moves, in amendment to the motion of the hon. member for Ottawa City, that the minority report be adopted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this amendment?

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order. The amendment has not been read and surely we should have it read.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member insists on having it read to the House, I will read it, but it has been printed and is in the hands of every member of the House.

Mr. Speaker read the amendment.

Mr. BENJAMIN RUSSELL (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), in his very pathetic closing remarks, indicated that he had had pretty hard luck in the prosecution of this case, without having the left-handed compliment paid to him by his friends upon the opposite side of the House, of assuming that the routine reading of this report by the Speaker, would produce a stronger impression upon this House and the country, than that which was produced by the hon. gentleman's speech. I think it was the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), who was mainly instrumental in securing the reading of the report, realizing that something was necessary to bring the House back to the consideration of the real question which was placed before the committee, and which was so gingerly and faintly dealt with by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. It will be perfectly remembered by every hon. member of this House, that when these charges were launched to the number of seventeen or eighteen paragraphs, in which the evidence, or facts relating to the matter, in the conception of the hon. gentleman, were expanded, they led up to what was in fact the main charge, namely, that the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden), for all these various reasons, and under all these circum-

stances, as above set forth, was guilty of gross and culpable negligence, in the various measures specified in four subparagraphs of the closing paragraph of his charge. I think I may justly say that in the speech of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, there was a smaller percentage of reference to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, than there was of proteids in any one of these samples that have been brought before the committee. I do not think that you will find 60 per cent, 80 per cent, or 90 per cent, or that you will find even 16 per cent of reference to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, in that long speech of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. You will not even find 13.8 per cent, or whatever it was which Hatch's proteid realized when subjected to the severe and analytical methods of the expert analyst who dealt with it. I think that indicates to every hon. member of this House that the judicious people of this country must have perceived the intention, the desire, the determination of those who instituted this charge to get as far away as possible from the issue in which they charged negligence against the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, and to attach as much odium as they could to everybody else connected with the matter. They have very little to say about the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, whose skirts have been proved to be as entirely clean as they could be. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier said that he would discuss the matter in a judicial tone, and we expected to find his tone in striking contrast to that of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some hon. members say 'hear, hear.' We all expected that there would be that marked contrast displayed in the remarks of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, but all must have been disappointed, after listening to his speech, when we found that it was delivered in a tone which nobody would ever have recognized as judicial if the hon. member had not taken the pains to inform us of the fact. The hon. gentleman's judicial tone in his speech was about on a par with the judicial position he assumed in the committee. He was prosecutor, counsel and judge in the committee: he undertook these three-fold functions, and having conducted himself in that way, I do not wonder in the least that he felt it was necessary to do something to redeem himself from the awkward position, from the rather equivocal position in which he had allowed himself to be placed.

I will not refer to the unpleasant episode in connection with the publication of the report. My hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) spoke of that. Certainly, it does not reflect the highest credit upon the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk),

who gave every member of the committee to understand, upon his honour, that there would be no publication of the report of the minority unless there was a contemporaneous publication of the majority report. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman realized the necessity of doing something to prejudice public opinion in advance of the conclusion which had been arrived at; but, I do not think it was candid, I do not think it was fair or just for him to allow the committee to separate without giving us all to understand—what he afterwards privately gave some of us to understand—that although he was prepared to jealously guard any copies of the minority report that happened to be under his own control, he could not answer for copies of that report which were extant in the hands of others who were speeding by train to Montreal, to have it in time for publication in the morning papers there, as it was published here in the Conservative organ on the following morning. I do not think that circumstance reflects the highest credit on the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. It is his misfortune, probably, that that occurred; it is one of the many misfortunes that have pursued him since he undertook this unpleasant and unprofitable business. Now, Sir, I and every member of this House will agree in the remark of the hon. member (Mr. Monk) as to the very keen interest which is taken by the community at large in this question, as in all questions which concern the safety and the happiness and the welfare of our brave lads who have gone to fight the battles of the empire in South Africa. There is a keen interest, as there should be in everything relating to this matter, and, Sir, it is right that everything relating to our valiant and heroic Canadian lads should secure the most efficient and ample attention. It is so in the old country. Everything that concerns the British soldier is keenly criticised, and, indeed, I may say that it is not always impartially or fairly considered by the general public. Even the great name of Lord Roberts does not shelter him from criticism, and from charges which have been brought against the administration of the military department in South Africa, which is under his immediate control. We know that Burdett Coutts is now making charges in England against the hospital service at the seat of war. It is right that such charges should be inquired into, and it is inevitable that the public will take the deepest interest in allegations of that kind and have them sifted to the utmost. But, Sir, while the public are jealous of everything that appertains to the welfare of the soldier in the field, they will not be unreasonable; they are not so unreasonable as hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House. The public do not look for absolute perfection in these matters, because they know that absolute perfection has never been attained by any administration in any war that ever took place in the history of

Mr. RUSSELL.

the world. The public do not look for impossibilities. They know the experience of other countries; the experience of countries of ampler resources and a more perfect system of administration in such matters than we can pretend to have. No war has ever taken place in any country under the sun in which there were not instances of transports failing to connect, of mistakes made, of some person imposing upon the authorities, who, in good faith, were seeking to discharge their duty in the best possible way. The conditions under which wars are waged do not permit of absolute perfection. There is not the same time for deliberation in the conduct of a war that there is in the prosecution of any peaceful avocation. Everything has to be keyed up to concert pitch, if I may use the expression. No reasonable man can expect the same consideration, the same deliberation, the same care in every minute detail in the administration of a war which you may hope to find in the administration of any civil branch of the public service. Even a government of all the talents, such as we had in this country in 1866, when that government had a disturbance on its hands, did not succeed in attaining to absolute perfection in the conduct of the affair. Those of us who attended the meetings of the British Empire League heard Col. Denison when he referred to the conditions under which he and his comrades in arms were sent to the front in 1866, and if hon. gentlemen forget it, I will read an extract from the graphic description which Col. Denison gave of the condition of things then; not under an amateur government—as gentlemen opposite sometimes call the present government—but under a government composed of men like Sir John Macdonald, Sir George Etienne Cartier, D'Arcy McGee, Wm. McDougall, Sir Alex. Galt, George Brown, and men of the highest administrative ability in this country. They had a war on their hands, and look under what conditions the troops were sent to the front then. Col. Denison said:

We were sent without carbines.

A much more important item, one would think, than emergency food.

We were sent without carbines, which I had earnestly asked for. We were sent with revolvers with only a few cartridges; not enough to load them at once. We had no haversacks; we had no water bottles, no nosebags, no canteens or valises, or camp kettles, or cooking utensils of any kind; no tents or no blankets. Some tents came after us in a few days. No one in the command had a proper map of the locality.

Mr. BEATTIE. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) what war that was?

Mr. RUSSELL. There was a war in 1866.

Mr. BEATTIE. Yes; where the troops got twenty-four hours' notice to take the field.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was an infinitesimal war compared with this, but yet, these great men in the government sent the troops out in the condition so graphically depicted here.

Mr. BEATTIE. It was a very serious war; it lasted half an hour. I was there, and we had to go out on twenty-four hours' notice.

Mr. RUSSELL. Col. Denison's remarks on the occasion I have referred to, were delivered extempore, but there is a more formal historian, who devotes some attention to that struggle, and to the way in which the repulsion of that raid was mismanaged. That historian was Col. Grey, a colonel and a judge both, and he speaks of mismanagement on the part of the highest military authorities in Upper Canada; he speaks of the entire absence of those preliminary preparations which are essential to any success in war; he speaks of volunteers hurrying to the front without proper supplies; he speaks of a divided command, with no previous co-operation, of deficient transport arrangements, of uncertainty of direction, and of insufficient medical care, and he goes on to say:

It is pitiful to read of boys slaughtered by such mismanagement.

Compared with such things as are here depicted, what becomes of alleged lack of sufficient provisions in an emergency food which may never be called into use.

It is pitiful to read of boys slaughtered by such mismanagement.

That occurred under a government of all the talents. How can you expect in these degenerate days—for there were giants in those days'—that we can find a Minister of Militia or a government capable of conducting this large campaign in a way more perfect than these great men were able to conduct even that comparatively trifling trouble that was then on their hands.

But, Sir, there have been other occasions when it was necessary to have military administration in this country. We had a war later on, a real war, a war usually spoken of in the journals as the disturbance in the North-west; and even in connection with that you will find that absolute perfection was not reached. You will find bitter complaints running through the reports of the brigade surgeon, and the reports of others who were charged with the administration of military affairs at that time—complaints that the clothing was not sufficiently warm, that each soldier was not supplied with a water bottle. We read that 'the 90th suffered very much from intense thirst during the four days they were engaged, owing to this want, as there were no means of supplying the line of skirmishers with water, who were out the whole day.' When you find that preparations were not made to supply the soldiers with such an absolutely prime requisite as water,

and that they were allowed to suffer for four days from intense thirst when on the line of skirmishers, how can you assert—even if there were anything in these charges, which I do not admit—that there was negligence or culpability on the part of the Minister of Militia? All other rations, even emergency rations, are supplied by the British government; but, because, in the effort to do that which was a work of supererogation, in the effort to supply that which should not be a necessity at all, the minister was imposed upon—even if he was imposed upon, which I do not admit—to the extent of a \$4,000 contract among the many contracts amounting to about \$1,000,000, which he made during that time, can you fairly say that is evidence of negligence or culpability? We find General Laurie referring to Colonel Williams' regiment in the following words:

I believe they want water bottles and clothing, and I have repeatedly asked for both, but I have not received either.

Well, Sir, if that is any serious reflection on the Militia Department in connection with the conduct of a war in our own country in those times, I want to know who is going to judge so minutely the supposed omissions or failures or negligences of a Minister of Militia, who, in a range of contracts running to about a million dollars, has been imposed upon, assuming that he was imposed upon, to the extent of a \$4,000 contract. One million dollars is to \$4,000 as 100 is to two-fifths of one. That is to say, in the whole range of expenditure apart from pay of our own soldiers in the South African war, amounting in round numbers to about \$1,000,000—the whole expenditure is, I suppose, over \$2,000,000—even if the Minister of Militia had been imposed upon by a designing contractor to the extent of \$4,000, that would only amount to two-fifths of one per cent on the whole; and it would be of infinitesimal matter in contrast with the general administration of the minister which has called forth high encomiums from men on both sides of politics all over the country, and won the applause of the whole empire outside. I say I am agreeably disappointed to find that there is nothing whatever in the charge, even though it is of such infinitesimal proportions, and I should not have been at all disappointed if it turned out that in regard to two-fifths of one per cent of his total expenditure the minister had been grievously imposed upon. Even if the food supplied by Dr. Devlin under that contract had been absolute trash, not worth a button, if it had not even been fit for human food, I would not have thought it was a remarkable thing to happen. On the contrary, I would have thought that in a large mass of contracts, extending over the whole range of materials requisite and necessary for such a service, it would have been almost a miracle if the Minister of Militia

had escaped by a larger margin than two-fifths of one per cent from being imposed upon by downright fraud and humbug. But in this case I say there had been no fraud and no imposition of any kind whatever.

Now, my learned and hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has gone into the evidence so fully, and we have had the reports before us and before the country for so many days, that it is not necessary for me to occupy so much time as I otherwise would have taken in the expansion of this proposition. I presume that the best way in which I can preserve some degree of continuity will be to deal with the subject in the order in which it has been dealt with by the findings of the committee. If those findings are based on evidence, and are correct, then there is absolutely no charge proved against the hon. Minister of Militia, nor even against Dr. Devlin. But I want to call attention again to the way in which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has sought to get away from the real issue. He is alarmed, apparently, at the spectre which he has raised, and is anxious to get as far away from it as possible. He is harking back from the charge he made, the gist of which was that the Minister of Militia had negligently allowed an inferior article of food to that tested at Kingston to be supplied to the troops going to South Africa. That is the gravamen of the charge, but on that my hon. friend has expended as little time and attention as he possibly could, with any semblance of respect to the indictment which he himself prepared and laid before this House. He has been attacking the officers at Kingston; and he has been attacking Dr. Devlin. What has the character or conduct of Dr. Devlin to do with the charge against the Minister of Militia? Who has been defending Dr. Devlin? Who in this House cares a button about Dr. Devlin? Whether he is the most honest man in the world or the greatest scoundrel that walks unhung, is certainly a matter of absolute indifference to any member of the committee. Then I want to know what sense there is in attacking Dr. Devlin or in charging him with attempts to impose upon the public. That is not the question we are here to deal with at all. The question, I say again, is whether the Minister of Militia has been at fault or negligent. Whether Dr. Devlin did or did not supply such a food as he undertook to supply, and whether that food was or was not equal in strength and character and quality to that tested at Kingston, is a subsidiary question which it may be profitable to answer for the purpose of showing that there was no imposition on the Minister of Militia. But if you grant to the fullest extent that Dr. Devlin succeeded in imposing on the officials in the Militia Department, that might still leave the charge

Mr. RUSSELL.

of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier absolutely unproved and foundationless.

The second paragraph of this report refers to the samples forwarded to the director general of medical supplies at Ottawa. These are referred to for the purpose of establishing a proposition which I say again it was not at all necessary to establish, but which is established beyond all reasonable controversy—that the food which was used in the test at Kingston did not contain a percentage of over 13·7 of proteids. The evidence of that rests on this fact, that there were two samples of food furnished, with the handwriting of Mr. Hatch on the envelope containing one of them, which Mr. Hatch himself told us he furnished to Dr. Neilson for the purpose of making a test in Kingston. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier referred to three samples. I am not aware that there were three. I understand that there were but two samples—one with 80 per cent of proteids and the other 50 per cent of proteid. The 80 per cent sample he called full strength, and the 50 per cent half strength. There was no other sample ever furnished Dr. Neilson. Mr. Hatch does not pretend that there were any other samples sent, nor does Dr. Neilson or Dr. Devlin suggest that there were any others. We then have this, as a reasonable conclusion to arrive at, that there were two samples sent to Dr. Neilson as samples of the food to be tested at Kingston. Mr. Hatch himself admits that it was not the 80 per cent sample which he was going to make the subject of the test, because that would have been altogether too strong. It would have been preposterous to feed soldiers for twenty days on 80 per cent of proteids, because that kind of food is only suitable for patients suffering from wasting diseases. What he did say was that he was going to supply a food with 60 per cent proteids. We know now that this sample which he sent, and which he called his sample of half-strength, contained, not 50 per cent, but only 13·7 per cent proteids. What he called his half-strength sample was submitted to an analytical chemist and analysed, and the evidence in regard to that is a direct, logical, continuous chain. It is absolutely true that the sample called the half-strength sample, furnished by Mr. Hatch to Dr. Neilson as a sample of the food upon which the soldiers were to be fed at Kingston, did not contain 50 per cent strength of proteid, but only 13·7 per cent, and Mr. Hatch admitted afterwards that it contained only 15 per cent. If Mr. Hatch assumed that what he was giving to Dr. Neilson was a 50 per cent sample of protose or proteid—because there is nothing in all this pother about the name on which my hon. friend insists so strongly, and I must say that a man is driven to the catch at a very small straw when he thinks he can make anything out of the difference in names

—if this sample, which Mr. Hatch called half strength, and which he supposed to contain 50 per cent of proteids, contained only 13·7 per cent, it is reasonable to assume that when he thought he was furnishing 60 per cent proteids, he was in reality only furnishing about 14 per cent. When Mr. Hatch supposed—and I am giving him the credit of good faith—that he was actually furnishing Dr. Neilson and Dr. Devlin at Kingston, for the purposes of a test, 50 per cent proteids, but which on analysis was found to contain but 13·7 per cent, it is fair to conclude that if he did the thing in good faith—and I am arguing on the assumption that he was in good faith throughout, though I strongly suspect he was a fakir from the beginning to the end—it is but reasonable to suppose that when he thought he was furnishing 60 per cent of proteids, he was in reality only furnishing about 14 per cent. That is entirely in accord with his own admission. The real truth is that he did not know what he was furnishing the government. He never knew anything about it at all. He simply made some hocus pocus mess that he called proteose, and never analysed it at all or had it analysed. Any one who will take the trouble to read his cross-examination will discover that he did not know what he was furnishing. He is not a chemist. He told us that he was a Galician Jew, practicing the trade of grist-milling when in his own country, and it is passing strange to find our hon. friends opposite, who have such a prejudice against that race, now championing the cause of the most prominent Galician in the country. If you will look at the cross-examination of Mr. Hatch, you will find that he could never have had any possible means of knowing what was the strength of the food he was sending to Kingston at all. He did have analyses made by Dr. Ruttan of some food, when he first came to this country, but when I probed him and when he was sharply questioned by other members of the committee, he had to admit—and he did so very reluctantly—that that was not food made in this country at all, but some food he had brought with him from the old country and had handed to Dr. Ruttan for the purpose of having it analysed, and he got an analysis and a certificate from Dr. Ruttan showing that it contained 60 per cent of proteids. And by a breach of faith, by a breach of the express understanding between him and Dr. Ruttan, he used that certificate as a puff for the stuff he was making in this country, with which it had nothing at all in common. I say therefore that, as a matter of fact, he did not know what he was giving the soldiers in Kingston at all. But he admitted, so far as his admission is worth anything, that the strength of the food he was giving them was 15 per cent of proteids. That is established by the uncontradicted evidence of Mr. Muir, of the firm of Muir & Torrence of Montreal, and I

noticed the very artistic way in which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier slides over that evidence. How can he get that out of the case? How can he get out of this record the uncontradicted admission by Mr. Hatch that he did not supply 60 per cent or 30 per cent or but only 15 per cent of proteids for the purpose of the test at Kingston. Mr. Muir gave the whole conversation. He explained that it was not merely a casual statement made to him by Mr. Hatch, and he explained why he had such an accurate recollection of the conversation. The very surprise excited in his mind by that statement caused him to remember the thing so well. If it was a lie told by Mr. Muir, it was a lie with a circumstance, which I admit is the most artistic kind of lie a man can tell, but the hon. member for Jacques Cartier himself admits that the statement made by Mr. Muir was a true one; and if it was true, that is absolutely the end of my hon. friend's case.

There is no foundation left for his case, if Mr. Muir told the truth. If Mr. Muir told the truth, Hatch made the clear and distinct admission that the food had not 50 per cent or 60 per cent, or even 30 per cent strength of proteids, but only 15 per cent. And, when Mr. Muir expressed surprise, and said he thought it was a very much higher percentage, Hatch went on to explain the reasons why he used a low percentage, and claimed that that was the very merit of his invention, and that he was enabled, by the peculiar constituents of the food, and by the way he mixes them, to make a food so quickly assimilable, that a 15 per cent strength of proteids had a better effect upon the system than a higher percentage of proteids would have in less perfectly composed and less perfectly blended ingredients. I press the concession of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), that Mr. Muir was telling the truth, and that this was really and verily a clear admission on the part of Hatch—an admission not made under any misunderstanding, but made with a detail and circumstantiality which shows that he fully and perfectly understood the matter; that his attention had been aroused by the fact that he had actually surprised Mr. Muir, and, with that full and fair understanding he made the frank, clear and distinct admission, that the food he had supplied at Kingston did not contain more than 15 per cent of proteids.

Now, if Mr. Muir was not telling the truth—which, however, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier will not contend, because he has admitted the contrary—it was the duty of these hon. gentlemen on the committee to bring Hatch before the committee, and have Mr. Muir's statement contradicted. The hon. member (Mr. Monk), admitted to my hon. friend from Kingston, that we are not going to try this case on evidence that was not before the committee; we are not at liberty to try this case by volunteer state-

ments made outside, without the sanction of an oath. There is no other way to get rid of the effect of Mr. Muir's statement, and, therefore, of Hatch's uncontradicted admission, except by having it solemnly contradicted under oath in the same way that it was given by Mr. Muir. I do not suppose that I need labour that matter longer. I do contend that from the uncontradicted admission to Mr. Muir, and the analysis made by Dr. Ruttan, it is clear that the food sent to Kingston for the purpose of being given to the soldiers subjected to the test, did not contain a higher percentage, at all events, than 15 per cent of proteids. Dr. Ruttan was called by my hon. friends on the other side to show that it was impossible that those results which were obtained at Kingston, could have been obtained with a food having only a 15 per cent strength of proteids. Though it is a little out of the line I intended to follow, yet, while the matter is present to my mind, I might as well deal now with the evidence of Dr. Ruttan on that point. This evidence was presented by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), and the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), with the intention of proving, by chemical authority, that these results could not have been obtained with a food of 15 per cent strength of proteids, but that the food used, must have had 50 or 60 per cent. And the way it was sought to be proved, was by asking Dr. Ruttan a number of hypothetical questions as to what would be the effect of feeding such and such men with such and such a strength of food, for such and such length of time under such and such circumstances. And in answering these hypothetical questions, Dr. Ruttan said that it would be impossible to sustain life for such a length of time on such food so given. But these hypothetical questions and the answers to them, proved nothing at all; because when I put in the affidavits of the men, showing that they had not relied exclusively on this food, but that they had had beef tea, sugar, milk, and some of them beer, Dr. Ruttan had to admit that every one of the results reported to have been accomplished by the test, might have been accomplished by the use of a food having no greater strength of proteids than 15 per cent. I say that this is absolutely fatal to the contention that the food tested at Kingston could not have had so low a percentage as 15 per cent, or otherwise the test would have had different results. Dr. Ruttan's evidence does not disprove, but rather confirms, the statement that the food used at Kingston contained only 15 per cent strength of proteids. Now, there is no dispute, absolutely none, about the proportion of proteids in the food sent to South Africa. There is no doubt that it contained at least 16 per cent. So that according to the evidence, it was a food as strong, if not stronger in proteids, than the food used in the tests in Kingston.

Mr. RUSSELL.

There was one feature of my hon. friend's (Mr. Monk's) speech, by the way, to which I must call attention. He spoke as though it were admitted that the proteids were the only nutritious element in the food. But the hon. gentleman knows very well that the proteids are only the tissue-producing elements, and that it is important for men on the march, or in the fighting line, or engaged in heavy work, that they should be supplied with the energy-producing elements as well as the tissue-producing elements. I am not a chemist or physiologist, but I venture my opinion for what it may be worth, that if there is any preference at all, as a matter of common sense, it is vastly more important to have the energy producing elements, than the tissue forming elements. I only refer to this matter to refute the utter fallacy of my hon. friend in assuming that because there was only 14 per cent of proteids, there was only 14 per cent of nutriment in the food supplied to the soldiers who went to South Africa.

Now, suppose there had been a mistake made—of which there is no proof—suppose there had been an improper food furnished. I venture to say that the responsibility does not rest, and cannot be made to rest in any degree whatever upon the Minister of Militia. Dr. Neilson took the right view of his position, when he said that he assumed and was obliged to assume the whole responsibility for recommending that food. It is necessary and right that there should be some person in the department to assume such responsibility for the supplies sent to South Africa. Do you suppose there would be any member in the Imperial House of Commons lunatic enough to make a personal charge against the Marquess of Lansdowne, because he had not himself personally examined all the supplies that were sent out with troops that were going to the front? And if not, why should we look for that in this country, which no sane man would think of demanding of Ministers of State in England? It is only right and reasonable that there should be technical officers charged with the responsibility of such matters, and upon whom the minister has the right to throw the responsibility, if anything goes wrong. Therefore, I say, Dr. Neilson was right in assuming, as he did assume, the entire responsibility. The sample was handed to him by Dr. Devlin, and he satisfied himself that it was the same kind of food that had been used in the test at Kingston. He undertook the whole responsibility; and more than that, I do not see why he was not as much entitled to rely upon the respectability and responsibility of Dr. Devlin as the collector of customs in Montreal was to rely upon the respectability and responsibility of Dr. Devlin. Hon. gentlemen opposite contend that it was all wrong for Dr. Neilson to accept the statement of Dr. Devlin without criticism, but when it comes to the collector

at Montreal, oh, then Dr. Devlin is everything, Dr. Devlin is a perfectly responsible man, and the collector of customs in Montreal does perfectly right in relying implicitly on the assurance of Dr. Devlin that these goods are those contracted for by the government. But Dr. Neilson must not rely upon Dr. Devlin for anything at all, when the latter assures him that this sample is really a sample of the food which was tested at Kingston and tested under Dr. Devlin's own care, tested under his own superintendence. Dr. Devlin was the man with whom Dr. Neilson had acted all the way through, and with whom the Minister of Militia and Defence had acted, and it would have been fair and reasonable to suppose that a man standing high in the community—and I know nothing against his honour, professionally or otherwise—was furnishing him a fair, reasonable and proper sample of the food. But he did not rest at that, he subjected it to the only test that it was feasible to subject it to at the time. He assured himself, at all events, rightly or wrongly; and if my hon. friends opposite will take the responsibility of saying that Dr. Neilson did not take proper precautions, and that he should be dismissed from the service of the Militia Department for not taking proper precautions and making an adequate test to satisfy himself that that sample was suitable to be the standard of the contract, then I have nothing to say about it. He is no relation to me in the world. I do not know that he is a protégé of any hon. gentleman on this side of the House; but I undertake to say that they will not insist that Dr. Neilson did anything wrong which would warrant his being blamed or dismissed.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what precaution Dr. Neilson took to satisfy himself that the food that Dr. Devlin undertook to supply was similar to that used at Kingston?

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to answer him by asking another question? Do you insist that he should be dismissed for not taking proper precautions, and do you say that if he failed to take proper precautions to assure the Minister of Militia and Defence of the genuineness of the food you have any right whatever to condemn the Minister, and that it is not a malicious proceeding to base any charge against the Minister if Dr. Neilson had satisfied himself in his own mind, and assured the Minister of Militia and Defence that these were samples which could be depended upon as fair samples of the food which was used in the test at Kingston.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman to come down to rock bottom, and tell us what precautions Dr. Neilson took to satisfy himself that the food was similar to that tested at Kingston?

Mr. RUSSELL. Dr. Neilson says under oath that he took all the precautions possible for him to take at the time. He says that if he had had a chemical analyst at his elbow like Mr. Hersey, he would have been very glad to have his assistance, but it was entirely impossible for him to analyse the specimens. The contract being made on the 4th and to be performed on the 15th, it was absolutely necessary to close the bargain at once, or else it was no use to undertake it at all. He says if he had undertaken to have the samples analysed the contract could not have been performed in time to allow this food to go to South Africa. He says further that if he had insisted upon the analysis it would have taken twelve days for the Inland Revenue Department to secure an analysis of it, and we know, as a matter of fact, that when the goods were afterwards put in the Inland Revenue Department for the purpose of being analysed, the process did occupy twelve days before any results could be given. But that is not the point. How anxious my hon. friend is to get away from the point; how anxious they all are to get away from the point; how anxious they all are, having failed in establishing their unfounded charge against the Minister of Militia and Defence of gross and culpable negligence, to find some scapegoat in the department upon whom they can transfer the charge. Now, I say again that the responsibility of Dr. Neilson in this matter he himself has recognized. I am not going to waste time by reading extracts from the evidence; every member of the committee can remember the statement of Dr. Neilson that he then became absolutely responsible to the Minister of Militia and Defence for the equivalency of that sample on which that contract was based to the food which had been used in the test at Kingston. It might be possible, if it had turned out that it was not equivalent to it, that my hon. friend would have a right to call for the dismissal of Dr. Neilson. But when it is proved beyond any fair doubt that Dr. Neilson was right, that the assurance given him by Dr. Devlin was right, that the analysis has confirmed every conclusion at which he arrived, and that the food which was sent to South Africa was really better than the food which was supplied at Kingston, then I say that Dr. Neilson, having taken that responsibility upon his shoulders, and having come out without being convicted of any mistake, without having been convicted of any blunder, taking the responsibility, taking the risk—I say he has passed that stage at which it is fair or reasonable to raise any further outcry against him. But even had he made ever so great a mistake, I say again that that would be absolutely no reason upon which to found any charge against the Minister of Militia

and Defence, no more than if any subordinate in any of the departments in England had been found guilty of carelessness or of negligence in allowing things to pass which should not have been passed without further criticism and without further care, that would have been a ground upon which to base a personal charge against the Secretary of State for War.

Now, then, my hon. friend referred to the letter of Mr. Hatch as being the foundation for another charge of negligence against the Minister of Militia and Defence; and he said that it was very wrong and unfair to describe that letter of Mr. Hatch as a letter from a disappointed applicant for a contract. Now, let us see. Mr. Hatch, I suppose it will be admitted, was an applicant for a contract, Mr. Hatch did not get that contract, and I suppose it is not a very long inference to draw that he was a little disappointed at not getting it. Now, if he was an applicant for a contract, and failed to get it, and was disappointed at not getting it, and wrote a letter about it, I do not see there is anything very wrong in saying that his letter was a letter from a disappointed applicant for a contract. That seems to me about as plain as the nose on your face. Very well, that was only one of the innumerable letters which the Minister of Militia and Defence was receiving every day; and although he would have been justified in throwing it into the waste basket as one of the innumerable back-biting letters of complaint which he was receiving, he did not do so, but he did everything which he would have done had he known the writer of the letter, that is to say, he made inquiries of his officials to discover whether there was any basis for the letter of Mr. Hatch, and he learned from the officers of his department the proceedings that had been taken. First of all, he learned that his deputy had taken care that Capt. Benoit should be sent to Halifax for the express purpose of seeing that proper delivery was made of these goods under the contract.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Not at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, absolutely so, as you will see at page 9 of the evidence. You will see the statement of the Deputy Minister of Militia 'that the cases were to be delivered to Capt. Curran, and Capt. Benoit, the secretary of the department, was sent to Halifax to see that everything was delivered according to contract.'

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is no evidence.

Mr. RUSSELL. Why does the hon. gentleman interrupt me to say that this is not evidence, when it is conclusive evidence.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Because Captain Benoit contradicts it.

Mr. RUSSELL.

Mr. RUSSELL. He does not contradict it. Capt. Benoit, in his cross-examination, stated that he had taken samples out of the box in which they were contained, for his own satisfaction. Was it for his own satisfaction individually? Not at all. I asked him: You mean, of course, for your own satisfaction as an officer of the Militia Department? Certainly, he said. Somebody, I suppose, had to be responsible. Somebody had to be charged with details of carrying out this contract. Somebody had to be charged with the responsibility of seeing that the contract was carried out, and Capt. Benoit was there in Halifax for the very purpose of superintending the matter. What was Capt. Benoit's business in Halifax? The Deputy Minister of Militia tells us that his special business in this connection was to be in Halifax to see that the delivery of these goods was in accordance with the contract. Now, my hon. friend seems to think that what is done by Capt. Benoit, by Col. Pinault, by Dr. Neilson, or by any other officials of the department in the way of taking proper precautions and seeing that things are done rightly, reflects no credit upon the department. It is only when a minister personally does anything in reference to these matters that it is to count at all. But whatever is done by the members of his department is not to count, and is not to be placed at the credit of the department. What are his subordinates for, except to see that the business of the department is properly carried out. When officials of the department were in Halifax or elsewhere, or in Ottawa or elsewhere, and when Capt. Benoit, for his own satisfaction, as an official of the department was there to see that the contract was properly carried out, took actual samples and forwarded them to Ottawa for the purposes of analysis, I do not know why the department should not get credit of it. The hon. gentleman's theory is that whatever goes wrong in the department, if there has been any carelessness or any negligence, that comes right home to the Minister of Militia, but if the officials of the department attend to their duty, if they are careful and solicitous in the discharge of their functions, then, the department is to get no credit for that, but it goes as a personal asset to the particular officer who attends to the discharge of the duty entrusted to him. That is a most monstrous and a most ridiculous suggestion. The minister discovered when he made the inquiries suggested by Hatch's letter, that a number of things were being done to ensure the proper performance of the contract, everything that any man would insist upon having done, had his attention been called to the matter. But, it was not Dr. Hatch's letter that secured the taking of these precautions. My hon. friend assumed that Dr. Neilson did not know anything

about the results of the analysis. Dr. Neilson knew all about what Mr. Macfarlane the Dominion analyst, had said: Dr. Neilson had the analysis in his own hands, and he was satisfied when he read the analysis of Mr. Macfarlane, and when he saw the proportion of proteids contained in the food, that it was a proper food to be sent to the troops in South Africa. The adverse language of Mr. Macfarlane was entirely uncalled for by the question submitted to him.

An hon. MEMBER. It was true.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was a gross impertinence on his part. I do not see anything in the submission which would call for the comments that he made. But Dr. Neilson, notwithstanding, chose to pass his professional judgment upon that food as a proper food to be sent to our soldiers in South Africa. He candidly admits that he expected it to contain a larger and higher percentage of proteids than it actually did contain. He does not pretend to be a food specialist. He does not pretend to know whether 14 per cent is better or worse than 30 per cent, or 50 per cent, or 60 per cent, but he exercised his judgment as the medical officer of the department, after having analysed the the foods which were sent to him or brought to his attention by the minister, and his judgment was that this was a proper food to be sent to South Africa. He adheres to that opinion to-day, and he expressed it without hesitation when sworn before the committee. One of the misconceptions that underlies the criticisms that have been made upon this food by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and by the newspapers in the country, as far as they have criticised it, is in assuming that this was to be an exclusive food. I lay stress upon that because the contrary is written clearly upon the official records. If hon. gentlemen will look not merely at the oral evidence that has been given before the committee, and which might be subject to the comment that is given after the event for the purpose of exculpating officials that are accused, but if they will discharge that from their minds and take the written record, the evidence which was put on record before any question had arisen in the community in regard to this food, if they will take the directions of the director general to the medical officers they will see that this was not an exclusive food at all, but that it was more a stimulant than a food. If they will look at the 'Instructions for medical officers on hired transports to the Cape,' at page 269, they will find the following:

The minister has added five days' emergency rations per man of a new nutritive extract known as 'protein vegetal'—(four ounces equal to one day's ration). On occasions when extraordinary exertion is called for, this light and compact ration will be found of great value. Its merits

have been fairly tested in 'A' Battery, R.C.A. (April, 1899).

He does not say that if you run out of all other rations, that if you run out of the regular rations supplied by the Imperial government or run out of whatever emergency ration may be supplied by the Imperial government, you will be able to rely upon this. He does not say that at all, but he says:

On occasions when extraordinary exertion is called for, this light and compact ration will be found of great value. Its merits have been thoroughly tested in 'A' Battery, R.C.A. (April, 1899.)

That is consistent with the test that had been made in Kingston. It never had been tested as an exclusive food. Hon. gentlemen cannot read the affidavits of the soldiers upon whom they tested that ration and come to the conclusion that it was being tested to learn whether it was a food to be relied upon exclusively. It was a diet to be taken with the assistance of auxiliary foods. So that, it was entirely in accordance with the test which had been made by the medical director and with his general directions to the medical officers that this food was not a food upon which they could rely, as an exclusive diet upon which men could live without any other food, but that it was a food to be resorted to:

On occasions when extraordinary exertion is called for.

The 'Instructions for medical officers on hired transports to the Cape,' given by the medical director are entirely in line with the purposes and results of the tests made at Kingston, and entirely in line with the evidence of Dr. Ruttan. Now, I do not know that there are very many other points in this matter that I wish to refer to, but I think if the House will call it six o'clock I will recall some points that I may have forgotten.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, the only important part of the report that I have not dealt with is the reference which it makes to the collector of customs at Montreal. I do not quite understand the position taken by the Conservative journals, and by some hon. gentlemen opposite, with respect to that matter. When the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) formulated his charges, he seemed to think that it was a very terrible thing that this food was imported from a foreign country, and that it was a still more flagrant offence, it being imported from a foreign country, that it should be brought in without payment of duty. He asserted in his charges that it had been brought in with-

out payment of duty by some order from the Minister of Customs or the Minister of Militia—I do not quite remember which he regarded as being the responsible minister in the matter. There is no doubt in the world that if my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) had not been entirely disappointed by the evidence, and if he had discovered that this food had been imported free of duty because of an order from the Militia Department or the Department of Customs, or any other department of government, there is no doubt at all that he would have rung the changes on that discovery and would have insisted upon it as a reason why this House should vote want of confidence in the government. He would have urged it as a reason that the particular minister should have been dismissed, or that the government, failing to get rid of that particular minister, should itself be dismissed. It seems to me that if that is the light in which the matter was viewed by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) when he supposed this food had been imported free of duty because of an order from some department of government, that it requires a great deal of casuistry to see that so far from it being a matter deserving of censure, it was a meritorious procedure on the part of the collector of customs. That is a species of casuistry which I confess I have not the intellect to comprehend. If, indeed, it would have been a grave and serious offence that this material being imported from the United States, was admitted free of duty by an order from a department of government, then I do not see why it is not a still more grave offence for a subordinate officer to exercise what hon. members opposite seem to regard as the 'magnificent indiscretion' of undertaking to dispense with the payment of duty upon this material imported from abroad, when he really had no discretion in the matter at all. The report, I consider, is very lenient in that regard, I do not see why it can be open to the comment of being in any way severe. It goes out of its way to point out that the collector for the port of Montreal might very well have been excused for allowing the first lot of this food to come in free of duty, because he might rely upon having a certificate from the Minister of Militia which would entitle it to be so imported. The report points out that the collector at Montreal might exercise a fair and reasonable discretion in the first case, depending upon the undertaking of the importer that he would produce that certificate, but I believe the report is entirely correct in saying that after he had failed to secure that certificate for the first lot, and after an interval of five or six days, if my memory is correct, the second lot was sought to be imported without any certificate at all or any order of any kind from any minister of the govern-

Mr. RUSSELL.

ment to warrant the free importation of the second lot, I repeat that the report is correct in saying that it was then certainly his duty to have called Dr. Devlin to account, to have refused any further concessions, and to have said that his discretion did not permit him to, for a second time, violate the strict routine of the department. I certainly am not a blood-thirsty person, and I certainly have no strong personal feeling against the collector of Montreal. I have no desire to see him get into any trouble at all. I was very favourably impressed with his demeanour before the committee, and I must say that personally speaking, it would rather be painful to me to see him in trouble on account of the indiscretion in which he has indulged. But at the same time, if this government is sufficiently lenient to the collector of Montreal to let him go undisciplined and unpunished for what is undoubtedly an indefensible proceeding, it will be because they are more lenient than other governments have been to other collectors of customs. I have in my mind the case of a collector of customs at the port of Halifax, who exercised just exactly the same kind of discretion in permitting the transshipment of fish from a vessel which came into port sailing under the United States flag. He did it in entire good faith, believing that he was acting in accordance with the wishes of the government of which he was an officer. It had been done frequently before. No person ever raised any question that the collector at Halifax did not act in absolute good faith in what he did. At the same time there was no leniency shown to him, and there was no plea made for him. He was obliged to tender his resignation, and he is no longer collector of customs for the port of Halifax. Well, Sir, I say that if Collector White still continues to be collector for the port of Montreal after committing this indefensible proceeding, and I have not the slightest personal objection that he should continue to the end of his days to be collector at that port—it will be only an evidence that this government is more lenient with officers who think they are acting in good faith than a former government was with my old friend, the Hon. William Ross.

I think, Sir, I have dealt with every part of this report that it is important I should deal with, and that in treating this matter in this way I have obviated the necessity of my going over the speech of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I must have incidentally dealt with most of the subjects to which he drew our attention in the course of my remarks. There are one or two things, however, not of prime importance, to which I shall refer in concluding. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) speaks of Mr. Hatch's supposed

secret. I assume that he has some secret, and the hon. member asks this House to infer that Mr. Devlin had no such secret, had no access to Mr. Hatch's secret, and had no opportunity for furnishing the same food to the government, because he entered into an agreement with Mr. Hatch in which he made a recital stating that Mr. Hatch was the proprietor of the secret. Well, Sir, if you can prove facts by recitals in agreements, then I admit that the fact is proved that Mr. Hatch was the sole proprietor of this trade secret. But it is a novel way to prove facts. It is quite true that Dr. Devlin might, in point of law, be estopped from making any assertion to the contrary of that which he had consented to insert in a document under his own hand and seal, but it hardly amounts to a particle of evidence as to the fact. It is as remote from proof as of that actual fact. It is as remote from proof as of that fact as another method of proof that was given to us by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) when he asked us to infer that a certain thing was a fact because he read it on the label that was attached to one of the boxes.

A word in reference to the exhibition of himself that Mr. Hatch made before the committee. He stated that he was when in his own country, a miller, that he had no pretensions to be a chemist, that he did not profess to have any scientific knowledge, and when he was asked if he had gone through any college or university, or anything of that sort, he told us that he had taken a course in a polytechnic school, but he told us also that he had no diploma, and in fact that the greater part of his life had been spent in the ordinary business of milling. When he was examined as a witness, he fully justified the inference as to his comparative ignorance which one would draw from his own statement of his biography. He undertook to say that any man who tried to live on a food containing less than 14 or 15 or 16 per cent of proteids, would be obliged to eat such large portions that his stomach would not hold the amount of food he would have to carry and that his digestive organs would break down. He was asked what were the percentages of the proteids in the ordinary food which we consume in everyday life. He was very reluctant to tell, although he professed to know all about it, what were the percentages of proteids in the ordinary foods daily consumed by an average man in an average vocation of life. So I had to take him piece by piece, one food after another, and the final result of the cross-examination was his confession that the average daily food of an average man in ordinary vocations of daily life would be from 7 to 9 per cent of proteids. Was it not a perfectly preposterous thing for him to say that if the average food which we eat every day of our lives con-

tains only from 7 to 9 per cent of proteids, then any person who ran the risk of eating a food, day in and day out, that contained less than 16 per cent of proteids would break down, that his digestive organs would not stand the strain, and that he could not endure to eat enough food to give him the requisite quantity of proteids. Surely it was the most marvellous exhibition of ignorance ever displayed. Then, if you look at page 12 of the third day's proceedings, you will find that Mr. Hatch admits that he does not know the very first thing about that on which he was undertaking to enlighten the committee. He had said that any food containing less than 14 or 15 per cent of proteids would involve the eating of so much that the digestive organs would not stand the strain. I asked him what extent of proteids oatmeal porridge would contain, and I think he said it contained 6 per cent, or less, because a large proportion of water entered into the making of the food. There are a great many people who live on oatmeal porridge year in and year out, and live very well. I believe Dr. Johnson once described oatmeal as a grain on which men were fed in Scotland and horses in England, and the report was that you could not find better horses anywhere than in England nor better men anywhere than in Scotland. If Scotchmen can live on oatmeal year in and year out, as many of them have done and do, I think Mr. Hatch displayed a marvellous variety of ignorance when he told the committee, that unless a man had 14 or 15 per cent of proteids in his ordinary daily food, he could not at all survive. I was pressing him on this point, and I asked him :

Q. Then from 7 per cent to 9 per cent would be for a healthy person in an ordinary sphere of life the normal average?—A. Of the whole volume taken together, the average that would nourish a man in average business.

Q. When you more than double that percentage are you not getting up to the danger point?—A. That depends on the individual; I think that is rather a question for a physician.

That is to say, when you give a man more than 14 to 18 per cent, or 15 or 16 per cent, my question was, is there not a danger that you are giving him too much proteids? Ought there not to be other constituents in larger proportion, and a smaller percentage of proteids? Look at his answer :

That depends on the individual; I think that is rather a question for a physician. I doubt even if a physician could tell you that.

Then, I asked him :

Q. Have you any opinion on this point : whether 7 per cent to 9 per cent being the proper percentage of proteids in the normal food of a healthy person in an ordinary avocation, when you double or more than double that, do you come to a point which is dangerous ?

And the man who undertakes to be a food specialist and to tell us that food for soldiers ought to contain 60 per cent of proteids,

and that he can give food containing 85 per cent, when I asked him whether, in the average food used by men in the ordinary avocations of life, if you put more than 14 to 18 per cent of proteids you would not reach a point that was dangerous, answered :

I don't know ; that is a question for a physician.

I say that is a confession of ignorance about the whole question which makes Mr. Hatch's evidence in respect to this matter absolutely useless.

I have already commented on the fact that Mr. Hatch was not brought, as he should have been, and as he could have been, to contradict the statement made by Mr. Muir. The excuse given by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier for not calling him, is that Mr. Hatch was sick and unable to attend. He was ill, I suppose, for he sent a telegram stating that he was ill ; but, if that was a vital point in the inquiry, and it was possible for Mr. Hatch to clear up that point, surely it was the duty of my hon. friends to ask that the committee sit another day to hear him. That was June 26 ; but my hon. friends got so tired and sick of the investigation that they said their stomachs would not stand any more of it, and we must close it at all hazards and meet to make our report. That was nine days ago, and we may have nine days more before we get out of this ; and if Mr. Hatch's evidence was of any importance at all for the purpose of contradicting the evidence of Mr. Muir, what possible objection could there have been to have Mr. Hatch called before the committee ?

With regard to Dr. Devlin's non-appearance before the committee, if the hon. gentlemen on the other side really believed that he did not wish to testify, and thought that it was important that he should testify, when, as was reported in the organ of the Conservative party in this city, I was making a plea for him to be heard, I want to know what objection there was to conceding that very small favour which Dr. Devlin asked to have the committee adjourn till Friday morning, when he would be present with his witness from New York to make the statement which he wished to make before the committee. I say that these hon. gentlemen, having asked the committee to close its proceedings without hearing Dr. Devlin, it does not lie in their mouths now to say that Dr. Devlin did not wish to be called. I did not, nor did any other member on the government side, ask Dr. Devlin to be called, because we regarded his evidence as entirely irrelevant to the charge. We had no regard nor concern for Dr. Devlin ; he was not in our thoughts. We understood the charge to be one of culpable negligence against the Minister of Militia ; and Dr. Devlin, so far as we knew, had no light to throw on that question. There was no evi-

Mr. RUSSELL.

dence that we could imagine Dr. Devlin capable of giving which would be relevant to the main issue. I did not ask that he should be called, and I am not going to charge him with seeking to evade an appearance before the committee, but the members of the committee who seek to make that charge should certainly have insisted on giving him an opportunity of appearing ; and having asked that the committee should close its labours and report, it is unfair on their part now to make any point against Dr. Devlin on the ground that he did not appear before the committee when they themselves refused the concession he asked for.

As to the statement of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, that this food which was sold by Dr. Devlin to the government consisted of broken biscuits. I am not aware that there is a single particle of evidence, from beginning to end, that will sustain that statement, which has gone broadcast all over this country, and which, I have no doubt, has influenced a great many people in making up their minds. It was a statement in the original charge of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, that the food was a powder resembling broken biscuits. When the bagful of stuff from the Saratoga trunk was brought before the committee, I understand that it exactly corresponded with the stuff which was approved of by Dr. Neilson, the director general of medical supplies. Broken biscuits, I suppose, might be made to resemble it, and so they might be made to resemble many other things. It might be reeking with proteids and still resemble broken biscuits, or it might resemble broken biscuits with scarcely a particle of proteids. I do not think it is a distinguishing characteristic of proteids at all that they do not resemble broken biscuits. But this food could not have been broken biscuits because Mr. McGill, who was called by my hon. friends opposite, said that wheat biscuits, as a rule, contained 8.55 per cent of proteids, and other biscuits a still smaller proportion. He said I admit that there was a kind of food used in the German army which contained a very much larger percentage of proteids, but that ordinary biscuits contained only 8.55 per cent. The fact that this food contained double that percentage is conclusive proof that it was not broken biscuits. I do not know on what authority or on what kind of evidence or why any member of this House should have the hardihood to get up and suggest that there is a particle of evidence to justify the statement that that food which was imported consisted merely of broken biscuits. I do not know that we have the right to assume that Dr. Devlin did not know how to procure it in exactly the same way, and, for all I know, from exactly the same sources as Mr. Hatch. It would be marvellous that he should have been so long collaborating with Mr. Hatch, kneading it in his own kitchen, making it in his own oven, having it

prepared by his own housekeeper, in close connection with Mr. Hatch in the whole business from beginning to end, and not know the methods by which Mr. Hatch got his materials and the sources from which he got them.

As to the price of the food, that is a comparatively small matter. It is not one of the statements of this charge, on which this country was made to ring. It was not anything so small and petty as a few thousand dollars that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier was thinking of when he formulated his charge in this House, on that day last month when he was pleading for our brave boys who are fighting the battles of their country in the South African war. It was nothing so small as that he was thinking of. It was the life-blood of our gallant sons that he was so much agitated about at that time. What was making his blood boil was the sorrows and afflictions from which those brave boys might be suffering in the field. But now what is in question is a matter of a few thousand dollars in the whole expenditure of this country in connection with this contingent—one-fifth of one per cent in respect of the whole expenditure and two-fifths per cent of the expenditure on account of supplies. If the case has come down to such a paltry issue, there is not a man, woman or child in this country who will bother about the thing any more. Everybody who buys a fancy article is called on to pay a fancy price. We know that this was a proprietary article, and the price which Mr. Hatch spoke of charging the government was two dollars and fifty cents. If Mr. Hatch could afford to charge two dollars and fifty cents to the government for what I have demonstrated to be substantially the same article as was furnished by Dr. Devlin, I do not see that any such grievous sin can be imputed to Dr. Devlin for charging two dollars for substantially the same thing.

I can very well understand, as my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has said, the great disappointment to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier that the charge which he depicted in such glowing colours, should have amounted to so extremely little, and how grievous must be the disappointment of my hon. friends opposite that it has not materialized into a magnificent scandal, something of the kind we were accustomed to see when they were in power. Something of that kind must have been what they were fishing for, but when they can bring home to any Liberal government or members of a Liberal administration in this country, one hundredth fractional part of the scandalous transactions that have not been charged merely but proved up to the hilt against successive Conservative administrations, it will be time enough for them to expect to excite the keen attention of the people. I go further and say that if ever that time should come—and I have no fear of ever living to witness it—when they will

bring home one hundredth part to this government of the scandals which have been proved up to the hilt against successive Tory administrations, the people will insist upon hurling the Liberal administration from power, even although it be at the risk of reinstating the very men who brought more shame on this country in days gone by than they can ever live to atone for.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorancy). I will begin by one of the last remarks made by my hon. friend when he spoke of the absence of Dr. Devlin from the committee. It seems to me that the absence of this gentleman and his evident refusal to testify before the committee, throws upon the whole transaction such a light of suspicion that it is well to dwell upon it for a short time. Dr. Devlin attended the meetings of the committee assiduously except one or two, and was there on the last morning the committee sat, and remained in the room until the last witness was examined and the last question put to him, and then all at once he fled the Chamber. At three o'clock that afternoon, we received a letter from him in which he said that he was very anxious to make a statement before the committee. We waited an hour and a half, and the committee adjourned until the following evening, when another letter was received from him saying that he had been called suddenly to New York in order to obtain important information regarding the subject-matter of the inquiry. What then happened? Did my hon. friends propose that the committee should wait until Dr. Devlin got back on Friday so as to hear him? They did not. If Dr. Devlin had anything to communicate to the committee, if he had not all the anxiety in the world, either for himself or the government, to avoid giving evidence, he had every opportunity to make a statement before that committee at any time, and could have made it just as well as did the hon. Minister of Militia and the Deputy Minister of Militia and the director-general of medical service. But the fact that he attended the meetings of the committee until the last witness was heard and then suddenly departed shows conclusively that he did not want to appear on the witness stand to make a statement, either because that statement would have been prejudicial to his own interests or the government, a friend of which he is.

I am not going over the ground which the chairman of the committee (Mr. Belcourt) went over this morning. He made a plea *pro domo*, he tried to show that he was right in the rulings he gave as chairman of the committee and to impress the House with the idea that he was the most impartial chairman who ever directed a select committee in this country. We have nothing to do with that question, but I would remind my hon. friend of the old French proverb, 'Qui s'excuse s'accuse,' 'who excuses himself accuses himself.'

There is one thing that struck me—and I do not wish at all to be disagreeable to my hon. friend—and that is that he came out of that committee a much wiser and milder man than when he went in. He came into the committee like a roaring lion but he went out as meek as a lamb. He learned so much of the procedure and the rules of the House which govern evidence in a committee of this kind, and of the conduct of an investigation by a committee, that the next time he is chosen by the government as member of a select committee in the House, should I happen to be a member of the same committee, I will vote him into the chair and thereby spare him the necessity of voting for himself.

Now, what did my hon. friend who has just taken his seat say? He spent a long time in addressing the House. Did he spend all that time in discussing the reports before the House, or the relative merits of these reports? No, a great deal of his time was spent in going over the mistakes committed in times long gone by, as long ago as Wellington, I believe, in preparations for war—to show that in the great armies of England, there had been scandals about rations and scandals about provisions for the troops. He went so far as to say that when our volunteers were called out in 1866 to repel the Fenian invasion, they went to the front without water-bottles. It seems to me that has not much to do with the subject before the House. What is the question before the House? It is a serious question. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side have tried to make light of this question, but it is a serious question. And the proof of that is the attention that has been given it by the press of this country—by the press on both sides of politics—by the attention given to it by the public, and by the attention given to it by this House; and also by the numbers of people who attended the meetings of the committee of investigation. The question before this House is this: Who is responsible for having paid \$4,660 for a worthless article? That is one question, **but not a very large one.** The other and important question is: Who is responsible for having furnished our troops in South Africa with a so-called emergency ration, a ration which was to be relied upon by the troops, when they had nothing else, a ration that could be taken out and depended upon by them for sustenance in the field—who is responsible for giving to the troops an article which does not deserve the name of an emergency ration, as the Dominion analyst said, and which is completely worthless as a ration at all.

Now, let me dwell, for a few minutes, on the report presented by the chairman of the committee. It is simply a whitewashing report. It is a thick coat of whitewash applied to the Minister of Militia, and to those in the Militia Department. It simply says that the charges made against the hon. min-

ister (Mr. Borden), and the Department of Militia are not proven. Hon. gentlemen on the other side who sat upon this committee, were bound to a certain extent, I take it, to whitewash the minister. They were bound also to whitewash the deputy minister, because otherwise they would have been condemning a great friend of the government, who had been placed in office by them. They could not condemn the director general of the medical staff, because that would have been condemning the Department of Militia, and also condemning the minister, who is at the head of the department. But they found an unfortunate Tory on their way, a gentleman named Robert White, who is collector of customs in Montreal; and because he is a Tory, they found him guilty. Guilty of what? They found him guilty of allowing this food to come into the country under the representations of Dr. Devlin, the very man upon whom the Minister of Militia and all the officials of the department relied in choosing this food to be sent to South Africa. And because Mr. White is a Tory, and because they had to blame somebody, they blame Mr. White. Now, my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, said that they had found that Mr. Hatch was a fakir. If they had known Mr. Hatch to be a Conservative—I do not know whether he is or not—I do not doubt they would have brought him in guilty of assault and battery. Let us take up the facts in this matter in chronological order. I am going to be as brief as possible, because the facts can be placed before the House in a nutshell. The very foundation of the charge made against us, is that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), declared that the food which was sent to South Africa, was not the same food as that which had been tested at Kingston, and that, as we had failed to prove that, our whole case falls to the ground. It seems to me that the evidence, as I heard it, and as any hon. gentleman might have heard it, in the committee, or may read it in the report, proves beyond any possible doubt, that the food sent to South Africa is not at all the same food as was tested at Kingston. On June 6, the Minister of Militia stated in this House, in answer to a question, that the food sent to South Africa, was known as protose, and he was absolutely right. As far back as 1898, the minister and his department were in communication with Mr. Henri Hatch: and in October of that year, letters were sent to and fro between the Department of Militia and the Hatch Protose Company. Letters bearing date of October 16 and October 20, were written on paper, headed 'The Hatch Protose Company,' and were signed by Henri Hatch. And, on October 24, the Minister of Militia signed a letter addressed to Henri Hatch, thanking him for an offer of emergency rations for the first contingent and declining the offer. Not only that, but the minister says, and the officials of

the department say, that the test was held at Kingston, which proved that this food was a good food for an emergency ration for the troops. This was an interesting question to the Minister of Militia, as he has said himself, not only because he was Minister of Militia, but because he was a medical man. He took a great interest in the test, and caused his officers to make a report thereon. After the test had taken place in Kingston, five affidavits were sent in of soldiers who had gone through the test, and these were filed in the department. If hon. gentlemen will follow these affidavits, they will see that in answer to the questions: 'What food have you lived on exclusively for twenty-eight or thirty days?' they answered 'Hatch's Protose Powder,' 'Hatch's Protose Biscuits,' 'Hatch's Protose Bread.' And the minister says that he saw these affidavits. And not only that, but you will find that the pamphlet which I now have in my hand, in which these affidavits were printed, was filed in the department in the office of the minister. Hon. gentlemen will see that it is headed 'protose,' and tells of 'protose' manufactured by the 'Hatch Protose Company.' What is contained in this pamphlet? First is a certificate by Dr. Ruttan of McGill University, dated June 3, 1898. This is addressed to Henri Hatch, and this certificate is important in two respects—it is important first, as proving that the Department of Militia and the minister himself, must have known that this product was called 'protose' and that it was manufactured solely by Henri Hatch—because, as I say, this letter was addressed to Mr. Hatch—and not only that, but it proved that this food was a highly concentrated food, and eminently suitable for an emergency ration, for which purpose it was sent to South Africa—if this was the food that was sent there. I will not read the whole of Dr. Ruttan's certificate, but only a part of it:

I have analysed the sample of protein vegetal which you submitted to me April 23rd, and also have carried on experiments regarding its digestion.

I find that the two samples, crude and prepared, differ somewhat in their composition, as will be seen in the subjoined table:

	P. c.
Soluble in water, crude.....	0·18
Finely ground prepared material..	0·13
Moisture, crude .....	16·25
"    prepared .....	8·75
Protoids, crude .....	84·78
"    purified .....	85·97

So it is demonstrated by this analysis, made by Dr. Ruttan of Montreal, one of the most eminent chemists in the country, that this product of Henri Hatch was the product into the composition of which protoids entered to the extent of 84 or 85 per cent. It is proven by this that Henri Hatch was able to make a food which contained as great a quantity of protoids as much as 84 or 85 per cent. The hon. member for Halifax said that this material was brought into the country

by Mr. Hatch, and was not manufactured by him. There is not a tittle of evidence in Mr. Hatch's evidence or anybody else's to prove that. This was food manufactured by Henri Hatch in Canada, and tested by Dr. Ruttan, and Dr. Ruttan gave him the certificate. Can it be pretended, that after Dr. Devlin had introduced Mr. Hatch to the Minister of Militia, as a food specialist, as far back as October or November, 1898, in the Windsor Hotel in Montreal, after the minister had written to him himself, after he had received several letters from him, all bearing the heading, as I said, 'Hatch Protose Company,' and referring to his food which was called protose, after the minister had written to him himself, after he had received several letters from him all bearing on that Hatch protose, all referring to this food that was called protose at the time, although the name was not yet registered—can it be pretended, I say, after the long experience the Minister of Militia and Defence had with Henri Hatch concerning this food, and the conversation he had with him on the train between New York and Montreal, that the minister himself, that the director general of the medical service, that the officials of the Department of Militia did not know that the only concentrated food that was ever mentioned in the Department of Militia, which was ever offered before the month of January, 1900, was the food prepared by Henri Hatch and called protose? It is also proven beyond controversy that the sole manufacturer of this food was not Dr. Devlin, who was simply the agent of Henri Hatch, but was Henri Hatch himself.

Now, following up the events in the order in which they took place, other people went to the Department of Militia when this contingent was being sent, and tendered their samples for emergency rations. The Boveril Company, as the member for Jacques Cartier said, offered its ration, and the emergency ration of the Boveril Company is known all over the world as suitable, and is used in the British army. But these people were told that the government were not purchasing any emergency rations at all. But on the 3rd or 4th of January a friend of the government, Dr. Devlin comes up here to Ottawa, and what reception does he get? Is he told that the government is not purchasing any emergency rations? Not at all. He interviews the director general of the medical service, and he interviews the minister; he brings with him a tin of this stuff upon which is a label which I will read. On the 4th the recommendation is given, on the 4th the tender is made, and this sample is put in, and on that very day this food, the supply of which all other tenderers had been refused, is accepted by the Militia Department. Now, Sir, what was the label that was on this tin? This is important as showing that the contractor himself knew very well that the food which

he was supplying to the department was not at all the food which was tested at Kingston. Let me read this label:

Vitallin.

Vegetable Proteid Food.

Two and a half days' rations for a soldier; one-half an ounce to an ounce every four hours, four times a day mixed in water at temperature not lower than 70° Fahr. beef tea, milk, light broths or soups; take three or four biscuits to a meal or half a pound to three-quarters of a pound of bread per day. On this diet with tea, coffee, Canadian soldiers have lived in perfect health twenty-one to thirty days.

VITALLIN CO.,

Montreal, Can.

Now, Sir, what did the director general of the medical service do? He simply said to Dr. Devlin: Vitallin, I do not know anything about that. I know protein-vegetal. And he knew that the stuff which had been offered to the Minister of Militia was protose manufactured, not by the Vitallin Company in Montreal, but by the Hatch Protose Company. Did he take any precaution to find whether this was the food upon which these soldiers had lived at Kingston for thirty days? No, sir. The only precaution which he takes was, as he said himself: I tasted, smelt, and felt the food, and I found it was the same. These were the only precautions he took, and upon the false representations made by Dr. Devlin, notwithstanding that this stuff bore a different name, and was manufactured by another company altogether, he recommended it to the Minister of Militia and Defence. It was the bounden duty of the Department of Militia, it was the bounden duty of the Minister of Militia and Defence himself in such an important matter, to find out and satisfy himself by proper analysis that this food was really the same food as that tested at Kingston; because, as I said before, in the minister's own words, this was a food upon which the troops could rely, all other sustenance having disappeared.

Dr. Devlin was a friend of the government, and upon his sole representations that this food was the same, it was accepted by the director general and by the minister himself. Dr. Devlin gets the contract, and he goes to Montreal, and then he goes to New York. There is no doubt this stuff was not manufactured in the country by the Hatch Protose Company, there is no doubt it was obtained from New York, there is no doubt that it was brought in here in twelve Saratoga trunks, six of which were smuggled through the customs in Montreal, there is no doubt that this stuff does not at all resemble, in its analysis, that which was tested at Kingston—there is no doubt on these points at all. It was surreptitiously brought into this country in Saratoga trunks, not in ordinary cases in which merchandise is usually imported, each containing two bags of this

Mr. CASGRAIN.

food. It was put into tins. And what label was put upon the tins? Dr. Devlin knew so well that this food was not the food which had been tested at Kingston that he did not dare to put upon the tins which were to be sent to South Africa the same label as he had put on the sample which he had offered to the Department of Militia with his tender. This label is also reproduced in evidence, and hon. gentlemen will notice the great difference between the two labels. Here is the label put upon the tin sent to South Africa:

Emergency Rations.

Vegetable Proteid Powder.

One ounce or two tablespoonfuls, four times a day, in beef tea, milk, broths or light soups or water at a temperature not lower than 70° Fahr. Take with powder three slices of bread or four or five biscuits, tea or coffee.

VITALLIN CO.,

Montreal, Can.

Cor. Craig and Bleury Sts.

Now, Sir, that was the emergency ration furnished the troops, the ration upon which it was said that troops could rely; but they were told at the same time that they had to take with that three or four slices of bread, and five or six biscuits, and tea and coffee also. So that from the mouth of the contractor himself it is evident that this stuff which he had put into these tins, and which was shipped to South Africa was not at all the food which had been tested at Kingston. He did not dare to say that upon this food soldiers had lived at Kingston for twenty-eight or thirty days.

Now, this stuff is sent to Halifax. Is it examined in Montreal by anybody from the Militia Department? Does the Minister of Militia and Defence send anybody down to John T. Lyons's drug store to see what kind of food was put into these tins? Did he take the ordinary precaution to satisfy himself that the stuff which was being put into these cases was food which could serve as emergency rations? If he did not want to get it analysed he could, at least, have taken the precaution to see that it was the same stuff as that which was in the tender. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that there was no time to make an analysis. Why, Sir, Mr. Hersey, one of the most eminent chemists in Montreal, probably in the province, and who is well known to be so, stated to the committee that he could make this analysis in three or four hours, and he offered to do so. So there was no reasonable test that the stuff which was shipped to South Africa was examined and analysed to show whether it was the equivalent of the tender. It is sent down to Halifax and accompanied there by Mr. Lyons, the druggist who got it put into the tins; and then by the merest chance, Capt. Benoit, an old and trusted employee of the Department of Militia, had sense enough, on his own motion, and for

his own satisfaction, to take two or three tins out of the boxes which were labelled vitallin, and to bring them back here to Ottawa. If Capt. Benoit, on his own initiative, and to satisfy himself that this was according to tender, that it was the right stuff, had not, without any instruction from his chief, taken out these tins from the boxes which were shipped on the *Pomeranian* and the *Laurentian* from Halifax, we would never have had the analysis which was made afterwards by the Dominion analyst, the result of which was produced before the committee. But, Sir, he says in his evidence, and in order that there may be no cavil about this, I will read just a few lines of what he did say. The question is put by the chairman, not in cross-examination, as was said this afternoon by the hon. gentleman :

By the Chairman :

Q. You went to Halifax at the time of the shipment of the emergency stuff?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Under whose instructions did you go?—A. I did not go purposely for that, I went there in case the troops might want something that would have to be purchased at Halifax at the last moment, but did not go on account of that food which was to be delivered there, that was all I had to do with it.

Q. Were you to receive it and see about its being delivered to whoever was the officer in charge?—A. I spoke to the quartermaster general there and he told me not to bother about it; that the local medical staff officer would attend to it.

Q. Otherwise it would have been your duty had not some one else had to look after it?—

A. Captain Gwynne told me that the local medical man would look after that.

Q. Were you there when it arrived?—A. I did not see it arrive, but I saw it there in the gun sheds at Halifax.

Q. And what did you do; did you take any samples away with you?—A. Yes, I went there to look at it and I saw it, a big heap of boxes there, and for my own satisfaction, I asked if they could give me a few tins of it, and the foreman, out of one of the boxes, in my presence, took out two tins and handed them to me.

If we had not the evidence of Capt. Benoit, and if Capt. Benoit had not gone to Halifax, there would have been no evidence at all before the committee to show that the stuff in question was according to the sample, or that it only contained 16 per cent of protose, as was shown by the result of the analysis made by Mr. Macfarlane, the Dominion analyst. He was sent to Halifax and came back to Ottawa, and what had taken place? On the 25th of January, or on the 26th of January, the hon. Minister of Militia admits that he received a registered letter from Henri Hatch in which Henri Hatch says that the stuff that is being shipped to South Africa is a pure imitation, and an adulteration of his product. This was a letter concerning a public contract, concerning the public affairs of the country. It was a letter concerning a most important affair, a letter concerning the sending of emergency rations

to our troops in South Africa. That letter was not marked private, or confidential, or personal, but it bore upon its face the mark of being a public document, and that public document did not belong to the hon. Minister of Militia, but it belonged to the public of this country. That document should have been filed amongst the public documents in the Department of Militia, and I am in the judgment of those occupying seats on the Treasury benches, I am in the judgment of those who have ever occupied positions in any administration, that when a document relating to a public question, relating to an important question, not marked confidential, private, or personal is received it is a public document, and should, of necessity, be filed with the documents of the department. This was a solemn warning given by a man whom the hon. gentleman knew to be the sole manufacturer of the food that had been tested at Kingston, that the stuff which was being sent to South Africa was an adulterated article, an imitation article which ought not to be sent to the troops in South Africa. What was done with that letter? Was it filed in the department? Not at all. Was it shown to any of the officials in the department? Not at all. It was the duty of the minister to go to the deputy and to the director general who had given his recommendation, and to have said to them: Here is a letter which I have received from the man who has been introduced to me by Dr. Devlin as food specialist, who is the manufacturer of 'Hatch's protose' which has been tested in Kingston; we should have an investigation, and see if the food which has been sent to South Africa is really fit to be sent there. That was the duty of the minister, and it was his duty to file that letter. If he has not done so, I state here in this House that he has been derelict in his duty, and that this was the first step he took in the culpable negligence which he has shown all through this transaction. Whom does he show the letter to? He shows it to Dr. Devlin, and he is not even certain that he did show it to Dr. Devlin. The only indication that he has shown it to Dr. Devlin is that there is written on the corner of the letter the words 'Dr. Devlin,' apparently in the handwriting of his secretary. He shows that letter to this contractor, to the man who has been making false representations to the government, and who has sold to the government not the stuff that was tested at Kingston, but his spurious dog rations, his dog biscuits, which is not worth—

Mr. BELCOURT. I suppose that is in the evidence—dog biscuits?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I say that it is not worth any more than dog biscuits—ordinary Spratt's Dog Biscuit, and it comes from the same place in New Jersey. There were two shipments of the stuff, one on the *Pomeranian*, and the other on the *Lauren-*

tion. One vessel left on the 20th of January, and the other on the 27th of January. At that time there is no doubt that the minister had time to stop one of the consignments, or, at all events, to telegraph, or write to South Africa warning the troops not to use this food. There is no doubt that this food could not have arrived in South Africa before, at the earliest, the 20th of February, so that ample time was given to him to warn the troops that they should not use these emergency rations, that they should not be exposed to rely solely upon these rations, so that if all other food gave out they should not be obliged to fall back upon Dr. Devlin's vitallin. Capt. Benoit, when he got back here thought it was prudent to have this food analysed. On the 2nd of February he made the suggestion to the Department of Militia, and upon his suggestion the Department of Militia sent this food to the Dominion analyst, and what did the analyst find? He found that there was only 16 per cent of proteid or nutritive matter in the food, and he says that seeing that ordinary wheat contained 12 per cent of proteid matter, this food does not seem to be a very concentrated food, that it does not deserve its name, and that it is not worth \$2 per pound. Did the Department of Militia take any steps after they had the report of the Dominion analyst, to notify the troops that these were not emergency rations? Not at all. They simply took the action of paying the contractor because, they said, the food furnished was according to sample, and they paid him \$4,666, which was due him. This was two days after the report of the analyst had been filed in the Department of Militia. After the reception of the letter of the 25th of January, from Henri Hatch to the minister, instead of taking into consideration the fact that the stuff which had been contracted for was called vitallin, while it was well known that the stuff which had been tested at Kingston was known as proteose, and after the analysis had been made by Mr. Macfarlane it is extraordinary that the Department of Militia should not have taken some steps to warn the troops in South Africa that these rations were really not emergency rations. It is most extraordinary that the employees of the department, seeing the result of this investigation and the analysis, should not have called the attention of the minister to the condition of affairs. I cannot understand how it is that the deputy minister, when he received the analyst's report, which proved conclusively that the rations were worthless, as such, did not call the attention of the minister to the fact. If this is the state of things which exists in the Department of Militia, the sooner such evils are remedied, the better. Let me just call the attention of the House to another fact. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) this morning, in

Mr. CASGRAIN.

his speech, said that it was at the suggestion of the minister that this analysis was made. If it was at the suggestion of the minister, as the hon. gentleman says, surely the minister should have seen what was the result of the analysis, and if he did not see the result of the analysis, it is another proof that he was guilty of negligence in not looking at this report, and seeing whether this food was really fit to be regarded as an emergency ration. A great deal of stress has been laid on this fact. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that this food which was sent to South Africa was exactly the same food as that tested in Kingston. Having established that to their own satisfaction, they say the case falls to the ground because the only requirement was, that the food should be food of the same strength as that which had been tested at Kingston, and which had been proven to be a good ration for soldiers to live upon for twenty-eight or thirty days. Let us see what they base their contention on, that the food was the same as had been tested at Kingston. First, they say that Mr. Muir, of Montreal, came here and swore that Mr. Hatch had made the admission to him that the food at Kingston only contained 15 per cent of proteid matter, and, secondly, they base their argument upon the statement that a quantity of powder which had been found by Dr. Neilson, in a drawer of his desk, after this question came up in the House, was analysed and found to contain only 13 per cent of proteids. Basing their argument on these two points, they affirm that the food sent to South Africa was of the same nature and strength as that tested at Kingston. Let me point out that Mr. Muir is an intimate friend of Dr. Devlin's. He had been introduced to Mr. Hatch by Dr. Devlin, who told him that Hatch was an excellent pianist, and it was proved that while the test was going on at Kingston Mr. Hatch and Dr. Devlin were, time and again at Mr. Muir's house. According to Mr. Muir, every time he got an opportunity, the conversation was upon his concentrated food, which Hatch was continually praising. Is it not extraordinary that if Mr. Hatch, in discussing this matter, had any admission to make, that he would not make it in the presence of Dr. Devlin, who was interested in the contract and in the test in Kingston, and who was present at all these conversations between Muir and Hatch. But, said Mr. Muir, this was not a conversation in his home. It was one day, a year and a half ago, in the month of February or March, 1899, that Mr. Muir, walking down street, going to his office after luncheon, met Mr. Hatch, and Mr. Hatch said: Look here, there is only 15 per cent of proteid matter in the food which is being tested at Kingston. I do not say that Mr. Muir deliberately came here to perjure himself, but there are some extraordinary circumstances surrounding Mr. Muir's evi-

dence. First of all, how is it that this did not come out in conversation in Mr. Muir's house in presence of Dr. Devlin, when they spoke of it so often? How is it that it only came out casually at the corner of the street when Muir was on his way to his office? And how is it that Muir never mentioned this conversation to Dr. Devlin until two days before he gave his evidence before the committee. I say, Sir, there is a great mistake somewhere. Here is Mr. Hatch, who has always told everybody that the food which he manufactured contained as much as 80 per cent, and at least 60 per cent of proteid matter, who has always been telling every one that the food tested at Kingston contained at least 60 per cent; here is the man who manufactured the food which was analysed by Dr. Ruttan, and which Dr. Ruttan ascertained to contain 84 or 85 per cent of proteid, and how is it possible that he could have met Mr. Muir in the street and said to him casually: Oh, the food which is being tested at Kingston only contains 15 per cent of proteids? No intelligent jury would have given a moment's attention to that evidence, and if they were disposed to be charitable they would find that Mr. Muir was rendering a friendly service to Dr. Devlin, but that he was mistaken in his comprehension of the conversation he had with Mr. Hatch that day. Yet, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the strong arguments which these gentlemen opposite put before this House to say that the stuff which was tested at Kingston and the stuff which was sent to South Africa are identical.

There is another point. They say that Dr. Neilson gave Dr. Ruttan a sample of the powder which was tested at Kingston, and that Dr. Ruttan found, by analysis, that it contained only 13 per cent of proteid matter. They argue from this, that the food tested at Kingston is not as good as the food sent to South Africa. Let us see what happened in that case. Dr. Neilson swore he got two samples from Hatch or Devlin before the test was made at Kingston, one being full strength, and the other half strength, and Dr. Neilson swears also that he brought back, or some one sent from Kingston, some of the identical bread or biscuits which Hatch sent to Kingston for the test. This was rather an important matter for Dr. Neilson, and it was important for him to prove that he had not been mistaken when he said that these two foods were identical. This is the story which Dr. Neilson tells. He came to his office one day; he did not find the bread or biscuits which had been tested at Kingston; he did not find the proteid powder of full strength which was given him by Dr. Devlin or Hatch, but he opened his drawer in which he kept postage stamps and other things, and at once he exclaimed: Eureka, I have found it. He found an ordinary envelope in his drawer, marked 'protein-vegetal,' and he immediately jumped to the conclusion that it was the powder sent to him—he did not know whom by—

a year and a half previously, and he hurried down to Montreal and he got this powder analysed. I will ask any lawyer, I will ask any reasonable man in this House, to put himself the question: Is this evidence on which any responsible body of men would pass judgment and say that there is proven an identity between the stuff which was tested at Kingston and the powder which Dr. Neilson brought to Montreal? Why, Sir, in such matters as this the greatest precautions are always taken, and the very essence of the evidence which would be given before a court would be that there must be absolute identity between the stuff which was analysed and the food which was used. But in this case, by some accident, Dr. Neilson finds this stuff in his drawer and he immediately concludes that it was that which was analysed at Kingston, and he gets it analysed. But, where were the biscuits and the bread, and where was the full-strength powder which was sent to him at the same time by Hatch or Devlin? It had disappeared. Disappeared how? Dr. Neilson does not know; he could not find it, and he says: I suppose the charwoman came along in dusting and she must have taken the bread and the biscuits and the powder away with her. That is the kind of evidence upon which these gentlemen opposite rely to say, that the food which was tested at Kingston and the powder which was sent to South Africa were identical in composition and strength, and were fit food to send as emergency rations to our soldiers in the battlefield. But, there was another test which our hon. friends opposite could have made, and which would prove conclusively whether or not this food which was tested at Kingston was really good emergency rations and concentrated food. Mr. Hatch came before the committee and he laid before the committee samples of the bread and biscuits and powder which he had prepared for the test in Kingston. He said: This is the same stuff which I prepared; I used to bake it with my own hands; here is some of the stuff which I prepared for Kingston and which was spoiled in the baking. It was not palatable; it was not fit to be used as food for the soldiers; but analyse it, and you will find that it contains 60 per cent of proteid matter. Here was a man who had devoted almost his whole life to manufacturing this food, and offering it for analysis to the committee. Can hon. gentlemen believe that if he thought he was going to be condemned by the analysis if he were afraid of a test, he would have made that offer? It was because he was certain that there was in the food which had been prepared for the Kingston test an average of 60 per cent of proteid matter that he almost defied the majority of the committee to have it analysed. After Mr. Hatch had made this offer to the committee, my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) moved to have it analysed by Mr. Milton Hersey, who was then present, and who

declared that he could make the analysis in three or four hours and have the report ready on the same day at five o'clock, if he were allowed to use the laboratory and the materials in the Department of Inland Revenue. What did the majority of the committee do? They refused. What could be the justification for such a refusal? They did not dare at that time to refuse point-blank, but they put it off by moving an amendment declaring that the time had not yet come to have this analysis made—that the committee should wait until Dr. Ruttan had made his report. My hon. friend from West Toronto moved again the next day that this food should be analysed. The majority of the committee again declared that the time had not yet arrived. Dr. Ruttan was heard as a witness, and he made his report of the analysis which he had made of the powder which Dr. Neilson had given him. Then the hon. member for West Toronto again moved that this food be analysed. Dr. Ruttan having made his report, the amendment was not in order and could not be moved again; but the majority of the committee refused to have it analysed. I ask again, why was this refusal made? The analysis of Mr. Hersey in the Department of Inland Revenue would not have cost the country anything, and the committee could have been satisfied by it whether or not Mr. Hatch was telling the truth.

Mr. BELCOURT. Will my hon. friend allow me to say why it was refused, or will he himself inform the House of the reason?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Go on.

Mr. BELCOURT. It was refused simply because it did not appear in evidence that this was part of the food sent to Kingston; but it appeared, according to Mr. Hatch's evidence, that all this food was spoiled, and did not go near Kingston.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What is the use of quibbling? Of course, this food was never sent to Kingston and was never near Kingston, but it was proved that it was prepared for the Kingston test and not sent to Kingston because it was not palatable, having been spoiled in the baking. Mr. Hatch said: 'This food could not be taken by the soldiers, as it was scorched and burned in the baking; I did not send it therefore; but it is the same kind of food, and I defy you to analyse it and find if it does not contain 60 per cent of proteid matter.'

Mr. POWELL. Was it made of the same material?

Mr. CASGRAIN. It was made of exactly the same material.

Mr. FOSTER. What evidence had they that Dr. Neilson's powder found in that little box was the same?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Simply Dr. Neilson's statement or conjecture, in face of the fact

Mr. CASGRAIN.

that he could not find the bread or biscuits returned from Kingston or the powder which he received at the same time either from Dr. Devlin or Mr. Hatch.

Of course, the question of price is a small matter; but I think we should call the attention of the House for a few minutes to it. The price paid was \$4,666 for 2,333 pounds. The price which Dr. Devlin swears he paid in the United States was 30 cents a pound. I say I do not believe Dr. Devlin when he says that, and why? Because the collector of customs asked him, not once, but twice, not only verbally, but by letter, to give him an invoice, and Dr. Devlin refused to do it—why? Because, if he had given the invoice, he would have been obliged to show that he had not given 30 cents a pound for this stuff, but probably only 10 cents a pound. The cost of grinding is \$23. The tin cans—ordinary cans, in which paint or white lead is put—7,000, at \$25 a thousand, cost \$175; labelling cost \$12; customs duties, for which he gave unaccepted cheques, amounted to \$140; making a total of \$1,049, for the whole stuff. So that this contractor, in this little transaction, made a profit of over \$3,000; and yet hon. gentlemen say that out of the million dollars spent by the government for provisions for the soldiers, we have only found this little thing. But wait until the Auditor General's Report comes down next year; wait until we see the returns and the accounts which will be produced before this House next year; and if we have found this instance of a profit of \$3,600 on a small purchase of \$4,600, what shall we find when we go into all the purchases amounting to \$1,000,000?

Now, Sir, I am not much concerned with the test made at Kingston, for this reason. If that test was a farce, if it was not a serious test, then I say that the department and the minister himself were guilty of negligence in that respect; because, as I said before, this was an important matter, a matter in which probably the life and death of the soldiers in South Africa were concerned. The department were sending them food on which they had to rely when all other food had given out, and therefore it was only on the positive assurance that the food was good and fit for emergency rations that it should have been sent to South Africa at all. Therefore, I say that if the test at Kingston was a farce and a fake, that does not relieve the Department of Militia and the minister, who said he took great pains to have the test properly made, from the charge of negligence. Now, Sir, viewing all the circumstances of the case, viewing the warning which had been given to the minister on January 25, viewing the analysis that was made by the Dominion analyst, viewing the fact that the food supplied by Dr. Devlin was not the same as that tested at Kingston, I say that the conclusions to which my hon. friend from

Jacques Cartier came when he first made his motion before this House, are amply borne out by the evidence which has been adduced before the committee. I say that the Minister of Militia and his department in this whole matter were guilty of gross and culpable negligence in sending to South Africa as an emergency ration a food which was absolutely worthless, and was proved to be so by the Dominion analyst. Therefore it is, I regret to say, my duty to state to this House that after having sat in that committee and heard all the evidence and gone through all the documents and seen everything that took place, the charge that the minister was guilty of culpable negligence in not seeing that proper rations were sent to South Africa with our troops, has been clearly proved, and that, I think, will be the verdict of every impartial man in the country.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). The speakers on both sides who have preceded me, Mr. Speaker, have taken this case up historically, and given all the facts in evidence in such a way that any one who has listened to this debate, can have no difficulty in forming an impartial judgment. I do not consider it necessary that I should speak at any great length. I just want to call attention to some of the points in the arguments that have been presented by hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), instead of confining himself to the evidence given before the committee, or to anything that has transpired in connection with the committee, dealt with what Mr. Hatch would say, had he been examined a second time, and with what this one or the other would have said, and not with what appears in the book containing the evidence, placed in the hands of hon. members. And my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), with that oratorical power which distinguishes him in addressing juries, wound up with an appeal to wait until next year. Wait, he said, until we get this matter before the Public Accounts Committee, and then we will show what fraud has been committed in the paying of this large amount for this food. But, all these things which he has promised to do next year, have not yet materialized, and have nothing to do with the question before the House.

I want to deal with this case historically, and show where we are, from my point of view, as a member of the committee and of this House. The charge that the committee had to deal with, is found in paragraph 10, in the long list of so-called charges made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier:

That, as a matter of fact, the food or emergency rations, supplied to the Canadian troops was not identical with the food tested at Kingston known as 'Hatch's Protose,' but was a totally different article, of a very inferior quality, containing scarcely 17 per cent of nutriment, whereas the food tested contained over 60 per cent of nutritive substance.

That is followed by paragraph 16, which says that the usual precautions as to inspection were not adopted by the Militia Department in regard to the shipment of emergency rations.

I do not know what the usual precautions were that were not taken in this particular case, unless what is meant, is simply the analysis. All ordinary precautions were taken. Boiled down, this charge—and that was the drift of the speeches delivered on the opposite side to-day—is that Hatch's food was all right, but Devlin's was all wrong. There is plenty of other matters in the charges, but it is what may be called padding. Consider them as closely as you can, and you will see that what I have said, is substantially the charge made. Conceding for the sake of argument, that Dr. Devlin's food was not identical with Mr. Hatch's, it does not follow that the Minister of Militia was in any way negligent. Before you can charge him with negligence, you must know the history of the transaction.

The majority report of the committee is that this charge is not proved, and the amendment of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, is a report which consists of twenty-nine sections of so-called arguments, unsupported by evidence. These twenty-nine sections, made up of so-called arguments and unsupported allegations, wind up with a verdict of guilty, against the minister, a condemnation of the food supplied, with a finding as to what should have been done, and some wholesome advice and recommendations as to what should be done in the future. Whatever this House may have power to do, this committee certainly had not any such power as might be given to a Royal Commission, to go into an investigation of this kind and make such recommendations as are made in the minority report.

If, as these hon. gentleman opposite argue, Hatch's food was all right, then, if the government had taken that food, there could have been no objection, and I want to see where that would lead us. When you charge the minister or his department with any wrong-doing in connection with the selection and purchase of this food, you do so because Hatch was set to one side and Devlin preferred. But, for the purposes of this sale, Hatch and Devlin were practically the one person, so far as they were known to the Militia Department. Hatch was introduced by Devlin to the minister at the Windsor Hotel in 1898. That is undisputed and it will be found on page 49 of the evidence. Hatch, at that time, boarded with Devlin, at 100 University Street, Montreal. He says that after that introduction to the minister, he received a letter from Dr. Neilson in October or November, 1898. I think that he was mistaken about the time, but that he did receive a letter from Dr. Neilson, is undoubted. But, I think he is mistaken as to the time

when he received that. Now, bear in mind, at this time, this food—there is no dispute about it at all—was called by Hatch himself Protein Vegetal. That is the name Dr. Neilson knew it by, and he knew it by no other name. He says that in his evidence time and time again. That is the name by which it was registered by Hatch himself up to the time the test was made in Kingston. It was so registered on April 21, 1898. It was not registered as Hatch's Protose until April 16, 1899. The test at Kingston took place between March 16 and April 16, 1899. The test was supposed to be successful. I am not criticising the test. Perhaps I may not be as credulous about it as some other hon. gentlemen; but, admitting that it was successful, as a result of it, this food was registered by Hatch as Hatch's Protose. But, bear in mind, there is no public notice given of this registration. It is here for anybody who wants to go and see it; but there were no circulars sent out calling special attention to it. Letters were written with the words 'Hatch's Protose' at the top of the paper. But, I ask hon. gentlemen in all fairness, if they do not often receive circular letters in reference to goods offered for sale, and afterwards they know no more about it, so far as remembering the exact name is concerned, than if they had never received the circulars at all. The next thing we know is, that Dr. Neilson asks for samples of the food. There is no letter—and I want to be candid about it and give the evidence as it is; and I invite hon. gentlemen, if they think I am misquoting, to challenge the statements I make and see if an explanation cannot be given from the evidence on the points we are discussing. There is nothing to show that a copy of the letter was kept, but there is evidence to show that Dr. Neilson's testimony is absolutely correct; because, on a date in February, 1899, he writes to the minister in reference to the letter that he has written for samples. Subsequently, he receives from Dr. F. E. Devlin an answer to his letter, inclosing samples. There is another step in the case connecting Hatch and Devlin—Dr. Neilson writes to Hatch for samples, and these samples come in a letter from Dr. Devlin. If that is not calculated to throw any person off his guard to prevent further inquiry, I do not know what would be. The only samples received by Dr. Neilson were those referred to in the letter of February 18, 1899, which will be found as exhibit 22, at page 261 of the evidence. The next step is that the Minister of Militia says that he has no recollection of seeing Hatch a second time in Montreal. Hatch says he did see the minister. That may go for nothing one way or the other, because Hatch does not say that anything special took place between him and the minister, further than this—that the food was mentioned and some reference was made to a test which Hatch wanted to have made. But nothing

Mr. BRITTON.

was arranged with reference to the test, and nothing was done that bears in the slightest upon this case. The next thing we have in the evidence is, that Hatch says he saw the minister in New York in the railway station. Just before the door was opened to allow persons to go to the train, they met, and the minister said: 'Hello, Hatch; you here?' And some other two or three words were spoken. The minister says that that is all the conversation that took place between them. On the other hand, Hatch says that they found themselves seated together in the pullman car, and they talked from nine to twelve o'clock at night on this subject. Now, I put that point to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. Here is a statement made by the hon. Minister of Militia, a member of this House, that no such conversation on the car took place as Hatch says. Hatch states what seems to me to be an absolutely improbable thing—that he, a Galician, an unknown man, comparatively, having nothing in common with the Minister of Militia except that he had a food to sell, sat beside the minister for three long hours, from nine o'clock to midnight, talking on the one subject of this food. I would ask the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), whom they will believe in regard to that—will they believe the Minister of Militia or will they believe Hatch? That is the story that Hatch tells, and even according to himself, that is the last time they met on the subject.

Now, all this, bear in mind, was before the test at Kingston. After the samples had come up and the letters with them, the test took place upon five soldiers at Kingston. Dr. Devlin was at the test. He was the man who received the food. He says he received it at Montreal, and Hatch says he sent it to him, so there can be no doubt about that. Dr. Devlin was the man who administered the food; he was the person looked to, as the responsible man connected with the test. I do not know whether the test was honestly carried out or not. Dr. Neilson himself was not there until the last day of the test, and he was there when answers were made by the men in reference to it. The point I want to make is, that Dr. Devlin was the man who was managing that test; and he was doing it, in a sense, for Hatch. I do not dispute that he was the agent of Hatch, but he was the responsible man and the only man who was brought in contact with Dr. Neilson, the representative of the Militia Department, on that occasion. Now, the test is ended. The government does not give any order. Hatch said that there was some talk about an order for the North-west Territories. That is not remembered by the Minister of Militia. It is not likely that the Minister of Militia would promise an order for a department over

which he has no control. No order was given, and nothing came of the test further than that the answers to the questions were embodied in an affidavit. The test ended on April 16, and, when it was over, the men were taken to a notary in Kingston, and what they said in answer to questions, and probably more, was embodied in that affidavit. And now, it is contended that the department should have known this food as Hatch's Protose, because possibly copies of this affidavit were seen by the department, and, if they had cared to read they would have found in the middle of them the name 'Hatch's Protose.' That is notice, after everything else having taken place, upon which the minister, we are told, should have refrained from dealing with the man who was the responsible man during this whole test—because, in the middle of an affidavit which is presented to him, or shown to him, made by one or all of these five men at Kingston, the words 'Hatch's Protose' occurred. But no purchase was made and nothing was done by the department in the shape of negotiation in this line. So it went on from April down to November. The next thing is a letter from the Hatch Protose Company, asking that they should be given an order for the first contingent. At that time the department had not intended to give any order, and the reply given to the letter was that they did not intend to order for the contingent because the ship was to provide for the men until they landed at Cape Town, and afterwards the British government was to supply all the food. So there was no need of sending any further answer than was sent, and there was no need of considering the question at all. Bear in mind this was prior to any intention on the part of the government to give any order at all. Then the first contingent is sent, and it is afterwards suggested by the Minister of Militia and Defence that perhaps it would be well for the government, who desired to deal liberally with those brave men, who desired to do for them more perhaps than would be considered necessary—both Dr. Neilson and the Minister of Militia and Defence thought, in consequence of something they had seen in correspondence from South Africa, that it would be well to provide what has been called an emergency ration for those who would follow the first contingent. Having made up their mind that something of that kind should be done, there were plenty in the field who could be found looking for contracts of that kind. Up to the time that the letter of Mr. Hatch was written, both Mr. Hatch and the Bovril Company, and Mr. Besserer, who represented another company, all got the same answer, either orally or in writing, that it was not intended to furnish any emergency food. But when the government made up their minds to furnish it, then naturally the

minister and Dr. Neilson thought of this kind of food that had been tested at Kingston. They believed that the test was good and that the food was a good food. Now, who, in that state of things, would they look to except to the man with whom they had come in contact during all these previous negotiations, the only man they knew, Dr. Devlin, the man who had introduced the food, who was present at the test in Kingston? So Dr. Neilson says that he saw Dr. Devlin here in Ottawa, and the result of all conversation and correspondence was a contract. First comes a letter from Dr. Devlin, who is on the alert for business. That would be so whether he intended to perpetrate a fraud upon the government, as we are told, whether it was a fake food or whether it was an honest food. But, I am only pointing out the position of the matter, because up to this time it is not pretended by anybody that there was any scheme to commit a fraud upon the government. At the time of his first dealing with Devlin they were not sending any contingent, this thing was not in anybody's mind, so there is no reason to suspect fraud in connection with it. Then when there is a perfectly honest transaction in which Dr. Devlin was interested and with which he was connected, when there came to be a desire to send an emergency food, then, I ask again, who were they to look to except to Dr. Devlin? Dr. Devlin wrote to the Minister of Militia and Defence, and the minister replied saying that he was interested in the question, and suggesting that if terms were satisfactory there might be a transaction. Dr. Devlin then came to Ottawa, and from that time to January 4, they had a great deal of conversation with reference to this food. The result was that Dr. Devlin agreed to supply 2,333 pounds of food to be put up in cans in the way that has been mentioned, for the price of \$2 a pound, supplied in Halifax at his own cost. On January 4, the tender was made, it was approved by Dr. Devlin, it was sent into the minister and approved by him, and the contract was made. This is the whole story with regard to this contract. There is nothing else about it, and these are all facts. There was not a single reason for suspecting bad faith or fraud. Supposing they were dealing for a specific thing that this man Devlin vouched for, that Dr. Neilson knew had been tested in Kingston, the matter came to an end. Now, it appears even at that time Dr. Devlin or Mr. Hatch had a disagreement, but there was no knowledge of that on the part of the Minister of Militia and Defence or of Dr. Neilson. There was no evidence in any way that they thought they were dealing with any one else than the man who had furnished the sample of such food.

Now it will be seen, according to what I have stated, that all the details were left to Dr. Neilson. The Minister of Militia and De-

fence, personally busy with a thousand matters at that time, had not time to deal with it, even if he had felt disposed under other circumstances to deal with it, and all the details were left to Dr. Neilson. Dr. Neilson made this contract on the express stipulation that the food furnished by Dr. Devlin was to be identical with the food that was sent to Kingston and on which the test was made. He had a sample of that food, as he says, furnished him, on January 4, and he made a comparison of it by analysis in such a manner as to satisfy himself that this food sent in as a sample was identical with the food tested at Kingston. Now that was the state of things down to the time the bargain was made. Then the bargain having been made I suppose that ought really to have ended the matter, because a bargain once made ought to be carried out unless there could be some reason shown to the contrary.

Now, I want to call attention to the different names given to this stuff as we have them in the evidence. The member for Jacques Cartier spoke about what was on the label as presented by Mr. Hatch, and took the label to be an indication of the composition of the stuff. I must say that that is an instance of faith that we do not often find, especially among members of parliament. He is willing to take as evidence of the constitution of a thing the label that is on the package of that article. He thinks the government should have taken some steps to ascertain that the article was just in accordance with the label. Well, Dr. Neilson relied upon the identity of the stuff and he says he knew the stuff as 'Protein Vegetal.' If you turn to his evidence on page 115, you will see it called Protein Vegetal Powder. It is called simply 'protose' and is called 'Hatch's protose' in the affidavits of these men. I call attention to the agreement, exhibit 19, which is rather an important matter as showing what this Mr. Hatch called it, with whom he has been dealing, and to show that negligence cannot be imputed to anybody for not remembering it as Hatch's protose. When that agreement was made between him and Dr. Devlin in reference to this article, it is called 'Proto-Vegetose,' or 'Protose,' or 'Protein Vegetal.' All these names are applied in the new agreement that is filed as exhibit 19, and so far as the name is concerned, it is as binding upon Hatch, being a party to the agreement, as it is upon Dr. Devlin. These names all appeared before this contract was made under the circumstances I have mentioned. After that we get the word 'vitallin,' and that is used by Dr. Devlin. Dr. Devlin having used that word and having put it upon his can as shown in exhibit 5, Dr. Neilson called his attention to it. He says: I do not know about that. I do not know what this 'vitallin' is, and Dr. Devlin says 'vitallin' is exactly the same as

the food which was called 'protein vegetal,' which was tested at Kingston. Dr. Neilson was relying, and he had reason to rely upon his assurance that:

It is absolutely one and the same thing, except that 'protein vegetal' is a double word, and 'vitallin' is a short word that appeals to the public.

You will find that at pages 115, 126 and 128 of the evidence. It seems to me that no point can be made out of the use of the word, but that it was explained by the person with whom the representative of the Department of Militia was dealing, and who represented to him that it was absolutely the same thing that was tested at Kingston. So, we have it shown, as it seems to me, that the department took all the ordinary precautions that could be taken in a matter of that kind. Dr. Neilson relied on the representations of Dr. Devlin, but he did not rely altogether upon these. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) put the question across the floor of the House: What precautions did Dr. Neilson take? All I can say is that apart from the representations on which he had a right to rely he took the precaution first of taking a sample, and of comparing it with the other sample, tasting, feeling and smelling it. Hon. gentlemen opposite made considerable fun of that, and said that it is clear that he could not test a powder in that way, and be able to judge one with the other. It does not lie in their mouths to say that. They brought before the committee an Italian from Montreal, a man of respectability, who has been in business there for a long time, and this Mr. Catelli, whose evidence will be found in the book, took the food that was presented before the committee, tasted it, smelled it, and felt of it, after which he was able to pronounce an opinion that satisfied hon. gentlemen. If Mr. Catelli could do that, I do not know why Dr. Neilson could not do the same thing. Then, in addition, Dr. Devlin did not come as an unknown man to Dr. Neilson, but he came with a certificate from Sir William Hingston and Prof. Ruttan, whose evidence is spoken of here. So that he not only had certificates in favour of his food, which he offered for sale, but in favour of Dr. Devlin himself. In regard to the test, this was a time of haste, not a time when there was an opportunity, as in ordinary contracts, to wait until an analysis had been made, and all those things had been done which might, perhaps, suggest themselves under other circumstances. Mr. Hatch is put forward as a great dealer in this food business. He is put forward as a man of honour, of good faith, having good food which has been advocated by hon. gentlemen who have discussed this matter, but we will see whether his food was any better than that of Dr. Devlin, as it turns out. It is all very well

to speak as hon. gentlemen do, after these things have come to light, because we know a great deal more about these things than we did at first, but I am basing my remarks upon what was the knowledge of the parties at the time the transaction was taking place, and not upon what it has turned out to be afterwards. Hatch, in his evidence, describes the kind of business he was doing. You will find at page 62 a good deal of information in regard to Mr. Hatch, and in regard to the way in which his food was made:

Q. This machine was in Dr. Devlin's house?—  
A. The apparatus and the hand mill were in my workshop at Dr. Devlin's house on the top floor.

That is Hatch, mind you, not Devlin. Hon. gentlemen are making a great deal of fun about Devlin, but this is what Hatch says about his food that we are blamed for not taking.

Q. A kind of coffee mill?—A. A hand mill; I only worked three and a half pounds?

Q. The stuff was made sometimes by Dr. Devlin's housekeeper?—A. Which, sir.

Q. The stuff you sent away?—A. Never. Sometimes I told her to watch the stuff, sometimes she helped me; she saw me working ten hours a day.

Q. How large is the cost of this machinery?—  
A. It depends on the scale you are working on.

Q. The scale on which you are working?—A. \$10 or \$15 will be enough for machinery to make two and a half pounds to five pounds.

Q. Where did you get your material?—A. That is my secret.

Q. You can tell us what country?—A. This raw material is not used by anybody else for food purposes but by me, and the committee wish—

Q. Is it got in Canada?—A. I cannot say.

Q. Was it made in Canada or outside of Canada; do you decline to tell me that?—A. I cannot do more than be prepared to show—

Q. Could it be made in Canada?—A. I could show any one.

Q. Do you refuse to say?—A. I refused you first, and you insisted, and then I gave you another answer.

Q. Do you refuse to say whether it was made in Canada or outside of Canada?—A. I told you it could be made in Canada.

Q. I didn't ask you whether it could be made in Canada, I asked whether your raw material came from Canada, or outside?—A. I cannot tell you.

Q. You mean you won't tell me?—A. I can't tell you.

Q. You mean you won't tell, don't you?—A. I don't wish to tell you; I have an interest not to tell you.

This food, this vaunted stuff, is made in an up-stairs room of Dr. Devlin's house, watched over in the manufacture sometimes by Dr. Devlin's housekeeper, and if the government had bought this stuff under these circumstances it would have been all right. But when the Militia Department bought what they supposed to be all right, it is guilty of great negligence, because Hatch was not interested in this food. That

is the whole case, as it seems to me. It may be good food which is being made by Hatch under these circumstances, but if so, it seems to me it may be good food even if made by Dr. Devlin, and he had an opportunity of getting the material in order to enable him to make this food as well as Hatch had, notwithstanding what Hatch says to the contrary.

I am not going to deal with the analysis of these goods further than to state that from first to last, until the charge was made by the hon. member (Mr. Monk), it has not been a question of the quantity of proteids in the food. It has been a question of the combination which would render the food easy assimilative, which would make it easy of digestion, which would nourish the system of the person who partook of it, and that was the secret of the food which Mr. Hatch had. It has, as I have said, not so much the quantity of proteid in the food, and, therefore, it is not singular that Mr. Hatch should have stated as he unquestionably did, to Mr. Muir, that his food did not exceed 15 per cent in proteids. Let me call attention to the testimony of Mr. Muir. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), accepted Mr. Muir's statement unquestioning, and he told the House that Mr. Muir was undoubtedly a respectable and a truthful man. On the other hand, the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), questioned Mr. Muir's evidence, and asked the House not to put any reliance upon his statement. Now, this statement of Mr. Hatch to Mr. Muir, was not made in a casual manner, but it was made by Mr. Hatch in the course of a lengthy and sustained conversation. It was not a conversation in which a remark was interjected by Mr. Hatch as to 15 per cent, but it was a deliberate statement made in conversation, and Mr. Muir has either told the truth, or he has given false evidence, and nobody suggests that Mr. Muir would be guilty of that. If Mr. Muir told the truth, and I think every member in this House will believe that Mr. Muir is a truthful man, then, Hatch stated specifically to him at a time when it was not a question of the amount of proteids, but a question as to the secret by which he was able to make the food of value; that this food only contained 15 per cent of proteids. That being so, it does not seem difficult to accept the other statements which have been made in regard to this food, putting it at all events identical with the food that was tested at Kingston. A great deal has been said about Dr. Devlin's company having no substance, but I want to know who this Hatch Protose Company is? Mr. Hatch was before the committee and he did not tell us. He told us of the registration of the name of his food, and of the room where he works and that is all we know about it. I say that it showed greater care on the part of the Militia Department, to have dealt with Dr.

Devlin, under the circumstances, than it would have been for them to go to Montreal and buy from the Protose Company, which has on the heading of its letters a place called 12 Richmond Square, and which does not mean any more than the announcement that Dr. Devlin packed his food at the corner of Bleury and Craig Streets, Montreal. Then the complaint is made that the government accepted this food in what the hon. gentleman called 'paint cans.' There is a good deal in the use of a word, and nobody knows better than my hon. friend who described them as 'paint cans' in a sense that was derogatory to the can. They were the shape of cans that paint is usually put in, but they were new cans, made specially for the purpose and they were practically water-tight. It is stated in the charge that the cans should be sterilized and be airtight, or at least water-tight, and we have the evidence of Dr. Neilson, who has some experience on that, and to use his own words, he describes it as 'bosh.' This may be described as desiccated food, which of course would suffer in contact with water, but would not be affected by the air. If they were sufficiently water-tight; in the ordinary case of a man being out in a rain storm, that was sufficient, for as long as they were not submerged in water, they were sufficiently water-tight to prevent the water coming in contact with the food. Flour is a desiccated food, and flour is exported in barrels and kept in barrels for years. There has never been any pretense that desiccated food, or flour, needs to be in a sterilized vessel or needs to be in a vessel that is absolutely water-tight. It just shows how far afield these gentlemen have gone to try and make out a charge against the government, of negligence in this matter. It has been shown in the evidence, and no one has pretended, for a moment, that this was at least not a very good food. It may not be so concentrated as to have the term concentrated food applied to it, but it is a useful, proper ration to be used and one that is in no way unwholesome. If it is true that this food is made under some secret, by which it is more useful than the amount of protoid matter in it would indicate, and as the test at Kingston shows, there is no reason why it should not have been bought and bought for the price paid for it.

But whether that is so or not, any evidence of negligence on the part of the department is absolutely displaced by the consideration of the facts of the case. I think praise instead of blame ought to be given to the head of the Militia Department for doing what he did. He was not obliged to do it; there was no reason for his doing it except his desire to serve the interests of the contingent. The vessels were obliged to provide food for the journey; the British government supplied them with their ordinary rations, and were to give them also an emergency ration. There was

Mr. BRITTON.

no reason for the minister supplying this food except out of an abundant desire on his part to do more than was absolutely required to furnish the contingent. So he made up his mind to add this ration, a small one, it is true, as a gift from Canada. All these preparations were made in a hurry. When the first contingent was sent, it was not known that a second one would be. It is quite true, we have a splendid militia force; but Canada is not yet, whatever it may become, a military power, and there has been no great experience or expense on the part of the Militia Department in mobilizing our forces or supplying them for war. Everything was rushed as to the appointment and the equipment of the men, and without any of the experience which nations constantly at war or with standing armies have. We have had a little experience, as the hon. member for Halifax said, under former administrations, and that experience was not very satisfactory. With regard to one of those occasions our hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie), who I am sorry to see is not in his place just now, thought he knew something because he was there. The hon. gentleman may think that in military matters, it is quite sufficient if he is there; but other people might think it would be necessary to have something else besides Major Beattie; and we find that the equipment was not well attended to then, as it has been in these latter days under the rule of the present Minister of Militia.

Now, we have these charges made. We have the state of things, which I have tried to present exactly as it appears in the evidence, without exaggerating or minimizing anything. The matter came before the House in the form of charges by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. The committee was appointed. I was not present when the committee was appointed, and of course had naturally no desire to be on such a committee; but having been appointed, I acted, and I have no hesitation in saying that I tried to do my duty fairly. The report of the committee has been presented to the House, and as soon as this report was made, what did we find? We found the Liberal members of the committee attacked by the Conservative press from one end of the country to the other, and accused of being blind, party-besotted, and ready to do anything for their party. These are the same papers which, as soon as the charges were made, considered them proved without hearing any of the evidence. They published articles from day to day assuming the charges to be established before a single syllable of evidence had been given; and they have charged the Liberal members of the committee with being party blind, because they have come to a conclusion after hearing the evidence. That is the condition of party politics to which we have come in this country. I might quote what was said in the *Mail*, I think

on the very first day that this committee met; and if I did so, I might say, as another hon. member said, 'Ex uno disce omnes'—from this sample learn all the others. I might say, therefore, that the Conservative press, from the head down to the tail, united in assuming that these charges were proved without hearing the evidence; and later on they have had articles blaming the Liberal members of the committee for the conclusion at which they have arrived. It may be that some Liberal papers have said similar things in regard to the Conservative members of that committee; but if they have, I have not seen them, and I think it is a poor piece of business if men have to be personally attacked because they come to a certain conclusion on evidence given before them. But I have come to the conclusion that it is a part of the campaign of our friends on the other side, that charges should be made and should be stuck to as much as possible, in the hope that the more charges there are, the more mud may stick, and, whether the charges are true or false, some party advantage may be gained from them. With that object in view, as part and parcel of a party campaign, we have these charges first made and then argued from as if they were established, and then those who take a different view are abused in the party press. A charge is made and guilty is the verdict before the evidence is offered at all. Guilty is all the word they care for; and from first to last this is apparently the policy to be adopted. We find that an attempt is being made to arouse public feeling, not so much because of any imposition upon the government in this matter, but because it has reference to soldiers' food. For instance, we see in the *Montreal Star* articles on the starvation and the sufferings from starvation put side by side with the comments upon this charge against the Minister of Militia. Now, there are none so blind as those who will not see; and whether we say that this food is a real emergency food or not, it certainly is nothing that is going to be a damage to our men in South Africa. There is no reason why, if they take it at all, it should not be an advantage rather than a disadvantage, and there is no reason for articles of the kind I refer to.

Now, the charges having been made, and having come before the committee, they must either be proved or they must fail. We have come to the conclusion that they have signally failed, and we have tried to have the evidence placed before the committee in a way that is eminently fair and proper. I want to call attention to two or three matters. In not one single instance was there the slightest obstruction or attempt to prevent any evidence being submitted that should have been taken. Strictly speaking, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was not entitled to submit the evi-

dence of Mr. Macfarlane, the man who made the analysis, and who was then on the ocean. The minority report states that they were not able to get some evidence because he was away. That is not true, because they were allowed to give the evidence they supposed Mr. Macfarlane would have given had he been here. The paper he signed was put in, and they were allowed to examine Mr. McGill, Mr. Macfarlane's assistant, who gave evidence as if he were the one who had made the analysis instead of Mr. Macfarlane. Hersey's evidence was also allowed. This man, whom they announced as an eminent authority, did not make any analysis. The analysis was made and furnished by Mr. Wood, and Mr. Hersey knew nothing about it, but he accepted the statement Wood had made, and we allowed all that to go in. The very parcel that was examined by Mr. Wood was brought to him by a person he did not know, but whom, he believed, was a woman. He knew nothing about where the parcel came from.

There was no obstruction or difficulty of any kind thrown in the way. A man named Moore bought a tin from Lyons and handed it to Mr. Hatch. Hatch says he gave it to a person, presumably a girl, but the girl was not called, and there was nothing to prove that it was the food sent.

We were charged with unfairness because we would not permit the refuse food that Hatch produced to be analysed. It seems to me the answer is perfectly obvious. If my hon. friends thought that there was any great importance to be attached to an analysis of that particular article, leaving its identity to be discussed later on, there would have been no trouble to them in having it analysed, because they had control of it. Why did we not allow that to be analysed? Because we doubted its being what Mr. Hatch swore it was. This food was said to have been made when the test was going on at Kingston, from March 16 to April 16, 1899. At that time Hatch was making the food at 100 University Street. After the test, he moved away, and I do not know whether he has a room where he lives at Richmond Square, but he does not live with Dr. Devlin, and he had his letters afterwards addressed to Mackay Street, where Dr. Devlin lives, and later on to 12 Richmond Square. It seems to me most improbable that this man Hatch should have saved a couple of pounds of food which he admitted was spoiled. Why, if spoiled, did he not throw it out? What object was there in keeping it? There could have been no question then of this investigation, yet, he kept it from April 16, 1899, nearly a year before the government entered into the transaction now under discussion. There was, therefore, no reason for his having kept that food, and yet he swears he did keep it. He moved in the meantime, and when people move they generally throw away refuse of this kind, but this Mr. Hatch said

he did not throw away, and he brought it to the committee to be tested. Another reason why we did not have it tested was, because Mr. Hatch said that different parts of the same food, for want of proper mixing, would not show the same proteids on an analysis. Why, then, was this spoiled food brought here? I, for one, was not satisfied that we could assume it to have been proved identical with that tested at Kingston, and there was no reason why it should be subjected to an analysis. We have no explanation why that food was kept other than the bald statement made by Mr. Hatch after this dispute arose, and I would attach no value whatever to an analysis of that food. There was no means of connecting it with the food on which the soldiers lived at Kingston, and I am prepared to stand by that position.

Let us look at the other side. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier said he hoped that he would not follow the example set by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), but would adopt a more judicial tone. I think he did adopt a judicial tone, but that is all there was judicial in his remarks. There was nothing else judicial but the tone. His argument was, from first to last, a misrepresentation of what took place before the committee.

I am not going to detain the House by repeating what has been already said, but I do say that I thought it was understood, as a matter of honour among the members of that committee, that the minority report was not to go to the press until presented to the House. It did go to the press, and appeared in the leading Conservative organs in Ottawa, Montreal and Toronto. Not only was this a breach of parliamentary privilege, but also a breach of faith.

Further, this minority report is a deliberate, wilful misrepresentation of the facts, when it refers to the exclusion of the evidence of Mr. Ramsay as to certain things he could prove. True, we objected to his evidence as to the disposition of the money in the bank, but, while that was objected to, the question was asked, and Mr. Ramsay answered it at length, so that his answer forms part of the evidence, and I cannot see how the hon. member for Jacques Cartier can say that this evidence was excluded. His evidence was to the effect that he was not able to trace the payments of the money, that Lyons had other money in the bank, and the money he chequed out could not be traced to any individuals. What was the object of putting that evidence in? Simply to insinuate what these hon. gentlemen dared not assert, namely, that some part of this money was used improperly. That, the hon. member for Montmorency said, he would establish before the Public Accounts Committee next year, if he should be in this House. That was a cowardly insinuation. There is nothing in the evidence to warrant it; and if people are to be tried

in this House upon insinuations not warranted by the evidence, there is an end to all air argument, debate or proper investigation. And yet, if the clause in the report means anything, it means that; and if it means that, it is not supported by one tittle of evidence given before the committee. It was unfair too, in view of the evidence of Dr. Ruttan. That evidence was given as to the analysis of food said to be a sample of the food tested in Kingston. The answer is, they say: You have not established that you have an analysis of a sample of the food tested at Kingston. That depends on two things. First, it depends on whether Dr. Neilson told the truth in giving his evidence, and secondly, on whether Dr. Devlin, when there was no object, so far as we could see, in lying, told the truth in regard to this being a sample. He sent the sample before the contingent was sent, before it was known that any troops were to be sent. He was friendly with Hatch at that time, and a party to the agreement produced before the committee. At this time he introduced this man Hatch to a capitalist in New York, named Hall, and the three men were parties to an agreement. And, if he did tell the truth, and if Dr. Neilson told the truth, then Dr. Ruttan analysed a sample of the food tested at Kingston. Yet, we have that kept out of the report, and the other analysis referred to. And this first analysis made by Dr. Ruttan is an analysis of stuff that was not made in Canada. Hatch himself says that, as will be seen in his evidence at page 71:

Q. I don't know whether you said you had ever made in this country an analysis of this protose?—A. It is printed in my pamphlet, in McGill University.

Q. When?—A. When I arrived two years ago.

Q. Where was that protose made?—A. That I brought with me when I arrived.

Q. The protose you made in this country was never analysed?—A. That I made here?

Q. Yes?—A. When I was treating Dr. Devlin in Notre Dame Hospital I prepared it daily.

Q. I am talking of analysis?—A. Oh, no, I never had it analysed except there.

And it is an analysis of food that was made in the United States and brought in with him, that is presented to show what the Hatch food was. And, as the long cross-examination by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) shows Hatch depended for his knowledge as to the quantity of proteids in these foods on the representation of a man from whom he bought the stuff that was put through the process of manufacture.

I have dealt now with both the majority and the minority reports. I say, from what has taken place—and I hope I may be pardoned for making this statement, if it is wrong—I have hardly a doubt that, from the time the committee first met, this report presented as a minority report, was in process of being made out—

Mr. CASGRAIN. I will ask my hon. friend (Mr. Britton), to allow me to say that that is not correct.

Mr. BRITTON. I must accept the statement.

Mr. SPROULE. How about the majority report?

Mr. BRITTON. That certainly was not made out until the time it was presented, or very little before. At all events, there is the internal evidence in the minority report, that it was not made on the spur of the moment; and I imagine the typewritten copies which found their way to the press, indicate that it was made before there was an opportunity of consultation as to what had been brought out by the evidence.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The hon. gentleman is wrong.

Mr. BRITTON. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain), and his colleagues are very expeditious workmen.

Mr. CASGRAIN. We are.

Mr. BRITTON. That is the only explanation I can give. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier said he hoped this House was not here to whitewash Dr. Devlin. I hope not. But I hope, on the other hand, it is not here to blackwash anybody. I do not think we should feel that to be our duty. There is nothing said in the majority report in reference to the customs-house officer of Montreal, which was not brought upon himself by himself. The facts are in accordance with the report, in my opinion. It is clear that the announcement made by the customs-house officer in explaining his action, whether it was intended to do so or not, did cast reflection on innocent people, as was thought. He seemed to desire, or some thought he desired, to imply in his telegram that blame was to be attached to the government, and that an order for the free admission of this stuff had been given by the government. But it turns out that he had no such intention, as I understand it. And while that is the case, I think it is quite open on the evidence to the finding the majority have come to on that point. The majority report seems plain and simple on the evidence, but the minority report is a very different thing. We are asked, and asked by lawyers, by this minority report, to find Dr. Devlin guilty of two offences. A man could not be convicted of using abusive language, or of an ordinary assault, or anything else, without being brought before a magistrate or some court, and a formal charge made. We are told that Dr. Devlin was before the committee, though he did not give evidence. But he did not know the charge that had been made against him in the report of the minority. And yet we are seriously asked by the members of the minority to find Dr. Devlin guilty of two offences—first an offence against the Adul-

teration of Food Act, and secondly an offence under the Criminal Code, without giving him an opportunity of being heard with reference to the charges, and not even telling him what those charges are. This, the largest deliberative assembly in Canada, the most important tribunal is asked to condemn a man on a charge for which he has never been arraigned. That would be no more illogical than some other things proposed by the minority report, but they certainly do strike one as going further than we have been asked to go in this line. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk's) address with reference to hygiene and health food, was of course interesting; but it was altogether beside the question. His reference to broken biscuit was entirely unwarranted by the evidence. Though when Mr. Hersey was giving evidence, the question was asked whether this material looked like broken biscuit, and the answer was in the affirmative. But there was nothing to show that it was anything of that kind. And, yet, without any evidence whatever, the hon. member for Montmorency spoke of it as dog biscuit.

Comment is made on the fact that Dr. Devlin did not appear before the committee. We have nothing to do with that. Dr. Devlin is his own master. I suppose we could have asked him to give his evidence. But the charge was before the committee, and it was not proved so far as we were concerned. If the other side wanted to make any further proof of charges by calling Mr. Devlin they had an opportunity, and they could have asked for an adjournment to get his evidence. It is reported that Dr. Devlin said he was going to New York, and therefore, he did not come. Well, he wrote that he was going to New York for the purpose of getting a witness to come before this committee, and he was told in Montreal on his way to New York that the committee had decided not to take any further evidence, so under these circumstances he did not go to New York. While the other side have appeared here as apologists for Mr. Hatch, I do not appear as an apologist for Dr. Devlin. I have no brief for him, and we do not accept any responsibility for not calling him, and I have given the reasons. But, I suppose that I am at liberty to make a statement in reference to Dr. Devlin as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier made one for Mr. Hatch. He said Mr. Hatch was willing to come here, willing to go into a room, as I understood him to say, and to experiment with this food—whether to make a new food or not—or do something with reference to it as an additional test. I do not think we want anything further from Mr. Hatch in regard to this matter. We have heard his statement, we know that he did not come back to contradict the statement of Mr. Muir. The hon. member stated that Mr. Devlin gave unaccepted cheques for the customs. It is true that

Mr. Ramsay stated that he had no account in the bank on which one cheque was given. That was a mistake. There was no account with the branch with which Mr. Ramsay was connected, but the collector of customs at Montreal is authority for the statement that that cheque was on the Merchants Bank, at the St. Catherine Street branch, and it was paid on presentation. It is only justice to Dr. Devlin to state that, and I state that he had an account at the Merchants Bank, but not at the branch where Mr. Ramsay was stationed. This is a statement that can easily be verified.

Now, a little ridicule was cast upon Mr. Cotton for giving a certificate before he had actually made the test at St. John's. Cotton is one of the men on whom the test was made at Kingston. He was satisfied that the food did him a great service. He was satisfied it was a valuable food, and he was willing, though a very stout man, to undergo a test again at St. John's. He asked to undergo a test, and his request was granted. When the food was presented to him at St. John's, from his examination and his taste of it, he believed it was the same food that he had tried at Kingston, and for that reason he was willing to certify to it. Dr. Neilson said he did not give much weight to the certificate, nor do I. But that is not the point; the point is that he was one of the men on whom the test was made at Kingston, he was an honourable man, he gives his testimony in a satisfactory way, and he repeats his testimony when he comes before the committee in regard to the test at Kingston, and says he has undergone the same test at St. John's under Dr. Devlin with the same kind of food; and he believes, so far as he can tell by the taste of it and by its effect upon him, that it is the identical food that was used at Kingston. Now, this food tested at St. John's is part of the food that is in question here. This statement is given by an honourable man, without any reserve, that that food was a good one, on which he lived for thirty days at Kingston, but taking a glass of beer at Kingston every night, though he did not take it at St. John's. He is the only man relied upon by the friends of Mr. Hatch as supporting the test which was made at Kingston. Under all these circumstances, I feel satisfied that the weight of evidence is with the majority report of the committee, and that is the report that I think this House should adopt.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). As one of the two laymen on the select committee appointed by the House to inquire into this matter, I trust I shall have regard to the proprieties, and in view of the fact that we have had the pleasure of listening to very lengthy and exhaustive speeches from the legal gentlemen who composed the remainder of the committee, I shall not attempt to trespass upon the time of the

Mr. BRITTON.

House more than a few minutes. Let me say that I entirely agree with one remark that fell from the lips of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), when he said that everything concerning the welfare of our brave soldiers, who are upholding the honour of Canada on the South African veldts, evokes the deepest interest in the public mind. There can be no doubt whatever of the accuracy and of the force of that statement; and that has been fully exemplified by the intense interest which has been aroused in the proceedings of this committee, and the intense horror that was felt throughout Canada when it was alleged in this House that a worthless emergency food had been purchased by the Militia Department, and supplied for the use of the Canadian troops in South Africa in cases of emergency. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the amount involved in the purchase of this food is not a large one. The misapplication, or the mis-spending, of three or four thousand dollars of the public money is not of itself a matter of very grave importance. The hon. member for Halifax, in the course of his remarks, said that although an expenditure aggregating a million dollars had been made by the Militia Department in the despatch of these contingents to South Africa, exception had only been taken to the amount involved in the purchase of this emergency food, some four or five thousand dollars. Speaking for myself, I would have preferred to see all the moneys that have been expended in the equipment and despatch of these contingents absolutely wasted, thrown into the ocean, rather than that the lives of the men composing the Canadian contingent should have been placed in jeopardy for one moment in consequence of the grave fraud which has taken place in the purchase and in the despatch of this emergency food. We are asked to believe that every necessary precaution was taken by the Department of Militia in securing for the men for whom it was intended a food that, in the hour of emergency, would not fail them. If that fact has been established, if it can be established by the evidence which is contained within the covers of the book which has been presented to parliament as the result of the deliberations of the committee, then I say, Mr. Speaker, that the report of the minority is not well founded. But I challenge any man to take up this book and read it from cover to cover, and, if he is an impartial man, he must, in my humble judgment, conclude that no such precaution was taken in a matter of the most vital importance to the well-being and to the lives of the men who are fighting for the honour of Canada at this hour.

This food, if it was of any real value, if it was of sufficient value to be paid for at the rate of \$2 a pound, must surely be all that was claimed for it. It was, according

to the admissions of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and according to the evidence, first presented to the notice of the department by a man named Henri Hatch, who was introduced to the Minister of Militia and Defence as a food specialist. It was his food that was tested by the Department of Militia at Kingston. It was his food that was relied upon as containing a percentage of nutriment sufficient to be used with confidence by the soldiers in case of great emergency or exertion. In the course of the speech which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) made this afternoon, he declared that Mr. Hatch did not know what was given to the troops at Kingston, that Hatch made a hocus-pocus mixture, that Hatch was a fakir, and yet this man Hatch is allowed to impose his food for a test upon the Department of Militia, the food is tested, and after the trial is made at Kingston, most flattering testimonials are given to Hatch as to the value of his emergency ration. Will it be believed that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has been arguing at considerable length, and he thought, with some force, that the food that was tested at Kingston was never analysed by the department, that the food which Hatch had secured splendid testimonials for, was food that had not been made in Canada, but was food that he had brought with him when he came to this country from the United States?

Mr. CAMPBELL. So he says himself.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely if the government of Canada had taken reasonable precautions, if they had desired to ascertain what were the component parts of the food which was tested at Kingston, they would have taken the ordinary business precautions, they would have required the Department of Militia, because they had the means available at their command, to have had a careful analysis made of that food. But, nothing of that kind was done. A statement was received from the men who underwent the test at Kingston with Hatch's protose as to the excellent qualities of this food. These men made affidavits as to how they felt after a test of the food had been made upon them for thirty days, and upon the result of that test most flattering testimonials were given to Hatch as to the value and efficacy of his food. Now, the first contingent which was despatched from Canada was not supplied with the emergency food, and the reason given was that the Imperial government were to supply all the rations that were required when the troops landed at Cape Town, and that ample provision had been made for their sustenance during the voyage from Halifax thither. That was the statement made by the hon. Minister of Militia when he was approached, not by Dr. Devlin, but by Mr. Hatch in the fall of last year before

the first contingent sailed, and asked to be given an order for the food which had been tested at Kingston. The minister declined to give an order for the reasons which I have stated. Officials of his department, Dr. Neilson for one, were waited upon by a gentleman representing the Bovril Company, one of the largest manufacturers of concentrated foods in the world, a company which supplies tens of thousands of pounds annually of concentrated food to the British army. A representative of that company waited upon the minister, or some of his officers, and a similar answer was given to him as that which was given to Mr. Hatch. A gentleman resident in Ottawa, whose business it is to deal in concentrated foods, waited upon the department and asked for an order to supply emergency rations to the first contingent. A similar answer was given to him as was given to the others. Now, we are asked to believe that between the time the first contingent sailed and some time towards the latter end of December, or the beginning of January, reports had come to Canada and had been published in the Canadian newspapers as to the insufficiency of the rations being supplied to our men in South Africa, and the happy suggestion was made to the Minister of Militia—the minister is not very sure whether it came from Dr. Devlin or Dr. Neilson—but the suggestion was made by either one of the gentlemen, that it would be a good thing to supply the second contingent, which was being enrolled for active service, with an emergency ration. Expedition seemed to be the order of the day. The matter had to be done with great speed, with great energy and celerity, and yet notwithstanding the fact that the minister and the Department of Militia had Mr. Hatch's address, that they had given him a testimonial as to the value of his food, that they had tested that food on the soldiers of the Kingston garrison; notwithstanding the fact that they had the address of the agent of the Bovril Company of Montreal, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Besserer, of Ottawa, had supplied food and had given the greatest possible satisfaction to the Geological Survey, and to the Department of the Interior, notwithstanding the fact that they could have written to these men, or that they could have communicated with them in a few minutes by telegraph, asking them if they were prepared to supply emergency food in great haste, not a single effort was made to communicate with any one of these gentlemen, and no attempt was made to advertise the fact that it was the wish and desire of the government to supply the second contingent with an emergency food to be used in case of great exertion or of forced marches. If ordinary business prudence had been adopted by the Department of Militia, in view of all the experience that the Department of Militia had had with Hatch's food, and in

view of the fact that he had made offers to supply emergency food for the first contingent, they were in duty bound to have communicated with him, and to have communicated with the Bovril Company, whose reputation for food products is world wide, and they were in duty bound to have communicated with the British War Office, and to have ascertained where and how they procured their emergency food. Was one of these precautions taken by the government? Not a single one. A bargain was made with Dr. Devlin. He came to Ottawa in the latter part of December or the beginning of January. The recommendation was secured from Dr. Neilson on the 4th of January, that recommendation was endorsed and approved by the minister on the 4th of January, a letter was written to Dr. Devlin on the 4th of January, informing him that his offer had been accepted, and a contract was actually made with him on the same day, showing the expedition which can be practiced by the government when a political friend and supporter was to be given something that he was not justly entitled to. How long would it had taken the Department of Militia to have placed itself in communication with those who were in a better position to supply this food than Dr. Devlin? I ask every business man whom I see sitting on the other side of the House if it were his own transaction, if he were asked to spend \$4,000 or \$5,000 of his own money to supply an emergency ration that could be depended upon, whether he would have adopted the methods adopted by the Department of Militia, and would have supplied the men of the Canadian contingent with the stuff that was supplied to them? I venture to affirm that there is not one hon. member on the other side of the House, if the transaction were his own, if his own business reputation were at stake, if his own funds were to be expended, would have adopted the course pursued by the government. Now, a contract was made with Dr. Devlin to supply certain rations for the use of the second contingent. He was to supply emergency rations.

What are emergency rations anyway? Are they what desert is after a full dinner? Not at all. Are emergency rations what people often take after dinner as a kind of settler for their stomachs? Not at all. Emergency rations are food which it is intended shall be used exclusively in case of great emergency and need, when it is not possible for the military authorities to supply the troops with the ordinary rations. That is what emergency rations are. The department in its wisdom, and I have no doubt with a patriotic desire to supply emergency food for the second contingent, entered into an engagement with Dr. Devlin that he was to act as their contractor for the supply of such food. What precautions were taken by the gentlemen who are re-

Mr. CLARKE.

sponsible to the people of Canada for the taking of reasonable and necessary precautions in an important matter such as this? Let us see. Dr. Neilson's testimony throws considerable light upon that. He had a conversation with Dr. Devlin as to the amount of stuff which was to be supplied, and Dr. Devlin was to supply food similar to that which had been tested at Kingston, and of equally nutritive qualities. He was to supply food four ounces of which would be a day's rations, and he was to put that food up in tins, each tin containing one day's rations. The department ordered 7,000 of these tins, which were supposed to be sufficient to supply the second contingent with five days' rations for each man. Let us see just exactly what the conversation was upon this matter between Dr. Devlin and Dr. Neilson, as narrated by Dr. Neilson himself. I read from page 116 of the evidence of Dr. Neilson, and it will be seen that the word 'he' in the text refers to Dr. Devlin:

He (Dr. Devlin) said: 'This is Protein Vegetal Powder, such as we have used in the experiments in Kingston; it is under the name of Vitallin; I have used that name for professional and commercial purposes.' It is, as I would have you see, a dry, desiccated powder. I don't know if he used the word 'indefinitely,' but would keep for a long time; he said: 'Particularly if in a tin tightly closed as this one is.' That appealed to me as very sensible. I said: 'This tin is too large, I want one to contain a day's rations.' He said: 'A tin containing four ounces will be a day's ration; I can make it that strength.' I said: 'Very well, Dr. Devlin, put it in the form of a tender, and your tender will be considered.' That was on January 4.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I draw the attention of the House to the fact that Dr. Devlin contracted with Dr. Neilson, who represented the Department of Militia, that he (Dr. Devlin) would supply food, four ounces of which would be one day's ration, and that food was to be inclosed in a four ounce tin. Dr. Devlin, as appears from the evidence, supplied 7,000 tins of the stuff, and it was sent to South Africa as emergency rations for our Canadian soldiers.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Read the balance of that evidence.

Mr. CLARKE. I will leave that to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell), as I do not wish to trespass too much on the time of the House. Further down, on page 116, Dr. Neilson gives this further testimony:

The tender was approved of, and Mr. Devlin set to work, and the outcome of it was that he supplied the second contingent with five days' rations for each man.

Now, let us see what kind of stuff this was that went to South Africa. By turning over a little further in the evidence, we can read the testimony of one of the leading analysts, as well as one of the best qualified chemists in Canada, to express

an opinion as to the value of this food. At page 169 of the report of the committee, Dr. Ruttan gave his evidence as follows :

Q. Do you concur in the opinion of the Dominion analyst? Have you seen it?—A. No, I have not. I read part of a newspaper report.

Q. Will you take communication of the report of the Dominion analyst marked exhibit 2L?—A. Yes.

Q. I don't mean the analysis, but in the conclusion of it?—A. I quite agree with the statement that it should not be considered a concentrated food.

Q. Therefore, do you consider that it is a suitable army emergency ration, the constituents being given as they are in that certificate?—A. That involves a good many considerations. The quantity, as I pointed out, that would be necessary for a man to carry in order to sustain life is so great that it does not seem to me to be better than almost any other form of rations, in fact, not so concentrated.

Q. What other form of rations, doctor?—A. Well, the ordinary form of powder.

Q. Anything else?—A. Biscuits or materials of that sort.

Q. They are more nutritious, you think?—A. Not more nutritious, but as nutritious.

Q. Beef, dried beef, stuff of that kind?—A. Much more nutritious.

Q. Dried beef would be much more nutritious?—A. Much more nutritious, yes.

These were the questions to Dr. Ruttan, and these were the answers given by him as to the value of this stuff that was supplied by Dr. Devlin to the Militia Department as an emergency food. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, this stuff was put up in four-ounce tins, one of which was to contain a ration for twenty-four hours for a soldier doing exceedingly heavy duty. Now, what does Dr. Ruttan say as to these precious tins. I quote from the evidence of Dr. Ruttan at page 174 :

Q. Then, it would take, according to your estimate, how many of these to sustain a soldier of 150 pounds for a day of arduous duty?—A. I should say about eight or nine.

Q. Eight or nine of these tins a day?—A. Eight or nine of these tins.

Q. Would one tin alone sustain him?—A. It would prevent him from starving.

Q. But would it maintain his vitality and strength?—A. No.

I could go on reading this testimony, but I do not wish to take up the time of the House. I merely desire to draw attention to the fact that we are asked to hold blameless the Department of Militia—

Mr. CASGRAIN. And the minister.

Mr. CLARKE. And, of course, the head of the department, who is responsible to this parliament, and not the officials. We are asked to hold the department blameless in view of the fact that they made a contract with Dr. Devlin, to supply food, four ounces of which he declared would be sufficient to sustain an able-bodied soldier doing arduous work for twenty-four hours, when the unchallenged testimony of one of the leading chemists in the Dominion, a professor in McGill College, is to the effect that the stuff which was supplied was of such poor qual-

ity that instead of one four-ounce tin being sufficient for that purpose, it required eight or nine tins to do the work. I appeal to the House, I appeal to every hon. gentleman present, if a gross fraud was not perpetrated upon the people of this country in this transaction. I submit that the parliament of Canada should hold the Department of Militia responsible for not safeguarding the public interests sufficiently to prevent this fraud being perpetrated, and if this House of Commons fails to do its duty in the premises, then, Sir, the people of Canada will hold the Militia Department responsible, and will visit it with the punishment which it deserves.

But, Sir, we are told that Dr. Neilson assumes the entire responsibility for this transaction. Suppose he does? I have not the slightest desire to say one harsh word about Dr. Neilson, but I do say that the Minister of Militia cannot relieve himself of responsibility by the chivalrous conduct of Dr. Neilson. The fact that Dr. Neilson is prepared to shoulder the responsibility, does not relieve the Minister of Militia of the responsibility that properly attaches to him as head of the department. Now, you have heard it stated to-day that evidence was produced to show that the food tested at Kingston, and the food sent to South Africa were practically one and the same. We have heard that repeated again and again during this debate. Dr. Neilson, who ought to know, and upon whom, jointly with the collector of customs at Montreal, hon. gentlemen are fastening the responsibility for all this trouble, gave evidence on this point, and what does he say, as to his own personal knowledge of the food that was tested at Kingston? Let me try to enlighten the House with a short extract from Dr. Neilson's evidence. At page 173, the following questions and answers will be found :

Q. Can you swear that this food that you have reported upon was the food used in the test at Kingston?—A. In a different form.

Q. You swear that it was?—A. Well if—I have got to put an 'if,' because it is on the assertion of Dr. Devlin. We dealt from the beginning with him, and until this spring I had no doubt but he was connected and proprietor and knew everything about this, and I did not doubt him. Moreover, he was so anxious that this be used in South Africa, so that it would be a good thing, so it would be brought to the notice of the army, that I could not doubt he would send the best supply he could.

Q. You have no knowledge yourself as to whether that powder was used in Kingston or not. You have no knowledge yourself. You depend entirely on what Dr. Devlin told you?—A. Oh, largely.

Q. To what extent are you depending on Dr. Devlin? What knowledge have you yourself that that food or powder is exactly similar to that was used at Kingston?—A. I didn't suppose it would not have been used.

Q. What personal knowledge?—A. I was not there present.

Q. Have you any personal knowledge?—A. I have no personal knowledge. I was not there

present at any time until the end of the experiment.

That is the testimony given by Dr. Neilson as to his personal knowledge of the food that was tested at Kingston. What help will it afford the people of Canada to be told—I leave the House to judge, from the extract I have read from his evidence, what kind of an authority he may be considered—that Dr. Neilson chivalrously assumes the responsibility that ought to rest on the head of the department? None whatever, because he seems to have known just as little about the quality of the food tested at Kingston, as any other member of the Militia Department.

Now, just two or three words more, and I will take my seat. Dr. Neilson told us that he had obtained samples of the powder, samples of the biscuit and samples of the bread that were used at Kingston, and that he had put them away—the biscuit and the bread in a jar or a box, and the powder in paper packages or envelopes. It will be well to remember that when Dr. Devlin made an offer to supply the second contingent with emergency food, and submitted a sample, Dr. Neilson made no attempt, such as would satisfy any business man, to ascertain whether that sample was similar to the samples which he had retained of the food used at Kingston. My hon. friend from Kingston, in the course of his remarks, said that Dr. Neilson had smelled the sample powder which Dr. Devlin had submitted, and had tasted it, and that we ought to be satisfied with that examination. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that that was not such an analysis or comparison as any business man in Canada would be satisfied with. But Dr. Neilson, after smelling the sample of powder which Dr. Devlin filed with the department when making his tender, after tasting it, feeling it, looking at it, was perfectly satisfied in his own mind, at any rate, that it was exactly similar to the powder tested at Kingston. Is it not absolutely absurd, Mr. Speaker, to ask the people of Canada to believe that any man, especially a man who has had no experience as a chemist or an analyst, could tell by tasting, smelling and looking at a powder, whether or not it was similar in nutritive qualities to another powder which he had not seen for twelve or fifteen months? What test did he make of this emergency food? He told us that he made a test upon himself. After breakfast, as usual, he took some of the powder for lunch and had his dinner in the evening; and we are asked in all soberness by hon. gentlemen opposite, to endorse the action of the Militia Department in this transaction, and to say that these safeguards were sufficient to secure value for the money they were paying out. Well, Dr. Devlin supplied the food, and it was sent to Halifax; and the secretary of the department, Captain Benoit, went to Halifax to supervise the

Mr. CLARKE.

embarkation of the contingent. While there, Captain Benoit, of his own motion, secured two or three samples of the food, and brought them back with him to Ottawa; and he suggested to the Department of Militia—I think it was to the deputy minister—that those samples should be tested by analysis and compared with the sample filed by Dr. Devlin when he made his tender. Now, Mr. Speaker, if it was desired to compare the samples of the food shipped at Halifax with the food which was tested at Kingston, I ask any fair-minded man why these officials did not make the analysis of the food sent to Halifax with the sample that had been retained in Dr. Neilson's possession? From the time the test was made at Kingston, it never struck them that was a proper thing to do. They thought it was sufficient to have an analysis made of the pot or tin filed by Dr. Devlin when he made his tender, and an analysis of the samples brought from Halifax. That was done, and the analyst of the Inland Revenue Department, Mr. Macfarlane, was instructed to make these analyses and report. I suppose, if he had carried out the strict letter of his instructions, he would have been satisfied with saying that sample A contains such a percentage of proteid matter, and sample B contains so much more, or whatever the case might be. But, Sir, like an honest official, like a man having the welfare of the Canadian contingents at heart, like a man appreciating the value of an emergency food in case of an emergency, he went just a little further, and declared that this emergency food, four ounces of which was guaranteed to be capable of sustaining an able-bodied man in case of great exertion, for twenty-four hours—that this stuff misnamed emergency or concentrated food, was not worthy of the name at all.

He pointed out to the Militia department that this stuff contained 16 per cent of proteid matter, while ordinary flour contained 12 per cent, and that the price the government was paying was altogether out of proportion to its value. That report was made by Mr. Macfarlane two days before the account of Dr. Devlin was paid. I ask any hon. member of this House, in view of the fact that the analyst of the department of Inland Revenue made that statement over his own signature—a responsible officer and perfectly reliable in every respect—was it a business proceeding on the part of the department of Militia to allow a check to be issued from the department for \$4,666, being at the rate of \$2 per pound for food that had been unequivocally and unhesitatingly condemned by the analyst of the Inland Revenue department? Is there one hon. gentleman opposite who, if the transaction were his own, would have under such circumstances authorised the payment of that money? I venture to affirm that there is not one hon.

gentleman on the other side, of any business experience, who would have allowed that money to be paid over to Mr. Devlin. How did the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) refer to that evidence. What did he say about Mr. Macfarlane's conduct in warning the Department of Militia that a fraud was being perpetrated upon it? He told us that it was a piece of gross impertinence on the part of Mr. Macfarlane. He told us that it was a piece of presumption on the part of a man in the public service in the Dominion to have done so, although that man is an officer whose duty it is to make an analysis when he finds any fraud being perpetrated on the people, or any department of the government, and make an announcement of the fact so that he who runs may read. If that statement is to go unchallenged, if a deserving public official is to be snubbed in this House for trying to save the treasury from being defrauded, the sooner that the people learn who it is that denounce such conduct on the part of an official, the better it will be for the proper administration of our affairs.

I do not think I will trespass more on the time of the House. Gentlemen who are in the habit of analysing and assessing the value of evidence, have given us reasons why they do not think that we should have tested the food and the powder which were presented to the committee by Mr. Hatch. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) gives as the reason why these were not examined, that Mr. Hatch had moved his quarters from the place where he had been manufacturing the food to some other part of the city, and he could not conceive why Mr. Hatch kept the samples of the food partially destroyed in the cooking for such a length of time. Well, Mr. Hatch was on his oath, and he swore positively that he had made or superintended the making of all the food used by the troops at Kingston, and that the food he brought before the committee, a portion of which had been spoiled by the attendant not looking after the fire properly, was a part of the food he was preparing for the Kingston test. He swore further, and his evidence has not been contradicted, that the powder which he also presented to the committee was the same as that used in the Kingston test and that it contained at least 60 per cent of proteid matter; and yet when the committee had the opportunity of analysing that powder and biscuit and burnt bread, and thus either establishing the accuracy of Hatch's statement or confounding him before the people for all time to come, they refused to allow that powder and food to be analysed on the ground that it was not the food or powder used in the Kingston test. Yet these very same gentlemen were quite prepared to allow a sample of half strength powder, which had been lying in Dr. Neilson's desk a year and a half, that had never

been used in the Kingston test, which Dr. Neilson could not swear was the same stuff as was used at Kingston—they were prepared to allow that powder to be analysed, while they would not allow the powder and the food Mr. Hatch swore was similar to that used at Kingston to be submitted to an analysis. If the committee was appointed, as I believe it was, to ascertain all the facts, and get at the very bottom of this colourable transaction, it would have helped us very materially had we been allowed to have an analysis made of the food and powder which Mr. Hatch brought to us, and which he swore again and again were exactly the same food and powder as that tested at Kingston. The hands of the committee were, by this refusal, in a measure tied. If Mr. Hatch's statement had not been borne out by an analysis, the charges of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier would have been materially weakened. We realized also, and so did hon. gentlemen opposite, that if an analysis had been made of the food and powder which Mr. Hatch submitted to us, and if that analysis had sustained his declaration on oath, that the strength of proteids in the food used at Kingston was 60 per cent, that would have proved the case of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier up to the hilt, and demonstrated beyond peradventure that a gross fraud had been perpetrated on the department, by substituting Devlin's food for that made by Mr. Hatch.

Next to the Minister of Militia, Dr. Devlin was the person most interested in giving every tittle of information he was possessed of with regard to this transaction from beginning to end. He was in attendance at the meetings of the committee from day to-day, he was at the elbow of hon. gentlemen opposite, giving them information from day to day during the course of the investigation. He appeared there until the very last day of the taking of evidence, and then he sent a letter to the committee expressing his desire to make a statement, and of course the committee would have been glad to hear him and waited an hour and a half. He did not, however, put in an appearance, and the committee adjourned until late in the evening for the purpose of giving him an opportunity to give evidence, but after the committee had adjourned at half past four, and before they had resumed at eight p.m., Dr. Devlin saw the chairman of the committee. The chairman knew that he was in the city, he was here at five o'clock or about that hour. It was surely of the utmost importance that the information he possessed should have been obtained in the interests of everything fair, honourable and straight in the matter. We should, at all hazards, have secured his evidence. But no. These gentlemen, after having seen Dr. Devlin, resumed the investigation at eight o'clock,

and a letter was then sent to us saying that Dr. Devlin had been suddenly called away. Another emergency transaction. Another case of great emergency. He had to go to New York to get evidence from somebody there bearing on the case, and he asked an adjournment until the following Friday. Well, if Dr. Devlin could have assisted hon. gentlemen opposite, if his evidence could have given them any comfort, he would not have hesitated to come up and give his evidence. Is it because he had something to conceal, possibly, that he did not give evidence before the committee. The fact that he did not come before the committee is of itself one of the most damning things in connection with this unfortunate affair. But, he had a sleeping partner or person connected with him in this sale named Lyons. Mr. Lyons said he wanted to make a statement; and when he was called and sworn, he said that if the committee wanted to ask him any questions he was ready to answer them. He was interested with Dr. Devlin in the sale to the government of this stuff that was sent to South Africa.

Mr. CAMPBELL. He swore he was not.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) can read his testimony. And when we sought to ascertain to what extent he was interested and also to what extent others were interested with him, he refused to answer; and the committee did not compel him to answer, and so we were not enabled to obtain the information on this point. I say that the whole transaction, from beginning to end, reflects no credit on the administrative ability of the head of the department or upon the executive ability of those officers whose duty it was to protect the people of Canada from fraud, and Canadian soldiers at the front from the possibility of being imposed upon by this worthless food. And I say that the evidence contained in the blue-book presented to the House fully justifies and vindicates the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in taking the stand he has taken in this matter. Fraud of the grossest, gravest, meanest kind has been perpetrated upon the people and upon the department; and the hon. member (Mr. Monk) would have been remiss in his duty, as one of the representatives of the people, if he had not taken the earliest opportunity that presented itself to make the declaration he did make, and give the Minister of Militia, and anybody else concerned, an opportunity to clear himself from the accusations made. But, when he made his statement in this House, how was it received? It was received as if he were an enemy instead of a friend. He was threatened and challenged to make his charges. But, he is of the kind of stuff that is not to be cowed by swaggering or threats; and when he was given an opportunity he made his charges. And it will

Mr. CLARKE.

rest with the people of Canada, when they have read and digested the report and the evidence given, to say whether these charges have been proven completely or not. For my own part, as one of the minority, I am fully impressed with the fact that the gross negligence is chargeable to the Department of Militia in connection with the purchase of this food and its transmission to South Africa.

Mr. DOMINIQUE MONET (Laprairie and Napierville). I wish to take five minutes of your time, Mr. Speaker, to explain the vote I am going to give on this question. There are four different people who are incriminated either by the charge brought before the House by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, or by the evidence given before the committee—the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden); Dr. Neilson, an official of the Department of Militia; the collector of customs at Montreal, Mr. White, and Dr. Devlin, the man who sold the stuff to the Minister of Militia. Two of these persons are Liberals, the Minister of Militia and Dr. Devlin, and two of them are Conservatives, Mr. White and Dr. Neilson.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I beg the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Monet's) pardon—Dr. Neilson is and always has been a great Grit.

Mr. MONET. If my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) were making a statement with regard to himself, I would accept it; but, it concerns another man, and I am informed by my friends that Dr. Neilson has always been a Tory and is still a Tory. There are two reports laid on the Table, the report of the Liberal majority and the report of the Conservative minority, of the select committee. The report of the Liberal majority exonerates from all blame the Minister of Militia and Dr. Neilson and Dr. Devlin. It does not say anything in favour of the latter two, but it does not draw any conclusion against them. But, it draws a strong conclusion against the collector of customs, Mr. White. The Conservative minority finds that the Minister of Militia has been guilty of gross negligence. The report of the committee reads:

On the whole, your committee find that the Minister of Militia and Defence and the Department of Militia were guilty of culpable negligence in purchasing and providing the Canadian soldiers with an article totally unfit for the purposes for which it was intended.

As to Dr. Devlin, the same Conservative minority of the committee come to the conclusion:

He violated section 448 of the Criminal Code, 1892, by offering for sale an article bearing a false trade description as defined by subsection (c) of article 443 of the code.

The Conservative minority of the committee do not draw any conclusion as regards Dr. Neilson or as regards Mr. White, the collector of customs. Now, I believe, honestly,

that neither of these reports show the impartiality that should govern such matters as this. When a member puts his seat at stake in making a charge of that kind, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has done, the question involved is one of honour for the member who makes the charge, and it should not be dealt with on grounds of political partisanship, but on grounds of mere justice. For my part, I believe that Dr. Neilson was the very man guilty of the charge that was made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier against the Minister of Militia. I believe that Dr. Devlin has criminally deceived the government in this case. I believe that the collector of customs at Montreal, Mr. White, has been an accomplice of Dr. Devlin to defraud the government in this matter, and the government should take action against these three. Now, here are the facts on which I base my judgment. I believe it is proved beyond contradiction: First, that a certain food worth 30 cents a pound, according to the sworn declaration of the seller himself, was sold at \$2 a pound to the government; second, that Dr. Devlin represented to the Minister of Militia that the stuff that he was going to sell him was the same kind as the stuff tested at Kingston, and that is the reason why the minister bought it; third, that the Minister of Militia and Defence, being warned by Mr. Hatch that the food of Dr. Devlin was an adulterated food and not the genuine protose, instructed Dr. Neilson to analyse the protein of Dr. Devlin, and report; fourth, that Dr. Neilson recommended the stuff to be bought by the government; fifth, that the vegetable proteid food of Dr. Devlin was unduly imported free from the United States, by the fault and connivance of Mr. White, collector of customs, at Montreal; sixth, that the vegetable proteid food, instead of being a concentrated food as it ought to be, to be of any use as an emergency ration, is instead a very ordinary and diluted food.

Now, as to the conduct of the Minister of Militia and Defence, I fail to see that any gross negligence is proved, as alleged in the report of the minority. When the minister was warned by Mr. Hatch's letter, he gave instructions to Dr. Neilson to analyse the stuff and report. We cannot imagine that the Minister of Militia and Defence should know all about this food of his own knowledge, he had to rely upon one of his officials, and that is what he did. For my part I cannot blame him on this point. But I wish to consider this matter from another standpoint. The same question is involved, that was involved when we discussed the sending of the Canadian contingents to South Africa. For the same reason that I was opposed to paying the expense of sending those contingents, I oppose the payment of this money to Dr. Devlin. I do not see any justification for the Minister of Militia

and Defence paying for the food that was furnished by Dr. Devlin. According to the well understood contract between the government of England and the government of Canada, as soon as the Canadian contingent touched the soil of South Africa, the troops were to be maintained at the expense of the English government. From a Liberal standpoint I fear that the electors at large will say that the Minister of Militia and Defence, after having first refused to buy the stuff when it was offered to him by the Bovril Company, afterwards made a bargain with a political friend of the government, Mr. Devlin, I fear that the electors at large will find that the bargain was made with a view of giving an undue favour to a friend of the government. I will vote against both reports.

Mr. A. CAMPBELL (Kent, Ont.). As one of the members of the committee—

Mr. FOSTER. There was an agreement made across the floor of the House, that the debate should stop with three on each side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I only want to make a personal explanation. As a member of the committee, and not having spoken at all, it is only fair to myself, that I should make a personal explanation. I did intend to speak on this question, but the House seemed to be anxious to come to a vote, and therefore, agreed not to speak. But I think it is due to myself to say that, having carefully considered all the evidence, I entirely concur in the report of the majority of that committee. I believe that it is true, and that the evidence and the facts that have been brought out, are correct, and I entirely concur in every finding of the majority report.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I am very sorry to have to take sides against the Minister of Militia and Defence in this case. It is not my fault, any more than my wish, that I have to do so. I am the last man in this House to place the responsibility for the action of Dr. Devlin, or of Dr. Neilson upon the Minister of Militia and Defence. But it has seemed good to the minister and to all parties concerned to consider this question from the standpoint of the department and to make it a departmental question. Then if the minister has made that choice, by that choice he must stand, so far as I am concerned, very much as I regret it. I think there is no question that a swindle has been perpetrated upon this country; there is no question that a swindle has been perpetrated by Dr. Devlin; there is no question that it has been perpetrated through the Department of Militia; and I am sorry to say, judging from this evidence, there is no question that it was to a certain extent within the knowledge of the Minister of Militia and Defence. I read in this report of Mr. Thomas Macfarlane, chief analyst of the Inland Revenue Department, dated Feb-

ruary 12, to whom a sample of this food was submitted :

Since the average percentage of proteids in wheat is about 12, it does not appear that this 'proteid powder' is a very concentrated food, or is entitled to its name, or has a food value equivalent to \$2 per pound.

I do not go any further than that. I say that was enough to demand an inquiry by whoever was responsible for the conduct of the Militia Department. So far from any inquiry being made, I find that two days after this report is dated, the money was paid on this contract; and I find that the last of that food was not shipped from Halifax until February 21, some nine days after the date of this report, leaving plenty of time to verify by every means necessary, the truth of the report as to the value of the food. Now, I do not know anything about the transactions of the department; but I say in the face of the evidence here, with the knowledge that must have come to the minister, if Mr. Devlin has not yet been criminally prosecuted, and if Dr. Neilson still occupies his place in the Militia Department, I cannot relieve the minister from responsibility in this matter.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). I would not like to give a silent vote on this question. I take the view expressed so clearly and so fairly by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), that some person must be held responsible for this fraud, that, it must be apparent to every fair-minded man, has been perpetrated upon this country in this connection. I dislike extremely to hold the Minister of Militia and Defence responsible in this matter, and I am sure that many will be disposed to deal with him very leniently, inasmuch as he must have been exceptionally busy during the period when this fraud was perpetrated. But as he has chosen to make it a departmental matter, and to take the responsibility for it, then he must share in that responsibility. I myself feel that the report of the majority utterly fails, inasmuch as it reports that this was a good food, and inasmuch as it fails to report that some person is responsible and should be punished in this connection.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And has defrauded the department.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The department and the country have been defrauded, certainly. I think it must be abundantly clear to every fair-minded man who chooses to read this evidence, that this is certainly not an emergency food: it may be a very good food, but it is certainly not what the country would expect should be purchased for that purpose. In order to prove that point, I desire to read one or two brief extracts from the evidence of Dr. Neilson himself:

Q. You said you did not know protose; were not any experiments made with it?—A. No, I don't know protose at all.

Mr. OLIVER.

Q. I understood you to say: 'I told him I had not experimented with protose'?—A. No; I wrote Mr. Hatch in October, as I told you. I don't know protose; I don't know that it is a variety of protein vegetal. I know protein vegetal, that is all. He said: 'This is protein vegetal powder such as we have used in the experiments in Kingston; it is under the name of vitallin; I have used that name for professional and commercial purposes.' It is, as I would have you see, a dry, desiccated powder. I don't know if he used the word 'indefinitely,' but would keep for along time; he said: 'Particularly if in a tin tightly closed as this one is.' That appealed to me as very sensible. I said: 'This tin is too large, I want one to contain a day's rations.' He said: 'A tin containing four ounces will be a day's ration; I can make it that strength.' I said: 'Very well, Dr. Devlin, put it in the form of a tender, and your tender will be considered.'

Let me just show you what Dr. Ruttan, one of the most eminent chemists in the Dominion, had to say on this point. I quote from page 166 of the evidence, and this ought to be conclusive:

By Mr. Monk:

Q. Supposing five soldiers doing fairly active work, do you think they could subsist in perfect health and in good condition of nutrition upon this 16 per cent food for a month?—A. Oh, yes, I think so.

Q. They could?—A. I think so; they would have to take a good deal of it; it is a food, you know: it is a very good food.

Q. Could they do it on four ounces of it a day? You will remember that that was the amount that Dr. Neilson had arranged with Dr. Devlin should be put in the tins:

A. No, they would require about a pound and three-quarters—between a pound and a half and a pound and three-quarters—in order to get sufficient proteids.

How on earth could our soldiers subsist for a day on four ounces when this eminent chemist says that they would require a pound and a half, or a pound and three-quarters?

—The usual amount as based upon the experiments which have been carried on for a good many years is twenty grammes of nitrogen, which would correspond to about four and a half ounces of protein for a day's ration, for a day's food.

Q. Four and a half ounces of proteids?—A. Four and a half ounces of proteids.

Q. Pure proteids?—A. Pure proteids.

Q. Well, that being the case, how many ounces of pure proteids necessary for sustenance did you find in one day's emergency ration of this stuff?—A. Well, 16 per cent of four ounces; if a man takes four ounces it would be 16 per cent of four ounces.

Q. Well, then, on this four ounces it would be impossible for soldiers to subsist to do efficient work?—A. Not on that alone.

Q. Well, what is your opinion of an army emergency ration of four ounces, containing 16 per cent proteids?—A. I consider it would not be sufficient.

Q. It is an insufficient ration?—A. An insufficient ration.

This gentleman, who must not be assumed to have any bias, and who was brought before the committee as an expert, tells us

that this is an entirely insufficient ration which was purchased as an emergency ration. It may be quite true that it is a reasonably good food, but no fair-minded man in this House, and no fair-minded man who reads the evidence and understands the case, will contend that it is an emergency ration.

Mr. WOOD. Have there been any reports from South Africa that it is an insufficient ration ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood) asked that question, because he usually asks inconsequential questions. Let me quote from 'Instructions to medical officers on hired transports to the Cape,' which were placed in the hands of the surgeons. This document is signed by 'H. Neilson, lieut.-col., Director-General Medical Services.' Clause 13 reads as follows :

XIII. The minister has added five days' emergency rations per man of a new nutritive extract known as 'protein vegetal'—(four ounces equal to one day's ration). On occasions when extraordinary exertion is called for, this light and compact ration will be found of great value. Its merits have been thoroughly tested in 'A' Battery, R.C.A. (April, 1899).

I think myself that the chain which has been forged for the purpose of establishing that this ration which was purchased is the same as that tested at Kingston is weak. I do not think the evidence is at all conclusive. I do not think that any absolutely satisfactory evidence has been furnished that the food which was purchased from Dr. Devlin is the same food which was tested at Kingston. I am not prepared to say that the food tested at Kingston was any better. They may both have been frauds, for all I know, but I have arrived at the conclusion that the food sent to South Africa is not an emergency food, although it may be a reasonably good food. I want to say a word in reference to a remark which fell from the hon. member for Laprairie and Napier-ville (Mr. Monet). He accused Mr. White, the collector of customs at Montreal, of being an 'accomplice.' I feel certain that any person who knows Mr. White and his record while a member of this House, will not for an instant think he is an accomplice in the matter. He may have made a trifling mistake in allowing the food to come in free of duty, but I think any person who knows Mr. White will not accuse him of anything more than having made a mistake, as he is a man of high personal honour, and one of the most competent officials in the service. I do not think any person who knows Mr. White will accuse him of being an accomplice of Dr. Devlin in order to share the profits that might be made out of it.

House divided on the amendment (Mr. Monk).

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Beattie,  
Bell (Pictou),  
Bennett,  
Bergeron,  
Broder,  
Carscallen,  
Casgrain,  
Clancy,  
Clarke,  
Cochrane,  
Craig,  
Davin,  
Dugas,  
Ellis,  
Ferguson,  
Foster,  
Gillies,  
Gilmour,  
Graham,  
Guillet,  
Haggart,  
Henderson,  
Ingram,  
Klock,  
Kloepfer,

LaRivière,  
Macdonald (King's),  
MacLaren,  
McCleary,  
McDougall,  
McInerney,  
McLennan (Glengarry),  
McNeill,  
Marcotte,  
Martin,  
Monk,  
Montague,  
Morin,  
Oilver,  
Powell,  
Prior,  
Puttee,  
Richardson,  
Rogers,  
Rosamond,  
Seagram,  
Sproule,  
Tisdale,  
Wallace, and  
Wilson.—50.

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Bazinet,  
Beith,  
Belcourt,  
Bell (Prince),  
Blair,  
Bourassa,  
Bourbonnais,  
Brodeur,  
Brown,  
Bruneau,  
Calvert,  
Campbell,  
Casey,  
Champagne,  
Comstock,  
Costigan,  
Davies (Sir Louis),  
Dechêne,  
Demers,  
Domville,  
Dupré,  
Edwards,  
Ethier,  
Featherston,  
Fielding,  
Fisher,  
Fitzpatrick,  
Fertier,  
Fraser (Lambton),  
Frost,  
Gauthier,  
Geoffrion,  
Gibson,  
Gould,  
Harwood,  
Hurley,  
Hutchison,

Johnston,  
Landerkin,  
Lang,  
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),  
Lavergne,  
Logan,  
Macdonald (Huron),  
Mackie,  
MacPherson,  
McClure,  
McGugan,  
McHugh,  
McIsaac,  
McLellan,  
McLennan (Inverness),  
McMillan,  
Madore,  
Malouin,  
Marcil,  
Meigs,  
Mignault,  
Mcnet,  
Parmelee,  
Paterson,  
Pettet,  
Rcs,  
Rutherford,  
Savard,  
Semple,  
Sifton,  
Stenson,  
Talbot,  
Toimie,  
Tucker,  
Turcot, and  
Wood.—73.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.

Davis,  
Snetsinger,  
Christie,  
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),  
Sutherland,  
Lewis,  
Macdonell,

Opposition.

Hale,  
Reid,  
Roddick,  
Tupper (Sir Charles),  
Taylor,  
Poupore,  
Roche,

## Ministerial.

Penny,  
Scriver,  
Mulock,  
Charlton,  
Morrison,  
Cowan,  
Russell,  
Debell,  
Flint,  
Tarte,  
  
McMullen,  
Somerville,  
McGregor,  
Fraser (Guysborough),  
Livingston,  
Carroll,  
Prefontaine,  
Maxwell,  
Copp,  
Dyment,  
Bostock,  
Burnett,  
Lemieux,  
Legris,  
Fortin.

## Opposition.

Osler,  
Blanchard,  
Corby,  
Moore,  
McAlister,  
Maclean,  
Borden (Halifax),  
Caron (Sir Adolphe),  
Mills,  
Tupper (Sir Charles  
Hibbert),  
Hodgins,  
Cargill,  
Hughes,  
Kaulbach,  
Earle,  
Pope,  
Quinn,  
Robinson,  
Bell (Addington),  
McCormack,  
Robertson,  
Kendry,  
Ganong,  
McIntosh,  
Chauvin.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. STENSON. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) has not voted.

Mr. DAVIS. I am paired. Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is now on the main motion.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, before you proceed to take the opinion of the House upon the main motion, I have an amendment to move which I will supplement with a few remarks. My position on this question is very much the same as that taken by the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Monet). I did not go into the details of the inquiry. I did not give any special study to the technical questions raised, for the good reason that from the very start my opinion was that whatever might be the quality of the food, and whatever might be the details of the arrangement entered into between the Minister of Militia and Dr. Devlin, that the Minister of Militia had no authority to buy that food or any other food. As it has been pointed out by the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Monet), the arrangement concluded between the British government and the Canadian government was that as soon as the Canadian troops would land in Africa, the British government would bear the whole expense of feeding and maintaining them as well as any other colonial troops at the seat of war. We have several evidences that the government themselves held that opinion when they sent the first contingent, and for several months afterwards. We find in the testimony of Mr. Besserer, agent for the Bovril Company, that he called on Dr. Neilson and offered him some of his concentrated food, and that Dr. Neilson very naturally told him that the Canadian gov-

Mr. RICHARDSON.

ernment was not buying any food for the troops in South Africa. We find the same testimony given by Mr. Hoy, manager of the same company, with this difference that the reply he received was not from Dr. Neilson but from the Minister of Militia himself. I will read an extract from the report to that effect:

Q. Did you have occasion at the time of the outbreak of hostilities in the Transvaal to interview the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) in regard to furnishing our troops with emergency rations; if so, will you state to the committee what took place on that occasion?—A. I saw Dr. Borden some time just before the sending of the first contingent, and just learned from him that the government was not supplying anything for the contingent.

The Deputy Minister of Militia deposed: 'We had nothing whatever to do with supplying the food for the troops in South Africa,' and the Minister of Militia himself, in his testimony, said:

We did not purchase any emergency ration for the first contingent, because under the arrangement with the Imperial government we had nothing to do with furnishing food, as we supposed and as we well knew.

There was, therefore, no doubt possible in the mind of the Minister of Militia that he had nothing to do with buying or supplying food to the troops in South Africa. I am quite surprised to find that two or three months after the minister had refused to accept any food from the companies that were supplying a large amount of this food to the Imperial army, he should have changed his mind. We have from the evidence that the Bovril Company was supplying a large amount of food to the British War Office; and what surprises me is that the Minister of Militia preferred an unknown food, a food that had not been experimented on a large scale either by Canadian troops or by the British soldiers, to a well known food which had been supplied to the British army. The minister appears to have very suddenly made up his mind that he would give a contract to Dr. Devlin; and the reason given by him in his testimony is based upon a foundation which I certainly think did not justify that change of mind on his part. He said:

Later on, experience showed, by the telegrams received in this country, I think in December, that hardships had been experienced by troops, some of our own, on long marches, because they ran out of the food, of the regular rations supplied by the Imperial government, the army authorities, and it was then suggested that it might be advisable to supply a small quantity of extra rations.

I think it is a very grave thing. Mr. Speaker, to hear at the end of the month of June, that our Canadian troops were suffering in South Africa; that they were suffering because they were not properly fed by the Imperial authorities, and that the Minister of Militia should have waited until an inquiry was asked for in this par-

liament, before he took steps to see that our Canadian soldiers were properly treated by the Imperial authorities. That is most strange. If there was a desire of going to the rescue of the Canadian soldiers suffering in South Africa, immediate steps should have been taken by the Minister of Militia here and by the government; they should have inquired from the War Office in London, and asked what was the reason for such treatment of our soldiers. The position taken by the Minister of Militia, and the reason given by him for awarding that contract to Dr. Devlin is nothing less than a straight slander on the administration of the British War Office in South Africa. If in every case where the British War Office is not doing its duty, if when the hospital service in Africa is not properly conducted, Canada is to interfere, how is it that our government does not propose now to send a whole army hospital corps to the seat of war, because there is undoubtedly better reason for doing that, and far better evidence before the Imperial public at large that the hospital service in South Africa is more defective than the commissariat. If, we are called to act whenever there is anything lacking in the army administration in South Africa by the Imperial authorities, then we would go very far. Logically, our government should have supplied better guns, they should have supplied better cannons, they should have supplied a better service of nurses and physicians.

Sir, this shows plainly that after one step comes the other. When the first contingent was offered, we were told that the only thing this government was doing was to allow the men who wanted to fight in Africa to go there. We were told that we were giving them the ships; that we were feeding them until they landed; but that the moment they landed, they became British soldiers, were incorporated in the British army and were paid and fed by the British government. After one thing came the other. When the second contingent was sent, it was no more a question of liberty given to those who wanted to fight. We gave them horses, we gave them rifles, we gave them saddies, we added additional pay; and now we are asked to approve of a report which says that the Minister of Militia did right in supplying them with extra food. My reason for moving the amendment is especially because of the 8th paragraph of the majority report, which says:

8. The committee finds that the Minister of Militia, in supplying our soldiers with the food in question, acted with a laudable desire to lessen the hardships they should have to endure on account of forced marches and scarcity of rations, by giving them a supply of valuable food, put up in small and convenient packages, easily carried, and which, as indicated in the instructions issued to the medical officers of the transports, was not to be regarded as a substitute for other food, but to be available as 'a light and compact ration' 'of great value' 'on occasions when extraordinary exertion is called for.'

Now, either the troops are well fed in South Africa, or they are badly fed. Either the Imperial authorities do not look after the welfare of the British soldiers or they do. If they do look after the welfare of the British soldiers, it is not for us to interfere and tell the British authorities that they do not understand their business and that we will do what they are unable to perform. If the troops are not well fed, if they have suffered days of starvation, the position of the government is not better. It is evident from the report of the majority, as well as from the report of the minority, and even from the speeches which have been made here to-night by members of the majority of the committee, that that food is not sufficient when other food is lacking. It may be a good food to be added to the other; but, is it to be supposed that, as a general rule, the Imperial authorities do not give proper food to the British soldiers? Until I am given strong evidence that the Imperial authorities do not treat the soldiers well, I refuse to join with those who think it is necessary to send them food from Canada. Therefore, I move, seconded by Mr. Monet:

That all the words after 'That' be struck out, and the following words inserted:

'Under the terms of the arrangement concluded between the British government and the Canadian government, the feeding and keeping of Canadian troops, as well as of other colonial troops serving in South Africa, are to be borne entirely by Great Britain.'

Therefore, this House considers that the Minister of Militia should not have involved the credit of Canada in this contract and expended Canadian money to buy food or rations for troops in the field.

Mr. SPEAKER. This motion does not appear to me to be relevant to the matter under discussion. We are discussing the report of a select committee appointed to inquire into the circumstances under which certain emergency food was purchased. I do not see the connection between a criticism of the Minister of Militia for spending the money and the subject under investigation; I cannot see the connection between the amendment and the subject being discussed in the House. Under these circumstances, I am obliged to rule that the motion is not in order.

House divided on the main motion.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Hutchison,
Belth,	Johnston,
Belcourt,	Landerkin,
Bell (Prince),	Lang,
Blair,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bourbonnais,	Lavergne,
Brodeur,	Logan,
Brown,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bruneau,	Mackie,
Calvert,	MacPherson,
Campbell,	McClure,
Casey,	McGugan,
Champagne,	McHugh,
Comstock,	McIsaac,

Costigan,  
Davies (Sir Louis),  
Dechéne,  
Demers,  
Domville,  
Dupré,  
Edwards,  
Fielding,  
Fisher,  
Fitzpatrick,  
Fortier,  
Fraser (Lambton),  
Frost,  
Gauthier,  
Geoffrion,  
Gibson,  
Gould,  
Harwood,  
Hurley,

McLellan (Prince),  
McLennan (Inverness),  
McMillan,  
Madore,  
Malouin,  
Meigs,  
Mignault,  
Parmalee,  
Paterson,  
Ross,  
Rutherford,  
Savard,  
Semple,  
Sifton,  
Stenson,  
Talbot,  
Tolmie,  
Tucker, and  
Turcot.—66.

## NAYS:

## Messieurs

Beattie,  
Bell (Pictou),  
Bennett,  
Bergeron,  
Bourassa,  
Broder,  
Casgrain,  
Clancy,  
Clarke,  
Cochrane,  
Craig,  
Davin,  
Dugas,  
Ellis,  
Ethier,  
Ferguson,  
Foster,  
Gillies,  
Gilmour,  
Graham,  
Guillet,  
Haggart,  
Henderson,  
Ingram,  
Klock,  
Kloepfer,

LaRivière,  
Macdonald (King's),  
MacLaren,  
McCleary,  
McDougall,  
McLennan (Glengarry),  
McNeill,  
Marcotte,  
Martin,  
Monet,  
Monk,  
Montague,  
Morin,  
Oliver,  
Pettet,  
Powell,  
Prior,  
Puttee,  
Richardson,  
Rogers,  
Rosamond,  
Seagram,  
Sproule,  
Tisdale,  
Wallace, and  
Wilson.—52.

## PAIRS :

## Ministerial.

Davis,  
Snetsinger,  
Christie,  
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),  
Sutherland,  
Lewis,  
Macdonell,  
Penny,  
Sriver,  
Mulock,  
Charlton,  
Morrison,  
Cowan,  
Russell,  
Dobell,  
Flint,  
Tarte,

McMullen,  
Somerville,  
McGregor,  
Fraser (Guysborough),  
Livingston,  
Carroll,  
Prefontaine,  
Maxwell,

## Opposition.

Hale,  
Reid,  
Roddick,  
Tupper (Sir Charles),  
Taylor,  
Poupore,  
Roche,  
Osler,  
Blanchard,  
Corby,  
Moore,  
McAlister,  
Maclean,  
Borden (Halifax),  
Caron (Sir Adolphe),  
Mills,  
Tupper (Sir Charles  
Hibbert),  
Hodgins,  
Cargill,  
Hughes,  
Kaulbach,  
Earle,  
Pope,  
Quinn,  
Robinson.

Mr. SPEAKER.

## Ministerial.

Copp,  
Dyment,  
Bostock,  
Burnett,  
Lemieux,  
Legris,  
Fortin.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. (Friday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 6, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

## PRAYERS.

YARMOUTH STEAMSHIP COMPANY  
AND THE DOMINION ATLANTIC  
RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth) moved :

That as it appears from the Minutes of Proceedings of the Senate that Bill (No. 185), An Act to authorize the sale of the Yarmouth Steamship Company's property to the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, was withdrawn and discharged from the Orders of the Day of the Senate, the accountant of this House be authorized to refund the fees paid on the said Bill, less the cost of printing and translation.

Mr. FOSTER. What happened to this ?

Mr. FLINT. The negotiations fell through, and I was requested to withdraw the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

## POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 191) to amend the Post Office Act. He said : The Bill has only one clause, and that is a clause proposing to reduce the postage upon newspapers to a rate of one-eighth of one cent per pound for transmission in the province or territory of publication.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it keep up the old exception in reference to newspapers and radial areas ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It leaves the law just as it is, except that it reduces the rate to the extent I have mentioned. That is the only proposed change.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much revenue do you expect to lose by it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps that had better come on the second reading. I will try and find that out.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

**RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.**

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move :

That the following proposed resolutions be taken into consideration to-morrow, and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider them :—

1. That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated), which shall not cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of \$3,200 per mile of fifty per centum on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as shall be in excess of \$15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of \$6,400 per mile. The expression 'cost' used in this resolution means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge, up to and not exceeding \$25,000, forming part of the line of railway subsidized not otherwise receiving any bonus, but shall not include the cost of equipping the railway, nor the cost of terminals and right of way of the railway in any city or incorporated town; and such actual, necessary and reasonable cost shall be determined by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and upon the report of the chief engineer of government railways, certifying that he has made or caused to be made an inspection of the line of railway for which payment of subsidy is asked, and careful inquiry into the cost thereof, and that in his opinion the amount upon which the subsidy is claimed is reasonable and does not exceed the true, actual and proper cost of the construction of such railway, the lines of railway being as follows, that is to say :—

1. For a railway from a point at or near the junction of the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway to the village of Minden, in the county of Haliburton, Ontario, not exceeding 12 miles.....\$38,400
2. To the Strathroy and Western Counties Railway Company, for a railway commencing at a point at or near Caradoc Station on the Canadian Pacific Railway and extending to the town of Strathroy, Ontario, not exceed 7 miles (revote) ..... 22,400.
3. For a line of railway from a point on the Pembroke Southern Railway at or near Golden Lake, towards a point on the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway at or near Bancroft, Ontario, for the further extension of such railway westerly from the western terminus of the 20 miles granted by Act 60-61 Victoria, chapter 4, for a distance not exceeding 20 miles..... 64,000
4. To the Algoma Central Railway Company, for 25 miles of its line of railway from its terminus at Michipicoten Harbour, Lake Superior, towards the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for a further extension of this company's line of rail-

- way from Sault Ste. Marie towards Michipicoten River and Harbour, Ontario, towards the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, 25 miles in all, not exceeding 50 miles .....\$160,000
5. To the Central Ontario Railway Company, for a further extension of their railway from, at or near Bancroft to a point on the Canada Atlantic Railway between Whitney and Barry's Bay, Ontario, not exceeding 20 miles. 64,000
6. To the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company, for a line of railway between Little Current on Manitoulin Island and Sudbury, Ontario, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, the company undertaking to bridge between Little Current and the mainland, the bridge to be so constructed and maintained as to afford suitable facilities, in the opinion of the Minister of Railways and Canals, for free vehicular traffic, the same as upon a public highway, the work to be begun and prosecuted from Little Current and Sudbury, one-half of the subsidy to be applicable, as earned, in respect of the work beginning at Little Current and carried on towards Sudbury, and one-half thereof to be applicable, as earned, in respect of the work beginning at Sudbury and carried on towards Little Current, the course of the line of railway to cross the Sault Ste. Marie branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, not exceeding 66 miles..... 211,200
7. For a railway from Bracebridge in Muskoka to a point at or near Baysville, Ontario, not exceeding 15 miles. 48,000
8. For a railway beginning at a point northerly 20 miles from Parry Sound and extending from that point to the French River, Ontario, not exceeding 35 miles ..... 112,000
9. For a railway from a point 20 miles easterly from the village of Haliburton, via the village of Whitney, towards the village of Mattawa, Ontario, not exceeding 40 miles..... 128,000
10. To the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, for a branch line of railway to iron mines in Bedford township, Ontario, not exceeding 12 miles ..... 38,400
11. To the Thousand Islands Railway Company, for an extension of their railway from the present northerly terminus to a point easterly thereof, not exceeding 2 miles..... 6,400  
And also for an extension from a point on the railway to connect their railway with the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway, the Bay of Quinté Railway, the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway or the waters of the Rideau Canal, the balance remaining of the subsidy granted by the Act 55-56 Vic., chap. 5, not exceeding 9½ miles (revote) ..... 30,400
12. For a railway from Dymont, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the New Klondike mining district, Ontario, not exceeding 7 miles..... 22,400
13. To the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company, for an extension of their line from its easterly terminus to a point at or near Bond's Lake, Ontario, not exceeding 4 miles.... 12,800

14. To the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company, for a railway from at or near North Bay Station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway towards James' Bay or Lake Tamagaming, Ontario, not exceeding 20 miles (re-vote) .....	\$64,000	from the mouth of the St. Francis River, N.B., westerly towards St. Charles Junction, 15 miles, in all not exceeding 60 miles .....	\$192,000
15. In aid of the Ottawa and New York Railway Company's bridge over the St. Lawrence River and for the Canadian portion of such bridge, not exceeding .....	90,000	24. For a line of railway from Bristol, in the county of Carleton, New Brunswick, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, westerly a distance not exceeding 17 miles .....	54,400
16. To the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, towards the cost of the rebuilding and enlargement of the Victoria Bridge over the St. Lawrence River, Quebec, in addition to the amount received by the company on account of the subsidy granted by 60-61 Vic., chap. 4, viz.: \$270,000, to make up the grant in aid of the undertaking to \$500,000, not exceeding .....	230,000	25. For a line of railway from Shediac, county of Westmoreland, New Brunswick, to Shemogue, in the said county, a distance not exceeding 38 miles.	121,600
17. For a railway and traffic bridge over the Ottawa River at Nepean Point, between the city of Ottawa, Ontario, and the city of Hull, Quebec, upon condition that the bridge be so constructed as to provide suitable facilities, to the satisfaction of the Minister of Railways and Canals, for free vehicular and foot passenger traffic, the same as upon a public highway, in addition to the \$112,500 already granted, a sum not exceeding.....	100,000	26. For a railway from Lockeport, Nova Scotia, to Sable River, or other convenient point of railway connection, not exceeding 20 miles.....	64,000
18. To the Canadian Northern Railway Company, in further extension of their railway north of Swan River towards Prince Albert, North-west Territories, in addition to the grant by the Act 62-63 Vic., chap. 7, a further mileage not exceeding 100 miles .....	320,000	27. To the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, for a railway in extension of the company's line northward from Broad Cove towards Cheticamp, C.B., Nova Scotia, not exceeding 40 miles .....	128,000
19. For a railway from the westerly end of the Waskada branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Manitoba, further westward, not exceeding 20 miles .....	64,000	28. For a railway from Bridgetown to Victoria Beach, Nova Scotia, not exceeding 30 miles .....	96,000
20. For a railway from a point on the Alberta Railway and Coal Company's Railway towards Cardston, Alberta, N.W.T., for 30 miles of railway at \$2,500 per mile .....	75,000	29. For a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway, Pictou branch, to Kempton, county of Colchester, Nova Scotia, not exceeding 4½ miles ..	14,400
21. To the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company, for a railway from Duncan Lake towards Lardo or Arrow Lake, British Columbia, or from Lardo to Arrow Lake, not exceeding 30 miles .....	96,000	30. For a railway from Brazil Lake on the Dominion Atlantic Railway to Kemptville, Nova Scotia, not exceeding 11 miles .....	35,200
22. To the Restigouche and Western Railway Company, for the company's railway, in addition to the 15 miles subsidized by the Act 62-63 Vic., chap. 7, on the easterly section of the line, and in continuation from the westerly end of the said 15 miles, a further distance of 15 miles towards the St. John River; and for the said railway, in addition to the 12 miles subsidized by the said chapter on the westerly section of the said line, a further distance from the easterly end thereof of 15 miles, towards Campbellton, N.B., not exceeding 30 miles .....	96,000	31. To the Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Railway Company, to enable it to extend its railway from Arundel to a point in the township of Preston, near Hartwell, province of Quebec, not exceeding 30 miles .....	96,000
23. For a line of railway from St. Charles Junction on the Intercolonial Railway towards the St. Francis branch of the Témiscouata Railway, Quebec, not exceeding 45 miles, and		32. To the Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company, for a railway from a point in Hochelaga Ward, Montreal, to a point on the Great Northern Railway in or near the town of Joliette, passing near the town of L'Assomption, Quebec, together with a spur into said town, not exceeding 42 miles.....	134,400
		33. For a single track standard railway bridge, with two roadways 10 feet wide, from Bout de L'Isle to Charlemagne, at the junction of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence rivers.....	150,000
		34. Towards the construction of a bridge across the Lac Ouareau River.....	15,000
		35. To the Arthabaskaville Railway Company, for a railway from Victoriaville to Chester West, province of Quebec, a distance not exceeding 12 miles .....	38,400
		36. To the Great Northern Railway Company, for a branch line from the town or from near the town of Joliette towards Ste. Emilie, touching the parishes of Ste. Beatrix and St. Jean de Matha, not exceeding 20 miles...	64,000
		37. For a railway from Farnham, province of Quebec, to Frelighsburg and the international boundary line, not exceeding 21 miles .....	67,200
		38. Towards the construction of a railway bridge over the St. Francis River, in lieu of the grant under 62-63 Vic., cap. 7, at St. François du Lac, on the condition that the bridge be built so as to allow the municipalities to make use thereof, to esta-	

- blish and maintain a suitable roadway for the free passage of foot passengers, vehicles and animals, to be approved by the Minister of Railways and Canals (revote)..... \$50,000
39. Towards the construction of a railway bridge over the Nicolet River at Nicolet, in lieu of grant under 62-63 Vic., cap. 7 (revote)..... 15,000
40. For a line of railway from Halifax towards a point on the Central Railway of Nova Scotia, in the county of Lunenburg, in addition to and in extension of the 20 miles authorized by the Act 62-63 Vic., cap. 7, not exceeding 20 miles ..... 64,000
41. Chapter 7 of 62-63 Victoria, section 2, subclause 20, is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'railway,' in the third line of the subclause, the words 'or to connect said lines.'

The subsidy provided for by chapter 7 of the statutes of 1899 towards the construction of a railway bridge over the St. Lawrence River at Chaudière Basin, near Quebec, shall be deemed to be applicable, as to one-third thereof, to the substructure and approaches, and as to two-thirds thereof to the superstructures, and the same may be paid upon that basis by authority of the Governor in Council, upon progress estimates to be furnished from time to time by the chief engineer of government railways and canals, so that one-third of such subsidy, and no more, may be paid in respect and upon completion of the masonry of the substructure and approaches of the said bridge, one-third, and no more, upon the work and material of one-half of the superstructure being done and supplied, in respect of such work and material, and the remaining one-third upon the completion of the whole work.

2. Resolved, That the subsidies hereby granted or any subsidies heretofore granted under any Act of the parliament of Canada, still in force, but not fully paid, towards the construction of any railway or bridge, shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and may, unless otherwise expressly provided, at the option of the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, be paid as follows:—

(a) Upon the completion of the work subsidized; or

(b) By instalments, on the completion of each ten-mile section of the railway, in the proportion which the cost of such completed section bears to that of the whole work undertaken; or

(c) Upon progress estimates on the certificate of the chief engineer of railways and canals, that in his opinion, having regard to the whole work undertaken and the aid granted, the progress made justifies the payment of a sum not less than sixty thousand dollars.

(d) With respect to (b) and (c), part one way, part the other.

3. Resolved, That the subsidies hereinbefore mentioned as to be granted to companies named for that purpose shall, if granted by the Governor in Council, be granted to such companies respectively; that the other subsidies may be granted to such companies as are approved by the Governor in Council as having established to his satisfaction their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively; that all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August next, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four

years from the said first day of August, to be fixed by Order in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications and upon conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the government, which agreement the government is hereby empowered to make, and that the location also of every such line of railway shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

4. Resolved, That the granting of such subsidies, and the receipt thereof by the respective companies, shall be subject to the condition that the Governor in Council may at all times provide, and secure to other companies such running powers, traffic arrangements and other rights as will afford to all railways connecting with those so subsidized, reasonable and proper facilities in exercising such running powers, fair and reasonable traffic arrangements with connecting companies, and equal mileage rates between all such connecting railways; and the Governor in Council shall have absolute control at all time over the rates and tolls to be levied and imposed by any of the companies or upon any of the railways hereby subsidized.

5. Resolved, That every company receiving a subsidy under this Act, its successors or assigns, and any person or company controlling or operating the railway or portion of railway subsidized under this Act, shall each year furnish to the government of Canada transportation for men, supplies, material and mails over the portion of its line in respect of which it has received such subsidy, and, whenever required, shall furnish mail cars properly equipped for such mail service, and such transportation and service shall be performed at such rates as are agreed upon between the minister of the department of the government for which such service is being performed and the company performing it, and in case of disagreement, then at such rates as are approved by the Governor in Council; and in or towards payment for such charges the government of Canada shall be credited by the company with a sum equal to three per cent per annum on the amount of subsidy received by the company under this Act.

6. Resolved, That as respects all railways for which subsidies are granted by this Act, the company at any time owning or operating any of the said railways shall, when required, produce and exhibit to the Minister of Railways or any person appointed by him, all books, accounts and vouchers showing the cost of constructing the railway, the cost of operating it, and the earnings thereof.

I beg also to announce that His Excellency the Governor General having been made acquainted with the subject-matter of these resolutions, recommends the same to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

#### JUDGES OF THE PROVINCIAL COURTS.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 189) to amend the Act respecting the Judges of the Provincial Courts.

Mr. DOMINIQUE MONET (Laprairie and Napierville). Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that the Orders of the Day have been called.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is too late to-day ; we are proceeding with the orders.

Mr. BOURASSA. The Orders of the Day have not been called.

Mr. FOSTER. No, we have gone into the business.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency) moved :

That all the words after 'that' in the main motion be struck out and that the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to strike out section one.

Mr. MONET. I would like to know whether the Orders of the Day have been called.

Mr. SPEAKER. We have proceeded to this order, and we have passed that stage. The question is on the amendment.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, before this amendment is put, I want to answer a few observations which were made the other day by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) and a few others in reference to the position which I took upon the question. The hon. gentleman and some others stated that I had given my opinion that the present number of judges in Quebec was sufficient to discharge the duties devolving upon those charged with the administration of justice. If the hon. gentleman would do me the honour of looking at what I said then in regard to this subject, he will find that I said I had no opinion to offer upon it because, having practically abandoned my profession for more than ten years, I could not give an opinion upon this subject. But, I stated that the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) could not hold the view that the present number of judges would be sufficient to discharge the duties connected with the administration of justice, because in a Bill which he introduced a few years ago into the legislature of Quebec, he provided that the present duties which are now discharged by 31 judges should be discharged by 41 judges, instead of 31, that there should be 15 judges of the Superior Court and 26 other judges, or what he called district judges.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Twenty-six ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, twenty-six. They would be practically County Court judges in the province of Ontario. That would make 41 instead of 31, and if that Bill had been passed, or if the present government of Quebec had taken the Bill of the hon. gentleman and put it through, instead of applying for an increase of three judges, they would have been asking for the appointment of ten additional judges. There is, therefore, no argument in that. What I wish to address myself particularly to is the statement made the other day

Mr. MONET.

by the hon. member for Montmorency, by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and by the hon. member for York, N.B., and some others, that the judges in the rural districts of Quebec have practically nothing to do.

That is not the way to look at the question at all. It was stated by some gentlemen opposite that there were judges in the rural districts of Quebec who tried only eighteen or twenty cases during the year. That may be true or it may not be true, but I want to point out that in the rural districts of the province of Quebec—as my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) knows—the judges do not only exercise their jurisdiction in the Superior Court, but they have also to discharge the Circuit Court and Division Court duties which appertain to the county court judges in the province of Ontario. The Superior Court judge in the rural districts of Quebec has to sit in every case, big or little, whether the amount be \$100,000 or whether it be only \$5. He has also to discharge the duties of the Court of Chancery in Ontario, and he has also to sit in the criminal court, a duty which does not devolve upon the Superior Court judges in the cities of Montreal and Quebec, as the criminal court in those cities is presided over by the Queen's Bench judges. The rural Superior Court judge has also to sit in the Circuit Court, which is not a duty which devolves upon the Superior Court judges in the city of Montreal. I believe with my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) that it would be better to have the judges residing in Montreal and Quebec and going on circuit in the province to discharge these minor duties which the Superior Court judges to-day have to discharge in the rural districts. I believe that our present system is antiquated in that respect, but the people of the province are wedded to it, and it gives them satisfaction. The system proposed by the hon. gentleman from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), by which the judges would reside in Montreal and Quebec, where they could confer together, would, in my opinion, be a better system, but it certainly would increase the number of judges, and it would increase rather than decrease the expenditure. That system would not only put upon the district judges the duties which are now discharged by the Superior Court judges, but it would assign to them the duties now performed by the district magistrates, and the Dominion treasury, instead of the provincial treasury, as at present, would have to pay these judges. For these reasons, the present Bill can certainly not be attacked upon the ground of economy.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I do not want to misrepresent the right hon. gentleman so far as I am concerned, but I would like to call the attention of the House to the statement that was made by the Solicitor General.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a different matter.

Mr. FOSTER. The Solicitor General, I presume, may be taken to represent the government and the Department of Justice, and he is a high authority on this matter. At page 9331 of the *Hansard* he says:

I notice that the hon. member for Montmorency was content to speak of the judges in the province of Quebec, saying that they were sufficient in number to perform all the duties assigned to them under our system. With that statement I have absolutely no quarrel. The great majority of our judges in the province of Quebec are, to say the least, not overworked.

There was a direct statement made by the Solicitor General, and it is a direct and absolute admission that there are quite a sufficient number of judges in the province of Quebec to do the work. Then the right hon. gentleman, in his speech, said:

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron), following the hon. member for Montmorency, said that the number of judges in the province of Quebec is already too large, and that opinion is shared to some extent by the Solicitor General.

Then the right hon. gentleman goes on to say that he would not undertake to decide that question, because he has been so long out of the practice of his profession. I find that the right hon. gentleman did not make the statement in so many words, but he did not feel that he could combat the absolute statement which was made by the Solicitor General. It is undoubted that this Bill is necessary, not because there is not a sufficient number of judges, but because the system of distribution is faulty.

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). I was one of those who took the same meaning from the right hon. gentleman's statement, and I took it from that part of his speech which is to be found at page 9114 of *Hansard*, which pretty fully bears out the contention which was made from this side of the House. The Prime Minister said:

The only objection is that it provides for a greater number of judges than are really necessary—that there are to-day a sufficient number of judges to administer the law, but that they are so distributed that some of them in the city of Montreal have too much to do, while others, in the rural parts of the country, have too little to do. I am free to say at once that everybody knows that. Everybody knows that in the district of Montreal the judges are overworked, and that is the very reason why we want to make the provision we are now doing. It has become an imperative necessity to have more judges in the district of Montreal. Then, it is stated that other judges have not sufficient work. That may be also. It may be that there are judges who could do more work than they do at the present time.

In view of these words, I do not think we took any too strong a meaning out of the statement of the Prime Minister.

Amendment (Mr. Casgrain) negatived on division.

## RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 132) to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Blair.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. W. H. MONTAGUE (Haldimand). Is this Bill printed as amended? Were there not some amendments made after it was printed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I will explain to the committee what did occur. After the Bill had been practically adopted, but before it was finally reported, it was suggested by some member of the committee that it would be well to have it printed and distributed so that it would be seen in what form it would leave the committee. It was so printed. There are one or two typographical errors which have crept into the Bill which will have to be corrected. But what I apprehend the hon. member is alluding to more particularly is a discussion which took place in the committee upon the Drainage Bill introduced by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). The result of that discussion was that an addition to the Railway Bill was proposed by me in substitution of the Bill the hon. member was promoting, and was agreed to by a majority of the committee. The other clauses which are to be found in the printed Bill were adopted practically unanimously.

On section 11,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose that the following be added as section 12, which is precisely as it was approved of by the Railway Committee when the discussion took place upon the Bill of the hon. member for West Elgin:

12a. Whenever proceedings for the drainage of lands have been taken by any landowner under the provisions of an Act of the legislature of any province in that behalf, and it appears to the committee that an outlet for such drainage is required over, across or under the lands of the company, the Railway Committee may, upon the application of the landowner or engineer in charge of the work, and on due notice to the company and hearing the parties, order the company to construct and provide upon its lands all necessary means of drainage, as in such order specified, upon the landowner first complying with such terms, as to payment or security for payment of the whole, or so much of the cost of construction and maintenance of the said drainage works as the committee may in such order provide.

12b. Whenever any application is made under the last preceding section or under section 14 of this Act, the Railway Committee may, if it thinks proper, direct an inquiry to be made in the locality in question by a person appointed under section 12 of this Act, and may authorize such person to hear the parties and take evidence under oath, and may also, if it thinks proper, act on his report without further hearing of the parties.

Mr. GEO. E. CASEY (West Elgin). I regret that some of the gentlemen who are most interested in this Bill are not able to be here to-day—for instance, the two members for Essex, and others whom I need not name; but I beg to offer a few general remarks on this drainage question and on the amendment proposed by the hon. minister. This is a matter that has been before the House for a number of years, and until now those who are in favour of securing rights of drainage for individuals and of providing a tribunal for the trial of drainage cases generally have not been able to interest any government in the question. This year, however, the Minister of Railways has given it, I believe, careful and earnest attention, and has proposed an amendment, which he honestly believes to be the best thing under the circumstances. I may have to differ in some respects from his amendment, but I must congratulate the minister and the government on having taken the important step of, at all events, recognizing the rights of private individuals in the matter and devising some means to right what was admittedly a great wrong.

Hitherto, all cases concerning drainage had to go before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, involving the personal attendance of the parties, the engagement of counsel, and a lot of expenses of that kind, which practically put it out of the power of the poorer municipalities to get justice done. Individuals had no right to appeal to any tribunal whatever on a question of drainage between them and a railway company. They could not appeal to the courts because the courts held that no provincial Act applies to a Dominion railway. They could not appeal to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, because there is not provision for their doing so in the Act which gave that body jurisdiction over railway companies. The municipalities alone had only the very expensive and inconvenient remedy to which I have referred. That people should have to come from the ends of the Dominion to Ottawa to settle a question of putting a culvert under a railway track, seems to me monstrous and preposterous. I therefore proposed the measure that has been before the House, substituting a tribunal of three arbitrators for the tribunal provided under the law for the settlement of these cases.

It was provided in my Bill that each of the parties to a case, the municipality or individual landowner, and the railway company, should appoint an engineer, and a third engineer was to be appointed by these two, or by the Minister of Railways. This board of arbitrators was to sit at the spot where the difficulty arose and take evidence under oath, and finally decide the whole question. That seems to be a most convenient tribunal, and the fairest all round. That Bill was unanimously adopted by this House, without expression of dissent, at its

second reading. It went to the Railway Committee, somewhat against my own judgment. The discussion of the Railway Committee, the hon. minister says, gave him much information on the subject, but it also had the effect of killing the Bill which had been adopted at its second reading by this House. I do not know, therefore, whether that reference was the most lucky thing for the Bill or not, under the circumstances. At all events, we are grateful for the fact that the minister has obtained a great deal of information on the subject, and has done his best to usefully apply it. Four sittings of the Railway Committee were taken up with the discussion of this Bill, a very large part of the time being taken up by the legal representatives of the different railway companies, who certainly had every opportunity to put their case fully before the committee. Then the minister proposed his compromise between the Bill and the present law. That raised distinctly the issue as to whether a court of arbitration, or the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, is the best tribunal to consider such cases. I have already given my reasons for thinking that an arbitration is the best tribunal. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council, of course, could have no personal knowledge of any of the cases that came before it. They must always depend on the report of some engineer, or the facts laid before them as evidence. The latter involved the attendance of the parties, and had the effect of preventing action in a great many cases. Again, when a case depended on the report of an engineer, it was practically decided on the opinion of one man, who might or might not be satisfactory. Again, the Railway Committee is composed of gentlemen who have many other duties to perform. The ministers of the Crown are busy, and have not the time to act as frequently, perhaps, as is required in cases outside of their own department. In other words, men who are busily occupied with their own departments have not the requisite time to sit as a tribunal for the trial of cases outside their departments. The minister believes, and other previous Ministers of Railways have believed, that really every case that ought to be attended to is attended to, but that does not seem to be the opinion of the public. It may be that the cases which actually were brought to the attention of the Railway Committee were disposed of pretty expeditiously, although I am told by a gentleman who was a candidate at the last election for this House that he knew of a case in which affidavits relating to a matter of this kind had been lying before the department since the term of office of hon. gentlemen opposite, and had never been attended to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Are you at liberty to state to what case you refer?

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. CASEY. I do not know what the case was, or whether I should mention the gentleman's name or not, but will give his name privately to the hon. minister, and he can inquire into the matter. The great point I wish to urge is, that, under this tribunal, the expense of going before it, and the difficulty of fighting the great railway corporations before it, have deterred the public from raising many cases that ought to have been raised. In fact, there has been a failure of justice for lack of an accessible tribunal.

My opinion on that point remains just as it was, that the tribunal of arbitration is a preferable one to the other. The amendment introduced by the minister, however, makes one great difference in giving the individuals some rights against the railway companies. Until the assumption of the different railways by the Dominion government, the people had those rights under different provincial laws. They were taken away by this parliament, and now an instalment of them is coming back to the people. There has been too much disposition on the part of all concerned in our legislation and administration to look upon railways as something sacred and inviolable, to look upon their property as something totally different from the property of other people. I believe, and I embodied the statement in the Act that was before the House, that every landowner should have the same rights of drainage over the property of railway companies as he has over the property of any other landowner, subject to due provision for the safety of the road-bed and of the traffic that passes over it. Those provisions, I hoped to attain, by having an arbitration by three engineers, one representing the railway and the other representing the department here. It has been contended by these people that to allow the right of drainage across railway lands would seriously endanger the road-bed and the lives of passengers, and the freight and rolling stock of the company. Sir, there is nothing in it. Every railway, when it is built, puts in a large number of culverts and smaller drains without the slightest danger to its road-bed or rolling stock. As time goes on, that railway is bound to keep these in order, to keep them in good condition; it is bound also, in justice to the public, to keep its tracks in good condition and the road-bed generally. Now, Sir, I am prepared to say that infinitely more danger exists to life and property from the condition in which parts of the road-bed of the different railway companies are kept at the present day, from sheer consideration for the purses of the company, than any danger which could arise out of a largely increased system of drainage across those tracks. It is perfectly easy to put in a culvert or drain in such a way that it will not hurt the track. But loose rails,

rotten sleepers, and old culverts are a great source of danger to the community.

Then again it has been maintained by the railway companies, and seems to have been maintained by a previous government, from the statements made in the Railway Committee, and I am sorry to say that it appears to be maintained by the present government, that the railway company should not only be paid the cost of putting in any new drainage accommodation required, but should also be guaranteed the cost of keeping that drainage accommodation in repair to all futurity. I beg to dissent in toto from that theory. The railway company is bound to afford drainage when the railway is first constructed for all natural watercourses, and for all drains then in operation. We all know that in western Ontario, and in many other parts of the country, there are no big watercourses which drain a whole district; each small part has to be drained separately through a comparatively small outlet, and the railway has to provide for these outlets and to keep them in order for all time at its own expense. I do not see why a different rule should be applied in case of new accommodation for drainage, from that which is required for a drain when the railway is first constructed. That outlet would not be given by arbitration or by any other tribunal, unless it was required. In most cases it has become necessary by the settlement of the country, caused by the operation of the railway, which country furnishes increased freight to the railway company and increased patronage, generally in consequence of opening it up. It is perfectly proper that, as the company's business increases through the opening up of the country, it should afford to the newly-opened districts, those conveniences which it was compelled in the first place to afford, when it first laid out its route across the lands. Those, I think, are all the points in regard to the general question that I need touch on now.

I want now to offer a few remarks on this resolution itself. In the first place, the amendment starts out by providing that, whenever proceedings for drainage have been taken under any provincial statute, then the Committee of the Privy Council may take cognizance of the grievance alleged by the individual. Now, in many cases no proceedings need be taken, or can be taken, under provincial Acts where drainage is required. A great many cases arise where a farm is cut in two by a railway. In my own county, for example, where a railway runs at right angles to the length of most of the farms, that case is very frequent, and the farmer is unable to drain one end of his farm into the other end without crossing the railway track. He certainly cannot take any proceedings under provincial Acts to enable him to do that, and, therefore, this proviso would leave

him out in the cold. Then in many other cases, he might wish to cross the railway track and drain on to the highway, or into the ditches on highways, or into the railway drains themselves. In that case, I do not think he could enter any proceedings under any provincial Act, and would be shut out. I would ask the minister to amend that clause so as to allow an individual to apply without having started proceedings under the provincial Acts. Of course, there are other cases where water, after crossing the railway track, would go into somebody else's land. In such a case as that, the individual could institute proceedings, but in the other cases he could not. Then we come to the latter part of the same clause which reads :

That cognizance may be taken of the case upon the landowner first complying with such terms as to payment or security for payment of the whole or so much of the cost of construction and maintenance of said drainage works as the committee may in such order provide.

That is the clause to which I object on the grounds already stated. I do not think it should be assumed, in the first place, that the cost of putting in these conveniences or maintaining them to all futurity, should rest upon the landowners. That should be a question for the tribunal which tries the case to decide, upon the circumstances of each individual application. In some cases it will be proper, and in most cases, it seems to me, it would be highly improper. I do not think the assumption should be made that the landowner is to be liable for these expenses before his case is heard. I propose to ask the committee to add to this Bill a couple of provisos, the first laying down general principles on which the tribunal should be guided. It is in the following words :

Subject to the provisions of this Act, every landowner should have the same right of drainage on and across the lands of railway companies, as he now has by law in regard to the lands of any other landowner.

I do not think there can be any reasonable objection to that statement of principle; certainly it would do all that is necessary to safeguard the railway companies. The only reason for putting it in is that the principle upon which the case should be considered should be declared in the Bill, namely, that the right of drainage inheres in the landowner whose land needs drainage, and the decision of that question should not be made subject to the railway committee of the Privy Council.

Then, again, a most valuable suggestion was made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson). He contended an arbitration in every case would probably be expensive, not as expensive probably as a reference to the Privy Council, but too expensive for the individual. There is a great deal of force in

Mr. CASEY.

that, and I believe that the amendment proposed by the hon. minister, with the addition of what I am now going to propose, would probably cover the case better than an absolute reference to arbitration in every case. What I propose is (as suggested by the hon. member for Lincoln, Mr. Gibson), that an engineer should be sent down by the Railway Department to make a general report upon the case in the first instance. That would not cost anything to either of the parties. I propose that his report as to what should be done should be made known to both the parties, and that then, if either of the parties felt sufficiently aggrieved by the report to risk the cost of an arbitration, an arbitration should be held before a board composed of three engineers. That clause would read as an addition to the clause proposed by the minister :

In case either the railway company or municipality or landowner interested notifies the Railway Committee of the Privy Council that they wish to appeal against the decision given in any question concerning drainage, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council shall authorize the holding of an arbitration before a board of three civil engineers, to be appointed as follows : One by the municipality or landowner, one by the railway company, and a third by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and the decision of this board shall be final.

I beg to move, seconded by Mr. McMillan, the first clause to which I have referred declaring the general principle which should underlie all drainage proceedings. I move that it should be placed before the clause proposed by the minister.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Is that in amendment to the clause presented by the minister ?

Mr. CASEY. It is in addition to it.

Mr. SPROULE. That would presuppose that the clause presented by the minister is accepted ?

Mr. CASEY. I suppose it might be taken in that sense.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to the amendment proposed by the government, it resembles, in my opinion, the homeopathic doses of medicine given by homeopaths to their patients as it is so infinitesimal so far as any benefits to be derived from it by the farmers of the country are concerned. However, it has this advantage, that, instead of the municipality taking up the fight for the farmer, the farmer can appeal himself to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. But, it compels a farmer to come down here and fight his case before the Railway Committee. It is true that the succeeding clause says :

Whenever any application is made under the last preceding section or under section 14 of this Act, the Railway Committee may, if it thinks proper, direct an inquiry to be made in the locality in question.

I presume that in the future, as in the past, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, will prefer to do their own work down here in their office, and that it will still necessitate the farmer coming down here to fight his case. I think it will be very little benefit to the farmer. It will be some slight benefit, but very little. In regard to the amendment to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). I do not know what it is because he reads it in such a low tone of voice that we could not hear it in this part of the House.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). I think the section now under consideration that is proposed by the minister might be altered a little with advantage to the landowner. I agree with what the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says that this is an improvement upon the Act as it exists, but there are cases in which after the landowners put the law in motion they have nothing to do with it whatever. They petition for drainage. Their petition is sent to the engineer of the township or of the municipality if the municipality is prepared to deal with the petition. After that the landowners have nothing more to do with it. It is true that under the other section the municipality can then come to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to get drainage across the railway or find an outlet. Suppose the municipality does not do it this amendment simply gives the landowners the right to come where the municipality refuses. Assuming that this be the case I think more benefit would be conferred upon the landowner if the words 'upon the landowner first complying with such terms as to payment or security for payment of the whole, or so much of the cost' were struck out and 'upon such terms as to cost' should be inserted. Although the landowner might be benefited he has nothing to do with the cost because the cost is fixed by the engineer and it is paid by the land assessed. The landowner should not be under terms personally as to the payment of the cost or giving security for the cost where the jurisdiction of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is invoked under that section.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the landowner could never satisfy the Railway Committee of the Privy Council as to the security he is compelled to give under this clause. Why do you compel him to give satisfactory security any more than the railway company? It seems to me that if the landholder is compelled to give security as it is proposed he would not be able to give a permanent security unless he gave a mortgage on his land. The railway company would never be satisfied with the security that the landowner would be able to give, and is therefore stopped from being able to go across the railway pro-

perty in my judgment. I do not think you should put such an onerous condition on the landowner. It is all put on the landowner and not on the railway company.

Mr. JOHN McMILLAN (South Huron). I have looked over this very carefully. A farmer inaugurating proceedings under the machinery provided by the local legislature under the Ditches and Watercourses Act, must call his neighbours together and try to make an amicable settlement. If he succeeds, the settlement is registered, and becomes, in law, the same as the award of the engineer. But if a settlement is not reached, the farmer has only to notify the township clerk, and the clerk is compelled—the council has nothing to do with it—to notify the engineer to come on within a certain time. But an engineer brought on under the provincial laws can only deal with what the province has control over. If a railway is involved he cannot make an estimate and send that to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, unless a clause is put into this Act giving that authority. Of course, it is all right after you cross the railway, but the engineer has no power to deal with the railway, which is under Dominion jurisdiction. Cases arise where the only parties involved are one farmer and a railway and the farmer clearly cannot take proceedings under the provincial Act, because the other party, the railway, is not under provincial jurisdiction. I hold that there must be power given to the local engineer to examine and give an estimate of the work on railways before a proper case can be laid before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Further, I object to the clause under which the farmer is bound for the whole cost. A good deal has been made out of the point of circumstances arising to overcome which the railway should not be held liable. But the circumstances, before the railway was built, were that the farmer had free access to means of drainage for his lands, and that which prevents his still enjoying that right is the building of the railway. The railway, in fact, has taken away a natural right; and to compel the railway to give the farmer drainage is only to compel them to restore that natural right. I do not see, therefore, why the farmer should be bound to give security for all the expenses.

Mr. BRITTON. I wish to put myself right in connection with what the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) has said, and I then shall have said my say with reference to his amendment. I am sorry I was not in the Railway Committee; if I had been and had understood the discussion that took place there, I probably should not have troubled the committee of the House. Both the hon. member for South Huron and myself spoke from an Ontario point of view. The hon. gentleman is quite right with respect to the Act concerning ditches and watercourses. But there is in another Act

in the province of Ontario which refers to municipal drainage—a larger class of drains—and that is what I had in mind when I addressed the committee before. I am now told by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) that this amendment is intended to apply only to ditches and watercourses, as they are called in Ontario. That being so, while the objection raised by the hon. member for South Huron and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) as to the farmer giving security for costs is a matter to be discussed, my point is not necessarily before the committee. The other class of drains is provided for by some other section of the Act, and this subsection *a* is intended to apply only to ditches and watercourses, so I have nothing to say.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think that the hon. member (Mr. Britton) is right in saying, with regard to the suggestion he made—he did not put it in the form of an amendment—that there would be no utility whatever in carrying out that suggestion. I think it would be well for members of the committee to bear in mind the fact that we have been called upon by the proposed legislation of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) to deal with cases which cannot be and are not being dealt with by the municipalities in respect to drainage. The existing law is ample to cover all cases in which the municipal body will declare its interest and will make an application under section 14 of the Railway Act.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). Will the hon. minister permit me—to save time in the discussion—to say that I fear he is not making the distinction between what is purely a matter of municipal concern rather than a municipality acting for a drainage territory. There is no provision in the Bill for the cases the people are most concerned in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The subject, I admit frankly, was a new one to me; and I did not apply my mind to it until the discussion came up in the Railway Committee at the instance of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). But the conclusion that I came to was this—that the provincial legislature was at fault in that it did not furnish the machinery which would enable the landowner to move so as to not merely invite but compel the action of the municipal body, and that we could not supply that omission. I will read a few lines of the 14th section of the Railway Act which, I think, will illustrate my meaning:

Whenever, after due notice of application therefor, the Railway Committee decides that it is necessary in the interest of any municipality that means of drainage should be provided—

That clause, you will see at once, presupposes that the municipality will declare that it is interested and will invite the interven-

tion of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for this purpose—

Mr. SPROULE. That would be only for municipal purposes?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that it would be limited to what would be called narrowly municipal purposes, but it must be limited to such purposes as the municipality is both empowered and willing to act in and to appeal to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council—

Mr. HAGGART. It is that broad—they can apply for an individual.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should think they would not be compelled to apply for an individual, but I would imagine that it would be within their competency to apply for an individual. But they have not done it and they cannot be induced to do it—as I understand it has not been found possible to bring enough influence to bear upon municipalities generally to induce them to move under the provisions of the Railway Act.

The hon. member (Mr. Casey) now comes in with this Bill, and he asks that a single individual may secure the laying down of drainage works across railways. The first answer to that is, that to-day you have your provincial legislature which has to do entirely with the subject of drainage, and if you cannot influence sufficient opinion in the province to put the law in the shape you desire, then it becomes a very difficult question to deal with, bearing in mind that the subject of drainage does not belong to parliament. I suggested to the committee that we might afford relief to these people by enabling a single landowner to act under what is called the Ditches and Watercourses Act in Ontario, and that having authority to lay the drain under that Act, it would be proper enough for this parliament to authorize the crossing of a railway, under such conditions as the Railway Committee of the Privy Council might deem to be fair and reasonable. The proposal of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) is to create a new tribunal on the basis of arbitration, and to absolutely ignore the existing law which has been in operation for years. My proposal is that it should go to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council which has the machinery at hand, which can lay down a uniform rule in these matters, and which in the past has exercised its jurisdiction with a fair degree of satisfaction to the public. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council, I contend, has had as large a measure of success as human institutions generally have. We propose not to alter the existing law; we propose to utilize the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to do practically what the hon. member (Mr. Casey) desires. We propose that the Railway

Mr. BRITTON.

Committee may send a proper and competent officer to the ground to examine it and make his report on all the material facts which are necessary in order to the giving of a decision. I ask the House to remember that we propose that should be done at no expense whatever to the applicant. I do not think that the system of arbitration would be satisfactory at all; I think the Railway Committee of the Privy Council would be better than an arbitration.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would, too.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Railway Committee will have all the machinery at its disposal, and it will be able to use that machinery without any cost to the applicant necessarily. of course he, the applicant, may incur as much cost as he pleases, and he may employ lawyers, ad libitum, but there will be no occasion for him to do so. During the tenure of the chairmanship by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), and certainly during my tenure in office, private individuals make applications to that committee; members of parliament come before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council and present cases on behalf of their constituents, and that is done without any expense whatever. You might imagine a more expeditious tribunal than the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, because sometimes the ministers are so much engrossed with other business that they have to delay decisions much more than they would wish, but on the whole there has been no serious complaint with regard to delay. The committee has been fairly expeditious in these matters, and the delays have almost uniformly occurred by the wish of both parties to the hearing. Under the proposal which I now make you get an inexpensive tribunal; you get a moderately speedy tribunal, you are utilizing machinery which is now in operation, and you are preserving that measure of control over the railways of the country which parliament has always considered necessary, and which parliament ought always to consider necessary in the interests of public safety. I can see nothing of advantage in the amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey), and I do not know that I am quite prepared to express an opinion as to what, if any, would be the effect of it. He declares that subject to the provisions of this Act every landowner shall have the same rights of drainage on and across the lands of railway companies as he now has in regard to lands owned by another landowner. How far this amendment would carry my hon. friend I am not prepared to say. Does not this present clause read with section 14, recognize that it would be a proper application in a proper case. You are not going to affirm arbitrarily that all applications must

be granted; you must leave the discretion somewhere, and you leave it in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council under my clause.

Mr. HAGGART. Would not the amendment, if passed, make the provincial law applicable to Dominion railways?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Were it not that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) starts out with the words 'subject to the provisions of this Act.' I would be inclined to think it did, but I cannot at this moment undertake to advise the committee as to what the effect of the amendment would be. But, this section might mean a great deal more; it might mean that you are entirely ignoring the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature in respect to the question of drainage. That is where one of the difficulties in connection with the hon. member's Bill has arisen. The hon. member seems to treat the matter as if it were simply a case of getting across the track of a railway; but it is not that alone. You have to provide for the drainage of lands on both sides of the track.

Mr. CLANCY. No. If you get across the railway the provincial laws will accomplish the rest. I quite agree with my hon. friend that a scheme should be set on foot under the provincial laws to start with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member's Bill makes no provision for that. It absolutely ignores the provincial legislation.

Mr. CLANCY. If you commence under the authority of the Ditches and Watercourses Act or the Municipal Drainage Act, then the question is only to get across the railway.

Mr. CASEY. The object of my amendment is this. Whatever tribunal is going to try these cases, whether the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or an arbitration, or a railway commission, it is only there to interpret the law. I do not think the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or any arbitration or anybody else should be above the existing law. My amendment says in plain language that the rights of the landowner against the railway company shall be the same as his rights against any other landowner.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my hon. friend means that, he ignores the fact that in crossing railway lands you are not crossing lands which either need drainage or contribute to drainage. He is applying his clause to conditions that are so totally dissimilar that it cannot be properly made to apply. The hon. member recognizes that he is setting up a perfectly new procedure, a procedure altogether outside of the Watercourses and Ditches Act of Ontario. To that extent his Bill is not within the legislative jurisdiction

of this parliament, and it becomes us in our legislation to recognize and utilize the existing law in respect to drainage passed by the legislature of Ontario. We have done nothing more than that, and therein I understand the hon. member for Bothwell agrees entirely with the principle underlying this provision. We say, utilize the machinery provided by the local Ditches and Watercourses Act, and if that machinery is not ample for your purpose, you ought to be able to get it improved or amended. Then come to the Railway Committee and it will give you the crossing. Thus, your scheme of drainage is complete. You indicate by your plans where you start, you foresee where you are going to carry the water, and when you once get it to the railway under the provisions of the local law, then we will provide the terms and conditions under which you can make your crossing, if it appears to be a proper case for drainage. I cannot see anything that will answer the case better than this.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be an improvement to say the Railway Committee of the Privy Council shall send an engineer, instead of may send one.

Mr. TISDALE. You cannot command them.

Mr. SPROULE. The word 'may' leaves it optional with them, whereas 'shall' makes it imperative. My reason for suggesting that is this. Suppose a farmer comes to argue his case before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council; he has pitted against him an expert railway lawyer, and, perhaps a railway engineer. He has not an engineer or railway expert to back up his case, and he presents it in his own humble way. The Railway Committee lets him go home, and he hears nothing more about the case, until after a while he receives notice that the case has been decided against him. I maintain that if the Railway Committee sent an intelligent engineer to the locality to see the conditions, he would be able to present the case on behalf of the farmer, and the individual would be relieved largely of the responsibility of having to fight a railway expert and an engineer before the Railway Committee.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the difficulty with the suggestion of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is this, that if you change 'may' to 'shall,' what power have you over the Railway Committee?

Mr. SPROULE. It means that they will always have to send an engineer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They may decide that there is no case made out. Then there is no possible way of compelling them to change their decision. In the Railway Committee the main point raised was that while a municipality had the right to go before the Railway Committee of the Privy Coun-

Mr. BLAIR.

cil, an individual had not, and it was often exceedingly difficult to get a municipality to take such steps as would guard the interests of an individual. The amendment of the Minister of Railways places the individual in the same position as the municipality, and I am prepared to support it.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to provide that when an individual makes a complaint to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, it will be the duty of that committee to send an engineer to examine the locality.

Mr. McMILLAN. In my opinion, there should be no necessity at all for hearing the parties after an engineer has reported. I would rather leave the matter in the hands of the Privy Council to act on the report of their engineer, than be compelled to come here and lay my case before the committee, and there meet these railway experts who, according to my experience, are very unscrupulous with respect to such matters. The Minister of Railways has said a great deal about taking this matter out of the hands of the government, but the Ontario government found it necessary to devise machinery for deciding such cases without the interference of the government. Under the Ontario Drainage Act, the parties are allowed to choose their own engineer to go and examine the whole work.

Mr. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). This matter has been discussed for days in the Railway Committee, and finally the committee agreed upon these clauses which the minister has introduced. If we are going to start anew and discuss the whole matter over again, it will take the whole afternoon. Surely after the time devoted to it by the Railway Committee, and after the endorsement of these clauses by the majority of the Railway Committee, we ought to accept them and be done with the matter for this session. Then, after a year's experience, if necessity should be shown for further change, we can deal with the matter next session.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose the word 'may' is tantamount to 'shall.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly. We could not accept the suggestion that the word 'shall' be inserted in place of 'may,' because then we could not exercise any discretion in any case.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where a case is made out, the clause is considered as compulsory.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. If it is distinctly understood that 'may' is equivalent to 'shall,' where there is need for it, I am quite satisfied.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My interpretation is this, that

in almost any supposable case, the first thing to do would be to send an engineer experienced in drainage matters to examine into it. That is the most simple and satisfactory way of disposing of the question.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). I think this amendment is a step in the right direction, and I shall be very glad to accept it, although I advocated strongly the Bill of my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey). I am quite disposed to give these amendments a trial for a year. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council so far has given very good satisfaction. And, until such time as a very large number of cases have been referred to them, and they have declined to act, or have not given satisfaction, there will be no necessity for altering the law. Give them a year under the present law, and the proposed amendment, to see how they will do; and, if they do not meet the expectations of the people who are suffering for want of drainage, we can press for a further amendment or for the Bill that my hon. friend has brought in.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), that this is a matter that we can drop in a few minutes, after having spent the whole of yesterday in a matter which is of much less importance to the people of the province I represent. The Minister of Railways and Canals says that my amendment ignores the provincial law. I do not see how he can get that idea. My amendment to his amendment is that, subject to the provisions of this Act, the existing law shall apply—whatever it may be. If a judge interprets that to mean that the provincial law shall apply, that is what it means. The object of my amendment is, so far as the right of getting drainage, and so far as the expense is concerned, to provide that the railway company and every other landowner shall be on exactly the same basis. Provision for safety to the roadbed, the right of way, and so on, are made elsewhere in the Act, and will overrule the other considerations. The point urged by my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) is extremely strong. The government of Ontario, so far from keeping up the old system of centralization, and keeping irresponsible power in the hands of the Privy Council, thought it necessary to divest themselves of all right to meddle in these matters. Experience has justified that course. If the minister's amendment results in litigation coming before the Privy Council on the part of individuals, he will be sorry that he did not divest the Privy Council of this power. There is no reason, logically or constitutionally, why the Railway Committee of the Privy Council should be the tribunal in such cases at all. It is part of the old Tory system of centralization which, I had hoped,

would be done away with. The system would utterly break down if all the cases really requiring attention were brought before the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Hitherto that body has not been overworked, because there was no chance for such cases to come before it. The hon. minister has admitted that he, coming from another province where they have none of these drainage questions, has only now been informed on the question. Here is another illustration of the inconvenience of calling upon cabinet ministers to settle cases of this kind. They would have to have every case argued out before them as to the provincial law—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so.

Mr. CASEY. Evidently, the minister does not think so. But he has admitted that he did not know the Ontario law, and others that may come up, until this discussion was brought on lately. If even he, a lawyer, was not acquainted—could not be expected to be acquainted—with the laws of other provinces on these matters, how about the other ministers, some of whom are not lawyers, and are not interested? I am ready to take the vote on the amendment.

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to say just a word—

Some hon. MEMBERS. One o'clock.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No—go on.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. minister (Mr. Blair) thinks the discussion can close before the House rises at one o'clock, I am sure he is mistaken. We had better call it one o'clock. I want to give the hon. minister all the assistance I can.

It being One o'clock, the committee took recess.

The Committee resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. CLANCY. I presume the phraseology of the section has not been changed from the one the hon. gentleman was good enough to hand the committee a day or two ago?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Just the same.

Mr. CLANCY. I am going to read the amendment to see if I have a proper understanding of it:

Whenever proceedings for the drainage of lands have been taken by any landowner under the provisions of any Act of the legislature of any province in that behalf—

Do I understand the word 'landowner' is to be taken in a plural sense, and that it means any number of landowners?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Then the clause continues :

And it appears to the Committee that an outlet for the drainage works is required over, across, or under the lands of the company, the Railways Committee may, upon application of the landowner or engineer in charge of such work.

I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that if it includes all, it includes any and every work that may be undertaken under the authority of any provincial Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. It meaning that, then you have to provide that a clerk of the municipality as well as the landowner and the engineer could give the notice.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the municipality is at all interested, then they have got the power under the existing law.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will see that the case provided for in section 14 is an entirely different one. The case of a municipality is one similar to the case of the city of Ottawa if it wished to improve its sewerage by crossing a railway which belonged to the municipality alone.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you mean the clerk of the municipality does not act for the municipality ?

Mr. CLANCY. The only machinery provided by the provincial law is the machinery through which notice must be given in any other case. For instance, if a drain is being extended into another municipality, the clerk of the municipality, under the provincial law, is the only party from whom a notice can come. If the words 'or clerk of the municipality' were added to the words 'engineer or landowner' it would include all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection to that.

Mr. CLANCY (reading):

Upon the landowner first complying with such terms as to payment or security for payment of the whole or so much of the cost of the construction and maintenance of said drainage works as the committee may in such order provide.

I am sure the Minister of Railways and Canals has seen much difficulty with regard to that matter of security. In many cases it means that it will probably be impossible for the landowner to offer such security as the Railway Committee may think reasonable security to go on with such work. But if the hon. gentleman will leave out 'landowner' and have it read 'upon first complying with such terms as to payments or security for payment,' that would include the landowner and it would include

Mr. BLAIR.

the municipality, because the municipality after all only acts for the drainage territory. For instance, a drainage territory petitions the council of the municipality to send on an engineer with a view to have drainage works. The council accept the petition and order the engineer on ; the work goes on and the municipality issues debentures. The municipality is, in fact, primarily responsible for the payment of the debentures. But we have the machinery for taxing the lands, and the lands thereof are security. The lands could be made security to the municipality, but if it was an individual case the individual would have to give the security.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not necessarily, because in the security the landowner would comply with that requirement if the municipality, on his behalf or at his instance, was prepared to give the proper security.

Mr. CLANCY. Now it says :

For the whole or so much of the cost of construction and maintenance of said drainage works as the committee may provide.

Now the hon. gentleman will see that there is an assumption in there that the landowner would have to bear the cost of the work. If you leave out the words 'for the whole' and say 'or so much,' 'so much' may mean the whole or a small part of it were reversed. I think the representatives of the railway companies would say : No, we don't want that in because that assumes that the company shall pay the cost of the work. I want to say on general principles there are few cases, there would not be a case in a thousand where the individual or a number of individuals would not be concerned. The municipality is in no sense concerned in this part of the section I am now reading, it is only in so far as a municipality is acting for a set of persons, either for a single individual or for a great number of persons ? Now section 14b says:

Whenever any application is made under the last preceding section or under section 14 of this Act.

I understand that that must be read separately, that the last clause provides that wherever a case arises under either this section or under section 14, the Privy Council will do certain things. Therefore, the works to be undertaken under section 14, are those belonging exclusively to the municipality, for instance, they are putting a sewer under a railway. The other case is different, it is a case of one or two individuals, or any number of individuals, seeking drainage in which the municipality has no concern beyond being the machinery through which the work is to be carried on under the provincial law. If the section read:

Upon such terms of payment or security for payment of so much of the cost of construction and maintenance of said drainage works as the committee may in such order provide.

That does not assume one way or the other, it leaves it perfectly free for any interpretation that would conclude that either the burden rested upon the railway company in the first instance or upon the landowners. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that as to the natural drainage, as to the fall of the land, as to the incline of the water in a certain direction, no landowner should be in a worse position for drainage than he was before the construction of the railway; that no landowner should be deprived of the natural drainage, of the advantage of an outlet by the incline of the water in a certain direction; he should not be in any worse position after the railway is constructed than he was before. The railway companies naturally assume that where a road is constructed and cuts off that natural flow of water, it is then a privilege for the landowner to get under. It is not a privilege, it is a right of the landowner. You have taken away the right and you are barely restoring it. I think the hon. gentleman will say that is a sound proposition, therefore, there should be no assumption one way or the other, the case being shown clearly to the Railway Committee that certain general principles should govern in that way. My object is to show that subsection *a* of section 14 should not be governed in any sense by the wording of section 14. The hon. gentleman is aiming at such a case as I think is clear to his mind. He has drafted this clause with great clearness, and I am well satisfied with it; but there should be no assumption one way or the other who is to pay this. Let the facts determine that, always keeping in mind the general principle that no railway company has a right to build a road and cut off the natural flow of water for miles, probably, and then say to the landowner: We are granting you a privilege to get through.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have no objection to adding a word or two to carry out a portion of the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. I beg to observe to the committee that I think he would be in error in striking out the words—

Mr. **FOSTER**. Are you going to admit his proposition? If you are, admit it, leave the observations off and let us get on.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, I am not going to admit it. I would not feel at liberty to express any opinion at all on that, but I say that there is no such assumption to be drawn from this clause whatever. The words 'so much of the cost' ought not to be left out.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I would leave out 'the whole or.'

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. You want to provide that the committee may impose the whole?

Mr. **CLANCY**. If you like.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Or that they may impose part, if they like.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Yes.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. You cannot do it without having both of these words in the clause. I am willing to add these words 'if any' so that it will read 'so much of the cost, if any.'

Mr. **CLANCY**. That will do. There is one thing more. When the notice is given to the Railway Committee and to the department, there should be some provision, and in making it we are not interfering with the provincial law, requiring that plans and specifications shall be filed with the department and served on the railway company. That will simply leave the matter, in the first instance, in the hands of the local engineer who is in charge of the work. Barely providing that notice shall be given to the railway company is very indefinite. The engineer, or the clerk of the municipality should be required to furnish the department when the application is made with plans and specifications of the work undertaken under the provisions of the provincial Act and to furnish a copy to the railway authorities as well. Under our system, where a municipality wants to drain through another municipality, or through a portion of another municipality, the clerk of the municipality has to serve the clerk of the adjoining municipality with plans and specifications of the whole work and with a statement of the assessment. That ought to be provided for in this case.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There is really no occasion for putting any provision in here more than we have, because the Railway Committee would not move a hand without giving notice to the parties interested. They could not do it. The first thing that the Railway Committee has to do in exercising all these general powers is to notify the parties who are going to be affected by their decision of the matter which is proposed to be taken up.

Mr. **CLANCY**. I have not made my meaning clear to the hon. gentleman, I am perfectly certain. The hon. gentleman would want plans and specifications in his department before he looked at the question. Why should they not accompany the application from the local engineer at the time the application is made?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We propose to send an engineer.

Mr. **CLANCY**. You will not require to send an engineer at all. I am endeavouring to provide against the sending of an en-

gineer if there is no necessity for it. The hon. gentleman must have these plans and specifications before him, the railway company should have them at the same time, and if we require them to be filed you provide for a necessary and cheap method. The hon. gentleman would not surely send his engineers to make plans and specifications without the local engineer having done it first. His engineer only goes up there to see if they are correct specifications.

Mr. WM. GIBSON (Lincoln). When this matter was up for discussion, the object that the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) had in view, or what seemed to be the general desire of the committee, at all events, was that in order to make the application of the farmer, or the township, as inexpensive as possible provision should be made that anybody could apply to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council or the Minister of Railways and Canals, stating his reasons. The idea then was to prevent parties suffering from want of proper drainage being put to any expense whatever except to require them to lodge their complaint with the minister, who would forthwith send his engineer to look into the case. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) wants to make this procedure as inexpensive as possible to those who require drainage, but if those who require drainage have to furnish the Railway Committee with plans and specifications they might supply plans and specifications for something that might not perhaps be needed. In that case he would oblige a farmer, or a township, to go to the expense of employing an engineer in the first place to make up the plans and specifications and estimates of the whole cost of the work.

Mr. CLANCY. No, that is not it at all.

Mr. GIBSON. The idea of the committee was that the farmer should be at no expense and that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council were to ascertain whether the farmer had a grievance in the first instance. It was suggested in the first place that a board of arbitration might be appointed, but that seemed to meet with a good deal of opposition from the committee, and, as a matter of compromise, I made the suggestion that the government should, in the first place, make inquiry and find out if the party complaining had the right to complain, and if so, notification should be sent to the railway company.

Mr. CLANCY. That is not the hon. gentleman's amendment at all.

Mr. GIBSON. That was the idea of the committee, at all events.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. Of course, I admit I have not been in the House following the whole Bill, but I have a distinct recollection that it was the desire of the committee that no

Mr. CLANCY.

litigation should be forced upon the farmer, that the matter should be made as inexpensive as possible, that he might come without even employing a lawyer or an engineer of any kind with his complaint, and the government would send an engineer to make a report upon the case. Then, all parties were to be notified and if the railway company did not agree, a board of arbitration was to be appointed, which was to consist of the local engineer, hired by the municipality, or farmer; the government will have their engineer, and the railway company, I have no doubt, will look after their engineer.

Mr. CLANCY. That was expressed, but would overturn what the hon. gentleman said entirely. There is no such provision now. The provision is, that it must not be undertaken by an individual unless under the authority of some provincial Act.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CASEY. I beg to move an amendment in the sense of the proposal to which my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) has just referred. After hearing his remarks in the Railway Committee, I saw reason to modify my idea of the desirability of an arbitration as the first resort, but, I quite agree with the hon. member for Lincoln in holding that if there is a difference with regard to the engineer's report, the final tribunal shall be an arbitration. I, therefore, beg to move that the following words be added to section 14b :

In case either the railway companies or a municipality or landowner interested notifies the Railway Committee of the Privy Council that he wishes to appeal against the decision given in any question concerning drainage, the Railway Committee shall authorize the holding of an arbitration, before a board of three civil engineers to be appointed as follows: one by the municipality or landowner, one by the railway company, and a third by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and the decision of this board shall be final.

I am very much obliged to my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) for his business-like suggestion, and I hope the committee will adopt this amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CASEY. I would ask the minister, before we finally dispose of this Bill, if he has considered the question, which I raised in the committee, as to the numerous cases in which it is impossible for an individual farmer to take any proceeding under any provincial Act? Take, for instance, cases common to my own county, where a railway is crossing a farm and the owner of the farm desires to drain from one part of his land to another. It is impossible for him to take proceedings under any provincial Act, and, therefore, he would be debarred, under the wording of this resolution, from appealing to the Privy Council.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have not had much opportunity of considering this, and I think that the cases of that kind are so extremely few in number that we could scarcely hope to cover them by any general enactment. I think that the hon. gentleman had better be content with the very substantial advance he has made in the direction of removing the grievances he has complained of, and another session the matter he has brought up can be dealt with, and proper attention and consideration given to it.

Mr. **CASEY**. It is not a question of a very few cases. In the western part of Ontario the farms generally run north and south, and the railways east and west, and a farm is cut in two as a general thing. Most of the cases of drainage arise from this circumstance. Why should not a farmer have the right to drain across a railway track, and have the right to apply at once to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, stating that he cannot take any provincial proceeding, and let his case be considered by the Privy Council?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is not very easy to deal with a matter of this kind on the spur of the moment and amend the law. Questions might arise in such cases, not involving simply the mere passage from one portion of a man's land to another, but his drain might require to follow the course of the railway embankment and cross other people's land. A variety of questions might arise, and I would not be disposed to settle such a question off-hand.

Mr. **CASEY**. The matter was brought up in the Railway Committee a week or two ago, where I discussed it fully, so I am not springing the idea on the House or the minister. The cases I refer to are probably the greater number which will arise, and we could avoid the difficulty, stated by the hon. minister, of draining from one man's land on to another's by providing that a direct appeal to the Privy Council should lie only in cases where the drainage required affects the one property. We might meet the case by adding after the words 'the provincial Act of the legislature of any province in that behalf' the words 'except in cases where all the drainage is to be done on the property of the landowner.' This would cover the whole case, and, I think, ought to be adopted.

Bill reported.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. **CASEY**. In order to put my views on this subject on record on the Journals, I am compelled to repeat the motions which I made in committee. I, therefore, beg to move, seconded by Mr. Beith:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole with instructions to add the following as section 14c:

'14c. Subject to the provisions of this Act, every landowner shall have the same rights of drainage on and across the lands of railway companies as he now has by law in regard to the lands of any other landowner.'

House divided on the amendment.

**YEAS:**

**Messieurs**

Beith,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bourassa,	Macdonell,
Broder,	MacLaren,
Brown,	McGugan,
Burnett,	McHugh,
Casey,	McMillan,
Clancy,	McMullen,
Clarke,	Marcil,
Cochrane,	Monet,
Copp,	Morin,
Ferguson,	Prior,
Fraser (Lambton),	Puttee,
Gilmour,	Richardson,
Guillet,	Rutherford,
Henderson,	Semple,
Hurley,	Tolmie, and
Johnston,	Wallace.—35.
Klock,	

**NAYS:**

**Messieurs**

Archambault,	Landerkin,
Bazinet,	LaRivière,
Beattie,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bell (Pictou),	Lavergne,
Bell (Prince),	Lewis,
Bergeron,	Logan,
Blair,	Macdonald (King's),
Borden (King's),	Mackie,
Britton,	McAlister,
Bruneau,	McCarthy,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McClure,
Champagne,	McCormack,
Christie,	McLellan,
Comstock,	McLennan (Inverness),
Costigan,	Martin,
Craig,	Mignault,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Montague,
Debell,	Mulock,
Dupré,	Parmalee,
Ellis,	Paterson,
Ethier,	Pettet,
Fielding,	Rosamond,
Fisher,	Russell,
Fitzpatrick,	Savard,
Flint,	Scriver,
Fortier,	Sifton,
Foster,	Stenson,
Frost,	Sutherland,
Geoffrion,	Talbot,
Gillies,	Tisdale,
Haggart,	Tucker, and
Harwood,	Turcot.—65.
Kaulbach,	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. **CASEY**. I beg also to move the second amendment. I think this may go on the same division. I do not intend to call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. **DEPUTY SPEAKER**. I do not think the hon. member has a right to make another motion. He has already spoken on the motion for the third reading.

Mr. McMILLAN moved :

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole with instructions to add the following to section 14b:

'In case either the railway company or the municipality or landowner interested notifies the Railway Committee of the Privy Council that they wish to appeal against the decision given in any question concerning drainage, the Railway Committee shall authorize the holding of an arbitration before a board of three civil engineers, to be appointed as follows: one by the municipality or landowner, one by the railway company and a third by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and the decision of this board shall be final.'

House divided on amendment.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Beth,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bourbonnais,	MacLaren.
Broder.	McGugan.
Brown.	McHugh.
Burnett,	McMillan.
Calvert,	McMullen,
Casey,	Marcil.
Copp.	Morin.
Davis.	Prior.
Fortier,	Puttee.
Fraser (Lambton),	Ratz,
Graham.	Richardson.
Hurley.	Semple.
Johnston.	Tolmie. and
Klock.	Wallace.—30.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Archambault,	Harwood,
Bazinet,	Henderson,
Beattie.	Landerkin,
Bell (Pictou),	LaRivière.
Bell (Prince),	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bergeron,	Lavergne,
Blair.	Lewis.
Borden (King's),	Logan.
Bourassa,	Macdonald (King's),
Britton.	Macdonell,
Bruneau,	Mackie,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McAlister.
Champagne,	McCarthy,
Christie,	McClure,
Clancy.	McCormick.
Clarke,	McLellan,
Cochrane,	McLennan (Inverness),
Comstock,	Madore.
Costigan.	Mignault,
Craig,	Monet.
Davies (Sir Louis),	Montague,
Dechêne,	Mulock,
Dohell,	Parmalee,
Domville,	Paterson,
Dupré,	Pettet,
Ellis,	Powell.
Ethier,	Robinson,
Ferguson,	Rosamond,
Fielding,	Russell.
Fisher.	Rutherford,
Fitzpatrick,	Savard.
Flint.	Sriver,
Foster,	Sifton,
Frost.	Stenson,
Geoffrion,	Sutherland,
Gillies,	Talbot,
Gilmour,	Tisdale,
Guillet,	Tucker, and
Haggart,	Turcot.—78.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificate of the return of Michel Esdras Bernier, Esq., for the electoral district of St. Hyacinthe.

CONCILIATION OF TRADE DISPUTES.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulack) moved second reading of Bill (No. 187). An Act to aid in the prevention and settlement of trade disputes, and the publication of statistical and industrial information. He said: When I had the honour a few days ago to introduce this Bill, the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) expressed his regret at its having been introduced so late in the session, and he spoke as if the Bill came as a surprise to him. The hon. gentleman must have forgotten that on the opening day of the session His Excellency, in the speech from the Throne, addressed himself to this question in these words:

The attention of the government has been called to the conflicts which occasionally arise between workmen and their employers. While it may not be possible to wholly prevent such difficulties by legislation, my government think that many of the disputes might be averted if better provisions could be made for the friendly intervention of boards of conciliation, the conclusions of which, while not legally binding, would have much weight with both sides and be useful in bringing an intelligent public opinion to bear on these complicated subjects. You will be invited to consider whether the provincial legislation in this matter may not be usefully supplemented by an enactment providing for the establishment of a Dominion tribunal for assisting in the settlement of such questions.

Therefore, nearly six months ago parliament was informed of the precise nature and mode of settling such disputes which would be embodied in a measure to be submitted for the consideration of parliament. I was consequently not prepared for the criticism of the hon. member for York, N.B., that the matter had come in at an unduly late period of the session, nor do I think that the hon. gentleman was quite fair in his criticism of that portion of the Bill which announced the establishment of a labour gazette. When I stated that it was to be published monthly, and that it would not be a medium for the expression of opinions, but would be a simple register of facts, I was surprised that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) should have inquired: How frequently it was to be published, whether it was to be a partisan organ, and whether it was to be in fact a medium for affecting public opinion. I endeavoured to make that perfectly plain, and I emphasized at that early date that the object of

the labour gazette was to be a publication of fact which all might read and comprehend, and from which they might draw their own conclusions.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is to compile the facts?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a matter that will be dealt with departmentally. I repeat this statement, so that hon. gentleman may be under no misapprehension as to what the labour gazette will be. The question of the treatment of differences between masters and workmen has invited the attention of legislators far and wide, and various attempts have been made to devise the best mode of dealing with such important questions. These have practically narrowed themselves down to two. One treatment of these disputes is by conciliation, and another by some other course more or less of a coercive character. Arbitration, where the parties to the controversy delegate to other persons to determine the issue, is in itself more or less of a coercive character. However, the most coercive measure that I have found on record is the New Zealand Act, passed some six years ago, and I do not know that the experience of the people of New Zealand would justify the people of the Dominion of Canada in following their course. The conditions in New Zealand are widely different from the conditions in Canada; but even if the New Zealand precedent were a good one, there are constitutional difficulties in the way of this Dominion parliament following it. The New Zealand law provides that if the question of wages, for example, has been referred to a board of conciliation, and if the judgment of that board is not acquiesced in by both parties, then one of the parties—necessarily the successful one—in order to secure legal force to that decision must take the case to the board of arbitration, which is composed of three men; one a representative of the employers, another a representative of the employees, and the third, who is the umpire or chairman, a member of the bench. The decision of the board of arbitration is final and cannot be appealed from on any ground of mistake in fact, or, error of judgment. The effect of its decision is to create a legal liability on the part of the employers and also on the part of the employees. If, for instance, that board should determine upon the rate of wages, thereupon, regardless of all contracts, the employer would be liable to pay that rate of wages. In many other ways one could illustrate how that legislation is an interference with the right of contract.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the employer be compelled to retain the men in his employment?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Under the Act in question, the employer cannot lock out; that is the answer to my hon. friend.

Mr. CLARKE. But, he can dismiss the men if he likes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, that is penal. Under the New Zealand Act, strikes and lock-outs are forbidden pending the reference of the matter to either of these tribunals. If the employer were to lock out for one or two reasons—say for the purpose of locking out, and that is the point my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) wanted to know about—

Mr. CLARKE. I beg the hon. minister's pardon—I thought he was explaining the provisions of his own Bill. I see he is explaining the principles of the New Zealand Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. He is going into the history of the thing from the flood up.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) may sneer at my observations—

Mr. FOSTER. I do not sneer at the hon. minister's observations; but, I do think that at this period of the session he might contain himself within some kind of bounds.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think I am not open to the rebuke of wasting time, so much as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) himself. I am referring to the New Zealand law because, doubtless, it will be referred to in the debate, and those who have not read it and are not familiar with the text of it, may not object to a brief explanation. I may explain that, as the New Zealand Act affects civil rights, and that the Dominion parliament has not the same power to legislate that New Zealand has. Under the British North America Act, legislation with regard to civil rights is confined to the provincial legislatures. So, it is not a question of choice with us. We cannot legislate here so as to affect the law of strikes, so far as the question of civil rights goes. Therefore, the extent of our legislation is at once brought within a narrower scope. We can, at best, pass a permissive Act, such as a conciliatory measure. At the same time, I think it is fair to compare the relative advantages of settlement of these difficulties by conciliation and by measures more or less of a coercive character. There has been on the statute-book of England since 1896 an Act known as the Conciliation Act, for the settlement of trade disputes. As I mentioned on its introduction, that portion of the Bill now before the House dealing with the settlement of disputes is an echo of the Imperial Act. There are some other provisions in the Bill which I shall allude to later on. As to the advantage of settlement by con-

ciliation or according to the New Zealand method, I would refer those who would advocate the New Zealand method to a most interesting book by Mr. Henry Lloyd, who is evidently a deep sympathizer with the New Zealand law. But, even a perusal of this book fails to convince one that the New Zealand method is a permanently durable one, but leads to the belief that it is submitted to for the time being, but does not produce the permanent good that flows from the conciliation policy adopted by the Imperial parliament. I simply allude to one extract, at page 59 of Mr. Lloyd's book. Dealing there with the settlement of a certain question, he says :

The masters and the men are both strongly organized. They hold unshakeable convictions; they even have conscientious scruples. They are not satisfied, for neither has secured what he asked for; but they find it less intolerable to obey the award and go on than to give up the business. The trade is kept in a continual agitation for six years. But how innocent an agitation.

Then, he goes on to draw a proper contrast between a settlement by strike and a settlement in a friendly way. The scheme of settlement by conciliation did not have its beginning in 1896 in England, when the English parliament passed their Act. It had its origin at an earlier period. The father of conciliation boards may be said to be Mr. Mundella, who, in 1860, adopted that system in connection with his own business as a manufacturer. Hon. gentlemen will find in a book by Henry Crompton, entitled 'Industrial Conciliation,' at page 33, a very interesting description of Mr. Mundella's experience. Throughout this book will be found a good deal of argument in support of the wisdom of the Imperial parliament's action—which was subsequent to the publication of this work—in adopting the legislation which is now upon the Imperial statute-book. The English Act has been in force, as I say, for four years. I have here a couple of reports which were presented to parliament as to the working of that Act. The contents of the first report are embodied in the second. Reading from the second report, I think I can say, that, while the number of cases referred to this board directly under the Act has not been very large, the working of the board has well justified the policy which led to the establishment of the law. The report shows that about six-sevenths of the cases that were referred to that board were settled by conciliation. There is an official publication by the Department of Labour in England which contains a schedule showing the number of cases settled by conciliation boards. When the Imperial Act came into effect, there were scattered throughout England a large number of conciliation boards, which had been brought about by agreement between the employers and the employees. These, under the provisions of the Act, registered; others came in afterwards

Mr. MULOCK.

and also registered. This annual report, showing the result of conciliation in the settlement of strikes and lock-outs is a most eloquent argument in favour of the conciliation system of settling such disputes. I shall not give the figures, but the report is available for any hon. gentleman who desires to see how valuable this mode of treating such disputes has proved. In connection with the United States Department of Labour, there are published monthly bulletins, and hon. gentlemen who would care to refer to the May bulletin, edited by Mr. Carroll D. Wright, a well-known officer in connection with trade disputes, will find most cogent arguments urging the United States Congress to adopt the English system for the purpose of settling such disputes. Among other publications, I would refer hon. gentlemen to the *Railroad Telegrapher*, a monthly publication, in the June number of which reference is made to a report recently made to Congress by an industrial committee which was issued by Congress to consider the question of how best to treat such controversies. On page 441, it states the following :

The commission reports that arbitration and conciliation laws in the states have been found effective for the purpose of conciliation, but that the strict arbitration machinery rarely performs its functions well.

I have given some evidence in support of the principle of the Bill. I cabled Lord Strathcona in order to get the latest information from the English Board of Trade, and I received a cable from him in reply. The letter in reply is dated the 12th of June, and my cable was about that time :

Has Imperial Act, being chap. 30 of 1896, for prevention of trade disputes, been of public service? Kindly have inquiry made of board of trade and cable me information earliest convenient moment. Similar legislation contemplated here.

I also asked him to send reports. To this cable he replied as follows :

Conciliation Act, am mailing reports and papers to-morrow. Act has been utilized to limited extent only, but board of trade believes its general effect has been good, and it provides machinery for settlement difficulties if parties to disputes agreeable. Several voluntary boards conciliation, organized by different trades, have adopted rules for appointment umpires by or reference trade disputes to board trade in cases where said boards fail agree.

Lord Strathcona sent me the following list of references to boards. This list which I am about to read is a list of cases where parties have taken advantage of the machinery of the Conciliation Act and agreed more or less to be governed by its provisions. The return to parliament which I alluded to showing the number of cases dealt with under the Act from year to year, does not include the information which I am about to give. These reports to parlia-

ment show the number of cases satisfactorily settled under the Conciliation Act. But in addition to that mode of settlement there is the other mode, namely, of parties settling the dispute themselves with the aid of some person sent down to assist them under the provisions of the Conciliation Act; and here are a few illustrations of advantage taken in that way by many persons interested in industrial life, both employers and employees. For instance:

Working rules agreed to by London Master Builders' Association and National Association of Operative Plasterers provided that in the event of conciliation board failing to arrive at a definite decision, either party may apply to board of trade under the Conciliation Act, or apply for the appointment of a conciliator, such conciliator's decision to be final and bind both parties. Another large class of interested persons, the London Master Builders' Association and Joint Company of Carpenters and Joiners, have agreed that in the event of the conciliation board failing to agree, they shall make application to the board of trade under the Conciliation Act, or apply for the appointment of a person to act as conciliator, whose decision shall be final and binding on both parties. Another class, the North Staffordshire Association of Master Painters and Plumbers, and the National Amalgamated Society of Operative House and Ship Painters and Decorators of the Potteries and Newcastle district, have agreed to appoint an arbitrator should conciliation board be unable to agree. A board of conciliation for the plumbing trade recommend the local employers and operators to appoint an arbitrator to act (failing settlement by the board), and that the dispute be referred to the arbitrator to be appointed by the board of trade under the Conciliation Act. And so other industries of the building trades of Reading, of the bricklayers in Ashton, of the operative plumbers of Wigan and district, the stone masons of Wigan and district, the Durham coal trade, the water, steam and beer fittings trade, the brass foundry trade, the gas and electric light fittings trade, the lace trade, the lightermen's trade, and so on.

All these industries have, in one form or another, adopted the machinery provided by the English Conciliation Act for the peaceable settlement of trade disputes. So that we are not embarking in any new field in asking this parliament to follow in the footsteps of the mother country, and to enact similar legislation here. A short time ago there was a serious strike in Canada, in the Kootenay district, between the miners and the mine owners, and the government on that occasion sent Mr. Clute to endeavour to reconcile the differences, if possible, and to bring that strike to an end. Mr. Clute went to British Columbia, he performed his mission, and peace is restored. I have a letter in my hand, dated 23rd of June

last, from Mr. Ralph Smith, of British Columbia, to Mr. Clute. Ralph Smith, as hon. gentlemen know, is a prominent citizen of British Columbia, a man who takes a deep interest in labour questions, a member of the local House, I think, a man of standing, and enjoying public respect in British Columbia. After alluding to the settlement of the strike in British Columbia, there is a passage which I may be permitted to read. Referring to the settlement Mr. Clute had been permitted to take part in, Mr. Smith refers to the result as follows:

Looked at from a public standpoint, there is every satisfaction, and the settlement is regarded by the people of this province as one of the best things that any government ever did in the way of sending conciliators on the ground where the trouble existed, and I am certain that the settlement saved this province from a very serious calamity, which would have stopped the development of the mines for years to come and put back the real cause of labour in the province for ten years.

I hardly think, Mr. Speaker, much more evidence is necessary in order to commend that portion of the Bill to the approval of parliament. There is another portion of it which proposes to establish a labour department, and states what the duties of that labour department shall be. As I stated when I introduced the Bill, I repeat now, that the Labour Department will not be a separate department of government, but will be attached to some minister of the government. It does not mean the establishment of a new portfolio, but merely an additional duty assigned to some minister. The Department of Labour will issue a monthly labour gazette, and in addition will submit an annual report to parliament. The labour gazette will be edited and conducted on the lines of the *Labour Gazette* in England.

Mr. CLARKE. How is that *Gazette* conducted?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They have an editor and a number of correspondents in different places in Great Britain. It is the duty of these correspondents to constantly gather facts that are of value and instructive to those engaged in industrial life and to communicate them to the central office there to be analysed, digested and published for the information of the industrial classes.

Mr. CLARKE. Are these correspondents to be paid for their services?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is some slight remuneration. The first number of the *Labour Gazette* of Great Britain was issued in 1894, and the introduction to it stands good as the introduction to our *Labour Gazette*. The announcement on the first page of the first number is as follows:

### The Objects of the 'Labour Gazette.'

The 'Labour Gazette' is a journal for the use of workmen, and of all others interested in obtaining prompt and accurate information on matters specially affecting labour. It is intended to stand to labour questions in the same relation as the 'Board of Trade Journal' to questions of trade and commerce. In other words, official information bearing on the interests of labour will be adapted for general use and made public, including information which the department obtains from its correspondents largely for the purpose of publication. . . .

With mere questions of opinion, the 'Labour Gazette' will not be concerned. The aim of the department in the publication is to provide a sound basis for the formation of opinions, and not to supply opinions.

It will be the duty of those who have to conduct the Labour Gazette to follow upon these lines. The importance of the Labour Gazette giving statistical information to persons engaged in industrial life, I think, will be generally conceded. It was some years before the *Labour Gazette* of Great Britain was established after public opinion had called for its establishment. As early as 1886 there was a resolution of the English parliament in the following words :

In the opinion of this House immediate steps should be taken to ensure in this country the full and accurate collection and publication of labour statistics.

The *Labour Gazette* of England has been published monthly ever since, and I have here the last publication for the month of May, 1900. I think in its general character it represents the publication generally, and reading from the title page, if hon. gentlemen will permit me, I will show the class of questions that are dealt with by this Gazette :

Employment Chart, 1899-1900; State of the Labour Market in April; Diseases of Occupations; Abstract of Labour Statistics; Accident, Old Age and Invalidity Insurance in Germany in 1898; Recent Conciliation and Arbitration Cases and Collective Agreements; Legal Cases Affecting Labour; Labour in the Colonies; Labour Abroad; Reports on Special Industries (Coal Mining, Iron Mining, Pig Iron, Iron and Steel Works, Tinplate, Seamen, Agricultural Labour, Women in Textile Trades, Shipbuilding); London Dock and Wharf Labour; Employment in London and Provinces; Industrial Accidents; Changes in Rates of Wages; Changes in Hours of Labour; Miscellaneous Trade Notes; Dividends on Purchases Paid by Co-operative Distributive Societies; Emigration and Immigration; Trade Disputes; Pauperism; Labour Bureaux; Foreign Trade of the United Kingdom; Women's Employment Bureaux; Industrial Organizations and Industrial Prosecutions.

That is a bill of fare in the *Labour Gazette* for May, which is most interesting and the knowledge of which subjects will be most valuable to all (be they employers or employees), engaged in the industrial life of Canada. Whilst our subjects are to be treated in the Gazette will not altogether correspond with these, still, the direction in which this Gazette has gone suggests how

Mr. MULOCK.

useful a properly conducted publication of this sort may be to the industrial classes of Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the employers of labour to be consulted as to the condition of the labour market by these correspondents ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend will have to allow the working out of the matter to proceed on the general lines I have indicated. It will be the duty of whoever is charged from time to time with the publication of the Labour Gazette to see that the Gazette fills its proper place and secures information from proper and reliable sources. It will be an error to suppose that any one class is to be considered in gathering information, because all this information will be applicable to the whole field of labour as a proper subject to be given to the public generally. It will be the duty of those charged with the publication, the conduct and the management of the Gazette, to see that it fills its proper place in the industrial world of Canada.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General if this Bill is entirely original, or whether there is any precedent for a Bill of this kind. I have read the New Zealand, the New South Wales and English Acts and the very condition upon which they are based is the incorporation and registration of trades unions, if I recollect correctly. If these are regularly incorporated and registered the Act applies, but in reading over this Bill I fail to see any means by which you can arrive at a conclusion, for instance, as to the question, who are the workmen interested. If you are dealing with trades unions, or with their officers, you know whom you are dealing with, but suppose a lot of workmen are satisfied and a lot are dissatisfied, who is going to speak for them when they are pulling apart. The English, New Zealand and New South Wales Acts make provision for all these emergencies. Looking at it very hastily it strikes me that this Bill is very crude, and has not the very first principle in it to arrive at a basis of conciliation. The first principle of this Bill is to place entirely in the hands of the minister the appointment of a board of conciliation. As I recollect—it is some two or three years since I read the English, New Zealand and New South Wales Acts—they make provision for the appointment by the men of one conciliator just as you appoint an arbitrator, and the appointment by the employer of another member of the board. These two men get together, and in a friendly way talk the whole matter over, and inquire into the facts, and if they cannot agree between themselves they call upon the arbitrators who are to be appointed under the provisions of the Act. This arbitration board makes a final decision which is binding on the trades unions.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The New Zealand Act is only operative where there is organized labour. But, the English Act is different altogether. The hon. gentleman describes the Bill before the House as crude and devoid of any machinery to put it into force.

**Mr. POWELL**. It has no principle of vitality.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The hon. gentleman in saying that, attacks the wisdom of the Imperial parliament which passed this measure.

**Mr. POWELL**. This is not the Imperial Act.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Word for word the Imperial Act is here, and in addition to that there are some clauses which I submit with modesty for the consideration of this House. The machinery contemplated by this Bill for conciliation is word for word the machinery of the Imperial Act with the exception that the word 'minister' in this Bill takes the places of the words 'Board of Trade' in the English Act, which words in English imply a minister of the Crown.

**Mr. POWELL**. How many English Acts are there?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. This is the English Act of 1895.

**Mr. POWELL**. It is some years since I looked into the English law.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I see the mistake which the hon. gentleman has made; he has not read the English Act of 1896.

**Mr. POWELL**. I have not.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I will repeat for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, that in 1896, the Imperial parliament repealed certain legislation referring to settlement by arbitration, and it passed what is called 'The Conciliation Act, 1896,' an Act which has been in force ever since and under which important trade differences have been settled.

**Mr. POWELL**. That wiped out these long Acts that existed previously.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It wiped out several, and it adopted a great many conciliation boards then in existence. The policy of the Imperial government was not to do anything directly, but to induce employees and employers to get together.

**Mr. POWELL**. On the principle that it is often ignorance or misconstruction of the other's motives, which causes these differences.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Quite so. It was considered that the best settlement and the most permanent one would

be reached when the parties had broken down the barriers which separated them, and when they came to look upon each other as brothers they could make a friendly settlement between themselves.

**Mr. POWELL**. I am in favour of the principle; you need not argue that.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. As the result of my research into the matter, I have found that the Imperial Act has been productive of substantial good and has been the means of permanent settlement in cases where a coercive measure might not have produced such good results. As to this point, may I be permitted to quote from the book of Henry Crompton, which was published prior to the passage of the Act.

**Mr. POWELL**. I have read the book. He recites a long page of history of the success of voluntary measures.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Yes. He compares in advance of this measure the preference that should be given to voluntary conciliation before and above any kind of force, legal or otherwise. This was one of the writings that educated public opinion in Great Britain, so that it was possible to crystallize it in the Conciliation Act of 1896. Mr. Crompton is somewhat severe on us of the legal profession, but we can afford to stand that. He writes:

It is better, therefore, not to depend on legal means, but for both sides to rely solely on moral means, and to endeavour to strengthen that in every way. By trusting to legal redress, I cannot but think that an obstacle is put in the way of the development of the mutual trust between employers and employed which is the only real reconciliation. The statute gives a very excellent form of contract, and may possibly be used in some industries, but will have little practical effect, as the opinion of both employers and employed, confirmed by experience, is against legal and in favour of voluntary arbitration outside the law. Here, as in so many other parts of our social life, we find the legal system becoming inefficient and antiquated. Legal remedies and the legal system were created by the past. The law and the lawyers have been the instruments of part of the human progress, and they have still a great and noble work to do. But it is a work that must constantly diminish. Professional lawyers naturally exaggerate the importance of their own profession, and judges will inevitably attempt to arrogate to themselves a moral authority which they do not possess. On labour questions they have shown how utterly incapable they were of grasping the conditions of the moral problem. The history of their actions in the labour laws and in the law of conspiracy ought to be the most valuable warning to the working classes not to trust to law for the solutions of these great industrial and social difficulties. The law and our tribunals, admirable and worthy of veneration as they often are, cannot be the means of reconciling capital and labour.

I should explain that prior to the passage of the Conciliation Act, the Imperial parliament had established a labour department

and a labour gazette; which is a handmaid in making effective the Conciliation Act. In this measure we propose to establish a labour department and a labour gazette which is not provided for in the English Act, but which was in existence before that Act was passed and continues in existence. The Bill contains one paragraph which may fairly be a subject of discussion and I will be glad to have its merits discussed in committee. There is a clause providing that on the consent of the parties to the controversy and of the conciliators, the government may authorize a person to take evidence upon oath. It sometimes happens that misunderstandings arise between employers and employees because of an imperfect knowledge of the facts, the elucidation of which would probably remove the grounds of dispute. Accordingly, provision is made in this Bill for evidence to be taken under oath by consent.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Would that be done under the Act respecting inquiries in certain public matters?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It could be done under that machinery; but it will be observed that that portion of the Bill cannot be taken advantage of except both parties consent. There are sometimes trade secrets which those possessing them are not willing to give to the public, and therefore that portion of the Bill is based on the consent of both parties. In fact the whole measure presupposes consent and the result of mutual agreement and not otherwise.

Mr. POWELL. It is entirely advisory.

Mr. DAVIN. Has the minister constructed this clause in consequence of a demand made by any parties?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, Mr. Clute, who was engaged in the settlement of the trouble in British Columbia informed me that a good deal of the difference between the mineowners and the miners was because they did not understand the facts.

Mr. INGRAM. Was that in the early stage of the dispute?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. After the strike was on, Mr. Clute told me that if he could have obtained information which would have been accepted as authoritative by both sides, it would have paved the way for an earlier settlement. Mr. Clute himself suggested to me the clause I am now referring to; but it is an experiment and it is not available except by the consent of both parties, and, therefore, it can do no harm if it is made a part of this Bill. I am glad to see, from the tone of the House, that the measure in its principle commends itself to hon. members. There is a wide distinction between the settlement of a difference by conciliation and its settlement after a

Mr. MULOCK.

strike. This measure contemplates, not merely dealing with a trouble that has broken out, but taking early action when a difference is springing up, and before it has assumed the proportions of a dispute, or before the dispute has assumed the proportions of a strike or lock-out; and it may be put in force by any party to the controversy, or it might be put in force by the minister himself, if so advised. So that the measure has a good object, and I trust will receive the hearty approval of parliament, which is of great importance to its effectiveness. The measure contemplates conciliation. I do not know that we can by any conciliatory measure bring together the two parties in this House on any question; but I venture to hope that the spirit of this Bill may find a response from the members of this House in dealing with this subject.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the hon. gentleman quite sure that this measure will not interfere with similar legislation passed by the provincial legislatures?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has been legislation in this direction in the various provinces. It is not necessary to criticise that legislation adversely or otherwise, but I do not know that any great use has been made of it. For example, there is the Ontario Act, which requires the assent of both parties for the submission of a difference to arbitration. But this Bill interferes with no other legislation in Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the Labour Gazette to be strictly confined to statistics, and not to give expression to opinion with regard to trade disputes or anything of that kind? And is the paper to be an advertising medium for patent medicines?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The first point my hon. friend raised, I have already dealt with, by stating that the Gazette will be a register of facts, and not for the expression of opinion. If it were to be a medium for the expression of opinions, it would cease, I think, to have the educational value which we expect it to have. It will follow, as near as may be, the *Labour Gazette of Great Britain*.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman intend that it should also be a medium for advertising?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a matter of detail which has not yet been considered. It will depend on the character of the advertisements perhaps. I will not take up the time of the House any further, except to express the hope that if this measure receives the assent of parliament, in the form in which it is now presented, or in some amended form, it may prove of some avail in bringing about more friendly relations between labour and capital, and in substituting industrial peace for industrial war. Strikes and lock-outs, the exercise of

physical force, are industrial war. Sooner or later, they have to be settled at great cost; and an agreement is at last arrived at which might have been arrived at without such great cost, and without leaving behind it the heart-burnings and estrangements which must linger long after a formal strike or lock-out has been enforced. I humbly submit this measure for the best consideration of parliament, and I believe that, if passed, it will be productive of great good, and prove to be one of the most important measures that have ever emanated from the parliament of Canada.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to ask if, in case of a dispute about the sufficiency of wages, it is contemplated to have an investigation of the margin of profits of the manufacturer or producer; and if so, is it intended to give the conciliator powers similar to those given to commissioners by chapter 114. of the Revised Statutes, if he desires to have evidence taken under oath, in order that contradictory statements may be harmonized and the truth evolved, when the feeling between labour and capital is very intense?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Any subject of difference between an employer and his employees can become a subject of consideration by a conciliator or a conciliation board. Most of the questions, so far as I have read the reports, have had to do, not only with wages, but with other questions, such as the hours of labour, sanitary conditions, and a great many other matters.

Mr. POWELL. So far as my experience goes, the mechanics of the country are a great deal more reasonable than they are given credit for. If they are satisfied that the margin of profits will not permit of an increase of wages, they are generally reasonable enough to accept the situation, and take the reduced wages offered to them. Under these circumstances, is it contemplated to have the conciliator inquire into the margin of profits, with the view of satisfying the employees as to the rate of wages which the industry will bear?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot better answer my hon. friend's question than by informing him that he will find the report of the settlement of a great coal strike in the north of England.

Mr. POWELL. That is the Newcastle strike?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps so. I have read so many of these settlements in the iron and coal trades, that I cannot recall a particular one. They went into the question of profits, which was a very important question, often the question, and the history I have read stated that the workmen had been given full information on that question, and not one had ever disclosed that confidential information. That

very question, the extent to which the trade would stand an increase of wages, was made clear, and a settlement arrived at.

Mr. POWELL. I am glad that is contemplated.

Mr. J. H. BELL (East Prince, P.E.I.) I am in favour of the principle and the object of this Bill, but am not so sanguine as to the benefits to be anticipated from it as is the hon. minister.

Our experience in this country, and the experience of England, is that in times of prosperity there are very few disputes between capital and labour; and inasmuch as a period of prosperity now exists in Canada, and is likely to continue a considerable time, there is happily but little prospect of our requiring to put this measure into operation.

Again, the experience of a similar measure in England has shown that since 1896 only 7 per cent of all the disputes in that country between capital and labour have been settled by boards of conciliation. The other 93 per cent were settled by the parties among themselves, or in some other manner apart from outside interference. In this country, therefore, we cannot expect that more than a similar percentage of the disputes will be settled by a resort to the provisions of the Bill before the House.

Further, labour organizations in this country and elsewhere, have so perfected their constitutions that they contain within themselves the means of settling disputes by arbitration. Their bylaws always contain provisions for referring any difficulties that may arise to a board of arbitration, so that there is little necessity in practice for the system of arbitration provided for in this measure.

Nowadays knowledge is widely spread, and the relations between capital and labour fairly understood among the workmen. The workmen are studying these subjects more closely, and hence are becoming more reasonable than they used to be, so that as education advances among them, there will be less liability to disputes of this kind than in the past, when ignorance of these great questions was prevalent.

Besides, there is no certainty of any boards of conciliation being formed in this country under this Bill. In England the conditions are different. In this country we have a dispute, for instance in Atlin or Kootenay, and there will be no board of conciliation established in either of these places.

Under these circumstances, I cannot take the same sanguine view of the results to be accomplished by this measure as is entertained by the hon. minister who has introduced it. Still, as a similar measure has led to the settlement of 7 per cent of the disputes that have taken place in England, and as there is a reasonable probability that a similar number of disputes may be settled

here, under the operation of this measure, I am in favour of the Bill as introduced.

Mr. POWELL. I trust that the hon. the Postmaster General will not interpret the few remarks that I made in interrogating him, as being hostile to the principle of the Bill or the Bill itself. I did not understand exactly what the hon. gentleman meant by the Bill, not having heard his explanation or had the privilege of having a copy of the Bill to read. I may say, however, that coming as I do from a county where there is a very large labour element, I most heartily endorse the principle of this Bill. I differ from my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Bell), because in dealing with this question we are dealing with one of the most difficult questions probably that thrust themselves into the arena of industrial affairs, and I think that the Bill itself, in its very crudeness and nakedness, is likely to be much more productive of good results than if it proceeded on more definite lines, and looked to the establishment of more cast-iron institutions than we have in Canada. The machinery could not be more elastic, and the whole object is simply a benevolent one. The Bill does not contemplate making decrees that have the force of law, but simply proceeds on the assumption embodied in the lines, 'We would love each better if we knew each other more,' or the principle announced a very long while ago, that the great differences between humanity probably resulted in ignorance of each other's motives. This is purely conciliation intending to bring about peace between two disputants by affording some means of bringing them together. Neither disputant cares to take the initiative, but when a difficulty arises here is the procedure to enable an outside party entirely, a party not interested except out of a feeling of good-citizenship, a party recognized by the government of the country, and therefore, not liable to be treated as one taking upon himself a matter that is none of his business—here is a procedure to enable such a party to effect a conciliation, and I look forward to most beneficial results from the adoption of the Bill.

In England this principle of conciliation has worked out most marvellous results wherever it has been established, and the records of the boards of conciliation are appealed to by gentlemen who study thoroughly the labour question as showing these boards to be the most effective means of settling the difficulties between labour and capital. Therefore, this Bill shall have my most enthusiastic support.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I was out of the House when the hon. the Postmaster General concluded his remarks. I would ask him if we have not had a Conciliation Act in force in Ontario for some years, and if he knows anything as to its operation?

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.)

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Conciliation Act in the province of Ontario cannot be put in motion except by the consent of both parties, but this measure can be set in motion at the suggestion of either, or by the minister himself, without the consent of either.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). I happen to represent a constituency in which this Bill will be hailed with great pleasure. In the town of Springhill, the largest single colliery in Nova Scotia, in a period of ten years, they went through nine strikes. One of these strikes lasted nine weeks. I have had some experience myself in dealing with these strikes, and I am bound to say that the only way I have ever seen of settling them is to bring the parties together so that they may understand each other better and argue out their differences, and whether the parties are brought together by their own motion or by an outsider, who acts as conciliator between them, a settlement is generally the result.

I cannot for one moment agree with the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Bell) when he says that nine-tenths of the strikes could be settled without conciliation. I do not think he speaks with knowledge of the facts or with experience in this matter, or he would not make such a statement. The history of the past has been, at least in the province of Nova Scotia, that these differences cannot be settled as between the parties. I have seen strikes where there was very little difference between the employer and the employee, yet after days and even weeks had gone by it was absolutely impossible for the two parties to come together for a settlement without the intervention of a third party.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) I was speaking from the latest returns with regard to strikes in England.

Mr. LOGAN. The latest returns with regard to strikes in England showed that, under the Act of which the Bill proposed by the Postmaster General is a facsimile, six out of seven of the strikes have been settled.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Six-sevenths of the references have been settled. Perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) would allow me to interject an explanation. I think he has been misled a little. I would say that in England this conciliation measure did not originate the policy of settling industrial disputes by conciliation. Voluntary conciliation boards had existed prior to this Act and have since continued. Those existing at the time of the passing of the Act registered, and new ones have come in since and registered. And the record—the book I have in my hand, the last official report of the Department of Labour to the House of Commons in England—shows that hundreds and hundreds of difficulties and disputes have been settled within the last year

by conciliation boards. I believe that in one trade alone there have been seven hundred settlements. They may not all be settled under the Act, but they are settled by conciliation boards recognized by the Act and, perhaps a great many of them through the teachings and influence of the Act and the development of goodwill and the recognition by public opinion and by parliament of that mode of settlement.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) What percentage, according to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Mulock's) reading, has been settled directly through the instrumentality of the Act passed in 1896?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are no statistics to answer that question. The Act provides, for instance, that trades and interests may invoke its machinery, and I find a list of a large number of trades that have agreed, in the case of any controversy or troubles, to abide by the decision of the arbitrator or umpire to be sent down by the Board of Trade. There might be no record of a settlement of that kind. The record we have is of the cases that have come directly before the board for settlement. And in this report you find hundreds and hundreds of settlements by the machinery of conciliation, whether technically by the conciliators appointed under the Act or by conciliation boards recognized by the Act, or through the machinery of the Act by arbitrators chosen—and all these all tributes to the efficacy of the principle.

Mr. LOGAN. The hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Bell) has also said that, owing to the better education of the working classes there is less liability to great strikes in the future. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman in that proposition, because it seems to me that the more the workmen are educated the less they are inclined to put up with the inconveniences and hardships of past years. Nor do I think that he will find that the statistics for the past few years will warrant the statement he has made. For I think it must be admitted that within the last few years the greatest strikes in the history of the world have taken place in Great Britain and in the United States. At this very present hour, there is a strike covering a large district of the United States which is assuming alarming proportions and manifesting alarming conditions.

A few moments ago I was referring to the town of Springhill, where a large number of strikes have taken place. Something over a year ago, the men themselves and the management agreed upon a conciliation board in that town, and they chose about half a dozen of the leading merchants of the town as conciliators. Since that time peace has reigned in the town, greater peace than has reigned there for the last fifteen years at least. So, should a dispute arise between a workman and his employer, the case is

immediately referred to the conciliation board of merchants, and they give their decisions; and the parties have so far abided by those decisions and strikes have been averted. The trouble in the past has been that we have not had the means by which we could set the conciliation machinery in motion. It seems to me that this Bill provides for that, as it has been explained by the Postmaster General; because, if neither of the parties will agree to conciliation, the minister administering the labour bureau can interfere himself and endeavour to settle the strike by conciliation. This is, in my opinion, most important legislation. Any one who has had any experience in labour difficulties, particularly in the strikes that have taken place in the past, must know that their effect is of the most serious and damaging character upon the community in which they take place. Not only does the strike affect the workmen themselves and their wives and children, but it affects the whole commercial community. It affects particularly the merchants of the town in which the strike takes place. And those who have seen strikes have not only seen trouble among the men, not only recognized the suffering among the women and children of those who are interested in the strike, but have seen merchants become insolvent and towns also become nearly bankrupt—often because there was not some one to come in and bring together the contending parties. As a representative of labouring men, as a representative of a constituency in which labour unions exist and in which there is employment given to a very large number of workmen, I hail with delight this legislation looking toward the establishment of better feeling between workmen and their employers. No more important legislation, in my opinion, has ever been introduced in this parliament. I trust that the spirit of conciliation which has been shown by hon. members on the other side who have spoken on this question in approaching this from a non-partisan standpoint will inure to the benefit of the workmen of this country, and that, in the future, we may avoid a repetition of such labour disputes as have taken place in different parts of Canada in days gone by.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) I am heartily in accord with the Bill, so far as I can understand it, believing that it will tend to prevent a repetition of the lamentable strikes that have taken place. I listened with great pleasure to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) who has just taken his seat, because I myself have had a great deal of experience in strikes and other disputes that have occurred between miners and their employers. I can verify all the hon. gentleman says with regard to the distressing results of such strikes. I never knew a strike take place that did not result in great loss both to employers and employed. Nobody makes anything out of a strike, and

a large amount of money is lost to everybody concerned and to the country at large. As far as I understand the Bill, it seems to me it is bound to do a great deal of good. I only trust that it will be found, as the Postmaster General has said it is, elastic in all its clauses; because I do not think that any Act that lays down a hard and fast rule authorizing the government to step in under any and all circumstances and interfere between employers and employees would work satisfactorily. I trust that the Bill will bring about the best results that we look for from its operation.

Mr. T. BEATTIE (London). This appears to me a very harmless Bill. If it does no good it will do no harm. However, I am glad to see any move made in the direction of assisting in settling the disputes between workmen and employers. I have not much faith in arbitration boards. This House will remember that last summer we had a street railway strike in the city of London. The men had organized a union and the company had refused to recognize that union in the manner the men wished them to do. There were several committees organized one after the other, but each of these committees seemed to increase the difficulty of settlement. The strike was not settled, it lasted for over five months, and finally ended in the defeat of the men. I can only say that I think this Bill will do no harm, and we can at least give it a trial. If it does not work properly it can be amended or repealed.

Mr. PUTTEE. The House does not seem disposed to discuss this matter very seriously, and I presume one reason is that it has been brought down so late in the session. We have been told the measure is non-contentious. I think I may also say that it will be non-effective. Of course, we are perfectly safe in extolling the virtues of conciliation, we are all in favour of conciliation. It is very pleasing and very satisfying to talk of conciliation in times of peace; it is extremely difficult to apply it after hostilities have broken out. I may refer to the last experience that we had in Canada in which Mr. Clute's mission was successful. But in that case the strike had been on eight months and both sides had had about all the strike they wanted, and all the damage that could be done was done by that strike, all the evils that a good Bill, if applied, would advert, had already occurred. Then, at an expense of six or seven thousand dollars conciliation was resorted to and a settlement was patched up, some kind of an arrangement that will last probably for a few months. I am not antagonistic to this Bill, I am prepared to accept and to apply anything that will in any way relieve this great question of industrial disturbance. But I do think that if we are going to make an experiment we might consider something really serious and try as far as possible to

Mr. PRIOR.

avail ourselves of the experience that has been dearly purchased by other countries. The hon. the minister said that we were not embarking on a new principle, and I think he is quite right. It is a fact that we are not embarking on a new principle, I believe he could have gone further and have told us that we are the last legislature to embark on this principle at all, and to the extent it goes we are on safe ground. I am unalterably in favour of the New Zealand principle adopted in their Conciliation and Arbitration Act, because I think that something should be done to remove the evils caused by strikes and industrial disturbances. I am in favour of that, because it is the only effective principle, the only one that has attained the object for which it was framed. The Bill before us is based on the English Act. The third section of this Bill provides:

3. Any board established either before or after the passing of this Act, which is constituted for the purpose of settling disputes between employers and workmen by conciliation or arbitration, or any association or body authorized by an agreement in writing made between employers and workmen to deal with such disputes (in this Act referred to as a conciliation board) may apply to the minister for registration under this Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, where you have men who have drawn up an agreement of conciliation, I am sure it hardly needs an Act of parliament to make that agreement effective. When the men have got together and have drawn up an agreement, you have the two elements that will give effect to conciliation. That is a very simple proposition, that if you can only get the men together and get them to agree to arbitration before arbitration is necessary, the whole difficulty is overcome. The machinery contained in this clause of the Bill, I believe, is the only part of it that will be used, and it will be used to a very limited extent, because in Canada we have very few such boards, very few agreements that have been drawn up in times of peace preparing for times of hostility. There are, I think, two or three different kinds of conciliation Acts. There are Acts in some countries that are purely ornamental, passed with no intention of their being used. This Act is modelled after the English Act, but the British parliament is the greatest capitalistic club on earth, it is hardly the best place to look for conciliation Acts that would be fair to both parties. The New Zealand Conciliation and Arbitration Act was passed about 1894, after the colony had been through stormy industrial weather, after its industries had almost been crippled, and when the colony was in pretty bad shape financially. This Act was introduced as an experiment only. The experiment has proved successful, and I do not think that anybody can say that it is now looked upon as simply a temporary measure. In their last report that has reached this country, bearing on the operations of the conciliation and arbitrations,

and also reviewing the scope and character of the Act and the additions that have been made to it, I noticed this very pregnant phrase :

The present merit of this Act is that it reaches down to remove even the tiniest industrial irritant.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is the hon. gentleman quoting from ?

Mr. PUTTEE. The Minister of the Labour Bureau of New Zealand, after this Act has been in operation five or six years. If you try to apply that sentence to our Bill here, you will see whether that will remove anything in the way of an irritant. This New Zealand Act has been prominently before the minds of the people in this country who have been paying attention to this matter, and the objection to it has been voiced in this House this afternoon, namely, that New Zealand is a small colony, and that it has full jurisdiction, that the Act could not be applied in Canada because of the want of jurisdiction in this parliament over provincial affairs. While that objection is good, that Act is very superior to any voluntary conciliation Act, and I believe we should do better to adopt that principle. We could make it applicable to all corporations and institutions which are operating in more than one province, imparting a Dominion character to the Act. By putting it on the statute-books of Canada we would take a step that would result in having it brought into force in the different provinces, because, I believe, they would accept it. I believe they would do so because some of the provinces now have voluntary Conciliation Acts upon their statute-books, although I think they have wasted their time in adopting them. I believe the principle to which I have referred would be speedily availed of by the different provinces if we adopted it, and that the Act itself could be put in force by vote of the legislatures. An. hon. gentleman on the other side of the House mentioned the street car strike in London which has been waged for fifteen months now. It has not been settled yet, although Ontario has a good Conciliation Act, as conciliation Acts go, on its statute-books. The theory upon which such Acts as these were based was that they would do some good. This Act has not been availed of at all. I think if we were to put the New Zealand principle in operation we would see a number of the provinces following in that line. The objection that has been taken to the English Act is an objection that applies to every Act of this kind, that it may be all right, but it does not do the work it was framed for. It has conciliated six-sevenths of the cases that have been brought under its provisions, but how many cases have been brought under it? The number is simply a drop in the bucket compared with the total number of labour disputes that

have occurred in England. Under the New Zealand Act either party can make a reference to a new court that has been created, and this court proceeds, happily, without the intervention of lawyers. The reports of the operations of this court are that its findings have been eminently satisfactory whenever it has been consulted. The beauty of it is that if you have a strike the strike is in the court room and not in the workshop. I do not see any value in United States reports of arbitration cases, because they do not take kindly to the settlement of disputes in this way, and I believe the United States will be the last country to wake up to the urgency of this matter of the settlement of industrial disputes. When the Bill comes down to deal with the labour gazette, I most heartily endorse it, and because of that principle, I can afford to accept the whole Bill. I shall not be disappointed in the Conciliation Bill, because I expect nothing from it. I do expect that if properly operated, the department of labour and the labour gazette will be very valuable to this country. We have already lost a lot of valuable time in not having our statistics collected and kept for record. I have here the journal of the Department of Labour of New Zealand, a much smaller publication than that which the Board of Trade produces in Great Britain, but it ought to satisfy those gentlemen who are a little fearsome that there will be political matter and patent medicine advertisements in it. It is a very small publication, but as it comes out regularly it effects the purpose. The whole purpose of a labour gazette issued under government auspices should be the collection of reliable information and the recording of statistics on matters appertaining to industrialism and labour in this country.

Mr. INGRAM. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) introduced this Bill the other day, I took occasion then to draw his attention to a few suggestions which I thought might be incorporated in it, but I find, to-day, that he has not done anything in the direction which I suggested. What I wish to say, now, before the second reading of the Bill, is that I approve of the Bill. I quite agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) in the belief that very little advantage will be taken of conciliation by mutual consent, but if the Act is placed on the statute-book, we have gone a step, perhaps, in the right direction, because, at a later period, some person may have the Act amended in such a way as, perhaps, will meet the objections which have been taken to it on this ground. The hon. Postmaster General said to-day that under this Bill the Governor in Council could undertake to investigate a difficulty without the consent of both the parties interested.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, not 'without.'

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, one part of it; but I did not mean that he could act under that clause which provides for the taking of evidence.

Mr. CLARKE. As I understand it, there is nothing compulsory in the Bill at all.

Mr. INGRAM. Take, for instance, the case of the Grand Trunk Railway strike that occurred a year ago; without the consent of the management of the Grand Trunk Railway and of the employees, this Bill would have no effect at all. They would require to mutually agree before this Bill would affect the case at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I have been misunderstood. What I desired to convey when I said that there was nothing compulsory in the Bill was, that you could not compel any person to abide by any advice or decision, but the first subsection of section 4 provides:

Where a difference exists or is apprehended between an employer or any class of employers and workmen, or between different classes of workmen, the minister may, if he thinks fit, exercise all or any of the following powers, namely:

(a) Inquire into the causes and circumstances of the difference, &c.

He may proceed further on to suggest the appointment of conciliators.

Mr. INGRAM. But, so far as both parties to the dispute are concerned, they can ignore that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They can.

Mr. INGRAM. I can quite readily understand the difficulty this parliament will have in passing legislation that will compel both parties to a dispute to agree to conciliation or arbitration. I understand there are a great many obstacles in the way, and that it is a very difficult question to solve. This Bill may not be worth very much at present, but, by placing it upon the statute-book we may open up the way for some person at some future time to bring in a provision amending it in such a way as to meet the objections which have been made.

Mr. CLARKE. Like the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), I endorse and approve of the principle of the Bill. As he says, if it does not do any good it certainly cannot do any harm. Neither of the parties to a dispute need avail themselves of the provisions of the Bill, but it is certainly a wholesome measure, inasmuch as it proposes to provide machinery whereby, if both parties are agreeable, arbitrators may be appointed and the disastrous consequences which often result when a strike has to be resorted to may be avoided. I think the objections taken by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), as to the time at which

Mr. MULOCK.

this Bill has been introduced, are well taken. It is true, as the hon. Postmaster General has said, that reference was made to the Bill in the speech from the Throne, and that that speech was delivered between five and six months ago. But, if I understood the hon. gentleman correctly, on June 12 he cabled to Lord Strathcona for some information as to the operation of the Conciliation Act in England, and he intimated to his lordship that similar legislation was 'contemplated' here. It seems to me that it would have been a great deal better if the Bill had been introduced at an earlier stage of the session, and if an opportunity had been given to hon. members on both sides of the House to obtain copies of the Bill, and to send them to the parties who would be most interested in the operation of the measure when it becomes law, namely, the employers of labour and the employees.

The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), says that this is the most important piece of legislation that has been introduced into this parliament for a long time, but if we are to judge by the scant attendance of members—there are scarcely three dozen in the House—not a great deal of interest is taken in it. I believe, however, Mr. Speaker, that it is a measure in the right direction. If machinery is provided to which the attention of arbitrary employers or hot-headed employees can be drawn, and if as the result of putting that machinery into operation, strikes, loss of time, loss of wages, and loss of capital can be avoided, then I think the government and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock), especially are entitled to credit. I heartily support this Bill, and while I have not very much faith in the amount of good it will accomplish, yet believing it to be a movement in the right direction, we must hope for the very best from it.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee thereon.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3.

Mr. CLARKE. What are the advantages to be obtained by registration?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will enable the department to make use of these boards as the necessity may arise, and it will give the boards an official connection with the department.

Mr. INGRAM. It says the application must be accompanied by the constitution and by-laws and regulations. What are these?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Whatever they choose to adopt.

Mr. INGRAM. I am afraid that would not work, for the reason that in some districts, where there is a small population they may want to form a conciliation board and may have no rules and regulations.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In that event they would not have to send them.

Mr. PUTTEE. They are bound to have rules and regulations or they cannot be formed at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is the way it is in the Imperial Act.

On section 4,

Mr. PUTTEE. What is meant by subsection c?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the minister found there was no board, he might then appoint one.

Mr. CLARKE. That would be in case of trouble?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You need not wait for that.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it the intention to appoint boards of conciliation all over the country?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no intention about it. It is hoped that when the Act is passed the interests concerned will themselves organize and register.

Mr. CLARKE. That is the reason I asked the minister if it was his intention to appoint in case of trouble.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In case of trouble, the minister having charge of the Act would be governed by the circumstances. It would be far better if the interests concerned arranged a tribunal in advance of the trouble, which would prevent the trouble coming to a head.

Mr. INGRAM. These boards will be purely voluntarily, I suppose?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no distinct policy with reference to the matter. It may be thought prudent to encourage the formation of these boards and I think the hon. gentleman would approve of that.

Mr. CLARKE. In case of trouble.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is our present hope that the people themselves will make use of this machinery.

Mr. McDOUGALL. In case neither of the parties agree to refer to the minister, would he act of his own motion?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This will be purely a matter of discretion when the case arises. Whoever is in charge of the measure will have to consider the situation, and if he thinks he could profitably offer his friendly offices, he will, no doubt, do so.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). There is one thing which strikes me as somewhat singular about this. The first part of the section provides for registering the boards of conciliation and assumes they will be in existence, but section 4, which is really the

heart of the whole Act and provides for the machinery, makes no reference to boards of conciliation at all. It provides that where there is apprehension of difficulty, the minister may take certain action, and then it says he may take such steps as to him may seem expedient, under section b. Is the 'person or body' referred to in subsection b, a board of conciliation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, that is the person or body to nominate a chairman.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). In this section 4, which seems to contain the machinery of the Act, the board of conciliation is dropped out of sight. As the great purpose of this Act is to promote the formation of these boards of conciliation, I would suggest that more prominence be given to the board of conciliation in preference to calling upon other parties or institutions to supply any other kind of machinery.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think my hon. friend has not quite apprehended the whole clause. It enables the minister to do what he might do without the Act, but might hesitate to do. The first subsection provides that he may, if he thinks it wise to do so, inquire, and his inquiry may take the form of trying to get the parties to meet together. When they meet together, in order to be organized, the first step is to get a chairman. Then they can have a further meeting. The clause then goes on to provide that if they ask the minister to appoint a board, he may do so.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it the intention that the person who is to act as conciliator, shall be remunerated by the government for his services?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no policy on that point at present.

Mr. CLARKE. What has the minister in his mind about it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My own opinion is that the conciliator ought to be chosen and settled with by the interests involved.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the practice in England?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is done in that way.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it the intention to follow that practice here?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have never contemplated any other course. I have never discussed the point. I think the whole machinery should come from the people, including the remuneration, and be left to move automatically.

On section 7.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman had incorporated into this Act the 'Act respect-

ing inquiries concerning public matters,' it would be more convenient.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I wanted to make it quite clear that power should not be placed in the hands of commissioners, without the consent of all concerned.

On section 9.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. I understand that the intention is that the minister shall move without either of the parties asking him to do so?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. He may suggest the establishment of a conciliation board. Of course, that is a thing he could do without this authority; but the object of this provision is merely to free the minister from the embarrassment of doing an act apparently of his own motion without statutory suggestions.

On section 10.

Mr. **INGRAM**. I suppose this will involve the employing of some qualified person to edit this Labour Gazette. Would the hon. gentleman say whether he has any person in view at present for that position? It is a very important position, requiring some person well posted on labour matters, and one in whom the large body of labour men throughout the country will have confidence.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The hon. gentleman's question is a perfectly proper one, and I would say that I have some one in view, and if we are fortunate enough to get him, I think he will be entirely persona grata to all classes—the labouring class as well as the employers of labour.

Mr. **INGRAM**. I might suggest to the hon. gentleman that no person engaged very much in party politics, I care not whether he is a Grit or a Tory, would be very acceptable to labour men generally. If some person could be got who has not associated much in party politics, but who knows a good deal of labour matters, he would be the most acceptable.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I may say that the gentleman whom I have in my mind has not, so far as I am aware, ever taken part in Canadian party politics. I dare say he has his party bias, but if we are so fortunate as to get him, the objection which my hon. friend foreshadows, will have no place.

Mr. **A. W. PUTTEE** (Winnipeg). Is it the intention to include other matters in the department of labour, such as the Alien Labour Act, the commissioners under that Act, the minimum wage clause, and so forth?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The Bill at present only deals with the subject of the bureau and the Labour Gazette, but doubtless from time to time changes may be made. It may be that these duties are

Mr. **INGRAM**.

like movable feasts and can be sent over to the minister in question by order in council. I do not know that they are attached by Act of parliament to any particular minister.

On section 11,

Mr. **BELL** (Pictou). What expenses will be included in this? And how far is it the intention of the government to defray the expenses of whoever may be appointed to inquire into labour disputes? Is it the intention that the expenses of the arbitrators or commissioners should be paid by the government or thrown upon the parties?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The expense to be defrayed by the government would include the cost of the Labour Gazette. As to the other questions, I stated to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), that I thought that the boards of conciliation, being local, should be appointed by the interests concerned, and their expenses paid by the interests that appointed them. In like manner, if those conciliators should be empowered to take evidence, the taking of the evidence should also be at the expense of the parties concerned. But if the situation required, for instance, some expert to be sent, it might be proper for the government to pay his expenses.

Mr. **INGRAM**. This Act should be entitled 'The Conciliation and Arbitration Act.'

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The title will not matter, because it will be popularly known as 'The Conciliation Act of 1900.'

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

## AFTER RECESS.

### IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 186) respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Semple.)

### CENTRAL VERMONT RAILWAY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 171) respecting the Central Vermont Railway Company.—(Mr. Gibson.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1.

Mr. **JOHN HAGGART** (South Lanark.) I have not seen the amendment which, I believe, is to be proposed, but I speak of the Bill as it is before us. This gives a power to an American railway to purchase, lease and operate the railways of the Montreal Pro-

vince Line Railway Company, the Stanstead Shefford and Chambly Railway Company and the Montreal and Vermont Junction Railway Company. I suppose the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has fully considered the question of a foreign corporation purchasing railways in Canada. I do not know under what corporate powers they will work the railways. I do not know whether the Vermont Central Railway Company is a state corporation or what powers they have. But, I think it is objectionable to give to a foreign railway company the right to operate and own railway corporations entities in Canada. I notice there is no provision under the Bill as to the liabilities of these three companies that are to be taken over so as to protect the rights of those who have claims against them. It gives an absolute transfer of these companies to this foreign corporation.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I did not happen to be present at the meeting of the Railway Committee which took this matter up, being engaged elsewhere. Therefore, I am not able to speak of what occurred at that committee. But when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) asks whether I have considered the question of allowing foreign corporations to operate railways in Canada under their charter, I would recall to his mind an occasion when a Bill was considered by a sub-committee of the Railway Committee, of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) was a member, dealing with a similar case and involving the same question. I refer to the case of the different lines that were to be operated under the charter of the Buffalo Railway Company an American company, so declared on the face of the Bill. The sub-committee included the leading lawyers of the Railway Committee. We considered this question very carefully, and came to the conclusion that there was no serious objection to allowing this course to be pursued in that case, and I do not know of any distinction that can be drawn between that case and this. My hon. friend himself subscribed to the opinion of the sub-committee, and was quite in favour of the action taken.

Mr. SPROULE. Was that the Niagara Central?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The Bill I refer to came up during the present session of parliament—only four or five weeks ago. The Niagara Central had a railway in operation under that name. But, the Bill I referred to provided for the amalgamation of two roads on this side of the line with a third road incorporated and operating in the adjoining state under the name of the Buffalo Railway Company. I see no objection to allowing the Vermont Central Railway Company to acquire and control a Canadian railway. There might be special reasons in this case

why we should not allow it, but I am not aware of them.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the extent of the railways to be taken over?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). The Montreal Province Line Railway has a length of about forty miles between St. Lambert and Frelighsburg, passing through Farnham; the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway runs from St. Johns to Waterloo in Shefford County, a distance of about thirty miles; and the Montreal and Vermont Junction is a road starting from St. Johns, Que., and going to the Province Line near St. Armand, about twenty-two or twenty-three miles. Altogether, I should think these railways would represent a mileage of about 100 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. What position would the creditors of these roads be in?

Mr. HAGGART. Unless provisions is made, they would have no remedy.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I understood that there was an amendment to cover that point.

Mr. HAGGART. I am afraid that the precedent cited by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) will hardly apply to this particular road. If I remember, the Buffalo Railway Company was a corporation chartered by the state of New York—an electric railway company. The amalgamation gave them power to take over a couple of bridges. Formerly, a bridge connecting Canada and the United States could not be operated under one corporate power. We had to form two distinct corporations, one working the Canadian side of the bridge and one working the American side. However, this only took over a small electric railway company near the Niagara Falls, and there was a provision made in the Bill as to the indebtedness, there was a provision for having an office in Canada at which it could be served. The danger of a Bill like this which gives the Central Vermont Railway Company the right of issuing bonds over this road, is that it may become an international question at some time if we attempt any railway legislation which would interfere with the rights acquired by a foreign railway company in this country. Legislation like this ought to be very carefully looked after. I think at least it should have been submitted to the Justice Department to find out what corporate powers they obtained in these roads in Canada, whether they were to be worked under the corporate powers which they received from a foreign government, and whether we would have power, without special reservation and special mention in the Act, to legislating from time to time with reference to the road. I think there should be at least notice in the Bill that it is subject to our legislation, and that their

corporate powers which they acquire in Canada shall have no greater effect than these railroads have at present, that is the right of working in Canada. While I would not offer any objection to such legislation as would enable this railway company, which I believe is virtually the Grand Trunk Railway Company, to acquire these roads and work them, that legislation should be such as is approved by the Justice Department.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I understand the hon. gentleman to object to the passing of this Bill upon the general ground that we are allowing a corporation which derives its existence from a foreign state to become possessed of, and operate a railway in Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Now, my hon. friend thought it ought to be well considered, and asked whether I had well considered it. I call his attention to the fact that during this present session of parliament he was a member of a sub-committee which did consider a cognate question, in fact the identical question, and he was of opinion that there would be no objection to allowing the company to acquire the property, interests and rights which had been conferred upon the companies that were being amalgamated with that company by the parliament of Canada, or by the legislature of Ontario. He will remember that I expressed my extreme reluctance to subscribe to that principle, but the committee almost as a whole, I think, concluded that there was no serious objection to that, particularly when their attention was called to similar legislation which has passed this parliament, and to which the company had consented, allowing a provision to be inserted which would safeguard our rights as a parliament, and would recognize the jurisdiction of the Railway Act over it. Now, I was not present at that meeting of the Railway Committee when this Bill came up, but I understand the committee passed it with a clause similar to the amendments that were added to the Buffalo Railway Company's Bill. I think if they do that they will meet any objections that, at all events, the sub-committee of the Railway Committee had to the passing of the Buffalo Railway Bill.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you got the clauses?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have them in my hand:

The Central Vermont Railway Company, hereinafter called 'the company,' is invested with and shall be entitled to all the powers, privileges and rights as a corporation necessary for the convenient and proper carrying on of the

Mr. HAGGART.

business and undertakings in Canada in the next following section mentioned.

Then another clause relates to the subject to which the hon. member has made reference:

The company shall have an office at or near Montreal, and service of process or legal documents may be effected upon any clerk or officer employed therein, or upon the person then in charge thereof, and such service shall be good service upon and shall bind the company.

These were provisions that we deemed it prudent to make in the case of the Buffalo Railway Company.

Mr. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). Is it not specified that it shall be subject to our Railway Act?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, 'all the laws of Canada,' not simply of the Railway Act, but of any other Act.

Mr. TISDALE. I am not sure whether that makes it subject to the Railway Act, what you read.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It must necessarily be subject to the Railway Act, because the Railway Act is one of the laws of Canada.

Mr. TISDALE. Yes, but the Railway Act applies to all this legislation by virtue of its being made applicable to all our railways. It seems to me that section ought to be made clearer, that the Railway Act shall apply to the corporation.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (reading):

Nothing in this Act contained shall relieve the company from the observance of the laws of Canada or Ontario, as the case may be, except in so far as such laws are inconsistent with the acquisition and operation of the undertakings as hereby authorized.

I think that makes it clear enough.

Mr. HAGGART. Still, I think it ought to include 'and the Railway Act.' The Railway Act per se does not apply to this railway at all. It is simply because all our railways are subject to the Railway Act. Now, the Central Vermont Railway is not subject to the Railway Act because it is a foreign corporation. Therefore, when you say 'the laws of Canada' it would mean the general laws, it would not mean a specific law.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman will see that any railway legislation which emanates from this parliament is granted always subject to the provisions contained in the Railway Act, unless expressly excepted. We are giving powers to the Central Vermont Railway Company to acquire and operate this railway. Now, if we put in this Bill a provision that notwithstanding the fact that they are a foreign corpora-

tion they shall still be subject to the laws of Canada, you include all laws. There is no law which may be applicable to such companies which would be excepted, and which would not be operative.

Mr. HAGGART. I would urge the Minister of Railways and Canals again to consider that clause, and see that it is drafted properly, and if necessary to submit it to the Department of Justice.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think there can be any doubt about the application of the law.

Mr. TISDALE. I cannot see any objection to the legislation if it is properly safeguarded.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course, the property in Canada is subject to Canadian laws, and we do not exempt it from the control of Canadian laws.

Mr. TISDALE. The Railway Act is only applicable to railways incorporated by this parliament, because we say that railways incorporated by the parliament of Canada are subject to the Railway Act. This is not a railway incorporated by the parliament of Canada. We say that a foreign road shall have certain powers, and then we say that the laws of Canada shall apply to it. The query is whether we find it necessary to specially say 'under the Railway Act.' I wish to see the Bill passed, because I know that a controlling interest in the stock is held by the Grand Trunk Railway and that the reorganization was effected practically by the Grand Trunk Railway. No one wants to object to their enjoying these powers, because I think it is in the interest of these roads that they should do so. What we want to do is to be careful that the legislation which will serve the purpose is put in such a way that afterwards it will not be brought up as a precedent for giving such powers to foreign corporations.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It seems to me that the amendment read a few minutes ago by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals fully covers the point and places the Central Vermont Railway Company, in so far as its property in Canada is concerned, absolutely under the laws of Canada. Of course, the Central Vermont Railway Company operating in the state of Vermont, is under the laws of the state of Vermont. We cannot control it in any way, but this clause only places the property of the corporation in Canada under the laws of Canada. At the present time, the Central Vermont Railway Company has no corporate existence in Canada, nor has it any property in Canada. It only leases these roads and operates them. For convenience in the working of these roads, there is no question that it is better in the public interest, that they should be under one cor-

poration. The Central Vermont Railway today is practically owned by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and the Central Vermont Railway Company has operated these roads in the past. It is more convenient that they should be worked under the management and in connection with the Central Vermont Railway Company. I think the clause in question places the company's property in Canada under the laws of Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher). fails to catch the point I am making. We know nothing of the corporate powers of the Central Vermont Railway Company, and we are giving to that company the power to acquire these railways. It may have different powers entirely from these under its incorporation. You give to this foreign company, of whose powers we have no knowledge whatever, complete control over these two roads in Canada, with the limitation that the hon. minister says he intends to apply, that is, to make the Railway Act applicable to them and all the laws of Canada which are at present in force, and which may be from time to time in force in Canada applicable to this company. My objection is that I know nothing of the corporate powers of the Central Vermont Railway Company. I do not know what control it may have over this property which it has acquired in Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It does not seem to me that it matters to us in the slightest degree, what powers have been given to the Central Vermont Railway Company by a foreign government. They can only have such powers in Canada as we choose to give them.

Mr. HAGGART. But we are giving them the powers which they have in a foreign country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, that is where I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) is misapprehending the scope of this Bill. All that we are doing is to recognize a company deriving its existence from foreign legislation which desires to acquire these railways mentioned here, and to operate them in their own name. These companies in Canada, at this moment, have existence, I suppose, being incorporated under Canadian laws, and in the name of Canadian companies. With these charters, the Central Vermont Railway Company have acquired the powers attached to them. We are not changing these powers in the slightest degree. We are only saying that the name of the owner of these railways shall be from the passing of this Bill, the Central Vermont Railway Company. We are not touching the property; we are not altering the status of the property.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). Are you not altering the ownership?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We are not changing the status of the property in the slightest degree. Let me illustrate it in this way: Suppose that some foreign firm, which we call by the name of Brown, Jones & Robertson, are acquiring this railway. That would be subject, as to the holding ownership and operating of this railway to the laws of Canada, and they could not acquire any right of operation, unless they acquired it under the laws of Canada, because they could not acquire any rights under the laws of a foreign state. You are only rechristening the company, giving it another name. Notwithstanding that you are giving this name to an existing foreign corporation and saying that that foreign corporation may own this property you are saying that they shall own it, subject to the laws of Canada. If I had been framing that particular clause, I think, perhaps, I would have framed it a little differently.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the objection of making it thoroughly inclusive?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think there would be no objection.

Mr. **POWELL**. The objection of the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), is rather that it is through the medium of incorporation that the power over the subject of incorporation, over the work, is given.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is a mistake.

Mr. **POWELL**. I will not say whether it is so or not. Possibly, the company itself was not within the scope of the Railway Act, and the clause that relates to it is rather one that assumes that it is, instead of absolutely declaring that it is. That is the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale). It is a backhanded way of getting at it. It says it shall not be exempt from the laws of Canada, but the hon. gentleman contends that it shall state affirmatively: It is subject to the laws of Canada.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON** (Three Rivers). It is quite clear that we can legislate only for that portion of the railway which is within the jurisdiction of Canada. We submit in the Bill the proposition, that that railway will be within the laws of Canada which, of course, includes the law regulating railways. That being so, I do not see there can be any doubt about it. When a foreign corporation comes into Canada with a portion of any railway falling under our jurisdiction, it is regulated by the laws of Canada and, of course, regulated by our Railway Act.

Mr. **B. M. BRITTON** (Kingston). The Central Vermont Railway Company is given power to purchase the capital stock of these different roads, and as to that power no

harm may come, because it can only operate these roads under the charter they now have. But it is also empowered to purchase and operate these railways, and if it operates this railway as a purchaser, then something is necessary in order to bring the Central Vermont Railway Company entirely within the laws of Canada. It does strike me that there may be something in the point that was raised. The Railway Act applies to any railway that is for the general benefit of Canada, and that being so there ought to be a clause inserted putting this railway company in the same position as if it were incorporated here.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The Province Line Company was incorporated by the parliament of Canada.

Mr. **TISDALE**. But when the Central Vermont purchased it, it ceased to be the Province Line.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is the railway; it is not the name.

Mr. **POWELL**. The Railway Act, so far as it is applicable to the property is all right. But what about these provisions of the Railway Act applicable to the company as distinct from the property, such as making returns of statistics, and so on?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The moment you make a railway subject to the Railway Act, then it is wholly subject to the Railway Act whoever may own it, and the Railway Act governs and controls as respects these returns, and so forth, as fully as you could make it by any special legislation.

Mr. **TISDALE**. I do not think the Railway Act will be applicable unless we make it specially applicable.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No matter whose property this railway may be, I do not see how it can be anything else than subject to the laws of Canada, so long as it is situated in Canada. Suppose this company desires to make a crossing or connection with any other railway in Canada, would any one seriously contend that this legislation would withdraw it from being subject to our laws.

Mr. **POWELL**. You have control over the property, but not the company.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Is there anything objectionable in providing specifically that it shall be subject to the Railway Act.

Mr. **POWELL**. That might meet the difficulty.

Mr. **HAGGART**. There is another difficulty. These railways were first of all purchased by the Central Vermont Railroad Company. That company became extinct in

Mr. **POWELL**.

the United States, and their properties were sold, part of which was the majority of stock in these different railway companies. Then there was a new company formed last year in the United States called the Vermont Central Railway Company. They elected a board, and that board by the charter, had to sit in Canada. Under this Bill you are giving them powers, although every director may reside in a foreign country, and they may be all foreigners. The board of directors may sit and reside entirely in a foreign country. This Vermont Central Railway Company may issue bonds on the whole undertaking, and that part of the road which is in Canada may be liable for the whole issue, to the extent of \$250,000 or \$300,000 a mile.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We allowed that in the case of the Buffalo company.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I am arguing on principle—not because it was done before for a little electric railway company. There cannot be any objection to giving this new company all the rights which the Central Vermont Railway Company had. They have the majority of the stock, they can elect their directors in Canada, and do everything they could before, and we have complete control over the corporation. But, the danger arises when you give to a foreign corporation certain rights in Canada which they may insist shall not be interfered with by any legislation of ours hereafter.

Mr. **SUTHERLAND**. It is provided in a special amendment that they shall be subject to the laws of Canada.

Mr. **HAGGART**. All I ask the minister is to submit the question to the Department of Justice, and have the Bill put in such a shape that it will be satisfactory to the House.

On section 2b,

Mr. **TISDALE**. This section says that nothing in this Act contained shall relieve the company from the observance of the laws of Canada or Quebec, as the case may be. Instead of that being in the negative form, I think it should be in the positive form, that the company shall be subject to the Railway Act and to the laws of Quebec.

Mr. **GIBSON**. There is no objection to that.

Mr. **TISDALE**. Like the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), I would prefer to have the Bill properly considered in the light of the objection which has been raised to-night. If this were a case of acquiring control by a transfer of stock, it would be a different matter, because then the different corporations would have to be kept nominally alive; but now it is proposed to bury these old corporations, so that the only corporation left would be the Central Ver-

mont Railway Company, a foreign corporation.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. I would not undertake to give a legal opinion on the matter, but I supposed that this amendment would cover the point. The great object is to do away with these small corporations and combine them into one under the Central Vermont Railway Company. I am still inclined to think that the laws of Canada would control that portion of the railway in Canada.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Are any of these provincial companies?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. The Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly and the Montreal and Vermont Junction companies were incorporated by the old parliament of Canada. The Montreal and Province line was incorporated by parliament.

Mr. **G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.) You have now control of these companies, because they are Canadian companies, resident in Canada. You cannot serve a process on a railway track or railway tie, but you can serve a process and impose penalties on a corporation. But, if we dissolve all these corporations, we shall have no longer a corporation in Canada. The properties will be in Canada, but the laws have to be enforced against the corporations which own the properties. Against whom are you going to enforce penalties in this case?

Mr. **WM. GIBSON** (Lincoln). The Bill provides that the office of the company shall be in or near the city of Montreal, so that service may be made upon it.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The office is there just for convenience, for the purpose of the service.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I suggest that words be added to declare these railways works for the general advantage of Canada, which will bring them under the Railway Act.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That does not touch the difficulty which I see. It does not give you any jurisdiction or power over a corporation which resides in the United States. Whatever may be the powers of a Canadian company, we grant them and know what they are. You are desolving all these. We do not know what corporate powers this company has. We do not know how extensive they are. That road is coming into Canada and getting at once 100 miles of railway for operation. That is not going to be the end of it. These are not finished lines. In the course of years they will stretch out to other parts of the country, as they properly should, and then you will have a large corporation, with these unknown powers, competing with Canadian corporations. It may be that this American corporation has not larger powers than

our own, but it may have very much larger powers. It will be here with what powers it has, and will read those powers into the miles of railway it owns and controls in this country, and consequently you will not have the hold over them that you would have over a Canadian company.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. They are subject to the Railway Act.

Mr. **FOSTER**. But if a corporation is outside of your reach, how are you going to enforce it?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Against their property.

Mr. **TISDALE**. We must not forget that the Grand Trunk Railway, in respect of the lines they own in the United States, have not been able to get there the legislation we are proposing to give this American road. They have to keep separate corporations for every road they have. That is hard on them, but, of course, because the Americans are not liberal to the Grand Trunk Railway is no reason why we should not be liberal here, provided we keep legislative control. It is a more difficult problem than it appears at first view.

Mr. **GIBSON**. I think that the suggestion of the ex-Minister of Finance perhaps is one in the right direction, and it would be better to allow this Bill to stand over until a conference is had with the Department of Justice. I have no objection at all to this; it would be far better to have the Bill in proper shape than one that is imperfectly put. We all know the Central Vermont Railway Company have had these lines under control for five and twenty years. That railway has gone out of existence and a new name given it, and the Grand Trunk Railway controls two-thirds of the stock of the Central Vermont, which controls all these lines, and the whole object is to enable the Grand Trunk Railway to control the lines in Canada of the Central Vermont, and it would be much better for the company and the Bill that the thing should be carefully considered. I therefore move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Carrying out the regulations concerning the health of employees on public works under the Public Works Health Act, 1890 \$5,000

Mr. **W. H. MONTAGUE** (Haldimand). I suppose that the hon. Minister of Agriculture will persist in endeavouring to pass this

Mr. **FOSTER**.

vote. I do not desire to consume the time of the House further than to say that this is simply a waste of money. If any attempt is to be made to do really what is pretended to be done with this \$5,000, no such sum would be at all adequate. It will be spent in the salary of an officer, appointed by the government from among its friends, and I have concluded, after going into the matter, that that is the real purpose. I want to enter my protest. I think the money will be wasted, but will make no further objection.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). I cannot allow that charge to pass unchallenged. Since this matter came up the other night, I presume that the hon. gentleman has studied the regulations and made himself acquainted with what is intended to be carried out by means of this vote. Those regulations are for the purpose of providing security for employees on public works, to secure that they will be looked after, both as regards the accommodation provided for their living and the securing of proper medical attendance and supervision, and also for isolation when necessary to prevent the spread of contagious diseases. The hon. gentleman seems now to be fully possessed of the idea that there may be some necessity for such work. He shakes his head, and therefore I presume that he is prepared to say that on public works the employees are quite able to take care of themselves, and there is no necessity for any effort on the part of the government to see that they are properly cared for. I differ with my hon. friend. I believe that it is our duty, on account of some occurrences that have been brought to light lately amongst employees on public works, to see that these employees are properly protected. We know well that contractors, busily engaged in the prosecution of their work, often in rather wild parts of the country, where the ordinary conditions for the preservation of public health are not easily obtained, may be very easily tempted by the exigencies of their work to try and force their employees to accept conditions which are not consistent with the proper care of their health. I believe that the Act passed last year was in the interests of the working people and the regulations founded upon them, but these regulations cannot be carried out if we leave the matter entirely in the hands of the contractors, and therefore we require to provide some supervision.

These regulations will require certain expenditure on the part of the contractors, and, no doubt, the profits of their contracts may be, thereby, somewhat curtailed. This being the case, it is only right and prudent on the part of the government or the country to see that these regulations are properly carried out. The machinery for that purpose need not be very expensive. My hon. friend, the other night suggested, that, no doubt, a superintendent might be requir-

ed whose salary might be as high as \$3,000 a year. I hope to be able to obtain a good man for considerably less than that, I have not gone into that question. I consider it necessary to secure a competent man, and one who would have the confidence of the workmen in doing this work, and for his salary, an adequate sum must be provided. There will also be travelling expenses of the superintendent, and occasional appointment of superintendents for particular pieces of work. The director general of public health, an officer of my department, who has charge of the quarantine service may be called upon to go to any of these public works to supervise the medical attendance if an epidemic should take place. Money must be provided for these contingencies. At the same time, I believe, with all due deference to my hon. friend's opinion and experience that we can efficiently carry out these regulations for the sum here proposed. Should a larger sum be required, it will have to be provided in future years, or, if necessary in the supplementary estimates for this year. But, so far as we can foresee at present, \$5,000 will be sufficient.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. minister knows that, so far, there is no instance that has been brought to our attention except that of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway—at least I have heard of none. My opinion is that cases that would require the attention of the department in the way of sending an officer, are so rare that the director general of public health could very well afford time to attend to the work that may be required in some special part of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the director general of public health has a great deal of time on his hands—

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not a great deal.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think quite enough to attend to all the duties that would be required of an officer under this Act. The hon. gentleman knows that contracts that are being carried out in well settled portions of the country will require no attention of this kind. Take, for instance the populated parts of the province of Ontario, or almost any place in Ontario—the local boards of health, which are very efficient, acting in concert with the provincial board of health, will be ready to take cognizance at once of anything requiring their attention. There may be cases in exceptional portions of the Dominion where such an officer will require to do work; but my point is, and was the other night, that the director general of public health will have plenty of time to attend to this in addition to his other duties, and the creation of this office is simply for the purpose of creating an office. Hon. gentlemen oppo-

site have created a great many offices. I do not think that any government in Canada, in such a short time, has created so many offices as this government.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is not my impression.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am afraid the number of offices created has been so great that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) has not been able to follow or record them. In his own department, quite a number of new offices have been created.

Mr. WOOD. The country is growing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend (Mr. Wood) is more active to-night than he was on the night of the coasting trade debate.

Mr. WOOD. That is all right.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He seems to have revived. Where was he when that important question relative to a great Canadian industry, the giving away of our coasting trade, was under discussion? I am speaking in all earnestness when I say that this is an unnecessary office, and, having that view I oppose the vote of the money. I do not oppose the government taking every means to maintain the health and add to the comfort of employees on public works in any portion of Canada. As much attention should be paid to these employees as to any other class of the community. But I do not think it is necessary to create a new office for that purpose. Moreover, I would point out that if the hon. gentleman is going to send his officer here and there and everywhere, whether a request is sent for him or not, he has not sufficient money here to do the work efficiently. An hon. gentleman the other night suggested that I had asked this item to stand time and time again. I took occasion to look that matter up, and I found that it stood just once at my request. Of course, if the hon. minister is bent on passing this item, it will be passed.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I agree with the necessity of looking after the health of those engaged in public works. I have been looking up the Act and find that it is open to the objection I urged at the time it was proposed. This Act professes to confer certain powers upon officers in the case of contagious diseases arising. But suppose that was in the province of Ontario, and I happened to be health officer there. I am instructed by the Department of Public Health in Ontario to do certain things, but some one representing the Dominion, comes in with supposed authority under this Act to make some other regulation. There would be a conflict of authority. In my opinion this parliament has no power to pass laws that will interfere with the carrying out of provincial laws regarding health. I agree with the

minister that it is desirable that the health of people on public works should be looked after. We had such a painful illustration of what can be done by the greed of contractors in the case of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, that it suggests the wisdom of doing what can be done in that direction. I could readily understand that it would be possible for this parliament to make laws and enforce them with regard to the North-west Territories or some other place where there was no provincial authority, no local boards of health. But in the organized provinces, where there are boards of health, I do not see how they can interfere with the work of those boards under this law or by instruction to this inspector. I agree with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), that if this work is to be done efficiently, there is not enough money provided here to do it. But I raised objection to this Act when it was passed, and my opinion is the same to-day as it was then, that there would be a conflict of authority in the event of a Dominion medical man who was appointed for that purpose stepping in and interfering with the rights of the local health officer who was endeavouring to carry out a local health Act.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman's argument is directed more against the Act itself, than against this regulation which is made under the Act.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman claims that we have concurrent powers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not prepared to give a legal opinion. When the Act was passed, it was discussed and, I believe, the Minister of Justice gave his opinion, sanctioning it, therefore, I take it for granted it is the opinion of the Department of Justice, that we have power to pass such legislation as this. My hon. friend speaks about the local health authorities. They certainly have certain powers, and in the provinces where they exist their powers are defined by provincial Acts. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Act, and then at the regulations, he will see that not only is this an Act to provide against the spread of contagious diseases, but also to provide for an inspection, to provide for proper sanitary conditions among labouring people on public works. But if the Act is in existence, and the regulations are in existence, and there is nobody to see to them, the Act is likely to be a dead letter, and, therefore, it is necessary to have a superintendent, which will carry out the provisions of the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. I say the Act goes further than we are justified in going. We can deal with mortuary statistics and we can deal with quarantine. But this is not a quarantine regulation, except as regards a public work. The minister says that my argument

is directed against the Act itself. I know it is, because I hold that the Act was going beyond our powers at the time it was passed. Now, he proposes to go still further, and to pass regulations upon the strength of an Act, which I hold we had no power to pass, thus intensifying the evil. But I want him to understand, that so far as we have a legal right to act, I am in favour of his scheme, but I do not like to see an attempt to carry out something that we would be unable to carry out in the event of a conflict of authority arising between the provincial and the local authorities.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Before we leave these votes, I wish to say a few words with regard to the farming interests of British Columbia. There is a general impression amongst the farmers that they have not been treated as liberally as they ought, they feel that they are neglected to a certain extent by the Agriculture Department. There also seems to be an impression in that department that British Columbia is not a farming country. Well, I admit it is not, as a farming country, to be compared with the great North-west and Manitoba; but there are, as anybody knows, who has been in that country, most magnificent stretches of country up the Cariboo wagon road, down the Okanagan valley and on the Fraser River. There is land in those regions that cannot be beaten, and also on the island, there are splendid areas of farming country of many thousand acres in extent, that will produce anything that can be raised in a climate of the kind. These farmers want no public buildings, or none to any extent, but they do think the Agriculture Department should give them the very best assistance in the way of expert advice. I asked a question in the House some time ago of the minister, as to what expert assistance was given to British Columbia, and he answered that two men had been out there for quite a length of time. Now, the Dairymen's Association met on January 12 to 13, in Victoria, and passed a resolution which I will read:

That the Dairymen's Association of British Columbia desire to impress on the hon. Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada the advisability of granting to British Columbia the advantages which have been enjoyed by the other provinces in their time of need, and which are at present enjoyed by the North-west Territories, from having an expert official devoted to the dairying interests established among them, and respectfully request that an expert in dairy matters be appointed to take up the work in the province without delay.

Now, they do not feel content that a man should go up there from the North-west for a few days, or a few weeks at a time. There are plenty of good dairy farms in British Columbia that could occupy the attention of one man, at all events, all the time from one end of the season to the other. In a letter from the secretary of that association,

Mr. SPROULE.

I find their idea is that Mr. Marker was sent out there on an average, about two weeks per annum, for the last four years. I would impress upon the minister the advisability of keeping a man there all the time. There is much support given to the farming industry in Manitoba and the North-west, and large sums of money are advanced to them, for creamery purposes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not in Manitoba, not the last four years.

Mr. PRIOR. They are managed by the government, then.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not in Manitoba, but in the North-west Territories.

Mr. PRIOR. It used to be so in Manitoba. But I think if the minister looks into the matter, he will see that he can do more than he has been doing for the farmers. I know the experimental farm is very well run there, and is under very good management; but that really does very little good for the majority of the farmers. Some of them are so far away, in a large country like British Columbia, that they really get no benefit from it. I notice in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, innumerable wharfs are being built by the government, that are of great benefit to the farmers in those provinces; but in British Columbia, ask as we may, we never get a cent for wharfs. There are any number of farmers on the coast and on the islands, who would only be too glad if the government saw fit to give them wharfs. They cannot get from the provincial government as many as are wanted. So I think the Minister of Agriculture, when he is looking after the interests of the North-west, might plead with his colleagues to see if some money might be spent on wharfs in out of the way places, so that the farmers can get their produce to market. I am sorry that the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), is not present, or any other hon. members from British Columbia, because the hon. member for New Westminster represents a magnificent farming district, and I am sure he would back me up, if he were present in the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is due that I should say a word or two in reply to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Prior) has said, and I can say that I quite sympathize with him in the expressions which he has let fall. British Columbia has magnificent agricultural capabilities. It was my good fortune last fall to pay a visit to that province. I had the opportunity of visiting the provincial fair at New Westminster, and of taking a trip to different parts of the province, where I saw a great deal of fine alluvial farming land. There are difficulties in connection with the development of agriculture in the province of British Columbia that I appreciate now

more than I did before I went there. The province is so much cut up that the farming sections which have been developed and are being farmed are somewhat isolated, and it is a little more difficult to deal with them generally, or comprehensively, than it is to deal with similar land in the other provinces. That difficulty will disappear as the province gains more population, and the intervening sections are filled up and more fully cultivated. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that in various sections there are magnificent farming lands capable of splendid development, and that the people who have gone there are doing a great deal in the way of such development. My hon. friend rather desires that I should do more, and has quoted a resolution passed last January by the Provincial Dairymen's Association. I received a copy of that resolution. Since that time no less than three of the officers of my department have been out in British Columbia and have spent a considerable time in that province. I was in communication with Mr. Anderson, the official of the Department of Agriculture in the province, and I have received resolutions from that very association, and from one or two other associations there, thanking me for the response which I made to their request and expressing gratification at the fact that the officers of the experimental farm, and other officials of my department, had been out there and had given them a great deal of assistance. I propose to continue that work. It is only the other day that the live stock commissioner, appointed by my department recently, came back from a lengthy visit to British Columbia, where he came in contact with the breeders of live stock there to a very considerable extent. He is going out again in the fall to reorganize the work in such a way as will be suitable to their circumstances. Mr. Marker, manager of the creameries of the North-west Territories, and one of the best dairy experts we have in our employ, has been six weeks in British Columbia, and he will make another visit of six or eight weeks before the end of the year. It is true that we have no permanent officer in British Columbia, but the difficulties have been rather great. I am trying to work them out, and if I can find the right man, a man who will be able to understand the conditions there and help the people in a suitable way, I would be very glad to place him in that province.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister spoke of regulations made in connection with this law. Where can these regulations be seen, or have they been made yet.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The regulations were passed by order in council on January 31, 1900, and published in the *Canada Gazette*, February 10.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Can the hon. gentleman tell us now what the expenses of the

Canadian government's commission at the Paris exposition up to date have been ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can tell you now if you wish. I can go into the whole question of the Paris exposition, if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I just want the amount up to date.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not tell the hon. gentleman without reference to my notes and going into the whole matter. The hon. gentleman can get all the information he has asked for when the supplementary estimates are taken up.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) still a free hand ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is still chairman of the commission.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And has a free hand ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As free a hand as he has always had.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the hon. minister say whom he intends to appoint to carry out this Act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not. I have not anybody in view.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this cover all travelling expenses as well as salaries ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is expected to cover all expenses in connection with the carrying out of the regulations.

To pay Gilbert Dredging Company, interest ..... \$22,338

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I wish to avoid repeating any portion of the explanation I made the other night that will not be necessary. Before taking up these different items which constitute this claim in detail, I beg to say that the committee were reasonably well satisfied the other night, so far as this claim was concerned, that the payment of the \$29,000 did not settle this claim on the 19th April, 1894. It was an open claim, and remained open after the payment, which was made on April 19, 1894, in respect of the abandonment of those sections and parts of sections of the Cornwall Canal work, which were discontinued.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I am afraid that we are going to take more time than is necessary if we take it up in this way. What we wanted to get were certain reports of the officers of the hon. gentleman's own department, and we have not these. The hon. gentleman may have them with him, and it would facilitate matters if we had these reports laid on the Table so that we could see them ourselves ; and then, having become masters of the situation, so

Mr. MONTAGUE.

far as that goes, we could discuss the matter much more quickly and come to a conclusion much more rapidly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think, if the hon. gentleman will allow me ; it is not an easy matter to understand—

Mr. FOSTER. We cannot understand it by word of mouth.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think you can understand it very much better. I think, if I made a statement of the facts, it would be more helpful and it would enable hon. gentlemen to arrive at a conclusion as to the different items in the claim and the conclusions that we arrived at in regard to them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman knows that he promised us, when we were discussing this matter the other evening, to have the contract and various reports, both by the chief engineer and the resident engineer, as regards this claim, before us, but we have not got them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I told the hon. gentleman that I would bring them down. I have done so, and I will read them, because I want the committee to understand what the claim consists of. I am prepared to furnish this committee with the minutest details in respect to this claim. It is a very simple and easy matter to cast doubt upon the integrity of the department in connection with the adjustment of such claims as this.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman need not get angry. If he will give us the reports, that is all we want.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not getting angry. The hon. gentleman need not assume that I am getting angry, because I am not. In connection with these contracts, there are portions that remain in abeyance necessarily for years, pending until you come to make your final estimate, and I would ask the committee to allow me to present these matters to the committee as they were presented to me and as they presented themselves to my mind.

Mr. FOSTER. That we want the minister to do, but we also want to be in a position to understand what the minister is saying and to be able to criticise it from a knowledge of the papers. We want the minister to give us the contract, the claims that were made, the report of the officers on which the payment was made in 1894, the claims that were made since, and the report of the officers on which the minister has based the payment on which he now asks us to vote. If we had these papers we could follow the minister when he makes this explanation. I am anxious for the despatch of business on this item, and that

despatch would be more rapid if the minister gives us the papers. I also asked for certain papers with respect to the Stewart claim and also as to the cement. These have not come down. Some of these nights when we are in a hurry the minister will get up and make a speech, but what we want first of all is the papers, and then we will be able to understand the explanation and the business will be despatched more promptly. There may be no ground for criticism, but we will not know that until we see the reports ourselves.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman does not say that he asked that the papers be placed on the Table.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Certainly, we want them brought down.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I was asked if I had these reports before me and I said I had not, but that I would bring them with me when we took up the item again. I have them here now.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What good are they to us over there in your book?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not believe that any one considered it a request to lay the papers on the Table. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says that he would understand these papers in a short time, I do not think he could. These gentlemen, the contractors, urged for a hearing, and they appeared before me on a fixed day, the superintendent engineer and the chief engineer being present, and we discussed the matter and I endeavoured to form the best opinion I could on it. I asked the claimants what they had to say on the other, and although this claim only amounts to \$58,000 in all, we had at least three afternoons devoted to the hearing before I could get a thorough understanding of the case.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. I understood from the minister that he heard the applicants on the one side and the engineers on the other, they being evidently against the applicants, and that he decided the case himself.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The conclusions in this case were reached after the discussion of each item. The claimants would give their reasons for claim No. 1 and Mr. Rubidge would say: Was not this the case, and the chief engineer would say: Was not that the case? The engineers on behalf of the government were labouring under the disadvantage that Mr. Page, the chief engineer, and Mr. Killaly, the engineer in charge, were both dead. The facts had therefore to be ascertained by investigation to a much greater degree than would have been necessary if Mr. Ru-

bidge had been superintending engineer all along.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Did the minister agree to pay this on the report of the engineers?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Will the minister let us see that report?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I will do so with pleasure. I would much prefer to approach these different questions seriatim so that they can be understood. The proper way is to take the matters up seriatim to show what conclusions were reached and why they were reached. On the 19th of April there was a settlement of the claims of these parties in respect to the abandonment of sections and parts of sections of the work, which settlement was based upon the allowance of 15 per cent for prospective profits upon the amount of the work which would have been done if the contract had been carried out.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. The minister has a report from the engineer on which that settlement was made.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman will hear just what I have if he will permit me to continue. \$29,350 was paid on the 19th of April, 1894, that being 15 per cent on \$196,000. It was conceded to have been paid in a receipt given by the Gilbert Blasting Company and a letter which was attached to the receipt and which was written by Mr. Ferguson, the solicitor for the contractors. Immediately upon the payment of that amount the Gilbert Dredging Company preferred their claim, dated the 24th of April, 1894, only five days after. The following was their letter:

We beg to submit herewith our claim for extra works, damages, &c., in respect to the works executed by us on sections 5, 6, 7, 8 of the Cornwall Canal. This is separate and distinct from the claim paid to us by your department the other day for loss of anticipated profits on abandoned works.

Attached is the claim for \$58,425.13, identical with the claim which I read to the committee the other night. This claim was sent by the department to Mr. Rubidge, who, in 1894, was in charge of the Cornwall work, and Mr. Rubidge made this endorsement upon it:

Full particulars should accompany this claim, without which it will be impossible to deal with it intelligently.

He knew nothing himself, not having been in supervision of the work, as to how these different items were made up or as to what constituted the basis of the claim. It appears that it was not until the 5th of August, 1899, that Mr. Rubidge made his report to the department in regard to it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Was there any correspondence in the interim?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The minister told us the other night that they had been constantly, time and again, pressing this on the department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So they had. They had been urging that it should be settled, but there does not appear to have been any written correspondence exchanged between them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. During the time, was Mr. Rubidge ever asked to make a report?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, frequently. I am afraid the old gentleman is a little too dilatory about these matters. The next communication we have on the subject on the files, so far as I am aware, and so far as the chief engineer is able to inform me, was on the 5th of August, 1899.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Before you go that far, you must have a final estimate. When was it made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The final estimates were not made when the hon. gentleman left the department in 1896, and they are not made up to this date.

Mr. HAGGART. That is extraordinary. When was the last payment made to Mr. Gilbert on this particular work other than the 15 per cent?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell you now, nor can the chief engineer state from memory.

Mr. HAGGART. That is most important. The whole question hinges on whether or not the claim of Mr. Gilbert was considered when the final estimate and the report of the engineer were made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The claim that is included in these items was not embraced within any estimate that was made.

Mr. HAGGART. Before you come to 1899, it was in 1894. Every amount due to the contractor, and every claim made by the contractor, it was the duty of the engineer in charge of the work to report to the department; and the last payment that was made must include all the claims of the contractor, because under the contract, I understand, he is not allowed any extras unless he puts them in monthly to the department. I want to know when the last payment was made on divisions 2 and 4, apart from the 15 per cent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were not divisions 2 and

Mr. BLAIR.

4, but divisions 5, 6, 7 and 8. The hon. gentleman received in his own department a detailed claim for the month of April, 1894, to the amount of \$58,000, and directed it to be sent to Mr. Rubidge to make his report upon it; and Mr. Rubidge endorsed it in his own handwriting on the 1st of May, 1894, stating that he could not make a report upon the claim or deal intelligently with it until those people furnished him with a statement of the particulars.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister does not see my point. The agreement was made in March, 1894, for a settlement in full or in part of the claim which Mr. Gilbert had for the work done independent of the 15 per cent. When was the last payment on that work made to Mr. Gilbert?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know. We will find out as soon as we can. But, I say that question cannot be a material one, when, beyond all doubt, these items were not covered or included in any such estimate.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Rubidge wanted a full statement of particulars from the Gilbert people. Did they put that in?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They did not put it in, in writing, so far as I know. They furnished the information.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If they furnished that detailed statement, it would be furnished in writing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If Mr. Rubidge had been in charge of the work, he would not have asked for these particulars he speaks of. He was furnished with detailed items numbering 13, and aggregating in amount \$58,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But he says he wants details, and he did not get them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I assume that he did not, because he does not make his report until the 5th of August, 1899.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why did he make his report then?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know. No doubt he was pressed and urged by the contractors to make his report, because their claim would not be dealt with by the department until his report was received. It did not come under my personal supervision until subsequent to the receipt of this report. Indeed, I did not take it up until January, 1900. That was the first time this case was presented to me.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He could not make his report in 1894, because he had not the de-

tails; but he could make it in 1899, five years afterwards, without the details.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have not any doubt that Mr. Rubidge was furnished with those particulars; but if he was, I have not them here. I am not personally aware whether he was or was not furnished with them, but I assume that he must have been.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Does not the minister see that what we want is the statement of claim of the Gilberts, and the report of the engineer upon it, and we cannot go through with this until we have those two things. It is absolutely impossible that the minister could have paid without statement of the claim in detail, or, I should think, without a report of his engineer. Now, we have a right to see that statement of claim in detail, and to have the engineer's report upon it. That is what we want, and that is what the minister promised to bring down.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Is it worth while for the hon. gentleman to state that what we want and what we ought to have is the engineer's report on this claim when I am in the very act of reading the report, and these gentlemen raise a controversy as to why the report did not come earlier? There is no use presenting these matters when questions are interposed as to why certain things occurred which no human being can answer. I have the report in my hand which I am proposing to read, and which I cannot get an opportunity to read.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Can I not get the minister to come down to a business basis? He wants to get his estimates through, and the House wants to get them through. If the hon. minister had acted in a business way, he would have laid that report on the Table—that plain statement of the claims, the report of Mr. Rubidge and the contract—and the next day we would have had an opportunity of looking over them and could have disposed of this item in a very short time. But he will take his own way and stand up first and go through the whole of them. He may do so, if he chooses, but before he gets his estimates through he will have to lay the papers on the Table, and give us an opportunity of looking through them. It is for him to decide whether he will save time or waste time.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. The hon. gentleman can see how very inconvenient it is to have to discuss these estimates without the papers being before the House. The other day, in the case of Battle Brothers, he charged me with discourtesy in not having told him, before he brought down his estimates, that I required these papers when the estimates were being discussed. But I had not asked for the papers because the discussion which gave rise to my ques-

tion arose before I supposed the item would have been brought down at all. Then he said, it is no use quarrelling over that point, I will bring down the papers.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that it was suggested that I should bring down the returns and lay them on the Table?

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. Certainly.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. My hon. friend must remember that these papers are very voluminous, and you cannot have them copied in a moment. I am not going to put the originals on the Table, but would have given instructions and had them copied. There is nothing about the papers that I am not perfectly willing to submit.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. The hon. gentleman is introducing a new rule. Parliament is entitled to have the originals on the Table.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not think it is.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. The hon. gentleman is absolutely wrong. Parliament has a perfect right to the originals, more especially when discussing the estimates. He says it will take time to copy these papers. Well, I do not know the length of these documents, but my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) asked him if he would bring them down, and the hon. gentleman said that certainly he would, and would lay them on the Table.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman will not find, on referring to *Hansard*, that any such statement was ever made by me.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. I have not consulted *Hansard*, but I remember the discussion perfectly well, and I am quite certain that it ended when the hon. gentleman told us he would give us the information we required before we could discuss that item. I have not heard of any other minister than the hon. gentleman, administering any department of this or any other government, ever stating to parliament that we are not entitled to have the originals on the Table. No individual member would have the right to take them away, but for the purpose of discussing the estimates, the originals must be placed on the Table where they can be examined by gentlemen who take an interest in the item under discussion.

Mr. **CLANCY**. Will the hon. gentleman tell this committee the date of that receipt of settlement for \$29,000?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The 19th April, 1894, and the 24th of April, 1894, the claim that I have

read several times was presented by these contractors. If the hon. gentleman who now asks that these papers should be placed on the Table had stated so, we would have understood each other. I thought that they would be satisfied if I brought the papers here, and I have them here now, and in my explanation desire to use them. I have no objection to allow hon. members to have these papers, but unless the House should order that the original papers should be laid on the Table, I would not understand that I was to do so.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It has been done frequently.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it is at all usual to do that. I have brought the original papers with me for the purpose of quoting from them by way of explanation, but I do not think it is usual to lay original papers on the Table. If hon. members want to have an opportunity of going through these papers, I will have them copied and put in their hands. I do not want to take any other course than one that will facilitate business, but I can assure hon. gentlemen that after they have the papers they will require an explanation.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We want to get them in order to ask explanations.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the hon. minister does not think we are going to purloin the papers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. We are all members of parliament together, and if the hon. gentleman would put the original papers on the Table, if they even came to my desk or the desk of the ex-Minister of Railways, he may be certain that they would be returned. The minister must not run away with the idea—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman need not undertake to lecture. I am not going to be lectured by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister must submit to be lectured so long as we feel disposed to lecture him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not without protest.

Mr. FOSTER. He may protest as much as he likes, but he will have to sit quiet and receive his lecture despite his protest. He will not get a dollar until we have had the papers in our possession. I want him to understand perfectly now that we want those papers in order to have an opportunity of examining them ourselves in our own hands, and we must have them before the estimates pass. He can give his explanations and take two hours doing it if he

Mr. BLAIR.

likes, and then he will have to let his items stand until we have the papers and go over them ourselves. He can let the item stand now and give us the papers, and then we will discuss it together, and come to an understanding, or he can give his explanation now, and then let the item stand until we have looked into the papers. He may not think it worth while giving us those papers, because it is an abstruse question and we would not understand it, but we will try, with our little ability, to understand it from an examination of the papers ourselves. We stand on an exact equality with the hon. minister, and we require the information which is at his hand just as he himself has it. I never yet heard of a minister objecting to put any papers or contracts on the Table until the hon. minister himself made such an objection last session when we discussed the matter nearly twenty-four hours, and the discussion ended in the hon. gentleman having to bring down the original papers and put them on the Table. He did more, he came over to the leader of the opposition and myself, and we went over the original papers together, and we found that the hon. gentleman was mistaken. We found that he stated a thing was so when it was not, and he had to acknowledge that he was wrong.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is drawing on his imagination.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, now, I want to make a formal request in the most formal way I can and in the most definite way, to have brought down to this House a statement of the Stewart claim; a statement of the costs that have so far been paid; a statement of all the awards that have been given in that suit with reference to Stewart so far; a statement of the claim for damages which is now before the court and the costs which have been incurred so far with reference to that. My hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) will make his own formal demand with reference to the cement case. He made it before and was promised the papers, but my hon. friend's (Mr. Blair's) memory has played him false again. He does not need to copy the records of a great many transactions. He can get one of his officers to make a statement that will be sufficient for our purposes on two pages of foolscap. What we want is to have it down definitely so that we can see it and analyse it for ourselves. This is not unreasonable and the hon. minister will not say it is. It is for him to say whether he will give us the papers and then discuss the question or whether he will make a one-sided discussion of it, and then let the item stand until we have the papers and are able to form an opinion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There would not have been the

slightest objection to the request if it had been made and there was no reason why it should not be complied with. But I understood, rightly or wrongly, that what was wanted was to have the documents here when these items came up again. These documents are here. But I should not be asked to lay original documents on the Table. That is not as the hon. gentleman suggests, because I fear that anybody will run away with the papers. But every member of the House has as much right to see them as has the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster); and papers passing from hand to hand may be mislaid without the slightest intention on anybody's part of doing any wrong. Original documents of value as records should not be handled in that careless manner. If I had understood that hon. gentlemen desired to have these papers in their hands, I would have had them copied as rapidly as possible and placed at their disposal.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. minister can have them copied yet. He had better let the item stand until that is done. We do not wish to delay the hon. minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What I object to is to have it assumed that there is any unwillingness on my part to furnish hon. gentlemen with the documents they require. I unquestionably had no desire to do that. But I doubt that with the documents they can come to a proper understanding of the case in the absence of explanation.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister says that the matter was settled by the chief engineer, and he has the chief engineer's report on that subject.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. That is one document I want.

Mr. FOSTER. We want a statement of claims made by the company; we want the report of the engineer on which the settlement of 1894 was made; we want a statement of the claims that were preferred on the basis on which Mr. Rubidge's report was given in 1899; and we want Mr. Rubidge's report of 1899. If we had these and the original contract we should have all the papers, so far as I know, that are necessary.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And we want the correspondence between the department and Mr. Rubidge which led to the making of his report in 1899.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not aware, nor is the chief engineer aware of there being any correspondence as to the making of the report. He may have been called upon personally or by telephone.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I refer to the details which Mr. Rubidge asked for in 1894, but which he evidently did not get.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief engineer tells me that he cannot say that details were furnished in writing. They are not in the files here. If they were furnished Mr. Rubidge would have them in Cornwall, and we should have to send for them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The details would be sent to the department here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, they are not sent here.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would also like to get the papers relating to the Battle case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All right.

Mr. HAGGART. The two last estimates on which payments were made to Gilbert & Company on the sections on which work was stopped other than the 15 per cent allowance on the \$190,000—we would like to get those also.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to capital—St. Lawrence River—

Gas buoys .....	\$37,160
Surveying, removing boulders, &c.....	40,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was asked to state the places at which these gas buoys were to be placed. The list is as follows: Worth Channel (both entrances), 2; King William's shoal, 1; Sparrow Hawk's Point, 1; Toussaint Island Point, 1; Point Iroquois shoal, 1; Morrisburg East, 1; Doran's Island, 1; Jackass, 1; Chrysler's Island, 1; Weaver's Point, 1; Goat Island, 1; Baker's Point, 1; Hoople's Creek, 1; Cornwall Island, 1; Clarke's Island, 1; Squaw Island shoal, 1; Island bank, 2; Point Mouille Flats, 1; Point Lewis Flats, 2; St. Zotique, 1; in stock, 2; total, 24.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these gas buoys placed and the lights arranged on that stretch of navigation on the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries' officers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. Mr. Rubidge, the superintending engineer for canal navigation.

Mr. FOSTER. From whom are these bought?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Schreiber cannot tell me the name of the firm that they are bought from, but the agent here in Ottawa is Mr. R. M. Courtney, son of the Deputy Minister of Finance.

Mr. FOSTER. Were tenders asked for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No tenders were asked, because

this is the only concern which manufactures them.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there only one kind of gas buoy?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume there may be others, but this is regarded as the best buoy.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is Mr. Courtney regularly in that business?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know whether he is in it regularly or irregularly. I had no communication with Mr. Courtney personally, on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. On what recommendation did the department buy them?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Rubidge recommended these buoys to the chief engineer, and the chief engineer recommended their purchase. These buoys were purchased from the same people that the United States government purchased their buoys from.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What was the cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One thousand five hundred and seventy dollars each, the same price the American government paid.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It ought to be easy to arrive at the value of these buoys. They were used by the Department of Marine and Fisheries on the St. Lawrence River for six or seven years, although I do not know that they are identically the same with those which the hon. gentleman wants to use on the canal. Gas buoys as a protection for navigation have been known for a number of years, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will corroborate my statement that they have been used on the River St. Lawrence at several points for years and years. Without contending that the item is an improper one, we require that information from the minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the particular information the hon. gentleman desires?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We mentioned the other night the information which was required, the name of the manufacturers, and also the places where the buoys were to be located. We have the names of the places where they are located, and now we want to know who are the manufacturers, and the price paid for the buoys.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand that the gentleman from whom these were purchased is Mr. Courtney, son of the Deputy Minister of Finance. That is not a matter with which the House has any reason specially to deal, unless there are special circumstances in connection with the purchase. If young Mr. Courtney is regularly in that business, if

he carried through this transaction as part of his regular business, and the government purchased through him, this committee can offer no objection, even though he got a fair-sized commission. But if, on the other hand, he is not in that business, but is engaged in some other business, and the government made a special case for that purpose and that particular transaction, and he becomes the agent of these men, then I think the committee ought to know it. I am not casting any suspicion whatever upon this purchase, nor upon the agency of the young man, but certainly the relationship between a deputy minister and the government is such, and particularly the relationship between the Deputy Minister of Finance and the government is such, that the government should not travel out of the ordinary course of business to make a purchase from any one so closely associated with the deputy minister, as this gentleman is in a family way. If he is not in that business regularly, the House ought to have every particular before the vote is passed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The necessity of purchasing these buoys was represented to me by the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, in view of the demand that was being made upon us for proper lighting in the river reaches. The deputy minister states that Mr. Rubidge had represented to him that the best buoys that we could get, were the same buoys that had been selected by the United States government to be used for the lighting of their wharfs, and that Mr. Courtney was the agent for these.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is Mr. Courtney's business?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He is an agent in the town. I had no communication myself with Mr. Courtney, and never saw him on the subject.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where is Mr. Courtney's place of business?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. On Sparks street, I am told. He is an agent doing business, handling cements, hardware and articles of various kinds, and amongst the rest he is agent for this concern. It was not a case such as the hon. member suggests at all of going out of the way, or of going to some person not in ordinary business.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not even suggest that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not the case. The firm of Mr. Courtney were carrying on a regular business of sale and purchase on commission, and they are carrying it on up to this day, although Mr. Courtney himself, I believe, is in South Africa.

Mr. BLAIR.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will bring down the name of the firm ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The minister will really bring down the name of the firm ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes.

Intercolonial Railway—To provide for building for baggage and express at Truro... \$2,000

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if members of parliament are allowed to distribute free passes on the Intercolonial Railway ? A letter was sent to me by a gentleman in Matane inclosing a copy of a letter which was written by an hon. member of this House, Mr. Ross, the member for Rimouski. It is in French, and I am translating it :

I inclose a pass for a trip from Petit Metis to Montreal and return. I think if you can come up here I will be able to demonstrate to you that everything, under the circumstances, which could be done has been done in favour of our friend, Mr. Fabien Morin.

I am, yours truly,

A. ROSS, M.P.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is that the genuine signature of Mr. Ross ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, it is a copy of a letter which was inclosed to me. I know the gentleman who sent it to me. It does not pretend to be anything else than a copy of the letter. I do not know what the important nature of the business was, but it is very important to know whether even on very important business it is permissible for members of parliament to utilize the Intercolonial Railway and to send a free pass to a gentleman whom he wishes to see in Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned the matter, and I will make inquiries. I can say that Mr. Ross received no passes from me to distribute, or a pass for any person, unless it might be for Mrs. Ross. I give members of parliament passes for their wives when they ask for them, but I do not give them to anybody else. Will the hon. gentleman give me the name of the person to whom this pass was given ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, I am quite prepared to hand over the copy of the letter to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). It is quite possible that the same thing has occurred in this connection as sometimes occurs in connection with other railways where, in cases of disputes arising over freight or baggage charges, passes are sent to claimants to enable them to go and confer with officials of the road. I received, for

a client, in one instance, not from the Intercolonial, but from another railway company, a pass to enable a claimant to go and interview one of the head officials of the road.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have followed the course which appeared to me to be fair. I have submitted the case to the minister, and I have given him all the information which I myself possess. I do not say whether it is a case in which a pass might be properly given or not, but I want to know from the minister whether it is such a case. I express no opinion at all, but I do express my astonishment that any member of parliament should write a letter to a gentleman and say : I am sending you a free pass to come from Petit Metis to Montreal on important business. It certainly requires an explanation, so that the people of the country may know how the department is administered.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. member whose name is mentioned will be here on Monday. In the meantime, I will make inquiries. He received no passes from me and the deputy says he received no passes from him. It may be that he bought a ticket and sent it to the man ; that would be a pass.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the hon. gentleman passes away from the question, I would ask him what are the initials of Mr. Courtney ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know ; his name is Reginald.

Mr. MONTAGUE. R. M. ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He does not advertise as a commission merchant. His card is in the Ottawa directory as 'R. M. Courtney, Insurance Agent.' It gives the insurance company he represents. There is nothing whatever about a commission business of any kind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman assumes that because he may be carrying on an insurance business, he would not be carrying on any other business.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I assume that if he was carrying on an insurance business and another business, he would advertise it on his cards.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The deputy minister tells me he is carrying on an insurance business and another business, and if he is not correct, we can easily find it out.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it understood to be a part of the rule of the Railway Department,

that in addition to the passes given to members, passes are given to their wives and members of their families ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, a trip pass during the session.

Mr. **FOSTER**. If it is the rule it ought to be made general, so that it would not be necessary to go and ask for it. Of course, in one sense, a thing that is worth anything is worth asking for, but after all, one puts himself under an obligation when he asks for a thing as a favour. I do not suppose that members on this side of the House would care to do that, even with so genial a person as the Minister of Railways. If it is going to be done at all, it should be done generally, as a matter of right, and not as a matter of favour.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The members receive annual passes, but these are trip passes.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. Is it confined to during the session ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Only during the session of parliament. No member gets it unless he applies, and I do not think there is any member of parliament who applied and has not promptly been accorded the courtesy.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Does that extend to members of the family ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, I have declined to extend it to the family of members on either side of the House.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. You have to draw the line somewhere.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not think it advisable to extend it. Might I ask the hon. member from Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), whether he saw the original of this letter ?

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. No, I just received this copy. I will give the hon. gentleman the name of the man who sent it, if he wishes.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. What is it, please ?

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. The name is L. H. Chouinard, of Matane.

To extend dyke at Leper's Brook..... \$300

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. This brook overflows its banks and floods the pits of the engine-house every year. This vote is to prevent that.

To build iron highway bridge, Rocky Lake. \$5,000

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There are three public railway crossings there and a dynamite factory near, and wagons loaded with dynamite

Mr. **FOSTER**.

now cross the track. There is an element of danger, apart from the ordinary hazard, and it is proposed to build an overhead bridge, and divert the highway.

To provide additional houses for engines. \$80,000

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. This is for the purpose of enlarging a number of the engine-houses along the road. It is intended to put in an entirely new eighteen-stall engine-house at Stellarton, which has become necessary.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. What will be done at Rivière du Loup ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We intend to extend and enlarge the engine-house there.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. Not a new building ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, an addition.

Mr. **H. F. McDOUGALL** (Cape Breton). Is it intended to extend the engine-house at Sydney ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We hope to be able to.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. What additional size is to be added ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I cannot say what the cost of each will be, but the average will be in the neighbourhood of \$10,000. It is likely we will have to enlarge Sydney more than we originally contemplated. The grant may be sufficient to enable us to do that although it may fall short.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Has not the enlargement and additions to engine-houses previously been charged to revenue ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. As a general rule that has been the case, but the demands that are now arising are of an exceptional and unusual character. Our engines have to be larger and heavier, and we require extensions of this kind.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Does the hon. gentleman think that whereas in former years when it became necessary to enlarge these engine-houses, they were charged to the revenues of the road, does he think that it makes any difference as to whether these are large or small engines, as to the method of charging such extensions. The fact is that the hon. gentleman is rendering completely useless any comparison as to the expenditures and receipts upon the Intercolonial Railway system by charging to capital account such items as this \$80,000 for the enlargement of station-houses, which were formerly charged to running expenses. This leaves the hon. gentleman \$80,000 of revenue available for the purposes of a surplus. It is an easy matter to have surpluses if the hon. gen-

tleman will change the method of appropriation and book-keeping, and will take out of capital and borrowed money what was formerly taken out of the earnings of the road. But how foolish it is to go about the country bragging about a surplus which you make in that way.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The answer to the statement which the hon. gentleman makes lies on the surface. What seems to be giving the hon. gentleman the most concern is the fear that this disturbs the value of a comparison. There is an easy and proper way in which you can make comparisons between the management and administration of the road at one period, and the management and administration at another. It is by ascertaining how much money was laid out of your earnings in each period for purposes of maintaining, repairing, improving and bettering the road and the equipment of the road. Here an emergency arises, a special condition presents itself; your business grows by one-half, you have to supply your road with additional and larger engines; you have to incur expenditures, either on capital account or out of income, away in excess of the receipts of the year. Would it be fair under these new and altered conditions to charge this extraordinary expenditure against the income of the year, and make out a deficit to the amount of half a million of dollars, when no necessity for such expenditures arose in times past? Would that be a fair comparison? It would no doubt suit the hon. gentleman when he wanted to show a deficit; but it would not be a fair comparison, and if a comparison is not fair, it ceases to be of legitimate value.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Did they never build engine-houses before?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The engines built on the Intercolonial Railway have all been built out of capital.

Mr. **FOSTER**. And the engine-houses enlarged?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not know of any enlargements before. The necessity for enlarging the engine-houses never existed until now. The engine-houses which we have are not thrown away, because we have a number of small engines; but for the larger engines we are getting, we require larger turntables and larger engine-houses.

Mr. **HAGGART**. There was \$40,000 voted last year, and you are now asking for \$80,000, making in all \$120,000. Will that finish the expenditure, or how much more will be required?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I cannot say that that will

finish it entirely. I am only asking for what will provide for the lay-out of the present year. We asked for \$60,000 last year, but we were not able to make arrangements to spend the money—we could not get the work done—and in the supplementary estimates for the present year we are asking parliament for a revote of \$52,000 out of the \$60,000 which we got last year.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. I would like to impress on the hon. minister the advisability of moving the engine-house in the town of Sydney to some other place, if possible.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I believe we are going to do that.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. The congested state of business close to the station, and the close proximity of the engine-house make it difficult to have business conducted there properly. The engine-house is also very close to one of the most important crossings in the town, and there is great danger arising from the way in which the railway crosses the street at present. Unless some precaution is taken, there will be serious accidents at that crossing.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We have had our engineers and officers down there with the view of providing new arrangements. I have the data available, and will call attention to the details when the supplementary estimates are up, touching the very subject the hon. gentleman has referred to. I think that the plans of the engineer will meet the needs of the situation.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. The hon. gentleman cannot make that crossing safe without providing a gate, because the railway track is right at the end of the bridge, and when teams are on the bridge they have to come within two feet of the track before they can see an engine coming out of the yard. The high board fence which is there prevents an engine being seen until you are within a few feet of the track, and unless something is done, a serious accident may happen at any moment.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We are going to make an entire change.

Mr. **J. A. GILLIES** (Richmond). Besides the danger alluded to by my hon. friend, I would draw the minister's attention to the extremely dangerous condition of two other crossings in the town of Sydney—the Mackenzie crossing and the Lorway crossing. The town is fast growing in the direction of these two crossings, and at the Mackenzie crossing the banks are very high on each side of the highway, and the street leading to the town of Sydney, crossing the railway at that point,

comes right up on to the railway. The Lorway crossing is equally dangerous. In fact, a man was killed there the other day, and something certainly should be done to prevent further fatalities happening. There is again the McKeagney crossing, very near the bridge, where the Sydney and Louisburg Railway joins with the government road. There is a number of tracks there, and this is the greatest thoroughfare going into the town of Sydney. Between the two crossings there is only a very small space, and often teams are caught there as in a trap. I was requested particularly to draw the attention of the minister to the condition of these three crossings.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will they require to be protected by gates?

Mr. GILLIES. Certainly. The department will be liable some of these days to heavy damages unless the precautions I indicate are taken.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Picton). I would like to get the attention of the hon. minister for a few moments with reference to the inspection of coal, as now conducted on the Intercolonial Railway system. In 1897. William B. Moore was coal inspector, and was dismissed that spring. I asked the hon. minister, in the course of that session, about this matter, and he told me the office had been abolished, but I have since learned that there are three individuals now acting as inspectors doing the same work Mr. Moore did. Will the hon. minister inform me who these are and what salaries they are getting?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If there are any inspectors there, they are only temporarily employed, and I cannot tell whether there are any, but I will telegraph in the morning for the information, and give it to the hon. gentleman before the estimates finally pass.

To pay balance due on Halifax cotton factory branch ..... \$5,802 50

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a matter to adjust book-keeping. There is no other way in which you can get this rectified.

Mr. POWELL. What is the arrangement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This Halifax cotton factory branch was originally built by the Halifax Cotton Company at their own expense for the purpose of affording a satisfactory means of railway connection with their factory on the high ground. This branch was such a convenient way of reaching the city, that it came into use to a very large extent by the Intercolonial Railway for its

Mr. GILLIES.

traffic. The Cotton Company agreed to transfer and have transferred all their interests in the line to the Intercolonial Railway. It was built originally at the expense of the Cotton Company, but with the understanding that we were to take it and operate it.

Mr. POWELL. What is the length of the branch?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It must be about three miles. We have a vote later on to provide for extending it. The present item is simply a matter of book-keeping. There is the sum of \$5,802 standing in our books and we want to have it struck off.

Intercolonial Railway—To provide freight shed and improve station at Rockingham. \$1,800

Mr. POWELL. What improvements are to be made at this station?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is now a small building which is used for both freight and passenger business. We propose to keep this for one of these purposes and put up an additional building for the other, and also, in the new one, to have another story, where the stationmaster can live.

Intercolonial Railway—To extend the cotton factory branch at Halifax..... \$7,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is the item to which I just referred. We own no land at the top of this height of ground, and have no place for our cars to stand. A large amount of business has drifted in that direction, and our cars are standing about, often blocking the streets and causing a great deal of public discontent. It has been found necessary to get additional land and lay down tracks and sidings, and, generally, to extend the line to a point in front of the commons.

Mr. HAGGART. How many miles is the extension?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The branch is about three miles, and it is proposed to extend it about half or three-quarters of a mile.

Mr. HAGGART. And it is to cost \$70,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, land is the most expensive item.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does it go on any part of the commons?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We go to the south-westerly side—not the part facing the harbour.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this to accommodate the Cotton Company?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, there is no occasion for it for their purposes, except that the cotton factory helps to swell the business and thus makes it necessary to provide more accommodation. A large number of residents of the city live up there, and a great deal of our traffic is carried up there at the desire of the people, because they get their freights delivered more satisfactorily than if they have to haul them up this hill.

**Mr. FOSTER**. How much did we spend on this extension ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Speaking from recollection, our expenditure was in the form of four or five thousand dollars worth of rails which were furnished by the late government. And, some time after they were furnished parliament passed an Act—one of the clauses of a Subsidy Act, I think, allowing the rails to be placed in construction on the Halifax Cotton Company's line and taken out of store account.

**Mr. GILLIES**. Will the hon. minister state what the land will cost ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We have had careful inquiries made into the question of right of way. We have paid nothing and have not yet acquired the land, waiting until we get the authority of parliament. I have before me a statement which has been prepared by the engineer upon this very subject of the valuation of the land we are proposing to take. Upon the valuations which we have ascertained, we judged that it would take to pay for the land and the consequences upon taking the land, \$70,000 or \$80,000. The extension proposed will cost \$96,000.

**Mr. POWELL**. Are you going to have a station up there ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is not contemplated to have a passenger station, we will have some freight buildings.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Is this for the cotton factory accommodation ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Not at all.

**Mr. McDOUGALL**. How is it that the parties interested in this siding do not provide the right of way, as we have to do in our town ? For instance, the town of North Sydney had to pay for the right of way for five miles into the town, otherwise they would not have got the railway. The town of Sydney could not get a railway to the water terminus, or to where the station is, without making a gift to the railway, of the right of way, at a cost of thousands of

dollars. I cannot understand why a different rule should be applied in one case to that which is applied in another.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. In the case of North Sydney they were desirous of having this extension made to the deep water, and they themselves made the offer, that if the government would do so and so, they would make a contribution of their own. That was the inducement held out, upon the strength of which the extension was made. This extension we are making at Halifax, is entirely for our own accommodation, and not in the interest of any individuals or residents in that locality.

**Mr. GILLIES**. In the case of North Sydney, before the railway could be got to the old terminus at all, the government made it a precedent that the town should furnish the right of way from the junction into the town; that was under the late government. The people of North Sydney did furnish the right of way from the junction to the town. The first location of the road into the town of Sydney, was placed at Fresh Water Creek, so-called, a distance of a mile from the present terminus, and when the people approached the government, and asked it to extend the road around the town to the deep water terminus, the government took the ground, that having selected the terminus, if the town wanted a deep water terminus, they would have to furnish the right of way between the place selected by the government and the place desired by the town. That was done, and the town paid thousands of dollars for that right of way. If it was made a condition that these towns should furnish the right of way, why should the rich city of Halifax call upon the government to pay \$70,000 or \$80,000 to pay for a siding ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The city of Halifax is making no demands, this is done in the interest of our own road.

**Mr. McDOUGALL**. The city of Halifax has terminal facilities given at public expense; they have the deep water terminus, the terminus at Richmond, and a terminus at the passenger station. To my mind this is done for the convenience of a portion of the people of the city, who desire to have this cotton factory siding, because it will be nearer to them than to the other station. Halifax is being treated more generously than the town of Sydney and the town of North Sydney. In the case of North Sydney, when the road was surveyed, the department provided only for going as near North Sydney as the junction, and when they were pressed to reach the town, the decision of the chief engineer was, that the government should not provide the right of way, but that the people should provide the right of way if they wanted the rail-

**Mr. BLAIR**.

way to go right into the town, and they did so, because they were determined to get it at any cost. It was the same in the case of Sydney. When the chief engineer decided on locating the terminus at what is known as Fresh Water Creek, the chief engineer took the ground that if they wanted the terminus anywhere else, they would have to pay for the right of way, and so they did. Instead of that being only for the convenience of the town, the location of the terminus at Sydney is more for the benefit of the railway, inasmuch as they were better able to make their connection with the Sydney and Louisburg Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman must not overlook the fact that there was not a large business at North Sydney, when this arrangement was made, to invite the construction of this railway, from a railway point of view. Therefore, it was that the government asked the people to pay for the right of way.

Mr. McDOUGALL. No, there was business always waiting for the railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It appeared to me to be a reasonable explanation of the action of the late government in the matter, but perhaps I am wrong in that, and I will have to leave the matter unexplained. As to this project all of this railway to the Halifax Cotton Company's premises was built at the expense of the Cotton Company.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Did they provide the right of way?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, they did it at their own expense. Now, the business conditions have so changed that we are obliged to increase our own accommodation. It is not a matter that we are asked to do by the corporation of Halifax, or by any of the people resident there. I have had no petitions from the people in the locality asking that this should be done, but it becomes absolutely necessary that we should increase our accommodation.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it proposed to buy out the interest of the Cotton Company, or to recoup them for what they have spent on the siding?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we do not require to buy it out. The cotton factory people agreed that the road should belong to ourselves if we would operate it. It was not supposed, I presume, that it would be very profitable to do so, or not sufficiently profitable to induce us to do so unless we were bound. We accepted the line on the condition that we would operate it. Now, the Intercolonial are driven by the increase of business, to extend this line to where they can get

Mr. McDOUGALL.

more yard room and where they can have tracks laid down to stall their cars.

Mr. POWELL. Have you expropriated the land for it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we have not struck a blow. The land on which the Cotton Company built the road was paid for by themselves.

Mr. HAGGART. Does this \$70,000 finish it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it will require \$26,000 more next year.

To increase station accommodation at Westville ..... \$8,000

Mr. POWELL. Is that to be a new station?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, we are converting the present building into a freight shed, and we are building a new station.

To increase accommodation at Sydney.... \$39,000

Mr. McDOUGALL. What increased accommodation is it proposed to give Sydney?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We propose to put in an additional siding to add to the freight house and the building adjoining, and we have to acquire land and to fill in a water lot. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) knows the lot I allude to. We have made an arrangement with the Steel Company which has bought rights in that neighbourhood. We think we have half of the property.

Mr. GILLIES. Are you buying from the Dominion Iron & Steel Company any land?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, whatever rights they may have in it they are willing to surrender to us. We claim that as riparian owners our property would run out to the middle of the body of water. I think, from a conversation I had with representatives of the Dominion Steel Company there would be no disposition on their part to raise any question to our rights. We have to fill in a water lot.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is that filling in to take place nearly opposite the station?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I thought there was a question about the ownership of the property.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Steel Company have bought up all the claims to the property.

Mr. McDOUGALL. To the water's edge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. Whatever remains would belong to the government and we are going to come to an understanding whereby we will get half of the property.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is another piece of land, which, I understand the government are taking over farther down from the station at what is known as Barrack Point, a property known as Louisa Garden.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I can locate the property that the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has the purchase of that property been completed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The latest information that I had on the subject was that the purchase had not been completed, but it was thought to be in a fair way to completion. I think the parties have agreed practically. There are two lots we are getting, one of which we will likely have to appropriate, while the parties are willing to sell the other at the price we are willing to pay.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There are two other properties, I understand, the government have been negotiating for, one between the bridge of the Steel Company's Works and the station, and one on the other side between it and the Sydney and Louisburg Railway before you come to the station?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has the department closed for the purchase of these properties?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have just said to the hon. gentleman that I think we can come to terms in regard to one of them, but in regard to the other I have my doubts.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can the minister tell me the names?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Would it be Muggah?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the name of the party, I think, that we cannot come to an agreement with.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The other party is Mitchell. I think it is more likely that you would be able to come to an agreement with Mitchell.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not clear about it. There is one property that we will have to appropriate.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The other property is known as the Louisa Garden. It is away

beyond that. Will the minister tell me the area of the land he proposes to take?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have plans of the whole undertaking, but I did not bring them with me. I think they will more particularly have a bearing on the items in the supplementary estimates. I will show them to my hon. friend if he would like to see them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it proposed to remove the station building from its present site?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We were considering whether we would use that for freight purposes and remove the station elsewhere, but it has not been finally determined upon.

Mr. McDOUGALL. A suitable site for the station could be found between the present site and the street leading down to the Steel Company's bridge. The present station could be utilized for freight sheds.

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

To provide sidings at Stellarton..... \$39,000

Mr. POWELL. Is it not exceptional to charge this to capital?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is entirely in accordance with precedents. It would be impossible to construct these sidings otherwise than from capital account. I do not say that they were all charged to capital formerly, but some of them were.

Mr. POWELL. What years?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot say just now. The sidings required are so extensive that it is absolutely impossible to provide for them in any other way.

Mr. POWELL. I think the minister is in error as to this being in accordance with precedents, because I have his return before me which he brought down last year, and in that return I find that during the years 1892-3-4-5-6, there were charged up to revenue account for sidings, no less a sum than \$57,699, or a yearly average of \$11,539.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and we are building out of revenue now just as extensively as they were built before.

Mr. POWELL. It is remarkable that these sidings should now be charged to capital. In the preceding years from 1881 to 1891, there were constructed sidings to the extent of \$246,537 out of revenue, or a yearly average of \$24,623. It does strike one as being a remarkable change.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The minister says he is building quite as much out of revenue now.

Mr. POWELL. I cannot tell what is building out of revenue this year, but his own return shows that he is in error, not only in respect to sidings, but to other things. There is a general tendency in the Railway department to charge these things to capital that had previously been charged to revenue. In this return for the five years from 1891 to 1896, buildings to the value of \$30,628 were charged to revenue, and during that time I fail to find a building charged to capital. Take the rebuilding of the Halifax elevator, that whole expenditure was charged to revenue. On no system of book-keeping, giving the minister the benefit of the most scientific process, can all these works be charged to capital. The betterments might be charged to capital, but to charge the whole thing to capital is simply ridiculous work. It is done for a purpose. I might point out also the gross injustice in this case which I have mentioned. At the time of the fire the wharf was destroyed and during the last year of the administration of the ex-minister (Mr. Haggart), that wharf was rebuilt at a cost of over \$50,000, which was entirely paid out of the revenues of the road. Take that item alone, and if the ex-minister (Mr. Haggart) had pursued the policy of the present minister (Mr. Blair) and had charged that to capital he would have wiped out his deficit, and have a surplus for every year he was administering the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How was the elevator built?

Mr. POWELL. Entirely out of revenue; not a dollar out of capital. From 1881 to 1891, I find from this return that \$183,999.69 was expended in the reconstruction of buildings and charged entirely up to revenue. While it is true that it may be hard that very large expenditures may be made in one year, yet that did not deter former Ministers of Railways from charging to revenue what is now charged to capital. In the year 1894, \$63,028.25 was charged to revenue for one building alone, and in the following year, for the completion of that building, \$29,000 was also charged to revenue, and not a cent to capital, but strange to say on this very building, the present minister (Mr. Blair) has charged \$7,000 to capital for fitting up an upper storey. Take the bridges. I simply wish to show how unfair it is; if for no other purpose, unfair to his predecessors that this should be done. His predecessor is attacked for allowing the road to run down, but his predecessor charged to revenue and not to capital in the five years I have mentioned no less a sum than \$98,855, an annual average of \$19,771 for bridges. All that was charged to revenue and not to capital. The minister (Mr. Blair) talks about the preceding history of the road. In a return which I have before me, I find that during

M. MONTAGUE.

the ten years from 1881 to 1891, the policy pursued by the present minister (Mr. Blair), was not pursued at all. When Ministers of Railways, under the Conservative government were charged by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) with improper book-keeping, with having cooked the accounts, with having fraudulently deceived the electorate; when they were charged with this, I find that no less a sum than \$234,495 was expended on the construction of bridges, in many cases new, but all of which was charged to revenue and not to capital. That does not represent the whole of it, because this statement that I have is simply a statement of betterments. The original cost is not included at all. Under the hon. gentleman's method of book-keeping the original bridges were all to be thrown to the winds and the total expenditure charged to capital, whereas there is the difference between the cost of the new structures and the cost of the old structures, which should be deducted. I find an item of land damages to the amount of \$2,500.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does not the hon. gentleman know that that is an item which has appeared continuously and without cessation every year since the Intercolonial Railway was built? The item of \$2,000, for land damages on the Oxford, New Glasgow and Cape Breton division appeared years before I came in, and I am simply continuing it. In some years there is something paid on it, and in some years nothing, just as the claims arise.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman is charging all land damages to capital, and on scientific principles of railway book-keeping he may be correct. I am simply calling attention to the unfair comparison this leads to. During the five years covered by the return which the hon. gentleman has brought down, I find that there was an expenditure on land damages of \$12,988, or an annual average of \$2,598, every cent of which was paid out of revenue. I also find that from July 1, 1881, down to July 1, 1891, a period of ten years, on land and land damages there was expended out of the revenues of the road \$30,802, or an annual average of \$3,080; whereas, the hon. gentleman is charging all these to capital. Another item here is \$2,000 for a building for baggage and express at Truro. If the hon. gentleman will take the pains to look back, he will find that buildings to a much larger extent than that have been frequently charged to revenue and not to capital—not only station-buildings, but residences for station agents. Here is an item of \$300 to extend a dyke charged to capital. In other years a trivial item like that would be charged to revenue and not to capital. We have here an item of \$16,200 to increase accommodation at

Halifax. I do not know exactly what that means, but last year we had a similar instance with respect to Moncton. There was an item chargeable to capital put in the estimates during 1896 by the ex-Minister of Railways in connection with the re-building at Moncton. So far as that stone and brick building was a betterment upon the old one, so far would the expenditure be charged to capital; but the old building was there, and yet, the total outlay is charged to capital, and not a cent to revenue.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimates were prepared by the late government.

Mr. POWELL. So far as the charge was for betterment, it was rightly charged to capital; but, the hon. gentleman does not charge it to capital on the basis of betterment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was not made on any such basis, either.

Mr. POWELL. I happen to be able to tell the hon. gentleman that the estimate was for only a portion of the expenditure, the betterment portion, which was a capital item. That item was put in at my own solicitation. I talked the matter over with both the ex-Minister of Finance and the ex-Minister of Railways. We discussed it from top to bottom, and they thought that inasmuch as there were considerable outlays made at Halifax and other places during 1896, which had to be charged in the accounts of that year, they could not see their way to contribute it at that time. I pointed out that betterment was a fair charge to capital expenditure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have the estimates and the explanations, and it was not on that basis.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman is venturing an assertion at random about something which he can absolutely know nothing about. He knows that there was an item in the estimates, but further than that, he is merely surmising. I happen to be in a position to know.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, it is very strange if it did not appear.

Mr. POWELL. I asked the hon. gentleman if the explanations ever appear in the estimates. What a silly thing that is for a Minister of Railways to say.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not state that they appear in the estimates, but they do appear in the office.

Mr. POWELL. I ask the hon. gentleman if he saw in the office any explanation different from what I have given?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have seen none such as you have given.

Mr. POWELL. Did the hon. gentleman see any explanation of it? I might go into other matters, such as the changing of air-brakes on passenger cars, \$13,000. If I mistake not, these improvements on passenger cars were formerly charged almost entirely to revenue, and not to capital. For instance, I find that from 1881 to 1891, there were improvements in freight cars amounting to \$45,000, or \$4,500 per annum, all charged to revenue and not to capital. And see also that there were charges amounting to \$90,000 for betterments on locomotives between 1881 and 1891, and these were all charged to revenue and not to capital. And by the return which the hon. gentleman has brought down, I find that between 1881 and 1897, a total of no less than \$115,062 was charged to revenue and not to capital. In the same way, I find that from 1891 to 1896 an expenditure of \$41,462 on passenger cars, and \$177,822 on other classes of cars were charged to revenue. If the hon. gentleman is going to adopt the principle of charging to capital instead of to revenue not only all betterments, but all these outlays, which were previously charged to revenue, he can see how absolutely fallacious is any comparison which he attempts to make between his own administration and the administration of his predecessor. I shall not take up the time of the House in discussing the matter at unnecessary length at this stage of the session; but, I do protest against this method of charging to capital what should be charged to income; and if the hon. gentleman continues to pursue the course he has adopted, then, I think it would be only fair, in giving his statement to the House and the country, that it should be supplemented by a statement on his part showing candidly that he is adopting a principle which is unfair to the administration of his predecessors, in some cases to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). I remember when the leader of the opposition was Minister of Railways, we had a very lengthy discussion in this House on items then charged to capital account that we thought should have been charged to working expenses. Some of those items were snow-sheds. In some cases, snow-sheds had been burnt on the Intercolonial Railway, and the new ones erected in their place, were charged to capital account.

Mr. FOSTER. What year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not remember.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not remember the year, but can turn up the discussion. Snow-sheds were actually charged to capital ac-

count, and the leader of the opposition, who was then Minister of Railways, said that while the repairs to cars should be charged to working expenses, new cars should be charged to capital account, and new engines, unless when they replaced old ones that were worn out.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has made the statements he did, because that helps us to a better understanding of his position, but I must express my surprise that, knowing thoroughly well how immensely the business of the railway has increased, and how imperative it is that these improvements, additions and extension in various ways, should take place, he should be almost the first man in this House to raise an objection to the proposed improvements.

Mr. **POWELL**. I am not objecting.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman is objecting and endeavouring to create a feeling in this parliament against putting the Intercolonial Railway into proper shape.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. State the words in which he objected.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The inference is perfectly clear. He says it is improper, that it is not a sound principle, what does that mean, but objecting?

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. He objected that it was not fair, for the purposes of comparison, to charge these things to capital, instead of to revenue.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Exactly, what I was proposing to do, was not fair. What was the object of the hon. gentleman's criticism?

Mr. **FOSTER**. To show that you are boasting of a surplus which you ought not to boast of.

Mr. **POWELL**. I said that it was not fair to your predecessor.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is eminently fair, and I am not boasting of a surplus I have not got. I am willing to make a comparison with the expenditure of the late government, covering all the ground which may be embraced within the improvement and betterment and the repairs of the Intercolonial Railway. Take them altogether. That is the way to do it. It is not fair to take an item here and there, as the hon. gentleman is so very ready to do, and say that the late government spent out of income a large amount for this or that purpose, but you are spending it out of capital.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. Does the hon. gentleman mean the House to understand that he

Mr. **McMULLEN**.

is making quite as large an expenditure out of revenue for betterment, as his predecessor did?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is what I mean. I make a larger expenditure, and I have given you the figures, and want them to be challenged. The hon. member for Westmoreland undertook to deal with figures the other night, but what did he do? I had proved that the average expenditure during the years I had been in charge of the department, as compared with the three years preceding, was larger, or, in other words, that in the three years of this government, we expended on these items something like \$50,000 per year more than was spent by the previous government in a corresponding period. If that statement is correct, and let hon. gentlemen contradict it if they can, it proves not that I spent as much on any one item, as perhaps the late government did upon the same item, but that my expenditure on the whole, was greater. You cannot look for the same class of outlay every year. Some years you will spend more on locomotives, in others you will spend more on buildings, and in others on rails, but taking them altogether, and comparing the three years of this administration with three preceding years, the outlay for the purposes of betterment, repairs, maintenance and equipment, made by this government, has exceeded the amount expended in the same period by the late government.

Mr. **HAGGART**. On revenue account?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

Mr. **HAGGART**. That is not so.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I say it is so.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Should not the hon. gentleman take a comparative view, based on the income of the road. You ought to spend more proportionately, when your income is greater.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That does not necessarily follow, but as a matter of fact, I have. I showed that this year the amount that was expended, taking into account the additional mileage of the Drummond County Railway, was over a quarter of a million more than the hon. gentleman expended during a corresponding period. The increase in the business is great, as hon. gentlemen know. We have heard nothing on the other side of the House, but appeals for extensions in all directions. The leader of the opposition, in the early part of the session, asked why I had not gone on putting up buildings, laying down additional sidings, affording more facilities, and he complained that I had not anticipated the growth of business and supplied the necessary extensions in all direc-

tions. What does that prove? It proves, accepting the statement of these gentlemen, that the increase in the business calls for larger expenditures than were ever called for before, many times larger than that ever called for by an increase in the business before, in the way of additional equipment and additional expenditure of all kinds, sidings, platforms, and other things that go to make up conveniences for the transaction of business of a railway.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are you still building loading platforms?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. When you have to extend your sidings, you have to extend your platforms as well.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We do not have them in the west.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You ought to have them; they are very useful. The hon. gentleman seems to think it is unfair for purposes of comparison that these charges should be made out of capital, overlooks the unfairness of a comparison between my administration and that of my predecessor if I were to be called upon to bear all these charges out of income. With my predecessor the business did not increase, and we did not need all these things. But I have to provide for a million and a half additional business. These hon. gentlemen think it would be all right to have all these things paid out of income. Then they could say that this government had greatly increased the Intercolonial deficit, and had spent a great deal more than their predecessors, and they would have given that as a conclusive proof that we had failed in our management. They would not take any notice of the increased demands arising. Therefore, it is that the hon. member is demanding that these sums be charged to income.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has the revenue increased in three years?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About a million and a half. The revenue for the year just passed, I stated at \$4,530,000. The last week was an estimate. Since then I find the actual receipts were \$4,540,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That ought to carry considerable more improvements.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And it has carried \$250,000 more improvements. But if the ideas of hon. gentlemen opposite had been carried out, instead of having a margin, a fair margin of profit on the transactions of the year, I would have had to spend nearly a million of money. The result in the long run—or in the short run, for that matter—is just the same to the treasury. The only com-

plaint of these hon. gentlemen is that we are not paying all these things out of income and showing a great deficit. If the expenditures made by this government for the maintenance of the road are as large as those of their predecessors—and certainly they are larger—we have fully met the demand, and the comparison is a perfectly fair one. The hon. gentleman has gone over a number of items which, he says, had been paid for out of income by the late government. I am satisfied that I can establish that my predecessor (Mr. Haggart) built sidings out of capital, built stations out of capital, and, in fact, made all the other classes of expenditure out of capital which are charged to capital here. I do not say, and never have, that the hon. gentleman did not pay for any sidings except out of capital. I think probably he built a large proportion of sidings out of income. But I have built as many and more than he built, but more are wanted than I can build out of income. They are absolutely necessary—there is a cry from all points for them, in consequence of increased business.

Mr. HAGGART. I would call attention to the fact that while the business has increased \$1,400,000, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) only wants \$2,000,000 within the same period for increased rolling stock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) knows there has been an increase in the mileage, quite as much as there was in 1891, when he bought 1,016 cars of various kinds, and charged them to capital.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was not that when the road was extended to the Island of Cape Breton, when there was an additional 100 miles of railway requiring this rolling stock?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not finding fault with it; but I am saying that the addition of the Montreal extension makes even a greater addition of mileage than that of 1891.

Mr. POWELL. Your additional rolling stock is all right—that is a fair charge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not got as much yet as I would be entitled to. I am willing that the comparisons should be made, but hon. gentlemen opposite want to make them one sided. Whenever he can find that I am paying for cars or for other improvements larger amounts in proportion than were expended by the late government, or if my outlay for betterments and repairs is not equal or greater than his, then, for purposes of comparison, I would be at a disadvantage.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to read for the benefit of the hon. gentleman a discussion

that took place in 1885, on a vote to supply air brakes to 100 engines, \$78,500 :

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would give us some information?

Mr. POPE. Up to the present time we have had the ordinary brakes in use. We have found them not only expensive but dangerous. Trains could not be stopped with them as quickly as with improved brakes. After a good deal of pressure brought to bear on the government by those who patronized the road, we felt it to be in the interest of the country to obtain the most improved brakes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Whose patent is to be used?

Mr. POPE. The Westinghouse.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman yielded to the pressure last year, for there is a large sum in the Public Accounts for the application of the Westinghouse air brake.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. An item of this kind should be taken out of ordinary income. To place charges for air brakes to capital account, which is supposed to represent permanent improvements, seems questionable policy.

Mr. BLAKE. How much has already been spent on the application of the Westinghouse air brake?

Mr. POPE. I cannot state.

Mr. SHANLY. When these 100 engines are supplied with the air brakes, will that finish the equipment of all engines on the road?

Mr. POPE. All but fifteen.

Mr. BLAKE. How many engines are there on the road?

Mr. POPE. One hundred and sixty, I think.

Mr. VAIL. There were \$32,500 expended last year.

Mr. BLAKE. This is all charged to capital account.

Mr. POPE. This is a new thing, and we think it properly belongs to capital account. We have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite that in repairing rolling stock we charge it to capital account, but we do nothing of the kind. Our running power has gradually increased from \$1,000,000 in 1877 to \$2,170,868 this year; and as we require more rolling stock to keep pace with our traffic, we charge it to capital account.

Mr. POWELL. I fail to see the pertinency of those observations. The hon. gentleman has charged me with making an unfair statement. If he will refresh his memory he will find that in these matters I have never taken the ground that the additional rolling stock required for a new road, or required for any portion of an old road, is a proper revenue charge, or that it is wrong to charge it to capital. Any gentleman who takes that ground, notwithstanding that Sir Richard Cartwright took ground like that, is taking an unfair ground. So far as necessary additional rolling stock is concerned, the hon. gentleman is making a fair and legitimate charge. What I found fault with him for the other night is that whereas he had allowed 320 cars to be condemned and remain condemned instead of rebuilding them at the expense of revenue, he had bought 260 cars and charged them to

Mr. McMULLEN.

capital. That is one item. The hon. gentleman has charged me with unfairly treating his comparisons the other night. I have to say to him that the unfairness and the absurdity are in his own comparison that he made the other night. Now, in railway accounts those matters that are betterments, those matters that look to the maintenance of the road-bed and the plant are classified under thirteen or fourteen heads. What are those heads? I have made a careful list of them: Repairs to engines, repairs to passenger cars, post, express and baggage cars, freight cars and vans, snow ploughs and flanges, ties upon the road, lumber, wharfs, buildings, platforms, rails and fencing, repairs to tools, repairs to water tanks. Those are the classes into which these expenditures for maintenance for roadway and plant are classified in the reports from time to time given out by the department. Now, the hon. gentleman makes a statement, made no doubt upon information furnished him, but information which I challenge. When I replied to him the other evening, what I objected to was that in 1893 he singled out the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals for condemnation in scrimping the expenditures upon the road, in starving the service. That charge was unfounded. In 1893, upon these thirteen services, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals expended \$1,308,413. Now, the last year ending 30th June, 1899, the hon. gentleman, with one-seventh more road than his predecessor had, expended \$20,000 less; whereas he should have expended, if the former regime was running down the road, nearly \$20,000 more.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Have you the items there?

Mr. POWELL. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The same as you put in the other night?

Mr. POWELL. No, but I will give him the totals for the same services. In 1894 the expenditure was, \$1,179,388; that is less than the minister spent last year. In 1895 the expenditure was \$1,178,734; 1896, \$1,278,681; in 1897, the first year the hon. gentleman came in, he expended, \$1,215,045. I have not got a statement for 1898, for the reason that that year was not clear. My object was to show a comparison between the earnings of the road with the extension to Montreal, and the earnings before the extension was built, consequently I did not make a statement for 1898. But, taking these years, I find that if the hon. gentleman had, upon these thirteen services, made the same proportionate outlay that his predecessor had made in 1893, he would have expended, not \$1,308,413, but \$1,471,704. He actually expended only \$1,283,000. So that he expended less by \$188,900 relatively, than his predecessor did in 1893, when he complains that his pre-

decessor had been starving the service of the road. I will tell the hon. gentleman how he makes it up. There are certain items that have nothing to do with the road-bed at all, that are entirely dependent upon the amount of traffic, and that is the train service. That is where the hon. gentleman has swollen his expenditures to the enormous amount he has referred to.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I did not include items for train service at all. The hon. gentleman says that I had taken the total of the average for 1897, 1898 and 1899. I have found that upon maintenance and new plant, he was \$50,000 in excess of what his predecessor had for the three previous years. Now, I call this fact to the attention of the hon. gentleman, that in 1896, or immediately preceding his advent to power, the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals rebuilt, out of revenue, the Halifax wharf, whereas the hon. gentleman is making a similar expenditure out of capital, and he omitted in his showing to take notice of this very important fact. Why, in 1898 the hon. gentleman was over \$200,000 behind! Let him distribute that over his three years, and where does his \$50,000 go? I put two years repairs in one.

Mr. **POWELL**. Well, we will give the benefit to you of two years, and then you come out behind \$200,000. Irrespective of the fair addition upon what you should make on account of additional mileage, you are still behind the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, even on your own showing. When the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was boasting of his surplus, he might have reflected a moment upon this fact: Taking four years of the administration of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals and retaining that charge against the working expenses and the rebuilding of the wharf at Halifax, the hon. gentleman's annual average deficit was about \$6,000, while the hon. minister's average deficit for three years is \$60,000 odd. Taking out this expenditure in the Halifax wharf and the ex-minister would have an average surplus of about \$8,000 per annum. But, if he will take a period of years, he will see where he is landed. The hon. gentleman has had an additional revenue of \$1,500,000. In anticipation of an increase of revenue of \$1,500,000 any manager of a railway would say that a very large percentage of that should be clear gain. On the contrary, the hon. gentleman only announced a surplus last year of \$100,000 on increased traffic, amounting to \$1,500,000. I think, in view of the fact that on the railways of Canada, every dollar of additional revenue was earned at a cost of about 22 cents, while every dollar of additional revenue was earned by the hon. gentleman at a cost of upwards of 93 cents, it is a very bad showing. If the hon. gentleman compares the management of his railway with that of the five leading rail-

ways of Canada, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canada Atlantic Railway, the Dominion Atlantic Railway, and the Canada Southern Railway, he will find that he has a worse showing than any one of these leading railways by 50 per cent. almost with the exception of the Grand Trunk Railway, which had a very small surplus.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Would the hon. gentleman argue or claim that it would be desirable that the rates on the Intercolonial Railway should be raised to the same altitude as the rates of the five great railways he has mentioned?

Mr. **POWELL**. Now, the hon. gentleman is raising a point that I will have to ask him to put upon the Notice paper. I do not think the hon. gentleman's question is pertinent. I am speaking now of increased traffic. The rates are exactly the same as they were before, and when the hon. gentleman considers his fixed charges and considers the proportion of the variable charges, he will find that a showing of 92 cents cost for every additional dollar of revenue earned, is a very sorry showing indeed.

Mr. **MONTAGUE**. How are the rates now as compared with 1896—higher, are they not?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think not.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. The local rates are higher. I pay 75 cents a ton on coal, whereas I used to pay 50 cents.

To continue improvements at Mulgrave... \$25,000

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. What are these improvements?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is a very congested point. There are no conveniences for the handling of the traffic going to and from the ferries, and we require to extend the wharf there, to fill in and grade the station yard, and to put in sidings.

To complete subway at Christy's Brook,  
Amherst ..... \$1,800

Mr. **POWELL**. Where is that?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Near Christy's, where the highway crosses the railway at the rail level. There has been a good deal of complaint about that crossing.

Mr. **POWELL**. There was an embankment there?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes. We are proposing to construct a subway at Christy's Crossing.

To increase accommodation at Amherst ... \$3,500

Mr. **POWELL**. Is that station, or yard accommodation?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We require additional siding accommodation, besides which we have to extend the passenger platform, provide a crane for the handling of traffic and to add to the baggage-room. There are several purposes for which this vote is asked.

Mr. HAGGART. A crane in the station yard?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. What kind of traffic are you providing a crane for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We require a crane to handle the traffic there.

Mr. LOGAN. It is to handle stone from the quarry.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely they provide their own crane?

Mr. LOGAN. There has always been a crane. There is a crane now, but it is not good enough for the traffic.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it possible that the railway provides the apparatus for loading?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We provide a crane to handle the traffic.

Mr. HAGGART. It was never known on a railway before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Always on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. But private parties provided it.

Mr. McCLURE. The government provides one at Truro.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Canadian Pacific Railway has one at the town where I live for loading threshing machines and other heavy freight.

To strengthen bridges..... \$100,000

Mr. FOSTER. What are you going to do with this?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are going to construct one bridge at Mill Stream and another at Penobscot.

Mr. HAGGART. Are you constructing or strengthening?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are taking out the structures that are there now, and in part distributing them along at various points strengthening the other ones and putting in new structures in the other cases. The plan adopted by the department is that if we have twelve bridges, we double the old ones

Mr. POWELL.

up making six, and then make the other six entirely new.

Mr. HAGGART. On all railways, the betterment is all that is charged to capital account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what we are doing.

Mr. HAGGART. That is what I want to know. If you take up a 56-pound rail, and put in a 70-pound rail, you only charge the difference to capital account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is all. That is the basis on which we are asking the appropriation.

To change air brakes on passenger cars... \$13,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where are you getting this done?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We get the brakes from the Westinghouse Company with whom we have a contract for a term of years.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it done by contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. POWELL. What do these cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About \$40 a car.

Mr. POWELL. Are the freight cars pretty well all changed now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Our time is pretty well up for making the change.

To change draw-bars on freight cars..... \$20,000

Mr. FOSTER. What do these cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. \$25 apiece.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are they got?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to speak with confidence, but there is an American patent and I think they are manufactured in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you get them by contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Are they a success?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They say so.

Mr. HAGGART. Have they been adopted by any other road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. We have notices from the several American railroads that they will not take our cars unless they are so equipped. The Baltimore and Ohio is one company.

Mr. HAGGART. Have Canadian companies got it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They must all have it, otherwise they could not send their cars across the line.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware that there is a combination of the holders of patents relating to railways who endeavour to force these couplers and other things upon the railways under the pretense that they are doing it in the public interest. It is a perfect fraud, and I doubt very much whether the railways in Canada have complied with these demands.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These rules, so far as they relate to the use of couplers and other apparatus, are enforced by the interstate board, and we have to submit. I have no doubt that what the hon. gentleman says is true, that the holders of these patents work up these combinations and impose their views upon the associations; but we are obliged to comply with them in order to have our cars admitted into the United States.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has the minister any report from his own staff on the road with regard to these draw-bars?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that I have got what you might call a report, but every year they send a requisition of some kind.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I might say that I saw a good deal of these couplers and draw-bars in use by the brakemen on the Intercolonial Railway, and I do not look upon them as a success.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The association maintains that they are safer.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not think the brakemen would say that they are. Does the minister say that at the mere whim of a railway outside of Canada, that happens to receive a car from us, he is to change the couplers and draw-bars on his whole system?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If people who do business with us have freights which they want to send to the United States, and if our cars are not admitted to the United States, we are not going to be able to do business. We have nothing to say about this matter. We must submit, or else undertake not to forward any freight at all to the United States. That would not suit our people.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then, if there is a man connected with the Baltimore and Ohio Railway who has a draw-bar or coupler which he wants to have adopted, he has only to go to the manager of that railway and induce him to put some of them on his cars, and at once the minister will change the whole system of the Intercolo-

nia Railway at the expense of this country.

Intercolonial Railway—Chargeable to capital—To provide additional rolling-stock ..... \$950,000

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister tell us what he intends to do with this immense amount of money? Does it not frighten himself sometimes?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would be much more frightened if I had to sit here and be denounced by hon. gentlemen opposite for not providing sufficient accommodation. We have \$950,000 in these estimates, \$190,000 in the supplementaries of last year, and \$400,000 in the supplementaries of the current year, making \$1,540,000 for cars. This amount of \$950,000 will furnish us with twenty-eight additional locomotives, 508 box freight cars, and twenty cattle cars.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are you getting the cattle and box cars?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are getting some from the Crossen Company, some from the Rathbun Company, and some from Rhodes, Curry & Co.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they all made in Canada and under contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are you getting your locomotives?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have no locomotives now under construction, except such as are being built at the Kingston works.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you propose to get your twenty-eight locomotives in Canada?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We cannot get them all in Canada. The last we got were from the Baldwin Company of Philadelphia. We got those at an exceptionally low figure, I think the cheapest of the size and weight that were ever brought into Canada. We bought them for \$9,800 each, their weight being between seventy-two and seventy-five tons.

Mr. POWELL. Are your box cars chiefly large ones?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, thirty tons.

Mr. POWELL. Could not some of these engines be made in the shops at Moncton?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We made four entirely new engines there last year.

Mr. POWELL. How do they compare in cost with the Baldwin ones?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We put in nine new locomotives this year. Four were made in our own shops and five were bought.

Mr. POWELL. The engines made in Moncton are really better than the Baldwin engine, requiring less repairs and are handier and do better work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to say that, because, in the general opinion of railway men, there is no better engine than the Baldwin made in the world. It may be that the men are not yet thoroughly familiar with the handling of it, but after a little training and experience, they will be able to handle it better and it will not require so much repairs as at present.

Mr. HAGGART. How do the Kingston locomotives turn out?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not too badly. The only trouble with the Kingston people is that they are so slow.

To provide accommodation and facilities along the line of railway ..... \$104,000

Mr. McDOUGALL. What facilities?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are providing here for an enlargement of the freight house and to buy land to put on a Y at North Sydney Junction, which will cost \$7,000 or \$8,000 before we get through.

Mr. McDOUGALL. To come in between that part of the road that runs into Sydney from the junction to the part that runs into North Sydney?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should think so. At St. Rosalie Junction we will have to furnish a Y also, which will cost \$3,000; another at Ingersoll; we have to extend and improve our station at Nash's Creek; we have some snow fences to construct; we have to convert a station house into a freight shed, and build a new station house in that town; we have to do the same at Milford and at Valley; we have to erect a protection wall in Cape Breton on both sides of the Grand Narrows; we have to put up freight protection at the embankments on the Oxford line at Tatagonish; we have to provide increased accommodation at Tignish and East Mines, and new tracks and Y at Springhill Junction; increased freight and passenger accommodation at Adamsville; new station house and freight shed at Barnaby River, and the old building we are converting into freight purposes; then we have to put up a dwelling house at Mulgrave for our station agent and another at Red Pine.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has the hon. gentleman provided any improvement in the station built at Boisdale.

Mr. POWELL.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I called attention the other night to the condition of that station. I told the hon. gentleman that one or two doctors had declared that the building was not fit to be inhabited by any human being, except it was intended to kill them. The hon. gentleman moved a young man with his family from Grand Narrows into that station, and compels them to live in that place, and yet will not spend a dollar to improve its sanitary condition. The drainage is bad, the cellar of the station is always half full of water and cannot be used.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must have that matter looked into.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It was called to the attention of the officials of the department from time to time, and they got reports more than a year ago, and yet nothing has been done. The first stationmaster who had charge of that station died in it, the next stationmaster lost his wife, and the doctor reported that both deaths were due to its unsanitary condition. Another death or two took place since from the same cause, and I do not see how the hon. gentleman can expect any one to live in it.

The other day I made application for a siding near the town of Sydney, and the hon. minister said he would have the matter attended to at once. But I have a letter from the general manager, dated the 4th instant, in which he says he sent a report to Ottawa, but has not yet received any instructions.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All I can say is that a day or two before the hon. gentleman mentioned the matter, the deputy minister put under my eyes the application to be approved, and I approved it immediately.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have here the letter. It is dated Moncton, 4th July. It acknowledges the receipt of my letter of 30th of June, and says he sent the papers and reports in regard to the siding to Mr. Schreiber on the 26th of June.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very likely. In due course of mail it came here, and Mr. Schreiber at the first opportunity brought the matter before me, and I decided it.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. minister allow sidings to be built between stations?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. No other railroad on the continent does.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have them on our road.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no greater danger to those travelling on the road than to have these numerous sidings.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman must remember that he allowed sidings when he was minister—

Mr. HAGGART. I do not care whether I did or not. As a general principle there ought not to be sidings between the stations. They ought to put sidings at proper intervals, and have people go there. If you allow sidings between stations, that is an end to the utility of your road.

Mr. POWELL. That would not do very well down our way. I know half a dozen places where, if you do away with a siding you do away with the living of those who use it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The remedy is to put a station at each siding.

Mr. POWELL. That would be expensive. I suppose they lock it up and give the key to the section man, so there is not so much danger.

Mr. HAGGART. But there is danger.

Mr. McDOUGALL. These sidings are put in for temporary purposes. In my own case there were 400 cars loaded, not one of which would have been loaded if they had been obliged to go to the nearest stations. From temporary sidings put in this way there were 3,000 cars delivered to the railway that would not have been delivered if the sidings were not put in where the material was convenient.

Prince Edward Island Railway—Murray Harbour branch, including Hillsboro' bridge ..... \$700,000

Mr. A. MARTIN (East Prince, P.E.I.) How much of the sum voted last year was expended ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there could not have been very much, because the contract was made late, and I think the contractor had not begun to earn. Something may have been paid on account of material, but that would be all.

Mr. MARTIN. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir L. H. Davies) speaking for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) last year, made the voting of this money an excuse why no sums should be spent in Prince Edward Island for wharfs all over the province. And yet the sum was not expended at all. What part of this \$700,000 is to be expended on the bridge, and what part on the railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the figures ; but I

should judge that in the current year we should build the substructure of the bridge which should cost about half a million, leaving about \$200,000 for expenditure upon the railway. We can spend \$200,000, I imagine, within twelve months. The contractors will work vigorously.

Mr. MARTIN. Contractors for the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I am speaking of the railway. No doubt the hon. gentleman desires to have the work pushed vigorously, and we propose to do so.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the hon. minister decided when tenders are to be called for for the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The call for tenders for the substructure of the bridge have already gone out.

Mr. MARTIN. The minister has only about twelve out of sixty miles under contract, and that only for grading. What about the rest of the line ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There have been petitions from various localities, and there is a good deal of rivalry as to the route to be taken. We want to give that some consideration before finally deciding.

Mr. MARTIN. I would ask the minister as to the proposed cross line by way of Montague bridge, concerning which I asked before ? His reply would indicate that he is in total oblivion about the petition sent, and not only these, but petitions with regard to other branches in different parts of the province. His reply does not cover petitions which I know to have been sent to the Secretary of State.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, they have not reached my department yet ; because, I apprehend that my officers would furnish me a statement of all the petitions received by the department.

Mr. MARTIN. I want to know if the government has come to any decision as to the construction of any, or how many of these lines ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is something I was not able to announce to my hon. friend, for the reason that no definite decision had been arrived at.

Mr. MARTIN. The minister knows that the survey for this road began in 1897. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said in this House that he was going to remove the building of that road from being a party question.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It has ceased to be a party question now, pretty well.

**Mr. MARTIN**. He has run two elections on the strength of that road already in that province. In 1897, a small sum was put in the estimates for a survey, with loop lines, in order to secure votes in two or three sections. These were alternate lines surveyed merely for the purpose of catching votes. The engineers were interfered with in their work with this object. In 1897 a sum was voted in anticipation of the provincial elections. In 1898, when the provincial elections were over, nothing was done. Last year nothing was done, until two by-elections were going on in the province. As soon as these two by-elections came on, the organ of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in Prince Edward Island proclaimed that tenders were to be called for to build a bridge last December.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We have the advertisements out now for the construction of this bridge.

**Mr. MARTIN**. I suppose that is an indication that the elections are not very far off. Now, I want to call the attention of the minister to the necessity of a short branch from Rustico to Charlottetown, a distance of only nine or ten miles. If the hon. gentleman has been down to that province and knows the section of the country that I refer to, he will know that it is the best watering place and summer resort in Canada, yes. I may say, in America, and the greatest drawback to it is that it is not connected with Charlottetown by rail. It should be the best paying part of the road. Rustico has good fishing grounds, and a short branch by way of Covehead is of the utmost importance. Several petitions were forwarded to the government, as also from Stanley and other sections.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

**Mr. HAGGART**. What are you going to do to-morrow?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. We will continue in supply.

**Mr. HAGGART**. What estimates? The hon. Minister of Railways will not have the information ready by to-morrow.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Perhaps not on that particular point, but there may be some other items which may be taken up. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has one item, there is one item still in the Interior Department, and then the Trade and Commerce estimates will probably be taken up.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. (Saturday).

**Mr. MARTIN**.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, July 7, 1900.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

**PRAYERS.**

### THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

**Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE** (Provencher). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to bring to the attention of the House certain documents, and to ask one or two questions of the government regarding them. I received the following letter in the month of June:

Winnipeg, Man., June 15, 1900.

Sir,—I send you herewith copy of a memorial recently sent by the Catholics of Winnipeg to the Prime Minister and members of the government. We trust that if the government act upon our appeal and bring in legislation for our relief, you will find yourself able to give it your support.

I beg to remain, your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) **P. MARRIN**,  
Secretary Catholic School Committee.

**A. A. C. LaRivière**.

The memorial referred to is as follows:

Winnipeg, Man., June 15, 1900.

To the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his Colleagues in the Dominion Government.

Gentlemen,—The following is a copy of a resolution unanimously passed at a mass meeting of the Catholics of Winnipeg, held on May 27 last:

'Whereas, the Catholics of Winnipeg have for ten long years suffered under the odious burdens imposed upon them by the School Law of 1890, and whereas, the recent negotiations with the public school board of this city make it plain that as the law at present stands, we can expect no relief; be it resolved, that we, the Catholics of Winnipeg in meeting assembled, hereby instruct the committee to take immediate steps to lay our grievances before the Dominion and provincial authorities, pointing out to them the severity of our long-continued persecution, and praying them to come to our relief on the lines laid down in the Privy Council decision.'

According to the instructions contained in the resolution, we now take the liberty of addressing you, and we feel that in doing so it is not necessary for us to add many words to the clear terms in which the meeting expressed itself. The facts of our position are undesirable, and speak for themselves. For ten years we have been forced to pay heavy taxes towards the support of the public schools, whilst at the same time maintaining schools to which in conscience we could send our children. We have derived not the slightest benefit from the Privy Council decision; the grievance declared in that decision to exist still exists, and even in aggravated form, and the so-called settlement of 1897, whilst it may by temporary toleration of the authorities, be workable for the time being in some country districts which are distinctively Catholic, has proved absolutely unworkable in our mixed community where Catholics are in a minority, and has failed to bring us a particle of relief. The burden has been hard to bear, and has lately become almost insupport-

able, and in our extremity we approached the public school board of the city, hoping that it might be possible, under a liberal interpretation of the school law, to obtain some slight measure of relief and assistance. This hope has now been proved to be vain, inasmuch as the school board declare that they can do nothing for us, and after consulting authorities, they point out to us that the law, and especially the amendment of 1897, is so clear and explicit that they are absolutely debarred from giving us relief, and the only thing they can suggest to us is that we should surrender everything to them, and put our children into their hands to be distributed amongst the public schools of the city. It being evident we could get no relief under the present law, we then approached the provincial government, and obtaining no satisfaction there, we now appeal to you to use the power vested in you to have the decision of the Privy Council put into effect in its fullness and entirety.

The burden is becoming insupportable and we must have relief. We are entitled to it under the constitution, the Privy Council has pointed out the means whereby that relief may be assured us, and with every confidence that you will see justice done, and the rights of the Catholic minority here restored, we have the honour to remain, on behalf of the Catholics of Winnipeg,

Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) P. MARRIN,  
Secretary.

(Sgd.) J. G. CARROLL,  
Chairman of Catholic School Committee.

I have since received a letter from the secretary of the same committee which reads as follows:

Winnipeg, Man., July 3, 1900.

A. A. C. LaRivière, M.P.,  
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Sir,—A couple of weeks ago a memorial on the school question was forwarded to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his colleagues by the Catholics of Winnipeg. A copy of the memorial was sent to you and others of our friends in the House of Commons and the Senate. We fully expected that the matter would have been brought up and ventilated in the House, but so far as our information goes, it has not been once referred to there. This seems to us all the more strange in view of the fact that during the previous two or three weeks the school question was frequently a topic of discussion in the two Houses. We think it of the highest importance that someone should ask the Premier whether he has received the memorial, and what he intends to do about it, and the committee instructed me to write you, thinking you might ask the necessary questions.

Yours faithfully,  
(Sgd.) P. MARRIN,  
Secretary Catholic School Committee.

I, therefore, wish to ask the government: Has the memorial I have just read been received by the right hon. the Prime Minister? I also ask: Inasmuch as the requirements of the remedial order of March 21, 1895, on the Manitoba school question, have not been complied with by the local authorities, what is the intention of this government in regard to removing the grievances complained of by the Roman Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The memorial which has been read by my hon. friend (Mr. LaRivière) was received by the government some few weeks ago, and the receipt of it has been acknowledged. The government has done nothing more, because the matter is now in the hands of the provincial authorities. It is of public notoriety that some few weeks ago the Roman Catholics of the city of Winnipeg approached the civic authorities with a view of having their schools taken over and made public schools under the Act of 1897. I am informed that these negotiations have not succeeded for the time being. I am also informed that it is yet possible that the Roman Catholics and the civic authorities of that city may come to an understanding to have their schools taken over in the same way as some eighty schools, and, perhaps, one hundred, have been taken over by the municipalities in different parts of the province. The Roman Catholic schools to the number of about one hundred have been taken over by the authorities in the different municipalities. There is reason to believe that the same thing will be done in this case. If after these steps have been exhausted the Catholics do not get the relief to which they believe they are entitled, they can address themselves, as they have done before, to the local legislature. I recall that at a banquet in the city of Montreal, on December 3, 1896, Mr. Greenway, then Premier of the province of Manitoba, speaking of the legislation of the province, stated, that if at any time this legislation was found to be insufficient; if experience showed that it should be remedied, he would be prepared to consider the representations made in that behalf, and I would suppose that the present legislature of Manitoba would be disposed to carry out such a legitimate purpose.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Since my right hon. friend refers to Mr. Greenway's statement in Montreal, he might as well have quoted his statement in his political address in the last election, when he said he would do nothing.

The PRIME MINISTER. I stated what I heard with my own ears.

#### AN ASSAY OFFICE FOR THE YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the right hon. leader of the government to a telegram which I received from British Columbia this morning. On June 15, I made some remarks to this House, as to the dire necessity which existed for the establishment of an assay office in the Yukon, so that the gold obtained by the miners there might be sold, and that they might get money for

it. The right hon. gentleman in answer to me, said :

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, having already spoken on the motion now before the House, would not feel justified in going at any length into the argument this evening ; but, at some other day he will answer the question.

The hon. Minister of Finance has not seen fit to say one word about that subject up to the present moment, and we are now very near the end of the session. The telegram which I have received this morning is as follows :

Victoria, B.C., July 7, 1900.

Col., the Hon. E. G. Prior, M.P., Ottawa.

Board anxious to learn government's decision regarding resolutions mailed you June 6, four millions gold dust from Yukon already delivered Seattle assay office. Great injury being done to Canadian trade through absence of government facilities in Canada for sale gold dust.

F. ELWORTHY,  
Secretary.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance or the right hon. leader of the government, whether they can give any assurance that an assay office will be established, or what the policy of the government is in regard to the matter ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It is hardly necessary to say that so far as the output of the present year is concerned, it cannot be done, as the wash-up has taken place, and the gold is going out. The question of what may be done in a future season is well worthy of consideration, and will receive consideration. At the same time, I would not like my hon. friend to assume that the view that is implied in his question, and in his remarks based thereon, is well founded. There is very much to be said in favour of treating gold, as any other article of value, which will always find men ready to buy and sell it. The banks in the district purchase it at what they consider its value, and there is competition between the banks. I do not suppose that such evil has befallen Canada, because of the absence of an assay office, as the hon. gentleman suggests. However, I am not offering any final judgment on the question. It is too late to do anything this season ; and, as to the future, the matter will receive consideration in connection with other matters relating to the royalty and the collection thereof.

#### HAWKESBURY AND LOUISBURG RAILWAY.

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond). I wish to engage the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals for one moment. During the session of 1894, this parliament granted a subsidy of \$96,000, or \$3,200 a mile, for thirty miles of railway, to be built from Hawkesbury to St. Peter's, being part

Mr. PRIOR.

of a line to be built from Hawkesbury to Louisburg. A contract for that subsidy was entered into between the late government and the Cape Breton Railway Extension Company, and that contract, as the hon. minister will see from data in his office, was renewed from time to time, by the late government, at the request of the company, so anxious was that government that the work should be proceeded with. The company did not go on with the work, and last session this parliament revoked the subsidy of \$96,000 for the thirty miles. I want to inquire of the hon. minister, if any contract has been entered into between the government and any company, for the subsidy which was revoked by this parliament last session.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No contract has yet been entered into in respect to that piece of road.

Mr. GILLIES. Are there any applications before the minister, and if so, from what companies ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are two applicants. There appears to be some rivalry between them. Neither of them has yet satisfied us that they can comply with the conditions. I could not tell the hon. gentleman the names of the companies at this moment. They are both incorporated, I think, under the provincial law of Nova Scotia.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I would like to ask if the return from the Railway Department with reference to dismissed officials is ready to be brought down ? I mentioned it the other day, and the answer was that it was ready and would be down the next day. I have not received it yet, and it has not, so far as I know, been brought down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was immediately prepared and sent to the Secretary of State the very afternoon the hon. gentleman called my attention to it. I will inquire why it has not reached us here.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish also to ask for the information with reference to the Gilbert, Stewart and Battle cement matters. At this stage of the session, unless these papers are brought down with some promptness, their absence will act as an absolute bar to the progress of business.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is no doubt aware that these papers have not been moved for as a return. The subject came up the day before yesterday in supply, and I understood the request of the hon. gentlemen opposite to be that when we again went

into supply and came to the item, I should be prepared from the papers to furnish the information they desired. Therefore I did not make any return and did not understand that I would be expected to make any return; but I was ready and willing to bring the papers down when we go into supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I want the matter thoroughly understood. Four or five days ago I asked the minister for those papers. They were not brought down. Last night we asked for the papers again. They were not brought down, but they were definitely promised. Now, we are told by the hon. gentleman that as they were not ordered by the House, he does not suppose he is bound to bring them down, but he will have them here when we go into supply, and use them in the discussion. I wish to give notice formally that the estimates of the hon. gentleman will not be allowed to advance one single step further until the demand of this side and the promise of the minister are fulfilled, and we are prepared to stay here all summer if necessary. Now, there is no beating about the bush. That is a frank, open statement, and I invite the attention of the Prime Minister in the lobby to it.

#### MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Michel Esdras Bernier, Esq., member for the electoral district of St. Hyacinthe, introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Richard Cartwright.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I wish to say that the remarks that have been made by the hon. member (Mr. Foster), and the spirit in which he has made them, are entirely uncalled for. The House will have sufficient recollection of what I said a moment ago, to know that the hon. gentleman did not correctly represent my statement. I did not state that I would not bring down the papers. I stated what my understanding of the request was; I did no more. I understood the matter to be just as I stated it to the House, and a reference to *Hansard* will show that there was not a request from hon. gentlemen opposite that I should lay the documents on the Table. I was asked in the ordinary and usual way to bring them with me when we were discussing these matters in supply. If I had had a request from hon. gentlemen to lay them on the Table, I would have no objection to do so. I do not want to be put in an unfair position by having my statements represented by the hon. gentleman to be otherwise than they actually were.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. the Finance Minister was here and I simply leave the matter in his hands. After having argued the

question as to why those papers were not ready yesterday before we took up the item, and having received the same answer as I have now received, namely, that the Minister of Railways did not understand that they were to be laid on the Table, and having tried, with all the force of language at our command, to make him understand that that was what we did want, and having made the formal demand that before the estimates would be allowed to go through we must have those papers brought down so that we may ourselves have an opportunity of looking into them, I leave the case entirely in the hands of the Minister of Finance, confident that he will support the position I take.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understood last night what the hon. gentleman desired, but it was then about one o'clock in the morning, and I have not been able to procure these papers: but I was referring to what took place the other day, when the hon. gentleman based his complaint on the allegation that I had not brought down the papers as I had promised. I stated last night that I would furnish the papers, and will do so at the earliest possible moment.

#### YUKON—THE FRENCH KLONDIKE BANK.

Mr. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister to a paragraph copied in *La Presse* of Montreal from a French paper entitled *Le Moniteur de la Bourse*:

I am in a position to give you to-day the names of the principal administrators of La Banque Française du Klondike. They are: Dr. Barthélemy, chief physician of the first-class, officer of the Legion of Honour, who will be the delegate administrator; M. Ponsignon, first minister plenipotentiary of the first class, officer of the Legion of Honour; Commandant Littré, shipmaster, officer of the Legion of Honour; M. Armand Grenier de Cassagnac, M. Janne de Lamare, besides 'two eminent personages of the superior Canadian administration will have seats in the council, but I cannot yet give their names.' I think that my readers will be satisfied with this choice, which will give them every guarantee.

Has the right hon. gentleman heard who are the two members of the superior administration in Canada who have places on the board of administration of this bank; and whether they are these two ministers who have been travelling for their health the last two or three months?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, that if he wanted the information, he might have asked for it in a less offensive manner. The question he put is fairly entitled to an answer, and if he had put it with ordinary courtesy he would have had his answer all the same. This is the first

time that I have heard of the Klondike Bank, I do not know that anybody in the government has ever heard of it, and neither do I believe the statement.

#### INQUIRY FOR PAPERS, ETC.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.). I see that the correspondence between the late Lieutenant-Governor McInnes of British Columbia and the Dominion government has been published—or rather portions of it have been published—in the British Columbia press. I would like to ask my right hon. friend if he will have that correspondence brought down to the House. It has been moved for in the Senate, I think, and the promise made that it would be brought down. Would the right hon. gentleman favour this House with the same papers?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no objection at all to doing so, but I may say that the correspondence which has, I understand, been published in the British Columbia press, is not official correspondence but private correspondence between the late lieutenant-governor and some members of the government. However, what official correspondence there is, there is no objection to bringing down.

#### DISMISSAL OF LIEUTENANT FOYLE.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the removal of Lieut. Foyle of Company No. 1 of the 94th Battalion. I understand that he was called upon to resign without any reasons being given and that having refused to do so, he was dismissed, or an order to that effect issued, and another man named McCrae promoted to his place. It appears that Lieut. Foyle was informed that the reason for his dismissal was that he was physically unfit to discharge the duties devolving upon him in charge of that company. He says that he was never examined by the surgeon-major, but that he has certificates of other doctors to the effect that he is physically fit to discharge all the duties devolving upon him in that position, in which he has served since 1885. He also says that he demanded a military investigation, which he was refused. I would ask the hon. the Minister of Militia whether he can give me any explanation?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). If my hon. friend had given me notice yesterday I would have brought down the information, but I do not remember anything about the case at all. It may have been before me, but if so it is one of hundreds of such cases, and I do not remember the circumstances. However, I will look into the matter and let the House know what the facts are. The commanding officer of the 94th is not here, but there is one of the officers in the

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

House who possibly may remember something of the circumstance.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will the hon. gentleman promise to give the information before the estimates of his department are up for consideration.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will give it to you on Monday.

#### MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. SPEAKER read the following Message from the Secretary of His Excellency the Governor General:

Office of the  
Governor General's Secretary,  
Ottawa, July 7, 1900.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Mr. Justice Taschereau, acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber at 12 o'clock to-day for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,

L. G. DRUMMOND, Major,  
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable

The Speaker of the House of Commons.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). With reference to the question put by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), I wish to explain—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. MACDONALD (P.E.I.).

Mr. A. C. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I am put down as having voted for Mr. Parmalee's amendment in the matter of provincial legislation. I wish to say that I voted directly the other way and in favour of the principle of prohibition.

#### ELECTION ACT—AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 133) to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members to the House of Commons.

Mr. A. McNEILL (North Bruce). Before this Bill is read the third time, I would like to call my hon. friend's attention once more very briefly to the amendment I proposed to the 72nd section of the Act. I may call the attention of the House to the fact that certain practices have arisen of late in regard to the placing of the ballot papers in the box which have given rise to a great deal of comment and have resulted in very great scandal in this country. It is notorious that constituencies have been stolen from the electors of this country, and

one of the means by which that has been done is by the substitution of one ballot for another by the deputy returning officer after he receives the ballot from the elector, and before he puts the ballot into the box. The mode by which this is accomplished is thus described in an affidavit read in this House during the present session :

The method of substituting a false ballot for a genuine one which the deputies I have mentioned were to use is as follows: He would keep the false ballots so that he could readily take one in his left hand when he wished to work it. When a known Conservative voter would be in the act of handing his ballot to the deputy the latter would place his left hand upon the table with a false ballot under the hand, but no counterfoil. At the same moment he could accept from the voter, with his right hand, the genuine ballot and counterfoil. He then would place the genuine ballot under his left hand fingers, as if for the purpose of tearing off the counterfoil, and with a quick motion of the right hand he would remove both genuine ballot and counterfoil, at the same moment raising the left hand and leaving on the table a ballot from which the counterfoil had apparently been just removed. He would put what he had right in his coat pocket, and then put in the box the ballot lying upon the table. This ballot, so put in the box, would be one of those previously furnished by me to the deputy, and on which I had put a cross in favour of the Liberal candidate.

—or it might be the Conservative candidate, if this practice were carried on in his interest. That fraud has been practiced, and has been practiced most successfully. The object of the amendment I have proposed is to make the perpetration of that fraud impossible. I venture to say that the words which I have suggested do make the perpetration of that fraud impossible, if the scrutineers who are present choose, in the slightest degree, to avail themselves of the opportunity which the law, with this amendment, will offer. The proposition I make is this—that we shall insert in section 72 the words ‘still keeping the ballot paper in full view of those present.’ My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) suggests these words: ‘That the deputy returning officer shall then in full view of those present, including the elector, remove the counterfoil and place the ballot paper in the ballot box.’ What I say, is that the words suggested by my hon. friend do not cover the point I seek to make, do not reach the action on the part of the deputy returning officer to which I object. I want to impose a mechanical difficulty between the deputy returning officer and the perpetration of this fraud, and in order to do so, I wish this House to legislate that he shall keep the ballot paper itself in full view of those present. The words my hon. friend has substituted instead of those I suggested, I venture to assert very positively, do not carry out the object that I have in view. The deputy returning officer may, in full view of those present, tear off the counter-

foil as this directs him to do, and he may in full view of those present put the ballot paper into the ballot box. If he does so, he has fulfilled the obligation which is imposed upon him under the clause as proposed by my hon. friend. If he does that, it would be impossible to convict him or to recover a penalty from him under the provisions of this Act. I do not profess to be a lawyer—though I do have the honour of being a member of the Middle Temple. It is thirty years since I practiced law. But I profess to have some glimmering recollection of the principles of law; and I have had the advantage and privilege of hearing the greatest advocate of my time, Carlake and Colebridge, and Parry and Roundell Palmer, and others, discussing questions of law day after day, and have heard the greatest judges in Westminster Hall giving their decisions upon them; and I venture to make the assertion that there was not in my time one lawyer of standing in that Hall who would venture to say that you could recover against a deputy returning officer (under these words introduced by my hon. friend), who had torn off the counterfoil in full view of those present, but who had held the ballot under his closed hand while he was tearing it off, and who had, for convenience sake, rested his hand upon the table, and, in full view of those present placed the ballot in the box. I am sure my hon. friend the Solicitor General himself will not say the criminal law would hold a deputy returning officer under such circumstances, guilty and make him subject to a penalty, for the simple reason that in doing this he would have fulfilled all the conditions laid down. These words, my hon. friend knows would be construed strictly in favour of a man charged in a criminal court. I have taken the precaution to have the advice of several of our own legal lights on this side, and they concur in the view that it would be impossible to obtain a conviction. They say that a man who tore the counterfoil off, as he is ordered to do, in full view of those present, and put the ballot paper into the box in full view of those present, would completely fulfil the law. As I said before, there is not a lawyer in Westminster Hall in my time who would stake his reputation on a contrary opinion. Now, why should we have any doubt about it? The words that I proposed make the thing perfectly clear. They provide not merely that the counterfoil shall be torn off in full view of those present and the paper put into the ballot box in full view of those present, but that the ballot paper itself shall be kept in full view while that is being done, so as to prevent the fraud which has been carried on so successfully, and which has resulted in stealing constituencies from the electorate of this country. I am sure that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will agree with me that it is right that we should put

in some words that will provide for this case.

The PRIME MINISTER. I understand that it is already provided for.

Mr. McNEILL. Any one who says so, of course, has a right to his opinion, but he does not agree with some of the leading lawyers of this House; and, if there be a doubt about the matter, as there is, in the name of goodness why not remove the doubt.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How does the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) propose to amend the section?

Mr. McNEILL. By providing that the ballot paper itself shall be kept in full view of those present. That is the only point. It is a question as to whether the ballot paper is to be kept in view or not. If it be kept in view of those present it is impossible to perpetrate this fraud. I think, in view of what has occurred in this country, it would be an extraordinary thing if this Act is allowed to leave the House without providing some words which will cover that suggestion. I would ask my hon. friend, at all events, to accept words which will remove all possible ambiguity from this clause.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). My hon. friend is aware, probably, much better than I can pretend to be, that for many years past we have heard of these charges of stealing ballots, and mutilating ballots, at elections. I have heard of them for almost fifteen or twenty years, and I know several cases, especially in the province of Ontario, after the election of 1896, where the judges determined that ballots had been improperly mutilated by the returning officer. For that reason, we consider it necessary to make a change. I think I can fairly state to my hon. friend that I have in view the same object as himself, that is to say, to guarantee as far as possible that the ballot paper given by the deputy returning officer to the elector shall go through the elector to the secret chamber, there to be marked, shall be brought back by the elector from the secret chamber and delivered to the returning officer—the same ballot shall go and return. Then, the further assurance should be given that when the ballot paper has reached the hands of the returning officer from the elector the same ballot paper he has received from the elector shall go into the ballot box. That is the object we all have in view. I say that object is achieved by the words of this section 72, where we say that the ballot paper, after it is received back from the voter, shall be examined by the deputy returning officer for the purpose of ascertaining whether it has the stamp and seal upon it, with the counterfoil and with the

Mr. McNEILL.

number. Then, we go on to say that the deputy returning officer, in full view of those present, including the elector, shall remove the counterfoil and place the ballot paper that he has just received in the ballot box. All that is to be done in full view of those present. It seems to me that puts the matter beyond a shadow of a doubt. But, the hon. gentleman suggests that, probably, some deputy returning officer may have the power of necromancy, such as Hermann had, and may be able so to manipulate the ballot in the presence of those who are there to keep watch as to remove the counterfoil and substitute another ballot. He thinks that may take place, but, to my mind, it is physically impossible. The words which he suggests to cover that case are not more conclusive than the words I used. But we are all of us inclined to think our own opinions are better than those of another man, and, perhaps, my hon. friend, coming from a portion of the British Empire that is well known to us all, may be a little more set in his opinion than a man who was born in the new world. But, I submit to my hon. friend that we should allow this question to go elsewhere for consideration. I wanted to get the opinion of the Minister of Justice to see whether the words suggested by my hon. friend could be really adopted. I saw him this morning, but I had not an opportunity to discuss the matter at sufficient length with him yet to be able to come to a conclusion. But, we are all anxious to get rid of the Bill, let it go through in its present form; and I say now that, my object being the same as the object of my hon. friend, if it should turn out that his words will achieve the object better than mine, I will be very glad to adopt them.

Mr. McNEILL. With reference to my hon. friend's remark as to my holding a set opinion, I wish to disclaim being a lawyer, and my statement here to-day would not have been made had I not been supported by three eminent legal gentlemen in this House, and natives of this hemisphere. I am glad to find, at all events, that my hon. friend, when he was discussing the matter with the Minister of Justice this morning, found that there was some little doubt about it, because a decision was not arrived at immediately as to whether he was right or not. With regard to the ballot boxes, my hon. friend asked me to make a suggestion. The suggestion I made was, that there should be a stout paper cover, such as I produced here, lined, if necessary, with linen, in which the ballot box should be encased, and that this cover should be sealed up. But, to meet a difficulty suggested by my hon. friend from East Grey, the suggestion I have to make now is, that this ballot box, so encased and sealed, shall be placed in a wooden box, and that the lid should be so constructed as not to press upon the seals; in that way

we would secure the ballot box being sealed effectively by the agents of the different candidates and by the deputy returning officer, and those seals being preserved intact.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). I desire to move an amendment to clause 52, specifying the hours during which the polls shall be open. When this matter was brought up in Committee of the Whole, a great deal of attention was given to it, and a general feeling was expressed that some amendment should be proposed to meet the wishes of all concerned. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) gave notice of an amendment to open the poll at seven o'clock in the morning. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) proposed that on election day there should be a half-holiday proclaimed. My own amendment, which was also included in a Bill I introduced early in the session, was to provide that in cities comprised in an electoral division and containing 10,000 inhabitants or upwards, the poll shall be open until eight o'clock in the afternoon. I can testify to the fact that when the polls are closed at five o'clock in the afternoon, there is not a fair chance for the workingman to poll his vote in a city.

The lists are sometimes several years old. In cities a large portion of the population have moved their residences during that time, and it often happens that the voter has to go across the city to get to the polling subdivision where he is entitled to vote. It is therefore, utterly impossible for him, under the present arrangement, unless some party conveyance is provided, or some special privilege is asked for and granted, to go to the poll and poll his vote. It has been suggested in this House that there should be some free time when a man could go and cast his vote without asking the privilege of any person. That is what my amendment seeks to do. I consider that the only valid objection raised to this amendment was that raised by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) when he said that in rural constituencies that contained a city of 10,000 it would not be fair to keep the polls open in the city and close them in the rural portions of the constituency, because information as to the result in the rural part of the constituency would be sent into the city, and it might lead to fraudulent practices which would have an influence upon the result of the election. I propose to make the amendment apply to cities of 15,000 and upwards, which will largely overcome this objection. I therefore move:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend clause 52 by inserting after the word 'day,' in the twenty-first line, the following words: 'and in electoral districts containing, comprising or being part of a city of upwards of 15,000 inhabitants, the polls shall be kept open until eight o'clock in the afternoon.'

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I fear that the amendment would be unworkable. Take the case of a rural constituency in which there is a city, and there are several in the country, we would have the poll in one portion of the constituency closing at one hour and at another portion closing at another hour.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). And in addition to that there are a lot of little towns which are really the manufacturing towns of our country, such as Galt, Preston and Hespeler, in which there are large factories, employing a number of operatives. The provision would not apply to these when it is limited to cities of over 15,000.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), who is unavoidably detained, I beg to move:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend the same by inserting after the word 'time' in the first line of the 38th section, the words 'within forty-eight hours,' and by striking out the words 'and before the closing of the polls,' in line 2 thereof.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to say that in my judgment the amendment is a very good one, because it leaves it open to the electorate to have the men of their choice. It sometimes happens that a candidate is put up for the purpose of dividing the votes on one side or the other, and he may be retained in the field until nearly the last moment when all the harm is done, or rather until it is impossible to get a straight vote of the electorate for one side or the other. Then, he may resign. I think he ought to make up his mind before that time, and forty-eight hours after nomination is quite long enough to enable him to do so. Then, it gives time afterwards to have information disseminated throughout the constituency that the candidate has resigned, and that there are only certain candidates in the field.

Mr. JOSEPH A. GILLIES (Richmond, N.S.) Mr. Speaker, I think the law as it now stands can scarcely be improved upon. The amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) provides for the retirement of any candidate within forty-eight hours after the nomination. Now, the ballot boxes in the meantime have gone out to the different polling places, and all the expenses incidental to election almost have been incurred. Unnecessary expense can be avoided by leaving the law as it now stands.

Mr. SPROULE. The ballot boxes will not have gone out at all within forty-eight hours.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Yes, in some constituencies.

Mr. GILLIES. I know that in several constituencies immediately after the candidates are nominated and all the preliminaries are over he sends the ballot boxes out to different parts of the constituency.

Mr. SPROULE. The ballots are not printed. They cannot be.

Mr. GILLIES. Yes, he has them printed, and as some polling subdivisions are very remote from the shire town, or centre where the returning officer resides, the time intervening between the nomination and election is short enough for him to have the ballot boxes distributed in the different districts. Therefore, the expense incurred in sending the ballot boxes to these polling subdivisions has been incurred before the candidate wishing to retire has given notice to the returning officer. I think it would be a most inopportune amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. Evidently the hon. gentleman is not familiar with the routine of the business after nomination.

Mr. GILLIES. I am so.

Mr. SPROULE. Because, in forty-eight hours, you cannot print the ballots, and none of the ballots are printed. The ballots and instructions are put into the ballot boxes. Before nomination you do not know who the candidates will be. It is only after nomination that you know who the candidates will be, and it is not until then that you can commence to print the ballots and prepare the instructions to put into the ballot boxes. It is usually two or three days before the ballot boxes are distributed, and it is to avoid putting the names of candidates on ballots who are not practically in the race at all that the proposal is made.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I think this would be a good clause in which to say what should be done with the \$200 deposit that is forfeited when a man retires. In some cases the money is given back to the candidate, and in some cases it is remitted to Ottawa. There is no law about it, and I think this would be a good clause in which to say what should be done with the money.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It goes to the Auditor General.

Mr. BERGERON. But it is not always sent to him.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There was an action in our province in which Mr. Turcott was plaintiff, where he wanted to get his deposit back from the returning officer, and the court said he could not get it, although he withdrew immediately after the nomination.

Mr. BERGERON. In my county in 1892 three candidates lost their deposits, but they all got their deposits back.

Mr. BLAIR.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The returning officer should have been made to account for it.

Mr. BERGERON. He was the sheriff.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to move the following amendment in reference to a half-holiday on election day.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) having moved one amendment, he is not entitled to move another.

Mr. BENNETT. This is an amendment to another clause.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is only one motion.

Mr. BENNETT. I will hand it over to my hon. friend (Mr. Puttee).

Mr. PUTTEE. I beg to move—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is in the same position as the member for Simcoe. He has already moved an amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg to move this amendment, Mr. Speaker, although I am not in favour of it. To oblige my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) I move, seconded by Mr. Haggart:

That Bill No. 133 be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by amending section 24 of the said Act by adding as paragraph 'E' the following: 'The declaration of a half-holiday on said polling day where a poll is demanded.' Also that form 'E' of section 1 is amended by adding thereto the words, 'and further, a paragraph containing these words, and in case a poll is demanded, there shall be a half-holiday on the forenoon of said polling day in accordance with a proclamation issued by His Excellency the Governor General regarding the same, and all persons shall govern themselves accordingly.'

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order.

#### ROYAL ASSENT.

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

His Honour Justice Taschereau desires the immediate attention of your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that His Honour Justice Taschereau had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act respecting the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls.

An Act to incorporate the Quebec and Lake Huron Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.

An Act to authorize contracts with certain Steamship Companies for Cold Storage accommodation.

An Act respecting the Nickel Steel Company of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Bankers' Association.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Frost & Wood Company (Limited).

An Act to amend the Acts respecting Interest.

An Act to incorporate the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Quebec Southern Railway Company.

An Act to enable the city of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water power.

An Act respecting the Algoma Central Railway Company.

An Act respecting the British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company, and to change its name to the British Yukon Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Toronto Hotel Company.

An Act to amend 'The Bank Act.'

An Act respecting the Buffalo Railway Company (Foreign).

An Act respecting the Ottawa and Hull Fire Relief Fund.

An Act respecting the Safety of Ships.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Merchants' Bank of Halifax, and to change its name to the Royal Bank of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada.

An Act for the relief of William Henry Featherstonhaugh.

An Act to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.

An Act to amend the Expropriation Act.

An Act to incorporate the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Acadia Loan Corporation.

An Act respecting the Canada Mining and Metallurgical Company (Limited).

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of James Milne.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting certain Savings Banks in the province of Quebec.

An Act to amend the Penitentiary Act.

An Act respecting the Grain trade in the Inspection District of Manitoba.

An Act to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

An Act to incorporate the Lake Superior and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Timagami Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Companies Clauses Act.

An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Servis Railroad Tie Plate Company of Canada (Limited).

### ELECTION ACT—AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION.

Amendment of Mr. Foster negatived.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton) moved :

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee

of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend the same by striking out all the words after the word 'paper' in the tenth line of section 34, also subsections 2 and 3 of the said section, and substituting therefor the following as subsection 2 :

'2. Upon receiving a nomination paper the returning officer shall give a receipt therefor, and such receipt shall in every case be sufficient evidence of the production or filing of such nomination paper and of the consent of the candidate.'

And that subsection 2 of section 39 is hereby struck out.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. A. MARTIN (East Queen's, P.E.I.) moved :

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole with instructions that they have power to amend the same by striking out section 69, and inserting in lieu thereof the following :

'In Prince Edward Island if the deputy returning officer refuses a ballot and the right to vote to any person who is willing to take the oaths prescribed by this Act or the provincial law, or gives a ballot to and allows to vote, any person who refuses to take such oaths, he shall for each such offence be liable to any person who may sue for the same, to a penalty of \$200.

He said : I complain, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill, as reprinted, was only placed in our hands a few minutes ago. In the Bill, as introduced, there was a section 69, which, I take it, was intended to whitewash returning officers when they went beyond their duties. After I had called the attention of the House in committee to that section, it was agreed to be struck out ; but I do not think that is going far enough, and I wish to insert this amendment as subsection *a* in section 68. In the discussion of the Bill, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that the law at present in Prince Edward Island worked very well. In that law, there are penalties attached to returning officers who fail to perform certain duties, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries contended that that law applied to Dominion elections. But that is not the case, as you will find on page 9078 of *Hansard* the following :

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the Solicitor General this. Does the provincial penalty which applies to a deputy returning officer in a provincial election apply to the deputy returning officer who acts under the Dominion law in a Dominion election?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

That shows that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not correct, and it appears that the penalties provided by the provincial law do not apply to the Dominion elections, therefore, it is necessary, in my opinion, to have this subsection introduced into the Bill.

Amendment negatived, on division.

Mr. A. C. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) moved :

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole with power to amend the same, as follows:

13. Section 90, in line 19, after figure (4), insert the following words:

'That in Prince Edward Island any person not qualified to vote in such electoral district has voted, stating the name, designation and residence of such person, and also the name and number of the polling division in which he has voted, or (4).'

Section 90, line 7, after the word 'dollars' insert the following words: 'or in Prince Edward Island \$300, if the application is made in relation to the third ground of application.'

Section 90, line 30, after the word 'application' insert the following: 'Or decide whether any person in Prince Edward Island not qualified to vote has voted, if the said application is made in relation to the third ground of application.'

15. Section 90, line 37, after the word 'be' insert the following words: 'together with a copy of the affidavit aforesaid.'

15½. At the end of subsection 4 of section 90, insert the following as subsection 'A': 'At the time and place appointed and before proceeding to recount the votes, the judge may receive an affidavit from the candidate or his agent, against whose return the affidavit mentioned in subsection 1 of this section has been directed, declaring that any other person not qualified to vote has voted, giving the name, designation and residence of such person, and also the name and number of the polling division in which he has voted, but the affidavits authorized by this subsection shall not be received by the judge except when the recount has been demanded on the third ground of application.'

16. Section 90, subsection 5, line 18, after the word 'counted,' insert the following: 'including in Prince Edward Island those numbered and initialled under section 67 of this Act.'

17, 18 and 19. Section 90, subsection 7, leave out from 'in' in line 32, to 'shall' in line 33, and insert the following words: 'Subsection 1 and 2 of section 81 of this Act, and in Prince Edward Island the judge, when recounting the votes, shall decide the qualification of all voters whose ballot papers were numbered and initialled, under section 67 of this Act, as having been objected to on the ground of want of qualification, and who have been described in the affidavits provided for in this section, and for the purposes of such decision he shall hear the candidates or their agents, and may examine on oath the person whose vote has been objected to or any other person. Both candidates may be represented by counsel, and the judge shall ascertain the facts and shall take such other evidence as he thinks necessary and is able to obtain, and may require the attendance of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence, and shall, for all purposes of such decision, have all the powers of a county court judge in Prince Edward Island exercising his ordinary jurisdiction in civil cases.

(a) In determining the qualification of the voters aforesaid, the judge shall not identify nor allow to be identified any ballot paper until it has been decided that the person casting it was not legally to vote, in which case he shall identify the said ballot paper and deduct the vote or votes marked thereon from the total number of votes received by the candidates or candidate in whose favour it has been marked.

(b) The judge.'

Amendment negatived.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's).

## YUKON—PRESERVATION OF GAME.

, Bill (No. 190) respecting the preservation of game in the Yukon territory (Mr. Sutherland), was read the second time; considered in committee; reported; read the third time, and passed.

## SUPPLY—DISMISSAL OF LIEUT. FOYLE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. ANGUS McLENNAN (Inverness). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief explanation with regard to the question asked by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall). My attention was called to the physical condition of Lieut. Foyle of the 94th Battalion, of which I am surgeon, and it was my duty to examine whether the evidence submitted with regard to his physical condition was well founded. I may say that I satisfied myself that Lieut. Foyle is an epileptic, and therefore, unfit to hold office in any battalion. To sustain my opinion, I have the evidence of another medical gentleman connected with the battalion to the same effect. I may say that if an epileptic be examined, when not suffering from these fits, that came on periodically, he may seem, from a cursory examination, to be in perfect health, but the fact remains that I have convinced myself of the fact, and have signed a paper to the effect that he is subject to that disease.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Has he political fits sometimes?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). No doubt, he is somewhat like my hon. friend in that regard.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Did the hon. gentleman examine Lieut. Foyle personally or sign his certificate on hearsay?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I examined him professionally and officially.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have here a copy of the certificate of a medical man which was sent to the department, and which has been placed in my hands:

Baddeck, June 11, 1899.

To the Hon. the Minister of Militia, Ottawa.

Sir.—In the matter of the appointment of Lieut. T. H. Foyle there appears to be some question as to his health, and as I have carefully examined him and given him a certificate of health, I feel it my duty to say a few words in his behalf. The facts of the case are that persons who are jealous of him will not stop at doing anything they can to his injury, representing him to headquarters as unhealthy, &c. This is not the truth, and it is pure spleen and vindictiveness. I can assure your Honour that I know whereof I speak, and I can justify his

health to be as perfect as possible and a very suitable person for the position.

Yours faithfully,  
S. G. A. McKEAN.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he gave a certificate. If the hon. member attended him during one of these fits, of course he would be competent to give a certificate, but if he gave it only on information obtained from another medical man, his certificate would not be of any value.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). The hon. gentleman knows well that there are symptoms following epileptics which are well marked, and these were distinctly marked in the case of Lieutenant Foyle. The hon. gentleman knows right well, as a medical man, also, that in an examination of such cases, a medical man can call in the evidence of another medical man who was in attendance. I refer to Lieutenant-Colonel Bethune, who has been in attendance on that officer professionally. Aside from my own examination to sustain my opinion, he assured me, that Lieutenant Foyle, while under examination as to his health, fell in an epileptic fit. While this evidence of a medical man and an officer of the battalion, together with the symptoms following a chronic case of epilepsy in evidence, I had no hesitation in giving the certificate I had given. And, I also may say that when inquiry is made in the department, a certificate will be found of another medical man living in Baddeck, the place of residence of Dr. McKean, whose professional standing, I can assure the House, is equal to that of Dr. McKean.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan (Inverness)), destroys the first argument he presented, which was that epilepsy, when the person was not under the influence of a fit, could not be detected by a medical man. Therefore, the examination made, as described, would be of no value. But the hon. gentleman goes on to say that it can be detected. I admit that in a chronic case of long standing, there would be symptoms which a medical man could detect; but, that being the case, I should imagine that the medical man who examined him, and who says he is in every way in a healthy condition, would be as likely to detect the symptoms as the hon. member (Mr. McLennan, Inverness), and his evidence would be as valuable as that of the hon. gentleman. But, one seeing a patient in a fit would be able to give a certificate that would be conclusive.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I did not say positively, that a medical man could not detect the symptoms. What I said was that it was possible that a medical man, if his attention was not called to the symptoms, might report a man to be in a fair condition of health.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Did the hon. minister promise the man a military investigation, which, I understand, Lieutenant Foyle requested? And will the minister promise that? It seems a reasonable request.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. At this moment, as I told the House, I do not remember the case. I cannot give any promise, except that I will bring down the statements at the earliest moment—on Monday I hope.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—GALLANTRY OF CANADIANS IN THE FIELD.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Before you leave the Chair, at one o'clock, I desire to read a telegram from Lord Roberts—with reference to the good work done by the 1st and 2nd battalions of Canadian Mounted Rifles in South Africa. The despatch is addressed to His Excellency the Governor General, and reads as follows:

Pretoria, July 6, 1900.

July 6.—I have much pleasure in bringing to Your Excellency's notice the good work done by the 1st and 2nd Battalions Canadian Mounted Rifles who have been repeatedly conspicuous for their gallant conduct and soldierlike instincts. During the attack by the Boers, on Katbosch, on the 22nd of June, a small party of Pincher's Creek men of the 2nd Battalion displayed the greatest gallantry and devotion to duty. Holding in check a force of Boers by whom they were largely outnumbered: Corporal Morden and Private Kerr, continued fighting till mortally wounded, Lance Corporal Miles and Private Miles wounded continued to fire and held their ground.

On June 18, a party of 1st Battalion, under Lieut. Young, when operating with a force under General Hutton to the north-west of Pretoria, succeeded in capturing two of the enemy's guns and brought in a herd of cattle and several prisoners without losing a man.

(Sgd.) ROBERTS.

It being One o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS.

#### SUPPLY—GRIEVANCES OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. E. G. PRIOR (Victoria, B.C.) Before you leave the Chair I want to say a few words in regard to matters in the province of British Columbia. Some time previously during this session, the right hon. leader of the government called me to task for bringing up matters when the Orders of the Day were called. He said that if we had any grievances the time to bring them forward was on motion to go into supply; therefore, I take this opportunity of doing so. Now, there are, I am sorry to say, several grievances that my constituents complain of, and I think the great majority of the people of British Columbia will agree with my constituents. The first and largest grievance is that the

province of British Columbia pays a tremendous amount of revenue into the federal exchequer and gets very little back. I have during the last few weeks gone to a great deal of trouble in trying to make out a correct list of the revenue paid by British Columbia, and also of the expenditure made by the Dominion government in that province. With the permission of the House I will read the figures, and I trust the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who is noted for his work on the Auditor General's Report, will not find fault with my figures. It has certainly taken a long time to prepare them, and I trust they are correct; if they are not, it is because it was almost impossible to reach a certainty in some items:

Revenue paid by British Columbia into the Dominion treasury during fiscal year 1898-9 :	
Casual revenue .....	\$ 1,593 23
Cattle inspection, fees .....	306 01
Chinese poll tax .....	215,009 50
Customs—Duties, &c. ....	2,113,927 24
Seizures .....	6,769 82
Esquimalt graving dock .....	10,315 63
Excise—Duties, &c. ....	513,563 94
Seizures .....	441 10
Experimental Farm .....	369 45
Fisheries, licenses, &c.....	45,801 75
Gas inspection, &c.—Fees, &c.....	923 25
Penitentiary, New Westminster ....	1,481 68
Post revenue—Postal revenue .....	242,335 19
Commission on money orders .....	13,648 60
Sick mariners' fund .....	8,246 62
Steamboat inspection fees.....	6,611 80
Telegraphs .....	2,204 28
Weights and measures.....	474 80
<b>Total revenue .....</b>	<b>\$3,184,023 89</b>

Expenditure by Dominion government in British Columbia, 1898-9:	
Administration of justice .....	\$ 42,751 86
Bounty on silver ores to mines, since 1895 .....	76,664 61
Chinese tax, 25 p.c. paid to province. salaries, &c. ....	53,262 50
" .....	2,134 00
Customs, salaries, &c. ....	90,904 34
Defence of Esquimalt .....	44,669 80
Esquimalt graving dock .....	11,957 05
Experimental farms .....	8,493 25
Fisheries, salaries, &c. ....	8,459 47
Hatchery, Fraser River .....	3,736 14
Indian Department .....	109,795 72
Inland revenue, salaries, &c.....	22,362 58
Lieut.-Governor's salary .....	9,000 00
Lighthouses and buoys .....	69,474 81
Marine hospitals .....	5,186 20
Meteorological department.....	3,435 19
Militia—Staff and annual pay .....	13,556 30
Penitentiary at New Westminster...	42,074 24
Post Office—Salaries and contingencies .....	124,674 64
" Subsidies for water and rail carriage .....	48,077 24
" British Columbia's share of C.P.R. main line subsidy .....	85,145 05
" Transportation of mail by road .....	70,246 41
Provincial subsidy .....	242,689 46
Public Works—Buildings and staff..	40,558 66
" Dredging .....	19,056 36
" Harbours, rivers and quarantine .....	77,463 41
" Telegraph lines .....	17,204 53

Mr. PRIOR.

Quarantine—Salaries, &c.....	\$13,578 71
" Cattle .....	2,380 14
" Tuberculosis .....	174 20
Steamboat and boiler inspection....	5,181 95
Surveys—Stikine .....	16,482 95

Total expenditure..... \$1,380,831 82

Well, Mr. Speaker, that deducted from the revenue gives a balance of \$1,803,192.07 that stands to the credit of British Columbia in the federal treasury. Of course, hon. gentlemen opposite may say that we have given a large sum of money to the Crow's Nest Pass road as a subsidy, and also that there are expenses of civil government and other outlays that ought to be taken into account. With regard to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway subsidy, I can say that I do not think it is fair to debit that altogether to the province of British Columbia. In the first place it is part of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and of equal advantage to the whole of Canada as it is to the province of British Columbia; moreover, the whole of it is not in the province of British Columbia, but a great deal of it is in the North-west Territories. Then the subsidy was far too large. When the Conservative party were in power they made an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway to build it, if I remember right, for a bonus of \$5,000 a mile, and a loan of \$6,000 guaranteed to be repaid, which was equal, with the interest that was charged, viz.: 5 per cent. to a bonus of only \$4,500 per mile, whereas the present government has given them a subsidy of \$11,000 per mile, representing \$6,500 per mile actually thrown away. However, if the hon. gentlemen think that ought to be taken in for comparison's sake, I am willing to take half the sum paid this year, viz., \$2,322,500. Half that sum is \$1,161,250. Then there is the percentage of the expenditure for the administration of civil government, and other matters contained in the consolidated fund account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do I understand the hon. gentleman says that the loan to be made to the Canadian Pacific Railway was only \$6,000?

Mr. PRIOR. I understood it was \$6,000 a mile to be repaid.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The bonus was \$5,000 a year, and if my memory serves me, the loan was \$20,000 or \$25,000, altogether.

Mr. PRIOR. If so, I stand corrected. I was only speaking from memory. Anyway it was to be repaid, and the bonus was only \$5,000 a mile. Now, I have taken the population of Canada at the same figure as the Minister of Trade and Commerce used in working out the results in his report, namely, 5,312,500. I have taken the population of British Columbia at the number esti-

mated by the statistics of last year, as 168,000. Taking those figures, and working out of the percentage. I find that British Columbia might be charged with the sum of \$530,888 on consolidated fund account. This includes an item 'miscellaneous' of \$318,907. Many of those items that are included in miscellaneous, and which I could not pick out correctly, are included in the expenditure that I have named, so that I am well on the safe side. Now, that gives a total, taking the Crow's Nest Pass outlay and consolidated fund account, of \$3,016,625, as the total expenditure in the province of British Columbia, which is even then \$111,054 less than revenue collected from that province.

Now, some hon. gentlemen contend that we cannot expect any more. Well, I think in a new country like British Columbia, a country of great possibilities, in fact of great certainties, I may say, in the mining, lumber, and fishing industries, it should be the policy of the government to expend large sums in developing that country to the utmost extent. We know that huge sums have been spent in the older provinces, far more than they ever paid into the treasury, and we think that now the time has arrived when British Columbia might get the benefit of these sums as the older provinces have in the past. If you make a comparison, with the receipts and expenditures of the other provinces, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, you will find that none of them pay any more, in fact, not as much into the Dominion treasury than British Columbia, and they certainly, as anybody can see by looking through the estimates, receive far more from the government to be expended in these provinces.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** You have not looked into the question.

**Mr. PRIOR.** I think you will find that I am correct. I will now take some special items. There is one item to which my attention was called some time ago by a friend in British Columbia, in regard to the way the customs accounts are kept in the Auditor General's Report. I looked it up, and I found that at page T-45 of the Auditor General's Report, British Columbia is credited with \$2,113,927.24 of customs duties, and besides that, the Yukon territory is credited separately with \$482,098.55. That amount is not credited to British Columbia, but if we go to the other side of the ledger we find that Victoria is debited with \$27,861.89 for salaries and contingencies of officers in the Yukon. That is manifestly unfair. If you are going to debit Victoria with the cost of the management of customs in the Yukon, you surely should credit her with the amounts received in the Yukon. Now, take the Chinese tax. The government collect, as everybody knows, \$50 per

head on all Chinamen coming into Canada. That is collected nearly altogether in the province of British Columbia. The receipts at Victoria last year were \$145,300, at Vancouver, \$69,609.50, at Nanaimo and at Rossland, \$50 each, making in all, \$215,009.50. Of this amount, the province only gets 25 per cent, which would make its share \$53,262.50, making the portion kept by the federal government, \$161,747. Of this sum, \$900 was refunded to Chinamen, making a clear profit to the Dominion government of \$160,847. I contend that as the people of British Columbia have to put up with the loss occasioned by these men living there, they certainly should get more benefit from the head tax. I think if the Dominion government were to just keep back enough to pay the salaries of the officers they have to employ for the purpose of collecting the tax, it would be a more equitable arrangement. I think it would be only fair to give the balance to British Columbia, and I hope the government will take that suggestion into their serious consideration. Hon. gentlemen may say: If you think so, why did you not move an amendment when the Chinese Immigration Bill for raising the head tax came before the House? Every parliamentarian knows that it would have been out of order. I tried to move some amendments, and I was told by the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that they would be out of order. That is the reason that I did not move an amendment in this direction. I think the question is one well worthy the attention of the government. Then, there is the question of the British Columbia fisheries. I find that the revenue collected by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) in 1898-9, in British Columbia, amounted to \$45,801.75. That is a large amount to be collected from salmon licenses, and you would naturally think that with such a splendid industry as this fishing industry is the government would spend a large proportion of the sum collected in that province for the purpose of improving the fisheries. The amounts expended were: Fraser River hatchery, \$3,736.14; salaries and expenditures, \$8,459.47.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** The hon. gentleman is hardly fair, considering that we voted \$12,000 for a fish hatchery this very year.

**Mr. PRIOR.** I am not dealing with this year. This year must speak for itself.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** I understand the hon. gentleman was arguing that we were not dealing fairly with British Columbia?

• **Mr. PRIOR.** Yes, for last year.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Oh.

Mr. PRIOR. I can only go to the Auditor General's Report. There was \$109,000 in the estimates last year for the defences of Esquimalt, and we found that only \$44,000 of it was spent. Nobody knows how the estimates will be spent. I agree that the hon. gentleman will do a little more this year, but it is last year that I have now under consideration. The expenditure on account of fisheries leaves a balance of \$33,606.14. I contend that that money should have been spent in British Columbia. The fisherman, the canners, and all the people in British Columbia interested in the fisheries, are almost a unit in the wish that the best class of hatcheries should be established there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are doing that.

Mr. PRIOR. I am very glad to hear it, and I trust he will be enabled to carry out what it is intended to do. Then, he might spend money very well in appointing more guardians to look after the rivers. At present there is a tremendous lot of poaching and a great destruction of trout in the rivers of British Columbia, and especially on the island. Some of the rivers, that a few years ago were the most magnificent fishing rivers, are being destroyed as fishing rivers, owing to poaching, dynamite and nets. But, if the hon. gentleman would pay small salaries to good men to look after these matters, much good would be done. This matter has been brought to his attention several times, but he has not seen fit, in his wisdom, to act upon the suggestion. This is a very important question amongst sportsmen in British Columbia, and we feel that as so much money has been collected from the fishermen, more ought to be expended. Now, I come to railway subsidies, and I will take up this year, if you like. The railway subsidies have just come down, and what do we find? We find a beggarly \$96,000 for British Columbia. That is the whole amount of the vote for British Columbia, a country that should be well subsidized, as I have already said, for the purpose of opening up its resources. There is nothing for the Comox and Cape Scott Railway, an application for which was backed up by the members for British Columbia, and I certainly understood that the government had given a promise to the chief promoter of the railway that a subsidy would be given to it, but there is not a cent down for it. I think the government is deserving of the utmost censure in not giving more money to the province of British Columbia. That road is to run from Wellington, a large mining district, to Comox, another mining district, and then to the head of the island. It would open up some magnificent lands, it would be the means of developing the island, and it is the general wish of the people of the island, and, I think, also of the people of Vancouver, that such a road should be built. It would be the

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

means of opening up a new route to the Yukon country. The British Columbia Board of Trade sent to the right hon. leader of the government a petition, on March 23, a copy of which was sent to me, and which reads as follows:

British Columbia Board of Trade,  
March 23, 1900.

The Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier,  
P.C., G.C.M.G.,  
Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada,  
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir.—I have the honour to advise that a special general meeting of this board was held this afternoon to consider the importance of the construction of a line of railway from the present terminus of the E. & N. Railway at Wellington to some point at or near the northern end of Vancouver Island, and it is unanimously resolved: 'That this board regard the proposed railway to the north end of Vancouver Island as a work for the advantage of British Columbia and the Yukon territory and recommends it to the favourable consideration of the government and parliament of Canada as deserving of assistance by a reasonable subsidy.'

In this connection it is desired to direct your attention to the large revenue the province of British Columbia contributes to the federal exchequer every year. During the fiscal year ending 30th June last the customs and inland revenue together amounted to nearly three million dollars, besides which there were large contributions made through the fisheries and other federal departments. In approximating the total provincial contributions it is necessary to add the duties which have been paid upon goods which find a market here; also the excise collected in the east upon goods manufactured there and consumed in British Columbia. This board is not in a position to approximately estimate what the total sum would amount to.

In view of the foregoing a more liberal expenditure by the Dominion government upon railways in British Columbia is considered to be justly due and this board trusts that this opportunity may be availed of to return to the province a small portion of its contribution.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) F. ELWORTHY,  
Secretary.

I beg also to read the following:

Copy of resolutions adopted at a public meeting, held in the City Hall, Victoria, on the 16th February, 1900.

Resolved that, in the opinion of this representative meeting of the citizens of Victoria the construction of a railway to the northern end of Vancouver Island, so as to afford continuous railway connection to this city and province and absolutely necessary for the development of the great resources of Vancouver Island, and that we earnestly recommend such a railway to the favourable consideration of the federal government and parliament and of the provincial government and legislature.

CHAS. HAYWARD,  
Mayor and Chairman.

That is all, Sir, I have to submit with regard to the railroad. I must say that I feel much disappointed that the government did not see fit to give a good subsidy to the Cape Scott and Comox Railway, as it is a road that was badly needed, and would have opened up a magnificent country.

I congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), on having put a vote in the estimates this year, to provide for a new steamer for the prevention of smuggling and the protection of the fisheries in British Columbia. That is a matter in which my colleague (Mr. Earle), and I, have taken great interest in past years. For the last seven or eight years, we, in British Columbia, have been pressing for it, and I am glad to see the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies), has come to the conclusion to comply with our repeated requests. I would now impress on the minister the necessity of having that steamer built in British Columbia. There are just as good shipyards and just as good mechanics, capable of building that boat in British Columbia, as there are anywhere else in the world.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Prior), that that is the intention if the vote passes.

Mr. **PRIOR**. I am glad to hear that statement from the minister, and so I need say nothing more on that point. He will get just as good work done in British Columbia, and he will get it done as cheaply as anywhere else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on the appointment by the government of the new Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia. Any one who knows Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière, knows that he is the personification of everything that is courteous and gentlemanly. I have no doubt he will give great satisfaction to the people of British Columbia, when they get to know him as we know him here. I trust, Sir, that he will enjoy his tenure of office, and I am quite sure, that having spent five years there, he will not want to leave us. But at the same time, I do not think it is right that the representatives of my province in this House, should let the matter pass without saying that the people of British Columbia have the right to expect that one of themselves should be nominated to the office. There are gentlemen in that province who have done yeoman service for the right hon. the Prime Minister and his government; and, no doubt, they expected some recognition at his hands, when the position of lieutenant-governor became vacant. I would ask the right hon. gentleman why were Mr. Bostock's claims overlooked? He is a gentleman whom every one will agree, is fitted for the position. He has great wealth, and could look after the social duties, while, at the same time, he is, no doubt, competent to discharge the other duties which belong to the office. Then, again, there was a gentleman now elevated to the Senate, who was beaten several times in his effort to become a member of parliament, and as the right hon. gentleman saw fit to place him in the higher position of a senator, surely he would be equal to the lieutenant-governorship. Then there is Dr. Milne, who has fought valiantly

for the party for years and years, and who has spent many a weary week trudging up and down the corridors on the look-out for recognition.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Which is the hon. gentleman's favourite?

Mr. **PRIOR**. It is pretty even betting. Dr. Milne was looking for subsidies, or something to turn up, but he has been ignored altogether. I can assure the Prime Minister that if he cannot get any one amongst his own party who would fill the bill, we can at least find him one or two on our side, who would make excellent lieutenant-governors. Joking apart; British Columbia has nothing to be ashamed of in the lieutenant-governors she has supplied from her province. There were the Hon. Jos. Trutch, the Hon. Mr. Cornwall, the Hon. Mr. Nelson, and the Hon. Mr. Dewdney, all British Columbians, and they all upheld the dignities of the office with the greatest credit to themselves and to the province. It is a great pity that when this vacancy occurred, the right hon. leader of the government and his colleagues, could not find some gentleman who lived in British Columbia, and had worked there for years for his party, to appoint to the honourable position. I can say this much; I am perfectly certain that if the Prime Minister proposed to appoint a British Columbian as lieutenant-governor of Quebec, the whole of the province of Quebec would be up in arms. If Quebec is bound to have her own governors, why should not British Columbia have her's as well? I am not saying a word against the present occupant of the office in British Columbia, because he is a thorough gentleman, as the people of British Columbia will find out, but the fact remains that the people of British Columbia would, on principle, like to see a gentleman from their own province holding the office.

There is another thing I want to mention, and that is that the government has let slip by, the opportunity to give British Columbia representation in the cabinet. When they sent Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière to British Columbia, the portfolio of Inland Revenue became vacant, and the least the government should have done, was to select a British Columbian to preside over that department. As we know, when the Conservative party was in power, they recognized that British Columbia deserved a representative in the cabinet, and they gave her one. She will never get her proper share of expenditure till she has a representation at the council to look after her interests. I have on several occasions asked in the House, if that good example was to be repeated, but the Prime Minister has never seen fit to give an answer. This was a fair opportunity to show justice to the province of British Columbia. It was a chance that may not occur again for a long time, but I suppose the people of British Columbia are

now accustomed to have promises made which are not fulfilled. For my part, I protest, on behalf of the province of British Columbia. There does not seem to be any other member from that province in the House, just now, but for my part, I repeat my protest, that the government has lamentably failed in doing justice to my province by not appointing a British Columbian in the cabinet.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have a word to say in answer to the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Prior). First, with regard to the lieutenant-governor: I am quite prepared, without the slightest hesitation, to admit that there are undoubtedly several gentlemen in British Columbia who would, under ordinary circumstances, be eminently qualified for the office of lieutenant-governor. We know, however, that the condition of things in that province for two or three years past, has not been as happy, or as harmonious as might have been the case. It would have been difficult to select any one in the province who has not been at some time or other, more or less identified with strifes of such a character, that his usefulness would be seriously impaired. Everybody, I think, will admit that. For this reason, the government came to the conclusion it did, and I believe it is a conclusion that has been ratified, not only by the people of British Columbia, but by the people of the entire Dominion. We came to the conclusion, that the government should select some gentleman of wide experience, of well known ability, of great fairness of mind, of many fine qualities, who under such circumstances, would be better qualified than any one that could be selected from within the province, to restore the harmony which must prevail in British Columbia, as everywhere else. We have appointed Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière, and I believe we have been eminently fortunate in securing all these qualities in the present Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia.

I place myself in the judgment of the House when I say that I believe that no man could be more suited for the difficult task which the lieutenant-governor of British Columbia has to perform at this moment. For these reasons alone, not as a precedent to be followed hereafter, but for the peculiar emergency that has arisen, the government, I think, have acted wisely in selecting Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière to represent the Crown in that province; and I endorse everything that has been said by my hon. friend as to his character, which my hon. friend has referred to in a way that is fair but at the same time generous. I feel, like himself, that when the tenure of office of Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière comes to an end, he may perhaps be induced to remain longer, but I hope that will not be the case. My hon. friend said the province of Quebec would resent any similar treatment. If the province of Quebec were situ-

Mr. PRIOR.

ated like the province of British Columbia, if it were torn by severe political strife, I do not know that it would object to such a man as Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière being sent from another part of the Dominion to become its lieutenant-governor. With regard to the question of the representation of British Columbia in the Cabinet, what applies to the lieutenant-governorship on this particular occasion applies also to representation in the Cabinet.

#### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to ask when there is to be another meeting of the Public Accounts Committee, and, if there is not to be another meeting, when the report of that committee will be brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The hon. gentleman knows that I have no power over this matter, but I shall be very glad to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to it.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Canals—Chargeable to collection of revenue—Repairs and operating expenses \$597,100

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.). Explain the increase of \$35,600.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The chief item of the increase is due to the provision which we have to make this year for the Soulanges Canal—\$20,337 for the staff and \$1,382 for contingencies, making in all \$21,719.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). How many employees are there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One overseer, one clerk, ten lockmen, ten bridge keepers, twenty linemen, one foreman, two lamp cleaners, three lamp repairers, one chief electrician, three oilers—fifty altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that for the whole length of the canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. How many men have you on the Beauharnois Canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not discharged the staff on the Beauharnois Canal yet.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there any navigation going on there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but I think that this year we shall be able to dispense with that por-

tion of the staff which has to do with the navigation of the canal. We shall only require to retain those people who have to do with keeping the bridges and looking after the water levels for the purposes of the mills that are operated upon it.

Mr. BERGERON. I hope it is not the intention of the government to close that canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not absolutely.

Mr. BERGERON. There is the old class of smaller boats which have to pass through it for local traffic. There must be six or seven of them during the week, which travel between Valleyfield and Montreal, and have to pass through that canal, or else it would be like passing through Quebec to go to Three Rivers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not yet sufficient information to deal with the question so as to determine whether we would close it this year or not.

Mr. BERGERON. I see a great deal of difference between closing it altogether, and keeping it as it is to-day. There are on each lock four men and one lockmaster. I do not think it would be good policy to close the canal now, but there might be a reduction in the employees, as there will only be about one-tenth of the work done which was done before. Instead of keeping five men doing hardly anything, I would have only two or three men and one lockmaster.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will have to examine into the question to really see to what extent the canal may continue to be used for navigation. We cannot have locks opened and shut at the call of even a limited number of craft without having men on every lock in sufficient numbers to handle the gates. It is not going to be so easy as my hon. friend thinks to reduce the staff, if the canal is still to be used for purposes of navigation.

Mr. BERGERON. I remember the time when there were only two men besides the lockmaster. There was an increase in the number in 1871 or 1872, when there were three men, and the fourth man was appointed in 1879 or 1880, because they were really working night and day. Although the Soulanges Canal is in operation, the smaller boats would still use the Beauharnois Canal. I am informed by some navigators that some very important work will have to be done at the head of the Soulanges Canal. I am told that when a western wind is blowing, tugs coming down with barges in tow run great risk in trying to get in the canal. That is one of the principal reasons why the smaller boats prefer the Beauharnois. The entrance of the

Soulanges Canal is in a very bad condition. There is a good deal of current, and the pier is not long enough. It would have to be lengthened and broadened. I do not think it would be wise to close the Beauharnois Canal until the government are satisfied that the entrance to the new one is perfectly safe.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would ask the hon. gentleman to consider how serious is his proposition that we should continue to maintain the Beauharnois Canal for the purposes of navigation. That involves not only the maintenance of a staff, perhaps not necessarily as large as at present, but still considerable, but the keeping of the canal through its entire length in a state of efficient repair. You must have your gates so that they may be used, and the breaks and defects that constantly occur along the banks carefully repaired. All these things would be necessary if we were to continue its use, even in a moderate way, for the purposes of navigation. If that can be avoided, and simply sufficient men kept to look after the lock water levels, so that those using the waters under lease from the Crown may not be interfered with, a considerable saving would be effected. The smaller craft will find that they can be as well served on the Soulanges Canal as on the Beauharnois. The condition of the entrance has been brought to my attention, and the engineers are having it put into proper condition. What the hon. gentleman refers to as being a source of some apprehension on the part of navigators is the shoals at the entrance, which must be removed, and we are proceeding with all despatch in removing them. I am informed that the work will be completed in a couple of months. The entrance is safe now, but we simply want to remove any possible apprehension on the part of even the most timid.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it would be bad policy to stop the work on that canal altogether until all the vessels which go through now are replaced with larger vessels. An accident might close the Soulanges Canal. Last year an accident on the Beauharnois Canal stopped navigation for four days. It must not be forgotten that in this canal were spent \$4,000,000; and, if it were abandoned altogether, it would soon go into decay. As the minister says, if it is to be kept open, it must be kept in repairs, and I believe repairs are required there now. Of course, the expenditure upon working the canal should be reduced, but I would be sorry to see the canal closed until the Soulanges Canal is so secure and in such complete working as to assure the absence of danger to navigation.

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond, N.S.) Is any of this amount for repairs on the St. Peter's Canal?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. This estimate includes the removing of 450 feet of the east wall at the northern entrance, \$600; renewing the coping of the south entrance at both sides, \$276; nine mooring posts and repairing facing with creosoted timber, \$43; ten new hanging fenders, and other small repairs, \$281.

Mr. **GILLIES**. Has the minister instructed any of his officers to report what would be the cost of straightening the canal? He is, perhaps, not aware that there is a large bend almost in the centre of the canal, which interferes materially with the navigation of the canal.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There have been no instructions to that effect, personally, I have never seen the canal, and do not know what the curve is or how, it is situated. But, I do not remember having had my attention called to the subject of straightening this canal before.

Mr. **GILLIES**. Has the attention of the minister been called to the necessity of enlarging the locks on that canal?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have no report from the superintendent on that subject.

Mr. **GILLIES**. I am sorry for that, for I was in hopes that we should see a considerable item in the estimates for the straightening of this canal and enlarging the locks. I may draw the minister's attention to the fact, and I am sure he will take it in the best part, because this is a work of great general utility and very extensive importance, and I am familiar with it, as it is situated in the centre of my constituency. This canal affords communication from the Atlantic Ocean to the Bras d'Or lakes, and thus to all the eastern ports, saving vessels the necessity of making the long and tempestuous voyage around by Cape North, or, on the southern side, around by the dangerous coast of Scataree. Should it be the fortune of the Minister of Railways and Canals to bring down the estimates next year, I hope he will have the necessary steps taken to verify my statement as to the need for the work to which I am drawing his attention. This canal is now extremely crooked, there being on the eastern side a great bend, and as the canal is only 800 yards in length altogether, and very deep and heavy, the hon. minister will see that vessels of any length going through have great difficulty in making their way from ocean to lake or from lake to ocean. The department had an engineer for some considerable time on this work, sent by the late government in 1891, to have repairs made to the canal.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That was outside of the canal.

Mr. **GILLIES**.

Mr. **GILLIES**. No, right in the canal between the Bras d'Or side and the ocean side, on the western side of the canal. The slope of the canal was so steep that it was constantly falling in. The department had it thoroughly examined by an engineer, and they decided to have the canal so sloped that there would be no falling in. The hon. minister will remember that this was done between 1891 and 1896, at a considerable outlay—something over \$100,000. Mr. McCarthy, an engineer of very considerable experience, was in charge of the work. While he was there I brought to the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals of that day, the present hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), the necessity of having the eastern side of the canal dealt with in the way I have indicated—straightened. Mr. McCarthy was instructed to make an estimate of the cost, and he did so. I am not prepared to say whether the estimate is in the department or not.

He did make an estimate, and he found that the material to be removed consisted of rock. His statement to me was that 150,000 yards of rock had to be removed to straighten out the eastern side of the canal and put it in a condition demanded by the exigencies of commerce, and this would cost, he said, \$150,000. That is a considerable sum, but I think it is very small in comparison with the conveniences that would be afforded to commerce. From time to time a demand has been made upon the department that the locks should be enlarged. The lock there now is only 200 feet in length, and when ships go there they find they cannot get through on account of the shortness of the lock. The depth of water on the mitre sill is 18 feet, and the width of the canal is 48 feet. It is therefore, as to breadth and depth, one of the largest canals in the Dominion. It has the greatest depth of any canal, except the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, which has a depth of 20 feet and a width of 60 feet, and the Cornwall Canal, which has a width of 55 feet. The length of the lock on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal is 900 feet, while this, as I said, is only 200 feet. What ship masters complain of is that the length of the lock is entirely too short in proportion to the breadth and depth of the Canal.

Now, Mr. McCarthy, the engineer in charge of that canal for five years, stated to me that the canal could be made absolutely straight and the lock enlarged to a length of 300 feet, for a sum less than \$300,000. Then we would have a canal that would be a credit to the government, and would be of much greater service to the transportation interests. I would call the minister's attention to the territorial position of the canal. The convenience it affords to the province of Prince Edward Island is that vessels coming down to markets on our eastern ports all come through that canal. There is also a large gypsum trade on the

Bras d'Or lakes carried on with the United States, and vessels of a large class are in that trade, so large that many of them coming to the canal find they cannot get through and have to go round the coast of Cape Breton; whereas if the lock was large enough they would have ready access to the lakes on the one side and to the ocean on the other. Besides these difficulties for persons who use the canal, there are people in the western counties of Lunenburg, Shelburne and Queen's whose ships go through that canal in great numbers to the Newfoundland banks. They prefer to pass through this canal instead of making the boisterous voyage of going around the Cape Breton coast. Now, I am sure the minister will be very much encouraged in entering into this outlay and in grappling with this question when I tell him that it was the policy of the late government to undertake such repairs as I have indicated, and to send this engineer there to make an examination with the view of straightening out the canal and enlarging the locks.

I have shown the necessity of the work being done, I will now give a few facts to show that the claims of this work are far in advance of the claims of some of the other canals. This canal is open earlier in the season and closed later than any other canal in the Dominion. The hon. gentleman will see from his own reports that in 1899 the canal opened on the 2nd of April and closed the 7th of January, giving a navigation of more than nine months. The other canals in Ontario and Quebec are open on an average about seven months in a year. The canal is, therefore, being used when other canals are closed. The traffic going through this canal is also much greater than the traffic going through some other canals. The cost of St. Peter's Canal from first to last was \$648,547. Last year 1,692 vessels went through that canal, carrying 64,490 tons of goods, and paying tolls of \$2,876. Compare that with the Murray Canal, and I am not finding fault with the hon. gentleman's administration of these works at all, or with that of any government. In fact, I was always a strong endorser of the policy that our canals in the west should be enlarged. The Murray Canal cost \$1,247,470.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Murray Canal is about 5½ miles long.

Mr. GILLIES. That does not make any difference. I am just showing its cost to the country. The tolls collected amounted to \$684, and the traffic that went through it amounted to 15,543 tons, or less than one-quarter of the traffic that went through our canal. The number of vessels that passed through was 677, or about one-third of the number that went through ours. Now, no objection can come from any hon. gentleman who advocated the construction of

that canal to any application for the enlargement and straightening of St. Peter's Canal. Now, we will take the Trent Valley Canal. There has been expended upon it \$2,543,240, and the estimate of the hon. gentleman's department is that it will cost about \$6,000,000 to complete it. The amount of traffic that went through it was 27,676 tons, or less than one-half of the quantity that went through ours, and the amount of tolls collected was \$1,094.63, or about one-third of the amount collected on the St. Peter's Canal. Take the Rideau Canal, which is almost within sound of our voices and within sight of Parliament Hill. The cost of that canal was \$4,095,043. Only 54,946 tons of traffic went through it, or 10,000 tons less than went through our canal. This is sufficient to show, I think, that the application from Cape Breton and Nova Scotia to have the locks of St. Peter's Canal enlarged to the dimensions of 300 feet, and also to have it straightened so as to allow the class of ships that ply there to go through it is a reasonable one. Now, I would also, in connection with this part of my argument, call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the canals I have mentioned, the Murray, Trent and Rideau call for a very much heavier outlay in the way of maintenance and repairs than our canal does.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are quite lengthy, you know.

Mr. GILLIES. On the Trent Valley Canal last year, the hon. gentleman's department expended in ordinary repairs, under the head of staff and repairs, \$12,634. That is a canal upon which \$2,543,240 were expended, through which only 27,676 tons of traffic passed, and upon which only \$1,094 of tolls were collected. The outlay in connection with the Rideau Canal was \$28,899. This was expended under the same heading, namely, ordinary repairs, under the head of Staff and Repairs, although only 54,946 tons of traffic went through it, although it cost \$4,095,043, and although 10,000 tons less traffic went through it than went through ours. Then there is the Murray Canal. Upon this canal, which cost \$1,247,470, from which only \$684 were collected in tolls, through which only 15,543 tons of traffic passed, and through which only 677 vessels went during last season, \$3,533 were expended in ordinary repairs under the head of staff and repairs. The operation of St. Peter's Canal, under the same heading, although 64,490 tons of freight passed through it, although 1,692 vessels went through its locks, and although it paid \$2,876.32 in tolls, only cost \$456.61. I think I am making a valuable brief for the hon. gentleman, and I hope that he will soon embrace my views—not my views altogether, but the views of those whom I represent here—and have the re-

pairs made in this canal by enlarging the lock and straightening out the canal that I am endeavouring to bring to his notice.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to add to the statement made by the hon. member for Richmond, N.S., (Mr. Gillies) who has gone very thoroughly into the matter, excepting that I give every word he has uttered in regard to the importance of this canal my most hearty support. The county that I have the honour to represent here is very largely interested in the canal, and in the efficiency of it. The greater part of the business done through that canal is done in the way of communication with the great centres in my county, and it is of the greatest possible importance that the canal should be improved because the business from year to year is growing. As the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) knows, in a great many instances, steam communication has taken the place of sail, and under those circumstances the change to steamers makes a greater demand on the conveniences of the canal in regard to the size of the locks than sailing vessels. I believe we would have several lines of steamers running through the canal from Sydney and from the Bras D'Or lakes if the canal was large enough to allow of the passage of such steamers. My hon. friend has gone so thoroughly into this matter that I consider it is unnecessary to take up the time of the committee any further.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is only fair to say that I am impressed by what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) has presented to the committee, at all events, to this extent that the business which is being done upon this canal, and the moderate outlay which is connected with it entitle it undoubtedly to very early and very full consideration. What he has pointed out to me as desirable to be done is a matter which I would assure him, as far as I am concerned, I will give my early attention to. I cannot, of course, undertake to express any opinion as to whether it would be important that the locks should be enlarged, or that there should be a straightening of the canal. That would follow on a very careful examination of the canal and the opinion of the competent officers. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies), that I will take into account what he has said, and give it every consideration.

Intercolonial Railway—Chargeable to collection of revenue..... \$4,100,000

Mr. HAGGART. That is on an estimate of about \$4,500,000 of receipts.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not able to speak with any confidence as to what the income in the year to come will be, but we are safe in saying that this vote will be required for

Mr. GILLIES.

the working expenses. It may be that we will have to ask next session, as we did this, for an addition in the supplementary estimates. We are not asking for any more than we are sure we will require.

Mr. HAGGART. If your estimate is \$4,500,000 of revenue, you surely do not expect a surplus of \$400,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My statement was with reference to the incoming year, which has just been concluded, and I can make no estimate for that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it the intention of the minister to continue the services of two express trains, leaving and arriving at Sydney each day?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So long as the business continues to be as it is now, we will undoubtedly have that service. I cannot speak with confidence as to the future of the business there, but it is highly probably that the two trains will be continued.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am sorry the Postmaster General is not in his place, because I want to say that since the train time is changed, the mail service between here and eastern Nova Scotia, is not at all satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There ought to be closer connection now.

Mr. McDOUGALL. To give an illustration. A letter mailed here yesterday, will not arrive any sooner in the eastern part of the province, than a letter mailed to-night. Unless letters are mailed before eight o'clock in the morning, which is very improbable, they cannot make any connection.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That ought not to be so.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There certainly ought to be some arrangement made to prevent that delay in the mail, as regards the eastern part of the province. It does not affect the system to Truro, or between Truro and Halifax.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Probably since the change of time was made, it will require the Postmaster General's Department a few days to meet the new conditions. I am quite sure that the Postmaster General's intention is to make the service as perfect as possible.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Suppose a letter is mailed at Sydney on the morning of yesterday, that letter used to be here at half-past ten to-night, but according to the present arrangement, it does not arrive until the late train leaving Montreal, brings it here at two in the morning.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You cannot have all connections, to answer every purpose equally well.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But we were given to understand that the change of time was made for the purpose of connection at Montreal, and that was told us at a setoff against the inconvenience of the hours of arrival and departure in Sydney, which is not quite satisfactory to some people.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot understand why there should be any delay coming west, the object was to have close connection with Ottawa.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is something over an hour. I know that when I came on the train to Montreal, I discovered that I was an hour or an hour and a half late. There is a train leaving later, by which I think the mail could be sent. With regard to the mail for Cape Breton, I left Montreal at noon by the Intercolonial Railway. I took with me some papers of the previous evening, and I arrived at my House in Cape Breton on the evening of the following day by the fast express; but to my surprise mail matter which was mailed at Ottawa before I left, did not arrive until the following day. That is due to the fact that the express to Halifax makes connection with the fast express for Sydney from Halifax at Truro, but does not transfer any mail.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the mail went by the Canadian Pacific Railway and it does not connect. That is not for the railway service, but for the Postmaster General.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Something should be done between the Railway Department and the department of the Postmaster General, because the whole of the mail for that part of the country is detained for twenty hours.

Prince Edward Island Railway—Chargeable to revenue ..... \$275,000

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase of \$25,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a good deal more business on the Prince Edward Island Railway than there was before, and therefore the working expenses are necessarily higher.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Might I ask the Minister of Railways if he procured the information I desired with respect to the coal inspection?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I telegraphed for it, but the reply has not yet been received. I shall have it by the time we reach the other items.

Customs—Province of Nova Scotia..... \$115,005

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the minister if he has finally disposed of the cases that occurred at North Sydney some two years ago, in connection with alleged infractions of the customs law?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I think they are all settled.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can the minister tell me what he succeeded in getting out of those transactions?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not got that with me. It was in the hands of the Department of Justice.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What fines were collected, and what did it cost to collect them, and the names of the parties?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think they cost a good deal, but have not the information just now, I understand the hon. gentleman wishes to know what was derived in the shape of fines, what it cost to collect them, and who the parties were who received the money, and I will furnish the information before all the estimates in my department are through.

For salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports, viz.:

Province of Nova Scotia.....	\$ 2,920
“ Quebec .....	13,750
“ Ontario .....	9,000
“ Manitoba .....	3,740
“ British Columbia .....	3,545
North-west Territories .....	1,560
For customs laboratory, additional amount required .....	200
	<hr/>
	\$34,715

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We found the service increasing and required additional help at different places. We found also that the vote taken the previous year was not quite sufficient to meet the demands of the different provinces. There is a number of small increases at the different ports in Nova Scotia, being increases in salaries. At Sydney there is an increase of \$550 in salaries, and \$150 in contingencies.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What are the increases at Sydney, and the names?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The estimates I have now are for the past year, and the amount will be larger next year. There is an increase to C. S. McEachren, Louisburg, from \$150 to \$300. The salary of Miles Fitzgerald, preventive officer, is increased from \$100 to \$250. P. C. Campbell, acting preventive officer, gets \$500 from November 1, 1899. He will do landing waiter services, or any other duties under the collector's direction.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has Mr. McVarrish had any increase? He should receive the same consideration as others.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My impression is that we are increasing all the officers there for the next year. The collector's salary is to be increased, and one or

two new officers have been appointed as well. Mr. McVarrish is not provided for in last year's.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am very sorry for that, because this man did all the business at that point previous to an assistant being named. The business was increasing very largely since about a year ago, and this man was nearly all the help that the customs collector had at that point, so that the work done by him previous to the appointment of a further assistant was very heavy, and I think it is unreasonable that he should not have got that recognition in the matter of increase in salaries which is given to others.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. McVarrish's salary is not large.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is very small.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know that it was brought under my notice.

Mr. McDOUGALL. My hon. friend will find that for several years claims had been made for an increase in the salary of Mr. McVarrish, and the reason alleged for not giving the increase was that the business at that point did not justify the increase. It was true enough that that business was not very large, and the department was adding expenses to the outports connected with that port; and, for that reason, it was difficult for them to accede to the request. But, now that the business justifies an increase, and as the salary was much too small in the past, I think the minister will agree with me, this officer should be the first to receive recognition when the change of circumstances makes it possible. I hope the minister will reconsider the case, and will take into account the services that Mr. McVarrish had rendered since last August, because he has been the principal assistant to the collector of customs at that point. I think the minister would be justified in taking up the case again and giving Mr. McVarrish an allowance for back services.

Mr. GILLIES. I know the case referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall). I know Mr. McVarrish personally, and know that he has rendered very assiduous and capable service for years. The hon. minister will bear in mind that the condition of the port of Sydney is far different from what it was some years ago. In past years, the customs receipts in the port of Sydney would average something like \$12,000 to \$14,000 a year, while the receipts at that port for last month alone were about \$50,000—and month after month the receipts have been about the same. The minister will understand, that greater labour had been imposed on Mr. McVarrish, the tide-waiter at that point, by this change of conditions. Again I would ask the minister's attention to the fact that the cost of living in the town of Sydney has gone up

Mr. PATERSON.

very much in the past year or two; and if a salary of \$300 or \$400 was considered sufficient under the old conditions, it requires very much more to maintain a family than it did then. Knowing, as I do, the case we are urging on the minister, I trust it will meet with the kindest possible consideration.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We are now considering the supplementary estimates for last year. I could not increase it now, for the past year. I will not say that it has not been considered for the year we are now entering on, for my impression is that we have made provision for an increase for the different officers there. I do not remember this particular officer by name, but I feel sure that we made provision for an increase for the collector.

Mr. GILLIES. How much?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not remember exactly. If the question had come up when the main estimates were on, I could have had the information ready, but I will ascertain.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. minister will find that this was a matter of oversight on his part. The correspondence was in the department.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I feel confident that provision was made for this year.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes, but how about the year just ended, and the eight or ten months of services that Mr. McVarrish has given? If the minister neglected to make provision as he did in other places, it would be proper for him to take it up again, and when other estimates are coming down—as I presume there will, before the session closes—he could make provision then.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The only way I could do would be to make a little further provision for next year.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That would do as well.

Mr. WALLACE. For whom is the increase of \$250 in Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is an increase of \$150 for Miles Fitzgerald at Port Sydney.

Mr. WALLACE. A new appointment?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, he is at International Pier, in Sydney.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was this Mr. Fitzgerald appointed in place of Mr. Carlin, who was dismissed?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He is the preventive officer at International Pier.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The preventive officer at International Pier in our time was

Mr. Carlin. Was not he dismissed and this man put in his place?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not recollect that.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not find Mr. Fitzgerald's name in the civil service list for 1900.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It will be found in the Trade and Navigation Returns.

Mr. WALLACE. No, I do not find it there.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If it is not there, he must be a new officer.

Mr. WALLACE. That is what I say.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), who knows the locality, tells me that International Pier is part of the port of Sydney.

Mr. WALLACE. On what ground was the former official dismissed?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know that he was dismissed.

Mr. McDougall. Then, I suppose the petty officials dismissed him?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) expected to remember the facts about every official in the department?

Mr. McDougall. Will the hon. minister (Mr. Paterson) promise me that if this man was dismissed without the knowledge of the minister, he will put him back?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, it would not be done without my knowledge.

Mr. McDougall. How is it that he knows nothing about it then?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not keep trace of so many officers.

Mr. McDougall. Perhaps the Minister of Finance could tell?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot tell you anything about it. There are five thousand things in the department for which it is impossible to give an answer at a moment's notice.

Mr. WALLACE. The minister (Mr. Paterson), has his estimates here for an increased expenditure, and he should be able to tell. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) wants to know about the dismissal of this man who is the predecessor of the man for whom the minister asks the salary. How is it that this man is appointed during the current year, and is getting an increase of salary?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He must have been appointed before that.

Mr. WALLACE. He is not on the civil service list.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I assume that he is a temporary officer, and not on the civil service list, but he is on the list I have here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The explanation probably is that it is the practice to appoint officers of customs who remain for many months before they are put on the civil service list.

Mr. WALLACE. How many officers are there at Port Morien?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There are three, but as Alex. McInnes, preventive officer, only got \$25, he was probably there for only a portion of the year.

Mr. WALLACE. The income from the port is \$48,611; and that is quite a large staff for the amount of revenue received. They appear to be new appointments.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman knows what the explanation is, with reference to many of these ports in the lower provinces. You cannot judge it by the revenue, because they are there as preventive officers. That is a thing which has been in existence for years and years.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the reason that led to the appointment of these three officers at Port Morien?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The salaries paid altogether at the port last year, were \$233.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The misunderstanding arises from the fact that Port Morien is the modern name for a place formerly called Cow Bay, which at one time did quite a large business, but for different reasons that business has been diverted elsewhere.

Mr. WALLACE. How far from Port Morien is Cow Bay?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I should say about twenty miles. The mines there have been suspended for some time. Recently a new mining enterprise has started there with very excellent prospects I believe. The customs arrangements are, I think, substantially the same as in former years.

Mr. McDougall. Mr. Bown was an old officer at the port. I cannot say as to Mr. Macdonald, but Mr. McInnes, who gets \$25 as preventive officer, probably got it in the way of expenses. There was a large business done at one time in this port, and for many years, two large collieries operated there. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), should have told the House, that the closing down of the business there, was one of the results of his legislation a few years ago at Halifax. The Gowrie mines at Cow Bay, or Port Morien, were amongst the largest that were operated, until the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) passed the Dominion Coal Company legislation. In consequence of that,

the business went down, but the customs officers remained the same. We hope that at an early date the business of this port will come back to where it was some years ago. There is a new company beginning to operate the coal mine there, and I hope it will be successful. It was one of the most prosperous of our mining districts up to the time of the Dominion Coal Company legislation. They found it to their interests to withdraw their operations from that point, and so they closed the mine, and the shipping left the port.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall), wishes to give the history of that event, he might give it with greater fairness. It is true that the Dominion Coal Company, which was created by the legislation to which the hon. gentleman refers, purchased the Gowrie mine, and came to the conclusion that it was wise to close the mines for the present. It is true they ceased to take coal out of that mine, but they have taken a great deal more coal out of other mines, and they have taken more coal out of Cape Breton than was ever taken by the former owners of the mines. The results of their operations have been such that the rates of wages have increased, the revenues of the provincial government have increased, and in every respect that enterprise which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) desired to sneer at, has been of immense advantage to the people of the province. Not only that, but it has been the means of establishing the great iron and steel industry which is doing so much to-day for the Island of Cape Breton, and which is creating all this prosperity to which the hon. gentleman refers.

**Mr. McDOUGALL**. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) made a very weak argument for his case. I do not wish at this stage of the session to go into the case, but if I did take the trouble to go into the case, I think I could convince hon. gentlemen that if you look at the operation of these collieries previous to the time that this legislation took place, and if you compare the percentage of increased output with that of the time subsequent to the placing of duty upon coal, it will be found that there is no greater increase in the output to-day from Cape Breton than there was before. It would only require a few minutes for me to show the committee how weak the hon. gentleman's argument is, but I do not desire to take up the time. I have not my figures with me at the present moment, but if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) will go to the records of the Mining Department of Nova Scotia and seek the percentage of increase in the output of coal from 1878 down to the time when his legislation was inaugurated at Halifax, he will see that he had just as large an output from these collieries then as we have to-day in consequence of the protection on coal. When we came down

**Mr. McDOUGALL**.

with a measure for the encouragement of the iron and steel industry, proposing to give a bounty on iron and steel, the hon. gentleman's friends, who then sat on this side of the House, objected. I am astonished that the hon. Minister of Finance, at this late day, and in the presence of an intelligent body of people in this House and in the country, should make such a weak statement. Where would that industry be to-day had it not been for this legislation granted by this parliament for the assistance of the people who were willing to engage in it at a time when the price of iron and steel was as low as it could be, when Mr. Graham Fraser and his associates undertook to build up that great industry in Pictou that was laughed at by the hon. gentleman's friends? But for that industry, would Mr. Graham Fraser be going down to Cape Breton now to seek a place for the establishment of works greater than the works he has established in Pictou? Another great measure that was undertaken previous to my hon. friend's legislation, was the building of the railway through Cape Breton to enable Cape Breton to send her coal to the iron and steel works at New Glasgow, where it was possible to test it and see if it was satisfactory. So satisfactory was it that these people found it to their interest to take their works down to Cape Breton instead of carrying them on in Pictou. The hon. gentleman spoke of the enterprise of Mr. Whitney and his associates. Mr. Whitney and his associates are enterprising men. Mr. Whitney is entitled to a great deal of credit for his enterprise, but we must not claim for Mr. Whitney that he has accomplished everything. A great deal was accomplished in the dark days and the bad times without the assistance of Mr. Whitney. We had to come to this parliament, and not only to fight my hon. friends upon the opposite side of the House, but, when we introduced to parliament a measure with the view of encouraging that great industry in Cape Breton and Nova Scotia, we had to reconcile our own friends, and we had a strong argument to meet in Ontario. That argument was, that the products of the mining industry of Nova Scotia could not reach the people of Ontario—a very strong argument indeed. We had to make our peace with these gentlemen, and not only had we to meet the opposition of the Liberal party throughout Canada, but we had to fight our own Liberal neighbours in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton. My hon. friend, time and again, went down to Cape Breton and spoke about the iniquities of the taxation imposed by the Conservative party, and he was bold enough to say that if his party got into power and gave free trade, the interests of the coal industry would be subserved and a tax on foreign coal would be unnecessary. Does my hon. friend find that it is unnecessary? He is bound to keep up the duty on coal to-day,

as he is bound to keep up the duty on every other article that comes into Canada upon which a tax was imposed by the Conservative party. If the hon. gentleman's policy had prevailed we would have had neither a coal nor an iron and steel industry. My hon. friend would have to begin to-day where we began twenty years ago. Instead of beginning four years ago, he should have begun eighteen years before he did by imposing duties upon articles that are consumed in this country, and which can be manufactured by our own people. This is the policy which prevailed, and the hon. Minister of Finance has been compelled, not only to agree to it and to support it, but to increase the duties imposed in some cases in order to meet the demands of the people of this country. When he comes at this late hour and in this intelligent age and tells us that his legislation was the foundation of the great iron and steel industry established at Sydney to-day, I tell him that there is not a child knee-high in the country but knows that it was not due to his legislation, but that the inauguration of that great industry was due to the protection that was given to that and other industries. Why, Sir, where are Mr. Whitney and his friends going to get the great portion of the raw material that they will put into that industry in Sydney? They are getting it through the operations of Mr. Graham Fraser, who was put in the position by the legislation of this parliament, by the protection afforded him by this parliament, to operate his own industry at Pictou, and not only to operate his own industry at Pictou, but to go to Newfoundland and take up large areas of iron-bearing lands. Some of them he made over to Mr. Whitney and his associates, and some of them he is operating himself, and which he will operate in connection with a great industry in Cape Breton lying side by side with the great industry that is to be carried on by Mr. Whitney and his associates. Mr. Fraser has very important, very influential and very respectable associates belonging to Canada. We have no right to belittle what these people do. We have a right to give to these people, no matter what their politics are, credit for what they have accomplished under very great difficulties in the establishment of this iron industry in Pictou during these years of hard times. These are the people to whom a great deal of the credit is due for what we have and what we hope to have in this country in regard to the iron and coal industry. They helped to provide us with a market for coal, and they helped to provide us with markets of all kinds. Their business must necessarily create other businesses, and to the pioneers of this great industry should be given the credit. The hon. gentleman has been obliged to give his adhesion to the policy inaugurated by the

Conservative party for the carrying on of this great industry.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Life is too short, and the weather rather too warm for me to follow the hon. gentleman through all the ramifications of his address, covering the history of the coal business for twenty years, more or less. But there are one or two points to which I want to call his attention. The point of difference between the Liberal and the Conservative parties in the elections in Nova Scotia was chiefly with relation to the American market. It was the contention of many men in Nova Scotia, of Liberals in Nova Scotia chiefly, that the best possible market for the coal of the island of Cape Breton and for Nova Scotia generally, would be the American market, if we could possibly obtain it.

Mr. GILLIES. Did the coal owners think so?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have found by experience that those coal owners who did not think so, did not know what they were talking about. The Liberal party for many years preached the doctrine that if we could get access to the American market, it was the most promising market for our coal, by reason of our geographical position; and the hon. gentleman opposite preached the doctrine that, even if we had free trade in coal with the United States, you could not send a pound of coal into that market. That was the argument used election after election, parliament after parliament: What is the use of the American market? If you had the duty taken off you could not send in any coal there. The hon. gentleman knows that since the mines passed from the hands of those old companies into the hands of men with larger capital, with modern ideas, with larger resources, with ample equipment, with enlarged facilities, and those modern aids of steam and electricity, trade with the American market has been opened up, and we are sending now hundreds of thousands of tons of coal from the mines of Cape Breton into the United States, the very market to which they said we never could send a pound.

Mr. GILLIES. With a duty of 75 cents a ton on our coal going to the United States, and with the policy of the hon. gentleman's friends to allow foreign coal to come into this country free, of what use would their market have been?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman contended—

Mr. GILLIES. Answer my question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not going to answer a question that does not deal with the whole matter. The point of the whole question was whether we

could send our coal to the States. We were negotiating for a free market, and I could quote speeches made by the hon. members where they said that we could not send a pound of coal, even if the duty was taken off. The companies were carrying on the coal business at that time in a small old-fashioned way. One or two large companies there were, but many of the mines were being operated in a very old-fashioned way, with limited capital, with limited resources, and without a knowledge of the progress the world was making in the production and in the handling of coal; and when these small mines were consolidated in the hands of a company with large capital, large resources, then it was found possible to do the thing. That was the policy the Liberal party had at Halifax, to bring in foreign capital, and to put the industry into the hands of men who knew how to handle and to manage it. The result was, as I have stated, and the predictions of the hon. gentleman were falsified, and to-day the port of Louisburg is sending tens and hundreds of thousands of tons of coal into the United States in the face of all the hon. gentleman's statements that it was utterly impossible. So much on that point. But he said that the national policy did it. Sir, if there ever was any class of people who were tricked, deceived and humbugged by the government of Canada of that time, it was the coal owners. I went down into one of those sections the hon. gentleman refers to, I went down into the county of Cape Breton at the time when I was preaching the doctrine that if we could get admission into the American market—

Mr. McDOUGALL. You have not got admission yet.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have got it; in face of the duty we are sending hundreds of thousands of tons of Nova Scotia coal into the American market, and if we had free admission into that market we could send millions. But I went down into that country preaching that doctrine, and what did I find? The hon. gentleman and his friends went from platform to platform in that country and told the miners that if there was free trade in coal between the United States and Canada they would come to starvation. I went to a great mining district at Glace Bay. There was a magnificent meeting, and friends came to me afterwards and said: Well, Mr. Fielding, in the main we agree with your policy, but we are told that if we had free trade in coal with the States the mines would be shut up and we would be starved. The people were frightened at that statement, and they voted to sustain the Conservative party. Now, Sir, what did we ascertain afterwards? We ascertained that at that very moment there was lying in the office of a public man of the United States an

Mr. FIELDING

offer of Sir John A. Macdonald to make coal free.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Nonsense.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am willing to produce the document, if the hon. gentleman wants it. I will bring it down at once. It was a letter written by Sir John A. Macdonald—I could almost quote it—dated at St. Patrick, Rivière du Loup, addressed to a gentleman in the United States, who is now connected with copper mines up at Sudbury.

An hon. MEMBER. Mr. Ritchie.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was the name, it was addressed to Samuel J. Ritchie, of Akron, Ohio. I can give the hon. gentleman the date, the place, and I can produce the document.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not believe it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does the hon. gentleman deny the statement?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is it true or is it not? Let us meet the fact. Does the hon. gentleman deny that at the time I refer to, Sir John A. Macdonald wrote a letter to Samuel J. Ritchie?

Mr. McDOUGALL. What was the time?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Shortly before the election of 1891, in the year 1890 or thereabouts.

Mr. McDOUGALL. No such thing.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will bring down the document, I do not want the hon. gentleman to back out. At that very time when they were telling these miners in the island of Cape Breton that if coal was made free they would starve, and when they were scaring these men into voting for the Tory candidates on that ground, at that very moment the Conservative government had made an offer of free coal to the United States government. That is what the records show of the policy of the late government in dealing with the labouring men and with the coal industry of Nova Scotia.

Mr. CLANCY. What were the conditions?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The condition was that the document was to be kept secret for the present! You can do this, but for obvious reasons don't publish it just now—that was the condition. Let the hon. gentleman be careful. I am not in the habit of making statements of that kind without authority. I am speaking of a document which is on record, and I think before the session is over I can find the facsimile of that letter of Sir John A. Macdonald's

Mr. McDOUGALL. Who is Mr. Ritchie?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Mr. Ritchie was the man who was engaged by Sir John A. Macdonald to negotiate with the United States, and if he was a good enough man for Sir John A. Macdonald to employ on this mission he ought to be a good enough man for my hon. friend to accept. Now, I want to come down to the question of the Dominion Coal Company, and I will be very brief. The hon. gentleman attacks the legislation which created the Dominion Coal Company. Let him go down into the county of Cape Breton and go on the platform to-day, and tell the people in that county that the legislation creating the Dominion Coal Company was bad legislation. I challenge him to do it, he dare not do it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I deny it.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The hon. gentleman did attack it time and again, if he did not join in the crowd, at all events he sympathized with them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. My hon. friend is mistaken. I say the hon. gentleman has no right to make a reference to that again. His organ in Halifax made a statement—

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. What are you referring to?

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman alludes to me as having used influence or tried to use influence to prevent that legislation passing. Is not that what he was saying?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. He did not give me a chance to finish my sentence.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I allowed him already to go a little too far. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that in alluding to a statement that was published in his organ—

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I have no organ.

Mr. McDOUGALL—at Halifax and published afterwards in the town of Sydney, to the effect that I was one of a number of Conservatives who went before the Governor General and tried to prevent the passing of legislation of my hon. friend at Halifax for the organization of the Dominion Coal Company—I say that statement was made by these people, and it was sent from this gallery down to these papers. The statement was as false as any words could be put together. I never did go to the Governor General, nor go to any of his advisers, or anybody else, or had any part from that day until this in opposing the hon. gentleman's legislation. But I never hesitated to criticise what I considered was improper and wrong about that legislation; and if the hon. gentleman will permit me just now, I will show that what I found fault with in connection with that legislation, was that it resulted in closing down prosperous industries like that at Cow Bay and at Victoria

Mines, rendering the properties of people who had spent their money in them, practically valueless.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. What the hon. gentleman or others may have done individually is not a matter with which we are concerned. The Tory party of Nova Scotia fought me day and night on that legislation, and I had to take my political life in my hand. What were the stories they circulated? They said: If you pass this legislation, the whole coal industry of the province will be monopolized in the hands of Yankees. It has not been monopolized. They said that coal would be greatly increased in price. It has been cheaper since than it was in the previous years. They said that the mines would be closed up. There are more men at work in the coal mines of Cape Breton to-day than ever before, they are getting better wages than ever before, and trade and commerce are flourishing there as never before. Then they circulated a story to the effect that we were going to bring in Poles, Scandinavians, and people from every other nation in the world to take the bread out of the mouths of our own people. Instead of that, our own people have more labour than before, and are working at good wages.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is not so, that coal is cheaper to-day than it was before.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I do not say that it is cheaper now, the prices of nearly all commodities have advanced of late, but coal was made cheaper by the legislation, because the company introduced steam and electricity and all modern improvements, which the smaller mines did not have. We were told that the Yankees would blow up the mines, and that if Her Majesty Queen Victoria sent a war ship to Cape Breton she would not be able to get coal there. Every mean and base fabrication was used by the Tory party to destroy the Liberals of Nova Scotia and their policy; but to-day we have the proud satisfaction of looking back and seeing that by that legislation the Island of Cape Breton has been made prosperous and it is to-day flourishing like a green bay tree.

Mr. McDOUGALL. My hon. friend referred to the increased shipments of coal from the Cape Breton collieries to the United States. My hon. friend knows that the records show that for many years after the organization of the Dominion Coal Company they failed to export any coal to the United States, and they had to avail themselves of the market in Canada which was provided by the policy of the Conservative party. Within the last year or two they have secured a market in the United States, and what is it? A market for culm coal, which, though it weighs just as much as round coal, is not worth nearly as much to the

operator nor to the people engaged in the industry. To show that it is not, I may say that every local consumer is compelled to-day to pay a dollar a ton more for coal than they paid before, while the operators are compelled to sell their coal in the United States for a dollar less. My hon. friend refers to the increase in wages, which he boasts of as a result of that enterprise. That increase in wages extends all over the country and applies to every industry.

Mr. McMULLEN. Because there is a good government in power

Mr. McDOUGALL. Because the same thing prevails all over the world; because the demand for the products of the different industries of this country is greater than ever before; because our manufacturers, who were able to establish their industries through the protective policy of the Conservative party, are able to furnish to the markets abroad what they could not furnish before. My hon. friend had to be schooled for twenty years before he was taught that it was necessary to have a protective policy in order to enable our people to place their products on the markets of the world.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). In these growing times, will my hon. friend give me this extra vote for these officers?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I will, if the hon. minister will increase the salary of the officer at Sydney.

Mr. DAVIN. This item includes \$1,500 for the North-west Territories. I do not wish to discuss it just now, but will the hon. gentleman bring down, before we discuss the next item, a list of all the customs officers in the North-west Territories, with the date of their appointment?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes. In a general way, I may say that the increases in the different provinces are necessary because of the increased business of the country, and they are also accounted for in part by the fact that in the previous year I did not take a sufficient vote, and a portion of the salaries of some of the officers for the year 1898-9 had to be paid out of the vote for the year 1899-1900. I may say that J. Beatty, for whom a gratuity of \$187.33 is voted, was an officer at Port Hope. We have three officers there, and it was thought that we could do with two. I may say with reference to Port Morien, Charles R. Bowen was a collector who died. Mr. Macdonald was appointed in his place, and Mr. McInnes is a preventive officer. We are working that port with two officers instead of three.

Mr. WALLACE. What are the salaries now paid there?

Mr. McDOUGALL.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. \$400 for the collector and \$100 for the preventive officer.

Mr. WALLACE. The collections are only \$48.61.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There are now, as there were under the hon. gentleman's administration, many places in the lower provinces where the salaries exceed the revenue.

Mr. WALLACE. There are men who are appointed as preventive officers and not as collectors. We have this preventive officer getting \$100, but the other man performs his duty as collector and gets \$400 for collecting \$48.61.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am told that the officer who died was getting the same salary from the late government. In 1895-6, the collections were \$221, and they are now \$48.61.

The committee rose and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, July 9, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TRANSPORTATION OF TROOPS.

Mr. POWELL asked:

1. What was the total amount charged by the Intercolonial Railway in connection with the transportation of the first and second Canadian contingents to South Africa, including transportation of equipment and supplies?
2. What was the total amount charged by the Intercolonial Railway in connection with the transportation of the Strathcona Horse, including equipment and supplies?
3. What was the total amount charged by the Intercolonial Railway in connection with the transportation of the militia to Halifax, as a garrison, including equipment and supplies?
4. What was the total amount charged by the Intercolonial Railway in connection with the transportation of supplies to Halifax and St. John for the British army?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The total amount charged by the Intercolonial Railway in connection with the transportation of the several contingents to South Africa, including transportation of equipment and supplies, is

\$25,778. 2. The total amount charged by the Intercolonial Railway, in connection with the transportation of the Strathcona Horse, including equipment and supplies, is \$8,357.73. 3. The total amount charged by the Intercolonial Railway for transportation of the militia to Halifax, as a garrison, including their baggage, is \$1,252.35. I have not been able to get an answer to the fourth question, as no period is named in the question, but I have telegraphed to the general manager.

Mr. POWELL. The words, 'in connection with the South African war,' should be in the question, and have been omitted either by myself in copying or by somebody else.

Mr. FOSTER. Let that part of the question stand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That might stand.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) (by Mr. Gillies) asked :

What were the total earnings of the government railways for transport of men, horses and materials due to the war in South Africa?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The total amount charged by the Intercolonial Railway in connection with the transportation of men, horses and materials, due to the war in South Africa, was \$35,388.08.

**INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—DEFICITS AND SURPLUSES.**

Mr. CALVERT asked :

What were the amounts of the deficits and surpluses in the working of the Intercolonial Railway for the various years from 1867 to date?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) :

Year.	Profit.	Loss.
1872-3	.....	\$308,434 34
1873-4	.....	951,745 07
1874-5	.....	670,996 19
1875-6	.....	426,336 33
1876-7	.....	507,228 22
1877-8	.....	432,326 78
1878-9	.....	716,083 53
1879-80	.....	97,131 23
1880-1	\$ 542 65	.....
1881-2	9,605 18	.....
1882-3	10,547 83	.....
1883-4	6,981 30	.....
1884-5	.....	78,547 90
1885-6	.....	133,905 79
1886-7	.....	262,252 69
1887-8	.....	383,445 69
1888-9	.....	276,846 73
1889-90	.....	547,835 87
1890-1	.....	684,946 56
1891-2	.....	493,935 03
1892-3	20,181 59	.....
1893-4	5,838 29	.....
1894-5	3,815 21	.....
1895-6	.....	55,187 52
1896-7	.....	59,940 65
1897-8	.....	209,978 66
1898-9	272,645 23	.....

There was no Intercolonial Railway prior to 1872-3. There were merely a couple of short detached pieces of railway.

**MAIL SERVICE IN MANITOBA.**

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

Since a tri-weekly mail service has been organized along the line of the Emerson branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Manitoba, why was not a similar service provided for St. Pierre, La Rochelle and St. Malo, from Otterburne station, as it has been asked for in a petition signed by the leading business men of those localities?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). I think the form of this question is objectionable, being argumentative. If the question were amended, by omitting the first clause, so as simply to ask why a tri-weekly service was not provided for the points named, I have the answer.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I have no objection to amend the question. I did not mean to cast any reflection.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The reason a tri-weekly service has not been provided for the points named, is the great cost as compared with the revenue.

**THE DISMISSAL OF LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR McINNES.**

Mr. MONK (by Mr. Prior) asked :

1. Did the Secretary of State in August last convey to Lieutenant-Governor McInnes instructions respecting the attitude he should adopt in certain matters towards his ministers in a letter marked 'confidential.'

2. Did the Secretary of State of Canada subsequently write another letter upon the same subject to the said Lieutenant-Governor McInnes marked 'strictly private'?

3. Were the instructions of the Secretary of State to Lieutenant-Governor McInnes, in regard to said letters, or any of them, to the effect that said letters should be destroyed?

4. Were the letters referred to in questions 1 and 2 purely personal communications from the Secretary of State or did he give the said instructions to the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia in regard to the conduct of public business in said province, as the official mouth-piece of the federal government?

5. Why were the said letters marked confidential, and why was the Lieutenant-Governor instructed to destroy them?

6. Why did the Dominion government, before dismissing Lieutenant-Governor McInnes, not await his official report, as requested by him in his telegram of June 19, as having been mailed from Victoria, B.C., on June 15?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The answer to the first five questions is, that the Secretary of State sent no confidential communications whatever to the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia, but Mr. Scott wrote to Mr. McInnes as a friend to a friend, certain purely personal letters, and for such letters Mr. Scott is not answerable to this House. To the sixth question, the answer is that when Mr. McInnes was removed from the office of Lieu-

tenant-Governor of British Columbia, the government was in possession of his last words.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose, then, that the letters sent by Mr. Scott, not as Secretary of State, included no mandatory of, or directory instructions?

The PRIME MINISTER. Nothing at all.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF ARTHUR PARENT.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

1. Whether there is at present employed in the service of the government, as foreman or otherwise, at the graving dock at Lévis, a man named Arthur Parent?

2. What are his duties?

3. What salary does he receive?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). 1, 2 and 3. Mr. Parent is employed as timekeeper by the contractor.

#### MILITIA CAMPS—TRANSPORTATION.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

1. To whom was given the contract for the transportation of the 7th Field Battery to and from the Deseronto camp this year?

2. What were the terms upon which the work was to be done?

3. What amount has been paid or is to be paid for the work?

4. What amount was paid, and to whom, for the transportation of troops to and from the Niagara camp, and upon what conditions?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Thos. Nihan, St. Catharines, Ont. 2. Eight hundred and seventy-five dollars from St. Catharines to Deseronto and return, including all dues and charges. 3. No amount has yet been paid: \$875 is to be paid. 4. No amount has yet been paid.

#### THE DUTY ON HAY.

Mr. RICHARDSON (by Mr. LaRivière) asked :

1. Is the government aware that, owing to the long-continued drought in the province of Manitoba, there will be a shortage in the hay crop, and that hardship will be experienced in procuring a sufficient supply of fodder for stock the coming winter?

2. Will the government remove the duty of \$2 per ton on hay, to enable the settlers to procure hay from the extensive low-lying hay lands immediately south of the international boundary?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I am glad to know that recent information from the province of Manitoba, encourages the belief that the condition of the crops is very much better than was anticipated a little while ago, and we hope that the expectation of the hon. gentleman who put the question will not be realized, so far as the shortage is concerned. In any event, however, it is not our intention to propose any tariff changes during the remainder of the present session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

#### TATAMAGOUCHE HARBOUR SURVEY.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) (by Mr. Gillies) asked :

By whom was the survey of Tatamagouche harbour made in the spring of 1899? What was the purpose of said survey? Have all amounts in connection with said survey been paid, and what was the total cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). 1. By Assistant Engineer Thos. J. Locke. 2. To dredge a channel forty feet wide in the harbour and river, up to the village of Tatamagouche. 3. Mr. Locke is paid a monthly salary. His travelling expenses were \$9.10. There is no information in the department that any accounts for the survey are unpaid.

#### FISHING BOUNTY CLAIM.

Mr. BELL (Pictou) (by Mr. Gillies) asked :

Did John A. Chisholm and W. A. Chisholm, of St. Francis Harbour, Guysborough County, make application to the government, or any officer thereof, for fishing bounty during the past year? If so, what was the amount of the claim; was it paid, and if not, why not?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Yes. 2. Four dollars and fifty cents each. 3. The claims were not paid because they were not filed within the time specified in the regulations.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—FIRST CONTINGENT LIFE INSURANCE.

Mr. PRIOR asked :

1. Were the lives of the members of the first contingent, now in South Africa, insured for \$1,000 each by a company doing business in Montreal?

2. If so, have not a number of claims for this insurance become due, and has not the government received official notice from Sir Alfred Milner of several of these deaths?

3. Does the government intend to take any steps towards the payment of these claims?

4. If not, what procedure is necessary on the part of the relatives or friends of the deceased men to obtain said insurance?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not exactly understand what is the particular company to which my hon. friend refers. If my hon. friend refers to the company with which the hon. the leader of the opposition has, more or less, to do, I may inform him that I myself gave Sir Charles Tupper an authentic copy of all the information we had up to that time, and I do not know that we will have any more for some time to come.

Mr. PRIOR. I would like to know whether the government have received official notice of the deaths from Sir Alfred Milner?

The PRIME MINISTER. I gave an official copy of the information I received from Sir Alfred Milner to Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. PRIOR. That does not indicate in what manner the relatives and friends of

the deceased men are to apply to obtain the insurance—whether to Sir Charles Tupper or the government.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I do not think the government have anything to do with the matter.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. G. E. **FOSTER** (York, N.B.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to renew my request for a return of the dismissed officials from the Railway Department.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair). I hope to have it before the end of the sitting.

#### CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House concur in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 180) respecting and restricting Chinese immigration. He said: The amendments are as follows: The Senate have provided that the Governor in Council may make regulations for the carrying out of this Act. They have made a verbal amendment to section 6. Section 4 they have amended by adding this proviso: 'Any woman of Chinese origin, who is a wife of a person not of Chinese origin, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed of the same nationality as her husband, and the children of the same nationality as their father.' The Senate have also provided that the Governor in Council may make the regulations necessary to prohibit the entering into Canada of any greater number of persons from any foreign country than the laws of such country permit to emigrate to Canada.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

#### SUPPLY—HOMESTEAD ENTRY IN MANITOBA.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. A. A. C. **LaRIVIERE** (Provencher). I regret that at this late stage I have to take up the time of the House, but the matter I wish to bring to its attention is of such importance for the good administration of public affairs that I cannot remain silent and leave it in the dark. We have in the province of Manitoba, connected with the Department of the Interior, a dual administration with regard to the public lands. We have the land office, which is directly under the department at Ottawa, and we have also the immigration branch, which interferes, more or less, in the administration of the department. I must call the attention of the House to the abuses that are committed in connection with this administration.

A quantity of land was disposed of some years ago, either by purchase or as homesteads. And, as the regulations under the Land Act have not been complied with in some of these cases, the sales or homestead entries can be annulled. As new settlers come in, they look over the lands and when they see a lot unimproved or unoccupied, they take note of that; and, if the regulations have not been complied with, upon application made by the new settlers, the sale or homestead entry previously made may be cancelled and the newcomer recognized as the first claimant either to purchase the land or enter it as a homestead.

I wish to call attention more especially to one case—and I am sorry to say there are others of a similar nature. The case I wish to refer to is that of the south half section 25, township 1, range 3 east. It appears from the books of the land office in Winnipeg, and also in the department that this whole section had been originally sold to Mrs. S. McCaul, of St. Thomas, Ont. But, as only a partial payment had been made upon the land and other payments were not forthcoming, the department was asked to cancel that sale. On December 15, 1897, one August Schmitke, a German, who had come into the province to settle down, wrote the following letter to the agent of the Dominion lands in Winnipeg:

Dominion City P.O., 15th, 1897.

Dear Sir,—I want to apply for the cancellation of the present entry for section 25, township 1, range 3 east, as I understand that the land is not paid for. If cancellation takes place, I would like to homestead the south-west quarter, and my son, twenty years of age, will take the south-east quarter.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) **AUGUST SCHMITKE.**

Agent Dominion Lands, Winnipeg.

A communication in reference to this letter was sent by the Dominion lands agent in Winnipeg to the secretary of the Department of the Interior, inclosing the application of Mr. Schmitke and asking for instructions with regard to the matter. On January 7, 1898, the assistant secretary of the Department of the Interior answered the agent of Dominion lands and informed him that he had advised one W. J. Whitley, who had made some inquiry about that land for German settlers. It appears that this Mr. Whitley who was also looking for that same piece of land, did not ask for the cancellation of the former sale; but merely asked the department as to the present holders of the land, so that he might communicate with them and purchase their right. The communication in which Mr. Whitley spoke of this matter was written on November 11, 1897. On January 27, 1898, the immigration commissioner in Winnipeg, Mr. McCreary, suggested that the sale to Mrs. McCaul should be cancelled and this land sold at auction to the highest bidder. This view, it appears, was favoured by the department; but when the offer was made at pub-

lic auction, nobody bid for the land, so therefore, it remained as it had been. On April 11, 1898, one George Christie, a land agent, applied for the purchase of this land on behalf of one Andreas Wahlman and his three sons. He did not apply to homestead, but to purchase the land. On April 25, 1898, the assistant secretary of the Department of the Interior notified Mrs. McCaul that the land sale made to her was cancelled. Thus, it was only from that date that the land became public property and could be dealt with in the regular way. On the same day, the assistant secretary of the department notified Mr. McCreary of the cancellation. On September 7, 1898, the Dominion lands agent in Winnipeg wrote to the Department of the Interior that tenders had been asked for, as I have stated and that none were received and asking for further instructions. On the 24th of the same month, an answer came from the Department of the Interior that homestead entries be accepted for the section. On October 17 following, the agent of the Dominion lands at Winnipeg notified the Department of the Interior that he was notifying August Schmitke that he could take the land. August Schmitke came to Winnipeg, made his entry for the land for himself and his son and paid the fees, and went to the land and started work upon it. Later on, Mr. McCreary, the Dominion immigration agent at Winnipeg, went to the land office and insisted on the entry that had been allowed in favour of Mr. Schmitke being recorded in the book and that the money be returned, because, as he pretended, there was a prior application.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Do I understand my hon. friend to say that this person, Mr. Schmitke, actually got an entry?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. He actually signed his entry paper and deposited his money.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Got his entry receipt, did he?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Did not get his receipt, but he signed his papers and deposited the money.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend speaks of the entry being cancelled. The entry could not have been cancelled unless it had been made, and if he had made the entry he would have had his receipt. The hon. gentleman understands that very well.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I do not know whether I said cancelled, but at the same time he signed his papers he deposited the money and went home, because his money was in the hands of the officials of the department and was returned afterwards. Well, this man, Geo. Christie, when he saw Schmitke taking possession of the land, started off for Winnipeg to ask why this land had been allowed to be entered by

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

that man Schmitke, as he himself had applied for it; and he ascertained that his application in favour of Wahlman was subsequent to that of Schmitke. Christie went back home, and then he heard that Mr. W. J. Whitley, another land agent in Emerson, had written on a prior date asking for some information with regard to this land, and asking who the owners of the land were. I have here a copy of the letter, and it is nothing else but an inquiry for information. Then Christie comes back with the letter from this man Whitley stating that the parties for whom he was inquiring were the Wahlmans, the very same men on whose behalf Christie himself was acting. On the strength of that, the money that had been deposited by Schmitke was returned, and he was informed that he could not get the land. I have here a copy of the official letter, dated October 17, 1898, of the Dominion lands agent in Winnipeg, to the secretary of the department in reference to this matter, in which he says, amongst other things:

On the 3rd inst. I notified August Schmitke, of Dominion City, that the land is available for himself and his son on the terms which govern the disposal of Dominion lands.

I am, sir.

E. F. STEPHENSON,

Agent Dominion Lands.

Then Mr. McCreary, commissioner, writes the following letter to the Deputy Minister of the Interior about this matter:

Office of Commissioner of Immigration,  
Winnipeg, October 21, 1898.

Re South Half 25-1-3 East.

Sir.—Mr. George Christie, Emerson, came to see me the other day in regard to this land for which he had made an application on behalf of a German family named Wahlman. On going to Mr. Stephenson's office I found that the first applicant was one August Schmitke, but on looking into the files, it would seem to me that Whitley made application to Ottawa at about the same time as Schmitke, or probably before. Now, I would be pleased if you would have one of the clerks send me an exact copy of the application made by Whitley, Christie, Schmitke and Scott, with the dates when they were received. Schmitke has come in to make his entry on receiving notice from Mr. Stephenson's office, but when I called their attention to the fact that they did not have a copy of Whitley's application, and consequently were not aware but that it might be prior to that of Schmitke, they held his papers until these documents had been received.

Yours truly,

W. F. McCREARY.

James A. Smart, Esq.,

Deputy Minister of the Interior.

Now, Sir, this is the first interference of Mr. McCreary in this transaction. In answer to this, the secretary of the Department of the Interior transmits to Mr. McCreary a copy of Mr. Whitley's letter to which I have referred, and perhaps it would be well that I should read that letter to let the House understand what it may be worth. It is dated November 11, 1897:

To the Commissioner of Dominion Lands,  
Ottawa.

Could your department give me the addresses of the parties who purchased section 25, township 1, range 3 east, from the government some years ago? I want to try and make arrangements to purchase these lands for some German settlers I am putting in in this township, and if I get the address of the parties holding the land I might be able to buy their interest and make the balance of the payment to the government. Any information you can give me will be thankfully received.

Yours truly,

W. J. WHITLEY.

This was merely an informal application for information, it was not an application to have the sale cancelled, or to secure land for settlers as homesteads. It is true that the contention of Whitley is that he wants to settle some German families. He does not name them, he does not say who he is acting for, he does not say what kind of a transaction he is going to make with those Germans. The fact of the matter is after having written that letter, we hear no more of Whitley. The land changes hands, the land is settled upon by Schmitke, and we hear no more of him until his letter is filed for the benefit of Geo. Christie's protégés as against the interest of the Schmitke family.

In the early part of this session, I moved for all the papers in connection with this transaction; but I am sorry to say that I only received about half of them, I did not get a complete file, and the best proof is that I have in my possession several original letters written by officials of the department in connection with that matter, which are not included in the return that I now produce before the House. I regret that these important letters should have been left out, and that the department did not bring down a complete return.

Now, Sir, I have stated that the fees that had been deposited by Mr. Schmitke were returned by the Dominion land agent. In an official letter bearing date December 13, which is not included in the return, I find the following:

Department of the Interior,  
Office of Dominion Lands,  
Winnipeg, Man., December 13, 1898.

Sir,—With reference to your application for the S.  $\frac{1}{2}$  25-1-3 east, I beg to inform you that upon consideration of the case, it is found that there was an application sent in a month previous to yours, and as the parties are ready to make entry, I am asking Mr. Charles A. Jones to return the \$30 which was forwarded as entry fees for yourself and your son.

I was advised some time ago by the department that it was probable that the N.W.  $\frac{1}{4}$  17-3-3 east, would be made available for entry if applications were received and if, after looking at the land, you think it likely to suit you, I shall be glad to communicate with the department at Ottawa. There is also the N.E.  $\frac{1}{4}$  22-2-5 east, which is available for entry.

I return herewith the letter from the department authorizing you to make a second entry.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,  
E. H. TAYLOR,

For Agent Dominion Lands.

August Schmitke, Esq.,

Emerson,

Manitoba.

This, of course, did not satisfy Mr. Schmitke, and he wrote to the commissioner of immigration at Winnipeg, who had also written to him, protesting against the treatment that he had received. Here is the answer that the commissioner gave to him:

Winnipeg, January 11, 1899.

Dear sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 9th inst. inclosing \$30, the amount which I had just returned to Mr. Schmitke.

Mr. Schmitke returned the money to the immigration commissioner, insisting upon his entry being accepted, and would not take his money back.

I inclose amount again, and at the same time would let you have the following statement in regard to this matter.

Mr. Schmitke, when at the land office, was distinctly told that entry had been applied for, for this land, but that in order to save him a further trip to Winnipeg they would take an application from him which would be forwarded to the head office, and that the decision would have to come from them in regard to this entry.

This statement, I must say, en passant, is emphatically denied by Mr. Schmitke, who says that there was no such agreement with him.

There was seemingly six prior applications to Mr. Schmitke's—

If it were parliamentary language, I would say that Mr. McCreary was telling a lie, that there were not six applications made prior to that of Schmitke. There was only one letter, which, by the officials of the land office, was not considered to be an application written by Mr. Whitley. All the other applications that might be considered as such were posterior to that made by the Schmitke family.

There were seemingly six prior applications to Mr. Schmitke's, and although everything was done in this office to try and obtain this land for the party mentioned, the land commissioner could not look over the fact that the other parties had a prior right, and consequently ruled against Schmitke. This was explained to Mr. Schmitke at the time, and he will now have to abide by the decision of the department. He is very foolish to have taken any premature action in regard to this land, and will have to suffer the consequences.

The premature action was that he had returned home, taken possession of his land, begun to break it and to haul up lumber to build a house after he had been told by the land office, in an official letter, that he could get the land as a homestead. The immigration commissioner tells this poor German immigrant, ignoring the laws of the

country, that he is very foolish to have taken any premature action in regard to this land, when he simply took action after having received the official information that he had received from the officers of the land office in Winnipeg.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to know what Mr. McCreary had to do with it?

Mr. LaRIVIERE (reading):

And he will have to suffer the consequences.

That is what he said to a poor immigrant, who has been deceived by the officers of the department. He will have to bear the consequences of the maladministration of the land office.

I am informed by Mr. Taylor, of the land office, that they have advised Mr. Schmitke of this fact—

That is another lie.

—and have also notified him of other land in that district for which he could obtain entry.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) W. F. McCREARY,  
Commissioner.

W. W. Unsworth, Esq.,

Notary Public, Conveyancer, &c.,  
Emerson, Man.

Kindly acknowledge receipt and oblige.

This is another of the letters which have been kept away from the files that I applied for, but I have the official document addressed to Mr. Schmitke's solicitor and signed by Mr. McCreary's own hand.

Mr. DAVIN. It is nothing extraordinary to have a letter kept back.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. In the same file, not the official file, I find also a letter dated January 20, 1899, addressed to the solicitor of Mr. Schmitke, by Mr. Taylor, who was acting for the Dominion land agent:

Department of the Interior,  
Dominion Land Office,  
Winnipeg, January 20, 1899.

Sir,—The commissioner of immigration has forwarded to me your letter of the 12th instant regarding the S.  $\frac{1}{2}$  25-1-2 east, and in reply I beg to say that the application of Mr. Schmitke was made on the 15th December, 1897; whereas an inquiry of Mr. Whitley on behalf of some German settlers, was dated 11th of the previous month.

I do not think I am acquainted with this gentleman, Mr. E. H. Taylor, who was acting in an official capacity during the absence of the Dominion land agent, but I must say on his behalf, that he is too honest to treat that letter of Mr. Whitley as a regular application. He speaks of the application of Mr. Schmitke, which was made on December 15, 1897, and says:

This inquiry was overlooked when the land was offered to your client, and before entry was granted to Messrs. Paul and Andreas Wahlman, a statutory declaration was required from Mr. Whitley that these were the same settlers on whose behalf he wrote in November, 1897.

I regret the inconvenience caused Mr. Schmitke and have written him offering him entry for

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

several other pieces of land at no great distance from Emerson. None of them, however, appear to suit his requirements.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

E. H. TAYLOR.

For Agent Dominion Lands.

W. W. Unsworth, Esq.,

Emerson.

Manitoba.

It seems that Whitley's letter was merely a letter of inquiry without any definite object, except, perhaps, as he said in his own letter, that he might purchase that land from the then supposed owner, and hand it over to some German settlers whom he did not name, and make a speculation on the property by that transaction. A legitimate speculation it would have been if he had purchased the land from the party who was then supposed to own it; because in that case the land would not be held by the government. About the same time, that is, on the 17th of January, 1899, having heard of the circumstances of the case, I myself made some inquiry. I wrote to the Dominion lands agent in Winnipeg, asking for some information, and here is the answer I received from him:

Dominion Lands Office,  
Winnipeg, January 23, 1899.

Sir.—I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 17th inst., and to say in reply that the S $\frac{1}{2}$  of 25-1-3, east, is entered by Messrs. Paul and Andreas Wahlman.

These were the two protégés of this man Christie, who, after Schmitke had returned his money, were allowed to enter for these lands. The letter goes on:

The applicants for the land were as follows: W. J. Whitley, November 11, 1897; August Schmitke, December 15, 1897; John Molloy, January 8, 1898; Michael Scott, April 6, 1898; as well as subsequent applicants.

Here is a list of four applicants given to me by the Dominion lands agent in Winnipeg, in which the first appears to be one Whitley, of whom we have heard before, who had merely applied for information, as I have stated; and then comes Mr. August Schmitke, who makes direct application for the land as a homestead entry. The immigration commissioner in Winnipeg answered Mr. Schmitke: 'There are six applications prior to yours.' Here is another official in the land office who says there are six, but Mr. Whitley is the first. If his letter can be considered an application, Mr. Schmitke comes in as the second. Therefore, even if that application of Whitley's had been a proper one, Schmitke would be the second in the list, and therefore there could not be six applications prior to his. The letter of the Dominion lands agent goes on:

Mr. August Schmitke was authorized, on the 3rd October last to enter for this land for himself and his son, it being considered that the letter of Mr. W. J. Whitley did not constitute an application for the land. A protest was entered on Mr. Whitley's behalf, and the whole matter being submitted to the deputy minister during his recent visit, he decided that Mr.

Whitley must be considered the first applicant, and the latter made declaration that Messrs. Wahlman were the settlers on whose behalf he inquired in November, 1897.

Now, Sir, here is the third gentleman stepping in and with his high authority interfering in this matter between the two other officials, the head of the land office and the head of the immigration office, and deciding in favour of this man Christie, who has made this man Whitley his tool in order to attain his own object. This letter goes on:

I have made several efforts to find other land suitable for Schmitke, but apparently none have proved satisfactory.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

E. H. TAYLOR,

For Agent Dominion Lands.

A. A. C. LaRivière, Esq., M.P.,

St. Boniface, Man.

This letter did not form part of the file which I have now before me, and which has been laid on the Table of the House by the Minister of the Interior, though I asked for every paper in connection with the whole matter. As I have said, on the 20th of December, 1898, the two Wahlmans, on whose behalf this man George Christie was acting, were allowed to make their entries and pay their money. I then received some information from the district where this transaction and other similar transactions have taken place. In one of the communications I have received is the following:

Before Schmitke made entry in October last, Christie had the effrontery to offer to sell the land to him for \$200. Failing to grab from Schmitke, he resurrects the Wahlman application. A cursory perusal of the letters I send you will show many charming blunders. In your letter the matter was submitted to the deputy minister. In my letter of the 11th January, 1899, it was the land commissioner. In your letter there is only Mr. Whitley ahead of Schmitke. In the commissioner's letter there were seemingly six. On the 13th of July, Mr. Stephenson—

That is, the land agent at Winnipeg—

—writes that the land is not in the hands of the government; but on the 9th December, the secretary of the Department of the Interior says the sale entry was cancelled in the March previous. This last will be found to be correct, and therefore any applications prior to that should not be taken notice of. Please note that they speak of Whitley's as an 'inquiry,' while that of Schmitke was an 'application.' Then, again, the practice is to give twenty days' time to complete application by depositing, fees, &c. This would knock out all those enumerated in your letter, and make Schmitke first in line with his money. I think you will find that the deputy minister's recent visit was coincident with Mr. Christie's visit to Winnipeg, when he made entry and paid the fees for the Wahlmans, or rather for himself in their names. But then, again, who really was it decided—the deputy minister or the land commissioner?

On the 15th March, 1897, I stated already that the two Wahlmans were allowed by the Dominion lands agent to enter this land, through their agent, Mr. Christie. I am not saying that this was done with their

knowledge, since they state later that they never knew that their names had been taken in the land offices as homesteaders for the land they were occupying because another transaction had taken place in the meantime. Mr. Schmitke, feeling that he had been wronged in this transaction, sent a protest to the Department of the Interior at Ottawa, insisting on the land being returned to him, as he was fully entitled to get it as a homesteader. This document I will read to show in what state of mind this poor German settler is after having been treated in this way:

Emerson, March 15, 1900.

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—When the south half of 25 S. 1. R. 3 east, was opened up for homestead I made application for the S.W.  $\frac{1}{4}$  and my son for the S.E.  $\frac{1}{4}$  and our application being first the department notified me that they would give me so many days to appear and take out my entry papers on receiving the notice I made preparations and went to Winnipeg two days after receiving the notice to take out my entry papers and paid the fee of \$15, the department held the money until I would go home and send up my son's fee of \$15 and promised to send the two entry papers back together. I trusted to them to do as they agreed and went home and on the 20th October, I sent up \$15 for my son's entry expecting everything was all right. I commenced to build and improve my homestead expecting my entry papers along every day but I never heard anything about them until about January 5, 1899, when I got my money returned and stating that I could not get the homestead after going to the expense of a trip to Winnipeg and improving the homestead. I returned the money on January 9, but it was returned to me again and is now in Emerson. Under the circumstances I think it is the duty of the department to grant me my entry papers. Hoping this explanation is satisfactory I hope to hear from you by return mail.

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) AUGUST SCHMITKE,  
Emerson, Man.

To this an answer was sent by the secretary of the Department of the Interior, which I shall read, because there is an important statement in it:

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, March 24, 1899.

Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th instant, and in reply to inform you that a copy of it is being sent to the local agent, in Winnipeg, for report and you will be advised after he has been heard from. I am to add for your information that there appears to be several applicants for the land, the south half of section 25-1-3 east, who seem to be entitled to consideration ahead of you, their applications having been filed some time in advance of yours.

Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) JOHN R. HALL,  
Secretary.

August Schmitke, Esq.,  
Emerson, Man.

Here is another false statement, Mr. Speaker, but this time coming from a higher source. This time it comes from the secretary of the Department of the Interior

at Ottawa. This letter, dictated probably by the minister or his deputy, contains another false statement in the line of that of the immigration commissioner at Winnipeg, to the effect that there were several applications ahead of this poor man's, while there is not a single letter that could be treated as an application, but only a letter asking for information.

I have here a copy of another communication, this time from the agent of the Dominion lands in Winnipeg, addressed to the secretary of the Department of the Interior, and giving the history of the whole affair up to the date of that letter :

Department of the Interior,  
Dominion Lands Office,  
Winnipeg, March 29, 1899.

Sir.—I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 24th instant, file 400312, and to say in reply that the facts connected with the S.  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 25-1-3 east, are as follows:

On the 3rd of October last, this land was offered to Mr. August Schmitke and his son, but before he appeared to enter for the land, on the 17th idem the Dominion immigration commissioner called here and protested against entry being granted until copies had been received of the various applications. They were submitted to the deputy minister when he was here in November, and he decided that the letter of Mr. W. J. Whitley, of November 11, 1897, must be treated as an application and must take precedence of that made by August Schmitke, on the 15th December 1897, provided Whitley filed a declaration that the German settlers whom he nominated for entry, are the same men on whose behalf he wrote in November, 1897. This was done and entry granted to Mr. Whitley's clients.

I may say that recognizing the delay and expense which has been caused Mr. Schmitke in this matter, I made several efforts to offer him other land in the neighbourhood, but none of these have apparently proved suitable.

Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) E. H. TAYLOR,  
For Agent, Dominion Lands.

The secretary,  
Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa.

This shows that it was not the agent who was considered the proper officer to adjust these matters, but the deputy minister himself. It was for that gentleman who decided whether or not Mr. Whitley's letter asking for information was really an application for the homestead. The secretary of the Department of the Interior wrote to Mr. Schmitke, in answer to his communication complaining about the way in which he had been treated :

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, April 7, 1899.

Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 15th ultimo, I am directed to inform you that a report has now been received from the local agent in Winnipeg, by which it appears that there were prior applicants for the south half 25-1-3 east, entitled to consideration before you and as the land has been entered for by them, it cannot be made available for your purposes. The agent reports he has been endeavouring to assist you in finding some other suitable location, but so far without success. He is now asked to make

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

another effort to help you in the matter and you will hear from him in due course.

Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) JOHN R. HALL,  
Secretary.

August Schmitke, Esq.,  
Emerson, Man.

While this correspondence was being exchanged, rumours were afloat that there was still something worse. There were rumours that there was a deal behind this privilege sought by this man Christie in favour of the two Wahlmans, as against the honest, straightforward application of Schmitkes, who were bona fide settlers. After having heard the details, I wrote to the Minister of the Interior the following letter, during the course of last session :

House of Commons,  
Ottawa, May 12, 1899.

Hon. C. Sifton,  
Minister of the Interior, &c., &c., &c.,  
Ottawa.

Sir,—There appears to be something crooked in connection with the entry and the granting of a homestead privilege to two Germans named Wahlmans, on section 25, township 1, range 3 east, and I would say that an investigation be made in this case. One Christie is accused of having acted as middle man and has or is to receive undue consideration for his share in the transaction. It is currently reported that this man Christie has been offering the privilege of entry on this land to several people at a high consideration, and that bona fide applicants after having deposited the fees and having entered the land, and prepared for building, were informed that they could not get it. This same man Christie has purchased the timber from these people and it is reported that he is to receive five thousand dollars or thereabout for the deal from the present homesteaders, who have as yet done nothing on the land.

As you see this is a very serious matter and as I do not intend to bring it before the House, unless it is attended to, I beg to ask that you see that justice be done to the rightful applicants, Schmitke, father and son, also Germans.

Yours very truly,  
A. A. C. LaRIVIERE.

To this I received the following answer :

Minister of the Interior, Canada,  
Ottawa, May 15, 1899.

Dear Mr. LaRivière,—I have your letter of the 12th instant, asking for an investigation in regard to the granting of a homestead entry to two Germans named Wahlman on section 25, township 1, range 3 east. The matter has not heretofore been brought to my attention, but I will direct that an investigation be made at once.

Yours faithfully,  
(Sgd.) C. SIFTON.

Hon. A. A. C. LaRivière, M.P.,  
House of Commons, Ottawa.

It took some time to get that investigation, but I must say that the hon. Minister of the Interior has always shown to me a willingness to sift this matter to the bottom; though I have to complain that after having done some thing, he has not seen fit to have justice done to whom justice was due.

The assistant secretary of the Department of the Interior wrote the following

letter to the agent of the Dominion lands at Winnipeg:

Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa, May 19, 1899.

Sir,—I am directed by the commissioner to hand you the inclosed copy of a letter to the minister from Mr. A. A. C. LaRivière, M.P., regarding the entries of two Germans named Wahlman for part of section 25, township 1, range 3 east. You will be good enough to make inquiry into the matter at once, and report for the information of the department. If necessary, the homestead inspector should be instructed to obtain the necessary particulars.

Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) LYNDWODE PEREIRA,  
Assistant Secretary.

The Agent of Dominion Lands,  
Winnipeg, Man.

The machinery was set in motion, and the result showed that the rumours which were in circulation were correct. The agent of the Dominion lands in Winnipeg sent one of the homestead inspectors to Emerson, and this inspector had the two Wahlmans brought before him. For the information of the House, let me give the letter of the agent of the Dominion lands on this matter, when instructed to make an investigation:

Department of the Interior,  
Dominion Lands Office,  
Winnipeg, May 29, 1899.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 19th instant, file 400312, and to say in reply that I am instructing the homestead inspector to take the evidence under oath of Paul and Andreas Wahlman as to what their arrangement with Mr. George Christie was, by which entry was secured for the S.  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 25-1-3 east.

So far as is known in this office, there is little to add to the explanations contained in my letter of the 29th March last, except that it was at Mr. Christie's request that the Dominion immigration commissioner protested against the entry being granted to the Schmitkes. The original application of Mr. Christie on behalf of the Wahlmans, dated April 11, 1898, is inclosed for your information, together with the letter and declaration of Mr. W. J. Whitley, setting forth that it was on behalf of this family that he made the inquiry of the department at Ottawa, on November 11, 1897, which it was ruled must be treated as an application for entry. The declaration made by the Wahlmans at the date of making entry through their agent, Mr. George Christie, will also be found inclosed.

Since writing the above, Mr. Paul Templin, a German pedlar of this city, called here to complain of Mr. Christie's treatment of his fellow-countrymen, and to find out exactly in what position the land stood in which they are interested. He states that the Wahlmans are entirely ignorant that they hold entry for the land above mentioned, and being required by Christie each to give a note agreeing to pay \$500 at the end of three years for purchase of the quarter section, refuse to go into occupation. He claims that a similar transaction has taken place between Mr. Christie and Louis Felsch, a German for whom the former made homestead entry on September 22 last, for the N.W.  $\frac{1}{4}$  1-1-3 east. The application that this land should be made available was made by Mr. Christie on Felsch's behalf on April 11, 1898, and Templin claims that Mr. Christie has agreed to sell the land to Felsch for \$500 and hold his note for that sum on which no payment is to

be made until expiry of three years, but in each of the first three years he is to deliver to Mr. Christie eight loads of hay as payment of interest on the purchase. Templin says that Mr. Christie supplied part of a farm outfit, for which Felsch is to pay the value in addition to the purchase price of the land.

If you think it well to have the Felsch transaction investigated by the homestead inspector, please instruct me.

Your obedient servant,  
(Sgd.) E. H. TAYLOR,  
For Agent Dominion Lands.

The Secretary,  
Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa.

So, outside of the case I am bringing before the House, the agent of the Dominion lands, in his official capacity, informed the department that this man Christie was carrying on other transactions—that he was actually selling the public domain and putting the money in his pocket, while he was deceiving the people by getting the land for nothing in their name.

Mr. DAVIN. Who is Christie?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. He is a shark.

Mr. DAVIN. Does he live in Winnipeg?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. He lives in Emerson, I am sorry to say—he is in my county. Now, while this was going on—it took some time—I was getting anxious to see the end of it before the session closed. So, while I was in Ottawa, I became very pressing with the Minister of the Interior to have the investigation completed as soon as possible. On June 6, 1899, having received some further information, I wrote the following:

House of Commons,  
Ottawa, June 6, 1899.

Dear Sir.—Following my letter of the 12th ult., I beg to submit further information in regard to the granting of a homestead entry to two Germans named Wahlman on section 25-1-3 east, and in reference to which I have suggested an investigation.

The information goes to show that there is something crooked in the transaction made, to the detriment of bona fide settlers who are still waiting for a just treatment on the part of the government.

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) A. A. C. LaRIVIERE.

Hon. C. Sifton,  
Minister of the Interior, &c., &c.,  
Ottawa.

This was accompanied by the following memorandum:

I have learned a few additional particulars since my last letter to you. One of the Wahlmans tells me 'the paper we got from Christie we think no good'; he promises to let me see it. Whitley also now tells me that Christie paid him (Whitley) \$50 to nominate the Wahlmans as the persons who first made inquiries to him for these homesteads. Then Christie obtained a set of blanks, had the Wahlmans appoint him agent, and so made the entry and paid the fees. This being done, Christie had a contract drawn up between the Wahlmans and himself whereby they contract to pay \$500 for each quarter at the end of three years. In the meanwhile, the scheme is to make them pay in kind or cash sufficient to cover his outlay on account of entry

fees, and they go on improving the land for Christie's benefit, who will bluff them out of a deed to himself as soon as the patent issues, unless they put up their respective \$500. Up to the present, however, the Wahlmans have made no attempt to begin homestead duties.

The minister, through his deputy, sent me the following letter in answer:

Ottawa, June 10, 1899.

Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the 6th instant in regard to the granting of homestead entries on section 25-1-3 east first M., to persons named Wahlman or Woolman, and in reply beg to say that this matter has already been brought to the attention of the department, and the agent of Dominion lands at Winnipeg has been instructed to have a full and careful inquiry made into these cases. As soon as the report is received from the agent, I will be in a position to consider the matter fully.

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) JAS. A. SMART,  
Deputy Minister.

A. A. C. LaRivière, M.P.,  
House of Commons, Ottawa.

I read all these letters because this is a matter the facts of which require to be put on record. We must not allow the public domain to be used by land sharks for their own benefit; we must not allow officials of the department to connive with these men and protect them as against the poor settlers, especially the German or other foreign settlers who cannot speak English and are ready to accept the ipse dixit of an official, thinking that he cannot be wrong, while, judging by this correspondence, the officials themselves stand self-convicted, because they contradict one another's statements and, in some cases, tell what is clearly not true. Following what I had already written, I addressed another letter to the minister for I thought it was taking a long time to get to the bottom of this matter. That other letter was as follows:

Ottawa, June 27, 1899.

Hon. Clifford Sifton,  
Minister of the Interior, Ottawa.

I have received some further information in the Wahlman matter which I beg to inclose herewith. There appears to be some miscarriage of justice in this case, and I hope you will press the investigation which you promised and see that justice is done to whom justice is due, and that the guilty parties will be punished.

Yours truly,  
A. A. C. LaRIVIERE.

This is the information which accompanied my letter. It is composed of part of a letter I received on the subject from a person who was well posted, and it contains the following:

I shall be glad to hear what progress has been made in the Schmitke investigation, particularly as the whole transaction turns out to be worse even than I thought it was. Since writing you last, one of the Wahlman's called upon me and gave me the inside history of it. Brief, they never knew this land was homestead land, never made entry for it and never authorized an agent, to make entry for them. All this notwithstanding the fact that Schmitke made personal and bona fide entry, paid his money and got his receipt a month before Christie contrived to

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

induce Winnipeg officials to substitute Wahlman's name for Schmitke's and to return the latter his money. Christie, on his return from Winnipeg after succeeding as above, told Wahlman he could now sell them each a quarter section for \$500 a piece. They agreed and gave Christie a joint note on demand for \$1,000; he making them believe that it was only a matter of form and that he did not want any money for three years—only seven or eight loads of hay a year and the taxes. Subsequently, in February last, Christie told the Wahlman's to come and fix the papers for the form. They signed some instrument of which there was no copy and which was retained by Christie—probably a quit claim deed. Mr. Forrester, however, (Christie's solicitor) presented them with the inclosed 'statement of claim' which they cannot read, but which they were led to believe was in some way connected with their title to the land and they carried it carefully home in this belief, never dreaming that they were being sued on their note. Of course they put in no defence and judgment is now actually registered against them for \$1,000. The first inkling they had of the true nature of the document was when I read and explained it to Paul Wahlman a few days ago.

There is no mistake about it Christie, McCreary and Smart conspired to deprive Schmitke of his homestead and helped Christie to obtain a \$1,000 judgment under the false pretenses.

How could they take entry in the land office without the proper forms of authority to agent being filled out and signed; the Wahlman's never signed a form of any kind, and yet Christie got them entered without either their knowledge or authority.

For of course, you see, he could not enter himself and if he had asked for their authority to act as agent to make the entry for them, he could not then have fooled them into 'buying' the land at \$500 per quarter.

I may add that one Wahlman has done nothing on his quarter and the other one has put in eight acres.

Well, Sir, we are getting into the inside of this transaction. In answer to that last communication inclosing an extract from my informant in Emerson I received an acknowledgment from the Deputy Minister of the Interior. The minister himself was becoming so disgusted with the transaction that he put it in the hands of his deputy and would have nothing more to do with it. It is dated Ottawa, 3rd of July, 1899:

Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the 27th ult., addressed to the Hon. Mr. Sifton, in regard to the Wahlman matter, and beg to say that as you were advised on the 10th ult., the matter will be gone into carefully as soon as the report from the agent of the Dominion lands is received.

Yours truly,  
JAMES A. SMART.

A. C. LaRivière, Esq., M.P.

Now, Sir, an investigation took place, as I have stated. The agent of the Dominion lands in Winnipeg instructed one of the inspectors there, a man of some standing in Manitoba and a good friend of the hon. gentleman opposite, a man who sits to-day in the local legislature of that province, and whose word must be taken as the word of a man who has fulfilled his duty in a conscientious manner. The whole matter is worth putting on record, and I propose

to read the report of Mr. Taylor, acting agent of Dominion lands in Winnipeg.

It being One o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at one o'clock, I was just about to give the result of a partial investigation which was made into the case that I spoke about in the forenoon. I say a partial investigation, because the full investigation that the case called for was not made. Charges that had been made against the parties concerned were not investigated at all, and the only whole investigation was confined to the taking of a couple of declarations from two of the parties concerned in the case. In regard to the other charge nothing was done. At the same time enough has come out of this investigation to show that there was cause for the complaint, to show that a wrong had been done, and to show that a very bad speculation had been made with these poor ignorant strangers coming to this country to settle. I will read now the report made by the acting Dominion lands agent in Winnipeg, transmitting to the Department of the Interior here the result of the partial investigation that had been made. I shall also, afterwards, read a couple of declarations that were forwarded to the agent in Winnipeg by the party who held the investigation :

Department of the Interior,  
Dominion Lands Office,  
Winnipeg. July 3, 1899.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 5th ult., file 400312, and to inclose, as requested, the report of Homestead Inspector Jerome, and declarations of Paul and Andreas Wahlman, regarding the transaction with George Christie, by which they acquired S.  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 25-1-3 east. The letter instructing Mr. Jerome to inquire into the case of Louis Felsch, of the N.W.  $\frac{1}{4}$  1-1-3, reached him too late to be inquired into upon his recent trip. It will be noticed from Paul Wahlman's declaration—

Paul Wahlman is one of the victims of this man Christie.

—that he has been sued and judgment recovered for \$1,000, which is claimed by Christie for services in procuring these two homestead entries, and a serious wrong appears to have been done these foreigners.

This is an official document.

You will remember that Mr. Christie only secured entry for these men by being able to procure W. G. Whitley's declaration that the application which he made in November, 1897, was on behalf of these two men, and in talking over this matter with Mr. Jerome—

The homestead inspector—

—I learned from him that the Wahlmans had never applied to Mr. Whitley for land.

The Wahlmans, whose applications has been entertained in preference to the bona fide application of these two Schmitkes, have been held by the department to have

priority on account of one Whitley writing to the department that he wanted some information about land on behalf of some Germans. It is the solemn declaration of Homestead Inspector Jerome that they never spoke to Whitley about the land, and therefore, Whitley's letter to the department could not have been in their behalf. This, I take, Mr. Speaker, from an official document, from a letter addressed by the head of the Dominion lands office in Winnipeg, making an official report to the secretary of the Department of the Interior at Ottawa. This letter concludes with the following sentence :

Evidently, therefore, there has been collusion between Christie and Whitley.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) E. H. TAYLOR,

For Agent Dominion Lands.

The Secretary,  
Department of the Interior,  
Ottawa.

Now, let us see what the homestead inspector, Martin Jerome, has to say. Mr. Jerome, as I have said before, held the position of homestead inspector in the land office at Winnipeg until he was elected a member of the local legislature in Manitoba. He is the political friend of my hon. friends on the other side of the House, and therefore, the work he did on that occasion should be satisfactory to them. Mr. Jerome writes from St. Malo, in the electoral division of Carillon, for at that time he was canvassing for his future election, while at the same time doing government duty :

St. Malo, June 24, 1899.

Sir,—Inclosed please find the declarations of Andreas and Paul Wahlman re the S.  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 25-1-3 east. I have inspected their two quarter-sections. There is no improvements whatever on the S.W.  $\frac{1}{4}$ ; on the S.E. there is about twenty acres of breaking recently by Paul Wahlman, and he is still breaking on the land. I must say, for your information, that the Schmitkes own the N.  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 24-1-3 east, and the Wahlmans have no lands.

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) MARTIN JEROME.

The Dominion Lands Agent, Winnipeg.

Now, here are the declarations referred to in the letter :

In the matter of the S.  $\frac{1}{2}$  25-1-3 east.

I, Andreas Wahlman, of the S.  $\frac{1}{2}$  25-1-3 east, of Manitoba, in the county of Provencher do solemnly declare that in the month of December, 1898, I met Mr. George Christie at Emerson, where he proposed me a bargain. He said he could purchase a good land very cheap for me, and he said the same to my brother Paul, which was the S.W. 25-1-3 east, and for the S.E. 25-1-3 east. It was agreed between my brother Paul, myself and Mr. George Christie, that we had to pay him \$1,000 in three years for the two quarter-sections mentioned above; he never told me that he or any other party had made a homestead entry for me; he therefore said that August Schmitke had not as much money than himself, and he was sure to get it for me, and he went to Winnipeg; after he got back he said to me to go to build a house and break upon the land, and my brother and I both signed a

joint note for \$1,000, payable in three years. We also signed another paper. I never done any improvement on the land, because I did not know that it was a homestead, but I am now ready to make all the necessary improvements required by the Homestead Act.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

I also declare that I never sold any timber to Mr. G. Christie.

(Sgd.) ANDREAS A. WAHLMAN.

Declared before me at Emerson post office, of Manitoba, in the county of Provencher, this 21st day of June, A.D. 1899.

(Sgd.) MARTIN JEROME,  
A Commissioner, &c.

Now, Sir, this is followed by another affidavit which reads as follows :

In the matter of the S.E.  $\frac{1}{2}$  25-1-3 east.

I, Paul Wahlman, of the S.  $\frac{1}{2}$ -1-2-3 east, of Manitoba, in the county of Provencher do solemnly declare that in the month of December, 1898, I met Mr. George Christie at Emerson, where he proposed me a bargain. He said he could purchase a good land for me very cheap, which was the S.E. 25-1-3 east. He said the same thing to my brother Andreas, for the S.W. 25-1-3 east. Then it was agreed between my brother, myself and George Christie to buy the said lands for \$1,000 at the end of three years from that date for the lands mentioned above. He never told us that he or any other party would make a homestead entry for us; it is only about three weeks ago that I was informed by a pedlar that it was my homestead; then, after that, I went to Christie and told him that I was told that the land was entered for as homestead; he said that is all right, but I wanted the money for my trouble. I had signed a joint note with my brother to George Christie for \$1,000 for three years, as we have thought, but in February he sued us, saying that the note was due. I have now eighteen acres broken on the S.E.  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and like to keep it. Mr. Aug. Schmitke never done any improvement on the land.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

P.S.—I also declare that I never sold any timber to George Christie.

(Sgd.) PAUL WAHLMAN.

Declared before me at Emerson, of Manitoba, in the county of Provencher, this 21st day of June, A.D. 1899.

(Sgd.) MARTIN JEROME,  
A Commissioner, &c.

It appears from the evidence taken by the homestead inspector, Mr. Jerome, that this man George Christie has imposed on these two men to the extent of \$1,000. It is proven that they signed a joint note and that when the note matured they were handed a writ by Mr. Christie's solicitor, the nature of which they did not know, and they were told to put it away very carefully in their pocket. They went home happy thinking that everything was right. But the writ being unanswered in the court, a judgment was taken by Christie by default against these parties, and that judgment is now registered in Manitoba. What

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

was the consequence of this? The consequence was that after a while, these people began to feel uneasy and they wanted to be relieved of the liability they had been led to assume. I asked that this matter should be reconsidered and the Schmitkes who were really the first applicants for this land should be confirmed in their application, and that they be allowed these two pieces of land to be taken by them as homesteads, yet, in the face of all these declarations, and in the face of his officials declaration, the Minister of the Interior still insisted on making further inquiry. He was very reluctant to decide against this man Christie. And what did the minister do? He communicated these two affidavits to Christie. I do not say it was very objectionable to do so, but Christie had these two men and under the fear he inspired in them, he got them to make before his own solicitor an ex parte declaration denying the one they had previously made openly and without any coercion before the official of the department who was appointed to make the investigation. It was not Mr. Jerome that examined these men again. Not at all. Jerome was told that he also should get a declaration from Christie as well as the one he had from Wahlman. He did get a declaration from Christie, but he had a great deal of trouble to obtain it because Christie was very reluctant to make that declaration. I am sorry that I cannot put my hand on that document just now, but at all events the inspector says that he met Mr. Christie and that at first Mr. Christie declined to make any declaration at all, but after awhile he consented to say something that was so ambiguous that it did not amount to anything at all. The inspector goes on to say in his report that he put many questions to Mr. Christie which Mr. Christie would not answer. Afterwards Mr. Christie went of his own accord and made another declaration before a commissioner, but he did it in the secrecy of the office. As I have said he brought these two men before his own solicitor in the solicitor's office, and under threat or otherwise, got them to contradict the statement they have made themselves freely before the official of the department who was sent to make the investigation. Perhaps in order to complete the case I should read some other documents in connection with this transaction, but as I have already detained the House long enough I shall conclude by stating that the result of this transaction has been to drive away from the country one of these poor unfortunate victims of this land shark Mr. Christie. One of the Wahlman's under the burden of that judgment that is hanging over his head was obliged to abandon the land that he had intended to occupy, and he went across to the other side of the boundary. The other man has not yet done any improvements on that piece of land. He has not built a house upon it, he has not resided upon it, and a com-

plaint has been lodged in the land office against the entry and an application for the cancellation of that entry has been made. But, he has the support of the department, because he has the support of Mr. Christie who still holds that judgment of \$1,000 against him. The poor fellow, if he can manage to get along and get his land, then when his three years have expired and he obtains his patent he will find himself overburdened with a mortgage of \$1,000 on that property which has been stolen from him. While the government is spending so much money to induce immigration to this country, and while we are voting thousands and tens of thousands of dollars to bring in settlers, what do we find? We find government officials around Winnipeg protecting these land sharks who are robbing the settlers, and who are squeezing out of them thousands of dollars. These two cases I have mentioned are not the only cases. In the correspondence that I have read, a reference is made to another similar case by the same individual who robbed \$500 from another German. These men take advantage of the ignorance of these poor foreigners coming into this country and they impose on them by selling them land which is actually the public domain and which they could obtain from the government by simply paying a fee of \$10 or \$15. These foreigners do not know that, and the land sharks are protected by the officials of the government. That is the charge I have to make against the government. I charge that when these investigations were made and that when it was proven that there was bribery and corruption and robbery on the report of their own officials, the government stood by the men who have been victimizing these poor foreigners, and the government still stands by them. Justice has been meted out in one case, because they could not help it; the man had left the country. But there is the other man Schmitke who is waiting for his piece of land which he is entitled, and on two occasions the government had the means of doing justice to this man but they declined to do so. One of the Schmitkes is still without his land while his father has succeeded in getting his share. With regard to the other case I do not know what has become of it. One man has been treated in the same manner and I say that it is a shame that these land sharks should be protected by the department at the expense of the interests of the poor settlers. I said Mr. Speaker, in the beginning of my remarks that there were two institutions in Manitoba in connection with the Department of the Interior one of which I have nothing to say against, but the other of which affords good cause for complaint. I refer to that political institution organized by the present Minister of the Interior, with Mr. McCreary at its head—the immigration branch of the department. Who is that officer Mr. McCreary? He is nothing but

a political machine. When an election comes along he musters around all these under him, clerks, land agents, guides, immigration agents and all sorts of officials. He brings them all in from the North-west and from the United States as was the case in the last local election in Manitoba, and he spreads them all over the province to do political work. They have been brought down from so far as Regina, and they have been compelled to go out and work for the good cause of the Liberal party.

More than that, they have their men who not only meddle with politics, but who take upon themselves to meddle with the school question. There is one man named Paul Wood who styles himself agent for the Galicians. He is a official of the Department of the Interior if you please, who went around the Galician settlements influencing them with reference to the school question. Most of these Galicians belong to one part of the Roman Catholic Church, that is the Orthodox Greek Church and he has been canvassing them in opposition to separate schools, and he comes out in the public prints with a letter signed by himself offering to the Winnipeg papers a document whereby he said: That the Galicians did not want any separate schools. By lying he induced half a dozen Galicians to sign a protest against separate schools, a thing that they never heard about and did not know anything about, and this man sent a letter to the *Winnipeg Free Press*, and he signs his name in his official capacity as Dominion agent for the Galicians, and he says that he has been entrusted by these poor Galicians with a protest against separate schools. I am not going into the merits of separate or public schools, but I will ask every member of this House, is it the business of an official of the government to interfere in any way in the matter? Is it his business to interfere in matters affecting the creed, the language or the nationality of any settlers coming into this country. No, Sir, it is not the business of officials to interfere with these immigrants, whether they be right or wrong. I say that the administration of the whole Department of the Interior to-day in Manitoba and the North-west, is on about a par with the administration of the department in the Yukon territory

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I had a good deal of difficulty in coming to a conclusion as to why my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) should indulge in such a very lengthy address at this late period of the session, but the hon. gentleman in the course of the last ten minutes has succeeded in showing to the House his animus upon this question.

Mr. LARIVIERE. I have been looking for my hon. friend for the last four months, but he has not been here.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not the least objection to my hon.

friend making the address he has made; he is quite within his rights; but the subject-matter of the earlier portion of his remarks did not indicate the necessity for such a lengthened address, and I fancy I know my hon. friend well enough to know that he would not have made a lengthy address on this subject if he had not been animated by some of the motives which he has disclosed in the last ten or fifteen minutes. I am not going to follow him in his reference to the school question. That is not a fair subject for discussion in connection with a matter of this kind. What my hon. friend has brought before the House is a purely departmental matter, and will be treated by me as such. Nor do I think it necessary to enter into an extended defence of the conduct of the officers of the department in general. I think I am justified in saying that my hon. friend has not been so anxious in the course of his remarks to attack me or the department as he has been to attack a gentleman named Christie, whose name has frequently appeared in connection with the papers which my hon. friend has read. It is no part of my duty as the head of the Department of the Interior to defend Mr. Christie or in any way to justify anything he may have done; nor is it part of my duty to support the attack which has been made upon him. It is nothing at all to me what Mr. Christie's character may be or what his relations may be with people who come into the country; and it is not my duty as head of the Department of the Interior to see that any particular person in the province of Manitoba or in the North-west Territories is honest in his dealings with his fellow-citizens. No such authority as that is conferred upon me as a member of this government, and it is quite impossible for me to enter into matters of that kind. The question which I have to decide, as head of the Department of the Interior, in connection with the particular case which my hon. friend has brought before the House, is: First, whether the officers of the department have acted correctly in assigning to a certain person the homestead entry for this land; or, if they have not, whether the circumstances are such as to justify me in interfering with their action and setting aside their decision. That is the whole question. It is a very simple question, and when it is reduced to a nutshell, it does not take very long to state it.

My hon. friend made a complaint in regard to which I think perhaps he was quite justified—that the return brought down was not complete. It is not my intention to justify the bringing to the House of an incomplete return. The return was prepared in the ordinary way, and no doubt the officers who prepared it and sent it to the House thought it was complete. The explanation, however, appears on the face of my hon. friend's remarks. It appears that the officers of the immigration branch of the

department had some correspondence with reference to this matter; but that fact appears to have been overlooked by the officers who prepared the return, so that the correspondence of the officers of the immigration branch does not appear in the return. If my hon. friend had brought this omission to the attention of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), who was acting as minister in my absence, he would no doubt have had that correspondence brought down. However, I am glad to see that my hon. friend was not inconvenienced, because he was able to supply the correspondence which did not appear in the return.

There were certain sales of land in the department known as time sales, that is, sales made to individuals on long terms of credit; and one question I had to deal with when taking office was what to do in reference to these time sales. Persons had made small payments and lived, in some cases, in eastern parts of Canada, in other cases in the United States, and in other cases in other foreign countries. There was no apparent intention on the part of many of them to go and complete the payments; and I came to the conclusion that if these people failed to pay up the balances due, we would cancel the sales and open up the lands for homestead entry. That is the way this particular piece of land came to be on the list for homestead entry. At that time it was considered advisable also to furnish the immigration commissioner at Winnipeg with a list of the lands opened for entry, for the convenience of intending settlers or persons who might come into the country, and who would perhaps more readily be brought into contact with the immigration commissioner's office than with the land office. That was done for the convenience of the settler. In the course of time this particular piece of land was applied for by several people, and my hon. friend has given fairly enough a statement of what took place in connection with it, with this exception, that I think he has hardly done justice to the officers of the department in describing the way in which they dealt with the matter. It came before them in this way. There were several applications made and several letters written with regard to this land, and the officials in charge therefore decided that the land should be put up to be disposed of to the highest bidder. That had been the practice in some cases before I took charge of the department, in cases where there were a number of applications for homestead lands, and it was difficult to decide which were entitled to priority. It was not a plan which I favoured, because, as a rule, it was easy enough to decide who was the prior applicant, and I myself decided to adhere to the rule of giving in every case the first applicant the first chance to get the land. No difficulty arose in this particular case, however, because, when the

land was put up to be given to the highest bidder, there were no bidders upon it, and the matter, therefore, reverted to its former position. Then an examination of the records showed that there were several applications. There was an application of the 11th of November, 1897, by one W. J. Whitley, on behalf of some German settlers; an application of the 16th of December, 1897, by August Schmitke and son; an application of the 8th of January, 1898, by one John Molloy for part of the land; an application of the 6th of April, 1898, by one Michael Scott; an application of the 16th of May, 1898, by W. W. Unsworth. Let me say that we have been compelled to adopt a well-defined rule in regard to applications of this kind. That rule is this. We do not hold down the applicants to any definite form of application. The man who writes to the department in regard to a particular piece of land in the most vague and indefinite way, which in any sense indicates that he desires to get that land, is regarded as the first applicant. We could not adopt any other rule. These applications are made in the proportion of ten to one by men who have not literary ability and who have little knowledge of business. They generally write their letter and complete it without saying that they started out to say; but they generally say something which gives the officer of the department an indication of the particular piece of land they are inquiring about. It does not make any difference how vague or definite it may be, we regard such a letter placed upon the file of the department or placed upon the file in the land office as an application for the land; and, when the land comes to be opened for homestead entries, our invariable rule is that the first man who has made inquiry in regard to that land is given an opportunity to get it.

In this particular case, Wahlman's application seems to have been overlooked by the officer of the department at the land office, and Schmitke was told that he should have the entry. He put up his money, but, apparently, was not given the entry. The matter seems to have been held for the purpose of taking the ruling of the department. A short time afterwards, the deputy minister being in Winnipeg, the matter was submitted to him; and he decided that Wahlman's letter came within the rules of the department respecting applications, and that it must be considered to be the first application. Of course, I know nothing about the matter personally; it is only when a real dispute arises in connection with these matters that it is possible for me to give personal attention to them. But, I am quite clear in my own mind that the deputy minister was correct in the ruling he gave on the question, to the effect that Wahlman's letter was an application within the rules which the department ordinarily recognizes. I should have ruled the same myself, if the matter had come before me. Upon

that ruling of the deputy minister, the two Wahlmans were given the entry for the land, and Schmitke was notified that he could not have the land. What I want to make clear is, that this is not a case of a man being put off his land and the land being left vacant; this is a dispute between two sets of men, Schmitke and his son and Wahlman and his brother. My hon. friend (Mr. LaRivière) has said a good deal about the abuse of the settler; but, so far as the settler is concerned, there is nothing in that. If Schmitke and his son got the land, Wahlman and his brother would not get it; and then some one would rise and speak on behalf of the Wahlmans, and would say that by giving it to Schmitke and his son, we have driven away two deserving settlers. We have to go upon clearly-defined rules in dealing with these cases; and, so dealing, when a dispute arises, some one must lose. The Wahlmans were given the entry. My hon. friend from Provencher shortly afterwards brought the matter to my attention. I need not go over the details of what took place; but the inspector was sent out for the purpose of making an investigation and arriving at the facts. He sent a report which, upon the face of it, was not complete; and the deputy minister sent to Mr. Christie the statement of what had taken place, and asked for his version of the case. The statements and reports by Mr. Christie were then placed on the file, and the matter came before me. It came before me only for this purpose and for this end—that I might decide whether or not it was wise and proper to cancel the entry of the two Wahlmans and give the land to the Schmitkes. That was the only action I could take in connection with it. My hon. friend from Provencher seemed to think it was my duty to in some way punish Mr. Christie. But, I wish to point out that I have no jurisdiction to do so. Mr. Christie has nothing to do with the land, and is not subject to my jurisdiction. If what he has done amounts to a fraud, those who are aggrieved have their remedy; but I have no power, nor has any member of this government power to afford any relief. It is a matter for which the parties must take such action as they see fit and may be advised. It certainly does not suggest itself in any way to me that I have any power whatever in connection with affording them any relief they may desire as against Mr. Christie. The only action I could take would be to cancel the entry of these two men, the Wahlmans. But, if I were to cancel their entry, what good would that do them as against Mr. Christie? That would not make them any better off; it would make them worse off. They would be in no better position to relieve themselves of any obligation they may have incurred to Mr. Christie, and they would not have the land upon which they had been expending their labour for the last year or year and a half. And we did not know that the Schmitkes

would take the land, and so we might have lost two settlers. The only question that could come before me was whether I would disturb the two men in possession of the land they had occupied for a year or more, and which they had declared they wished to occupy, and, occupying it, to become bona fide settlers. I have no hesitation in saying that if my hon. friend from Provencher had had to settle the case, he would not have disturbed the entries of these men and put some one else on their land. Whatever their misfortune may have been—and it is a matter very difficult for any person in this House to decide such a case, because nothing is more difficult than for a person who is not in the position of a judge, who has not heard the viva voce evidence on a point of that kind to decide whether the transaction had been a bona fide transaction or not—surely, it will be clear to the House that I could not remedy the alleged fraud against the two men. Wahlmans, by depriving them of the only thing they had in the world, the land; and that would be the only possible action I could take. So far as I was concerned, there did not appear to me to be sufficient ground to cancel the entry of the two men, and it would be no advantage to them, no remedy for any obligation they may have incurred, to cancel it; that would only leave them penniless and still liable to Mr. Christie for any judgment he may hold against them, any note of theirs that he may have, any liability they may have incurred. I am at a loss to understand what my hon. friend would have me do, or what he would have the government do; I am at a loss to imagine what course he would suggest for the government in a case of this kind. He wound up his address by saying something which the facts he stated to the House did not justify—that the officials of the government were defrauding settlers. There is nothing in these papers to indicate, directly or indirectly, that the government officials, in any way, shape or form, have done anything improper—

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) to say that I charged the officials of the department with having defrauded people?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. So I understood.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. No, I did not say that; what I did say was, that they had protected those who defrauded people.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am glad I misunderstood the hon. gentleman on that point. It seems to me that we are not justified, even by the most extreme view of what the hon. gentleman has laid before the House, in coming to any such conclusion as that. But, I understand him now to say that the officials of the department are protecting men who defraud settlers. In the name of common sense, what power has an official to protect a man who

Mr. SIFTON.

commits a fraud? Here it is alleged that a man named Christie has got a note from these unfortunate men who are homesteaders, and whom my hon. friend, when he described their misfortunes, wants me to put in a still worse position by cancelling their homestead entries and putting them on the road. These men seemed to have signed certain obligations to Mr. Christie. My hon. friend says, on hearsay evidence, that these obligations had been fraudulently obtained. Well, what power has an officer of the government to protect a man who does anything of that kind? In what way, will my hon. friend please explain to the House, has any officer of the government protected such men; in what way can an officer of the government protect a man who commits a fraud upon a fellow-citizen? There is no possible way by which such protection can be extended by an officer of the government; and, as a matter of fact, the officers of the government have done nothing except to send to the head office of the department the report of their proceedings, upon which I have decided—what? I have to decide whether I would turn these two men off their farms, put them on the road, and deprive them of their homes; and I decided that, however, unfortunate they may have been in the past, it was not going to help the matter for me to deprive them of what little they had, to deprive the country of two settlers, the other two men, as my hon. friend says, having gone to Dakota. I do not know that there is anything else to be said in connection with it. I do not think that any member of this House, filling my position, and called upon to decide what to do under the circumstances disclosed by these papers, would have done any differently from what I did, that is to say, leave the matter as it stood and leave these men in possession of their farms.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I wish the galleries were crowded with people from the North-west and Manitoba, to have heard the earliest speech made by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), after returning from his four months sojourn in Europe. What is the position this parliament has to contemplate, as exposed by the hon. Minister of the Interior? My hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) exposed one of the most oppressive transactions with regard to settlers which have ever come before my notice. He brings to our notice some Germans who have been put in the talons of swindlers and land sharks, the actions and machinations of these land sharks being aided by officers of the Interior Department, one man driven from the country by these land sharks, with a judgment of \$1,000 against these two settlers, another settler deprived of a homestead to which he had a right. But we find the Minister of the Interior getting up and saying: What in the name of goodness can be done? How can I

help them? Will it help the matter if I put these two Wahlmans in a worse position than they are? What can be done? It is true this Christie is a swindler, it is true this wrong has been perpetrated, but what can be done? At the close of the hon. gentleman's speech, he showed that he saw what was the real issue, namely, the character of the officers of the department, whom he has employed in the North-west. What happened? Schmitke got an entry for himself, and his son paid \$15, and arranged to send the other \$15. Then McCreary, an officer of the hon. gentleman, the gentleman who, when mayor of Winnipeg, aided him to pay his indebtedness to the city of Winnipeg, and of course, therefore, has the minister by the hip, and in a position that a minister should not be in—McCreary comes, in the blustering way of a master, to the land office, and he says to them: Schmitke cannot have that land, he must not have it. And then they trump up a prior application, as it is called, on the part of Whitley, not on the part of Wahlmans, but on the part of Whitley himself, a person not a principal. It is not the habit of the land agents in the North-west Territories, it has not been their custom in the past, to consider the application of a middleman, even if it were prior, and made regularly, after an entry has been granted to a bona fide homesteader.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** The hon. gentleman is incorrect. It is the universal practice of the Department of the Interior in the North-west, in the land department, to receive applications which are made by third parties. It is the common custom, it has always been done; such an application is received and treated precisely in the same way as if it were made by an original.

**Mr. DAVIN.** The hon. gentleman is perfectly wrong about that. But suppose he were correct; this was not an application, it was in inquiry, as shown by the papers. Those Wahlmans have no knowledge whatever about an application. When the commissioner goes up from the Department of the Interior to inquire into this, what does he find? Here we have the affidavits of the two Wahlmans, and they swear positively they knew nothing about any application for a homestead entry. They swear:

We have to pay him \$1,000 in three years for the two quarter-sections mentioned above. He never told me that he or any other party had made a homestead entry for me.

Therefore, this man Whitley could not have made a homestead application for them, because they themselves, the principals for whom it is alleged he had acted, had no knowledge of it. It was altogether an afterthought. Then after McCreary had thus bull-dozed Mr. Stephenson and the agent of the land office, there is a dispute, and

the whole facts are brought before the Department of the Interior. Then the dark figure of this drama appears—and this is not the only thing that this dark figure has done—then the confidant and close officer of the hon. gentleman, Mr. Smart, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, comes up. He locks into the whole case, and with the facts before him, although he knew well according to the evidence before us, that Whitley had merely inquired, and could not have made a bona fide application for a homestead. Mr. Smart wants to oblige his friend, McCreary, who is always ready to do the kind of work my hon. friend speaks of, and Mr. Smart there and then decides, as he did in another case, according to the evidence before this House at the present time, when he decided, in order to please a political partisan against the evidence, just as he decided against the evidence here, and in favour of these land sharks. I say a more lamentable spectacle has rarely been presented to the people of Canada, than when the Minister of the Interior, with these facts before him, throws up his hands and says: I am helpless, we are helpless. Sir, if he were the Minister of the Interior that he ought to be, and if his first loyalty were to the people of Canada, and his hands were free to deal with his officers, as they ought to be, then he would come here, not saying: This rascality has been done, I am helpless; my officers have been engaged in it, I am helpless. But he would come here and say: There has been an atrocious wrong perpetrated and my officers sanctioned it, but these officers are no longer officers of mine. But he has not the power to do it, because these men have the whip hand over him, and, therefore, as long as he remains at the head of the Department of the Interior, we can expect nothing better than transactions of this sort, shady transactions, land sharks like Christie, his accomplice, like McCreary, engaged as an officer of the Department of the Interior, all working together to filch money from the settler; but the department is helpless, because, as I say, all these gentlemen are familiars of the Minister of the Interior, and it is the same way as it was. My hon. friend struck the true key note. The Minister of the Interior sent up men to the Yukon in the same way, men who were his dear friends and counsellors, and know all about him, and he is helpless in their regard, too. It is a lamentable situation. I am glad that he has at last come back. I wish I could compliment him on having effected the purpose for which he went, because he seems to be about in the same condition—I regret that—as when he went away; but, Sir, I am glad he came back in time, in order that the people of Canada may see what is the position of things under his rule in the Department of the Interior to-day.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Department of Trade and Commerce, including \$700 to Miss Shaw, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act... \$8,870

Mr. FOSTER. What is the exception that makes it necessary to take a jibe at the Civil Service Act?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman will recollect that Mr. Buck had a salary of \$700 or \$750. He sent in his resignation, and as Miss Shaw had been for a number of years in the department, and was recommended as a very excellent official there, I promoted her from \$550 to \$700.

Mr. FOSTER. Was she in the class of temporaries?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Third-class clerk?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes. She was not an appointment of mine. She was appointed before I entered the department.

Ocean and mail service between Great Britain and Canada ..... \$150,000

Mr. SPROULE. What is the arrangement made this year? Last year, I think, we had a temporary arrangement.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Advertisements were published calling for tenders for a two years' service. One period the service was to be from the 1st of June to the 1st of November from Rimouski to Merville, and Merville to Rimouski, to be performed within an average of seven days. The other period of the year was to be from the 1st of November to the 1st of June, between Halifax and St. John and Merville, and it was to be performed in eight days. This service was tendered for, and tenders were received from the Allans and from one other company. The Dominion Company appear not to have tendered. The contract was awarded to the Messrs. Allans, but owing to the breaking out of the Boer war the Allans declined to fulfil their contract, and we were obliged then to make the best terms that could be made with the only other parties who could be induced to tender for the service, the Elder-Dempster Line. They received the contract for two years.

Mr. BERGERON. On the same terms that the Allans had taken it?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. At something less, not much less, but somewhat less. I see by the memorandum submitted to me that the Allans contract would have figured out to \$161,817, while the contract on the part of these other gentleman was about \$150,000. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) that the contract was given to the Allans in the first instance, but owing, as they alleged,

Mr. DAVIN.

to the British government having seized their vessels, or having taken possession of their vessels, they declined to carry out the contract and left me at that time to make the best arrangement that could be made with the only other parties who could be induced to tender for the service.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the date of the contract?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The time for receiving tenders, according to the advertisement, in the first instance, terminated on the 1st of August, but it afterwards was extended to the 14th of August. I see that my recommendation to council was made on the 16th of August, recommending the acceptance of the Allans tender. On the 19th of September the Allans declined on the ground I have stated. Then, negotiations ensued with them. I was rather anxious that they should go on with their contract, but they would not do it unless they were permitted to go for a number of trips to Portland in place of St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. Calling, I suppose, at St. John?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, they declined to call at St. John. They wanted to substitute Portland as the terminus.

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Absolutely, with a certain deduction on the service. In view of the policy which had been adopted on a former occasion, by our predecessors, as well as by ourselves, of attempting to make St. John the winter port, council did feel at liberty to vary this condition of the contract. These negotiations were spread over the greater part of October, and on the 20th of October, 1899, a contract was entered into with the Elder-Dempster Company.

Mr. FOSTER. On the same conditions?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not quite.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the variations?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The variations were these: Whereas, the Allans were to make the trip in seven days Elder-Dempster people required seven and a half days in summer, and the average in winter was to be eight days. The rate was to be \$2,500 for each round trip from Montreal to Liverpool and return, and \$3,500 for each round trip from Liverpool to St. John and return, touching at Halifax. We thought it only fair to allow them an additional \$1,000 per trip when they started the service to St. John and Halifax. It is precisely the same service excepting on somewhat lower terms than the Allans undertook to do it for. It is about \$11,000 or \$12,000 lower.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it a trip contract with the Allans? What did you give them per trip?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Allans were to have received, in the first instance, sums varying according to the vessels that they supplied. For the *Bavarian* and the *Tunisian* they asked £750 per trip, which, in round numbers, would be about \$3,750 in summer, and £500 per trip for the *Parisian* and *Californian*. As we moneyed it out, this made \$161,817, supposing that they adhered to the proposal they made and gave us the services of these two superior boats during the most part of the summer.

Mr. FOSTER. Were there any other variations allowed the Elder-Dempster Company?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. None but the one I have named.

Mr. FOSTER. None, but the half day?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. None but the half day.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the comparison as to the class of vessels?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The vessels that they gave us in the first instance were considerably better than those with which they carried out the service. They pleaded that the British government—I am not quite sure that they had a legal right to do it—but they pleaded that the British government had sequestered two or three of their vessels. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) took one of their vessels for the purpose of sending Strathcona's Horse to South Africa. We have been obliged to do with a somewhat inferior service to that which I contemplated having.

The question of the reductions to be made are now under the consideration of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman to make reductions in proportion to the deterioration in the class of vessels?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand, the class of vessels has considerably deteriorated?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It has considerably deteriorated.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the average of the voyages kept up?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. To what extent has that lapsed?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Speaking generally, I should say that the voyages have been a matter of

twenty hours worse than in the case of the Allans.

Mr. FOSTER. At least?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. At least, I think. I say candidly to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that I am not at all satisfied with the service we have got, and if it had been under any other circumstances than those I have mentioned, if I had not reason to know that it was due to the stress of war and the imperative necessity on the part of the British government, and to some extent on our own part, to secure the vessels, I would have dealt very much more sharply with them. But, it was rather a difficult position to be placed in. The British government were demanding these vessels. We ourselves, through the Militia Department, were taking one of the vessels, and the company had some excuse for saying that there was a sort of force majeure on them to give up these vessels for the public service. I admit frankly that the service has not been done up to the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. After this deterioration of the vessels became evident, was there any negotiations with the Allans, to allow them a part of the contract or anything of that kind, with similarly low-class vessels?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will see that it would be very unfair to make a hard and fast contract demanding superior vessels, and then, when by stress of circumstances the good vessels were drawn off from both these lines, that the contract should be given to the Elder-Dempsters, with an altogether inferior service, without any chance for the Allans to put on a similarly inferior service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The contract was not given until the Allans had declined. Before finally closing the matter, I directed my deputy to go down to Montreal and propose to the Allans to join forces with the Elder-Dempsters, and divide the service with them, but they declined to do anything of the kind, as he reported to me.

Mr. FOSTER. What power has the minister over the contract?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I can cancel it, or I can deduct what appears, after full investigation, to be a fair amount for each particular trip.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman say that he intends to do it?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do. I intend to make a deduction upon it.

Mr. BERGERON. After the Allans had refused to carry out their contract, no new tenders were asked for?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. There was absolutely no time. We were obliged to keep the service going. Negotiations went on with the Allans after they had declined, and for nearly five weeks the Allans on this side of the water appeared to expect that they would be able to make a contract which we might accept. I was willing to go very far, under the circumstances, in order to prevent difficulty about it, foreseeing that there was danger of that service not being done as well as I could wish. But, the members of the firm on the other side of the water would not agree to make a contract unless, indeed, as I have mentioned, we would abandon St. John, to a partial extent at all events, in favour of Portland. That involved a question of public policy, and, on the whole, I thought it was the lesser of two evils to stick to St. John, which has now become our winter port, and in which the trade has largely increased; rather than to allow a diversion to Portland again. These are rather grounds of public policy than commercial grounds. We have been embarrassed ever since Portland was discarded as a terminus. The chief lines have a very great preference, I may say, for going to Portland.

**Mr. BERGERON**. The hon. gentleman has spoken of want of time to call for tenders, but he has forgotten to tell us whether any offers were made to the other steamship companies, like the Dominion Line?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Yes.

**Mr. BERGERON**. And the only company which accepted, under the circumstances, was the Elder-Dempster?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. They were the only ones which could be got to offer at all.

**Mr. BERGERON**. Did they go to St. John?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. They went to St. John.

**Mr. FOSTER**. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do? Is he going to keep on this service?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The whole matter is at this present moment under negotiation and consideration. I must say that I am not satisfied with the service, and unless I can get better, and very decidedly better, I shall have to consider the expediency of closing it, as I have the power to do.

**Mr. SPROULE**. Is there any stated time for the mails to leave Montreal on each trip?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The contract was that they should average eight days on their winter passage, and seven and a half days on their summer passage.

**Mr. SPROULE**. Does that mean a mail every eight days?

**Mr. BERGERON**.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. It is a weekly service, but the average time we consumed between Rimouski and Merville in summer should be seven and a half days, and between Halifax and Merville in winter it should be eight days. But the service is to be weekly.

**Mr. CLARKE**. That is an average of how many knots in the summer and how many in the winter?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Seven and a half days would, I think, be about thirteen knots.

**Mr. FOSTER**. But, they do not do it. You are probably getting a nine-knot service.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. More than that.

**Mr. FOSTER**. I doubt if you are getting more than that with some of those vessels.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. There has been a very considerable difference always between the summer service and the winter service.

**Mr. FOSTER**. I believe the minister was quite justified in not going back on the policy of making our own ports the port from which these vessels should sail. I agree with him entirely in that, but, I do not agree with him, if it is his idea, to keep this inferior service going another season. I hope he has made up his mind not to continue such a service as that. It is practically almost as good as none. All this brings to view the wretched state of circumstances that has come in the wake of the government not pressing with vigour the fast line service when they had the opportunity of doing so. If the work had been carried on in good spirit from where it was left when the late government went out of power, there is not much doubt that we would have had, for some time past, a good, adequate fast line service between Canada and Great Britain. As it is now we have really a worse service than we had before the agitation commenced for a fast line. We have a worse service now than we had in 1896.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. You will remember that in 1896 they sailed from Portland.

**Mr. FOSTER**. In 1896, before we went out of power, the policy had absolutely been fixed that there should be, from the time the contracts commenced in that season, sailing from St. John and Halifax alone. But, owing to pressure which was brought upon the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) and his friend, they gave them one year's further grace, and they were allowed that year to sail from Portland. They had their excuse for it, which we, at the time, did not think, and do not think yet, was valid. But, that was the fact. The steamship companies believed they did not have sufficient notice, al-

though, I believe, they got sufficient notice, and on that ground they were allowed to go another year, and then the policy which had been adopted before was carried out in full in that respect. Here we are to-day with a service which is growing worse instead of growing better. I think the hon. gentlemen should confess their sins, in the first place, and, in the second place, try as speedily as possible to get a better service or else to stop the waste of money—for I am convinced it is very close to a simple waste of money to spend it on this service, which is given by what, in comparison with fast Atlantic steamers, you might describe as tugs, and they are really not much better than that.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I have expressed on former occasions my own concurrence in what the hon. gentleman says. I will point out this to him, however, without in the slightest degree wishing to disparage St. John, which we are trying to build up in every way possible, that it is infinitely easier to get these important lines of steamships to give us a good service, especially in the winter season, which is the difficult season, from Portland than from St. John. The reasons are obvious. I may say that we have very largely increased the trade with St. John. I had a communication from the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities the other day, in which they intimated that whereas in former years the freight they carried to St. John amounted to 35,000 tons, it has now become 193,000 tons. The trade has increased very largely, which itself, I hope, will enable us to get a better service. My hon. friend is perfectly right in saying that the present service is very far from being what it ought to be.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Can my hon. friend say whether the volume of mails carried by the Canadian lines has increased or diminished since 1896? I believe a great deal more mail matter goes by the United States than went formerly.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I cannot give the hon. gentleman an exact statement as to the volume of mail matter, but I have here a memorandum in reference to the amount paid to the United States. Apparently we have not paid to the United States more of late years than we did before.

Mr. **FOSTER**. You have to take into account the lessened postage.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I will leave the Postmaster General to deal with that. The statement submitted to me shows that the United States transit charges were as follows:

1895.....	\$36,016
1896.....	35,974
1897.....	35,928
1898.....	35,249
1899.....	34,924

I do not know whether my hon. friend the Postmaster General pays the United States on any different basis from heretofore.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. We pay according to arrangement fixed by the International Postal Union for periods of five years.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I am advised that merchants and others in Montreal who are interested in having their mail matter carried as fast as possible, are accustomed to send their mails by the American instead of by the Canadian line.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. I think there cannot be two opinions as to the fact that the present system is not only far inferior to the old system, but far inferior to what Canada should have at the rate now paid. I am told that the hon. gentleman stated that the tender of the Allan Line and the Dominion Line was \$160,000.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. That was what they tendered for.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. In my time as Postmaster General they were receiving \$125,000 per annum.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. That was from Portland as a terminus, the vessels calling at Halifax.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. It was for the purpose of the Canadian service, and it was a very much smaller consideration for the service they were rendering than the rate we are at present paying to the Elder-Dempster Line.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. On the contrary, they would take a much smaller rate to go to Portland.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. I do not see that at all. The amount given to the Elder-Dempster Line is \$150,000, and it must be recollected that the average time of the Allan Line and the Dominion Line has been eight days.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Not quite.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. Yes. I know my hon. friend is usually accurate, but I am absolutely accurate in this instance, because I have gone into the figures. I have here a letter from Mr. John Torrance, in which he says:

I notice that you spoke of the Allan and Dominion Lines' time as being about ten days. It has been nearer eight than ten, and I thought I would like to correct this.

If the hon. gentleman will take the sailing times of all the steamers between British ports and Canada and vice versa, he will see that I am absolutely correct. The other day, in discussing the point from the standpoint of the postal service, I stated that the average time was ten days, and it was in consequence of that statement that this let-

ter was addressed to me by Mr. John Torrance, and I am perfectly satisfied that any hon. member who knows Mr. John Torrance will take his word.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have the time before me, and I can give it to the hour.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would be very glad to have it given me, and, as a reciprocal compliment, I will give the hon. gentleman the time of the Elder-Dempster Line.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have that, too. I admit that owing to the circumstances which I have stated, the Elder-Dempster Line has not done as well as the Allan or the Dominion Line. I have not the slightest desire to deny that, and under other circumstances the matter would be more strictly dealt with. The average time from Halifax to Merville is 9 days, 8 hours, 9 minutes, and the average time from Merville to Halifax is 9 days, 18 hours, 24 minutes. The memorandum supplied to me is as follows: Allan Line—Halifax to Merville, 9 days, 3 hours, 11 minutes; Merville to Halifax, 9 days, 17 hours, 4 minutes. Dominion Line—Halifax to Merville, 8 days, 7 hours, 40 minutes; Merville to Halifax, 9 days, 6 hours, 18 minutes. The Allan Line time is very little better than 10 days.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. For the purpose of my argument, ten days are quite sufficient. I do not question the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's information. I think my own is equally good.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am speaking of what was actually done, but not of the present year's service. I cannot tell what that is.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It must be remembered that all the new ships of the Allan Line and the Dominion Line have been chartered by the Imperial government as transports to South Africa, and the conclusion I draw from that is that if the contract were still in the hands of the companies who performed the service so well for Canada during a number of years, they would shorten the time still further with their new ships. As the hon. gentleman knows, the contract with the Elder-Dempster Line terminates at the close of navigation in 1891. The contract time was eight days between Merville and Halifax, and when that time was exceeded evidence had to be given by the contractor as to the cause of the delay. If we pay for an inferior service, it is right that parliament should know whether any explanations have been given by the contractors as to the cause of delay, because, if not, the government will be doubly within its duty in exacting an explanation, as there is a penalty attached to the non-fulfilment of the contract.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Undoubtedly my hon. friend is quite right. They have not been paid in full for their services, and explanations were demanded from them. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, will not care to hear the whole details read, but the upshot was that in three or four cases, in which I had complained against him, they gave abstracts from their log books as evidence of their steamers having experienced severe weather. That constituted their chief excuse other than the one I have mentioned, that the British government have taken away the boats on which they had depended to make a fair average passage. The matter remains in the hands of the government for settlement and adjustment as to what would be, under all the circumstances, a reasonable and fair deduction for their default in carrying out their contract.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Then it is the intention of the department to exact further information from the contractors and charge them for any delay that is not explained to the satisfaction of the department.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I want to draw attention to this fact, that since the contract has been entered into between the government of Canada and the Elder-Dempster Line, except on two occasions, they have never fulfilled the condition of their contract which fixing a time limit for each trip. This is exactly the time their trips have taken, according to their log. One voyage of the *Ashanti* occupied nineteen days sixteen hours and thirty seconds. There may have been rough weather, but that certainly shows that their boats are not fit to do the work in the fall in the time agreed.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am not sure whether this vessel broke down or not, but it certainly experienced very rough weather. I objected strenuously to having any more to do with the *Ashanti*.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Another voyage took over fourteen days, by the *Yola*. There were two voyages by the *Lake Huron* and *Lake Superior*, over thirteen days and over twelve days respectively. Two voyages of over twelve days by the *Lake Ontario* and the *Etolia*. There were five ranging between nine and ten days, and five ranging between eight and nine days. The average time of the Allans was less than ten days.

It was also remarked the other day that the Allans and the Dominion Lines had refused to make a terminal port in Canada. My information is the very reverse. These lines carried the mails to Halifax and went on to St. John, during the winter of 1898-9 at a very heavy sacrifice and at a lower

price than paid the Beaver Line the previous winter, which had not given satisfaction to the department, and from which consequently the contract was taken. In consequence of the service being so unsatisfactory, letters are all sent via New York. Again quite lately, on May 29, the *Lake Superior* left Liverpool and passed Cape Ray on June 11, at 2 p.m., while the *Parisian*, which left Liverpool on May 31, got into Quebec on June 9, and the Postmaster General will remember that the recent additions to the Allan Line were all chartered by the Imperial government, as I have said. As to the fact of the bulk of mail matter being sent on American bottoms, there can be no question. I know it from personal experience when in London, and have questioned my hon. friend the Postmaster General upon that point, and he knows that the facts are absolutely as I have stated. My hon. friend knows that we are paying a very large amount of money for a very unsatisfactory service, which is driving the mails away from the Canadian Pacific Railway and its Pacific Ocean fleet, subsidized by Canada to an enormous amount, and is running down the fair name of Canada in so far as our means of communication are concerned. We have paid a large amount to build up the Canadian Pacific Railway. We make fast time crossing the continent, we make fast time crossing the Pacific Ocean; but all the time saved on these routes is lost by a trip of nineteen days, sixteen hours and thirty minutes. You might as well send the mails by sailing vessels.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That steamer broke down.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a broken-down line.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, it is a broken-down line. It is a line that the government of Canada, having due regard to the interests of this country, should not have given the contract to. The average time was over fourteen days. In these days when cables cross the ocean, when there are telephones in every village, when competition moves at electric speed—is it possible for Canadian trade with British merchants to be upon a proper footing, when we have the mail contract given to a broken-down line? Can we expect that letters will be sent by such a line when they can be sent by American ships, which carry letters in six days at the utmost? I say that the government should immediately cancel that contract, because the money which is paid to the Elder-Dempster Line is absolutely thrown away, Canada receiving no benefit therefrom whatever. I hold the government responsible for giving the contract to a line that was known in England to be one that could not carry out a contract of that kind, and, in doing so, took that contract from a line that had been the pioneer in the ocean-going trade of the St. Lawrence, and had done the work well, and at a much lower

price. Fancy an increase of \$23,000 given to a line incapable of doing the service, so that while they are paid that money for carrying our mails, our mails are carried in American ships. The mails for our own Pacific coast, and for the Australian colonies which, if we had a proper service, would come through Canada, are sent by American ships to American ports, across by United States railways to the Pacific coast, the letters for British Columbia going to Vancouver, and those for Australia, going direct from San Francisco. This contract with the Elder-Dempster Line should be cancelled without delay, for every day it continues, it means so much of the public money of Canada absolutely wasted.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) was not in his place when I made a statement with regard to this matter. Had he been in his place, he would have learned that I gave the contract to the Allans in the first instance, that they, of their own proper motion abandoned it. It was on August 16, that I recommended to council that the contract should be given to the Allans, and they undertook it. But the Allans subsequently, about the middle of September, withdrew from the contract. After that I went on negotiating with them longer, perhaps, than I should have done—four or five weeks, trying to arrange a modus vivendi with them, because I understood that the British government was subjecting them to considerable pressure. I will read to my hon. friend my memorandum of October 13—after a considerable number of attempts to bring them into line:

A letter was received from Messrs. H. & A. Allan stating that their Glasgow firm had advised them that the requirements of the British government for transport steamers were so pressing that their offer of Saturday last—

Mind—

—to run five steamers between Liverpool and St. John via Merville and Halifax for the carriage of mails would have to be withdrawn.

I have not acted hastily; I have done all that a government could be expected to do, to secure the services of the line that the hon. gentleman refers to. They proposed to perform a service between Liverpool and Portland, via Merville and Halifax, with such vessels as the British government should leave available. But we did not think it wise to turn our backs on our own winter port of St. John, and go back to Portland. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact, that he is not justified in speaking of the Elder-Dempster as a broken-down line, whatever their defects may be—

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They are a slow line.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. But the hon. gentleman knows

that the Elder-Dempster Company have sent a class of extremely fine and valuable vessels to Montreal. I think they are considerably larger than those sent before; so far as regards the purposes of the St. Lawrence trade, this company have been, to a great extent, the pioneers of what you might call the great traders. It is true they were a line for freight purposes, rather than for passenger traffic. But I was in this position—it was not a question of choosing between the Elder-Dempster and the Allans. I did not do that. It was a question of getting any line at all under the circumstances, which the hon. gentleman forgets. The British government had pretty nearly swept the sea of every available vessel for transport purposes. It is true that there were two vessels that made bad voyages, the *Yola* and the *Ashanti*. But vessels of the Allans had been nearly as slow. They made the voyage in thirteen days on more than one occasion. In—

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have the figures at hand. The *Numidian* occupied 13 days, 6 hours and 45 minutes, on one westbound trip. However, I am not denying the substantial accuracy of the hon. gentleman's main statement—that the Elder-Dempster Line have not been able to give as good service as they promised, or as I expected—for the reasons stated. But when he blames the government for having chosen them, he should remember that we had no choice. The Dominion would not tender, and the Allans would not carry out their contract. I negotiated with them up to the last possible moment, as the hon. gentleman will see by the papers. They finally offered to go to Portland for a portion of the service. Had I felt free to go to Portland, I could have made a much better bargain; but that would have been to go directly in the teeth, not only of our own policy, but of the policy which the hon. gentleman's own friends inaugurated. All these steamship lines prefer to go to Portland.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. For their cargo?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes. They repeatedly offered to do the service for less money, if we allowed them to go to Portland. But our object is to build up Canadian ports. We are obliged to make some sacrifices; we are obliged to pay a great deal more, or accept a much inferior class of service. Among other difficulties that affect this service, is the fact, well known to the hon. gentleman, and to everybody who has paid any attention to the matter, that the British insurance companies, for reasons best known to themselves, have discriminated heavily, and, in my opinion, unfairly, against St. John and Halifax. They put very much higher charges on vessels going from St. John and touching at

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Halifax, than on vessels going from Portland and touching at Halifax. That, in itself, is a very serious obstacle in our way. However, the whole matter is engaging our attention; and I am as desirous as the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) can desire me to be, to obtain a better service. I desired to say one thing to my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), and it is this—I think we must recollect that in 1896, when we came in, the Allans and Mr. Huddart, who, I think, were the only two tenderers, had not made us a proper tender. All they offered to do, was this—if we would give them four or six months to look about them, they would tell us at the end of that time whether they would accept the contract or not. They were to be allowed to hawk our offer about, and make whatever bargain they could; and, if it did not suit them, they would not carry it out. In their letter they laid down a variety of conditions, which would have nullified the chances we had of obtaining a fast service.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The point I want to make is that the tender has failed in accomplishing the object. I agree with the hon. gentleman that in a service between England and Canada the terminus should be in a Canadian port; I am as anxious as the hon. gentleman to build up a Canadian trade. I also agree with him as to the absurd discrimination of the underwriters against the St. Lawrence route and against Halifax and St. John. I also agree with the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), that it is time some portion of our Canadian capital should be invested in underwriting covering partly or wholly risks coming to Canada, or from Canada to Great Britain. I think that will operate wonderfully upon the English underwriters and cause the rates to come down. That is the only means I can see of putting an end to these discriminating rates, which are also unjust. Now, the hon. gentleman has stated that the Allans took four months to look round and decide whether to accept the contract or not. He is not absolutely accurate in his facts, if he will excuse me for saying so. A clause was inserted in the contract which the government of Sir Charles Tupper signed with the Allans—

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I never heard he signed any contract.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, I meant to say proposed to sign. The hon. gentleman knows why it was not signed. It was all ready, it had been discussed between the contracting parties, and all the conditions had been agreed upon. The four months' clause was put in at the request of the Allans, who said: If we sign a firm contract now with the government of Canada we shall be helpless in the hands of the great railway corporations of this country.

We want to make our conditions with the railway companies, and for that purpose we ask for a delay of four months before signing the contract. The hon. gentleman knows better than anybody else that the Allans did not require to make any financial arrangement with any parties in Great Britain; their own means are quite sufficient to build any fleet and to carry out any contract which they may desire to enter into. Mr. Dunlop, their agent, when he was in London, went to the high commissioner, then Sir Donald A. Smith, and stated that he was prepared to give up the four months' clause and to enter into a contract without it. But a mistake took place. His Excellency, upon the advice of his constitutional advisers, thought fit not to sign that contract, because the present government fancied they were going to make a much better one. The brilliant success which they have achieved is now before the country, and proves whether this government were right, or whether the leader of the late government, Sir Charles Tupper, was right when, after he had left office, knowing the importance of that line for the trade of Canada, knowing its importance for the good name of the St. Lawrence navigation, wrote to the right hon. leader of the present government asking him to induce his colleagues to advise His Excellency to sign that contract. The hon. gentleman refused, he said that they were going to make a much better contract. The much better contract, if you please, was the bottle-necked fast line of steamers which have never materialized, and which have caused an enormous amount of trouble to my hon. friend from Quebec West. They have kept him away from his constituents for the last year or year and a half; for every six weeks he has had to go to England to get a peep at these bottle-necked steamers. The only thing we have seen about them is the model that was exhibited in the lobby here. The commercial men of Montreal laughed at the whole thing as being an absurd scheme impossible of realization. Those are the facts. The country knows that the cause of the delay in obtaining the fast line was because the leader of the government refused to advise His Excellency to sign an excellent contract; whereas, if he had signed it, we would have had two years ago a fast line of steamers instead of having, as now, to depend upon steamers that take nineteen days to cross the Atlantic.

Now, the mail service, to my mind, is of the greatest importance. We all know how conservative trade is. We know that once commercial men adopt a route they rarely leave it. Trade follows one route, and very seldom gives it up for a new one. When commercial men find that they can send their letters across the Atlantic in five or six days over an American line, they are going to adopt it. Now, why pay \$150,000

to the Elder-Dempster Line? Why not cancel that contract immediately? The hon. gentleman says that he agrees with me upon the interpretation of the contract; he agrees with me that under that contract they are limited to eight days, and that there is a penalty attached to the violation of that contract. He agrees with me that except in a couple of instances they have never carried out the conditions of that contract. Why not impose the penalty immediately after each trip, when the contract gives the minister power to do so? That would lead them either to give up their contract or else improve their line in such a way that Canada would have the benefit of the money which she is paying. But I think it is criminal to allow the people of England to remain in the belief that they have got to send their letters over an American line when Canada is paying so large an amount of money for a Canadian line. They look upon us as men who have not a business instinct when we allow the government to pay \$150,000 a year to carry letters which never go over that line because the steamers take fourteen days, thirteen days, twelve days, fifteen days, sixteen days, nineteen days.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There were only two cases, one of fourteen and one of nineteen.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Well, I am right in so many instances that they confirm my argument that the contract should be cancelled immediately and a penalty should be imposed. Now, the hon. gentleman has said, what I am prepared to admit, that the Elder-Dempster Line is a freight line, and nothing more. They have constructed their fleet almost for the sole purpose of carrying freight. The newer steamers have an enormous tonnage, a large carrying capacity, but they are not built for the purpose of speed. If there is any reason in our subsidizing a line for carrying mails, it is that this line may compete with the fast services of the United States. I will leave it to the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) himself to say if letters sent from Canada to Great Britain are not sent via the United States. I know in the old days I have seen returns which indicate that a large proportion of the mail goes via the United States. As to coming from Great Britain, I think the whole of it comes except letters which are of no importance whatever as respects their time of delivery.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). If my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) wishes to argue that we are only to give this subsidy to the particular vessels which are fast enough to command the mail service, then I am afraid we shall not be able to get that service from the lines which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. It is an admitted fact that a large

proportion of the mails go via New York, but it also was a fact under the contract with the Allans.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Not to so great an extent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Possibly not to so great an extent. While the service has increased in its efficiency from year to year, there has been but a moderate degree of improvement in regard to the Canadian service as compared with the service via New York, and I quite realize the difficulty there is in keeping up with New York in the race. Even when the Allans had the contract it is a fact that the bulk of the mails went via New York.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. No, not the bulk.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, there is a certain class of matter, the package mail, that is bound to go by our service.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. And other matter too.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been no time in ten years when the service between Great Britain, Montreal, Halifax and St. John could be compared as to efficiency with the New York service, and necessarily letters are sent via New York. Then, there is another consideration which should be kept in mind as explaining the reason why letters are sent via New York, and it is that there there is a vessel leaving on almost every day of the the week. If a person writes a letter on Monday he is not going to wait until Thursday or Saturday in order that it may go via Canada. Even on the very day that our Canadian mails will be sailing many people will mark their letters 'via New York,' because they believe that their letters will arrive more quickly. The Elder-Dempster Line is not a very fast line, but I would be sorry that any hon. gentleman should say anything in the discussion upon this question which would cast a reflection upon it. This line has done a great deal for the trade of Canada. I notice that in the papers it is stated that the Elder-Dempster Company has just put on a new 12,000-ton ship which is the largest ship coming to our waters. At the particular time that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce made this contract the Elder-Dempster Line was the only service available. It was not a contest between the Elder-Dempster people, the Allans and the Dominion Line. It was a question as to whether we should have the Elder-Dempster Line or nothing. We have had a Canadian mail service between Canada and Great Britain for a number of years, not only for the mails, but, because, in the interest of our trade, we desired to have established lines of steamship communication. I held that it would

be a great pity to break the connection that existed before, and that even if we should have a poorer service for a couple of years, it would be better than that we should cease to have fixed communication between Canada and Great Britain. I very well remember when the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce submitted to me the proposition from the Allans that they should continue the service if they were permitted to make Portland one of the terminal points. Both governments had laid down the principle that we would not give this subsidy to any line of steamers that would not make its terminal point in Canada, and in doing that we were trying to give direction to trade and traffic. The question for our consideration was not what lines would do at some future time, or what they might have done in the past. No doubt the Allans have done very much for the trade of Canada, but at that particular time owing to the demand in connection with the South African war, the Allans were not able to comply with our conditions and we had to accept the Elder-Dempster service or go without any. The question was whether we were to have a service at all. Though it might be somewhat slow, it was better than nothing, and we made a contract for a service between Canada and Great Britain, thus preventing the continuity of the service being broken.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The continuity is broken. The mails do not go over these lines. The hon. gentleman knows very well the custom of the trade to-day in Canada. People write their letters to Great Britain on one day—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is past and gone now. People write their letters to Great Britain every day.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Because we have vessels that are quite useless for the purpose. I do not want to run down the Elder-Dempster Line. The hon. gentleman has said that the Elder-Dempster Line has done a great deal for the trade of Canada. Well, utilize the Elder-Dempster Line for the purpose for which it was designed. Do not utilize the Elder-Dempster Line to carry the mails when it takes nineteen days to make the passage.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is not quite fair. It only took that on one occasion.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman is enabled to show that the mail matter for Great Britain will go across the Atlantic by such vessels, I am prepared to give up the discussion, but it is impossible for the hon. gentleman to deny, that, under the present conditions, we cannot expect mail matter to go from Canada by such vessels, but that under present conditions we must expect that almost the whole of the correspondence exchanged between Great Britain and Canada will continue to

go as it goes now, by American lines. If that be so, where is the justification for paying \$150,000 a year to the Elder-Dempster Line? The continuity as to travel is being kept up. The Allan and Dominion services are improving every day, and had it not been for the unfortunate trouble in South Africa the finest steamers would have been on the line, and we would have obtained the benefit of these modern improvements, and also of the large amount of money expended by the Dominion Line upon the service between Great Britain and Canada. But, what I insist upon, and what I want to have explained, if there is any explanation for it, is why Canada is called upon to pay \$150,000 to carry mail matter which does not go by the Elder-Dempster Line. The people of Canada will hold hon. gentlemen to account for the manner in which they are spending this money, and this is one of the things for which they will demand an explanation when hon. gentlemen will go before them. That contract should be cancelled immediately, the penalty should be imposed without delay. Whatever agreement has been entered into between the government and this line should be carried out in its entirety.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In the hon. gentleman's zeal for the Allan Line he is not quite aware of the actual condition of the case. There were two bad voyages which he has alluded to, one by the *Yola* and one by the *Ashanti*, but the average of speed would be very little in favour of the Allans as against the Elder-Dempster Line having reference to their service in the past. I have here a statement of the service of the Allan Line for 1895 and 1896. From Moville to Halifax, westbound, the average was 10 days and 10 hours in 1895, and east bound it was 9 days, 6 hours and 22 minutes. In 1897 the average speed of the Allan Line from Moville to Halifax was 10 day and 22 hours. That is, I think, quite as high as the average of the Elder-Dempster Line, barring these two bad voyages that I have alluded to. Their average from Halifax to Liverpool east-bound was 9 days, 22 hours. I may just remark en passant that apparently the Beaver Line did considerably better in 1898 than the Allan Line did. Their time from Halifax to Moville was 8 days, 19 hours, as against the figures I have given; and from Moville to Halifax it was 10 days, 3 hours, as against 10 days, 22 hours. There is no doubt about it that for several years back we have not had a good mail service, but I must call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that in 1895-6 and in 1896-7 there was no improvement at all. The first improvement was made by the Beaver Line. Curiously enough, the Beaver Line did better than the Allan Line during these two years.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Allans were building their new fleet.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. But they would not give us their new fleet. I would have been delighted to take them if I could have got them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Of course they could not anticipate the war in South Africa, but even then my information is from their own books, and when the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) speaks of my zeal for the Allan Line I may tell him that I am really quite impartial about it. The fact of my comparing their service with the Elder-Dempster Line shows that I am merely quoting facts without any feeling one way or the other. I have had no occasion to see the returns which the hon. gentleman has, but it appears from the Allans own books that their average time has been a little less than 10 days. The hon. gentleman brings up the average of the Elder-Dempster Line by putting aside all their slow ships. He says we will not consider the 19 days or the 14 days, but he draws an average from their best voyages and on that argument he says they come very close indeed to the Allans. I took the average of the Allan Line for every one of their ships, and I took it during the number of years they have been serving Canada, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) puts aside the *Ashanti* and *Yola*.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have here the average time including the *Yola* and the *Ashanti*, and that actual time is 10 days, 13 hours and 36 minutes. The net time as it is called is 11 days, 11 hours and 40 minutes. That is from November 12 down to the end of the voyage of the *Yola*. I will give the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) the benefit of the 14 and the 19 days' voyages and he will see that the difference is mighty small.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. How is that possible? Here we have one voyage 19 days, 16 hours and 30 minutes, another 14 days, two voyages at 13 days, one over 12 days, two over 10 days, and then five ranging between 8 days and 9 days.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will send the list over to the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron).

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am quite prepared to take the statement of the hon. minister, but my figures are taken from the Allans' books and they must be correct. At all events the hon. gentleman must admit that the time made by the Elder-Dempster Line is far behind the combined service given by the Allan and Dominion Lines.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think it is as good as the Allans but not quite as good as the Dominion.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The contract was divided between the Allan and the Dominion Lines, and if you take their combined time you will find that my average of inside of ten days is correct. That will dissipate the argument in favour of the Elder-Dempster Line.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have got here that the average time of eighteen trips, including the *Ashanti*, which practically broke down through stress of weather, and it was 10 days, 1 hour and 25 minutes. It is quite true that the Elder-Dempster cannot compete with the Allan and Dominion Lines combined, and I was very anxious to get the Allan or the the Dominion Line to conjoin with the Elder-Dempster, but they would not, for reasons of state, I suppose.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I call the attention of my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) to the contract to which he has referred regarding what he was pleased to call the fast line and which the late government intended to enter into with the Messrs. Allan. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) led the House to infer that that line was to run at an average speed of about twenty knots an hour.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I did not refer to any speed.

Mr. FOSTER. He never mentioned any speed.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I never referred to any speed whatever (as every hon. gentleman who heard me knows), for the simple reason that I was not discussing that part of the contract. I spoke of the four months' clause.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman abandons that I will not refer to it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not abandon anything. I never abandon anything I say.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman makes no contention as to the rate of speed I will not take up time in discussing it. I call attention to the four months paragraph and I will content myself with reading what the Allans stated when my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) came into power, as to their contention with regard to that. On the 9th of June, before the present government was sworn in, the Allans wrote to the late Hon. Mr. Ives, Minister of Trade and Commerce :

The proposed undertaking will greatly exceed in extent any existing service between Great Britain and the American continent. It will involve the expenditure of much money, the conversion of the Allan Line into a company under the Limited Liability Acts, and the completion of several important negotiations. We

have reason to believe that we shall have no insuperable difficulties in completing the financial and all other necessary arrangements within four months of the acceptance of this offer; but should we, from any unforeseen cause, fail in doing so, we reserve the liberty to resign the contract at or before the end of that period.

When the present government came into power this is what they said about that four months' condition :

Our tender was accepted subject to the following conditions:

1. We are to have four months from date of completion of contract in which to float a company with necessary capital, and to carry through certain necessary arrangements. Should we, from any unforeseen cause, fail in doing so, we are to be at liberty to resign the contract without penalty.

That is exactly what the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, namely, that they had four months to rescind the contract if they did not float their company as they intended.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries need not have got up to repeat word for word what the Minister of Trade and Commerce stated if that is all he had to say. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) will continue to read from that book which he has in his hand he will find that Mr. Dunlop went to Lord Strathcona and stated that they were prepared to abandon the four months' clause. I have given the reason why the four months was insisted upon. It was not at all to allow the Allans to find time to make financial arrangements, because the Allans had all the money they wanted to build any fleet they required, but it was because they had not entered into arrangements with the large railway companies and before they signed the contract with the government they wanted time to complete these negotiations. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will find that in the correspondence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot find in this a corroboration of what the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) says. The letter which I have quoted is a letter signed by Andrew Allan on behalf of himself and the other members of the Allan firm.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think too great sympathy ought to be extended to the Elder-Dempster Company in taking the matter of penalties into consideration, because the swifter vessels have been taken away, and I imagine that those taken by the British government made a pretty good financial arrangement for the company. The company is not losing by the fact of the swifter vessels being taken off, and I do not think it should be relieved of the penalty for the very poor service it is giving, compared with what the contract requires. One other point, by way of reprisal to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fish-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

eries. He seems to have a great objection to the Allans, a very responsible firm—

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman should not misrepresent me. I have no objection whatever to the Allans, and expressed none.

Mr. **FOSTER**. He seems to have a very great objection to the Allans, a strong firm financially, and a reputable ship-building firm, who have been in business for years and years, and are known to carry out their contracts, having four months in which to complete their operations: but, he has no objection at all to giving the contract to a mere ship broker, and allowing him nearly three years' time to hawk it around the streets of London.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. The hon. gentleman is most unjust in misrepresenting me in that way. I have no objection to the Allans; on the contrary, I feel as strongly in favour of the Allans as the hon. gentleman does. What I said was that the Messrs. Allan wrote to the present government stating that they understood their contract to be that they were to have four months to float their company, and that if they failed, they were to have the privilege at the end of four months of resigning the contract without any penalty. I simply contented myself with reading the paragraph to the House.

Mr. **FOSTER**. And what did the hon. gentleman use that argument for—merely to take up the time of the House, or as an argument against this side of the House, to show that we had not made a firm and fast contract, and, consequently, that they had a right to sweep it away, because the Allans had not made arrangements in four months, though the government afterwards gave Mr. Petersen, a mere ship broker, two years' time to hawk the contract around the streets of London, and failed in the end?

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. There was no contract with the Allans.

Steam service fortnightly between St. John and Liverpool, Great Britain, during the winter season of 1900-1, not less than ten round trips ..... \$20,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. Who is doing this service?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. That service has virtually not been done as a separate service for some years.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Has the money not been expended?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The money was expended in the case of the Beaver Line in 1898-9. They demanded \$1,000 additional for going from St. John to Halifax, but nothing was done. This service is specifically between St.

John and Liverpool. It is left as a sort of supplemental vote, and will probably not be used. The service in the past season was performed by the Elder-Dempster Line.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is it the intention of my hon. friend to use this for next year?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. It is quite possible that I may have to use it, in case I get a service more to our satisfaction.

Steam service between Halifax and St. John's, Nfld., and Liverpool, from July 1, 1900, to June 30, 1901..... \$20,000

Mr. **FOSTER**. What was done with that last year?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. That service used to be performed by what is known as the Canada and Newfoundland Steamship Company. This year they had to transfer their service to the Furness-Withy & Co., who, since that time, have performed the service.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the service?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. From Halifax to St. John's, Newfoundland, then to Liverpool and back again.

Mr. **FOSTER**. How many trips?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. They sail at intervals of seven-teen days.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is it a freight service?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Yes, to all intents and purposes.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the object of that?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. The object of it was largely, no doubt, to encourage communication with Newfoundland.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Have we not a much-better line of communication with Newfoundland by way of North Sydney? Does the hon. gentleman think this is a service which gives us the worth of the money?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). It is a freight service, practically, between Halifax and Great Britain. The Elder-Dempster Line calls at Halifax for the mails, but takes very little freight.

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. How is it that the government refuse to recognize the service which is giving a great deal of benefit to the farmers and producers of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island? So far, that service has not received a dollar at the hands of this parliament. I can understand the Minister of Trade and Commerce paying very little attention to this matter, but I cannot understand the Minister of Finance refusing to grant this service, although it is connected with the Newfoundland Railway,

such aid as is given to other steamers engaged in similar services. It carries a large quantity of live stock, butter, cheese and other farm products of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island to the Newfoundland market. It carries the mail three times a week each way between the port of North Sydney and St. John's, Newfoundland, and points on the line of the Newfoundland Railway. Although that service has been in operation three or four years, and the country is getting a great deal of benefit from it, would be of still greater benefit if it were not discriminated against. Here is a boat subsidized from Halifax to carry freight only once a fortnight to the port of St. John's, Newfoundland, and getting a subsidy for doing that, and, if I understood the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce correctly, getting a subsidy for carrying the mails. The people only get these mails once a fortnight, and possibly they are not sent by this boat at all, unless without the knowledge of the people who are forwarding the mail matter. These people would naturally prefer sending their mails by the steamer which runs between North Sydney and Port au Basque, three times a week. I brought this matter up last year and the year before, and I am curious to learn what kind of an excuse the hon. minister can offer, for not granting the subsidies to this service. The matter was brought before his predecessors, and the promise made that whatever grants were given to other steamboats carrying the mails between Halifax and St. John's, Newfoundland, a grant would be given to Mr. Reid, for this service between Sydney and Port au Basque, but, no doubt, when my hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce came into office, that put an end to the fulfilment of the promise made by his predecessors.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The promise of my predecessors was not brought to my notice.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I called my hon. friend's attention to it three years ago.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I found this service we are now discussing had been promised by the late government, a subsidy of \$20,000, from Halifax to St. John's, Newfoundland.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That was before the present service of which I speak was established. That was the only service they had at that time.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am not unwilling to consider applications at the proper time, but cannot grant all the applications made to us from every quarter. As a rule, we confine ourselves, in granting subsidies, with the exception of those which had been existing for a number of years, to lines between Canada and European countries or Great Britain.

Mr. McDOUGALL.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Surely a most necessary service to receive recognition is such a one as this.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That may be the opinion of the hon. gentleman, but there are a great many other demands made upon us, and we cannot all at once grant them all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would be quite impossible for us to keep track of all the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite. If the hon. gentleman drew my notice to the fact that a particular promise had been made to that particular line, it escaped my notice.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentlemen was present when I repeated the statement, year after year, since he came into power.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That only adds one to the very large number of promises hon. gentlemen opposite made when they had no power to grant them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There was no occasion for granting this one until after my hon. friend came into office.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What the people of the lower provinces are chiefly concerned in, is not the subsidies, but the steamships; and inasmuch as the service to which the hon. gentleman refers, has been regularly and faithfully performed right along, without these subsidies, I fail to see in what way the public service has suffered severely. I am not in any way reflecting on Mr. Reid's enterprise, which is in every way worthy of praise.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will my hon. friend allow me to tell him that frequently Canadian freight is left over at the port of North Sydney, while American freight is taken in preference to Newfoundland, and we cannot blame the company, because they have no contract with the government to do our work, and consequently are at liberty to take what they think best first.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If they take American freight to the exclusion of Canadian freight, that is a very poor reason for giving them a subsidy.

Mr. McDOUGALL. They could not carry both, and had to give preference to the freight from the United States.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not unless they wanted to.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes, if they wanted to build up a business.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is a very poor advocate. His statement goes to show that this line is trying to discriminate against Canadian trade, and I do not think that a company which does that, is in the position to claim a subsidy from this government. I hope my hon.

friend is mistaken. I do not think that Mr. Reid would take that course. Probably at the time there was some defect in the railway connection between the ship and the trains, and, no doubt, that has been remedied. I admire the enterprise of Mr. Reid very much, but I understand he is under contract with the government of Newfoundland to perform that service, and there is not the slightest danger of its being neglected. At the same time, it may be that a case will be presented in such a form that we may be able to grant a subsidy. There has been some consideration given the subject already, and I do not wish to be understood as passing final judgment upon the question, as I have great admiration for the enterprise which Mr. Reid has taken up. I understand further that every pound of mails which that boat carries, she is paid for, so that there is no grievance on that account.

Mr. McDUGALL. I wish to be properly understood, and do not want my hon. friend to run with side issues at all. With regard to this service leaving Canadian freight and taking American freight, that is due to the fact that the steamer had, at that particular time, more freight than she could carry. She had missed a few trips on account of the heavy ice, and the local freight was left behind, while that from the United States—a great deal coming from as far as Minneapolis and St. Paul—was, no doubt, sent forward under special conditions, and Mr. Reid, not being obliged to give any preference to Canadian trade, did, as any business man would, take the freight he was pressed to deliver in the shortest possible time. The other lines of steamers running to ports in Newfoundland, and to Ste. Pierre, get subsidies, and are obliged to carry Canadian freight, which prevents their giving a preference to outside freight. That is my reason for asking that a subsidy be given this line, and I think it is one which the people who send freight to Newfoundland will consider very important.

Mr. GILLIES. I have only a word or two to add in this connection. I fail to see how any good business reason can be given for this vote of \$20,000 for a steamship service between Halifax and St. John's. Before the Reid route, so-called, was opened, two or three years ago, there was every reason why this steamship communication between Halifax and St. John's should be supported. But, if the minister will look into this matter and follow me for a few moments, I think he will agree that I am right. No one in Halifax now will take the steamer from Halifax to St. John's. How does he go? He goes by rail to North Sydney, thence by steamer to Port au Basques, six hours distant, thence by railway to St. John's—arriving in St. John's from Port au Basques in less than 24 hours, the whole trip from Halifax to St. John's occupying 38 hours. But if he takes

this steamer, which is subsidized to the extent of \$20,000, it will take him 60 hours to make the voyage, a difference of 22 hours in favour of the North Sydney route. I presume the hon. minister did not scrutinize this closely enough before making his appropriation; but, with the argument I have given against it, there can be no earthly reason that I can see for the repetition of this vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies), it seems to me misses the real point in this case. This is practically for steamship connection between Halifax and Liverpool, England. The fact that it calls at Newfoundland, makes it none the less worthy.

Mr. GILLIES. But this is a special steamer from Halifax to St. John's.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. According to my hon. friend, it does not compete with the Reid route.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My attention has been drawn to the fact that in speaking a short time ago, I used the name Munro, when I should have said Dunlop. I take the opportunity of reading to the hon. minister (Sir Louis Davies) what he could not read or find—

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I found it and read it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. This is taken from sessional paper No. 28, 1896. It is in a despatch from Sir Donald Smith to Sir Charles Tupper, dated 10th July, 1896. Mr. Dunlop is well known as the agent and a partner in the Allan House:

I may add that Mr. Dunlop informed me, before my interview with Mr. Chamberlain, that his firm were prepared to withdraw from the stipulation, to be given in the form of a letter, that the contract should be given to them subject (without penalty) to their succeeding in floating a company in four months. I communicated this statement to the Secretary of State, although Mr. Dunlop has not yet placed it before me in writing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. minister may say 'hear, hear.' But I stated simply that the stipulation of four months had been abandoned by the Allans, and the despatch of Sir Donald Smith proves it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And I call my hon. friend's (Sir Adolphe Caron's) attention to the fact that three days afterwards, on the 13th of July, the Allans wrote over their own signature to the Premier of Canada that, so far from abandoning that condition, they adhered to it, and their tender was subject to that condition. At page 19 of the papers brought down, is the following:

Our tender was accepted subject to the following conditions:

1. We were to have four months from date of completion of contract in which to float a company with necessary capital, and to carry through certain necessary arrangements. Should we, from any unforeseen cause, fail in doing so, we are to be at liberty to resign the contract without penalty.

Mr. FOSTER. Where was that dated?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is dated Montreal. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) quotes a conversation which Mr. Dunlop had with the high commissioner in England, which was never reduced to writing; and here we have a statement in black and white, three days after the despatch referred to by the hon. gentleman, in which they say that they adhere to that condition.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Mr. Dunlop was conducting the negotiations with Sir Donald Smith on behalf of the Allans, and it was this very portion of the contract which Mr. Dunlop was authorized to withdraw.

It being six o'clock, the committee took recess.

#### AFTER RECESS.

(The House resumed in Committee.)

A line or lines of steamers to run between St. John and Halifax, or either, and the West Indies and South America. \$80,700

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is a small increase here of \$2,700. That is due to the service being doubled, by agreement with the British government.

Steam communication during the season of 1900, that is, from the opening to the closing of navigation, between the mainland and the Magdalen Islands..... \$9,000

Mr. FOSTER. What vessel is carrying that out now?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. At present it is the *Amelia*. The one under contract last year was the *Lunenburg*, but the parties who were being served objected to her, and since that time the company purchased the *Amelia*. She is a steamboat built in 1894, and is larger than the *Lunenburg*, about the same size as the *St. Lawrence*. Mr. Lisley, of Halifax, is the owner.

Steam communication during the season of 1900, that is, from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Prince Edward Island and the mainland..... \$10,000

Mr. FOSTER. What vessel is doing this work?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The vessel that was doing it was the *Wanderer*, and we are making a bargain with Mr. Tatton, of the *Grand Manan*, to give us a little extra service. We are, at present, getting three trips, and we are to get four trips per week in the summer and

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

two in the winter. There will be a supplementary vote of \$1,000 for this vessel.

Steam communication from July 1, 1900, to June 30, 1901, between Quebec and Gaspé Basin, touching at intermediate ports ..... \$7,500

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What steamers are used, and who has the contract with the government?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The *Wanderer* is the name of the steamer now providing that service, her proprietor is Mr. Webster, of Quebec.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Is that the coal merchant?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I understand so.

Steam communication between a port or ports in Prince Edward Island and a port or ports in Great Britain ..... \$5,000

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Would the minister tell me what is being done with respect to steam communication between Prince Edward Island and Great Britain?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The last time we endeavoured to make arrangements with the Elder-Dempster Company to provide that service, but they only gave us one trip and only got paid for one trip. They have lately tendered for this service again, and the service is being performed by a gentleman named Hazard, of Prince Edward Island. He is giving one trip, and will give another on the 5th or 6th of this month. We hope to get one or two more in the course of the season.

Mr. MARTIN. How much is paid each trip?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It varies from \$1,500 to \$2,000 per trip.

Mr. MARTIN. How much was paid last year, all told?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. \$2,000 was paid to the Elder-Dempster Line.

Mr. MARTIN. That is all that is expended of the \$5,000?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, because this \$1,500 to pay Mr. Hazard will go into the \$5,000 that was voted for last year's service. The Elder-Dempster had promised to give us three trips, but for the reasons that interfered with their main mail service, they were only able to secure one vessel.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman knows that he can hardly take the present trip out of last year's vote.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The trip which was completed in the month of June came into last year's

service. The present trip, of course, will come under this year's service, that is to say, the vessel that will sail on July 6.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to call the attention of the minister to the great disadvantage under which the province of Prince Edward Island labours at present. A great deal of our produce has to go to Great Britain. In the first place in order to accomplish that the shipper has to go to a large expense to ship his produce in the first instance to Halifax, and in many cases the freight on these goods from Charlottetown to Halifax is 50 per cent of the freight from Halifax to Great Britain and probably more. It is very necessary, in view of the relative situation of that province with regard to the other provinces, that there should be a regular service on which shippers can depend. I notice in these estimates that almost every province in Canada has direct communication with Newfoundland—all the maritime provinces.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken: Nova Scotia is the only province that has such communication. There is none from New Brunswick to Newfoundland.

Mr. MARTIN. Halifax has such communication. There is hardly one of the lower provinces whose trade with Newfoundland is greater in the produce of the farm than Prince Edward Island. Our means of communication with Great Britain are so slight that it is very necessary for the government to take some steps to provide direct communication with Newfoundland, which is one of our best markets. The greatest part of our pork, butter, cheese, grains and cereals find a ready market in Newfoundland, but we have to ship our products by a roundabout way. If we ship by Cape Breton from the port of Sydney, there are a great many transshipments, and if we ship via Halifax, there are a great many transshipments. I think it is necessary, in the interest of that province, that there should be direct communication with Newfoundland. The hon. gentleman will notice the very small sums that are in these estimates for Prince Edward Island. There is here an item of only \$1,200 for steam communication between Pictou, Murray Harbour, Georgetown and Montague Bridge. That is a very important service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Look a little higher and you will see an item of \$10,000 which will really be \$12,000. I am afraid, for communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. MARTIN. I am not a bit sorry if it will be \$12,000. If it is \$12,000 it is because the company which is performing that service is doing it in a way which can hardly be overrated. The hon. gentleman knows that this service is provided for by the

terms of union with Prince Edward Island and Canada cannot shirk it. As I was saying the service between Pictou, Murray Harbour, Georgetown and Montague Bridge is a very important one indeed. It not only takes in these points but it takes in Charlottetown, the capital of the province, and if my memory serves me right, Yarmouth and Nova Scotia. The company is not a strong one, and an additional subsidy would enable it to place a large boat on those routes, and it may be possible, if the company receives a sufficient subsidy, to make the route include Newfoundland. When you look over the estimates, totalling \$724,000, you will agree that it would not be too much that the province of Prince Edward Island should have \$7,000 or \$8,000 more out of that amount. I hope the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce will take these matters into his serious consideration. The small subsidy given to this company is much the smallest on the list.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am doing a little better for Prince Edward Island than was done before. I have put in this \$5,000 which is for the island.

Mr. MARTIN. I hope it will be expended this year. It was placed in the estimates last year and it was not expended.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not at all; most of it was.

Mr. MARTIN. I think even if the whole of it was expended it would be a very small grant for communication with Great Britain.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say, in reply to the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Macdonald) who introduced the subject, that very special efforts were made by myself this year to have one of the larger steamship companies supply a service between Prince Edward Island and Great Britain for this subsidy. I went to Montreal and conversed with Mr. Campbell, of the Elder-Dempster Line at great length. We discussed the possibilities and prospects of the traffic and he came to the island and saw some of our leading merchants on the subject. He thought that if we made Chatham, N.B., one of the ports of call in addition to Charlottetown that he would be able to induce his company to build a boat specially for the purpose, and I gave him the assurance, after conversing with the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, that if he could get his company to build a boat and give a regular service the government would be disposed to go a little further than this amount in the estimates now. The company were kind enough to say that they would send him home to England to consult with the directors at the head office. I have had a number of communications from him since he saw the directors of

his company and I was in hopes that he would be able to induce them to build a boat specially for the purpose, but, he intimated that they were unable just now to do so, because so many of their boats had been drawn off to South Africa and they were not in a position to establish this service at present. However, he held out hopes that they might do so in the future. I corresponded specially with the Allans, who, I hoped, would tender, but they did not see their way to do it, although, at first they thought they would be able to have one of their steamers that leaves Quebec and makes five trips in the season call at the island. But, after having thought the matter over they determined not to tender. There was hardly a steamship company that might possibly tender that I did not communicate with and I hope, when the steamers which have been called off to South Africa return, we will be able to get one of the great companies to tender for a reasonable sum to carry on a stated and fixed service between the island and Great Britain, making at least five trips in the year. That is the impression which my correspondence and conversation with the Elder-Deupster people gave me as to what will be the result. Although we are only for this present season getting two trips, we hope to get two more in the autumn, which, I suppose will use up the \$5,000 now being voted.

Mr. MARTIN. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has given this subject his attention, but I am very sorry that his efforts have not been very successful. The province of Prince Edward Island has been leaning on a broken reed for two years. There were a great many promises made, but they have not been very well fulfilled. The hon. gentleman's hopes are bright for the future, and I trust, in the interest of the people of Prince Edward Island, that his expectations will be realized. Last year the hon. gentleman professed to be very anxious to see this service established. He might have seen that tenders were not called for before the 1st of June, the very day in which the service was to begin. The service was to begin in June, and tenders were called for in June. The farmers of Prince Edward Island had prepared their freight for the old country and they were very much disappointed. When they expected the steamers the tenders were called for. Of course, I am very much gratified that the hon. minister has given his attention to the subject, but I am very sorry that he has not had better results from his efforts. I hope that the bright dream he has for the future will be realized for the sake of the people of Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Fortunately the hon. gentleman is about the only disappointed one. The people of Prince Edward Island are pretty well satisfied with what has been done.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

Direct fortnightly steam service between Montreal, Quebec and Manchester, England, during the summer season, and between St. John, Halifax and Manchester during the winter season. \$38,933 33

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to have a good explanation of this vote.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This has been done by the Manchester Liners, Limited. They agreed to give us a fortnightly service, and the steamers, as soon as they can construct them, are to be of 8,500 tons dead weight; able to carry 650 head of cattle, and to be fitted with cold storage. The service the first year was not as satisfactory as the contract called for, and the subsidy was reduced by one-third. Last year they have done considerably better. They have given us more trips than they agreed to, although all the vessels have not been quite up to the contract mark. Our reports go to show that the introduction into Manchester of goods direct from Canada, has been on the whole, very advantageous, and likely to add considerably to our trade with England.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman any statistics of that trade?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is almost impossible to discriminate between goods of Canadian produce and goods of American origin which are brought into Montreal. But we know that a very large quantity of Canadian produce has been shipped, and I am in considerable hopes that we will establish our hold firmly in Manchester. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows, Manchester is the centre of the largest consuming population in England. There is within a radius of twenty or thirty miles of that city, a population amounting to—I am almost afraid to mention it—amounting to between 7,000,000 and 8,000,000. It is an extremely densely peopled region. The corporation of Manchester are, I believe, interested in this line of steamers, and they sent a special deputation to us. They erected, at great cost, very excellent cold storage warehouses, into which these steamers unload directly, and which is not provided at any other port, except perhaps London. I am told by the deputy minister, that Manchester is better in this respect than any other port in England, although they have somewhat similar warehouses in London. This cold storage accommodation is of great advantage to our products. I may mention that the contract expires this year, and we are not, of course, obliged to renew it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is on that point I wish to speak. The hon. gentleman knows that when he gave a contract to a line of freight steamers out of Montreal, he was aiding them in competing with numerous lines which have been trading with the port of Montreal for many years, and which have never received any subsidies. This is ex-

clusively a freight line. I, for my part, raise no very strong objection to this at the outset, because I think that the introduction into Manchester itself of vessels plying direct from Montreal, was worth the expenditure of a certain amount of money. But it is a grave question as to how long that invidious subsidy, so to speak, should be given to one freight line plying to one particular port. The hon. gentleman would be well advised, if he would make this self-sustaining as soon as possible, and not continue the subsidy longer than he can help. If the Manchester Ship Canal, and the approaches to it from the mouth of the Mersey, turn out to be successful, as I am advised will be the case, and when the initial difficulties in the way have been overcome; other lines of steamers would use that route, and it would be necessary for the minister either to provide a subsidy, or to give up the idea of subsidizing one particular line.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. There is much force in what the hon. gentleman has said, and it shall receive due consideration. *Prima facie* he is right, but we must remember that Manchester is a very valuable point of distribution for Canadian produce.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Yes, and for a little time I am not adverse to a subsidy being given. We are too late in the session to do what we ought to do, namely, to have a conversation extending over, at least, two days, on this whole subsidy business in regard to steamships. The time has come when we ought to require each year from the Minister of Trade and Commerce a pretty full statement, as to what these subsidized lines are really carrying, as to whether they are simply sentimental subsidies, or a real benefit to trade, and whether or not that trade is growing. We have all along rather dodged that issue—probably the old government as assiduously as the present one—but the little talk we have had to-day, tells this House how little we really know as to whether these lines are carrying what they ought for the subsidies or not. We are spending three quarters of a million dollars a year for this purpose, and it is a large amount of money.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. No doubt.

Mr. **FOSTER**. If there is an election next year, I will not say much about it, but if there be no election, and the present government continue in power, we ought to take up these steamship subsidies a little earlier in the session, and to go over the whole question for the past eight or ten years. I think the deputy minister might be assigned a little duty with regard to making up a tabulation of the facts, so that we shall have these statistics on hand. It is business foolishness to be giving three-quarters of a million dollars, and not knowing whether these

Mr. **FOSTER**.

lines are nearing the self-sustaining point or not.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. In practice, the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is carried out, but we have not brought down these minute details, it not being the habit to inquire for them. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is well deserving consideration. I shall not object to it, for my part. As the hon. gentleman remarks, just before an election is not a very convenient time for him or for me to discuss this, but I do not, in the least, object to his cross-questioning on any of these subsidies.

Mr. **FOSTER**. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), is in very good humour now, and I ask him to make a promise, which he will carry out as nearly and as promises can be carried out, that if he is in office next year, he will bring these estimates down at an earlier period of the session?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I have been ready and willing for a long time.

To promote direct communication and trade between Canada and South Africa..... \$5,000

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. This was not used last year for obvious reasons. We could not get hold of any vessel while this war was going on, but I thought it as well to keep the vote in the estimates, because I am engaged, at the present time in making inquiries as to what can be done in the way of promoting trade with South Africa. When things resume a proper condition there, and when better laws, I hope, will be in force in the great mining regions, I do not at all despair of opening up a very tolerable trade with South Africa, although, as the hon. gentleman knows, in some respects the Australians have rather the pull upon us. They communicate a good deal more easily than we do with South Africa, and we must send a good deal of our trade, I fancy, through New York. At best, it will be a difficult matter to develop, on this side of the continent, at any rate, a large direct steamship trade with South Africa, unless we are prepared to subsidize pretty heavily. On the other hand, we may do something from the Pacific coast by and by. At the same time, we are endeavouring to collect all the information we can on that subject, and I hope we may be able to develop some considerable trade. Perhaps some of our returning friends from South Africa will be able to give us some useful information on the subject.

Mr. **KAULBACH**. Would a steamship in that trade be required to go direct to Cape Town, or would it call at the Gold coast, and would it be permitted to go around the Cape of Good Hope to the east coast?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. So far as my present information goes, I do not think it would be possible to call at the Gold coast. Of course, the hon. gentleman will see that this is a merely experimental vote. The utmost that could be done with \$5,000 would be to get a single vessel chartered. I apprehend that it could call at one or two points on the west coast of South Africa, go to Cape Town, and possibly around to Durban.

Mr. **KAULBACH**. Has the minister decided on the Canadian port of departure?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. At present, I think, Montreal.

Mr. **KAULBACH**. That would only do in the summer time. Halifax would be a better port and less costly.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. As we could only employ one boat, it would probably sail during the summer time.

Mr. **BERGERON**. In these different votes for services between Montreal and the old country, I do not see anything for the French line.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. That is authorized by statute.

Mr. **BERGERON**. The statute is there, but I do not think it amounts to anything. There is a new French line plying between Montreal and Havre, which I understand does not get any subsidy at all. I see a vote of \$38,000 for a fortnightly service between Montreal, Quebec and Manchester. We always vote these sums of money for steamship services with great facility, because it is in the interest of Canada to encourage trade between this country and the old country; and I do not see why a French line plying between Montreal and Havre should not be encouraged in the same way, as it promotes trade between France and Canada. I am sorry that there is nothing here for the line that is operating to-day.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. If I am correctly informed, the vessels the hon. gentleman speaks of are French vessels with a French register and flying the French flag.

Mr. **BERGERON**. It is a French line, but a good many Canadians are partners in the company.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I doubt that it would be consistent with public policy to subsidize any foreign line. If, for hypothesis sake, the line were half registered, in Canada and half registered in France, and the French government were subsidizing as well as our own, it might be a fair subject for consideration; but the hon. gentleman could hardly expect us to subsidize a line of ships belonging to a foreign country which

Mr. **KAULBACH**.

might be taken up by the government of that country for its own purposes.

Mr. **BERGERON**. The Bossière Line which was subsidized by the Conservative government was entirely a French line.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I do not think anything was paid for that line.

Mr. **BERGERON**. That was a French line flying the French flag. I do not think you could get a Canadian line to undertake that service; you must have a line from the other side.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said there was a line under the statute, but he did not help the statute by putting anything in the estimates for that line. I am quite certain that if the Minister of Public Works were in Canada to-day, he would appeal to his colleagues to grant some money for a line between Canada and France, or else, owing to the success he has achieved in France, he might not require any money from Canada, but might have got it all in Paris. The Bossière Line was subsidized by the late government to the extent of \$50,000 a year up to the time it gave up the service.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. I think the hon. gentleman is in error in supposing that any money was paid.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Oh, no; money was paid.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. I am quite certain money was paid, though to what amount I am not prepared to say without consulting the records. Irrespective of any other consideration than the advancement of trade between Canada and any other country with which trade can be advanced, I think it is quite right for us to ask for some money to encourage a line of steamships between Canada and France, because of the commercial relations which exist between the two countries. I think it would be fair not only to leave the French line upon the statute-book, where it is quite inoperative, but to add to the statute subsidy that would promote the commercial relations between Canada and France. I think that if the hon. Minister of Public Works were present now, he would urge that on the consideration of his colleagues on the Treasury benches.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Well, the matter might be considered.

Steam communication during the season of 1900, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, and one trip each fortnight to Big Pond and East Bay..... \$4,000

Mr. **McDOUGALL**. I may say that the service is performed now twice a day.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I move to amend that by striking out the word 'daily.' As a matter of fact we have better than a daily service.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Do I understand from the hon. minister that he strikes out 'daily' without putting anything in its place. I may say that the service is performed now twice a day, from about the 1st of June until about the 1st of November, and once a day from the 1st of May to the 1st of June and from the 1st of November until the close of navigation.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The reason that I omit the word 'daily' is this. Occasionally it is absolutely impossible for them to perform daily service. The boat must be overhauled occasionally and lie off. If we put in the word 'daily', the Auditor General would probably rule that unless we can show that the work was performed every day, he will not pay, and he would be right, according to the strict construction of the vote. But it is not unreasonable that the boat should be allowed to be inspected and overhauled.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not think that that is sufficient reason for dropping the provision for a certain number of daily trips. I happened to be there when the boat was last inspected, and there was a great deal of complaint on the part of the passengers coming and going by train to connect with that boat. It was on the Queen's Birthday when a great many people were travelling on excursion rates by train, and they came to that point with the view of making a trip to Beddeck and returning in the evening. Coming from Sydney to Grand Narrows, they found the boat tied to the wharf by order of the inspectors of boilers and hulls. The people complained of not having been notified of the fact that the boat was not going to perform her regular trip that day. The captain could not help it, but I considered it very wrong on the part of the officials of the department to have the boat tied up on that day, when they knew that the public wanted to take advantage of the round trip by boat and train, and on a public holiday. All that the captain could say was that he could not help it. The very same day, the inspection was going on at the other points. Those inspectors, for their own convenience, selected this day at different points, and the owners of this boat could not get one of the other boats to perform the service. Had the inspectors arranged the matter a little better for the convenience of the public, this difficulty might have been avoided. The department should see that the boat is inspected at a suitable time so as not to interfere with its connections with the railway, which could very easily be managed.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will make a special note of the hon. gentleman's complaint. He is quite right. It showed great carelessness and indifference to the public convenience to select that particular day.

Mr. McDOUGALL. In the next place, I find that only one trip a fortnight shall be performed to Big Pond and East Bay. Big Pond is a place about ten miles from the railway terminus at Grand Narrows, and East Bay is about twenty miles distant. We had usually two trips a week from the boats running on the lakes there up to last year, or year before, and I cannot understand why this reduction has taken place. The people of Big Pond, in order to get to the railway, must either go to Sydney, a distance of about thirty miles, or take this boat. That is the nearest railway to them overland, and the nearest by water is at Grand Narrows, about ten miles. The people of East Bay are certainly within fourteen miles of the town of Sydney, where they can connect with a railway, but yet it is a round-about way for those people who have to drive to Sydney and then travel back by railway, whereas they were in the habit of getting communication with St. Peter's and Grand Narrows by line of steamers. There is no steamer between St. Peter's and East Bay except this fortnightly service, which is practically no good at all to them. The people are coming and going by train every day, and there is only one day in the two weeks when they can get across the lake. On the other side, a boat comes from Mulgrave by St. Peter's Canal down the lakes and calls at Marble Mountain and on the opposite side at Irish Cove, and provides that service twice a week. That is quite proper, but I cannot see why the south side—Big Pond and East Bay—and East Bay north side should not enjoy the same convenience. The people of Marble Mountain are twelve or fifteen miles from a railway, but the people of Big Pond are thirty miles from the nearest railway point, except by water to Grand Narrows. I would like if the hon. gentleman would make that service at least once a week, if not twice a week, as it used to be years ago.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I cannot pretend to possess the local knowledge which the hon. gentleman does. We have endeavoured to arrange this so as to give the best service possible. I cannot always compel the steamers to give all the service everybody would desire over those routes. They seem to be giving a considerable amount of service for the amount of subsidy granted, and I was in hopes this would have satisfied the people along the region referred to. I am informed that the amount of traffic at this point is very small.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes, because the trips are so seldom.

Steam communication daily during the season of 1900, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Port Mulgrave and St. Peter's, to extend twice each week to Irish Cove and Marble Mountain ..... \$4,000

Mr. GILLIES. At what date did this service begin this season.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The contract provides that it shall begin on the opening of navigation. I believe it began about the middle of April this year.

Mr. GILLIES. I will not trouble the minister, as he does not seem to have the information at hand. But, I can tell him that it was unusually late in commencing this season.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) remember when it commenced?

Mr. GILLIES. It commenced some time in June, although navigation commenced unusually early this year.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Is the hon. gentleman quite certain he is correct, because I am informed quite differently?

Mr. GILLIES. Quite certain. I understood from some of the people connected with the steamer that the delay arose from the small amount of the subsidy given by the government, \$4,000. They wanted their subsidy increased; and I see in the supplementary estimates a vote of \$1,000 for this service, which goes to show that this was clearly the cause of the delay. I wish to bring to the minister's notice the fact that this is a very important service, as these services go, and that the steamer running on this route accommodates a large number of people and a large section of territory. It is a very excellent service, the minister will be glad to know, the steamer running very regularly. But, I would ask, for the convenience of the people, that they should not be subjected next year to the delay in the commencement of the service which took place this year.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I increased this once, and I am increasing it again in order to endeavour to accommodate the people and give them a better service. It was \$7,000 for these two services, and it is now \$8,000, and there is a further supplementary vote.

Mr. GILLIES. No, I am afraid the hon. minister is mixing them up a little. The service for which \$7,000 was paid was from Port Mulgrave to St. Peter's and down to East Bay. But, at the completion of the railway, the late government thought it was not necessary that the steamer should run daily to East Bay, but should run daily to St. Peter's and three times a week down the lake, and the subsidy was lowered to

Mr. McDOUGALL.

\$5,000, under the administration of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). By the hon. minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) the subsidy was reduced to \$4,000. But the steamer refused to perform the service for that amount, consequently, this difficulty arose, and the hon. minister found it necessary to provide \$1,000 additional. I am drawing the minister's attention to the matter, so that the inconvenience suffered by the people this year in consequence of the refusal of the government to grant this small sum of \$1,000 should not be allowed to occur this year, because the time of the year when this service is the most required is during the months of April and May, when the travel by road is bad, and connection with the railway, for that reason, difficult to make.

Mr. ANGUS McLENNAN (Inverness). With regard to the refusal on the part of this company to start the service earlier in the season, this arose, as the hon. member from Richmond (Mr. Gillies) said, from the fact that they insisted that the subsidy was insufficient to enable them to perform the service of semi-weekly trips from the Strait of Canso to Marble Mountain. I may say that, for my part, I impressed upon the minister the necessity and the urgency of providing a service for the people of Marble Mountain, in view of the very extensive works, lime and marble works, that are going on there, and the rapidly growing population. I insisted, therefore, that the boat should perform a semi-weekly service between the Strait of Canso, Port Mulgrave and Marble Mountain. I may also say that members of the company offered to run once a week to Irish Cove in the constituency of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) and once a week to Marble Mountain, in the constituency I have the honour to represent. I protested against this and appealed to the minister to grant this \$1,000 in addition to enable the company to serve the two counties in the way indicated. This having now been granted will secure a semi-weekly service. I may say that this is a very important service to both counties, much more so, indeed, than the service in the sparsely-settled district of East Bay or Big Pond, on the eastern end of the lake. The fortnightly service would certainly be calculated to suffice for all the traffic that could be expected in that quarter, whereas, in the instances I have just cited, a semi-weekly service is urgently necessary. I make this explanation in order to show that the minister yielded the grant of \$1,000 in order to meet the additional requirements of the county of Inverness.

Steam communication during the season of 1900, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation between Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, and the continuation of service after close of navigation at Dalhousie to December 31, 1900 between New Carlisle and Gaspé Basin.. \$12,500

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Has there been any change in this line of communication? And what steamer is carrying on the service and who are the owners?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The steamer is the *Admiral*, owned by the North American Transportation Company. They have to make sixty full round trips between Dalhousie and Gaspé Basin, and, after the close of navigation, the contractors agree to continue the service between New Carlisle and Gaspé Basin to December 31.

Steam communication from April 1, 1900, to March 31, 1901, daily between Port Mulgrave, Arichat and Canso; three times a week between Port Mulgrave and Guysborough; and from the opening to the close of navigation in 1900 twice a week between Port Mulgrave and Port Hood, such trips to be extended once a week to Margaree and Cheticamp..... \$8,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I move to strike out the word 'daily.'

Mr. GILLIES. If the hon. minister strikes out the word 'daily' from these votes, what control has he over the service? If you strike out the word 'daily,' then how can you compel them to perform a daily service?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman is aware that as a rule they do give a daily service, but we do not propose to compel them to do it. It is represented to us that, practically speaking, during a great portion of the year, four times would be sufficient. The objection my hon. friend raises might be overcome by putting in the words 'not less than four times a week.'

Mr. GILLIES. That would be satisfactory, because it would simply mean four times a week if not a daily service. But I would advise the minister to leave the word 'daily' there and hold them up to their contract. If you leave out the word 'daily' and substitute another word, you will have no end of trouble.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If my hon. friend prefers 'daily,' we will leave that in.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the same objection apply to the preceding votes? Suppose you strike out the word 'daily' in these other votes, what is the House to understand they are getting?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In the other cases they are getting more than a daily service, in some places they are getting twice a day. One reason for striking it out is that I have mentioned, occasionally an inspection takes place, when they cannot run.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I suggest that the word 'daily' remain there, and stipu-

late that they may have a day off for repairs or for any other necessary purpose. But does it not strike my hon. friend that in leaving out the word 'daily' he is losing control over his contract?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not propose to lose control in any contract. The fact is that this was done chiefly in deference to the somewhat stringent rules of interpretation which are affixed to these votes by my esteemed friend the Auditor General in so comparatively small a matter as the question of inspection for one day, he has occasionally raised the point that this vote must be construed to the extremest letter of the law. That is the reason why I was disposed to modify it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has the minister struck out the word 'daily' for that vote between Baddeck and Grand Narrows?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, the word 'daily' is struck out. We just leave the steam communication as per contract.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am sure that will lead to serious difficulties.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think not, the contract itself provides for the number of trips. I am simply taking a precaution against what is perhaps a little strained construction enforced on us by the Auditor General.

Mr. McDOUGALL. At this point at Grand Narrows, and at Iona, there are six trains leaving daily with passengers, and two trips a day would only connect with two of those six trains; so the minister will see the importance of making it at least two trips a day. I hope the company will not take any advantage of the minister under our vote in the estimates. If it were possible, I would like to have three trips a day at least, in order to accommodate the travelling public.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As a matter of fact I am advised that the contract does provide for two trips per day.

Steam communication between Halifax, N.S., and the Island of Porto Rico ..... \$8,000

Mr. FOSTER. What has been done there?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. James T. Hamilton, of the city of Halifax, has contracted for eight trips, one sailing in each month, beginning with October, between the port of Halifax and Porto Rico, with the steamer *Tyrian*.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). Mr. Chairman, while I am very anxious indeed, to encourage trade between the port of Halifax, N.S., and Porto Rico, I want the House and the country to understand that this vote is not in the interest of the people of the county I represent, as an immense amount of capital is invested by them in a

fleet of sailing vessels, and in view of this, by the government aiding a steamer with a subsidy, such as this is intended to do, to provide a service between Halifax and Porto Rico, it is depriving a large number of seamen and master mariners of the profits which should legitimately flow from their calling, were this subsidy not granted. By this means the government are not only interfering with the shippers of fish and other products, but they are depriving them of a profitable market, for the reasons I stated some years ago, when a subsidy of this kind was brought up in this House of a similar character. When the people of Porto Rico, and the other parts of the West India Islands, learned by cable, of a steamer having left Halifax for a given port, intending purchasers will not buy anything during the time that the steamer being on her voyage between Halifax and her port of destination, expecting to be supplied from the steamer's cargo. Any of the cargoes that might arrive in sailing vessels in the meantime, previous to steamer's arrival, would have to wait the arrival of the steamer to see what the prices might be. Fish are oftentimes slaughtered on the market in Porto Rico when large steamer cargoes arrive, thereby shippers of fish by sailing vessels are prevented from getting fair prices for this article. I am sorry that I have to repeat what I said some years ago, and I think that I have named it each time that an item of this kind has appeared in the estimates, that this subsidy is not in the interest of the county I represent, because we have a very large fleet of vessels, I might say, correctly, as many vessels as there are in the remainder of the province, taking into consideration, the increase in number that we had during the last few years. It will be remembered that previous to the Island of Porto Rico being ceded to the United States, I had correspondence with the Canadian government urging that they ask the British government that they approach the American government with a view of their being allowed only to take over the Island of Porto Rico with the understanding between Great Britain and the United States, that all articles of shipment from British ports to the Island of Porto Rico would be entered on the same terms as articles going from the United States. Although that appeal was made in the most earnest manner on behalf of the shipping interests of Canada, nothing was done. I also then urged that they should see that the coastal trade done between Porto Rico and the maritime provinces, via part of the United States, should not be interfered with, but no recognition—whether it was neglect or otherwise—was given to my appeals, and as a result we in Nova Scotia have been suffering: because of our vessels, going to Porto Rico, being compelled in many cases to return in ballast for want of a return cargo, which they would not infre-

quently have from Porto Rico to an intermediate port in the United States before that island was ceded to them. These circumstances have so materially affected the trade in fish that in many cases parties engaged in the trade with Porto Rico have been obliged to divert trade channels or give it up entirely. This condition of affairs not only affects the trade of our port, but affects mechanical labour as well, because, when trade with Porto Rico is injured, we find the shipbuilding industry is in a measure crippled, and fewer vessels built, which discourages the mechanics, because the shipbuilder employs a less number of blacksmiths, sailmakers, caulkers, carpenters, painters, &c., and thereby deprives the master mariner, fishermen and sailors of their living in consequence of the unfair position the government assume in offering a subsidy such as this trade for steamship communication between Halifax and Porto Rico. Porto Rico trade is of greater importance to our fleet of sailing vessels than any other island with which steam communication is established. I objected when communication with Jamaica and other islands was provided for by government subsidy, but no attention was paid to my protest. I would ask the government to consider this matter carefully and to view it in the sense that I have tried to convey my views to the House, and if they do so, I feel satisfied that they will agree that this subsidy had better be withdrawn in the interest of the province as a whole. It may be in the interest of Halifax, but it certainly will not be in the interest of the county I represent. I particularly urge upon the government to see if some arrangement cannot be made, whereby the coastal trade is not interfered with, so that our fleet may engage in that trade in future, as it has done in the past. I believe that if the American government were approached in a proper spirit, by the Imperial government, upon advice from this government, our wishes in this respect would meet with recognition to a very great extent. When I state to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, that on each quintal of fish, the loss is so great, that it amounts in cases to thousands of dollars in one ordinary shipment, he will see that it is a matter of great importance to us, and that this item is really an injury instead of benefit to my port, as it interferes materially with the employment of our sailing fleet. While I am anxious to see the port of Halifax benefit in every way possible by trade communication between it and West India ports by this proposed steamer subsidy, still, West Indian merchants and shipowners of Lunenburg County are materially interfered with, and in consequence, I would ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to view the matter carefully and withdraw this item.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In respect to striking out the

subsidy, I am not able to say to the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) that I will venture to do that. In respect to the other point that he has named, which is of very great importance to Nova Scotia and to the maritime provinces generally, of obtaining the same privileges of trade with Porto Rico that were possessed prior to its acquisition by the United States, I can only assure him that over and over and over again that matter has been pressed by us on the consideration of the British government; and the British government—both through their ambassador at Washington and through the direct intervention of Lord Salisbury, the Prime Minister—have been using every possible exertion to induce the Americans to make those concessions. How far they may ultimately succeed it is difficult to say. The Americans treat Porto Rico as an absolute conquest, and apparently are not disposed to extend any particular consideration to other countries in their dealing with it. Nevertheless, the matter has been strongly put before the attention of the United States cabinet, and the Congress too, for that matter, and it may be that we may be able to obtain such concessions as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) desires. He will note that this is entirely within the power of the people of the United States. They now absolutely own Porto Rico, and they are in a position to do with it as they see fit. The only way in which we can appeal to them, is in view of the good-will which they profess to maintain towards the British Empire, and the well-known fact that the British government was, to say the least of it, friendly neutral during the Spanish war which resulted in the acquisition of that island. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) that every possible exertion has been used by us and by the British government to endeavour to get the Americans to take a liberal view in this matter.

Mr. KAULBACH. We have a strong argument in favour of our trade between the British possessions and Porto Rico, in view of the fact that when the war broke out between Spain and the United States the policy as laid down by the United States, was that they were only seeking the independence of Cuba. But they went beyond that and interfered with the Island of Porto Rico which was at that time a law-abiding and peaceful population, and who were in no way aggressive towards their motherland, Spain, or towards any other country. The United States instead of confining their operations or hostilities strictly to Cuba, planted their flag in Porto Rico, and not only that, but they went to the Philippines and sought to obtain territory there as well. As a matter of fact Cuba is to-day in no better position than she was under Spanish rule. I think this government should approach the Imperial

government and place before it the conditions under which Porto Rico was taken over by the United States, and impress on the latter country that as England did not interfere at the time with the United States, the United States should now be sufficiently conciliatory to have the trade between Porto Rico and the British possessions placed upon a similar basis as that of the trade of the United States.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. All that was very strongly presented over and over again.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand that at present no Canadian vessel can take cargo between the United States and Porto Rico?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am afraid that is true.

Mr. FOSTER. What tariff do we meet with in Porto Rico as compared with the United States?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I believe the United States have only exacted 15 per cent of their general tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. At one time it was settled at 25 per cent.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There was a compromise made, and I believe it is now 15 per cent. What I understand the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) to refer to is, that formerly you could send a ship from any part of the maritime provinces to Porto Rico, discharge her cargo, go to any American port and then go back. Under the operation of the American coasting laws at present that cannot be done, and it was very hard lines indeed on the maritime provinces and on British commerce generally, that the result of their friendly neutrality should be to deprive them of the valuable trade which they formerly enjoyed. We lost no time in calling the attention of the British government to that in every possible way, through Lord Herschell, through Lord Pauncefoot, and direct to the home authorities. To do them justice I have every reason to believe that they used their utmost exertions to retain for us the trade privileges which we have heretofore enjoyed. Up to the present date, although they had some little encouragement, they have succeeded in obtaining no concession, except professions of friendship which do not weigh so much in these matters.

Mr. FOSTER. I should not think there is the least hope of obtaining any concessions. If the United States propose to treat Porto Rico as part of the United States territory, which appears to be their present policy they will not give up the coasting privilege.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am afraid not.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the hon. gentleman to look into the question as to whether we do not pay the full United States duty in Porto Rico, and as to whether it is not the United States people who get their goods in at 15 per cent of the United States tariff?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They were desirous of conciliating the people of Porto Rico, who objected to paying the United States duty, and I think the 15 per cent applies to every one. However, I shall look into the matter and obtain the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KAULBACH. Strange to say, the Island of Porto Rico takes nearly the whole of our catch of fish. I should think they take fully 80 per cent of all the fish caught, in Nova Scotia, whilst the remainder of the Archipelago, foreign as well as British, take but 20 per cent. That will prove to the minister the great disadvantage that our shippers are labouring under by the existing state of affairs. It represents a difference of about 60 cents per quintal which on a cargo, amounts to a very great deal. If we are going in any way to be relieved of that burden, the thanks of those interested in the trade and their blessings as well, will go to the government for a long period of time if they can restore to Nova Scotia the trade she previously enjoyed with Porto Rico.

Mr. FOSTER. The government need the blessing anyway.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I entirely appreciate the truth of what the hon. gentleman has stated. The matter is of great importance, I know, to the maritime provinces, and it was one of those matters which received our best attention during the rather protracted stay we were obliged to make at Washington about a year and a half ago. It was not owing to any lack of diligence on our part in pressing it upon the British government, and I do not think it will be from any lack of diligence on the part of the British government if we fail in getting what we desire.

Steam communication between Murray Bay and River Ouelle ..... \$5,000

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have the particulars of this.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Tenders were asked for this service last year; and we received three replies, but the boats offered were not suitable for the service. Arrangements were made with J. C. Kane, of Quebec, to commence the service next winter with a boat specially built for it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Who were the other tenderers?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will get them for the hon. gentleman if he wishes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

High Commissioner's Office—Contingencies \$10,600

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a decrease of \$1,100 due to the fact that the house formerly occupied by the high commissioner has been sold, so that the taxes hitherto charged upon it will not have to be paid. The present high commissioner has never occupied it.

Mr. TAYLOR. What became of the money?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it found its way to the Receiver General.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was received for it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the information, but I will get it for a later stage.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It was sold for about half what it cost.

Contingent expenses in connection with the voters' lists ..... \$32,500

Mr. McDOUGALL. When may we expect the voters' lists to be printed which have been delivered to the Printing Bureau or to the proper officer here some months ago? The Cape Breton voters' list, which was sent here last May, is not printed yet.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the voters' lists of last year were duly printed.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What does my hon. friend call the last list?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What particular list does my hon. friend refer to?

Mr. McDOUGALL. The list of Cape Breton County prepared between last December and January. The final revision took place some time early in April or late in March. The lists were sent up early in May. I went to the Printing Bureau some days ago and nothing was done towards printing them, and could get no information as to when they would be printed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Those are the lists of the present year. During the session the Printing Bureau is exceedingly busy, and so far has not been able to attend to the printing of the lists. Immediately after the session, the printing of the lists will be their first work.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is another difficulty that I learned on that day, and that is with regard to the old lists. The price of the list is kept up at the same rate, up to the very time when the new lists are printed, and whatever then remains on hand of the old lists is burnt or destroyed after the new ones are published. Would it not be better, when the time has arrived for the printing of the new lists, to sell the old ones at reduced price rather than destroy them. Take my own case. I want the

latest list, and when I cannot get the new lists I shall be glad to get the old ones, but they are not of the same value; and if the new list costs \$2, the old one should be sold at half that price. It would be in the interests of the Bureau to take a lower price for the old list rather than destroy them.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I shall call the attention of the Secretary of State to the matter. The point is new to me.

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. The lists should have been published long before this. Take the county of Three Rivers and St. Maurice, the lists have not been set up yet. Suppose we had an election there, I should have to go out and apply to the local people in the district to get my lists and pay extra money for them. There is really no reason why these lists should not have been printed and delivered long before this time. The hon. gentleman says that during the session the Printing Bureau is very busy, but one of the first necessities is to give to the people of Canada the lists upon which they should be called on to vote. I have never heard any explanation that was satisfactory why these lists should not have been printed long ago and delivered, as they should have been, under the law.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I am desirous to help on these lists and will make it my business to inquire and ascertain how quickly the printing can be expedited.

Mr. **SPROULE**. It is becoming rather a chronic farce—this inquiry about the lists and the little information given. We have been assured for the last four months that these lists would be printed and sent out as fast as the Bureau could supply them, but I do not know of one list that has been sent out to our part of the country. In a short time, the new lists will be revised. They commence revising them in August in our county, and shortly after that they will be available. But we have not the old ones. We are told that they are going to be printed. Is that the fact or is there an understanding that they are not to be printed? The latter is the only conclusion I can come to. All during the session we have been making inquiries about the lists and have been told that they are in the hands of the Queen's Printer, but so far as we can learn there is no intention of having them sent out. If there was, surely they ought to be out before this. It is a matter of great importance, during the session, that we should have them, if for no other purpose than for the purpose of mailing political matter to the electors, because they give the post office addresses and the names. We ought to have some more information.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Although we will let this item go through, I think the Minister of Finance had better ask the Prime Minister to make us a pretty full statement with reference to the present state of the voters'

list and give the information whether the government propose to send us to the electorate before all the lists are printed or not.

Mr. **WILSON**. The voters' list for Lennox County were sent in on January 18, and those for East Northumberland were sent in on the same day. Mr. Cochrane has had his list for more than a month and I have not had mine yet.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The lists were printed last year.

Mr. **WILSON**. I got none last year.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The lists were printed last year in my own province.

Mr. **SPROLUE**. In our part of the country they were not. In my own riding and in East and North Grey and Cardwell and Wellington, there were no lists, so far as I have heard, printed last year. How is it they were printed for the hon. gentleman's province and not for others?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The lists are furnished at different times and do not come in together.

Mr. **SPROULE**. But we have not had any lists at all. The last revised lists were sent in six months ago.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I will endeavour to get the information.

Yukon Territory—Miscellaneous.

To pay Canadian Bank of Commerce for services in handling and shipping gold dust from Dawson—

4 per cent (including insurance at 1½ per cent, freight at 1½ per cent, convoy and all other charges connected therewith of ½ of 1 per cent) on \$533,695.44, to June 1, 1899.....	\$21,347 80
2 per cent commission on drafts issued free of charge to miners at Dawson, to June 1, 1899.....	4,285 96
1½ per cent on revenue collections, \$664,274.83, to September 30, 1898....	9,964 10
1½ per cent on cash payments, \$252,555.51, at Dawson, to September 30, 1898 .....	3,788 33
2 per cent on drafts of the Northwest Mounted Police .....	3,931 95
2 per cent on drafts of the Department of Militia and Defence.....	979 78
3 per cent (less 2½ per cent for disbursements and insurance) on \$468,382, from June 1 to October 31, 1899 .....	3,512 87
1½ per cent commission on revenue issued free of charge to miners, from June 1 to October 31, 1899....	10,971 82
1½ per cent commission on revenue collections of \$2,140,003.83, from October 1, 1898, to April 30, 1900....	26,750 00
1½ per cent on cash payments of \$425,531.84, from October 1, 1898, to April 30, 1900 .....	5,319 14

To pay Bank of British North America—

2 per cent commission on drafts issued free of charge to miners at Dawson, to June 1, 1899.....	4,589 85
---	----------

1½ per cent commission on drafts issued free of charge to miners at Dawson from June 1 to September 30, 1899.....	\$4,981 25
	\$100,422 85

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item is set forth with such considerable detail in the appropriation that not much need be said further by way of explanation. When the rush to the Yukon occurred in the latter part of 1897, and the beginning of 1898, there were no banking facilities in that district. If funds were required there by the government or private parties they had to be taken in at considerable inconvenience and risk. If parties wanted to send out funds, they were unable to do so in the usual way, and very large expense had to be incurred.

The only facilities of the kind, I think, were those that were afforded by the transportation companies, which were willing to buy gold at very low rates and to issue drafts at very high rates. Under ordinary circumstances, our Canadian banking institutions, which are known to be very enterprising and progressive, are found ready to respond to every demand made for business of that character. However, in the case of the Yukon, the circumstances were so exceptional—that is access to the country was so difficult, the business so uncertain and the risk involved so great—that the banks did not seem willing to go into the district at all. We had some negotiations, informal at first, and subsequently they took formal shape, with a gentleman representing the Bank of Commerce; and it was ultimately agreed that they should establish a branch at Dawson with a view to meeting the demand not only of the government business but that of the public. It will be remembered that I presented to the House some correspondence on the subject soon after the arrangement was made. We agreed that the Canadian Bank of Commerce at Dawson should be the government bankers in the district, but required that the terms on which the business should be done should be reserved for further consideration and entirely subject to the Minister of Finance. It was felt—I felt—very strongly at the time that the business was in such a condition that we were hardly able to fix a fair rate; and we asked the bank to go in and undertake the business, with the understanding that in due time we would make them a fair allowance for it. Speaking from recollection, I think that before that time when the transportation companies issued drafts out of the Yukon district, they charged 5 per cent. Besides, for the handling of the gold, they paid themselves handsomely by buying it at very low prices. We thought it, therefore, very important to make this arrangement. The guarantee we gave the Canadian Bank of Commerce was that they would have the government business in the district at rates

Mr. FIELDING.

to be subsequently fixed by the Minister of Finance. There was another feature of the business. We decided we would give the miners drafts on the cities of old Canada free of charge—that is the government would pay the cost of the drafts, thus relieving the miners of the charges for bank drafts which were very heavy. About that time, another bank went into the district, the Bank of British North America. We agreed that this business of miners' drafts should not be confined to the Bank of Commerce, but that any miner paying royalty and desiring a draft on any city of old Canada might be allowed a draft at either bank on the same terms, and, in due season, we would allow compensation, the rate to be the same to one bank as to the other. That was the understanding on which the Bank of Commerce, and subsequently the Bank of British North America went in. After some considerable time, we undertook to adjust the compensation. The bank, like other people who do work, wanted to be well paid, and we wished to see that they did not get too much. The ultimate settlement of the matter is stated in detail in this vote. We agreed to allow for handling gold collected by way of royalty—because a considerable part was taken in gold—4 per cent. That included very heavy charges for insurance, 1½ per cent, and also 1½ per cent for freight and a charge for convoy and other expenses. And so, the 4 per cent, while it seems, in one way a high rate, when you consider that the bank had to pay these heavy charges, it will be agreed by any banker that this was not a heavy rate.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that a local insurance or an insurance in transit?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Insurance in transit from Dawson to where the gold could be marketed at the mint. We agreed to pay 2 per cent on the miners' drafts and 1½ per cent for whatever business they did for the government, that is, for moneys they received and moneys they paid out. It is worth remembering that in the case of business in a city of old Canada, a bank that undertakes to do business for the government is able to recoup itself from day to day, that is, money comes in as fast as it is paid out. But in the Yukon they have to carry the moneys to our credit for a very considerable time. All the receipts of the government come in during a limited period, and for the rest of the year we draw on them for any money that we need. So, the general condition of affairs was quite exceptional, and we had to pay for services rendered to us rates that we would not have thought of paying in any other part of Canada. For the next season the matter was somewhat readjusted, and we agreed upon lower rates. For handling gold we were to pay equivalent to 3 per cent. The transaction was somewhat changed in form, but that was the net result. The charges

on drafts, instead of being 2 per cent were changed to 1½ per cent, and the charges for the management of the government business were reduced from 1½ per cent to 1¼ per cent. This covers the two seasons and brings us to the present year. We have made a change in one respect. As I have mentioned, a considerable portion of our royalty is paid in gold. The gold dust or nugget is still to a considerable extent the circulating medium in Dawson. We have concluded that, instead of trying to send the gold out, we will dispose of it in Dawson and invite tenders from the two banks for the output of the season. Tenders have been asked for, but they have not yet been received. We have asked the banks to specify a rate per cent at which they will take the business, they taking the gold, delivering it at the mint and accounting to us with mint certificates for the full value, in the meantime, giving us advances up to the approximate value. When we adjust the transaction through the mint certificates, we pay them the rate at which they may contract to do the work. Tenders are expected from the two banks in a day or two.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you fixed a maximum?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it is a question of rates. They take the gold over at a nominal value of say \$15 per ounce and give us credit, and we are immediately in a position to draw against that in any part of Canada. They send the gold to the nearest mint at which a market is found, which, I believe, is Seattle, where there is an assay office in connection with the mint in San Francisco. The mint will give the certificate showing the exact value of the gold, and we will pay the bank at the rate per cent which we have agreed to pay. This is the arrangement proposed on this point for the current year.

Mr. FOSTER. But, when asking tenders do you fix a maximum price?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not asking tenders for gold exactly; that is hardly the way it is done.

Mr. FOSTER. No, but it is asking for tenders for the percentage which they will charge. You are practically shut up to two banks and they might easily make a combination.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would be possible. The only guard we have is that if the price is excessive, we can take the gold and handle it ourselves. We do not anticipate having to take that course. The banks there are competing very keenly.

Mr. SPROULE. The government would have a good deal if they had a mint out there—say in British Columbia.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Does not the hon. minister think that the time is near at

hand, if it has not come already, in the development of the rich gold fields of Canada, when we should have a mint of our own? I think we are losing a very valuable business which the Americans are controlling to-day. The hon. gentleman knows that if we had control of that gold, a great deal of the gold that is exported and which pays no royalty to Canada could be handled in this way—and that royalty might be imposed on all gold leaving Canada. If we had a mint the royalty might be imposed upon all the gold leaving Canada, and then the government might agree to accept the certificate from the mint as to the gold that is kept in Canada. I have heard it stated by gentlemen who have been out there that a great deal of the gold which is taken out of the Klondike leaves the country without paying any royalty to the government. If we had a mint and gave up the royalty, imposing a moderate duty upon gold leaving the country, I think we would secure much more benefit from our gold fields than we do at present.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend's remarks touch on two points which are not necessarily connected; one is the method whereby the royalty is collected, and the other is the establishment of a mint. With regard to the method of collection, of course it cannot be altered in the present year. Since the return of the Minister of the Interior from England, I have had some conversation with him on the subject, and the matter is under consideration. As to the mint, we have once or twice had a discussion on it in the House; and while I do not wish to be understood as giving judgment against the project, it is well to remember that the quantity of gold which we can use in Canada under our system of currency is not large. What I am afraid of is—and I do not wish my remarks to be taken as a decision against the scheme, I think I can see some plan under which, possibly, a mint might be made advantageous to us—but, my fear would be that if we had a mint in Canada, and we were to convert our Canadian gold into sovereigns, they would very probably be shipped out of Canada and be converted back into bullion in the United States, because we have not a field for the use of any large quantity of gold in Canada. There are some ways in which, possibly, that might be overcome. I agree with some of the suggestions of my hon. friend, and I can assure him that we are giving careful consideration to the question whether it is desirable that gold should be minted and handled in Canada, and there are advantages associated with it which I do not undervalue.

Mr. SPROULE. As long as the banks get these large commissions and these large rates, I think we can take it for granted that the moneyed institutions of the country will fight against the establishment of a mint. That is probably one reason why

the government are not inclined to consider the question. There are two banks out there now, and till some time ago there was only one. I have no doubt they will come to an understanding of what the commission should be. I do not think there is anything like a keen competition between them, because monetary institutions are not so sensitive that they cannot easily come to terms when their interests point the way. I think we are paying a large commission now. They have been so long in the business, and the improved means of conveyance and security of conveyance are much better than they were a few years ago, that we ought to be able to get a reduction.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have made no terms for the present year at all, we have left them to be settled later on.

Mr. SPROULE. If this is granted without any reluctance by the House, it will be a basis upon which they will strike the rate for the future.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They will not get it, I will guarantee that.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not be disposed to offer a severe criticism on the first year's payment owing to the great difficulties which, as the minister has observed, have to be met in introducing banking institutions in the Yukon. But there are one or two things that I would like to say. I think the rate of four per cent, although I see by correspondence it was arrived at after considerable negotiation, was a very large rate to be paid, including insurance at  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, freight at  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, convoy and all other charges connected therewith,  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1 per cent. The whole negotiation, as I understand, was carried on by the bank as giving them a clear profit of 1 per cent over and above all costs and charges, and that they claim as not too great, considering the business was new. I think that was the basis upon which ultimately the claim was made. I think the bank made a claim, too, that it was going to cost \$80,000, or something like that, to establish themselves there, and that they ought to have very generous payment in order to recoup them in part for that. That idea might be carried too far. They go there to establish themselves for general business, and they get a tremendous advantage when they get a cinch upon the whole government business from the start. They are initial organizations which propose to carry on a business as long as that country continues to provide business, which I hope will be for a long series of years. I think, therefore, that the 4 per cent was a very large remuneration. The Minister of Finance must know that, because he has brought it down, and they have

Mr. SPROULE.

consented to its being brought down, to 3 per cent. But even 3 per cent is large. Now, with reference to the tender. I hope there will not be a combination between the banks. Probably the competition is keen between them, and may be it will be so keen that they will actually compete for business, and so bring it down to a reasonable basis. But there is this I see about it. Two banks are not too many for the Klondike, which is rapidly increasing its transactions and rapidly increasing the output of gold; and if you by tender bind yourself down to these two banks, the Bank of Commerce and the Bank of British North America, without being at liberty to give business to any other bank that comes in, it is like giving a monopoly of business to two banks, and in some way I think the Minister of Finance ought to make a stipulation whereby other banks that come in there may have a portion of the business at the same rates. I do not think it would be fair to make an equal division between the new bank that went in as against these other banks, although in one way that is not too much, because the new bank would have all the initial expense of establishing itself, while the others would have been established two years before, and would be able to recoup themselves from government business and local business. But in some way I think that ought to be guarded, otherwise the government will be giving an unfair advantage to two banks who happened to get there first, and go there very largely because the government is willing to make a very generous bargain with them in order that they might go there. Therefore it would not be improper at all, when they are giving their tender, to have an arrangement with them that new banks coming in should have a proportionate share of the business at the same rates. That competition up there will be sufficient to get fair bank rates. There is one thing that I do not quite see the justice of. A poor devil who goes in there and spends all the money he has, and all he can borrow, and ruins himself, has to pay his draft charges and bank charges, and he gets no consideration at all, but the government pays for the man who strikes it rich and who has a large amount of money to send out, his commission on the drafts upon all the money he has to send out. It seems to me that when a man is fortunate enough to have money to send out, he could very well afford to pay his own costs and charges. I hope this commission, borne by the government, and the issuing of drafts to miners free, is not contemplated in the tenders which are asked for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have considered that, now the banking business is getting down nearer to ordinary business conditions, there is no reason for continuing that, and we do not propose con-

tinuing the free drafts. The tenders we are taking are only for the gold of the present season; there are only two banks in there now, and no other banks can get in during the present season, so that there is no use of extending the privilege to anybody else. We agree to this for one season only, and if other banks go in we will be able to take advantage of the competition.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad that the 2 per cent commission is dropped off. On revenue collection and cash payments 1½ per cent is a very large commission. Of course, we cannot compare conditions there with those in London, or even at our own banks here, but 1½ per cent is a very large charge. Why was the 2 per cent given on drafts for the North-west Mounted and Militia Defence? That seems to be rather strange. I should think that should come in upon the same basis as the usual business here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is because all drafts were paid at 2 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very high for drafts on government business. 'Three per cent less 2½ per cent for disbursements and insurance,' I do not quite see what that means.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It practically means a reduction of from 4 per cent to 3 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. For the same year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it is for a separate year.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not feel like criticising it sharply the first year. I think that the charges were very generous indeed, but with the tender system introduced the commission taken off, the free drafts done away with, I think probably the hon. Minister of Finance has done all he could do for the present.

Mr. SPROULE. Who furnished the convoy? Was it furnished by the bank or by the North-west Mounted Police?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The bank bring out a large quantity of gold, not only gold of the government, but gold purchased by themselves, and they will have to make arrangements for convoys. They charge us our proportion and the controller in Dawson gives us a reasonable assurance that the cost is just.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the convoy furnished by the mounted police?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it is paid for out of their own pockets and for which they get paid. It is actually money which the bank have to pay, and we have to repay them.

Immigration—Salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries ..... \$110,000

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words on this immigration business, but before I do so I would like to have the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) answer a few questions. I presume he will do it cheerfully. I see that he gave an interview to the *Montreal Herald* the other day in which he said that he expected a very large immigration this year. I would like to know, in the first place, upon what he bases that expectation. In the second place, I would like to know why he wants such a large vote this year as we have in the main estimates \$395,000, and in the supplementary estimates \$50,000, making in all \$445,000. Then I would like to know whether he is going to give assisted passages, and whether he is going to make loans to immigrants when they come to this country to help them to settle. I would like to know whether he is going to appoint more immigration agents, and if so, where they are to be located. After he answers these questions I will go on.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The first question which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) asks relates to an alleged interview in the *Montreal Herald*. Well, I have no recollection of any interview in the *Herald*.

Mr. WILSON. Would you like to see the interview?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. At the same time I have been seen by reporters, but as I have not seen the alleged interview I do not know what the *Herald* says. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to see the interview.

So far as the prospect in Europe is concerned, Hon. Mr. Sifton said that beyond a few matters of detail there is little room for improvement. There is the highest prospect for a considerable emigration of desirable settlers to Canada from Germany, Norway, Sweden and Denmark. 'I think,' he added, 'we can look forward to an increase from Wales, Scotland and Ireland. Should there not be an increase from England, it will be due to the strong desire to secure English settlers for South Africa, to which many people in the old land are now looking as a promising field for settlement.'

Substantially, that is what I said to the reporter; I am not sure whether it was the *Montreal Herald*, reporter or not. Having recently seen practically all the agents in the British Isles, and having spent some time securing information with regard to the position on the continent, I can say that the prospects are what I stated in that interview. There is nothing definite which would enable me to give statistical information. All that a person can do in regard to such a question, is to gather the impression of

the agents who are in the field, and that statement simply contains the information I have obtained from them. The total amount in the main estimates is \$395,000, and there is \$50,000 in the supplementary estimates, making \$445,000. I will give a general summarized statement first, and if any member desires me to itemise, I shall be happy to do so later on. The following are the items under the general head: Salaries of officers, as they exist at the present time, \$110,000. Women's Protective Immigration Society, Montreal, \$1,000. Girls' Home of Welcome, Winnipeg, \$1,000. The High Commissioner's estimates, including \$10,000 for miscellaneous and unforeseen expenses, special delegates, and so forth, forty additional for continental bonuses, amounting to \$120,000. United States general expenses and contingencies, \$35,000; advertising and printing in foreign countries, including the United States, \$40,000. Advertising and printing general immigration literature, \$40,000. Bonuses on children, \$4,000. Commission on settlers from the United States, \$6,000. The usual grant to the Lake St. John Railway, \$8,000. Grants to hospitals for work done, arising in connection with immigrant patients, \$6,000. Extra clerks at head office, \$3,000. General expenses and contingencies in Canada, \$40,000. Special expenses at seaports, \$8,000. Postage on immigration literature, \$11,000. Repatriation grant to immigration societies, \$5,000. Collection of exhibits, \$5,000. Miscellaneous, \$2,000. Total, \$445,000.

Mr. WILSON. I wish to know what the minister did in 1899, with the \$224,000 he spent in Canada, and which was mentioned by Mr. Pedley in the committee?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. To what does the hon. gentleman refer?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Pedley in his evidence before the committee gave the expenses for immigration in Canada, at \$224,363.35 in 1899. I want to know how that was distributed?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is for the fiscal year?

Mr. WILSON. There seems to be a difficulty about that, because most of the immigration business goes into the calendar year, while the other goes to the fiscal year. The appropriation for the immigration branch is the same as in other departments.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The appropriations for the immigration branch are the same as in the other departments.

Mr. WILSON. That may be, but while you only appropriated \$225,000 for immigration in 1899, you spent \$387,000, so that you see you get things mixed. I urged before the

Mr. SIFTON.

committee that this system should be changed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A difficulty does arise in the way the hon. gentleman suggests. The last day of the fiscal year, is the middle of the immigration season, and every officer is then busily engaged travelling or otherwise. The largest expenses are then being incurred and it is practically impossible on the first of July to close our accounts. The statement as to the number of immigrants and the result of the work only comes at the end of the calendar year. It is absolutely impossible for us to close our accounts in the immigration branch on July 1st with the same exactitude as they do in other branches. I am quite prepared to hear any plan which the hon. gentleman can suggest to make it better.

Mr. WILSON. I wish to ask the minister, first: What is the policy of the government with regard to granting loans to immigrants after they arrive in Canada, to give them a start; and second: What is the policy of the government with regard to granting assisted passages?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The policy of the government with regard to granting assisted passages has not, I believe, been changed since I have had charge of the department. We have not given any assisted passages in the accepted sense of those words.

Mr. WILSON. What you intend to do is what I want to know.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. And I was going to say that no intention whatever exists at the present time of changing that policy. In fact, I have taken a very strong stand on that point in opposition to representations which have from time to time been made, especially from England. Last year, I think it was, the Queensland government, being very desirous of securing a larger number of immigrants from Great Britain, offered large inducements in the way of assisted passages as well as bonuses, and I was asked to consider whether I would ask my colleagues to adopt a policy to meet the policy of the Queensland government. I was told that if we did not do that, we would not be able to compete with Queensland in getting immigrants. I took the ground that no such step was necessary for Canada, and I am strongly of opinion that that will prove in the long run to be the best policy. Our present policy is not to go any further in that direction than to give the usual bonus to steamship agents to prevent them being hostile and advocating immigration to other countries; for that is what it means. No facts have been brought before me to induce me to change my opinion in that respect. I have no intention of appointing any

new agents or of increasing the staff. A considerable increase in the staff has been caused by an immense increase in the work which has been thrown on the department by the necessity of taking care of immigrants when they came here. That has been very onerous, and has resulted in a large expenditure. I hope to keep the staff where it is or to reduce it a little. As to giving assistance to new settlers on their arrival, I have never intentionally inaugurated any deliberate policy of that kind. Any assistance that has been given has been for the purpose of saving people from want, and not on any general plan of giving them assistance to start farming. Our desire and intention is to avoid any outlay in that direction.

Mr. WILSON. I was very anxious to get the minister's views on this question, and I agree with him with regard to assisted passages and making loans to immigrants. I have always been opposed to both of these, because I have felt like a man who has reached middle life and has a family about him, and who has no friends nor relatives to assist him with a small loan or otherwise, is not a very good man to become a settler in this country. Once in a while such a man might make a good settler in this country. Once in a while such a man might make a good settler; but, as a rule, I think it would be a great mistake to import that class in large numbers. I think the announcement made by the minister, if I can rely on what his officers say, has entirely destroyed his hopes for a large immigration to this country this year. If he looks over their reports, he will find that they all agree that the policy which has been pursued for many years is a failure, and that unless some new policy is adopted, they will not be able to induce many immigrants to come to this country. I am going to read some extracts from the reports of the High Commissioner, Mr. Preston and Mr. Jury to show that the position taken by the minister is entirely different from the position taken by these gentlemen. The High Commissioner says:

The emigration returns for the year have not yet arrived. They will probably show a slight falling off in the emigration from Great Britain to Canada.

In 1899, there was a reduction in the number of immigrants from that country of 934 persons. Then he goes on:

For the last year or two, the United Kingdom has been in a very prosperous condition, and the effect of this state of things has been felt by every class of the community. There is always a tendency for emigration to fall off in these circumstances. . . We have arranged to still further increase our efforts to induce emigration to Canada during the coming year. I am afraid, however, although we may be able to sow useful seed, and to attract attention to the country, that our emigration is more likely to fall off for a year or two than to increase. This

is explained, as already mentioned, by the prosperity which obtains here, by the fact that both capital and labour are fully employed, and that prices of all kinds of produce have had a tendency to rise in consequence of the troubles in South Africa.

I think the High Commissioner gives a very much better reason why we have no right to expect a very large immigration from that country than the minister has given—a reason which will commend itself to this House—that when capital and labour are fully employed, the people are doing as well as they can do under any circumstances. If a man who invests his money in any kind of industry, whether manufacturing or farming, is getting such a good return from it that he is encouraged to put all his capital into it, he can afford to pay good wages to his employees, and the result will be that they will be satisfied, and it will be hard to make any impression upon them in the way of inducing them to go to another country. It is true, as the minister says, that Queensland and some other countries are paying bonuses or giving assisted passages to immigrants. The High Commissioner says:

I am inclined to the opinion that it would be of advantage to the Dominion to offer some such assistance to farm labourers and domestic servants, and also to farmers who have small means, but not enough to enable them to start immediately they arrive in Canada.

It seems that the fact that the other colonies are lending money or paying bonuses to encourage immigration has influenced the High Commissioner to feel that we ought to do something in the same direction. I hope the minister will not yield to that demand.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
I am quite clear on that.

Mr. WILSON. I think we had better stand a little firm, even if we do not get as many immigrants. Then, we have a report from Mr. Preston, a gentleman who was appointed by the present minister to be a sort of superintendent of immigration from Great Britain and Ireland and the continent, and who has made himself also a commissioner to the Boers to see if he cannot induce them to come over here. The following statement in his report greatly disappointed me when I read it. There has been a good deal in the newspapers some years back about the desirability of getting tenant farmers from the old country. They are a class of people who have some means, some of them a good deal, they are considered good farmers, and they would be a very desirable class if we could induce them to come to this country; but it appears that Mr. Preston has given up the idea altogether of being able to induce them to come. Not only that, but both he and Mr. Jury hold out the idea that they would not be the best settlers that we could get for this country. Mr. Preston says:

A great deal has been said and written in Canada about the desirability of securing a movement on the part of the so-called tenant farmers towards the North-west Territories. But one has only to be thrown into contact with these people here to be assured that they are not likely to leave their positions of ease and comfort upon English farms and assume cheerfully the alleged responsibilities attached to pioneer life in a new country.

But the project to induce them to emigrate to Manitoba and the North-west might, in my humble opinion, be abandoned.

Mr. Preston has evidently made up his mind that there is not the slightest use of trying to get these farmers to come to this country and especially to the North-west. He said that they are living a life of comparative ease and comfort and would be entirely unfit to grapple with the difficulties of a new country and rough it as our farmers have to do. Then he goes on further to say :

In England and Scotland wages for agricultural labourers have reached an exceedingly high figure, while in the manufacturing centres great activity prevails, and consequently the earning power of labour has increased enormously.

That would most effectively dispel the idea that we could induce that class of people to leave a country, where they have plenty of work and good wages, and come to a new country where they would have to start afresh. Further on he adds :

To carry on successfully an immigration propaganda in Great Britain it is now necessary to go beyond the usual advertising, addressing public meetings and attendance at fairs. There must be a policy of personal contact between the government agent and the prospective emigrant—or in so far as possible, a personal canvass of every probable emigrant, carried on with the same system, but perhaps not with the pertinacity which characterizes life insurance business in our own country. Yet, under such circumstances, and with the continuance of the system of a bonus to booking agents, too much must not be expected from Great Britain. It will require every possible effort to prevent a continual annual decrease in the returns from here, on account of the adverse circumstances already referred to.

So far as Mr. Preston is concerned, he has become fully convinced that a desirable class of immigrants, such as farmers and farm labourers or labourers of any kind, are not going to be had without a great deal of difficulty. In fact, he says we will have great difficulty in preventing a decrease in the immigration from Great Britain and Ireland, and I think that is a reasonable conclusion to come to when you consider the great prosperity of the old country. When people are fully employed, it is not a very easy thing to get them to move to a new country where there is no certainty that they will be better off than at home.

Then we have Mr. Jury, who is the agent of the government in Liverpool, and who used to be a labour agitator in this coun-

try, very much opposed to bringing out any people here to compete with our own workmen. He reports :

My opinion is that the ordinary tenant farmer is by no means the most desirable emigrant or the one best adapted for doing pioneer work, either in the older or the new provinces of Canada. As a rule, the English farmer has not been used to the toil and hardship and self-sacrifice incident to such a life: judging by their appearance, they are, as a class, better off than the ordinary Canadian farmer.

It is not very likely that Mr. Jury will be able to do a great deal to induce such men to come to this country, when he himself is convinced that they will not better their condition, but make it worse.

The average British farmer would not improve his lot by becoming an average Canadian farmer, but in most cases rather the reverse. If some scheme could be devised whereby members of this class could be guaranteed employment on farms for the first year, so that they would not feel that they were giving up a certain living, though a poor one, for an uncertainty, I think quite a number of good British settlers could be got, both from the urban and rural districts, if the scheme were well advertised. But unless some new method is introduced and some extra effort made, I do not think the prospects for an increase in the number of emigrants in the near future are very bright.

These are the reports from three leading officials of the government, and these men have been on the ground four years, with the exception of Mr. Preston, who has been there a year and a half. They have been going over the ground, coming into contact with the people, and their reports are that, in all probability, unless a new system is introduced and some inducement held out to the ordinary farmers and farm labourers different from that laid out in the past, there is no reasonable probability of that immigration increasing. The deputy minister, Mr. Smart, himself was in the old country, and I notice by his report that he was strongly in favour of either helping them out to this country or helping them after they come to this country. He seemed to think that in that way we would get a desirable class of people which we would not be able to obtain in any other way. Another thing is that in every case in these countries, England, Ireland and Scotland, from which settlement is most desirable, there is likely to be a decrease instead of an increase. I do not think it is any great advantage to get such people as the Doukhobors, and it would be less advantageous to get the Boers, for the latter will introduce rebellion and want to live by themselves in an unprogressive manner, and be very undesirable in every way.

Before concluding, I would like to make some reference to Mr. Devlin, who has been in the old country ever since the general elections, and who a short time ago wrote to a friend of his in Ottawa indicating

pretty clearly why he went over there. He was a fine speaker and promising young man, and I think would have liked to remain in public life, but when his party came to power, they knew he was bound, above everything else, to have justice done to his co-religionists in Manitoba and to have their separate school system respected. It does seem to me, if I can read between the lines, that he had an interview with the Prime Minister before he went to Ireland, and decided there was one of two things he had to do—either stay here and fight for what he believed are the rights of the minority in Manitoba or go to Ireland and become an immigration agent and be buried out of sight for some years to come. I think that he took the latter course, feeling that it was after all perhaps the better one, but he is not at all satisfied with it and does not feel at all comfortable in his present position. He says :

Do not imagine that the one which is my lot is more agreeable to me to-day than it was the first day I left the country, home and friends. True, I love the land of my ancestors, but it is not my native land; here I was not born, and I miss the circles in which I moved and lived. I am as much and as strong an Irish Canadian as I ever was. I hold and affectionately cling to the leanings, belief and doctrines during so many years.

It is not opportune—it would not be wise for me to return just now; and it is not my intention; I know that I am not missed and not wanted.

That is what Mr. Devlin said. Then, Sir, he explains according to his report—and it is not a very long report for a man getting \$2,000 a year and his expenses—that the statistics are not kept in such a way that one can tell what number of immigrants come from Ireland and which do not. He says that he leaves all the outside work to Mr. Webster, and he sits in his office and answers inquiries, and so on. A good story is told about him. After he had addressed a public meeting—and every one who knows Mr. Devlin knows that he can do that well—an Irishman rose to move a vote of thanks. I am sure Mr. Devlin must have captivated him. When he moved the vote of thanks, he said to the people: you are not going to leave Ireland until all our grievances are settled. That would offset all that Mr. Devlin had said. There is one peculiar thing about the Irish office. The office in Scotland costs \$9,283, according to Mr. Pedley's evidence, and from Scotland we got 1,337 immigrants. That is, it costs us \$6.99 per head for our immigrants from Scotland. For the office in England and Wales, we spent \$14,758.07, and from there we got 8,756 immigrants, or \$1.72 a head. In Ireland we spend \$11,034.53, and from that country we get 747 immigrants, or \$14.77

per head, or twice as much as it costs for Scotchmen or eight times as much as it costs for Englishmen. It does seem to me—and I call the attention of the minister to this matter—that something ought to be done with these officers, not only in Ireland, Scotland and England, but in the United States, whereby the expense would be greatly reduced; because we are spending a great deal too much money considering what we are getting in return, as I shall take the opportunity to show pretty soon. Now, there are four offices of which I wish to speak particularly. I do not know how many the old government had, and do not care. I think the time has come when the business of this country should be done on business principles no matter what other people did. Here is Mr. W. T. R. Preston, who has a salary of \$3,000 a year; and I will venture to say—and I do not think it will be very extravagant—that his expenses will be \$3,000 more, because as I understand it, he has carte blanche to travel any where on the British islands or on the continent where he thinks immigrants for Canada can be had. Then we have Mr. Pedley at \$2,500 a year. Of course, he will not be away as much from home as the other gentlemen, and his travelling expenses will not be as much, though, no doubt, they will amount to a considerable sum. Then there is Mr. W. F. McCreary, another gentleman getting \$2,500. Then there is Mr. W. J. White, who receives a salary of \$2,000 a year and expenses, I presume, when he is away from home. Now, I think the business in the office has been conducted on a very extravagant plan. In the Agriculture and Colonization Committee, we have spent a great deal of time trying to get information. I do not complain of the course pursued by the gentlemen who came before us, because I think they were willing to give us all the information they had. There was one difficulty. It was three months to a day after the session opened before the report of the Department of the Interior was laid on the Table of this House. We had to examine the deputy minister himself before the committee had that report in their hands. That ought not to have occurred this year, and I hope it will never occur again, no matter who is in power. For, after all, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was not far out when he said 'business is business,' and we ought to adhere as closely as possible to these lines. I made up a table, as well as I could, from the Auditor General's report, of twelve of the agents in the United States. I believe there are two other gentlemen who live in Canada and do work in the United States—two clergymen, I believe, who are paid \$500 a year, and I presume their travelling expenses when they are away. This is the table to which I refer :

Names of Dominion Government Immigration Agents in the United States and the Cost of the same. Auditor General's Report, 1899, pages H—12, 13 and 14.

Name of Agent in the United States.	Name of State.	Salary.	Board and Lodging.	Fares.	Street Car, Cabs and 'Bus, Livery and Pullman.	Assistance in Office.	All other Expenses.	Grand Total.
M. V. McInnes.	Michigan...	1,500 00	682 75	718 23	4 00	1,050 00	1,014 96	4,969 94
Benj. Davis..	Minnesota...	1,500 00	373 25	708 25	395 60	667 30	1,773 31	5,297 71
James Grieve....	Michigan...	1,200 00	784 05	221 94	106 65	3 00	282 68	2,598 32
E. T. Holmes....	Minnesota...	1,200 00	525 10	595 83	502 00	30 50	463 02	3,316 45
C. J. Broughton.	Illinois.....	900 00	575 75	566 85	365 00	53 05	506 29	2,967 94
T. O. Currie....	Wisconsin...	1,200 00	722 25	401 70	117 05	32 00	111 53	2,584 58
W. V. Bennett.	Nebraska...	900 00	212 50	249 60	219 20	142 95	354 48	2,078 73
D. L. Cavin....	Michigan...	1,200 00	722 75	343 30	185 65	86 85	444 32	2,982 87
J. S. Crawford...	Montana...	900 00	593 35	331 84	123 04	79 30	466 00	2,493 53
W. H. Rogers....	S. Dakota...	900 00	670 75	1,118 45	146 75	48 00	64 40	2,948 35
W. J. White.....	.....	1,933 34	1,187 85	642 90	542 70	35 85	904 93	5,224 18
C. O. Swanson....	.....	1,500 00	433 00	82 20	260 60	2 80	292 12	2,570 72
Totals.....	.....	14,833 34	7,483 35	5,981 09	2,968 24	2,231 60	6,677 09	40,128 32

Now, there are twelve agents employed by this government as immigration agents, and their cost is over \$40,000. Then, there are two more at \$500 a year each, besides travelling expenses, and their hotel expenses while they are away. Now then, we had last year, according to the statement made by the minister, about 100 agents paid by commission in the United States; this year we had 256 agents in the United States paid by commission, and they got in commissions, \$5,077. Then, there was spent in the United States for printing of all kinds, pamphlets and advertising, \$38,500, according to Mr. Pedley's statement, making a grand total of \$83,500.

Now, I want to turn up Mr. Pedley's evidence and show you what these agents are doing. Here is a statement made up of the commissions that are paid, \$3 on all males over 18 years, and \$2 on females, and \$1 on all others. Well, I find that a great many went out again. Here is one agent that got \$2, another got \$8, another got \$6, another got \$3, another got \$2, and so on. It would seem as if these agents ascertained when people were going across the line and said to them: You take this certificate from me, and I will get the commission, whatever it is. The hon. gentleman may say that makes no difference, because we got the immigrants. I do not think that is the case, because, under the system now in vogue, as soon as the immigrants across the line the agent is entitled to the fee. I have another calculation to present. They report about one-fourth of the immigrants that came in as coming from the United States; I do not

agree with them, but I have taken one-sixth, which I think is as much as they can show in any possible way. I take one-sixth of \$224,000 and call it \$37,800, which, added to the \$83,500, gives us as the cost of the immigrants coming in from the United States, \$121,310. Now, there is a difference of opinion as to which is right in the number of immigrants from the United States, the deputy minister or Mr. Pedley, the superintendent of immigration. The deputy minister says we got 9,839 immigrants from the United States, Mr. Pedley says we got 11,945.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think it is clear, from my knowledge of the figures, that the deputy minister must have been speaking of the previous year and Mr. Pedley of the last year.

Mr. WILSON. They both bear the same date, as the deputy minister will see by turning to his own report, page 12. Now, it is a well understood thing with the government that the only parties for whom we pay commissions to agents are either farmers or farm labourers, and I believe that only extends to Manitoba and the North-west Territories; it may extend to British Columbia, for all I know. But, I know that Mr. Pedley stated in the most emphatic way that they only paid a commission to an agent when he got a farmer or a farm labourer. That being the case, it will be a natural thing to suppose that farmers coming in from the United States, a large proportion of them, would take up land in the North-west or in Manitoba, and in that way would become homesteaders. Now

Mr. WILSON.

the number of homesteaders reported by the deputy minister is 1,604; and according to his way of counting,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  persons for each homesteader would make 3,405 people that came in under that head. Then, they claim that 906 people came in to the Lake St. John district; the Repatriation Society of Montreal, they say, brought in 973; then, they say that 227 went into the Rainy River country, and Mr. T. O. Currie claims that he sent in 280, making in all, 5,791. Now, I will later on turn to Mr. Pedley's evidence, which, in my judgment, will prove that on the whole, 15,000 or 20,000 immigrants are reported to have come into this country that cannot be found, the hon. gentleman cannot account for them. Now, that makes 6,154 immigrants from the United States that are unaccounted for according to the report of Mr. Pedley. That means that we are paying for the immigrants we get from the United States at least \$20 for each man, woman and child. It does seem to me that this is a little too much. I will have to trouble the House to read another table. It is interesting to me, and I hope it will be so to the House, because I think there is some information in it that we have not had for some years. I may say that the committee spent more time over immigration this year than they have for several years in the past, and this is the result. I may remark that the government, as I said before, only allowed these agents their expenses while they were travelling, if they had a family at headquarters. If they, with their families, lived in Canada or anywhere else, they allowed them just as much. Mr. Davies is one of the men who had a family at home where he lived. Consequently, when he was at home he would not be entitled to living expenses. I will just read this table, because I am anxious to have it in the *Hansard* in the form in which it is here:

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that we have not the days travel by the two last named gentlemen, nor the days that they were in their offices; consequently, we cannot carry this table out fully. The superintendent of immigration, I think, has done his whole duty, because I see that these gentlemen were written to six times, and telegraphed to two or three times, advising them that a committee of parliament wanted these particulars. I think, unless there is some very good reason why these gentlemen should be retained in the service, they should be dismissed forthwith. Mr. Rogers said that he did not know that the department required this information, and that he kept no diary, notwithstanding the fact that six letters had been sent to him notifying him that this information was necessary, and that a detailed statement could not be presented to the committee, unless it was forthcoming. Now, I want to look for a few moments, at how economical some of these gentlemen were as travellers, lodgers and boarders, because I believe the people of this country are interested in that question. We will take the case of Mr. Davies. He only travelled fifty-eight days; consequently we would only be liable for board during these fifty-eight days. His fares would have all have to be spent in these fifty-eight days. That means that Mr. Davies cost this country, for the days he travelled \$13.93, for fares, cab-hire, livery and pullmans, per day. Of course, he boarded in a very humble kind of way, and it only cost us \$6.43 for his board and lodging, or a total of \$20 per day, to keep this gentleman during the days that he was travelling. I do not know Mr. Davies, and I have no personal feeling in the matter, but if he could live in that style, I think he should be made a colonel at once. He certainly lives in the style that would be becoming to a colonel, and it does

—	Number of days Travelling	Number of days in Office.	Number of days Employed	Fares, Livery, Bus, Street Cars, Cabs and Pullmans.	Salary.	Board and Lodging.	Total.	Cost per Day.
				\$ cts.				
Benj. Davies ....	58	218	276	807 94	1,500 00	373 25	2,977 10	10 80
James Crieve.....	232	56	288	328 58	1,200 00	784 05	2,312 68	8 05
E. T. Holmes....	136	68	204	1,097 82	1,200 00	525 10	2,822 93	13 83
C. J. Broughton..	228	82	310	931 85	900 00	575 75	2,407 60	7 76
T. O. Currie....	157	121	278	518 75	1,200 00	722 25	2,441 00	8 78
W. V. Bennett..	140	148	288	468 80	900 00	212 50	1,581 30	5 50
M. V. McInnes..	105	99	204	722 25	1,500 00	682 25	2,905 10	14 24
D. L. Cavin.....	266	34	300	528 95	1,200 00	722 75	2,551 70	8 50
J. S. Crawford ..	.....	.....	.....	454 88	900 00	593 35	1,948 33	.....
W. H. Rogers....	.....	.....	.....	1,265 20	900 00	670 75	2,835 95	.....

not require anything more to fit a man to be a colonel nowadays. The travelling expenses of Mr. McInnes, fares, &c., cost us \$7.57 per day, and living expenses \$6.50, making \$14.37 per day that this gentleman cost this country for the days that he travelled. If he has a family at the headquarters, as I understand he has, as a matter of course, the department would not pay his expenses while he was at his headquarters. I understand that the government have changed that system, and that whether a man has a family or not at headquarters, they do not pay his expenses now.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They do not pay his living expenses when he is at headquarters.

Mr. WILSON. In 1899 they did it. I am glad to know that an improvement has been made. There are several others living in quite as high style. Now, I want to take up this other matter of population. The homesteads entries reported in 1899, were 6,689, but there must be deducted from these, the following :

Persons from the eastern provinces and British Columbia, Manitoba and the Northwest Territories .....	2,134
Persons who had previously entered.....	720
Austro-Hungarians, who are credited as Galicians .....	1,114
	3,968

Total number of immigrant homesteaders.. 2,721

It is all very well to say these are immigrants in that part of the country, but they are certainly not immigrants in the broader sense of the word of being new comers into Canada. That leaves only 2,721 homesteaders to be accounted for and at the rate allowed in the report, viz., 31-5 per homesteader, that would give us a population of 8,707. Then we have the Doukhobors, that a great many people do not think are very desirable immigrants, to the number of 7,350 ; the Galicians, 6,700 ; the Scandinavians, 1,526 ; they claim to have sent into the Lake St. John district 526 ; the Repatriation Society of Montreal claim to have sent in 973, they claim to have sent into the Rainy River district from the United States 227 ; and sent into Canada by T. O. Currey from the United States, 280. This makes in all 26,669 that are accounted for, and not 44,543 as stated in the minister's report. This leaves a difference between those reported and those accounted for of 17,874.

Population as Figured Out.

At 3½ per homesteader there are .....	8,707
Doukhobors .....	7,350
Galicians .....	6,700
Scandinavians .....	1,526
They claim to have sent into Lake St. John district from United States .....	*906
Repatriation Society of Montreal, from United States .....	*973

Mr. WILSON.

Sent into the Rainy River district, from United States .....	*227
Sent into Canada by T. O. Currey, from United States .....	*280
	26,669

\*No proof of these.

Now, then, I might as well point to the evidence to show what I base this on particularly, in addition to what I have already stated. I quote from Mr. Pedley's evidence given on the 6th of June, page 63 :

By Mr. Clancy:

Q. That there may be no confusion, I will take the larger number you have given, the 43,000, and take the number of homesteads?

A. We have done that, and got 15,000 or 20,000 I did not account for.

On page 65 of the evidence of Mr. Pedley I read as follows :

By Mr. Clancy:

Q. When we left off, Mr. Pedley, a moment ago, we were endeavouring to account for the excess of something like 20,000 upon the whole. Have you any definite information to enable you to say that these persons are still in the country?

A. We have no definite information that anybody at all is in the country except those we see.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we are paying a good deal too much for the kind of immigrants we are getting, because if you deduct the Doukhobors, the Galicians and the Scandinavians to the number of 15,576, it will leave you, of what might be called desirable settlers, 11,093, and to get these we spent in the last calendar year \$387,000, while there was only appropriated a little over \$255,000. That is all the Auditor General's Report shows, because he reports for the fiscal year while these immigration returns are for the calendar year. I do not wish to be unfair at all, and I may be referred back to the years 1882-3, 1883-4, and 1884-5, when the late government spent a very large amount for immigration. But they saw the folly of it and they decided to quit and during the last year of the Conservative government they spent only \$120,000 for this service. I will take the last three years of this government and the last three years of the Conservative government and compare them. This government is now asking the House for a total vote of \$445,000 for immigration for this year, and that is a larger vote than we have been asked to vote for a great many years. It is asked for in the face of the fact that the reports of the officers of the department are that unless we are prepared to give bonuses or assisted passages, or invent some new scheme, we will not be able to get as many immigrants in the future as we got heretofore. For my part, I am entirely opposed to voting such a large sum for immigration, more especially when the signs of the times are against our getting a very large increase.

for the year 1900 the appropriation for immigration was \$360,000, and the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) brought down a supplementary estimate to this House for \$75,000, making in all \$435,000, which we spent in the year 1900 for immigration, and I am satisfied that we got less than 30,000 immigrants for that money. The following figures, Mr. Chairman, will show the cost of immigration for the different years under the Liberal and under the Conservative governments :

Cost of Immigration, 1901—	
Main estimates, 1896-7-8-9 .....	*\$395,000
Supplementary estimates, 29 .....	50,000
Total amount asked for .....	\$445,000
Cost of Immigration for 1900—	
Main estimates .....	\$360,000
Supplementary estimates for 1900, No. 23 .....	75,000
Total cost of immigration for 1900...	\$435,000
The cost of Immigration for 1899 expended during the calendar year was as follows :	
Great Britain and Ireland and on the continent .....	\$ 80,000 00
United States .....	83,500 00
Canada .....	224,363 35
Grand total for 1899.....	\$387,863 35
Appropriation .....	255,878 88
Over-expenditure .....	\$131,984 47
How spent—	
Continental bonus .....	\$13,150 67
British bonus .....	1,629 00
Doukhobors .....	36,000 00
United States commissions paid, agents .....	4,785 00
Grand total of bonus and commissions.	\$55,564 67
Amount spent by Conservative government in last three years—	
1894 .....	\$202,235 52
1895 .....	195,652 97
1896 .....	120,199 00
The Conservatives spent in three years .....	\$518,087 49
What the Liberals spent in three years—	
1899 (calendar year) .....	\$387,863 35
1890 .....	435,000 00
1901 (are asking for) .....	445,000 00
The Liberals spent in three years..	\$1,267,863 35

\*Increase, \$34,000.

It will be seen from the above figures that the Liberals have spent in three years \$749,775.86 more than the Conservatives spent during the last three years they were in power. I would like the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to give us a detailed statement of what was done with \$224,363 that was spent in Canada for immigration last year. It is a very large amount of money, and while I am glad to know that so much was spent in our country yet we must be sure that it was profitably spent and not wasted. It does seem that the time

has come when we should cry a halt in this matter. I have some letters here from Manitoba showing the dissatisfaction of the people there with the Doukhobors, but as the hour is late I will not read them to the House. I might mention that it would seem from the London interview with Mr. Preston that he thinks it desirable if we could get the Boers to settle in this country. He believes that they would forget their disloyalty and become good citizens. For my part I am not willing to risk the experiment. The Boers have done a great deal for Great Britain, in the sense that they made the empire a unit from one end to the other. The result of the South African war has been that the heart of every man in the British Empire beats in unison with his fellow-subjects of the Queen all over the world. But while we are anxious to be united as a great people, and while Mr. Preston thinks it would be a good thing to get the Boers away from South Africa and scatter them in some other land, I hope he and the government will scatter them somewhere else than in Canada.

Mr. McDOUGALL. And the Doukhobors too.

Mr. WILSON. These are not Doukhobors, but Boers, and I believe it will be admitted that they fight pretty well. A gentleman named Mr. Young from the North-west Territories was interviewed in Toronto in June in reference to these Galicians and here is what he said :

We have between 7,000 and 8,000 Galicians in Alberta now, said Mr. Young, and every person there wishes they would get out. The people are opposed to them because they are bad neighbours and poor settlers, and thus retard the development of the country.

This gentleman is the editor of a paper out west, and a man who has, I presume, had good opportunities of knowing these men. I have made some inquiries about him, and, so far as I have heard, he is a very respectable man.

Mr. DAVIN. John J. Young, editor of the *Calgary Herald*.

Mr. WILSON. That is the man. I have another authority to quote to the House. I do not purpose talking much longer, and I would not have talked so long only we have been deprived of the opportunity of discussing this matter because of the delays of the government in bringing down the returns. The hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) was in Prince Edward county on June 16 last, and the *Globe* reports him as saying :

The doctor opposed strongly the government policy of immigration. He did not see why we should be in such a terrible hurry to give the country away to foreigners or to induce all the poor people of Europe to take up our lands. We were whittling at the wrong end of the stick. His plan would be to develop the country, and bring the market within a reasonable distance of the settlers' homes.

That, I think, is the feeling of a good many people living in that country. While we are all desirous of doing what is for the best interest of this country, and while we believe it to be for the best interest of the country to fill it up with desirable settlers, if we can get them, I believe it is not for the best interest of the country to bring in people who live in communities, who make their own clothes, their own wagons and sleighs and everything they use, and give them special privileges. I understand that there is an arrangement with the Doukhobors that they are not to be required to take up arms in this country if the necessity arises. I wish to say in most emphatic terms that I am opposed to giving any immigrant who comes to this country any special privileges which we are not prepared to give to our own people. I think Canadians are as good men as those who come here from any other country, and I am not prepared to give to any man who comes here any special privileges over our own people. I move that the item for the salaries of officials be reduced by \$10,000.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). Does the hon. gentleman think it is a privilege for a man to be exempted from fighting? I think a majority of our people think it is a privilege to be allowed to fight.

Mr. WILSON. I never saw a coward that did not want to be exempted. I like to see a man who is ready to take his coat off, if necessary, and we are not prepared to give special privileges to any class of people.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the minister to state that it was practically impossible to keep the immigration accounts so that they will be made up to June 30, like all other accounts. I would like him to explain why that is practically impossible.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have already spoken of the difficulty of making the accounts correspond with the fiscal year. It is easy to make up the returns of the immigration work to the end of the calendar year. The work is done in the spring, the summer and the fall. At the end of the year the reports of the agents come in, and we know what has been done, whereas the fiscal year, as we all know, ends in the middle of the calendar year, just when our agents are at the full stretch and most of them are away from home incurring expenses in such a way that it is almost impossible to make up the accounts to June 30. I think the members of the committee will readily see the difficulty of adopting any other plan than that which exists at the present time, and no particular advantage would be gained if the report of the Immigration Department were made to conform to the fiscal year instead of the calendar year. The facts set out would be practically the same. I may say that I have no great fault to find with the criticism which has

Mr. WILSON.

been addressed to the department by my hon. friend who has just resumed his seat, after giving his views at considerable length. For my part I would be only too pleased if the same attention which has been given to the subject this year were given to it every year by members of the House, because I fully recognize the fact that no minister can possibly hope to carry on the work of his department in such a way as to be free from legitimate criticism or from suggestions which may redound to the benefit of the work in the future. I cannot agree with all the conclusions at which my hon. friend has arrived, and I think that he has reached some of his conclusions upon somewhat insufficient evidence. On a number of smaller matters to which my hon. friend has referred, possibly a word or two would not be out of place. My hon. friend first referred to the reports of the various agents in England as indicating the great difficulty of getting the class of immigrants we would like to get. First he spoke of the English tenant farmers. No person can travel through England without being impressed most strongly by the fact that England is not, in the sense in which we understand the term, an agricultural country. A very small portion of the population subsist by agriculture, and it is rather a diminishing than an increasing quantity; and it is most difficult, as is pointed out in the reports of the agents which the hon. gentleman read, to do immigration work among the class of people to whom he refers.

Mr. WILSON. Might I call the hon. minister's attention to the fact that Mr. Jury said he did not think the tenant farmers were desirable immigrants?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Jury might not think they were desirable in the sense that they were people who would be likely to be satisfied to live such a life as new settlers are compelled to live on prairie farms. In that sense he might possibly be correct, although, if they were induced to come, they would no doubt weather the difficulties of pioneer life as they have done in many cases and proved to be desirable settlers; but there is very little that an officer of the Canadian government can place before the tenant farmer of the better class to induce him to come to Canada. Generally a man of considerable means, he lives in most comfortable style, surrounded by the society which it pleases him to mix with, and there is very little indeed which could be placed before him by any of our officers that would induce him to break his home connections and settle in this country. We have to some extent to make efforts to get this class of people to come and settle in the older provinces. I am not prepared to say that the efforts have met with very much success, and doubt if they will for some little time to come. But

while my hon. friend was quite correct in calling attention to the facts to which he has adverted, it does not follow that there is going to be a serious falling off in immigration from the British Isles. It may be we will not be able to increase the number largely, but by continuing the expenditure and the work carried on in the past with increasing vigour, we may, with the advantage resulting from increased experience, continue to receive even as large a number as we are doing at present. I indicated, speaking to the reporter to which my hon. friend referred, that there might be doubt of our receiving as many immigrants from England itself during this year as during the last, but that is due, to some extent, to the fact that a very strong effort is being made to induce English settlers to go to South Africa—with what success it is not possible for any one to say.

Mr. DAVIN. I thought the hon. gentleman said that he had given no interview.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. I said I did not remember speaking to the Montreal *Herald* reporter, but that I had spoken to some reporter, and that what was reported was substantially what I said.

My hon. friend referred to efforts being made to bring people here to compete with the labouring men in Canada.

Mr. WILSON. I referred to Mr. Jury, in Liverpool, who, prior to his going over there, had been a labour agitator in this country, and declaimed against bringing out working men to compete with our labouring classes, and I called attention to the fact that I did not think he was the best kind of man to be an immigration agent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. While I am not in a position to state exactly what Mr. Jury may or may not have said, in the very large number of public addresses he delivered in Canada before he became immigration agent, his work so far has been fairly successful, and I have no fault to find with his activity or ability.

But I may say that no effort is made on the part of the officers of the department to bring people out to compete with our own labourers. The contrary is the principal on which they work.

Mr. WILSON. That being the case, are you not astonished that the few who have taken up homesteads are found on the farms?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will come to that in a few moments. Just now I desire to state, in connection with this particular point, what the policy of the department is and is likely to be. Since I have been in charge, and I presume in former years to some extent at least, our policy has been to avoid bringing out peo-

ple of the class, generally known as labourers, namely, men who would go to the cities to compete with what is generally designated as labouring men. Farm labourers are considered in a different class altogether, because the farm labourer makes the most desirable citizen in a new country. After spending a year or two working with a farmer, almost invariably, he becomes a settler, and one of the best you can get.

My hon. friend made some reference to the work in Ireland. It is quite impossible, carrying on a large system of work such as we do in various countries, to say we will only carry on the work where we get the largest number of people for the smallest amount of money. Although to a certain extent, we must adopt that principle, we cannot adopt it absolutely. I do not think the hon. gentleman would agree that we should at once close up a certain work because the total expense, in proportion to the number of people we got from that particular place, were larger from some other place. We desire to get all the people we can of the proper class, and if we can get a larger number of people from Ireland by increasing the expenditure, I do not think that \$6.97 per head, as the hon. gentleman figured it—

Mr. WILSON. \$14.77 per head, while from Scotland it is little less than \$7, and from England and Wales about \$1.72.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think that the expenditure the hon. gentleman has figured out is an excessive one. Let me call my hon. friend's attention to the expenditure, which takes place in connection with other institutions, which have found it desirable to settle up vacant lands. Take the expense incurred by the western railways. In the United States, they have for years past calculated that each head of a family placed upon land in that country costs on an average \$500. This enormous expenditure shows the difficulties of doing successful immigration work, and these difficulties have been most seriously exemplified by their efforts than the efforts of any other institution. I would not think that the figures of the hon. gentleman, which I have not checked, but will later on, would be excessive if we can secure settlement from year to year. We have to make expenditures in certain places and watch results and be guided somewhat by circumstances. I may say to my hon. friend, on that point, that we have been overhauling the work in Ireland for the purpose of seeing if expenses could not be reduced without impairing the efficiency of the work. One man in the Dublin office, Mr. Webster, will possibly, be shifted to the North of England, Scotland, but that step has not been taken yet.

My hon. friend referred at considerable length to the case of Mr. McInnes, the agent of the department at Detroit. He

gets \$1,500 a year, and the expenses to which the hon. gentleman had referred. I do not think that his salary is excessive. He has been most successful in the work he is called upon to do. He went to Detroit and started his work there when there was no movement of any kind whatever from that place.

Mr. WILSON. I knew the agent very well who started the work in the United States, and that was the head centre, Captain Holmes, who lived in my town. McGinnes worked for him at \$900 a year, and no doubt thought he was very well paid.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon gentleman is right in saying Mr. Holmes inaugurated the work in the United States. But I am sorry to say his efforts were not successful. I said that there was no movement from the agricultural districts about Detroit to Canada, until Mr. McInnes went there, and what I said was perfectly correct. But there has been a very considerable movement since Mr. McInnes went there to work. For the first few months after he went there, he was not successful in getting many immigrants. But, by persistent work, he has secured a large number of very desirable settlers; and since he made his first successful beginning, there has been a steady stream of most desirable people coming to Canada, as a direct result of the efforts he has made.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) referred to the commission that we pay on the people that come from the United States. He spoke of the fact, that as soon as an immigrant from the United States crossed the line, the bonus was earned. And the impression he left was, that for every person crossing the line the commission was paid. But my hon. friend, having looked into the accounts would know that that is not the case. Last year we paid a trifle less than \$6,000 for bonuses on people, the number of immigrants who came in being 12,000. Then he spoke for a considerable length of time—called my attention to it again a few moments ago—on the question of accounting for the numbers that come over. I understand his argument to be, that in accounting for the number of these people, you take the number of homestead entries, and you allow so many for each homestead entry, multiply the number you have allowed and you have so many people, leaving a balance not accounted for.

Mr. WILSON. I did not say that, I gave you the homestead entries and a large number besides.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend then made an estimate of the number of persons who went into the several districts. But I want to point out that it is impossible for the department, under any circumstances whatever, to be able to account for all the people that come across by the number that take up homestead entries. We have a large in-

Mr. SIFTON.

crease in the number who took up homestead entries, but it does not follow that the balance of people, whom we cannot exactly locate have left the Dominion of Canada. Such is not the case. Those who are familiar with settlement in the North-west, know that that is not so. Some go to the city of Winnipeg; they spread out in the district around Winnipeg; they buy land from the North-west Land Company, the Hudson's Bay Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or some other railway company; and it is impossible for us to have an actual account of where each of these people have gone. We do show a phenomenal increase in the number of entries, quite as large an increase, as ought to be expected, considering the number of people that we claim to have come in. For instance, in 1896, the number of immigrants reported, was 17,464, while the number of homestead entries in the same year, was 18,557. We reported in 1899, 44,500 immigrants. That would be a little over two and a half times as many immigrants as in 1896. In that year, there were 6,689 homestead entries. Taking from that the entries made by Canadians, which would indicate there would still be about 4,000 homestead entries, which would indicate that the proportion of homestead entries has grown in just about the same proportions as the reported growth in the number of immigrants. I may point out, too, that a large number of the best settlers we have, are people who have come from the United States. Large numbers of them are Western farmers. Many of these people simply come there themselves, examine the country for themselves, decide where they are going to locate and purchase land; and there is no possible means of keeping an exact record of where they are located. It is a fact of common notoriety in Manitoba, and the North-west that settlement has increased with very much greater rapidity in the last three years, than in former years. In connection with homestead entries, to which my hon. friend refers, I wish to point out that the total number was 6,689 last year, but that does not include any of the entries that are to be made for the seven thousand odd Doukhobors. So if these were taken off, the total number of immigrants being a little over 44,000, that leaves the proportion of entries to immigrants much higher than in 1896.

Mr. WILSON. I accounted for all the Doukhobors and Galicians, except those who had homesteaded before; because they were accounted for before. I did not ignore the Galicians or the Doukhobors.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson), ignored them; I am simply pointing out that the homestead entries have grown more largely in proportion to the number of reported settlers, and also that it is

absolutely impossible that we should be able to give an exact account of the rest of the people. If we had the Russian system of passports, we could do so; but we cannot do it under our institutions. The only way we can do it is to keep as exact an account as possible of the people who come in. And we have no reason to believe that there has been any considerable exodus from the west. I think I am safe in saying that there is a general agreement among the people who are best acquainted with the circumstances, that the loss of population which did take place in Manitoba, and some other portions of the North-west to a very considerable extent some years ago, has been practically checked, and there is no serious loss of population going on at present.

Mr. DAVIN. What evidence is there of that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am simply referring, as my hon. friend (Mr. Davin), is aware, to what I believe to be the general opinion of the people in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, who are familiar with the facts of the case. I assert without any hesitation, that the fact is, that there is no substantial loss of population in Manitoba and the North-west by the departure of people to the south, as there was in former years. I make that statement without hesitation, and quite convinced that the best opinion of the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories will concur in what I say as being correct. The hon. gentleman asked me to give in some detail, if possible, so that he might locate it, the expenditure of \$224,000, which was spoken of by Mr. Pedley, the superintendent of immigration, as having been made in Canada last year. The statement with which I am furnished, is as follows: Salaries, \$73,000; seaport expenses, \$23,000; expenses looking after settlers and locating settlers, salaries and general travelling and other expenses incurred in connection with the Winnipeg office, \$44,000; Doukhobor bonuses, \$35,000; advertising and printing pamphlets, \$12,000; grant to Lake St. John Railway Company and Repatriation Society, \$10,500; girls' homes, \$1,500—that would be the Montreal Women's Home and the Winnipeg Girls' Home; bonuses on children, \$2,300; collecting exhibits, \$2,800; miscellaneous expenditure in Canada, including largely liens for grants paid for settlers, to which the hon. gentleman made some reference, altogether about \$20,000. That makes a total of \$224,000.

Mr. WILSON. I thought the hon. gentleman told us they were not making advances to settlers?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I said we had made some advances under circumstances in which we thought it was necessary for the purpose of preventing settlers from coming to want, but I said

we had no general policy of advancing money in this manner, and only did so under circumstances of great necessity.

Mr. WILSON. He is asking for \$10,000 more this year to pay salaries than last year. Now, the hon. gentleman told us that he is not going to put on any more officers, therefore, I do not see why he wants any more money. It does seem to me that an expenditure of \$44,000 on the Winnipeg office is outrageous.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The pay list at the present time for salaries of officers who are now in the employ of the department, amounts to \$103,616.25 for the year. I can give the hon. gentleman the list of officers, if he likes.

Mr. WILSON. If he only wants \$103,000, why does he ask for \$110,000?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have put in a round sum of \$110,000, leaving a margin of \$6,000 or \$7,000 to cover any changes which might be made. But, as I said before, I have no intention at the present time of appointing any new agents.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say a few words with regard to immigration in general, before dealing with the specific items that are submitted for our consideration. I have been looking into the subject somewhat during the session, and have come to the conclusion that the expenses for immigration are growing very rapidly, without affording any adequate return for the outlay. For a number of years past we endeavoured to reduce the expenditure. In 1894, \$202,235 were spent on immigration, and the hon. gentlemen opposite, who were on the opposition side of the House, declared that we were spending entirely too much on immigration, that the country did not get a proper return for it, and that the expenditure ought to be cut down. In harmony with that view the government endeavoured to curtail it, and in 1895 they reduced it to \$195,652. The next year the same story was told, and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and his friends attacked the expenditure ferociously. Consequently, it was again cut down the following year, 1896, to \$120,000. The present government then came into power, and notwithstanding that they had attacked the immigration policy of the preceding government so vigorously, they did not put their preaching into practice, for we find that in 1897 they increased the expenditure to \$127,438; the following year they increased it to \$261,194; in 1899 they made another jump and brought it up to \$387,863; in 1900, the expenditure crept up to \$435,000, and for the year 1901 they propose to expend no less a sum than \$445,000 on immigration. And this, notwithstanding the fact that most of their agents in Europe declare that the outlook for getting immigrants is by no means bright; that the improvement of

times in the old country, and the opportunity of profitable employment for labour, and the attractions of other countries, all tend to diminish the prospects of European immigration. Under these circumstances, the people of Canada will naturally ask how it is that the department spends this large amount of money without increasing the number of immigrants to a proportionate extent.

In looking over the items, one is struck with the way in which this money is expended. The Minister of the Interior said that he pays for agents, alone in salaries, \$103,000. The fact is that the number of officers employed in the immigration department has gone up so rapidly of late years that now we have practically an army of them pensioned on the country at very large salaries and giving very little return. We have in the United States at present 256 agents who are paid by commission, receiving \$3 a head for every male over 18 years of age, \$2 a head for every female, and \$1 a head for every child they bring into Canada; and the consequence is, that if they happen to find a man who is coming into Canada, it may be out of curiosity, and who intends to return again, they put him down as one of their immigrants and receives \$3 a head for bringing him in. Now, in the Committee on Agriculture we endeavoured to ascertain how these agents managed to satisfy themselves that the commissions they received represented so many actual settlers brought into Canada, and they could not tell us that these people who came in all settled in Canada, they could only tell us that they crossed the line. When they were asked on what grounds they claimed payment of their commission, they said that if a man came over here to take up land, that was sufficient evidence to entitle the agent to the bonus. The result is that we have 256 agents who are collecting bonuses in this way in different states of the union.

In addition to that we have some twelve or fourteen salaried agents who are operating in the United States. The hon. Minister of the Interior told us that Mr. McInnes, who is operating in Michigan, had done some splendid work through the year. We have a return showing the number of immigrants that he has brought in from that state, and while there appears to have been a few brought in, it does not indicate that there is any great amount of work being done. In the state of Michigan, although there are three of these paid agents, there are in addition to them some dozen or two dozens commission agents. They got, in the year before last, ninety-seven people from the state of Michigan, and they ostensibly secured 126 settlers from that state last year. That was the result of the work of three salaried agents who were paid large salaries in Michigan, and of the large number of commission agents employed there.

Mr. SPROULE.

We are paying out that large amount of money to get the number of people that I have mentioned. We have an army of these agents. Let me give a few, as shown by the Department of the Interior. In the United States we have W. G. White, inspector of United States agencies; M. V. McInnes, D. L. Caven, James Grieve, C. J. Broughton, T. O. Currie. Mr. Grieve is an ex-member of this House and Mr. Currie was one of the leading spirits of the Patron organization, who corralled the Patrons and brought them into the camp of the Grits. He had to be recompensed for his services, and they gave him the position of immigration agent in the United States, which he is now filling at the large salary which he receives. Benjamin Davies, E. T. Holmes. Mr. Holmes, I believe, is a brother of the hon. member for West Huron. J. H. M. Parker, W. H. Rogers, William Ritchie, J. S. Crawford, W. V. Bennett, Rev. R. A. Burriss, on Rainy River and Thunder Bay immigration; C. O. Swanson, on Scandinavian immigration; Rev. M. Blais, on French colonization; Rev. H. L. Gouin, on French colonization; Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Colonization Department; Dr. T. A. Brisson, agent general Colonization Society of Montreal; Professor James Mayor, on European emigration. These are a few of the agents who are operating in the United States.

Then, we have a large number besides who are employed as agents in Eastern Canada: S. Gardner, immigration agent, St. John, N.B.; F. W. Annand, immigration agent, Halifax, N.S.; P. Doyle, immigration agent, Quebec, P.Q.; John Hoolahan, immigration agent, Montreal, P.Q.; Andrews Home, Montreal; Women's National Immigration Society; Dr. Barnardo's Homes; Children's Distributing Home, Knowlton, P.Q.; Marchmont Home, Belleville, Ont.; Canadian Catholic Emigration Society; Robert A. Dawson, Dominion S.S. Line interpreter; Ignatius Roth; Liverpool Catholic Children's Protective and Rescue Home; Scandinavian National Society, Montreal; Consul-General Schultz, on Austro-Hungarian immigration, G. Bogue, travelling immigration agent.

There are besides these the agents employed abroad as follows: High commissioner for Canada; inspector of agencies in Europe; G. H. Mitchell, agent, Liverpool; Alfred F. Jury, agent in north of England. Mr. Jury is now in England endeavouring to induce the labourers of England to come to Canada and he says that they comprised the only class of immigrants that we are likely to get, while, a few years ago, he was employing his time in decrying the Conservative government for bringing these labourers to Canada and placing them in competition with Canadian workmen. W. L. Griffith, agent in Wales; H. M. Murray, principal agent in Scotland; John Grant, agent in Scotland; Thomas Duncan, agent

in Scouland; C. R. Devlin, Canadian Commissioner in Ireland; Edward O'Kelly, agent in Ireland; John Webster, agent in Ireland; A. Bodard, agent in France; D. Theau de Coeli, agent in Belgium.

Then, we have the agents in Western Canada as follows: W. F. McCreary, commissioner of immigration; Dr. C. S. Corbett, Dominion health officer, Winnipeg; W. Langmuir Watt, on settlement of Winnipeg vacant lands; J. M. McGovern, travelling immigration agent; J. W. Wendelbo, Scandinavian officer; Léon Roy, French interpreter; Thomas Gelley, French interpreter; C. A. Jones, German interpreter; Cyril Genik, Galician interpreter; C. W. Speers, general colonization agent; W. H. Paulson, Icelandic agent; agent at Brandon, agent at Minnedosa, agent at Dauphin, sub-agent at Swan River; J. S. Crerar, immigration agent, Yorkton; agent at Alameda, agent at Regina, agent at Lethbridge, sub-agent at Pincher Creek, sub-agent at Medicine Hat, agent at Calgary; Jos. M. Smith, land guide; Cook Myer, land guide; J. W. Burdick, land guide; C. W. Sutter, immigration agent; Thomas Bennett, immigration agent; agent at Edmonton; Gerhard Ens, land guide and interpreter; agent at Prince Albert, agent at Battleford, agent at Kamloops, agent at New Westminster. These are only a few of the number that appear in the report of the Department of the Interior that are to-day pensioned on the country, and we find that the return that we get from them is very small indeed. We find that the expenses for immigration purposes have crept up from \$120,000 in 1896 to \$445,000 for the coming year. Now, I do say that we are paying out entirely too much for this purpose. We heard the hon. Minister of the Interior say a few years ago that the great requirement of Canada was to fill up our great western country. He said that the illimitable possibilities of that country were such that we would be justified in paying out a large amount of money to bring people into the country and place them there. My answer to that was that I did not regard it in that light. I have never believed that it is a matter of very great importance that we should make our country as thickly peopled as the eastern countries. The condition of the people is, I believe, of more importance to the country and to have the people profitably employed and their labour properly distributed, every one deriving the full profit of his labour, than it is to have a very large number of people in the country. If the only consideration was an increase of population we might take China and Japan, which have 450,000,000 of people, many of whom are degraded so low that they are very little above the brute creation at the present time. Take those European countries that have such large populations. Where do you find the great mass of the people in the most abject poverty? It is in these countries. So that,

it is not a matter of such great importance to have our country filled up with population as it is to have the population in our country profitably employed and able to support themselves. But we are told that it is very desirable to have an increased immigration to our country, and that we must have an army of agents employed for that purpose. Who are the people that they are bringing into the country? We have Doukhobors and Galicians, two of the outcast classes of nations of continental Europe. The Canadian government claims credit for bringing these races to Canada, when the country from whence they come have practically cast them from their shores. I stated a few years ago that I did not believe these were desirable immigrants, and this statement was stoutly combatted by the minister (Mr. Sifton), who read communications from his own agents who were sent out to get reports favourable to the government to refute it. Since then I have taken some interest in this question, and I taken some interest in this question, and I find the strange coincidence that after these people got to Winnipeg, the police reports showed that a large majority of the commitments were of Doukhobors and Galician immigrants. When the children of these were charged with theft, they said that their parents compelled them to go out into the streets and lanes of the city, and that they would beat them when they got home if they did not bring back something with them—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What authority has the hon. gentleman for that?

Mr. SPROULE. The police reports of Winnipeg.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Would the hon. gentleman refer me to any single such report?

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot just now, but I remember the facts very well. In addition I have the information from gentlemen living in the place that the commitments were very numerous, that the thievery amongst that class was very extensive, and that many of them were purloining and thieving everything they could get their hands on.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) give one single instance of a Doukhobor having been convicted of stealing in any part of Manitoba or the North-west?

Mr. SPROULE. The principal offenders in that regard were the Galicians, but my information is that they were both.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Will the hon. gentleman tell us who gave him that information?

Mr. SPROULE. I will not now, but I am satisfied that it came from a reliable source.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I thought you would not give it.

Mr. SPROULE. It can be verified by hundreds of people in the city of Winnipeg, and especially by those who attend the police courts. My information is from a gentleman who attended the police court and saw with his own eyes, and who had no object in distorting the facts. We have the sons of Ontario who are anxious to go to that country, but who cannot get assistance from the government, to the extent of one dollar to do so. They are native born people, accustomed to our manner of life; they have helped to make the country prosperous, but they are compelled to pay their own way; while Doukhobors, Galicians, Scandinavians and Finns, are encouraged and subsidized to settle in the North-west by this government. That is a crying injustice. It is an unjustifiable waste of public money which the people of this country will not endorse. There has been a rather startling proposition made by Mr. Preston, who proposes to go to South Africa to induce the Boers to settle in Canada. Have we not had experience enough of the Boers already, when we have been obliged to send our citizens to help England to maintain law and order in their country. Mr. Preston who says he has travelled nearly 20,000 miles in the last few years hunting up immigrants, proposes to bring the Boers into this peaceable and law-abiding portion of the British Empire. They cannot be kept in subordination where they are; they are in every way antagonistic to the sentiment of English law and English civilization, and yet we are invited to spend our money to enable them to settle down in this country. The people of Canada paid nearly \$2,000,000 to send their sons and brothers to keep those Boers loyal to British rule, and now it is proposed that part of this \$445,000 shall be spent in importing them here. If we had them here, we would probably have to spend thousands of dollars to keep them loyal. I believe, Sir, that the people of Canada will not endorse any such proposition as that. What are we spending this immense amount of money on immigration for? We are spending it for the purpose of giving bonuses to steamship companies who are supposed to distribute our literature, but Mr. Preston tells us that that literature is often found in large quantities in the cellars of the houses, and is not distributed. We are spending this money for commission to agents, for the Barnardo Home, for different societies that bring waifs and strays from every country to our shores, and many of whom become objects of charity when they get here. I want to say a word right here with regard to Mr. Preston's conduct when he was before our

Mr. RUTHERFORD.

committee, and I state that he showed an insolent and impertinent disregard of the rights of that committee and the rights of this House which appointed that committee. The time at our disposal at each sitting of the committee was not sufficient to enable us to get the information we desired, and in fact Mr. Preston had to promise to secure that information from the department, as he did not know anything about it himself. The second or third time he appeared before us, he said he would not come before the committee again. We insisted that he was bound to, but he said he had taken his passage for Europe, and there was not another passage to be obtained until next fall, so that if he did not go then he could not go at all. I told him that Europe would not suffer much if he never got there. He said distinctly that he would not attend that committee whether we liked it or disliked it, and although he was instructed to return, yet at the next meeting it was announced that he had taken his passage to Europe and had entirely disregarded our order. Had I been at that meeting of the committee I would have reported Preston to this House to deal with him as he should have been dealt with for his insolent and impertinent bearing before that committee and his failure to give the information which we desired and to which we were entitled. That man ought to be brought home and put at some other work, because he is not fit for the position he occupies. We have a number of these agents travelling through the country distributing the immigrants on homesteads. C. W. Speers is one of these; and he gets, I think, \$100 a month. To show his conduct, I have a letter written by Mr. James Armstrong of Toronto, who was connected with the York Colonisation Company for several years, and who, on going up there, saw this condition of things. He says:

On the way out I met W. H. Haines, a miller from Saltsburg, Pennsylvania. He was advised by the Dominion agent (Mr. Caven) to go to Calgary, and thence to a point midway between that place and Prince Albert. I had a talk with him and had his ticket changed from Calgary to Yorkton, promising him two homesteads from eight to ten miles from Saltcoats or Yorkton. On the train to Yorkton he met Mr. Speers, the general immigration agent of the Dominion government, and told him he would have to go forty or fifty miles from Yorkton to get a homestead. Speers, had left the train down the road before Haines told me. I have now had Haines to write a letter to the board of trade at Saltcoats stating the facts of the representation made by Speers. I purpose when I reach Yorkton having a list of homesteads made out, which I think will show that within fifteen miles of Yorkton there are 100 vacant homesteads.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Deserted.

Mr. SPROULE. Not by any means deserted. The hon. gentleman is a little too previous.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I know the country better than the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking from information given by a man who is quite as respectable, truthful and intelligent as the hon. member, who has travelled over that portion of the country time after time, who knows it thoroughly, and who is speaking of what he knows. Then I ask, why do Mr. Speers and the other agents advise people to go beyond Prince Albert to settle? A gentleman has given me a reason, which may or may not be the correct one, that is, that there is some kind of connection between them and the Mackenzie and Mann crowd who are building a railroad in that district. But why an agent of the government should directly falsify the situation, and tell the people that a homestead is not to be got within a radius of forty or fifty miles of that place, when hundreds are open for entry, is something I cannot understand. This conduct should not be allowed to continue, because it is unfair to people who desire to settle in that country. One objection which people have to settling in that locality is that the Doukhobors have settled there. I find that the lands of English-speaking settlers who happen to be located in close proximity to where those people are settled, have gone down in value from twenty to thirty and sometimes as high as forty per cent, because English-speaking people do not want to live near them. Why should we spend so much money in bringing immigrants to Canada and do so little for our own people? The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) told us that every immigrant who came here from Ireland cost \$14.75, and every immigrant from the United States cost \$20; and I think he is under the mark. Why should we spend \$20 bringing a man from the United States to locate in Manitoba or the North-west when we would not give our own Canadian boys from Ontario or Quebec a cent to go and settle there? I say it is unjust to our own people. Therefore, the government are not justified in spending this money. The hon. member for Lennox has proposed to cut the vote down. I am heartily in favour of his proposal, and shall vote for it, because I honestly believe that we are spending money unwisely and extravagantly for the purpose of bringing immigrants to Canada a large part of whom are of a very undesirable class as settlers. There may be a fusion of the races in the future, but they will assuredly drag down the Canadian race. Instead of uplifting and bettering the condition of the Canadian people, they will rather make it worse; and I fear that there may be a time, it may not be in the near future, it may be in the distant future, when we shall be subjected to another such expense as we have had to incur in keeping the Boers under control in South Africa, and that will be for the purpose of taking care of and keeping in sub-

jection the undesirable class who are pouring into our country to-day. In my judgment this government have been extravagant from the first day they came into power until to-day, that extravagance is growing very rapidly, and the people of Canada at the earliest opportunity will give it their condemnation at the polls.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite prepared to admit that great care and economy should be exercised in the expenditure of money for the purpose of bringing people into this country. When I sat on the other side of the House, I criticised the expenditure for immigration from year to year. I conscientiously believe that a large percentage of the money expended was virtually thrown away. I am glad to see that a great deal better work has been done in the last few years than was done before. We know that in ten years previous we spent about \$3,300,000 upon immigration, and accomplished very little.

In the last few years, we have unquestionably brought more settlers into Canada than in any six years before. This is a good return for the money expended. I admit frankly that immigration agents are sometimes disposed to be extravagant, and I would warn the department to hold a tight rein on all these men and see that each of them is doing work proportionately to the amount of money he is drawing. If not we should certainly dispense with his services.

I believe that good work has been done through the establishment of agencies in the United States. These agencies have been the means of bringing a good many immigrants into this country, who will become the most desirable settlers we have. I do not know where you could get a class better fitted to succeed in our North-west than the people you can bring from the western states. But, great care should be exercised in the selection.

I have travelled with immigration agents and have remarked the style in which they travel, and in many instances it has struck me as absurd. It seems to me that there can be no reason why they should travel in a pullman from morning until six o'clock at night instead of the ordinary car, though the case is different when travelling by night. If an agent is extravagant, the inspector of agencies should be held responsible. He should see that these men do work in proportion to the moneys they receive. For my part, I am not prepared to endorse extravagance of any kind, and would insist on the department looking carefully after these men, for if you give them a loose rein they will be sure to go beyond the limits.

I hope we will continue to receive as many settlers from the United States as we have done in the past. We have had some criticism from hon. gentlemen opposite of the class of immigrants we are bringing in. The hon. member for North Grey, for in-

stance, found great fault with the Doukhobors, and even went the length of making serious charges against them, but when brought to book and challenged to give his authority, he was utterly at a loss, and placed in a very humiliating position. I have seen these people and made inquiries about them, and from all I saw or heard they are very industrious, honest and good workers. But, I can remember the time when Mr. Daly was Minister of the Interior, and his brother an immigration agent in the United States. His brother went across to Chicago and brought into our North-west a lot of Jew pedlars, with packs of cheap jewellery and other nick-nacks on their backs. These people were admitted as immigrants, and it was only when some of them were arrested for swindling that the whole thing became exposed. I should say it is much better to bring in the Doukhobors, or even the Galicians, than Jew pedlars. No doubt immigration agents are sometimes deceived themselves, but Mr. Daly must have known what class of people these were, and he got the ordinary per capita allowance for bringing them in. This principle of per capita allowance is not a new one. The present government did not inaugurate it, but I question very much whether it is a good one. I question whether it would not be better to have first-class men at a fixed salary and trust to their honesty, instead of paying a per capita allowance.

I am glad to say that good work has been done during the past year, and I hope that the department will see that no expenditure is incurred beyond what the necessities justify. One pleasing feature on which we must congratulate ourselves is the fact that the exodus from Canada has ceased, to a large extent, and that we are having instead a large influx of population both from the United States and other parts of the world. What we want in Canada is increase of population. If we can get them to settle in the North-west and other sections of our country, that will tend to build up Canada and improve it as we can in no other way; and I should not think \$8 or \$10 a head an extravagant expenditure for every head of family that would become a settler and occupy our lands, or even do mining work. But, whatever expenditure should be made in the future, I would strongly urge on the department to see that we get the value of our money.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman had the grace to apologize for the expenditure on immigration.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. DAVIN. If his speech was not an apology, I do not know what it was. But I will say it was a defence in the shape of an apology. The hon. the Minister of the Interior had no explanation to give in reply to

Mr. McMULLEN.

the demand of my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson), who wanted some explanation of the enormous expenditure on immigration and the enormous sum the hon. gentleman is asking for this year, \$445,000. The Minister of the Interior got up and referred to certain items with regard to Ireland, and argued that an expenditure of \$14 per head there was no reason why we should cease our immigration work in that country. But, he carefully avoided going into details. Take that very case in Ireland. The proposition of the hon. minister, that because the outlay in any given field might be in excess of the outlay in another, is no reason for abandoning that field, I grant you. But that was no reply to the criticism of my hon. friend from Lennox. Who doubts for a moment that the best proof we have that the expenditure in Ireland is excessive is the fact that the agent we sent there, Mr. Devlin, we sent not for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of the staff, but for the purpose of decreasing the surface irritation in Canada. Mr. Devlin was sent to Ireland for no other purpose than to keep him from being a thorn in the side of the Prime Minister.

What did the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) who spoke before me, say? And, by the way he has fled the House as is his custom when anybody rises to reply to him. He says he is not going to apologize, but he says he is not going to defend extravagance on the part of the Minister of the Interior, he is not going to defend excessive outlay in the United States. He expressed the hope that this expenditure would be carefully looked into, and that next year it would be seen if there was any extravagance that extravagance would be done away with. Is not that apology? And in the very same speech in which that apology was made, he yet defended the present outlay of \$445,000. I ask the attention of the people of Ontario, and I ask the attention of the electorate of Wellington to the speech we have just heard from this renegade from economy. He referred to the time when he used to speak from a bench on this side. And, in 1894, speaking from this side, he said, referring to a number of things that could be done in the direction of economy:

Then, we can save \$200,000 a year on immigration. We have squandered an enormous amount in immigration. Three millions and a half of dollars have been spent in the last ten years to bring people into this country, and when we come to enumerate the population, we cannot find them in the country.

The expenditure on immigration for that year was \$202,235. That showed that he thought that \$202,235 was sufficient.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Judging by results.

Mr. DAVIN. That assertion of my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) is about the same value as the assertion of the Minister of the Interior when we asked

him for evidence of the bold statement he made that there was no exodus now. I asked him for his evidence, and his answer was: That is the best opinion on this subject. Just as I have heard a lawyer who had no case, when the bench asked him why he stated such and such to be the law, not being able to quote a case, he could only answer: It is my belief that that is the law. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) can only go upon his own belief. However, I am now dealing with the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), one of the economical critics of other days, though he is now defending this expenditure of \$445,000. When the expenditure on this service was \$202,000, he said we could save \$200,000. He stated the expenditure in the previous ten years at three and a half millions. But, if you look at it, you will find that it amounts to only \$2,630,368, or he overstated it by \$869,631. What I wish to call the attention of this committee to is that the hon. member for North Wellington like the rest of the party in the House—happily not like the rest of the party in the country, for the voice of the Liberal party in this country is as sound for economy as it ever was—stands for extravagance. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) asks to reduce this item by \$10,000. Why not so reduce it? It is evident from his own report that Mr. Devlin for instance renders little or no service for the \$2,000 a year and expenses paid to him. He sits in his office and leaves the work to be done by others—such work as is done—and, as a matter of fact, there is but a beggarly return from that office. Then, take Preston. I expected when my hon. friend criticised Preston that we should have some explanation; and I attended the committee for the purpose of learning what was the explanation of Preston as to why he was employed. And what was his explanation? Why is he paid \$3,000 a year and expenses to go from hotel to hotel, to go from capital to capital in Europe? He told us in the committee that he went from agency to agency, and what did he find? Everything glorious. He had not a fault to find with anything, except that the literature of some of the old Tory activity was a little musty—and he made no effort to change it. So, you give a gentleman an opportunity to go all over Europe and enjoy himself at our expense—\$3,000 a year and carte blanche for expenses; and the only return we get is that he comes and tells us that everything is very satisfactory. In these two men alone, you have nearly the amount of the \$10,000. Then, take some of these men who are employed, and employed for political reasons. For, Sir, the unfortunate thing about the officers of the immigration branch of the Department of the Interior is that too many of them bear palpable evidence that they have been appointed solely on account of political exigencies. One appointment is made to reward a defeated

candidate, another is made to get an undesirable person out of Canada and so on. And, I say to this committee, if it is to do justice to the facts before it ought to reduce this amount by \$10,000. The hon. Minister of Interior made an argument as to the relation between the number of immigrants who have come into the country in 1899, and the number of homestead entries in that year on the one hand, and the number of immigrants who came in in 1896, the number of homestead entries in that year on the other; and he said the relation was about the same. If it is about the same, what ground can he have for saying that the relation of both to the exodus would not be about the same? The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and his faithful henchman beside him (Mr. Rutherford) laugh at that. But, surely, if the relationship between the immigrants coming in 1896 and the homestead entries in that year is the same as the relationship between immigrants of 1899, and the homestead entries of that year, would it not be a fair conclusion that if we lost a certain proportion of our immigrants in 1896 we should be losing the same proportion in 1899? Now, as to the exodus, my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), who is not in his place to-night, on a previous occasion brought forward such facts as the amount of settlers' effects exported to show that the facts did not support the contention that the exodus had ceased. I shall certainly support my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) in seeking to reduce the vote and shall register my protest against these bloated expenditures. Let me say here that I do not say one word and never will, against any poor man from any country coming into Canada. But, I entirely disapprove of having any class of settlers; I entirely disapprove of the system of settling people in colonies. Above all, I entirely disapprove of discriminating against our own people. I say that anything you do for any immigrant coming in here, you should do for a Canadian. Do not make fish of one and flesh of another, particularly when you are making fish of your own countrymen, who have certainly as much claim upon us as a man coming in from one of the four corners of Europe.

Mr. BERGERON. I intend to vote for the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson). This reminds me of what I used to hear in Quebec, concerning immigration during election times. Our friends opposite used to say that the government of Canada was squandering money upon immigration, that instead of spending it usefully, in helping to bring back our compatriots from the States, who desired to return to Canada, we were spending it in bringing in foreigners. In 1895, we spent \$130,000 on immigration, in 1896, about the same amount; and now we are asked to vote \$445,000, not to bring back our compatriots

from the States, not even to help our Ontario boys who desire to settle in the North-west and Manitoba, not to help the people of Quebec who may desire to move into the North-west—but this immense sum of money is largely spent in bringing the worst kind of immigrants from the other side of the line. I want to tell my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, what I have seen of those immigrants. A good many of them come up by the New York Central to Montreal, where they tranship to the Canadian Pacific Railway. These people are so filthy that the railway company has to give them a special car, which they attach to the rear of the train. On one occasion, last year, when I was travelling on that road, I asked the conductor how it was that he seemed to have two ordinary tourist or immigrant cars hitched on to the rear of the train, instead of as usual having the parlour car at the rear, and he told me that he was obliged to put these immigrants at the rear of the train because they emitted so offensive an odour, that the people in the other cars could not endure it. That is the kind of immigrants they are bringing into Canada. I grant that the hon. gentleman is trying to do his best, but I must say, that in my opinion the Galicians and Doukhobors belong to a class of people that we should not spend any money in attracting to our country. Now, a word about the exodus. I have often heard hon. gentlemen opposite say that the exodus has discontinued. That is a mistake. The emigration of our people to the United States is just as great now as it was five or ten years ago. I do not blame the government for it. I am only mentioning the fact that no change has taken place in that respect. People emigrate just as they used to do, as some of my hon. friends from Quebec counties can testify. They go away to work in the States, some of them come back in the fall, and some do not. Now, Sir, we are voting such an immense sum of money this year, nearly half a million dollars, that even the hon. member for North Wellington is uneasy, and advises the government to use strict economy. For these reasons I shall support the amendment of the hon. member for Lennox.

Mr. PUTTEE. I understood the minister to say that he did not expect there would be any more appointments to the immigration staff, that the amount of money now asked for would be about the limit. I am glad the limit is about reached, and I hope the expenditure will not go any further. It is something to know that a half million a year will not be exceeded, and that the army of able-bodied pensioners are now in full strength. We are really spending a large sum of money, for which we get no adequate return. I believe that it is the general feeling throughout the country that neither in the matter of quantity or quality of the immigrants are we getting proper returns. While I do not wish to

Mr. BERGERON.

to speak disparagingly of any race of men, at the same time, I must say that there are some people we prefer to others as neighbours, who are more desirable settlers and who will make more desirable citizens. It is well understood that the people of Great Britain and Ireland, and the northern countries of Europe make the best settlers, and those are the countries from which immigrants are expected in lesser numbers each year. The Deputy Minister of the Interior says that he does not expect much more immigration from the United Kingdom. As respects continental immigration, he says:

As to this class of immigration, it is undoubtedly true that the Germans and Swedes are among the best settlers who have located in the United States or Canada. But the laws enforced in those countries with regard to emigration are such as to preclude our making any direct effort to secure settlers from Germany and Sweden. This also applies to other countries. German emigration has greatly fallen off within a few years, and the same may be said of Swedish emigration. That is probably due to the fact that emigration has been discouraged by the respective governments of those countries. It will be necessary for the department, therefore, to direct its efforts to other countries where less restrictive measures are in force.

I think this is an unfavourable time to increase our immigration expenditure, when we have it on the authority of our blue-books that the very countries where we used to get good immigrants, are the countries where the volume of immigration is decreasing; because that means that the increased expenditure will be spread over other countries where we cannot get desirable immigrants. The deputy minister refers in his report to two sects of Southern Russia, as being likely to come over in considerable numbers. I think we now have a right to expect that immigration should be carried on without government assistance to the extent of the immediate past. It can be expected that from some of the districts in southern Europe there will be a steady stream to join those already here, without the government spending any more money for that purpose. I am sure we can depend on getting a sufficient number of undesirable immigrants, without going to the expense to obtain them. I do not think it is just to the people that are already settled in the North-west to place colonies of these Europeans around them to a greater extent than can be assimilated. I believe that at present, as in the past, immigration to this country is chiefly in the interests of the transportation companies and the land speculators. These parties have a direct interest in stimulating immigration. But in the interest of the people who are already settled in this country, I think the government should go slow in spending money for bringing in people from foreign countries.

I believe that a man who wants so much inducing to come is not the best man. Men

who come to our country, who are going to make valuable citizens, are men who are more likely to come of their own volition. Then, there is also a political aspect to this affair, and it is a serious one. Where these various nationalities are being placed in colonies together, knowing the history of party politics in this country, we may expect to see all kinds of plans being made and tricks and schemes employed for securing their votes for one or other of the parties. To show how far this fad of immigration has gone—and it is now a fad—I might draw the attention of the committee to the report of Prof. Mavor in the blue-book. Prof. Mavor has evidently wandered all over Europe touching every little country and every little sect, all of which are reported upon fully. It is very interesting to any person who wishes to make a study of the various races which inhabit Europe, but why it is put in this blue-book I do not know. There is a paragraph on page 228 that I do not think would have been allowed in a blue-book if it had been observed. In speaking of the attitude of the United States towards the immigration question, he says :

The actual exclusion of the European so-called pauper immigrant has, however, been carried only to an insignificant extent, probably owing to the immense power in politics of the capitalistic interests, for it is clear that the 'generous welcome' implies among other immediate results increased competition for employment; and therefore apparently, and perhaps really, for the time being, the keeping down of wages.

Now, I am not going into that any further. Everybody knows that that is what it means. But, it always strikes me that we are a long suffering people, especially in some of our cities where we see the effect of these things, and where the people say so little in protest against them. We have our tariff policy, our customs tariff that increases the price of everything a man buys, that helps the manufacturer to sell all his goods dearer, and at the same time we not only do not extend this protection to labour, we not only allow labour to come in free, but we actually bonus it. That is a complaint which is a well grounded one, and it is one which should be done away with. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this is a bad time to increase the immigration expenditure. I am not finding fault specifically, because there has been great activity in immigration matters. Previous to the last general elections both parties tried to outdo each other in their promises as to what should be done to promote immigration. I believe we have seen this matter of immigration carried far enough. I believe that the North-west Territories can be left alone to a considerable extent, and that we should look more to the government of the country. It does look like an absurd proposition to spend half a million dollars to bring people into the country knowing, as we do,

that in the past, and probably in the future, we have retarded settlement by railway land grants and exemptions. I will support the amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson).

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, the committee will remember that the hon. Minister of the Interior is now asking for pretty nearly half a million of dollars for immigration. We have an experience, not of any new policy, as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) would have given the committee to understand, but it is simply a repetition of the old policy, whether good or bad. I am not stating my own opinion now, but I am stating the evidence that was given more than once, so that there is no mistake about it, that the policy of the present government, whether good or bad, is the policy practically of the preceding government. I am not going into a comparison between what has been accomplished by the respective governments. It is possible that it may be found that neither was as successful as one would wish, but it must be remembered that a very large increase is now being asked for, and if hon. gentlemen are to be judged at all as to what the future will be they must be judged fairly on what the record of the past has been. I am going to be very brief, but I must refer to some of the answers which the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) gave to my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson), who made what seemed to me a very useful, a very thoughtful and a very important speech on the subject to-night. One thing that the hon. gentleman complained of, and justly complained of, was, speaking in regard to some of the agents in Europe, that Mr. Jury's whole life was the opposite of the course he is taking now, and he pointed out that no man could turn around in his opinions so quickly and become a useful man. He quoted his report, and one thing in his report, that must be circulated in Europe, was, that he would not advise tenant farmers to come to this country because they would be worse off than if they remained in the old country, and also because their condition now in the old country was such that we could not expect them to come. That was rather throwing cold water on the whole thing, and the hon. Minister of the Interior might as well have recalled Mr. Jury. The hon. gentleman said in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson): I am not able to say what all the deliverances of Mr. Jury were or how many speeches he made in Canada, but I know that he is doing very good work. If the hon. gentleman thinks that is a good answer he is not doing himself justice. The hon. gentleman is never wanting in argument when there is any answer to be made. He is not wanting in skill, in putting it in the best light, and therefore, we must conclude that he has no argument in regard

to Mr. Jury, and that he thought he had better leave the complaint unanswered. In regard to what the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) has said, I think it is entirely too late to discuss the question of adding to the numbers of the people in this country. I believe we are all agreed that we should have this country filled up as rapidly as we can, but the number of the population of Canada no more determines the progress of Canada, as a single element stands out by itself, than it proves that a family of thirteen is infinitely better than a family of six. Neither would determine anything.

The immigration policy of the present government has been extremely unfortunate, and has been, in my opinion, detrimental to the best interests of our country. The government and their supporters may say what they like about this, but any defence they may make is utterly futile among the people who know them best. I believe, for my part, that if this immigration policy had not been entered upon, no man in his senses would attempt to inaugurate it in the light of our experience to-day. I ask the Minister of the Interior a question, and the answer to it may tend to shorten this discussion. Is it the policy of the Department of the Interior to encourage in the future as largely as in the past, the immigration of Galicians and Doukhobors?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
No.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) says, No, and I am glad to hear that declaration from the government. The hon. gentleman sees now that his policy was a mistake. I can understand there being an anxiety to increase our population, but there never was a greater mistake committed than the importation of so many of these undesirable settlers. The Minister of the Interior has made an open confession, and it is a good thing for Canada that he has announced, on the part of the government, that their policy is not to repeat the mistakes of the past. When hon. gentlemen opposite go upon the stump they will, no doubt, claim credit to the government for increasing the immigration. But, let us analyse the results of their policy for a moment and see where they stand. I will not give my own word, because that unsupported might be worth little, but I will quote from the records. It appears that the government claim that last year there were 44,543 immigrants. They are called 'declared' settlers, and that is quite a diplomatic word to use. Now, that claim of the government is not borne out by the records and that being so, it may be set aside as thoroughly worthless. There are said to be 6,889 homesteads entered upon during the last year. It is an unjustifiable assumption that all these homesteads were entered by immigrants brought into the country, because

Mr. CLANCY.

no one will deny that many of these homesteads were taken by farmers already in the country for their sons. Of these homesteads, 2,134 were of persons from the other provinces, 720 by persons who had made previous locations. If you deduct these that would leave only 3,832 homesteads that can be assumed, with any reason whatever, as being located by immigrants. Taking the basis of three and one-fifth to each family, that would give you 12,272 people as being found upon homesteads. Let us see how we are going to account for these 44,000. There are 12,272 found to be located, 7,350 Doukhobors came in in addition. There were children brought in from the Barnardo home, and other homes of a similar character, to the number of about 1,100, who are entered as 'declared' settlers. I would ask the Minister of the Interior, if it is fair to enter up as declared settlers the little children that are brought in by these societies? Does that not make the report misleading to a certain extent. 906 persons are reported to have settled in the Lake St. John district, 973 are reported to have come in under the repatriation society, 227 in the Rainy River district, and 280 brought in by Mr. T. O. Curry. That leaves 23,000 in round numbers accounted for, including the little children and the Doukhobors and the Galicians and others, so that we have 21,434 that are not accounted for at all.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) allow me to ask him if he is not aware that a very large proportion of the immigrants from the United States do not take up homesteads at all? They come into the older settled portions of Manitoba, and they buy railway lands or lands from private owners. In the neighbourhood where I live there are no homesteads available at all, and we have an enormous settlement of these people who came in there and bought lands and settled upon them.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Rutherford) gives that as his opinion, but he cannot expect to have that opinion carry any weight simply because he lives in that country. The immigration department is supposed to account for the persons who arrive at Winnipeg, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rutherford) is entirely wrong, because the army of agents who are there to receive the settlers, and make account of them, take no notice of these persons, under the circumstances, the hon. gentleman speaks of.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. They are all declared settlers; they are brought in by the immigration agents.

Mr. CLANCY. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, does not wish to make a mistake, but it is impos-

sible for these people to come in without our getting a record of almost every one of them, as they come in by well-known routes.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman has read the reports of his own department, he knows that it is alleged there that fully 5,000 have come in by other means, and that there is no account of them at all. If the hon. gentleman's statement is true, that of his agents is at fault. I say you cannot account for every person who has come in; but to say that there are 21,000, or one-half the alleged number who have come into the country, who cannot be found, is perfectly ridiculous. It proves, if one is to draw any reasonable conclusion, that they are not there at all. We are asked for nearly half a million dollars to bring into the country exclusively agricultural classes. Now, let us see what has been accomplished during the past year. Quoting from the reports of the agents at St. John, at Halifax, at Quebec, and at Montreal, I find that the persons brought from Europe, including farmers and farm labourers, and including every boy of twelve years of age and upwards as an adult, out of the 44,000 odd settlers declared in the hon. gentleman's report to have come in, only numbered 6,889. I am referring to the male population. I would like the hon. gentleman to give some explanation to the House and the country of this great discrepancy. If that statement has any element of truth in it, it discloses a most lamentable state of affairs. It means that the policy of the government has been a dismal failure. I am sure that the hon. gentleman will not admit that it has been a success. If these figures are correct, there is something radically wrong. When we sum up the whole thing, we find that of the 44,000 persons alleged to have been brought into the country, 14,000 or 15,000 were Doukhobors and Galicians—that one-third of the whole number have been of a very undesirable class as farmers. Let me read what the hon. gentleman's own agent at Alameda in the North-west Territories, J. S. Crear, says of the Doukhobors:

These people have now good buildings in their villages. They are very handy with axes and other tools. They are all mechanics of some kind—carpenters, blacksmiths, wagon-makers, tanners, shoemakers, harness-makers, &c.

These are the persons who are brought into the country as professed agriculturists.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. So they are.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman might as well go down Sparks Street and say the watchmakers are. Here is the opinion of an agent who was not discreet enough to withhold that from his report. If he had had the proper training from his minister, he would not have put it into his report.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. If the hon. gentleman will permit me a moment, I know those people. They are exactly the same as a handy Canadian farmer. They do the work for themselves; they are handy with tools, but they are all farmers.

Mr. CLANCY. How does the hon. gentleman know that they were all farmers before they came here?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Because they had no means of earning a livelihood except by agriculture.

Mr. CLANCY. And yet they have each been able to learn a trade. It shows how ready and how worthless the hon. gentleman's opinions are. They are as worthless and current as brass coppers.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but that certainly is strong language to use. I had an opportunity of watching and conversing with those people for months, and I know the people I speak of, but the hon. gentleman knows nothing about the subject whatever.

Mr. CLANCY. I am speaking of what I find in the report of the Department of the Interior against that immense knowledge of the hon. gentleman derived from conversing with these people for months. It is simply on the ground of assurance that the hon. gentleman gets up and gives his experience as against the report of the department. I have no doubt that if you were to take all the shoe-makers, wagon-makers and tanners in Ottawa and put them up there on farms, they would be engaged in farming, but that proves nothing. It shows that the class of persons stated to have been brought in have not actually been brought in.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What page is the hon. gentleman quoting from?

Mr. CLANCY. Page 150, of Mr. Crear's report. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how he can account for the small number of persons that are said to have been brought into this country—I mean the adult population, from twelve up, forming the mass of the population of the agricultural classes out of the 44,000—have settled on land?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may say at once that I quite agree that the hon. gentleman's criticism is a fair and moderate one, though I cannot always agree with his conclusions. His first point is the number of agricultural settlers compared with the number of immigrants. He figures out that there are only 6,700 odd agricultural settlers out of the 44,000 immigrants. I presume that the hon. gentleman gets at that by taking the number shown in the returns

from the ocean ports. That would not be a fair way to get at the number. In the first place, there are 7,300 Doukhobors in the returns of last year. As the hon. member for Macdonald says, they are all agriculturists, although, of course, there are among them persons practising handicrafts of various kinds. The agent says that these people are very handy with the axe and other tools, and in various kinds of handicraft, and that in their physique they will compare, both men and women, with any British settlers. But these people have always been upon land and have no intention of doing anything else than settle upon land.

Mr. CLANCY. They are included in that 7,000 or nearly 8,000, classed as agriculturists by the agents?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They could not very well be included in that. There were 7,300 Doukhobors, and the hon. gentleman says that there were only 6,700 agriculturists, so that the 7,300 could not possibly be included in the 6,700. In addition to the 7,300 Doukhobors, there are 6,700 Galicians. These people have practically all gone upon land. I do not suppose that out of the 6,700, there are 100 who have not, in one way or another, gone upon land, either as actual settlers, or as agricultural labourers. Take the rest of the 44,000, there were in the neighbourhood of 12,000 who came from the United States. It is safe to say that they are practically all agriculturists, though I do not say that there was not here and there a man who was not, especially in the colony from the neighbourhood of Detroit. There were, no doubt, a few people who intended settling as mechanics, among those they knew, who came from that part of the country, but the great bulk of the 12,000 came as agriculturists, without any intention of being anything else. There were therefore, these 7,300 and 6,700, and the 12,000, who may be classed as agriculturists.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman surely will not take the ground against the reports of his own agents at St. John and Halifax, Quebec and Montreal, who kept the record and got their information by inquiry.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No doubt they inquired the occupation and business of these people just as they would in case of settlers from the mother country. I freely admit that this is the first time this has been called to my attention, and I have not been able to give my personal attention to it, but, besides the theoretical explanation which I am now giving, I will be able to give my hon. friend an actual explanation the next time this matter comes up. But my hon. friend must remember that a great many people have gone to the North-west and followed agriculture, who never followed that pursuit before; and whatever may be

Mr. SIFTON.

the special avocations of these people, when they left their native countries, they certainly came here with the intention of settling on lands, and the great majority of them have done so. My hon. friend asked me if it was the intention of the government to encourage the immigration of Doukhobors and Galicians to as great an extent in the future, and I answered at once, that it is not; but in making that statement, I am not in any degree expressing any regret for the policy of the government in the past in connection with these people. It does not follow that because we do not desire to bring in 7,300 Doukhobors this year, we regret having brought them last year.

In the same way, we had considerable Galician immigration. I think that the number of Galicians that have come in is not excessive. If I had my way at the present moment, I would not lessen the number of Galicians who have come into the country. I think we shall be able to assimilate them, in fact, I have not the least doubt of it. I shall not go into the question in great length, because I spoke for a couple of hours last session on the subject of the Galician and Doukhobor immigration, and said about all I had to say; and no purpose would be served by my repeating that now, after two o'clock in the morning. My own opinion, as I say, is that we have not too many of them; and, as I said last year, I do not see any objection to a moderate number of these people, the Galicians, coming here year by year. I would not encourage them to the same extent to which we encouraged them in the past, because then there would be a larger number coming than it would be easy for us to handle. These people, not knowing our language and customs and not having any large means cannot well take care of themselves at the first and are apt to cause a good deal of work for the officers of the department.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. minister think it desirable to bring in any class of people who are unable to take care of themselves. I ask that in view of the statement he makes that they may easily come in in such numbers that the department cannot handle them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in saying that they cannot take care of themselves at first. Being strangers, not speaking our language, not being accustomed to our ways, they are not able to take care of themselves in the same way that people from the western states are able to take care of themselves, and they need a great care and attention on the part of the officers of the government in the first year, and they require sometimes some assistance, too. But if the hon. gentleman will look into this matter attentively he will find that they are good people, that

they are getting along all right, and will be substantial settlers. If the hon. gentleman will go back in memory to the coming of the Mennonite settlers, he will see that the same thing happened that has happened in the case of Galicians. When the Mennonites came in, the government of that day was blamed for bringing to Canada the scum of the earth. They were attacked with violence, even greater violence than has characterized the attacks upon this government in connection with the Galicians or Doukhobors. There have been some excessive attacks made upon me in this connection, as, for instance, where I was held responsible for the murder said to be committed by Galicians. But, apart from erratic remarks of that kind, the criticisms in the present case has been moderate enough. There was much more violent criticisms against those who brought in the Mennonites. I need not enlarge upon the point, but the hon. member (Mr. Clancy) and the House know that the Mennonite settlement has been most successful. Their habits, when they first came, were not all that we could desire. A Canadian going through the Mennonite settlement twenty or twenty-five years ago, as I did when a boy, would see many things that would not be very pleasant for him to see. But, to-day these people are a prosperous, substantial people.

**Mr. CLANCY.** Will the hon. minister say that at any stage the condition of the Mennonites was precisely the same as that of the Galicians or Doukhobors?

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I venture the statement that the Galician people on the average, are in much better condition than the Mennonites were after having been a similar length of time in Canada. I have no doubt that any one familiar with the circumstances will say that. I may say, in addition to that, that while we differ politically, I am sure that my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) will at least do me the honour to treat me as I do him—that is, listen to what I say and take the trouble to ascertain whether it is correct or not. I say, and the hon. gentleman will find it to be true, that these people are desirous of assimilating with us and becoming Canadians; they desire that the habits which attached to them in the land from which they come should be set aside and that they should become Canadians. And they manifest great facility in acquiring the language and habits of the Canadian people. I cannot say so much, in this respect, for the Doukhobors. They are somewhat like the Mennonites. They are inclined to remain together and become somewhat repellant in their ideas and habits. Assimilation, in their case, will be somewhat more difficult than in the case of the Galician. However, I am satisfied with what we have done; I would not undo it, though I am aware that

is has subjected the government to some criticism by hon. gentlemen opposite which may produce more or less effect. I do not know that there is very much that can be said in connection with that subject further, except that I may make a slight reference to what my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) said. I am sure he could not have thought very carefully of what he was going to say when he made the statement that the Doukhobors and Galicians were a class of the people from whom the criminal class was largely recruited. I make the statement without fear of contradiction that the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in his facts. Of course, the debate springing up without either party having the records to prove their contentions, it cannot amount to more than the expression of the hon. gentleman's opinion on one side and the expression of my opinion on the other side. But, I make the statement, as head of the department and with the full sense of the responsibility, that I am satisfied the hon. gentleman cannot show that there has been a large proportion of either Doukhobors or Galicians who have come under the ban of the criminal law than of any other class of the population. On the contrary, I venture to say that, in proportion to their numbers the Doukhobors have been brought less in contact with the criminal law than any other separate nationality in Canada—certainly than any other nationality in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I am not saying that by way of reflection on any others, but it has been remarked there that these people are especially law abiding people who are not brought into contact with the criminal law in the sense the hon. gentleman speaks of. The Galician people I would not say so much for. It is true that there have been a number of cases in which the Galicians have been prosecuted for criminal offences. There were, unfortunately one or two cases of murder, one of them of a particularly atrocious character. But atrocious murders are committed even by Canadians sometimes, we are sorry to say. There is nothing to indicate that the Galician people are a criminal class or that they have criminal tendencies in an especial degree. The criminal offences committed by them, I think, were almost entirely petty thefts, and the number of cases arising was not so great as to indicate that they were more inclined to take offence than any other class of the population.

My hon. friend has criticised at considerable length the actions of Mr. Jury. Now, of course, I appreciate the act that when a gentleman who has been actively engaged in political matters and has made, perhaps, more or less enemies amongst my friends of the other side is appointed to office, it is only human to expect that they would address considerable criticism against him. Therefore, Mr. Jury and Mr. Preston and some other gentlemen somewhat in the

same category must expect to get rather more than their share of criticism. However, I am sure that in their calmer moments hon. gentlemen will admit that these are men of fairly good ability and quite competent for the work they are called upon to do. Mr. Jury is a man, so far as I have learned, of much more than ordinary capacity. I think that every one who is acquainted with his character will say the same. Mr. Jury has been working hard, and I think it would not be fair to him to let this criticism pass without saying that he has earned the salary that is paid to him, that he has worked faithfully to do what he was sent to do, and I think he is doing it with a reasonable amount of success.

I wish to say a word too, about the general question of the expenditure. I am not surprised that my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) calls a halt; that he makes the statement calling the attention of the committee to the amount of the vote asked for this year. The amount is unquestionably large, but I am perfectly satisfied that the work in which we are engaged cannot be carried on for a smaller amount. That being said, we come to the question as to whether the work is worth the money. Upon that point I have myself no doubt whatever. There are no doubt hon. gentlemen who honestly hold the view of the member for East Grey, that we might just as well drop this expenditure and take our chances in regard to getting increased population. For my part I take the directly opposite view. I think that if we can get an accession of 40,000 or 50,000 to the population of Canada year after year for the expenditure which we are called upon to make, which would average about \$10 per head, it would prove a great benefit and amply repay the outlay. I think the increased production of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and the effect that it will have upon the general prosperity of Canada, especially upon the manufacturing towns of eastern Canada, will be well worth the money. For my part, while I am prepared to admit that the subject is a debateable one, I am strongly of the opinion that the policy the government is pursuing is a correct one.

Mr. PUTTEE. I wish to say that when these immigrants are in our country we should see that they are protected and that they should be fairly treated, and we should treat them fairly ourselves. I think that is a matter the Minister of the Interior should attend to. Sometimes the railway companies employ large bodies of these men on their lines, and there was an arrangement by which they employed them through agents and deducted \$2 a piece from each man for the agent's fee. The commissioner of immigration in Winnipeg undertook to supply these companies with men when they wanted

them, of course without fees, with the intention of saving to the men the \$2 fee. But I understand that recently there has been an arrangement made by which, although the commissioner supplies men straight to the companies, the agents still take \$2 off the wages of these men for their fees. I think that is a matter that ought to be looked into and remedied at once.

Amendment (Mr. Wilson) negatived, and resolution adopted.

Women's Protective Immigration Society,  
Montreal ..... \$1,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This society was organized for the purpose of caring for female immigrants arriving in Montreal. A report is made annually to the department of the operations of the society, which is embodied in the departmental report. The report of the society for 1898 shows that 164 immigrants passed through the home during that year. Those who arrived at the home are kept there until such times as places can be procured for them.

Girls' Home of Welcome, Winnipeg..... \$1,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This home in Winnipeg is under the management of an English lady named Miss Fowler, a philanthropic person of considerable means. She undertakes this work purely from love of it, and I was strongly pressed for the last three years to increase the assistance from \$500, which we formerly have been giving to \$1,000. We are giving \$500 extra, which of course, is only a small portion of the amount that is spent in connection with the institution by this lady herself.

Contingencies in Canadian, British and foreign agencies and general immigration expenses, including salaries of extra clerks at head office..... \$283,000

Mr. WILSON. I am sorry the minister did not see fit to meet us part way. I feel we are spending altogether too much money on this immigration business, and I move that this item be cut down by \$83,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the minister explain to us what is the reason of the \$24,000 increase in this vote over last year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is difficult to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) an exact statement of where the increases come in because of the way in which the estimate is made up. We have estimated for the total expenditure. I can, however, give the hon. gentleman some items which will give the hon. gentleman an idea of the increases, although they do not show the exact amount. We have an item this year of \$11,000 for postage,

which we did not have last year. We did not pay postage last year because under an arrangement with the Postmaster General, all kinds of immigration literature were franked by the Post Office Department; but the Auditor General and the Minister of Justice decided that it was not lawful for the Postmaster General to frank immigration literature and now we have to pay the postage. Then, there is \$52,000 for continental bonuses, as against \$12,000 last year. That is a difference of \$51,000. The total difference, as hon. gentlemen will see, is \$24,000. That will show the increases in the two items which I have mentioned. There are other items running all through the estimates, in some of which there are decreases, and I could give the hon. gentleman a statement in detail, but it would not add greatly to his information.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that the hon. gentleman has included in his estimates a vote for extra clerks at the head office. How many extra clerks does he propose to employ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is \$3,000 allowed for extra clerks, and it is allowed because, particularly, during the summer, and until December, the work at the head office is increasing. We hire clerks under the Civil Service Act, and pay them \$400 a year.

Amendment (Mr. Wilson) negatived.

Mr. CLANCY. I wish to say to the hon. Minister of the Interior that it seems to me to be a great anomaly that we should have a calendar year for the departmental report, while the accounts are running for the fiscal. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should consider the advisability of having some conformity. Of course, there will be six months of accounts appearing at one time. That must happen if a change is made, but I am sure he recognizes the advisability of having the reports running for the fiscal year to be at all intelligible, and for the purpose of making comparisons from anything like an intelligible point of view as between two years.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman must see the difficulty there would be in adopting his suggestion. Supposing I wanted to make a report showing the operations of the department for the fiscal year; it would be absolutely impossible to tell what the real scope of the operations of the year were, because the fiscal year ends in the middle of the work. Of course, if the House insists upon it, we would have to make a report covering the fiscal year. I do not know that my hon. friend is not within his rights in saying that it should be done. I am quite prepared to consider what he says is desirable should be done.

Mr. CLANCY. I admit the difficulty that the hon. gentleman points out, but there is a difficulty both ways. It seems to me that it would be less by having the report made up in the way that I suggest. The report would always have to be six months behind, as there would be six months that you could not cover. We have passed this last fiscal year without having looked into account, and, of course, that will always happen. I think if the change were made it would, perhaps, serve a better purpose than the system which prevails at the present time.

Mr. SPROULE. Looking over the report, it seems to me that it would be very difficult to divide the accounts for the year, and there might be a very good reason for having the accounts as they are. I would like to say a word in reference to what the hon. Minister of the Interior said in regard to some of the agents he has in Europe. He said that some severe criticism had been directed against Mr. Preston and Mr. Jury. Knowing Mr. Jury very well, I made no unfavourable comment upon him, but I think we might be pardoned for criticising the conduct of Mr. Preston rather adversely. Most of the officers of the hon. gentleman's department, notably Mr. Pedley and Mr. Smart, did everything that men could do, and were desirous in every way to give information that the committee desired to have, but there was one notable exception, and it was Mr. Preston. I think his conduct justly merited any criticism that we directed against him to-night.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) knows that I was not here, but I am satisfied he will do me the justice of saying, that if I had been informed that any officer of my department had not treated the members of the committee with proper respect, I would have endeavoured to see that he did so.

General immigration expenses ..... \$75,000

Mr. DAVIN. We cannot take any more to-night.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have been discussing the whole immigration question, and really the whole field has been covered.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman knows well that we did not cover very much of the question to-night. There were absolutely no details asked for. If it had not been so late, I should have inquired about the Winnipeg office and many other places.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let us go on.

Mr. DAVIN. We have passed four large items without the least criticism, and the hon. gentleman knows very well that ordinarily these items would be canvassed, and we would have asked more details. We cannot go further to-night.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not want to be unreasonable, but we have discussed this item as an item of \$445,000 all night and we have also included the item of \$50,000. Every hon. gentleman who has spoken has done that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) will have plenty of opportunity of discussing the immigration policy on going into supply. The Finance Minister wants to get these main estimates passed.

Mr. DAVIN. We have gone through the main estimates and there is only an item in the supplementaries. We cannot go any further to-night.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All right.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will the Finance Minister take up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe that Private Bills not dealt with will be the first order in the morning. Then we will probably take up the Post Office Bill and later in the day either the railway subsidies or supply.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Both.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly, both, if time permits.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.35 a.m. (Tuesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, July 10, 1900.

### PRAYERS.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

### ADDITIONAL SESSIONAL INDEMNITY.

Mr. G. E. CASEY (West Elgin). Before we proceed to the Orders of the Day, I have to call attention to a most gratuitous and uncalled-for insult directed against one of the leading nationalities of this country by the Conservative organ in Hamilton. The *Spectator* of Saturday last has the following:

Mr. DAVIN.

The French members of parliament are demanding additional sessional indemnity, and have gone on strike to compel Laurier to open the public treasury to their greedy grasp. The round robin was signed by Frenchmen only, the British members knowing that their constituents would not approve, and Sir Wilfrid, taking his cue from this fact, determined to do the right thing for once in his life. He is now trying to pacify the strikers by asking them to dine with him; but the cash patriots of Quebec insist upon 'ze mon.' It is not improbable that Sir Wilfrid will come down.

It follows up this gross insult by one or two similar ones. For instance, 'The Frenchmen in the House of Commons are a-round robin again.' The pun is very easily understood.

Will Sir Wilfrid's English head refuse, or his French heart agree to pay the increase of wages demanded by the striking French members?

In the first place, as an English-speaking member from the province of Ontario, I wish to protest against this gratuitous insult.

Mr. GIBSON. What paper?

Mr. CASEY. The *Spectator*.

Mr. GIBSON. You cannot expect anything better from it.

Mr. CASEY. We ought to expect something better than a purely gratuitous lie.

Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. It is absolutely false to say that the demand came only from the French members of the House and the Liberal party. We all know that it came from a very large percentage of members on both sides, both English and French. The English members signed it, members from all over the Dominion signed it, and for my part I am not ashamed to say that I signed it myself.

Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. At the same time I quite understand why it might be a bad precedent to take such a step at the fag end of the session, when a lot of the members have gone home. I am ready to defend the assertion any where you please that \$1,000 is quite insufficient indemnity for a five or six months' session, and that it should be permanently increased if the sessions are to be as long as they appear likely to be. But that is by the way. My main object in rising was to resent this insult to the French nationality, and to resent it, as an Ontario man, who cannot help feeling disgusted and expressing his disgust that any journal in this province should have descended so low.

Hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad that my hon. friends opposite feel the same as I do on the subject.

Mr. T. D. CRAIG (East Durham). I am very glad that my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) has brought this matter to the attention of the House, because I intended to do it myself if he had not. I was prepared to call attention to it when he rose. It is most unfortunate that any newspaper, especially in Ontario, should refer in this way to French members of the House, and especially is it unfortunate in a matter of this kind, when the facts are not stated, but absolutely misstated, and a false impression cast abroad in the country.

I agree with what the right hon. the Prime Minister said the other day about trying to weld the different parts of this country together, and I believe we are pretty well welded together, but there is no doubt that statements like this tend to excite feeling in the minds of the people of Ontario, who do not know the facts, against not only the French members of this House, but the French Canadians generally. I am very glad to be able to corroborate everything said by the previous speaker about the signing of this round robin. He says that he signed it, and is not ashamed of it, and I repeat that statement with regard to myself. I say this to defend the French members of this House from the aspersion cast on them by the *Spectator* and to repudiate the statements made by that paper. I have no doubt that this statement was made under a misconception of the facts. I would not like to think that the *Spectator* would make such a statement, knowing the facts to be the reverse. ♦

An hon. MEMBER. You do not know the *Spectator*.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not, but still I think hardly any newspaper would do that. It is very unfortunate that newspapers think it their duty, when any matter of this kind is mentioned about members of the House of Commons, to write in a strain reflecting on the members, and, in fact, giving the impression to the people that we are down here working absolutely for ourselves and not in the interest of the country at all. I can say strongly for every member of this House, as far as I know, and speaking for myself, that that is not the case at all. I hold that there is not a man in this House who does not come here at an absolute loss to himself. Even if the indemnity were increased, that fact would still remain the same. I cannot imagine any man who is not in business of some kind, for the most of us have to be in business in order to support our families, and no one in business can come here and spend four or five months here every year without suffering loss. It is very unfortunate that the news-

papers should feel called on to cast aspersions and slurs on the members of this House when they endeavour to do what they think is justice to themselves and those who depend on them. With reference to this increase of indemnity, there are two precedents, though I am not particularly wedded to precedents, and if I think a thing is right, am willing to support it without looking back to see if somebody else has done the same thing some time previous. I prefer to judge by the conditions existing. In 1885 we had an increase of \$500 of indemnity. That was given because the session was a long one, lasting six months. The Franchise Bill had been under consideration, and the members of the Liberal party thought it their duty to vigorously oppose the Bill, and even obstruct it, in every possible way, and on that account the session was prolonged. At the fag end of the session, the government brought in estimates to give the members an additional \$500, because they had been so long in session. There was very little objection to it, but some recrimination as to who caused the length of the session. I might perhaps discuss the reason for the length of this session, but do not intend to do so. I know that there are hon. members opposite who have said that the session has been prolonged by the opposition, but it cannot be proved by *Hansard* that the opposition have done anything to unduly prolong it. We have discussed the different measures that have come before the House, it is for that purpose we have been sent here. If the opposition did not discuss all the measures that come before the House, the country would condemn them for their want of diligence. In fact, the only power the opposition has is to discuss measures and expose them to the country. As has been truly said by a newspaper some time ago, the opposition are really the attorneys of the people. It is their duty to expose the measures that the government bring forward, and show their weak points.

Just imagine, if the opposition did not discuss the questions, what would happen. I maintain that the opposition—and I speak not of this opposition alone, but of any opposition—saves the country millions of dollars every year. For, I do not care what party is in power, there is such pressure brought to bear upon that party by their supporters outside that, were it not for the fear of criticism, they would not resist. The opposition here have not done more than their duty. On the other hand, it might be argued, and it might be said by some that the government have prolonged the session, that their estimates have been late in coming down, and their railway subsidies also were late. But what I contend is that neither side has the right to accuse the other of prolonging the session. I go further and say that, from my observation, I am led to believe that the sessions hereafter will not

be less than four months except under special circumstances, and they will probably last between four and five months. Why? Because new countries have developed—the North-west, British Columbia, the Yukon, and so on. These new countries take time. If we look through *Hansard* we shall find that most of the time this session has been taken up in discussing the interest of these new countries. It may be said that parliament could do better if it were smaller. But we have to deal with things as they are. It must not be forgotten also that private legislation occupies a great deal of time, and it is increasing. The country does not suppose that we are going to pass everything without criticism. We are here to criticise fairly and to decide with mature judgment on the matters that come before us. Passing from 1885, when the precedent was made for the granting of an increase, I come to 1891. In that year, the House sat for five months. At that time a measure was brought down to give an increase of \$500 to the members of the House by the government, and I notice that the resolution was supported by the leader of the present government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I want to read a few words of what he said, because I agree with it all. I might read every word of his speech, for it is all good, but I will be brief. The present Premier said :

I am prepared to approve and endorse every word which has been spoken on this occasion by the hon. Minister of Finance. The necessity of the measure which has just been introduced does not require to be defended on the floor of this House ; for the public at large will realize, I am sure, that all the members of this House, with perhaps not more than four or five exceptions, are men who have to depend on their labour for their living—men who are not capitalists, and who have no income but what their daily labour gives them. Under such circumstances, it is absolutely impossible for men to continue to discharge the duties which devolve upon them as members of parliament if the sessions are to last, as this one has lasted, five months in the year.

The present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said :

There is no doubt, Sir, I think, that the statements made by the hon. Minister of Finance and by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, will be most fully appreciated on both sides of this House. Whether they will be equally appreciated outside, I am not quite so sure.

I wish to remark that, so far as I heard, not a word was said against this increase of indemnity to members. I never heard the slightest objection to it ; in fact, I know that people in the country thought we were quite justified in voting it and accepting it, and I believe that to-day the same feeling prevails. It is possible for a newspaper to stir up some feeling on this as on any other subject ; but when the people are left to themselves, now that sessions are—through the fault of nobody—prolonged to

Mr. CRAIG.

about five months, there will be no objection to an increase in the indemnity. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) went on :

But under the circumstances I, for one, am perfectly prepared to share the responsibility and to justify the action of the government. There is no doubt whatever, as my hon. friend has stated, that from the first day of February last up to the present first day of October, the vast proportion of the members of this House, who are dependent upon their professional exertions for their maintenance, have suffered very great loss.

The present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) made some opposition, not to the principle itself, but rather to the way it was introduced. He said :

I would say that it would be more becoming, in my judgment, for the future, if it is not deemed wise to adopt the suggestion at present, that there should be legislation on the statute-book providing for exceptional sessions such as this, so that all will know in advance how exceptional sessions should be dealt with. Such legislation should not be the work of those who are going to benefit or suffer by it, but be applicable to succeeding parliaments alone. If this resolution be adopted, I trust that the administration will, before another session rolls by, introduce a measure that can be discussed by those who are not to be affected by it—a measure applicable only to succeeding parliaments.

That is all right, but it was not acted upon then, and this government have not acted upon it. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) advocated that some statute should be passed. Why has he not introduced—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not advocate that. I said that if—

An hon. MEMBER. Careful.

Mr. CRAIG. The hon. gentleman said it would be more becoming, certainly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not referred to my remarks since, but my impression is that when the proposal came before the House I said that as an alternative it would be more fitting, instead of the parliament of the day voting money into their own pockets, if they dealt with the subject at all they should deal with it in the form of legislation making it applicable to future parliaments. I did not express myself in favour of the proposition.

Mr. CRAIG. The Postmaster General objects to my saying that he advocated it—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not express an opinion.

Mr. CRAIG. I did not mean to say that the hon. gentleman expressed an opinion. He said that instead of voting the additional indemnity for that session a Bill should be passed. But we cannot suppose

for a moment that the Postmaster General would say that members should sit here for six months for \$1,000. I cannot imagine him believing that; and I do not think anybody in the country believes it. If sessions are to be permanently lengthened longer than they were, as I believe to be the case, and the indemnity is to remain at \$1,000, you could not get men to come here, except men who are in politics exclusively or men who are independently wealthy—or as a member near me has suggested, men who are coming here to make money out of politics, and I do not think there are many of that kind here. I wish also to read some few remarks of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). He took some exception to the proposal. He thought there ought to be a definite understanding as to the allowance to members of parliament and thus avoid calling upon members from time to time to vote money into their own pockets. He said:

It is certainly a great hardship that we should have to remain in Ottawa for five months during the hot season of the year; and I am quite sure, if the experience of others had been like mine, that \$1,000 would hardly pay their incidental expenses in this city.

Now, I have something stronger to read than anything I have read yet. It is from the present hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills), who was then a member of this House. I am going to presume on the patience of the House to recall a little more fully from Mr. Mill's speech than I did with the others, because I agree with everything he says, and because the hon. gentleman took strong ground on this question which, I believe, will commend itself to every elector:

I was not in when this motion was proposed, and I feel it is necessary that I should make a few observations with regard to it. I believe the proposition is a reasonable one, one that is in the public interest, and I have no disposition to apologize in any way for supporting what I believe to be proper. I feel that I ought not to undertake to represent a constituency if I am not as ready to defend what I believe to be the rights of myself and my fellow-members as I am to defend the rights of the people.

It was well said by Mr. Burke, many years ago, that no system of government which was undertaken to be established upon the heroic virtues could ever end in any other way than that of corruption. I think that is a sound political maxim, and it is the more necessary in a country like this, where you have not sitting in parliament men of great fortune, but men like the rest of the community, who are obliged to pursue some useful avocation in order to obtain for themselves and their families the necessary means of subsistence. That being the case, it is right and proper that a reasonable indemnity shall be allowed to the members while they are here, and we have always before us the fact that we are responsible to the people for what we do. The question is as to what is a reasonable indemnity for the services we are performing,

or rather for the loss we individually sustain through our devotion to these public duties.

Then the hon. gentleman goes on to say:

I think \$1,000 is a reasonable indemnity for an ordinary session.

Meaning at that time a three months' session.

I think the indemnity ought never to be fixed at a sum that would invite candidates to run for parliament for the sake of the indemnity which is offered. That is one thing to be guarded against, and in order to guard against that, members who have business of their own to discharge must always undertake the duties at a considerable loss to themselves; but whatever expense they are put to, whether during the session or during the period when parliament is not in session, which is a necessary outcome of their position as members of parliament, is an expense that the members are called upon to bear from the amount of indemnity which is granted. We might sit here for three months. It is possible for the government to keep back important measures that they might think unpopular measures, and then rush them through when every member is anxious to get away. Under the ordinary system of indemnity, without any provision for its being supplemented, the longer a member is here the worse he is off, the greater the loss he sustains, as well as the loss he sustains by being away from his own residence. It is always in the public interest that, when important measures are under consideration, or important subjects are being investigated, parliament should remain in session, and the duties that devolve upon it should be carefully and efficiently discharged. In order that that may be done, if you require members to sit beyond the ordinary period of a session they ought to be protected against loss in consequence of remaining, and you can only do that by giving them a per diem or some other allowance in addition to what they receive for the ordinary period of three months.

Members will see that Mr. Mills at that time advocated keeping the indemnity at \$1,000 for three months, and if the session lasted longer, giving something additional.

My own opinion is in favour of a per diem allowance after ninety days have expired, a very moderate allowance, an allowance that would be no temptation to the man in the most straitened circumstances to remain longer than necessary. If you were here ten days you would get something. If you were here twenty days you would get something more. If you vote a lump sum for a period of two months, such as we have spent here beyond the time of the ordinary session, you have no rule laid down for anything less than two months; but if you had a per diem allowance for anything over the ninety days, no matter how small it might be, you would still have something. Last year we sat for over four months, and there was no additional indemnity. I do not think that was fair to the House, and I think it is always easier for the public at large to bear the additional loss that arises in consequence of a protracted session than it is for the individual members who sit in this House. The five millions outside are better able to bear that than the two hundred inside this House.

In conclusion the hon. gentleman says :

I say here, as I say to those I represent, and as I say to the whole country, that the country is bound to see that this House shall give them the best service in the power of those who represent them in the interests of the community, and that the community shall protect the members of this House against actual loss on account of the services they faithfully and honestly perform.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to endorse every word that was said by the present Minister of Justice, then Mr. Mills. I think he spoke common sense, he spoke it boldly, without any concealment. There is no doubt at all that \$1,000 was intended for a three months' session: in fact in 1873, when the amount was increased from \$600 to \$1,000, the sessions lasted about ten weeks, and for five or six years afterwards as I find on looking up the *Hansard* they lasted for about ten weeks. So I say that if the indemnity was increased from \$600 to \$1,000 when the sessions lasted about ten weeks on the average, what should we say about sessions lasting five months and a half, and perhaps more? I hope we may get through this week, but nobody seems to know.

Mr. SEMPLE. There is too much talking done, and too little business; that is the cause of the long sessions.

Mr. CRAIG. I am glad the hon. member said what he did. If every member of this House exercised the opportunity which he might exercise and spoke about fifteen minutes a week on every subject that came before the House, the session, instead of being five months long, would be six months long. I do not deny that some members talk rather long, but there are many members who never open their mouth in this House, they do not feel that they are called upon to do so. But I hold that every member has a perfect right to express his views on every question that comes before this House. I say that if every member spoke only half an hour a week in this House, the sessions would last at least six months without anything being done at all but talking. It is the duty of members to talk: and while I would be very glad to vote for a motion limiting the length of a speech to one hour, we have to take things as we find them. While it may be said that there is too much talk, how are you going to stop it? This is a free parliament, and members have a right to talk if they want to. But the members who do not talk are here to represent their constituents, and are they to be bound, because somebody talks too much, to keep silent? After all there are very few members who talk at all in this House, comparatively speaking, and there are very few of whom it might be said they talk too much.

Then if we look at the Act what do we find? We find that members of parliament are allowed by the Act to draw pay at the

Mr. CRAIG.

rate of \$7 a day, and it goes on to say that a balance shall be retained until the end of the session. Now, I am speaking of this to show that the session was never intended to last anything like the time it lasts now. That when the indemnity was made \$1,000 it was intended to last only about three months in a year. I may mention at the same time that when we compare the indemnity paid here with the indemnity paid in the Ontario legislature, that sits about eight weeks, and they get \$600, and with the Quebec parliament, sitting about the same time, and they get \$800. I never heard anybody complain of that. Somebody was pointing out to me that the door-keeper of the Senate gets \$900 a year for his duties. I merely mention that fact to show that the members of this parliament, lasting between four and five months, are getting an indemnity that is far too small. I take that ground deliberately, and am prepared to stand by it.

After all, what is the indemnity for? It is to recoup the members for the loss which they suffer by coming to parliament to serve the country. It may be said, You need not come here unless you want to. That is true enough, but after all men do come here, and the indemnity is supposed to prevent them from suffering any loss. I hold that the indemnity does not prevent them from suffering loss. If the indemnity is not increased there are two things that will happen. If the session is going to last four or five months, only wealthy men will be able to come to this House at all, which I am very sure the country would not like. While I like to see some wealthy men in this House, it would be a most unfortunate thing if the House was composed of wealthy men, because we would find in many cases that they would be legislating for their own interests. But when we get men here who are not wealthy men, they have no interest to legislate on except the interest of the public. They come in with the rest of the people whom they represent: they have no money invested in large interests, and would not be tempted to legislate in behalf of those interests. I believe the farmers and the workingmen of this country would not desire to see a state of affairs where only wealthy men could afford to sit here. The people would not be satisfied with that state of affairs, and we find as a rule that they do not prefer wealthy men when they have a chance to elect their representatives. But another thing might happen, men might come here and would come here for the sake of the thousand dollars, men who could not make a thousand dollars anywhere else. That would be an unfortunate thing, too. I think the House of Commons as constituted to-day, with all classes of men in it, men who have no money, men who have a little money, and men who have a good deal of money, is about right, and represents the country fairly. But in order to continue

that state of things it will not do to keep the indemnity at \$1,000 for sessions lasting four or five months of the year, because there are men who are not able to afford it.

Now, there is a great deal of talk about robbing the people and all that sort of thing, but I agree with the present hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills), when he says that 5,000,000 people in Canada are better able to bear it than the 213 members of this House. If \$500 were granted to each member what would it amount to? It does not come every year. It is nearly nine years since an extra indemnity was granted, but suppose you take it for this year, and apportion the cost to your own constituency. Take my own constituency, for instance; there are 5,000 voters in that constituency, and \$500 would mean 10 cents apiece. I am satisfied that if I took the trouble to go around amongst them, they would give me 10 cents apiece. But the fact is that I have not time to do that. I would rather get it in an easier way, even if I wanted to do that. I do not think there is a voter in my constituency who would grudge giving me 10 cents for sitting here an extra two months.

Mr. PRIOR. The Grits would.

Mr. CRAIG. No, I am satisfied they would not. They may hope to elect a member themselves for that constituency some day, and if they did, I would not object paying that small amount. I put the case in this way, to show that after all it does not amount to so very much as we might sometimes imagine, in view of the fact that some talk so much about it. I believe with the hon. Minister of Justice, that the people are better able to stand it, that each man is better able to lose 10 cents, than I am able to lose \$500. It has been suggested that there is great disparity between the salaries of members of the cabinet, and members of the House, and if there is to be no increase in the allowance of members of the House, I suppose we may look for some legislation to be introduced by the government to make the salaries of members of the government proportionate to those of members of this House. The members of the House do not claim to be men of such eminent ability as the members of the government, but we think that there are some members of this House who have as much ability as some members of this government. I am not very hopeful that any such legislation will be granted, because a little while ago the government brought in a measure increasing the salaries of some of its members, who took office at \$5,000, to \$7,000 a year. I am not saying anything against that at present, but I want to say that that is the way to look at it. I do not intend to say anything more. I have said about enough, I think, for one member of this House on this question, but I feel satisfied that whether the country agrees with me or not, I am ex-

pressing the views of a great many hon. members on both sides of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CRAIG. I am satisfied that I have endeavoured to put the matter fairly before the country. It may be that some of the newspapers will single me out for a little adverse criticism. I remember once in my constituency, the Liberal organ gave me a good deal of abuse. My wife was rather offended at it. She did not like it. She felt rather hurt. I said: Never mind; it is all right. I went in to see the editor, and I said to him: I have not the slightest objection to your doing this, as long as you do not charge for it. Go right ahead; you are doing me good. I hold that if newspapers criticise me unfairly it can do the object of their criticism no harm. I am sure the country will justify a member in getting up and voicing what are his views on the question, and what he considers to be the views held by a great many members of this House, without regard to politics. I have endeavoured to put the case fairly, and all I ask from the newspaper press is that instead of trying to make a few little headlines, or to produce something sensational, they will put the matter fairly before the country. I hope that some day some of the gentlemen representing the press will sit in this House as the representatives of constituencies, and if they do I am sure that I will be willing to give them the same consideration that I am now asking from them. I have no more to say, and if the House does not insist upon it, I will make no motion.

#### EXERCISE OF CLEMENCY IN CAPITAL CASES.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (Three Rivers). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I invite the attention of the government to a matter which is at the present moment exciting public interest to a very great extent in the province of Quebec. I refer to two cases of murder. Sometime ago a man named Dubé was convicted of the murder of one Mooney. The wife of Mooney was also tried for murder and acquitted. Improper relations had existed between Dubé and the woman Mooney. She was tried for the murder of her husband and acquitted. Dubé was tried before Judge Bossé, convicted and hanged a few days ago in the city of Quebec. Another murder occurred about the same time in the city of Quebec. A policeman by the name of Cazes, in a drunken fit, in broad daylight, rushed into his house, pulled out a revolver and shot his wife dead. He was tried, convicted and sentenced to be hanged. In the case of Dubé, the sentence was carried out. In the case of Cazes, the sentence was commuted to imprisonment for life. Of course, I do not wish to criticise in any way the

manner in which the prerogative of clemency has been exercised, because in such cases, I believe in allowing the responsibility to rest upon the executive whose painful duty it is to investigate these matters and decide them, but, from the nature of the crime committed by both of these men, it appears to people who have given some attention to it, to be impossible to understand the distinction which would have allowed, in the case of Cazes, a commutation of the sentence, and required, in the case of Dubé, the carrying out of the sentence. Both cases were tried by Judge Bossé. The eminent judge has, no doubt, sent in his report on both cases to the hon. Minister of Justice, and my reason for calling the attention of the government to the cases, is for the purpose of asking the government to bring down the report of the judge in these two cases.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It would hardly be right to comply simply with the request of the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron), to bring down the reports of the judge. The whole proceedings should be brought down. Under the constitution, the pardoning power rests upon ministerial responsibility. The right of His Excellency, representing the Crown, must be exercised on the advice of his ministers, and, therefore, since this right has to be exercised on the advice of his ministers, it is only right and proper and in accordance with the principle of elementary justice, that parliament, to whom the ministers are responsible, should be put in possession of the facts. Orders have already been given to have the papers brought down in these two cases. There has been some feeling, I understand, in the city of Quebec, in regard to these two cases. The public at large hardly appreciate the reasons which have induced clemency in one case and the refusal of clemency in the other case. Both cases were simply shocking murders, and if you look at the case of Cazes, simply from the facts that are apparent on the surface, there would seem hardly to be any reason for the exercise of clemency in his favour. His case was a most outrageous one. But, there was this, in his favour, and it was the reason that induced us to advise His Excellency to exercise clemency. Horrible as the crime of that man was, the shooting of his wife without provocation or motive apparently; the trial judge expected the jury to do one of two things, either to bring in a verdict of manslaughter or a verdict of murder, with a recommendation to mercy. The jury did neither of these. They rendered a verdict of murder without a recommendation to mercy. The opinion of the judge was that a verdict of manslaughter would have been justified. Under the circumstances, I suppose every one will agree with me that it would be a monstrous thing to execute

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

that man, if the judge who tried the case and heard all the evidence came to the conclusion, that in that hazy line which divides manslaughter from murder, the jury would have been warranted in rendering a verdict of manslaughter. Under such circumstances, the executive came to the conclusion that it would not take the responsibility of sending the man to the scaffold. That is the reason why the sentence on Cazes was commuted. The papers will be brought down. In the case of Dubé, there was no redeeming circumstance, except that he was young, and that, apparently—though we cannot say exactly—he had been induced to commit the crime by another person. There was no doubt whatever that Mooney was murdered by Dubé. Dubé had improper relations with the wife of the man whom he murdered; he had been living with her in adultery, and after the husband, who had been away for some time, returned, the man who had been living in adultery with the wife, killed him. Under those circumstances, the government could not see that there was any reason why the sentence should not be carried out.

#### RIGHT OF MEMBERS TO VOTE.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to remind Mr. Speaker that there is a decision due to the House on that point raised by Sir Charles Tupper, as to the right of directors, being members of the House, in a company, a Bill with reference to which is before parliament, voting on that Bill. The Speaker undertook to take the matter into his consideration and to give the House a formal decision upon it. We wish for that decision of the Speaker, so that there may be no doubt as to the proper mode of procedure in that respect.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. I have received a return from the Minister of Railways in answer to an order of the House for the employees dismissed or retired from the service of the government on account of alleged partisanship since July 1, 1896. The whole return brought down is simply a statement that sixteen employees were dismissed from the Department of Railways and Canals on account of political partisanship, and in each case the dismissal was preceded by an official investigation. What I wanted was the names of those dismissed, and in every other return they have been given. I ask the right hon. gentleman that he should require the department to supplement the return in this way. It is almost incredible to me that in the Department of Railways and Canals no persons have been dismissed for offensive partisanship except sixteen, from July up, and all these after investigation. We have had in this House time after time

the assertion of the minister (Mr. Blair), with reference to special cases brought up, that they were dismissed for partisanship, and that he did not consider it necessary to hold an investigation. I do not want to distrust the return, but, perhaps, there is a mistake about it. I ask the First Minister to call the attention of the department to that point, because I think there is a misapprehension somewhere. I am pretty certain there must have been more dismissed.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I cannot say at this moment how the matter stands. I was careful to instruct all my colleagues to comply strictly with the orders of the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) seems to be surprised at the moderation of the minister (Mr. Blair) with regard to dismissals. Perhaps he is entitled to credit for that fault, but I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. We also are waiting for the papers with reference to the Stewart claims and the cement claims, and the papers connected with the Gilbert Dredging Company in reference to the Galops Canal.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will take a note of that.

#### ELECTORAL FRAUDS—JUDICIAL INQUIRY.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Prime Minister give us any information with reference to the Royal Commission to inquire into electoral frauds? When does the commission propose to go to work? Are there to be local or other solicitors in addition to and in help of the two counsel who are employed, one on each side? The fear is that if they are left without any recourse to the help of local solicitors, that the commission is very likely to take on the same appearance as that one in Ontario, which did not seem to be satisfactory in regard to probing into these things.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot give any information to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) at this moment. I will have to inquire from the Minister of Justice, and tomorrow I will do so.

#### HON. MR. TARTE.

Mr. FOSTER. I see it stated in the newspapers that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has sailed for home. Is that good news correct?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have not been informed that the Minister of Public Works has sailed for home, and I do not believe it. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has also seen in the papers that Mr. Tarte was to be replaced by Mr. Fabre as commissioner at Paris. There is no truth in that rumour.

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing is too good for Tarte yet.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). I wish to remind the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) that I am waiting for the papers with reference to the dismissal of Lieut. Foyle to be brought down. I call the attention of the Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies) to the dismissal of pilots at the port of Louisburg, Cape Breton. I want to know from him why the commissioners of pilots called upon the pilots of that port on May 5 last, by letter, to return their licenses within three days?

When it was found that some of these pilots did not comply with the request of the commissioners, they were dismissed. I would like to have my hon. friend give some reason for that action; and if he is not in a position to do so to-day, I would like him to bring down the papers. There was no complaint against the pilots, and they were, I think, without exception, efficient. I think it is only proper that the reasons which led the commissioners to take this high-handed action should be made plain.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not aware of the facts to which my hon. friend has called my attention. Whatever was done, was done by the commissioners in the exercise of their statutory powers, not by the government at all. I will see if there is any record of papers in my department; I am not aware of any.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is no statutory power.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then they must have acted illegally.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will my hon. friend bring the papers down?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will see if there are any papers bearing on the subject, and will let my hon. friend know later.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If there are any, will he bring them down? I want them before my hon. friend's estimates go through the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot promise to bring any papers down until I see if there are any.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I want my hon. friend to be reasonable. When people are treated in this way, surely the minister has papers in the department, and why should he wish to conceal them?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no knowledge of the existence of any papers, but I will take the first opportunity to inquire and ascertain if there are any, and let my hon. friend know.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE** (Mr. Borden). With reference to the inquiry of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), the case is substantially as was stated by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan), who is Surgeon-Major of the 94th Battalion, the battalion in which Mr. Foyle was a lieutenant. Lieut. Foyle was about to be appointed to the captaincy of a company when the question of his physical fitness came up. It was reported by the two medical officers of the battalion that Lieut. Foyle, being subject to epilepsy, was unfit for promotion—was, in fact, unfit to hold a commission in the militia. The matter was referred to the Director General of Medical Affairs here, who reported on the 19th of May that Surgeon-Major McLennan's certificate clearly established the fact that Lieut. Foyle was unfit for service in the militia, and the Director General accordingly recommended his retirement. That is all I know about the case. I can only say that I approve entirely of the action taken, and I do not see any reason for reopening the case.

Mr. McDUGALL. Does my hon. friend approve of a certificate about the health of an officer being made by a medical man without a personal examination?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. That was not done.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Does the hon. minister contend that it is necessary for an officer to submit to a medical examination before promotion? That is quite new to me: I never heard of that before. The practice is that when a commission is given first the recipient has to undergo a medical examination; but I never heard of an officer having to go through a second medical examination on being promoted. If he was given a commission without a medical examination, when once he has his commission, there is an end of it. I do not know of any regulation that would require him to submit to a medical examination before promotion.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. I did not intend to give that impression; but for some time before the question of promotion came up, the question of Lieut. Foyle's health had been raised.

Mr. PRIOR. By whom?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. I think the Lieut.-Colonel himself reported. Mr. Foyle had been for a long time lieutenant, and it is quite possible for a man to have epileptic fits without the fact being generally known; but after Lieut. Foyle received his commission, it became known to others that he was an epileptic; and when the question of his promotion came up, it was reported that

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

he was an epileptic and ought not to hold a commission at all, and it was then that action was taken.

#### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). As the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee is in his place, I would renew my application to the Prime Minister to be informed when the Public Accounts Committee is going to meet again, or, if it is not going to meet again, when the report is to be brought down.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). I have been waiting at the service of the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), or any other hon. member opposite who wanted a meeting called for any business, and for that reason I wanted to put off the final meeting to as near the end of the session as possible. There will be a meeting called either to-morrow or the day following to prepare our report.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. J. A. GILLIES (Richmond). I wish to call the attention of the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock) to the fact that a return which was ordered on the 10th of July, 1899, a year ago to-day, has not been brought down. I think there has been sufficient time to enable the officials of the department to prepare this return; and although it may not be of very much service to me this session, still I would like to see the order of the House complied with, and I would ask the acting minister to see that that is done.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). The hon. gentleman brought this matter to my attention a few days ago, and I at once communicated with the deputy minister, who informed me that the return would involve a great deal of labour and expense. I think it was for information beginning either at or prior to confederation.

Mr. GILLIES. It was a return in reference to the public works constructed in the different provinces of Canada at the expense of the public treasury from a certain time up to a certain time. I do not think the expense of getting it out can be very great. I could furnish it myself to the Minister of Public Works; but I wanted to have upon it the imprimatur of the Public Works Department so that I could use it. Whether it was expensive or not, it was an order of the House, which ought to have been complied with long ago.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I am not defending the Public Works Department for not complying with the order, nor do I wish the department to treat the order

of the House with any disrespect. I had forgotten what the order was; but now I remember that it called for a detailed statement of the expenditures on all the public works of Canada since confederation. Any hon. gentleman will see that that would involve a great deal of time, labour and expense.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would renew my application to the Minister of Militia with reference to Corporal Courtney. The hon. gentleman promised to bring down the papers several days ago and make a statement.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have been waiting for the hon. gentleman, who was absent a number of days.

Mr. TAYLOR. Only two.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have the papers here. The case is one of regimental discipline, and I am satisfied that the action taken was legal and proper and one which I have no power to review. Corporal Courtney was ordered on certain duty by his superior officer, and twice refused to carry out the orders. The matter was reported to the commanding officer who immediately appointed a court to inquire into the matter. The court was composed of Major J. N. Caines, commanding 15th Battery, Captain W. O. Tidswell, 13th Battalion, Captain W. J. Morgan, D.S., 15th Battery. The prisoner pleaded guilty and was sentenced to degradation to the ranks.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was the order?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was to take charge of a squad of men and conduct them to the canteen and see that each man received only what he was entitled to. Each man was entitled to a glass of beer or its equivalent.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought there was no beer at the camp?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This was not in camp but at the depot at Kingston. It is a rule of the canteens in those depots that on certain days, of which the Queen's Birthday is one, the men are entitled to a glass of beer or its equivalent in tobacco, cigars or anything else. There is a popular impression that a canteen is solely for the sale of liquor, but that is altogether wrong. A canteen contains all sorts of supplies which the men in the depot are supposed to require. A statement of his character, as shown by the defaulters' book, was produced before the court, and contains the following entries:

For using improper language, twice; being dirty on parade, once; abusing horses on parade, once; breaking out of barracks when a defaulter, once; insolence, once.

Corporal Courtney had been at the time

eight months and eight days in the battery. The court sentenced him to be reduced to the ranks, and the sentence was confirmed on May 29, by the officer commanding A Battery. Lieut.-Col. Stone forwarded the papers with the following remarks:

There are no grounds for considering that Corporal Courtney was detailed for duty which he was justified in objecting to perform from conscientious motives.

And Lieut.-Col. Vidal, officer commanding Canadian militia, reported to me as follows:

This N.C.O. was ordered, on May 24 last, to perform canteen duty, and to see that a certain free issue of beer was correctly made. (2) The order to perform the duty above mentioned was a 'lawful order,' and 'in accordance with the well-known and established customs of the army,' see 'Manual of Military Laws,' page 23. (3) Corporal Courtney, having refused to obey the lawful command of a superior, has been properly tried by court-martial, and reduced to the ranks.

The order given to that non-commissioned officer was legal. Queen's regulations allow the establishment of canteens, and order and discipline must be maintained in them. Non-commissioned officers must be detained to perform canteen duties and see that everything be properly carried out.

Corporal Courtney refused to perform this duty and was reduced to the ranks; his only excuse is his 'principles.' Here is the law on this point: Manual of Military Law, 1899, paragraph 11, page 23:

But so long as the orders of the superior are not obviously and decidedly in opposition to the law of the land, or to the well-known and established customs of the army, so long must they meet prompt, immediate and unhesitating obedience (a).

12. Religious scruples, however bona fide they may be, afford no justification for neglect or refusal to obey orders. An officer cannot (for example) plead conscientious scruples as justifying a refusal to go into the trenches on a Sunday, or to pay marks of respect enjoined by superior authority to a religion different from his own.

#### CENTRAL VERMONT RAILWAY.

The House again resolved itself in committee on Bill (No. 171) respecting the Central Vermont Railway Company—(Mr. Gibson.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Has the hon. the Solicitor General submitted the Bill to the Justice Department, and are the provisions all approved of?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I did not submit it to any one, I looked at it myself.

Mr. HAGGART. To me the important point is the obtaining of property by a foreign corporation in Canada.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Foreign corporations have absolutely the same

powers in Canada as local corporations. Perhaps there is a distinction with reference to railways. No individual can own a railway and no corporation can own a railway except by consent of parliament, and we have introduced a section into this Bill making the company subject to all the laws of Canada except with reference to its internal organization, such as election of directors, &c.

Mr. WM. GIBSON (Lincoln) moved that the following section be added to the Bill:

6. Nothing in this Act contained or done in pursuance thereof shall take away or prejudice any claim, demand, right, security, cause of action or complaint which any person has against the Montreal and Province Line Railway Company, nor shall it relieve such company or its properties from the payment or performance of any debt, liability, obligation, contract or duty.

7. Nothing in this Act contained shall take away, annul or affect any agreement or stipulation made in relation to the line of railway belonging to the Montreal and Province Line Railway Company with any municipality which granted or which was part of a territory granting any bonus, aid or assistance to either of the said lines of railway; but the said Central Vermont Railway Company shall, in the event of such lease, sale or amalgamation, carry out the conditions under which such bonus was granted.

8. The Central Vermont Railway Company, in purchasing, leasing or operating the Montreal and Province Line Railway Company, shall assume and be liable for the charges and rights secured to Jacques Franchère, doctor of medicine, and others of the village of Marieville, in the district of St. Hyacinthe, by deed of sale passed before Maître G. Bombardier, notary public, the 19th day of June, 1877, under the No. 865, which rights and charges are mentioned in the deed granted by the sheriff of the district of Montreal, to Farrand Stewart Stranahan, in trust, in the year 1896, by which deed the said sheriff sold and handed over to the said Stranahan, in trust, the said railway belonging now to the Montreal and Province Line Railway Company.

9. The Central Vermont Railway Company may, after acquiring the said roads as herein provided, enter into an agreement to transfer or lease them to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It is very unreasonable to propose so many long amendments, which are read hurriedly, making it quite impossible for any member to get an intelligent idea of what the effect of them will be. This is particularly objectionable when done at this stage of the session. It is unfair to the House and every member of it, and I am inclined to think that it results in imperfect or undesirable legislation going through and is a practice that should not be encouraged.

Mr. GIBSON. I am sure that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is under a misapprehension as to the nature of these amendments. These amendments have been before the House for nearly a month.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. member (Mr. Gibson) tell me where they are to be

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

found by an ordinary member of the House.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, in the Votes and Proceedings of the House. May I be permitted to use your own name, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Brodner), and say that these amendments were given notice of by yourself in order that the county you represent and some of the adjoining counties through which the road runs should be protected in any claim they have against the Central Vermont Railway.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They are local matters.

Mr. GIBSON. And, as my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) suggests, these only affect local interests, and those interests, very properly, looked after by these amendments proposed by yourself. So far as the amendments are concerned, they have been before the House, I am quite sure, for three or four weeks.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no objections to the amendments so far as they are correct, but I am only objecting to the loose system adopted in passing them through in such a way that members cannot have an intelligent knowledge of them.

Mr. GIBSON. I may say, in a word, that these changes were not suggested by me. But they were proposed, and I brought them before the company, and they were accepted by the company. The Bill has been, as I said, three or four weeks delayed by one thing and another before the company would accept these amendments. That being all cleared away, the constitutional question came up last Friday, it being suggested by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), very properly, that the Bill should be referred to the Department of Justice so that the Solicitor General might have a conference with the railway company and see if there is anything in it that would affect the rights of the Dominion of Canada in foreign corporations coming into Canada to operate lines. That matter has now been finally disposed of. And, it being important that the Bill should be put through the House with as little delay as possible, the Prime Minister was kind enough to ask unanimous consent for the Bill to be brought up this morning.

Bill, as amended, reported, and read a third time.

Mr. GIBSON moved that the Bill do pass and the title be 'An Act respecting the Central Vermont Railway Company (foreign).'

Motion agreed to.

#### RIGHT OF MEMBERS TO VOTE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I want to say to the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) in reference to the question he raised respect-

ing the right of a member to vote on a question in which he is personally interested, that I have looked into the matter and find that it is one of those questions that the House does not entrust to the Speaker to decide, but keeps it in its own hands and settles each particular question on its merits. I may just briefly quote the English practice according to Mr. Speaker Denison :

Any hon. member having a direct pecuniary interest in the question before the House is not entitled to vote. But it is the usual practice of the House to hear the hon. member whose vote is challenged, and then a motion can be made 'that the vote be disallowed.' The question is one for the House to determine. The vote is challenged and the motion made after the division.

In view of these circumstances I thought that as it was a matter the House kept in its own hands it was not necessary for me to draw the attention of the House to it. However, since the hon. member for York raised the question, that is the conclusion I reached. I may say further, that in looking at the English cases the English parliament appear to have interpreted the question very broadly, because many members there are found to be interested in public enterprises as shareholders and contractors and it appears that the question there is treated in a very wide manner.

#### RELIEF OF J. W. ANDERSON.

Order called for consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 108) of the House of Commons, to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of J. W. Anderson.—(Mr. Cargill).

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Is the promoter of this Bill going on with it ?

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). In the absence of the promoter, I move that these amendments be concurred in. All the parties interested in this Bill have agreed to let it go as it is.

Motion agreed to, and amendments concurred in.

#### POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 191) to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I would like to have an explanation of this Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Bill proposes to amend section 26 of the Post Office Act as it was amended by the statute of 1898, by inserting in the 22nd line of the section, after the word 'weight,' the following words :

For transmission beyond the province or territory wherein they are published, and at the rate of one-eighth of one cent for each pound weight, or any fraction of a pound weight, for transmission within such province or territory.

The effect of the amendment is simply to reduce the rate per pound on newspaper matter, namely on publications that are by that section made subject to pay half a cent a pound, to reduce the rate within a certain distance to one-eighth of one cent per pound, that distance being, in the case of a province, the province of publication, and in the case of a territory, the territory of publication.

Mr. FOSTER. On what principle do you introduce a provincial boundary ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The object is to reduce the rate for limited distances and you have to introduce some system of limit. This country is so vast that a rate on great quantities of mail matter that are shipped by the ton, as newspapers now are, would be reasonable within a limit and would not be reasonable over a vast continent such as British North America. It is difficult to apply a mileage limit, as for example, the radial system which applies to ordinary publications. I think in the United States they adopt county boundaries for certain classes of publications. But that will not work very satisfactorily, because that is a mere distance limit, and there would be these narrow lines, and publications might be published near the confines and part of the circulation would be in other counties or in other counties as in the United States, and in that way they would not have the benefit of a fairly liberal area. By adopting a provincial limit you give a very large area to each publication. It is not the same everywhere, it is true, but practically I think it will work out pretty much the same. Take a province like Prince Edward Island. I am not aware that they have any publications there with a Dominion circulation; so that by giving a provincial area to publications in Prince Edward Island you are really meeting all the requirements of that province. The same may be largely said of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What about Quebec ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose it will largely meet the requirements of the province of Quebec; but whether it does or not, it will meet the requirements upon this principle, that it will give this reduced rate within the province affected, and a province of considerable area, some hundreds of miles in length. The same with Ontario. It would be unreasonable, if you admit the soundness of the principle of making any charge at all for the transportation of newspapers—

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not think so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, to those who do, it would be unreasonable, in their judgment, and it would be in mine, to convey car-loads of mail from ocean to—

ocean at the same rate as you convey them within the limited area of your own province. If any publication within any particular province happens to have its chief circulation either without or within the province, that does not affect the question at all, it simply affects the question as regards that portion of the circulation within the province. It is an attempt, at all events, to reduce the charge on newspapers, and to that extent it is an advantage to them.

Mr. FOSTER. I was a little curious before I came here to know what excuse the minister would give for the legislation which he proposes, the peculiar limitation which he puts upon it. I must say that it is about the most inconsistent and absurd explanation that I ever heard a minister or any one else attempt to give of a measure in this House. Now, the only ground upon which the hon. gentleman justifies himself in putting down the limit, is based upon the cost of carriage. He says it is absurd to think that you should carry car-loads of stuff for immense distances at the same rate for which you carry car-loads of stuff for a shorter distance.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not use the word 'stuff.'

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman objects to the word 'stuff,' we will take another word and call it mail matter. What is the whole theory of the carriage of mails in this country? I put a two-cent stamp on a letter, and that goes to the Yukon. I put a two-cent stamp on a letter, and it goes no farther than to a street address in Ottawa. In one case it is carried for thousands of miles, and in another case it is carried a few rods. Would the hon. Postmaster General be listened to for a moment in this House if he attempted to make an arrangement by which, if you send letters outside of your own county or your own province, you pay more than if you send these letters within your own county or your own province? The same principle holds good in regard to newspapers. I put a cent stamp on a newspaper and the newspaper is carried to the Yukon; I put a cent stamp on a newspaper and it is carried to a house on a street in Ottawa. The same amount of postage is paid in each case, and I think the hon. Postmaster General would be hard set to it to get even such obedient followers as he has on that side of the House to follow him in attempting to grade, according to mileage, newspaper and letter postage in this country. That is what he is doing in this case. He proposes that he shall reduce the newspaper postage to one-eighth of a cent per pound, but he says that he will only reduce it on newspapers in so far as their distribution is confined to the province in which they are published. The hon.

minister says that it would be absurd to say that you should carry newspapers a long distance at the same rate as you carry them a short distance. Take the case of a newspaper published in the city of Montreal. One half of its issue goes to the province of Ontario and a few miles out of Montreal, comparatively speaking, it is met at the border. On all that class of issue the old rate of postage has to be paid. We will say, for illustration's sake, that the mass of it does not go farther west than the city of Toronto. There is another part of the issue of that paper published in Montreal which goes down as far as Gaspé and all over the province of Quebec, 500, 600, 800, or, it may be, 1,000 miles distant from Montreal. That portion of the issue the hon. minister carries for one-eighth of a cent per pound, while he refuses to carry the other portion for a few miles into the province of Ontario, except at four-eighths of one per cent per pound. Is there any principle of reason, or businesslike common sense in an arrangement of that kind? There is a distinctly vicious principle in this matter. So long as you confine it to zones, you do not bring in that vicious principle, because you make no provincial distinctions, but the moment you provide against going outside of provincial limits, you fine the newspaper for extending its circulation, which introduces a vicious principle into the legislation of this country. You are legislating according to provincial lines. You are saying to a newspaper in Quebec: Do not try to do business in any province outside of Quebec. Do not try by enterprise to extend your circulation in the province of Ontario. Do not try to bring the light and leading, which your newspaper is calculated to spread broadly, to any other province but the province of Quebec. If you do we will fine you. Confine yourself to your own province. If this is the effect, what is the result? It works against the unity of the provinces, founded upon a unity of knowledge and the interchange of that knowledge that the newspaper carries to and fro. Is that a good thing in this country? It is a vicious thing. It is un-Canadian. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), speaking on the prohibition question the other day, distinctly laid down the principle that it was against national development, and national growth and against every principle of legislation on national grounds, that we should in reference to the sale of intoxicating liquors, legislate in a certain way within different provincial boundaries. Here is a mighty pervasive influence in this country—the influence of the press. The best newspapers will be the newspaper that will be most widely circulated, and which will spread their light most widely, and you are proposing to put a fine upon them for endeavouring, in their enterprise, to extend their circulation as widely and broadly as possible in this

Mr. MULOCK.

Dominion. It is a distinct benefit to the province of Ontario that the people in that province shall have the Quebec view, presented in the newspapers published in Quebec, sent just as broadly as possible through the province of Ontario, and vice versa, it is a distinct benefit to the province of Quebec that the Ontario view, as represented by the newspapers, should be sent as widely as possible through Quebec. It is a distinct benefit that the British Columbia papers shall have as wide a circulation as possible in the east, so that we may know what is going on in business, social and political circles in British Columbia, and the same principle applies to all the provinces in the Dominion. But here we have the hon. Postmaster General, by his miserable attempt at legislation, saying to one of the broadest educating influences in this Dominion: You are fined if your enterprise leads you into any other province than your own. Upon what principle does the hon. gentleman proceed? None, except that given by the Postmaster General, that he cannot carry a long distance as cheaply as he can carry a short distance. The whole theory of the post office is, that the distribution of mail matter shall be made at equal rates, no matter what the distance may be. I am not going to take up time. I simply make my protest, as strongly as I can, against this legislation, and I will back that protest up by a statement which I read in the *Montreal Witness* last night, and which is as follows:

The Postmaster General's new Bill, reducing to almost nothing the postage on the newspapers within the province of publication, far from mending the deliberate injustice of his former measure—

I agree with that entirely.

—of placing a distinctive tax upon city publications, while giving preferential privileges to country newspapers, is a serious aggravation of that tyrannical injustice. Why Mr. Mulock, of all people, desires to develop provincialism in the newspapers of Canada, and keep one province from intercourse with another, it is hard to conceive. He has been talked of as an expectant knight for the breadth of his policy in breaking down the lines of demarkation between one British country and another, and for that feat he certainly deserves the honour. Yet here he sets up distinctions between the provinces of Canada such as enormously favour his own province and gives him effective vengeance on the Montreal papers, which so vigorously condemned him. How can he and Sir Wilfrid Laurier now face each other—Sir Wilfrid who went into such rhapsodies of patriotism against the iniquity of giving one province a deliverance from drink-selling that another did not have, and the prospective Sir William, who deliberately fines newspapers for going beyond their own provinces or out of the country. This new Bill is little else than a special tax and handicap on certain Montreal newspapers, which are the only ones which have the bulk of their circulation outside of their province. We have always favoured newspaper postage, but we are not favourable to its being collected off a few papers, and thus making them pay for the carriage of their rivals.

That is a stinging article, but it is stinging because of the truth that is in it. The hon. gentleman, who broke down distances in his advocacy of a two-cent postage all through the British dominions, largely on the ground of the unifying effect it would have on the British dominions, yet goes to work and develops this petty provincialism for what reason no man on earth knows not even the Postmaster General.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up the time of the House further than to say that I entirely agree with what has been so ably said by the leader of the opposition. It is difficult to understand the principle that has led the hon. gentleman to take this step. He cannot justify what he is doing on the statement he makes, namely, that it costs him more, or that the railways charge him more for long distances than for short distances. That, as the leader of the opposition has so ably shown cannot apply to distances fairly, because he would have to pay more for a distance within the province which might exceed the distance outside the province. Not only that, but to go deeper into the principle, you go into the whole question of transportation, and if the Postmaster General has gone as fully into it as from his position he ought, he knows very well that the cost of transporting any weight over a vast distance is very small compared with the apparent extent over which it is to be carried. Once you have set the force in motion to carry a weight across the continent then, as all scientific railway men know, the cost after the first expense is incurred is comparatively small. I shall move, seconded by Mr. McDougall:

That the Bill be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time this day six months.

If this amendment is voted down, then, when we go into committee I shall move that the clause shall be amended by changing the  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent per pound to  $\frac{1}{4}$  cent per pound. Let the Postmaster General do this and he will to some extent retrace the retrograde step he took when he decided to tax knowledge some time ago. Every one knows it was a large liberal policy to allow newspapers the freedom they had prior to the Postmaster General taking this step. Any way, as he is going to tinker with this clause, I will propose in committee, if the second reading of the Bill is not postponed that the  $\frac{1}{4}$  cent rate shall apply generally.

It being One o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (Three Rivers). I wish, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words on the question now before the House, and it would have been necessary for me to en-

ter at greater length into the discussion were it not that the speeches made by the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) expressed my views somewhat fully, and I believe, Sir, that they express not only my views, but the views of the people of the country generally. The Postmaster General seems to have rather an erratic way of conducting his department. He appealed to the sentiment of the empire when he reduced the postage and he gave as a reason for that course that it would introduce more unity than had existed between the component parts of the Dominion and the greater component parts of the British Empire. To-day we see the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) introducing a post office law whereby he proposes to draw distinctions even between the provinces of the Dominion. I thought that the hon. gentleman's idea was that there should be uniformity and that the rate of postage all over the Dominion should be the same, but it seems now that the policy has taken a different shape. The hon. gentleman practically proposes that the circulation of newspapers shall be limited to the provinces in which they are published. That is neither good postal law nor sound public policy. What right has the Postmaster General to propose to circumscribe the circulation of the newspapers? The press is the channel through which the people of one province learn of the doing of the people in another province. We mingle in parliament here from different provinces and can interchange views and devise means for the welfare of our country, but the people generally have not that opportunity, and they can only avail of it by reading the press of the different provinces. If the newspapers of Quebec go to the province of Ontario and if the newspapers of Ontario come to our province, is it not the very means of carrying out the programme which the right hon. gentleman has announced, namely, to unite the people of Canada as a whole. The Postmaster General gives as his reason for this change that it would cost more to carry tons of newspaper matter over the railways than if it were limited as he wishes. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has shown the absurdity of that argument. The Postmaster General has entered into a contract with the railways for conveying mail matter all over the Dominion, and the contract is not going to be affected by the quantity of mail matter. That the hon. gentleman knows well. The contract is framed in such a way that the distance really amounts to very little. This policy of the Postmaster General discriminates another way as against the provinces. The province of Quebec, for instance, pays more than one-half of the money which the Postmaster General receives since the introduction of postage upon newspapers. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) proposes to-day a divisional policy, and one not in the interests of the Dominion as a whole.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.**

I think the policy of making this distinction between the different provinces, is antagonistic to the best interest of Canada. We want to become more and more every day a united people. We do not want the people of Quebec to be in a position to say: The Postmaster General has imposed a tax which prevents our papers circulating through Ontario or the maritime provinces, or the North-west, and showing to the people of those parts of the country how the people of Quebec feel and think. This is, to my mind, a retrograde step when he re-imposed the postage on newspapers; but if he wants now to come back to the policy followed by the Conservative party, which the government have pretty well adopted in every other respect, let him abolish the postage altogether. If he does not do that, I am prepared to vote for a six months' hoist; and if that does not carry, I am prepared to vote for the  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent postage, as proposed by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, if the House will pardon me, I will endeavour to put this question, if I may say so, in its true light. I do not think it has been properly understood or explained by hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House. I take issue with my hon. friend who has just spoken (Sir Adolphe Caron), and with my hon. friend from York, N.B., (Mr. Foster), who have taken the view, that all mail matter should be treated indifferently, whether it be newspapers or letters. There is all the difference in the world between a letter and a newspaper. A newspaper is merchandise; a letter is not. Letters are written conversations between two parties, with regard to business, pleasure or anything else; but there is no intrinsic value attached to them. A letter simply conveys to somebody the views and thoughts of another. But newspapers are merchandise, and the publisher of a newspaper is a manufacturer of merchandise which he sells. Now, I do not see any reason why this class of merchandise should not pay freight for its transportation as well as any other class of merchandise. It is true, there is some difference; newspapers are a class of merchandise by themselves. You cannot term them groceries, but everybody knows that they are an article or merchandise sold by one man to another, and nobody can object if freight is charged for the carrying of that merchandise. Two years ago my hon. friend the Postmaster General introduced the system of charging freight for the carrying of newspapers at the rate of one-half cent a pound. Now, the object of the present proposition is to reduce the rate from one-half cent to one-eighth cent a pound. It must be remembered that at the present time there is a free zone for a certain class of newspapers. Under the law introduced by the Postmaster General two years ago, it is pro-

vided that weekly newspapers shall be carried free of postage, within a radius of forty miles, while all other newspapers which are not weekly, have to pay freight at the rate of one-half cent a pound. My hon. friend proposes to decrease the rate of freight, and I do not understand that there can be any objection to the proposition as far as it goes. We may be told that the proposition of the Postmaster General does not go far enough. That is a fair subject for debate; but so far as it goes, it ought to be acceptable to every member of this House. I do not, for my part, object to hon. gentlemen on the other side thinking they are serving a good purpose, by opposing the decrease which the Bill makes in the rate; but I do not think they are consulting either the interests of the country or their own interests in doing so, because, as they say, it does not go far enough. I should think they would be willing to accept it as far as it goes, or move to make it still broader. But at the present time they refuse to accept the reduction proposed by the Postmaster General.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We want to abolish it.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not the motion of the hon. member for Western Assiniboia. His motion is to kill the Bill. If that motion carries, the Bill will be killed, and the freight on all newspapers will remain as it is to-day, at one-half cent a pound. If that is the view taken by these hon. gentlemen, I have nothing to say; let them take their own course in that respect. But I appeal to the fair sense and the intelligence of the House. Everybody knows that the increase of the rate was for a transient period. At the present time my hon. friend the Postmaster General, thinks the revenue of the Post Office Department is sufficiently buoyant to enable him to take his first step in cutting into the freight on newspapers; and suppose the Bill passes, what will be the consequence? There will be a free zone for newspapers of a certain class. Then, there will be another zone in which all papers, which to-day pay one-half cent a pound, will be carried for one-eighth cent a pound, which will be a saving to the papers in Montreal, on which my hon. friend shed a tear a moment ago, amounting to several thousands of dollars a year. But my hon. friend says he does not want that saving to the newspapers; he wants things to remain as they are, because the saving does not go as far as he thinks it should go. The only criticism which is worthy of consideration, is that as to the nature of the zone which is created.

I think that the establishment of zones—a free zone, a limited zone and then a full zone—must commend itself to the judgment of the House. A fair criticism was made by the hon. member for York when he said that a province zone was not a good one.

Well, a different one might be established, but that is a question which might be well discussed in committee. The object of this Bill is not to prevent newspapers being circulated in the other provinces, and it might be well to have a zone established by miles. I suggested this to the Postmaster General in conversation, but my hon. friend thinks there are very serious objections to it. In the committee, however, all these questions can probably be debated, but it seems to me that the principle of the Bill ought to commend itself to both sides.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Despite the evident threat of my right hon. friend against those who are prepared to support the six months hoist, I desire to explain that it is the principle of the Bill we object to. We have always been opposed to the tax on newspapers. We were opposed to the first tax, which my hon. friend himself has found so improper that he is obliged to come before parliament and ask to modify it. What are we dealing with to-day. My right hon. friend the Premier says that newspapers are merchandise; but in that I cannot agree. I look upon the press as an educator; and the more we circulate the press, the better it will prove as an educator to the people. I am further opposed to this Bill because it discriminates against that section of the country from which I come. There can be no doubt at all that the newspapers of Montreal city have paid more than half the tax imposed on all the newspapers in the country. I would not go so far as to say that the hon. the Postmaster General desires to punish some of the Montreal newspapers, but it looks like it. The Montreal *Star* is largely circulated all over the Dominion, but I am not here to protect that newspaper because it is well able to do that for itself, and I have read in the *Star* not long ago that it would be better for the government not to touch that tax at all, and that that newspaper was ready to pay. Neither am I here as an advocate for the Montreal *Witness*, another newspaper largely circulated throughout the whole of Canada, and looked on as a religious paper. I have no doubt that many of its subscribers rank it next to the Bible. That is another paper which will be heavily taxed by this amendment brought down by my hon. friend. Nor am I here to defend *La Presse*, which can well afford to pay any tax the government may impose. But these three newspapers will pay more than all the other papers in the Dominion together. *La Presse* is not circulated so much in the other provinces as the *Star* and *Witness*, but it has a very large circulation among our compatriots in the United States. There it does good work, bringing them news of home and keeping alive in them the love of their native country, and a desire to return, and no doubt if any of them do return and settle amongst us again—good citizens

whom we were sorry to lose—that is due in great measure to *La Presse*, and no doubt also, to *La Patrie*, which also circulates among French Canadians in the United States. I look upon these papers, therefore, as different from merchandise, as something that touches more patriotism than business. I have always been opposed to any tax on the press, and am opposed to this measure, not only because it is a tax, but because it discriminates; and if there is one thing which the Dominion government should not do, that is to discriminate against any one province. I repeat, therefore, in spite of the threat of my right hon. friend, that I shall vote for the six months' hoist. Let him bear the odium of having imposed a heavy tax on the newspapers, and let the public know exactly how the thing stands rather than have the pill administered to it with a little coating of sugar.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). It looks to me as if the hon. the Postmaster General were coming down very considerably before the general elections. He announces half a cent a pound as the tax that has been imposed was imposed, but now he says the tax will be one-quarter what it was before. That is an acknowledgment that he must have been wrong in his previous imposition of a tax of half a cent a pound. The right hon. the First Minister told us that he views newspapers very differently from letters, that newspapers are merchandise, and he elaborated that opinion. If they are merchandise, why should the people of Canada be called upon to carry merchandise for nothing or nearly nothing—one-eighth of a cent per pound. It costs ten times that much to carry them, perhaps twenty times as much, and if they are merchandise they should be made to pay as such. There is no obligation on the people to have a post office department which can carry merchandise for one-twentieth of the cost. I am quite sure that in our postal parcel the government have lost sight of that very important principle and view it largely in the light of letters and have decided on carrying postal parcels—that is merchandise—for very much less than the cost of carriage. They tell us that the Postmaster General himself has quite a personal interest in those matters, that last year he had no interest in the newspaper business, but this year he is very heavily interested as a stockholder in a Toronto newspaper. If that be the case, it may account in some degree for his change of front in regard to this matter. But the important point that I wish to call attention to is this—that the Postmaster General has proposed, so far as a large portion of the newspapers are concerned, to reduce the postage to one-quarter of what it was before. What was the total income from the charge of one-half per cent a pound—can the Postmaster General tell me?

Mr. BERGERON.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not got the figures at hand.

Mr. WALLACE. Was it not \$60,000?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not the figures.

Mr. WALLACE. We should proceed upon some principle in this matter. If the principle laid down by the Postmaster General is correct that newspapers should pay for their carriage—or as further elaborated by the right hon. First Minister, that newspapers are merchandise—they ought to pay like other merchandise. For myself, I take the ground that the Conservative party and government have taken all along—that newspapers should be carried postage free. We lay down the principle that newspapers are not merchandise, but as the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) says they are a means of communication as a letter is. As the hon. minister says, it is like a conversation between those in different parts of the country, and spreads intelligence. If anything is done in the matter, it should be to wipe out all imposition upon the newspapers and make them free. Suppose that the income from this rate of one-half cent per pound on newspapers has been \$80,000 a year. Reducing it to one-quarter, as is proposed would mean a revenue of \$20,000. This is an amount so insignificant in comparison with the total revenue of the Post Office Department, and so insignificant in comparison with the cost of the service performed that it is an absolute farce. It would be better by far to transmit newspapers free of postage, as was done before. This is an imposition upon the newspapers of the country. It does not reach the subscribers, because the imposition is too small to have any effect upon the price of the newspapers. The newspapers have not suffered so much, because the prices of paper have been falling during the last few years, and the money they have saved in the price of their paper they have been compelled in part to contribute to the government in this little vexatious tax. This tax has nothing to justify it. If the principle were to be adopted of charging the newspapers for the cost of their carriage this would not pay one-tenth of the charge. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I think this is another example of the bungling administration of the Postmaster General.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not agree with some hon. gentlemen who have spoken. I have always believed that there should be a postage charge on newspapers, but that it should be imposed on all papers alike, irrespective of their radius of distribution. I do not see why we should carry newspapers free any more than we should carry letters free. It may be a little difficult to adjust this tax between the publisher and the subscriber, but that is a thing that can be done and ought to be done. I

regard it as most objectionable to put a tax upon a newspaper that is circulated within a radius of ten or twenty miles, and, as soon as it gets outside of that zone, to increase the tax. I do not think that is a correct principle, and I am against it. I would rather have seen an amendment proposed in the direction I have indicated, than to kill the Bill entirely. But, since the motion is before us and as it may result in bringing about the thing which I would have preferred, I am prepared to vote for it. However, in my opinion, the tax should be put on all newspapers, regardless of where they are circulated, and, whatever the tax is, let it apply alike to all.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Davin) :

## YEAS :

## Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	Macdonald (King's),
Bell (Pictou),	McAlister,
Bergeron,	McCleary,
Blanchard,	McDougall,
Broder,	Martin,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Moore,
Clancy,	Morin,
Davin,	Powell,
Foster,	Prior,
Gillies,	Sproule,
Gillet,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Wallace, and
Henderson,	Wilson.—27.
La Rivière,	

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Angers,	Ingram,
Bazinet,	Johnston,
Beith,	Kaulbach,
Bell (Prince),	Landerkin,
Bernier,	Lang,
Blair,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Borden (King's),	Lavergne,
Bourbonnais,	Logan,
Brodeur,	Mackie,
Brown,	McGugan,
Burnett,	McHugh,
Calvert,	McIsaac,
Campbell,	McLellan,
Carroll,	McLennan (Inverness),
Casey,	McMillan,
Champagne,	McMullen,
Copp,	Madore,
Costigan,	Marcil,
Cowan,	Meigs,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Mignault,
Dechêne,	Monet,
Demers,	Mulock,
Dobell,	Parmalee,
Dupré,	Paterson,
Edwards,	Penny,
Ellis,	Pettet,
Ethier,	Proulx,
Featherston,	Puttee,
Ferguson,	Richardson,
Fielding,	Rutherford,
Fisher,	Savard,
Fortier,	Scriver,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Semple,
Fraser (Lambton),	Sifton,
Frost,	Somerville,
Gauvreau,	Sutherland,
Geoffrion,	Talbot,
Graham,	Tucker, and
Harwood,	Wood.—79.
Hurley,	

## PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Davis,	Hale,
Tolmie,	Montague,
Snetsinger,	Reid,
Christie,	Roddick,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Gibson,	Corby,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Fitzpatrick,	Casgrain,
Lewis,	Poupore,
MacPherson,	Rosamond,
Macdonell,	Roche,
Belcourt,	Monk,
Britton,	Cargill,
Russell,	Borden (Halifax),
Flint,	Mills.

Amendment (Mr. Davin) negatived.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) has not voted.

Mr. MACDONALD (East Huron). I was not in the House at the time the motion was put; had I been here in time, I would have voted against the amendment.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

## SUPPLY—WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. A. H. MOORE (Stanstead). Before you leave the Chair, at the request of a large number of the people of Canada, I desire to call the attention of the House to a subject of great interest to the people of this country at large. It is not a controversial question, and consequently, I trust, that it will receive the consideration that it deserves on its merits. I make this proposition at the request of a great number of the women of this country, who ask this honourable House to remove from the statute-book the disabilities under which they are labouring.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MOORE. They ask us to remove from the statute-books of Canada, the disqualification which prevents them from voting at Dominion elections. I am of the same opinion, and I think the hon. members of this House will be of the same opinion, as Sir Stafford Northcote, who thus expressed his views upon the question in the British House of Commons, in 1884 :

If you make a capable elector, the test you will find that you are bound to go very much further, and in a very different direction in some respects to what you have done in order to complete your definition. I take the case of the female franchise. There cannot be a doubt if you ask who are capable electors, you will find it very difficult to declare that the females who are in a certain position as taxpayers and ratepayers, and who are electors for municipal purposes, are not capable citizens, and that they should not be included in the franchise.

I believe that about one-seventh of the electors of the municipalities of the kingdom are females, and on the principle on which you

are proceeding you will find it difficult to say that they are not entitled to vote.

The conditions in England in respect to this matter and the conditions in Canada are analogous, and an argument that will apply in one case, will apply equally well in the other. They claim that mentally, morally and intellectually, they are not the inferior of men, and to deny that, would be to insult our mothers, our wives, and our daughters, and would not reflect any great credit upon ourselves. We would not have to dig very deep into the pages of history to find instances and testimony sufficient to prove that they are not incapable of exercising the suffrage by reason of their mental or intellectual incapacity. It is claimed that the three greatest and brightest eras in British history have been those when the British Empire was ruled by Queens instead of Kings. I refer to Queen Elizabeth, Queen Anne, and last, though not least, to Victoria, the greatest and best Sovereign that ever graced any throne. I would refer to Maria Theresa, Austria, and to Isabella of Spain, who pawned her jewels to help equip a fleet to enable Columbus to discover the great American continent. I will not take up your time by going into details in regard to the position that women have taken in literature. I will only cite one instance, and refer to a book that was written by a lady of the United States, that passed through more editions in the same length of time than any book on record, that has had more readers and has influenced a larger number of people than any book that has ever been published on this continent. I refer to Uncle Tom's Cabin, written by Harriet Beecher Stowe. That book had more to do with the emancipation of the slaves in the United States than anything else that occurred in that country. Not only are women intellectually capable of exercising the suffrage, but they are amenable to our laws; they are obliged to obey the laws we make, and yet they have no hand in the making of those laws. It has been the boast of British subjects all over the world that British law is no respecter of persons. That every man, woman and child stands upon an equality. But, I think we will find, on consideration, that in respect at least to the exercise of the franchise, they do not stand on an equality with men, and consequently a great injustice is being done to them. I think, Sir, that upon any platform throughout the country, throughout the United States and throughout the British Empire, taxation without representation has been most vigorously condemned. If I remember correctly, the present hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said in 1885, that it was a great injustice. Here we have half of the population of this country who are taxed, who have no voice in levying the rate of taxation, or electing the men who are entrusted

with the duty of making our laws. This matter is not new in this House, or in this country. It has been agitated throughout the country, to some extent, and the result of it is that, for municipal purposes, in some of the provinces, the right has been granted to women to vote for municipal purposes. I will refer to a speech which was made on the subject of woman suffrage on August 19, 1884, by Bishop Carlisle:

When woman satisfies every condition but that of sex then it seems to me impossible in reason, and I believe it will soon be impossible in fact, to deprive her of a vote.

If a woman is a householder, still more if she be an employer of labour, and one through whose employment a number of men possess votes, what is there in the mere accident of sex to make it right to say she shall have no political influence.

Rev. Canon Kingsley, speaking on this subject, made this statement:

Women who are, or who desire to be, self-supporting, have no rights at all. They owe the same allegiance as men. They are favoured by no privileges, indulgences, exceptional legislation, from the state, and ask for none. They are just as capable as men. Why are similar relations, similar powers and similar duties not to carry with them similar rights? To this question the common sense and justice of England will have soon to find an answer.

Mr. Henry Fawcett, M.P., made a statement on the floor of the British House of Commons, October 13, 1884, as follows:

Search through the speeches that have been made in favour of the enfranchisement of the rural householder, and I say there is not an argument or an appeal that has been made which does not bring into striking relief the injustice of saying that no woman shall be admitted to any share in the government of her country. There is a saying, 'be just and fear not.' On a thousand platforms we have declared that taxation and representation should go together. Is it just that woman should be taxed without their consent?

We heard it announced on the floor of the British House of Commons not many months ago that the enforcement of the unwise policy of taxation without representation cost England her great American colonies, and to-day the booming of cannon and the rattling of musketry are heard in South Africa for the enforcement of that principle. British rights were invaded, British subjects were denied the privilege of representation although they were taxed, and to-day the cost in blood and treasure to the British Empire is very heavy in vindication of the principle that British subjects should not be taxed without representation. Woman suffrage has been agitated in the United States, and many years ago the state of Wyoming was selected as a place in which to test the subject. It was tried in that state and found satisfactory. It has been tried in Utah, in Kansas and in other places in the United States, and in all of the places where it has been tried it has proved to be satisfactory. It has been tried in New Zealand, in one of the colonies belong-

ing to the British Empire, and the result has been highly satisfactory in that country. We have the statement of Mr. Courtney, a member of the British House of Commons, who said :

Women are elected for boards of guardians and it has proved successful, and also school boards. On these important boards having proved satisfactory, is reason why they should be eligible to parliamentary franchise.

It has been advocated in the House of Commons of this country and the principle was introduced into the Franchise Bill of 1884 by Sir John Macdonald. The principle of the right of women to vote met with a good deal of favour in this House in 1885, and I am glad to say that very many hon. members on the other side of the House, and some ministers of the Crown were in favour of that principle being incorporated in the Franchise Act. The present hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Postmaster General and others made the statement on that occasion that it was the only good provision in the Bill, and the women of Canada had a right to expect when the present government came into power, and a new Franchise Bill enacted, that women would be given a right to vote. It was advocated by other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, among them, by the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald and by Sir Mackenzie Bowell, but it was finally withdrawn on account of the opposition that it met with from various sources. It was advocated in the House of Commons in England, and here is what Mr. Herbert Spencer, who, it will be admitted, is a very good authority on a question of that kind, stated :

The extension of the law of equal freedom to both sexes will doubtless be objected to on the ground that the political privileges exercised by men must thereby be ceded to women also. Of course, they must, and why not? We are told, however, that 'woman's mission' is a domestic one, that her character and position do not admit of her taking part in the decision of public questions, that politics are beyond her sphere. But this raises the question, who shall say what her sphere is? As the usages of mankind vary so much, let us hear how it is to be shown that the sphere we assign her is the true one, that the limits we have set to female activity are the just and proper limits. Let us hear why on this point of our social polity we are exactly right, whilst we are wrong on so many others. We must conclude that, being required by that first requisite to greatest happiness, the law of equal freedom, such a concession is unquestionably right and good.

Here is an authority that cannot be questioned and from one of the greatest statesmen that ever lived in England or in any other country. I refer to the late Mr. Gladstone. In his speech in the British House of Commons, on May 3, 1871, Mr. Gladstone said :

Modern law has extended the right to women in the municipality, so far as voting is concerned. With respect to the school boards we

have done wisely in giving both the franchise and the right of sitting on the school board to women. Then comes a question, with regard to parliament. We are to ask ourselves whether or not we shall go further. There is a more presumptive ground for a change than some of the opponents of the measure are disposed to own. Women obtain, in some important particulars, much less than justice under social arrangements. In the case of farms, I believe, to some extent, in the competition for that particular employment women suffer in a very definite manner in consequence of their want of qualification to vote. So far as I am able to form an opinion of the general tone and colour of our law on these matters, where the peculiar relation of men and women are concerned the law does less than justice to woman. The man who can arrange a safe and well adjusted law as to political power bearing upon the welfare of woman, will be a benefactor.

Lord John Manners, speaking in the British House of Commons, in March, 1884, made the following statement :

Take the case of one large and influential section of the female ratepayers—I mean, female farmers.

The census shows that in 1881 there were upwards of 20,000 female farmers in England. Not one of these has the vote for parliamentary purposes.

Pass this Bill, and every carter, every ploughman, every hedger and ditcher, every agricultural labourer, who receives wages from the female farmer will have the privilege of voting. But the female farmer, who pays the wages, who is so important a factor in the economy of the parish, will remain without a vote. Will you tell me that the anomaly will not be greatly increased, and the sense of it embittered to the female ratepayer whom you are going to treat in this cavalier manner.

I have another declaration from one of England's great statesmen, Mr. Benjamin Disraeli, the late Prime Minister of England. Disraeli, replying to a memorial of the Women's Suffrage Association, on April 29, in 1873, penned the following statement :

I was much honoured by receiving from your hands the memorial signed by 10,000 women of England, among them some illustrious names, thanking me for my services in attempt to abolish the anomaly that the parliamentary franchise attached to a household or property qualification when possessed by a woman should not be exercised, though in all matters of local government, when similarly qualified, she exercises this right. As I believe this anomaly to be injurious to the best interests of the country, I trust to see it removed by the wisdom of parliament.

That question was discussed for many years in the British House of Commons, and divisions were taken on it. I shall quote the result of these divisions for a number of years, commencing in 1867, and coming down to 1884 :

Divisions in House of Commons, England.		
	For.	Against.
1867.....	75	196
1870.....	94	220
1871.....	151	220
1872.....	143	222
1873.....	155	222
1875.....	152	187

## Divisions in House of Commons, England.—Con.

	For.	Against.
1876.....	152	238
1878.....	140	219
1879.....	103	217
1883.....	114	130
1884.....	135	271

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I am wrong in my advocacy of woman suffrage, I, at least, have the satisfaction of being wrong in very good company. Let me read to the House a brief list of some of those who have advocated this policy in the parliament of Great Britain, and elsewhere in the mother country :

Benjamin Disraeli.  
Wm. E. Gladstone.  
John Stuart Mill.  
John Bright.  
Jacob Bright.  
Herbert Spencer.  
Sir Stafford Northcote.  
Bishop Carlisle.  
Rev. Canon Kingsley.  
Lord John Manners.  
Col. King Harmer, M.P.  
Mr. Courtney, M.P.  
Prof. Lindsay.  
The London 'Times.'  
Mr. Joseph Cowan, M.P.  
The 'Pall Mall Gazette' (in an article written by Mrs. Henry Fawcett).  
Mr. Chisholm Austey.  
Mr. Henry Fawcett.  
Lord Brougham.  
Lord Iddesleigh.  
Mr. Forsyth, M.P.  
Mr. Hugh Mason.  
Mr. Woodall, M.P.  
Baron de Worms.

In conclusion, permit me to say that if there is one thing more than another which we require for the welfare of this country, it is purity in elections and the purification of the ballot box. If there is one thing more than another that this country desires, or should desire, it is to elevate our standard of political morality, and to cultivate a healthier political moral sentiment. From the revelations that have been made during the last few years, of ballot slipping and ballot stuffing, and the substitution by officials of false ballots for genuine ballots, by which honest Canadians have been cheated out of their votes; it should be quite clear to us all that rascalities have occurred in connection with our elections which ought to make every honest Canadian hang his head for shame. I think it will be admitted by every hon. member in this House, that the purification of the ballot box is necessary if we are to become a righteous nation. That happy result would be speedily brought about, in my opinion, if this parliament should decide to endow the women of Canada with the franchise. Woman is better, morally, and she is as good, intellectually and mentally, as man, and to endow her with the vote, would be a move in the direction of purifying our elections. I regret to say, Sir, that at the present time there seems to be an impression abroad in this country that the ballot is given as an article of

Mr. MOORE.

merchandise, instead of being vested in our citizens as a sacred trust, to be used only in the interests and for the benefit of the country in which we live, and to be the true palladium of the rights and liberties of the people. I submit, Sir, that if we give to the ladies of Canada the right to vote, it will place our country in a higher position than she occupies at the present time.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have just one word to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Moore), and that is to remind him that the question of the suffrage has been relegated by this parliament to the provinces. Without expressing any opinion upon the views which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Moore) has presented today, I submit to him that the proper sphere to propagate them is in the legislatures of the provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. MOORE. I would point out to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that he is somewhat mistaken in that contention. The Electoral Franchise Act, which passed through the House this session, deals with the qualification of certain voters, and, therefore, it is plain that the House has not divested itself of its power in that respect. We have provided in that measure that certain voters shall be disqualified, and surely, if we can do that, we can provide that certain classes of our citizens shall be qualified to exercise the franchise for elections to the federal parliament.

## THE COAL INDUSTRY OF CANADA.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, there is a matter which seems to me important enough to justify a reference to it, even at this late date of the session. I speak of the coal industry of Canada, and I refer more particularly in this connection to the coal industry of Nova Scotia. This is a question which has engaged the attention of the House for very many years, and, particularly, for the last twenty years. This parliament came to the rescue of that great industry in 1878, and in almost every year since then legislation looking to its development has been enacted. There were two periods, however, at which the subject received more than ordinary consideration at the hands of this House and the people of the country. Recently, the impression has gone abroad that the efforts of the parliament of Canada were, to some extent, wasted on this industry, on account of the means which parliament adopted for its encouragement and development. Outside of this House, and sometimes in this House, a great deal is said about our coal industry, and it is often said at random, and said without a knowledge of the real facts. To the people of Ontario especially, who made great sacrifices for over twenty years in consenting to a measure which had for its object the encouragement and development

of the coal industry in Nova Scotia, particular reference should be made. I, as one of those who come from a coal county, know, from personal knowledge, the difficulties that members of my own party had in influencing, not only those who were opposed to us in politics, but also those who were with us, to give that support, by means of a duty imposed upon the product of other countries which entered into competition with us, and which protection we considered necessary to give to the coal industry what we would call fair-play. The people of Ontario, as hon. members know, cannot expect that a large quantity of coal from the lower provinces will enter their province.

For that reason they were obliged to draw their coal supplies from the United States. When we received the protection which we demanded for our coal, it naturally worked against the interests of the people of Ontario, and year after year we had to offset that by meeting a demand from the people of Ontario for protection on their flour. By an arrangement with our friends from the province of Ontario we were able to secure for the coal industry that measure of protection which we thought necessary in order to enable our operators to compete with the coal producers of the United States in the markets of our own country, especially in the markets of the St. Lawrence up to the city of Montreal. Now, when these people hear the statement made that all that has been done for that industry has been wasted, it is important for them to understand whether such a statement is founded on fact or not; and that is my apology for troubling the House for a few moments at this late hour of the session. My contention is that such a statement, which is frequently made in this House and outside of it, and sent broadcast throughout the country, is without foundation, and I propose to bring before the House certain facts in proof of what I say. In 1874—and I do not propose to go further back in the coal history of our country—the total coal sales of the operators of the province of Nova Scotia, which covered all the coal that was mined in Canada at that date, was 749,127 tons. In 1878, after four years of the rule of the Reform party, during which that industry received no assistance whatever at the hands of the people who then governed the country, the sales were reduced to 693,511 tons, or a decrease of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent in four years. When I refer to the operations in my own constituency, Cape Breton, I find that while the sales of 1874 amounted to 337,016 tons, they were reduced by 1878 to 299,055 tons, or a decrease of  $11\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. Hon. gentlemen will remember that as a part of the National Policy the Conservative party in 1879 imposed a duty on American coal in order to encourage the coal trade up the St. Lawrence as far as it could reach by navigation. The result of that policy was that in the year 1880, the sales of the province of Nova Scotia increased to 955,659

tons, or an increase of 39 per cent over the sales of 1878, and the sales in the county of Cape Breton increased to 380,848 tons, an increase of 30 per cent. That was the result in two years, with the experience of only one year of protection. Five years later, in 1885, the sales of the province of Nova Scotia reached 1,254,510 tons, or an increase of  $31\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, and the sales of the county of Cape Breton reached 617,975 tons, or an increase of  $62\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. At the end of the next five years, that is, in 1890, the sales of Nova Scotia amounted to 1,786,111 tons, or an increase over those of 1885 of  $42\frac{1}{2}$  per cent; and the sales of the county of Cape Breton amounted to 916,994 tons, or an increase over those of 1885 of  $48\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. In 1893 a change took place in the management of the coal industry of a portion of the province of Nova Scotia, for which a great deal of credit is claimed for the development which that industry has experienced since. For that reason I take that year for the next comparison, and I find that in 1893, the coal sales of the province amounted to 1,997,543 tons, or an increase of  $10\frac{1}{2}$  per cent in three years, and those of the county of Cape Breton amounted to 1,284,381 tons, or an increase of 40 per cent in three years. I might mention that in 1893 the government of Nova Scotia changed the fiscal year for calculating the coal business, making it end with end of September instead of, as was formerly the case, at the end of December. I refer to this change so that persons looking at the records will not be misled into supposing that 1,400,000 tons were the sales of that year instead of 1,997,543 tons. Then, taking the year 1898, at the end of five years after the change to which I have referred was brought about by the legislation in the province of Nova Scotia for which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance frequently takes a great deal of credit to himself, I find that the increase during those five years was only 8 per cent, the smallest we have had in any period of five years, extending over twenty years. The total sales of the province of Nova Scotia, at the end of the five years, after the organization of the Dominion Coal Company, were 2,135,397 tons, and for the county of Cape Breton the increase in the five years was  $8\frac{1}{4}$  per cent, or 1,390,596 tons—the smallest increase for over twenty years.

I want to point out that while things were going on as they were from 1879 to 1893, we had a larger percentage of increase from year to year than we have had since then up to 1898, and I might say to the House that the full year 1898 is the last record available in this House for the purposes of comparison. But I think my comparison is reasonable when I take five years from the time that legislation had passed and compare that period with any one of the five year periods preceding.

I want to put the matter in another light before the House. Hon. gentlemen will remember that at that time all the coal fields

operated in the county of Cape Breton were amalgamated into this one concern, known as the Dominion Coal Company, except the General Mining Association property at Sydney mines. That is the oldest of our coal mines. In 1885, the sales of that mine—and when I speak of the sales, I speak practically of the whole production of the mine except what is required in connection with its operation—in 1885 the sales were 103,917 tons. In 1890, at the end of five years, and under the national policy, the sales of that mine increased to 150,468 tons, or an increase of 45 per cent over 1885.

In 1893, at a period when the other coal mines in the neighbourhood were handed over to the Dominion Coal Company for three years operation, the sales were 164,078 tons, or an increase of 8½ per cent over 1890. This percentage is very much the same rate as the percentage which took place in respect of the other collieries and the total product of the province of Nova Scotia. In 1898, five years after the passing of the Dominion Coal Company's Act, and the amalgamation of all the other mines—and when the General Mining Association was not worked with this great modern plant, according to statements frequently made, but just as it was before and by the same people—the production of this colliery ran up to 243,638 tons, or an increase of 48½ per cent. I hope that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will make a note of this, that while the increase in this mine was 48½ per cent over what it was five years previously, the total increase which took place, taking all the mines, was only 8 per cent, which goes to show that instead of the Dominion Coal Company properties increasing its output in the ratio in which the output of the mine which was not incorporated increased, it fell to so far below as the difference between 8 per cent and 48½ per cent. My contention is that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and those who speak as he does, are speaking without being backed up by the facts, when they say that the organization of the Dominion Coal Company was the cause of any prosperity or of a great measure of the prosperity that we have to-day in that industry. I say that while these people are doing well, while they are spending a large amount of money, employing a great deal of labour, and in some instances giving higher wages, those facts are due to circumstances other than any to which the Minister of Finance or any of his friends can make any claim.

Another argument is that through the organization of this company, a large market was secured to the United States, and that to that market is due the measure of prosperity we now enjoy. I take issue on that also, and I want to show that in 1898, after the operations of five years on behalf of that company, with influential members of that company residing in the United States, commanding great avenues in the

Mr. McDougall.

United States, possessing great influence in the legislatures of the United States, and with the consumers of that country, instead of our being able to market any large quantity of coal in the American market, we failed to do so up to the end of the year, 1898, for which I have the figures and for which only figures are available in this House. I tried to get the figures for the subsequent year, but was not able. However, for the purposes of my argument I think I can fairly take five years operations and compare that with any five years beginning 1879, and what do we find with regard to where this coal is marketed. We find that in the province of Nova Scotia itself, in 1898, our operators marketed 657,250 tons; in New Brunswick, 266,789 tons; in Prince Edward Island, 62,051 tons; in Newfoundland, 93,241 tons; in Quebec, 944,160 tons; in the United States, 98,027 tons. That is to say, in the United States, we marketed about 4,000 tons more than we marketed in the colony of Newfoundland and only about 30,000 tons more than we marketed in the little province of Prince Edward Island. And this is the great market to which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) calls our attention as the market which was secured to the people engaged in that coal industry by means of the legislation passed in Nova Scotia when he was Prime Minister of that province. In other countries we marketed 3,877 tons. This made a total production for the province of 2,281,454 tons. Now, let us examine into another feature of this market. Of the 98,027 tons that we marketed in the United States in 1898, only 12,956 tons were what we really called coal, that is coal for domestic purposes, for steam purposes and so on—round coal—while the remainder of 85,071 tons was culm or slack coal, which goes into the United States market under a duty of 15 cents per ton. More than that, I am quite sure that I am within the facts when I say that not one single ton of that coal marketed in the United States has yielded the operators a ten-cent piece of profit. Rather than that, I venture to say, there is a loss on every ton of it; and that loss has to be made up on the quantity of coal they send to other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). They must be great fools to send it there.

Mr. McDougall. That is not our business.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) give the figures for 1899?

Mr. McDougall. I could not get them; they are not in the library.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I have them here.

Mr. McDougall. I sent to the library twice and could not get them. The hon.

gentleman may be favoured ; I am not favoured. His friends in Nova Scotia may have sent a copy in advance to him before sending it to the library.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not want to give the figures ; they would not suit his speech.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am willing the hon. gentlemen should bring forward anything he has in that respect. As I said, the hon. gentleman will have plenty of time when I am done. I am quite willing to have any figures of the years since 1898—only one complete year can be available—from the returns presented to the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia. I have no hesitation in saying that an increase has taken place in the sales in the United States. I do not want to deny that for a moment. But my contention is this—that if a further increase has taken place, it is a mere bagatelle.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Is it not nearly double ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. If it is double or quadruple, what is that to speak of ?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). It would not suit the hon. gentleman's speech to give the figures.

Mr. McDOUGALL. When I speak of coal, I mean coal that is saleable in any part of Canada. How many tons of culm or slack coal would be sold in Montreal or more than a very few miles from the coal mines, except for the purpose for which it is brought to the United States. The coal sent to the United States by the Dominion Coal Company is consumed in a manufacture which is carried on by themselves—gas works, or something of that kind. It is a cheap class of coal. It is the coal that the company may consume ; but I say the coal that our operators live by is the coal that they sell to our own people, mainly for carrying on the industries of Canada, industries that were encouraged by the national policy. This is what they reap the profit from, and not from the coal shipped to the United States. It will be enough for my hon. friend to make a claim of benefit from the market in the United States when returns actually come from it. But, so far they have not got a dollar of return from it, and so they need not boast.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. No. They are sending this coal to the United States against a duty of 15 cents a ton. But what is to prevent the people of the United States from putting up that duty to 75 cents a ton or putting it up to where they had it in 1867, to \$1.25 a ton. The only way we can get a market in the United States with any stability about it or one in which we can

place any dependence is by some sort of reciprocity arrangement under which the duty will be fixed for a number of years. But a market to which we send a few thousand tons against a duty of 15 cents a ton and under a loss is nothing to brag of. On the other hand, look at the increase of our trade in the other provinces of Canada which I have already given. These are the markets we should seek, these are the markets we can always depend upon. We may be able to send a large quantity to the United States one year and, perhaps, the next year cannot send any. I have given the export to the United States for 1898, the last year for which I have returns. If the hon. gentleman follows me and gives to the House the figures for 1899, I would like him to name the proportion of round coal, screened coal, or run-of-mine coal even, that goes to the United States and also the proportion of slack or culm coal. That explains what kind of coal we are sending to the United States. What benefit are we getting from it ? This culm coal was only waste some years ago in Cape Breton, and that comes in and creates a market for this material.

It is possible that their experiments will result, after some years, in creating a large and permanent market. But it must be remembered that this was being done under difficulties, that we were sending coal to the United States at a time when we were met by a higher duty than we are met with now, and, therefore, so far as we are concerned, it is not worth looking after. It may be worth looking after for those who are engaged in the business, but for my part, I would not attach any importance to it. The market to which I attach importance, is the market where the coal industry is now being developed, and the Montreal market, and the market of the great centres of Canada, where we have no duty against it. In 1867, we had a market in the United States for nearly all our coal, we sent that year 450,000 tons to the United States. That was partly due to the fact that the coal mines of the United States were not so fully developed, and the markets in the great centres of eastern Canada were not what they are now. The rates were high, they had to pay two or three times present prices for the conveyance of coal from the coal countries of the United States to the New England markets, and because the only way of disposing of our coal then, was to send it by water. In 1867, when the United States found that our coal was being sold to that extent in the Atlantic cities on the seaboard, they put on a duty of \$1.25 a ton, and that knocked our coal out. They can do that any time they see fit, and the very moment they do it, they shut us out. Then, what must we do ? We have turned our attention to the American market altogether too much for our coal. I say no man of good sense will undertake to engage in business

under conditions of that kind. The coal miners want the Canadian market, they want the home market, every market they can reach. In 1898 we sold of round coal to Prince Edward Island, 25,498 tons, instead of 12,000 that we sold to the United States; and we sold to Newfoundland, 89,972 tons, instead of the 12,000 that we sold to the United States. But we only sold of slack coal, 3,269 tons. I hope the Minister of Finance will be more careful when he speaks outside or inside this House, and boasts that the legislation for which he claims so much credit, brought about such a great measure of prosperity. I hope he will be more careful to give us some better facts to sustain that contention, than he has so far given; in fact he has given us nothing, he made bald statements in this House and outside of this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To whom is the hon. gentleman referring?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am referring to my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does the hon. gentleman know that he is out of order?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not think that I am out of order, the hon. gentleman very frequently refers to that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has made a statement which he knows is out of order. I do not want to interrupt him, but I ask him not to do it again.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I say that the Minister of Finance for years has been claiming credit for benefits accruing from the legislation which he passed before he left the legislature of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is quite correct, I endorse that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But, I say that these statements were made without being supported by facts. There is another cause of complaint in my constituency in regard to that legislation, and that is that it closed down some collieries that were prosperous at that time. The mine known as the Gowry mine, in 1885, produced 7,580 tons of coal; in 1890, 124,641; in 1892, 138,413. Now, this mine was closed after that legislation was passed, and the people who were engaged in working that mine lost their employment at their homes. A great many of them had established homes for themselves, and these homes were rendered valueless to them. They were obliged to abandon them without being able to get any return for them. In the mine known as the Victoria mine, in 1885, the production was 39,926 tons; in 1890, 77,367 tons; and in 1892, 108,332. The House will see that those mines were doing about the same rate of business as the other mines which were incorporated with them, as the property that was made over to the

Mr. McDOUGALL.

Dominion Coal Company. In the case of both mines, a large number of people who were engaged in working the mines and had saved money during a period of some twenty years, had bought land and built houses for themselves, shortly after the passing of this legislation were obliged to abandon those homes. Not only was that the case, but a number of these people had to crowd into other collieries, where they found it difficult to get employment, and where there was little employment enough for those already there.

Now, I do not wish it to be understood that I find fault entirely with that legislation. I am willing to admit that that legislation did some good; but I am not willing to admit that it has done any more good than was done through the development of those collieries under the old system and under the old management. Those mines and the people who worked them were already enjoying a fair measure of prosperity during the fifteen years previous to that legislation, and I think it would have been better to let them remain as they were before the change took place, a change which was made at a sacrifice of so many interests of the people concerned. I say that so long as things were going on well, no disturbance should have been made. There was a way by which this legislation could have been accomplished without bringing about these troubles which I complain of, for so many of our people.

My hon. friend's policy was to bring about this amalgamation, cost what it would. Now, it was the duty of the company to get such concessions as would enable them to carry on that business in a business-like and profitable way, and nobody can find fault with them for so doing. They were not going into this business for the benefit of the workmen who were engaged in that occupation. They were going into it with the view of advancing their own interests, and if the interests of the people conformed with their own interests, well and good. The Minister of Finance should have seen that the interests of the people were guarded. But, the hon. Minister of Finance brings about another change in the condition of things. A short time before this these coal mines paid a royalty of 8 cents per ton on their output. That was a tax on the labour of the workman, and we considered that it was a high enough tax. We consider so still. But, the hon. Minister of Finance went to work and imposed a tax of 12½ cents a ton royalty on coal under the new conditions. It is not unreasonable to suppose that this organization expected a quid pro quo, and it got it in this way, that, previous to the passing of that legislation, any man who held a coal mine without working it would forfeit it to the Crown, and anybody might acquire it under the laws of the province. The hon. Minister of Finance goes to work and changes that

part of the law and allows this company to hold these properties whether they worked them or not, they paying no royalty on them, and giving no employment to anybody.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did you ever know of one to be forfeited under the old condition of things ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. No, because they were being worked.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, they were not being worked, and the hon. gentleman knows it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not know that my hon. friend can go very far in that direction without being put right.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman knows that scores and miles of them were not worked.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There were very few properties in Cape Breton that were not worked.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were scores of leases in Cape Breton, and a pick was never put into the ground.

Mr. McDOUGALL. We are not talking about leases. I am talking about opened and developed mines. The difficulty then was that there was more coal than there was a market for. More of them would have been worked if the market had been there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman says that he is speaking of developed mines. The Block House mine was a developed mine, it was not worked, and it was not forfeited.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman knows very well that only two years ago a proposal was made by his successor, Premier Murray, of Nova Scotia, to the company for giving up its Victoria mine, and that he then went so far as to offer a reduction in the royalty, owing to the pressure brought on him by the people and workmen, after the closing of the mine.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is another question.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is a question that bears very strongly on the question at issue.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman undertakes to state a fact. The hon. gentleman said that the conditions of the old law required that a mine should be worked or forfeited. I said that there were scores of leases on which a pick was never put, and that they were not forfeited. Then, he said that he had spoken of developed mines. Then I took the case of a developed mine that was not worked and that was not forfeited, so that what he stated as a fact did not exist at all.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am not talking about what the practice was. I am not talking about those who had the power to put the law into operation, but I am talking about the law as it existed, and it was that a property must either be worked or given up to the Crown. The hon. gentleman changed the law, and, no doubt, the company acted within the law. If he had left the royalty where it was, and not unduly tax the company, but in consequence of the increased royalty these people are paying just now more than \$100,000 a year, and they have to economize where they can.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hear, hear. Where does it go ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. My hon. friend says 'hear, hear.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Where does it go ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Into the provincial treasury.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hear, hear.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But, where does it come from ? It comes from the operator, and from the hard working labourer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The operator has got higher wages than he got before.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Precisely, but he is getting that everywhere else. Where is the place that the hon. Minister of Finance can name where he cannot get better wages now than he got at that time ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is a Liberal government in power now.

Mr. McDOUGALL. On the question of exercising the power of closing a mine, it was never intended to forfeit a mine unless the government saw fit to do it. Those mines which were opened were then producing enough coal for the market. It is not the case to-day. People who had gathered around the Victoria mine or the Gowrie mine, and taken up properties there with the intention of living there for the rest of their lives, were compelled by this legislation to abandon them. I do not mean to blame the company. What they did they did legally, under the law that the hon. gentleman passed. Could they have done it under the previous law ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, certainly, just as readily.

Mr. McDOUGALL. They could not, because the laws of Nova Scotia would not allow them to hold these mines without working them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As a matter of fact, the hon. gentleman knows that the same mine was closed under the

old law and was not forfeited, the very mine he speaks of.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That might possibly be in regard to any of the mines, because there was more coal produced than there was a market for. Take the company known as the General Mining Association, operating a colliery on each side of the harbour, with ships coming into the harbour; they found that they could only get a market for 100,000 tons of coal, and they closed down operations at the mine across the harbour, known as the Victoria, because they could produce all the coal that the market required on one side. That is the reason that the General Mining Association did not work that mine for a while.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). What about the Lingan mine? It was owned by the General Mining Association.

Mr. McDOUGALL. They worked the Lingan mine, and then they removed their operations to the Victoria mine. I believe that the coal was exhausted in the Lingan mine. We had the closing of mines then; we had them practically forfeited.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They forfeited them, how?

Mr. McDOUGALL. There was the Block House mine on Cow Bay. During the hard times, from 1874 to 1878, when our coal mines had difficulty in keeping their operations alive, when the whole production was only a little over half a million tons, the Block House mine on Cow Bay got behind with its royalty, as did every other coal mine in Cape Breton. The owners could not market their coal, and when they did market it they were obliged to market it at a loss. The Block House mine was indebted to the government of Nova Scotia for royalty. The manager of the Block House mine happened to be, in politics, opposed to the present hon. Minister of Finance, who was Prime Minister of Nova Scotia at that time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He was an American citizen, and did not have a vote.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not know that there is very much need of referring to that, since the hon. Minister of Finance's greater man, Mr. Whitney, has no vote in Cape Breton.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not an objection that he is an American citizen, but when the hon. gentleman says that he was opposed to me in politics, I simply call his attention to the fact that he had no vote at all.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not think the hon. gentleman would object to the support of some people who have no votes, even if they are American citizens. This man was opposed to the hon. gentleman in

Mr. FIELDING.

politics. He was like the rest of the coal operators in Cape Breton; when they were looking to the party of the hon. gentleman for a policy that would encourage the great coal industry, they found they could not secure it at the hands of the hon. gentleman and his friends. Therefore, it was, that they supported the people who advocated that policy which they believed to be in their interests. Mr. Belloni, who managed that mine and the majority of the workmen supported the Conservative party. He supported me in 1878. He was in arrears for royalty, as were nearly all the coal mines in Nova Scotia at that time, but when my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) came into power in 1882, one of the first things he did was to go to work, and finding Mr. Belloni in arrears for royalty, for labour, and for material; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) took advantage of the law and he sent down his legal missionary to Cow Bay and seized on the plant and rolling stock of Mr. Belloni.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) knows it was a long time after I came into power.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It does not matter; you closed him up anyway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But it does matter. The hon. gentleman says that the very first thing I did when I came into power was to interfere with this poor man's business, but as a matter of fact he was allowed to go on for several years without paying one penny.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not know whether it is one year or two years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then if you do not know you should not talk about it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It does not matter what time it took place; it had the effect of destroying that man's business, and more than that, it prevented him from paying his labourers. That is worse than the condition to which my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) referred, as to the coal mines not being closed. They could have been closed if the law had been put in force.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And you say we could have forfeited his property and did not do it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The reason you would not do it was because you knew you would have a white elephant on your hands the same as you had in the Eastern Extension Railway, and you did not know how to handle the white elephant. I say, Sir, that under the law it is our duty to encourage every one who operates a coal mine, and whether that be Mr. Whitney or any one else, we should not take an unfair advantage of him. Mr. Whitney was perfectly justified in closing these mines if he saw

fit, because he did it under the law passed by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding). Our quarrel is with the people who passed that law. So long as Mr. Whitney complies with the law that was passed for his benefit, and under the pretense of being for the benefit of the whole people of Nova Scotia, we have no quarrel with Mr. Whitney, but we have a quarrel and we will continue to have a quarrel with my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) and those who were associated with him in passing that Act. They had a remedy at their hands. There was a means by which they could have promoted the interests of Mr. Whitney and at the same time protected the interests of the people, and we claim that they were derelict in their duty in not adopting that remedy. I say that the coal industry was unduly taxed by that legislation. The coal industry is a business that has to be carried on with great danger of loss, both to the mine owner and to the workmen, and for that reason it should not be taxed as it has been in Nova Scotia. There is no coal mine in Canada to-day that should be taxed to pay 12½ cents a ton royalty. The only reason ever given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) for taxing that coal industry was to get a revenue for the province of Nova Scotia. I will not at this late hour of the session go into details as to how that increased revenue was disposed of in the province, as compared with the revenues enjoyed previously. If I compare the disbursement of that revenue with the disbursement of the revenue previously, and which was smaller than it is now, I could show with the greatest ease that the increased revenue from the coal royalty was of no advantage at all to the people. This, Mr. Speaker, is a matter which not only Nova Scotia, but the other provinces of the Dominion are interested in. The more we develop our great industries, whether coal or iron or steel, or anything else, the more we do for the general good of our country. I say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has unduly taxed that industry, and he and his associates will have very little peace until that tax is reduced and until justice is done. Now that a large increase has taken place in the production of coal, there is not the same necessity for a high royalty, and for that reason, I hope the day is very near when we will have that tax reduced, and an opportunity given to open up again the undeveloped mines we have in Cape Breton. We have immense coal properties there, and it is the duty of this government and of the provincial government as well, to enable us to supply the market for coal which we now have, and to create new markets. I might deal with the question of the iron and steel industry in Cape Breton, for the development of which the Liberals outside of this House—aided by the statements of the Finance Minister—are trying to take great credit to themselves, but I do not

think it is necessary to do so at this stage. I believe that the Canadian people have too much good sense to be carried away by such baseless statements that are indulged in at random by the Liberals of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The question that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) has discussed at such great length is somewhat local in its character: although I will not say that it is not interesting in some quarters. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) will agree with me that there are manifest indications that the question does not interest the House very much at this present stage of the session. The question is well understood, however, in the county of Cape Breton, where all the facts which the hon. gentleman has stated are well known, and where the things he has stated which are not facts are also perfectly understood: and in the presence of the conditions as they exist in the county of Cape Breton it is really not necessary for any one to say much on the subject. There is an illustration frequently quoted of a tablet in St. Paul's in London, placed there to the memory of the great architect who designed that stately pile. It gives the name of Sir Christopher Wren, and says: 'If you would see his monument, look around.' The Liberal candidate in the county of Cape Breton, when the necessity arises for one, will only have to say that if the people of that county wish to see the results of the Liberal policy, all they will have to do will be to look around at the prospect.

Mr. McDUGALL. Does my hon. friend refer to the monument he erected in Nova Scotia, known as the public debt, which casts its shadow over the door of everybody in that province?

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—THE TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I desire to bring a matter to the attention of the House, and my reputation for short speeches is so well established, that hon. gentlemen need not have much apprehension. The idea prevails very generally in this country that the government should turn as much of its business as possible into the hands of Canadian subjects; but I wish to call attention to the fact, that the freights of materials sent to South Africa, were very largely handled through American brokers, to the exclusion of Canadian brokers. My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills), before he left for home, had looked into this matter, and it is more on account of the trouble he took in connection with it, than any direct interest I have in it myself, that I now bring it before the House. It is a matter that affects largely the province of New Brunswick and certain citizens of St. John; but it affects

others as well, because, as is well known, the business of freight shipping is very largely conducted in the maritime provinces. This matter was deemed sufficiently important to warrant soliciting the assistance of some members of the government to endeavour to obtain from the gentleman who had charge of the business, Mr. Robertson, the dairy commissioner in the Department of Agriculture, some attention to the claims of these Canadian ship-brokers. There may be no just ground for complaint, and there may have been no harm done; but the matter which I have been asked to bring to the notice of the House is this, that the business done by the Department of Agriculture, with regard to handling and exporting materials, largely the produce of Canada to South Africa, was almost exclusively conducted through firms of brokers resident in Boston; and the parties in Canada most interested in the matter, the firm of Scammell & Co., of St. John, are inclined to feel that they have not been very fairly used in this connection. They almost go the length of saying that they were to a certain extent misled in connection with the matter; or, if they were not misled, there was something very inconsistent in the results achieved by them with the correspondence they had with the dairy commissioner, Mr. Robertson. I quote a letter from Messrs. Scammell & Co., addressed to a member of this House (Mr. Mills), because it contains the gist of all that is to be said on the subject, from their point of view:

I beg to advise that the following steamers have loaded here on the government account for South Africa, and with the exception of the 'Mohican' (fixed by Wm. Thomson & Co.), have all been chartered by American brokers, who, apparently, had early information as to the government's requirements, and consequently the preference on the business. We did our best to secure some of this business, but apparently could not come in touch with the government. They declined the 'Manhanset' from us, and afterwards took her from a Boston firm, with whom they did the most chartering.

The vessels chartered as given in this letter were: The *Massapequa*, 1,935 tons, two trips; the *Janeta*, 2,197 tons; the *Manantia*, 1,760 tons; the *Masconomo*, 2,738 tons; the *Mohican*, 1,749 tons; the *Fashoda*, 1,782 tons; and the *Manhanset*, 1,742 tons. These gentlemen inclosed in their letter a telegram, showing the peculiar way in which this business was done. On March 8, they had a telegram from Mr. Robertson saying:

Not yet ready charter April sailings, and will not require sailings before April 23.

Early in April, within a month or so after the date of that telegram, a charter was made for an April sailing steamer, by Mr. Robertson, without further communication with these gentlemen; and it looks as if the government, or the gentlemen who had charge of this business, had not made any effort to bestow the very lucrative business

that would arise from these charters, upon Canadian firms. I find that another firm in St. John had the same impression—that they were not very well treated. I quote a letter from Wm. Thomson & Co., of St. John, dated April 2, to Professor Robertson, in which they say in reference to the steamer *Manhanset*:

We note confirmation of your fixture of this boat through Messrs. John G. Hall & Co., which we presume will consign to us in St. John; but the agency fee here is only \$50, whereas Messrs. Hall make six times that amount in commission on her charter. In regard to the matter, Messrs. Hogan write us:

We have fixed this boat on same terms and conditions as 'Mohican' with Prof. Robertson. We regret that in fixing these boats some arrangement could not have been arrived at whereby both of you could participate, but we have considered the only fair way was, after we received intimation that you would like to have a boat placed through yourselves, to name the same price and conditions to all the brokers, and then, of course, Prof. Robertson would be the one to decide which should have the fixing.

You will see by this that the whole matter is in your own hands, and as Messrs. Hall have now fixed five boats with you, and we have only had one, we hope you will give us the preference on the 'Massapequa,' which we have wired you would accept \$29,000 and £55 per day demurrage.

They go on to say:

Messrs. Hall have made a very handsome thing out of the five charters, and we do hope you will not give American brokers all the commissions.

The result was that as far as the papers show—and I have those brought down in reply to a motion made in the House, which contain a portion of the correspondence, but manifestly not the whole of it—that with the exception of the steamer *Mohican* almost the whole of that very lucrative business—and it is stated that the brokerage in one of these cases would amount to \$1,000 a trip—went into the hands of this Boston firm. So far as I know, the gentlemen in St. John who did not succeed in getting the business, are supporters of the present government. Therefore, I do not think I could put up a case to show that the government are favouring their own supporters as against their opponents. But out of respect to my hon. friend from Annapolis and his correspondents, who are prominent business men, I thought it proper to bring the matter to the notice of the House in this very brief fashion. These gentlemen claim that they made every reasonable effort to secure a share of the business and conclude that their failure was due entirely to the manner in which Prof. Robertson of the Agriculture Department conducted it. I do not suggest anything wrong, but I see no good reason why the business should not have been done by Canadian firms. The articles exported were the produce of Canada, and the business was that of the Imperial gov-

ernment, and should have been given to Canadians. If there was preference shown to a firm of foreign brokers, that was a mistake, and one of those with which the people will not be disposed to be patient.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If my hon. friend had told me he was going to bring this matter up, I would have had the details to present to the House.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I had intended waiting until we were in committee, but as there is great anxiety to get through with business, I took this opportunity of bringing the matter up, and must apologize to the hon. minister for not having sent him word.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only speak from memory, not having the details at hand, and not with that accuracy which the question deserves. In the fall of last year, when we were seeking for vessels to take hay across from the port of Montreal, we applied to all the ship-owners and brokers of Canada to make us offers, and found great difficulty in getting any, and the best we did receive came from this American firm. We afterwards had to get more ships and applied to the Canadian shipowners, and several ship brokers in the maritime provinces wrote to the department or telegraphed, in some instances, asking for an opportunity to offer ships. In every instance they were given an opportunity, but invariably we found the offers made by the New York firm considerably the best. In some cases, the New York firm offered the same ship at a price equal to \$5,000 or \$6,000 for the trip less than that at which the same ship was offered to us by brokers in Canada. Under the circumstances, we felt it to be our duty to the Imperial authorities, whose agents we were, to accept the lowest offer. I expressed my surprise more than once to Prof. Robertson, and he said that the ship brokers had told him that there were so many more ships chartered in New York by those firms that they could do the business cheaper and to greater advantage than Canadian firms.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The firm that did all the business was not a New York firm, but a Boston firm—John G. Hall & Co.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, I think the hon. gentleman is right, but of course, I am only speaking from recollection. We felt it to be our duty to get the work done as cheaply as we could. As a matter of fact, none of the ships were Canadian ships with the exception of the *MicMac*, which was chartered from a New Glasgow firm. As far as Prof. Robertson was concerned, he consulted with me and I share the responsibility with him, although, of course, I left the matter almost entirely to his judgment. But he put the facts before me and showed me he was doing the very best he could to ship this hay at as low a price as possible. While

it is true that this foreign firm did a good deal of the business, that was not due to any desire on the part of the department to deal with foreigners or to any desire on the part of Prof. Robertson or the department not to put this business in the way of Canadian ship brokers.

Mr. J. V. ELLIS (St. John City). I trust that the minister will refresh his memory and make a further statement to the House on this subject. As I understand the complaint of Scammell Bros, they made application to Professor Robertson to place a ship, and Professor Robertson notified them that no ship was needed at that time. In the meantime, an application was made to a Boston firm, I think, and they placed a ship. Scammell Bros. maintain that if they had been furnished with the information that the ship was required, they could have furnished it. I am not finding fault with the minister (Mr. Fisher), but am merely making this statement so that he can inquire into the matter and satisfy public opinion at St. John as to the facts of the case. Because one can readily understand that in a maritime port like St. John, where there are a great many carrying on business as brokers, there is considerable feeling at the admission of American brokers into the Canadian business—particularly business such as this was. A Canadian broker naturally has advantage for carrying out arrangements for shipping from a Canadian port. I shall be glad if the minister will look into the matter, particularly with reference to Scammell Bros.' complaint. I am not so well acquainted with the complaint of the Thomson Company, but I would like a better explanation as to the whole case.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will do so.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It would appear from what has been stated that there is some misunderstanding. The statement of the minister is entirely at variance with what has been stated by others. Some time when the estimates are under consideration, the hon. minister might refresh his memory and give a fuller explanation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall be glad to follow the wish of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis) and my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell). I am satisfied that I can put the case in such a way that they can understand it thoroughly. A limit was put upon the cost of this hay to be delivered in South Africa. That limit regulated the amount of hay that we could send, and also, to a very considerable extent regulated the price that could be paid for hay in Canada. The less we paid for freight, the more we could pay for the hay; therefore, it was in the interest not only of the Imperial authorities but also of Canada that the freight should be secured as cheaply as possible.

## SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). I wish to draw the attention of the House, and particularly the Minister of Public Works, to a grievance that exists in the town of Sault Ste. Marie. I made reference to this matter some time ago—making the statement that though we had spent millions of dollars in building probably one of the finest locks in the world for the purpose of facilitating the transport of freights between the east and the west, the steamers of deep draught could not stop at the town of Sault Ste. Marie. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) contradicted the statement and said that the reason why the Canadian Pacific steamers went to the American side of the river was because they got their supplies of coal there.

Mr. GIBSON. Free of duty, I said.

Mr. TAYLOR. Free of duty—yes. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) contradicted me and said that there was plenty of water for steamers at the docks on the Canadian side. I made inquiry, and I want to read a resolution of the town council of Sault Ste Marie, and also a letter from one of the captains of the Northern Navigation Company. The letter is dated Collingwood, 9th of April, 1900, and reads as follows:

Dear Sir,—Replying to your favour of 5th inst., government dock at 'Soo,' Ont., has 14 feet water, 180 foot face and 200 foot sides; international dock, 14 feet water and 180 foot face. Plenty of dock room at canal piers, with twenty feet of water. I am not aware that boats going through locks stop all night on American side. No reason why they should unless they have business there, such as orders, coal, mails, &c. I do not think dock room would help matters there, but for the local trade there they require more water at the government and international docks, and more dock room. Local boats would require at least eighteen feet of water, as they would be drawing that on down trip loaded with flour and wheat. They often have freight for Canadian 'Soo,' which we cannot unload on account of the depth of water at docks.

Yours truly,

JAMES BASSETT,

Captain.

Here is a copy of a resolution passed by the town council of Sault Ste. Marie:

The council of the town of Sault Ste. Marie most respectfully submit:

Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., has no dockage facilities that will permit any of the larger class of steamers landing on the Canadian side when laden, either on up or down trips.

The 'Majestic' has from time to time refused freight for this port, or when she did accept any quantity, landed same on canal slip and paid expenses of moving same to consignees.

The Canadian Pacific Railway steamers do not, and cannot, call at Canadian docks, neither can the Beatty steamers when loaded; they are forced to use the American docks. The Canadian Pacific Railway steamers do not coal at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, but take on coal at Owen Sound, where it is stored in bond, and neither they nor

Mr. FISHER.

any steamers plying those lakes pay duty on such coal as they consume; they can coal 'in bond' at Canadian ports.

The government dock is in a disgraceful condition, and positively dangerous for ordinary traffic. Horses frequently break through the rotten covering, and last season one was killed. There is not sufficient depth of water at either of the docks on the Canadian side to enable steamers, 'except those of light draught' to land, and the channels by which the docks are approached are dangerous because of the boulders that exist and impede navigation.

Nearly all supplies for this section from Manitoba, such as flour, feed, bran, &c., has for years been landed on lights at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, or taken to Owen Sound and transhipped to local steamers and taken to Sault and other shipping points.

The loss in general trade to this country by steamers being unable to call is very considerable, and their landing at our docks yearly becomes a more important and desirable addition to our trade. The loss to the hotels in Sault, Canada, by the large passenger steamers being unable to land is a very serious item, and severely felt, while the delay, loss of time, worry and inconvenience every traveller from Canada is subject to, is incalculable.

Surely the most important town in Algoma, commercially and geographically speaking, with large ship canals and immense industries being developed, is much more entitled to the immediate attention and action of the government than many places where the population is practically nil and the traffic equally so, but to take care of a traffic that does not exist, large sums of public money is being voted. The present average depth of water at the government dock is about fourteen feet.

W. H. PLUMMER,  
Mayor.

GEO. BARBER.

R. LANG.

W. H. HILL.

E. NOBLE.

S. E. FLEMING, M.B.

(Town seal.)

I think that ought to be enough to prove the statement I made before that there is a grievance there. It is a scandal that this country should have spent millions of money to make the best waterway there is in the world on the Canadian side of the Sault and have our trade driven over to the American side. When I went up there last year, I asked for a ticket for the Sault, and when the agent asked me, which Sault, I answered: The Canadian Sault. I was landed on the American side by the Canadian Pacific Railway steamer, and had to get aboard a little ferry boat that ferried us over to the Canadian side. I found that the same was done with all freight to the Canadian side. The late government made arrangements for a government dock, with the intention of making it part and parcel of the Canadian transportation system, the plan being that all the Canadian trade should stop there. But this government came in, and the matter is left as it was. They spent millions on other places, but they have not spent a dollar there and the trade of that port is driven to the American side, just because a few thou-

sand dollars has not been spent in deepening the waterways, so that the steamers could come to the Canadian side of the river. I found, while at the Sault, that it was a great grievance that steamers could not touch there on account of the lack of water. As I say, when I made the statement, the hon. member for Lincoln contradicted me and said that the steamers went to the American side because they got their coal and supplies free of duty. Now, the town council shows that they can coal in bond at any Canadian port, and that they could go to the Canadian Sault if there was a sufficient depth of water there. While I was there last year, a boat had blocked the channel and there were about two hundred steamers on the American side waiting for a chance to pass, and not one on the Canadian side. They stayed there for three or four days until the obstruction was removed from the channel. If facilities had been such that they could have landed and tied up at Canadian piers, our Canadian merchants would have received a portion of that trade. Since the government is making so large an expenditure of money this year, I think that Sault Ste. Marie should receive their first care. They should give that government dock as well as the international dock each a sufficient draught of water to allow at least our Canadian Pacific Railway steamers to pass, so that they can call at Canadian ports instead of being forced, as now, over to the American side of the river on account of the shallow water.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

### AFTER RECESS.

#### REVIEW OF THE FINANCIAL SITUATION.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) At this stage of the proceedings, in pursuance of the notice given to the Minister of Finance, I wish to make a few remarks and to conclude by a motion. The motion itself and the remarks as well have to do with the position of the government and the taxation and expenditures of the country. The subject-matter is probably not new to the House, and in its various phases has been discussed at every session since the accession to power of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not propose to do anything more than give a brief resumé of the question as it strikes me, and as I think it will strike the vast majority of the electors of Canada. The Liberal party came to power in 1896, after a pilgrimage in the wilderness of opposition of some eighteen or nineteen years, during which time they were vigorously impressing upon the electorate the lines of their policy, what they were opposed to, what they would do if they came into power. I do not propose to follow the

multitude of promises that they made, nor go over the many lines upon which those promises were laid, but to confine myself to a very few and the principal ones of the number.

In the first place they proposed to reduce the volume of the taxation of the country. The answer to that is given, since they came into power, by the citation of a few facts. In 1894-5 the taxation raised from the country was \$25,446,198; in 1899-1900 the taxation raised from the country, in round numbers, is \$38,000,000. Their reduction of the volume of taxation, their fulfilment of the solemn promise they gave in that regard, is read in the increase of \$12,500,000 in the volume of taxation, comparing 1894-5 with 1899-1900. It will be remembered that their promise to reduce the volume of taxation officially commenced in 1893, and continued uninterruptedly from that time until they came into power. I have taken the year 1894-5, because it marked the lowest period of taxation reached by the Liberal-Conservative party, after the reduction of the large volume of taxation by taking off the duties upon sugar and the three tariff revisions that took place between 1891 and 1894. After 1894-5 a part of the sugar taxation was restored. They promised to decrease the public debt, they deplored the way in which it mounted up, they declared that it was a menace to the liberty of trade and to the business interests in the country, that it ought not to increase and that it ought to be diminished. They have fulfilled that promise by increasing the debt, in round numbers by \$8,000,000 from 1896 to 1899-1900. They have made this increase to the public debt in face of some of the most buoyant years of revenue that the Dominion has ever experienced, in face of some of the largest surpluses that the Dominion has ever enjoyed. Notwithstanding this immense revenue, and notwithstanding the large surpluses, instead of diminishing the public debt, they have increased it by, as I have said, \$8,000,000. They promised to cut down expenditure, in definite and absolute terms they made that promise. The answer is found in the fact that whereas, in 1896, the total expenditure on all accounts amounted to \$41,702,383; in 1899-1900, the expenditures on all accounts were \$53,050,000, being an increase of \$11,300,000 in round numbers. This increase has been general, it has ranged over the whole list of the services of the country, from the interest on public debt, which has increased by 3½ per cent, the administration of justice by 7½ per cent, to arts, agriculture and statistics, where the increase has been 22½ per cent; civil government, where the increase has been 1½ per cent; geological survey, where the increase has been 12 per cent; immigration, where the increase has been 110 per cent; quarantine, where the increase has been 42 per cent; Indians, where the increase has

been 12 per cent; lighthouse and coast service, where the increase has been 16 per cent; mail subsidies, where the increase has been 9 per cent; militia and defence, where the increase has been 90 per cent; miscellaneous, where the increase has been 8½ per cent, ocean and river service, where the increase has been 80 per cent; penitentiaries, where the increase has been 8½ per cent; pensions, where the increase has been 12 per cent; public works, where the increase has been 50 per cent; railways and canals revenue, where the increase has been 200 per cent; superannuation, where the increase has been 4½ per cent; customs where the increase has been 16 per cent; railways and canals, where the increase has been 11 per cent; and trade and commerce, where the increase has been 800 per cent. That is comparing 1895-6 with 1898-9. If the comparison is made with the year just ended, it will make the increases larger than those which I have read. I might go on to give instances of the individual increases, but I will not do more than give the list which I have read to the House, except to mention the increase, which is tremendous in the expenditure on account of immigration, which, in Liberal-Conservative times, ran from \$150,000 to \$200,000, and which, in 1899-1900, has gone up to \$425,000, while under the present estimates, \$455,000 is asked for immigration alone, the great proportion of which, and the largest by far, is expended on agents' salaries, contingencies, and the like of that. Another single instance of the extravagance of the government is afforded in the matter of commissions. I have had the curiosity to look up the record of this government in the matter of commissions. I find that, leaving out the Behring Sea Claims Commission, and the Commission on Seal Life, during the three years, 1896-7, 1897-8 and 1898-9, this government has expended on commissions, \$116,380.39. Most of these commissions have been the reward, and used only for the reward, of earnest and partisan followers.

The party, when out of power, promised that they would obtain reciprocity. Well, Sir, they have been in power for four years. They have given the United States free corn, given them free twine, given them free wire in many numbers, and they have largely reduced the customs taxation upon the large lines of exports from the United States. For all this they have not reaped the advantage of one single cent in compensations granted by the tariff of the United States. In addition to that, they spent \$34,600 of the people's money in an importunate and unavailing attempt to persuade the commissioners of the United States government that after having been given all these things, they ought, in Christian charity, if for nothing else, to give something in return. They failed, and only a year ago, the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Lau-

rier) himself made his public recantation of his error in reference to the supposed desire of this country for reciprocity in the hearing of the House and before the country.

They promised to abolish protection. Well, Sir, my answer to that is, that the average of protective tariff from 1892 to 1896, under Liberal-Conservative rule was 17·47 per cent, and that during the three years from 1896-7 to 1898-9, under the present government, the average was 17·17 per cent, so that if you take the average of the last five years of Liberal-Conservative rule of protection, and the average of the three years that hon. gentlemen opposite have been in power, you will find that, on the average, they have reduced the tariff by the amazing sum of thirty one-hundredths of one per cent.

They promised to open new markets. They declared that this was the great need of Canada. They came to power and they have been in power for four years. Where is there a single new market open? If you ask the question whether they have opened up new markets in Canada for other countries, the answer is in the affirmative. The first year that they were in power, as a result of an attempt at legislation, they opened up new markets in Canada for some thirty of the great trading countries in the world, giving a preference in our markets, and getting no preference in any single market in return. If you ask the question whether or not they have opened up, in other countries, any heretofore unknown market for Canadian products, the answer is an absolute negative, for no country and no quarter of any portion of the habitable globe allows Canadian products to enter its markets at the slightest reduction over what had been granted to Canada before these hon. gentlemen came into power. They have succeeded in raising discriminative tariffs against Canada in some of the large trading countries in Europe, but in no single country in the world has a single bar been taken down or any advantage given to any Canadian product.

They promised to abolish railway subsidies. One of their oldest, most respected and leading members, he who was supposed to voice the financial and trade policy of the party, particularly, Sir Richard Cartwright, I mean, made common cause with the Patrons, and one of the planks of the Patron platform, as of his, was that railway subsidies were corrupting in their tendency, and were a source of untold peril and a menace to the health of the body politic, and ought not to be continued. They came into power, and in three years they brought down to this House railway and bridge subsidies, in 1897, to the amount of \$4,053,944; in 1899, \$6,540,000, and in 1900, to the amount of \$3,600,000, being in all, \$14,200,000 of railway subsidies. Nor is it possible, until these contracts are made and the cou-

tracts ended, to fix the liability of the country or to place the sum at what it will exactly be, owing to the entire change in the manner of paying the subsidies, by which an indefinite sum running between two limits may be paid largely as a matter of agreement or arrangement between those who build the road and the minister, and the minister decides what it is to be paid. Outside of these subsidies they have paid to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway and for the Drummond County road, \$5,300,000; and they have put under a ninety-nine years lease, which means in perpetuity, an annual sum to be paid to the Grand Trunk railway, which represents in capital no less than \$13,800,000.

But one of the least gratifying features of all this business, is that the government has gone far towards to arranging valuable franchises for their friends; for profit, for sale. If ever there was in this country a happy hunting ground for the go-between, we have it to-day. It is well known all through our provinces. People point to these men, as they pass up and down, and it is coming now to be a matter of jibe and comment, that in certain quarters, in order to get what you want, certain persons have to be named go-betweens. There was no more signal instances given of the improper granting of a franchise than when a year or so ago—against the protest of this side of the House—the government absolutely made valuable, and immensely valuable, a franchise for a railway running from Edmonton over the Yellowhead Pass, gave it and a subsidy to a number of their friends, who have since, as I have been informed on very good authority, sold it out to the only persons to whom it was really useful and necessary; just as it was prophesied in this House that it would be done.

Well, Sir, they promised to protect the independence of parliament. Every gentleman who is in this House to-day, and who was in this House when the Liberals were in opposition remembers the plaintive appeals that were made by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the government, by the Postmaster General, and all their supporters at that time to protect the virtue of members of parliament, by not dangling office before their greedy or innocent eyes (whichever you like), and by not making promises of emoluments and of office. Well, Sir, this government came in and these plaintive tones had scarcely ceased murmuring around the halls of this House of Commons, until they began the insidious process, headed by the right hon. the Prime Minister himself, and the hon. gentleman, the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). And up to date they have seduced from the paths of independence and of parliamentary virtue, no less than fourteen members of their own party. As partisans of the first water while they were here, those gentlemen did good party service for the Liberals,

and they now sit in places of honour and emolument, no longer independent members of parliament, but gathering the rewards for which they asked, the promise of which hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in opposition declared to be unworthy, subversive to good government, and highly corrupting and dangerous to the body politic.

They promised to introduce purity of elections. What has been done by the party as a whole is written in public records, and it is open and known to all men. There is no need of repeating it here. Let Huron and Brockville answer.

They were to be a business government. The first essay they made in that, was to endeavour, before parliament met (a very short time before), to give an unheard of contract to two gentlemen to build a narrow gauge tramway, 150 miles, between two ice points, and to give them 5,000,000 acres of picked gold lands in the Yukon territory as a reward for their services. They did not allow these to wait until the House should have time to pass on that contract before they should go to work, but the government made it obligatory that these gentlemen should proceed with the undertaking forthwith. Obedient to the mandate of the government, they went to work. This House passed the improvident contract. Fortunately the Senate rejected it. Since that time, without the expenditure of one dollar of money by this business government, one of the best—and I am inclined to think the very best—routes has been opened up into and out of the Yukon, and is now being used without the cost of a single dollar to this government. But there is a residuum, bitter possibly to the taste of the government, for I understand that a neat little bill of about \$334,000 has been handed to the Minister of Finance and the government, and payment requested for what were legitimate expenses paid out by the contractors under the order of the Canadian government, and which this Canadian government is now face to face with, as a matter of justice and equity. Will they pay it? Will they repudiate it? That is a question which they themselves have to answer; but the bill is before them. That is the first business act which this business government performed. The next was with reference to the fast line. What a humiliating confession we heard only yesterday in this House from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), that Canada in this age; in this year of progress, is doing a service between this country and the old country with vessels that have been able to make the voyage in nineteen days, in fourteen days, in thirteen days, and a bright spot like an oasis in the desert is pounced upon by the minister, when he could point on the paper to a vessel which had crossed the Atlantic in nine days, or in eight and a half days. This government found ready to its shaping, an arrangement by which Canada

could have had a fast line service running now for months; a service perfectly equipped, thoroughly up to the times, and in keeping with the needs of the country. They saw fit, as a business government, to do nothing; rather to undo something and to destroy the progress of this arrangement towards its fulfilment. And as a business government they gave a firm of shipping brokers the right to dangle about the markets of London, for some two years, a possible contract, whilst the member without portfolio (Mr. Dobell) made his peregrinations on the salt water to and fro, in vain search for that bottle-nosed contingent of ships which was to revolutionize trade across the Atlantic. And to-day on two occasions, we have had the Minister of Trade and Commerce confess to this House, that the time when Canada shall see a fast Atlantic service of her own was so far distant, that it was not worth while contemplating it, because, first, of the rise in the price of material, second, because of the pre-occupation of the ship-builders of Great Britain, and lastly, because of wars and rumours of wars.

This was to be a business government, and a business government generally thinks somewhat of contract after tender, and of tender in the case of all contracts for public works in this country. That rule has been set aside by this business government. Here are only two or three instances of the many which one may give of this. One is the celebrated instance—unfortunately not an isolated one—where the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), invited the father-in-law of his son, who knew no more about dredging than I do, probably less, invited him to take part in a contract. He fell before the invitation, undertook it, and carried on a contract in dredging to the amount of \$23,000 or \$25,000, without stirring out of his place of business in Montreal, and at a happy percentage of profit to himself. That is business; whether it is best for the country, or best for the father-in-law, remains to be seen.

The Minister of Railways ignores the healthy law of tender and contract; and we have the examples staring us on every page of the estimates and on almost every page of the Auditor General's accounts. It is not necessary to particularize them. You may take the cement business, gone into against the advice of the engineer in charge of the work—

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Do you mean to say that was done without tender?

**MR. FOSTER.** What I say is that it was done against the express recommendation and wishes of the engineer in charge of the work—

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I beg your pardon—nothing of the kind.

**MR. FOSTER.**

**MR. FOSTER**—because a political supporter persuaded the hon. gentleman to contravene the interest of the public works of this country and the advice of his engineer, and, as a result, a neat little bill—I have not the return: the hon. gentleman would rather have all his front teeth pulled than to bring them down; but I venture to say that probably \$20,000 will be the loss to this country on that business. Then, business methods are used by the Minister of Railways, when, as a result of failing to get legislation to expropriate a man's private property, he enters upon the possession of it himself; but he had no more than done so when he was kicked out, and, as a result, the country has to pay \$30,000—I do not know how much more—for that little business act of the minister. There is going on dredging, or sweeping, or whatever you may call it, in the channels of the river and canal service by a tug at the rate of \$425 a day, on an arrangement entered into, I am informed, without tenders being called, which has eaten up the people's money already to the extent of \$131,000. Why any tug or dredge should have the immense daily wage of \$425 for sweeping a channel, and that without tender, may make itself patent to the average business man; I doubt myself very much whether it does. You have the oil contract on the Intercolonial, where under the system of the late government oils were tendered for and contracts given upon tenders after the analyses were made. The hon. gentleman who presides over the Department of Railways and Canals found those tenders called for, found them accepted, found competent and satisfactory analyses in his department when he came in. He took occasion to turn down the page, and I believe without an order in council quashed the tenders, and gave a contract without tender to the Galena Oil Company, under which he is paying very much larger sums, and I believe mulcting the country in very much larger sums than he need have done under a system of tender and contract.

These are instances of a business government's management. But a most signal instance is given by what has occurred in the Department of Militia and Defence in connection with the emergency food business. That is a dealing which can be appreciated by business men very easily—it is a distinguishing mark of a business government—where a food is taken under the circumstances in which this was taken, offered in one hour, and the contract given the next, and nobody in the department, I am charitable enough to think, knowing in the least whether it was a food which had ever been tested; whilst every one in the department from the minister down ought to have known, if they did not, that there was no test, and that it was not the same food as had been tested in Kingston months before. But a political partisan having undisputed authority in the depart-

ment, and over the minister, and over the director of stores, gains the ear of all, and palms off a worthless food, and puts in his pocket as the result of that little transaction some \$3,400; and a worthless emergency food, which was meant to sustain men's lives in times of exigency and stress, when no other food is to be had, is sent to our boys in South Africa. That is a business transaction; and yet the swindler is not to be prosecuted—he is too good a political partisan; and yet the convenient medical director of stores, I suppose, will have his salary increased because he was blind to everything that went on. No officer in the department is to be even reprimanded—by the government or by the majority of the party which supports them; but I miss my judgment entirely if the country composed largely of common-sense business men, does not see the exact force and the exact scope of transactions like this.

This business government undertakes another thing. Where it cannot deceive the people in any other way, it undertakes to deceive them by false book-keeping. The Postmaster General cabbages all the revenues upon mail matter going into the Yukon and out of it in the years 1897-8 and 1898-9, puts it to the credit of his account, and the Finance Minister so enters it in the books of this Dominion; but when it comes to bearing the burden of the mail-carrying into the Yukon in 1897-8 and 1898-9, \$3,000 of it is thrown on to the shoulders of the Minister of the Interior, and \$47,000 is thrown on to the shoulders of the mounted police, and paid for with money, not one dollar of which was ever voted for that purpose or should have been used for that purpose. By that simple expedient the Postmaster General has posed before this country as having a deficit of some \$50,000 less than it otherwise would be; but it is at the expense of honest statement and clean and clear book-keeping in Dominion accounts.

The Minister of Railways charges to capital account what his predecessors charged to the revenues of the Intercolonial Railway, to the amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and then goes through the country boasting that he has a surplus, whereas his predecessor had to show a deficit. This is an extraordinary business method. I commend it to the hon. member without portfolio (Mr. Dobell) for the province of Quebec, who, I venture to say, would not keep his shipping and other business accounts in that way.

I stated at the outset that I did not intend making an extended series of observations. One point alone I will now add in reference to this business government, and that is the management of this session. The delays and procrastinations which have taken place, the fact that we are here now in our sixth month, and nearly one-half of that month past—and any man can take

stock and see what has been done by this parliament in those five and a half months. Down to the very end of the session every important business has been kept and then launched upon the House. Tired, decimated as to its members, and in no condition at all to consider and come to a fair conclusion with reference to legislative measures. And to-day we have before us, with the end of the session just in view, a supplementary estimate involving some seven of 800 items, all of which ought to have close consideration, but on none of which, under the circumstances, can possibly be given anything like consideration by this House.

These are the ways in which this business government conducts its business. For making pledges and absolutely repudiating them, this government carries away the palm, an unenviable palm. We leave them to carry that out soon to the country and display it before the people, before whose honest eyes they waved the flag of retrenchment and reduced taxation in 1896. We have talked of all these things in this House, and have made up our minds on both sides, though I venture to say that these minds are not expressed as fully as they might be by hon. gentlemen on the other side. We leave the issue now with the electorate of the country to punish the men who made promises to get into power, and who then forgot every one of them and who seem to labour under the delusion that the people will not call them to account for their utter failure to keep faith with the country. I therefore beg to move:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following added instead thereof: 'the Liberal party, in their published platform and through their leaders, sought the support of the electors of Canada by making the most definite and solemn pledges to reduce the burdens of taxation and lessen the expenditure of the country. That the following are examples of the pledges thus solemnly made:

'We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt, and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the government that had been continuously in power since 1878; and we demand strict economy in the administration of the government of the country.'—(Liberal Convention, 1893.)

'The Liberal party says that several millions may be lopped off the present expenditure without injury to the public service.'—Hon. (now Sir L. H. Davies.)

'The Liberal party, if in power, could at once reduce the public expenditure and effect other savings to the extent of five million dollars per annum without impairing the efficiency of the service.'—(John Charlton, M.P.)

'If we get in power we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie; and I say that, although we may not be able to bring the expenditures to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount two, yes, three millions of dollars per year.'—Hon. (now Sir) Wilfrid Laurier.)

'For my own part, I do not hesitate to tell him that I consider a yearly expenditure of



a time when there was not government business on the Order paper ready to be proceeded with.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Some hon. gentlemen opposite say 'oh, oh.' But my statement will be verified by the facts. There was nothing to be gained by loading the Order paper with a multiplicity of affairs while those on the order paper were making no progress. At a reasonable hour of the session, the estimates were submitted to the House; they have been in the hands of hon. members for a long time; and there is no ground whatever for the complaint that the business of the House has been delayed by the action of the government. I desire that point to be clearly and emphatically made, because I believe that the public records will show that I am correct. What, then, has caused the delay in the business of the House? The House has been delayed by the determination of hon. gentlemen opposite to exercise their undoubted right to discuss all sorts of questions at great length, and very often to make lengthy speeches on no question at all. The extent to which the procedure of moving the adjournment of the House in order to introduce some subject of debate has been followed this session is exceptional; and I trust that the time is not far distant when some amendment may be made to the rules of the House so that the abuse of this system shall no longer be allowed. We have again and again, when the government was ready to proceed with the business, found business interrupted by some hon. gentlemen opposite calling attention to some matter that brought on a discussion, and when you, Mr. Speaker, at a later stage, decided that the discussion should not proceed in that form, the motion has been made for the adjournment of the House, and the discussion continued. There is a principle with respect to moving the adjournment of the House that we should recognize. It is a method which should be occasionally used to allow the discussion of a subject brought before the House; but, in the past, and especially during this session, that principle has been abused; and, in the interest of public discussion, it will be necessary in future sessions, I believe, to make some rule which will prevent the continuance of that abuse.

Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) referred to the question of railway subsidies. He has given the House to understand that there was some new and wonderful policy introduced by this government with respect to the railway subsidies, some decided change for the worse. I want to tell my hon. friend that the only point in which there has been any change in the manner of voting railway subsidies is a point very much in favour of the present government. We have voted large sums, it is true, for railway subsidies: but, my hon. friend, while

he has condemned them generally, has never been able to bring his courage up to the point of saying which of them were wrong. He condemns them in a general way, but he will be prepared to admit with me, that in the present condition of our country, the granting of these subsidies is necessary. Wherein have we made the change? In the first place, we have made a change with regard to the amount. In the old days, a railway costing \$10,000 or \$12,000 a mile would receive a grant of \$3,200 a mile; and a railway costing \$18,000 a mile would receive the same amount—except a special vote was taken, as was done in a few cases, for a double subsidy. It did not seem to be quite fair or reasonable that the same subsidy should be paid to a cheap road as to a more expensive road. Now, though the change made is one that brings some difficulties and embarrassments, still, the principle on which it is based is a sound principle—and that is, that the subsidy to be paid by the government shall bear some reasonable proportion to the cost of the road itself. That is one point of importance in which a change has been made under our government in the granting of railway subsidies as compared with the government of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is another point. Hon. gentlemen opposite granted their subsidies to railway companies practically without conditions. We have placed recently in our subsidy acts conditions which certainly are of benefit to the public. The condition has now been included in these railway grants, that where the government has business with the railway in the way of postal service, or other public service of any kind, we shall have that public service rendered free until we shall have received a return interest on the subsidies we granted to these roads. To the extent of the interest of these subsidies we have an annual claim for services to be performed for the government as respects the postal department or any other department of the government.

Then, my hon. friend had something to say about the Mackenzie & Mann contract. According to my hon. friend's view, that was a monstrous contract, something utterly unheard of and entirely indefensible. But, he must not forget that a greater than he—in rank, I mean—the hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), when he had that contract first placed before him and the policy of the government was made known through the public press, declared that it was a good contract, that it was a policy which the country ought to adopt, and he commended Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann as the one set of contractors in the Dominion of Canada who were able to carry out such an undertaking successfully.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the hon. minister if he will persist in declaring that the leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), when he signified his approval in

the newspapers of the conditions, had the contract or the particulars of the contract before him?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The contract itself was not in print, but the general purpose of the contract was certainly before the public, and with the knowledge of that, the hon. leader of the opposition, at a moment, I am sure, when his mind was unbiased, and before he was taken hold of by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) gave expression to his frank and honest opinion that that was a good contract for the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. **FOSTER**. He had never seen the measure.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. He had seen the public announcement, the substance of the whole transaction. My hon. friend had something to say about the post office accounts, something to say on behalf of clean and honest book-keeping. Now, what is the ground of his complaint? That the Postmaster General procured a portion of the service of the postal department to be performed for him by the Interior Department and by the Department of Mounted Police, and that it was not until after the close of the public accounts that that service was accounted for. The Postmaster General has, in his own departmental report, fully explained the matter, and shown that the statement in the public accounts, as to the revenue and expenditure of the Post Office Department, is subject to that qualification as respects the service in the Yukon. But my hon. friend says that is dishonest book-keeping. He would have the post office accounts show clearly in the actual public accounts that are issued every year by the Minister of Finance, he would have these accounts show the earnings of the Post Office Department and the expenditures of the Post Office Department fairly and squarely. Why, he said, was it right for the Postmaster General afterwards to pay to the other departments claims that were due for that service?

Mr. **FOSTER**. No, the hon. gentleman must not misrepresent me. I did not say anything about paying them afterwards. That proposition never has been before the House.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Well, the point my hon. friend makes is that the Post Office department only adjusted this matter after the accounts were closed in the Finance Department, and that therefore they do not correctly show in the general statement of the revenue and expenditure of the year.

Mr. **FOSTER**. No, my ground of contention was that the Postmaster General received service for 1897-8 from other departments, and did not either charge the expenditure to his own department nor did he repay the other departments that did the work.

Mr. **FOSTER**.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. But in his own public report he accounts for the matter which, so far as the public are concerned, is all the same thing. It would have done no good if he had then made the transfer and paid the money into the hands of the other departments. I fail to see wherein the difference would come, seeing that it affects the ratepayer in the same way, whether it is paid by one department or the other. But I want to call attention to this, that the hon. gentleman insisted upon clean and honest book-keeping in the public accounts and the Post Office Department. How does he propose to excuse the fact that his Post Office Department went on year after year issuing through the Finance Department and in the public accounts, statements purporting to show the expenses of the year, when in reality there were large sums still due for services which were not shown? We had the question out the other night, and the best he could say for it was that there had been a practice whereby the accounts for one year were carried over into another. What does he say of the fact that in 1895 there was a post office deficiency, there were \$618,000 of unpaid accounts, which did not show in the public statement? And if he pleads that that was the result of a bad practice extending over a number of years, and the hon. gentleman thinks that helps him out, then let him take note of the fact that by the time he reached the close of the year 1896 that deficiency had increased to \$680,000, showing in that one year there was a direct loss on the operations of the post office to the extent of \$70,000 which was not shown in the accounts at all? Yet, as my hon. friend reproaches the Postmaster General, not because he has concealed any statement of his affairs, but because he shows a certain part of the business in his own departmental report and does not happen to show it in the statement issued by the Department of Finance.

Mr. **FOSTER**. We fought that out the other day. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. My hon. friend is free to say so, of course. Then, my hon. friend had something to say with regard to the policy of this government upon the tariff. Why, he says, did not this government undertake to change the tariff materially when they were going to reduce the protective element?

Mr. **FOSTER**. I did not put it so candidly.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. He gave us to understand that the government made no material change in the tariff, that is to say upon the whole list of duties. The hon. gentleman is great upon the doctrine of averages. He says the average duty before was so much, the average duty now is so much, therefore, the reduction in the tariff

is only so much. Well, let it be so. Then, if we are able to show that we have carried on an enormous business the past three or four years without any increase of the tariff, but by reducing it even in the smallest degree, it is something to be proud of, and we can go to the country on it. But my hon. friend knows that we went into this at the earlier stage of the session; he knows that the principles of averages is a very unfair way in which to approach this question. He knows, for I pointed it out—but he did not need to have it pointed out—that you may make changes in your tariff which will not reduce the average a bit, and yet on the whole would amount to a material tariff reform. You may make such changes in your tariff that you increase the average, and yet there are great and material changes. If you increase the duties on your luxuries and at the same time make material reductions upon the articles that enter into common use, then you are making a material reform, though your average duty may be as high as before.

But he says now that the change does not amount to anything. Well, I must remind him again of that speech made by his hon. friend the leader of the opposition when the tariff policy was brought down. We were not told then that no changes were made. We were not told it was only an infinitesimal change. Do we not remember how the leader of the opposition sat there and told us that he heard the wail, the sorrowful wail, that was rising up from the artisan and from the manufacturer of this country, who were going to be crushed into ruin by that policy? That was the story then. They tried to lead the whole country to believe that trade was going to be destroyed by the change that we were making. Then they stood around and waited for the calamity to come. They expected to see the tall chimneys come down, and to see factories closed up. Day after day they waited, and what happened? The tall chimneys grew higher, and in the factory that formerly had twenty men they discovered there were forty. As you went into the large manufacturing towns you discovered that these factories were not able in the hours of the day to do the work that was on their hands; you passed through the streets at night and you found them blazing with light, men working extra hours for higher wages, and the factories busier than ever before. Then when my hon. friends found this state of affairs, it occurred to them that they had better go round on the other side of the circle, and they started in to say: Well, there was not any change in the tariff after all. Well, Sir, his own friends know better. My hon. friend went to Toronto, and made an important speech there, and I happened to cut out of a newspaper an account of it. I do not quote what my hon. friend said, because, of course, he is taking a new tack

now that there was no change in the national policy. But the chairman of the meeting seemed to know better, for he is reported as follows:

The chairman, in introducing the speaker, said this was a gathering of Canadians, who were meeting to hear something of the national policy, which was being torn in tatters by the government in power.

So we discover that the opposition thought then, only a few months ago, that the national policy was being torn into tatters by this government; but, to-day, the cry is there no material change, there is no reduction of taxation, we have not attacked the principle of protection at all.

Then, my hon. friend had something to say about emergency rations, and the negligence of the officers of the government. Granted for a moment that officials of the department were not as careful as they should be—

Mr. FOSTER. Nor the minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman knows very well that there is no evidence to show that the minister was negligent. I do not hesitate to make that statement here. But what were the circumstances? The hon. gentleman knows very well that at that time the whole Department of Militia was in a constant rush. What if, in a case of four or five thousand dollars, a minister had to rely upon his officials? What if, in a case of that amount, everything that was proper to be done, had not been done? There is talk about the constitutional responsibility of a minister; there is a constitutional theory whereby a minister is responsible for everything. I have some officials out in British Columbia attached to my department: if they should go wrong there I am constitutionally responsible for them. But, while I would be liable in a constitutional sense, would it be held that I could be held responsible for their action in a moral sense? That I could be held responsible, if I had taken the precaution of sending capable and trustworthy men there, for any mistake that might occur? It follows that if the hon. Minister of Militia put this affair in the hands of trustworthy officials and if some things were neglected, much as we might regret it, it is not a matter which the hon. gentleman need get very much excited over. But, I am talking of the amount now. The hon. gentleman is aggrieved because there has been possibly some mismanagement in a transaction amounting to some \$4,000. Does he know that his government permitted a contractor to substitute an inferior material for the better material that the contract required, and that, according to the evidence, which is now available—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You will get the name—and that according to the

evidence that is now available the loss to the public treasury on that series of contracts was \$150,000. Hon. gentlemen ask the name—The British American Bank Note Company of Canada. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) did not prosecute, he did not inquire, he did not do anything. It is now a matter of evidence, although the court has not given judgment yet as to the amount, that inferior material was sent into the offices of the government year after year, that the contractor collected the price of good material, and that the difference between the value of good material and the value of inferior material aggregates a sum of about \$150,000.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) if he speaks from a decision which has been given by the court?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman asks me if I speak from a decision. No. Will the hon. gentleman say that the material supplied was the right material? Will he deny that an inferior material was supplied? Why, the only hope the contractor has of escaping the consequences of his action is to prove before the court that the government permitted him to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course I cannot carry on a discussion with my hon. friend, but I wish to say that I entirely deny the statements which he has made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The case is passing through the courts.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman had better leave it to the courts to give their decision.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Evidence has been given, and we have evidence which puts it beyond question that inferior material was supplied. That is not disputed. We have the fact that the contractor got the price of the better material and supplied the inferior material, and the matter has been referred to officials to ascertain the exact amount of the difference, and from the best information we can get it is about \$150,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not a fair statement.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You shared in the spoils.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is one point in which the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) is consistent. There is not much consistency on that side of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. A remark was made by an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House (Mr. Landerkin) which I do not think ought to have been made. The statement was that I shared in the spoils. I think that might be withdrawn.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then you are sorry you did not.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a statement that should not be made.

Mr. SPEAKER. I was not paying any attention to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin). Certainly such a remark should not be made. I hope hon. members will allow the hon. minister to proceed.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I hope they will.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not affect any one, but it is not seemly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) has in one point been consistent, but there is not much consistency amongst hon. gentlemen opposite. We find their swords pointing at each other in their several versions of the so-called Conservative policy. We have one hon. gentleman suggesting that the fiscal policy of the government ought to be condemned because we have reduced the tariff, and we find another hon. gentleman suggesting that it should be condemned because we have not made the duties lower still. But, there is one point upon which they are consistent, and that is in the policy upon which they entered four years ago of trying to alarm the country at the extent of the expenditures of this government. In the very first session that this parliament had under the auspices of the present government the leading men on the other side of the House began to alarm the people and to try and scare them out of their lives at our expenditure. They said this government was plunging the country into a lavish expenditure, and they predicted that deficits and financial disaster would be the result. What has followed? All these predictions have proved to be entirely false; all these predictions have been shown, in the light of experience, to have been entirely unwarranted. Canada has never before enjoyed a period of greater financial prosperity than that which has marked the time during which the present government have been in power and during which hon. gentlemen opposite have been trying to alarm the public on this question. They have not been successful, because the public have got tired of these alarms and scares. The public understand what they amount to. The hon. gentleman spoke of the matter of the increase of the public debt. We have increased the debt in four years, or practically, in the three years that we have had control of the finances, to the extent of something over two and a half millions per annum. If you deduct from that the amount of the expenditure which had to be made to meet the unpaid bills of the old government, which the actual increase of the public debt is much below that point, but take it,

if you like, at two and a half millions. My hon. friend will not be able to draw very much comfort from that because his government increased the debt \$6,500,000 for every year of the eighteen years that his party were in office. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that we need be afraid to go before the country with a comparison of \$6,500,000 of increased debt for every year that the Conservative party were in power as against \$2,500,000 for every year that the Liberal party have been in power? I think that is a state of affairs upon which we can safely appeal to the public.

My hon. friend had something to say about the cost of commissions. He says that we have spent a lot of money on commissions. He could not object very much to it, for you might take account of quite a number of these commissions, and find that their cost is not equal to the \$80,000 or \$90,000 spent by the hon. gentleman for the commission on the liquor traffic. I do not think my hon. friend can make very much out of that. He would have the country understand that if they could be prevailed upon to change governments they would have a policy of economy under hon. gentlemen opposite. There are some things that they may have some hope of imposing on credulous people, but I venture to say that there are no people in the Dominion of Canada so absolutely foolish as to expect a policy of economy from the hon. gentleman who now leads the opposition. We have had some evidence of that. On the last occasion, an occasion corresponding somewhat with the present one, when, on the eve of an election, because it cannot be very many months before we shall have an election, on the last occasion that the hon. gentleman who now leads the opposition had the privilege of propounding a policy under somewhat the same conditions, we had the same professions of virtuous economy that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has manifested to-night. I hold in my hand an extract from a speech made by the present leader of the opposition in this House in 1878, when hon. gentlemen were in opposition just as they are now. He was complaining bitterly of the extravagant expenditures of the Mackenzie government. The Mackenzie government increased the expenditure in four years by a very small amount indeed. But the hon. gentleman then started in to give the public to understand that if they would permit a Conservative government to come into power, they would have a policy of economy. It was said on the Liberal side of the House that the policy of these hon. gentlemen would lead to large expenditures. No, hon. gentleman opposite said, when we come in there will not be large expenditures. We merely want to readjust the expenditure and taxation so that the people may find employment and may get the means of paying the taxation. Now, that

I may not misquote the hon. leader of the opposition, I am going to quote from *Hansard* of 1878 a portion of a speech made by that hon. gentleman :

I trust that I have satisfied the House that it is not a question of high or low taxation any further than this, that inasmuch as we governed the country with a small taxation, and inasmuch as we are prepared to govern the country again without those extravagant expenditures made by the present government since they have been entrusted with power, all we ask is, not that the taxation of the people shall be increased—

I want to ask the particular attention of the House to what follows :

—because we do not require as much money as hon. gentlemen opposite, as we have shown by our economy in the past, and as we are prepared to practice in the future, but that the money shall be levied in such a way as to furnish employment for the people and provide the means of paying the taxation that is levied upon them. What we ask is not an increase of the taxation, but a readjustment of the taxation. . . . .

I ask the House to bear in mind that in that speech, Sir Charles Tupper, then, as now, occupying a very prominent place in the Conservative party, solemnly declared to this House, and to the people of Canada, that his party were prepared to carry on the government with less money than was expended by Mr. Mackenzie :

We do not require so much money as hon. gentlemen opposite.

That was his pledge. Now as to the fulfilment of it, and perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), will discover that there have been more breeches of promise in this matter of expenditure than he imagines. The expenditure of the Mackenzie government in 1878, was \$23,500,000, and Sir Charles Tupper said it was too large.

They did not need as much money as Mr. Mackenzie.

That is what Sir Charles Tupper said, and the Conservatives came into power. In their first year, they spent \$24,500,000 ; in the next year they spent \$24,850,000 ; in the next year they spent \$25,500,000 ; and in the fourth year of that parliament, before they went to the country, these gentlemen who said they did not need to expend as much money as Mr. Mackenzie spent, in that last year of their first parliamentary term, spent \$27,000,000 against the \$23,500,000 which Mr. Mackenzie had spent. (I am speaking entirely of consolidated revenue account in these figures.) And, Sir, before the Conservatives went out of power they increased their expenditure by leaps and bounds, until it reached \$39,000,000 in one year. In the light of that promise made by Sir Charles Tupper, and in the light of the manner in which it was carried out, I will leave hon. members in this House, and I will leave the people of

the country to judge of the faith that can be placed in the professions of the Conservative party, that if placed in power, they will carry out a policy of economy.

Let us understand what is economy. We have spent a great deal of money; we admit it. The hon. gentlemen opposite boast that they spent little, but their little was extravagance, because they did not have the money to pay. They spent little and they ran the country into debt. We have spent much, but we have had the money to pay it. We have paid every bill, and we have had a reduced rate of taxation, as is admitted by gentlemen opposite. We have spent these large sums; we have met the demands of the people, we have paid the bills, and we have had a handsome balance from year to year on the right side of the ledger. I was in the western part of Ontario some months ago with the right hon. the Prime Minister, attending a series of meetings, and I was much struck by a motto which stretched across the street, in one of the beautiful Ontario towns. That motto was: 'Wise expenditure is true economy.' I believe that that is the basis of sound finance. Economy does not mean parsimony. It does not mean niggardliness. It means the meeting of the reasonable demands of the people by an honest expenditure, designed to comply with all the requirements as far as possible. That, Sir, is I believe true economy. A young lady was spoken to by her aunt who said: Mary it is a very serious thing to get married; and she replied: Yes, aunt, it is, but it is a much more serious thing not to get married. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), came to a large appropriation in his estimates for the Intercolonial Railway the other night, and the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Foster), said: Is the minister not really afraid of this large item? The minister replied: I am not, but I would be very much afraid, if I should come down to this House and have to acknowledge that I was not prepared to provide the funds necessary for carrying on the public business of the country. It is a serious thing, Sir, to provide these large estimates, but it would be a much more serious thing if we had to stand before parliament and the country to-day in such a position, that these hon. gentlemen opposite could point to us and say: You are afraid to give the people the means which they require to carry on and to develop the trade of the country. We are not afraid to meet parliament and to meet the public with this bill of expenditure. In the first place hon. gentlemen know that it is useless to try to scare people with the amount of the estimates. There is always an important difference between estimates and actual expenditure. It has always been so and will always be so. A very large estimate does not necessarily mean that there will be a very large expenditure. There will be for various reasons, considerable sums voted in the esti-

mates which will not be expended. There will be what are called lapsed balances. Why, Sir, in the very appropriations we have to-day before the House, there are no less than \$2,000,000 of revotes, which means that these were moneys appropriated last year which the various departments were not able to expend, and so they appear in our estimates again, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), has the great luxury of counting them against us twice. He counted them against us last year, and now he counts them against us this year. It will be a comfort to the public to know that though they may count twice in these estimates, they only count once in the expenditure. It is very desirable that we should get the fact understood, that the expenditure of the country ought to be considered in relation to the services rendered, rather than in the aggregate. It is useless to talk about this expenditure, unless we are prepared to look at the various departments, and see what the money is expended for. This is indeed a growing time, and it would be a monstrous thing, in the face of the present condition of our business, if the government did not respond to the reasonable demands of the people, to sustain and to encourage that business.

But, Sir, there is an important distinction between increased expenditure and increased taxation. There is a large increase in the public expenditure of Canada, but there is a decrease in the rate of taxation. And in so far as we are able to carry on the various obligations that are arising without increasing the rate of taxation on the people, I feel sure that the public opinion of Canada will sustain us. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster), quotes the aggregate taxation, but he has forgotten to say that that has not entailed any increased burden on the people. That aggregate taxation is an evidence of the prosperity of the people which has enabled them to become large consumers, and with a reduced rate of taxation, to provide themselves more liberally with the things which they could not buy if times were not prosperous. Then we may ask ourselves is this expenditure merely keeping pace with the growth of population? I think, Sir, that a careful examination of the facts will show that while the aggregate expenditure is increasing, it is not increasing beyond the growth of the country. We have also the further fact that a great deal of this increased expenditure is balanced by increased receipts on the other side, but hon. gentlemen opposite never mention that. Take the case of the Intercolonial Railway. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) has to ask for large increases in the appropriations for the working expenses of that road, and that goes to swell up our annual estimates. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: See the immense increase in the expenditures by this government, but they do not tell us that for every dollar of that, one and a half million dollars

increase in the expenditure of the Intercolonial Railway, a dollar comes back to us in the shape of increased receipts from the road. Would it be a reasonable thing, if for fear of criticism of that character, we should refuse to provide the Intercolonial Railway with the necessary facilities for carrying on the business of the country?

Then, take the case of the Yukon. There again we have had to spend very large sums of money. Hon. gentlemen opposite will talk about increased expenses; but they will not tell the people of this country that in the case of the Yukon, for every dollar that has been expended we get a dollar back. I have made that statement before, and I can make it now in the light of later information supplied to me by the Interior Department, which may be taken as substantially correct. It covers the years 1897-8 1898-9 and the six months of the year 1899-1900, up to December 31 last; and what do we find? That in the various departments we have expended in the Yukon during those two and a half years, \$3,215,765. Oh, hon. gentlemen say, see how these people are increasing the expenditure—three millions and odd expended in the Yukon! Yet, hon. gentlemen forget to say that though that swells the total expenditure of the country, it does not add a cent to the burdens of the people. On the contrary, so far as the people of old Canada are concerned, it is a positive relief, because against that expenditure, we have received from the Yukon, \$3,867,000.

When hon. gentlemen talk about the expenditures of the country, they should, in all fairness, let it be clearly understood that the increased expenditure does not add to the burdens of the country, but is caused by the desire of this government to provide facilities for handling the business of the country. On this point I have a quotation from a speech of a prominent member of the opposition, made before the last election, which I have never heard contradicted. I am going to quote it to show that when hon. gentlemen opposite talk so frequently about their expenditure of 1896 as being \$37,000,000, or a fraction less, and try to convey to the public the idea that under their administration the business of Canada could be carried on upon any such terms, they themselves know very much better. In their main estimates for 1896-7, they brought down votes amounting to \$38,200,000, and they had other estimates behind which have frequently been the subject of discussion in this House, and which we contend would have brought their appropriations for that year up to \$42,000,000. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper is quoted as having made this speech shortly before the last election.

I take the responsibility for saying that whether my party or the other party be successful at the next election, I have not the slightest doubt that the expenditure of this country will

increase instead of diminish. And I will go further and say that, provided wisdom presides over the system of management and expenditure, I hope, and devoutly hope, that the expenditure will increase instead of diminish. This country, as it grows, this country, as it successfully develops, certainly this country as it accumulates a larger population, will and must require a larger amount than \$40,000,000 a year for its government.

So that when hon. gentlemen opposite were able to show an expenditure for 1896 of a fraction under \$37,000,000, they knew perfectly well, from evidence which I have quoted, that that was not a fair statement of what the business of the country could be carried on for; and if they had continued in power they would have been obliged largely to increase the expenditure. I read a statement at an earlier stage of this session which was calculated to show, and I think did show, that viewing the matter from a per capita standpoint, the expenditure of the country had not increased; for if you make allowance for the greater growth of population, which, I am sure, we all feel we have had during the last two or three years, you will find that the rate of expenditure chargeable to consolidated account has not been any more per capita in our time than it was under the late government.

But, there is another test, which is a very fair one, of the growth and progress of the country, and that is the total trade. Look at the figures for a moment. In the whole eighteen years of the Conservative government, the increase of the total trade was \$64,000,000, whereas in three years of the Liberal government, the increase was \$82,000,000. Is there any man in the Dominion of Canada who supposes that a country increasing its trade at this rate can carry in its business without any increase in the public expenditure? If a merchant's business is increasing he must have some increase in his expenditure; that is inevitable. If he can carry on the business and his expenditure only keeps pace with the growth of his business he does not consider that a failure.

Now, look at the expenditure of the country on consolidated account in its relation to the total trade, which I think is a fair way of viewing it. The country started out in 1867-8 with an expenditure on consolidated account which was about 10 per cent of its total trade. That increased after a few years, especially under hon. gentlemen opposite, until in 1885-6 it was as high as 20 per cent of the total trade of the country. In that year it was a little higher than usual, owing to exceptional circumstances, and I would not refer to it without this explanation. But, if you look at other years about that time, you will find 17 or 18 per cent as the prevailing proportion. Coming down to our time, you find that in the last three years the average expenditure on consolidated account bears the proportion of only 13½ per cent to the

total trade as against 16 per cent, the average in the last three years of the late government. I claim that the increase in the trade of the country, while not the only test, is a fair measure of the increasing business and prosperity of the country; and, therefore, it is perfectly reasonable to consider that when you are considering the total expenditure. Whether you look at the growth of the country by population or at the growth of the country's trade, you will come to the conclusion that these increased expenditures have only borne a reasonable proportion to the general development of the country.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the time is coming when we must appeal to the people. Sir, we recognize that fact, and we look forward with the utmost confidence to what the verdict of the country will be.

Mr. FOSTER. You are a goner.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend's friends have for a number of years been using that goner argument. For a number of years they said, 'Mowat must go,' but he remained. They have been using the goner argument a long time, but it does not amount to anything. We do not fear a comparison of the record of this government with that of the government which preceded us. I believe the people will return this government to power, for two reasons: First, because the record of this government is good; and, second, because, even if its record were not so good, they would rather have this government than go back to the government of 1896. We shall appeal to the people, Sir, with a record of which any government and any country may be proud. We can point to a record of four years of good government—four years of clean government, unstained by the blotches which marked the career of hon. gentlemen opposite; four years of splendid development of Canada, both in her material interests and her national advancement; four years of remarkable success in the financial and commercial development of this country; four years of a truly Imperial policy, which has given Canada a position in the eyes of the empire and the world such as she never occupied before; four years of that kind of settled government which commands the confidence of capital and of industry; four years of busy activity among the working classes of Canada, who have found themselves busier, happier and more prosperous than ever before; four years of peace, instead of that condition of affairs which at one time threatened this country with serious differences of a religious character—four years of peace, four years of progress; four years of such prosperity as this country never before knew.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). A number of things, Mr.

Mr. FIELDING.

Speaker, have been omitted in this debate that I do not think it would be fit to leave untouched in so important a crisis in our parliamentary history. It is perfectly clear from the speech we have just listened to, that we are on the eve of a general election, and therefore, we are looking back over five sessions and four years and a month of the administration of the present government.

The hon. gentleman who is leading the opposition (Mr. Foster) in a brilliant, cogent, convincing speech, went over a number of items, a number of great questions and great administrative transactions on which this government stands convicted before the country. The hon. gentleman spoke of the dealings of the Minister of Public Works with Mr. Gauthier and Mr. Robillard, and he referred inferentially to the dealings with regard to the Edmonton bridge and a number of other matters that have disgraced the conduct of the Public Works Department.

He referred to the Railway Department, which at this moment is regarded as a pear that has the yellows, by the people of Canada. He referred to that department, the administration of which, now that we are closing these four years, the people are beginning to understand, and with regard to which a frightful revelation has been made in another place.

He referred especially and particularly to the \$425 per day for the dredging of the Galops Rapids, in regard to which not one word has been said by the hon. the Minister of Finance. Why? No doubt because not one could be said. The hon. gentleman was here the other night when we wanted information from the Minister of Railways. Could we get any information or any explanation? We could get nothing from him but what I regret to have to describe as what we should not expect from a minister of the Crown. What we should expect from a minister of the Crown is candour, confidence in parliament, ingenuousness and readiness to give information. You would not expect from him the insolence of an illiterate and dragged up person. I do not say that the hon. gentleman is such a person, but I say that I never saw a nearer approach to vulgar insolence than we got from the hon. gentleman when we wanted to know what was the meaning of this tremendous charge of \$425 per day for a dredge. Not one word was said about that incident by the hon. the Minister of Finance. Not one word did he say about the oil contract or about that change of contract by the Minister of Railways, which places him in the same category as the emergency food business has placed the Minister of Militia. Where that has placed the Minister of Militia is understood by the people of Canada, and all the glowing words of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat and given such a nice little defence, cannot

relieve his colleague, the Minister of Militia, from the charge that is in the people's minds against him as the head of that department. Either one of two things—either he is an imbecile or he is corrupt.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That is not in order.

**Mr. DAVIN.** If that is out of order, I withdraw it. The hon. gentleman will see that I put it alternatively, and if I wished to argue the point, I think I could show that I was not out of order, but I withdraw it at once, because I have no desire to be out of order. I will say this for the Minister of Finance. There is one thing great about him, and that is his audacity. He commenced by saying that the present government is in no way responsible for the delays that have taken place this session. He said that there was not a day when the government was not ready with business, and tried to throw the blame on the opposition. Why, it was the 23rd March before the hon. gentleman brought down his budget. Parliament opened the 1st February, and it was the 23rd March before the hon. gentleman gave us his budget. And what is the business of the country? It is to discuss the budget, the estimates, the supplies. What happened subsequently? We had a fire in Hull. On the day of that fire, we met here to do business, but the right hon. the Prime Minister got up and with an ingenuousness on which I cannot compliment him, he said: We will not have any more light for some days, and had better adjourn, and on his motion we adjourned until the following Tuesday. There was no reason for the adjournment because there was plenty of light, except the reason that the government had no business to go on with. Yet the Minister of Finance has the effrontery to stand up here and say that the government was always ready. Then who does not remember the junior member of Halifax moving an amendment on the preferential trade on the motion to go into Committee of Supply?

Is the hon. gentleman aware of the record of the Liberal party with regard to railway subsidies? Unable to defend himself he has recourse to the plea that there had been some slight difference in the way the Liberal party has dealt with subsidies as compared with that of the previous government. I leave that to the public to judge.

Then we have the hon. gentleman's defence of the McKenzie & Mann contract. Did he defend it on its merits or say it was a good contract? Did he say it showed the heaven born genius of the young Napoleon or the wise genius that presides over the council chamber of seventeen heaven-born ministers? Not at all. All he said was that it was sanctioned by Sir Charles Tupper, so that all that the Minister of Finance has to say of this scheme that was universally con-

demned by the people, that was thrown out by the Senate, and that the government never dared to revive—all that he has to say is that it was approved by Sir Charles Tupper. But, as a fact, it was never approved. The defence the hon. gentleman makes has not a single inch of ground to stand upon and I will tell you why. Sir Charles Tupper was in Montreal when the contract with Mackenzie & Mann was announced, and saw the newspaper paragraphs with regard to it as he was coming upon the train; and when he got to Ottawa he gave an interview to a reporter. He endorsed the general scheme, but not one word did he say as to the merits of the transaction. So, the defence of the Minister of Finance falls to the ground.

Now, we come to the tariff. And we need not be surprised that the hon. gentleman made no defence on that subject. He said: We are accused of only making small changes in the tariff. Well, he could not say they had made great changes, although he had on his right his leader—that leader who had declared that if he got into power he would take a sponge and wipe away protection; that leader who went from end to end of Canada declaring that the Upas tree of protection should be pulled up; that leader who came to Manitoba and the North-west Territories and who in Regina and Moosejaw declared that the farmers should be relieved of the oppression of the protective system; that leader who with his prospective Minister of Agriculture at his side allowed that hon. gentleman to declare that the 20 per cent duty on implements was oppression, thereby declaring, by implication, that if they got into power, that duty would be done away with; that leader who afterwards took the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) into his cabinet, a gentleman who had run the campaign for Dalton McCarthy as well as for himself on the cry of 'free implements.' And yet they have been in power five sessions and there is still a 20 per cent duty on implements; and the cheaper cottons are taxed higher than ever; and coal oil is dearer than ever, and no relief for the consumer. The Finance Minister knew all these things. He was like a man skating on thin ice; he glided over the traffic as quickly as he could. As to the tariff, there is not a man, but especially the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior, and the Minister of Agriculture—there is not a man belonging to the old leaders of the Liberal party in parliament here that does not stand before Canada forsworn—their lips are blistered with their perjury to the people of Canada. No wonder the Minister of Finance glides away from the tariff question.

What is his defence on the emergency ration? Why, he did not see the point. The point is that you have a Minister of Militia closeting himself with a contractor, receiving from him a tender and

giving him a contract, the whole thing done in this sleight-of-hand manner. And you have not merely broken biscuits in paint cans sent to our soldiers—that is not the gravamen of the charge; but the gravamen of the charge is, as a Liberal speaking behind them said, it smells of something that we must not name in this chamber at least in connection with the name of any hon. member; but it is named and will be shouted throughout Canada. The gravamen is that it is impossible to come to any other conclusion than that somebody in that Department of Militia was conspiring with Devlin. Who he is I am not going to say. And how does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) defend it? Why, he says, it was only the small sum—\$4,000. As if this would make any difference, if it were only forty cents—if there was fraud and villainy and infamy beneath it. But the minister (Mr. Fielding) glides off and says that something similar took place under Conservative rule. Is that any defence? The leader of the opposition (Mr. Foster) traversed what he said: Is this the kind of government we have—that they cannot defend a single charge except by saying that somebody else did something as bad? You call me a thief, and I say you have purloined a pocket handkerchief. You say my virtue is not what it should be, and I ask you if you are chaste? It is talk only heard in the unnamable purlieus of great cities. You see two people with arms akimbo and jaw to jaw howling, 'you're another, you're another.'

When the hon. gentleman came to the expenditure, there was the gliding on thin ice. I suppose he learned to slide in Halifax. I should like to see him on skates. Here is a government whose members, in a hall within earshot of this chamber, declared that if they were returned to power they would reduce the expenditure and reduce the public debt, both of which they characterized as fearful. But after four years we find that they have increased both. And what is their defence? 'We have not increased them as much as you did.' Why, this is the language—I suppose I may name the hon. gentleman as he is now in Paris—this is the language of Tarte. As he says: We have spent much, but we have made much. 'We.' It is not the ploughman in the field, it is not the mechanic in the shop, it is not the merchant, it is not the toiler, who have made Canada prosperous but 'we,' sitting in 'our' offices or making 'our' little speeches in parliament. Why, Sir, the expenditure, as the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has shown, has gone up to a frightful extent. But the answer is: If you will look at it closely, it will not look quite so bad, because the country is prosperous and can bear it. This is the language of a young spendthrift who has come in for a great fortune. He has promised his father that he will economize and will look carefully after the

estate. But after four years the father finds that he has been indulging in the most licentious extravagance; and when spoken to about it the young spendthrift says: Is it not my own? Have I not a fine income and a great estate? He has both, though he did not do anything to create them. Hon. gentlemen opposite came into a great estate, I grant you, an estate that had been managed for eighteen years with consummate skill, with such skill as to lay foundation for expansion to the present proportions. But, coming into that estate, they say: It is we who have made it all. The Prime Minister points to the great canals sweeping through the vast domain, canals that have been deepened by his predecessors and says: Is it not magnificent? I did it all. But one who hears that begins to think: Well this man has only been on the estate for four years; and I think I have heard about one John A who used to be here; and I think I have seen these canals deepened years ago. But no, the Prime Minister says: I did it all; I made all this prosperity. The argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) with regard to the expenditure is worth noting carefully. He says, with regard to the expenditure that that expenditure is not so bad, because it has been kept within the receipts. Has he done that? Why, Sir, one of the ways that it appears to be kept within receipts, is this, that you are charging to capital account things that should never be charged to capital. The Minister of Railways and Canals the other night had to reduce, at the bidding of my hon. friend, one item by \$7,000. The hon. gentleman saw it was improper. Among those items, we had \$5,000 for a snow fence charged to capital. If we could only get a glimpse at that snow fence, we should see still more clearly that it is a scandal to book-keeping to charge a snow-fence to capital. But in that snow fence there is a nigger. He has a rubicund face—I will go no further.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in claiming credit for the extension of income, forgot to say that the price of every commodity has gone up. You are under a complete delusion. You are deceiving the people unconsciously, when you say there have been much larger purchases than in years past. The fact is that the price of everything has so gone up that these gentlemen are collecting tolls on that advanced price, and they are working the whole out of the expenditure of the country. Then the hon. gentleman felt uneasy about economy, he felt the dart of the leader of the opposition sticking under his fifth rib. What was his defence? What was the final defence made by these hon. gentlemen the last time they will sit on those Treasury benches for many a year? What is their defence for not having brought about the economy they promised? Why, Sir, they read a speech of Sir Charles Tupper made in 1878. Sir Charles Tupper said

in 1878, that they would be more economical than Mr. Mackenzie, and were they not? Did the hon. gentleman prove that the Conservative government did not carry out his promise to be more economical? When he said he would be more economical, he meant that the incompetence and maladministration that had characterized the Mackenzie government, would not characterize his administration, and that he would on the lines of administration of Mr. Mackenzie be more economical than he; and if you make a comparison of the two administrations you will find that that promise was carried out. And the hon. gentleman to-night points to the expenditure in 1881-2, in order to show the vast extravagance of the present government was not so bad after all. When, in 1879, the Conservative administration came into power, a new sense of life rushed through the veins of the country. Great schemes were put forward. At that time the government of Sir John A. Macdonald had entered upon the greatest work that any people of ten millions or twenty millions had ever entered upon, that of building the greatest railway in the world, a work which put back-bone and body, breadth, as well as length, into Canada. The government of Sir John A. Macdonald entered upon a career of great public works, and yet the hon. gentleman puts his hands on his heart, and says: It is I who built all these canals. There they are, false to every promise, false to the promise of tariff reduction, false to the promises of economy, and then, strutting about like a jackdaw in peacock's plumes, saying that the achievements of better men who preceded them, are their achievements. It is by such means that they hope to capture the people. Sir, the people know them from the Prime Minister to the Minister of the Interior, from the Minister of the Interior to the Minister of Public Works, from the Minister of Public Works to the Minister of Railways and Canals. Why, there is not a man of them who is not convicted before the people of Canada to-day. And yet the minister says: We are going before the people, we will be accepted and returned again. Yes, returned again. Do they indeed suppose the people at this hour, are capable of being humbugged to the extent they think they can humbug them? The policy of this government on which it got in, and on which it is living to this hour, can be described in just one word: Humbug, humbug, humbug. I was surprised to read the other day in the *Gazette* of 1877, that a constituent of the right hon. gentleman, had at that period actually done what it took some of us a couple of years to do. A constituent of his wrote a letter to the *Gazette* quoting a speech that the hon. gentleman made when he thought that only French ears were listening to him. He was talking about the tax on tea, and he said: The tax only affects Irishmen, because Irishmen only are fond of tea, pota-

toes and whisky. The writer of this letter is an Irishman who resented this insult to Irishmen. And he then states that he had heard the hon. gentlemen in different parts of his constituency, and that his habit was to say one thing on one platform, and another thing on another. We know that is his habit. But, Sir, 'in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird.' The people of this great community have been taken once, but now the net has been spread so palpably that the game cannot work any longer. The right hon. gentleman came up west and spoke in his calm, nice way and charming manner, and the people took him at his word and they said: He is going to give us what he promised at Moosejaw, lower freight rates, free implements, cheap coal oil; he is going to give us complete enfranchisement. Now, they believe that if they gave him power again, he would not touch one of the things he promised, no not with his little finger.

Now, Sir, need we be surprised that under these circumstances we find yourself, Mr. Speaker, and other hon. members of this House refusing, some of them refusing out of fear and some of them because they will not face the people under the weight of the odium, under the crushing weight of broken pledges and falsified promises that any man who shoulders the task of running as a candidate of the right hon. gentleman has to face and to bear—refusing to again offer themselves for re-election to this House. Where are they going? They cannot be elected. I have been in some of the constituencies. I have attended some picnics in the west, I have made some speeches, and the people of the country, if I may use a vulgar expression, are on to them and on to them all.

The hon. gentleman glided very rapidly over very thin, thin ice. He did not dare to touch Gauthier, my son's father-in-law, or Robillard. The charming way that Robillard gets a note from the secretary of the department: Please tender! You remember the connection by marriage with one of the sons or daughters, I do not know which it is, of the hon. Minister of Public Works. Please tender; and then Robillard tenders. Robillard is more wide awake than Gauthier, and what does he do? Now, Mr. Speaker, I commend this to your consideration. Robillard antedates his application so as to make it appear that it preceded the invitation to tender. But, he forgot, when sending it, with that guileless innocent of an Israelite indeed, to tell the clerk in the Public Works Department not to stamp the letter, because it is the custom when a letter comes into the department to stamp the date upon which it arrives, and we have that guileless letter of Robillard dated after the invitation to tender was given. Then Gauthier, I believe, is a quill driver. Fancy Gauthier advancing to dredge the rapids with his quill in his

hand! When the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Foster) or myself asked the hon. Minister of Public Works: 'Who is Gauthier? Is he a relative of yours?' 'No,' in his rather bluff, emphatic way, 'He is no relative of mine.' 'Is he your son's father-in-law?' and then the heroic manner in which the hon. Minister of Public Works said: 'How can I help it if my sons do have fathers-in-law?'

The hon. gentleman glided over the cement business and he never said a word about \$425 for a dredge. We want to know what kind of a dredge it was? Four hundred and twenty-five dollars a day! I was speaking to a man, not very far from a minister of the Crown, and he could not understand how any dredge would cost \$425 a day. Eight dollars an hour is a good price for a dredge or \$80 a day. Eight dollars an hour is what Gauthier gets, I believe. He gives \$5 and sits there in his office, writing away with his quill; the dredging is being done and he takes \$3 an hour. Is it not a nice thing to be the father-in-law of the son of a minister? It is one of the best assets in Canada to-day to be a relation of one of the ministers. I think we have heard of a relation of a minister who had a sleeping interest in a railway contract. And, we had the young Napoleon. I do not know whether the hon. leader of the opposition said anything about Burrows. These marital relations are so embarrassing to the government. One is the father-in-law of the son of a minister, another is the mother-in-law and Burrows is the brother-in-law of the hon. Minister of the Interior. I exposed how Burrows got an opportunity away from all competitors, without fulfilling the conditions of an order in council, passed to enable him to get hold of these timber limits, and how he was enabled to make \$25,000 at a snap. These relationships are a great thing. Then, my hon. friend gave us a proverb. This government is strong on many things. It is strong on tu quoque, but it is especially strong on proverbs. It commenced its career with 'Business is business,' enunciated by the hon. Minister of Public Works, and now we have the hon. Minister of Finance telling us that he is a great admirer of what is written up in the west. 'Wise expenditure is true economy.' The Galena oil deal, the Crow's Nest deal, the Drummond County, the Galops Rapids, the Edmonton Bridge, the Mann-Mackenzie deal, and in face of these we have the proverb, 'Wise expenditure is true economy.' Then we have last, but not least, the emergency ration business. It is only \$4,000; what signifies it? It is not \$4,000 that the people are caring about. We had better have it dragged out into the light at once because we know we have a man at the head of the Militia Department whose character ought to drive him from that position. We know that the Prime

Mr. DAVIN.

Minister knows it because I know that the facts are in the possession of the Prime Minister, and it is scandalous cowardice on our part that we will not drag into light the infamous use that is made of the authority of a minister who uses his ministerial power to gratify the errant impulses of a corrupt nature. There are transactions known to the Prime Minister in regard to that man that should have prevented the Prime Minister from placing him in a position where he would have the opportunity of gratifying his greed, to put it mildly. I say it is scandalous, and if the Prime Minister had had a proper sense of what is due to himself and due to the people of Canada the hon. Minister of Militia would not have been in his present place, and we should have been spared these developments in regard to Devlin which are as disgraceful to Canada as they are dangerous to our young men.

Then the Minister of Finance said that the aggregate taxation was a proof of prosperity, and that the country was merely keeping pace with it. Increased expenditure; increased income; and he harped upon that. The thing is so utterly baseless, that the strongest admirer of the Prime Minister in Canada, the gentleman who writes in the *Sun*, has had to abandon a defence in regard to these matters and to come out and say that there can be no defence for it. It is all very well to see these ministers in the second and third year of their term, coming to the House with their shoulders swaggering as we have seen them, coming in feeling that their pockets are well lined, and that they are in power and can drive about in their carriages; that is all very fine, but now when they are about to go before the people of Canada and to render an account there is an unwonted pallor and an unused humility in their demeanour. What was the minister's (Mr. Fielding's) defence about the Yukon. He said: I have just got the figures from the Minister of the Interior, and for three years, 1897-8, 1898-9, and into 1900, the receipts were \$3,869,000, and the expenditure \$3,215,000. That would make a surplus of \$653,000, or for the three and a half years \$187,000 a year. That is the profit from a Golconda; that is the profit out of the cream skimming of the richest gold-bearing land in the world. Why, Sir, if the Minister of the Interior had managed that territory in the interests of Canada and not in the interests of Wade and McGregor and his pals, instead of having \$187,000 a year we should have had a million in the coffers of Canada. Did the Minister of Finance try to show there was no mismanagement? Not at all. His duty was to have defended the sending of the militia there which is perfectly indefensible, and to have defended the numberless mal-administrations on the part of the minister (Mr. Sifton), but all he did was to say there was \$187,000 a year profit out of the richest

gold-bearing lands on the face of the globe. It is a scandalous record, and there is no part of the somewhat bold defence of the Minister of Finance bolder than that.

Then, we had his peroration: Four years of good government; four years of clean government. Clean government! Why, Mr. Speaker:

Heaven stops the nose at it, and the moon winks;  
The bawdy wind that kisses all it meets  
Is hushed within the hollow mine of earth,  
And will not hear it.

Clean government, forsooth. Corrupt government, a government so corrupt that it is putrid now. The Minister of Finance said: Look at us. We had a bath this morning; our face is washed; we have a paper collar and a new tie, and a white shirt that we got done in the Chinese laundry; see how spick and span we are. Yes, Mr. Speaker, look closely at them. Why, Sir, you cannot go near them without having evidence to more than one sense that there has the foulest of all diseases crept into that government. You cannot talk with a man on the street car but he tells you—sometimes a Liberal, and sometimes a Conservative—that the moment this government appeals to the people, they will be swept away by the indignation of the electors at their misconduct. I grant you that from a popular government or from the administration of any government, you cannot wholly keep away much that you would like to. Corruption will steal in. But it is a form of corruption that may leave ministers comparatively pure. Under pressure of politics, sometimes more men may be employed or something of that sort, but what we see in the present government is that into every part of the House, into their parlour, into their study, and into the holy of holies, so to speak, of the internal management of the government things that we do not like to speak of have crept. You cannot think of the Department of the Interior, with its Wades, its McGregors, its McCrearys, its deals—and all more or less connected with the minister—until that minister is so discredited, that when the Minister of Finance yesterday or the day before tried to get up a cheer for him, and the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to-day, they could only just clap their two miserable hands together. There was not an echo from another member. And when the minister (Mr. Sifton) rose to speak after being four months away, presumably ill, allegedly ill, and when the party should have some tenderness for him, when he rose in his place twice to vote, there was not a cheer. An attempt to cheer from the ministerial benches ended miserably as I have described. It was vain to try and get one up, and those who did had to clap their two miserable palms together in vain.

Let me say here in regard to the Minister of the Interior. We may discuss it. He has come back, and I am

sorry to say that he is not a bit improved. I know what his disease is, and I honestly regret to say that it is incurable. The technical name for it is non-purulent otitis media catarrhalis. In ordinary language it is called dry catarrh of the middle ear. It is incurable. It may go on as it is for years and years, and the hearing remain about the same, but every aurist knows it is impossible to make it better. One of the best aurists in the world is Dr. Buller, of Montreal, and yet we read of the Minister of the Interior going here and going there, speaking in London and speaking in Paris, when he could have consulted the very best professional advice at home. What was to prevent him coming across to Canada? It is only a nine days trip. What was to prevent him coming across the ocean and spending a night with us, and giving us some explanation, and going with us to one of the committees. No, Sir; he never spread his wings for Canada until the rumour came that this House was about to close. Take Mr. Tarte. Nobody need have any tenderness in speaking of his health. The man who can go about making speeches from one part of the continent to the other (and making such speeches) nobody thinks for one moment that it is illness that keeps Mr. Tarte away. The reason why both these gentlemen have kept away from this House was to prevent us doing what we would have done if they were here, namely, arranging them as you could not arraign them in their absence. That is the reason they remained away.

Take the conduct of the Minister of Public Works. Take his carpet scandal, take the scandal of the fence around the park. Take the scandal of the Edmonton bridge. Why, Sir, I said in regard to that bridge, and I repeat it, that I put the handcuffs on his wrists in such a manner that no power under heaven can take them off. Mr. Tarte will stand for ever before the people of Canada with regard to that Edmonton bridge, with the handcuffs on his wrists, because the facts as shown by the documents to be found in his own department, bring guilt home to him.

These things being so, fancy the boldness of the hon. gentleman. I said the other day that if my friend the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) were dissected, I would like to get his gall. But what would the gall of the member for North Wellington be to the gall of the hon. gentleman who has just defended his government? He told us a story about some young lady and about marriage. It was a nice little story and very appropriate. I suppose I may tell a little story that will apply to this government when they go with their sunny ways and offer the boy Canada an orange, and he refuses, as I think he will to take the orange, or to be taken in by the smile; and the reason will be illustrated by this story. There was a doctor who used to give

sweets and candies and oranges to a little boy. One day he gave the boy an orange, and afterwards, to see how the boy would take it, he hid himself and threw aside a curtain which concealed a skeleton such as doctors sometimes have. The boy ran away frightened. The next day the boy was at the other side of the street, and the doctor said, 'Come, won't you have an orange to-day?' 'No, no,' said the boy, 'I will have no more oranges of yours; you know I saw you naked yesterday.' When the hon. gentleman goes with his sunny ways and offers the boy Canada taffy and oranges, if his taffy and his sunny smiles do not have the same reception as they used to have, and the boy Canada gives him the cold shoulder and a wide berth, let him remember that the boy has now seen him naked. The skeleton of the Liberal party is before the people of Canada, and the sunny ways and the taffy will avail no more.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. Foster :

## YEAS :

## Messieurs

Beattie,	Kendry,
Bell (Addington),	Klock,
Bell (Pictou),	LaRivière,
Bennett,	Macdonald (King's),
Bergeron,	MacLaren,
Broder,	McAlister,
Clancy,	McCleary,
Clarke,	McDougall,
Cochrane,	McInerney,
Corby,	McNeill,
Craig,	Martin,
Davin,	Moore,
Dugas,	Morin,
Ferguson,	Powell,
Foster,	Prior,
Gillies,	Quinn,
Gilmour,	Rosamond,
Hale,	Sproule,
Henderson,	Taylor,
Hodgins,	Tisdale,
Ingram,	Wallace, and
Kaulbach,	Wilson.—44.

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Angers,	Holmes,
Archambault,	Hurley,
Bazinet,	Hutchison,
Beith,	Johnston,
Bell (Prince),	Landerkin,
Bernier,	Lang,
Blair,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Borden (King's),	Lavergne,
Bourassa,	Legrin,
Bourbonnais,	Logan,
Brodeur,	Macdonald (Huron),
Brown,	Mackie,
Bruneau,	McGugan,
Burnett,	McHugh,
Calvert,	McIsaac,
Campbell,	McLellan,
Carroll,	McLennan (Inverness),
Casey,	McMillan,
Champagne,	McMullen,
Charlton,	Madore,
Copp,	Marcell,
Costigan,	Melge,
Cowan,	Mignault,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Monet,

Mr. DAVIN.

Davis,	Oliver,
Dechene,	Parmalee,
Demers,	Paterson,
Dobell,	Pettet,
Dupré,	Proulx,
Edwards,	Puttee,
Ellis,	Ratz,
Ethier,	Rogers,
Fielding,	Ross,
Fisher,	Rutherford,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Savard,
Fraser (Lambton),	Semple,
Frost,	Sifton,
Gauvreau,	Somerville,
Geoffrion,	Stenson,
Gibson,	Sutherland,
Gould,	Talbot,
Graham,	Tucker, and
Harwood,	Wood.—86.

## PAIRS :

## Ministerial.

## Opposition.

Tolmie,	Montague,
Snetsinger,	Reid
Christie,	Roddick,
Featherston,	Carscallen,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Fitzpatrick,	Casgrain,
Lewis,	Poupore,
Macdonell,	Roche,
Penny,	Osler,
Belcourt,	Monk,
Britton,	Cargill,
Scriver,	Blanchard,
Fortin,	Chauvin,
Russell,	Borden (Halifax),
Flint,	Mills,
Mulock,	Haggart,
Godbout,	Marcotte,
Tarte,	Caron (Sir Adolphe),
McGregor,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Livingston,	Maclean,
Bostock,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Préfontaine,	Hughes,
MacPherson,	Earle,
Guité,	Guillet,
Maxwell,	Pcpe,
Domville,	Robinson,
Morrison,	Robertson,
Lemieux,	Seagram,
Comstock,	Kloepfer,
Fortier,	Ganong,
McClure,	McIntosh,
Dyment,	McCormick.

Amendment negatived.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Dominion Rifle Association—Allowance for a building on the Rockliffe rifle range... \$1,500.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Was a contract given for that.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden), This building was constructed by the Dominion Rifle Association, under the direct charge of Lieut-Col. Tilton. A portion of the work is done by contract, but I am positive that the expenditure has been very carefully considered and full value obtained.

Mr. BERGERON. Has any contract been let for the rifle range at Montreal?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, for about \$33,000 or \$34,000. I think the contract was given to White & Lyons, of Ottawa, who were the lowest tenderers.

Compensation to E. W. Armstrong, 14th Field Battery, for injuries received at annual drill, June, 1898..... \$500

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have a report here of that matter. During the annual drill at camp Fort Nope, June, 1898, driver E. W. Armstrong was thrown from his seat and injured by the horse stepping on him and the wheel passing over him. As a result he has been deformed ever since. Considering the condition of the patient and his sufferings, we have recommended compensation, and also in view of the fact that unless liberal treatment is given in case of accident, recruiting will be much discouraged.

Mr. T. D. CRAIG (East Durham). I approve of this grant. Armstrong lives in my constituency, and, knowing all the circumstances, I endorse this vote.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). I had to call attention, two or three years ago, to the case of an accident, but could obtain no allowance for the victim. As, however, the policy of the department has evidently been changed, I shall have to call the attention of the minister to the matter again.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Each case must be taken on its merits, and this vote does not constitute any precedent for undertaking to pay everything. This is not the first instance of a compassionate allowance having been granted.

Mr. H. F. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Will the hon. minister grant a military investigation in the case of Lieut. Foyle ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not see how I can do that, but I will look into the matter, and if any injustice has been done will see that it is remedied.

Mr. McDOUGALL. In the first place, the hon. minister (Mr. Borden), should have brought down the papers, as he promised on Saturday to do. But, he was kind enough to show me the report of an official of his department with regard to the case of Lieutenant Foyle. From what I can gather from the papers, and from what I have heard from Lieutenant Foyle, it seems that a medical certificate was sent to the department by a man who did not examine Lieutenant Foyle himself, but who spoke on the authority of some one else who was called in. And the House heard the hon. member from Inverness (Mr. McLennan), that he had made the certificate with the assistance of another medical officer who was in command of the battalion. And the only information on which that certificate was given, was that Lieuten-

ant Foyle had fallen in his chair, while the doctor was administering medicine to him, or something of that kind. But, I cannot see that that is sufficient ground for a medical officer to make out a certificate that would terminate the official of an officer in the militia. The hon. member (Mr. McLennan, Inverness), tells us that the medical man who assisted him, told him that Lieutenant Foyle had fallen in his chair. But he might as well tell us that this very officer who had given him the information, and whom as commanding the regiment, had fallen off his horse.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Who fell off his horse ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. The commanding officer, and what is the difference between falling off his horse and falling in his chair ? Did that gentleman fall off his horse because he had an epileptic fit ? I do not consider the ground of the certificate as satisfactory or sufficient to disqualify Lieutenant Foyle. Julius Cæsar himself was an epileptic—there is no question about that, but that did not render him unfit for the discharge of the great duties devolving upon him. But Lieutenant Foyle, in the opinion of the hon. member for Inverness, is unfit to discharge the duties of lieutenant in the 94th Battalion, because somebody who had fallen off his horse, told him that Lieutenant Foyle fell off his chair while he was administering to him. We do not know what he had been administering to him—something to make him fall, perhaps. All that Lieutenant Foyle asks is a military investigation, and I cannot see any reason why the hon. minister should refuse it. Will not he say that he will grant that ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The whole question turns on whether Lieutenant Foyle is, or is not, an epileptic. If he is, as represented by two surgeons of the battalion—

Mr. McDOUGALL. They never examined him.

Mr. ANGUS McLENNAN (Inverness). The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) is talking of what he knows nothing about—

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE—by the two surgeons of the battalion, confirmed by the lieutenant-colonel, who is himself a surgeon—if he is as they say, a confirmed epileptic, any one who knows anything about military matters, will agree that he is not a man to be an officer in the militia.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What about Julius Cæsar ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He was not a lieutenant. I can only say that I will look over the evidence again, and, if there is any doubt, I will take further testimony on the subject. I do not

believe there is any. If the man is an epileptic, it is not necessary to see him in an epileptic fit to be able to decide as to that fact. I am told it is notorious in the neighbourhood where Lieutenant Foyle lives, that he is an epileptic and has been for many years.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). The hon. gentleman from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall), certainly pays me a high compliment professionally, in taking the view of my certificate that he does. I have given my certificate upon this case, upon evidence which is perfectly clear, and quite sufficient; and I declare to the hon. gentleman and to this House, and I will stake my reputation on the fact, that from my personal knowledge and from having examined Lieutenant Foyle professionally, I know that he is an epileptic. I am backed up in this by the evidence of Dr. Macdonald, another medical officer of that battalion, a fellow townsman of Lieut. Foyle. Dr. McDonald, of Baddeck, practices his profession within a short distance of where Lieut. Foyle lives. Dr. McDonald's certificate as to the fact of Lieut. Foyle being an epileptic is in the Militia Department as well as mine. And yet, my certificate is questioned simply because a Dr. McKeen has given a certificate not at all to his credit, and with whom I would not care to be put in comparison professionally or otherwise. I declare, Mr. Chairman, that the two certificates were officially given, backed by the evidence of Dr. Bethune, and I would ask this House whether they are to be set aside by the opinion of the hon. member for Cape Breton, who knows nothing about epilepsy except what he hears about Julius Cæsar being afflicted in that way. I think his knowledge of the health of Julius Cæsar is on a par with that of his knowledge of Lieut. Foyle. I have given that certificate and I stand by it. I do see on what ground the member for Cape Breton can doubt the validity of that certificate. It is notorious in and around Baddeck and through the county of Victoria that the lieutenant is an epileptic and has all the characteristic symptoms of a chronic case of epilepsy. As I said the other day, there are cases, even in an asylum, of epileptics who have lucid spells like others afflicted in this way, and even a professional man such as Dr. McKeen claims to be, without his attention being called to the fact that a person is epileptic, might pass him as rather a healthy man.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I think my hon. friend will have to offer us something in the way of a margin in addition to speaking of his reputation, before this House can accept the statement of a gentleman occupying his position and undertaking to give a certificate of the kind he did in respect to Lieut. Foyle. Without having examined the man, he told us that he was in the field

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

with him on two occasions, and yet he was unable to detect in Lieut. Foyle the conditions which he certified to in his certificate, and he was therefore obliged to call in two doctors to give him some knowledge, and those two doctors had never examined this man. So, on the strength of hearsay my hon. friend comes and gives his official certificate to the effect that Lieut. Foyle was discharged because of some affliction of which he knew nothing. Imagine, Mr. Chairman, any insurance company accepting a certificate of a medical man in respect of a man they were insuring, on the strength of that medical man going and asking somebody else what he knew about his health. I never heard of anything of the kind before.

Guard at Welland Canal..... \$2,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I move to reduce that item to \$1,700. The accounts have been received from the accountant, and he thinks that \$1,500 might be enough, but advises that \$1,700 be voted in order to make sure.

Motion agreed to.

War in South Africa—Expenses of Canadian regiment, temporarily serving in garrison at Halifax to replace Imperial regiment, the removal of which was caused by the war in South Africa.... \$160,000

Mr. FOSTER. How long are they to be there?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This regiment consists of 1,000 men who are stationed at Halifax for the time being to replace a portion of the Imperial garrison which was required to serve in South Africa. The government does not know yet when the garrison will be relieved of this service.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). This may be the proper place to renew my request for the names of the parties who bought the horses that were sent to South Africa, and the amounts paid for them.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I promised my hon. friend that information twice, and I am sorry that I have not got it with me. I think it will come more properly under the supplementaries for next year. I will make a memorandum of it and bring it down when we get through these items.

Mr. SPROULE. When that item comes up I may not be in the House. The hon. gentleman might leave it on the Table or send it to me in an envelope.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will do that.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). Concerning the pay of the volunteers in South Africa, are they retaining that pay until they get back to Canada? Have they retained the pay of the volunteers who were sent to South Africa? I protested

at an earlier period in this session when it was announced that the volunteers were not to be paid by the Canadian government until they returned to Canada.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think the understanding was that that would be the course of procedure. At any rate, no amount has been paid to them since their arrival in South Africa on account of extra pay.

Mr. WALLACE. I think this is an outrage. These men have been undergoing all sorts of privation, and they have required money. I say it is a shame, a scandal and a disgrace for the government of Canada to retain that money without a particle of reason for doing it. What is the reason? The reason given was, that there might be somebody here who had some claim. Suppose that a man has a wife here. I understand the patriotic fund is providing for the people at home. Is the government paying the wives of any of these soldiers who are left at home?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, that is the regular allowance for the permanent corps; but, I mean outside of that?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The separation allowance is being paid outside of the permanent corps.

Mr. WALLACE. That is the separation allowance they are entitled to receive. But, what about the pay of the soldiers?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Nothing has been done with that.

Mr. WALLACE. In the case of the militia soldier it has not been paid. These men who have been sent thousands of miles away, require, as Canadians, more in the way of necessities than the British soldiers have been accustomed to, and they require money. Although money is due from the Canadian government, it has not been paid to them. There is not a shadow of reason for it. I know there is a necessity for the money. Did we not read the other day in the paper about two or three Canadian soldiers who had returned to England convalescent, who were being sent to a ship some distance away, and who had not money to pay their street car fares? But for some benevolent persons these poor wounded soldiers, who had not strength to walk, and who had no money, would have been unable to get along, although the Canadian government knew very well that this money was due to these men, and that it had not been paid. I know there are a great many cases of hardship besides this, and there is not a shadow of excuse for the government having refused to pay these men.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think that the criticism is

scarcely fair. I am not aware that there have been any cases of hardship. These men are precisely in the same position as all the other soldiers of the British army, and I have not heard that there has been any suffering through want of money. No doubt there has been suffering in many cases, but on many occasions millions of money would have been of no use to them when the soldiers were away from the base of supplies and where there were no supplies that money could secure.

Mr. WALLACE. What about when they were at the base of supplies?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. When they are in the presence of supplies the British government gives them ample supplies. I have had letters from officers, and there has not been the slightest complaint on that score. I received several letters, one only the other day from Dr. Ryerson, of Toronto, who has been out there in the interest of the Red Cross Society, who has done very valuable work, and who has distributed a great deal of money for that society. He has never hinted at any suffering from the cause mentioned by the hon. gentleman. So far as the hon. gentleman's reference to the cases in England is concerned, these men were in charge of the War Department. The Imperial authorities undertook, when we delivered our volunteers in South Africa, to return them, and to take care of them, and they gave them the same treatment that they gave their own soldiers. If they choose to bring them back by way of England, as they do in many cases, they will transfer them from place to place. If anything of the kind has occurred, such as has been mentioned by the hon. gentleman, it must be because the Imperial authorities have made some mistake in the matter, and not because it was not intended to provide fully for these men.

Mr. WALLACE. If they had had a dollar of the money which they had earned in their pockets they would have been able to pay 10 cents or 20 cents street car fare. I have letters stating the necessity for money, and they are from those who are not extravagant in expenditure either. The money is required there.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They did receive their pay there.

Mr. WALLACE. I know they received British soldiers' pay there.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Yukon—Further sum required ..... \$50,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is that for?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Twenty thousand dollars is to repay the North-west Mounted Police for supplies of wood and rations. This \$20,000 is really a matter of book-keeping between the Militia Department and the mounted police.

Mr. FOSTER. When was that incurred ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you pay it directly ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was supplied by the Northwest Mounted Police, and we are returning the money. The remainder is for the construction of a barracks in the Yukon.

Mr. FOSTER. What for ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman will remember that I said the barracks would probably cost about \$40,000. The accountant says that for the construction of the barracks in the Yukon \$50,000 has been paid out of the ordinary votes for pay, supplies, transports, &c. The cost has been greater than was anticipated.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of the permanent force have you up there yet ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have not any there now. They will be here in a couple of days.

Mr. FOSTER. You have taken them all out ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes. I do not know how many have come out, but there were 100 in the Yukon last year.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total cost of that whole militia business, from start to finish ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not able to tell the hon. gentleman at this moment. I will give him the information when we reach a small item that appears in the supplementary estimates for next year.

Mr. FOSTER. What is done with these barracks now ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The mounted police are using them ; but they are larger than are required.

Militia—For pay and maintenance of Yukon field force..... \$30,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This item I propose to reduce to \$20,000, and it will be made up as follows : pay of force to July, including good conduct pay, \$5,000 ; transport from Dawson to Vancouver, \$7,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How are you bringing them out ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. By rail and boat. The memorandum I have here gives the rate from Dawson to Vancouver as \$75 per man as per contract with the Canadian Development Company. From Vancouver to permanent

corps stations, \$5,000. The first-class rate from Vancouver to Montreal is \$76.75 ; second-class, \$64.50, with one-third off ; meals for officers, 75 cents ; for non-commissioned officers and men, 40 cents. The third item is for supplies in the Yukon during June, and contingent expenses, \$3,000 ; making a total of \$20,000, which will wind up the expenditure in connection with the militia in the Yukon.

To provide for the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law..... \$9,000

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister say how that is to be expended ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). This is the same amount as was taken last year. Last year less than \$600 was expended. Nineteen agents have been appointed throughout the Dominion. The only permanent agent appointed is E. T. Bremner, for the province of British Columbia. He is to have \$1,500 per annum so long as his services are found by the government to be necessary. His duty is to examine into all branches of the Alien Labour Act so as to prevent as far as possible alien labour coming into the province of British Columbia.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is there an agent in British Columbia and not in the other provinces ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We have appointed agents in other places, but not under salary. They are to be paid according to the work they do.

Administration of justice in the Yukon territory ..... \$50,500

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I promised the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) to give him the statistics which justify the appointment of an additional judge in the Yukon. Mr. Ogilvie, the commissioner of the Yukon territory, and also the Bar Association, have pressed for the appointment of two additional judges, but the government has not seen fit to make more than one appointment. An inquiry made in December last reveals the following facts : The number of civil cases standing on the list on January 1, 1899, was 50 ; on the 15th of June, 1899, it had increased to 80 ; on the 15th of September it had increased to 96, and on the 13th of December last to 118. It was then reported by the clerk of the court that it was unlikely that the end of the list, as it then stood, would be reached by the 15th of June, 1900. My attention has been drawn to the fact that a great deal of the time of the court is taken up in hearing appeals from the magistrate's courts and preliminary objections, and it has been necessary to take examinations of witnesses before the clerk of the court. In the year 1898, 348 cases were instituted in the court, and up to the 1st of January, 1900, the number had increased to 799.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Mr. SPROULE. What class of cases ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. These are all cases which in the province of Quebec would be Superior Court cases, in which the amount involved exceeds \$200.

Mr. FOSTER. As the judges do not leave Dawson, I do not see why there should be \$1,500 for travelling allowances.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have no information on that point. I am willing that that item should stand until I get the information.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase of \$1,500 in the sheriff's salary.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. A salary of \$500 is provided by statute, but provision was made that in addition to that sum he should have certain fees. The statement of fees was not received, and in the meantime the salary was fixed at \$1,200. Judging by the fees it has been found that they would justify a salary of \$2,000. He is obliged to account to the government for all the fees in connection with the office.

Mr. FOSTER. What do the fees amount to ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The memorandum I have received is, that from the fees he would be entitled to a salary of \$2,000. I infer from the memorandum that the statement of fees has been received, but it has not been submitted to me.

Mr. FOSTER. The Solicitor General might bring that down with the others.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the clerk ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot give the name of the clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we had better let the item stand; the minister is not ready for his work.

Interior Department—To improve road at  
Grand Falls ..... \$400

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. (Mr. Sifton). It is for needed repairs on the road leading north and south to Beau-lieu's Mills, on the ordinance land. The land was owned by the Dominion government, and the municipality declines to do any work on the road. From 1885 to 1895, the Federal government expended about \$7,000 on this road. From 1895 until last year there was nothing done, and upon earnest representations, I asked for an appropriation of \$400. My information is that \$400 more would make the road fairly passable.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). Was not the expense of making the road in the first instance, incurred in order to effect the sale of the lands ? If the lands have been

sold, why should this government maintain the road ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The land is sold, but is not paid for, and there is considerable difficulty in securing payment. The parties think they pay too much, and there is considerable dissatisfaction. I fancy that unless the government show some disposition to assist them in this matter, the difficulty will be all the greater. Under the circumstances, it does not appear to me to be an unwise policy to spend a little money.

Mr. FOSTER. The lands are all sold ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the lands are all sold to private parties, and will the minister tell me in what other place we build roads on lands belonging to private parties ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The position of the government is that of being an unpaid vendor, and the government has, therefore, a very large interest in the matter. If the land had increased in value since the sale, then the government would be independent, but my advice is that the land had decreased in value, and if we sold it again, the possibilities are that we would not be so well off.

Ordnance lands ..... \$1,300

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is the same vote as last year for the management of ordnance lands, and is made up as follows : \$200 for advertising sales ; \$200 for legal and other expenses connected with sales ; auctioneer's expenses, \$500 ; and caretaker's expenses, \$380.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there any buildings on the lands to take care of ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are some buildings that were formerly used for military purposes, but they are not, I suppose, of any special value from an intrinsic point of view. I think the farm at Longueuil, a considerable portion of which was sold last year, had some buildings.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any rent to be received from these lands.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, there is some small revenue. I think in connection with the lands near Ottawa, they are of some value.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me we are paying a big price for auctioneering, \$500. Why pay that amount if no sales are contemplated.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are simply providing in case sales should take place. If anybody applies for these lands, they must be sold by auction, and if there are no applications there will be no auction fees.

To compensate members of the North-west Mounted Police for services rendered carrying mails between Bennett and Dawson during the winter of 1898-9, 64,013 miles, at 10 cents per mile ..... \$6,401 30

Mr. SPROULE. That is where the Post Office Department gets the benefit.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). No, the police carried the mails during the year referred to and the cost was fixed by the controller at some \$47,000, which was charged up in the Postmaster General's Report. But the controller thought that the police themselves should receive some extra pay for this extra service, and he recommended the payment of this amount.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman, out of the post office vote, paid the mounted police the \$47,400 due them for carrying the mails?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Parliament voted last year a bulk sum for the service of the police, some \$300,000. A part of that item was a joint vote to be applied for certain common services and was so applied, according to the order of parliament. But these policemen were not specially engaged to carry the mails, and the controller thought they should be compensated for this extra work.

Mr. FOSTER. As the Postmaster General will not answer my question, I ask the Minister of Finance whether in the item for 1898-99, in the expenditure of the Post Office Department, the sum of \$47,400 is included, which was paid the mounted police, or whether that is charged against the mounted police in the public accounts and not against the Post Office Department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). In the public accounts that money is entered as paid to the North-west Mounted Police, but the Postmaster General, in his report, has charged the Post Office Department with the amount, and to that extent diminished the surplus he would otherwise have.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the Postmaster General paid that amount out of the Post Office revenue? I am putting the question to the Minister of Finance.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Postmaster General may be said to have done so, because that money was voted by parliament to be applied in a certain way and was not handed over to the Post Office Department, but with the hon. gentleman's own consent and at his own suggestion and on his own demand, it was voted in that way, and the vote was carried out literally according to the direction of parliament. The money was applied as parliament directed,

Mr. SIFTON.

and the hon. gentleman must be well aware of that fact.

Mr. FOSTER. The Postmaster General knows that he has never paid one cent out of his post office revenues or appropriations of that \$47,400 for the mail service performed by the mounted police. He knows that it is a dishonest transaction, as far as the keeping of the public accounts is concerned. He made a speech in this House in which he declared that his deficit was a certain amount, and the *Toronto Globe*, in its report and editorial comments, makes the deficit exactly the same, and that deficit takes no account at all of the \$47,400 paid for carrying the hon. gentleman's mails by the mounted police. I have never known such a gross case. I do not know which most to condemn, the petty, miserable quibbling of the Postmaster General, the action of the Minister of Finance, or the utter blank dishonesty of the transaction.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If it is dishonesty, I will give the hon. gentleman a case of greater dishonesty. His administration, dishonestly—if we are to use strong language—withheld from the public accounts by robberies of future appropriations of parliament a deficit which had accumulated to the extent of \$685,000. He got the service carried on for years, by robbing Peter to pay Paul, by eating into the next year's appropriation; and went on until we had a deficit of nearly one-fifth of the parliamentary appropriation, yet not one farthing of the expenditure appeared in the public accounts. In the year 1896, he pretended to wind up with a certain expenditure; yet, when the accounts came to be audited, it was found that for the last year they were in office, that they had not expended the whole parliamentary appropriation for that year, but for that one year they had accumulated a deficit of \$70,000—that is \$70,000 extra which was not charged against their expenditure for 1895-6. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that he is simply trying to destroy the force of good administration by his petty fogging quibbling in connection with this service. He knows that in his own administration they did do what he wants us to do. He knows that his administration deliberately passed an order in council declaring that a large amount of expenditure in connection with the carrying of the mails in the North-west should be charged to other departments of the government. I have told the hon. gentleman twice and I tell him the third time—he knows full well that under his own administration, the wretched makeshift which they dignified with the name of a service to the Yukon was a dismal failure, and they did not even pay their liabilities but left them for us to pay. He established a service by the mounted police in the Yukon, and you will not find anything for this service charged to the Post Office Department dur-

ing the hon. gentleman's regime. He placed the carrying of the mails in the Yukon in the hands of the mounted police, and did not pay them for it; and the expense does not appear as an item in the Post Office accounts. Why, then, is he so anxious that we should do what he did not do? We have treated the matter in a fair way. We have given in the Postmaster General's report the cost of the Yukon service and the revenue from it, and we have also given the revenue and expenditure for the rest of Canada. There are two distinct accounts that anybody can understand, and that can be compared with the accounts for similar service under the late administration. If the hon. gentleman wants to add the two together, let him do so. Adding the \$47,000 or whatever is the excess of expenditure over income, gives him the total. Let him take all the comfort he can out of it, as an offset to the disreputable record of maladministration of the post office under his own administration. As the Minister of Finance, he said that there would be a deficit of \$800,000 for many years to come, and he had no expectation of improving it. Will the addition of \$47,000 to the postal deficit under this administration extricate him from the difficulty in which he finds himself, owing to the complete failure of his predictions? Let him take all the comfort he can out of this \$47,000, and you still have the fact that the service under this government is carried on with only half the deficit that characterized it under the government of which he was a member, while postal rates have been reduced 33 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two or three things to say. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has acknowledged his fault, but has attempted to justify it by saying some things which might be true in part, and he has said other things that are not true—but whether true or not, they make his position no better. His position is that all the receipts and the expenditures are put down in the accounts of the Post Office Department. But the other fact lying alongside of it is that in some way he got another department to carry \$47,400 worth of his mails into and out of the Yukon, and he has not paid for these charges, he acknowledges that, but says the figures appear in his report. But that does not exculpate him, because when you come to the public accounts you will see that his receipts are there and his expenditures are not there. If you wish to find his expenditures on this service, you must look at the North-west Mounted Police accounts. The hon. minister acknowledges the whole thing. And yet he is willing as a cabinet minister and as Postmaster General to go to the country year after year with the false pretense that his revenue, as compared with his expenditure is so and so, when really his expenditure is \$47,400 more.

The hon. gentleman says, in order to exculpate himself, that that transaction is not to be compared in turpitude with another transaction. He says that the Post Office Department, at the end of one year had overexpended and had consequently dipped into the vote for next year. There is not a department in his government that has not done that this year, there is not a department which will not do it to a greater or less extent—I hope it will be to a small extent. But I will tell the hon. gentleman what was not done by the Post Office Department with regard to that \$617,000—they did not attempt to conceal it—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They stole it altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. No, they neither stole it nor concealed it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They took it improperly.

Mr. FOSTER. No, the post office service was paid for out of the post office vote. But the post office service in this case is concealed in the North-west Mounted Police vote. And the public accounts which go to the country from the hand of the Finance Minister contain that assertion also. Now, the hon. gentleman says that I have done the same thing with regard to the Yukon service in my time. There was no Yukon service until 1896.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, there was.

Mr. FOSTER. Testimony is given both by his own deputy and by Mr. White, of the North-west Mounted Police, that up to 1896, there were practically no mails into or out of the Yukon. Mr. White gave his testimony on oath to that. His statement simply was, that what was taken in was so small that it was carried in a despatch bag and the steamers took it in and charged nothing for it. Then, there was no filching from another vote in that respect. Then, from 1886 to 1888, there were three different contracts entered into with the post office for small sums, and all paid, so far as they were paid, by the post office. Those were the facts of the case, so far as they came out in the evidence. But the hon. gentleman is willing to sit in this House and claim that his deficit on the post office transaction of 1898-9 was \$393,000, when it was \$393,000 plus the \$47,000, which is covered up in the North-west Mounted Police vote.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman thinks it is very honest, I suppose, for him to take money that was voted to carry on the service from July 1, 1895, and with it to pay debts for a previous year. Is that his idea of carrying on administration? I will concede that

trifling expenses may not be closed up during the year in which they are incurred, and being trifling may run into the next year, or there may be some cause of delay, and necessarily the unpaid account has to be paid out of a future appropriation. But, that is an entirely different thing from adopting the principle, and in deliberately doing it as the hon. gentleman himself on the floor of parliament declared that it was done, not by accident—it did not happen because the accounts were not closed up—but it was deliberately done, knowingly done, and done with all the impropriety that one can attach to such a transaction. It is just as improper to take money that was voted to carry on a service from July 1 forward and apply it to a service for another year, as to take money from one department and apply it to another. That is my view. It is improper to apply money for a purpose for which parliament did not vote it. But, so far as this item of \$47,000 is concerned, it was applied as parliament voted it. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well the discussion that took place a year ago on this floor. He knows that he himself and his leader both agreed to that mode of voting the money and to that mode of expending the money. They both agreed that that was the proper way to have this service performed by the police. When it was done, as the hon. gentleman knows, it was not possible to obtain details in time to meet the requirements of the audit office and to apportion it in the public accounts, and months elapsed before Controller White adjusted the amounts, but as soon as he adjusted the amounts, the particulars were set forth in full in the Postmaster General's report.

Mr. FOSTER. I deny entirely the statement made by the hon. gentleman. The whole basis of the transaction of that vote arose in this way. I attacked the principle of the hon. gentleman getting his work done by other departments than his own and not paying the bill. I did not object to the mounted police doing the work, because they could do it more economically; but I took the ground that the amount of work that was done for the post office by the mounted police should ultimately be charged upon the Post Office Department itself. The hon. gentleman agreed to that, and the proposition was that when the accounts were made up there should be the proper allocation to the Post Office Department of the amount of work which was done and charged for by the mounted police. The hon. gentleman got the work done, but he has made the mounted police pay the bill. Now, Mr. White testified that he charged nothing but the actual expenses, he charged nothing for the extra time of the police, nothing for posts, nothing for permanent equipment, but he just charged the extra amount in men, and dogs, and food, which

Mr. MULOCK.

was necessary, and he so made up his accounts. Now, this is an amount of money which the controller of the police thinks ought to be paid to the men for their extra work in carrying the mails. Mr. White testified that instead of paying \$47,400, if the Postmaster General had done the work himself, he could not have done it for less than \$100,000. That is what the Postmaster General would have debited to his account if he had done the work himself. But the police undertook the work, they did it for \$47,000. He has not paid a dollar, and he will not even pay the little *douceur* which should be granted to the police.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If we are going to rearrange the public accounts so that the public can have a correct idea of them, I hope the hon. gentleman will correct them in respect to that \$685,000.

Mr. FOSTER. There is nothing that needs correcting.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman left \$685,000 of unpaid bills. He compelled us to apply to parliament and to add this \$685,000 to the public debt. That \$685,000 was never charged against the expenditure of the Post Office Department. You will find nothing in any of the accounts of that \$685,000. How are you going to correct that? The hon. gentleman is entirely in error, in saying that there was no attempt on their part to establish a Yukon service before 1896. There was an attempt in 1894, and an attempt in 1895, and a continuation of that in 1896. They attempted several times to get people to undertake to go in. It is true that they got a Mr. Hamilton to agree to carry the mails in, and they agreed to sponge on him and pay him nothing. They agreed with another man in the fall of 1895 to carry the mails in for \$600. He undertook to do it, but he abandoned the mail, and the late government never paid for the service. The department when it came under my charge, had to pay for that.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly, when the account was adjusted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some time in 1896 we recovered the bag and we paid for it.

Mr. FOSTER. Could you pay for it before?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman was so proud of his service, why did he not pay for the services that the department succeeded in getting performed? He did not pay one of his accounts, except one of \$100, and he left a number of accounts for his service unpaid. Why did he not pay them and allow them to be charged against his service? Why did the hon. gen-

tleman not pay his bills and allow them to go into the report for the proper year? The hon. gentleman is quite inaccurate when he says that because the services performed for his administration by the police, were small, no allowance should be made. It is quite true that the mails were small, but yet they had to be carried, and if the hon. gentleman, instead of utilising the police had had to carry in a small jag of mails and to carry out a small jag of mails, if he had not endeavoured to do what I did, utilise the police, what would it have cost him to send in a handful of mails and bring them out again? It would have cost him probably just as much as it cost us, and yet because he was able to utilise the police, he is not to be charged with anything. If the argument is good, it is good to the full extent of it. If he got the police to carry one pound of mail matter in there, the Post Office Department should have been charged for the service so rendered. It is no excuse to say that it was not a large quantity. It was a valuable service performed for the Post Office Department, and if the police had not been utilised, a more expensive system would have been adopted. So, with us. In my case, we had the frankness to charge the Post Office Department with the expense of the service that was performed, and to put it in black and white in our report.

Mr. FOSTER. You did not charge the Post Office Department with it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman knows quite well that we did.

Mr. FOSTER. You did not, and you never paid it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman may assert and reassert, but that does not displace the fact.

Mr. FOSTER. When did you pay for it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Parliament voted the money to be applied in a certain way. Parliament placed the money under the control of the police, and not under the control of the Postmaster General. The police are under the control of another minister, and parliament gave the money to the other minister to be applied for the carrying of the mails, and the performance of police duties. The controller of the police, in due time, apportioned the cost and he fixed \$47,400 as the fair value of the services rendered to the Post Office Department.

Mr. FOSTER. And you never paid it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman knows we did pay it.

Mr. FOSTER. The Post Office Department never paid it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would not dare to override a pledge to parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. You pledged parliament you would have the accounts distributed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have had them distributed.

Mr. FOSTER. No payment has been made by your department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman may assert and reassert, but his statements do not displace facts.

Mr. FOSTER. I know that not a cent has been paid by your department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman knows he is quibbling. He knows he is making himself ridiculous. He knows that there is set forth in black and white, a full and frank statement of the transaction and he knows that it compares most excellently with his record when he utilised the police and when he failed to put anything in the public accounts showing that the police had performed any service. I challenge him to put his finger on a single account for 1894 or 1895, to show that he charged the Post Office Department with the service which was rendered. If the service was valuable to the Post Office Department, it should have been charged to the department. Now, the hon. gentleman says that these very services should be paid for by the Post Office Department.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That proves nothing. The hon. gentleman is incapable of forming a fair judgment upon anything connected with my department. The hon. gentleman has never been very economical in his criticisms of my department. I challenged him to show by reference to anything he has ever said in this House, that he has ever once ventured to utter one single word of approval of anything that I have ever done in public life, and I have just one prayer, and it is that he never will.

Mr. McDOUGALL. You will not have reason to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not expect to have his approval, and I hope I never shall.

Mr. FOSTER. The Postmaster General should not make a spectacle of himself; he is a cabinet minister.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have submitted to your freedom of speech a good deal, and I will submit no longer. You will get back just as good as you give. The hon. gentleman has had his full swing at me, and he will have it no longer. I pro-

pose to defend myself from him from this time forward.

Mr. FOSTER. You are a fine old warrior.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have been charged already with \$47,000—

Mr. FOSTER. And you have not paid a dollar of it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is misstating the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. You know you have not. You are a good old quibbler.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If there is any quibbler in this House the hon. gentleman is a master.

Mr. FOSTER. Stand up and say you have paid a single dollar of it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was paid in the way parliament said it should have been paid, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows it. He only chooses now to be obstinate. If I could get the statutes for 1899, I could show how it was paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you not get it, and not be talking about it all the time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman should not be so discourteous.

Mr. FOSTER. The post office never paid a dollar of it, and he took all the revenue.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Your statement proves nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. Deny it if you can.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would ask the hon. gentleman to conduct himself with decorum.

Mr. FOSTER. You are setting me a bad example.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You should not object to a bad example.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been used to it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And you imitate it well.

Mr. FOSTER. I will try not to imitate this one.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The controller of the North-west Mounted Police fixed on 10 cents a mile as a fair allowance to the police for the extra service rendered by them. I asked him whether he thought that amount ought to be charged to the Post Office Department, or if the \$47,000 included that, and he said it did, and that

it should not be charged to the Post Office Department.

Mr. FOSTER. They were doing your work, which you never paid a dollar for.

Mr. SPROULE. The object of book-keeping is to show the parties interested the exact income and outlay of a service, and if that is so, the Postmaster General is not familiar with the first elements of book-keeping. His books should show what the post office service cost the people of Canada, but he is misleading the electors in this case, because he gives all the receipts from the service, but when it comes to giving the outlay and item of \$47,000, which does not appear in his books at all, but is paid from another source. He justifies this by saying that his predecessors kept their books badly. But two wrongs do not make a right, even if what he says is true. According to his own statement he started in with a better system of book-keeping when he obtained power, but we now find out his system of book-keeping is of the very worst kind. The people of the country are misled by it. I have heard it stated very frequently that the Postmaster General was entitled to credit because, although he had reduced the postage he had been so economic that the deficit in the post office service was not as large as it had been for years previous. Now we see that he gains this credit by conducting an improper system of book-keeping, and that services are performed for his department which are not charged against his department. The people of Canada have just ground for complaint because they are misled by the system of book-keeping he has adopted and is carrying out.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I have no desire to waste the time of the House, but it seems to me that the government do not desire to have these items passed, and, therefore, we might as well occupy a little of the time of the House in getting at these details. But, as the hon. Postmaster General has travelled so far from the record, and brought up for the fourteen hundredth time a matter which any schoolboy of ten years of age could understand, I do not think it out of place if we occupy a little time in discussing it. Some two or three years ago, when this bugbear of \$600,000 of debt was brought out by the Postmaster General, I confess I actually thought that there was something wrong—that some money was lost to the country; but, to my great surprise, in listening to the debates in this House during the last week or two, and hearing this matter thoroughly ventilated, I discovered that the whole thing was a mare's nest. The Postmaster General has to-night declared the transaction to be an illegal one. As I understand it, year after year, when July 1

came, there was a quarter's salary due to the postmasters and mail couriers. The salaries could not be paid on June 30, the vouchers had not been sent in nor the cheques drawn; but the money had been paid in, and that, I understand, is the huge debt left on July 1 to be paid by the party now in power. This practice had been going on year after year, and I cannot conceive that the first cent of loss to the country occurred from doing business in that way. In fact, it had all the appearance of a reasonable business transaction. We can easily understand the reason why there was not money to the credit of the Postmaster General on July 1, 1896, to pay those salaries. Simply because the opposition, in the session of 1896, absolutely refused to allow any estimates to pass. The Postmaster General tells us that it was an illegal transaction. Now, who is to decide whether it was or was not? I fail to see that there was anything wrong or illegal about it. The Auditor General is the officer of this parliament who in every instance determines whether payment is legal or illegal, and he had declared year after year that that mode of paying these officers was legal, because he invariably sanctioned it, and we are bound by what the Auditor General sanctions. Therefore, it does not lie in the mouth of the Postmaster General to say that in this matter the former government was guilty of an illegal transaction. If the Auditor General allowed these payments to be made year after year, and hon. gentlemen opposite regard them as illegal, why do they not impeach the Auditor General? I know of no better principle that could be adopted. It is known all over the country, and the postmasters and mail couriers do not expect to get their pay until about three weeks after the expiration of the fiscal year. The money is voted to the Postmaster General for the mail service, and out of that money these salaries are paid in a way which the Auditor General declares to be perfectly legal; and I would like to know what we are sitting here for night after night discussing a transaction that has been pronounced a perfectly legal and honourable transaction by the man who governs the finances of this country? It seems to me to be perfectly childish to bring up matters of this kind and declare there is something wrong in them. Now, are we going to stop this discussion and allow the estimates to go through? For my part, I am willing to do so; but, if hon. gentlemen opposite are going to keep us sitting here until three o'clock in the morning, I am going to have a turn.

The committee rose and reported progress.

**MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.  
—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.**

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I stated the other day that there would be no new

estimates to be submitted, but that possibly there might be some revotes which were omitted. I find that there is quite a large item for the port of Colborne, which was in the estimates of last year, and should have been revoted. Also for Hull public buildings \$19,300, and a bridge over the Chaudiere slides \$19,300. These will have to be revoted, and I propose to submit new supplementaries covering these items. I beg to present a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending June 30, 1901, and in accordance with the provisions of 'The British North America Act, 1867,' the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,  
Ottawa, July 10, 1900.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the message of His Excellency together with these estimates be referred to the committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

**ADJOURNMENT—SIDINGS ON INTER-COLONIAL RAILWAY.**

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to have an understanding with the Minister of Railways and Canals as to the information that I have asked for. He has promised me that information many times.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McDOUGALL. When?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the morning.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I will not be here in the morning. I have waited for this information for a long time. It is not to the credit of the hon. gentleman to use such tactics to deprive me of the information to which I am entitled.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by 'tactics.'

Mr. McDOUGALL. I want the hon. minister to understand that in the administration of his department he has not treated me properly. As a business man I was doing business with his railway and he did not treat me fairly. Now, the least he can do is to give me the information he prom-

ised me. I waited to the last moment in order to get it, and before the Chairman left the Chair the hon. minister was going to give it to me. And now again he wants to put it off. I will not be here in the morning—and that is what the hon. gentleman is looking for, a chance to deprive me of the information. If he has the information, why can he not give it?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that the hon. minister (Mr. Blair) having promised the information should tell the hon. gentleman what he proposes to do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not got the information, though I expected to have it. I told the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) that I would give it to him in the morning, but he tells me that will not answer. If he likes, I will send it to him. If I had the information I would give it to him.

Mr. McDUGALL. The hon. gentleman has promised me the information for a week and now he is putting it off day by day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not putting it off. I expected to have the information, but not having it I cannot give it.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.15 a.m. (Wednesday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 11, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### I.C.R.—TRANSPORT OF SUPPLIES FOR BRITISH ARMY IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Mr. POWELL asked :

What was the total amount charged by the Intercolonial Railway in connection with the transportation of supplies to Halifax and St. John for the British army in South Africa?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I cannot find that any supplies were transported over the Intercolonial Railway from St. John and Halifax for the British army in South Africa.

Mr. McDUGALL.

Mr. POWELL. At least, the Intercolonial Railway transported a very large quantity of hay for the army.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The manager at Moncton tells me that the only thing he knows of is some hay that was carried to South Africa, but he is not able to tell me the quantity. He would have to pick out the amounts from the way bills, and that information he will forward as soon as he gets it. Nothing ever went from here for the British troops in South Africa that we know of.

Mr. POWELL. It may be that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) could give that information, as the work had the oversight of his department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If we can get the information, it will have to be by taking it from the way bills.

Mr. POWELL. It ought to have been collected by this time.

### POSTAL RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR YUKON SERVICE.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Does the \$3,693,177.53, given as postal receipts in the Public Accounts of 1899, column three, page (1) III., include the receipts from the postal matter carried into and out of the Yukon during the year 1898-9?

Does the \$3,603,788.10, given as postal expenditure in Public Accounts, 1899, column five, page (1) VIII., include the sum of \$47,400 paid by the mounted police in the year 1898-9 for carrying mails into and out of the Yukon, the \$3,000 paid by the Department of the Interior for similar service in the same year, and the sum of \$750 paid by the mounted police for postal matter sent by boat via the ocean and river route in the same year?

If not, are the \$47,400 and the \$750 included in the \$865,415 in column four, Public Accounts, 1899, page (1) VI., under the head of mounted police expenditure, and in what column and under what heading is the \$3,000 above mentioned included?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). I think that question has been so fully answered in debate that I can add nothing to the information the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) already has on the subject. But if the hon. gentleman desires it, I can repeat the substance of the answers given.

Mr. FOSTER. I certainly desire an answer to the question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The total receipts of the Post Office Department for all branches of the service in all parts of Canada are correctly set forth in the Postmaster General's report for the fiscal year closing 30th June, 1899, and that, in conjunction with the public accounts, cor-

rectly sets forth all the particulars of receipts connected with the post office. The same remark applies to the inquiry as to the expenditure, with the exception of the \$3,000 referred to, and the \$750 referred to. I think that the \$3,000 referred to is included in the expenditure by the Department of the Interior, as set forth in the statement of Controller White, or the Deputy Postmaster General, before the Public Accounts Committee. I do not remember about the \$750 transaction referred to here, but I will get the information on that point for a later date.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that I did not ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) the question which he has answered. I asked definite questions of the Finance Minister who is, I suppose, responsible for the public accounts; and I would like to have the answer of the Finance Minister as given by his officers. I think the attempted answer by the Postmaster General is an attempt to evade such as I have ever scarcely before seen in this House. Is the question a fair one or not as to the public accounts? If so, I would like to have an answer. I am going to ask the government to allow that question to stand, and later, to answer it directly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Since the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has referred to me, I can only say that the money in question was appropriated for the North-west Mounted Police, issued in cheques for the North-west Mounted Police, and had necessarily to be charged against them. That is all I can say so far as the Department of Finance is concerned. As to the details of the Post Office expenditures I leave my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) to deal with that.

Mr. FOSTER. That was not the question I asked of the Finance Minister. The question was:

Does the \$3,693,177.53, given as postal receipts in the Public Accounts of 1899—

—That is the account for which the Minister of Finance is responsible—

—column 3, page (1) III., include the receipts from the postal matter carried into and out of the Yukon during the year 1898-9—

—and so on. That is a definite question, and it has to do entirely with the public accounts. I am not asking anything from the Post Office Department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is aware that the question has been answered half a dozen times during the present session. He knows, as ex-Finance Minister, that the Finance Minister can only credit in his receipts what the Postmaster General sends to that depart-

ment. Every penny that he paid directly into the hands of the Receiver General is credited in the statement. Nothing more can be stated.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I understand the government do not propose to give a fair answer to a fair question?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, but I want the House to understand that it is not a fair question.

Mr. FOSTER. I will read the question, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, and allow the House to judge whether it is a fair question or not:—

Does the \$3,693,177.53, given as postal receipts in the Public Accounts of 1899, column three, page (1) III., include the receipts from the postal matter carried into and out of the Yukon during the year 1898-9?

Does the \$3,603,799.10, given as postal expenditure in Public Accounts, 1899, column five, page (1) VIII., include the sum of \$47,400 paid by the mounted police in the year 1898-9 for carrying mails into and out of the Yukon, the \$3,000 paid by the Department of the Interior for similar service in the same year, and the sum of \$750 paid by the mounted police for postal matter sent by boat via the ocean and river route in the same year?

If not, are the \$47,400 and the \$750 included in the \$865,415 in column four, Public Accounts, 1899, page (1) VI., under the head of Mounted Police expenditure, and in what column and under what heading is the \$3,000 above mentioned included?

That is a matter solely for the accountant of the Finance Department to ascertain and answer, and he alone can do it. It is as to that item of the public accounts that I asked a plain question, and it is evidently a fair question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose to answer the hon. gentleman at once. The postal receipts in the public accounts of Canada include all the receipts which were reported to my department by the Postmaster General. The details which go to make up that total are a matter for the Postmaster General to deal with. The postal expenditure as shown in the public accounts includes all the sums of money placed by the Finance Department in the hands of the Postmaster General for the service of the Post Office Department. The details of the expenditure are a concern that the Postmaster General will have to deal with.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not a correct answer in the first place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is quite correct.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is absolutely wrong.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

### POST OFFICE EXPENDITURE.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Does the \$3,593,647.47 shown in Public Accounts, page (1) VIII., column five, as post office expenditure for the year 1894-5, include all sums for service on post office account up to June 30, 1895 ?

If not, what amount accrued for said services of 1894-5 are not included ?

Does the \$3,665,011.30, shown in same column as post office expenditure for 1895-6, include all sums due on post office account for services up to June 30, 1896 ?

If not, what amount accrued for services of 1895-6 are not included ?

And similarly for the \$3,789,478.34, expenditure, 1896-7 ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). In answer to this question, the item of \$3,593,647.47 shown in Public Accounts as the public expenditure for the year 1894-5, does not include all sums due for services on post office account up to June 30, 1895, but omits the sum of \$616,712.99 reported by auditors, Mr. W. H. Cross and Mr. W. F. Munro, as the amount of certain outstanding accounts up to June 30, 1895, but not paid, and therefore not included in the expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895.

With reference to the rest of the question, the answer is as follows : At the close of the fiscal year 1895-6, the debts of the department in excess of all parliamentary appropriations applicable thereto, amounted to the sum of \$685,447.03. The existence of these debts was not known to the Postmaster General when the accounts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895-6, were closed, but was ascertained as the result of an audit by Messrs. Cross & Munro, which audit began in the fall of 1896 and was completed in the early part of 1897, and reported to parliament, whereupon parliament passed a special vote of \$685,447.03 to recoup that amount to the vote of 1896-7, which had in the meantime been drawn upon to pay such indebtedness.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another question similarly for 1896-7.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is answered by the previous answer.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all, that is another year entirely.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will get the answer for that.

### MAIL CARRIAGE, KAMOURASKA.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked :

1. Is the Postmaster General aware that the mail carrier carrying the mail between Kamouraska, St. Paschal and St. Paschal Station does not now exchange mails with the mail clerk on the maritime express going east at 20.07 ?

2. Has he been relieved of this service ?

3. If not, will the Postmaster General compel him to do his duty in the premises ?

Mr. FOSTER.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). 1. I have been so informed. 2. Yes ; as it is not considered necessary, the mail arriving there at 8.07 p.m., too late for delivery that night, and is returned by train passing west at 6.38 the following morning, in time for delivery. 3. This mail contractor is doing his duty in so far as the department is aware.

### POSTMASTER AT ROUND HILL.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Who was the former Postmaster at Round Hill, county of Annapolis, Nova Scotia ? What was his salary and allowance for carrying mails from the railway station, and why was he replaced ? Was there any reduction in his salary since 1896, and if so, what ? Who has taken his place, what is his salary and allowance for carrying the mail ? What distance was the old and is the new post office from the railway station ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). Mr. Jas. A. Whitman was the late postmaster at Round Hill, N.S. His salary as postmaster was \$90 per annum. For carrying the mails from the railway station—a service of 12 trips per week—he received ten cents per trip. He was replaced as postmaster, having tendered his resignation of that office. Yes, \$10 a year. Mr. Samuel E. Bancroft has been appointed to the postmastership in Mr. Whitman's stead. Mr. Whitman is still performing the mail service, under an agreement, dating from July 1, 1898. The postmaster's salary is \$90 per annum, and the amount paid for mail service ten cents per trip ; the same amounts as were paid the previous postmaster at the time of his resignation. No change is reported as having been made in the distance between the old and new post office and the railway station.

### THE OLIVER EQUIPMENT.

Mr. WALLACE (by Mr. Sproule) asked :

1. Whether it is the intention of the Militia Department to make any further purchase of the 'Oliver Equipment' ?

2. What number of such equipments have been ordered, delivered and paid for ?

3. What is the cost of each equipment, and what is the weight ?

4. Whether they have been found sufficiently successful in South Africa to justify any further purchases ?

5. Is it the intention to issue this equipment to the militia ?

6. Has experience shown that the water bottle has been thrown away as useless after a short trial of it, and that there are other serious defects ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Not at present. No more required. 2. 35,000 sets ; nearly all of which have been delivered and paid for. 3. \$6.45 per set ; weight, 8 lbs. 4. No special report upon the Oliver Equipment has

been received in the department from South Africa. But a letter from a British colonel, who has been in South Africa, has been published in *Army and Navy Gazette* strongly commending the Oliver Equipment, and saying that disasters which have attended British arms in South Africa would have been avoided had the Oliver Equipment been adopted by the War Office. 5. Yes. 6. No.

#### RECEIPTS AT SYDNEY.

Mr. GILLIES (by Mr. Sproule) asked :

1. What was the total amount of receipts of the Intercolonial Railway at Sydney and North Sydney respectively, as returned to the Auditor General, since the 30th day of June, 1899, to the date of the last return ?

2. What is the date of the last return ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The total amount of receipts of the Intercolonial Railway at Sydney from July 1, 1899, to the date of the last return is \$269,396.21. The total amount of receipts of the Intercolonial Railway at North Sydney from July 1, 1899, to the date of the last return is \$41,446.20. The date of the last return is May 31, 1900.

2. The date of the last return is May 31, 1900.

#### POSTAL NOTES.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

1. What is the regulation regarding the payment of postal notes ?

2. Is there any provision made for the postmaster to have on hand funds to pay postal notes, or can they refuse payment at their will ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The answer to the hon. gentleman's question is found in the general regulations respecting the issue of postal notes, a copy of which has been furnished me by the department, and if my hon. friend would like to peruse them, I will send them to him. They are too lengthy to form part of my answer.

#### BROCHURE ON IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

Mr. BOURASSA asked :

1. Is the government aware that a brochure has been printed and published by the Government Printing Bureau under the title 'Imperial Federation : by the Right Hon. W. E. Forster, M.P.,' with an introduction by the Hon. R. R. Dobell ?

2. Has that brochure been printed with the consent or authorization of the government or of the Secretary of State ?

3. How many copies were issued ?

4. Has it been printed free of cost of publication ?

5. If not, what was the price charged ; by whom and when was it paid ?

6. Does that brochure express the opinion and the policy of the government on the question of Imperial federation ?

7. Is it distributed by order or with the authorization of the government or of any of its members ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). 1. Yes. 2. No. It was not done under the authority of the government ; nor of the Secretary of State. 3. 400 copies. 4. No. 5. The price charged was \$46.11, and paid for by the Hon. R. R. Dobell personally. 6. No ; the question has never been considered by the government. 7. No ; it was distributed entirely by Mr. Dobell, in fulfilment, as I am informed, of an understanding arrived at between the members of the British Empire League at their last meeting, held in this city during the month of March last.

#### POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTS.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to read an item in the Appropriation Act of 1899, which was appealed to last night by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), but which was not read, and I ask the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to the same :

North-west Mounted Police—To complete service of the year ..... \$385,000

This sum covers certain expenses for carriage of mails, rents, services, &c., on account of the Post Office Department, the amount of which, when ascertained, is to be charged to that department.

I leave that with the hon. Minister of Finance, believing, of course, that he will carry out the enactment of the Bill.

#### INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Prime Minister got any supplemental information to that report on dismissals ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In looking at the report I see that the officers of the department have complied with the request of my hon. friend. He had not asked for names, but simply for the number, and the number was given.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I will try and get the names through the day.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask the minister if that return is inclusive of all the dismissals or resignations—the sixteen—all the employees that were dismissed for partisan reasons in the hon. gentleman's department ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So far as I can ascertain, that is correct.

### SOULANGES CANAL—THE STEWART CLAIM.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister of Railways and Canals no information with reference to the Stewart matter?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have here the original papers which I now lay on hand to the hon. member.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister then found that he was wrong in thinking that he had given them yesterday to the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) heard what took place. I said that Mr. Jones had gathered up the other papers and had delivered them to the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was not here. I state the facts as they are stated to me by my deputy. I am not speaking from personal knowledge. I do not know what the hon. gentleman anticipates in regard to these papers. I have to refer to the officers of my department and I cannot give any more information than I get from them.

Mr. BERGERON. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he had given the papers himself to the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. If he will look at *Hansard* he will see what I said. I spoke from personal knowledge as to the papers in regard to the cement and the other papers which I personally handed to the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. I do not think that the hon. member understood what occurred.

Mr. BERGERON. I was only telling the hon. gentleman what I understood. If I am mistaken I am very glad to hear it.

### POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 191) to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, may I ask, before you leave the Chair, whether the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), after having thought the matter over, has come to the conclusion to modify his Bill in any respect?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, Mr. Speaker, I am quite convinced that the measure, as now before the House, is the best proposition that I can submit. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has anything to offer, but in committee we will have an opportunity of considering all these

Mr. BLAIR.

propositions. He has not favoured us in advance with any, so that this, being the best measure up to date that I can suggest, I can only submit the Bill to the consideration of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister did not explain to the House on what basis he placed the estimate of one-eighth of a cent a pound. The rather startling theory was advanced yesterday by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), that newspapers were simply merchandise. It will be interesting to know whether the hon. Postmaster General coincides with that view or not. If we start off on the same ground that is taken and held firmly by the Prime Minister that newspapers are mere merchandise, we then have to discuss the proposition as to whether the post office is a medium for carrying the merchandise of the country either free or at less than cost. That is a proposition which, stated in that way, would be very easily answered by every man, whether the post office is to constitute itself a carrier of merchandise for the people of the country either free or at less than cost price. If you stand by the principle of carrying merchandise free or at less than cost price, where are you going to stop? The absurdity involved in a contention of that kind will, I think, make itself apparent to the House, and I do not believe it will be accepted by the House that newspapers are merchandise and that they should be treated simply as merchandise. I have not yet heard from the Postmaster General on what basis he has placed the rate at one-eighth of a cent a pound. Was the half cent a pound that was charged sufficient to carry the postal matter that went under that rate? Was it sufficient to pay the cost, or is the reduction to one-eighth of a cent per pound a reduction to cost, or if the minister is carrying this matter at less than cost, on what principle does he base his first rate of one half cent a pound, and on what principle does he base his reduction to one-eighth of a cent per pound? These are pertinent questions which we ought to have answered. In reference to the arbitrary adoption of a line, I think I showed yesterday that there was no just principle in it. He simply makes the provincial boundary line the limit beyond which you shall not go. If there is any argument at all from the post office point of view for zones, you may then regulate by some uniform plan the cost of carriage to a certain extent, and thus prevent the post office from being obliged to carry long distances for small rates. That is the basis upon which the zone system is established. But this system does not even have the merit of the zone system. It is an arbitrary line, and if a publishing house happens to be situated close to the border, and has a general circulation outside of its own province, you are face to face with this, that in its legitimate field of

enterprise in the other province, where it comes into competition with other newspapers, you tax it by a large discrimination and you justify that on the ground, that you cannot carry for long distances at such a small rate as for short distances. Then you turn around and carry for a hundred or a thousand miles in the other direction merely because it is within the province, for the same low rate. I cannot see any business principle which underlies that, but I do see two objections to it, one the establishment of provincial lines beyond which, if newspaper enterprise directs its circulation, it will be fined when it crosses the border. That is a very unjustifiable proposition. The other is the unfair nature of this change. The hon. gentleman, who is very largely interested, I am told, in a newspaper published in the city of Toronto, takes care that he shall have the advantage of the reduction in postage.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Now, does the hon. gentleman assert that himself?

Mr. FOSTER. I have been told that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then you have been misinformed.

Mr. FOSTER. If that statement is given to us here, the hon. minister will have to deny it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Make the statement and you will get your answer.

Mr. FOSTER. At the same time the argument is just as strong, although it would be a little more reprehensible on the part of the hon. minister, if that were the case. But the argument as to the unfair discrimination is a very strong argument. Take, for instance, the Montreal press; a very large proportion of their circulation is outside of the province of Quebec. They are, in every respect, national newspapers, and on 80 or 90 per cent of their circulation you tax them one-half a cent a pound, in competition with other papers in different provinces that are bounded by provincial lines. It seems to me that this is not a fair principle to go upon. It is a discrimination which I do not think has anything to warrant it, either upon the ground of necessity, or for any other reason.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (Three Rivers). I fully agree with every word which has fallen from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) who has just resumed his seat. But I go beyond that. I think the Bill is directed absolutely against the enterprise of the press of the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman must know that some of the papers published in Montreal have a circulation extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. That is well known in the Post Office Department and outside of it. And it is also well known that the *Globe* and the larg-

est papers published in Ontario have a very small circulation outside of that province. That is absolutely a fact. The right hon. the Prime Minister knows as well as I do that some of the papers published in Montreal, the *Montreal Star*, for instance, has a circulation extending over the Dominion from Halifax to Vancouver. Is it reasonable, is it businesslike, is it giving encouragement to the enterprise which has made the *Montreal Star* one of the greatest newspapers on the continent, that the Postmaster General should now propose to tax it, and to discriminate against it in favour of papers which do not circulate outside of their province. Why, Sir, I am surprised that the Postmaster General should have brought in such a Bill as this, and I am still more surprised that the Prime Minister and his colleagues in the cabinet should have sanctioned it. The *Toronto Globe* and the *Toronto Star* circulate outside of the province of Ontario to only a limited extent, and hence it is that this Bill is a tax on the business enterprise of men in the province of Quebec, who control newspapers the circulation of which is world-wide. The Bill should not be sanctioned by this House. I have already expressed my views against taxing newspapers at all, but, outside of that question, it seems to me that any hon. gentleman who wants to give fair-play all around will not vote in favour of this Bill, which discriminates against the newspapers published in Montreal.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I stated yesterday that newspapers were merchandise, and I find that proposition controverted by gentlemen on the other side. At this stage of the session, I shall not take up time by giving arguments in support of my view, but I am quite satisfied to leave it to the common sense of the House. If newspapers are to be put in the same class as letters, that would be an end to the argument. But, the *Montreal Star*, which my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) has alluded to, is said to have made a large fortune for its proprietor, and, at all events, we can fairly say that the proprietor of that newspaper is selling newspapers and making a profit out of the business. He is not selling coffee or tea, and there is a difference, I admit, but, in the generic sense, the proposition is quite true that he is making money out of selling newspapers. Of course we know that the selling of books or any product of intellectual labour, must be put upon a different footing from the product of manual labour. However, it is all the result of labour, and it is distributed in the community, and that is what makes it trade and merchandise. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) says that if you class newspapers as merchandise, then you must class letters as merchandise. There is a fallacy in that proposition, because while we realize

that newspapers are merchandise, it would be absurd to treat them as every other class of merchandise is treated, and in no civilized community is that done. We carry newspapers which are a special class of intellectual food for the community, through the mails, and there is a difference between carrying newspapers and ordinary merchandise, just as there is a difference between carrying newspapers and carrying letters.

Mr. FOSTER. Any one can see that.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, if that be true, there was good reason in the proposition made by my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) two years ago, to introduce a special rate of one-half cent a pound for carrying newspapers. Since that time the newspapers of a certain class within a certain radius are exempt from postage, but all other newspapers were carried at the one-half cent rate, and I submit to the House that it was good legislation and beneficial to the community. If a newspaper proprietor sells 100,000 newspapers, and sells them to make a fortune if he can, or to make money anyway, there can be no injustice done to him if we ask him to compensate the mail service, to some extent although not fully, for the work which it does for him.

Mr. FOSTER. Put them all on an equal footing.

The PRIME MINISTER. I maintain that they are all on an equal footing. If you put a two-cent stamp on a letter it carries it to the extremity of the world, but it also takes two cents to carry it to your next neighbour. My hon. friend (Mr. Mulock), introduced his measure two years ago, and he stated then and there, that for the benefit of the reading public, weekly newspapers circulating in the vicinity should be exempt from the tax—I will not call it a tax, but, exempt from the postage paid to Her Majesty for carrying those newspapers. The Postmaster General then laid down, that all other newspapers should be treated differently and should pay for their carriage through the mails, in order to recoup the government for part of the expense incurred. The proposition now before the House is to amend this law and to reduce the postage paid by newspapers from one-half cent to one eighth of a cent per pound within a certain radius. My hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) said there was discrimination in this. What discrimination is there? A paper which has an extensive circulation and an extensive business gives more labour to the mail service to transmit it, and it naturally should be made to bear its proportion of that extra labour. There would be discrimination against Quebec in favour of Ontario if this legislation were intended to prevent the papers of Quebec from circulating in Ontario; and to force the newspapers of Ontario to come to Quebec. But, the moment the Ontario newspapers come to Quebec,

they are submitted to the same postage rate as are the Quebec newspapers which go to Ontario.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. But the Ontario papers do not come to Quebec.

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, they do.

The PRIME MINISTER. The *Globe* newspaper circulates all over this continent, though not to the same extent, perhaps, as the *Montreal Star* or *La Presse* or the *Daily Witness*.

Mr. GIBSON. They do not give the *Globe* away for nothing.

The PRIME MINISTER. That does not matter. When the *Globe* newspaper goes to the province of Quebec it will pay this rate just at the *Star* newspaper will pay the same rate when it goes to Ontario. Therefore, all papers are placed upon the same basis. There would be discrimination if different conditions were applied to one paper from those applied to another; but when all are placed on exactly the same footing, there is no discrimination. I am sure that the *Montreal Star* has a circulation of several thousands in the province of Quebec alone, and this reduction from one-half cent to one-eighth cent a pound will benefit the *Star* to the extent of thousands of dollars a year. So with the *Herald*, the *Witness*, *La Presse*, *La Patrie* and all the other papers in the province of Quebec. In the province of Ontario, the *Globe*, the *Mail* and all other papers which to-day have to pay one-half cent a pound on their papers wherever they go, will have to pay only one-eighth cent a pound for those which circulate in the province of Ontario. The same is true of the papers in the maritime provinces and in all the other provinces of the Dominion. Therefore, when the proposition before the House has for its immediate object and its ultimate result that these papers shall pay to the treasury less than they did before by several thousands of dollars a year, I cannot understand the zeal of hon. gentlemen opposite in saying: 'Don't do that, but keep the postage at one-half cent a pound, because we say the reduction should be applied in a different way.'

Mr. FOSTER. What is the radius of the new arrangement?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman knows it as well as I do, because he knows the geography of the Dominion; he knows that it will be confined to provinces. As I stated yesterday, when we go into committee, that is a question which, for my part, I shall be prepared to have discussed, as well as every other sensible suggestion made by the other side. The proposition that the radius should be a certain circle of so many miles is one which could be defended; but as to the principle of reducing the postage paid to-day, that is one which I sub-

mit in all fairness to the House cannot be disputed.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the Prime Minister knows by this time that it does not pay him or the leaders on the Treasury benches for the ruck of his party to indulge in unparliamentary demeanour in my regard.

Mr. BRITTON. You set a pretty bad example last night.

Mr. DAVIN. I spared the hon. gentleman, I did not expose his relationship with the Gilberts, and he should not talk.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You should not talk either.

Mr. DAVIN. Why shouldn't I talk?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Because you talk too much.

Mr. DAVIN. There is not a man in Canada who can prevent me talking.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You talk nonsense. You are always talking nonsense.

Mr. DAVIN. I spared the hon. gentleman the other day.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not want you to spare me.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, please. I would suggest to the House that we come to order.

Mr. DAVIN. The right hon. gentleman started out by saying that he would expose the fallacies uttered by my hon. friend from York, (Mr. Foster), but he did not expose any fallacies. He referred to the statement of the hon. member for York, that newspapers were not merchandise, and said he thought they were merchandise, but he at once proceeded to point out that the government of Canada through the Postmaster General treated them as if they were not merchandise. Why is it that you make a difference in your treatment of newspapers from the treatment you deal out to iron or cattle or any other form of merchandise? The right hon. gentleman declared that newspapers were not letters. Well, strictly speaking, they are not letters, and yet he could not help yielding to the proposition that as a fact they are treated more or less as if they were letters. And, Sir, what are newspapers? Are they not, after all, open letters addressed to the community generally, and why is it that we make a special arrangement in regard to letters? It is because it is held to be for the good of the country generally that intercommunication between the citizens of the country should be promoted; and the communication of fact, of the events of the day which is effected through newspapers, has always been held to be a very

important matter—so important that Mr. Gladstone, when doing away with the duty, not on newspapers, but on imported paper, actually defended that action on the ground that the duty on paper was a tax on knowledge. If the duty on printing paper is a tax on knowledge, then in proportion as you tax the carriage of newspapers you are taxing knowledge; and the hon. gentleman is perfectly aware of that, because he deals with newspapers differently from the way in which he would deal with any other form of merchandise. In one sense a newspaper is merchandise. It is sold for one cent or two cents, and the newspaper man is a vendor of news. But in another sense, from the point of view of public policy, the government does not treat newspapers as merchandise, but treats them on lines strictly analogous to letters.

I was very glad to hear the right hon. gentleman say that when we go into committee he will be ready to consider any amendments to this Bill. He said that if the conditions were equal, there would be no discrimination, but the conditions are not equal. Take a paper that is published on the borders of one province and is largely circulated in the adjoining province. Take, for instance, the *Star* which is published in Montreal, and has a large circulation in all the other provinces. You cannot say that the conditions are the same in its case as in that of a newspaper which is published at Toronto and circulated mainly in Ontario, and therefore, enjoys all the advantage of the change, whereas the *Star* and the *Witness* get very little advantage from it. The right hon. gentleman spoke as if only newspaper proprietors were interested, but the readers and purchasers of newspapers are also interested, for we know that when the price of paper went up, the newspapers had to increase their charges. You cannot give easy conditions to certain newspapers and give less easy ones to other newspapers without discriminating, and therefore, exercising injustice. That is the reason why I moved the motion I did yesterday, not because I was hostile to lowering the rates on newspapers, but because I was opposed to the principle of the Bill as an unjust one, and when we go into committee I intend proposing an amendment which I hope will meet with approval. The right hon. the Prime Minister did not attempt to answer the argument of my hon. friend, and he himself described the press as a superior class of intellectual food. Well, if that be the case, it should not be treated as merchandise.

Mr. T. D. CRAIG (East Durham). I do not consider this at all a party question. The Conservative party are not united on this any more than the party opposite, if we go into particulars. There may be a difference of opinion as to whether newspapers should pay postage, but that is not

the point under discussion, for this Bill is really a measure to reduce the postage, and it ought to please those who think that newspapers ought not to pay anything for their carriage by mail. I am in favour of this Bill because it will operate a large reduction in the cost of postage to all newspapers, and I do not believe that it is at all a discrimination against the province of Quebec. We have newspapers in Toronto and Hamilton and other parts of Ontario which are circulated all over the country just as are papers published in the city of Montreal. Theoretically we may discuss the question of creating provincial zones, but we cannot make any Bill perfect theoretically; and the right hon. the First Minister has declared that the government are prepared to accept some change in this respect. There is a great deal of force in the contention that the city newspapers, which are circulated largely out of their own province, are making large fortunes and can well afford to pay postage, while country newspapers are in a different position in this respect. While the proposition to allow country newspapers to go free of postage within certain limits, which was in the former Bill, has been criticised largely by the city papers, I am heartily in favour of it because the country newspapers are a great convenience to the communities they serve, by keeping them posted on local and other news, and it is only right that the government should allow these papers to circulate free of postage within certain lines. I am practically in favour of the principle of the Bill because it is a reduction in postage.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). In so far as the reduction of postage is concerned, I am in favour of the measure, and am also of the opinion of the hon. member, who has just taken his seat (Mr. Craig), that this is not a party question. But so far as the spirit of the Bill is concerned, I entirely disagree with him, because I consider that it is not a sound one. It will operate against that national unity which we all desire to promote. We all want to unite this country, we want the people of the different provinces to know each other better, we want the people of Quebec to know what is going on in Ontario, and the people of Ontario to understand the views that prevail in Quebec, and if we wish to create a really national spirit we should encourage instead of preventing newspapers circulating in the provinces other than those in which they are published.

So far as the province of Quebec is concerned, this Bill certainly discriminates against the leading papers published in the city of Montreal, such as the *Star* and *Witness*, which have a larger circulation outside their own province than I think any other paper published in any other province. It discriminates also against the French newspapers published in Montreal,

Mr. CRAIG.

which find a large constituency in the great mass of French Canadians who are living outside of the province of Quebec, both in the other provinces of the Dominion and in the United States. This Bill, therefore, involves no less than direct taxation on all the French Canadians outside the province of Quebec. I am not, however, considering this Bill solely from the point of view of my own province, for if the situation were reversed and the papers of the province of Ontario equally discriminated against, I would take exactly the same view. What I find objectionable in the Bill is that it creates a provincial rather than a Dominion taxation, and I do not think that this parliament is justified in imposing any tax which will affect any one province more than another, or discriminate in favour of any one province against another. What we are here for is to impose taxes when necessary on the people of Canada at large, and not upon each province separately. I think it is against the spirit of our constitution, against the spirit that should animate this House, that of creating good feeling between the different classes and different nationalities in this Dominion. Therefore, if any amendment is suggested to this Bill to do away with this provision, I shall certainly vote for it.

Mr. J. V. ELLIS (St. John). I quite agree with the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Craig) in his general view of this matter. As to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), I would point out to him that the condition is not made any worse by this measure. The Bill, as I understand it, draws lines within which the lower rate shall prevail. I do not agree with the Postmaster General that the best lines have been adopted. So far as the lower provinces are concerned, the smaller newspapers will, by the operation of the Bill, be confined within a comparatively small radius. Take, for instance, the province of Prince Edward Island, the area of the province within which the newspapers published there will circulate at this lower rate is very small indeed. The richer the newspaper the better able it is to pay this tax, and so the impost does not fall equally upon the business of newspapers. I have a special grievance against it so far as the city of St. John is concerned, but not in connection with any paper in which I am interested. For instance, take the newspapers of St. John. The two principal morning newspapers serve the whole shore of Nova Scotia, forty miles distant. The mail is carried in a steamer subsidized by the government. We voted the other night \$12,500 for that steamer. I do not know whether she gets anything extra for carrying the mails or not. On all the newspapers going from St. John to Nova Scotia this tax would be imposed. There is an injustice here. I do not know that I could propose anything to overcome

it, unless I should suggest to the Postmaster General to make all the maritime provinces one territory. It would work better and be far more equitable than the present plan and would help the newspapers in Prince Edward Island to which I have just referred. Generally, I agree with the Bill heartily, because it reduces the tax.

Mr. M. J. F. QUINN (Montreal, St. Anne's). I was very glad to hear the hon. member for Labelle speak as he did on this subject. He certainly expressed the idea I wish to express, and did it in so much better form than I could that I am satisfied that he must have benefited by his late visit to Ontario and the North-west. I think the hon. gentleman's speech this morning, as contrasted with his previous speeches, is the strongest possible argument for the position he favours here to-day. It is only a few days since we heard the hon. gentleman speak in what many of the members of this House would consider a most narrow-minded manner upon a subject which was being discussed. If there was such a thing as limiting him in his travels to the province of Quebec, the possibility is he would remain in the darkness in which he was three or four weeks ago. But it is by the enormous amount of money that has been expended by the Dominion to provide the best means of transportation for the people of this country from one province to another, that such as he are enlightened. It is due to this, that we see the splendid development in broad-mindedness that the hon. member for Labelle shows this morning. I quite agree with him that this Bill is a retrograde movement on the part of the government. The Postal Union of the world is endeavouring in every way not only to have the letter carriage reduced to a minimum all over the world, but to have newspapers of every country circulated throughout the world at the lowest rates. What is the object of this? It is simply an outcome of the progress of our civilization, the idea being that the different peoples of this world may exchange their ideas so that they may learn to live harmoniously together and avoid wars in the future. And we here in Canada, among ourselves are working in the same spirit. Look at the amount of money we have spent in the attempt to unite the different provinces of Canada into one grand Dominion. Look at the millions upon millions we have spent on the Intercolonial Railway, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, in building our canals, in deepening our rivers—in every means of communication between the different provinces. Yet, after all that work has been completed, after we have started a nation, after we have built up a nation even—at the very last moment we put in a block in the wheels of progress by this measure declaring that the people of these different provinces shall not communicate freely together, shall not be allowed to cir-

culate their newspapers for the enlightenment of one another, but that on newspapers passing from one province to another, there shall be high postal duty. It seems to me that this is a subversion of the principles of the confederation for which we have so long struggled and the perfection of which we see in the near future. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) and some of the other hon. members say that this is not a direct blow aimed at the newspapers in the province of Quebec. I do not wish to say that it was intended maliciously as a blow at certain papers in that province; but, even if I did go so far as to say that, I think there is something in the conduct of the Postmaster General in proposing this matter which would lead the general public to believe that it might be even a malicious attack on those newspapers. What are the facts as regards the English papers in the province of Quebec? You must understand that the English portion of the province of Quebec is in the neighbourhood of 300,000. So that those newspapers, which include two of the largest newspapers in Canada, the daily *Star* and the daily *Witness* are limited, so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, to a clientele of 300,000 individuals—say 60,000 families. But the *Globe* of Toronto and the *Mail and Empire*, and all the other English papers in the province of Ontario have a clientele of nearly three and a half millions. Would it be fair to say that because there was only an English-speaking population of 300,000 in the province of Quebec, that the daily *Star* and the daily *Witness*, which, by their enterprise and the money expended in them have secured a circulation in every province of the Dominion should be charged a tax the moment they leave the province of Quebec and enter any other province. It is most important that the ideas and sentiments of the people of the province of Quebec should be communicated to every other part of Canada. It is important that the sentiment of every Canadian, even in the most remote parts of the Dominion could be known to every other Canadian, no matter what part of the Dominion he may inhabit. Is not this an attack upon the very interchange of ideas and sentiments which all the people, certainly all the good citizens of the Dominion of Canada desire to promote.

Now let us take the case of the French newspapers of the province of Quebec to which reference has been made. They have a very large circulation in their own province. But, owing to the numbers of French Canadian people in the Dominion, we do not find them confined to the province of Quebec alone. We find them in the extreme east of the Dominion, we find them in the extreme west of the Dominion, we find them in the very heart of the province of Ontario, and wherever we find them they

are anxious to read the French newspapers of the province of Quebec, the only province I believe in which there is a newspaper of any importance published in the French language. These French newspapers circulate not only in Canada but all through the United States; but we find that the very moment one of these newspapers is sent to a French Canadian in Manitoba or Ontario, or any of the other provinces, it is charged with a certain tax by the government of this country. It seems to be an anomaly, a retrograde step, on the part of the government. If that was the intention of the Postmaster General when the first tax was put upon newspapers in this country, I think it would be well that he should reconsider it to-day and wipe out the tax altogether. It seems to me to be a retrograde step, it is not in keeping with what our Postmaster General has learned in the Postal Union of the world, it is not in keeping with the ideas of progress which characterize civilization in this beginning of the twentieth century. Speaking more particularly for the newspapers of Montreal, I think the hon. gentleman ought in all fairness to those papers to arrange the limit in such a way that they can circulate throughout the Dominion of Canada at the same rate that they can in their own province.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). To my mind this Bill is in the highest sense of the term calculated to promote provincialism. It aims at preventing the interchange of knowledge between the various provinces, and outside of the province in which the newspaper is printed. Whether intentionally or otherwise, it seems to be aimed particularly at the newspapers in the city of Montreal. Take the newspapers published in Toronto, they have a radius of circulation of about 200 miles; but the newspapers published in Montreal have a much more circumscribed area, it is only about forty miles from the city to the limits of Ontario, therefore you give them a radius of circulation amongst their own reading public of only about forty miles. There is another objection to this Bill. Outside of the city of Montreal there is no large paper printed in the French language. In no other part of the Dominion is there a French settlement large enough to support the publication of newspapers in that language, and whatever information the people may get in their mother tongue must come from newspapers published in the province of Quebec. But this Bill says they shall not get the knowledge they are entitled to without being subject to additional taxation. I think that is unfortunate, and it is unwise. Whether the hon. gentleman intended it or not, his Bill is a blow at the French newspapers in the province of Quebec. I am in favour of the reduction of postage on newspapers, but I am against the principle that is set forth in this Bill.

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS (Russell). We have had this morning an exhibition of provincialism, but if hon. gentlemen could only be large enough, and broad enough, and intelligent enough to be free traders in that which feeds the material man as well as in that which feeds the intellect, we would not require discussions of this kind in this House. Now, we see a very strange anomaly. We have the hon. member for St. Anne's division, Montreal, (Mr. Quinn), complaining of a reduction in the taxation upon newspapers, and at the same time advocating the principle of free trade in newspapers, because a newspaper is one means of feeding the intellect. But if men could only be a little larger, and nobler, and go the length of absolute free trade in the food of the body as well as in the food of the mind, we would not have in this Chamber discussions such as we are having this morning.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. DAVIN. I beg to move that the words 'for transmission beyond the province or territory wherein they are published, and at the rate of one-eighth of one cent for each pound weight or any fraction of a pound weight for transmission,' be struck out and the following be substituted:

That one-eighth be substituted for one-half in lines 20 and 21, after 'fraction of' in line 20.

The result of the amendment will be to make a flat rate of one-eighth of a cent throughout the entire Dominion, instead of having it graduated as it is now. The only objection there can be to this is the loss of revenue. But this motion will give one-eighth within all the provinces. For instance, the great papers of Toronto have their main circulation in that province, therefore, the amount of revenue that the Postmaster General gets from the circulation of the great dailies of Toronto outside Ontario is very small. In the case of Manitoba, I suppose the circulation of the daily papers of Winnipeg outside of that province cannot be large, and the revenue from that source would be infinitesimal.

The same thing applies to the North-west Territories, the lower provinces and British Columbia. The only revenue that would be lost, is the revenue that the Postmaster General at present gains, and that will not be very considerable. It might be something of importance to a trading concern, but the amount of revenue that is got from the Montreal *Star* or the *Herald*, which is forcing its circulation, or the *Witness*, would be a certain amount, but it would after all be very little. I ask the right hon. gentleman's attention to the principle that underlies his

utterances this morning, and he evidently does not believe in discrimination. He himself admitted that geographical zones would have been a juster system to go upon than provincial lines, and that he had suggested it to the Postmaster General, who had pointed out to him that there were difficulties in the way. What is the use of making this change for the small revenue which will be the residuum after this change is made, because all the revenue you get from the law, as it exists, is in consequence of the large circulation of such great papers as the *Mail* and *Globe*, and other papers within the province? I make the motion which I have read.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I do not think that the government can accept the proposition. It is too low a rate to propose. We have the case in point of the rate that prevails in the United States. The rate in the United States, is one cent a pound for the whole union. Ours at present is one-half of a cent, or only half of what it is in the United States. That is a pretty low rate as it is, and the proposition before the committee to reduce the rate within the province, instead of discriminating against circulation outside of the province, will promote circulation outside of the province. A newspaper company, like any other business enterprise, has many features of its enterprise that are more or less paying. Some branches do not pay at all, but are regarded as aids towards the general enterprise. A newspaper which has a circulation throughout the whole province, and which is necessarily published in one province, if it has an extra provincial circulation, if there is a saving upon its circulation within the province, by reason of the reduction of the rate of postage, that enables it the better to promote its circulation outside of the province, because the working expenses are reduced upon the amount of the circulation within the province. Take, for instance, a newspaper posting one hundred pounds of newspapers. We will say that half of them are for circulation within the province of publication, and that the other fifty pounds are for circulation without the province. The cost at present would be 50 cents upon the 100 pounds. We will suppose that one-half of the circulation is within the province; instead of paying 25 cents on fifty pounds within the province, they will only have to pay 6½ cents for that circulation within the province. They will not have to pay any more for the circulation outside of the province, but will be saving on the fifty pounds within the province 18½ cents, which will aid them in furthering their circulation beyond the province. It will aid circulation without the province, and, therefore, it commends itself to the committee. As for myself I am in favour of the freest interchange of opinion throughout every part of the Dominion.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it a fair thing to take the proportion that the hon. gentleman has taken? He has supposed that there will be 25 cents to pay within the province and 25 cents outside of the province. The *Globe* would have its preponderating circulation within the province.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Suggest the proportion just for illustration.

Mr. DAVIN. For illustration, I should think that the number of *Globes* that would be circulated within the province of Ontario, would certainly be ten or twelve times the number of *Globes* carried outside of the province of Ontario.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Suppose we say nine-tenths within the province, for illustration?

Mr. DAVIN. Very well; I know that the *Montreal Star* circulates largely in the Northwest Territories and in the province of Ontario, and I should think that the circulation of the *Star* outside of the province of Quebec would be four or five times what it is within the province of Quebec.

Mr. QUINN. Nine times.

Mr. DAVIN. What I want to ask the Postmaster General is what amount of income will he lose, suppose he were to adopt my suggestion, or what amount of income is he retaining from say, the *Globe*, or the *Toronto papers*, by keeping up half a cent a pound on the transmission of their papers outside of the province?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I just want to take the converse case. The hon. gentleman took exception to my illustration. I gave the suggestion of a newspaper having 100 pounds of newspapers, half of which are circulated within the province, and half without the province, and my argument was that the reduction on the circulation within the province would aid in promoting circulation without the province. The hon. gentleman thought my illustration hardly a representative one, and he cited the *Toronto Globe* as perhaps a fairer illustration. Let us assume that the circulation of the *Globe* within the province of Ontario is nine-tenths, and that the circulation without the province is one-tenth. Suppose that is the case; I do not know whether it is or not. At present of the 100 pounds of *Globes*, according to the suggested estimate, ten pounds would circulate outside of the province, and the postage upon that quantity would be 5 cents, while the ninety pounds would circulate within the province, under the reduced rate, instead of costing 45 cents, it would cost 11½ cents. The people would make a saving of 33½ cents, and it would be all the stronger to promote the circulation outside the province.

Mr. QUINN. Take the *Star* which has a 10 per cent of a circulation in the province of Quebec, and 90 per cent outside.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman might work that out for himself.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the Postmaster General answer the question as to what would be the loss of revenue if the suggestion were adopted that the tax be reduced to one-eighth of a cent all round.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would simply mean the loss of three-quarters of whatever is collected.

Mr. CLARKE. If the amendment of the Postmaster General is adopted, then the further suggestion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) would entail only a very small further loss to the revenue. Can the Postmaster General say what that would be?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is impossible for us to give the proportion of the circulation of the various papers within and without the province of publication. All we know is that our cars are being loaded with newspapers. Hon. gentlemen are entirely in error in assuming that the length of the journey does not make extra cost. It lays the foundation for extra claims by railways and there is in the department at present a demand on the part of practically all the railways in Canada for increased payment. It is quite impossible to treat newspaper postage in the same way as letter postage. A letter is carried as a separate item of mail matter at a uniform rate of two cents per ounce, and it would be impossible to apportion the charge in regard to the distance carried.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Why not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If you fix a small maximum rate you could not find a division of coin sufficiently small to enable you to put a postage stamp on for the shortest distance. It is practically impossible to apply a rate to letters for a certain radius.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They used to be charged according to distance.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the infancy of postage there were zones for letters, but it was given up in view of the difficulties in the way. A man posts his own letter and puts a stamp on it, but the newspapers send their letters to the post office by the ton and the whole wagon load is weighed and the stamps are then in bulk attached to the sheet and not to the mail matter itself. A ton of newspapers at one-eighth of a cent per pound would be charged \$2.50. A ton of newspapers would contain, say, 20,000 separate pieces, and the proposition is that we should carry those pieces over the continent, organize a staff

Mr. MULLOCK.

of mail clerks, provide bags and expenses of all kind and deliver these 20,000 pieces in many cases, at \$2.50 per ton.

Mr. DAVIN. How many tons of the *Globe* do you send outside the province of Ontario?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no information behind the scenes as to the *Globe*. I know nothing except what is printed on the newspaper, and I fancy that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) from his experience as a newspaper man would know more about it than I do. Let me illustrate the absurdity of charging \$2.50 a ton for that kind of mail matter. The cheapest kind of merchandise sent by freight cars would not be lower than one-half cent per ton per mile.

Mr. DAVIN. You are arguing against your own proposal.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are various anomalies in all business. A railway classifies the freight carried and the same car that brings one class of freight will bring another class of freight at a far cheaper rate. There is no uniformity in the matter. I can discover no fixed principles upon which railways classify their freight except that they try and make the goods they carry in a sort of average way bear the cost of transmission and some reasonable profit to those who have invested their capital.

Mr. DAVIN. The Postmaster General is joining issue with no one.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, I have not intruded myself on the attention of parliament this session, and I hope I may be permitted now to clear up some points that have been discussed. I have not changed the postal rates that have been fixed by my predecessors for many classes of mail matter. There are four or five classifications. You will find engraved plates charged at one rate and printed matter charged at another rate; a sheet of music will be transmitted through the mails at one rate and a picture at another rate. These are anomalies and I have not interfered with them, but they are there to illustrate the difficulty of having any fixed principle regulating rates of postage upon mail matter. The proposition we now make is to reduce the rates on newspaper postage within the several provinces. It will promote the circulation of provincial papers beyond the province, and to that extent it entirely answers the argument of those who suggest that it is of a provincial character. If my hon. friend has any fairer basis of fixing the rate, I would like him to suggest it. But the proposition of \$2.50 a ton to carry 20,000 pieces of mail matter from the point of publication to the homes of the people all over this country is one which I think the government should not seriously entertain.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the one-eighth cent a pound cover the cost of the newspaper postage within the bounds of each province ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no calculation made as to whether it will or not.

Mr. FOSTER. On what basis, then, did the Postmaster General fix the one-eighth cent ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. For the purpose of lowering the rate of postage to assist the newspapers. There was a complaint made, and the hon. gentleman, I think, or his leader, took exception to the rate, and this is a reduction of the rate for the benefit of the newspaper world.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman devoted the greater part of his speech to repeating the argument which he made originally when imposing a tax on newspapers, and which had no bearing whatever on what he is doing now. For the most part, he was arguing against his own Bill. We wanted an argument against the position we took up, if there is really any good ground for discriminating against people outside of a province. We are not dealing merely with the newspaper proprietors ; we are dealing with the people. I take the *Globe* and *Mail* as illustrations because it affords the strongest argument against myself, because I know of no papers that circulate more widely outside of their own province ; and unless the hon. gentleman can controvert my argument, he is in no position to resist my amendment. I say that the weight of *Globes* sent outside of the province of Ontario is so small that the loss of revenue would be trifling, and there is no reason why we should fall back upon a vicious principle especially when no end is accomplished. But take the case of a Montreal paper circulating widely outside of the province. In that case there is a discrimination, and yet the amount of revenue on the bulk of newspapers altogether circulating outside of the province will be, under the hon. gentleman's amendment, very small. What I say to the hon. gentleman is this : You are taking a right step ; as you acknowledge, you are acting on the suggestion of the leader of the opposition ; you say it is in consequence of the criticism—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I did not say it was in consequence. I cited his utterance.

Mr. DAVIN. Then it is not in consequence, though it is post facto. The hon. gentleman quoted Sir Charles Tupper, and he is taking the right course in taking off some of the taxes on knowledge. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has made a good argument against it, and I was glad to hear that argument—that this is essentially narrow and provincial legislation. What I say is, why should you be narrow and provincial, even if you gain something ? But you should never be narrow and provincial if you gain nothing. The hon. gentleman has not attempted to answer that argument.

At One o'clock the committee took recess.

The House resumed in committee at Three o'clock.

Mr. DAVIN. I am afraid the hon. the Postmaster General is the unwilling father of an unloved measure, judging by the way he has argued against his own Bill. It would seem to have been forced upon him by the majority of the government, and that he himself is not in favour of it, and I would recommend him to look at the matter from a large, statesmanlike point of view. I have tried to make a calculation here, which I propose to put before the House. Take half a ton or 1,000 pounds as the basis. On its circulation outside the province a newspaper pays 50 cents per 100 pounds postage, and on its circulation within the province it pays 12½ cents per 100 pounds. A newspaper, therefore, which sends 900 pounds outside the province, will pay \$4.50, and on the 100 pounds which it circulates within the province, it will pay 12½ cents, or \$4.62½ in all, and thus save 37½ cents on the 50-cent rate. A newspaper which sends 800 pounds out of the province in which it is published, will pay \$4, and on the remaining 200 pounds within the province, it would pay 25 cents, or \$4.25, making a saving of 75 cents. A newspaper sending 700 pounds outside the province would pay \$3.50, and on the other 300 pounds it would pay 37½ cents, or \$3.37½, and thus save \$1.12½. A newspaper sending 600 pounds outside the province would pay \$3, and on the remaining 400 pounds it would pay 50 cents, or a total of \$3.50, making a saving of \$1.50. 500 pounds would pay \$2.50, and 500 within the province 62½ cents, or \$3.12½, or a saving of \$1.37½. 400 pounds would pay \$2, and the other 600 pounds 75 cents, making \$2.75, or a saving of \$2.25. Or, tabulating the figures, they appear as follows :

½ ton (1,000 lbs.) at 50c.		Will pay \$5		On ½ ton (1,000 lbs).	
900 lbs. at 50c., \$4.50 ;	100 lbs. at 12½c., \$0.12½ ;	will pay \$4.62½ ;	will save \$0.37½.		
800 " 50c., \$4.00 ;	200 " 12½c., \$0.25 ;	" \$4.25 ;	" \$0.75.		
700 " 50c., \$3.50 ;	300 " 12½c., \$0.37½ ;	" \$3.87½ ;	" \$1.12½.		
600 " 50c., \$3.00 ;	400 " 12½c., \$0.50 ;	" \$3.50 ;	" \$1.50.		
500 " 50c., \$2.50 ;	500 " 12½c., \$0.62½ ;	" \$3.12½ ;	" \$1.87½.		
400 " 50c., \$2.00 ;	600 " 12½c., \$0.75 ;	" \$2.75 ;	" \$2.25.		
300 " 50c., \$1.50 ;	700 " 12½c., \$0.87½ ;	" \$2.37½ ;	" \$2.62½.		
200 " 50c., \$1.00 ;	800 " 12½c., \$1.00 ;	" \$2.00 ;	" \$3.00.		
100 " 50c., \$0.50 ;	900 " 12½c., \$1.12½ ;	" \$1.62½ ;	" \$3.37½.		

Thus a paper with nine-tenths of its issue published outside of its own province, and one-tenth inside, would save 37½ cents on 1,000 pounds, or half a ton, whereas a paper with half its circulation outside and half inside, would save \$1.87½, and a paper with only one-tenth of its circulation outside and the balance inside its province, would save \$3.87½. Thus a paper with nine-tenths of its circulation outside would pay \$4.62½. Whereas one with only one-tenth of its circulation outside would pay only \$1.62½, or \$3 per half ton less than the former. This is very grave discrimination, and at the same time the revenue gains very little. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should make the rate a flat rate of one-eighth of a cent all over, and thus have a measure that will not be provincial and discriminatory, but be national and large and statesmanlike.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I think, perhaps, that the hon. the Postmaster General is perfectly right in retaining the rate he has on newspapers. It was a mistake, I believe, on the part of the late government to take away the rate altogether. I do not see any reason why a newspaper should not pay something for its carriage through mails as well as letters or anything else, but I think my hon. friend makes a mistake when he confines the area of the advantage given the newspapers to the provinces. The question of carrying letters and papers throughout the country has been discussed again and again, and the determination arrived at that the proper way after all was to impose a uniform rate on letters and papers throughout the country in which they are distributed. The question of distances was considered and threshed out long ago, and the principle of a discrimination within certain distances abandoned in every country in the world. Look at how this measure affects newspapers in the Dominion. One newspaper in Montreal has nine-tenths of its circulation in the other provinces, whereas other newspapers published in Toronto have nine-tenths of their circulation within the province in which they are published. You can see at once how a newspaper published in the city of Montreal is handicapped. It pays double as much postage to the Dominion government, or nearly so, that is paid by a newspaper published in Toronto. What is the reason for that? The Postmaster General argues that the reduction of the postage on newspapers enables them to push their circulation outside the provinces in which they are published. But, after all the circulation of a newspaper is a matter of competition, and if one gets its material for one-half the price that the other has to pay, that is an immense advantage to it over its competitor. Suppose a newspaper proprietor can get his paper at a less rate, he can publish cheaper and get more

Mr. DAVIN.

subscribers than one who had to pay the higher rate, and the same argument holds good in the matter of postage. I will venture to say that nine-tenths of the circulation of the *Montreal Star* and *Witness* is outside of the province of Quebec, and these papers pay double the amount of postage that the papers published in Toronto do. I see no reason for this discrimination. It is against the principle adopted in every country in the world of a flat rate on newspapers and letters circulated in every part of the country. Besides this measure gives to newspapers a provincial character, whereas, what we want is higher politics in the country than those of provincial newspapers. We want national newspapers that can speak for the whole Dominion and not merely from a provincial standpoint; but under this measure a newspaper which wishes to be a national one is under the disadvantage of having to pay double newspaper postage. Take English newspapers published in Montreal, there are only 300,000 English-speaking people in the province of Quebec altogether, and if that newspaper wants to have a large circulation and influence in the country, it must seek for it outside that province, but it is handicapped by having to pay a double postage rate on nine-tenths of its circulation, compared with newspapers published in Ontario.

Then, as my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis) stated, look at the disadvantage to the papers of the little province of Prince Edward Island. This prevents them from seeking anything but a local circulation, and compels them to remain local newspapers all the days of their existence. What I would recommend to my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) is to decide upon the amount of revenue which he expects to get for this service—and what he proposes is but a moiety of what will be needed to cover the expense—and let him increase the flat rates from one-eighth cent a pound to whatever may be required to raise that revenue. This would not interfere with the circulation of newspapers and would not compel them to be provincial instead of Dominion.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). I am sorry I cannot agree with the ideas expressed by many hon. members. I am as much in favour of newspapers being Dominion in circulation as anybody, but I think the county paper, the town paper, for the next quarter of a century, will be more important for us than the Dominion paper.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Though some hon. members say 'no,' yet, I believe that to be the fact. A great newspaper makes a reputation by its greatness, and the charge for postage would not hamper it. But that which is important to the people

is the paper in the village, which gives the people information about their own home affairs, which tells what is taking place in the county. Not only does such paper give the local news, but if there is anything worth while in that newspaper it will be found in the local paper also. The provincial paper also is important—such papers as the *Halifax Chronicle* and the *Charlottetown Patriot*. Were it not for the cheapness of the great Dominion papers, very few of them would be bought. I venture to say that the ordinary farmer would prefer the paper published in his own town at a dollar to one of a national character published at the same price. The people have neither time nor desire to read the large papers, with so much of their space taken up with general matters. I was amused at the ex-Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron) saying that it was most important to encourage the circulation of the French newspapers in other provinces.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When did I say that ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I thought it was the hon. gentleman, but, if not, it was some other hon. gentleman on that side. In Nova Scotia, we have a French paper, the *Evangeline*, which circulates largely among the Acadians in the maritime provinces, and that is the paper they want. It relates the news of the lower provinces, particularly happenings among their own compatriots, and it is all they require. I venture the assertion that of the large French newspapers in Montreal, there are not two dozen circulated in our whole province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). In my own county, where there are two sections of French people, there is not one of these papers taken.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman, probably, does not receive the French papers, while his French constituents no doubt, do.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I venture to say there are not two dozen bona fide subscribers to the French newspapers among the Acadians in Nova Scotia, and in my own county, as I say, there is not one of them taken. What the people want is a nice paper like the *Evangeline*, published in Nova Scotia, and one that not only has the news of the day, but has much in it about the Acadians themselves, who are different, in many respects, from their fellow-citizens of French origin in the province of Quebec.

Mr. BERGERON. But, when that paper goes into New Brunswick, it would have to pay the higher tax.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I do not object to that. You must draw the line

somewhere. It may be said that provincial lines are not the best; but, we do divide on provincial lines, and I do not see how you could get any better lines for this purpose just now.

Mr. MONET. Why make any difference at all ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I do not see any better way out of it.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Why not adopt the suggestion of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) and have a flat rate of, say, one-quarter cent a pound all around ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Well, if you like to do that, that is a different thing altogether. But, can that be carried out ? These questions of postal rate are very difficult of adjustment; and this service must be paid for by somebody. I confess, I have a great deal of sympathy with the view expressed by my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards), that we seek to draw too fine lines in this matter. After all, this whole discussion is with respect to one or two papers in Montreal; and I do not think that one or two papers only should be considered in deciding this matter. I would say the same if it were the *Globe* or *Mail* that was concerned. One thing is certain—these great newspapers will always find a ready sale if they are of the kind that hon. gentlemen opposite say; and, if there must be some hardship, it is better to let it rest upon the large papers than upon the county papers that are circulated in the immediate neighbourhood of the place of publication. I have the greatest sympathy with the county newspapers. Many of them are run under great difficulty; yet, I have seen in them just as good writing as in the city newspapers. While saying this, I sympathize with the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) as to the broadening influence of one province upon the other. And, by the way, he read hon. gentlemen opposite a salutary lesson, which should prevent them from saying or thinking again that he seeks to set province against province.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough) has been urging that the county newspaper, the local newspaper, should get a cheap rate. Does not the hon. gentleman know that under the present law such a newspaper does not pay a cent ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). If they go all over the province they do.

Mr. TAYLOR. But, the hon. gentleman was speaking of the local newspapers, the county newspapers, distributed immediately around where it is published. He ought to know that newspapers circulate free within forty miles of the office of publication.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). But, that does not cover the county—my own county is 200 miles long.

Mr. TALYOR. But, what my hon. friend was talking about was the local newspaper circulating near the office of publication. I leave it to hon. gentlemen on both sides if it is not so.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). They circulate free within forty miles—I know that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I agree with the suggestion made by the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Haggart), that there should be a flat rate, that instead of saying with the present Bill, one-eighth of a cent for the province and one-half of a cent for outside the province, make it such a rate that it will make up the loss the revenue would sustain, if it was all made one-eighth of a cent; raise it another sixteenth, or to one-quarter of a cent. Why should people who are living in the counties of Russell, Glengarry, Stormont and Cornwall, be obliged to pay more than their friends who live across the provincial line? The charge may be the same, but from whom does the loss to the publisher come out of? It comes out of the public. From whom does he take it? From the workmen who are printing the papers. Somebody has to pay it. A French paper published in Montreal cannot be delivered as cheaply in one of these counties as it can to the man living in the county of Soulanges. What the publisher has to lose he will take out of the men who print the paper. Therefore, make it a level thing, so much per pound, so much per hundred, to cover the entire Dominion. Whatever the department would lose would be very little. The revenue would be maintained if you raised the rate to a quarter of a cent. I should say three-sixteenths would be about the right rate.

Mr. CLARKE. There were one or two questions I wanted to ask the Postmaster General. One is, what was the total revenue derived last year from this newspaper tax; and the other is, what loss the revenue would sustain by the coming into operation of this amendment?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I might perhaps, be allowed to amend the question from my standpoint. When the hon. gentleman buys a ticket to go home, he does not call that a tax, it is a payment for services rendered, I am not able to give the revenue for the fiscal year just closed, but I can state to the House that the revenue for the six months, from July 1, 1899, to June 30, was about \$22,000. At that time the rate was one-quarter of a cent. The full rate of half a cent came into force on July 1, so if you multiply that by 4, you will get \$88,000, which is probably in the vicinity of a year's revenue. As to the other question of the hon. gentleman, it is impossible to

Mr. TAYLOR.

tell what loss the revenue will sustain, unless we were furnished with statements as to the distribution of the papers, what proportion of the circulation is in the province of publication, and what is not.

Mr. QUINN. I regret to see that some members who advocate the interest of the local paper, should think there is any attempt on the part of city members to legislate against the country paper. That is not the object. I think that possibly the ideas which have been expressed by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), spring more from the supposition that there is such an intention in the minds of city members, than from any conviction he has that the course which we wish to adopt is incorrect. The intention of those who support the views of my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), is to secure that papers should be circulated throughout the whole Dominion at as little cost as possible, either to the publisher or to the reader of the newspaper. We do not want to discriminate against the local paper at all. We say the local paper ought to be distributed freely throughout the county in which it is published; we go further, and we say it ought to be distributed as freely as possible throughout the Dominion, consonant with the revenue to be derived by the Postmaster General. But we say also that if the local paper is to be distributed freely in the immediate vicinity of the place of publication, that is the large paper, it ought to be distributed throughout the whole Dominion at a minimum rate, so as to afford as much revenue as possible for the Postmaster General, and also in order that the expense may not operate as a tax upon any particular newspaper, or upon any particular class of newspapers in the Dominion. The hon. member for Guysborough made, I think, two statements which are not quite accurate. He said that the farmer would prefer a paper published in his immediate vicinity to one of the large city newspapers. I think he is mistaken. I think if the farmer could get a paper published in the city of Toronto, or the city of Montreal, which would give him the latest market reports, for example, from a large commercial centre, and at the same time the latest reports from the European markets for the produce which he grows, if he could get that paper at the same rate as a county paper, he would prefer to have it, not to speak of the advantages which he would derive from the large circulation, from the employment of the cleverest editors. My hon. friend surely would not pretend that the farmer would prefer a small county paper, whose ramifications must be confined almost to the place of publication, to the city newspaper, which could give him the news of the whole world, at the same price. So when the hon. gentleman says that the farmer would prefer a county paper, he must add to that, because the county paper is cheaper. Now,

is it not our duty to try to put the very best literature in the form of newspapers into the hands of the farmers of this country? I do not say that there should be any legislation to hamper the county newspapers. The county newspaper has its sphere, it is doing a useful work, and we ought to endeavour to encourage it. But at the same time it is our duty to put into the hands of every farmer in this country, the very best newspapers that are published, and at the lowest rate. That is the object of the amendment which my hon. friend makes, and which I heartily support. In the next place, the hon. gentleman says: You must draw the line somewhere, in imposing a rate of postage on newspapers. Now, that is contrary to the progress which has been made in postal matters within the last ten or twenty years. The idea of the great postal authorities of the world has been to enlarge the circulation of literature as much as possible, to make it possible for newspapers to circulate throughout the world at the very lowest rate of postage. So I say the hon. gentleman is wrong when he says that we must draw the line somewhere. There ought to be no such thing as drawing the line within a province. A newspaper published in the most obscure town of Canada should circulate as freely in the province of British Columbia or the province of Nova Scotia, as a paper in either of those provinces.

There should be no such thing as drawing the line. Why should there be? Why should a farmer in Quebec, for example, be prevented from reading the *Toronto Globe*? Because, forsooth, the hon. Postmaster General thinks that a line must be drawn somewhere, and in his wisdom he says that that line must be drawn at the border of the province of Quebec. To me it seems that this is taking a backward step altogether. Instead of drawing a line we should try to enlarge the limits of the circulation of our newspapers. My hon. friend says that a Montreal newspaper cannot interest a farmer as much as a paper published in his own county. I join issue with him there. The farmer gets the Montreal newspaper report of the great commercial metropolis of Canada, and I speak of Montreal, as I am more deeply interested in Montreal.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Does he not get that in the local papers which give the markets of their own particular province? Before the Montreal papers reach the farmer they will be two or three days older than his own local paper.

Mr. QUINN. I will answer my hon. friend's question. The local paper of which he speaks is published once a week.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). No, I mean the daily papers. There are weeklies, tri-weeklies and dailies.

Mr. QUINN. My hon. friend speaks about daily papers. He is not talking about the

local county paper of which he spoke a moment ago, and in order to be fair with the committee he must admit that.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Certainly.

Mr. QUINN. When he speaks about a daily paper he speaks about the class of papers which will come under this Bill.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). No, not in the various provinces.

Mr. QUINN. When he speaks about a county paper he speaks about a weekly or a tri-weekly paper. It may contain the latest market reports from the principal town of the province, but would he accept that as a good guide for our farmers, particularly our farmers of the North-west Territories? Do we not want our farmers in the North-west Territories to be able to judge from the Montreal markets what should be the prices of the grain they are growing?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The market quotations are in the dailies published in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and these reach the farmers of that portion of the country days before the Montreal papers reach them.

Mr. QUINN. My hon. friend says that the information contained in the papers published in Montreal and Toronto will reach the farmers days after that published in the local papers. When will the information contained in the weekly papers reach them? After it is a week old. If they take the Montreal or the Toronto papers the information will be two or three days old only, before it reaches them, but if they have to rely upon their weekly paper, it will be a week old. And then, can they place the same reliance upon the market reports of small county journals that they can upon those of the *Toronto Globe*, or the *Montreal Star*, or the *Witness*?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). The hon. gentleman must surely know that all these county papers get, before going to press, from the chief city in the province, the market reports at that moment.

Mr. QUINN. No, they do not. But I will take my hon. friend on that. He says they get the reports of the markets at that moment. But they have to wait until their next edition comes out, which is probably in the middle of next week, and in the meantime the markets have fluctuated two or three times. They have no idea from the local papers of the fluctuations of the markets, while if they had a daily paper they could keep themselves familiar with the market as a doctor by feeling the pulse of his patient, keeps himself informed as to the condition of his patient. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis) argued before luncheon that there was no discrimination. I think the hon. gentleman is wrong there. There is discrimination against the paper

of one province the moment you compel them to pay that duty or tax, call it what you will. There is discrimination against the newspapers of one province the moment you make them pay anything at all upon going into another province. My hon. friend says that they are all on the same footing. That is quite true, but he will not pretend to say that the *Montreal Star* is on the same footing with the newspaper published in St. John, if you charge half a cent a pound postal duty for bringing that newspaper from Montreal to St. John. As regards the city of St. John and the province of New Brunswick the *Montreal Star* is not on the same footing as a newspaper published in St. John. He will not pretend that it is on the same footing as a newspaper published in Toronto, the *Globe*, or the *Mail*, where the *Montreal Star* has to pay half a cent a pound before it will be allowed to go into the province of Ontario, when the *Globe* and *Mail* can circulate all through the province of Ontario at a very much reduced rate of postage. Surely there is discrimination there. Call it by another name, if you like. If the hon. gentleman does not like the term discrimination then we should coin a word and call it what it is. There is certainly an embargo of more than a quarter of a cent a pound on the newspapers published in Montreal as compared with newspapers published in Toronto. Of course, difficulties must present themselves to the Postmaster General in solving this question of how a revenue is to be derived from the large quantity of newspaper matter that is carried through the mails, but I think the only way that it can be done is to make a uniform rate throughout the whole Dominion. The revenue will not lose at all by creating a uniform rate. Although there is a discrimination in favour of county papers, leave them free as they are to-day, but when papers are circulating between different provinces you should have a uniform rate all over the Dominion and then there will be no discrimination whatever. Take, for instance, a paper published in the city of Montreal. I said before luncheon that nine-tenths of the circulation of that paper is outside of the province of Quebec.

Mr. PARMALEE. Nonsense.

Mr. QUINN. I beg pardon ?

Mr. PARMALEE. You are exaggerating.

Mr. QUINN. I do not think so.

Mr. PARMALEE. Yes.

Mr. QUINN. I have it from a newspaper man in Montreal that the circulation of the large Montreal dailies is nine-tenths outside of the province of Quebec. What is the effect? Let us take 100 pounds of newspaper mail matter; 10 pounds are circulated in the province of Quebec, and the payment made by the newspapers is 1½ cents, while

Mr. QUINN.

on the other 90 pounds they have to pay 45 cents, which makes altogether 46½ cents. Under the system which exists at present they pay 50 cents all round. They save 3¼ cents on 100 pounds by the reduction made to-day. Take the case of a newspaper which has a very large circulation such as that which is found in the province where the English language is spoken by the majority of the population. To-day that newspaper pays 50 cents on 100 pounds, while under the reduced rate of one-eighth of a cent per pound it pays 12½ cents. The proprietor of that paper saves 37½ cents upon his home circulation, and pays 5 cents, as he does to-day, on that going outside of the province. Thus, he makes a net saving of 32½ cents, as against 3¼ cents saved by the English newspaper which is published in a province where the population is largely French as it is in the province of Quebec. If this is not discrimination, I would like to know what it is. I think this is a most unfair discrimination. I think this is a discrimination that will work very largely against the establishment of powerful papers in such a place as the city of Montreal, which, being the commercial centre of the Dominion, must have large and enterprising newspapers. I am informed that the hon. Postmaster General says that the total revenue derived from newspaper postage is \$88,000 a year. If my information is correct, under a rate of half a cent a pound one newspaper in the Dominion pays nearly \$30,000 a year postal charges. Who will say that this is not a tax? Who will say that it is not a very heavy tax on that newspaper? It is a large amount of money, and if they are only going to gain at the rate of 3¼ cents for every 50 cents under the proposed reduction, it will be a reduction in their favour of only \$2,000 in \$30,000. On every newspaper published in another province where the population is largely English the proportion saved would be something like \$15,000. I submit this to the consideration of the committee and I ask them in all seriousness to say whether we should treat a Canadian newspaper in that way. Our ideas are to spread as much as possible the influence of the Canadian county newspaper, but at the same time to give the farmers the benefit of the best literature published in the Dominion at the cheapest possible price.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). I have listened to this long discussion, and I find that one or two important points have virtually been lost sight of. It is well known that the country press has, as a rule, a struggle to get along financially. Their subscribers are limited, and it is most desirable that encouragement should be given to them. On the other hand what you might call the Dominion press has a large circulation, when in consequence of that large circulation, it gets very high prices for its advertisements. The *Montreal Star*

will charge you probably ten times as much for an advertisement as would an ordinary country paper, and that is because it has a circulation not only in the province, but throughout the Dominion. Men who want to reach the ear of the Dominion will advertise in the *Star*, the *Witness*, the *Globe* and the *Mail*. They have a monopoly of the very best paying work that newspapers get, and I would like to know why they should not pay at least some of the cost which this country is put to in order to circulate their papers, and from which distribution they reap such great advantage. On the other hand the country press is limited in its sphere and its financial resources. In the face of the very great reduction the Postmaster General has made in the rate of postage, the metropolitan press should be made to pay for a portion of the work at least, that is done for them. Let us compare the rate paid in Canada for newspapers with the rate paid in the United States. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) says that a newspaper in the city of Montreal pays at present \$20,000 a year in postage. Let me tell him that if that paper were published in the United States it would pay \$40,000 for the same circulation. I believe that my esteemed friend (Mr. Mulock) has acted wisely in this matter, and I believe his action will benefit both the local press and the metropolitan press, the latter of which can well afford to pay postage.

Mr. A. T. WOOD (Hamilton). I have listened for two days to doctors and lawyers talking on a pure matter of business, but I have not heard a business man speak about it yet. Are the publishers issuing these newspapers for the good of their health or are they doing it to make a profit? If it is to make a profit, why should the country help them? Why should I ask the Postmaster General to afford me facilities to get my goods into my warehouse at a less cost than I do now. If the *Montreal Star* is making many thousands a year—

Mr. GIBSON. He is a millionaire.

Mr. WOOD. Yes, and if he can afford to give large contributions to the election funds of hon. gentlemen opposite, the proprietor of the *Star* can afford to send agents all over the country to point out to subscribers the advantage that they would have in getting this paper and paying the postage as well. It is simply a matter of business. Newspaper publishers should just be as liable to pay postage on their newspapers as I am to pay freight on the goods I put in my warehouse. I do not think that the papers published in Ontario are asking for any advantage. I am a stockholder in a large concern and I have never heard any one find any fault with paying postage on the newspapers. If the people of Montreal whom my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) represents so earnestly and efficiently, want to circulate

their newspapers so as to let the Ontario people know what the Quebec people think of them, let them send agents out to hunt up subscribers, as I send agents out to hunt for orders. Why should the country be called upon to do that for them? I am quite satisfied that the law introduced by the Postmaster General is in the general interests of the country, and that the publishers in the different provinces of the Dominion will be perfectly satisfied with it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood), is no doubt quite satisfied with this proposal because he is a large stockholder in a paper, the circulation of which is in his own province and this law is calculated to keep out competition. The law will affect him beneficially if it is calculated to keep out the *Montreal Star* and *Family Herald*, and therefore, I do not wonder that he supports it.

Mr. WOOD. Let them send out their agents to get business.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not give them an opportunity to do so on equal terms? As to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen), I would point out to him that the local papers have a radius of about forty miles of free circulation, and there is not one out of a hundred of them which circulate beyond that. This does not touch the local papers; it applies to the metropolitan papers that circulate all over the country.

The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) says every one wants to take his local paper, because it reports the markets up to the hour of going to press. That shows how little the hon. gentleman knows of the way the local papers are conducted, because they only report the markets of their own villages and the neighbouring villages. What the farmers want are the markets of Toronto, Montreal, London, Hamilton, Buffalo and the outside world generally, which they do not get in their local papers. They want these markets more than once a week; they want them every day, if possible; and many farmers take the daily papers for that reason. There are twenty or twenty-five local papers published in my county; but I find in the rural districts more of the *Montreal Star* and *Family Herald* than of the local papers. I ask the farmers why they take it, and they say in reply, because it gives them information in every line, as well as the markets of the world, and a large amount of general reading matter in addition. The hon. member for Guysborough says he has seen splendid political articles in the local papers; but a great many of the local papers have no politics in them at all; and if you want to get information on the political questions which are engaging the attention of the public, you have to get it from the city papers. The Toronto and Hamilton papers

have never made any complaint in regard to this proposed postage, because they circulate largely in their own province; but the papers published in the city of Montreal have reason to complain, because they circulate largely among the farmers of Ontario, and the greater you make the burden upon them, the greater you make it upon the farmers who read these papers and find them valuable.

Mr. QUINN. The remarks of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and those of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) have, I think, let the cat out of the bag as to the motive which several hon. gentlemen have in supporting the postage on papers going from one province to another. The full argument of the hon. member for North Wellington was this, that inasmuch as the county newspaper had difficulty in getting along, and its field was limited, and inasmuch as the city newspaper charged higher rates for advertising and had a wider field, there must be a tax put on the city newspaper to protect the county newspaper. That is his argument put in a nut shell. The hon. member for Hamilton follows on the same line, and says: 'I do not want these Montreal papers to come into Hamilton, because they compete with the paper in which I am largely interested.'

Mr. WOOD. I did not say that.

Mr. QUINN. Put in a nut shell, that is his argument. I do not expect that the hon. gentleman will say that I have expressed his idea in the words he would select; but that is his argument, going to the bottom of it. Now, I ask the hon. members of this House who have broader minds than that, and who are interested in the advancement of the country, to put into the hands of the people the best newspaper material they can; and they can only do that by establishing a uniform rate of postage all through the Dominion. The hon. member for North Wellington attempted to answer me by saying that the newspaper in Montreal that pays \$3,000 to-day, if circulated in the United States, would be obliged to pay double that amount. But my hon. friend lost sight of the fact that if it were in the United States it would have a possible clientele of 70,000,000 population, whereas here we have only five or six millions. There is no law in the United States which limits the circulation of a newspaper, or puts a tax on its circulation beyond the state or city in which it is published; but every one of the 70,000,000 people in the United States is free to subscribe to the *New York Herald* or any others of the large dailies published in the city of New York without any discrimination against him. Why could those papers not afford to pay a very much larger rate when they have such a large clientele? Once more, I would ask the members of

Mr. SPROULE.

this House who are not governed by these narrow ideas, who perhaps are not dependent on a county newspaper for their election to this House, or who have not their money invested in some little newspaper in their county or city, to put aside these considerations and look on a newspaper as it is—not merely as a commercial venture, but as a great educator—as one of the most powerful influences we have in the Dominion for the education and advancement of our people; and let us place in the hands of the people the best newspapers we can, which are undoubtedly the great newspapers published in the large cities.

Mr. D. D. ROGERS (Frontenac). It is quite evident that when the tax was first put upon newspapers it was done to prevent the abuse of the privilege granted to them. That tax, which was put in the shape of postage has had a good effect, we have derived quite a revenue from it, and I believe the people are very well pleased with it. I have heard very little complaint from any of the newspapers of the province of Ontario on account of it. We know that many of the large papers in the cities are wonderfully pressing for government pap.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROGERS. The other side is that many of them want the other fellows to get into power and give them big advertisements, some times at double what they are worth. Hon. gentlemen will remember the time the *Empire* was started, when the *Mail* was a grand independent paper. They will remember that \$250,000 or \$300,000 was subscribed in a few weeks to start the *Empire*, in opposition to the *Mail* when it was independent. In a couple of years that fund was exhausted. I am a reader of the *Montreal Star*; I have had it in my house for a number of years; and it obtained its great footing in Ontario when it was an independent paper. I have many clippings in my house taken from the *Star* at that time advocating Patron principles. The fact that it was an independent paper enabled it to find its way into the homes of many of the farmers of Ontario. I wish to say, in the interests of our local papers, that many farmers do not care to take too many papers, and as a general thing they want the local paper, because it gives the local news. If the circulation of the local papers were retarded or checked, it would be a very serious thing for them, because they could not get so many advertisements, and the more outside papers go to the farmers' homes, the worse it is for the local papers. The *Montreal Star* and other city papers are fine papers; but we know there is a great deal of useless matter in them, whereas the local papers are thoroughly read. The more the city papers circulate among the farmers, the more they tend to drive out

the local papers, and prevent them having the scope they otherwise would have. Then, the local paper has more independence, which we sadly need in this country. The larger papers are bitterly partisan, and it is not in the interest of the masses that they should displace the local papers. In my opinion the Postmaster General is perfectly justified in raising a revenue from newspaper postage. I am only sorry, so far as I am concerned, that he has reduced the rate from one-half cent a pound. I am sorry that he reduced the rate from one-half to one-eighth on newspapers circulated within the province of publication. That does not affect the local papers, that should particularly be encouraged for the better news they give. We have local papers that give commercial news as regularly as the *Star* and a day or two ahead of it.

Mr. CLARKE. I regret very much that the hon. the Postmaster General is not able to give the information necessary to ascertain in what way the revenue will be affected by the proposed alterations in the law. I understand, however, that, in round numbers, the total revenue derived from the distribution of the newspapers in the mails during the past year was some \$88,000. That is on the basis of half a cent a pound on the papers liable to this tax. If the intention of the government were to reduce the rate charged from one-half to one-eighth of a cent, the loss to the revenue would be \$60,000 to \$65,000. If we could ascertain from the hon. gentleman how much the revenue will lose by the proposed change, we will be able to arrive pretty accurately at the further loss the revenue will sustain if the suggestion of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) were adopted, but, unfortunately, we have not that information at hand. I venture to assert, however, that it would not involve a further loss of revenue of more than \$10,000 or \$15,000 at the very outside.

Mr. DAVIN. Not that.

Mr. CLARKE. And, in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman is making a reduction, that seems a very small amount. It is difficult to understand on what principle the taxation for the services rendered by the post office to the newspapers is based. The Postmaster General appears to be re-establishing the old system of charging by zones or areas and applying that only to newspapers and not to other mail matter. A county zone has been established, within which newspapers are distributed free, and the local press that has benefited by the present law is discharging a peculiar function to its locality that no provincial or Dominion paper can possibly discharge. And these local papers are not, because of their position, materially injured by the influx of provincial or Dominion papers into the districts which they serve. The local

papers have to be taken for the local news, which can never be supplied by papers that occupy the more pretentious position of provincial or Dominion journals. But, in addition to this county zone, the Postmaster General proposes to establish provincial zones, inside of which the provincial newspapers will be distributed at one-eighth of a cent, and a further zone, extending beyond the limits of the provinces, in which newspapers shall be charged postage at the rate of one-half cent per pound. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he knows that such a system of distribution of newspapers is in force in any other Post Office Department in the wide world? On the contrary, that system was abandoned long since, and the reintroduction of it is a blur on the administration of the hon. gentleman. Besides, our provinces are not at all of the same size. Take, for instance, the province of Prince Edward Island, which is not as large as some of the counties in Ontario and Quebec. The island is about 200 miles long, and, probably, 20 or 30 miles wide, and a newspaper published in it is circumscribed by that smaller provincial area just the same as newspapers published in the larger provinces. Why should not papers published in Prince Edward Island be permitted to circulate over as wide an area and at the same rate as those published in Ontario and Quebec? If the Postmaster General deems it sound policy to apply this principle of distribution by zones, charging a smaller fee for distributing newspapers in a definite area and a larger fee for their distribution in a larger area, why does he not apply that principle to the distribution of letters and postal cards and circulars? Again and again representations have been made to him by the great centres of population on the unfairness of charging drop letters in the cities the same price as letters mailed to the ends of the earth. It must appeal to the common sense of the committee, that if it is sound principle to charge on the scale of distances on newspapers, the same principle ought to apply, especially with regard to drop letters in the cities and towns. But, the Postmaster General has been obdurate, and so far we have not been able to convince him that it is unwise to continue charging on these drop letters a higher rate than they can be distributed at by private hands in the various cities of the Dominion.

Mr. WOOD. Who is responsible for making the drop letters pay two cents?

Mr. CLARKE. I presume the hon. gentleman is aware that the postage on drop letters was reduced some years ago and afterwards increased.

Mr. WOOD. By whom?

Mr. CLARKE. Because the revenues of the department were not as large as now, and the service cost more when a smaller number of drop letters were distributed.

But, with the vastly increased number of drop letters, the cost of distribution has been substantially reduced, and there is no reason why the people should not receive the relief and assistance in this respect that they are entitled to. I cannot understand on what principle the department is working in allowing local newspapers to be distributed free within an area of twenty or thirty miles, and charging one-eighth of a cent within the limits of the respective provinces, and one-half on the circulation beyond the confines of those provinces. That system does not obtain in any other postal service in the world, and I think, in view of the very slight further reduction that will be made in the revenues of the department, it would be well if the Postmaster General would see his way clear to adopt the suggestion, and either make the rate one-quarter of a cent per pound uniform, or make the rate of one-eighth of a cent apply generally. There would be practically no difference in revenue by adopting the suggestion of the hon. member for Assiniboia, and in view of the buoyant position of the revenue, newspaper proprietors might fairly ask the Postmaster General to make this concession.

Mr. BERGERON. I would ask my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), if he would be kind enough to put before the House the names of all papers that have been affected by this tax, and the amount paid by them respectively? That would enable us to calculate the difference between the price asked now and the one proposed by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron), asks that at a very late stage in the session.

Mr. BERGERON. I ask it when the Bill is before us.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But he asks for the details at a very late period of the session. I submit whether what he asks would be fair to the newspapers. A year ago, a motion was made in this House for a return, showing the amount of postage paid by each newspaper, and, it not appearing to me to be objectionable from a public point of view, I caused the return to be prepared and laid on the Table. But immediately afterwards I received communications from a number of publishers of newspapers complaining that the publicity so given, gave information to their opponents as to the state of their business, and they objected. But when a motion was made this session of the same character, I called attention to that objection, and the motion was not pressed. The hesitation I have in bringing down the information is simply for that reason. But, as I have said on a previous occasion, there would be no objection on the part of the

Mr. CLARKE.

department to allowing any member of the House, in confidence, access to the records, for his own guidance.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It was in answer to a question asked by me, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock), made the remark to which he refers.

Amendment (Mr. Davin) negatived. Yeas, 27; nays, 44.

Bill reported.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIN. I move, in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but it be referred back to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of amending the section substituted by section 3 of chapter 20 of the Statutes of 1898 for section 26, as amended by this present Bill, of the Post Office Act, by substituting in line 20 and 21, after the words 'fraction of,' in line 20, the words 'one-eighth' instead of 'one-half,' and to omit the following words: 'for transmission beyond the province or territory wherein they are published, and at the rate of 1 cent for each pound weight or any fraction of a pound weight for transmission within such province or territory,' inserted after the word 'weight' in the 23rd line.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). When the Bill was in committee I did not understand that that amendment was before us, until the vote was taken. I should be in favour of the amendment, were it not for the ridiculously low figure fixed by it. I take it by this amendment the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) gives expression to his opinion that the carriage of newspapers should be free—for one-eighth of a cent per pound is practically free. If the rate proposed by the hon. gentleman were one-quarter or one-half of a cent, I should be in favour of his proposition. The principle that I favour, is that there should be a poundage rate on newspapers, and that it should be uniform. I think that in committee we have struck a very bad principle in discussing how this measure would affect different newspapers and different businesses. The whole trouble, probably, arose from the fact that when the postage rate was charged against newspapers, a free zone was allowed the country newspapers. This made the city newspapers jealous; and I think that if the country newspapers have a right to a free local zone, the city newspapers are entitled to cheap provincial zone. If the amendment fixed the rate at one-quarter or one-half of a cent, I would be glad to support it.

The House divided on amendment (Mr. Davin):

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Beattie,	Kaulbach,
Bergeron,	Klock,
Blanchard,	Kloepfer,
Bourassa,	LaRivière,
Broder,	MacLaren,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McAlister,

Clarke,  
Cochrane,  
Corby,  
Davin,  
Ferguson,  
Foster,  
Gilmour,  
Guillet,  
Haggart,  
Henderson,  
Hodgins,  
Ingram,

Martin,  
Monet,  
Moore,  
Morin,  
Poupore,  
Powell,  
Quinn,  
Seagram,  
Sproule,  
Taylor,  
Wallace, and  
Wilson.—36.

**NAYS :**

**Messieurs**

Angers,  
Bazinet,  
Beith,  
Bell (Prince),  
Bernier,  
Blair,  
Borden (King's),  
Bourbonnais,  
Brodeur,  
Brown,  
Bruneau,  
Burnett,  
Calvert,  
Campbell,  
Casey,  
Champagne,  
Copp,  
Costigan,  
Cowan,  
Davies (Sir Louis),  
Dechene,  
Demers,  
Dobell,  
Edwards,  
Eilla,  
Fielding,  
Fisher,  
Fortier,  
Fraser (Guysborough),  
Fraser (Lambton),  
Frost,  
Gauvreau,  
Geoffrion,  
Gibson,  
Gould,  
Graham,  
Harwood,  
Hutchison,  
Johnston,  
Landerkin,

Lang,  
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),  
Legris,  
Livingston,  
Logan,  
Macdonald (Huron),  
Mackie,  
McGugan,  
McHugh,  
McIsaac,  
McLellan,  
McLennan (Inverness),  
McMullen,  
Madore,  
Marcil,  
Meigs,  
Mignault,  
Morrison,  
Mulock,  
Oliver,  
Parmalee,  
Paterson,  
Prcuix,  
Puttee,  
Ratz,  
Richardson,  
Rogers,  
Ross,  
Rutherford,  
Savard,  
Scriver,  
Semple,  
Sifton,  
Somerville,  
Stenson,  
Sutherland,  
Talbot,  
Tucker, and  
Wood.—79.

**PAIRS :**

**Ministerial.**

Davis,  
Tolmie,  
Snetsinger,  
Christie,  
Featherston,  
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),  
Charlton,  
Fitzpatrick,  
MacPherson,  
Macdonell,  
Penny,  
Belcourt,  
Britton,  
McMillan,  
Russell,  
Flint,  
Tarte,  
Fortin,

**Opposition.**

Hale,  
Montague,  
Reid,  
Roddick,  
Carscallen,  
Tupper (Sir Charles),  
Tisdale,  
Casgrain,  
Rosamond,  
Roche,  
Osler,  
Monk,  
Cargill,  
McDougall,  
Borden (Hallfax),  
Mills,  
Tupper (Sir Charles  
Hibbert),  
Chauvin,

**Ministerial.**

McGregor,  
Erb,  
Ethier,  
Maxwell,  
Domville,  
Hurley,  
McCarthy,  
Stubbs,  
Leduc,  
Bethune,  
Lemieux,  
Martineau,  
Desmarais,  
McClure,  
Doiglass,  
Pettet,  
Dyment,  
Heyd,  
Holmes,  
Archambault,  
Comstock,  
Lavergne,  
Gauthier,  
Bostock,

**Opposition.**

Prior,  
Hughes,  
Marcotte,  
Gillies,  
McCleary,  
Craig,  
Robertson,  
Robinson,  
McIntosh,  
Kendry,  
Dugas,  
Bell (Pictou).  
Pope,  
Bennett,  
Bell (Addington),  
McLennan (Glengarry),  
McCormick,  
Clancy,  
Ganong,  
McDonald (King's),  
McInerney,  
Earle,  
Maclean,  
McNeill,

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time, and passed.

**MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT.**

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden) moved that the order for the third reading of Bill (No. 155) to amend the Militia Act, be discharged, and that it be referred back to the committee.

Motion agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I desire to add two amendments to this Bill, and before proceeding to explain the amendments, I wish to say that I have had the advantage of discussing this Bill with several military gentlemen in the House, including the two hon. gentlemen opposite who for so many years occupied the position of Minister of Militia and Defence, with the result that an understanding has been come to with reference to the Bill. I agree with the views of those gentlemen that for the future it would be wiser to limit the appointments of honorary colonels and lieutenant-colonels, if any are made, to cases where it is desired to reward military men who have served with honour, and with distinction in the military service of this country, and I have undertaken that the regulations under which appointments of this kind have been made, shall be cancelled, and a new regulation issued in accordance with the statements that I have just made. With this preface—I propose the following amendments in order to make the Bill entirely workable. The first amendment that I propose is in the first section, line 8, to strike out the word 'the' and insert the words 'not below that,' between the words 'rank' and 'of' in the same line. That is to say, that whereas now the rank which a district commanding officer shall hold is

limited to lieutenant-colonel, under the Act as amended power will be taken to give him the rank of full colonel. This I think is very desirable in the case of officers like Colonel Otter and others, who have served a long time, and who are now approaching the age limit. Both on the ground of long and distinguished service and also because receiving the rank of full colonel will give them a longer tenure of office, I think power should be taken to confer the rank of full colonel upon these gentlemen.

Then in the second section I propose the following amendment: To strike out the words 'according to' and insert between the words 'and' and 'under' the words 'officers now on the retired list holding commissions as lieutenant-colonel may be promoted to the rank of colonel.' That is, power is taken to promote any deserving lieutenant-colonel now on the retired list to the rank of colonel on the retired list, without his having to return to the active militia in order to receive promotion. These are the amendments I propose. I may say that I have discussed them with the two gentlemen who have occupied the position that I now hold, and I think they meet with their approval.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (Three Rivers). The hon. gentleman is quite correct in saying that he consulted me, and I have no objection to what he has proposed. But I would like to draw his attention to one point which I consider important. The hon. gentleman is taking power to appoint colonels, and as an instance of merit he has named Colonel Otter. I think he is quite right. But there is one danger about that power. These positions are given to men who are deserving of them on account of long service. The title of honorary colonel, as I understand, in England is a title which confers as much honour on the regiment over which he holds the rank of honorary colonel, as it does upon the individual himself; that is to say, that nobody would think, in England, of appointing an individual to be a colonel except for services which would be looked upon as equivalent to military service, that is, valuable services rendered in the branch of public service to which he belongs. I merely rise for the purpose of suggesting to my hon. friend that if that list is going to be extended beyond proper limits, it will destroy the value of the appointment and the title given to the recipients of that honour. I may say that when I heard that a lot of gentlemen who are very deserving of every civil honour, but who had never seen any military service, were appointed honorary colonels and given the rank of full colonel, and allowed to go about the city of Montreal in military uniform without having served a day in any branch of the service, I thought it was a great mistake, and a mistake which is not to the credit of the military organization of Canada. Of course

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

the hon. gentleman promises to cancel that order, because it would never do that such honours as the commission of a full colonel should be given to civilians who have not served in the force. If it is not extended beyond proper limits, I would be disposed to give the necessary authority to the minister to give these commissions. But, if it is extended beyond the proper limits it would destroy the value of the position.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). The ex-Minister of Militia and Defence must be mistaken in the statement as to the granting of the rank of a full colonel. If I understood the hon. Minister of Militia rightly in his statement he said that no full colonels had been appointed at all. We looked up the Militia Act and we found that he had only power to make lieutenant-colonels. I drew his attention to the anomaly that there was no such rank in the English service as an honorary lieutenant-colonel at all. I understood from the hon. minister that these were only honorary lieutenant-colonels. I ask the hon. minister if his Bill or any other Bill gives him power to promote colonels to the rank of honorary lieutenant-colonels, and if so, has he promoted colonels to the rank of honorary colonels?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. HAGGART. And you do not intend to do so.

Mr. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). The point that the hon. gentleman raises is, that under the Queen's Regulations it was claimed that they had power to make honorary colonels, that they had it in England.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In reference to what the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) has said, I would point out to him that he is quite correct in saying that we have no power to create any officer higher than a substantive lieutenant-colonel, excepting in two cases, and therefore, in giving the honorary position, we were limited to the position of lieutenant-colonel because we had not the power. In nearly all cases we have made these officers honorary lieutenant-colonels. There is no power by this amendment to promote them, so far as I understand it. I suppose there would be another way in which it might be done in the case of military men. I do not think it should be done in reference to any other. In reference to what the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) has said, I now give the House the assurance that it is the intention of the government that the position shall not be given to any one who has not had long service and who has not distinguished himself in the position of lieutenant-colonel. That is the statement which I make here, and the government, I

am sure, will be governed by that statement. There is no desire on the part of anybody to reduce in importance a position of this kind. Possibly some of the appointments that have been made ought not to have been made, but I think, on the whole, the appointments that have been made do not reflect any discredit upon the militia. But, the principle will be changed in future and the positions will be given only as rewards to military men of long standing and to those military men who have distinguished themselves.

Mr. BERGERON. On what rule do you appoint civilians as lieutenant-colonels?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is given up. I do not wish to convey the idea that any of the appointments which have been made have cast discredit upon the militia, but I would like to know why a civilian should be made a colonel any more than a man should be made an archbishop, simply because he is a good man. I claim that the militia is a profession, like any other profession, and I claim that because a man may be a distinguished statesman it is no reason why he should be made a colonel any more than he should be made an admiral, or anything else. Such a practice as that only makes such appointments ridiculous. I saw a gentleman in Montreal who had more gold lace than Lord Roberts probably wears. He had never served a day in his life in any branch of the service, and yet he is a full lieutenant-colonel sporting his gold lace. I think he was present with the hon. Minister of Militia distributing the medals at the Arena in Montreal. At any rate, his uniform was quite new. It evidently had not been exposed to hard service in so far as I could judge, and he had more gold lace than probably Lord Roberts ever wears.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, he will permit me to say that in justice to the entire militia service of Canada, I cannot concur in the views expressed by him, the promoter of this Bill, as the object is, to my mind, wrong in principle. The idea of making honorary colonels or lieutenant-colonels out of civilians is wrong in principle. It should be confined strictly to the militia officers meriting promotion, and none other, but to permit any civilian without having acquired any knowledge of military training, or any prestige as a militiaman or a soldier, is, to my mind, an injustice to the officers and the militia service, who have been lifelong soldiers, and I consider it as well an injustice to the whole militia service of Canada. As was properly said, the government might as well introduce a Bill to make a civilian, without any knowledge of theology, an honorary bishop or archbishop, because of his money, his influence, or

political stripe. The principle, to my mind, is precisely the same as to make a civilian a lieutenant-colonel or colonel without any previous military rank or distinction as a soldier. Besides, I contend this Bill is contrary to the Queen's Regulations and Orders, inasmuch as it enables a civilian, if it become law, to leap in the dark into the position of lieutenant-colonel, over the heads of all majors, captains and lieutenants as well as over all officers of the staff, thus ignoring all real officers meriting reward or promotion as good soldiers who have borne the burden and heat of the day, and bestowing rank and honours on parties unworthy of honours or positions of this sort, not being military men, but only recognized for their political cast without any merit or military training. The Queen's Regulations require that no officer shall take precedence of his neighbour, unless by consent or unless he is an efficient officer. Unless an officer has been derelict in his duty it should not be in the power of the department to appoint another over his head. I say military titles should be left to military men. I do not object to the lieutenant-colonels who are holding commissions in the active militia, or who have retired and are on the reserve list, receiving the honorary rank of colonel, but I do object to those who have never taken any interest in military service at all and who were never attached to any corps of the service having this honorary rank bestowed upon them over the heads of others. I, myself, have been in the active militia and holding a commission for nearly twenty years as lieutenant-colonel in command of the 75th Regiment, having risen gradually from a lieutenant and adjutant to the command of the regiment, and spent much valuable time and means in the service to have it efficient, and in referring to myself as a lieutenant-colonel. I do most strongly object to the principle involved in this Bill in giving priority to parties in no way deserving of a rank or title of this sort. In doing so I am fully convinced I express the sentiments of my brother officers, who will be only too willing to concur in the views I have thus submitted, that the passage of an Act of this sort would be not only an act of injustice to all militia officers, but a serious injury to the entire militia service of Canada.

On these grounds, I do not feel justified in concurring in the appointments that have already been made. If this law is to take effect only from to-day, then I want an explanation from the minister as to what is to become of the colonels who have already been appointed without any legal authority, on the part of the minister. My hon. friend beside me, says that the appointments have only been of lieutenant-colonels, but I suppose this Bill means that those appointed as lieutenant-colonels will now receive the rank of colonels.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. KAULBACH. I offer these remarks to the House, in support of the position taken by majors, captains, lieutenants, and staff officers of our militia, who have communicated to me their objections against this proposal. If the appointments that have been made are not to continue, save in certain exceptions, it is all right; otherwise, I object.

Mr. TISDALE. There seems to be some confusion in the minds of hon. gentlemen as to what this Bill is. I state now that I concur in the amendment which the minister has made to the Bill to-day. When there is nothing in the Militia Act bearing on a question, the Queen's Regulations apply, and the minister acting under the impression that the Militia Act did not forbid him appointing lieutenant-colonels. My personal opinion is that the Militia Department had not that authority, because the Militia Act does speak of the officers who should be appointed. The minister further tells us that he will repeal that order and not act under that authority again. That settles that question. The minister can only do two things under this Bill, as it is now. First, in retiring an officer from the active militia to the retired list, he can make him an honorary colonel; and second, an officer who has been retired with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, can be made an honorary colonel. That is all there is to it. The objections to the original Bill have been removed by this amendment, and so far as the law is confined to military men, it will be satisfactory to the militia of Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. The Bill goes further, and it allows the government to promote the honorary lieutenant-colonels to be full colonels.

Mr. TISDALE. No.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It refers to men who have actually served and who have earned their commissions.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In order to make progress, and to relieve the feelings of my hon. friends on the other side, I will resign my commission.

Mr. DOBELL. I am perfectly willing to follow the example of my right hon. friend, if it will expedite business.

Mr. KAULBACH. It is my personal wish that the right hon. gentleman should retain his honorary colonelcy, and I am sure there will be no objection so far as he is concerned. I have had correspondence from officers in the active militia, objecting to the Bill which was originally introduced; but having had explanations from the hon. gen-

Mr. KAULBACH.

tleman (Mr. Borden), and the other members of the government, I am satisfied to let the matter remain as it is.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

#### SUPPLY—THE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, ST. JOHNS, P.Q.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DOMINIQUE MONET (Laprairie and Napierville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is carried, I wish to call the attention of the government to the conduct of Mr. H. W. Wood, collector of customs at St. Johns, in the province of Quebec.

For over a month some newspapers have published in their columns certain charges which have become of public notoriety and which are attributed to Mr. Wood. In its issue of the 25th of June last, the *Canada Français*, of St. John, reproduced those charges in these words:

Thanks, Mr. Wood.

We have learned, of late, a very edifying story, and one which speaks volumes as to the feelings of Doctor Wood, collector of customs in this city, towards the French Canadians.

It was at the time of the students' disturbances in Montreal, and the valorous doctor who has undoubtedly a good deal of leisure time, outside of his official duties, was discussing the merits of the Transvaal war, at the Grand Trunk station, when finding himself nonplused, he gave utterance to these words which show what kind feelings he entertains towards us:

'In 1837, he said, the British hung several French Canadians; well, they ought to have hanged them 'all; so we would be rid of the whole breed.'

Brave words these, coming from the doctor!

Therefore, we think we are voicing the feeling of all the French Canadians of this city in conveying our best thanks to Mr. Wood for his kind remarks addressed to our race.

Decidedly, we have very warm friends among the British Tories. How kindly these people feel towards us!

At all events, men cannot help experiencing a strange feeling when they meet on the street one of these gentlemen whose very look and smile reminds one of Radcliffe, and who seems to say: 'There goes a fool whom a slip-knot would fit better than a sailor's knot!'

Really, it makes one's blood run cold.

Now, in order to show that the matter was brought to the notice of the community, outside of St. Johns, let me quote from a Montreal paper, *La Patrie*, of the 26th June, which published the following article under the heading: 'Is it True.'

We are informed that a serious complaint has been made to the Minister of Customs against Dr. Wood, collector of the department at St. Johns, Quebec. If the facts brought to the knowledge of Hon. Mr. Paterson are true it becomes his duty to dismiss this officer without delay.

Mr. Wood is accused of having declared in a public place in the presence of several people that the English authorities in 1837 should have hung high and dry all the French Canadians, and if this rigorous measure had been adopted Canada to-day would have been freed from this pitiful breed.' Mr. Wood is a public servant, paid by the money of the French Canadians as well as by the English, and we repeat that if it is true that he used this outrageous language he should not be allowed to remain in the public service five minutes longer.

We hope that Mr. Wood will be able to refute the accusation laid against him, but if it is proven we trust that the Minister of Customs will not be slow to act.

Mr. Wood, realizing that he was accused in the way I have just stated, undertook to reply to his accusers in the columns of the *News* of St. Johns, in a letter which he signed in his quality of collector of customs. That letter which bears the date of the 28th was published in that paper, and it runs as follows:—

To the editor of the 'News.'

Sir,—After reading the cowardly attack made upon me in a recent number of the 'Canada Français,' of this town, and the exaggerated statement in 'La Patrie,' of the 26th instant, it becomes necessary for me to place myself in a proper light before those people whose respect I covet.

Living in a community where one-half of the citizens at least are Boer sympathizers, who have talked treason every day since the war in South Africa began, and have gloated over every misfortune that has befallen the British arms, it is not to be wondered that a man, who was born a loyal British subject, and has continued to remain so for more than half a century, should become enraged at continually hearing disloyal utterances.

After hearing one of these Boer sympathizers say that the government had no right to send men to South Africa; that our brave soldier boys had no business there, and that he hoped they would all be shot, and that not one of them would ever return, I made the remark to him that the British hung several like him in 1837, and that they ought to have hanged more.

Now, if the 'cap fits' the editor of the 'Canada Français,' or any others who read this, he or they are at liberty to put it on.

My remark was intended for such men as the Boer sympathizers above mentioned, and not for such men as Major Pelletier, Dr. Fiset and the other brave French Canadian boys who went to South Africa; whose actions have been such that all loyal British subjects are justly proud of them.

In conclusion, I may say that I have been a civil servant for more than ten years, and have been sober and attentive to my business, and have not defrauded the government to the value of a farthing, and if under these circumstances the government sees fit to dismiss me from the service because I am loyal and have lived up to the oath of allegiance which I have taken, and am unwilling to listen to disloyal talk without protesting against it, I must submit, but I shall not hang my head in shame, nor be obliged to seek a refuge in a foreign country.

Yours, etc.,

H. W. WOOD,

Collector of Customs.

St. John, June 28, 1800.

As a matter of fair-play, and in justice to Mr. Wood, I deemed it my duty to read that letter in English before giving a translation of it; and I have endeavoured to make that translation as literal as possible.

The *Montreal Gazette* has partly reproduced the articles which I have just brought to the notice of the House, and I find, in this morning's *Citizen* Mr. Wood's letter reproduced under the heading:

#### A PLUCKY CIVIL SERVANT.

He is not afraid of Tarte and his disloyal organ.

Now, this is the question I want to put to the government: Does the government think, from the letter which Mr. Wood has written to the *News* of St. Johns, on the 28th of June last, that he has shown that he can be impartial enough in the discharge of his duties to be maintained in his position? I hold that he has not; and moreover, I think the intention of our constitution in forbidding civil servants to take an active part in politics aims only at securing that impartiality which all those who are connected with the government of the country ought to show in the discharge of their duties. Todd, in dealing with the matter, says that it is a well known rule of constitutional government that all public officials should abstain from participating in active politics, by remaining absolutely neutral in that regard.

Now, as to Mr. Wood's reply to that man Poitevin, a poor labourer—for he is the man referred to in his letter of the 25th June—I understand perfectly well that the utterances of that man, unwarrantable and inhuman as they were, were such a provocation to the just feelings of Mr. Wood, namely, his desire to see the British arms prevail in South Africa, that I could easily forgive him for having replied to Poitevin in the way he did. But I think he should not have gone beyond that, and he should have refrained from making an attack upon the French Canadians and using such outrageous language with regard to the patriots of 1837. However, it is not that altercation between Poitevin and Wood which is the ground of my complaint. The subject of my complaint is that he wrote a letter to the *News*, in which he reiterates his charge and declares that the Boer sympathizers are all traitors to their country. 'Living,' he says, 'in a community where one-half at least of the citizens are Boer sympathizers, who talk treason every day, it is not to be wondered at that a man should become enraged at hearing such utterances.'

As I said, can a civil servant living in the midst of a population where one-half of the citizens are Boer sympathizers be impartial in the discharge of his duties when he has to deal every day with matters in which French Canadians are interested, when, I say, he has to render justice to a French

Canadian whose father he says the British ought to have hanged in 1837; can that civil servant under such circumstances administer equal justice to all alike, French and English? As I understand it, the only reason why public officials are forbidden to engage actively in politics is to secure the most absolute impartiality in the administration of public affairs. Now, can it be said that Mr. Wood, as collector of customs, is unbiassed and impartial? I emphatically say that he is not; but he pleads provocation, saying that he was enraged at the utterances of Boer sympathisers. But it must be borne in mind that with the exception of the case of that man Poitevin, he does not point out a single other case of any man having used such offensive language as that he complains of. Now, in his letter he states that one-half of the population of the city of St. Johns are Boer sympathisers and talk treason every day.

Let me ask the House here whether the French Canadians in the province of Quebec or throughout the country have not the right to sympathise with the Boers and to hold the views held in Great Britain by Englishmen? As a matter of fact, I do not know whether one-half or ninety-nine per cent of the population in the city of St. Johns are Boer sympathisers or not. But I may say one thing and I speak knowingly, as I have occasion to go down there every week to attend to my professional business before the courts. I know that a great many French Canadians were opposed to that war, being of the opinion that there was no just cause for it; they were also opposed to our participating in that war and to our contributing men or money towards it; but I do not know of any other individual besides that poor man, Poitevin, who can harbour such an inhuman sentiment as to hope that all our soldiers sent to South Africa would be shot. As I said, that altercation between that man and Wood is not the ground of my complaint, because the latter was acting under provocation; but what I have reason to complain of is when he states in his letter that one-half of the citizens of St. Johns who are Boer sympathisers are traitors to the British Crown. Are Morley, Bryce, Clarke, and many other British statesmen to be branded as traitors for having publicly declared that the war now being waged in South Africa was an unjust war? Does the 'stop the war committee' which has been started in Great Britain, speak in different tones from the language used by those French Canadians who are Boer sympathisers? Why, Sir, was it not out of sympathy with the Boers that 125 members in the British House of Commons voted against the war subsidies? Did ever Mr. Wood dream of sending over to England a halter to have all those Englishmen hanged who think and talk just as some French Canadians do?

Mr. MONET.

We have had enough of these heated appeals to prejudices; we have had enough of these race and creed wrangles and of that campaign of hatred conducted by certain newspapers and politicians in the province of Ontario and in other English-speaking provinces against the French Canadian population. When the newspapers are the initiators of such agitation, we have to put up with it; but when such appeals come from a salaried public official, from a man whose salary is paid out of the money of the French Canadians as well as the money of the English, it cannot be tolerated, and if the government indirectly shields that official, they will be held responsible for his insults to our race.

As to the insulting reference made by Mr. Wood to the patriots of 1837, I may say that never did a man use language which was more offensive to the population of St. Johns. The city of St. Johns and all the neighbouring country, and as a matter of fact the whole district witnessed the events of 1837. The population now living in the district of Iberville and in the neighbouring parishes is nearly entirely composed of descendants of the men who took an active part in the events of 1837 and 1838, and we are all proud to descend from the patriots of those times. That country is still reeking with the blood shed by our ancestors in the battles fought in that portion of the country. Now, as Mr. Wood is an old citizen, claiming as he does that he has been a British citizen for over half a century, he should have realized how offensive was his language, under the circumstances, when attacking the French Canadians of 1837.

Mr. Speaker, there may be a difference of opinion as to the events of 1837 considered from a religious standpoint; and as Catholic divines hold that rebellion is practically unwarrantable under any circumstances, even when directed against a tyrant, we have to leave it to the Almighty judge of the oppressors and their victims to settle that side of the question. For our part, all we have to do is to consider the generous sacrifices of the men who laid down their lives and shed their blood for securing to us responsible government. If they were human, in so far as they failed in their efforts, they rank as demigods owing to the magnitude of their sacrifices and we cherish their memory, for the sacred inheritance they have bequeathed to us.

There is no difference of opinion as to the generosity of the sacrifices made by the patriots of 1837, and Mr. Wood knew perfectly well how deep a wound he was inflicting when using such outrageous language. But, as he said, the patriots of 1837 have not all been hung, and although there are but few men left who bear the names of those who died on the scaffold, and although but few Papineaus have been spared, still, thanks be to God, there are enough broad-

hearted men left in the province of Quebec and in the other provinces who resent the attack made against our race and who will never put up with insults such as were hurled against us by Mr. Wood.

Again, I ask, have the French Canadians in this country less rights than their English-speaking fellow-countrymen? At the very moment when the citizens of the city of Toronto are erecting a monument to the memory of William Lyon Mackenzie, the chief rebel of 1837, in Upper Canada, is it becoming on the part of certain Englishmen to throw mud at the French Canadian patriots of 1837, and to insult the memory of those men who have bequeathed us the political freedom which fanatics are now using against us?

I think I am but echoing the voice of the citizens of St. Johns, in protesting here against Mr. Wood's letter, and I ask the government to inquire without delay into the circumstances which preceded and accompanied the publication of that letter. If the charges laid against Mr. Wood are proven, I ask the government to dismiss him.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation.) As my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is not familiar with the French language he has asked me to reply to my hon. friend from Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Monet), and I think it would be more proper that I should give my answer in English.

Mr. Speaker, the matter which has just been brought before the House by my hon. friend from Napierville (Mr. Monet) is one which, up to two days ago, was altogether unknown to the Government, as no complaint had been made against the official in question. It appears that an altercation took place in March last between Mr. Wood, collector of customs at St. Johns, Que., and a man named Potvin, who, I believe, is an employee of one of the railways in the same city. A discussion arose between them in connection with the troubles which had taken place one or two days before in Montreal in regard to the students of Laval University. Mr. Potvin, as I understand the matter, stated that, in his opinion, the government had no reason whatever to send the contingents to South Africa, and he desired for his part that they should all be killed. Mr. Wood is said to have retorted, that the British government had hanged several French Canadians in 1837 and 1838, and that it was a pity that more of the same race had not been hanged. My hon. friend from Napierville very properly said, and I am glad to repeat his statement, that he attached no importance whatever to this altercation nor to the language uttered by Mr. Wood, reprehensible as it was, under the circumstances; but the subject of the complaint of my hon. friend is, that Mr. Wood afterwards wrote a letter to the press, and, therefore, acted deliberately,

in which he repeated what he had said before, that it was a pity that more French Canadians had not been hanged in 1837.

Mr. FOSTER. Was not that drawn out rather by the article in *La Patrie*?

The PRIME MINISTER. The first article appeared in *Le Canada Français*, and was reproduced in *La Patrie*. But, Mr. Wood repeated, and rather gloried in the statement, that for his part he was sorry that more French Canadians were not hanged in 1837. I do not hesitate to say—and I am sure I voice the feelings of every man in this House—that such a sentiment expressed by any citizen of Canada in this year 1900 is certainly most unfortunate, and in a public official, most reprehensible. Mr. Wood might have remembered that there were not only French Canadians hanged in 1837, but also English Canadians, who, like many French Canadians, took up arms, not with the object of separating Canada from the British Crown, but simply to vindicate the rights which are the privilege of every born British subject. I would prefer that at this time we cast a veil over those events, and act rather in the spirit of the Toronto city council, which, at this moment, as I understand, is erecting a monument to the memory of the chief rebel of 1837 in Upper Canada, William Lyon Mackenzie, whom the judgment of the people of Canada has long proclaimed as one of the fathers of Canadian liberty. I can say with equal truth that the Canadian people are of opinion that those who fought for the same cause in Lower Canada were also the fathers of Canadian liberty; and now that we enjoy the fruits of the seed then sown with so much misery, I am sure that we all agree that it is most unfortunate that any man, especially a civil servant, should recall, in a spirit of hostility to the French race, the events of that day. There is one thing, however, to be said in favour of Mr. Wood; that is, that he pleads provocation. He has a right to be heard and to have his full conduct inquired into, and it would not do for the government at this moment to offer any opinion as to whether he is guilty or not guilty. Though I, for my part, very severely repudiate and denounce the language he has used, we know that language, which is unfortunate and reprehensible, may sometimes have, not justification, but some excuse. It would not do for the government, which has to hold even the scales of justice between all parties, to pronounce any opinion on the matter at this moment, and I am sure the hon. member who brought it to the attention of the House does not wish that either. In fact, he concluded by asking that Mr. Wood's conduct be investigated.

Mr. BERGERON. No, he asked that Wood be dismissed.

Mr. MONET. If found guilty.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. That may follow or not, according to what we find as to the language used by Mr. Wood, which I think everybody must admit was most reprehensible and offensive, and such as could not be tolerated in a free country like this. At the same time, Mr. Wood has a right to say that he was acting under provocation, and to present his views before the government take any action. I will simply say that it will be the duty of the government to look into the matter very carefully; and I may add, in conclusion, that I do hope that henceforth we all endeavour to live in peace. Though Mr. Wood said he was living in a community where half the people were Boer sympathizers, yet, there is no one living in St. Johns, or in French Canada or in English Canada—because there are some who believe, like Mr. Bryce, Mr. Morley and others in England, that the war was unjust—there is no man in Canada who could harbour such a horrible sentiment as to hope that all our soldiers sent to South Africa would be killed. That would be a most inhuman sentiment, which I repudiate with all the power I am capable of, and which has also been repudiated by my hon. friend from Napierville. But when, unfortunately that unfortunate occurrence in St. Johns has arisen, it behoves the government to approach it without fear, without favour, and with the intention of giving justice wherever justice may be due.

Mr. **HENRI BOURASSA** (Labelle). The Prime Minister has treated this question in the spirit that should prevail in the inquiry which the government propose to hold; and I think it is very important, in order that the matter should be dealt with properly, that the facts should be stated exactly as they are. As my hon. friend from Laprairie and Napierville has properly said, the accusation which he brought is not based upon the personal quarrel that took place between a man named Wood, a collector of customs, and a man named Potvin, an employee of some railway company. The important fact is that, after a month had elapsed after the quarrel took place, when there was no provocation possible and no question of anger or personal feeling at the moment, the collector of customs, signing his name as such, deliberately wrote a letter in which he said that all people sympathizing with the Boers were traitors and should be hanged, just as the men who fought for liberty in 1837 should have been hanged.

Mr. **BEATTIE**. He did not say that.

Mr. **CRAIG**. He did not say that.

Mr. **BOURASSA**. He said it in so many words:

Living in a community where one-half of the citizens at least are Boer sympathizers, who have talked treason every day since the war in South Africa began, and have gloated over every misfortune that has befallen the British arms,

Mr. **MONET**.

it is not to be wondered that a man who was born a loyal British subject, and has continued to remain so for more than half a century, should become enraged at continually hearing disloyal utterances.

Then, further down:

My remark was intended for such men as the Boer sympathizer above mentioned, and not for such men as Major Pelletier, Dr. Fiset and the other brave French Canadian boys who went to South Africa.

Therefore, in that gentleman's opinion, the people of Canada are divided between those who believe in our sending Canadians to fight British battles in South Africa, and those who do not believe in the justice of the British cause and in Canada taking any part in that war. The latter he declares to be disloyal, and the former the only loyal people in the Dominion. If all those who are opposed to this African war should be hanged, that would give a great deal of work to Radcliffe or the regiment of hangmen whom the government would be obliged to employ, since in St. Johns City alone more than half of the people think exactly as we do. Leaving aside the small question under discussion, I am very glad indeed to have this occasion of pointing out that a man who favours the intervention of Canada in the war is obliged to admit in a public document that, in the particular locality in the province of Quebec where he resides, more than half the people think and speak exactly in the same way as a few members of this House have had the courage to think and to speak. There can, therefore, be no doubt as to the offence committed by Mr. Wood in that letter. If we refer to some years ago, I think the members from the province of Ontario will recollect that a gentleman by the name of Myer, who was either a county attorney or held some other office under the Ontario government, was dismissed because he spoke in favour of annexation. Well, if it is a public offence for a civil servant to speak in favour of a political change for the whole Dominion, it must be a far greater offence to the whole community to say that men who speak and think in the same way as many thousands do in that community as well as in England and Scotland, should be denounced as traitors and hanged. And this public official has increased his offence by publishing letters which are reproduced by Tory organs, accompanied by compliments on him as being a plucky civil servant who is not afraid to defy the sentiments of a large portion of the community. The offence in his case is far greater than in Myer's case, because it is directed against the feelings and sentiments of a large portion of our people, and is, therefore, a position hostile to our nationality, taken by a public servant.

I am anxious that Mr. Wood should enjoy the same liberty as any other man in this country. I am too much a lover of

liberty and freedom of speech to maintain that a public servant has not the right to think and talk freely on any question. But as long as it is contended that public servants, being appointed and paid by the whole community, comprising all classes and all nationalities, and all political parties, have no right to take part in political discussions; when an example has been set by the Ontario government, who laid down the principle that a civil servant has not the right to be an annexationist; surely a public officer should not have the right to say that at least a million and a half of people, who are as loyal as any other people in the country, should be hanged because they differ in opinion from that of the apparent majority of this country on the question of the South African war. The offence committed by Mr. Wood, I contend, is far greater than that committed by Mr. Myer, and for which Mr. Myer was dismissed. If a man is to be dismissed from a public office, who takes an active side with either political party in this country, surely a public servant who thus denounces a large number of our people, and even goes the length of saying that so many loyal subjects should be hanged, should not be allowed to go scot-free.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I think that the manner in which my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) has spoken emphasizes the necessity for very great care, that care which the right hon. the Prime Minister himself promises he will take before any judgment is delivered at all in this matter. The hon. gentleman has generalized very widely upon the assertion, which, it appears, was made by Mr. Wood. As I understand it from the newspaper, Mr. Wood was told by Mr. Potvin, in the course of a very heated discussion, that Canada had no business in sending troops to South Africa, and expressed the hope that every Canadian who went to fight Britain's battles in that country would be shot, to which Mr. Wood replied that the man who made that statement and other men who talked like him ought to be hanged, and that it would have been well if the government had hanged many more than they did who held such sentiments. That is a very different thing from being simply a Boer sympathizer.

Mr. MONET. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, Mr. Wood plainly said that he did not refer exclusively to Mr. Potvin, but that he was living in a community where thousands of the citizens were Boer sympathizers, and talking treason every day. He does not address himself to Mr. Potvin particularly, but says that if the cap fits the editor of *Le Canada Français*, or any other gentleman who reads his letter, they are at liberty to put it on.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite so. There is no occasion for any heat in the matter at all,

and the hon. gentleman who introduced it spoke without heat, and the right hon. the Prime Minister as well; but I was sorry to hear the generalization made by the last speaker, because I do not think it is warranted, and I wish to make that matter clear, as we all must admit that there is need to proceed in a matter like his with the absolute truth.

Mr. Wood said further, as reported:

Living in a community where one-half of the citizens at least are Boer sympathizers, who have talked treason every day since the war in South Africa began and gloated over every misfortune that has befallen British arms, it is not to be wondered that a man who was born a loyal British subject, and has continued to remain so for more than half a century, should become enraged at continually hearing disloyal utterances.

The hon. member for Labelle admits that the majority are Boer sympathizers, and proceeding further, Mr. Wood says:

After hearing one of these Boer sympathizers say that the government had no right to send men to South Africa; that our brave soldier boys had no business there, and that he hoped they would all be shot, and that not one of them would ever return.

I made the remark to him—

That is, not to a Boer sympathizer, but to one who had said that our brave boys had no business in South Africa, and he hoped they would all be shot—

I made the remark to him that the British hung several like him in 1837, and they ought to have hanged more.

More what? More like him—that is more like the man who would say that our brave soldier boys had no business in South Africa, and he hoped they would all be shot.

Mr. BOURASSA. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), allow me—

Mr. FOSTER. No, I think I shall get through better this way. The mistake that the hon. member for Labelle made, was that he generalized upon a statement made to Mr. Potvin, and spoke of it as applying to all French Canadians. That is doing violence to the statement as it appears in the paper. I want to call attention to that as emphasizing the necessity for us all holding our opinions back until we know exactly what the circumstances were, what the provocation was, and what was said. Then, I am sure that justice, and nothing more than justice will be done. It is a case that ought to be treated very carefully. We do not want such cases to multiply, if we can help it; and we should treat them in as calm a manner as we possibly can, and not go any further than the exact utterances that we have to deal with.

Mr. BOURASSA. But the men who were hanged in 1837 did not desire that the soldiers going to South Africa in 1900 should

be shot. Therefore, if he wanted men like them hanged, he wanted men hanged, loyal British subjects, who demanded only British liberty in this country.

Mr. N. CLARKE WALLACE (West York). I have seldom heard such a gross misrepresentation of any man's case as has been made here, more particularly by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). He has misconstrued the language, and, I am sorry to say that the right hon. First Minister has done the same. What did the First Minister say? He said, and he repeated it three times, that Mr. Wood had stated that several more French Canadians ought to be hanged. Mr. Wood made no such statement. What Mr. Wood said, was:

After hearing one of these Boer sympathizers—

Referring, presumably, to Mr. Potvin—

—say that the government had no right to send men to South Africa—

That is the next thing.

—that our brave soldier boys had no business there, and he hoped they would all be shot and that not one of them would ever return—

That was the beautiful expression that the First Minister had not the slightest tone of condemnation for, and that the hon. member for Labelle condones and justifies.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have never justified that.

Mr. WALLACE. And misrepresents the man who objected to this expression.

Mr. BOURASSA. I think I have a right to raise a point of order. I never justified the language of Mr. Potvin, and the Prime Minister has condemned it.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) did not justify it, he condemned the man who censured such vile, outrageous language.

Mr. SPEAKER. In the face of the declaration made by the hon. member for Labelle, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace), is bound to accept the statement.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa), did not mention Potvin's name, but what he did was to condemn the man who censured such vile and outrageous utterances. And now they are to have a trial, they tell us, to have this man punished. I would like to see them punish a man in this country for using loyal language, a man who has not said what the First Minister imputed to him—

The PRIME MINISTER. I imputed no language to Mr. Wood, because I had not his language under my eye. I was speaking of what had been quoted as his language.

Mr. BOURASSA.

Mr. WALLACE. If the First Minister had had Mr. Wood's statement in his hand, he would not have made the statement he did make. But he stated three times—and *Hansard* will show it—that Mr. Wood had said that several more French Canadians ought to be hanged, and that that was outrageous language for Mr. Wood to use. He used no such language.

Mr. BOURASSA. He wrote it.

Mr. WALLACE. No, he did not. I have his letter here. This man Potvin had said that our brave soldier boys had no business in South Africa, and he hoped they would all be shot, and none of them return. He said nothing about French Canadians, or men of any other nationality. And, I think the man who utters such language as this of Potvin's, if he be a Canadian citizen, or a British subject, should be put upon his trial, instead of a man who stood up loyally for the country, or for the soldiers whom the government sent out to fight our battles. All Mr. Wood said was that the British had hanged men like him in 1837, and they ought to have hanged more of them. The right hon. First Minister compared them to William Lyon Mackenzie, whom he spoke of as one of the fathers of Canadian liberty. He was a man who made a bargain to hand this country over to the United States, a rebel, a man who did not follow constitutional methods, as was done in other provinces for the redress of grievances, but was trying to cause bloodshed, and did cause bloodshed, in this country. In my opinion the language of Mr. Wood was very moderate. He made no attack on the French Canadians.

Mr. BOURASSA. He spoke of Boer sympathizers.

Mr. WALLACE. He made no attack on Boer sympathizers even. The attack he made was on the man who said that he hoped our brave soldiers would all be shot, and that none of them would return.

An hon. MEMBER. Read it.

Mr. WALLACE. I will read it, and I will not misrepresent it, as was done by the hon. member for Labelle, and the hon. member for Napierville and Laprairie.

Mr. BOURASSA. In what way did I misrepresent it?

Mr. SPEAKER. To say that an hon. member has misrepresented, is not a parliamentary expression, and I trust the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) will avoid such expressions.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to have some word that expresses it better. I say that the man who was guilty of such vile, treasonable utterances as that, is the man to be condemned, and not the man who

resents it. Now, let us read the second paragraph :

Living in a community where one-half of the citizens are Boer sympathizers, who have talked treason every day since the war in South Africa began, and have gloated over every misfortune that has befallen the British arms, it is not to be wondered at.

I hope it is not true that half of this community referred to are Boer sympathizers. I should regret it very much, that when Canada arose as one man to the defence of the empire and to the resistance of invasion of British soil by these Boers, that there should be any community in Canada one-half of whose citizens sympathized with this attack on the empire. I say that it would be a matter of very great regret if it were true. I hope there is not a word of truth in it, but the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Monet) says 'hear, hear.' He is delighted to think that it is true. Here is the reply he makes to those who are Boer sympathizers :

It is not to be wondered that a man who was born a loyal British subject, and has continued to remain so for more than half a century, should become enraged at continually hearing disloyal utterances.

This is the reply that he did make. He says that he had become enraged at the continually hearing these disloyal utterances. What loyal man would not? Would the right hon. First Minister be pleased to hear such statements as those made in his presence? Would the members of the government, who have declared their loyalty, be pleased at hearing the utterances of Potvin, or would they be enraged as Mr. Wood was enraged at hearing disloyal utterances all around him? That was the only language that could be applied to persons who are Boer sympathizers who wished that our brave Canadian soldiers would be shot and that none of them would return to Canada. Mr. Wood said that such men as he were hanged in 1837, and that they ought to have hanged more. They are going to try this gentleman for this offence. The First Minister says that these utterances of his are most reprehensible and most improper. He says that his language was offensive, reprehensible, and such as should not be tolerated. The First Minister says that he had not the letter in his hand. I presume that he had not read it, or that, if he had read it, he had forgotten it. I do not see where that letter is offensive, reprehensible, or such as should not be tolerated. The First Minister condemns it. He says: We will give this officer a trial, but we ought to punish him, because his language is reprehensible, offensive, and such as should not be tolerated. This reminds me very much of an old Dutch magistrate, who tried a case and said: I have heard all of the evidence, I will take two weeks to consider my verdict, and after

that I will fine the defendant \$5 and costs. That appears to be the course mapped out for Mr. Wood. We will look with a great deal of interest for the result, so as to see what punishment Mr. Wood receives for having said that a man who uttered such disloyal and such disgraceful language as that used by this Mr. Potvin, an agent for some railway, ought to be called to account. Apparently by his smiles that language meets with the approval of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa).

Mr. BOURASSA. Not at all; neither apparently nor otherwise.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman can get up and misstate what Mr. Wood said, but he has not a word of censure for what Potvin said. If a man used such language as that, and if others used such language as they are said to have used, we should see that the liberty which is given to the people of Canada is not turned into license and employed for the perpetration of such foul language within the Dominion.

Motion (Mr. Fielding) agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

It being Six o'clock, the committee took recess.

#### AFTER RECESS.

(The House resumed in Committee.)

Department of Public Works—Increase to T.

F. MacLaughlin, second-class clerk ..... \$100

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). This gentleman has been in the Public Works branch for many years. He has had no increase for four years, and has been highly recommended by Mr. Ewart, the architect. I desire to add these words: 'Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' The Auditor General objects to paying any vote of this kind for over \$50.

Public buildings—Ottawa military buildings, new store (revote, \$19,000)..... \$25,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a new building for military stores which is being erected in rear of the drill shed on Cartier Square. We discussed it a few evenings ago in the supplementaries. At present the Department of Militia and Defence occupies some premises that are to be taken possession of for the purpose of a central railway station. A year ago parliament authorized this work, and it is under construction now. It will be ready within about a year, and will cost \$50,000. Nothing so far has been paid, because the first estimate has not yet come in. The contractor is Mr. Bourque, who was the lowest tenderer.

Harbours and rivers, Manitoba—St. Andrew's Rapids, Red River (revote)..... \$125,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Last session parliament voted a certain sum, and specifications and plans were prepared and tenders invited. They came in late this spring, and in the meantime the government had decided to incorporate the fair-wages principle in the construction of these works, and accordingly new tenders were invited, and the advertisement is now current. Tenders will not be due until the 20th of this month. The engineer estimates that it will cost half a million dollars to complete this work, and that it will take two or three years. I would not like to give a more exact estimate, because the matter is now before the public for tenders. Tenders for the whole work are now being called for.

Mr. BERGERON. What is to be the advantage of this work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is going to provide navigation over a stretch of unnavigable water between Lake Winnipeg and the city of Winnipeg. It is going to make a large country tributary to the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. SPROULE. What number of feet of navigation do you hope to get after that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About ten feet.

Transportation facilities—

Lévis graving dock—Lengthening dock (revote) .....	\$ 85,000
Montreal Harbour (lower division)—Improvements below St. Mary's current (revote) .....	300,000
Port Colborne—Harbour improvements (revote) .....	50,000
	<hr/>
	\$435,000

Mr. BERGERON. What about the Lévis graving dock?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is to lengthen the dock from 484 to 600 feet. A contract was made with Thomas Powers, of Lévis, on the 23rd of October, 1899. The amount of the contract is \$94,976, and the allowance for superintendence and contingencies \$5,024, making the total probable cost of lengthening the dock \$100,000. The expenditure up to the 30th June was about \$15,000, leaving a balance of \$85,000 which is asked for here. About \$12,000 has been paid to the contractor, and the date of the completion of the contract is the 23rd April, 1901.

Mr. BERGERON. Was the contract given by tender?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was let after public tender. I have no personal knowledge of it, but the chief engineer informs me that it was awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. BERGERON. How is it that nothing has been done?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When the contract was let on the 23rd of October, it was very near the close of the season of navigation. The contractor has been paid \$12,000 for work done, and has more under way.

Mr. BERGERON. Did we not vote \$110,000 last year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Then your estimate is \$10,000 less than your estimate of last year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) that it was felt by the merchants and shipping men that that work was absolutely required, and I express my own view, when I say that the government did entirely right in carrying out that work.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the \$100,000 finish the whole work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is the whole contract.

Mr. BERGERON. In what state are the Montreal harbour works now? The Connors syndicate were to do certain work there, and carry out certain plans to be approved by the Minister of Public Works. Has the minister been called upon to sign the plans and specifications, and in what condition is that matter at present?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This work my hon. friend knows better than I do. This is in the lower part of the river, the Connors syndicate work being in the harbour of Montreal proper. With regard to the arrangement between the harbour commissioners and the Connors syndicate, the harbour commissioners approved of the plans and specifications and forwarded them to the Department of Public Works, and I submitted them to the Department of Railways and Canals and the Public Works Department, and both departments carefully examined and approved of them. This particular vote is for a dock or pier to be erected in the lower division of the harbour and to be 1,000 feet long by 272 feet wide. It is now up for tender, and the tenders will be due on the 20th of this month.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this upon the recommendation and the plan of the harbour commissioners? As I understand, this is away down below the present harbour.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is beyond the jurisdiction of the harbour commissioners entirely.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, I think it is wasting money. The harbour commissioners of Montreal are business men who ought to know the situation quite as well, if not better than other people. The work they are now doing in the harbour is of a most commendable and useful character; but, to commence the construction of piers practically outside of the city limits is a waste of money. It would cost as much to transport goods from there up to the city as it would cost to bring them half way from Liverpool. If there was such a development of trade as there was not room to accommodate in the harbour, there might be some justification for building piers down there; but, I think this expenditure will be largely money thrown away.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) need not feel at all alarmed about this vote, because there will be no money spent down there. This is a continuation of a bluff that was made by the Minister of Public Works about four years ago to satisfy the eastern part of Montreal, which is represented in this House by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Prefontaine), and two or three of the neighbouring counties. There will not be a cent of this vote spent. It is not an honest vote. It would be a great deal better for the government to come out in a manly way and say: We will not vote money for this purpose. Tenders will be received until the 20th of July for immense works involving an expenditure of \$500,000; but the whole thing is a sham. I want to draw the attention of my hon. friend to this fact, that under the Connors syndicate arrangement, certain works are to be done in the eastern part of the harbour of Montreal, which is under the supervision of the harbour commissioners. This is another occasion on which the people have been played with. Mr. Connors, under his contract, is to build elevators in the centre of the harbour of Montreal, within what is called the Windmill Point. He was to build three-million elevators, and these are now reduced to one and a half-million elevators, and he is to build some elevators in the eastern part. Like the hon. member for East Grey, I would be tempted to oppose the expenditure of any such money there if it were not spent in the proper way, if the Connors syndicate arrangement had been carried out honestly, and if there had not been an underhand understanding between the Minister of Public Works and his friends and the Connors syndicate that the eastern part of Montreal was to be entirely sacrificed. The Booth Company have been asking for the last two or three months for a berth in the harbour of Montreal; but they cannot get it because the Minister of Public Works, and some of his friends have shackled the whole harbour of Montreal and put it into the hands of the Connors syndicate, who have done nothing yet, so that the har-

bour is in the same condition that it was in two years ago. Although the plans have been sanctioned by the harbour commissioners, who are creatures of the Minister of Public Works, and who were threatened with dismissal if they did not sanction everything he wanted, and although the Connors syndicate signed a contract in January, the capacity of the elevators has been reduced 50 per cent. The Booth Company asked the harbour commissioners for a place where they could unload their grain, but they could not get a place, because the whole harbour has been signed over to the Connors syndicate. The merchants said it would cost them nearly as much to transport the goods from that part of Montreal to their stores as it would to bring them from Liverpool; but there is plenty of room there to build elevators and warehouses for the transshipment of grain from the west, and it might as well go there as anywhere else. But, nothing is done, because the whole harbour of Montreal is shackled in the hands of the Connors syndicate. What is the Connors syndicate? It is composed of politicians, who have put the whole harbour of Montreal into the hands of Mr. Connors, and he is doing nothing, while the harbour of Montreal is suffering. This House can vote this \$300,000 without any danger, for not a cent of it can be spent; it is impossible to spend it. The Connors syndicate is in the way. I would be glad to have my hon. friend give some explanation about this \$300,000, if he can say something new.

Mr. SPROULE. If what my hon. friend says is correct, this item is not needed here at all. It is here either for political purposes or for business purposes. If it is here to be spent, we want to know all the conditions surrounding it, so as to decide whether it will be wise to spend it. I agree with the hon. member that it would be a good place for grain elevators, because it would not matter very much, when you had your grain in barges, whether you went a mile further or not. But when you build storehouses and land your goods there, I am told that it will cost nearly as much to transport them thence to the wholesale houses as from Liverpool to the docks. Besides there is a large dock already right in front of that place. Is this dock being used to-day? It is a long dock and a new one, and I am told that there is seldom a boat landed there except boats coming with unrefined sugar for the sugar refineries. Why is that dock not used? It is either because there is sufficient room in the upper harbour, which is a more convenient place for vessels, and they do not need it, or it is so far out of the road that the trade will not use it. If it is not intended to build this dock, the estimate should not be voted.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would like to know whether what is said about the Con-

ners syndicate is correct or not, for if so it is quite impossible for the Department of Public Works to expect us to vote this amount. As I understand it, the Conners syndicate submitted its scheme to the harbour commission of Montreal and that commission agreed to the application, and so did the Department of Public Works.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think that my hon. friend from Beauharnois is at all correct when he says that this item is put in for show.

Mr. BERGERON. It has been voted for two or three years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot say anything about the past, but I am proceeding in good faith when asking for this vote, and when tenders are received, the lowest will be accepted, if it is a proper tender. I made a little error in saying that the lower part of the harbour was not under the jurisdiction of the harbour commissioners. What I meant to say was that this particular work was not under their jurisdiction. Montreal is a very growing city, and we look to its becoming much more important, and this pier will serve a useful purpose. The Conners syndicate have nothing to do with this pier.

Mr. BERGERON. I quite appreciate the position in which my hon. friend finds himself. He cannot be expected to be acquainted with all these matters, but he can find out from his officers whether this is a part of the \$500,000 voted last year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is.

Mr. BERGERON. This was voted last year for the purpose of building storehouses and docks down in the eastern part of the harbour of Montreal, principally elevators, warehouses and a dock if possible.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. BERGERON. That was the explanation given last year, and nothing was done. I know the ground well, and I know that the hon. gentleman cannot do anything with this \$300,000 now unless the Conners syndicate allows him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Conners syndicate has no possible control over this work or the policy of the government with respect to it. This money is part of the cost of the construction of a pier, of which I will give the hon. gentleman a description, and will be so applied or not at all.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would like to know whether this vote has been submitted to the harbour commission and received its sanction and approval.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am informed that the harbour commission are in entire accord with this vote. This will be a high level pier, with an approach 1,000 feet long, and 272 feet wide, and the foundation will be in thirty feet of water. These are the substantial details of the proposed work. The location is to be at the boundary line between Montreal and Maisonneuve, and between the two lower level piers built by the Montreal Harbour Commission.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) signed the arrangement as Minister of Public Works between the harbour commissioners and the Conners syndicate?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I mentioned that the harbour commissioners sent to the department for approval of the plans and specifications of the improvements to be made by the Conners syndicate under their agreement. These were approved by the officers of the department and by the officers of the Department of Railways and Canals, and also by the two ministers. The matter is out of our hands. We simply acceded to the request of the harbour commissioners and gave authority for what they had agreed to.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not wish to repeat what has been said in former sessions. But, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has said, this is out of our hands. That is the kind of thing I have protested against as long as twenty years ago. Anything in the hands of the harbour commissioners, we cannot control, and yet it is public money that is being spent. The Minister of Public Works twenty years ago, used to say, when complaints were made: I cannot do anything; it is in the hands of the harbour commissioners. I say that every cent of public money that we vote here should be under our direction. I do not blame my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock), but I am sorry he has authorized this. I would like to have asked him, before putting his signature as Minister of Public Works approving that arrangement, to insert a condition that the Conners syndicate shall be called upon to carry out work in the eastern as well as in the western part of the harbour. Under the agreement the Conners syndicate must build elevators and other structures in the western and eastern parts of the harbour. But now that this is signed, they will make one or two elevators in the western part of the harbour and will do no work at all in the eastern part. The consequence will be congestion in the western part of the harbour, while, in the eastern part they will be doing nothing. Worse than that, when Mr. Booth, of the Canada Atlantic, or anybody else wants to secure a place in the harbour, he will be told that it cannot be done, because the Conners syn-

dicade hold it. The Conners syndicate hold the whole thing by their contract with the harbour commissioners, but they will not use the eastern part. To build a wharf where the hon. gentleman proposes to build it, under present circumstances, is like building it in the middle of Lake Superior. But all these great wharfs should be used. Mr. Booth brought down last year, I believe, about sixteen million bushels of grain. This grain comes down in barges; it might easily be transferred to vessels at the eastern part of the harbour. There might as well be from seven to ten steamships loading there, not interfering at all with the other trade of Montreal. I am sorry that the Department of Public Works is not au courant with these things. I do not blame the officials, but I have no word strong enough to blame the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), who is at the bottom of the whole thing, and who has humbugged the whole eastern part of Montreal for political purposes, and probably to revenge himself on some of his political friends. But the city of Montreal suffers for it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would again like to ask the minister whether what he is proposing has the sanction of the harbour commissioners of Montreal. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) has expressed disapproval of some things. I am not as familiar with the question as he is; but I have no doubt that the harbour commissioners of Montreal have gone into this whole matter and are agreed upon it; and if the department is working in accordance with the views of the harbour commission, I do not see how we can oppose this vote, and I do not consider that it will be worth while discussing this point any longer. The harbour commission ought to take their responsibility as administrators of the money which is loaned by the government for the improvement of the harbour.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) is quite right in putting the question. The harbour commissioners have given their approval of this proposition. That is on record in the department.

Mr. BRITTON. I do not understand what the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has been saying in reference to tying up matters in Montreal harbour. I have understood that all the Conners syndicate got was a concession of about 1,800 feet, whereas everybody who knows Montreal harbour, knows that it has a very large frontage, so that arrangements can be made with Mr. Booth, or with anybody else hereafter for the erection of warehouses and elevators. I do not understand that what the Conners have got, may be called in any sense a monopoly, they have only got a concession. It may be a very valuable concession, I would think, perhaps, it is. But they have

come under very heavy liabilities in regard to it, and if they carry out their part of the contract, it will certainly be for the benefit of Montreal harbour. The Montreal harbour commissioners surely know their business, and what is best for the interests of the city. I do not think Montreal is to-day in the hands of that syndicate to their prejudice. Now, I want to ask a question in regard to the other item, the \$50,000 for dredging Port Colborne harbour. I saw advertised in the papers the other day a large amount of dredging work for the Port Colborne entrance of the Welland Canal, and I believe the contracts have been made. I want to ask whether the line is well defined between the work that is to be done under the supervision of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and that which is to be done under the Minister of Public Works; in other words, I want to know where this Port Colborne harbour ends and the entrance to the Welland Canal begins?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would explain to my hon. friend that two departments are interested in the harbour improvements of Port Colborne, the Railway Department as having to do with the canal system, and the Public Works Department, as having to do with the construction of public works. The Railway Department is extending the piers at the entrance of the canal, some 600 feet out into the lake; then there is a space of perhaps half a mile between the southern terminus of these two piers and the shoal, where this breakwater is to be constructed. The breakwater is to be constructed, commencing at a point on this shoal, and extending in a westerly and northerly direction towards a point known as Sugar Loaf Point. If that pier is completed unbroken, it will be about three-quarters of a mile in length. But it is not expected it will be necessary to construct the whole of it. A small portion will be constructed opposite the mouth of the entrance to the canal, by the Public Works Department. As to the separation of the work between the two departments, the statutes define the jurisdiction of the various departments and what portion of the public work is to be regarded as an incident to the main work itself. The Railway Department will keep within its own jurisdiction.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me the hon. member for Beauharnois has made certain allegations here which, if correct, would offer a serious objection to our voting this money. He says that the Conners syndicate have practical control of the lower harbour, and of the upper harbour as well, in so far as they have a right to build elevators and boats, that they are holding that control over the lower harbour, while they are not expending any money there for the purpose of carrying out their contract; that they are expending money at the Wind-mill Basin,

and building an elevator there; and that they are doing that to the detriment of other corporations, notably the Canada Atlantic Railway, which might go down and build an elevator if room was available at the lower harbour, but it is not, on account of the contract made with the Connors syndicate. I think this House ought to know whether that is the fact or not. If it is a fact, it is a serious objection to voting this money; if it is not a fact, we ought to know it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understand that the Connors syndicate have made an arrangement with the harbour commissioners whereby the syndicate agreed to erect certain public works at a point, at least two miles westerly of the place where this pier is to be built. The Connors syndicate's jurisdiction covers about 1,800 feet out of eight or nine miles of harbour frontage in Montreal. Their jurisdiction does not come within 10,000 feet of where this particular pier is, and they have no more to do with the location of this pier than the hon. gentleman or myself.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I assume the minister has looked over the contract and has grounds for what he says, because the contention is made just as strongly on the other side. Now, I understand the minister to say that whatever rights the Connors syndicate had in the lower harbour—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They have none.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say a moment ago that they had a right to build elevators down there.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, permit me to explain. I rely for my information on the officers of the department who are familiar with the rights of the parties, for myself, I have not looked into the documents. The departmental officers inform me that the Connors syndicate had a right to construct certain elevators, and are under obligations to construct certain elevators and other works at a point in the western end of Montreal harbour, for a distance of about 1,800 feet, and that the easterly limit of their concession is not within 10,000 feet of where the proposed pier is to be built.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a contract between the harbour commissioners and the Connors syndicate which gives the Connors syndicate the right to build their elevators, as I understood the hon. gentleman, up in the Wind-mill Basin. The hon. member for Beauharnois says that they have also the right to build elevators at the lower or eastern end of the harbour. Do I understand from the hon. minister that they have?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Connors syndicate have an option to build

Mr. SPROULE.

an elevator in the lower division, but that does not give them any monopoly over the whole district there. To that extent I qualify my previous observations as to whatever area will be involved in the building of that elevator.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister takes back at least part of his contention, and it may be that when we get further information he will take back a little more. To that extent the hon. member for Beauharnois is correct in saying that they have the right to build an elevator in the eastern harbour. The next question would be this: Have the harbour commissioners bound themselves not to allow any others to have room for elevators where they are building these piers until the Connors syndicate avail themselves of the right they have to build their elevator?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, they have no location assigned to them yet, and they have no right to the ground except the place where this pier is to be erected.

Mr. SPROULE. So far that is all right. I am informed that they have the right to the use of 1,200 to 2,000 feet for themselves whether that is the place where this pier is to be erected or not. The next question: Is the allegation correct that the hon. member for Beauharnois made that Mr. Booth could not get ground down there to build upon because of the control over this ground by the Connors syndicate? If that be the case there must be something covering that point in the contract which binds the harbour commissioners to refuse this right to others.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am unable to say whether the commissioners may or may not have refused Mr. Booth. The commissioners are in possession of the harbour in so far as they may concede rights to other people.

Mr. SPROULE. I assume that they would not refuse these rights to other people unless there was something in the contract that made it impossible for them to give another concession.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is nothing to show that they refused Mr. Booth. Perhaps Mr. Booth asked for something that they were unable to grant. I think that the harbour commissioners are most anxious to bring business to their harbour and that they would grant any reasonable request that Mr. Booth might make.

Mr. SPROULE. I believe that the harbour commissioners, being intelligent men, are able to judge for themselves what is right if they are left untrammelled, but the control exercised over them by the Minister of Public Works was such that they were

practically forced into adopting what in their judgment was not the best thing to be done in the harbour; or, in other words, the minister would not allow the money to be expended where it was necessary it should be expended for making it a good harbour.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The harbour commissioners are perfectly free to make any arrangements with Mr. Booth if they can make terms. There has nothing taken place to deprive the harbour commissioners of the right to grant to him any concession. It depends upon the two parties being able to make an arrangement.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it has been exactly what I said it was; the baneful influence that the hon. Minister of Public Works exercised over the harbour commissioners has trammelled them to such an extent that they cannot exercise their free and unbiassed judgment as to what ought to be done there. I am told that that is really the situation and that it is the condition on which this money is voted. Before the harbour commissioners can spend one cent of this money they have to work in harmony with the Minister of Public Works. I want to make some inquiry about the Port Colborne harbour. Has there been anything done in regard to the Port Colborne harbour since last year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, specifications are just about completed. Nothing has been spent yet. It will take the best part of a month to get the specifications completed. The engineers have been at it for a considerable time.

Mr. SPROULE. My remembrance is that last year the hon. minister could not tell us very definitely what the estimated cost of the work would be. Could he give us any closer estimate of the cost of the work now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I stated last year that it would cost about \$150,000 to build about 1,700 feet of the breakwater.

Mr. SPROULE. To what depth of water?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is variable. There is a bit of ridge and the breakwater will be built upon this ridge. The ridge is perhaps 5,000 feet from the shore. It will give a splendid harbour when it is made available in other respects.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that there will have to be some dredging done.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The material dredged will be utilized as filling for the pier at the same time. The two works will go on together.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the estimate is that this pier will cost \$150,000

or \$170,000. In addition to that, of course, the dredging will have to come in. Am I correct in that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The dredging will be rock work and the dredged material will be utilized for rip-rapping, so that what is taken out by the dredge would be utilized for filling in the pier at the same time.

Mr. SPROULE. I know, but is the \$150,000 or the \$175,000 simply to be used for building the pier?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are two things going on at the same time, the making of the harbour and also the building of the pier with the same expenditure. The contractor will be required to get his filling, or rip-rapping right in the harbour. He will be deepening the harbour and he will there get his rip-rapping.

Mr. SPROULE. And the deepening of the harbour and the building of the pier will only cost \$150,000?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is for about 1,700 feet, which may meet all the requirements. You cannot tell until the breakwater is constructed whether it will be long enough to meet the requirements, but if commerce and shipping warrant it may be advisable to extend the pier. It may be, if a great deal of shipping comes there, that it will be necessary to have a longer pier.

Mr. SPROULE. What depth of water will there be for this 2,000 feet?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About twenty-two feet.

Mr. SPROULE. In all of the harbour?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not in all of the harbour.

Mr. SPROULE. As a result of this expenditure and without any more?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There will be 100 acres in that harbour. When you get in towards the shore on the west side it shoals up to nothing. The hon. gentleman asks me what depth of water there will be to the north of the breakwater. It is not of uniform depth at all.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister either is playing with words or he does not desire to give the information. What I say is that there must be a certain portion of that harbour which the boats will use and which will require to be of a certain depth. I want to know will this expenditure of \$150,000 give a sufficient depth of water for the needs of navigation, without a large additional expenditure. I am told that it

will cost \$300,000 or \$400,000 to make the improvements which the Minister of Public Works has mapped out. If \$150,000 or \$175,000 will be sufficient, I do not think any one would object, but if it is going to cost half a million, then I think the outlay is of very doubtful wisdom. When this \$150,000 is expended, will the vessels coming there, be able to use the harbour?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When the \$150,000 is spent in the construction of a breakwater and taking up whatever riprap there is there, and doing the work that is required, there will be a navigable channel of at least twenty feet from Lake Erie to the entrance of the canal. When you come to the entrance of the canal the Department of Railways and Canals provides for the navigation after that.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister will ask for tenders for the work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. It will be let by contract.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will.

Halifax—New public building ..... \$25,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) has asked me to answer the question. Under a vote of last session a site was bought which will enable the department to proceed towards the erection of a building. It will be a building adapted to the business of the city of Halifax. The business of the Dominion government is at present carried on in a building which was there before confederation, but as it is not large enough they have been obliged to rent premises in various parts of the city. The old market building is purchased as a site. It may be necessary to take down the old building, but the material would be used, I suppose, to advantage in the new structure. When the building is erected all the Dominion offices will be accommodated in it.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the plans, and what is the proposed cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The plans have not yet been completed, but judging from what buildings of that character in a similar city cost, the cost would be from \$150,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not the more business method to perfect the plans before you take a vote, so that we might have some idea as to the cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is sometimes impossible to wait until you have your plans completed. We all know that a building such as this put up in the capital city will cost a large sum; probably as

Mr. SPROULE.

much as a similar building in the city of St. John. To wait until we have the plans and specifications ready would involve delay which I do not think the community would be satisfied with.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you expect to do with this vote of \$25,000 on a building which the Minister of Finance says will cost \$150,000 or \$200,000?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When this vote is passed the officers will prepare the necessary plans and specifications and tenders will be called for. It is not very likely that much can be done in the way of expenditure this fall, because the building season will have terminated. But the contractors will probably be able to get to work in the spring.

Mr. FOSTER. As nothing can be done before parliament meets again, would it not be preferable that the House should know the plans and the proposed cost before the contract is entered into? You simply put in a little sum of money with which you can do almost nothing on a building that is expected to cost \$200,000 or more; in fact there is no limit.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. While there is no limit in a sense, it would be limited by the ordinary requirements of a Dominion building in such a city. It is certainly desirable that some idea should be given to the House as to the probable cost, and the officials of the department say that from the inquiries they have made, the building would cost about \$150,000, and that would occupy two years in construction.

Mr. FOSTER. The department has no plans and no figures as to the cost of material or labour, or anything else, and under such circumstances, you might as well ask the chairman of the committee to give you an estimate as the officers of the department. If we vote this, we may find ourselves bound later on by a plan and contract entered into for an expenditure of \$200,000. I point out that this is a very bad method of proceeding with such work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Even if it did cost \$200,000, it would not be out of proportion to the cost to public buildings elsewhere. But the architect of the department who has examined the ground and made inquiries, is of the opinion that \$150,000 would put up the structure. I understand that the custom-house at St. John cost \$200,000, and I do not think that would be an extravagant sum to spend on a like building in the city of Halifax.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not object to the cost, if you have a cost which is based on an intelligent working out of the scheme. I have no objection to your taking the vote

for \$25,000 if you say you will not let a contract until we meet here again. I have no objection to your giving the people of Halifax a taste to indicate that you propose to go on with the work; but I do not think you should enter into a contract until you get a vote in proportion to the cost of the building which you intend to erect, and after knowing what you are going to build.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a certain hot place said to be paved with good intentions, and I am afraid the good people of Halifax would not be satisfied with our good intentions. They want to see the work go on; and subject to the ordinary limitations as to the cost of public buildings elsewhere, I think the department should be willing that the work should be begun.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not object to the erection of a building in Halifax, but I am not prepared to express an opinion as to the amount of money that should be voted, for the simple reason that I do not know what is expected to be the cost of the building. I think the hon. minister is wrong in coming down with this vote without having a plan. He simply says: In St. John you put up a building which cost \$200,000, and somewhere else you put up a building for the same purposes for which this building is required, and so we are asking this amount of money. But the government, in asking parliament to vote money for a public building, should be prepared to say exactly what they want, as a result of an examination and estimate by the architect; and upon that statement laid before parliament by the Minister of Public Works, we would be quite prepared to consider the amount to be voted. But we do not know whether the minister wants \$100,000 or \$250,000. He only says: I notice a building somewhere else which seems to me to be suitable for the purposes for which we require a building in Halifax, and I think it will cost \$150,000. That is not the way to appeal to the representatives of the people in parliament. I think the minister should be prepared to lay before parliament a plan made by the architect or the engineer of his department, which will indicate what the cost of the building will be.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The error of my hon. friend's statement is in assuming that I said that in my opinion the building would cost \$150,000. That is not my opinion; it is the opinion of the chief architect of the Public Works Department.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is only an opinion, and it is not worth any more from the architect or the engineer than from the hon. gentleman, unless it is based upon a plan laid before the minister, and which the minister could lay before parliament.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What my hon. friend contends for is impossible—that no vote for a public work could be taken until there was a plan prepared in all its details. The hon. gentleman knows that that could not be done. As to the usefulness of the work, I do not think there can be any debate. My own department, and some of the offices of the Customs Department and the Inland Revenue Department are in hired buildings in different parts of the city. The hon. gentleman says that the architect should make an examination. He has made an examination, he was sent to examine the site, and he has given his opinion that the building can probably be erected for \$150,000. But I will say this, that if the Public Works Department, after inviting tenders, finds that the cost will exceed \$200,000, I for my part would consider that was an extreme sum, and I would not ask them to go on without coming back to parliament and having the matter further considered. But we know that a customs house for a city with a population of 40,000 or 50,000 cannot cost an enormous sum. I should say that \$200,000 was the outside figure.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman absolutely agrees with me, for he does not know any more than I do as to what the new building is likely to cost. I am not objecting to the vote, but simply desire more information.

Liverpool public building—To complete... \$2,150

Mr. FOSTER. What will this cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. \$20,000, including fittings and the site and everything.

Mr. KAULBACH. I certainly must acknowledge my disappointment in not finding an item in the supplementary estimates for a public building at Bridge-water in my county. After the many and earnest appeals made by me every session of parliament since the sad calamity that befell that picturesque town by fire, when the very centre and business part of it was swept away, I certainly expected this government would have come to its rescue and placed an amount in the estimates, even at this late period this session, sufficient to have started a suitable building. This was due to the citizens of that place at the first opportunity appearing after the sad calamity occurred, and the government's failure to come to their rescue was not for the want of a reminder, as I have brought the subject to the notice of the government at the commencing of each session since the sad event occurred. St. John, N.B., and Ottawa each were assisted by a tangible money grant, and the city of Hull was not only assisted

with a money grant, but arrangements were made for a new public building as well. Now, I have no hesitation in saying that none of these places were more deserving of aid, considering the loss pro rata with the population, than was Bridgewater, possessed of no ordinary degree of enterprise, full of loyalty to the Crown, and unquestionably loyal to hon. gentlemen opposite. But, notwithstanding all this, hon. gentlemen opposite have not only turned a deaf ear to all approaches and appeals for a grant for a public building, suitable for a post office, customs, savings bank, shipping office, &c., but never have offered, so far as I am aware, even an expression of sympathy considering the devastation that befel them by said fire. This is certainly not only a sad state of affairs, but treatment such as the people of Bridgewater least expected and are least deserving of. However, I suppose I must consider this now as the third and last time of asking, and rest my soul in patience till a better opportunity offers, when my appeal in this particular will have better recognition.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman should have exercised some of his zeal on behalf of Bridgewater when he was in a position to exert some influence. However that may be, Bridgewater is a very thriving place, and, last but not least, a very gritty place, and I am quite sure the people there have intelligence and judgment enough to be patient, hopeful that in due season their patience will be rewarded.

St. John, N.B.—Immigrant building ..... \$5,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is for the construction of an immigrant shed, as there is none there for the convenience of immigrants.

Mr. McALISTER. There was \$19,000 voted last year for repairs to the Dalhousie post office. Was that contract given by tender?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My deputy informs me that Mr. Lamarche, of Montreal, made an offer to perform that work at a certain price, which was referred to the architect, and he reported the offer a very reasonable one, and a contract was entered into.

Mr. McALISTER. What was the amount spent?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not that information at hand, but I will get it for the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Public Works—Chargeable to income—Public buildings, Quebec—Buckingham public building (revote, \$3,000) ..... \$8,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This should read 'revote \$5,000.'

Mr. KAULBACH.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the cost of this building?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Between \$8,000 and \$10,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What does 'public building' mean?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is for a building in Buckingham to be used as a post office.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Then it should be called a post office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is customary, I believe, to describe these as public buildings. They are available for the purposes of any department. I do not think there is any customs or excise officer there, but should these officers be appointed, the building could be available for carrying out the work they have to do.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. But if the building were required for only one department, it would naturally cost less money than one to be used by three or four departments.

Victoriaville—Public building (revote, \$3,000) ..... \$8,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is Victoriaville?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In Arthabaska.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the cost of the building?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About \$13,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the post office revenue?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Postal revenue, \$1,989.91; customs-house duties, \$7,482.59; money orders issued, \$3,222; money orders paid, \$7,252.

Chicoutimi—Public building ..... \$5,300

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is to make provision for the purchase of a site to erect a public building at Chicoutimi, and on account of the building. The building is to be used for post office purposes, &c. The postal revenue last year was \$1,876; customs duties, \$1,098; money orders issued, \$8,793; money orders paid, \$5,476. Chicoutimi is the chief place in the county of Chicoutimi, and has a population between 2,000 and 3,000 in a parish of 5,000. It is the terminus of the Lake St. John Railway.

Drummondville—Public building ..... \$5,000

Mr. FOSTER. What are the statistics of this place?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Population, 1,955; postal revenue, \$1,045.37; money orders issued, \$7,362.61; money orders paid, \$4,163.31. Drummondville is an incorpor-

ated town in Drummond County, has two railway stations, lumber mills, shingle mills, and foundries, and has a branch of the Banque Jacques Cartier. It is an old established town.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the building to cost ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About \$8,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the site been purchased ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the \$8,000 include the site ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deputy thinks that \$8,000 will cover the cost of site and building.

Quebec cartridge factory—Rolling mill.... \$11,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is this ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is called for by the Department of Militia and Defence, and the hon. minister (Mr. Borden), will be able to explain the object.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Hitherto we have had to import the shells in which our cartridges are put up. It was found very inconvenient to do that, and it is not wise to rely upon getting them from outside. By having this rolling-mill, we shall be able to manufacture the whole cartridge in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Where have you been getting them ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In England.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they not reputable makers there ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, but we think it is in the interest of the country and of our safety, in the case of any trouble, to be in a position to manufacture the whole cartridge here.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The government has been receiving the metal for these shells from Woolwich—at least that is where it came from in my time. I think we might have waited for some time to come, rather than to put up this rolling-mill for the purpose of rolling this metal. Of course, the hon. gentleman has been over the cartridge factories, and he knows how these metal sheets are sent over from the old country. They come out in an absolutely perfect condition, and at a much lower cost than is represented by the initial amount which will be required to establish this rolling mill. It seems to me this is an expenditure that we might leave in abeyance.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

We have had a good deal of difficulty. The shells have by no means given satisfaction. The gentleman in charge of the cartridge factory is, as my hon. friend knows, a very able man. Major Gaudet has very strongly urged that this should be done, and after looking into the matter carefully I am entirely in accord with his views. I believe it is a sound expenditure, and there is no reason in the world why we should not manufacture cartridges in Canada, and the sooner we begin the better.

Hochelaga—Post office ..... \$10,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Hochelaga is a suburb of the city of Montreal, and has a fast growing population of about 10,000. The building is estimated to cost about \$20,000. The site has not been bought yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Have the plans been prepared ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Just an election vote.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it has been asked for by the people of Hochelaga. They are pressing for it, they have presented a petition asking for the erection of a public building.

Granby—Public building ..... \$5,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is estimated this building will cost between \$8,000 and \$10,000. The population of Granby is 2,795, according to the municipal census of 1898. The postal revenue is \$3,712; customs duties, \$10,509; money orders issued, \$21,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the estimated sum include the site ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, that is approximate, the site has not been selected yet.

Mr. FOSTER. Have the plans of the building been prepared ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Another election vote.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I want to enter my protest against these votes. The Minister of Public Works comes down and asks parliament to vote money for buildings, before a site has been selected, just on the eve of a general election. He has not a single plan upon which he can form his opinion as to what the building is going to cost. I have never known since I have been in parliament estimates brought down as these are without stating how much money would be required to purchase a site, or without the architect, at least, having expressed an opinion what the building was going to cost.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I remember dozens of in-

stances in which votes like this were brought down in the last days of the session when the Conservatives were in power, and the hon. gentleman was a member of the government.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Point out one.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got them under my hand, but they can be pointed out. The hon. gentleman says that a vote of this kind ought not to be asked for until a site has been chosen, and until plans have been drawn. The site cannot be purchased until after the department is sure it is going to have the money to pay for it. The site will, of course, be in a central position in the town of Granby. I am not prepared to discuss all the other items for public buildings, but I can safely say that there is no place where a public building is more justified than it is in the town of Granby. Granby is a growing manufacturing town, and the population has increased enormously in the last few years. There are several well established factories which in former years were not as prosperous as they are to-day, factories which have been increasing their output, and increasing their number of hands during the last three or four years, to such an extent that the public buildings which are now leased for public purposes are utterly inadequate. Granby is to-day paying into the public treasury over \$150,000 a year by its several offices, and I think this amount justifies a vote for a public building.

Mr. FOSTER. I only yield to this vote as having to yield to force majeure. We have these estimates of \$7,250,000 thrown upon us on the 161st day of the session, and we are absolutely physically, or in any other way unable to sit here and discuss these 800 items before us as they ought to be discussed. We made our protest last night in a general resolution, and we throw the responsibility on the government for all these votes, and they have got to take the responsibility. But I may be allowed to say here that in no preceding years, even up to the last three years of the present administration, have we had the spectacle of all these votes brought down at this inconvenient season, and in this inconvenient way. What is the use of having your officers to estimate the cost of public buildings and to draw up plans therefor? All you have to do is to get up and say: We propose to put up a public building in a certain place, we have no site, no plans, we do not know what it is going to cost at all, but we guess it will cost so and so. Now, where has the theory gone about putting up public buildings in villages? Here is one village of a thousand people, Drummondville; here are Buckingham, Victoriaville, Chicoutimi and Granby—they are all what you may call little towns. Time was when the Liberal party, headed by Mr. Mills in this House, followed by the

Mr. FISHER.

whole rank and file of the party, declared that it was simply outrageous to put up these public buildings in places with a population of 2,000, 3,000 or 4,000 people. That was what they believed in then, passed by a solemn resolution and canvassed before the people. To-day they come in and they propose to place public buildings in all the little villages of the country and to incur large capital expenditures. We might stand here and talk to the day of judgment; we are not strong enough to prevent the vote, it will go through and they must be responsible for it. These are undigested estimates. The hon. acting Minister of Public Works has no plan put before him, he has no site, he does not know how much the land will cost, he has not a single reasoned calculation in reference to the matter, and this is the class of votes that these hon. gentlemen are putting through.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is the way you used to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. The only answer we can get is the utterly imbecile answer: You're another; and even that is not true.

Mr. GIBSON. It is true.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose it were true, was not this government pledged to a better course? In the preceding estimates we had three or four of the same class of public buildings in other provinces. Here the government are dotting large capital expenditures in little villages all over the country. Formerly, it was the cardinal policy of hon. gentlemen opposite that this was not a proper kind of expenditure. To-day it is the expenditure upon which they rely and to which they give the whole force of their influence and power.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman includes all the votes just made in his general observations. I did not say anything on the vote for the immigration building at St. John.

Mr. FOSTER. I am speaking of these public buildings.

Mr. ELLIS. In regard to the site for this building it is quite understood that the site will be supplied by the city.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). How about Marysville? Was that voted by the hon. gentleman?

Mr. FOSTER. Marysville is a revote and I have not challenged revotes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is on the same principle.

Mr. FOSTER. Everybody knows that the Marysville building vote was voted eight or ten years ago. There was a vote on this basis, that we gave so much and Mr. Gibson was to furnish the site for the building, and build the post office with this small sum. There never was a proposition

brought before the House that was more opportune or more economical. That has been kept in the estimates. I affirmed a year ago what was said in its justification. I know it is a revote. We have all we can do to challenge some of the worst of the new votes without taking up the revotes.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. You cannot have a site until you get the vote first. Surely you must have the vote before you can know about the style of the building that will be required.

Brockville—Drill hall (revote) ..... \$9,000

Mr. **CLARKE**. Mr. Chairman, I would like again to draw the attention of the hon. acting Minister of Public Works, and of the government to the condition of the Toronto drill shed, if I may be allowed to say a word about it under this item. Some twelve years ago the city of Toronto expended \$14,000 in procuring a site which was presented to the government, and upon which a drill hall was to be erected. Plans of the hall were prepared. These plans showed accommodation for cavalry and artillery. The plans have not been executed in their entirety, and again and again representations have been made by the military authorities of the city of Toronto asking that the government shall fulfil its part of the contract by completing the building. The city of Toronto supplied the site at a cost of \$14,000 for the purpose of this drill shed on the understanding that it should be built in accordance with a certain plan. I appeal to the hon. acting Minister of Public Works, after this matter has been brought before the Department of Public Works and before the Department of Militia and Defence time and time again, that it is only fair that the government should fulfil its part of the contract and complete the building for which a free site was given. I do not see any vote in these estimates to complete this work. I have appealed to them a dozen times in this matter, and I do not propose to make any further protest except to draw the attention of the committee to what I regard as a breach of contract.

Mr. **WOOD**. Why did you not make your friends do it?

Mr. **CLARKE**. Why do you not get up so that you can be heard and not sit mumbling in that way?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. Mr. Chairman, it is quite true that the members for Toronto and the mayor of Toronto, representatives of the militia and others have called to my attention the fact alleged by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) that an understanding existed at the time of the construction of the drill hall at Toronto that certain accommodation should be afforded. Unfortunately,

this is not a matter of record in the department. I am not going to say that I doubt the allegation made, but unfortunately there was neglect somewhere. At the time the understanding was arrived at to which the hon. gentleman refers there was no record made of it, and there are no papers, so far as I can find, which indicate that such an agreement existed between the government and the city of Toronto. However, altogether apart from that, there is every desire on the part of the Militia Department and the government, as fast as possible, to afford all the accommodation required. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the infantry in Toronto has increased perhaps more than was contemplated at the time of the construction of the drill hall, and that certain space, which would have been available for the artillery, at any rate, is not so available because it was found necessary to give greater accommodation to the infantry. As a matter of fact, the militia of Toronto is fairly well accommodated now. As Minister of Militia I would like very much to see an addition made, and I am in hopes that in the near future it will be made. It is unfortunately true that the friends of my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) did not, at the time they were constructing the building, and when he says the contract was deliberately made between this government and the city of Toronto, carry out their agreement. That was the time to have done it, and that was the time it would have been much more cheaply and more easily done than now. I think it is rather hard to hold us accountable for the failure on the part of my hon. friend's political friends to carry out the solemn agreement which he says they entered into.

Mr. **CLARKE**. The hon. gentleman is blowing hot and cold in this matter. He says that there is no record in the department that any agreement was made and then he finds fault because that agreement was not carried out by his predecessors in office. The hon. gentleman knows that since he has occupied the position of Minister of Militia, all branches of the service have made representations to him over and over again asking that this agreement be carried out and that the building be completed. The hon. gentleman knows that the volunteer force has been largely increased in Toronto as a part of the policy of the government, and that they have taken the place unfortunately of the artillery and cavalry, and it is all the more incumbent upon the government to supply additional space for the cavalry as the Cavalry School was established in Toronto since the building was erected. Up to that time the cavalry had their accoutrements and arms stored in the old government building. The necessity for giving additional accommodation in the drill shed has become more apparent since that time. There is space

enough, as sufficient area of land was acquired upon which to complete the shed as it was originally intended. The hon. minister has never before presented the argument that there was no agreement or understanding with his predecessors to have the shed completed. The hon. gentleman said that he would try to get a sum placed in the estimates as soon as possible, but that the government could not place a sum in the estimates last year or the year before.

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. A large delegation waited upon me some time ago, headed by the mayor of Toronto, and the matter was discussed, and I pointed this out to them.

Mr. **CLARKE**. The minister admits the necessity for the addition to the building. It is not an unreasonable request to make, that when the city was induced to purchase a site large enough, at such enormous cost, to have this building completed, that it should be completed without delay. We are not taking exception to these items for drill sheds, and so on, throughout the country, but in a military centre like Toronto, having such a magnificent volunteer force, the government should no longer hesitate to provide the necessary facilities.

Mr. **McLENNAN** (Glengarry). There was \$2,000 voted last year for an armoury in the town of Cornwall. A deputation was here to see the minister not long ago, and they informed me that the probability was that there would be money in the estimates this year to do that work, and probably to extend it by building a drill hall. What is the present condition of that matter? What was done in connection with the expenditure of the \$2,000 voted last year?

The **MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE**. There is a vote in the estimates for \$35,000 for the construction of armouries, and when that vote is reached I will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) the information.

Deseronto—Public building ..... \$5,000

Mr. **WILSON**. What will this building cost, and has a site been secured?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Deseronto is a very important and growing town.

Mr. **CLANCY**. That is the old story.

Mr. **WILSON**. It is true about Deseronto.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It is a large manufacturing town, and its exports from 1888 have ranged from \$404,000 to \$641,000 a year; while the imports have ranged from \$64,000 to \$91,000 a year. The duties collected have ranged from \$10,000 in 1888, to as high as \$82,000 in a year. The postal revenue is \$5,226, and the population 4,000.

Mr. **CLARKE**.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Deseronto is a nice little town. What will the building cost?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. In the vicinity of \$20,000.

Mr. **WILSON**. Is that all?

Sir **ADOLPHE CARON**. Have you got the site?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. That will be purchased as a first step.

Mr. **J. M. HURLEY** (East Hastings). The site is given by the town of Deseronto. This is really a revote, but it was left out for a year or two. The Minister of Public Works said: Why won't you give the site, and I told the town this, and they made a present of the site to the government. It is a lot in the centre of the town.

Some hon. **MEMBERS**. Hear, hear.

Mr. **SPROULE**. That will do.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The minister knew nothing about it, he said he wanted the money to buy a site.

Mr. **WILSON**. Deseronto is my next town, and in comparison with the money we have been voting for buildings in other towns of not so much importance, it is entitled to a better building than a \$20,000 one. Deseronto is one of the most enterprising towns in the country, and it has one of the best firms in Canada, namely, the Rathbuns.

Mr. **GIBSON**. Make it \$40,000.

Sarnia—Public building (revote, \$10,000).. \$15,000

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The site for this is purchased at a cost of about \$8,000, but the building has not been begun yet.

Picton—Public building ..... \$13,000

Mr. **WILSON**. Where is this building to be located, and what will it cost?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. There has been a site purchased.

Mr. **WILSON**. There are two sites. There was first a site down near the wharf, in a very prominent part of the town, and there was some dispute about that, and I understand there was a lot bought in the middle of the town.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The site first purchased was exchanged for the site now to be used, which I believe has a frame building upon it.

Mr. **WILSON**. What will the building cost?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. \$13,000, I think.

Mr. **PETTET**. The late government purchase a site for \$4,000, and when they were defeated they had \$13,000 in the estimates for a public building at Picton.

There was some dissatisfaction with the first site, and this lot was purchased afterwards in the centre of the town.

Toronto post office—Improvements, including automobile cars (revote)..... \$10,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The object of that vote is to purchase automobile cars, and to make structural changes in the post office for their accommodation. Tenders are being invited now for five cars.

Mr. FOSTER. How many have you?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We own none; we are merely experimenting.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the estimated cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will depend on the design. My own impression is that we shall select cars which have steam engines in them, with gasoline for fuel. The storage battery is hardly sufficiently advanced yet, I think, to be made generally available on our Canadian roads. When we receive the tenders a selection will be made; but I do not consider that the designs which we shall now select will be at all final, though they will be the best up to date.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What will be the approximate cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The representative of the company in Hamilton which makes the automobile with a steam engine, using gasoline for fuel, was here the other day, and my recollection is that he told me that the cost of the size we require would be between \$1,000 and \$1,100. We shall also endeavour to have smaller ones for rapid delivery. The larger ones will be for the collection of mail matter.

Mr. FOSTER. What will the automobiles do—simply transfer mails to and from the post office, or gather mails from the boxes?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will in time displace the system of horses altogether. They will be used for transferring bulky mail matter from the station to the post office, and vice versa, and will also be used for transferring the mails collected from the letter boxes. Considerable quantities are gathered together at central stations, and wagons go to these central stations and gather the mails and bring them to the post office.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any calculation been made as to the relative cost of the new method compared with the old?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Bennett, who is acting inspector for cities, thinks it will not cost as much as the present system, and it will be infinitely more rapid. In addition to the five which we want, we may get some smaller ones for rapid delivery.

Mr. FOSTER. You are making the experiment in Toronto before introducing them anywhere else.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I hope to try it in Montreal before the end of the season.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. But before going to greater expense, you will try them in Toronto, and if the experiment is satisfactory there, they may be applied to other large centres like Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the distributors on the mail trains now distribute the mail matter, so that on the arrival of the train in Toronto these machines will be used for quick delivery, so that the mail may reach the people in the forenoon instead of the afternoon.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will be used for that purpose as well.

Toronto Junction—Public building ..... \$5,000

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have the statistics of this.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Toronto Junction is a suburb of the city of Toronto, and is a large and growing place. The postal revenue last year was \$4,645. There are some large manufactories in the town, it has a custom-house, it is an outport, and it is rapidly becoming a prominent business centre.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be expended there?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not determined yet. This will be expended for a site.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The site may be presented.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It might be, but I have not heard of anybody proposing to present the site.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the town ought to give the site, as Deseronto does.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I understand that a deputation from Alexandria waited on the minister this session, and that he promised that a sum would be put in the estimates for the erection of a post office at that place. I would ask if it is intended to put anything in the estimates for that purpose?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A deputation from Alexandria waited upon me and impressed upon me the importance of Alexandria for a public building. Unfortunately, they came when the estimates for public buildings had been settled for the year, so that it was too late to deal with the subject this session. They presented a strong argument in favour of Alexandria, and I have no doubt its claims will be entitled to recognition; but there is nothing in the present estimates.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I am very glad to hear that there is some chance for Alexandria. I would be very much pleased myself to see a post office erected there. I went so far as to offer a site, and I would be glad to do anything I can in the interest of the place with regard to a post office or anything else. I think we are entitled to some consideration at the hands of any government, but we have never got very much, though we have contributed to the revenue of the country for a great many years. There is very little that we can get unless it is a building, and I hope the government will consider the request of the deputation. I am sorry the government cannot do something this session, for I am a little afraid they will not have the opportunity in another year.

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand that this \$5,000 is to buy a site in Toronto Junction?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will be used as far as necessary to buy a site. Anything over would be available for a building; but I have no idea of what it would cost. Land in Toronto Junction is not very expensive just now, I think.

Mr. CLANCY. Probably the hon. gentleman would say what the probable cost of the building will be.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are many prices. It would depend on what you would select.

Mr. CLANCY. This is a sort of padding out, I suppose, as in many other cases.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not understand the term.

Mr. CLANCY. It means that the hon. gentleman comes down with estimates which the House is not warranted in voting.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Which one is not warranted?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is trying the patience of the committee a good deal when he comes down with estimate after estimate, and is unable to say what the probable cost of the buildings will be. Surely the hon. gentleman has some idea of what he is pledging the country to.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the acting minister, if he proposes to place parliament under contract to build the building, or is he simply taking this vote for the site, and will ask for a vote later and give information as to the kind of building before giving the contract?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Supposing I were to say that if the building were to cost more than \$25,000, no contract would be let, without first submitting it to parliament?

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman ought to go no further than the site on this vote, because it will not build anything.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps it will just do a little more than buy the site. If the hon. gentleman will allow the vote to pass, I will answer his question definitely either to-morrow, or on concurrence.

Toronto—Custom-house and examining warehouse, paving ..... \$4,515

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the sidewalk business?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is for paving the lane at our customs-house and the city pays one-half. It is for the convenience of carters.

Ottawa—Fitting up and furnishing offices for Customs Department, Wellington Street ..... \$6,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is for the statistical branch, and applies to the building adjoining that just taken by the Imperial Bank on Wellington Street, next to the vacant lot west of the Rideau Club. We have arranged to rent it from Mr. Ahearn at \$1,500 a year for ten years, which is the same rate as paid by the Imperial Bank for the adjoining building. The owner is paying \$1,265 towards the repairs, which we will make ourselves, and at the end of the ten years they will be his property, except in the case of those which are removable.

Mr. FOSTER. How many clerks will be in that office?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. As many as forty or fifty.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the Minister of Customs to give a comprehensive explanation of what he proposes to do before we close, as it seems to me that there is almost a pilgrimage to the city from various parts of the Dominion?

Kingston Royal Military College—Additional building, gymnasium and hospital. \$8,000

Mr. BRITTON. The site is one of the best in the Dominion, and as this is a Dominion institution, it seems to me that any money expended in repairs should extend to adjacent property which may be considered part and parcel of the institution grounds. Cedar Island is just off the main shore to the west, and the Martello Tower on Point Frederick may be considered on the college grounds. The storm has taken off the weather roof and injured the appearance of the tower, very much to the disparagement of the college itself. We are justly proud of that institution, and certainly \$1,000 at least, ought to be expended immediately in repairing these buildings and improving the walls. The greatest care ought to be taken to have at least the gymnasium ready for the opening of the college on October 1. It would

also be true economy for the government to erect a building between the post office and the customs-house in Kingston, where there is a vacant lot, which could be erected at a cost of, at the outside, of \$8,000, for the examining warehouse and inland revenue, and save the rental we now pay of \$1,000 per year. And there would be this additional advantage—that the caretaker of these buildings would occupy the new building between the other two.

Windsor—Drill hall (revote, \$4,000)..... \$15,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is that to cost ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Tenders are now being invited.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimate ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is \$40,000.

Rideau Hall—Fire protection, renewals, repairs, alterations, remetalling, &c... \$11,800

Mr. FOSTER. We would like an explanation of this ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is to provide a system of fire protection and to make alterations, repairs, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the principal details ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The fire protection system is estimated to cost, with excavating of rock, hydrants, water pipes and other equipment, \$3,000. A new conservatory is estimated to cost \$3,500. The woodwork of the present conservatory is decayed and the building has gone so far that it cannot be repaired.

Mr. FOSTER. Before going into that, please explain as to the fire protection system.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is proposed to make connection with the city waterworks.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they not had that before ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, but not in a manner to supply a sufficient quantity of water for the purpose now proposed.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the pressure be sufficient at that height ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The architect is of opinion that it will, and I have no doubt he has tested it as well as he could. Mr. Ewart is the architect, and he is a very capable and careful man. He made a personal inspection. Then there is the conservatory, \$3,500 ; alterations in the basement, \$1,700 ; heating and hot water apparatus, \$1,500 ; incidentals, \$300 ; painting, papering, &c., \$1,767.05 ; incidentals, \$22.95—

Mr. WILSON. I would like to call the attention of the acting minister (Mr. Mullock) to some of his utterances when he was on this side of the House. When the Liberal-Conservative party were in power he used to think they were extravagant in their expenditure on Rideau Hall. I am sorry the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is not now present. He must have gone out knowing that this was coming up. Here are some of the recent expenditures under this government on Rideau Hall: Usual annual vote, \$17,000 ; heating, water and light, \$8,000 ; a new wing to the building \$14,000 ; and for furnishing the same, \$5,000—a total of \$44,000. I am afraid hon. gentlemen opposite are not showing very great improvement over the late government. I call particular attention of the acting Minister of Public Works to this, because he was one of those who were most anxious that these expenditures should be kept down.

Mr. FOSTER. What did he say ?

Mr. WILSON. He said the country could not possibly stand such extravagance.

Mr. CASEY. That was when we had deficits.

Mr. WILSON. But the money comes out of the people's pockets just the same. I was amused at the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) the other night trying to make the people believe that the taxes were less now than they were under the Conservative government. But they find that the government gets the money out of their pockets just the same—\$12,000,000 a year more than the Conservative government used to take. I think it is time for hon. gentleman opposite, who have expressed such opinions, to look into this matter, and when they are called upon to make further expenditures, they should say: We would be glad to do as you wish, but we have pledged ourselves to the people that we cannot afford it.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the acting Minister of Public Works give us any idea who looks after those old carpets nowadays ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. CRAIG. Are not hon. gentlemen opposite making a mistake in providing fire protection for Rideau Hall? Better let it burn, then they will have a chance to put up a good building.

St. Thomas—Drill hall and armoury..... \$8,000

Mr. INGRAM. I quite endorse this vote, because we have a first-class battalion there, and they have no place to store their arms. But, I wish to say a word about the purchase of the site for this building.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Take it on concurrence.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not ask hon. gentlemen opposite to excuse me for taking up the time now, because on the 19th of February last I asked for a return of the correspondence between the department and Dr. Wilson, the owner of this property, and the return was only completed on the 10th of July—so it was not my fault if I did not discuss the matter before. Last year I drew the minister's attention to the fact that the price they proposed paying for this site was altogether too high—that I knew the property well and flattered myself that I knew what the proper valuation should be. When the hon. gentleman said that something in the neighbourhood of \$8,000 was asked for it, I said it was not worth more than \$3,000 at a fair valuation. But the department had paid Dr. Wilson the equivalent of \$7,500—that is \$6,000 cash, and the old drill shed. The hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) promised last year that he would have a fair and proper valuation of the property made. And how did he proceed to do that? Dr. Wilson has the patronage of this government in that riding. And whom did the hon. minister ask to recommend a valuator? He applied to Mr. Donald McNish, who is the representative of West Elgin in the local legislature, entirely overlooking the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) who, I think, would have recommended a gentleman who would have given a fair valuation on the property. The minister asked his own officer to interview Alexander Darrach to find out about this property. And who is he? He is the person whom Dr. Wilson recommended to this government for an appointment in the Department of Customs. His officer is asked to interview Mr. Alex. Darrach, who has handled this property for Dr. Wilson for years, and has collected his rents. He is under obligations to Dr. Wilson, he owes to Dr. Wilson the position he holds as collector of customs. I do not wish to bring the private matters of Dr. Wilson up in this House, but I want to show the Minister of Militia and Defence that he has been imposed upon by a gentleman who should have the interest of this country at heart, because it is he who is supposed to have the patronage for the government in East Elgin and in the city of St. Thomas. But, instead of dealing with the government honestly, he misrepresents the facts for the purpose of getting a large price out of this property. What did they do? Instead of writing to my hon. friend who represents West Elgin (Mr. Casey), he writes to Mr. McNish, and Mr. McNish, M.P.P., recommends the president of a loan company who holds a mortgage against this property, and a loan company only a short time ago valued it at \$80 a lot, and it is now valued at \$300 a lot, and he makes the government pay that for it. I say that having warned

Mr. INGRAM.

the minister last year, both privately and publicly, that the property was too high, the hon. gentleman, in my judgment, has not exercised reasonable care and caution in the purchase of this property. It is well known to every person in St. Thomas that the property is not worth half the money that the hon. gentleman has paid for it.

Mr. CASEY. How large are the lots?

Mr. INGRAM. There are thirty-two lots in the property, which is eight acres and five-eighths in extent. The property lying alongside of it, known as the race course property, that has buildings upon it for the accommodation of the races and the agricultural show, was bought at less than one-half what the government is paying for this property. So, I say, without detaining the House any longer on this question, that the sooner the hon. gentleman gets his advice from some other quarter the better it will be for the country financially, and politically for the government.

North-west Territories—Red Deer—Court-house, lock-up, &c., \$5,000; land office, \$700 ..... \$5,700

Mr. DAVIN. Why do you have two separate buildings? Instead of putting up a \$5,000 and another \$700 building, it would be better for the town, and more suitable to the public interest, that one building, costing \$7,500, should be erected for the purpose of the court-house and land office. I do not see why the land office should not be in the same building with the court-house.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot say why it was done. I can only say that this \$700 is asked for by the Department of the Interior in order to provide accommodation for their office, which is now in a separate building. At present the Department of the Interior rents a small building at \$96 a year, and the accommodation is reported to us as wholly inadequate.

Mr. DAVIN. I see the Minister of the Interior in his place, and I would like to ask him if he has a land agent at Red Deer?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Prince Albert—Artesian well, &c. .... \$1,100

Mr. FOSTER. Are they experimenting for water?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Regina—North-west government buildings—To refund to the government of the North-west Territories amounts disbursed by them, 1897-8, for repairs, renewals, fittings, &c. .... \$1,773 87

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is to recoup the North-west government the expenditures they made on the government buildings. The sum is made up of a great

number of small items, such as freight, carpets, curtains, stoves, pipes, curtain poles, window shades, lumber, hardware, two carpenters, caretakers, glazing—pages of such items.

Mr. WILSON. Had the North-west government a right to order these things just as they liked? If we have to pay the bills we ought to have something to say about the things that are purchased.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These are all on government buildings. We have no officers there, but these were certified to by Mr. Dennis, deputy commissioner of the Department of Public Works at Regina.

Dominion public buildings—Salaries to clerks of works, assistants, &c. .... \$9,000

Mr. FOSTER. What does that cover?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is for clerks of works. Formerly the salaries of clerks of works were charged against the respective buildings, and now they are grouped altogether in one item.

Mr. FOSTER. And are not to be charged to different buildings?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are not to be charged to different buildings.

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Construction of armouries ..... \$35,000

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I would like to ask the hon. minister what this covers?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As I explained when the militia estimates were under consideration, it is necessary to have armouries at regimental headquarters, in order to take charge of the new rifles, and in other cases it is necessary to have proper accommodation for caring for cavalry and artillery outfit. In the militia vote for maintenance and repairs, there is a certain amount of money voted which may be used in the case of buildings that the department already possess for changes or additions to these buildings, which they intend to use for central armouries. This vote is for the construction of certain new armouries. I regret to say that the vote is not as large as it ought to be, but in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan), I may say that buildings are required at the following places: Woodstock, Ont., infantry armoury; Sussex, N.B.,—

Mr. FOSTER. Cost?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will speak of the cost when I go over this list.

Mr. FOSTER. It will save time, if you give the cost in each case.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In some cases \$500 is all that will be necessary, in other cases \$1,500 will construct a building that will be suitable, while

in the more important towns, where larger accommodation is required, the cost will be \$2,500, and in some cases \$4,000.

Mr. FOSTER. As the minister goes over the list, let him give the cost.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Woodstock, infantry armoury, cost, probably about \$4,000; Sussex, N.B., cavalry regimental stores, cost between \$3,000 and \$4,000. I am not able to give the exact amount, because it will be necessary, before expending this money, to have some officer of the department go around and see the different localities. We have plans, of course, for armouries according to the size of regiments, but it will be necessary after this vote is taken to look carefully over the ground, and see what the requirements are.

Mr. FOSTER. What the minister is really doing, is taking an omnibus vote.

THE MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is precisely the case. Then, there are to be buildings at Cobourg, Cornwall, Woodstock, N.B., Sarnia, Gananoque, Guelph, Port Hope—

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). What is it proposed to do at Cornwall?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is proposed to build an infantry armoury, but to construct it in such a way that later on a drill hall may be added to it. The expenditure will not be a large one.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). What will the first expenditure amount to?

THE MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Probably \$2,500.

Mr. I. J. GOULD (West Ontario). I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden), whether there is any provision made for building an armoury in Ontario County?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. At what place?

Mr. GOULD. Uxbridge. We had a nice drill hall there, but it got out of repair, and the government finally tore it down and sold it. We expected that they would have given us a new drill hall, but they have not done so. I was hoping that we would have an armoury, as we have a very good company, and as the battalion band is located in our town. I believe that our company stood first at Niagara. I think some provision should be made for our battalion at that place.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We cannot undertake to construct buildings, except at the headquarters of battalions.

Mr. GOULD. Uxbridge is the headquarters of our battalion.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then, I may tell the hon. gentleman that provision will be made at the earliest possible moment.

Department of the Interior—Steel file cases with drawers, &c. .... \$12,500

Mr. FOSTER. There are a number of items calling for the expenditure of a large amount of money for steel shelving. Can the hon. minister give us any idea as to the amount expended within the last three years under this one item of steel file cases with drawers? It must have amounted to a very large figure. How far is it going to go?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deputy is not able to-night to give any information that would really be accurate, but I will endeavour to get a statement by three o'clock to-morrow on that point.

Livingstone's Cove—To complete wharf... \$2,500

Mr. FOSTER. We would like a complete explanation of every one of these, with plans.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Detailed?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, detailed, with the plans. I suppose before these estimates are discussed, the hon. gentleman will lay the plans on the Table. There will not be more than 800 of them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A vote of \$2,500 has been called for by the chief engineer to complete the breakwater which was commenced in 1898, which was estimated to cost \$6,000, but which, through the mismanagement of the foreman, and owing to other causes, will exceed that amount by about \$2,000.

Blue Rock—Breakwater, repairs ..... \$2,000

Mr. KAULBACH. Where is Blue Rock?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In Antigonish.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have a Blue Rock in my county, and I thought perhaps this might be it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No such luck.

Gabarus—Breakwater (revote) ..... \$3,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of the whole work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. \$20,000. Nothing has been expended on it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it being done by tender?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It has not been determined as to how it shall be done.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it is understood it shall be done by tender and contract?

Mr. GOULD.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I myself personally favour that system, and always adopt it where it is possible, but there are some cases where it would be proper to do it by day's labour.

Mr. FOSTER. But this is a new work.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There will be no difficulty in having it done by contract, and therefore it will be done by contract.

Mr. FOSTER. Have all these places been visited by the officers of the department and reported upon?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, the chief engineer so informed me.

Mr. FOSTER. In every case?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In every case.

Ecum Secum—Wharf ..... \$3,000

Mr. KAULBACH. In which county is this?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is on the boundary line between Guysborough and Halifax counties. The wharf is in Guysborough County.

Mr. KAULBACH. Can vessels use this wharf to load and discharge?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is 160 feet long and 10 feet at extreme low water.

New Harbour—Breakwater (revote, \$2,000). \$9,000

Mr. McALISTER. Is this the place the government were not able to locate a year ago?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has been discovered since.

Porter's Lake—Dredging and breakwater at entrance of channel (revote) ..... \$4,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is this?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is in Halifax County. It is a small arm of the sea and it is proposed to dredge the entrance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is two miles east of Halifax.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a place of large commerce?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a navigable lake and when this channel is cleared it will connect it with salt water. The trade is not so large as in Montreal, but it is considerable.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cost of the work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The vote was \$9,000 last year and it is found it will cost about \$3,000 more. It will not be possible to spend more than \$4,000 at the

present time. It will have the two-fold purpose of enabling the water to escape rapidly from the lake which now overflows the surrounding country, and of creating a harbour as well.

Mr. KAULBACH. It is practically a canal for the safety of boats passing from the lake into the sea.

Luxenburg, N.S.—Dredging harbour, \$5,000; blasting rock at entrance, \$200.....\$5,200

Mr. KAULBACH. This work is much needed, and should have been attended to long ago. All I am anxious about now is to see the work carried on.

Mr. FOSTER. In view of that explanation, I think we had better pass these two votes.

Broad Cove, N.S.—Repairs to breakwater.. \$500

Mr. KAULBACH. Is that work in my country?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Will all these works be let by tender?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These repairs could not be done by tender.

Mr. DAVIN. Will those of \$5,000 and over be let by tender?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The principle of letting by tender, where it is possible, will be adopted—where the work is new; but the repairs cannot be let by tender.

Pinette Pier, P.E.I.—Repairs..... \$500

Mr. MARTIN. This is a very small vote for Pinette. This is one of the places the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) championed in the House for about fifteen years. I inquired last session whether or not a petition had been received in the department from this section, and the reply was that there was none. But during the progress of an election last fall, a letter was sent down stating that the petition was in the department, and this raised the expectations of the people that a pretty large sum of money would be voted. I think the petition was signed by 400 people. A good deal of dredging is required there, and I hope the anxiety which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries exhibited in years gone by has not altogether dwindled away.

Wood Island, P.E.I.—South breakwater extension ..... \$7,000

Mr. MARTIN. I would like an explanation of this.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This work will be let by tender. This vote will be applied towards the extension of the southern breakwater, 400 feet seaward,

and dredging a channel 50 feet wide between the piers to a depth of seven feet, low water, spring tide. The total estimated cost is \$14,000—\$10,000 for the extension, and \$4,000 for the dredging.

Canoe Cove—Breakwater (revote) ..... \$10,000

Mr. MARTIN. Will the hon. minister give the assurance that this will be expended this year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Tenders are now being invited.

Mr. MARTIN. I am a little bit anxious, because I notice in the *Patriot*, a paper published in that province, that at a public meeting held there the other day, the Premier of that province had to give his assurance that the money was to be expended. An election was then going on, in which the Minister of Marine was very much interested. The newspaper reports that at the meeting in question, Premier Farquarson was asked if the Dominion government intended building the breakwater, and he gave his word that tenders would be called for at once, and if any one tenderer complied with the conditions required, he would stake his reputation that this work would be accomplished. So it appears, whether the tender be high or low, the government is bound to accept it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken, the election is over, and we have carried the district by 311 majority.

Mr. MARTIN. That is not astonishing, in view of the fact that the Premier of that province had to go on his knees and pledge his word that this sum would be expended.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the last thing that the Minister of Marine ought to gloat over that his party carried a county, because the Premier of that province went down, and with the promise of the Minister of Marine at his back, assured the people that if they would vote right this work would be done.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Tenders had been called for and were received, but were found too high, and we called a second time.

Campbell Cove—Breakwater, reconstruction \$5,000  
Annandale Pier—Reconstruction of pier head ..... \$1,250

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). What is to be done at these places?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Annandale pier is a work of reconstruction. This money is to be applied to reconstruct the pier head, and also to effect repairs to the shore abutment. At Campbell's Cove, the breakwater will be reconstructed to its original length, with an additional block of 30 feet, and the existing work will be strengthened.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). That work can be done to much greater advantage at once than by leaving it to the autumn. I would advise the hon. gentleman to ask for tenders without delay, and in the case of Annandale pier it is likewise of great importance to have it done before the fall, having regard to its usefulness at that particular season.

Souris Knight's Point—Strengthening of breakwater (revote) ..... \$8,000

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to call the attention of the hon. minister to a claim against the government, a few years ago, by Whiteman & Bellish, who had a contract for building a breakwater at Souris Point. They were not allowed to proceed with the work on account of delays in completing the contract, which was due to the engineer not having the plans ready. A storm came on and carried a great part of the work done away. I brought the matter to the notice of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) two sessions ago, and he said at first that these men had no claim, but, on my explaining the matter more fully, he said he would look into it the second time. Is there anything in the department to show whether he has done anything or not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is the first time the matter has been brought to my attention, and I think it had better be left over until the return of the Minister of Public Works, as nothing can be done now.

Mr. MARTIN. Perhaps the hon. minister would look over the papers and see if the Minister of Public Works has come to any conclusion, and let me know?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will inquire and let the hon. gentleman know.

Summerside Harbour—Breakwater (revote) \$20,000

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). Has anything been expended on that yet?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The contract was let on May 25, and the probable cost will be \$59,000.

Mr. DAVIN. I am assured by a gentleman who knows the island well, not a member of parliament, that the \$20,000 especially is palpably a political vote, and the same is true of most of the others.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is very badly informed. This vote has been in the estimates for some years, and was put there by the late government and supported by the hon. gentleman himself—so it could not be political except in the larger sense of being a benefit to all.

Mr. MARTIN. It has been in the estimates for the last four years. I am very glad the government are proceeding with it, and I hope it will be successful.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) The vote is absolutely necessary for Summerside harbour, the second harbour of importance in Prince Edward Island. It needs it first for the breakwater to shelter shipping, and next for deepening the harbour.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Since this has come up, I venture to say, that it will do no good so far as deepening the harbour is concerned, as the harbour of Summerside has all the water the trade of the port requires. So far as the shelter is concerned it may be of some use, but I doubt it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) is mistaken. The harbour of Summerside, though a good harbour, has been filling up towards the mouth, and we have had to have it dredged to enable the steamer *Stanley* to come in.

Dipper Harbour, N.B.—Breakwater..... \$4,000

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the cost of this work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About \$25,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the contract been let?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the plan?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The proposed breakwater will be 235 feet long, 44 feet wide on top, with a height of 8 feet 9 inches in high water, and 32 feet 9 inches at low water. It will be placed inside the site formerly occupied by the original breakwater on the western side of the harbour. Dipper harbour is 24 miles from St. John; it is a mile long by a mile and a half wide, and it is open from east to west. The original breakwater was swept away by a storm. There are 43 boats and six small schooners of from ten to eighteen tons in that harbour, all engaged in the fisheries.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the work to be let by tender?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Chance Harbour, N.B.—Breakwater ..... \$4,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is for a breakwater 250 feet long by 38 feet at the other end.

Mr. FOSTER. How far is this from the other?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is 19 miles from St. John—about four and a half miles from the other.

Mr. FOSTER. These are two very expensive works. Are the government making harbours of refuge within such a short

distance of each other. What will be the cost of this work at Chance harbour?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About \$25,500.

Dorchester, N.B.—Breakwater ..... \$5,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is being done at Dorchester?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is required for the construction of a breakwater at Westmoreland on the bank of the Peticodiac River.

Mr. DAVIN. That is a new work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. The breakwater will be 995 feet long, and 20 to 30 feet wide. The estimated cost of the whole work will be \$30,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the purpose to be effected by this immense expenditure?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a very large shipping point, and the work has been petitioned for by the people. They state that twenty-one million superficial feet of deals were shipped there last season. A large quantity of this lumber had to be handled by lighters, and the traffic was very much incommoded in consequence.

New Brunswick—Campbellton—Wharf extension and repairs, &c..... \$6,700

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is for repairs to the ballast wharf and the approaches, with the view of affording to the public the free use of the same for shipping purposes, as prayed for by the citizens of Campbellton in a petition transmitted by Mr. McAlister, in February, 1895, and recommended by the chief engineer in 1896.

Campbellton—Dredging ..... \$5,000

Mr. McALISTER. What dredging does that include?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Dredging a basin about six hundred feet long by four hundred feet wide, opposite the ballast wharf at Campbellton, to a minimum depth of sixteen feet at low water, by the removal of small shoals which now obstruct that part of the harbour.

Mr. McALISTER. There is no provision made for dredging the basin. In the present state of the harbour, vessels cannot take a full cargo at that wharf, vessels of five or six hundred tons, but they have to take part of their cargo below the bar.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The necessity for this work is recognized. The difficulty is that there is no dredge available at present. We have not enough dredging plant.

Mr. McALISTER. Like my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaubach), I have from year to year pointed out the necessity of providing some means for a ferry land-

ing in the town of Campbellton. At present we have no ferry landing at all for the ferry running between Cross Point in the county of Bonaventure and Campbellton. The place at present used for a landing is on private property, the owner of which can stop the landing of boats at any time, and should he do so there would be no landing at all. When the Minister of Public Works was there two years ago this was pointed out to him, and he promised that an engineer would be sent down immediately to examine the situation, and that he would have an appropriation made at the next session for building a ferry landing. That has not been done. Any person who will go down there and see the situation will see exactly how the matter stands. There was a part of the ferry landing built some years ago, but it is utterly useless for the purpose for which it was intended, and cannot be used unless some \$1,500 or \$2,000 more are expended upon it.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to ask my hon. friend the acting Minister of Public Works whether these New Brunswick items were arranged for before the Minister of Public Works went away, or were they arranged for by the hon. gentleman?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These items have been accumulating, and they were dealt with before the hon. minister went away in some cases. In many cases, I think in almost all of these cases, if not in all, the matters have been reported upon by the local engineers and the officers here.

Mr. DAVIN. I consider that these items for New Brunswick, as the items for Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, that we have been passing at this hour of the night and at this time of the session, with a thin House, are a most striking and eloquent commentary on the financial system that has been adopted by this government, a financial system that, in order to appear to have a surplus, charges up items to capital that should be charged to current expenditure.

Mr. CHARLTON. These are all charged to income.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand that, but by charging up items to capital that should be charged to current expenditure it enables the government to have money for these purposes.

Mr. CHARLTON. We are not dealing with such items now.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand that, and the hon. gentleman will please allow me to make my protest. The protest I make is this, that boasting of a fallacious surplus, members of parliament and prospective members of parliament can go to the hon. Minister of Finance and to the hon. Minister

of Public Works, and have items like this put into the estimates. There has never been such a carnival of inconsiderate extravagance as these estimates show.

Mr. FOSTER. It is now midnight, and we were here last night until a very late hour.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think we have made reasonable progress to-day, and I beg to move that the committee rise.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

#### FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 192)—from the Senate—to amend the Bank Act Amendment Act, 1900.—(Mr. Fielding).

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood that the railway subsidies were to be the chief order of the day to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It will either be that or supply. If the Minister of Railways and Canals is in his seat to-morrow, we will take up the railway subsidies.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Thursday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, July 12, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

#### PRAYERS.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PAY OF STRATHCONA CONTINGENT.

Mr. OLIVER asked :

Will supplementary pay be provided for the members of the Strathcona contingent as in the case of the first and second contingents ?

If their Imperial pay is not to be supplemented to the Strathcona contingent, will any separation allowance be given the dependents of officers and men of that force ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The matter is under consideration.

Mr. DAVIN.

#### LIEUTENANT MILLER, 4TH FIELD BATTERY.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Is Lieut. Miller an officer of 'A' Battery ?
2. If so, when was he appointed ?
3. Is he still drawing pay as a customs officer in Hamilton as well as his military pay ?
4. If so, how much money has he drawn from the public chest since January 31st last ?
5. What rank has the gentleman now at Deseronto camp who signs himself 'Col.' McRae, Guelph ?
6. Does his name appear on the militia list ?
7. What are his qualifications ?
8. Why was he appointed D.A.A.G. camp quartermaster ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. No, but there is a Lieutenant W. T. Miller, 4th Field Battery, attached for duty to "A" Field Battery. 2. He was authorized to be attached for duty on February 19, 1900. 3 and 4. W. G. Miller has been paid his salary as a customs officer since January 31, 1900, for four months, at the rate of \$39.28 per month, amounting to \$157.12. 5. The rank of lieutenant-colonel in the reserve militia. 6. The names of the officers of the reserve militia are not included in the militia list. 7. M. S., 1st class. Also a second-class artillery certificate. 8. Because he was recommended for the appointment by Lieut.-Col. Stone, inspector general of artillery and commandant of the camp, and was known at headquarters to be eminently fitted for the duties.

#### GOVERNMENT WHARF, PORT DUFFERIN.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. When was the shed upon the government wharf at Port Dufferin or Salmon River, in the county of Halifax, completed ?
2. Was this shed built by contract or how otherwise ?
3. What amount has been paid on account of the cost of construction of this shed, and what bills have been rendered for on account of the cost of such construction ?
4. What wharfage has been collected in respect of the government wharf at Port Dufferin or Salmon River, in the county of Halifax ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). The department has telegraphed for the information asked for here, but the answer has not yet come. It may be here by to-morrow.

#### WHARF AT GORDON POINT.

Mr. BELL (P.E.I.) asked :

Has the Minister of Public Works received a petition from certain inhabitants of Searlton, Prince Edward Island, and vicinity asking for an appropriation for a wharf or pier at Gordon Point, and if so, is it the intention of the government to grant the prayer of such petition ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mu-  
lock). Such a petition was received, and  
the matter was referred to an engineer to  
make an investigation and report. He made  
a careful examination, and reported that the  
cost of the proposed work would amount to  
some \$22,500. In view of the large expendi-  
tures involved in improvements at Summer-  
side and other places in Prince Edward Is-  
land, it was not deemed possible to provide  
an item in the estimates at the present ses-  
sion for this work.

LIEUT.-COL. MCGILL, ROYAL MILI-  
TARY COLLEGE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Is Lt.-Col. McGill acting staff adjutant at the Royal Military College, Kingston ?
2. If so, what is his salary ?
3. Is he paid monthly ?
4. If so, how much is he paid per month for salary and how much for lodging allowance ?
5. Has he been paid for the months of April, May and June last ?
6. Has Lt.-Col. McGill been devoting all of his time to the management of the Frontenac Loan and Trust Company, of Kingston, since the first day of April last ?
7. Is he the manager of that company ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DE-  
FENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Yes. 2. His sal-  
ary is \$1,400 a year. 3. I believe he is paid  
monthly. 4. \$116.66 for salary and \$25 per  
month for lodging. 5. He has been paid for  
the months of April, May and June last. 6.  
In March last, Lieut.-Col. McGill, an old offi-  
cer of seventeen or eighteen years' standing,  
and a most efficient and painstaking officer  
of the Royal Military College, applied for  
leave of absence for three months. During  
all those years he has served, he has never  
had a longer leave at any one time than ten  
days, and has served during the vacation at  
the college. This application for leave was  
strongly recommended by the commandant,  
Lieut.-Col. Kittson, and was granted. 7. I  
have no means of knowing, nor do I care,  
nor do I think it is a matter of consequence  
to the people of Canada, what Lieut.-Col.  
McGill may have done, or how he may have  
utilized his time during the period of his  
leave of absence.

ELECTORAL FRAUDS—JUDICIAL IN-  
QUIRY.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before  
the Orders of the Day are called, is the First  
Minister prepared to make any statement  
with reference to the Elections Commis-  
sion ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Lau-  
rier). I am sorry to say that I am not in a  
position to make the statement that I ex-  
pected, but I shall endeavour to do so dur-  
ing the present sitting.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND  
CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved that the House  
resolve itself into committee to consider  
certain proposed resolutions respecting sub-  
sidies to railway companies and towards the  
construction of railways and works therein  
mentioned. (*Hansard*, page 9333.)

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before  
that motion is carried, I think the minister  
had better give us a general explanation of  
what he proposes to do with these subsidies.  
It is not the right way to commence an ex-  
penditure of \$3,500,000 by simply running  
into committee without any explanations.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Lau-  
rier). That is not the practice.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois).  
That is the practice. He spoke for an hour  
and a half last year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND  
CANALS. Though I do not think that the  
practice has been generally followed, I have  
no objection to making a few brief prelimi-  
nary remarks upon the subject of the reso-  
lutions which we now ask be referred to  
Committee of the Whole. These resolutions,  
Mr. Speaker, outside of the particular rail-  
way enterprises that it is proposed to sub-  
sidize, do not differ materially from the re-  
solutions which have usually accompanied  
the submission of these grants during the  
present administration. We have not de-  
parted from the principle, as respects the  
amount of the grants which we propose  
to make, from that which we adopted in  
1897. We have seen no reason to think that  
that method of aiding undertakings of this  
character was not a wise and judicious meth-  
od, and is not greatly to be preferred to  
the system which was in vogue under the  
previous administrations. I have, therefore,  
no excuse to offer for including these reso-  
lutions with the general resolutions which  
are to be referred to the committee.

If any particular criticism is directed  
against this policy, I should be very happy to  
offer any remarks that may occur to me in  
defence of the particular resolutions to  
which these objections are taken. I am  
aware, however, that this plan of providing  
for a sliding scale, in accordance with the  
cost of the roads, is one that has not com-  
mended itself to hon. gentlemen opposite.  
It is not one which seems to meet with the  
approval of their newspaper press, but there  
has been, it appears to me, a complete and  
total absence of any argument at all in  
support of the objection which has been  
generally taken by our opponents to this  
principle. I think we might very well take  
exception to the attitude of these gentle-  
men and of their leading press, upon this  
question, because they have made, not, per-  
haps, a successful, but at all events, a very

desperate effort to mislead the public mind as to the exact character of this principle and as to its effect generally in its application to railway undertakings. The impression is sought to be created that to allow payment of additional subsidies up to \$6,400 per mile in respect of roads which cost over \$15,000 a mile is to adopt a principle which would involve the payment of this double subsidy in all cases, and is one which does not admit of any limitation at all. This is the attitude, which I understand is being taken, at all events, by the press of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I think I can fairly say, in effect taken by hon. gentlemen themselves. I will, if you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, call the attention of the House for a moment to what has been put forward by the leading organs of the opposition in the country. I will refer to the leading organ of the party, the chief exponent of the views of the party and the paper, I think, which regards itself as entitled to speak with more authority than any other as to what the views and policy of hon. gentlemen opposite are, in reference to government measures. I find in an issue of the chief Toronto organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, of no more remote a date than July 11, that, in respect to the resolutions which are now about to be submitted to the committee, these remarks are made. The article embodies a general attack, as was to be expected to the granting of railway subsidies by this government. It implies that subsidies ought never to have been granted by this government. It is announcing a policy for us to adopt in the granting of railway subsidies, but not detaining the House in reference to that particularly. Let me read what the *Mail and Empire* says :

If the road costs \$15,000 a mile to build, the country pays \$3,200 per mile as a subsidy; but if the cost exceeds that, and it always does, we pay half the additional price, but not more than \$6,400 per mile in all. The system of doubling the subsidy, so far as it has gone, has resulted in the double subsidy being paid.

Further on it says :

This session the bonuses so far proposed are for 720 miles of railway on the sliding scale basis, aggregating \$6,400 a mile, which, of course, will be paid, \$4,508,000, and for bridges, \$650,000.

Anybody who refers to this organ of Conservative opinion for information as to the facts, I think, must generally find himself most egregiously misled, because here is a statement emanating from the leading organ of the party which, I would be sorry to know, would be written by any one so ignorant so as not be aware that it is incorrect, and yet, I would be sorry to think that any one had deliberately penned so inaccurate and untrue a statement.

Mr. POWELL. What paper is that ?

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am reading from the Toronto organ of the Conservative party, from the *Mail and Empire*, of July 11. The statement is not true that all the railways which are subsidized under the Acts passed since 1897, or which will be subsidized under the resolutions and the Bill found upon them, will be paid the subsidy in full. There is nothing which would justify any such statement or anything approaching it. It is utterly and absolutely misleading, yet these are the gentlemen who honestly try, as they say, to enlighten the country as to the conduct of this government as and to the effect of its policy, with their eyes wide open, deliberately misrepresenting the facts. I have no fear at all but that upon a fair consideration of the character of these resolutions they will justify themselves to any fair-minded man, and to any one who is at all in favour of aiding undertakings of this kind. I do not say that they will justify themselves to men who are entirely opposed to the granting of subsidies at all. I think there are very few gentlemen of that opinion in this House or in the country. I do not think that parliament has come to the conclusion that this Dominion has reached that perfected stage of its development in which we can afford to refuse parliamentary assistance towards the railway development of our country, certainly not in the west. It goes without saying that we must assist railway development in the west, and, I think, in the eastern provinces as well. Therefore, I say, that those who are disposed to look with favour upon a reasonable and moderate contribution in aid of the construction of these great developing works in this country, must favour the policy also of giving the assistance in proportion to the cost of the undertaking to which the aid is given. We have, I think I may say, with confidence, placed the minimum amount of cost before the operating clause of our principle will begin to apply at a high figure. We have placed the cost of railways, to which a subsidy in excess of \$3,200 per mile will be paid at \$15,000 per mile, a very safe amount, an amount so safe that when you see how that law has operated, those who are in favour of granting assistance, will say that it is an unreasonable limit, a limit in excess of the amount at which it should be placed. I have a statement prepared in reference to this very subject, with the view of enlightening the House as to the exact facts. I do not think the House requires to be informed that all the railway companies subsidized by this government, have not received double subsidy. There is not an hon. gentleman in this parliament who does not know this to be the case. There is not a thinking man in this country who does not know that it would be utterly absurd to put forth any such statement, and yet this organ

of public opinion, has so poor an opinion of the constituency to which it is addressing itself, that it makes this statement, expecting it to be believed. Now there has been subsidy contracts entered into by this government since we came into power in all to the number of forty-seven.

Mr. BERGERON. Will you name them ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, if the hon. gentleman desires. There is the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company, the—

Mr. BERGERON. Have you the amount opposite the name of the railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have only the amount of the subsidies which have been paid.

Mr. BERGERON. Have you the amount paid to the St. Lawrence and Adirondack ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. The amount is \$84,480. The following are the railways: The Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company, the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company, the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, the St. Stephen and Milltown Railway Company, the Montfort Colonization Railway Company, the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company, the Gulf Shore Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Drummond County Railway Company, the Ottawa and New York Railway Company, the Restigouche and Western Railway Company, the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company (Limited), the Tilsonburg Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the East Richelieu Valley Railway Company, the Pembroke Southern Railway Company, the Dominion Eastern Railway Company, the Cobourg, Northumberland and Pacific Railway Company, the Great Northern Railway Company, the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company, the St. Gabriel de Brandon and St. Emilie de l'Energie Railway Company, the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company, the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company (2), the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company (2), the Great Northern Railway Company, the York and Carleton Railway Company, the Phillipsburg Railway and Quarry Company, the South Shore Railway Company, the Great Northern Railway Company (3), the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company and Ottawa and Gatineau Valley Railway Company, the Nova Scotia Southern Railway Company (Limited) (2), the Canada Eastern Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company (2), the Midland Railway Company, the Central Railway Company of New Brunswick, the Great

Northern Railway Company, the Massawippi Railway Company, the South Shore Railway Company (2), and the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company. This makes forty-seven subsidy contracts that have been entered into by this government.

Mr. BERGERON. Although the minister has not named the amounts, I suppose they will go into *Hansard* ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the amounts, but I will state the facts with reference to the amounts. I am only able to give the sums paid up to date in respect to these contracts, and I will give that if the House desires. Seventeen of these companies have been paid subsidies out of the forty-seven. Of these seventeen only three have received any additional subsidy under that clause. And, Sir, out of these three—far from fortifying the statement that every company that gets a subsidy will be paid the whole of the \$6,400 a mile—there is only one of them that has received \$6,400 a mile.

Mr. BERGERON. Which one ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That one is the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway. Of the other two companies, one, the Restigouche and Western Railway, earned, in addition to the \$3,200, only \$1,493 per mile, and it received, not \$6,400 a mile, but \$4,693 per mile. The other, the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company, instead of receiving \$6,400 per mile, received \$4,909 per mile, or \$1,709 increase on the ordinary subsidy. You see, Mr. Speaker, that gentlemen opposite have sought to alarm the people, but when the facts are known, they will find, I trust, that they have done so without success.

We have endeavoured, Sir, to establish a principle which is just and equitable to the railway undertakings of the country. We have sought to put the railways in a position in which, when they have bona fide and actually expended a larger sum than the \$15,000 as the maximum figure for the lesser subsidy; when they have bona fide and actually expended a larger sum than that, we have established the principle that they should get an additional subsidy, but, not unless they have done so. I want to know whether any one who is at all disposed to think that railway undertakings in the country should be aided by the government to any extent, believes that they can be aided upon a juster and sounder or fairer principle than according to the cost of the undertaking.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the minister if he will state with reference to the seventeen railways on which subsidies have been paid: How many of these have been totally com-

pleted so that all payments are made and the accounts adjusted? And, also: As to whether any others besides the three that are mentioned have made claims for extra payment beyond the \$3,200 per mile?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. None have made any claims, so far as I know, or so far as is known in the department, beyond the three I have mentioned, and so far as these seventeen railways are concerned. Did I say seventeen—I should have more properly said sixteen railways, because one of these is a bridge. So far as these sixteen railways are concerned, I am of opinion, and I believe—though I would not like to state that with absolute confidence—I believe that these sixteen companies have been paid the full amount of their subsidy for the completed work. That is what I think at this moment, but I will verify it further and qualify it, if necessary, if I am asked later on. I asked for a statement that would show the amounts of the subsidies paid in full, and there are none of them marked here 'paid on account.' None of them represent payments so made, so far as I am aware.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is only one other matter which, at this stage, I will mention to the House. The government had had, for some little time, in contemplation a question as to the desirability, if we are to continue these subsidies, of granting them upon such terms as shall have the effect of stimulating the manufacture of steel rails in Canada. There is every prospect that this industry, with a little proper and judicious encouragement might be established with advantage in this country. We had determined upon that policy, and it was in our minds that we would incorporate a clause in our subsidy-contracts giving effect to that policy, and we were of opinion, and are still of opinion, that such a clause would answer a very useful purpose. We believed it would suffice to embody it in the contract without making it part of the law of the land. But, on further consideration, it has appeared to us that it might be preferable in some ways if we would add an additional clause to these resolutions, embodying that idea, so as to make it on the face of it, apparent that such was the design of the government and of parliament.

The insertion of this clause in the Bill might, perhaps, make it known more generally so that it would have the effect of stimulating the object we have in view.

Mr. FOSTER.

better than if we had not given it publicity in that form. When the House resolves itself into committee on these resolutions, I shall propose an additional resolution to the following effect:

The Governor in Council may make it a condition of the grant of the subsidies herein provided, or any heretofore granted by any preceding Act of parliament as to which a contract has not yet been entered into between Her Majesty and the company for the construction of the railway, that the company shall lay its road with new steel rails made in Canada if same are procurable in Canada upon terms as favourable as other rails can be obtained, of which the Minister of Railways and Canals shall be the judge.

With that exception there is nothing, I think, in these general resolutions which is novel or which differs in any material degree from the ones which have heretofore been discussed and adopted by parliament in other sessions, or which need call for any further comment from me at this time. I might point out before I sit down that the total amount of the subsidies proposed in these resolutions, upon the basis of \$3,200 per mile, and with the bridge grants, will be \$3,493,000—an amount which, having regard to the importance of the various undertakings which are provided for in part by these resolutions, will not, I think, strike the House as being at all excessive, but which I think will appear on all sides to be very moderate and reasonable. I saw what our proposals in this direction were anticipated to be in the press—I will not say the press of both parties, but the press which espouses the cause of hon. gentlemen opposite. I saw that it represented that we were going to bring down subsidies which would aggregate twenty odd millions of dollars. I do not know whether our hon. friends are disappointed that we did not do that, or whether they are pleased.

Mr. CLANCY. We are always disappointed when you do right.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I notice very little evidence of disappointment on their part, and I take it that we do not always fall into error. I think some times we must make proper and reasonable proposals, yet they have not produced the effect which the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the minister whether he has laid on the Table, or proposes to lay on the Table, any correspondence and information which always precedes the proposal of the government to grant a subsidy, so that the members, when we come to take up the items in committee, may have that information to go upon? I do not suppose it is imaginable that the ministry have discussed and considered, and

have proposed to the House \$3,400,000 of subsidies without a very careful investigation on information afforded; and certainly the House has an undoubted right to have that information placed before it, before it is called upon to consider these measures. I suppose the minister has that ready, and can put it on the Table of the House before we take up the items.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I admire the calm seriousness with which the hon. gentleman rises in his place and makes the statement which he has just made. I think one cannot fail to elicit admiration who can with such an air of seriousness make such a statement. The hon. gentleman asks me, am I prepared to bring down the plans and correspondence and statements which have always been laid on the Table of this House when the railway resolutions have been submitted.

Mr. **FOSTER**. There is no use of the minister misrepresenting me. I did not say have always been laid on the Table. I said I supposed that no government would propose three and a half millions of expenditure to the House without having such information before them, and I said it was the right of members of this House to have that same information, as far as it could be given in correspondence and all that, which precedes the affirmative action of a government upon the propositions that are put before it. That is what I said, and I think that is a fair proposition.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I take the hon. gentleman's statement as to what he said, though I followed him very closely, and I am bound to say that what he now says he said did not strike my ear, and my hearing is not particularly defective.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The trouble is not with the hon. gentleman's hearing.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman now tells us that no government can be supposed to propose the granting of subsidies to the amount of three millions and upwards, without putting all this correspondence and all the information and all the material upon which their proposals are based, upon the Table of the House.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Again I beg leave to correct my hon. friend. I made no such statement. What I stated was that I did not suppose it was imaginable that any government would propose a vote of \$3,600,000 for various lines of railway without having had all that information before them upon which to base their conclusions; and then I said I thought it was right that the mem-

bers of this House should have that information, or so much of it as was possible to be brought down, in order that they might have the benefit of the information when they were making up their minds to give the vote; and I think that is fair.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman may rest assured of this, that we would have to furnish a very slim quantity of information indeed if we did not supply it as amply and fully as it was supplied during the administration with which the hon. gentleman was connected; and I can assure this House that, as respects each and all of these applications, we shall be prepared to give to the House good and sufficient reasons why the House should join with us in adopting the resolutions.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Have you plans for all these?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I would be very sorry to tell the hon. gentleman that we have. I think it would hardly be a reasonable expectation that we should have plans for all.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I do not know. I think it should be done.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Plans are very rarely drawn for railways until people get sufficient encouragement to believe that they will have aid and be able to finance the undertakings. They very seldom engage in very large expenditures until then, and the expenditures would have to be considerable in order to prepare plans, until they have some encouragement that they will be able to get on with their work. No, we have not plans.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I asked that because the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) would never allow any subsidies to go through until the plans were laid on the Table of the House, so that everybody could look at them.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Plans of bridges, not railways.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Plans of railways, too.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think my hon. friend will find on inquiry that he is quite in error in that. I have taken occasion to look over the reports of *Hansard* as to what transpired during the submitting of previous railway resolutions to parliament; and I can assure the hon. gentleman that if he does the same, he will find that no such condition was attached to them by any member of parliament. Somebody may have complained, but to say that the govern-

ment of the day yielded to all the complaints or furnished the information the hon. gentleman refers to, is quite a misapprehension on his part.

Mr. BERGERON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I have seen this table loaded with maps representing the different railways and the subsidies that were granted. In the *Hansard* of 1894, the hon. gentleman will see a speech of the Minister of Railways on the very same subject, giving all these particulars.

Mr. FOSTER. The earnestness and the controversial spirit with which the Minister of Railways began what we asked as a general explanation on the particular measures brought down is a fine example of how not to do it, so far as putting information before the House respecting the measures directly under our consideration is concerned. I did not ask the Minister of Railways to set up a newspaper article that he read, putting the paper up within fair striking distance and making a pugilistic display before it with all the heat and fire of simulated combat. What I asked for was information, and of that we have got very little. What I asked for was that in proposing a vote of three and a half million dollars, the hon. minister might condescend to give some general information with regard to the nature of the enterprises for which the money was to be voted, and I do not think that was an unfair request, but the whole House sees how the hon. gentleman met it and what information we have got as the result.

There are some things we may learn. I notice that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce got to his feet as quickly as he could and left the room when the Minister of Railways began his proposition. No wonder he left. That gentleman who, I suppose, is a valued member of the Liberal party, expressed his views very strongly through a series of some ten or twelve years at least, from 1882 to 1896, and I can recall no single occasion on which he did not express himself as most unqualifiedly opposed to the whole system of subsidizing railways, root and branch, not only on account of the expenditure of public money, but also on account of the corrupting influences which, he declared, these railways exerted on the public mind. In fact he used to go the length of declaring that there was very little more basis for the most of these than simply an attempt to cajole and seduce the electorate. There were equally as strong expressions made by other members of the present government. I notice that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is not just now in the House, and neither is the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), and it would be extremely interesting and point an extremely valuable lesson to the people, if we only

Mr. BLAIR.

had a little time to go through the pages of *Hansard* from 1882 up and give choice excerpts from the speeches of these gentlemen with reference to measures similar to those before the House to-day.

In 1882, the government at that time undertook the policy of subsidizing railways, commencing with the initial idea that wherever capital would put itself into the work of constructing and carrying out a railway, if that railway would, was considered for the benefit of the country, if it were a proposition which worthily demanded aid. The government would aid it to the extent of providing a subsidy sufficient to rail the road after all the other expenditure had been carried by private capital.

At that time \$3,200 per mile was considered sufficient, but later on, as steel rails decreased in price, that subsidy did more than that, but that was the general basis of the subsidy. Then again, in the case of certain roads which had to contend with great natural difficulties, the government, after considering each case, came to a conclusion either to grant or not to grant a larger subsidy than the \$3,200 per mile. If they decided to grant a larger subsidy, they justified their decision by the nature of the construction and the money was voted, and it was possible for the country to know what its liability would be as regards the construction of each mile of railway and for the country to know, without any goings on between the minister and the company itself, without any manipulations of accounts or anything of that kind, just exactly what it could expect to pay when this road was finally passed by the engineer who had to report upon it. That policy, the present Liberal government, representing the Liberal party, from its head down to its foot, vigorously denounced. So far as lips and tongue could go they were eloquent and fiery, perfectly sanguinary in their denunciations of that policy introduced in 1882, and never did a subsidy vote come before the House that these gentlemen's mouths were not active and their tongues not nimble, but of course very different results often happened when the individual items came up. Then we saw men with the nimblest tongues leave their seats and their coat tails flying as they rushed from the Chamber. We saw the Minister of Justice at one time, who was one of the most eloquent denouncers of these railway subsidies, rush from this Chamber quicker than a flash of lightning when a subsidy was proposed having something to do with his own county.

I am not going to take up the time of the House by reading these denunciations from year to year of hon. gentlemen opposite, from the right hon. gentleman down to the humblest member of his government. They are on record in *Hansard*, so that any enterprising and curious person can read them.

What else have we? Most vigorously did these denunciations flow from these hon. gentlemen concerning the period at which these railway subsidies were brought down. First, because there was not information enough to go upon, and secondly, because important legislation of this kind was kept back until the dying hours of the session. There was no honest heart there beating in a Grit bosom, which did not swell with most vehement denunciation of this unstatesman-like, miserable and totally unparliamentary plan of throwing millions as railway subsidies on the Table of the House just a few days before the expiry of the session, when the members were neither in a position to investigate these matters or in sufficient number to control, by any fair criticism and consideration, the course of legislation in that respect. All these things are written, and if you wish, you can find them in the book. They are a matter of history. And then this wide country through, where was the hustings that did not ring with these denunciations of railway subsidies. Where are the Grits, who to-day move and live and have their being in the militant ranks of the party, that did not then use their maxim guns and quick-firing apparatus over and over again on the hustings. What since happened? To-day we have the Minister of Railways arising and challenging any intelligent man to stand up and oppose the system of granting subsidies to railways. Why, he says, the country would stand still if you did not do it: it is against all progress; only fools would contend against a policy of this kind. And he is not content with going that far, but has made a distinct departure.

But for the tender susceptibilities of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards), I would expatiate more upon this last proposition of the Minister of Railways and Canals. But I forbear, on his account and on his account alone. What was it we used to hear?—Protection the bane and curse of Canada; protection the rampart of the monopoly holder; protection the feudal castle of the robber baron from which he sallied down and took the hard earnings of the burghers and peasants living on their ill-tilled lands. But now the Minister of Railways and Canals is going to propose—and the hon. member for Russell will obediently vote for it—that you are to make it an absolute condition that a man shall not buy steel rails where he wants to. Alas and alas for freedom of purchase. Alas and alas! for the statement that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) so eloquently directed to the voting bulk of the population showing that it was intolerable that people should be dictated to by tariff legislation where they should purchase their tea and their cottons, and so on. But the Minister of Railways and Canals with the consent of the right hon. gentleman, with the consent of the hon.

member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), with the consent of the hon. member for Russell, actually puts into legislation that if a set of men propose to build a railway and to avail themselves of the assistance the government offers them those men shall be told: Go down to my one factory of steel rails and buy your steel rails there, or you shall not get the subsidy that the government has provided for you. Where is free trade? Where is the liberty of purchase? We are living in growing times, in moving times; and the Grit party seems to have grown out of any semblance of respect for its previous pledges and its previous principles—if we go to the length, by way of courtesy, of saying that they ever had principles or ever made pledges based upon conviction in regard to these things. The Minister of Railways and Canals flouts at the demand which is made that the loyal commons of this country shall have a little of the information that the minister has as to these lines of railway, upon which information, of course, after a well-reasoned investigation, he and his colleagues have decided to choose these railways to receive the benefit of subsidies. He flouts the assertion that any information was ever laid on the Table of the House before; and he asserts in that large and generous way which is peculiar to him that it was never known that any information was laid on the Table of the House at such a period as this. On these points, let us have a word or two. I take up *Hansard* of 1894, and I find that on the 19th day of July of that year the railway subsidies came up for discussion. I find that the leader of the opposition of that time said:

Several times in the past we have had to complain of the manner in which these resolutions for railway subsidies were introduced in this House. In fact, every time they have been introduced they have been introduced as they have been to-day, within thirty-six hours of prorogation, and this year the proceeding is worse than ever, because formerly, as a rule, we have had the correspondence on which these resolutions are based placed in our hands at least twenty-four hours before the day set for the discussion, but this year we have not had a word of correspondence until twelve o'clock to-day—

Now, there is a statement made by the present Prime Minister, the leader of the opposition in 1894. I presume his statement was correct—I have no doubt it was. I have perfect recollection that, not all the correspondence was brought down—we do not ask that to-day—but that the principal papers relating to these matters were laid on the Table in time for the members to have a look at them before the discussion came on. There is my answer to the large and generous assertion of the Minister of Railways and Canals that such a thing had never been known. I refer him to his own Prime Minister:

—until twelve o'clock to-day, when the minister placed on the Table a batch of letters which it has been utterly impossible for any one to go through before this discussion came up. I enter my protest against such proceedings.

Will the right hon. gentleman help me to protest now? What was right as a principle of legislation in 1894 is correct now. I shall wait with great anxiety to see whether the right hon. gentleman will rise in his place after I sit down, and, turning around to his Minister of Railways and Canals, will say to him: Sir, I protest with all my force that you should have had these letters down at least at twelve o'clock—you should have had them twenty-four hours before, in order that we might have a look at them, and have some of the information that you yourself have. Will the right hon. gentleman make that protest? No. Why? Because he had no conviction when he made this protest in 1894, and he has just as much just now. Further, he says:

I enter my protest against such proceedings; the session has lasted four months, and the government have had more time than was necessary to prepare these resolutions.

Will the right hon. gentleman rise and say to his Minister of Railways and Canals: The session has lasted five and a half months, and you have had infinite time for the preparation of these resolutions; why did you not prepare them and bring them down earlier? Will he say it? No. Is the principle he enunciated in 1894 right to-day? Yes. Why, then, will he not protest? Because he had no conviction in 1894 in regard to this matter, and he has just as much now. Still further he says:

How is it possible that this House can discuss these resolutions intelligently, covering as they do about sixty different railway schemes and involving an amount aggregating over three millions of dollars?

Will the Prime Minister rise when I am through and turn to his Minister of Railways and Canals and say: How is it possible for the House to discuss these resolutions of yours intelligently—resolutions involving \$3,500,000? No, he will not. Why? Because he was talking to the gallery then as he will talk to the gallery now. There was no conviction in either case, and again:

It is quite impossible, under such circumstances, that any man in this House can give intelligent attention to this question.

It is equally impossible to-day, if it was impossible then. Well, Sir, Mr. Mills, the present Minister of Justice was in the House at that time, and he followed up in the line of the right hon. gentleman who was then leading the opposition. I am not going to read what Mr. Mills said, but it will be found at 6380 of *Hansard* of 1894. The present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was also in the House. And what did he say:

Mr. FOSTER.

This abuse is one of long standing, and therefore, all the worse. We ought, in all conscience, at the time of the budget or about that time, get a description of what our obligations are, and what further obligations it is proposed the country should incur.

Was that right in 1894? Was it uttered by a sane and honest man? Is it any less right to-day? Is the Minister of Trade and Commerce any less sane and honest than he was in 1894? Why is he not here to make the same statement to-day, or why was not he in his place as the strong member for the province of Ontario to see that these resolutions came down about the time of the budget, so that we might know what our obligations were, and have time to consider them? But he is not here, the big policeman is on strike. He goes on to say:

Here we have had a long discussion as to the railways of the country, as to the extent of our resources, and our obligations, and, all told, there are about four millions of dollars of obligations of which we had no hint the time the discussions were going on. More than that, every human being knows that this practice of putting these railway resolutions off until the end of the session is carried on for the express purpose of stifling and preventing inquiry.

Was it true in 1894? Is it not equally true now? Who are attempting to prevent investigation and stifle inquiry? The Minister of Trade and Commerce himself, the Prime Minister, and all those who howled so in 1894, and further:

It is owing largely to that that the very objectionable grants in the past have been through from time to time. We have no opportunity of getting printed what meagre information is given us—

There again the information was given, but the complaint is that there was not time to get it printed so that it could be examined before the legislation was asked:

—so that the majority of the members can avail themselves of it. One or two may possibly look through the returns which are brought down—

So you see, 'one or two may possibly look through the returns which are brought down,' showing that they were brought down.

—but the great body of the members in the House know nothing of them, and vote on all these things in the most perfect ignorance of what they are doing.

Well, Sir, Mr. Mulock was in the House at that time, Mr. Mulock is a member of this government, he is not in his seat to-day. What does he say?

I concur in the remarks that have fallen from my hon. friends, and I think they could have put the case with even greater force.

He says amen to every denunciation I have read, but he puts a caution on that, he does not think it is quite as strong as it ought to be.

We are called upon not only to consider the propositions involved in these resolutions, but we ought by rights to consider the whole situation with a view of determining whether this is the wisest mode in which to grant aid in promotion of railway enterprises.

And so on through half a page.

One-half the House has gone home. A week ago the government gave notice that practically the work of the session was over; to-day we have scarcely more than one-half the House sitting, and not one of us has had an opportunity of communication with the outside world before we are asked to vote away public money.

The claim was not that they had not the papers, they were on the Table, brought down that day at twelve o'clock; but the complaint was that they had not time to have them printed, had not time to communicate with the outside world, with the public, before they voted away the public money.

It is on a line, Mr. Speaker, of the financial administration of this government.

How about it to-day?

They are practically engaged in wrecking the finances of Canada to-day.

So said Mr. Mulock then. How is it now? Look at last year. Yes, Sir, you have old, accomplished and professional wreckers who are wrecking the finances of this country to-day. There they sit, accomplished hands who know just how to do it. Any man who sat here last night and saw us go through at race horse speed the 800 political votes in the supplementary estimates of seven and a quarter million dollars, will agree that this is on a par with the financial administration of this government—estimates which were only entered into on the 161st day of the session, when the House was decimated and the members away, and no opportunity to communicate with the outside public. That is what was being done in 1894, so say these members. Where is the Postmaster General to-day to give us his opinion about that? He said:

A government that has shown less regard for the finances of Canada has never occupied the Treasury benches since we have had responsible government. Hon. members may be surprised. I am but voicing, as I believe, the sentiments of the thoughtful people of Canada.

Well, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), to go from greater to less, from large to small, the hon. member for North Wellington occupied a seat in this House at that time. He had his voice on this subject, as he generally had on all subjects, from the carpets and spoons in Government House up to millions of dollars to a railway company, always on the line of rigid economy, based upon indestructible Puritan principle with regard to the management of the public finances of a country. What did he say:

I concur in the views expressed by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock).

How natural it is, and how long continued it has been, this concurrence with the member for North York. They concurred when they were in opposition on the Governor General's salary, they concurred that it ought to be reduced—on the reduction of the salaries of ministers, altogether too high, and ought to be reduced. A beautiful and sentimental concurrence. On the matter of expenditures all through they concurred. Since this government has been in power how beautifully the stream of concurrence rolls on—never a ruffle, not even the dimple that a small pebble thrown into water would cause to circulate towards the shore, has yet been discernible in this unrestrained and constant concurrence between the member for North Wellington and the member for North York. He goes on to say:

I concur in the views expressed by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) with regard to the objects and aims of the government in bringing up these resolutions and forcing them through an almost empty House.

How full is the House to-day?

Now, they are setting on foot here about forty railway schemes, with regard to which there is not one tittle of evidence that a financial basis is already laid down with the view of carrying out these schemes.

What about the thirty or forty grants to-day? Is there any information, any tittle of evidence?

Many of them are new, just recently formed under a charter, or the renewal of an old charter. The government are virtually offering bonuses to some particular corporation that will control the charter for three or four years, and peddle it around with the hope of being able to make money out of it. It is a most debasing and demoralizing scheme from beginning to end. It is a very great pity that the Tory party are driven to such extremes that they are compelled to carry on a corrupting system of this kind—

Does the hon. gentleman object to a system of this kind?

—by offering to build with the people's money, or to subsidize, roads through sections of country where they think they may possibly secure some political interest in their favour. It is done for that purpose. Before the last three elections we always had these subsidies brought down, new schemes set on foot, members sent home with the announcement to their constituents that they have got a grant towards the construction of a road through some portion of the constituency that they represent, and they will, no doubt, say that if the government is only sustained—

How beautifully he hits off the present.

—if the government is only sustained the probabilities are that the road will be built, and if they are not sustained, of course they cannot hope to get any aid. These will be the arguments used.

No doubt, now, as well as then.

Now, I sincerely deplore the condition to which political morality has dropped, as exhibited by hon. gentlemen opposite.

In this concrete instance, because he was speaking particularly with regard to railway subsidies.

Any scheme, any movement, any sacrifice of money that will possibly contribute to their retaining their positions on the Treasury benches, is resorted to unblushingly and without the least hesitation.

But, last night, near the midnight watches, a member of this government rose and announced that they had carried the constituency in the province of Prince Edward Island for which a vote for \$10,000 passed through last night which had been promised previously by the Premier of that province, to be used as a threat, on the one hand, and as an inducement, on the other, to the community to vote right, and, consequently, to get the expenditure in their locality.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How many years had that vote been standing?

Mr. FOSTER. How many years?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. It served its purpose for hon. gentlemen opposite. It was there dangled, until at last, in a critical extremity, the Premier of the province had to go down and make a solemn oath that this time it would be carried out, if they would only vote right. Last night the promise was carried out, when it was found that they had voted right. What is the necessity of multiplying testimonies? The book is full of them. Every *Hansard*, from 1882, is full of them, up to 1896. After 1896 there is a wonderful change in the style and tone of *Hansard* literature in that respect. We cannot find a protest from any Liberal member in the *Hansard*, from 1896 up to the present time, in reference to this matter; not one. Here is another illustration, that I did not sooner see, in the year 1894. Then, a protest was made so strong because the information had come down late that the subsidies actually were allowed then by the government to stand over at the request of the opposition until they had had an opportunity of looking into the papers which were brought down so as to be placed in a position to fairly investigate and fairly look into them. For what purpose have I risen to-day? To call the people's attention to this, because I would not have spent one single bit of time or one atom of breath in appealing to hon. gentlemen opposite. They are passed any salvation in that respect, but I still have hopes that the great heart of the people beats right. My aim in getting

Mr. FOSTER.

up before this House and making these statements to-day is, to show again, for the thousandth time, before the people, as an object lesson, the lack of conviction of hon. gentlemen opposite, both in promises and in positions taken by them, the utter and absolutely polar contradiction of their working when they are in office, and of their statements, pledges and promises when they are out of office. Now, let us be candid and let us get down to the real position. Why am I making this statement? It is a statement which ought to make hon. gentlemen opposite think, a statement which contrasts their past professions with their present performances, and it is a statement which is to go to the country to show the direful change with regard to the public in a party which make solemn pledges when out of power and consistently repudiate them when they get into power. The position of the Liberal-Conservative party is clear. In 1882 they adopted the principle of aiding in this new country the building of meritorious lines of railway and of giving a small proportion of the cost by way of subsidy. Each one was to be taken on its merits. That government is open to criticism, as every government is, as to whether every railway which received aid was a meritorious road or not. You might contend, and contend successfully, that roads were aided that should not have been aided, but I assert the policy of the Liberal-Conservative government was to aid deserving roads, to pick out from the large number of applications those which were the most deserving, and in so far as the treasury would allow to grant them some assistance. That is the position of the Conservative party to-day. We are not opposed to railway subsidies as a whole. We are not opposed to aiding necessary works in this new country, although, personally, I take the ground that the time is rapidly coming, if it has not altogether come, when we can afford to allow capital in this country to aid the development of the country in reference to railways, except maybe in some very large undertakings, which are national in their character, and which would appeal, therefore, to the national fund. We are in favour of the granting of judicious aid. All I want to do, and I think I have done it, is to call to these hon. gentlemen's minds the professions they made and the utter and absolute contradiction they are making to-day of all these professions in reference to the expenditure of the country.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). Mr. Speaker, I would not have risen to make any reply to my hon. friend if it had not been for the very discourteous manner in which he referred to me as a humble member of this House, when I was in opposition, in criticising public expenditure. He said that I was in the habit then of dealing with expenditures in connection with such

things as spoons and carpets. There is one thing I have to say to the hon. gentleman, and it is, that I never stole any other man's spoons, nor have I ever treacherously trod upon any other man's carpet. The hon. gentleman says that he objects first to the principle embodied in the resolutions regarding the purchase and use of steel rails manufactured in Canada on roads built in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that it is worth while making a denial, but I may say that I did not object. I simply showed the amazing inconsistency of hon. gentlemen opposite in proposing it.

Mr. McMULLEN. All I have to say is, that it has been the policy of the people of Canada, both of the Reform government in Toronto, in the province of Ontario, as well as of governments elsewhere, to pay a bounty to encourage the production of pig iron in Canada. We have done in this House that which has been done in Ontario. Having brought about by an act of that kind the production of pig iron, the next step is to encourage the production of steel rails. We admit steel rails free into Canada at this present moment. The measure which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals now brings before the House simply provides that if, in the opinion of the minister, steel rails manufactured in Canada are equal in quality to those which are imported, the party getting the bonus shall use Canadian steel rails. There is nothing wrong in regard to that. Allow me to say to my hon. friend, that if the present government brought down bonuses to roads on the same principle that he brought them down when he was in power, I should undoubtedly oppose them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, but what is the position to-day? Every railway that receives a bonus from this government receives it on the condition that any work performed in the carriage of mails or otherwise shall be applied to the payment of interest at the rate of 3 per cent on the subsidy. I challenge the hon. gentleman to get up now and tell this House of one single road in Canada to-day that is not earning enough now to pay interest at the rate of 3 per cent on \$3,200 per mile.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no such provision in the statutes.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is such a provision in regard to the bonuses that are granted.

Mr. FOSTER. None.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister of Railways has brought in a law which provides that any road getting a grant to the

extent of \$3,200 a mile or \$6,400 a mile, if that road earns in its operation a sum sufficient to enable it to pay 3 per cent upon the money so granted, it shall be applied for that purpose. That is the law to-day. Under that law we are granting aids to roads, and in doing so, we are simply making them a loan. It is not a grant; it is a mere assistance.

Mr. BERGERON. Where do you find that law?

Mr. McMULLEN. Although the Conservatives boast of possessing all the statesmanship and wisdom that is to be found in Canada, they never had the statesmanship to inaugurate a principle of that kind. It remained for the present government to inaugurate this improved policy of granting this assistance to roads, and if they brought down these resolutions in the old Conservative way, they certainly would have my opposition. Look at the condition of things which existed under the bonuses granted by hon. gentlemen opposite. Take the Carquet Railway owned and operated and constructed by Burns, who sat in this House many years ago. There was one of the most scandalous pieces of extravagance. It was in fact pledging the resources of this country for party purposes, and \$620,000 of the money of the people was given towards the construction of that road. Where is it to-day? It is in the sheriff's hands, and not an engine or a train is running over it. It is lying there as a monument of the recklessness of the Conservative government in granting railways bonuses. Where is there an instance of the present government granting assistance to a scheme of that kind. Show me and I will vote against it. I admit that it is desirable that railway subsidies should be brought down in fairly good time. When we advocated that principle in opposition, we advocated it honestly. Perhaps we were not as fully aware of all the difficulties that beset ministers in coming to a mature decision as to whether, and what roads should be aided or not, as we now are when we are on the Treasury benches. There is no doubt that there is great difficulty in deciding on these applications. For instance, the Minister of Railways must have the advice and consult with his confreres before it is possible for him to mature his scheme. I admit that it would be well if the railway subsidies could be brought down earlier in the session, but hon. gentlemen opposite have kept us day in and day out, and night in and night out, talking; everlastingly talking about matters that are absolutely frivolous, in place of giving the government an opportunity to bring forward the business of the session. There was no end to their wind, and they have all become Davins, whatever is the matter with them this parliament, with the result that the public business could

not be transacted. I congratulate the government on the new scheme they have adopted in granting aid to railways. I believe that every one of these roads that are proposed, if they are built, will easily earn a sum that will enable them to pay back into the treasury of this Dominion 3 per cent of the money that is advanced and which we are borrowing at 2½ per cent. Is not that a great improvement upon the method adopted by the Tory government, which gave the money away and asked nothing in return. Yes, Sir, it is a very great improvement, and the government are to be congratulated upon it.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS (Russell). I do not rise, Sir, because I have been challenged by the acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Foster). I intended to speak on this question anyway. It is not my desire to embarrass, in any respect whatever, my own political friends; nor do I particularly care about gratifying hon. gentlemen opposite. I say, Sir, that any principle I hold, I will advocate in this House, so long as I am a member of parliament, and I will advocate it outside the House as well. I am a well known free trader. I recognize fully that Canada has lived for many years under the terrible disease inflicted upon her by protection. I was the first man who said in this House some years ago, that free trader as I was, I would not apply the remedy in such a drastic way as to destroy the patient. If you ask me whether an immediate fiscal revolution would be desirable in the interests of the people of Canada, my answer is that I believe it would. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to see that sudden revolution under our present conditions, because of the immediate deleterious effects, that I know it would have. I will support no government which does not as rapidly as the conditions will permit—and perhaps more rapidly than a great many men would desire—bring about the freest trade in Canada that possibly can prevail. I dissent, and I dissent absolutely from the proposition laid down by the Minister of Railways, which imposes upon the buyers of railway material, a condition which will not permit of them buying their steel rails in any way and in any place they choose. If they can buy with advantage from a Chinaman, I say: Let them buy from that Chinaman. The proposition made by the minister (Mr. Blair) is a retrograde step. I believe, Sir, that the remedy for protection as it exists today should be brought about gradually. I am not prepared to condemn the government because they do not hasten on improvidently towards the goal of free trade, but I as a free trader, must protest against any advance being made in perpetuating the protective system. I consider that this proposal is an advance, and a very improper advance, in that direction.

Mr. McMULLEN.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am also like my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards), a free trader, though, perhaps, I am not as sound in the faith as he is.

Mr. BERGERON. But you have the free trade medal.

Mr. FOSTER. The member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) should get that now.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know that I am guilty of any departure from the principles of the Cobden Club in this matter. Whilst I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) entirely, that every man should be free to buy wherever he wants to buy, I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the proposition which we have placed in this resolution is not a departure from that principle. No one will be compelled to buy in any other market than that which he desires to buy in.

Mr. FOSTER. But you fine him if he does not.

The PRIME MINISTER. We do not. If parliament chooses to decide in favour of a Canadian enterprise, such as the building of a railway, it is no violation of the principle, if we say to the man to whom we offer the bounty: You can have the bonus if you want it for the construction of your railway, but we make it a condition that if you can buy your steel rails in Canada, at the same price that you can buy them abroad, then you should buy from a Canadian producer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is what we are doing, and I do not know that we are, in any way, deviating from the principles of free trade. Of course, the constructor of the railway will be at liberty to do as he pleases. He will be at liberty to buy abroad or not to buy. But, after all, is it not a fair thing to say, that if we aid a Canadian to build a railway, we should also say to him: You in your turn should give help to the Canadian manufacturer of steel rails.

Perhaps my hon. friend will not agree with me; perhaps he will think this is a deviation from the principles which he and I hold dear; but this is the answer which I have to make to my hon. friend, and I invite him to look at it seriously from the point of view I have taken; we do not by law compel any man to buy in any market which he does not wish to buy in. If we were to introduce a law to that effect, then my hon. friend and I should agree; but we make the acceptance of our policy purely optional on the construction of a railway, and do not make it an absolute condition. My hon. friend from York has reiterated the complaint made in former years that these subsidies are brought in late. He said,

quoting my words, that the House had not the necessary information until the resolutions were actually before the House, and speaking of me he said: 'He had no conviction then, he has no conviction now.' The hon. gentleman repeated these words three or four times, so pleased was he with them; but when a man by his own confession has had moments of weakness, no doubt he thinks that is also the case with others. If the hon. gentleman wanted to quote me correctly, why did he not quote everything I said? In the session of 1894, I complained that there was no information laid on the Table of the House in regard to the railway resolutions, though we had again and again made requests that all information relating to them should be placed on the Table before the resolutions were moved. I am not aware that any such demand has been made on this occasion. In 1894, the Minister of Railways said:

Nearly every one of the resolutions which the House will be asked to consider, giving assistance to any road, is in favour of a road that has already been in existence, some portions of it built, and it is for the extension of these roads that the assistance is asked.

That was the excuse why the information was not brought, and it is an excuse on this occasion also.

Nearly all the roads have been under consideration by the House in previous sessions, and the House has had their favourable qualities explained.

That was the explanation then given, and it may be repeated on this occasion.

Nearly every one is a necessity, for only those that were absolutely necessary were included in these resolutions as worthy of assistance. With reference to the lateness in bringing down the correspondence, it is only two days since I got the resolutions through council. It was impossible for the department to make copies faster than we did, though I gave instructions at once.

What was the position I took then? I said:

I will withdraw one-half of my charge, and blame the hon. gentleman for having brought his resolutions down so late.

When the Minister of Railways at that time informed me that it had been impossible for him to get the information earlier, I accepted his statement at once, and said: 'I withdraw one-half of my charge.' In the face of that, what becomes of the statement of the hon. gentleman that I had no conviction then and that I have no conviction now? I leave him to the statement he made.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (Western Assiniboia). I will tell the hon. gentleman what becomes of that statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You will?

Mr. DAVIN. And I may tell him this, that last session, when it was proposed by leading members on this side of the House who are now within my hearing that in resentment of conduct which was disgraceful on the part of hon. members opposite the Prime Minister should be received as they received certain hon. members on this side of the House, I said: 'I won't have it; don't do it in resentment of anything that may have been done to me; treat the Prime Minister with respect.' I want to show what becomes of the statement of my hon. friend from York, that the Prime Minister had no convictions in 1894, and has no convictions now. What that means is this, that when two or three days before prorogation the Minister of Railways comes down with resolutions for vast subsidies without laying any correspondence on the Table in reference to them, the Prime Minister sits there quietly and never protests against what he protested against in the strongest terms when he was on this side of the House. If it was wrong in 1894 not to bring the correspondence down late, is it not tenfold more wrong in 1900, on the part of a Minister of Railways led by the hon. gentleman who protested in 1894? What the hon. member for York pointed at was the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman, so glaring that it is impossible to account for it in any other way than the way in which the right hon. gentleman accounted for the action of his Minister of Trade and Commerce at a celebrated dinner, where he told his hearers and Canada and the world that for seventeen years his Minister of Trade and Commerce had been playing a false part, had been uttering opinions in this House and on the hustings while all that time he hugged to his bosom opinions totally different from those expressed. Therefore, taking the description of him given by his leader at that dinner, we have to say of that hon. gentleman—how can you say anything else?—he had no convictions at any time during those years, and he has no convictions now. But if we have to credit the Minister of Trade and Commerce with convictions, then, in proving traitor to those convictions, in all those years, he stands in a worse, a maligner character.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is he now?

Mr. DAVIN. When the hon. Minister of Railways commenced to make that extraordinary speech in regard to these resolutions, the Minister of Trade and Commerce adopted a *ruse de guerre* which is characteristic of this ministry: he disappeared from the Chamber in order to deprive of point such comments and quotations as the hon. member for York has made. It would have been edifying to watch the countenance of the Minister of Trade and Commerce if he had been in his place as my hon. friend read his utterances in 1894. So with the

Postmaster General, who was not present either. It would have been edifying to have watched his face while my hon. friend read those excerpts; and it was most edifying to watch the demeanour of the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) when he rose in his place to reply. Why, Sir, the excited state of that hon. gentleman when rising to defend his conduct has only a parallel in the excited condition of the Minister of Railways when rising to make what we supposed would be a statement. We thought that at the instigation of the leader of the opposition the Minister of Railways would have got up and told us what he proposed to do with regard to giving us information; and what did he do? He was well described as going through a pantomimic pugilistic exercise for the benefit of the gallery.

At One o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. DAVIN. Before recess, I was dealing with the hon. gentleman's reference to an article which appeared in the *Mail and Empire*. Was the writer of that article without justification when he said that the bonuses so far proposed this session for 720 miles of railway, on a sliding scale basis, aggregating, at \$6,400 per mile, \$4,508,000, will be paid? That depends very much on the railway projectors and contractors. It depends on whether the conditions will come into existence that would compel the payment of this sum. But the hon. minister must have had another object in directing our attention to this article. He no doubt did it because he resented the fact that when he was about to bring forward those extravagant bonuses to railways, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who had always denounced such bonuses, suddenly decamped, and this article does not so much deal with the Minister of Railways as with the position of the government, as illustrated in the person of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The writer begins by quoting the *Winnipeg Tribune*, which is the true Liberal organ in the west, the organ that is regarded by all Liberals in the North-west and Manitoba as the real Liberal organ. That paper denounced railway bonuses as barefaced robbery. The writer calls attention to the fact that Sir Richard Cartwright in other days, wrote a strong letter to the Patrons, which I will refer to in a moment, and then goes on to refer to the tribute pronounced on that hon. gentleman by the First Minister:

Sir W. Laurier, in his recent tribute to Sir Richard, drew two remarkable pictures of the venerable knight. In the first place, he declared that for eighteen years Sir Richard had stated what was untrue to the public on the tariff question. Viewing Sir Richard in the light of this eulogium, it might be safe to conclude that his anti-bonus speeches and writings were as deceptive as his free trade deliverances. But then Laurier gives us a second picture of

Mr. DAVIN.

the knight. He says Sir Richard opposes in council projects which he believes to be wrong; but appears in public and supports them in a most loyal and manly fashion once the government has decided to push them through. Canada, Sir Wilfrid adds, little knows how much it owes to Sir Richard for doing that sort of thing. This description of Sir Richard's attitude suggests that possibly he is convinced that the subsidies are 'bare-faced robberies,' and that he supports the steals after his colleagues have agreed to them, with a view to increasing Canada's volume of indebtedness to him. Whatever may be the proper explanation of Sir Richard's changed position towards the subventions, one thing is certain, namely, that he is doing those things that he said he would leave undone. What is more, he is doing them with a vengeance. He and his friends are not content with giving subsidies; they must actually donate them at twice the old rate. The 'reckless Tory horde' asked in their day \$3,200 a mile as grants to railways. But the economical new Liberals, who were to have stopped the grants altogether, provide in their Subsidy Bills that the bonus may climb up, according to the cost of the railway, to as high as \$6,400 a mile.

I have here the letter which the Minister of Trade and Commerce wrote to the innocent Patrons, and in that letter what did he say about railway bonuses? Having declared that on the question of the tariff, the Liberal party saw eye to eye with the Patrons, and having denounced the ministers of that day as ignorant charlatans who had foisted this precious protective system on Canada in 1878, he asked what are the other planks in the Patron platform:

Economy of administration, purity and independence of parliament, a tariff for revenue only, reciprocal trade, protection from labour monopolies, no railway bonuses.

And he added:

Now, there is no single one of all these objects which the Liberal party have not been fighting for, moving resolutions for, and doing their best to obtain any time during the past twenty years.

And so they were, not only the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but the Prime Minister also. Can any one doubt what the leader of the opposition has said that not one of them had any principles in 1894 or has any now? Talk of the principles, there is not a child in Canada who would not laugh if any one were to credit any of the leading members of the administration with principles.

The right hon. the leader of the government sought to make out that his government is to-day, with regard to these bonuses, in the same position as that in which the government of 1894 stood. I propose to show that it is not in the same position, but even if it were that could not be a justification for his policy, because in 1894 he condemned the government on that policy and also condemned them for not having brought down the subsidies in time and for not having brought down the information with regard to these subsidies in

time. Yet, to-day, his Minister of Railways comes forward to propose these resolutions, without having placed the requisite information on the Table. Let me refer to what took place in 1894. On July 16th, Sir John Thompson moved that the House resolve itself into committee to-morrow on the railway resolutions, and the right hon. the First Minister, then leader of the opposition, said :

I would call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the fact that we have not had a particle of information in the way of correspondence which should accompany these resolutions. It will be impossible to discuss them until we have such correspondence laid on the Table.

Was the resolution pressed on the morrow ? Not at all. Mr. Haggart did not move the House into committee on them until the 19th, and before doing so he placed the correspondence on the Table, so that there is no analogy whatever between the late government's position and that of the present, and I repeat that even if there were any analogy, that would be no justification for these hon. gentlemen. Are we to be perpetually met by this defence, when we complain of the inconsistency of the administration, that something of the same kind was done in 1894. But what was done with regard to railway bonuses in 1894 is no justification for exorbitant bonuses in 1900 ? Is the time never going to arrive when these bonuses shall cease ? Ontario, in years gone by, had a lot of land to be colonized, and there was some justification for bonusing railways in that province, but at present when Ontario has reached a high position of settlement and civilization and when Quebec and the lower provinces are in the same position, it is monstrous for this government to ask us to bonus railways in these provinces. The only place where such bonuses can be justified is an unsettled country, where the railways will act as colonizers and over which we still have complete control, because we exercise all the provincial powers over the North-west Territories with regard to railways. But where you have highly organized and settled provinces, the same necessity does not exist. Where is the sense of asking us to bonus in such provinces a railway twelve miles long, another nine miles long, and another seven miles long ? Where is this going to stop ? Are you going to give a bonus for a railway three-quarters of a mile long from the manor house to the pig-sty ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why do you not move to strike them out ?

Mr. DAVIN. I would move, if hon. gentlemen opposite would support me. But what is the use of moving ? Every man pledged against these things, including the ministers, would vote me down.

The PRIME MINISTER. What was the use of moving an amendment yesterday ?

Mr. DAVIN. I thought I might be able to move the Postmaster General (Mr. Mullock). I give my honour to the House that I thought the hon. gentleman would yield to me ; and I told my friends here : They are really going to take the right course after all. If the Postmaster General had been in a more tractable mood, I could have moved him ; but he was in a stubborn mood, and I could not move him. There is no justification for these bonuses, and I protest against them. And the whole country is protesting against them. My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) is connected with an excellent paper in Winnipeg called the *Voice*. You would hardly think that *Voice* could be the same as the one that votes so continuously with hon. gentlemen opposite. But the *Winnipeg Voice* last week denounce these bonuses. No doubt, we shall hear from my hon. friend from Winnipeg with regard to that. Here is the *Weekly Sun*, a paper that professes to be, and is, I dare aver, the most truly Liberal paper in Ontario. It is not a machine paper ; it is not a paper in the hands of gold speculators ; it is not a paper like the *Globe*, which has abandoned the high position that a great Liberal gave it and has become a mere recreant thing in the hands of these gold seekers. The *Weekly Sun* is the organ of the farmers, and the leading writer is a radical of the radicals. The editor is a man well known to me, and he is a Liberal. This is what that paper says about these railway bonuses, criticism regarding which on the part of the *Mail and Empire* put the hon. Minister of Railways a little aside from his propriety, so that there was not that calmness of demeanour, that reticence and balance that usually characterizes that hon. gentleman's utterances. The *Weekly Sun* says :

Mr. Blair has introduced resolutions granting railway donations amounting to \$3,943,000. Following the usual practice, he has held back the resolutions until the hour of prorogation has almost arrived, when the sittings are almost continuous, and the members, tired out after a long and wearisome session, are anxious to get to their homes.

The amount of the proposed donations is less than the sum voted a year ago, but it is just \$3,943,000 too much. It is said to be fairly distributed among the people of the various provinces. As a matter of fact, but little of the money will go to the people. It will go to the political and professional promoters, and to the two great railway corporations. A good share of it will, according to Mr. Osler, go back to the politicians who make the grants, to be used for the purpose of electoral corruption. It is not the subsidies, but the taxes out of which the subsidies will be paid, that will be distributed among the people at large.

The Conservatives now have an opportunity to show that they are sincere in their professions of economy. If they do not make a fight against these donations, they will indeed prove

themselves to be as a sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.

We will make the best fight we can, but what can we do? Here is a cast-iron majority opposing us on which no argument can make any impression. We protest and we fight as much as we can.

Now, the right hon. Premier, in reply to my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) made an argument that I think, curiously illustrates his own psychological get up. The hon. member for Russell declared that he could not support one portion of the proposition of the Minister of Railways—that portion that provides that the recipients of these bonuses must, if they can find as good conditions, buy their iron and steel in Canada. That is not exactly the wording, but that is the sense. The Prime Minister says that is not protection, but it is quite optional for the receiver of the bonus to buy in Canada or not. I do not know exactly what he means by that. If the receiver of a bonus can get iron as cheap and as good in Canada, he must buy in Canada. I do not see where the option comes in. Who is to be the judge as to whether iron can be got as good and as cheap in Canada as elsewhere? Is it the man himself? If so, the clause is worth nothing. Is it the government? If so, then this is not only protection, but it is protection with the complexion of monopoly under corrupt conditions. If the government is to decide it, the government may not only tell him: You must buy in Canada, but you put it practically into the power of the Minister of Railways to say where in Canada he shall buy, and that moment you introduce an element of corruption—you introduce an element of monopoly which is the worst form of protection. When one of these railway builders comes to the minister for a subsidy, the minister can say: I know you can get iron as good and as cheap in Canada as elsewhere, and you must buy in Canada; I know you can get them as cheap from A or B—for instance, in the establishment of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Wood). I do not say that would be the place, but the minister might say that. And if he said that, the person seeking the bonus would have to buy there. He is in the position of receiving benefits. That is the way the Prime Minister put it—that the railway builder receiving this bonus from Canada, what grievance would it be to compel him to buy his iron in Canada, if he bought it as cheap as elsewhere? Now, I wish to deal for a moment with my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). He grew quite dithyrambic. I thought really that he must have been reading the way the Bacchantes used to act when the frenzy came on them, and that he was giving us one of those dances that, under such conditions, those inspired persons give. Now, why did he get so excited?

Mr. DAVIN.

He was in this position, that he is supporting subsidies more extravagant than he ever denounced. He concurred in 1894 in all that was said by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, in all that was said by the Prime Minister and by the present Postmaster General. But now he gets violently excited in denouncing us because we criticise him. Now, here is the reason why he is able to support these extravagant subsidies.

Resolved, that every company receiving a subsidy under this Act, its successors or assigns, and any person or company controlling or operating the railway or portion of railway subsidized under this Act, shall each year furnish to the government of Canada transportation for men, supplies, material and mails over the portion of its line in respect of which it has received such subsidy, and, whenever required, shall furnish mail cars properly equipped for such mail service, and such transportation and service shall be performed at such rates as are agreed upon between the minister of the department of the government for which such service is being performed, and the company performing it, and in case of disagreement, then at such rates as are approved by the Governor in Council—

This is the clause that justifies the hon. member:

—and in or towards payment for such charges the government of Canada shall be credited by the company with a sum equal to 3 per cent per annum on the amount of subsidy received by the company under this Act.

Is it not palpable that that last clause, is of no value to the public in so far as carrying mails and other government business is concerned? If you run through the various items and if you ask what mails or what goods of the government will be carried over these, you will see that in nearly every instance it is merely delusive. The idea is held out to the people that they are getting something when they are getting nothing whatever of value. Take the Northwest Territories while an arrangement was made with the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway, with the Calgary and Edmonton Railway, and I think with the Alberta and Athabaska Railway; an arrangement was made for carrying police supplies and mails. That is a solid service. There you had from 800 to 1,000 mounted police to supply. But holding out that over a little branch line there is going to be a great service performed for the public—the whole thing has the appearance of mere humbug. There is nothing in it whatever, and I am surprised that a business man like my hon. friend has got so very excited on a matter so very sodawatery as this is. I will not suggest there was a reason in connection with his becoming director of one of those railways that may ultimately get a bonus, but the hon. member for Kent, Ont. (Mr. Campbell) who is one of the principal promoters of that line, would not say that they would not ask by-and-by a bonus.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What line is that ?

Mr. DAVIN. I am speaking of your transportation company. I will not say that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) by becoming a director in that transportation company, was influenced by that hope. But if he is really sincere in telling us that he has been influenced by that clause the hollowness of which I have exposed, then he is filling his belly with the east wind.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). Before the House goes into committee on these resolutions, I wish to enter my protest against them. I have no past, so far as this House is concerned, at any rate, that makes my words sound as the crackling thorns under a pot, and no records that embarrass me in the position I take on these resolutions. I protest earnestly and emphatically against granting these bonuses, these bonuses in particular, and the bonus system generally. By the list we find on the Order paper of forty bonuses, it appears that the thing is now systematized. It is apparent that the bonuses are distributed over the whole country. That is probably because no member will then feel altogether free to protest against them; in fact the leader of the opposition has twitted the members of the old opposition with having, in those days, vacated their seats when bonuses affecting their districts were under consideration. But, I refuse to look on these bonuses as grants to provinces; I look upon them as bonuses to groups of men, to promoters, to politicians, to charter-mongers. If it were absolutely necessary, in order to secure the construction of railways, that this parliament should grant one-fifth the cost for that purpose, it would be a very dangerous duty to impose on any government, because it is inconceivable that it can go on long without grave abuses growing up under it. I oppose the system of bonuses because I believe the people want and are ready for a new policy; because I believe we are ready to assume a new relationship towards the railways of this country; and especially because in the past the system has resulted in erecting great corporations whom even this government seems powerless to control, and which have such a power that they are fast becoming a menace to political freedom in this country.

Mr. BERGERON. This morning when the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals read the names of those forty-seven different railway companies, I asked for the amount of money given to each of them, and he gave me an answer in one case, the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Company. I understood that the paper would be put in the hands of the reporter and that he would copy the amounts, but I am told that this has not been done, so that if my hon. friend will be kind enough to read the amounts, if he

has them, they will then go in *Hansard*. Besides that I want to ask my hon. friend if he will be kind enough to give the House the number of railway companies which have been thus subsidized, and which carry mails according to the clause which has been put in the statute by my hon. friend providing for the carrying of mails, the carrying of men or troops, or anything the government of Canada might want. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) emphasized that clause a great deal this morning. I want to find out how many railways so subsidized have been acting according to that statute. In particular I want to ask my hon. friend if the mails are carried by the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway according to that clause, and if not, why is not the statute obeyed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I intended to make a few remarks at the close of the debate, and in doing so, I shall take occasion to answer the questions that the hon. gentleman has asked, if no person wishes to speak upon the motion.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Lisgar). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend at this late stage of the session, to take up any considerable time in discussing these railway votes. My position in regard to the railway question, and railway bonuses, is pretty well known in this country. I am utterly opposed to the system of bonusing railways, and if my memory serves me correctly, I protested against the railway subsidies last year. I believe, Sir, that the time has come when this country and this parliament ought to stop giving bonuses to railways. It seems to me a monstrous proposition, that, especially in the old settled provinces of this country, we should continue this system of railway bonuses. The fact of the matter is that the Dominion of Canada, the provinces and the municipalities, have contributed \$198,000,000 in cash for the construction of railways in this country, about \$50,000,000 of which went into the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. We own that road ourselves, and the statement which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was able to present to this House the other day, goes to indicate, that, under proper conditions, with shrewd and careful management, we will be able to make that road pay interest. I think that the time has come in this country when a different policy ought to be adopted in regard to railways. It is a fact that we have given this large amount in cash, and we have also given 40,000,000 acres of our best lands for the purpose of aiding railways, to say nothing of the lands which have been contributed in the province of British Columbia. It is my belief that if these lands were properly administered and adding the large amount of cash which we have given, the country has contributed in cash and lands practically sufficient to build the entire system of railways

in this country. If that is a fact, does it not occur to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the hon. members of this House, that we should own these roads ourselves. If we have built them, why should we not own them? Let us see what the experience in the Australasian colonies has been: The Australasian colonies, as hon. gentlemen know, own all the railways in the colonies, and the governments of those colonies have expended £130,000,000 in construction. The net return for the financial year 1896-7, was equal to 3.27 per cent, and as the actual rate of interest payable on outstanding loans was 3.96, the deficit on the whole system, was 0.69; so that you see, in a country that is just as sparsely settled as ours, the Australasian colonies have been able to build this vast system of railways, giving rates very much better than those which prevail in our own country, and are able practically to pay interest on the entire cost.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What are the Australasian rates?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I can give the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron), the rates later on, if he will come to me. I have all the data in my desk, but I do not happen to have it available at my fingers' ends at the present moment. If this can be accomplished in the Australian colonies, why not in Canada? Are we to go on eternally bonusing these railways, and are these bonuses to be granted without any proper conditions being imposed? We are not able to exercise the control that we should, over these railways. I cannot help but feel that the country is rapidly coming to the conclusion that the time has come when this system of bonusing shall cease. We have practically paid in cash and lands for the whole of these roads, because of the double exploitation of provincial and federal parliaments. The exploitation of the provincial and Dominion treasuries has been such that we have in many instances contributed sufficient to build the entire roads which have been subsidized. If this is the case, does it not appear that the people of this country should, at least, own these railways, and should they not be in a position to exercise more control over them, or of owning them. The government should, at least, provide one transcontinental line in this country, to be under government control. That is why I protested very strongly last year against giving those vast subsidies to the Ontario and Rainy River Railway. The government of Ontario had contributed \$4,200 a mile, the Dominion government \$6,400 a mile, and the Greenway government had offered to contribute \$1,000,000 to the same enterprise. I thought that inasmuch as these governments were giving enough to build that entire road, they should unite in owning and controlling the road, and in that way they could form a connection with the Intercolonial Railway, and we would

Mr. RICHARDSON.

then have a government controlled system from the wheatfields of the west to the Atlantic Ocean on the east. I do not propose to move a resolution with regard to the matter, but I would like earnestly to ask that the government should give its most careful consideration to these facts that I have presented, and if possible, let us get rid of this vicious system of the country paying for railways which are owned by private corporations, and over which little or no governmental control is exercised. The people are getting their eyes opened upon this important question. They realize that these bonuses are frequently, if not generally, given, not so much for the benefit of the country, as for the benefit of the men who ask for them. I may say in regard to many of the railway enterprises in the west, that we are constantly told that the country is contributing large sums of money for the purpose of building our railways. My own belief is that these subsidies are not pressed for, so much by the people in the west, as they are pressed for by the exploiters who expect to, and who usually do, make money out of them. For these reasons which I have presented to the House, I desire to enter my protest against these railway bonuses.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in reference to one point that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) has touched upon. I understand him to argue that we might still have railway appropriations either for government roads or for subsidized roads—that is perhaps a minor matter—that we might still have railway subsidies for roads in what he calls the new country in the west. I presume that means for roads in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. The fallacy of my hon. friend's argument is in assuming that the older provinces are well supplied with railways. There are portions of the older provinces which are yet without railway communication. I know that is so in the maritime provinces, as it is so in parts of Ontario and parts of Quebec. I can speak more particularly of the portions of the Dominion with which I am more familiar, and I know that in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia there are important sections of the country which are practically without railways at all. These people have been contributing for generations to the construction of railways elsewhere. They have contributed their share of the very large expenditures for the development of the great west. Surely, if companies can be found to give these people railways now, it is not unreasonable to say that they shall not be denied the privileges which have been given so generously to the other sections of the Dominion. It only requires a little knowledge of the conditions of the older provinces to see that the argument of the hon. members (Mr. Richardson

and Mr. Puttee) is based on an entire misconception of the condition of affairs in Ontario and Quebec I think, and certainly in the maritime provinces. Undoubtedly, there are sections of our country which are, so to speak, gridironed with railways, and sometimes gentlemen representing these sections say, in a spirit of generosity, that we should cease giving railway subsidies; but, it is a fact that in parts of Ontario and Quebec, and most certainly in the lower provinces, there are considerable sections of the country which have not received the railway accommodation they need, and which is necessary to the building up of the country. I say this because I do not think that some gentlemen in the west fully appreciate the situation in the other provinces, or else they would not advance the unreasonable argument that it is all right to bonus railways in the west, but you must not bonus railways in the older provinces.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I did not say that you should bonus railways in the west and not in the east. I entirely dissent from the principle of bonusing railways, and the Minister of Finance must have misunderstood me when he attributed to me the remark that I was willing to have railways bonused in the west and not willing to have them bonused in the east. When I quoted the sum of \$198,633,000 as being contributed by Canada, I meant that that sum was contributed by the Dominion, provincial and municipal authorities, and not by the federal parliament alone.

Mr. D. D. ROGERS (Frontenac). It is well known that one of the many planks in the Patron platform is against bonusing railways; and as that organization existed in every province, this plank would apply generally. It is quite evident there was some good reason for that plank being placed there. It was one of the planks that was somewhat criticised, and it was said that in some cases bonuses might be necessary. However, the argument generally was that the principle of the thing is wrong, and that it had been so abused in the past that it was time the taxpayers should call a halt with regard to it. In times past, when the country was new, there might have been more excuse for it than in the present day. We all know that instead of capital being scarce there is plenty of it on hand waiting for paying investments. There is no doubt that we should not continue the system of bonusing as we have hitherto, and if we change it at all it must be along the lines proposed by the present government, by which there is some check applied. I do not think I, individually, would object to aiding the railways if the government retained a claim over these railways so that some return might come back to the treasury, and I am glad to see there is now a move in that direction. Some people have not much hope that this idea will result in

good, but, for my part, I am willing to give it a fair trial. I have not been too hide-bound in this matter. I do not think that the leader of the opposition can criticise the policy of the government very much, because when I brought in a resolution stating that we should have a lien on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, so that we might get some return for what we gave, there was not a gentleman on either side of the House to second that motion. My proposal was in the line of what the American people do with their railways, and by which they insist on getting full return for the bonuses given. I believe that the people of this country are tired of giving free gifts to railways, and in the next campaign I am certain that the people will exact from the candidates a pledge that this system must not be continued longer.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I do not desire to repeat any of the stock arguments for and against railway bonuses which are tolerably familiar to the House, but it occurred to me that I might say a word in reference to the views expressed by my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee). There are two resolutions here relating to North-west roads, one the bonus given to the Canadian Northern Company for 100 miles of an extension westward towards Prince Albert, which will go through the Red Deer and, to some extent, the Saskatchewan valley; the other is the proposed bonus for the extension westward of the Waskada branch. I desire to say that the statement made that these bonuses are not pressed for by the people of the localities interested is altogether incorrect. The Waskada branch is in my own constituency, and I am familiar with all the facts. It will be a short branch, which will run through a country that is very well settled, and which, at the present time, is so situated that the farmers who, to a large extent in fact, almost exclusively engage in grain-growing, have a very long distance to transport their grain. They have pressed long and continuously for closer railway connection, and it is only a fair and reasonable measure of justice in the interest of the people there, and the country at large, that this small extension should be provided for. I may say, in regard to the general question of railways in the west, that the question is one which, in order to be understood, must be studied in the light of its history. The lack of progress in the North-west, particularly in the province of Manitoba, which was so apparent nine or ten years ago, was almost entirely due to the fact that men who had gone in to engage in grain-growing found themselves so far away from a railway that they could not profitably market their crops. It is quite true that, to a very large extent, these difficulties have been overcome, and the system

of branch lines of railways which exist there at the present time meets, to a very large extent, the difficulties which formerly existed. I have no doubt it is true both in the province of Manitoba and in the eastern provinces, that there are to be found sections of the country which are well supplied with railways, and where the people are not so anxious that railway bonuses should be granted as are the people living in these sections which are not so well supplied. In other words, the people who feel the want pressing upon them are more anxious about it than the people who are already well supplied. But my own experience of the public mind on that question is that the people who are well supplied with railways are not so selfish when the matter is fairly put before them as not to be willing that their fellow-citizens shall be supplied as well as themselves, but are quite ready to approve of a liberal policy in that respect. As for the bonuses which have been granted by this House in respect to North-western railways, I think it will be found that they have conduced very largely to the settlement and proper development of the country. I think it was last session that we granted a subsidy for an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway into the Moose Mountain country; and my hon. friend from Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) can tell my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) that a very large and fertile section of country was practically prevented from being depopulated by that extension. Another two or three years of the absence of railway facilities would certainly have depopulated that section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would it have been built without aid?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would not have been built without aid. Pressure had been brought on the company to build that line year after year, and it was impossible to induce them to build it until a subsidy was promised. Then, if you take the case of the Canadian Northern Railway, I would say to my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) that the workmen, and the mechanics whom he represents are more interested in the construction of that railway and in the filling up of those great fertile valleys with a population that would be tributary to the city of Winnipeg, than any other people in Canada—certainly much more interested than the people in immediate proximity to the road. That extension is largely for the purpose of making it possible to colonize a large and fertile territory; and it has become impossible to direct a movement of population to any part of that western country where there is not an immediate prospect of a railway, or unless a railway is already there. Fifteen or twenty years ago people would settle a long distance from a railway, accepting

Mr. SIFTON.

the promise of the government that a railway would go to a certain place: but people have been so often seriously disappointed that at the present time they will not do that. In order to secure the settlement of those fertile valleys, it is necessary to give some guarantee that a railway will be built within a short period. There is no hundred miles of railway that can be built in Canada that will be more fruitful of results than the hundred miles mentioned in that resolution. I venture to say that within a year, certainly within two years, after the railway is constructed, it will not be costing the country a dollar, because the return which the country will receive in the carriage of the mails which would otherwise have to be provided for out of ordinary revenue will be more than equivalent to the money we have contributed to it in the shape of a bonus. I do not wish to take up the time of the House: but I thought, in view of what has been said, that one or two observations would not be out of place.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has asked me to inform the House as to the amounts which have been paid on subsidy account to the different railways which have contracted with the government. I did not read them before, having handed the list to *Hansard*, which I thought would have suffered; but as the hon. gentleman thinks it will not, I will take a few moments to read the amounts that have been received by the several companies: To the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company, \$349,312; to the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company, \$84,480; to the Coast Railway Company of Nova Scotia, \$90,400; to the St. Stephen and Milltown Railway Company, \$3,648; to the Montfort Colonization Railway Company, \$64,400; to the Gulf Shore Railway, \$15,299; to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, \$3,116,250. This is the railway from Lethbridge through to Nelson—the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. This subsidy, as hon. gentlemen may remember, was a specific sum, and was not operative under the clause.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that comprised in the forty-seven?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but not in the sixteen which I mentioned, nor in the three which received more than \$3,200 a mile. It could not properly be so included, because it did not receive its subsidy under that clause. To the Drummond County Railway Company, we have paid \$136,000; to the Ottawa and New York Railway Company, \$172,384; to the Restigouche and Western Railway Company, \$46,930; to the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company, \$16,739; to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, \$271,-

628 ; to the East Richelieu Valley Railway Company, \$69,952 ; to the Pembroke Southern Railway Company, \$64,000 ; to the Phillipsburg Railway and Quarry Company, \$2,112 ; to the South Shore Railway Company, \$14,725 ; to the Canada Eastern Railway Company, \$8,000.

Mr. BERGERON. That is only seventeen.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I stated that there were only seventeen which had received subsidies from this government under contracts entered into by us.

Mr. BERGERON. I understood the hon. gentleman to say this morning that there were forty-seven.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me to this extent, that while we had paid subsidies to only seventeen companies, we had contracted with forty-seven, and the remaining companies had received no subsidy. The hon. gentleman asked me to inform him whether the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company had any contract with the government to carry its mails and supplies. There is no such contract clause in the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company's contract, the reason for that being that that contract was entered into before this clause was adopted in our Subsidy Acts. We introduced that clause in the last session of parliament, whereas the contract with the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Company was made in October, 1897, nearly two years before.

Mr. BERGERON. So that the speech of the hon. member for North Wellington amounts to nothing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the speech was entirely in point, because from that time to to-day there has not been any contract entered into between the government and any railway company without that clause in it.

Mr. BERGERON. Which are those ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am going to give them to my hon. friend. I was answering his question, whether the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Company had such a contract. I will now give him the names of the companies that contain that clause. All contracts entered into since July 1, 1899, contain it: the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company, the St. Gabriel de Brandon and Ste. Emilie de l'Energie Railway Company, the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company, the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway Company, the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, the Great Northern Railway Company, the York and Carleton Railway Company, the Phillipsburg Railway and Quarry Company, the South Shore Railway Company, the Great Northern Railway Company, the

Nova Scotia Southern Railway Company, the Canada Eastern Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Midland Railway Company, the Central Railway of New Brunswick, the Massawippi Valley Railway Company. These contracts have all contained the clause referred to.

I would like to say a few words in answer to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Foster). As to a very great deal of the speech he has just given us, it appears to me that it would be very much more appropriate in a debating club, in which each member was trying to rival the other in rhetoric and get a little training in debate, rather than in a serious body like this. The hon. gentleman took up a great deal of time endeavouring to establish the charge of inconsistency against certain members on the Treasury benches. I might retort that having failed, despite his many efforts, to impress that view upon the country, it was scarcely worth his while taking up the time of parliament at this late day of the session in trying to impress it upon the parliament and country again. It seems to me that if the hon. gentleman were properly seized with the dignity of his position, he would leave such an attempt to gentlemen on his own side of the third or fourth rank, and that, as the acting leader of the opposition he would deem it scarcely of sufficient business importance to read for the thousandth time, at this hour, what was said by hon. gentlemen on this side on the subject of subsidies in the past, or on the lateness of the period when they were submitted to parliament. It is easy to establish the inconsistency of any public man. It would be difficult to name a public man of any importance in any country, against whom such a charge might not be established. In fact, I think there are only two instances in which we can fairly affirm that a man is not consistent. He is not inconsistent if he is a fool or if he is dead ; but there is not an honest thinking, or a sound politician, against whom you cannot quote opinions delivered at one time in opposition to those delivered at another. But are the ministers so very open to the charge in this instance ? I very much doubt it. I think it would be assumed by any one disposed to rationally consider the whole question that an expression of opinion as to when these subsidy resolutions should be brought down, could be honestly and conscientiously given, and yet those who gave them would not be open to the charge that they were entirely wanting in conviction, as the hon. gentleman has said with respect to the Prime Minister and other members of the cabinet. They are not necessarily inconsistent, because when in opposition, and without that personal experience with respect to a particular class of measures, not having been in any government be-

fore which these questions actually came, they formed an opinion honestly that such measures could be brought down at an earlier period than they were brought down by hon. gentlemen opposite in their day. Hon. members know that applications of this kind come to the government continuously. They know that down to the very last moment of the session, you will have meritorious applications, well supported by the people of the particular localities concerned, strongly supported and pressed upon the government, and properly so, by members of parliament, and you have to consider them, to give them due weight, and cannot throw them aside. And when you come to mature your views with regard to them, even though it be late in the session, you have to bring them down. So it was in the days of the late government, and with the experience I have had in this administration, I do not think they were properly open to the charge of having deliberately delayed the presentation of these resolutions, but believe they were constrained to do so by the circumstances surrounding them, and to which all governments are subject. My hon. friend took the occasion to draw the inference—and I think it was a very offensive and entirely unjust inference—that because the Prime Minister expressed a strong opinion, when the late government was in office, on a certain matter, and has not in this government acted up to the full measure of that opinion, therefore, he is open to this accusation. The hon. gentleman made the charge that the Prime Minister had either no convictions then or has none now, and he asked this House, and through it the country, to assent to the proposition that the Prime Minister was not a man of conviction at all. I think that that was a very offensive statement to make, and I tell the hon. gentleman that, in my opinion, his judgment with regard to the Prime Minister will fail completely to strike a responsive chord in the judgment of the country that the fair name and fame of my right hon. friend will survive on the pages of Canadian history when that of my hon. friend, the acting leader of the opposition, as a carping, captious, and hair-splitting critic, has long been forgotten.

But is the hon. gentleman prepared to have the same measure meted out to him that he undertakes to mete out to the men who administer public affairs on this side? Does he believe that every man who expresses his firm and solid convictions on any question of public interest, who day in and day out declares that his honest judgment and conviction on any question is to be taxed later on, when he changes his mind, with not having held honestly the opinions he expressed and with being a man utterly destitute of convictions. If he is prepared to live up to that view with regard to a minister of the Crown, he must accept a similar judgment

Mr. BLAIR.

on his own record regarding important public matters, and admit that he was a man without convictions on a certain question which he declared to be a burning one. No one went before the country in the past and declaimed more loudly and with greater vehemence, and a greater appearance of sincerity than he, the opinion that prohibition was a principle that should be adopted and enforced in this country, and that the time had come when parliament could and should deal with it. I have heard the hon. gentleman myself express the opinion long years ago, before he became a minister of the Crown, before he had put on him the mantle of governmental responsibility, before he knew the difference between expressing views when he was not occupying a responsible position, and when he was clothed with all the responsibility of office—I have heard him in those days affirm that not only was this country ripe for prohibition, but rotten ripe, and yet we know the course which the hon. gentleman has since taken.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend quoting me literally?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the very words he used.

Mr. FOSTER. I never aspired to such eloquent classical language.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, I think that the experience we have had of the hon. gentleman's diction in this House will justify us in saying that less elegant phraseology than I have quoted has often fallen from his lips. I have often had the opportunity of hearing the hon. gentleman speak on the question of prohibition, I went to hear what he had to say, and I well recall to mind the occasion in Fredericton when he told the people that not only was the time ripe for prohibitory legislation, but rotten ripe. My hon. friend ought to give some little evidence of modesty of disposition, which would recognize the possibility of other men falling into errors as well as himself. I have never, in this parliament or elsewhere, charged the hon. gentleman with being at all deficient in honest conviction on the prohibition question, and do not do it to-day. I have never charged him with want of sincerity when he expressed that view. But when he sees good reason to change his mind, and to recede from his position as an impossible position for a public man to hold on that subject, I think he ought to have a little sense of consideration for other men who have had occasion to change their views, on a public question, and he ought not to speak as if he occupied a position in this country too high for other men to reach, and to call upon the people to look up to him as a demi-god in these respects.

**Mr. FOSTER.** That is a good argument for railway subsidies.

**Mr. WILSON.** And a good way of getting on with the business isn't it?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** Though it is a little late in the session, yet I think it well that what I have said should be said. There are gentlemen who have sat in this House and allowed themselves to be lectured by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), who is not worthy to lecture anybody. I do not attach any particular blame to the hon. gentleman, as I have said, for the course he had taken on the prohibition question; but when an hon. gentleman has not only had moments of weakness, as he himself confesses, but year in and year out has suffered in a condition of prostrated judgment, I think it would be more becoming in him if he would recognize that other men as well as himself are human. I think that he and others in this parliament occupying the position of critics of the government should remember that no government with which any of the present ministers were connected ever had the present policy of railway subsidies to deal with. He should recognize that governments are largely children of circumstances in respect to the order of business in parliament; they must bow to the conditions that surround them; and that if we come late in the session to make these propositions, it is not because we do not desire to make them earlier, but that we have found it impossible to do so. Let me say a word with regard to the question that the hon. gentleman and others as well referred to—that they have not been furnished with the information, with the correspondence and so on which they desire. It is true that he has not been so furnished. But why? For the very good reason that he did not ask to have this correspondence supplied. When the hon. gentleman rose in his place after I sat down, he did not ask to have these papers submitted, but he claimed, rather, that it was the invariable practice to lay on the Table petitions and correspondence with regard to the different applications for subsidies before those subsidies were considered in this House. My experience in this House has been very limited in point of time. But since I came in I have been an observer, and before coming here I have read the *Hansard* reports of what took place on these occasions. And while my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has been able to refer to one instance in 1894, when the correspondence was brought down at the time when the resolutions came up for consideration, he would find it difficult to refer to many instances of that kind. What I am saying will be justified by the recollection of older members of this House. This is the 8th day since these resolutions were laid on the Table. Twenty-five of the rail-

ways affected by these resolutions have been looked into and considered by this parliament before. We are extending and revoting subsidies to twenty-five railways that we have discussed in previous sessions, and as to these the hon. gentleman is not suffering for want of information. But, I have had the correspondence here all morning, having brought it down ready to supply at the request of hon. members. If they think the time is not sufficient to enable them to give the questions such consideration as they desire, I have no doubt that further time will be given. As to the others besides the twenty-five I have mentioned, we can furnish all proper and reasonable information. Various members of the House are informed with regard to each of these railways, and know how important they are. Many of them are entirely new roads which, it is expected, will develop and improve the country. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has referred to one important road, and this and the others can be discussed, as we reach them with the information we are able to supply. Now, before resuming my seat, I desire to say a word on one other question. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) said there was nothing in the law which made it the duty of the railway receiving the subsidy to carry the mails or render services—

**Mr. FOSTER.** Who said that?

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I understood the hon. gentleman to say that across the floor.

**Mr. FOSTER.** I made no such statement. I have a little common sense, and can read English.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I must have misunderstood the hon. gentleman. I thought he had made that statement and that it was repeated by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron.)

**Mr. BERGERON.** My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) explained that provision of the statute. I did not make such a statement.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I understood that the remark was made across the floor to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen.)

**Mr. McMULLEN.** The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) asked me where the law made that provision.

**Mr. FOSTER.** If the minister (Mr. Blair) would like an explanation, I can give it to him. The statement was made that the bonused railways would have to pay 3 per cent on the subsidies. I contradicted that statement. There is no such provision in the law.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) must have misunderstood me—I said that they had to pay back in earnings, if they performed services for the government.

**Mr. FOSTER.** That was your revised statement, but, the first time, you made the other. I do not intend to take up time following the hon. minister. He complains of having been lectured—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Spoken.

**Mr. FOSTER.** No, I am in order, just as much as the Minister of Railways and Canals. He spoke twice—the first time when he moved the Order of the Day. The hon. minister proves himself so stupid with reference to the rules of the House that it is necessary that he should be lectured, and I have now to deliver him another lecture—a short one. He had better read up the rules of the House. He has taken up time in a manner not sanctioned by the rules of order, but I am not going to follow his example—because he has said nothing to reply to.

**Mr. T. DIXON CRAIG** (East Durham). I have no intention of discussing the general question of subsidies. But I merely wish to say in starting, that I do object to having these important propositions brought down at this late stage of the session. I must vote for or against these subsidies, and when I am asked why I voted one way or the other, I must confess that I did not know what I was doing. I have not any idea about them at all. We have no time at this stage of the session to get explanations on them. Now, I think that in 1894, the Liberals were quite right in criticising the action of the Conservative government in bringing these down very late; but I think the Liberal government, too, are quite wrong in justifying their action in bringing them down as late as they do. The minister said just now, that it was not because they did not want to bring them down earlier, but because they could not. Now, I have to accept that statement, but I really do not accept it in my heart. What are the facts of the case? Suppose this session had lasted only four months, then we would not have had any subsidies at all brought down, because we have been in session over five months, and it has taken all that time to bring these subsidies before the House.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** You have had them on the paper eight days.

**Mr. CRAIG.** Yes, eight days, and the House has met every day at eleven o'clock in the morning and discussed other matters. Now, what time have members to discuss these subsidies during the last few days of the session? I hold there is no time at all to discuss such important matters. I have not had time to do it. I have only had time

**Mr. FOSTER.**

to get up in the morning and get my breakfast, come up here at eleven o'clock, and sit here till after midnight, and then go home and get to bed; and besides, I have been doing that these last few days at my own expense, unfortunately. That might be some excuse to my constituents when I have to tell them that I do not know anything about these items, it is because I was not paid to know anything about them.

**The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** Has not that ten-cent business materialized yet?

**Mr. CRAIG.** I have not had time to go round yet.

**Mr. MORIN.** There is a good time coming.

**Mr. CRAIG.** Now, we have had to-day a good sample of what we have had all this session. I have made no charge that the government side were prolonging this session, but I think to-day has been an example of what we have had all the session. I maintain that the opposition is here to criticise the government, that is our business; and I hold there is no reason at all to blame the acting leader of the opposition because he does criticise, and sometimes criticises a little strongly. That is his duty, he is here for that purpose; and I hold that the Minister of Railways and Canals has no right to get up and lecture him on prohibition and all that sort of thing, and charge him with inconsistency. Evidently the Minister of Railways and Canals does not want to be criticised at all. We have seen several times during this session, that when members of the opposition have criticised these matters, members on the government side have got up and have taken up just as much time, or more time, than the members of the opposition. I hold they have no right to do that, when they find fault with the members of the opposition for taking up time, because it is the function of an opposition to criticise. I say there has been no obstruction this session on the part of the opposition. I heard an hon. member this morning call out something about blocking progress. Surely the cabinet is blocking the way, in bringing down such important measures so late; surely the voting of three millions and a half of money deserves some discussion. I repeat that I cannot give an intelligent vote on every one of these resolutions, and I complain that we have not time to consider them properly.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee on the resolutions.

(In the Committee.)

**Mr. FOSTER.** Now that we are in committee, perhaps the minister might give the rest of that prohibition speech.

**The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** That is the only point that struck me.

1. That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to grant a subsidy of \$3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated), which shall not cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than \$15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of \$3,200 per mile of 50 per centum on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as shall be in excess of \$15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of \$6,400 per mile. The expression 'cost' used in this resolution means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost, and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge, up to and not exceeding \$25,000, forming part of the line of railway subsidized not otherwise receiving any bonus, but shall not include the cost of equipping the railway, nor the cost of terminals and right of way of the railway in any city or incorporated town; and such actual, necessary and reasonable cost shall be determined by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals and upon the report of the chief engineer of government railways, certifying that he has made or caused to be made an inspection of the line of railway for which payment of subsidy is asked, and careful inquiry into the cost thereof, and that in his opinion the amount upon which the subsidy is claimed is reasonable, and does not exceed the true, actual and proper cost of the construction of such railway, the lines of railway being as follows, that is to say:—

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any change in this from the clause in the previous subsidies?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. None whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the minister to tell us shortly, how he proceeds to satisfy himself in the case of a road that claims more than \$3,200?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief engineer sends one of his engineers over the road in question, when application for the payment of a subsidy is made, after the road is constructed. It will be impossible for us to have frequent visits made by the engineers during the progress of the work, but after the work is completed, we send an engineer, and he makes a report. If the sum claimed exceeds the normal and usual amount of \$3,200, he then makes a very careful inquiry as to the cost of the work. He gets a statement from the company as to what the road has cost, they are required to furnish vouchers, establishing the cost, and that will be required with more particularity in cases where there is the slightest doubt as to whether the cost would entitle the company to the double subsidy. There is only one case in which the full amount of the double subsidy was applied for and granted, that is the case of the St. Lawrence and Adirondack. Our engineers reported that the cost of the road was far and away above

the amount required to pay the double subsidy. I think any one who has travelled over the St. Lawrence and Adirondack road and has noted the road-bed, the rails and the grade, will agree that the subsidy was well earned.

Mr. BERGERON. A first-class road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where there is any doubt that the amount is likely to be less than \$6,400, or not over that sum, then an inquiry is made very particularly, in the first place, as to what the company paid for it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is especially of their accounts and vouchers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. And then the engineer himself goes over the work, makes his estimate and forms his judgment as to whether that amount is a reasonable cost, because you will find that the clause requires that we shall not only know the cost, but that it must be a reasonable cost.

Mr. FOSTER. Is any rolling stock or equipment counted in?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, that is not taken into account in estimating the cost of the road.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, we have had a statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals as to how he gets at the cost when it is more than \$3,200 a mile. After the road is constructed, after which it is almost impossible for any man, even an engineer, to make a close estimate of the cost of construction as he has not seen the construction, he makes his estimate. He simply sees the finished road.

Mr. GIBSON. It is easier afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. The chief engineer of railways does not agree with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), because the chief engineer has put it in a report that it is very difficult to make an estimate after the road is all finished. I should think if any business man would have the same idea, because the work is all covered up.

Mr. GIBSON. All the rails and ties can be seen, the tunnels are all to be seen, the character and extent of the grading can be ascertained by levels, and the whole work can be better seen after it is done than before.

Mr. FOSTER. The work can be seen, but it stands to reason that no man can estimate the cost of labour and construction in a finished road after the work is entirely covered up.

Mr. CHARLTON. What part of the road that is finished is covered up?

Mr. FOSTER. That is one point. After the road is finished—

Mr. CHARLTON. What part of the road that is completed is covered up, so that an examination of the work after its completion cannot take in every part of the work? Can you not measure the cubical contents of the embankments, the cubical extent of the excavations, count the number of ties, ascertain the weight of the rails to the yard, the amount of timber used, the number of cattle guards and everything else? Everything is there to be examined after the road is completed, and it is a better time to get at the cost than before.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the hon. gentleman's opinion, and I will let him keep that opinion. Others who are more practical than myself can advert to that point later. I have come to my opinion from an authority that, I think, is just as good as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton). It is the common sense view that if I ride over a road after it is finished it is not possible to make as careful an estimate of its cost as if I were there when the work was going on.

Mr. CHARLTON. You do not want to ride over it. You want to walk over it, and take it all in.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. minister says that the cost of the road is ascertained in the second place by the examination of the accounts and vouchers. The accounts and vouchers would show the actual money expended for labour and material which had gone into the road. In the third place he says that no rolling stock is to be taken into account in the adjudication as to what is to be paid over the \$3,200 a mile. Would the hon. gentleman be surprised to learn that he is already paying over and above the \$3,200 per mile in the case of roads which have not been gone over by the engineer, in regard to which the engineer states that it was very difficult to arrive at a knowledge of the actual cost, where there were no accounts seen, no vouchers had, and that in the ultimate, when all these things were lacking, which should have been there, but were not there, the actual apportionment was made after taking into the total cost the amount of money expended for rolling stock as well?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not aware of it if that was done.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the papers brought down in reference to these roads, so that we can see what the basis of apportionment was.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What are these roads that the hon. gentleman alludes to?

Mr. FOSTER. I am alluding to one of the roads which has got more than \$3,200 a mile. I am speaking on information which I have.

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Which one?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a matter for myself at present. I am told that it is very difficult practically for the accounts and vouchers, in the construction of a road in this way, to be kept and to be ascertained, and it seems to me that there is no other way by which you can get at the cost than by an examination of the costs as they are shown by the accounts and vouchers, showing the actual money payments that go into the labour and construction. The hon. gentleman knows that the Auditor General has had trouble with this system of his, and that he has put it on record that it is practically impossible to arrive at any true statement as to the cost under the conditions. He has advised the hon. gentleman to adopt some other method on a basis by which it would be possible to more accurately apportion the real cost, so that the basis upon which the payment is made, may be a basis that practically can be carried out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no hesitation in saying, that, as respects each road, and the amount of subsidy which you are going to give to it, there is no other way of ascertaining what the cost of the road would be upon the pro rata principle of payment than the method which has been adopted by the department. I admit at once that this is a plan which is attended with a great deal of difficulty and trouble, and that unquestionably it is not free from objections, but I do not think that there is any ground to fear that any subsidy will be paid in excess of the proper amount. There are reasons for believing that the company will not succeed in getting as much subsidy as it is entitled to, but I do not think there is any reason for believing that it will get more. I do not know of any instance that has occurred in the department of the character that the hon. gentleman mentions. I said before the hon. gentleman spoke that in respect to the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway, there was not felt by the engineer of the department to be the same occasion for requiring the production of accounts and vouchers as there was in regard to other applications that came in.

Mr. FOSTER. And in that case they were not required.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume in that case they were not required. The engineer had no trouble whatever in advising that the railway cost more than it need cost to entitle the company to this double subsidy. As to the other two roads, I cannot conceive that what the hon. gentleman says did occur in respect to some one railway which he has not chosen to name, could have oc-

curred. I know that there was no end of visits, no end of interviews with the engineer, and of examinations of accounts and vouchers made as to both of them. There was only one question that occurred in respect to the Tilsonburg road, and that was as to whether the cost of the road should include any portion of the terminals.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not bear upon it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not, and it was not allowed.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister bring down the papers in reference to the Tilsonburg and Adirondack roads before we concur in the resolutions?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will send for them now.

Mr. FOSTER. To whom was paid the \$84,000 for the St. Lawrence and Adirondack?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot say who personally received the money. It did not come before me except in a perfunctory way, because the engineer's report was abundantly clear and without doubt or controversy.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no doubt it is a first-class road.

Mr. R. R. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I must dissent from the proposition laid down by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) that it was easy to estimate the cost of a road after it is completed. I do not believe there is a practical engineer in Canada who has any respect for his reputation, who would endorse that statement of the hon. member (Mr. Gibson). It is impossible to estimate a road accurately when it is completed. There is, for instance, side-hill work which you cannot estimate when the road is finished, because you cannot find the round of the hill and you have to make the measurements in the bottom and top, in this way take the average, which is not correct. There are rock cuttings, such as we have on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and where there is a price for loose rock and boulders, you cannot make an accurate estimate when the road is finished. Two-thirds of the material in the cutting may be rock, and when that is taken out the sand which is between the crevices makes the formation of the slope, and it looks like an earth cutting. On the Canadian Pacific Railway there were boulders over 100 yards, many of them on the surface, and when they were blasted and put in the embankment, it was impossible to estimate them. No man of practical knowledge in that kind of work would say that when a railway is completed you can accurately estimate it. I could give you a hundred instances to prove that it cannot

be done and the very best engineers will agree with me. It is nonsense to speak of making a correct estimate after the work is completed. If you are going to subsidize a railway, and if you think \$3,200 a mile is not enough, then, when the man makes an application to you for more, you can inquire into it, and you are then in a better position to estimate the cost than after the work is done. The first clause of this Bill will create a great deal of trouble. It is encouraging men to act dishonestly with the government, and I venture to predict that the government will find out by experience that the greater number of these subsidies will amount to \$6,400 per mile. The minister takes the statement made up by the contractor.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). In many cases the contractors will endeavour to get all the money they can out of the government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not governed by the statement of the contractors.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). This is a very foolish clause, because you are putting the country under obligations, the extent of which you do not know. You lead the people to suppose that you are only subsidizing railways to the extent of \$3,200 per mile, whereas, in fact, it may be \$6,400. You are placing the country at the mercy of those who want to make money out of the government, and I am sorry to say that very often people think it a legitimate business to take advantage of the government, as we all know has been the constant practice since the Liberal party came into power. I was speaking to a contractor not long ago, and he gave me to understand that he was sharp enough to see that he would get the larger subsidy. I warn the Minister of Railways to look after this matter more closely than he has done in the past. I can tell him that an estimate was made by an engineer after a certain work was done, and his estimate was \$50,000 per mile for work that could be very easily done for \$14,000 or \$15,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When was that?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). That was in regard to the Drummond County Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. The whole clause is a very foolish one, and should not be incorporated in this Bill. If you want to give \$6,000 a mile, give it, and let the public know what you are paying, but do not mislead them with the idea that you are only giving \$3,200 per mile. It is altogether an unbusinesslike way of doing things.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In my opinion, this is one of the best clauses in the Subsidy Act, and I am sorry to find that

an experienced railway contractor like my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) should view it in the light he does. I admit there is some difficulty in enforcing it, and if any better means can be suggested to attain the object in view, I am sure there will be no objection to adopt them. What you do by this clause is to give the railway builder \$3,200 per mile and if by actual experience it is found after the work is done that the building of the road has been very expensive, then it would be his right to get more. The proposal is so fair and reasonable that I am surprised that an experienced contractor like my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) should oppose it. If you could afford to have an engineer all the time on every road in Canada, watching the work as it goes along, I have no doubt that you could make a more correct estimate than when the work is finished; but that is entirely impracticable. As a rule engineers have sufficient knowledge of such work to enable them to make a fair and correct report. The clause is so fair and equitable, that until some better one is suggested, my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) should not hastily condemn it.

Mr. GIBSON. I admit that the hon. gentleman from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) has had considerable experience in railway building, but he knows that he is not paid by the contractor, if he has a sub-contract, until the estimates are made, and accurate estimates cannot be made before the work is completed. The hon. gentleman says that large boulders are met with and that they are blasted and distributed in the embankments, but this is against the hon. gentleman's argument because if there are no boulders to be seen when the work is completed, if there are no obstacles to be seen and no insurmountable difficulties to be overcome, this railway will not receive from the government \$6,400 a mile. As to the side hills and cuttings, my hon. friend knows that all these are cross-sectioned very accurately, and the measurements made by the contractors will be available to the government to show the number of yards of rock-cutting. All the quantities allowed to the contractors will be brought forward in order to prove to the government that the company should receive \$6,400 a mile. The engineers are not going to make cross-sections and profiles of the railway for the purpose of defrauding the government. In my judgment—and I have had considerable experience in building railroads in the last thirty years—it is easy for the government engineers to go over the railway and judge by an examination of it whether it is entitled to \$6,400 a mile; and whether the Dominion government is Conservative or Liberal, I have faith that these men will do fairly by the country, and will make such a report and be able to produce such evidence to the Minister of Railways as will warrant him in deciding whether he should give the increased subsidy or not.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). We would be very glad to receive that evidence now with reference to the subsidies which were granted last year on the same conditions. I do not think the minister will undertake to say that he has the cross-sections and profiles made by the engineers of all the roads that were subsidized as stated by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson). I am sure he has not, and there is nothing in this Bill or in the statutes to compel the companies to give them to him. They have their own engineers, and the government have nothing to do with them. The whole thing is in the hands of the company themselves. The minister is present, and I will venture to predict before he says anything, that he has no report of cross-sections sent in by any of the companies which received subsidies last year. He is completely at the mercy of the contractors as to whether the larger or smaller amount should be granted. The Minister of Finance said this was a most fair arrangement, which would be regulated by a sliding scale, and under which justice would be extended to everybody, and that you could not give \$6,400 a mile without knowing anything about the work. I do not think we should give even \$3,200 a mile without knowing something about the work; but I will venture to say that most of these subsidies are granted without an estimate a map, profile or tracing or anything placed before the government to show them what they are doing. Our experience in the Railway Committee is that charters are applied for without the slightest information being given to the committee. It is all a hap-hazard sort of business, and it is time there should be an end to it. If a railway is entitled to \$3,200 a mile, give it; if it is entitled to \$6,400 a mile, give it; but first look into the matter and decide how much it is entitled to. This sliding scale is going to encourage dishonesty on the part of men who receive subsidies.

For a railway from a point at or near the junction of the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway to the village of Minden, in the county of Haliburton, Ontario, not exceeding twelve miles ..... \$33,400

Mr. FOSTER. Let us know what this is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a vote to enable the existing road to be extended from the point of junction with the Grant Trunk Railway to Minden, which is on the lake.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Has the hon. gentleman any estimate of the cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). What are you voting this subsidy on? We want to know whether the subsidy is too large or too little.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We give every company that presents a meritorious application, this subsidy of \$3,200 a mile. They have to build in accordance with the contract, and when they ask for a contract, we require them to furnish the plans. They have to build under conditions which regulate the grades and quality of the work. Except in some few exceptional cases, where the companies were required to make profiles of their lines, and determine their routes, before we asked parliament for a subsidy, we do not require these companies to furnish estimates and plans. After they have ascertained that they will get such assistance as will enable them to proceed with the work, they submit their plans and profiles.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). You admit that you do not know anything about this road ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). You have no plan, or map, or tracing, or estimate ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Have you in the case of any of the others ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Do you know anything about any of them—the cost or the nature of the building ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have told the hon. gentleman that we have followed the course always adopted.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). This is a deplorable state of affairs. We have a Minister of Railways giving \$3,000,000 odd in subsidies, and he has to admit that he does not know the slightest thing about the roads—has no maps or estimates of cost, or profiles or cross-sections, or anything to give us the slightest information.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I know that my hon. friend is something of a humourist, and I appreciate his humour on this question. Would the hon. gentleman carry the joke so far, as to require a company, before it knows whether it can get any assistance, to determine its route, with sufficient accuracy, as to have profiles and cross-sections made and all the necessary plans, grades and curves determined upon, and all the engineering material which would be required in order to make a contract. Does he think that would be a reasonable suggestion in this joke which he is perpetrating for our benefit ?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I do not think that the hon. gentleman enjoys it as a joke at all, nor do I think the electors or this House will look upon it as a joke. I do not claim that he should have all the engineering plans. How can he tell about the cost if he does not know anything about the work ? You should have a tracing or a map to place on the Table and give information so that we could deal with this intelligently before asking us to vote. That is a very humiliating confession that the hon. gentleman has had to make. I did not really think that he would place himself in the position of having to say that he simply knows nothing about any of these railways to which subsidies were granted last year and this year.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the traffic on that road ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The statement is made, and confirmed by representations from other sources, that this piece of line will open up a very well wooded section of country, and good, fertile land. It is said that the hardwood, tan bark and pulp wood is very considerable. It will also extend to a series of lakes and waterways, and enable people living upon the borders of these lakes, to have railway connection with the Grand Trunk Railway and the competing lines.

To the Strathroy and Western Counties Railway Company, for a railway commencing at a point at or near Caradoc station on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and extending to the town of Strathroy, Ontario, not exceeding seven miles (revote)..... \$22,400

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the road which is within a stone's throw of another ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is not within stone's throw. This vote was passed three years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. How comes it that the road has never been built ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I presume the company had difficulty in raising the necessary funds. That is the experience of a good many companies which have obtained subsidies. Many of them were only built after struggling for many years.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that company own any other road, or is it chartered for this alone ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The whole line is thirty-one miles, I believe.

Mr. CALVERT. Twenty-four last year.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes, seven miles—three years ago, and it is hoped this will enable them to complete it.

For a line of railway from a point on the Pembroke Southern Railway at or near Golden Lake, towards a point on the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway at or near Bancroft, Ontario, for the further extension of such railway westerly from the western terminus of the twenty miles granted by Act 60-61 Victoria, chapter 4, for a distance not exceeding twenty miles ..... \$64,000

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. minister the plan of that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I will show it to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. This is a mere township plot and affords no idea of proportion or relation to the railway system of the country. It is not worth shucks. What is the ground on which this subsidy is voted?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The district which is to be traversed by this railway is represented to be a very extensive mineral district, and in part suitable for agriculture. The original line of the Pembroke Southern runs from Pembroke, and the whole distance from Pembroke to Golden Lake is fifty miles.

To the Algoma Central Railway Company, for twenty-five miles of its line of railway from its terminus at Michipicoten harbour, Lake Superior, towards the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for a further extension of this company's line of railway from Sault Ste. Marie towards Michipicoten River and harbour, Ontario, towards the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, twenty-five miles in all, not exceeding fifty miles ..... \$160,000

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Is the portion between Sault and Ste. Marie and Michipicoten built?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Forty lines were subsidized last year and construction is in progress.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Is this for the extension from Sault Ste. Marie to the pulp district?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. Last year we gave a subsidy for forty miles, of which, as I understand, twelve miles have been completed, and the rest is under construction.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a bonus from the Ontario government?

Mr. A. E. DYMENT (Algoma). Yes, a land grant. Twelve miles have been completed, with trains running over it, and ten more have been graded, and the rails laid alongside ready to place in position, and ninety miles more are under contract.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the general nature of the country through which the road

Mr. BLAIR.

goes, and what is the cost of construction—you have the actual cost for twelve miles?

Mr. DYMENT. That twelve miles cost about \$30,000 a mile. The rest goes through a similar country—difficult to build through. The country has been prospected considerably, and a large deposit of iron ore has been located—I suppose the largest in Canada. This deposit is being worked extensively, and the iron ore carried out on the railway.

Mr. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). If all the roads subsidized had the merits of this one, there would not be much difficulty about the system. I know the country very well. The twelve miles from Michipicoten have cost about \$40,000 a mile. The road is built to an iron mine. The people interested have expended in the building of this twelve miles of road and other transportation facilities and docks about a million and a half of dollars. These twenty-five miles covered by this vote will cover the extension toward the Canadian Pacific Railway, which will give an outlet, at Missanabie, I think, for the whole mining district. This iron mine is a celebrated discovery in Ontario, and a most important one. There are a great many gold prospects in that section. The main line from the east runs to another point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and is estimated to be over 100 miles. The Ontario government have given a large land grant under conditions requiring colonization. There is seventy miles of the road contracted for and under construction. It all goes through a wilderness, so whatever opinion hon. gentlemen might have—and I have my own—as to the extent to which we ought to call a halt in the subsidizing of railways, this one must be considered as a colonization road, and there should be no hesitation in making this grant, as it will be a great thing for that part of the country. And it would be a great thing for other parts of Ontario if we could get other roads of this kind built by subsidizing them. For my own part, I would rather give them a much larger subsidy and stop subsidizing some of these roads in the older parts of the country, the subsidizing of some of which may well be criticised.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Probably hon. members are not aware that the people who are promoting this enterprise and building this railway are the Sault Ste. Marie Power Company, and they are spending a large amount of money in developing this portion of the country. They represent to me that they have more than 1,000 men employed in the mine to which this road leads. They have an immigration bureau, and are encouraging people to come in, and people are coming in, many of them from the United States,

They say they will have five thousand people brought here inside of five years—people who, but for their efforts, would not go there. I understand that there is a condition in connection with the grant made by the Ontario government that they shall carry on the work of this kind. That is what Mr. Clergue, who represents the Sault Ste. Marie Power Company, tells me.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, this is the Clergue business?

Mr. HAGGART. I have no objection to a grant for laudable purposes, but I am sorry the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) is not here that I might draw his attention to the fact that this railway is subsidized for the purpose of being built to a mine. He seemed in other days to have great objection to granting subsidies for any such purpose.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand there is a provision under which 3 per cent of the money of this grant will be returned to the government each year for carrying the mails. I would like to ask the Postmaster General what sum he would consider a fair amount to pay this railway of fifty miles for carrying the mails each year? I want to ascertain whether the government will actually get back the 3 per cent which the hon. member for North Wellington promised us would be returned to the government each year. Three per cent of this money would be \$4,800; would the Postmaster General consider that that was a fair compensation for carrying the mails fifty miles on this road, or would he consider it too much? If it is too much, then the government is not getting back the three per cent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I should have to consult the controller of the railway mail service in order to ascertain what, in his judgment, would be the value of the service. The hon. gentleman will see that in the case of an unoccupied country the mail service would be limited, in order to give an intelligent answer to such a question we would have to lift up the veil that shrouds the future. I have no doubt that the government will be getting on an average fully the 3 per cent that the Act calls for, and will be receiving services to the extent of what would represent the payment to the railways of 3 per cent. We have our present experience to guide us when establishing railways all over Canada, and I think the amount we have to pay averages between \$90 and \$100 per mile for the use of the railways of Canada by the government for this purpose, in some cases more and in some cases less. But, for the mails alone, the service will be an expensive one, and when the road costs a great deal the ser-

vice costs a good deal. It would cost us more to employ teams to carry the mails into this district than it would into more accessible districts, and in districts along which there might be more travel and more profit to the mail couriers in the way of parcels and passengers. I have no doubt that even at the commencement the account against the government for carrying the mails will be considerable.

Mr. HENDERSON. The calculation is made on the basis of \$3,200 per mile. The Postmaster General tells us that about \$100 per mile is the ordinary sum paid for carrying the mails, which would make the sum about \$5,000, or about the equivalent of 3 per cent on the money. But, I assume that in most of these cases where \$3,200 a mile is put down, ultimately it will mean \$6,400. I think we can rest assured of that, so that instead of 3 per cent which the government says will be recouped to the country for these railway bonuses it seems it will simply get 1½ per cent.

Mr. WILSON. I desire to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if the policy of the government this year is the same as last year; if the 3 per cent is not earned by the railways for carrying the mails, whether it will be written off, or whether they will carry it forward and charge it against the company? I understood by an answer the hon. gentleman gave me last year, that if the money was not earned in the year, at the end of the year it was written off, and not carried forward as a charge against the railway. If that is the case, the argument of the hon. member for North Wellington is not correct, because we are not making a loan on which we will get 3 per cent, and we will simply get whatever happens to come in that year. If this is a bona fide business transaction, it seems to me that if the money is not earned in one year it should be carried forward to the next year, until they did earn it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may say in reply to my hon. friend, that I have looked into this matter. Take, for instance, the Canadian Pacific Railway. If the government that inaugurated the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway had put in a provision of this kind when the company were granted twenty-five millions of money for building that road, 3 per cent on that sum would be \$750,000. Now, we are paying the Canadian Pacific Railway for carrying the mails alone \$621,854. That shows that the roads as a rule are earning sufficiently to cover this amount. But, if the government that made the bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway had put in a clause that that principle should apply only after ten years, see what an amount of money the treasury of Canada would be getting to-day in return for the assistance it gave the company. But, in place of that the hon. gentlemen opposite gave

the entire sum to the Canadian Pacific Railway and exacted no conditions, in return, and the result is that the millionaires of the Canadian Pacific Railway pocketed all the money, and the people of Canada got nothing.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. member (Mr. Wilson) properly asked whether there was any distinction between the clause as introduced this year and that of last year. My reply is, that there is none. If it should happen that after a longer or shorter period there is a demand that a particular railway should carry the mails, and if we should have no government supplies of any kind to be carried, then it would earn nothing in respect of such carriage which would be entitled a charge against it. But the hon. gentleman is proceeding upon an improper presumption. I know from some experience in my own province that the very moment a railway is built there is a demand in the locality that the railway should carry the mails. This demand immediately arises and is pressed with such persistence that the department is obliged to accede. So, I cannot conceive that there will be any considerable portion of the railways that come under the authority of this clause that will be likely to escape having to comply with it. We know that many of them are travelling through countries which we expect will be filled up. The amounts of the obligations which the government will have to contract with these roads will be much in excess of the amount that we are deserving here. We are asking 3 per cent interest, which represents the full capacity of the government, and if we get that there is really no gift to the railway company. We are making an investment which answers all the purposes of payments to the railway company and we get interest upon it.

Mr. Haggart. The hon. gentleman has not answered the question of the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson), which was whether this was cumulative or not.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I said last year that it was not, and I say that there is no difference between the clause last year and this year.

Mr. Wilson. Last year I pointed out to the hon. minister, when he said that they would have to carry the mails, that there was not much business about that and the minister's answer was that they were not doing this on strictly business principles. I am not discussing the question as to whether they are going to earn money or not. I know that some of the roads will not earn money, but if you are going to give them this money as a loan let it be done on business principles and make them all pay alike.

Mr. McMullen.

If it is a business transaction why should it not be done on business principles and if they do not pay one year they should pay another year.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us agree as to what it really is. There is no use of misrepresenting it on either side. It is a misrepresentation of the case to say that in all these cases where we subsidize these roads they return interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum on the amount of the subsidy you give them. They do not do that. If the road, after it is constructed, carries mails, it carries them free to the extent of 3 per cent on the subsidy. If the amount earned for mails is above 3 per cent the railroad is paid for the overplus. If it carries less mail than amounts to 3 per cent it does not make up the deficit to the government. You get the right to demand of the railway that when you put your mails or services on it you shall not pay up to an amount equal to 3 per cent upon the subsidy which you have given to the railroad company.

Mr. POWELL. It is payable specifically out of the fund, I understand.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is right.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), at one time in his checkered career, had a strong objection to any of the public money going into the construction of a road which was built into a country where mining operations were going on, and that when the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) proposed a subsidy to a road running into the coal areas near the Crow's Nest Pass the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) then declared himself something like this: This is a private enterprise, these men are mining for their own benefit, and their own health. What right, under heaven, have we to give the public money to aid in the development of this property.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). You had better give chapter and verse.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend needs the actual text?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I will give it to him before we get through.

To the Central Ontario Railway Company, for a further extension of their railway from, at or near Bancroft to a point on the Canada Atlantic Railway between Whitney and Barry's Bay, Ontario, not exceeding twenty miles ..... \$64,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is this?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. This is a piece of railway in further extension of one to which we granted subsidy last year from a point upon the Central Ontario Railway to Bancroft. That line has been built. I think the point of departure from the Central Ontario Railway is Ormsby. They have constructed up to Bancroft. This Central Ontario Railway is a very important line, which I know, from personal knowledge, having been over the line. It is doing considerable for the development of that part of the country. It is a very useful line and its extension, I am sure, will be very much in the public interest. They have built to Bancroft under the subsidy of last year. The work is not altogether completed, but good progress has been made. The intention is to give them a subsidy for twenty miles further towards a point upon the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway, now called the Canada Atlantic Railway, which point would be located somewhere between Barry's Bay and Whitney. The whole distance which will have to be built to connect with the Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway will be forty miles, but we are now giving a subsidy for twenty miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Before we pass the next item I will fulfil my promise to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). Behold it is written in this book entitled 'Debates of the House of Commons, Dominion of Canada, session 1894, vol. II,' and at the 6396th page thereof, on a railway subsidy proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart), at that time Minister of Railways, for a line of railway—

—which will afford means of transportation from the coal mines to the junction of the Elk and Kootenay rivers—

And so on and so on, my hon. friend is thus reported, and it is written in the records :

For whose benefit is this to be developed?

But we do not own a scrap of this coal. Let people who own it develop it. Why should we be called upon to tax the ratepayers of Canada \$108,000 for the development of some valuable coal mine, whether it belongs to the British Columbia government or to private individuals? What justification is there for heaping on our overburdened people all these expenditures for enterprises of the merits of which we know nothing at all, and which, if they be one-quarter as valuable or one-tenth as valuable as they have been represented to be by the hon. gentleman, ought to be able to pay their own way. I object to the whole system, for the matter of that, but particularly, it seems to me, that going into the wilderness in this fashion, or the vague statement that there are valuable coal mines, in which, even though they are as valuable as they are represented, the people of Canada have no interest, is something worse than throwing away our money. Who are the parties who own this coal?

&c. &c.

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE** (Sir Richard Cartwright). What

did you say justifying your measure on that occasion?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has just informed us that this road, which is going forth into the wilderness, is approaching very nearly to the mine which the hon. minister tells us will be employing 1,000 men before many months roll by.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. There are 1,000 men employed there now.

Mr. FOSTER. Who owns this coal mine? For whose benefit? Why should we overburden the taxpayers of this country by asking them to put their money into this enterprise, for the benefit of other people?

The **MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE**. What were your arguments in contravention?

Mr. FOSTER. They did not seem to convince you.

To the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company, for a line of railway between Little Current, on Manitoulin Island, and Sudbury, Ontario, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, the company undertaking to bridge between Little Current and the mainland, the bridge to be so constructed and maintained as to afford suitable facilities, in the opinion of the Minister of Railways and Canals, for free vehicular traffic, the same as upon a public highway, the work to be begun and prosecuted from Little Current and Sudbury, one-half of the subsidy to be applicable, as earned, in respect of the work beginning at Little Current and carried on towards Sudbury, and one-half thereof to be applicable, as earned, in respect of the work beginning at Sudbury and carried on towards Little Current, the course of the line of railway to cross the Sault Ste. Marie branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, not exceeding sixty-six miles ..... \$211,200

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have an explanation of this.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. This line of railway is to give to the Manitoulin Islands railway connection with the rest of the world. I may say, the railway will pass through a very important mineralized section, the future of which is exceedingly promising. We are given to understand that there are already opened four or five important mines in which a good many people are employed. The government have been bombarded with petitions from those interested in the construction of the line.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it not necessary to have a bridge there? It crosses the channel of navigation.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you an estimate of the cost of the bridge? It seems to me it will be very expensive.

Mr. DYMENT. This is a vote that is no doubt well known to all the members of the old government, as the late government subsidized forty-one miles of this road. This is for an extension of the old road into the mineral belt that surrounds Sudbury.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the width of the channel there?

Mr. DYMENT. It is very narrow.

Mr. HAGGART. Four hundred feet.

Mr. DYMENT. Not more than that. It is going to be a splendid outlet for the surplus products of the farmers of the Manitoulin Islands to the mining districts. It will be the making of the island.

For a railway beginning at a point northerly twenty miles from Parry Sound, and extending from that point to the French River, Ontario, not exceeding thirty-five miles..... \$112,000

Mr. HAGGART. What is the object of this road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Last year, we gave a subsidy for twenty miles from Parry Sound in that direction. No progress has been made, but we are assured that the work will be undertaken to connect Parry Sound with the French River.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this subsidy to be given to any particular company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. There are two companies incorporated which have power to build.

Mr. TISDALE. I think the province of Ontario has also made a grant for seventy miles.

Mr. HAGGART. Who is applying for this? It must connect with either the Canada Atlantic or the Grand Trunk Railway.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The district around Parry Sound is rich in mineral wealth. Lately there have been large copper discoveries in the vicinity of Parry Sound and up towards the French River. At French River the road will doubtless receive a good deal of custom in lumber; and in time the road may be extended across the river until it reaches the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the meantime the vote is not assigned to any company but is merely an extension of the subsidy given last year.

For a railway from a point twenty miles easterly from the village of Haliburton, via the village of Whitney, towards the village of Mattawa, Ontario, not exceeding forty miles..... \$128,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is an amendment to this which I shall propose. At the request of Mr. BLAIR.

the hon. member for the district (Mr. Klock), I move to amend the resolution by substituting the word 'northerly' for the word 'easterly' in the first line, so as to make it read 'twenty miles northerly from the village of Haliburton.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It runs 'easterly' too. I presume every one knows where it is intended to go.

Mr. KLOCK. It runs northerly from this point and the resolution should read in that way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why not say 'north-easterly.' I think that would answer the purpose.

Mr. KLOCK. It is more 'northerly' than 'easterly,' but I see no objection to accepting the suggestion of the Minister of Railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very well; we will make the resolution read 'north-easterly.'

It being Six o'clock, the committee took recess.

#### AFTER RECESS.

(The House resumed in Committee.)

To the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, for a branch line of railway to iron mines in Bedford township, Ontario, not exceeding twelve miles..... \$38,400

Mr. HAGGART. Where is this?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is from a point on the Kingston and Pembroke Railway, near Harrowsmith, directly north-east to the mines in Bedford Township.

Mr. HAGGART. You are doubling this in two or three places. There is another line of road connecting the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway, and the Bancroft road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That goes in the opposite direction.

To the Thousand Islands Railway Company, for an extension of their railway from the present northerly terminus to a point easterly thereof, not exceeding two miles..... \$6,400

Mr. HAGGART. What is this?

Mr. HURLEY. The Grand Trunk Railway is moving its station two miles east from Gananoque, and this is to build the Thousand Islands Railway to that station.

Mr. HAGGART. The Grand Trunk Railway has not moved its station, and, so far as I know, has no intention of moving it.

Mr. HURLEY. There is no doubt that the Grand Trunk Railway intends to move its station. That is the central point between Toronto and Montreal; and where the pres-

ent station is, the ground is rocky, and there is no room for sidings. It intends to call the station the Thousand Islands siding, which is two miles east of the present station at Gananoque.

And also for an extension from a point on the railway to connect their railway with the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway, the Bay of Quinté Railway, the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway, or the waters of the Rideau Canal, the balance remaining of the subsidy granted by the Act 55-56 Vic., chap. 5, not exceeding nine and one-half miles (revote)..... \$30,400

Mr. HAGGART. Where does this connect with the Brockville and Westport Railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At a point in the township of South Crosby, I would judge, very near to the line dividing it from the township of Bastard.

Mr. HAGGART. This railway overlaps the two miles which you have just provided for.

Mr. HURLEY. This is a different road altogether.

Mr. POWELL. Where does it cross the Brockville and Westport line?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are alternative points of connection.

Mr. HAGGART. The Kingston and Pembroke Railway runs northerly from Kingston, and evidently the intention is to utilize the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway, or make connection with the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway, but that latter railway is not in existence at present or very likely to be soon.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman object to this item?

Mr. HAGGART. No, but I want to know where the road goes.

Mr. HURLEY. The Bay of Quinté road runs over the Kingston and Pembroke, from Kingston north to Hastings, which is a very short distance west of Westport. The Thousand Islands road is only about fourteen miles east of Kingston, and Westport is some eight or ten miles east of the eastern terminus of that road. All these roads come in here together, but there are some mines between Harrowsmith and Westport, and Westport and Harrowsmith are north of the Grand Trunk, and the Thousand Islands Railway is south of the Grand Trunk Railway. These nine and a half miles will go towards connecting the roads the company own.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has forgot-

ten that the wording of this vote is exactly the same as the vote passed seven years ago, when he was Minister of Railways. The Thousand Island Railway Company, by their petition, say that it has built a line between the town of Gananoque and the Thousand Islands Junction, and has kept the same in operation and cheapened the rates of transportation between the points named, and assisted many industries and developed business in the town of Gananoque and along the said line, and that it proposes to extend the line in a general northerly direction, but owing to the various streams and rough country the difficulties are such it requires an additional subsidy for the completion of the said extension, which is of the highest importance to the many factories in Gananoque and that district. I am not familiar with the geography of the place.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand the geography of the place thoroughly. It is true that the Kingston and Pembroke runs northerly to Harrowsmith, and if this vote is for the purpose of making connection between Harrowsmith and the Thousand Island road, it must go through the township of Bedford and connect at Westport or Newbury, and thence run down to Gananoque. You will then be just paralleling the road we gave a grant to immediately before, namely, the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company, for a branch line of railway to iron mines in Bedford township, not exceeding twelve miles. That road runs exactly in the direction that this road would run from Harrowsmith to the other place. The evident intention is to get an extension of the road from Gananoque for the purpose of joining the Sault Ste. Marie Railway, commonly known as the Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Railway.

Mr. BRITTON. There is no intention at present of extending the Bay of Quinté Railway eastward from Sydney, which is its most easterly point, but the object of this grant is to put the Thousand Islands Railway nearly to the mines that are north of Gananoque and to make connection with the Brockville and Westport Railway, which of course, is a running road. The Kingston, Smith Falls and Ottawa Railway is mentioned, but there is no such road in existence and not much possibility of its being built. I doubt myself if they will build this road; of course, if they do, it will open up a section of the country which is in need of being opened up, and will develop a mining region which has not so far been developed.

Mr. POWELL. Would nine and a half miles reach any railroad from that point?

Mr. BRITTON. No, there is no railroad so near as that, but that would bring them into a region where there are undeveloped mines,

and they only get power to extend the road that far.

Mr. HAGGART. That is all their charter gives them.

Mr. BRITTON. They had the bonding power only for that extent of railway. They will not be able to build any more, without coming here for legislative authority. Hon. gentlemen who know that part of the country, are aware that the road cannot be built for any such sum as the bonus. If these gentlemen are willing to put their own money into it, for the purpose of extending it into that section of the country, I am satisfied it will be a great benefit to that part of the country.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no objection to the bonus, the objection is to the wording of the grant.

The PRIME MINISTER. Let it stand in the meantime, and take it up later.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think we might as well dispose of it now.

Mr. HAGGART. We will vote it, and let the hon. gentleman fix the wording in his Bill.

For a railway from Dymont on the Canadian Pacific Railway to the New Klondike mining district, Ontario, not exceeding seven miles ..... \$22,400

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway called Dymont. The object is to go from this point into an extensive mining region. Somewhat over \$400,000 have been expended in this mining region, and what is called a customs stamp mill has been placed there. They are hampered in this enterprise from the need of getting railway connection into the mines, they cannot get ore down to their stamp mills.

To the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company, for an extension of their line from its easterly terminus to a point at or near Bond's Lake, Ontario, not exceeding four miles ..... \$12,800

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The work of construction has begun on a railway between Schomberg and vicinity of King's station, at a point on the Grand Trunk Railway, and that easterly point is some miles westerly at Yonge Street, Toronto. By extending it four miles or thereabouts further east, it will also connect with the Metropolitan Railway that goes down to Toronto.

In aid of the Ottawa and New York Railway Company's bridge over the St. Lawrence River, and for the Canadian portion of such bridge, not exceeding.. \$90,000

Mr. HAGGART. That bridge was completed a year ago, was it not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. This is the bridge, a part

Mr. BRITTON.

of which went down. The cost on the Canadian side is between \$600,000 and \$700,000.

To the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, towards the cost of the rebuilding and enlargement of the Victoria bridge over the St. Lawrence River, Quebec, in addition to the amount received by the company on account of the subsidy granted by 60-61 Vic., chap. 4, viz., \$270,000, to make up the grant in aid of the undertaking to \$500,000, not exceeding ..... \$230,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This bridge is practically completed, and we have ascertained what the cost has been. I may say at the outset that a large portion of the material which went into the bridge could not be obtained in Canada. In round figures, 45,000,000 pounds of steel were consumed in the superstructure, and of that quantity, 9,261,666 pounds were obtained in Canada. The company obtained all they could in Canada. They made every effort to secure from the home manufacturers as large a proportion of the material for this structure as it was possible. The amount they were able to secure fell short of the whole by 35,387,011 pounds. They were obliged to import this quantity from abroad, upon which they had to pay \$227,000 duty. Of course this sum went into the revenue and went for to reduce any assistance they got from us under our grant of two years ago. The whole cost of the superstructure is \$1,400,000; the cost of erecting the steel in the bridge was \$253,000; the cost of freight was \$67,000; the cost of the superstructure up to May 3 last, was \$99,416.80. To complete the construction there will require to be expended in retaining walls, rip-rapping to protect the banks, finishing grading and paving approaches, sidewalk paving, tracks for tram service, &c., \$250,000, which make a total of \$2,131,565, as the actual cost of this structure. Under all the circumstances, the government felt that the grant that is here proposed would not give the company more than the aid which was proposed under previous legislation.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this simply a railway bridge?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, it is a highway bridge as well.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been told that the traffic tolls over this bridge are out of all reason, that they practically prohibit the use of the bridge by farmers desiring to cross the river.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, no.

Mr. SPROULE. Subsidizing this bridge so largely, I submit that it should be, as you propose the inteprovincial bridge here shall be—free for vehicular traffic and foot-passengers.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am informed that this bridge offers good facilities to the

farmers. It is not altogether a free bridge; but those who are in a position to know tell me that the tolls are very much below those charged by boats between Lougueil and the city.

Mr. SPROULE. The last time I was in Montreal, a gentleman told me that these tolls were quite unreasonable, and he said that as there was a prospect of the government giving an additional subsidy, provision should be made for the abolition or at least the reduction of these tolls.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the schedule of tolls for the carriage way?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot say.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of the cost of the bridge is due to the fact that provision has been made for its use by vehicles?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not give that accurately. As the highway portions are simply built on projecting arms, I should think that the cost of these ways on either side would not be more than \$75,000 or \$100,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) informs us that making a railway bridge into a bridge for vehicular traffic and passenger traffic—a bridge over the St. Lawrence at that place—would only add to the cost about \$75,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no figures before me, and am only giving my own impression. But I should be surprised if it added to the cost of the bridge more than \$100,000.

Mr. SPROULE. When we gave the subsidy to this bridge, it was distinctly agreed—was it not?—that for the sum of \$300,000 then given, they were to complete the bridge. How does it come that we are now asked to make it \$500,000? At that time, the Drummond County Railway deal was going through, and it was claimed that very liberal terms had been secured from the Grand Trunk Railway. Is it possible there was some understanding that the subsidy they got was to be supplemented by another that would make up for the concessions they were supposed to have given? I do not see any justifiable reason why we should give them so large a sum as \$200,000 in addition to what we gave before. The minister says that more steel went into it. But, I should think that the engineer ought to have been able to calculate how much steel would be required and, at the market price, how much it would cost. This additional subsidy seems to me quite unreasonable.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I would make one suggestion with regard to this matter and that is that the government should have

control of the tolls. There is really reason to complain of the present tolls, and I do not know why the Grand Trunk Railway has made such a tariff. The bridge certainly does not receive the patronage from the public that it should receive, the reason being that the tolls are too high or are wrongly distributed. I think they charge twenty-five cents for an ordinary cart with a carter and ten cents for every person carried.

Mr. FOSTER. How is that?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I understand it is twenty-five cents for the cart, and ten cents for every person carried. That tariff is not a good one even in the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a good deal of traffic?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There would be a good deal of traffic under ordinary circumstances, if the tolls were well arranged; and I think, therefore, that the government should see that they control these tolls in such a way that the public will have benefit from any bonus that is given to the bridge.

Mr. FOSTER. This seems to be a vote which marks a distinct departure from anything we have hitherto done in the way of railway subsidies. I am sorry that the vote is proposed, and I am more sorry for the explanation which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals gave. The only reason that he gave to justify it was that they had paid certain duties upon material which went into the construction of the bridge and that in this vote we were paying them back those duties. Is it to be accepted as a principle that we are to relieve these large corporations, and more than relieve them, outside of the very generous contribution that was their due from a railroad point of view, by remitting the duties on material brought in for the construction of these works? The fact is, when you come to boil it down, this government has surrendered to the corporations, body and soul, coat and breeches—simply surrendered everything to the corporations. I have the impression that a year or two ago the president of this road said to the shareholders in Great Britain that it would be so arranged that this bridge would not cost them anything. They knew whereof they spoke. They knew that they had a facile government under their thumb. They knew how much they had squeezed from them, they knew how much more they could squeeze from them, and this vote to-night fills the bill. They have got their bridge, and I do not think it stands them for the fixed charges one cent out. How much has it cost us up to date? Three hundred thousand dollars is what we have already voted and we are now asked to vote \$230,000, which make \$530,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Five hundred thousand altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought it was \$300,000 that we voted before?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have not got more than \$270,000 to date.

Mr. FOSTER. There was \$300,000 voted, and that will leave \$30,000 which they will still get.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They cannot get it. Read the grant.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, then; we will say that you are only giving them half a million. The hon. minister has put the cost of the bridge at the outside at a little over \$2,000,000, counting in the approaches, rip-rap protection work and everything. The bridge that the Canadian Pacific Railway built for its enormous traffic, and its largely increasing traffic, cost less than \$1,000,000. This is a bridge for the whole Grand Trunk system. It is a bridge that has cost twice as much as the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge. How much has been paid by the government? The government is paying to the Grand Trunk every year for the use of that bridge, \$40,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that not the amount that is being paid?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the amount they originally asked for.

Mr. FOSTER. What is being paid?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We took \$10,000 off the gross amount they asked for.

Mr. FOSTER. Off the bridge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Off the whole.

Mr. FOSTER. Forty thousand dollars is the amount paid for the use of the bridge. Now, let us make a calculation. Suppose that the bridge cost \$2,000,000; you are paying them \$500,000 out of the Canadian fund. Then, there is \$1,500,000 left. You are paying them \$40,000 a year, which is certainly the interest on \$1,300,000. There is provision for \$1,800,000 of the cost, and I will venture to say that their tolls will come up very close to carrying the rates on what they have actually expended on that bridge. That is the way that the Dominion government has put its hands into the people's pockets in order to pay this enormous sum to this corporation, that has had these gentlemen for two or three years between its thumb and forefinger squeez-

Mr. FOSTER.

ing them as it pleases and helping them as much as it likes. It has squeezed the government until the cost of carrying that immense structure is reduced to almost nothing, if anything, and the ratepayers of this country are paying the bill. Why do the government pay more than the munificent donation they gave towards the cost of the bridge, \$300,000, one-third of the cost of a sufficient bridge? If the Grand Trunk choose to build one that costs twice as much as that, that is for the Grand Trunk to decide, if it is in its own interest, but there remains the fact that we are giving them one-half at least, and probably more than half of the whole cost of a sufficient bridge over the St. Lawrence River, in addition to which we are paying them this \$40,000 a year in perpetuity. That is the state of things. The \$300,000 that was paid at first was thought by this parliament to be a princely donation. So it was. It is supplemented by \$200,000 more. It does seem to me to be simply a monstrous transaction.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think we can safely put aside the very high words of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has made use and come to a simple business discussion of this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Now we will hear a business discussion.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, we can safely put aside the very high words of the hon. gentleman about the government being between the thumb and finger of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and come to the discussion of this matter. The policy was introduced nearly twenty years ago of aiding in the construction of railways and railway bridges. This policy has been accepted by both sides of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. When?

The PRIME MINISTER. In the long process of the years which have followed its introduction since 1882. There may have been individual expressions of dissent from that policy, but it never was made a party question between the Liberal and Conservative parties. This country, above all things, is a country of large rivers. For railway bridges which were to cost less than \$100,000, the policy was to give no aid at all. For other bridges the policy was to give 15 per cent of the cost. But, there are bridges in this country which we think should receive aid in excess of the 15 per cent. We have these large bridges across the St. Lawrence River which are beyond any comparison at all and the like of which are not to be found in the world.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, my!

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes; perhaps there may be one or two bridges which may be comparable in length with the St. Law-

rence River bridges, the Forth bridge, for instance; but, as a general thing, there are no such bridges across the rivers of the world as we have in Canada. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) made a comparison between the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge at Lachine and the Grand Trunk bridge at Montreal. I say without hesitation that there is not the slightest comparison to be made between the Grand Trunk bridge and the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge. First of all, I believe the difference in length is more than half. Anybody who knows the locality knows that the depth of the river at Lachine and at Montreal is not to be compared. The foundations of the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge are upon rock in perhaps three or four feet of water. The foundations rest upon solid rock, and, moreover, there are islands which also serve for the foundations of the bridge. They have nothing of the kind at Montreal. The bridge of the Canadian Pacific Railway, if I remember rightly, cost \$900,000. I am sure that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) will not say, if the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge cost \$900,000, that the Grand Trunk bridge would not cost at least double that amount, and more than that. The Grand Trunk bridge is more than double the length, and there are also the foundations to be taken into consideration. I will give the figures to show what the bridge has cost, and the House is startled at the amount. The number of pounds of steel that went into the bridge exceeds 44,000,000 pounds, the cost of which is very nearly a million and a half of dollars, \$1,400,000.

Mr. POWELL. The first cost?

The PRIME MINISTER. The first cost. That is only for the material. The laying of the superstructure cost \$250,000. The freight alone amounted to \$67,000. The substructure, the masonry, and it is not completed yet, has cost about \$100,000. There are accounts in the Railway Department rendered by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and submitted to the examination of the engineer of the department, and very largely passed, amounting to \$1,881,000. The bridge is not yet completed. And when it is completed it will cost \$2,231,000.

We propose to give a subsidy which will be in the neighbourhood of 25 per cent on that, and I leave it to the judgment of the House if that is an exorbitant subsidy for a work of that kind. There is another consideration to which the hon. gentleman attaches no importance, but which has its own weight in my judgment. It is not an argument upon which I would rely in presenting this matter to the House, but it is one which has its own bearing. When the government asked parliament to grant this subsidy of \$300,000 no objection was raised; I was in England at the time, but so far as

my memory serves me that was the case. The Grand Trunk Railway have not received that \$300,000, but assuming that they had received it with one hand, and with the other they paid into the treasury of the Dominion \$227,000—

Mr. FOSTER. Does not every railway that is constructed do that?

The PRIME MINISTER. But every railway is not constructed under the conditions that this was. They calculated that it would be possible to get steel in this country, but that was found impossible, and they had to go abroad, and whilst they would receive out of the treasury \$300,000, they would put into the treasury \$227,000, so that practically they have been helped not to the extent of \$300,000, but to the extent of \$70,000. Under such circumstances, can I not say with some degree of confidence that there is reason, and ample reason for the subsidy which we now ask parliament to grant to the Grand Trunk Railway. My hon. friend does not discuss the question upon its merits. But he says: That we are paying to the Grand Trunk Railway in another direction so much a year. Well, we get value for that. It is an independent transaction and I am not aware that whenever the parliament of Canada has helped any railway company, that it has balanced against that help any subsequent transactions with it. We have now taken a new departure as to the carriage of the mails for the first time. There is no argument at all in the proposition that we must in this case take in consideration the fact that in another transaction which has been approved by parliament we are paying a certain amount of money to the Grand Trunk Railway. Whether that transaction was wise or unwise it has been approved by parliament, and the two things are quite independent one of the other.

Mr. HAGGART. Both sides of the House have agreed as to giving subsidies to railways; but both sides have refused to grant subsidies for the purpose of repairing roads already constructed. Parliament has never agreed to the proposition that when a railway which has been constructed for thirty years, wants to renew its bridge, forsooth, it should be given assistance for that. It is a most vicious principle to adopt. It is altogether wrong. The right hon. gentleman entered into calculations to show what the Grand Trunk Railway had expended for the purpose of making this improvement, but he forgot to tell the House that a half interest in perpetuity in that bridge is owned by the people of Canada who are paying \$40,000 a year for the privilege. The people of Canada have the right to use over one-half of the bridge, and the Grand Trunk Railway was bound to deliver that bridge completed when the contract was made. They got a grant of \$300,000 in the first place, contrary

to all the principles that ever guided the granting of these subsidies before, and they get for the use of the bridge \$40,000 a year, which they can exchange for \$1,300,000 in cash at any time. I leave it to any railway man in the country if that, with the \$500,000 extra which they get, would not complete a road and bridge equal to the Grand Trunk Railway property in that particular place. The right hon. gentleman says the Canadian Pacific Railway were able to build their bridge for \$900,000, because there is only three or four feet of water at that particular part of the St. Lawrence. The right hon. gentleman no doubt believes that, but it is impossible that the St. Lawrence even at that point, should be only three or four feet deep where the piers are laid.

The PRIME MINISTER. I say so advisedly. Perhaps in the middle of the channel it might be deeper, but for the greater part of the width of the river I believe that is the case.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, no. That may be the case in some places near the shore, but when you get towards the middle of the river the depth must be considerably more. However, that would be a small consideration in the building of a bridge of that kind; the construction of the piers would not be one-quarter of the total cost of the bridge. Here is a bridge built by the Canadian Pacific Railway without one cent of subsidy for the construction of the road there or the building of the bridge. How do they like the idea of a rival company situated below them on the river and competing with them for the same business, getting a subsidy, not alone for the building, but for the alteration of their bridge and for the railroad as well. I do not say that the subsidy given to the Grand Trunk Railway was not for the benefit of Canada, and I believe that the road is a credit to Canada, but they receive \$20,000,000 towards the construction of that road, while their corresponding road, the Canadian Pacific Railway, did not receive one cent. It is a bad enough system to subsidize the construction of the railroads, but when you get into the policy of repairing a bridge and a railway already built out of the exchequer of Canada, there is no end to the expenditure which the people of Canada will be called upon to pay in that regard.

Mr. SPROULE. The old Act provided that we should give them 15 per cent of the cost not to exceed \$300,000. The explanation then given was that it was very desirable to have that bridge enlarged, so that it would be suited for the traffic of vehicles and foot-passengers; and though it was going to be a very costly affair, we thought we knew the exact cost, and supposed that was going to be the limit. The grant of \$230,000 more to-day seems to be indefensible, and I can only think it is through some private understanding with

Mr. HAGGART.

the Minister of Railways for some consideration, that this would be brought out in the future and that they would build up a case to justify the additional grant. As the ex-Minister of Railways says, it is a most vicious principle, and the House should not allow this vote to pass, for which no justification has been given. In connection with this subject, I said that I understood from information received that the tariff of that bridge was very high. The answer of the First Minister was that it was very low. To satisfy myself, I sent and got the tariff, which I will read to the House; and I think a good many members will agree that it is very high, especially to the poor people of the rural districts who wish to cross the bridge to reach the markets of Montreal. It is as follows: Foot passenger, 5 cents each way; bicycle, 10 cents one way, 15 cents both ways; tandem bicycle, 20 cents one way, 30 cents return; hand vehicle, used by rag pickers, scissor grinders, &c., including person in charge, 15 cents one way, 25 cents both ways; vehicle hauled by goat or dog, including the driver, 15 cents one way, 25 cents return; horses and mules in droves, per head, 15 cents each one way; cattle, 10 cents each one way; sheep, 3 cents each one way; calves, 5 cents each one way; swine, 5 cents each one way; horse and driver, 15 cents one way, 25 cents return; light vehicle drawn by one horse, 20 cents one way, 30 cents return; vehicle drawn by two horses, 30 cents one way, 50 cents return; larger vehicle drawn by one animal, 20 cents each way; larger vehicle drawn by two horses, 40 cents each way; vehicle drawn by three horses, 55 cents each way; vehicle drawn by four horses, 70 cents each way; milk van, driver free, drawn by one animal, 25 cents return; drawn by two animals, 50 cents return. I think this justifies my statement that the tariff is high, and there is a good deal of force in the suggestion of the mayor of Montreal that the government should have power to reduce these tolls, especially in view of the large assistance we are giving the Grand Trunk Railway to build this bridge. But in the first place, I condemn the principle of giving assistance to any railway company to rebuild its line after we have subsidized it once, and I see no justification for giving the Grand Trunk Railway Company \$500,000 to assist them to build a bridge after they have partly worn it out, and used the earnings derived from it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I certainly think, from the tariff that has been read by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that he has made out a very good case for his statement that the tariff is excessive. I presume the rates are based upon the ferry charges, and, as the great bulk of people who cross the river would prefer to pay the same amount to go

over the bridge to going by the ferry, except foot-passengers. I apprehend that the company thought they could charge those rates; but it seems to me that the imposition of such rates is really calculated to defeat the object in view—to prevent, rather than encourage, the use of the bridge for vehicular traffic. I think there is a good deal in the suggestion made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve, and I would propose to insert in the 6th line of the clause, after the word 'highway' the words 'upon condition that the tolls upon the bridge for passenger and vehicular traffic shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.'

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I am somewhat surprised to see this amount to subsidize a toll-gate. We had a good deal of discussion last year in regard to the grants given to the Drummond County and Grand Trunk Railway. I understand that \$300,000 was given to that railway last year for this bridge, and I have no doubt that every man in the country outside of the government believed that that grant should not have been made. The tolls charged on this bridge have been read by the hon. member for East Grey, and I think they are extortionate charges imposed upon the people in the immediate neighbourhood of Montreal for crossing that bridge. Yet the Minister of Railways and Canals proposes to give the company another grant of \$230,000 towards its cost. I do not know what his justification is for doing so, in view of the tolls they are charging, which will no doubt bring them in a very large revenue. As the ex-Minister of Railways says, other railway companies are building bridges without receiving subsidies. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company built their bridge without a dollar of subsidy from this or any other government; and why the Grand Trunk should get \$500,000 to help them to build this bridge and yet impose such tolls upon the people who cross it, I fail to see.

Let me read some of the tolls charged by this company on this bridge, which has been subsidized by the government to the extent of \$530,000, and I do so because it is very difficult to convince hon. gentlemen opposite when they are doing something detrimental to the interests of the country: Foot-passengers, 5 cents one way; bicycle and rider, 10 cents one way, and 15 cents over and return; tandem or social bicycle and one or two riders, 20 cents one way, and 30 cents both ways; extra bicycle, 5 cents one way; bicycle or tricycle or similar vehicle, ridden by more than two persons, each person 10 cents one way, and 15 cents both ways; hand vehicle, used by rag picker, scissors-grinder, &c., including persons in charge, 15 cents one way, and 25 cents both ways. Hon. gentlemen opposite laugh. This may appear funny to them, but not to the people who have to pay it. There are many other items but I will not take up the time of the House

in reading them. This company charges a fare on everything that crosses that bridge. What justification can there be for this? Why should the government subsidize this company to build this bridge, out of which the company are bound to make a very large revenue, in the shape of tolls. If I take a contract, I include all cost of material, and am not entitled to any special aid from the government to carry it out. We are all purchasing goods and have to pay the duties, without any reduction being made to anybody, yet here are these people, making money out of this bridge, and getting besides a subsidy from the government. The hon. Minister of Railways misrepresented the cost last year when he stated that it cost \$10,000,000 to build the Victoria bridge. He knows that it never cost anything of the kind. Why then did he make such a statement? The Grand Trunk Railway Company got more than they were entitled to. They were allowed at the rate of \$50,000 a mile for a road that could be built for \$14,000 a mile, and they were allowed in Montreal, over that flat, level country, for a road into Montreal, not including buildings, or anything of that kind, \$80,000 a mile, and then they were allowed this enormous amount, which capitalized, would amount to nearly \$5,000,000 for the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway. I have nothing against the Grand Trunk Railway, nor has any gentleman on this side, but when that company has got more than it was entitled to, why should it be subsidized in this way, \$300,000 or \$400,000 every year. The schedule of prices which it is charging for crossing that bridge is more than would pay for the cost of maintenance of that bridge. No doubt a large amount of money is collected in tolls and the hon. minister cannot justify our throwing away money in this fashion. The cost of the Drummond County Railway and the deal with the Grand Trunk Railway, which extends over ninety-nine years, was more than sufficient, without giving any further grants, and I would ask the hon. minister to explain his reasons for granting this additional \$230,000, besides the \$300,000 granted last year. And despite all these grants, we have this company charging tolls more than sufficient to keep this bridge in repair. They are in a position to charge these tolls, and are allowed besides \$40,000 per annum for ninety-nine years on that bridge, and then we are paying them some \$230,000 to \$300,000 a year. I cannot see why they should get all these subsidies, and still charge these tolls to the public. Are we going to have these grants continued? No, because the hon. minister will not be in a position to give them anything, and it is unfortunate for the country that should be in a position to-day to commit the extravagances in the way of railway subsidies and bridge subsidies and estimates, which he is committing to-day.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Does the hon. gentleman expect to be Minister of Railways?

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). No, I expect nothing. I am not like the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who are making a general scramble for everything in sight.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. member was not here when I made the explanation, and I do not think it is fair to ask me to repeat it.

Mr. BERGERON. Did the hon. gentleman receive any communication from the city council of Longueuil about this subsidy?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. It is true that the Grand Trunk Railway will not allow the Montreal Electric Railway to cross the bridge over to Longueuil and St. Lambert?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not know about that, but I know that the municipality have passed a resolution on the subject, expressing the wish that the Grand Trunk Railway be compelled to do that. That would necessarily involve the use of the double railway tracks by the electric railway company. I think that the extent of the railway traffic would hardly make it advisable to run electric cars as well as regular railway trains on that bridge. At first blush, it does not strike me favourably.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). As a representative of the people in this House, I consider that I have certain rights, and I will insist on those rights. One of them is to be furnished with information to enable me to judge of the measures put before us by the government. I have asked for some idea of why this money was granted, and I insist upon some answer. The minister will get along just as fast if he will give me some kind of answer as to why this money is granted to the Grand Trunk. I think the minister, as a matter of courtesy and fair-play, should give me this information.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I should be very sorry to treat my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan, Glengarry) with any want of courtesy. But does not he think that it would be a bit unreasonable if every hon. gentleman who absented himself from the House till business had been proceeded with, should come in and demand that explanation which had already been given should be repeated? Do I understand my hon. friend that he desires to be informed on this subject that he may know to what conclusion he should arrive at upon it? Because, I rather gathered that he considered himself sufficiently informed to have made up his mind to condemn the proposition. Having con-

Mr. McLENNAN.

deemed it in such an unqualified manner, it looks as though the hon. gentleman were asking me for information which could not have the slightest effect upon his mind, and that he would not think worthy of consideration. He has delivered judgment; does he expect the argument now? However, I have no objection in stating to the hon. gentleman that the government have felt that this undertaking of the reconstruction of the Grand Trunk bridge is a very large one indeed. Any person who speaks of the cost of the structure as a whole, as being represented by a million and a half or two millions of money, is speaking either without knowledge or in spite of what his better information teaches him.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, the hon. member (Mr. McLennan, Glengarry) wanted an explanation, and not an attack upon me.

Mr. E. COCHRANE (East Northumberland). Give the information without so much talk.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I labour under the disadvantage that neither my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), who is hankering for information, nor the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster), even if they were overwhelmed with information would attach the slightest value to it.

Mr. FOSTER. Now you are making another diversion.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think it is not fair for the hon. gentleman to speak of this structure as one that could be built for even four times the amount of money which they have stated, much more than it could be built for the sums they have mentioned. We know what has recently been done in respect of the—

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). If the hon. minister does not wish to give the information, at least he need not take up so much time.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan, Glengarry) is not willing that I should make my statement, I will take my seat.

Mr. FOSTER. What he wants is that you should make your statement and not take up time pitching into somebody else.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. minister has referred to me. I am not hankering so much for knowledge as I am for information.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. What is the difference?

Mr. COCHRANE. The difference is that we might get a little information without so much talk. I always thought that a minister of the Crown was a servant of

the people, but it appears to me that the present minister does not so consider himself. The government make complaints about the time occupied by this session. I want to tell the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that if he and the other ministers would take less time and give no more information, we would get through the business of the session a great deal sooner. When asked for information they commence to make a speech—as the boys in the country would say, begin to palaver around the subject.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I would like to appeal to my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane)—

Mr. **COCHRANE**. Just sit down. When you are asked for information you make a long speech, and when you get a little criticism, you are ready to show temper. But you need not show it with me.

Mr. **CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Flint). Address the Chair.

Mr. **COCHRANE**. If I have not treated you with all courtesy, Mr. Chairman, I grieve at it very much. I realize the dignity of your position. I am sorry you have not even a more dignified position; but I dare say if you swallow all the principles you advocated in opposition, and be a good boy, perhaps you will get it. Now, as a representative of the people, I want to tell the hon. minister that he does not own this country; he is not running a little show in the maritime provinces. He may have mortgaged the country, but the people will own a little of it even when he gets through. I can tell him that the time is not far distant when he will be relieved of the responsibility of office, and will no longer insult the members of this House with so much of his impertinence. The minister is laughing, and it amuses me to see him laugh, for he generally gets cross. What I want to know is why this money is being given for this work, and that question has been asked half a dozen times. The minister says that the work cost a lot of money. Of course it cost money. I remember, however, when the subvention to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was first proposed in this House, there was a great deal of talk by hon. gentlemen opposite about the enormous sums of money that had been given to the Grand Trunk, and we would never get a dollar of it back.

If the Grand Trunk Railway saw fit to reconstruct that bridge it was their own business and not ours. We have paid all this country could afford to pay as a subvention to the Grand Trunk Railway. Now, why, after giving a subvention of \$300,000, do you want to give them \$200,000 more when you are paying them \$40,000 a year for the user of that bridge? When a subvention was given to the bridge across the Ottawa River and they asked for more aid, you put in the condition that the people

should have a right to travel over that bridge; but here you are granting \$200,000 extra to a toll bridge. Why do you not put in a condition that the people should travel over the Victoria bridge free, and then you would get something for the people in return for this subvention? While I have sat in this House I have never raised my voice against spending money to develop the resources of the country, but I now enter my solemn protest against subsidizing the reconstruction of a bridge that the country helped to build when I was a young man, and now, when my head is hoary with age we are still to subsidize that road to the extent of \$200,000 more. So far as I am concerned, if I get a chance I will record my vote against it

Mr. **McLENNAN** (Glengarry). I insist on getting some statement as to why this money is granted for that bridge. I have asked the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to give us some explanation, and he talked about twenty minutes and never touched the point. Now, if the hon. gentleman wants to save time he will give the House a reason why this money is granted. I have asked for an explanation, and must have it. If the minister refuses to give it, I, for one, am prepared to remain here until I get it. I am going to insist upon it, and I will stay upon my feet till I get an answer, if it takes all night.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. If the hon. gentleman had allowed me to continue without interruption the explanation I was giving, we would have been through with it long ago; but he got up twice and was in the act of getting up the third time when I sat down to make way for him. Now, there is the same reason for giving assistance toward the reconstruction of this bridge as there is for giving assistance to any other bridge in Canada. You are not dealing with a bridge of a few hundred feet long, with three or four piers, but you are dealing with a bridge two miles in length, the reconstruction of which has cost over two millions of money. As the Prime Minister has said, we considered that having regard to all the circumstances, having regard to the fact that the company paid back into the treasury of Canada, we felt that 25 per cent of that cost would not be an excessive sum to grant them, and that amounts to \$500,000. My hon. friend must bear in mind that this is an enormous work. It was not simply in the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway Company that this new superstructure was placed upon the piers. I maintain that this work of reconstruction was as much in the interest of the country as was the original construction. The reconstruction has enabled a great deal more business to be done by the people of Canada over it than could be done before. The bridge has now a double track which makes it possible and safe for a greatly increased number of trains to be taken over

it in the course of twenty-four hours. It had practically reached the limit of safety beyond which it was not possible for them to take any more trains. With the double track and the additional accommodation, they will be able to do all the Intercolonial Railway business, all the Grand Trunk Railway business, and all the business of the other roads having connection with the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Where was the iron made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About ten million pounds was made in Canada by the Dominion Bridge Company, and two or three other companies.

Mr. HAGGART. Does not the material that enters into that bridge pay duty?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think to only a limited degree.

Mr. BERGERON. When we were first called upon to aid in the reconstruction of that bridge I understood that the street railway would be allowed to pass over it. I remember that one of the strongest arguments advanced in favour of granting assistance to that bridge was that the street railway would be able to cross it to St. Lambert and Longueuil. Now the hon. gentleman tells us he hears they will not allow the street railway to cross,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I have not heard they would not; but I understand they had not yet allowed any electric tramways to use the bridge.

Mr. BERGERON. Why should they not allow it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it would be a somewhat dangerous thing, that is my own impression.

Mr. BERGERON. We have paid already \$270,000, and we are called upon to pay \$230,000 more, that is to say, the government are giving \$500,000 for the renewal of that bridge which is after all the private property of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. We are paying \$40,000 a year for the privilege of passing the Intercolonial Railway over that bridge, and still if an elector of Canada, who has paid his share of that money, wants to cross that bridge he has to pay the tolls which have been read here to-day. Now, I am surprised that my hon. friend from Chambly-Vercheres (Mr. Geoffrion) does not rise in his place and exact from the government an assurance that they will do everything in their power to procure this privilege for the people of Montreal and the towns on the other side. We are paying \$500,000, we are paying \$40,000 a year, and still if a man wants to cross that bridge either on foot or in a carriage, he has to pay a heavy toll. The street railway company of Montreal, which obtained permission to cross to St. Lambert on the other

Mr. BLAIR.

side, and other street railway companies which have obtained charters here with the intention of crossing that bridge are now refused permission to do so.

I ask my hon. friend, and I am putting the question in a public-spirited way: Is it fair that the people of this country should be treated in this way? Would it not be better, when the government are doing so much for an old and rich company which has been subsidized by this country to the tune of \$28,000,000, upon which we have never got one cent of interest, when the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals asks parliament to pay them \$500,000 as a bonus for the reconstruction of a bridge, when we are paying them \$40,000 a year for allowing the Intercolonial Railway trains to pass over that bridge, that we should exact some concessions in return for the benefit of the people who desire to use that bridge? Every person who crosses on foot or drives over is called upon to pay toll, and the Street Railway Company of Montreal, or any other street railway company, is denied the privilege of crossing over the bridge, a privilege which it was promised to the people of Longueuil and St. Lambert would be granted. My hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Geoffrion) should stand up and ask the hon. minister to see that the Grand Trunk Railway Company reduce their rates and allow street cars to pass over their bridge. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said that he was ready to make an amendment to the clause, providing that the company should have their rates approved by the Governor in Council. My hon. friend has surely not thought that out. He has the power already of doing that, and what is the use of putting it in the clause? The only effective way of providing for such an approval of rates is to stipulate it in the resolution. That will have precedence over everything. You already have the right to regulate rates by the Railway Act. You are empowered by the Railway Act to approve, or disapprove of any arrangement come to by any railway or bridge company which has been subsidized by the government. If my hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres and my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Prefontaine) are satisfied with this little amendment, that it shall be left to the Governor in Council, they are satisfied with very little indeed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) has made a statement, which I think, perhaps, he has not considered. I am entirely unaware of the fact that the government is in any position to impose its will upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company outside of a provision such as I have proposed to the chairman of the committee to regulate tolls as respects vehicular traffic over the bridge. All the power that the Railway Act gives to the Governor in Council is to regulate railway rates.

Mr. BERGERON. And tolls.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Railway rates and tolls.

Mr. BERGERON. That is by the Railway Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But that would not cover foot passenger or vehicular tolls.

Mr. POWELL. Would not the government have power to make it one of the conditions of the grant?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have some doubt as to whether it would without having it in this Bill, and I am proposing to put it in the Bill for that purpose.

Mr. POWELL. For greater caution?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. But the hon. gentleman has that right already.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In reference to the question of tramways the hon. gentleman said that the Grand Trunk Railway Company have refused to allow tramcars to be run across the bridge.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not saying that. I am saying that the resolution of the council of Longueuil, which was addressed to my hon. friend, and he admitted that he had received it, says so. The council of Longueuil declared that the Electric Railway Company of Montreal had been refused permission to pass over the bridge. I am not saying it; I do not know anything about it. I am taking the resolution of the council of Longueuil, a copy of which has been sent to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères and to the right hon. Prime Minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understood the hon. gentleman to state it, but I understand now that he accepts the statement contained in the resolution referred. There is nothing but the resolution which he sets forth that they did refuse. I do not know that they did refuse. I have had no statement from the Montreal Street Railway Company to that effect, and I do not know the ground at all, if they have refused, upon which they have done so. The subject is probably one which would require to be well considered. It may be that they would have good reason for refusing to allow an electrical car system to use their tracks. They have only two tracks and you would require that the bridge should be equipped in such a way as that it might be used electrically, and it might be regarded, in view of the very large traffic over the bridge, as a very dangerous proceeding to have electric cars running over and have these cars mixed up with

railway trains. That might be regarded as a very serious objection. As to the matter that the hon. gentleman has referred to, I would have no objection at all to putting myself in communication with the Grand Trunk Railway Company to ascertain whether any application of that kind has been made and refused, and if so, upon what ground the refusal has been based. I should be very glad to make the necessary inquiries. It is only within a day or two that the resolution came to hand and I have had no opportunity of looking into the question at all.

Mr. VICTOR GEOFFRION (Chambly and Verchères). Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say that I think the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) is right when he says that he has not power to regulate traffic on the bridge or to force the railway company to allow an electric railway company to put down another track upon the bridge. I am ready to support the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) in his contention that we ought to insist upon the people on the south side of the river being provided with the accommodation which they require, and which has not been accorded them by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. We have already done a great deal in adopting the proposition of the hon. Minister of Railways for them. I hope that the government will see that the tolls are properly regulated, and if I thought that this parliament had the right to force the company to alter its bridge so as to permit a track being laid for electric cars. I would be the first to urge that it should be done. I know that it would be a great convenience to the people living on the south side of the St. Lawrence River to have the street railway crossing over the bridge. I hope the government will study this matter carefully and see if they can force the Grand Trunk Railway Company to allow street cars to cross over the bridge. Unfortunately, I do not think we have any such right, and I have arrived at this conclusion after having looked into the case.

Mr. BERGERON. We have every possible right here. We can do anything we want to in this parliament, particularly when we are voting money. When we are giving money to anybody we can impose conditions.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Has my hon. friend looked into the Railway Act upon this question?

Mr. BERGERON. Certainly. When we are granting \$230,000 the hon. minister can impose any condition that he wants to. There is nothing to prevent him from doing so. It is a natural law that when you give you name the conditions upon which you give. My hon. friend is very anxious about these different electric railway tracks. The first time that this proposition was mooted before the House the government were go-

ing to arrange with the Grand Trunk Railway Company for electrical tracks and it was understood that tracks should be put on that bridge for the use of electric railways. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), who knows a good deal about the matter, can correct me if I am wrong when I state, that the bridge was first built with that intention. There is a space on each side of the bridge for an electric railway track, but instead of having that, they have made a footpath and carriage way out of it, for what reason, I do not know. The Grand Trunk Railway Company apparently have made up their minds not to put on electric tracks, and we cannot force them to do so, except on an occasion like this, when we are voting them money. We are now called upon to give \$230,000 in addition to the \$270,000 we have given them already, and the \$40,000 a year which we pay them for ninety-nine years. If my hon. friend (Mr. Geoffrion), wants to obtain any concession for his people now is the time to force the Grand Trunk Railway Company to put down an electric track, and afterwards they can lease it to the Montreal Street Railway, or to any other railway they please, which will give the people of Montreal South the street car facilities which they need, with the city of Montreal. I tell my hon. friend (Mr. Geoffrion), in a friendly way, that if he wants to get that done, now is the time, and he may have it for the asking.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is quite right in his suggestion that if the parliament of Canada chooses to annex to the grant, a condition that they shall place a tramway track on the bridge, we are empowered to do it. But what my hon. friend (Mr. Geoffrion) had reference to was, as to our power to regulate or control the passenger or vehicular tolls, and I agree with him that under the Railway Act, we have no power to do that. I do not know sufficiently about the effect of compelling the company to lay down a street car track, to express an opinion about it. We know now that they have two tracks, and that there is not room for more than two tracks, unless you interfere with the vehicular traffic. That is my impression, at all events, but anyway under the circumstances it would be very unwise to act in the direction which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) suggests. It seems to me too clear for argument, that it would be a most dangerous thing and a most unsafe thing, to compel them to use the railway tracks for tram-cars.

Mr. BERGERON. That is not what I want. There is sufficient width on the bridge without that.

The PRIME MINISTER. You would have to put your tram-cars on the arms.

Mr. BERGERON. The member for Lincoln can tell you all about the width of the bridge.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. GIBSON. It is sixteen feet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), says there are sixteen feet clear on each side. If you put down a tram-car in that space you will have to destroy the utility of the highway for passenger purposes.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all.

Mr. GIBSON. Of course you will.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should think so, and you would have a rebellion on the part of the people who use that for passenger and vehicular purposes.

Mr. BERGERON. I believe the Minister of Railways wants to do what is right, but I would ask him, is it not a fact that when the rebuilding of that bridge was first spoken of, it was well understood that there would be two tracks for electric railways? Why was the idea changed? It must have been done for some purpose. One of the first arguments in favour of voting the immense amount of money which has been voted by this parliament for the renewal of that bridge, was that it would provide accommodation for electric cars, and the proof of it is, that the property on the south shore of the river went up by leaps and bounds when that was announced.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is right to the extent that there was a rumour at the time that the bridge could be used for electric cars as well as for steam cars. But I never heard that it was intended to put an electric railway on the arms of the bridge, which were designed for foot-passengers and vehicular traffic. I do not know that the arms of the bridge are strong enough for that. It was contended at one time that the tracks now used for steam purposes should be used for electric cars, but I should imagine there would be great difficulty about that.

Mr. BERGERON. I take it for granted that gentlemen on both sides want to do what is best in this matter, and there is no question that the people of Longueuil and St. Lambert desire to have an electric railway across that bridge. It now seems from what the minister (Mr. Blair) says, that the Grand Trunk Railway refuses to do that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do not quote me as saying that. I do not know.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, we must take it for granted from the signs which are apparent, that they will not allow it. The council at Longueuil must be well informed as to the matter, and I have here the report of their opinion, as to that. My friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Prefontaine) and my hon. friend from Chambly (Mr. Geoffrion), must be en courant as to whether the people of the

south side of the St. Lawrence tried to obtain the passage of electric cars over that bridge. It is a very easy matter to settle the question as to whether there can be electric cars there or not. The engineer of the Grand Trunk Railway, or the chief engineer of Railways and Canals, can very soon report as to whether it is possible to have an electric railway on that bridge, and as there is no hurry to pass this vote to-night, it can well be left over for a short time. When we are called upon to vote such an immense amount of money, we should, at least, give satisfaction to the people who are most interested in the matter, and that would be a very easy way to settle it.

Mr. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Maison-neuve). I quite understand that when the vote was first asked, it was understood that tramways would run across the bridge.

Mr. BERGERON. Certainly.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was said in this House, and repeated in the press and in the county of Chambly, but I think the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), is under a wrong impression as regards the building of tramway tracks. It was understood that the tramways would have access to the bridge on the tracks used for the railways.

Mr. BERGERON. I never understood that.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no other way of putting tramway tracks on the Victoria bridge as it is constructed now. Besides, vehicles cannot pass each other on one side. There is only room for a vehicle to go one way on one side and come back on the other side. So that there is no possibility of putting tracks on the bridge for an electric railway without completely destroying it for vehicular traffic. The question of allowing tramways to cross on the rails I think has been considered by the authorities of the Grand Trunk Railway. They have not yet come to any conclusion in the matter, and they may come to some arrangement with one of the tramway companies. It is a very serious question for the engineers to decide, whether it is possible to run both steam railways and electric tramways on that bridge at the same time. That is a matter that will have to be studied, and it may, perhaps, be arranged. There is no doubt that the general impression was when the bridge was built that tramways would have access to it. Of course, at present it is impossible.

Mr. GIBSON. As the hon. member for Beauharnois has several times referred to me in regard to the Victoria bridge, I may say that I am quite sure that every member of this House was under the impression that tram-cars would be able to use it. At the time the renewal of the bridge was in contemplation, there was no idea of the

Grand Trunk granting to the Intercolonial Railway running powers over the bridge. As it stands to-day, there are only two tracks which tram-cars could possibly use, unless the vehicular traffic was destroyed entirely; for the only place where tracks could be placed for the tram-cars would be on the outlying trusses, and these were built only for vehicular traffic, which is calculated at about 2,000 pounds to the running foot. Then, the bridge is so constructed that if an electric system ran between the railway trains, the present signals on the bridge would be destroyed. The bridge is used almost continuously by the traffic of the Grand Trunk itself, the Central Vermont and the Intercolonial; and, in my opinion, it would be a most dangerous experiment for parliament to force the railway company to provide for a system of trolley cars upon the Victoria bridge. There is no possibility of running them over the top of the bridge; because the centre span is of a different height from the others. It was at first anticipated that a continuous level would be maintained on the top chords of the bridge, so that in future it might be arranged to run electric cars there; but the question of the navigation of the river arose, and the shipping interest waited upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and also on the Minister of Railways and Canals, and insisted on the headway of the bridge being maintained at its old level. It was necessary in consequence, to put in a solid steel floor system, in order to make it as shallow as possible, and a much higher truss on the central span—twenty or thirty feet higher than the other trusses. There is no possibility of getting over the difficulty that I can see, unless a new truss was put in for that purpose. The central span is 100 or 120 feet longer than the others, so as not to interfere with the navigation of the river, and the truss had to be made higher in order to carry that long span; and every member of this House will agree that the navigation of the river is paramount to the interest of the railway. For these reasons, I do not think the Grand Trunk Railway Company, without going to a tremendous expense, could provide accommodation for trolley cars. A very large fence, almost up to the level of the car windows, separates the tracks from the highway, so that the horses shall not be disturbed by the passing trains; in fact, the trains are almost hidden from them. If trolley cars were put on the outside of the bridge, it would be impossible for vehicles to use it.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). While the hon. member for Beauharnois is looking up a point in *Hansard*, I have just a word to say. This is a new departure, and in common with other gentlemen on this side of the House, I have been listening for some justification for this exceptional grant. The hon. leader of the House and the Minister of Railways have given us

three or four pretexts, but I do not think they have given us their reason. What has been urged is first, the very large cost of this work; secondly, the duty that was paid on account of the company being obliged to bring the iron into the country; and, thirdly, the construction of the approaches and additional rip-rap. As respects the very large cost of the work, I find that if the annuity of \$40,000 is capitalized, it comes to \$1,391,000; and if to this added the \$500,000 which will be granted when the present estimate passes, we shall have a present grant to the company of \$1,891,000. The First Minister has said the cost of the bridge up to date is about \$1,900,000; so that the company, by our grants and annuities we have agreed to pay them, are recouped the whole cost of the construction of the bridge. Passing to the question of the duty, it was said that the company found they could not get the iron in Canada and were obliged to import it. There is nothing in this, because I ask the hon. gentleman if the bridge companies do not import the whole of their iron. There has not been a bridge constructed in this country of any importance for the last ten years, or, for that matter, ever constructed, in which the iron has not been imported. It is imported either from the United States or from across the Atlantic, and the duty has to be paid under any circumstances, and this is simply putting forward a pretext for a reason. As to the rebuilding of the bridges, I call attention to this fact that the approaches to the old tubular bridge were not interfered with by the construction of the new bridge. They were in as good condition as ever. They were ample for all the railway purposes of the new bridge, and the additional approaches and rip-rapping were caused entirely by the construction of the highway on either side of the bridge. What then are we asked to do? We are asked to give a grant towards a purely provincial purpose, the construction of a highway. That is a new departure, which is entirely unjustifiable.

Now, as respects the objection raised by the hon. gentleman from Grey, that this work has been completed, there is a great deal in that point. The bridge has been completed. We give grants for what purpose? We give grants to railway companies for the construction of their lines and bridges because the financial status of the road or the earnings of the particular work are insufficient of themselves to guarantee the completion of that work. But, in this case, the company have not only completed the work, but their revenues have so increased since that they actually have been paying bondholders, who for years previously had received nothing. It is not because the Grand Trunk Railway requires it that we are giving this grant, for the Grand Trunk Railway is in a most flourishing condition during these last few

Mr. POWELL.

years. There is, therefore, no reason for giving it. That company is not in financial difficulties on account of this work. Its revenues are very buoyant. And yet we are asked to take this new departure in the history of parliament. If we grant this subsidy, what is to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway coming to-morrow, and with equally good reason saying: The railway bridge that we constructed across the St. Lawrence above Montreal was a work of such vast extent, that we think the company should be recouped to a certain extent by parliament. And we should have no reason for refusing that request were we to grant the application of the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. In the latter part of the discussion with reference to the electric railways, we have lost sight of the preceding discussion which was on an important point. I stated shortly after dinner that, if my recollection was not at fault, the president of the Grand Trunk Railway had informed the shareholders in Great Britain that very advantageous terms had been granted by the Ottawa government—so advantageous as to practically relieve the company of the cost of reconstruction and repairing its bridge. I find now that the statement was much stronger than I thought it was, and I will read it to the House:

Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson, in the course of his address to the shareholders in London, said, among other things, that the Grand Trunk Railway had agreed with the Ottawa authorities that the government, having extended the Intercolonial to St. Hyacinthe, the Grand Trunk Railway would grant the government road running powers into Montreal over the Victoria bridge, on terms which he believed would enable the bridge to be double-tracked and practically constructed without a cent's cost to the company.

The paper went on further:

The announcement of these favourable terms was greeted with applause loud and long. When it had subsided, Sir Charles proceeded, stating that in addition to what he had announced, the Dominion and Quebec government were each contributing 15 per cent to the cost of renewing the bridge.

So that the arrangement made, by which we were to pay \$40,000 per year for the bridge, was so advantageous, in the opinion of the president of the Grand Trunk Railway, that it would enable the bridge to be double-tracked and practically reconstructed without a cent of cost to the company, and then that 15 per cent in addition upon the cost, would be contributed by the Ottawa and Quebec governments.

Mr. HAGGART. What year?

Mr. FOSTER. 1897. I am very sorry indeed that the Minister of Trade and Commerce should have left the House. But here is the position to which we have come in connection with this subsidy. Up to the present time there has been an agreement,

and the principle was acted upon in accord with that agreement, that these bridges, costing over a certain amount, would get an extra subsidy of 15 per cent of the cost, not to exceed so much. The Prime Minister thought that that was not quite fair, because, he said, this is a bridge which has cost twice as much as the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge. Well, if it has cost twice as much, we give twice as large a subsidy as the amount is arrived at by a percentage. So that if this cost \$2,000,000, it would get 15 per cent, or \$300,000, while a bridge that cost \$1,000,000 would only get \$150,000. Being on a percentage basis, it was fair all round, because the one that cost the most would get the larger subsidy. But to-day you are introducing the principle that you may subsidize bridges, if the government take it into their heads to do it, to the extent of 25 per cent of their cost. And if you subsidize one bridge to the extent of 25 per cent of its cost, what will hinder you from subsidizing another bridge to the same extent. Will not the principle and the rule hereafter be that each company will get 25 per cent if it has sufficient political influence, because that is the precedent established. You are altering the basis entirely upon which this parliament has heretofore been giving subsidies to bridges on lines of railway. You are doing more than that. The rule has been heretofore that you would give subsidies only to railways and bridges that were not constructed. But you are introducing the principle of subsidizing to the extent of 25 per cent of its cost a bridge, and a railway in connection with it, which has been in operation for scores of years, and which is consequently not a new bridge, but simply a reconstruction of an old one. Therefore, every railway company which requires to double-track and repair and reconstruct its large bridges, will have a perfect right, under this precedent, to ask the government for a subsidy.

These are two things that we are doing. On what principle? None has been stated. The absurd statement has been made by the Prime Minister that you ought to give this company a larger subsidy because they have been paying duties on the one hand while we have been paying them the subsidy on the other. That has been met by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) who shows that this bridge at Montreal is of material, that is imported by the bridge company, and that duty is paid whether it is imported by the bridge company or by the railway company, as in this case. What reason is there why, having made arrangement to pay \$40,000 in perpetuity as a contribution toward the first cost, or the reconstruction cost, which represents the capital sum of \$1,300,000, now we are to supplement that with \$500,000, and thus we are to pay practically the whole cost of the reconstruction of this bridge. There is no

use talking longer. This is the statement made by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) by the hon. member for Westmoreland and myself. It is the statement which must go to the country, and the country will have to judge of it. But, I do wish the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) were here that he might have those question categorically put to him, and that he might tell this House what he thinks of these changed conditions. Does he approve of them? Does the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) approve of them? If he does he has made a complete volte face from his former profession. From the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) we expect nothing better; from the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) we expect nothing better. Neither of these gentlemen grounds his actions upon principle, neither of them has the least notion of consistency. But there are some gentlemen in the Cabinet in who have had principles, and who, I hope, have them yet, and who have some regard for consistency. We have not heard from these gentlemen. Some of them have left the room while this discussion has been going on, while others say nothing. The country may judge. This is as I say a simply political vote which the government are taking out of the hard earnings of the people and giving to this company for the reconstruction of this bridge.

For a railway and traffic bridge over the Ottawa River at Nepean Point, between the city of Ottawa, Ontario, and the city of Hull, Quebec, upon condition that the bridge be so constructed as to provide suitable facilities, to the satisfaction of the Minister of Railways and Canals, for free vehicular and foot passenger traffic, the same as upon a public highway, in addition to the \$112,500 already granted, a sum not exceeding..... \$100,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to insert in this some words which have become necessary by reason of the fact that this subsidy will be in addition to the previous subsidy. After the word 'granted' I move to insert:

Notwithstanding anything contained in the said Act, the subsidy hereby given, together with the grant of \$112,500 under 61 Vic., chap. 4, to be paid upon the completion of the bridge and its approaches upon the report of the chief engineer of such completion and the recommendation of the minister.

Mr. POWELL. If you put in the word 'additional' before 'sum,' that would be sufficient.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, there is a difficulty. The word 'bridge,' as interpreted in the Justice Department, as we are advised—and, of course, that would govern the Auditor General—means simply the structure from the water's edge on either side, and does not include the approaches.

Mr. SPROULE. When will this bridge be completed? It has been a long time in construction?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has; but I think, perhaps, not so much blame is to be attached to the company after all. They were delayed very much by two causes. My department delayed them until we had an inspection of the concrete which composed the piers. A good deal more delay arose in consequence of the objection that was taken to what was thought to be an interference with Major's Hill park. They were cutting away some of the side of the park, and we delayed them until we could satisfy ourselves that they were not going to impair the appearance of the park in any way. I think, altogether, we were the occasion of their losing some months of time.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the result of the investigation of the concrete? And what is the estimated cost of the bridge independent of the approaches?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The concrete was found satisfactory. The estimated cost of the bridge, when the work was started, independent of the approaches, was \$750,000. But the increase in the material and in wages would add enough to the cost, I am informed, to bring it up to about \$1,250,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the percentage the minister is giving in the case of this bridge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We were not basing this grant so much upon percentage as upon the consideration that the bridge would cost a good deal more than was anticipated. At the time application for the subsidy was originally made and the first assistance given, we estimated 15 per cent upon the cost would realize \$112,000. Under this additional subsidy, we will probably be giving to the company in the neighbourhood of 18 or 20 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a dangerous principle here, as in the other. I find that the old grant for this bridge was fixed at 15 per cent of the cost, not exceeding \$112,500. It appeared to be the settled policy of the government to give a subsidy of 15 per cent, upon the estimate given by the engineer to assist in building bridges. But now the minister gives as a reason for an additional subsidy that this bridge costs more than was estimated. I am afraid that this principle once conceded will be appealed to in every case in the future. All they will have to do is to come here and say: The bridge will cost more than we estimated, and therefore we want the government to give an additional grant. They have these precedents established which they can refer to for their justification.

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think the precedents will be found to have much effect in the way the hon. gentleman has stated, because we have precedents of the same kind scattered all through our subsidy legislation. There are numbers of instances in which grants have been made in aid of bridges of not more than 15 per cent of the cost.

Mr. FOSTER. Which ones are those?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Last year or the year before we gave a grant in aid of the Yamaska bridge for a fixed amount, irrespective of the 15 per cent. There have been several instances of that kind.

Mr. BERGERON. Why did not the hon. gentleman also put into the grant to the Grand Trunk Railway these words "for free vehicular and foot passenger traffic?" instead of referring the whole thing to the Governor General in Council?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was part of the arrangement in one case, and it was not in the other.

Mr. BERGERON. Why discriminate between the two?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One is two miles long and the other probably about 1,500 feet long.

Mr. HAGGART. I think there was a provision in the charter that the electric railways should have the right of use of this bridge; is that the case?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think so. But you see we are providing here that this traffic should be free, but the electric railway business is not free.

Mr. HAGGART. The reason you mentioned that at all is in order that it may be free.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to see the estimate confirmed by the hon. gentleman's department that the bridge and piers will cost \$1,300,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Are you considering the approaches?

Mr. HAGGART. I want to know what the cost of the bridge and piers alone will be?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They originally estimated that the cost of the bridge would be about \$750,000; but there has been, as everybody knows, an increase of 15 per cent in the price of material and, unfortunately for them, the increase had taken place after they had made their arrangements, and after they had got their subsidy.

Mr. HAGGART. Fifty per cent increase on the cost of the superstructure would never bring up the cost to \$1,300,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say it would cost \$1,300,000. We had a delegation of gentlemen interviewing the government on that subject. We had Mr. A. F. Gault, Mr. Hanson, Mr. Beemer, and some other gentlemen who are connected with this enterprise, and they represented to the government that by reason of the delays which have taken place, the prosecution of the work had been much retarded, that the prices of materials of all kinds, and of labour as well, had gone up considerably; and that altogether the cost of the bridge would be 50 per cent greater than the original estimate, and that consequently the bridge and the approaches would cost a million and a quarter dollars. That was an approximate estimate of those gentlemen.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of that delay was due to the government's action in testing the concrete?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Probably there was a month or two of delay. They made all possible progress. But there was considerable delay in consequence of difficulty in getting the right of way around the park. They think now they will be able to finish it this year.

To the Canadian Northern Railway Company, in further extension of their railway north of Swan River towards Prince Albert, North-west Territories, in addition to the grant by the Act 62-63 Vic., chap. 4, a further mileage not exceeding 100 miles ..... \$320,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is an extension of the road built by Mann & Mackenzie. How far is that built up?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot say just how much of the hundred miles has been built, but they say they will have 150 miles built this year from Swan River. From Swan River to Prince Albert must be 500 or 600 miles. If they add 100 miles to that which they have built, that will make 200 miles, and they will then have 300 miles more to build. My hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) thinks that I am fifty miles out of the way. It is not more than that any way.

For a railway from the westerly end of the Waskada branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Manitoba, further westward, not exceeding twenty miles..... \$64,000

Mr. HAGGART. What is that for?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The assistance now being authorized by the resolution is for the extension, as the resolution states, of Canadian Pacific Railway Company's branch, which now runs from Deloraine to Waskada. It stops

on the easterly side of the Souris River. On the westerly side of the Souris River there is a district of country which has been settled for a great many years. Some ten or fifteen years ago a large number of people left that district on account of the lack of railway communication, but since that time the district has filled up again to a considerable extent. A great many plans have been made of late years, and strong efforts were made last year to have the Canadian Pacific Railway extend their branch, which was only built last year, from the present terminus, fifteen or twenty miles further on. The twenty miles which is now contemplated will be sufficient to furnish reasonable transportation facilities to the people of the whole district. I think this is a meritorious undertaking, because of the fact that the country is settled and the people have to transport their grain for a considerable distance at a very heavy loss to themselves.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has a petition from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company asking for the grant, and stating the necessity of it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To be frank with my hon. friend, I am not possessed of a petition from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company are not the only company that have authority from parliament to build this line, and while it might be hoped that they would construct it, yet I think that would not be the sole dependence of the people in the locality.

Mr. INGRAM. I have received two or three letters from a gentleman living in the Swan River district, wanting to know when the plans were filed in the Railway Department in connection with the Canada Northern Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You mean for the extension?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have not been filed, because the route has not yet been determined.

Mr. INGRAM. Can the hon. gentleman tell me when the plans of the portion that is already built, were filed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not from memory, tell the date. Perhaps, if the hon. gentleman would like to get the information accurately, he will allow the question to stand, and I will get it to-morrow.

Mr. HAGGART. It is rather strange that you should take a grant to give to another railway company, if necessary, this sum of money?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not wish to do so.

Mr. HAGGART. You take power to give it to another railway company, if the Canadian Pacific Railway do not choose to construct it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is very important to get the road built.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is a provincial government railway.

Mr. HAGGART. It seems to me strange, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company having built their road to this point, not seeing the use of extending it, and not asking for a bonus, the government should take a grant for the purpose of extending it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It very often happens that the company are not particular at all, but the people are anxious for the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. What other company would build twenty miles of railway from the leaving off point of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and without any other railway at the other extremity of the twenty miles?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has been known to be done.

For a railway from a point on the Alberta Railway and Coal Company's Railway towards Cardston, Alberta, N.W.T., for thirty miles of railway at \$2,500 per mile..... \$75,000

Mr. HAGGART. What is that for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my hon. friend will be good enough to look at the map on the Table, he will see the irrigating ditch which has been built by the Colonization Company. They have expended in cash, we are assured by Mr. Galt, a very large sum indeed, in the building of the irrigation ditch, \$400,000. It occurs to me that this is an exceptionally important work, sure to make that section of country exceedingly fertile and productive. Settlers are beginning to come in, and arrangements are being made for a large population. I understand their irrigation canals are ninety miles in length. The population which this gentleman represents to us, is either in there, or is going in, will not be less than from 5,000 to 7,000 people.

Mr. HAGGART. How far is Cardston from Fort McLeod?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is quite a distance.

To the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company, for a railway from Duncan Lake towards Lardo or Arrow Lake, British Columbia, or from Lardo to Arrow Lake, not exceeding thirty miles.. \$96,000

Mr. HAGGART. What company is the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a company incorporated by the British Columbia legislature. I was

Mr. BLAIR.

about to propose that the words 'to the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company' be struck out, so that it may be open to the government to make an arrangement with either that company or any other company. The Canadian Pacific Railway are in the neighbourhood, and they may possibly be willing to undertake the construction of this road as part of their system. This is a section of country which is exceptionally valuable in minerals, and this is with the view of making these accessible.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the only subsidy given to a railway in British Columbia?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there an application received for a subsidy from Wellington to Cape Scott, at the head of Vancouver Island?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is Mr. Dunsmuir's road?

Mr. SPROULE. It was rumoured that a subsidy was promised for that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think we had any application from the company, and it did not appear to us that there was any pressing urgency for it at present.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand from the minister there was no application from this company for a subsidy?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is my recollection. I thought I had the papers here, but I find I have not, and I cannot furnish the hon. gentleman any definite information about it. What request we had was not from the company if I remember aright. It did not appear as though the company were moving in the matter and under the circumstances we did not feel that it was an urgent case.

Mr. HAGGART. If we are to judge from the wording of the resolution there is nothing to prevent you giving the subsidy to an American company.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. HAGGART. You have the power.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, we would have the power no doubt.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, the wording is very objectionable. If it is the intention to give it to the Canadian Pacific Railway, why not say so?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not want to force it upon a railway company.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, you came pretty near forcing it upon them in the preceding

resolution. It is not the intention of parliament to give power to the government to give subsidies to an American line of railway. Will the minister give me an assurance that he does not intend to do so.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not understand what the hon. gentleman means about an American company, but, of course, any company has to have a corporate existence in Canada which an American company would not. I could not give an assurance that the government will not give a subsidy to a company which has Americans in it.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not speaking about that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) may rest assured that we will safeguard in every possible way anything that will imperil the national interest.

Mr. HAGGART. You could give this subsidy to a provincial railway company which connects with the American system of roads, and we should guard against that. We should keep that territory for our own people. In view of the assurance given by the minister I have no objection.

To the Restigouche and Western Railway, for the company's railway, in addition to the fifteen miles subsidized by the Act 62-63 Vic., chap. 7, on the easterly section of the line, and in continuation from the westerly end of the said fifteen miles a further distance of fifteen miles towards the St. John River; and for the said railway, in addition to the twelve miles subsidized by the said chapter on the westerly section of the said line, a further distance from the easterly end thereof of fifteen miles towards Campbellton, N.B., not exceeding thirty miles ..... \$96,000

Mr. HAGGART. There is no overlapping in this?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman can rest assured that there is no overlapping that would injure the object we have in view.

Mr. POWELL. What gap would this leave?

Mr. McALISTER. One hundred and ten miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would leave the distance between Campbellton and the St. John River. There has been 37½ miles subsidized altogether, and we are adding now 30 miles.

Mr. McALISTER. I thought there were 47½ miles subsidized?

For a line of railway from St. Charles Junction on the Intercolonial Railway towards the St. Francis branch of the Temiscouata Railway, Quebec, not exceeding forty-five miles, and from the mouth of the St. Francis River, N.B. westerly towards St. Charles Junction, fifteen miles, in all not exceeding sixty miles ..... \$192,000

Mr. HAGGART. Is it the intention of the government to build another railway in the Temiscouata district when you have a railway from Riviere du Loup across?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This starts from the St. Charles junction.

Mr. HAGGART. I have no doubt whatever that the proper way to construct the road in the first instance is from the St. Charles Branch into that section of the country. Unfortunately, we built a line of railway already from Riviere du Loup on which the grades are so excessive that the road is practically useless. I point out to the minister that he is building two roads into that section of the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are going through an entirely different section of the country, and a section which is very fertile, and you are making the line thirty or forty miles shorter.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, no.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). Mr. Chairman, with your permission and the permission of the House I will give a few words of explanation as regards the territory through which this line of railway will pass. The principal portion of it, from St. Charles Junction going eastward, passes through my county. The Intercolonial Railway runs through three different points in my county—St. Charles, seven miles from the St. Lawrence River, St. Michael's, four and a half miles, and St. Vallier, four miles. My county extends to the boundary of the state of Maine. Back of the height of land, called the Alleghanies, or Blue Mountains, runs an immense valley, extending all the way from the county of Beauce to New Brunswick. In that part of the country there are three extensive parishes with a population of 7,000, and these people have to travel by vehicles all the way to Quebec, that is, sixty miles, in order to get to market. They have no railway accommodation of any kind, and they have to go over a range of mountains 1,800 feet above the level of the St. Lawrence River. For the last twenty years these people have been promised railway accommodation, but they have never got it. It might be thought that the Intercolonial Railway would have served all the requirements of that part of the country, but that is a great mistake, which is apparent to any one who travels through it. It is a fine country, as far as cultivation is concerned, and heavily timbered.

Men from New Brunswick and from the United States have immense limits there, and they float their timber down by the St. John and Doaquam rivers. This railway runs from St. Charles Junction eastward, and forms an open angle with the Intercolonial. In my county there are three parishes distant fully forty miles from the Intercolonial Railway—the parishes of St. Magloire, St. Philemon and Buckland. In that part of the country there are in every parish two or three creameries or cheese factories. The valley through which this railway will run is sufficient in extent to afford accommodation for about one hundred parishes, but people have been leaving many of those parishes and going to the Lake St. John district where they get railway accommodation. In my county, election after election, railway accommodation has been promised to the people who have been there twenty-five or thirty years; in 1896 it was promised in every one of those parishes. All that part of the country, which is from fifty to seventy miles from the Intercolonial Railway, is going to receive the benefit of this railway, and every man who knows that part of the country will realize what a great boon it will be.

Mr. POWELL. What will the length of the gap be after these portions are built?

Mr. TALBOT. I could not exactly say.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The length of the whole line will be 130 miles after the connection is made.

Mr. HAGGART. What would the distance be from Rivière du Loup to the common point of junction on the main line?

Mr. COSTIGAN. If you take the common point of junction at Edmundston, the distance from Rivière du Loup is eighty-four miles. This will be the shortest line. I agree with the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals in the statement he made that it is rather unfortunate that the line of the Intercolonial was not originally built in that way, because it was established in this parliament years ago beyond the shadow of a doubt that so far as grades and curves and facilities of construction were concerned, it was the most direct and economical route to follow, while the Temiscouata Railway ran straight across from the River St. John via Lake Temiscouata to the River St. Lawrence at River du Loup. But it is not fair to say that this is an additional line covering the same territory or accommodating the same people. This road is serving a different section of country entirely, and an important section. I speak of it warmly, though I have perhaps less interest in it than others. It only extends eighteen or twenty miles into New Brunswick; the greater part of it is in the province of Quebec. There are several counties that will be served by this line. The Intercolonial was an additional accommodation to the

Mr. TALBOT.

people along the St. Lawrence in summer when they had navigation, but all these back townships have been settled since, and they have been left in the cold, so far as railway accommodation is concerned, because the Intercolonial has not been of service to them. The Temiscouata Railway is not a competing road, and the company favour this grant strongly. It will make their branch from St. Francis to Edmundston more valuable, and from Quebec to the city of St. John it is the shortest possible line.

For a line of railway from Bristol, in the county of Carleton, New Brunswick, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, easterly a distance not exceeding seventeen miles.. \$54,400

Mr. POWELL. What point does that reach?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It reaches Foreston, a village with saw-mills.

Mr. POWELL. Whose mills are they?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Walsh's mill. Lynch operates there, to.

For a line of railway from Shediac, county of Westmoreland, New Brunswick, to Shemogue, in the said county, a distance not exceeding thirty-eight miles ..... \$121,600

Mr. POWELL. Is it intended to extend this to Cape Tormentine ultimately?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is intended to give the people what they want on the coast.

Mr. POWELL. Has the provincial subsidy lapsed, or is it still in force?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know about that.

Mr. POWELL. There are two petitions. One was in 1892, for a railway from Shediac to Chemogue. Is there not a petition since that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, there is another petition.

Mr. POWELL. I would suggest that you make it read from Shediac to Chemogue and towards Cape Tormentine.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will do so.

For a railway from Lockeport, N.S., to Sable River, or other convenient point of railway connection, not exceeding twenty miles..... \$64,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A line of railway is being constructed in that section, which does not touch Lockeport, and this will give this important village a branch line.

Mr. SPROULE. I would ask the hon. the Minister of Railways if he has not had an

application from the people of Meaford for an amount to extend the railway down to the harbour. The Northern Railway passes some distance south of the town, and they are taking it down to the harbour for the purpose of reaching the elevators that are to be built there. The town has burdened itself very heavily by way of a bonus of \$50,000 to bring this railway down, and in addition \$30,000 to build an elevator. It has a little over 2,000 inhabitants. Last year this parliament voted a subsidy to extend the railway from the present terminus on to Owen Sound, and if the people are to get the advantage they ought to get from this road, it will only be by extending it down to the wharf. Since we are giving assistance to short railways, four or five miles long, it seems to me that the government ought to give assistance to this branch.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I have received a good many applications and I am not sure that there may not be one from the town of Meaford.

To the Chateaugay and Northern Railway Company, for a railway from a point in Hochelaga Ward, Montreal, to a point on the Great Northern Railway in or near the town of Joliette, passing near the town of L'Assomption, Quebec, together with a spur into said town, not exceeding forty-two miles .....	\$134,400
For a single track standard railway bridge, with two roadways ten feet from Bout de L'Isle to Charlemagne, at the junction of the Ottawa and St. Lawrence rivers.....	150,000
Towards the construction of a bridge across the Lac Ouareau River.....	15,000

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I might explain these three items together. The object is to give to an important section of the community in the counties of Assomption, Joliette and Montcalm, railway communication with Montreal. The railway is intended to leave the city of Montreal at Hochelaga and cross over by means of a bridge to the mainland, and then go direct to Assomption, to about within a mile of the village and then go to L'Epiphanie and direct to Joliette, making connection with the Great Northern Railway. First, there are two bridges for the two branches of the Ottawa at its junction with the St. Lawrence—Rivière des Prairies and Rivière Jesus. There will be a bridge from the mainland to L'Isle Bourdon, and from that island to the mainland on the other side. The length of bridge on the island before it reaches the river will be 500 feet; the bridge over the Rivière des Prairies will be 1,794 feet; across L'Isle Bourdon 2,200 feet; over Rivière Jesus, 1,194 feet and at Charlemagne, because the land is low and marshy, 1,750 feet, a total of 7,438 feet. The bridge over Rivière des Prairies will be composed of seventeen spans—fourteen

spans of 100 feet each, one span of 200 feet, and two spans of 97 feet each. It will be twenty-four feet at the top, and six feet wide, and the distance between the water and the bridge will be twenty-six feet. The bridge over Rivière Jesus will have twelve spans—ten spans of 100 feet each and two of 97 feet each.

Mr. **BERGERON**. There is no navigation there ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Not now. There was formerly, but the waters are so shallow that navigation is not feasible.

Mr. **BERGERON**. What is the probable cost of the bridge ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. In the neighbourhood of \$600,000. There is to be another bridge over the Lac Ouareau River on the same railway. It will be 834 feet long and be composed of four spans—two spans of 140 feet each and two spans of 137 feet each. It will be thirty-five feet at the top and six feet wide, and will be forty-three feet above the surface of the river, the neighbouring country being very high.

Mr. **BERGERON**. There is no navigation there either ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No.

Mr. **FORTIN**. I understand that this bridge at Bout de l'Île is to serve for vehicular traffic ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Yes.

Mr. **FORTIN**. And I understood it was to be a free bridge; so I move that the same words be added here as in the case of the Nepean Point Bridge :

For free vehicular and foot passenger traffic, the same as on a public highway.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I am very glad, since subsidies are being given to railways and bridges, that the right hon. gentleman has brought down this vote. Were not some representations made by the people of Berthier and other municipalities asking that the road should pass nearer to Berthier than is arranged for here ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. What the Berthier people have been asking for is that this railway from L'Assomption should be extended towards Berthier.

Mr. **BERGERON**. A spur ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Yes.

Mr. **BERGERON**. What distance ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Speaking under correction, about fifteen miles—certainly not less than twelve miles.

Mr. **BERGERON**. On this large bridge at Bout de l'Île do vehicles cross on the railway allowance ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No, there are ways on either side for foot-passengers and vehicles.

To the Arthabaskaville Railway Company, for a railway from Victoriaville to Chester West, province of Quebec, a distance not exceeding twelve miles.. \$38,400

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I move that 'ville' in 'Arthabaskaville' be struck out, making it read 'Arthabaska Railway Company.'

Motion agreed to.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Is there a company to build that road ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. There is a company organized, incorporated last year. The municipalities interested, Chester and others, have subscribed and contributed.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Is that to be an electric railway ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No, a steam railway.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Only twelve miles ?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. The charter is more ambitious, and, in course of time, the road will be developed for its whole length. The charter is for a railway from Dudswell Junction on the Quebec Central in the county of Wolfe and reaching the Intercolonial Railway at Maddington Falls across the townships of Dudswell, Ham South Ham North, Chester West and the parishes of St. Christophe, Arthabaskaville, Victoriaville, Ste. Victorie, Ste. Rosaire, and Ste. Anne du Sault, a distance of about sixty miles.

To the Great Northern Railway Company, for a branch line from the town or from near the town of Joliette towards Ste. Emilie, touching the parishes of Ste. Beatrix and St. Jean de Matha, not exceeding twenty miles ..... \$64,000

Mr. **BERGERON**. That is the old Great Northern Line.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. The Great Northern as my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) knows is building a railway from Ottawa to Quebec. This is to be a branch line from Joliette towards the north, where my hon. friends knows very valuable establishments are now carried on. Colonization is going very fast in that direction, and this is intended to serve those people.

For a railway from Farnham, province of Quebec, to Frelighsburg and the international boundary line, not exceeding twenty-one miles ..... \$67,200

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** (Mr. Fisher). This is a continuation of what used to be the Montreal, Portland and Boston, and of what is now the Montreal and Province line. It is one of those railways for the amalgamation of which we passed a Bill the other day, going into the hands of the Central Vermont Railway.

Mr. **BERGERON**.

Mr. **BERGERON**. That is an American company, is it not ?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. The Grand Trunk Railway Company practically controls the Central Vermont, and they have promised to build a continuation from Farnham to Frelighsburg and the frontier if this subsidy is given.

Mr. **HAGGART**. This is in order to enable them to connect with the line between the United States and the city of Montreal, is it not ?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. The road will make connection at the frontier probably ; but the subsidy here is to go for a road from the town of Farnham, a large railway junction in the eastern townships, to Frelighsburg, and the frontier line.

Mr. **HAGGART**. What road comes to Frelighsburg from the other side ?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. I think it is a branch of the Central Vermont in the state of Vermont, which is built right up to the boundary line, or to a village a few miles from the frontier.

Mr. **HAGGART**. There is no such line now as the Montreal and Province line. It has been merged in the Vermont Central Railway Company, and to be of any utility at all to any railroad it must be given to an American company, the Vermont Central.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is really owned by the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. **HAGGART**. We gave power, under the charter which we passed the other day, to the Vermont Central to amalgamate with or sell out to the Grand Trunk Railway ; but we are giving under this grant, let it be clearly understood, a subsidy to an American railway company that owns the Vermont Central and has acquired the right of ownership of two railways in the province of Quebec.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. We gave this railroad company, and the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly, and the Montreal and Vermont Junction Railway Company, the right to sell their properties in Canada to the Central Vermont, and this is a continuation of what has been the Montreal and the Province line, a company under the control of the Central Vermont, and will be built, I suppose, under their auspices.

Towards the construction of a railway bridge over the St. Francis River, in lieu of the grant under 62-63 Vic., chap. 7, at St. François du Lac, on the condition that the bridge be built so as to allow the municipalities to make use thereof, to establish and maintain a suitable roadway for the free passage of foot passengers, vehicles and animals, to be approved by the Minister of Railways and Canals (revote) ..... \$50,000

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a subsidy to be given to the South Shore Railway Company. It is a revote, but there are new conditions attached by which the company shall do what we have provided already that the Chateauguay Railway Company shall do, that is, give free passage to the people. This bridge is to cross the St. Francis River. The approaches will be 1,500 feet long, of trellis work, because it will be necessary to leave open spaces. The bridge itself will be 1,000 feet long. It will be composed of eight spans of 125 feet each, seven of them fixed spans and the other a swing span. There will be nine piers and two rest piers. The height of the piers above the water will be forty feet, under the water, about fifteen feet, the bottom being clay and sand. The cost of the bridge will be about \$350,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the old bridge of the Canadian Pacific Railway that was carried away?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, that is now being reconstructed, that is on the Yamaska River. I may mention that the South Shore Railway Company has to build, in the short distance of less than 36 miles, four heavy bridges. First, there is a bridge upon the Richelieu River, that is finished; then, the bridge on the Yamaska, which is now under process of construction; then, there is the bridge over the St. Francis River, which this subsidy is intended to cover; then there is the bridge over the Nicolet. Between Richelieu and Yamaska there is a distance of only nine miles; between Yamaska and St. Francis the distance is less than seven miles, and between the Nicolet and St. Francis the distance is about seventeen miles; so that within a distance of less than 36 miles this company has to build four very heavy and expensive bridges.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there any provision by which foot passengers or vehicles can reach and pass from the bridge?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, it is so provided in the resolution.

Mr. BERGERON. This is part of the South Shore Railway is it not?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Has any contract been entered into for that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and work has been done, I do not think a great deal though.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are nine miles of this now in operation. At the end of ten miles they come to the bridge over the Yamaska, which they are now building, and the company intends as soon as that bridge is completed to go on this fall to the St. Francis River and commence the building of this bridge.

Mr. BERGERON. Are they going on with the old Canadian Pacific Railway line?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Have the company bought that?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, and paid for it.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the length of that line?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Thirteen miles.

Mr. BERGERON. This part of the line was subsidized before.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes. It was subsidized to the extent of \$3,200 a mile by this government, and \$4,000 a mile by the local government.

The PRIME MINISTER. It has been subsidized by the local government, but not by this government.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no subsidy for the line of road; it is only for the bridge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is all. Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to put in the words 'and approaches' after the word 'bridge' in the third line.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BERGERON. From Yamaska to St. Francois du Lac will it be a part of the old Canadian Pacific Railway line?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, there was no Canadian Pacific Railway then. It was Mr. Armstrong's road.

Mr. BERGERON. Was that bought by the South Shore Railway Company?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. The subsidy we are giving here is in lieu of the subsidy we voted last year in favour of that line.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, it is only for the bridge.

Mr. BERGERON. There is a grant towards construction.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is a grant to the bridge.

Mr. BERGERON. No, Nos. 62 and 63 Victoria, passed last year, provided for a subsidy to the road itself.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That is for the bridge. It is put in a different way.

Mr. BERGERON. No, no. This is part of the eighty-two miles, for which we were called upon to vote \$3,200 a mile last year. If I understand it, we are changing part of it, and giving it towards the construction of the bridge.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all. We are simply providing for a subsidy for the bridge this year. We are revoting the subsidy so as to force the company to give bridge facilities to the public.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, then, we are voting \$50,000 over and above the \$3,200 a mile, which we voted last year on the eighty-two miles.

The PRIME MINISTER. No. Last year we voted \$50,000, and we are doing the same to-day.

Mr. BERGERON. Then the whole of it is a revote.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the object of it?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The conditions have changed since last year. The company got a subsidy from the local legislature. They got \$75,000, and a clause introduced, embodying a new condition, and in order to make the Dominion vote for the bridge conform with the provincial vote, it was asked that we should insert the same limitation.

Mr. BERGERON. Then it does not change the subsidy granted last year to the eighty-two miles?

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all.

Mr. BERGERON. The South Shore Railway Company which got a subsidy for eighty-two miles, has acquired the road of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Sorel to Yamaska, and that part of the Armstrong road, the Great Eastern, from Yamaska River to St. Francois du Lac. The first part was subsidized by this government.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, no.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, and by the local government. The road from the Yamaska River to St. Francois du Lac has been subsidized to the extent of \$3,200 by this government, and \$4,000 by the local government. That line has been subsidized to the extent of \$7,200 by the country. We are now giving it \$3,200 a mile more.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is quite true, I believe, that the road between Yamaska and St. Francois du Lac was subsidized by this government. It is quite true that a subsidy was voted but it is quite true also that there never was a train run, over that piece of railway. It is also perfectly true that after the subsidy had been paid, the rails were taken up, taken over to Nicolet, and put down on the section of railway between Nicolet and St. Gregoire, and a new subsidy was given for the same rails. The road has never been in operation. I do not know whether the company will use it; I do not think they will.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. BERGERON. Why did they buy it?

The PRIME MINISTER. To get rid of the charter. There were two charters given for the same section of country, one to the Great Eastern Railway Company, and the other to the South Shore Railway Company. The two charters covered the same ground, and the South Shore Railway Company, to get rid of the other company, had to buy their charter.

Mr. HAGGART. That is a most extraordinary state of affairs. A road is laid down and subsidized, and then some one takes up their rails, puts them on another road, and receives a subsidy. The man who did that should be sent to penitentiary. The man who commits a crime like that, should be arrested and punished. I do not care who he is. This is the first time that I ever heard of it, and if any crime of that kind has been committed, the guilty party, no matter who he is, ought to be sent to the penitentiary.

The PRIME MINISTER. I quite agree with my hon. friend that the party who did that ought to be sent to the penitentiary. I state on my responsibility, as a member of this House, and as occupying the position which I do, that the fact as I have stated it, is literally true. There never was a train run upon the road except one. One train was run over the road, and then the rails were taken up, removed, put down upon another section of the railway, and a subsidy was obtained for that road.

Mr. BERGERON. As a matter of fact, we are giving \$10,400 a mile for this piece of road.

The PRIME MINISTER. Under the circumstances, yes.

Mr. SPROULE. When was that done?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think about 1887.

Mr. FORTIN. I think we should know who the party, or company is.

The PRIME MINISTER. The company was known as the Great Eastern Railway Company.

Mr. HAGGART. There must be some fault on the part of some of the officers of the department. It never came to my knowledge. The officers of the department who would certify to the government that this road was furnished with new rails, and was entitled to receive the subsidy, must have known, because it must have come to their knowledge that the rails were taken off another portion of the road, that had already been subsidized, and these officers of the department, whoever they are, ought no longer to be continued in their positions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Towards the construction of a railway bridge over the Nicolet River at Nicolet, in lieu of grant under 62-63 Vic., chap. 7 (revote) ..... \$15,000

Mr. BERGERON. What about the line between St. Gregoire and Nicolet? Does that also fall into the same line of railway?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. This line has also been subsidized before.

The PRIME MINISTER. It has been subsidized before and subsidized very much under the same circumstances. There never was a train run between St. Gregoire and Nicolet, for which subsidy was paid.

Mr. BERGERON. So that this has been subsidized by two governments, federal and provincial, and we are still subsidizing it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. The subsidies of the two governments have been absolutely squandered.

Mr. BERGERON. This is a very bad state of things.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is.

Mr. BERGERON. There is one thing more I should like to know in regard to the Nicolet bridge. Are not the piers of the bridge all built?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think they are.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that taken into consideration in estimating the cost of the bridge as far as the government is giving aid to it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. The subsidy is only \$15,000, and the bridge will cost at least \$180,000 before it is completed.

Chapter 7 of 62-63 Victoria, section 2, sub-clause 20, is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'railway,' in the third line of the sub-clause, the words 'or to connect said lines.'

Mr. HAGGART. What is the effect of that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is to make clear what was thought to have been clear in one of the clauses of the Subsidy Act of last year relating to the Bay of Quinte Railway Company. There would really be no controversy over it. I thought it was well to have these words put in. These words are put in for the purpose of making clear the language contained in clause 2 of the Act of last year in reference to the Bay of Quinte Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. Does it refer to a particular railway?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. It removes a doubt which has arisen, and it refers to a particular subsidy.

The subsidy provided for by chapter 7 of the Statutes of 1899 towards the construction of a railway bridge over the St. Lawrence River at Chaudière Basin, near Quebec, shall be deemed to be applicable, as to one-third thereof, to the substructure and approaches, and as to two-thirds thereof, to the superstructure, and the same may be paid on that basis by authority of the Governor in Council, upon progress estimates to be furnished from time to time by the chief engineer of government railways and canals, so that one-third of such subsidy, and no more, may be paid in respect and upon completion of the masonry of the substructure and approaches of the said bridge, one-third, and no more, upon the work and material of one-half of the superstructure being done and supplied, in respect of such work and material, and the remaining one-third upon the completion of the whole work.

Mr. HAGGART. You are introducing a principle here that does not apply to the other subsidies. I see no objection if you give one-third of the subsidy.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what we are doing.

Mr. HAGGART. Not at all, you are paying on progress estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is really necessary.

Mr. HAGGART. You might as well apply it to all subsidies given to bridges and railways. It is a new and vicious principle. Unless you have an officer on the ground the whole time, it is impossible to keep track of the progress estimates in the understructure of a bridge. The better way is to give the subsidies when the understructures are completed, and in whatever proportion you find that they bear to the total cost of the bridge. You could pay the superstructure on progress estimates, and although that is bad enough it is not so bad as the system of paying on the understructure. For instance, you might pay subsidies on the piers or understructures of the bridge and the bridge might never be completed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not, I think, risking any public money in respect to a work which will not be fully completed, because we are only paying a small proportion on the whole cost of the work. Here is a bridge which will cost, say, \$4,000,000, and if \$100,000 is asked for and they have \$400,000 worth of work done, you are moderately safe in giving them a proportionate amount. I quite agree that if you were to adopt the principle generally it would occasion a very great deal of additional work in the department and more than our present staff would be able to discharge. We are not, however, doing this generally, and we are limiting it to a large and important bridge.

Mr. HAGGART. I can tell you that you will get yourself into trouble.

Mr. SPROULE. It is my opinion that you are going too far in this matter. The suggestion of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals is a good one, and ought to be adopted. The result will undoubtedly be that you will have to pay all this money on progress estimates. There is nothing in the resolutions to prevent you doing that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But you limit the proportions.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but whatever proportion you pay you must remember you are paying it on progress estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only real objection to this clause is that if we were applying it to all the cases, it would make an exceedingly large amount of work for the department.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you not think it would apply to all the railways you are building under these resolutions?

Mr. HAGGART. It certainly will.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, no, unless the party is entitled to \$60,000.

Mr. SPROULE. They will not have much work done on a railway until they can claim they have done \$60,000 worth. You will find that you will be asked to pay all this out on progress estimates, because \$60,000 will not complete ten miles of an ordinary railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It prevents your being bothered with applications for smaller amounts.

Mr. HAGGART. How does the minister obtain from the railway companies the cost of construction by which he pays in excess of \$3,200 per mile. I understood from the minister when he was explaining this a year or two ago, that they were to furnish the actual amount of money expended. The railway company said that it was impossible to keep the accounts separate, and they would not be able to furnish them. The accounts are paid on the estimate of the hon. gentleman's own engineer after going over the work, without any information from the company at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is referring to the case of the St. Lawrence and Adirondack.

Mr. HAGGART. I am referring to the three cases in which the hon. gentleman said he would insist on getting full information before any payment was made, but for which he brought down estimates without such information. I am surprised at the Auditor General paying the money.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is in error as to that being the case in regard to these

Mr. HAGGART.

three roads. As respects the St. Lawrence and Adirondack, the engineer was perfectly clear as to that costing a great deal more than would entitle the applicants to the double subsidy. Perhaps he followed the method which we had laid down, after consultation together, to be pursued in these cases. I do not think he got vouchers from the company. They were building a good deal of railway in the United States at the same time that they were building this, and it is quite true that the accounts would be mixed more or less. In one of the other cases—I think it was the Tilsonburg Railway—from what I have heard, the company said they had not the books and accounts available which would show the cost of the work. Therefore, the engineers had to make an estimate for themselves, but they were very careful in reaching a conclusion. The probabilities are that the books would show, if they were produced, that the roads in these cases cost more than the engineers would estimate. He would not be at all likely to make an estimate in excess of the actual cost.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did they not produce the books, unless they had some object in view?

On resolution 3,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to make a change in this resolution. In the ninth line, after the word 'council,' strike out all to the end of the resolution, and substitute these words:

And shall also be constructed according to descriptions and specifications and upon conditions to be specified in an agreement to be made in each case by the company with the government, which agreement the Minister of Railways is hereby empowered to make.

I am putting that in because the matter will be submitted to the Governor in Council. The hon. member for Lanark, I think, suggested in the committee the change in the Railway Act which makes it necessary that this change should be made for the sake of uniformity.

Mr. HAGGART. The objection to that is that in every other case there was a cast iron rule that the railways had to be constructed according to a certain standard; but, here you propose to give the Minister of Railways the right without the approval of Council to make a contract in any form he likes.

Mr. POWELL. What is the objection to leaving the clause as it is?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection; but this was sent to me by the law clerk as necessary in consequence of the change made in the Railway Act.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. PUTTEE. There is standing on the Order paper, a government notice of motion

known as the current-wage clause, on which the debate has been adjourned, and the last paragraph of that motion reads as follows :

It is hereby declared that the work to which the foregoing policy shall apply includes not only work undertaken by the government itself, but also all works aided by grant of Dominion public funds.

Would that be a condition of granting these subsidies ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I would like to have an opportunity of looking into the clause, and will take occasion to advise the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Mr. **POWELL**. You always embody in these agreements a provision for the protection of workmen.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not just recall the precise nature of the section, and no doubt it will answer the hon. gentleman's purpose if I let him know to-morrow when these resolutions are submitted for concurrence.

Mr. **PUTTEE**. It evidently was the intention, when this clause was drafted, to include therein all works aided by Dominion funds.

Mr. **SPROULE**. That resolution never passed, and I presume was never intended to pass, and now their chickens are coming home to roost too early.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I propose to add another clause, to be called clause No. 7.

That the Governor in Council may make it a condition of the grant of the subsidies herein provided, or any heretofore granted by any preceding Act of parliament as to which a contract has not yet been entered into between Her Majesty and the company for the construction of the railway, that the company shall lay its road with new steel rails made in Canada, if the same are procurable in Canada of suitable quality upon terms as favourable as other rails can be obtained, of which the Minister of Railways and Canals shall be the judge.

Mr. **POWELL**. The quality should be mentioned. Supposing the rails manufactured in Canada were second quality, the contractors would be bound to accept that provided the price was not higher than second quality of rails could be obtained at elsewhere.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman probably means his remark to apply to the quality of rails we would allow to be laid under a contract. We have never stipulated in any other terms than new steel rails of a certain weight.

Mr. **POWELL**. I remember a case in which steel rails were purchased for the Intercolonial Railway and were so poor in quality that they had to be taken up and none others were afterwards bought of that

quality. Parties starting steel works in Canada might not at the outset be able to make rails of first class quality.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The instance my hon. friend referred to, took place at a time when steel rails were first being made. The trouble was that the rails were too soft, and then afterwards the rails furnished were too hard. It was only after considerable experience that the manufacturers were able to make rails on the necessary solidity and durability, and not liable to break, but nobody nowadays is going to manufacture steel rails for the market unless they can make them of a proper quality, and besides all the rails contracted for are rolled under inspection.

Mr. **HAGGART**. This is carrying out the idea of free trade as it is in England with a vengeance. What is the object of including it in a resolution of this kind ? Has not the minister power to make any conditions he likes upon which these subsidies will be paid. This is simply an advertisement, because he can make such a clause as this a condition of the contract before entering into it.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is an expression of the opinion of parliament as to whether that would be desirable or not.

Mr. **HAGGART**. The government may make any conditions they like in a contract before granting the subsidy. What an absurd clause this is, providing that the railway company will only be obliged to take the rails if they can get them as cheap as elsewhere. The railway companies will do that in any event.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. It is hardly as absurd as the hon. gentleman thinks, otherwise persons contemplating establishing rolling mills for the rolling of steel rails would not attach importance to it. We have been asked by two different companies that contemplate establishing works for this purpose, to make it a condition that companies receiving subsidies from the government shall buy their rails in Canada if they can get them on as favourable terms, and unless we adopt this clause it might not be possible to have manufacturers of this kind started in Canada. The clause is not objectionable, and will have the effect of stimulating the manufacture of steel rails in this country.

Mr. **POWELL**. You might as well extend it to engines and locomotives which the government are buying in the United States, and which are not as good as those manufactured in this country. These can be manufactured here on just as favourable terms as in the United States, and

such a resolution would prevent the government being sinners in the future.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. When we have manufacturers of rolling stock asking us to insert such a clause, I do not say it would be unreasonable to adopt it. By doing so, you put a little gentle pressure on the railway companies to buy Canadian rails, provided they are as good and as cheap as those which can be obtained elsewhere, and in this way you encourage the establishment of the manufacture of such rails in this country.

Mr. **POWELL**. It is perfectly innocuous, as the government have the power to insert such a provision in every contract if they wish to do so.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. If you have this in an Act of parliament, you have an assurance which is more valuable than the expression of an intention to make it a condition of a contract.

Mr. **HAGGART**. You are adopting a system of protection in the form of a bounty to the manufacturers of steel rails in this country. You give a bounty to every ton of steel rails manufactured in the country, and besides you take the manufacturers under your paternal protection by saying that if you furnish the rails as cheaply as the manufacturers in other countries, you will get the contract. This is carrying out the principles that these gentlemen advocated when they were before the electors—with a vengeance. They wanted people to be left free to purchase where they pleased. But now not only do they give a bounty for the manufacture of the article, but they undertake, as a government, to exercise their paternal influence to make sales.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. That principle is very well where you are leaving people to buy with their own money. But, where you interfere and subsidize a railway, I see nothing inconsistent or improper in saying: If you are able to buy in Canada rails of equal quality with those in other countries, you shall give the preference to the Canadian manufacturers.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Why do you not do it in locomotives and everything else they buy?

Mr. **POWELL**. I object to this, because it does not go far enough. I am a protectionist and I stand by that principle. Instead of it being permissive, it should be obligatory upon the government to insert this clause in the contract.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. This will be inserted in the contract—that is the intention. True, the word used is 'may.' But, it is just the same as in the granting

Mr. **POWELL**.

of a subsidy, which the law says 'may' be granted—but everybody knows that it is going to be granted. The really permissive part of this comes in in the minister exercising his judgment as to whether the rails are of equal value and quality with others.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Fancy a party building a subsidized railway and making purchases of rails in England. He brings those rails before the minister to decide whether they are better quality or cheaper than the Canadian rails.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. That is not the way it operates. If, as a result of this a rolling mill is established in Canada, before a man makes a purchase in England, he will go to the minister, and, if he is not satisfied with the Canadian rails will say so and arrange that he is to get the others.

Mr. **HAGGART**. How will the minister decide without seeing the rails?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Rails, like other things, have their standards. There are marks and brands to indicate the character of a rail. If the Canadian rails are as good as the others, they will be laid, if not, representations will be made and the parties will be authorized to import rails.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Then, the Minister of Railways is liable to have the manufacturers of this country use their influence to cause him to declare in favour of their rails, and they will say: If you allow rails from abroad to be placed on these railways, we will use our influence at the next election to prevent you getting votes in our locality. It is protection of the most vicious kind. The Premier promised us free trade as it was in England. Can he quote an English precedent for this—that a minister is to decide as to the quality of goods before they can be purchased?

Mr. **POWELL**. There seems to be a difference of opinion among the members of the government. We were assured positively by the Minister of Railways that steel rails—he did not mention the Bessemer process, but they are all the product of that process—are uniform in quality. But, we are now informed by the Minister of Finance that there are different grades of steel rails.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I did not say that.

Mr. **POWELL**. The hon. gentleman said there were marks and brands to show the quality. If there are different grades, a railway may want to lay down a grade different from the grade manufactured in Canada.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Even under the present law, they must submit

their rails to the Minister of Railways, because he will not pay the subsidy unless the rails, like everything else, are satisfactory.

Mr. RICHARDSON. May I ask, with regard to the subsidy granted the Canadian Northern, under section 17—have they a land grant, and, if so, to what extent?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not given any land grants since we came into power.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But, I think that road has the charter of the former Hudson's Bay Railway Company, and if my memory serves me correctly, that carries a double land grant.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not northerly from Swan River, I think.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The line is being deflected to Prince Albert.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not get a land grant unless there was legislation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am disposed to think they cannot surely have a land grant for this, although I have seen it stated that they have. But if they have a double land grant—12,800 acres per mile—in addition to this subsidy, it will be seen that they are getting infinitely more from the country than enough to build the entire road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We give them no land grant. What land grant they got on the other section running north, they got years ago; and unless some legislation was passed in parliament to authorize a diversion in the land grant on this line, running westerly, they would not be entitled to it. That is my opinion, and I am quite confident in the expression of it.

Resolutions reported, and read the first and second time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 193) respecting certain subsidies to railway companies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What will be the business for to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER. The second reading of this Bill, and supply.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. Friday.)

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 13, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright) presented the Sixth Report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House during the present session.

The committee, acting upon the precedent established in 1885 and 1891, would recommend that an additional allowance of \$250 be granted for this session to each member of the present staff of translators of the official report of the Debates, as owing to the unusual length of the session, the work performed in connection with the translation of the Debates has been fully doubled.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE moved that the report be now concurred in.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I think that this report had better wait over until another day. It ought to be looked into, as it recommends the payment of increased salaries.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion stands.

### ELECTORAL FRAUDS.—JUDICIAL INQUIRY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) called the attention of the government to the judicial commission ordered by this House some time ago, and he wanted to know what time the commission would proceed, and if solicitors were to be appointed. As to the first question, the government can give no information, because it is altogether in the hands of the commissioners themselves. With regard to the other point, after conference with the Minister of Justice I can state that he is now endeavouring to make such arrangements as will place at the disposal of the counsel such assistance in the way of solicitors as may be necessary.

### ST. JOHN, N.B., HARBOUR WORKS—THE TENDERERS.

Mr. GEO. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I wish to ask from the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Railways, as to whether the forfeits of the two contractors, Haney & Mayes, have been made. There were three tenders put in for the works in St. John, viz.: Connolly's, Haney's and Mayes'. Connolly was the successful tenderer, and in 1899, speaking in the House the Minister of Railways said that the sums deposited with the tenders in the case of Haney & Mayes had been forfeited, and I have not been able to see them in the accounts. One

was for \$24,000, and the other \$14,000. Of course they may have come in since the accounts were made up. I would ask the Minister of Finance to give me the information in the course of the day.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). I will make inquiry into the matter.

Mr. **FOSTER**. We want the names of the tenderers and the amounts, in the case of the Brockville drill hall, so that we may have the information when we take up the estimates.

#### ARBITRATION OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE DOMINION.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I want to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following article, which has appeared in the newspapers :

It is understood that Sir George Burton will retire about the 1st of September. He has accepted the position of sole arbitrator to determine the liability, if any, of the Dominion towards the province of Nova Scotia in respect of the Eastern Extension Railway claim. This line was made a part of the Intercolonial system some years ago. The road was built by an independent company, but was subsidized by the province to the amount of \$671,836, and it is in respect of this sum, with interest, that the provincial government claims a refund. When this matter is disposed of, the provincial claim respecting the Western Counties road may be dealt with by Sir George Burton, but for the present it is in abeyance. This claim is for \$679,197, with interest, the amount of the provincial subsidy to said road. It arises over the statute of the Dominion passed in 1887 declaring the Western Counties Railway a work 'for the general advantage of Canada,' and 'subject to the legislative authority of the province.' The province contends that, in recognizing the Western Counties road as a work 'for the general advantage of Canada,' the parliament of the Dominion virtually admitted that the public aid given by the province should have come from the treasury of the Dominion, and not from the province.

That opens up, as will be seen, a serious question for the Dominion, as there have been other subsidies voted in other provinces which must follow the same line. I do not suppose there is any truth in this, because I do not think the government would enter upon arbitrations involving such principles and such large sums while parliament was in session without acquainting parliament at least of its intention and getting the opinion of parliament about it.

I have seen it rumoured in the papers about another and, perhaps, still graver matter, namely, that the government had granted a fiat to certain parties in connection with the Regina, Long Lake and Prince Albert Railway, involving a sum of \$5,000,000; the claim being that money should be paid according to certain values of land, for lands granted to the railway, but which were not contiguous to the road, or not found suitable for settlements, and which consequently have not been selected. That

Mr. **FOSTER**.

opens up a mighty serious question, and we quite know what these fiats mean, and we quite know how far the court may go under influences which are not antagonistic on the part of the government. If we are opening up these immense vistas of probable awards against the government, it is something that parliament ought to be acquainted with. I take this as being only a rumour at the present time, but if it proves to be more than a rumour, then it is an intensely grave question for us.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With regard to the last question to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has alluded, I must say at once that I earnestly deprecate the tone of his remarks. It is not to my knowledge that in any British parliament such censure has ever been passed upon a British court of justice. The idea that the hon. gentleman deliberately states is, that there may be influences brought to work upon one of the courts of the country; a court which was constituted by the late government and not by this government. For my part, I do not believe that such a thing exists, and in the name of the Canadian people I must solemnly object to such language. I hope there is no court in this country that can be made amenable to such influences or influences of any kind, and I hope that the Court of Exchequer is not an exception to this rule. I must say to the hon. gentleman that I understand from the Department of Justice that a fiat has been granted to the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Company. I do not know what is the nature of the claim, and I have but a hazy idea about it, but whether the fiat has been granted or not, I submit that it is a question upon which parliament has not any jurisdiction. It is not a matter which is exercised on ministerial responsibility; it is simply a question of law to be determined by the officers of the Crown as to whether or not a subject praying the Crown for a fiat is entitled to it. The petition discloses the right of action, and the law is well settled that if a subject pray the Crown for redress by way of petition of right, he sets forth on his petition the claim, which may be well founded or not, but at all events it is a claim which has to go to the judicial authorities, and the duty is incumbent on the officers of the Crown to grant a fiat under such circumstances.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). As to the claim in Nova Scotia, I desire to say that Sir George Burton has not been appointed to arbitrate on that. The statement in the press is entirely unjustified. The government have not agreed to refer to arbitration the claim referred to, nor has Sir George Burton been appointed.

Mr. **FOSTER**. If the House will allow me a moment, I do not wish to get out from under any responsibility as to what I really did say; nor do I wish to be saddled with

any responsibility which I did not intend to take. My statement is simply this, that if a government is favourable to a claim, it may, by not putting in a defence or by waiving certain legal technicalities, put the claim which goes to the Exchequer Court in a very different position from what it would if it were not so favourable. That is a matter of common notoriety; and if a government takes such a position, it is no imputation against the Exchequer Court, or any other court, that it takes cognizance of any waiver which a government may make with regard simply to technical matters, which, if insisted upon, would be a complete bar to the claim being considered by the court. That far I went, and I went no further. I am quite willing to take the responsibility of going that far.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). In regard to the matter to which the hon. gentleman has referred, which comes particularly within my department, I may say that he is under a misapprehension with regard to the position of matters. The position of the government is that they are called upon to administer a contract which was made by their predecessors in office. The company have made certain claims against the government. They have pressed that they should receive certain considerations and certain compensation for what they claim to be the failure on the part of the government to carry out the contract. I declined to recognize that position, and I said to them that their interpretation of the contract was not the interpretation of the government. They are now proceeding in the courts to get a legal interpretation of the contract, and the government is standing strictly on its rights with respect to the contract.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I understand, from what the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) has said, that the first class of claims to which I referred have not been referred to arbitration yet—the Nova Scotia claims.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The claim to which my hon. friend particularly referred was with regard to the Western Counties Railway; which, he said, would give rise to claims of a like character elsewhere. The government have not agreed to refer any claim of that character to arbitration.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What about the provincial claim?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. That was a claim of the province. The whole thing was a claim of the province.

Mr. **FOSTER**. There were two divisions.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. One related to a claim on account of the Intercolonial Railway. That, it was stated in the

House some time ago, the government were prepared to refer to arbitration; but the claim with regard to the Western Counties Railway the government was not prepared to entertain.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Has the first one been referred?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. It has not been officially and actually referred, but it was stated in the House that the government were willing to refer it to arbitration.

Mr. **NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN** (West Assiniboia). Under which contract are proceedings taken—the contract set out in the legislation of 1889?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The contract with respect to the granting of land to the railway company is provided for in an order in council. It is the interpretation of that order in council which is in question. I have not seen the pleadings in the case, because they have not come before me. They came before the Minister of Justice, I think, in my absence.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Can the minister recollect the date of the order in council embodying the contract?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. It would be about 1889.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). The first one was in 1887, and it was amended in 1889.

Mr. **DAVIN**. My memory is that there was a contract set out in the legislation of 1889, and in that contract there is a clause dealing with the land grant, as well as a clause dealing with the \$80,000 a year.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The land grant is, of course, given under authority of an Act of parliament. Then, the department prepared an order in council which sets out practically the terms of the contract. Of course, if the Act did not authorize the order in council, the order in council would be of no value.

#### PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. **W. H. MONTAGUE** (Haldimand). Following up the remarks of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), it might be well for parliament to know whether the government are considering the question of carrying out the suggestions made by the Interprovincial Conference a few years ago, to which, I believe the right hon. leader of the government expressed his adherence, namely, the question of increasing or readjusting the provincial subsidies.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No, the government are not considering it.

### FIRE INSURANCE POLICIES.

Mr. JAMES GILMOUR (East Middlesex). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Solicitor General to state briefly in what regard he proposes to secure uniform conditions of policies of fire insurance?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The intention is merely to introduce the Bill, so as to have it printed and distributed, in order that members and others may become familiar with it for next session. It is not intended to proceed with the matter further this session.

### I.C.R.—SHIPMENT OF SHINGLES.

Mr. JOHN McALISTER (Restigouche). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if he has yet received a report from the general manager of the Intercolonial Railway on the memorial presented some time ago by the shingle manufacturers of Restigouche and Bonaventure with regard to the change in the weight of shipments over the Intercolonial, and if so, has the change asked for been made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have not received a report.

Mr. McALISTER. This matter is causing a great deal of inconvenience and injury to the shippers of shingles over the Intercolonial Railway, along the shore, and it is to the interest of traffic over the Intercolonial Railway that the request of these men be granted.

### JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

House proceeded to consider amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 189) intitled: 'An Act to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.'

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The amendment made by the Senate consists in striking out the first clause of the Bill, as it went up to that House, which clause refers to the appointment of three additional judges for the district of Montreal. I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Sutherland:

That this House do disagree with the Senate in the said amendment for the following reasons:—

1. Because by section 92 of the British North America Act, it is provided that in each province the legislature will have exclusive power to make laws concerning "the administration of justice in the province, including the constitution, maintenance and organization of provincial courts, both of civil and of criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure in civil matters in those courts";

2. Because by section 96 of the same Act, it is provided that the Governor General shall ap-

point the judges of all courts so organized by provincial legislatures, except those of the courts of probate in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick;

3. Because by an Act of the legislature of the province of Quebec, passed in 1899, viz., 62 V., ch. 29, it was provided that the constitution of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec should be amended, and that the said court should be composed of thirty-four judges, the object being to give three additional judges to the district of Montreal;

4. Because the object of the first section of the present Bill was rejected by the Senate, is to comply with the duty imposed upon the federal government and parliament by the aforesaid section 96 of the British North America Act, in so far as the above action of the legislature of Quebec is concerned;

5. Because the act of the Senate in rejecting the said section of this Bill is an infringement of the principle of provincial autonomy secured in the British North America Act.'

With reference to this amendment, I beg to draw the attention of the House to this fact, that by paragraph 19, section 92 of the British North America Act it is provided that the provincial legislatures may exclusively make laws in relation to the administration of justice in the provinces, including the constitution, maintenance and organization of the courts of both civil and criminal jurisdiction, and including the procedure in civil matters in the civil courts. It has been suggested that while the power is vested under the constitution, in the provincial legislatures, of establishing the courts, they cannot in the exercise of their power impose additional burdens on the federal exchequer without our consent. But I would draw attention to this fact, that if it be argued that a provincial legislature cannot, even in the exercise of its undoubted exclusive right to constitute courts, do anything which may have the effect of imposing additional burdens on the Dominion parliament, no one pretends that it is not within the power of the Dominion parliament to make laws, for the administration of which the local legislatures are obliged to create courts. We may thus, without the sanction or co-operation or control of the provincial legislatures, make laws which will have for their effect to impose additional burdens on the provincial exchequers. Not only may we do that, but we have the right, under the British North America Act, to retain in our own hands the enacting of laws with reference to criminal procedure. What is the effect of that? It imposes burdens upon the provinces which they cannot regulate or control, but to which they are obliged to submit; and so far do we go in that respect, with reference to our criminal law and procedure, that in so far as Quebec is concerned, we practically operate an injustice. Under our system of criminal procedure, which we control exclusively here, we impose upon the province of Quebec burdens which are not imposed on the other provinces. Take, for instance, the city of Montreal, you have a criminal court sitting permanently there four months in the year, and by our criminal law we im-

pose on the provincial exchequer the expense of a double trial in many cases, especially in the centres of trade. That is the result of the system which we have imposed on the province of Quebec, and which makes it possible that in all criminal cases, the defendant may have a jury composed half of English and half of French-speaking men. The result is that in such case you have a double trial and double expense imposed on that province.

Then take our election Act, which we absolutely control, and the administration of which we impose on the provinces though it is one exclusively of federal concern. You put, consequently, on the provinces the burden of the execution of that Act and thus impose on them a very considerable obligation.

It is said that while we have, under the constitution, vested in the Dominion parliament the right to impose those additional burdens on the provinces, they have no right to do that which they think is necessary in their provincial interests, if by so doing the federal exchequer is in any way encroached upon. That is an anomaly which goes to show that you must read sections 92 and 96 of the British North America Act in conjunction, and read together they mean that there is a distribution of responsibility as between the federal parliament and the local legislatures, and that, in the distribution of that responsibility, the local legislatures have imposed upon them the obligation to provide the courts for the administration not only of the laws made by the local legislatures and also the federal laws, and they must organize and maintain the courts, but if they require additional judges, it is the duty of the federal parliament to meet them half way and co-operate with them in the expense of providing salaries for the judges necessary. It is said, however, that we can afford to deal lightly with the recommendations of the local legislatures, that we exercise a supervisory control, and that, in our discretion, we may revise their legislation and declare that the additional judges which they say are necessary, are, under the circumstances, not required.

In that connection let me read an extract from a speech of the late Sir John Macdonald, on the 20th February, 1880, when the same question was raised with reference to the appointment of judges in British Columbia. He said :

But, as has been said before, it is very difficult indeed for the federal parliament to decide when a wish is expressed by the legislature of any province, that it should be disregarded. The constitution, organization and maintenance of the courts are left to the provincial legislatures. The cost and responsibility for the administration of justice, excepting the salaries of the Superior Court judges, are thrown upon the different provinces, whose governments are responsible for their peace and good government. So that, when a provincial legislature passes an Act, declaring that an additional number of judges is

required for the due administration of justice, it is incurring a great responsibility for the federal parliament and government to say : You do not want them ; you can administer justice and keep the peace of the land without them, and therefore, we refuse to appoint them. As a general rule, I think we may safely trust to the discretion of the provincial legislatures in this regard.

Sir John Macdonald went on further to say :

The burden of the administration of justice is thrown on the provincial legislature, and when such powers are given them exclusively, we having no right to interfere with their powers, it is assuming very great responsibility for us to say : Although you declare certain judges are wanted and have passed an Act constituting a particular court, we refuse you the means to carry that policy into effect.

That is what the Senate has done and what we cannot agree to. In the exercise of what I maintain to be the undoubted right of a provincial legislature, its exclusive right, the legislature of the province of Quebec, in 1899, passed the statute, 63 Vict., chap. 99, providing for the appointment of three additional judges for the district of Montreal. Let me draw attention to the fact that that statute was passed in the provincial legislature without division. It did not come into force immediately, but was brought in force by proclamation on the 1st March last.

During the interval between the passing of the Act and its coming into force, the people of the province had ample time to consider its effects. It was submitted to the public, amongst others to the Bar Association of the whole province, and met with the unanimous approval of the whole Bar Association, made up, as it is, of Conservatives and Liberals. Not only has it met with the approval of public opinion in that province, as represented by the two branches of the legislature, but also with the approval of that particular class of the community most directly interested in the proper administration of justice—I mean the bar of the province.

But let us see what were the conditions existing which made it necessary to pass this law, and what are the conditions which exist to-day. We find, for instance, in the district of Montreal that, notwithstanding that of the sixteen judges appointed to administer justice in country districts, seven of them were brought to Montreal for the purpose of taking part in the administration of justice—that is to say, seven judges were taken from the performance of their legitimate duties in the districts assigned to them and brought into Montreal. And I may say, en passant, that one judge, whose district is in St. Hyacinthe, sat 222 days in the last year in Montreal out of 250 working days—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the Solicitor General tell me whether the administration of justice was interfered with by that ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL—but, notwithstanding that we had seven judges in

addition to those already in Montreal. What do we find to be the result of the year's operations so far as the administration of justice is concerned? We find that on the 30th June last, there were 317 cases in the Superior Court in Montreal inscribed to be heard, and not one of them was heard. There were 83 cases inscribed in review which also remained unheard. And, in March last, of 261 cases inscribed in that month, 130 cases remained undisposed of—in one month alone. I now speak with the official record in my possession to show that the figures I give are absolutely accurate. Is it to be tolerated that such a condition of things shall continue in such an important district as Montreal—that is to say that litigants shall have their cases at the end of the year undisposed of, but not only undisposed of—for this does not take into account the number of cases taken under advisement by the judges—but actually unheard: 317 cases at the end of the legal year inscribed and not reached at all? Is there to be no remedy for such a condition of things? And I speak now for the members of the bar, for those men who are brought daily into contact with this condition of things, as I have pointed out, these men who know what is going on in the courts because of their daily participation in the administration of justice. What are we told is to be the remedy? We are told that the remedy is to be a change in the judicial system of the province of Quebec; in our imposing on the province of Quebec the obligation to abandon one of its most cherished institutions, its judicial organization. We are told by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron): Do not remedy this grievance, do not give to the province of Quebec and the district of Montreal in particular that to which it is entitled, because, if you refuse to do justice you will succeed in causing them to acquiesce in injustice. If we refuse to give them the justice to which they are entitled, we may deprive them of the judicial system of which, as I said a moment ago, they are justly proud and to which they are sincerely attached. I say, we have no power to enforce such a change upon the province of Quebec—constitutionally, we cannot do it. It would be impossible for us in this parliament to pass a law which would have for its effect to interfere in any way with the courts of the province. If it is not, constitutionally, our right to do this directly, can we do by this indirect method suggested by the hon. member for Beauharnois what we cannot do directly? I say, undoubtedly, we cannot do anything of the sort. What right would we have to interfere in this way? We find, for instance, that my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) attempted to change the judicial system in our province. As I said a week ago, the hon. member for Montmorency, when Attorney General of the province of

Quebec, introduced a Bill to change the system in the province, and to change it in a way which I have no doubt, he thought necessary—and in that proposal, I concurred. But we, though we both did our utmost, could not bring about that change in the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) did not even succeed in getting his Bill to the committee stage in the legislature. And, as I said on a previous occasion, he could not even win the approval of his own colleagues in the cabinet. The outcome was that the Bill never got beyond the second reading. There is an indication of the opinion of the province of Quebec with reference to this change, manifested through that body which alone has the right to speak for the province so far as its judicial system is concerned. And, in the presence of such an expression of opinion, is it to be conceived for a moment that the Dominion parliament would impose on them a system which they repudiated a few years ago by the almost unanimous voice of the local legislature? This was in 1894, but, even this year, during the last session of the provincial legislature, an attempt was made to modify the judicial system to this extent—a Bill was introduced in the legislature which had for its purpose to permit the judges appointed for the country districts to reside in Montreal and Quebec—not to centralize, but merely to change the residence of the judges. And what was the result? That Bill never got its second reading. The legislature would not agree even to such a change as that.

Now, whether they be right or wrong, whether the judicial system of the province of Quebec is an effete, as was said by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), is it within our power and within the scope of our duty to interfere and to impose on the province a system other than that which, of their own choice, they selected in 1857, I think, and with which they have been content down to the present time? Not only that, but I say that the province of Ontario has not been satisfied with the centralization system which they seek to impose upon the province of Quebec. My hon. friends from Ontario know full well that only a few years ago application was made to the Department of Justice to bring about a change in the judicial system in Ontario; and, having failed there those who sought that change went to the local legislature and endeavoured to bring about in the province of Ontario that system which exists in the province of Quebec. They did not succeed at that time, but they got a half measure. It has been decided that the judges of the high courts shall go to each of the judicial districts one day in each week, to do what the judges in the province of Quebec, if they performed their duty would do from one end of the year to the other. Before I pass away from that let me call attention to this point—it is said it is

not within the power of the province of Quebec, notwithstanding that they have the right to organize courts and create courts, to add to the number of judges, because that would be an attack on the federal exchequer. But, if they have the right to organize and maintain courts, have they not the right to suppress judicial districts—that is, for instance, that instead of having twenty judicial districts, they should have eighteen? What would be the effect of the exercise of that right—that we should appoint a judge to administer justice in a district in the province of Quebec and the legislature should say that that district was not necessary and should suppress it—what, then, becomes of the judge? Would not the judge disappear with the district. And, if so, what becomes of the independence of our judges and of the system of life tenure of which we are so justly proud? If the legislature, then, in the exercise of their undoubted right should be guilty of such an injustice, are we not guilty of a greater injustice when we refuse to give them the aid in the administration of their affairs that they are fairly entitled to have, especially when we realize that the burdens imposed upon them are imposed without their consent and without their participation.

Now, I say that so far as this government is concerned, at all events, we will not participate in any attack on our provincial institutions, we will not be parties to any assault upon the institutions of any province of this Dominion; and, certainly, all of us who come from the province of Quebec will refuse to join in any attack upon the judicial institutions, or any other institutions of that province. I myself was extremely anxious to bring about a change. I thought, in the interest of the province, that a change was necessary and that it would operate to the advantage of its judicial institutions; but, after all, my voice proved not to be the voice of the province, and when I saw that an Act submitted to the local legislature did, apparently, not meet with favour in the province, my duty was, and is, to conform to the wishes of the province and not seek to impose upon them a system which they have already rejected. It is the right of the Senate—I say it is not only their privilege, it is their right; I would almost say it is the duty of a Senate constituted as the present Senate is, that institution which is the haven of rest for the rejected of the people—that they should be deaf to the voice of the people, should refuse to participate in giving effect to the voice of the people, and should endeavour in all respects to thwart it. That is their duty; but it is our duty, it seems to me, gathered as we are from the different parts of the Dominion, gathered as we are from the different provinces, to see that the rights guaranteed to each province by the Confederation Act are respected, to be careful that we do not impose on any single province a condition of things which is objectionable to that province.

Now, I would like to give a few statistics, before concluding, with reference to judicial business in the province of Quebec. Take, for instance, 1897, the last year for which I have the official judicial statistics applicable to the whole province; there were 8,206 writs issued in the Superior Court of that province; there were 33,095 writs issued in the Circuit Court; there were 398 cases tried in Review. That gives you some idea of the volume of business done in the province of Quebec. I now make this further statement, that notwithstanding the restrictions placed upon appeals to the Supreme Court, notwithstanding that in the province of Quebec an appeal to the Supreme Court can only be had in cases where the amount involved exceeds \$2,000, whereas in the province of Ontario the amount is restricted to \$1,000, and in the maritime provinces, I think, it is restricted to \$200—notwithstanding that restriction on appeals to the Supreme Court, 43 per cent of all the business done in the Supreme Court comes from the province of Quebec, more than from the province of Ontario, and 43 per cent of all the business of the Dominion. Now, as respects the machinery that we have provided to administer that business, we find that there are 31 judges of the Superior Court in Quebec and 6 in the Court of Queen's Bench; whereas in Ontario you have 15 High Court judges, you have 66 county court judges, and you have 7 district judges, in all 88, as against 37 in Quebec. Then, with reference to the question of salaries; notwithstanding that the volume of business done in Quebec far exceeds that done in the province of Ontario, how do we stand in that respect? We find that the Dominion parliament contributes to the administration of justice in Quebec \$186,450; whereas in Ontario the contribution is \$264,400, a difference of over \$70,000. Now, if you bear in mind the volume of business, the position that we occupy because of the additional time and labour which the judges must give to the administration of justice as a result of the existence of the dual language; and if we take into account this further fact, that we have in the province of Quebec the great metropolitan city of Montreal, where more business is done than in the whole province of Ontario—if you take those facts into account, I say that every man who wishes to deal with this matter impartially, must inevitably come to the conclusion that the request made by the province of Quebec, through its legislature, is a fair and reasonable request, and one that ought to be granted. And I say we must come to the further conclusion that, to use the words of Sir John A. Macdonald, we would assume a very great responsibility if we were to say that although the legislature of the province of Quebec declares that certain judges are wanted, and have passed an Act constituting a particular court, we refuse that province the means required to carry that

policy into effect. It would be a serious matter for this parliament to take this course, and I appeal to the words of Sir John A. Macdonald in justification of the the course adopted by the government.

Mr. J. A. C. MADORE (Hochelaga, Montreal). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I deem it my duty, under the circumstances, to protest, with all the energy that is in my power, against the action taken by the Senate, under the inspiration of the Conservative leaders of the province of Quebec. In my capacity of bâtonnier of the Montreal Bar, I protest against the action of the Senate, because they have refused to accede to the wishes of that public body, which had demanded the appointment of an additional number of judges, required for the due administration of justice in the district of Montreal.

As a member representing here the county of Hochelaga, which is one of the divisions of the judicial district of Montreal, I protest, in the name of my constituents, against the action of the Senate, because they have denied them the means of having their cases tried with such quick despatch as is required by the trade and business interests.

As a member from the province of Quebec, I protest against this unwarrantable encroachment upon the rights of the province of Quebec, which, under the constitution, has the control of its judicial system.

As just remarked by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), the Act passed by the legislature was submitted to the Bar Association of the province of Quebec and to the Bar Association of the district of Montreal, and met with their unanimous approval. Those two bodies first passed resolutions to the effect of asking the legislature to increase the number of judges for the district of Montreal, and later on, after the passing of the Act, they asked the Dominion government to do their duty by appointing three additional judges.

There was no dissentient voice among the members of the Bar Association of Montreal on that point; and all the members of the Bar, belonging to both political parties, were a unit in declaring that this addition to the judiciary was required for the due administration of justice in that district, the present number of judges being totally inadequate to the volume of judicial business pending before the courts in the district of Montreal.

The hon. Solicitor General gave us, a little while ago, the statistics with reference to the judicial business in the district of Montreal for 1897 and 1898. Let me give, in addition to that, the number of cases inscribed for the whole province of Quebec in 1899. We find that there were 7,916 writs issued for the whole province. Out of that number, the district of Montreal alone claims 4,577, that is to say, that more than one-half of the whole judicial business of the province originates in the district of Montreal. Besides, I find that there were 3,422

judgments rendered in default in the whole province, and of that number there were 1,701 in the district of Montreal alone, while out of 2,273 contested cases, 1,354 were disposed of in Montreal. In short, it may be said that more than one-half of the whole judicial business of the province originates in the district of Montreal.

Now, in order to relieve the courts from the congestion of business, there should be as many judges in the district of Montreal as there are in the rest of the province. But there are only ten judges, and the district of Terrebonne is assigned to one of them; so that there are only nine judges left to expedite the judicial business of the district of Montreal. It is quite evident that the number of judges there is altogether inadequate. Besides, I do not think there is an hon. gentleman in this House who has ever claimed that the number of judges assigned to the judicial district of Montreal was adequate to the needs of that district. But, although they agree that the position of affairs is critical and that there is a congestion of business before the courts, they refuse to accede to our proposition, and they say that the additional judges which we think are necessary, are not required. They suggest another remedy, and that is judicial centralization.

The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) was of opinion that under that centralization system, the evils complained of could be easily remedied. Granting for the benefit of the debate, that with that change of system the grievance complained of would be redressed, that the judges would have to wait for cases to be tried instead of cases having to wait for an opportunity to be heard, and, in short, that everybody would be satisfied with that system, it is none the less true that such a system is a utopia which nobody can impose on the province of Quebec, as the people of that province are unwilling to accept it.

At the time when the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) held the post of Attorney General for the province of Quebec, he tried to bring about that change, and to impose such a system on the province. But, as remarked by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) he did not even succeed in getting his Bill to the committee stage in the legislature; he could not even win the approbation of his own colleagues in the cabinet, and his Bill never went beyond the second reading. So, that centralization system was repudiated by the unanimous voice of the local legislature and by the voice of the people.

There was another attempt to modify the judicial system and to remedy the sad state of affairs prevailing in the district of Montreal, and that was by permitting the judges appointed for the county districts to sit in Montreal. But this is again the centralization system, under another name. It would not give satisfaction to the people in the rural districts, as it would deprive them of

the presence of their judges, which is considered as absolutely necessary. Moreover, that system would prove more expensive than the appointment of the three additional judges which is contemplated by this Bill.

Now, if, on the one hand, judicial centralization is out of the question and outside the realm of practical politics, having been repudiated by the people, and if, on the other hand, you cannot bring the country judges to Montreal, there is only one way of remedying the evil, and that is by appointing the three additional judges as provided by the Bill under consideration.

Now, under the constitution, the judges are appointed by the Governor General in Council. By paragraph 19, section 92, of the British North America Act, it is provided that the provincial legislatures may exclusively make laws in relation to the administration of justice in the provinces, including the constitution, maintenance and organization of the courts of both civil and criminal jurisdiction. That power is vested, under the constitution, in all the provincial legislatures, and it is vested in the legislature of the province of Quebec, as well as in all others.

It is within the power of each legislature to say what is the number of judges required for the due administration of justice in the province, and the only power vested in the Dominion parliament, under section 100, is to fix the salaries of judges. Therefore, parliament has no right to interfere with that power, and neither the House of Commons nor the Senate have the right of restricting the number of judges either in the province of Quebec or in any other province. Section 100 reads as follows:

100. The salaries, allowances and pensions of the judges of the Superior, District and County Courts (except the Courts of Probate in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick) and of the Admiralty Courts in cases where the judges thereof are for the time being paid by salary, shall be fixed and provided by the parliament of Canada.

That is the only power vested in the Dominion parliament. Now, when the legislature of the province of Quebec declares that three additional judges are wanted, and have passed an Act constituting a particular court, the Senate has no right to refuse the means required to carry that policy into effect; and in so doing, the Senate is going against the practice that has invariably obtained so far. If you refer to the Quebec Revised Statutes, you will find that eleven judges were at first appointed, under the Act of Judicature of the province of Quebec, to sit in the city of Montreal and in the city of Quebec. In 1888, the Quebec legislature amended that Act, by raising to fourteen the number of judges sitting in those two cities, ten in Montreal, and four in Quebec. Immediately after, the Dominion parliament passed an Act on the lines of that passed by the Quebec legislature, and providing for the salaries of those judges, who were allowed \$5,000 each. In 1894, the Quebec legisla-

ture, having declared that an additional judge was wanted for the district of Terrebonne, forthwith the Dominion parliament passed a law to the same effect. In 1898, another law was passed to the effect of putting the judge at Terrebonne on the same footing as those of Montreal, and raising his salary to \$5,000. At the same time, the law was also amended in favour of the province of Ontario, by appointing an additional judge to the Court of Appeals.

Now, all this goes to show that, in the case of the different provinces, the Dominion government and parliament have invariably complied with the demands of the local legislatures as to the number of judges wanted. So I say that the federal parliament and, consequently, the Senate, which is only a branch of the legislative body, have no right to limit the number of judges, and that all that we have to do here, as shown by the statutes, is to provide for the salaries of the judiciary, leaving to the provincial legislatures to decide what additional number of judges is required for the due administration of justice.

The province of Quebec, through its legislature, having declared that the constitution of the Superior Court in the province of Quebec should be amended, the object being to give three additional judges to the district of Montreal, the Senate has no right, under the constitution, to say that an additional number of judges is not required. I have no hesitation in saying that the action of the Senate is an encroachment upon provincial rights, and a step in the direction of legislative union, a system which the province of Quebec repudiates. Unfortunately, while thus taking a step towards legislative union, the Senate is only following blindly the leaders of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec.

The electorate, I hope, will resent this attack upon provincial autonomy and the rights of the district of Montreal, and the guilty parties will be called to a strict account at the hands of the people. The electors of Jacques Cartier will remember, I hope, that their representative here was silent, like the dog mentioned in the Bible. He allowed his friends to kill this Bill, and he never said a word, while his colleagues were intriguing to have it rejected by the other House. I hope also that the hon. member for the division of Ste. Anne (Montreal), Mr. Quinn, will meet the same fate as his colleague (Mr. Monk), for having pursued the same course. The electors of Ste. Anne (Montreal) will also, I hope, do justice on their representative (Mr. Rodrick), for not having stood up and advocated the interests of the district of Montreal, and for having failed to impress upon his colleagues the desirability of voting for this just measure, and one so calculated to promote their interests. I do not say that those hon. gentlemen have caballed together and induced the Senate to pass this amendment, but I say that they have allowed their colleagues

to intrigue to that effect, and I have no doubt that the electorate will call them to a strict account for it whenever an opportunity offers.

Mr. THOMAS FORTIN (Laval). Mr. Speaker, I only desire to say a few words in support of what has been said by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Madore), who has just taken his seat, and who has so ably and so eloquently defended the rights of Quebec. In rising I desire, as the hon. member who has just taken his seat has done, to enter my most solemn protest against the unwarranted attack made by the Senate upon the rights of the province of Quebec. Strange to say, the Senate, whose very reason for existence, it has been said many, many times, is to protect minorities and to protect the provinces, and which is looked upon as the bulwark of the provinces, is the first body to attempt an encroachment of this kind. For my part, as a member representing a constituency in the district of Montreal, and as a member of the bar practicing in the district of Montreal, having practiced there for nearly twenty years, I do most solemnly protest against this injustice, which, if it is allowed to be consummated, will be done to the district of Montreal. That it is necessary that three additional judges shall be appointed for the district of Montreal I think is fairly well admitted now. There can be no question about it whatever, after the figures which have been given by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to-day, and after figures given on former occasions. It is admitted by our opponents that there is a large amount of work in arrears, that there are a large number of cases waiting for an opportunity to be heard. There were 400 cases on June 30 last. We heard the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) say the other day: Well, bring in the judges from the adjoining districts. I could conceive of such an expression coming from the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), who does not really practice his profession, but I cannot understand such an utterance coming from the hon. member for Montmorency, who is actively engaged in the practice of his profession. The hon. member for Montmorency must know that the judges who live in the district of Montreal are brought in whenever they can be procured. The hon. Solicitor General has given an instance of that. Here is a judge who, out of 251 judicial days in one year, has spent 222 days in Montreal. It is notorious to every member of the bar practicing in the district of Montreal that every available judge is brought in, and while the members of the bar practicing in Montreal are very well pleased to see these judges come in, it is more difficult for them to give satisfaction than if they were judges appointed for the district of Montreal. Why? This is a matter of common, almost daily occurrence. A judge can only be taken from his district when he is not engaged therein. That is the

**Mr. MADORE.**

first drawback. In the meantime, cases may be accumulating there by hundreds, and if the judge is busy in his own district he cannot be brought to Montreal. Suppose he can be brought to Montreal, sometimes he cannot stay there more than a few days. A long case is inscribed for hearing, and is called. The judge says: I cannot take that case if it will last more than three or four days, or possibly two days, because I must go back to my district in the country. It is a common occurrence, happening almost every day, that a case is commenced before a judge from an outlying district, and if perchance a witness goes away, or falls suddenly ill, or cannot be heard, and the case must be postponed, the case will have to stand to a day when the judge can come back from Sherbrooke, or Bedford, or St. Hyacinthe, and continue the hearing. Meantime all the witnesses may have disappeared. I only quote this instance to show that judges are brought in from outside judicial districts whenever they can be got and whenever they can spare the time. But, even under the best possible conditions, with the assistance of the judges in the neighbouring districts, it is impossible to get along and dispose of the business pending in the courts of the district of Montreal. The very fact that they are brought there as soon as and as often as they can be brought, the very fact that cases are accumulating and that the arrears of work are increasing instead of decreasing, shows that the position I have now laid down is well supported.

Now, I want to say a word more upon the question of the rights of the provinces in regard to the constitution and maintenance of provincial courts. Section 92 of our constitution provides that the organization and maintenance of provincial courts, having both civil and criminal jurisdiction, falls exclusively under the control of the different provinces. The word 'exclusively' is to be seen in the text of section 92 in the first paragraph. Now, I submit that whenever a subject-matter is assigned exclusively to the jurisdiction of a province, that province has supreme power and has supreme control over that subject, and it does not lie within the power of the Dominion parliament to put any obstacle, except there be a breach of the constitution, in the way of the exercise of such power. I want to quote, upon this point, in order to place it beyond dispute, if possible, the opinion expressed by Lord Watson in a case that came before the Privy Council. It was in a case arising out of the liquidation of the Marine Bank in New Brunswick. Here is the language used by Lord Watson on that occasion:

It is clear that the provincial legislature of New Brunswick does not occupy the subordinate position which was ascribed to it in the argument of the appellants.

Mr. Speaker, it is found written in many books, I regret to say, and often quoted as

authorities on our constitution, that the provinces occupy a subordinate position to the Dominion parliament in this country. I hold that this proposition is not according to law, as will be shown by this quotation from this very high authority.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the page ?

Mr. FORTIN. This is a decision given in the case of the liquidation of the Merchants Bank of New Brunswick, to be found in Todd's 'Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies,' page 573.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It has been decided twenty times.

Mr. FORTIN. Yes ; I am merely taking this as one case. This is what Lord Watson says, speaking of the province of New Brunswick, and it applies to all the other provinces in Canada :

It derives no authority from the government of Canada, and its status is in no way analogous to that of a municipal institution which is an authority constituted for the purposes of local administration. It possesses powers, not of administration merely, but of legislation, in the strictest sense of that word; and, within the limits assigned by section 92 of the Act of 1867, these powers are exclusive and supreme.

Exclusive and supreme. Here is the opinion held, in fact, it is the judgment of the Lords of the Privy Council. Now, if the provinces have exclusive and supreme power in regard to the organization of provincial courts, I say, Mr. Speaker, that it follows as a consequence, that the moment they have organized a court of the jurisdiction provided for by the constitution, it devolves upon the parliament of Canada to appoint the judges and to vote the salaries to pay the same. Otherwise, the supreme power of the provinces would be ineffective. What would be the use of the province of Quebec deciding, for instance, that thirty judges shall constitute the Superior Court of that province, if parliament can step in and say : No, we will only appoint twenty-five judges ? There would be no supreme power, and the exercise of control over those subjects which are given to the province would be utterly illusory and ineffective. But, whatever view we may take of that, in this particular case there is no excuse to justify the action of the Senate. This House, fortunately, has had a higher sense of its duty than the Upper House in regard to this measure. This Bill has passed this House. The opponents of it who worked so vigorously in the Upper House against it did not even have a division upon the Bill in this House, so that, therefore, either looking at this question from a purely constitutional aspect, or looking upon it as a matter of urgency, I may say that it is not only necessary, but that it is urgent that these judges should be appointed, that the action of the Senate is totally unjustifiable, and in this case it is an encroachment upon provincial rights. It is an attack, and

an unwarrantable attack upon provincial autonomy, and I agree with the hon. gentleman from Hochelaga (Mr. Madore), that the people of the whole province will resent that attack upon their rights. I can tell the hon. gentleman from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) that he may hear something about it in his own constituency, even though he does not represent a constituency in the district of Montreal. I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is publicly stated that he and the hon. member from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) are the guilty parties in this matter.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not hide what I said here.

Mr. FORTIN. It is believed that it is they who induced the Senate to take such an unprecedented action.

Mr. BERGERON. That is not so.

Mr. FORTIN. The Conservatives have been in power for eighteen years, and they appointed judges year after year. The hon. gentleman from Hochelaga has just told the House of the number of judges increased by provincial statutes, and there never was an attempt by the Senate when the Conservatives were in power, to prevent the appointment of judges, or to come into conflict with the provincial legislatures in that regard. In 1888 a statute was passed in Quebec, to establish in the district of Montreal, a magistrate's court, in order to relieve that court from the congestion of business. The hon. member from Beauharnois knows that at that time, when a case was ready to be put upon the roll in the circuit court, the lawyers for the parties had to wait for a year, and sometimes two years, before it was inscribed. In view of that state of things, the legislature in 1888, passed an Act to establish a magistrate's court in the district of Montreal, the province paying the judges. We hear talk in this parliament about the people's money, as if the people's money was supplied from outside the province, and those who speak in that way seem to forget altogether that the province pays the money. It is not for the Senate to deal with the money of the people ; that is the duty of this House. Well, when the legislature of Quebec passed that Bill in 1888, the statute was disallowed, although the Dominion parliament had not one red cent to pay for the salary of these judges. The legislature re-enacted that statute. The argument to justify the first disallowance was that in establishing a court for the district of Montreal, and appointing judges bearing another name, it was nothing less than a district court, which falls by the British North America Act, under the authority of this parliament. The provincial legislature passed another statute, limiting the jurisdiction of these magistrates to the city of Montreal, and that statute was again disallowed. The ground taken by the government of the time, was that it was an attempt to encroach

upon the rights of the Dominion, by appointing judges under a different name. Now, Mr. Speaker, if these gentlemen opposite were so jealous of the rights and privileges of the Dominion parliament in those years, why are they not equally jealous to safeguard the rights of the provinces now. I go so far as to repel the idea that we have the right in this parliament, even to question the desirability of appointing these judges. I say we have no right to question the propriety of the provincial legislatures in passing these laws. Judging from some language I have heard in this House, I can say that if things are allowed to drift in the way they are drifting, then, in two or three years (when we are still in power), if perchance we are called upon to appoint another judge, these gentlemen of the Senate will move for a committee of investigation, and if they are allowed their own free will, they will hold an inquiry into whether the provincial legislatures have acted wisely, and as to whether they have been actuated by proper motives in passing their laws. I protest solemnly against such an idea as this, because I believe that it is drifting towards legislative union. I protest against the action of the Senate all the more because that body is looked upon by the province of Quebec as a bulwark of the defence of our provincial autonomy. It has been truly said that the number of senators in the province of Quebec at the time of confederation, was to be the same as the number from the province of Ontario, without regard to population, because the Senate should be a protection to the province of Quebec. I hold that the action taken by the Senate in this matter, has shown that they have entirely forgotten their origin and that they are absolutely oblivious to their mission. I believe, Sir, that the people will condemn the action of the Senate, unless, indeed, the senators act wisely, and recede from their position, which I believe to be an untenable one.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin) has prophesied that possibly something very bad will happen to me, when I go back to my county.

Mr. FORTIN. I hope so.

Mr. BERGERON. I have never doubted the hopes of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin), in that respect, or the hopes of those who sit around him. For the last twenty-five years, he and his friends have been wishing for my political downfall. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fortin), said that he was not surprised to see the position I have taken on this question, because I do not practice law. I take it that my hon. friend (Mr. Fortin), did not make that statement in any bad spirit, but I can tell him that when he has been for twenty-three years a mem-

Mr. FORTIN.

ber of this House, as I have, and when he spends four or five months here every session, he will find his law office a pretty cold place, when he puts his nose in there.

Mr. FORTIN. I dare say that is true.

Mr. BERGERON. It is well known that those who engage actively in politics and fairly conscientiously discharge their duties as members of this House, cannot attend much to their law offices, after even an experience of five or six sessions.

Mr. FORTIN. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. BERGERON. All the same, I contend that I am in a much better position to judge of a question like this, than if I were actively practising my profession before the courts. I do not think it was quite proper for the Solicitor General and for the hon. members from Hochelaga (Mr. Madore), and Laval (Mr. Fortin), to attack the Upper House. I am not here to defend the senators, because they can do that very well for themselves. But, I am here to say, that I have not interfered with their judgment in any way. The hon. gentleman from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), has not been here for the last week, I know that he has had no opportunity of speaking with the members of the Senate, and I can state for myself, that I have not in any way spoken to them as to what their action should be. I would be ashamed to have any such dealings with the members of the other House, for I would look upon it as a matter of honour, not to mention to these hon. gentlemen anything in the direction insinuated by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin). These hon. gentlemen know their duty and they do not need to be prompted to it by any one in this House, or elsewhere. The hon. gentleman from Hochelaga (Mr. Madore), occupies a very high position at the bar of Montreal, and I was rather surprised that he should lay it down that the Senate had no right to do what it has done. The Senate has a right to act as they have.

The PRIME MINISTER. They have the power.

Mr. BERGERON. They have the power and the right too.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. BERGERON. They have the power and they have the right to sanction or to reject any Bill coming to them from this House. My hon. friend said the Senate had the right to change the salaries of the judges, but in that he made a mistake. The Senate have the right to accept or refuse the Supply Bill as a whole, but they cannot take any item away from it. Therefore, when my hon. friend said the Senate might have changed the salaries of the judges, but

had no right to reject entirely what was proposed by this House, he forgot the line of the constitution. Our hon. friends on the other side show so much heat in this discussion that one would think—though I am convinced that that is not their object—that some of them wished to take those positions on the bench. We have heard a good deal lately about the right of members of this parliament to express their opinions.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Did they ever do it in a similar case before?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know; I am talking of the case we have in hand. Any one in this House has a right to discuss any question, and it comes very badly from hon. gentlemen opposite to cast insinuations against members of parliament for exercising their rights and privileges. My hon. friend says that the judicial work in the district of Montreal is congested. I admit that; it has not been denied. We all say it is true; but we are opposed to the remedy which hon. gentlemen opposite want to apply. My hon. friend says there are ten judges in the district of Montreal, but that is not enough. To show hon. gentlemen opposite how far they are from obtaining a remedy for the present state of things, let us look at their figures. My hon. friend the Solicitor General said the other day that it had cost last year over \$16,000 to bring judges from the rural districts to sit in Montreal. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) said it had cost \$7,000. But let us put the figures aside; they have not much to do with the argument. We know that Judge De Lorimier sits in Montreal nearly all the time; that Judge Ouimet, of the Richelieu district, sits in Montreal nearly all the time—he lives in Montreal; that Judge Tellier, of the St. Hyacinthe district, sits in Montreal nearly all the time; that Judge Charland, of St. Johns, sits in Montreal nearly all the time; that Judge Langelier sits in Montreal nearly all the time; that Judge Choquette sits in Montreal very often; and others whose names I have not got. The result is that you have sixteen judges who sit in Montreal nearly all the year round, and still you were 400 cases behind on June 30. The three men you want to appoint are not any better, surely, than those who are there now.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The judges from the country parts cannot do their duty properly while oscillating backward and forward between the country districts and the city. I say that because I have had considerable experience in the Montreal courts, and know something of what is going on there.

Mr. BERGERON. With these three judges, and the ten judges in Montreal, you will have thirteen judges.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend is not correct. There are eleven judges in Montreal, not ten.

Mr. BERGERON. I am taking what the hon. member for Laval said; but if there are eleven judges, that will be all the better for my argument. You bring from the country six more, which makes seventeen judges that you have nearly all the year round; and still you are 400 cases behind. You want to change all that in order to appoint three men, who, added to the eleven, will give fourteen judges for the district of Montreal—because the Solicitor General said the other day that no more country judges will come to Montreal; and how do you expect fourteen judges to do the work when to-day seventeen judges cannot do it?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Because the six men who come from the country parts spend most of their time travelling backward and forward. In my own experience, a judge who was trying a case that I was connected with broke off in the middle of the case, and postponed it for two months.

Mr. BERGERON. There may be some cases like that, but most of the judges from the country can sit from ten o'clock in the morning till five in the afternoon, and then go home by train and come back in the morning again. I know that Judge Tellier does that. He comes to Montreal in the morning; he is often there at nine o'clock, and he holds his court from ten in the morning till five in the afternoon, and then takes his train and goes to his home in St. Hyacinthe.

Mr. MADORE. The train leaves at four o'clock, so he cannot stay till five.

Mr. BERGERON. Though my hon. friend says I do not practice in the courts, I was pleading before the Superior Court last year when it sat so many hours a day that a jurymen, a merchant of Montreal, said to me: 'I would rather give a hundred dollars out of my pocket than sit here a week.' Hon. gentlemen opposite say we cannot change the system here, but they should get the government of Quebec to change it. My hon. friend threw a kind of a slur on Judge Tellier when he said he was 200 days in Montreal; but Judge Tellier never came to Montreal except when he was requested to do so by the chief justice, and the bar were always glad to see him, because he is a good judge. My hon. friend from Laval talks about my not coming back here. My hon. friend may not come back, but I shall be here after the elections. Let hon. gentlemen opposite, if they dare, find a man to offer himself against me. They cannot do so. If you appoint these three men, you will have as many judges from the country

as you have to-day; but you will have put three political friends on the bench; that is the point.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. There is the proof; listen to the echo coming from that side of the House.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is the whole trouble; that is your argument.

At One o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. BERGERON. I have only a few words to add, Mr. Speaker, to what I said before recess. That there is congestion in the administration of justice in the district of Montreal is undoubted, but what we contend on this side is that the proposed remedy will not meet the case. As a matter of fact, at present there are seventeen judges in Montreal, but under this Bill we will have but fourteen, if the judges in the rural districts are no longer to assist the Montreal judges, as we were told the other day by my hon. friend the Solicitor General.

To show that the local legislature of the province of Quebec has the remedy now in its own hands, if it wanted to apply it, let me cite a couple of instances. If the district of Montreal is so congested, why not take some of the counties, which to-day are included in that district, and add them to districts which are not congested, where they could obtain justice just as well administered as in Montreal? Take the counties of Soulanges and Vaudreuil, which to-day belong to the district of Montreal. Why not add them to the district of Beauharnois? They are further away from Montreal than from Beauharnois, and if added to that district, that would take two counties off the district of Montreal and give less work to the judges there. Then take Chambly and Verchères, they could be very well added to the district of Richelieu, and go to Sorel for the administration of justice instead of to Montreal. Hon. gentlemen opposite have laid great stress on their desire to meet the wishes of the province of Quebec, and have insinuated that we on this side are in some way seeking to infringe on the rights and privileges of that province. Let me tell you, Sir, that the people of the province of Quebec have never been consulted upon this question. It is true that my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) brought in a Bill in the local legislature in 1894 to reform the Quebec judicial system, and it is true that that Bill had the support of my hon. friend the Solicitor General, but it did not go through for the simple reason that the local government at the time was too weak to put it through. But I am not of the opinion of my right hon. friend that we are here to follow the public breeze. That may suit a man like him who has no fixed policy, but allows himself to be car-

Mr. BERGERON.

ried away by whatever current of public opinion happens to run strongest at the moment. I say that we are here to lead public opinion. The Bill of my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) was never submitted to the people for their verdict. It was simply killed by the members of the local legislature for considerations to which it would be too long to enter into. The people themselves were never consulted. But no doubt after this discussion, and when they know that they will be called on to pay a larger sum of money than they have hitherto had to pay for the administration of justice, and that justice could be just as well administered without that additional expense, they will modify their opinions a good deal. I would not be afraid to go on the hustings and there speak as I do here; and I have no doubt that when the question is properly put before the people, they will fairly appreciate it and approve of the stand taken by hon. gentlemen on this side.

We have had homilies from these hon. gentlemen opposite on the respect which we must show for any law coming from the local legislature, because otherwise we would be threatened with legislative union and the destruction of provincial autonomy. It is passing strange to hear these hon. gentlemen display their new-born zeal for provincial autonomy. Why, Mr. Speaker, what party is it that has always supported and worked for provincial autonomy, if not the party to which I have the honour to belong? Who was it that prevented legislative union in 1867, if not the late Sir George Etienne Cartier, speaking in the name of the whole province of Quebec. We have always been, and always will be in favour of provincial autonomy. But my hon. friends are not logical. In 1898, the Attorney General for the province of Quebec had a law adopted by the local legislature of Quebec. What was that law:

Article 2321 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended by adding thereto the following: The three judges of the court of review are, however, taken from all the judges of the Superior Court of the province, at the discretion of the chief justice or acting chief justice, as the case may be.

What does that mean? It means that any of thirty-one judges can be brought into Montreal district or Quebec district and there sit as judge in review.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are doing that to-day.

Mr. BERGERON. Let me finish. Every judge of the superior courts in the province, whether he is sitting in a rural district or in an urban district, whether he is paid \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year, is entitled to sit in the court of review, and country judges were often called to sit in that court. But the Solicitor General has changed that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How have I changed it? The hon. gentleman is alto-

gether wrong. I simply require that they shall come to Montreal and sit in the court of review at the discretion of the chief justice.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend, by clause 8 of chapter 52, 61 Victoria, amended the Act concerning provincial judges, by providing that the judges in the rural districts shall only sit in the court of review when their presence there is declared necessary by the chief justice. That is to say, the judges of the Montreal and Quebec district will alone compose that court, and no country judge will be called in, unless one of the city judges cannot be had.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It does not mean that.

Mr. BERGERON. The chief justice interprets it in that way, namely, that only when a Montreal or Quebec judge cannot be had, will he call on a judge from a rural district. What is the result? Out of the eleven judges in Montreal district, two or three are called on every month to sit in the court of review, which leaves only eight to sit on cases in the first court, so that instead of having eleven judges available, you have only eight. I may say that the judges in the country districts felt very much wounded in their dignity when this clause was inserted in the law by my hon. friend. Well, if we appoint these additional judges, that will make fourteen judges in the district of Montreal, out of which there will be three detailed to sit in the court of review every month, so that you will still have only eleven judges in Montreal to sit in the courts of first instance, whereas to-day you have seventeen. Therefore, I say that the disregard of the local legislature has been carried further by this government than we are asking them to carry it.

My hon. friend the Solicitor General is very much concerned about the lawyers. Well, so am I, although, as my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin) has said, I do not practice my profession to any considerable extent. Still, I am very proud of it—I see my hon. friend from Labelle laughing—but I repeat I am proud of being a lawyer, because I have gone through all the preliminary stages which have usually to be followed in order to be admitted to the Bar, and was not made a lawyer by Act of parliament as my hon. friend was.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have not yet been admitted to the Bar.

Mr. BERGERON. We are not here to legislate for the lawyers. They can take very good care of themselves. What we are here for is to legislate for the best advantage of the country at large. We are not here even to legislate for any particular province, but for the whole Dominion, and I contend that it would have been in the interests of litigants in the province of Quebec, if the Bill of my hon. friend from

Montmorency had been carried. I believe that the working of that Bill would have had the effect of providing our province with better judges, because if all the judges went on circuit, and none of them confined the year round to the one rural district, they would gain much greater experience and be better fitted to administer the law and establish wise jurisprudence in the different districts, than they are at present.

Here is what section 8 of chapter 52, 61 Victoria, provides :

No travelling allowance shall be granted to any judge requested to sit in review unless it is certified by the chief justice or the acting chief justice in the district that the attendance of such judge was, in his opinion, necessary.

There was no use in putting that clause in the law unless it meant that the judges of the Montreal and Quebec district shall first be called on to sit in review, and that only in case any of them are not available for that work shall a country judge be called on. I know nothing about the reasons the Senate had for rejecting the clause which they rejected in the Bill under discussion. I have not had an interview with any of them or talked with any of them about the matter, but I imagine that some of the reasons were those I have just given.

Now, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the other day, uttered what seems to me a very dangerous doctrine. He said that these judges should be appointed, because it would hurt the feelings of the people, it would go contrary to public feeling, if the law as it is to-day were changed. But, if it is changed for the good of the people and in their interest, does he not think it is the duty of public men, wherever they are, to take the responsibility of doing that? I thought the doctrine he professed a monstrous one. Would he be where he is to-day, should we have confederation at all, if the politicians, the public men, of 1867 had not taken hold and done what they thought was best for Canada, carrying it through without consulting the people? That is the only way you can carry on the affairs of the country. You are supposed to be endowed with certain talents and to have acquired knowledge which are not possessed by everybody. And, for that reason you are called upon to direct public opinion. My hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin) said to me : We will watch you. But, he cannot drive me from my position in that way. I approve of what has been done by the other Chamber, and I shall vote as I did before. I am not afraid to do so. I take this course because I think it is best in the interest of the people of the province of Quebec, and best in the interest of the whole country. I shall not be afraid to go before my electors and declare my position. I have done it in the past. My right hon. friend knows that I have not been afraid to express my opinions ; and,

thank God, I have been able to show the people that what I did was in their interest, and they have sanctioned the position I have taken. I am ready to do the same thing to-day; and, threats or no threats, I am going to vote against the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick).

Mr. DOMINIQUE MONET (Laprairie and Napierville). The question before the House is, to my thinking, of such concern to the province of Quebec that I feel that I should say a word upon it. I may paraphrase the expression of the great Nelson and say that the province of Quebec will expect every Liberal of Quebec to do his duty. We have certainly entered upon a struggle between the people and the Senate; and it comes by the provocation of the Senate and by their infringement upon the rights of the people of the province of Quebec. This session has been a very bad session so far as our constitution is concerned. It commenced by the ratification by this House of an encroachment upon the constitution by the government, and it is ending by an encroachment by the Senate upon the provincial autonomy of Quebec. I protested against the first encroachment, though I had to go against my own friends. It was with regret that I did so. It is with great pleasure that, to-day, I side with the Liberal party to protest against this encroachment upon provincial rights by the Senate. I was not surprised at the speech delivered by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), nor with those delivered by my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin), and by the bâtonnier of the bar of the district of Montreal, my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Madore). Like every Liberal, these hon. gentlemen are born with an instinct in favour of popular rights. Shall I say that I had been surprised at the tone of the speech of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), or of the action of the Senate in this matter? These things are to me surprising, because they are inconsistent with the boast that hon. gentlemen opposite have always been making about having framed our constitution, their protection of the minority, and about their determination to uphold the constitution against all attacks. I believe it is blindness on their part; but, I would withdraw the word 'blindness,' if I were shown that the denunciation of the manner in which justice is administered in the province of Quebec by the hon. member for Beauharnois was not intended for political effect in the other provinces. The hon. member for Beauharnois related a story the other day about a boy who had been badly treated by the jailor of Beauharnois because, when he was allowed out of jail, he did not come back early enough in the evening. What was the object of that story, if it were not to impress upon the other provinces that justice was not well administered in the province of Quebec? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) may boast on the floor of this House

Mr. BERGERON.

that he will be returned and my hon. friend from Laval will stay at home. But, I suppose, the electors of the district of Beauharnois will have a word to say about that; and the whole province of Quebec will protest against the speech of the hon. gentleman to-day, and the speech he delivered in a previous debate on this question.

What are the facts? In 1899, the legislature of the province of Quebec, acting within their constitutional powers, passed a Bill declaring that it was expedient that this parliament should increase the number of judges of the Superior Court of that province from thirty-one to thirty-four. The law was not to come into force at once, but was to be brought into force by a proclamation of the Lieutenant-Governor. On June 3, 1899, a resolution was proposed in the council of the bar of the province of Quebec to the effect that this government should appoint three new judges for the province of Quebec. To show that there is no political partisanship in the matter, no grasping at a job by the Liberals of this House, it is sufficient to say that motion was moved by a Liberal and seconded by a Conservative, Mr. J. Henri Archambault. Afterwards, the same resolution was considered by the whole bar of Montreal, and was unanimously adopted. On July 1, this government, acquiescing in these petitions and in the law passed by the local legislature, asked this House to vote the salaries for three new judges. On July 11, the Senate amended that Bill by striking out the first clause, containing all that related to the province of Quebec; and to-day this House is asked simply to stultify itself by accepting that amendment, which we would not accept when this Bill was before us in the first place. The law that governs the matter was given us in 1857 by the most eminent leader that the Conservative party ever had—George Etienne Cartier. Under this law a decentralization system of administration of justice was established in Quebec. In 1867, when the British North America Act came into force, the same system was in existence; and, by section 92 of the British North America Act, it is declared that the power of fixing the administration of justice in the province of Quebec should rest exclusively with the legislature of the province. Here is the section:

The legislature has exclusive power to make laws concerning the administration, maintenance and organization of provincial courts, of both civil and criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure in all civil matters in those courts.

So, Mr. Speaker, Quebec is entitled to say what the number of judges shall be, whether thirty, thirty-one or thirty-four, and all this government has to do is to appoint the judges so desired and to pay their salaries. I admit that this is an anomaly. It is to my mind an anomaly that the government who pays the money should not have the right to say in what way this money should be

spent. But does not the same anomaly exist in the province of Ontario and in all the other provinces? Has this government a word to say of the manner that it may please Ontario to conduct her judicial system? Certainly not. And yet the Senate has made no change in those portions of the Bill relating to the province of Ontario. So if there exists an anomaly the only way to remove it is to amend the constitution, and not by the Senate attempting to infringe upon the constitution as long as it exists as it is to-day. The provincial governments have always had the full enjoyment of the right to say what the number of judges shall be and what their duties shall be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the justification of the Senate? because there is an alleged justification. It is a well-known axiom in law that the greatest culprits never plead guilty to a charge; and so the Senate has set up a sort of plea for their justification, and the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has adopted their plea on the floor of this House. But before examining this plea, let me show in what spirit this question was approached by the Senate. Let me quote a few words that I find in *Le Journal*, the French Conservative organ of the province of Quebec:

But whose fault is it if the position of the judges does not go to these gentlemen? Perhaps if Mr. Mills had not been so stiff and so autocratic, the position of the Senate might have been different.

So the matter has not been approached by the Senate on its merits, but the action of the Senate was taken because Mr. Mills was a little too stiff for those hon. gentlemen. It is amusing to hear those old Tory senators talk of stiffness. Sir, I believe there is a certain stiffness in the Senate, but it exists in their brains as well as in their legs; and certainly it does not exist either in the legs or in the brain of the Hon. Mr. Mills. Another reason given by the Senate is that the system of the province of Quebec has not worked satisfactorily, that it is a vicious system and should not be continued any longer. The hon. member for Beauharnois seems to think that if the judges for the rural districts were allowed to come to Montreal and help dispose of the cases that the present number of judges are unable to dispose of, that the litigants in Montreal would be put to greater inconvenience. But the hon. member himself gave a strong argument against that contention when he admitted that during last month no less than six judges came from the districts surrounding Montreal to sit in Montreal, and with what result? Did they dispose of all the cases brought before the court? Not at all; no less than 131 cases remained undisposed of. No stronger argument can be adduced to show the need of more judges in Montreal than this admission of the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. BERGERON. Certainly we want more judges, but not in the way you want to employ them.

Mr. MONET. My hon. friend is a lawyer, I admit he is a talented man, and if he does not practice at the bar more than he does it is not for want of ability. But will the hon. gentleman claim before this parliament that we have any right to change a system which he thinks himself is so vicious? Certainly not. So we are face to face with this situation, that we have no right to change a system and to remedy an evil that is admitted to exist by the member for Beauharnois. We are asking for more judges in the Montreal district, and we are entitled to get them. Not only do we require more judges in Montreal, but even with those judges who have come to the assistance of their colleagues in Montreal, they have not been able to dispose of all the cases. But my hon. friend says that owing to the law put through parliament last session by the Solicitor General, the judges do not come to the court in Montreal. Well, he has just admitted that six judges did come from the surrounding districts of Montreal to sit in the city courts.

Now, the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), whom I do not see in his seat to-day, brought up a new argument the other day when he said that Mr. Justice Cimon has admitted, in an interview published in a newspaper in Montreal, that the system is vicious, and has admitted that it would be expedient to compel the judges of the rural districts to sit in Montreal and help dispose of the cases there. But if Mr. Justice Cimon has chosen to take the public press into his confidence, he does not remain a judge but has become a public debater, and I will treat him accordingly. I will read to the House an opinion of that gentleman before he was a judge and when he was a member of parliament. In 1881 there was a question of appointing two new judges in the province of Quebec, and after certain remarks from the Hon. Edward Blake, Mr. Cimon spoke as follows:

Verily do I regret the conduct of some judges in the rural districts of Lower Canada, especially in the country below Quebec, which conduct justifies what the hon. member has said. I regret that the judges appointed by the federal government, and who are compelled by the local enactment to reside in their districts, I regret, I say, that they should take the liberty of leaving the country and residing in town; they thus give cause to the hon. member for Durham's assertions. But because the judges do not perform their duties, because they act contrary to law, because these judges neglect the administration of justice in the places where they are bound to, it does not follow that such administration should cease to become necessary.

So, Mr. Speaker, the argument of the gentleman who is now a judge and who was then a member of this House, was for the

maintenance of the system as it then existed. He wanted only to redress abuses.

More remains to be said. What is the conduct of those judges who should remain in their districts? They take up their residence in the district of Montreal. With the system which they have adopted of preventing the transaction of business in the rural districts, there is nothing to be surprised at if that business should be so small. I maintain that with such a system there is no cause for surprise at the cases in rural districts being but few, nor is there anything to be surprised at that one should hear the hon. member from Jacques Cartier exclaim that the judges should be made to return to town from the country.

Some figures have been given in this House to show the work that is performed by the judges. Some hon. members have said that there are only thirty contested cases in one district, only twenty in another district, that the judges have very little to do, and that a change in the system of administering justice in the province of Quebec should be made right away. But, Mr. Speaker, the figures which have been given to the House do not give a fair idea of what is going on. The figures given to the House include only the cases brought before the superior courts, but all these judges, and this is where the system in Quebec differs from the system in the province of Ontario, are at the same time judges of the circuit court, and judges of the criminal court, so that they are kept a great deal busier than hon. gentlemen opposite have said they were. And I may say most important cases come from rural districts. But, Mr. Speaker, this is not to my mind the main feature of the question at issue. I claim that it is not for hon. gentlemen acting as federal members in this House, but for the people of the province of Quebec in their local legislative capacity, to change the system that is in force in that province, and that if it is considered proper in the best interests of the country that it shall be changed, the people of Quebec constitute the only authority competent to make the change. We in the province of Quebec do not admit the right of the province of Ontario, or of the maritime provinces, or of the western provinces, to change the system that is in force in the province of Quebec. We claim the right of non-interference from the province of Ontario and from senators coming from the province of Ontario, who are the men who come to-day and tell us that our system in Quebec is vicious. It is true that the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) also made this statement, but we can answer him. He is in a position to come upon the hustings in the province of Quebec and speak his own mind, and we are able to answer him, but when senators come from the province of Ontario, or from other provinces of the Dominion, and tell us that our system is vicious, we have only one thing to tell them, and it is: Read the constitution and

Mr. MONET.

mind your own business. That is what we are ready to do, and that is what we ask them to do. What are the first conditions that should be present to enable a legislator to enact wise legislation as far as the administration of justice is concerned? If you want to make a good law it seems to me that you should first know the wishes and habits of the people to whom this law is to be applied. What do the senators from Ontario, from the maritime provinces, from the western provinces, know about that? They do not know anything about it. They do not, I suppose, know the geography of the province of Quebec, and if the question is asked: Would it be proper that these gentlemen should come and teach us what we should do in regard to the administration of justice in the province of Quebec, I say no. What kind of judges would we have if they had the right to come and teach us what we should do? They are indirectly asking the province of Quebec to change its system and to make a reform. But, what reform? The very reform that was brought before the legislature of Quebec by the hon. member for Montmorency, which the hon. member brought, not only once, but twice, before the legislature of Quebec in the years 1893 and 1894, with the result that neither of these years was the Conservative government then in power able to have it carried through. What is the meaning of that? The hon. member for Beauharnois told us the other day that the government were not strong enough to have the measure carried. The hon. member knows better than that. He knows that the Conservative government, in power in Quebec in 1893 and 1894, was, numerically speaking—

Mr. BERGERON. I did not speak in that way.

Mr. MONET. Numerically speaking, one of the strongest governments that had ever been in power in that province.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not mean to say that its numbers were not sufficient to enable it to carry the Bill, but I meant that morally speaking it had not the courage to do it. That is what I meant.

Mr. MONET. That is a very poor certificate for the Conservative government of Quebec, and is in marked contrast with the language held by the hon. gentleman when he told the right hon. Prime Minister that he should not defer to the wave of public opinion, but that he should do what is right. What about the hon. member for Montmorency? He was not strong enough to have his measure carried out. Why, if numerically the government were so very strong? What was the reason? Was it because the Conservative members of the local legislature in 1893 and 1894 did not represent the feelings, the sentiments and opinions of their own respective ridings?

No. Neither the Liberal nor Conservative party in the legislature of Quebec has dared at any time to change the system in force in that province. So that, we have the unanimous feeling of both political parties in the province of Quebec, which is expressed in this way: We cherish this system, and we will stick to it. It does not belong to the hon. member for Beauharnois in his capacity as a federal member, and it does not belong to the Tory senators in the Upper Chamber to come and teach us what we must do in the province of Quebec. But, Mr. Speaker, if I failed to understand the exact position of the hon. member for Beauharnois from listening to the first part of his speech, I must frankly admit that in the last portion of his remarks the cat jumped out of the bag. He did not say that it was his main objection, but I am sure it is that these appointments are not to be made by his own party. He admitted indirectly that if the Conservatives were in power, and that if the appointment of these three judges were not to be in favour of the Liberal party he would carry this measure before the Senate.

Mr. BERGERON. What is that?

Mr. MONET. If that were not the exact idea of the hon. member for Beauharnois, surely it was the idea of the hon. member for Montmorency, because the hon. member for Montmorency has been more indiscreet than the hon. member for Beauharnois, as far as plain language was concerned. Last year the hon. member for Beauharnois, criticising the appointment of a new judge for the district of St. Francis, said openly on the floor of this House—and I have still the sound of his very words in my ears—that there was indeed a law proposed by him in the legislature of Quebec, asking for a new judge, but they had done so, not because it was expedient, but because it was to serve political exigencies. We, therefore, see that party exigencies are influencing the action of gentlemen opposite on political questions, and if that is not the idea foremost to the mind of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), it is certainly the idea which actuates the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). I believe there is some truth in the statement I have made with reference to the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). I will not say he is looking for a job, but I am fairly sure that if his friends are returned to power after next election, he will be the first one to call for the appointment of three new judges. It is not as a mere matter of inference that I say so, but it is a statement made in view of the facts, because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron), has himself told us that he pleaded a case before the courts last year, while for several years before, he never pleaded a case. It is, therefore, quite clear that he wants to go back to the practice of law, so that if his

friends come to power, he may be raised to the dignity of the bench.

Mr. BERGERON. Must I tell my hon. friend (Mr. Monet), of all the cases I have pleaded?

Mr. LANDERKIN. You will plead strongly for a judgeship, no doubt.

Mr. BERGERON. You will need the services of a lawyer pretty soon, if you keep on.

Mr. MONET. I assert that if there is not absolute blindness in the conduct of the Conservative party, there is certainly inconsistency. We have on record the speech made by Sir Charles Tupper last year, and referring to the platform of the right hon. the Prime Minister as to the reform of the Senate, Sir Charles Tupper said: That if this reform of the Senate was to be accepted by this parliament, there would be no more provincial autonomy and there would be no more protection for the rights of the minority in the province of Quebec. He first quotes the Liberal leader, who says:

The very essence of our compact is that the union shall be federal and not legislative. Our Lower Canada friends have agreed to give us representation of population in the Lower House on the express condition that they shall have equality in the Upper House. On no other condition could we have advanced a step; and, for my part, I am quite willing they should have it. In maintaining the existing sectional boundaries, and handing over the control of local matters to local bodies, we recognize, to a certain extent, a diversity of interests, and it is quite natural that the protection for those interests, by equality in the Upper Chamber, should be demanded by the less numerous provinces.

Sir Charles Tupper then goes on to say:

Mr. Speaker, to-day I speak, not only in the presence of this House, but of the country, when I say that no union, no confederation could have been achieved except upon the principle that representation by population in the House of Commons should be safeguarded by an independent Senate, whose members were nominated by the Crown for life, and in which Quebec would have twenty-four members, the same as Ontario, whose population was much larger, and Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island should have twenty-four senators also, although their population was much smaller than even that of Quebec. What is this proposal which is now made? It is a proposal to strike at the very foundation of this principle of confederation. I brand every man in the great province of Ontario who would support such a proposition, as guilty—not of treason to his country, because it may suit Ontario—but I brand him as guilty of the worst description of bad faith in going back upon the pledge under which the province of Quebec and the smaller provinces were induced to enter into this confederation.

The province of Quebec was induced, Sir, to enter into confederation on the very condition, without which confederation would never have been accomplished, and that condition was that there should be provincial autonomy. Our provincial autonomy is guaranteed in the clause of the British

North America Act, which I have read to the House, and we are entitled to have it maintained as it is. Sir Charles Tupper proceeded to say :

I am not surprised that the First Minister was obliged, in company with his friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), to hie himself away to Quebec to dragoon the leader of that province into giving support to such a proposition. They found, after all their communications had failed, that the legislature of Quebec was about to rise without giving them support in this matter. And why?

Let the hon. member from Beauharnois regard these words :

Because there is not an intelligent man in the province of Quebec—and I say it fearlessly—who knows what he is doing, who recognizes what this project would be, that does not know that by supporting it he is cutting the throat of his province.

I feel, Sir, that now, in the last years—I might almost say in the last months, or hours—of my life, I would be only too glad to be exempt from the labour and difficulty which such work involves; but I feel that I would be faithless to the Crown, faithless to Canada, faithless to this great empire to which we belong, if I did not consecrate every hour of my life to meeting on the threshold this dire attempt to subvert the very foundations of this Canadian confederation. I have not a knowledge of the French language; but, Sir, I will make it my business to visit every part of the province of Quebec, and, with the assistance of my able friends and compatriots on this side of the House, I shall be prepared to meet the Minister of Public Works or the Prime Minister of this government, and let it be fairly debated in the presence of intelligent men, whether Sir George E. Cartier, Sir Etienne Taché, Sir Hector Langevin, would not have burned their hands off in the fire before they would have assented to a confederation on any such principle. I do not hesitate to say that no power could have induced either Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island to have any lot or part in this confederation if they had supposed that any party which obtained power as this party has obtained power, could, without the due sanction of the people of this country, lay their unholy hands on the ark of confederation itself, and endeavour to destroy that work which I need not say to this House has made of this Dominion of Canada a country of which every Canadian can be proud.

Sir, if we allow the Senate to infringe upon provincial autonomy, as it has infringed upon it, then every man in this House, whether he be Conservative or Liberal, who will support the action of the Senate, will be guilty of that treason to his country which becomes the hon. gentleman from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and the hon. gentleman for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), to be the first to support those men who have voted against the vested rights of the province of Quebec in this matter. I believe that the people of the entire province will resent, not only the silence of those who did not speak, but also the words of those who spoke, for their words have been worse than the sil-

Mr. MONET.

ence of others, but the whole province will resent the language and the action of hon. gentlemen opposite. I believe, Sir, that the people of our province will resent that conduct to such an extent, that after next election the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), will never have an opportunity again to record such a vote as he wants to give to-day.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). I should not rise to speak, Sir,—

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. This is a most extraordinary thing. Here is one of the most important constitutional questions that could possibly be brought before the House, and three speakers on the other side have addressed us, and hon. gentlemen opposite seem unwilling to deliberate. It must be said that my hon. and learned friend the Solicitor General did not introduce the question in a very deliberative tone, and it has not been discussed in that spirit of deliberation which it should be by the hon. and learned gentlemen on the other side. What, after all, is the position? The Senate is a revising body. Is it to be supposed that a revising body shall never come to a decision contrary to the views of the government of the day. The Senate would be perfectly useless if at any time we should contemplate it taking such a course as that. And, whatever action the Senate may take, it surely can be approached in a perfectly calm state of mind, and one consonant with the spirit and letter of the constitution. What has happened? A question has been brought before this House in the form of a Bill relating to the appointment of judges in different provinces, and amongst others the province of Quebec. The first clause of that Bill provides for adding three judges to the number of the judiciary in the province of Quebec. The opposition in this House takes a different view from the government, and the Bill passes on division. It goes up to the Senate, and it is discussed there. The result is that the first clause is thrown out in the Senate. The Bill comes back here, and the Solicitor General rises to move that this House do not agree to the amendment of the Senate. In that he is perfectly right; that is the first step according to the constitution. The next step will be to see what the Senate will do. I suppose the next step after that would be a conference with the Senate. We do not know what the result of that conference would be. It may be that after the conference the Senate would come to the conclusion that looking at the question on all sides the government view is the

one that should prevail, and that they would not insist on their amendment. All these constitutional steps have yet to be taken, and yet, we have the Solicitor General, in a somewhat strident and incendiary speech, introducing this question, and we have my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Monet) making a speech which I think would be more suitable to a flaming political issue and on a platform outside of this House. Now, with reference to the constitution, let me point out the proposition which is actually before this House at the present time, emanating from the Solicitor General. It is that any local legislature can, in regard to the appointment of judges, make automatons of the two Houses of the Dominion. That is the proposition, and when it is stated in its length and breadth, I am sure it will startle hon. gentlemen opposite, who have been very facile in pronouncing on the constitution, as if they were the only persons who knew anything about it. The proposition of the Solicitor General, of the bâtonnier of the Montreal bar, of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin), and of my hon. friend who has just spoken, is: Let any local legislature pass an Act providing for a number of judges—say three, say five, say ten, say twenty—because if the proposition is good for anything, it is good in an extreme case; then all that need to be done is to have this House apprised of the fact, and we have to pass legislation in accordance therewith. Here is the proposition: That a measure has to be introduced into this House, it might be involuntarily by the government, and we must not debate it. We have nothing to do except to consider what the local legislature has done; the Senate must not debate it, and we must forsooth pass it. I cannot agree that that is the meaning of the constitution. We could all agree with the Solicitor General that the subclause of section 92 and section 96 of the British North America Act have to be read together; but they have not to be read in the sense that the two Houses of the parliament of Canada are abject creatures, without wills of their own, without a right to deliberate, helpless automata in the hands of the local legislature, with respect to the appointment of judges. I cannot think that is the constitution; and to show the absurdity of the proposition you have only to state the extreme case, that you might have a silly, ignorant legislature in some very small province providing extravagant judicial machinery, requiring the appointment of a number of judges altogether in excess of what would be reasonable, and calling upon the Dominion parliament to pass a measure providing for those judges; and all the Senate and House of Commons would have to do would be to endorse it. The Solicitor General, the hon. member for Laval and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, have stated again and again that the Senate, in throwing out the clause

in the Bill providing for three judges are assailing provincial rights. That is the most extravagant statement I ever listened to. How are they assailing provincial rights? We are on the eve of a general election. Let it be put forward as the policy of this government that they want additional judges, and let them get the sentiment of the country in favour of their policy, and everybody knows that the Senate will give way. Everybody knows that the Senate, like the House of Lords, is a delaying body whose chief function is to place the sovereign power where it rightly belongs, namely, in the electorate. Everybody knows, therefore, that the Senate's veto, whether of a railway charter, a Bill like this, or a constituent measure, is simply a delaying act, and not conclusive and final. My hon. friend who has just sat down, and also the Solicitor General, spoke as if the province of Quebec were a unit upon this question, and as if the bar of Quebec were a unit upon it. The Solicitor General said: 'I speak for the bar.' How absurd that is when a few days ago we heard two distinguished members of that bar, who practice constantly before it, the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), stating that they were against the measure. If the province of Quebec and the bar were a unit in favour of this measure, how utterly absurd it would be to suppose that my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) would be so lost to the incumbency which attaches to his position as a prominent politician as to array himself in the strong manner he does against it. The claim that neither the province of Quebec or the Quebec bar is a unit on this question is therefore palpably contradictory to the facts. And I think I am within the memory of the House when I say that my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) told us the other day that he had consulted in 1892 all the lawyers on this Bill and only one objected to it. Besides, in point of fact, the hon. the Solicitor General then supported it.

As the constitution has again and again been referred to, we may as well just see what the constitution is. I have in my hand Todd's 'Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies,' and on page 699, Mr. Todd says:

Under parliamentary government an Upper Chamber derives peculiar efficacy and importance from the fact of its independent position. Free from the trammels of party, it is able to deliberate upon all public questions on their merits unrestrained by political considerations, which are too apt to bias the judgment of every administration in certain contingencies. For the same reason, an Upper Chamber, being unable to determine the fate of a ministry, is much less influenced by party combinations and intrigues than the popular assembly. This constitutes the special value of an Upper House, under parliamentary institutions. But while the Upper Chambers of all constitutional legislatures recognize their position as one removing them en-

tirely from party considerations, and as designed to be a guard against hasty and immature legislation, they would doubtless feel it to be their duty to weigh with more than ordinary anxiety and care the explicit declarations of public opinion, when deliberately given by all classes of the community upon any measures, after the period of excitement which might have given rise to it had passed away. When such a spirit pervades the Upper Chamber, there need be no apprehension of a conflict between the two branches composing the legislatures.

Again, this great author says :

But whether constituted by nomination or election, the Upper House in every British colony is established for the sole purpose of fulfilling therein the legislative functions of the House of Lords, whilst the Lower House exercises within the same sphere the rights and powers of the House of Commons.

What is the function of the House of Lords? It is a revising, a delaying Chamber, as I have already described the Senate. Sir, within recent years we have had the House of Lords in England fulfilling this function. We have had it delaying measures passed by the overwhelming majorities in the House of Commons, and in regard to which excitable people—people not understanding that in the House of Lords they have the best second Chamber that could possibly be devised—attacked the House of Lords and menaced it with ruin. What happened? These measures were submitted to the opinion of the electorate, and the electorate endorsed, not the action of the government and the Lower House, but the action of the House of Lords, and swept out of power the government of the day.

I have here Mr. Bagehot, and I want to read one sentence from him, who is probably the most radical writer on the constitution that we have :

With a perfect Lower House it is certain that an Upper House would be scarcely of any value. If we had an ideal House of Commons, perfectly representing the nation, always moderate, never passionate, abounding in men of leisure, never omitting the slow and steady forms necessary for good consideration, it is certain that we should not need a higher Chamber. The work would be done so well that we should not want any one to look over or revise it.

And he goes on to point out how impossible it is to get these conditions, and, therefore, how absolutely necessary to a free constitution is the guarding influence of a second Chamber :

The most dangerous of all sinister interests is that of the executive government, because it is the most powerful. It is perfectly possible—it has happened and will happen again—that the cabinet, being very powerful in the Commons, may inflict minor measures on the nation which the nation did not like, but which it did not understand enough to forbid. If, therefore, a tribunal of revision can be found in which the executive, though powerful, is less powerful, the government will be the better; the retarding Chamber will impede minor instances of parliamentary tyranny, though it will not prevent or much impede revolution.

Mr. DAVIN.

We had an illustration of the benefit of a second Chamber in what occurred here in one of the early sessions of this term. We had the famous Mackenzie & Mann contract, which passed this House by an overwhelming majority, although it was well known that it was only by the exercise of executive tyranny that the measure was forced through, and we had members of the Liberal party, who had voted for the contract, going over to the Senate and appealing to the senators: For God's sake, throw out that measure that we have been forced to swallow. The Senate threw it out. If the sentiment of the electorate had been with the government, the government would have reintroduced that measure, or there and then dissolved the House and appealed to the country, as the Minister of Public Works wanted it to do. But the government dared not do that, because they knew that the people would register their verdict in such a way as to show that the Senate had subserved the very purpose described by Bagehot :

This is the mode in which the House of Lords came to be what it now is, a Chamber with (in most cases) a veto of delay with (in most cases) a power of revision, but with no other rights or powers. The question we have to answer is, 'The House of Lords being such, what is the use of the Lords?'

He goes on to show that in cases where there is no doubt as to the will of the people, and no danger of executive tyranny paralyzing the deliberate will of the House of Commons, then the House of Lords gives in. Here is Mr. Dicey. He says :

The electorate is, in fact, the sovereign of England. It is a body which does not, and from its nature hardly can, itself legislate, and which, owing chiefly to historical causes has left in existence a theoretically supreme legislature. The result of this state of things would naturally be that the conduct of the legislature which (ex hypothesi) cannot be governed by laws, should be regulated by understandings of which the object is to secure the conformity of parliament to the will of the nation.

The same thing holds good of the understanding or habit in accordance with which the House of Lords are expected in every serious political controversy, to give way at some point or other to the will of the House of Commons, as expressing the deliberate resolve of the nation, or of that further custom which, though of comparatively recent growth, forms an essential article of modern constitutional ethics, by which, in case the peers should finally refuse to acquiesce in the decision of the Lower House, the Crown is expected to nullify the resistance of the Lords by the creation of new peerages. How, it may be said, is the 'point' to be fixed at which in case of a conflict between the two Houses, the Lords must give way, the Crown ought to use its prerogative in the creation of new peers? The question is worth raising, because the answer to it throws great light upon the nature and aim of the articles which make up our conventional code.

This reply is, that the point at which the Lords must yield or the Crown intervene is properly determined by anything which conclusively shows that the House of Commons represents on the

matter in dispute the deliberate decision of the nation.

And nothing can so completely show that as an election in which the verdict of the people would be given one way or the other. He refers also to the prerogative of the Crown. Now, I read this to show how far Mr. Dicey goes. In discussing the relative actions of the Upper and the Lower House, he has before him the probability, which we know to be very strong, but the deliberative will of a House may be paralyzed by the action of the executive. He uses it as an analogy to strongly point his view in regard to the power of the Upper House. Referring to the prerogative of the Crown, he says:

The discretionary power of the Crown occasionally may be, and according to constitutional precedents sometimes ought to be, used to strip an existing House of Commons of its authority.

Mr. Dicey is a man of extreme radical views. He contemplates that even the House of Commons may so far and so palpably act out of agreement with the law of the nation that the Crown may step in and deprive the House of Commons of authority—in other words, dissolve it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Question.

Mr. DAVIN. This is the question:

But the reason why the House can, in accordance with the constitution, be deprived of power and of existence, is that an occasion has arisen on which there is fair reason to suppose that the opinion of the House is not the opinion of the electors.

Mr. CHARLTON. This is the 163rd day of the session, and we want to get home.

Mr. DAVIN. Here is an extraordinary thing—the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says this is one of the last days of the session, and this is a question on which three gentlemen have spoken on the other side, it seems to me with some heat—

Mr. CAMPBELL. They are interested.

Mr. FOSTER. And, if the House will allow me, it is a proposition which I was prepared, with the consent of the Prime Minister to let go entirely without discussion.

Mr. BERGERON. We were willing not to say a word, and four men spoke before we commenced.

Mr. DAVIN. It was most important to recall the House to what is really the issue and to point out the constitutional position as I have pointed it out from Todd, Dicey and Bagehot. And, now that the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has returned, I repeat that his proposition that these two Houses are only automata in the hands of any local assembly as to the appointment of further judges, is a violent pro-

position, so violent that you have only to state it in its extremity—that, for instance, a foolish provincial assembly might call for the appointment of twenty or thirty new judges and this government and this House of Commons and Senate would have nothing to do, but, without deliberation, to pass the necessary measures though it might be contrary to our conviction—you have only to state that proposition to show it to be absurd and indefensible.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). It is not my intention to follow the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) in his quotations of constitutional law. I am not, for one, disposed to question rights of the Senate to act within their constitutional functions. But I say that if that body, or the majority of them, wish their House to be respected by the people, they must play the role for which they were established—to act as special keepers of the constitution, and not to set the example of violating it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has read us long quotations of gentlemen with whom he was personally acquainted, and other illustrious personages, assuming a likeness between the Senate and the House of Lords. I need not point out to the House the difference between these two bodies. The House of Lords is an institution the utility of which we may question, but its origin and the traditions it represents we cannot question; while the Senate has, unfortunately, for the last number of years, in fact almost ever since confederation, degenerated into a body of politicians; a circumstance which is particularly conspicuous since the majority of that House is not in harmony with the majority here. I may say en passant, that the hon. gentleman has referred to Senator Power as having supported the majority of the Senate on this Bill. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his information. I know that Senator Power opposed the position taken by the Minister of Justice on the amendment to the Criminal Code as to trade unions; but I do not think that he agreed with the majority of the Senate in regard to this Bill—in fact, I understand that Senator Power both spoke and voted in favour of the Bill. The hon. gentleman has also quoted the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), to show that there was a difference of opinion among the members of the Quebec bar on this question. Though I have a great deal of respect for the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and the hon. member for Montmorency; though I acknowledge that they are amongst the lawyers of good standing in the province of Quebec; yet, I must say that in this matter, they did not act as members of the bar of the province of Quebec or as representing the interest of that province, but—like the majority of the Senate—they simply acted as

Tory politicians and took their position as such. As to the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), I am not surprised at the position he has taken, because he is nothing but a Tory politician. Nobody knows better than the hon. member for Montmorency what the opinion of the bar in the province of Quebec is in this matter. In 1894, he brought in a Bill in the provincial legislature to organize the judicial centralization which the hon. member for Beauharnois would like to force upon the province in contravention of the conditions made with that province when it entered confederation. He sent a copy of the Bill to all the lawyers and all the prothonotaries of the province of Quebec, Conservative and Liberal. The answer was so unanimous against the measure that he thought it well not to allow the Bill to face the certain condemnation of the majority of the House, but to drop it. He has himself admitted on the floor of this House that he could not find, even among his own colleagues in the government of Quebec, supporters for that measure. Whilst, on the contrary, the Bill upon which the government have been acting and have proposed the appointment of three new judges, has been not only approved by the Liberal majority of the legislative assembly, but passed without division through both Houses of the parliament of Quebec. There we have a striking example of what is the opinion of the people and of the bar of Quebec. In one case, the Attorney General of Quebec, commanding a majority in both branches of the legislature, could not pass his Bill favouring judicial centralization, as the opinion of the bar was against it; while, on the other hand, the Attorney General of the Liberal administration carried his Bill through both branches of the parliament of Quebec, though the legislative council was composed of a majority of Conservatives. Therefore, it is plain what the opinion of the people of Quebec is on this subject.

Now, the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has tried to make a point against the Solicitor General, who, by the law of 1898, provided that the chief justices of the districts of Montreal and Quebec should designate the judges who are to sit in the court of review, and the hon. member for Beauharnois charges against the Solicitor General that he was the first to bring in a Bill infringing upon the rights and autonomy of the province in respect to the judiciary. Sir, I think his argument is unfounded. The federal government, the nominating body, and the body who pays the judges of the various provinces, passed an Act, not to interfere at all with the judiciary of the province, but simply to provide that some judges nominated and paid by this parliament should not be able to take advantage of their position to increase their salaries and travelling allowances beyond what they were entitled

Mr. BOURASSA.

to. But, Sir, the proof that the Solicitor General in his Bill respected the autonomy of the province, is that he left the operation of the Bill exclusively to the two chief justices. Now the member for Beauharnois gets up and says: Supposing centralization were a good thing for the province, this parliament should force it upon the province. Sir, whatever any law may be in theory, I say that no law is good when it has to be forced upon an unwilling people. The position taken by the member for Beauharnois well illustrates the principles of the party to which he belongs; it is quite illustrative of the old principle of legislative union which forced the will of a majority upon a minority. For my part, I believe that, although judicial centralization might be a good thing, it is not the function of this parliament to enforce it upon a province. But, I go further, and I say that the principle of decentralization, which is at the bottom of the judiciary of Quebec, is the principle upon which all the institutions of this country, all true British institutions, are founded. Decentralization was the principle of the old province of Normandy, from which the French population of Canada came, and it was the principle of some of the old British institutions which were introduced by the Norman population into England. It is no wonder that the French people of Quebec are attached to these institutions, since their ancestors enjoyed them in France, and they left France before those institutions were abandoned by the monarchical and imperial regimes in France. Of course, the English provinces have chosen a different system and preferred the principle of centralization; but, if Quebec has preferred to abide by the system which has proven to be a good one, and, as a matter of fact, is more economical than the system adopted by the English provinces, I do not see why this parliament can object. Especially, I do not see how a representative from the province of Quebec, who boasts sometimes of being the representative of a party that has protected minorities, should now come here and ask the majority of this House, the representatives of the other provinces, to impose upon a province that he is supposed to defend, a system that all previous administrations have rejected, a system that his colleague the member for Montmorency tried to establish in the province of Quebec and which he was forced to abandon.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think the hon. gentleman wishes to be unjust towards the member for Montmorency. The member for Montmorency said, the other day, and it will be found in the *Hansard*, that in 1894, after this measure had secured the sanction of the Solicitor General, then a member of the Quebec legislature, he called together all the leading lawyers of the province of Quebec, and only one of them was found to be op-

posed to the scheme suggested by that hon. gentleman.

Mr. BOURASSA. I did not hear what the hon. member for Montmorency said, but if the facts are exactly as stated by the hon. member for Beauharnois, they further illustrate what I have said. If not only one member for Montmorency but some other leading lawyers were in favour of that system, and they found it impossible to induce the legislature of Quebec to accept it, that is a strong evidence that the people of Quebec are opposed to this system.

Now, a great many things have been said in this debate. Theories have been enunciated, arguments have been adduced, interpretations of the constitution have been attempted; but, I must say, to the hon. member for Beauharnois, that we should try and bring the argument to a point. One reason given by the hon. member for Beauharnois for opposing this measure, for stultifying himself and forcing his Conservative colleagues from Quebec to stultify themselves, is this—I am ashamed to say it: They do not like to lose the chance of coming to power in the next general elections, and so have the chance of appointing some of their own friends to these positions. True, that is a very unworthy point of view, but that is the justification of hon. gentlemen opposite for forcing upon a whole province a system that it does not want, and thus violating one of the soundest principles of our constitution. It is just as well that the members of this House, coming from the other provinces, should know exactly what is the size and measure of the men who assume to speak here for the province of Quebec. Sir, the Conservative representatives from Quebec, who are, I am bound to say, even smaller in quality than in quantity, have forced their friends in this House, and have forced the majority of the Senate, to stultify themselves upon this question for one of the least worthy of party purposes; that is because they think, as the hon. member for Beauharnois said this morning, that the Liberal government has brought up this measure in order to enable them to appoint some of their own friends to positions on the bench. Something may be said against the principle of a government giving judicial positions to political friends. But I state that as long as there exists such a thing as government patronage, I am prepared to support a government proposing a measure that may give some favours to some of their friends, provided it is a measure for the benefit of the public; and I refuse to stand with hon. members who are opposing this measure, not because it is not in the public interest, but for the sole reason that it does not favour their political friends.

But this is not the worst feature of this matter. The position taken by the gentlemen opposite can be explained to the electors and the electors are in a position to punish them; but the position which they have induced their friends in the Senate to take is most detrimental to the welfare of this country. I am not one of those Liberals who assert that we should do away with the Senate. As a matter of general principle, I might side with those who say that in this age and land of democracy we need no Upper House. I admit that there are arguments to be employed for and against it. But Canada is a federated country in which an Upper House was conceded, not merely to act, as in England, as a check upon the democratic instincts of the Lower House, but for the protection of the minorities and for the preservation of provincial rights. One of the greatest dangers would be to ask the Senate, in order to serve some small petty party purposes, to violate one of the principles upon which it was established, to take a step against the constitution and therefore to be untrue to the very cause for which it was given authority and existence. The province of Quebec is, as I understand, in favour of the existence of the Senate. It would be, of course, in favour of its reform. But, if the Senate was to lower itself to the degree of a mere political committee and take its instructions from politicians, the people of the province of Quebec, as well as of the other provinces, would be found against the Senate. I would regret it if such were the case because that protection which is in the constitution would disappear. If the majority and the minority as well, in the Senate, would think about the role they have to play in this country, about the protection that it is their duty to give to the provinces of Canada and to provincial rights generally, they should not allow themselves to be influenced by politicians who simply want their favour for party purposes. Therefore, it will be with the greatest pleasure that I shall support the motion offered to this House by the hon. Solicitor General.

Mr. M. T. STENSON (Richmond and Wolfe). Mr. Speaker, the legal gentlemen who have spoken have exhausted the arguments on the question before the House, and I do not intend to expatiate on them. I rise in my place in this House to protest against the action which the Senate has taken. I do so in the name of the judicial district of St. Francis, of which I am the only representative present here to-day. That district sends four representatives to this House, there being four counties in it, and I am the only representative in the House to-day. I do not criticise the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McIntosh) who, I very much regret to say, is absent owing to severe illness. The hon. member for

Stanstead (Mr. Moore) is not in his place, although usually constantly in attendance in this House. The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) is not in his place. It is true that it is not often that he graces this House with his presence, but nevertheless he has plenty of time on his hands to go through my constituency and abuse the Liberals in his own peculiar style of eloquence. He has not time to come here. The district of St. Francis, being composed of four counties, the judicial seat is in Sherbrooke, where there are two judges and a district magistrate, all three eminent legal gentlemen. They have plenty of work to do. The fact that there was too much work for the two judges of the Superior Court to do is proved by the nomination of a district magistrate by the province of Quebec. The action of the Senate would tend to do away with this judicial district of St. Francis, and it is on that ground that I protest against it. There is to be a new courthouse built at Sherbrooke, the appropriation is made for it, and here is the beginning of the principle of centralization which has been adopted by the Senate as shown in its opposition to the measure providing for the appointment of three judges in Montreal. I have said that I would not enter into the details of the question, and I will not delay the House farther than to make my protest as strongly as I can against the action of the Senate in refusing to consent to the appointment of these three judges. I do so in the name of the district of St. Francis. I see that the hon. member for Stanstead is here now, and I ask him if he is willing to vote that this proposed centralization should take place and that the district of St. Francis should disappear. For my part I protest against it and I will leave my hon. friend to speak for himself.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say only a few words on this question, because it has been very well gone over up to the present. What struck me about the debate particularly was the introductory speech of the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Instead of being of that calm, dignified and judicial tone which we would expect from a man in his position, it was rather, in my judgment, of an excited and incendiary character, and I think, it was delivered in that way for a purpose. I think it was anything but what might have been expected from the hon. Solicitor General as an example of that dignity and moderation that we look for in every part of the country from the lawyers and judges of the country. The hon. gentleman spoke of the unwarranted attacks of the Senate upon the provincial rights of the people. I think he has gone a long way to reach that conclusion. Can it be contended that the Senate have no rights in regard to legislation either in the direction of checking it or of giving advice? What is their

Mr. STENSON.

function in this case but simply checking legislation? If this House did not see fit to agree with what the Senate had done it was their duty to say so calmly and return the Bill to the Senate. If that had been done it would be in order for the Senate to reconsider their action or to ask for a conference with the cabinet and the House of Commons and see if they could not come to some understanding as to what would be best in the interest of the country in regard to this measure. Instead of doing that, it seems to me that hon. gentlemen had a purpose to serve and that purpose was to create strong antagonism and provincial feeling which would inure to their benefit when the election would come on. That is the inference I draw from their conduct and I think it is a reasonable inference because otherwise we would not have been obliged to listen to these incendiary speeches which were made by hon. members on the other side of the House. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) was rather a puzzle to me when he said that the people of Quebec were always opposed to centralization. How he regards the appointment of three more judges to do the work in the province of Quebec, in the city of Montreal, as opposed to centralization, I do not understand.

Some people in Ontario thought that the proper way was to centralize the law business in the city of Toronto, but the people of the country thought that some of that law business should be transacted outside of the city of Toronto, and that we should enlarge the powers of the county court judges. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) says that they have always been opposed to centralization in the province of Quebec, and if that be the case he ought to be opposed to the appointment of three more judges in the district of Montreal, because it tends towards a greater centralization of the law business in Montreal. It is very easy for the province of Quebec to change its judicial system so as to give the district courts, or the county courts, as we call them in Ontario, more work to do and less work to central courts in Montreal. By that means they could easily avoid the congestion of legal business in the cities. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) said that the Senate took this action for small petty party purposes. That was undignified language coming from a lawyer who ought to know better, and I question the wisdom or the right of a member of this House to impute such motives to the members of the Upper Chamber. I call attention to the fact that the use of such language in this House is not the highest form of parliamentary decorum. Now, let us inquire into what cause led to the necessity of three more judges in Montreal. The Solicitor General himself admitted that nearly all the judicial business of the province was done in Montreal, and he told us

that for that reason he had joined with the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) some years ago in an effort to rearrange the judicial system of Quebec so as to obviate that condition of things, but they were unable to carry their measure in the legislature, and so they were obliged to fall back on the system which had existed from time immemorial in that province. We therefore, see that the Solicitor General belonging to the Liberal party and the hon. member (Mr. Casgrain) joined together to remedy the evil. They were both lawyers of eminence, and they sought to apply the remedy, but they were unable to carry the measure in their native province, and because of that the legislature falls back on the power they have of asking the Dominion government to appoint and pay more judges. In view of this fact, if the Senate comes to the conclusion that the remedy is in the hands of the provincial legislature, the provincial legislature is bound to apply that remedy by so distributing the judicial work that the appointment of these extra judges will be unnecessary. Surely the Senate is not to be censured if it should believe with the Solicitor General, that it is in the power of the province to afford the remedy without this parliament adopting the ill-advised legislation which has been submitted to it. Until the hon. gentlemen opposite are able to bring stronger arguments than they have advanced against the Senate, it is my belief that the people of this country—and a large number of the respectable lawyers in the province of Quebec—will not agree that the Senate has gone beyond their powers in this matter. There is no reason at all for the argument of gentlemen opposite who state that this is an attack upon provincial rights. The Senate has a duty to perform as well as the Commons, and the Senate is there for the reason amongst others of retarding hasty and inconsiderate legislation. There is a recourse against the Senate provided in our constitution, but the government and their friends do not adopt that constitutional course. On the contrary, they seem to be glad of this opportunity, because they desire to raise some strong provincial feeling in the province of Quebec which may redound to their benefit at the coming elections. The conduct of the government in this whole matter has not been characterized by that dignity which we would expect from them, and which we would more particularly expect from leading members of the bar on that side of the House who belong to the province of Quebec.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see why two gentlemen on the other side of the House should say 'oh!' If they are not gentlemen,

they ought at least to submit to the rules of the House. I think we must ask the Speaker to keep order.

Mr. CHARLTON. We shall be delighted to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. I had no desire to prolong the session. The other day everything that could have been said on the merits of the Bill and on the constitutional point was said, and was thoroughly discussed for hours. When, therefore, the Senate, exercising its undoubted right disagreed with the majority of the Commons and amended the Bill as they had a perfectly constitutional right to do, when the Bill came down and the government proposed to urge its dissent, I did not see that there was any particular reason why there should be any further discussion on the merits of the Bill. I consequently proposed to my right hon. friend across the Table that we should vote upon it without discussion on either side. That proposition was not accepted, and why? For one very simple reason, and one very simple reason alone, and this reason was not in order that the merits of the Bill might be more widely discussed and more fully investigated, because that was not necessary.

Why, Sir, the first statement made by the Solicitor General gave the keynote to the reason why the Prime Minister did not propose that this session should be allowed to go by without a long discussion on this Bill, and upon the action of the Senate. A member of the cabinet, even though Solicitor General and a representative of the Department of Justice, thought it was not apart from the merits of the question, and not aside from the dignity of a cabinet minister, to open his remarks by a fling at the members of the other House as gentlemen who were promoted to a haven of rest after having been rejected by the people. Now, I take it that the Senate have a perfect right to exist, even though the Solicitor General may have his opinion of them. I hold that it is perfectly constitutional for the government, when it is exercising its power of appointment, to appoint a man to the Senate who has never been before the people, or a man who has been before the people and been elected by them, or a man who has been before the people and been rejected by them. Is there anything in the constitution against it, or any regulation against it? None. Well, Sir, is there any ground, from a party point of view, why a sneer like that should be introduced into a judicial argument of great gravity? None, for hon. gentlemen opposite have placed in the Senate the rejected of the people. Where is Mr. Gillmor? Where is Mr. Burpee? Where is the Minister of Justice himself? All of them rejected by the people, worn-out politicians, placed in the Senate by the Solicitor General and his fellow-members in this cabinet. What necessity was there, in order

to elucidate the merits of this Bill, for the Solicitor General, as the representative of the cabinet and of the Department of Justice, to commence his judicial remarks with such an eminently judicial phrase as that? But, Sir, that is the keynote of the whole discussion. The Prime Minister did not want this matter to go on its merits; he did not want it to be voted on simply as the members of this House understood it, on its merits, and they understood it thoroughly. It was too good an opportunity to commence the campaign; consequently, the order went out to the back benches to make a campaign day of it, and a campaign day of it we have had. The constitutional question, the merits of the Bill, have not been elucidated by a single English or French phrase over and above what was done the other day; but, some gentlemen think that a fine lot of campaign literature has been manufactured. One gentleman went so far as to threaten with the pains and penalties of an enraged French people an hon. gentleman on this side of the House who represents a French constituency, because he dared to say that he would vote against the proposition to enlarge the quota of judges by three. That is an eminently judicial and eminently parliamentary kind of warfare. Another gentleman called out the name of a member on this side of the House and asked him how he would fare before the outraged sentiment of the province of Quebec in regard to this matter. Is it not all a rather pitiful thing on this last day of the session? Would it not have been far better for the dignity of this parliament, far better for the unity of the peoples of this country, if my right hon. friend had taken my suggestion and simply voted, as every man in this House knew how to vote, on the merits of the question, after the three or four hours' debate the other day, without having all this heated partisanship thrown into it? It is but of a piece with the word that has gone out. Why, Sir, here is an eminently beautiful sentiment in *Le Soleil*, an organ of the right hon. leader of the government. I challenge him, when I read it, to get up and repudiate it; we shall see if he does. Here is a life-sized portrait of a member of this House, with a bludgeon and a sword, one in either hand, marching out straight against an imaginary foe. Under it all good Liberals in the province of Quebec and elsewhere, but chiefly in the province of Quebec—all good Liberals of every race, but chiefly of the French race—are bid to remember that this is the arch-enemy of the Catholic religion and of the French people in this country. *Le Soleil* lies about it, and the right hon. gentleman benefits by the lie. Amongst many other things that are said, we read:

Ces orangistes sont tous liés par serment à faire disparaître de cette colonie anglaise l'élément français et catholique.

Mr. FOSTER.

That is:

All these Orangemen are bound together by a solemn oath to exterminate the Catholic and French element in this English colony.

Is that true or is it a lie? That is one of a series that appears day after day, week after week, in this organ of the Liberal party, which has never yet been disowned by the gentleman who reaps the gains of these heated appeals by lies to partisans, to race, and to religion. This is a gross case; but, it is the exact twin brother of what has been going on here to-day, led by the Solicitor General and applauded by the First Minister, who goes about through this country and lays his hand on his heart and appeals to the people, that when he lies in the ground and a monument is raised above him, all he wants on that monument is the statement that he devoted his life to trying to cement together the two races and the different religions in this country. But, that is what goes on; it is a part of the programme; the right hon. gentleman knows it. When the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) puts on his doughty armour and fights against the loyalty of this country and its contingents in going to fight for the British flag, there is a little simulated indignation; but the next minute these two gentlemen meet and put their arms around each other's necks, and in love most intimate they confer with each other. These are two parts of a campaign just like what we see to-day. What has been the whole aim of this discussion started by the Solicitor General? The whole aim has been, as the too honest, as far as expression went, member for Laprairie (Mr. Monet) showed, to excite the French people against my hon. friend here (Mr. Bergeron), against Liberal-Conservatives in this House and in the country. What did the hon. member for Laprairie say? He said simply this: What are they trying to do? They are trying to hold up the French in Quebec and shame them before the English people. What a sentiment that is—what a worthy sentiment—applauded by the right hon. leader of the government. Just another part of the campaign, simply that and nothing more. These gentlemen have all striven to erect this question into an attempt, of Liberal-Conservative Englishmen particularly, to humiliate and oppress the minority in this country. Stripped of all its verbiage, what is the simple question? Is the Senate a constituent part of our parliamentary system or is it not? Who doubts that it is? Has the Senate legislative power? Who doubts that it has? Has it responsibilities? No one doubts it. The Senate, as an absolutely free, constituent part of our parliamentary system, legislating as it has the right to do, forms its opinion and takes the responsibility of its opinions and expresses that opinion in its legal act. You may consider as to whether their action was wise or not, and they may

consider as to whether our action was wise or not, just as we on one side of the House canvass the action of the other side. And just as there is not the slightest doubt that we here have the right to our opinion and to give expression to it in legislation, when we are in the majority, so there is not the slightest doubt that the Senate has the right to put on the statute-book its expression of opinion when it sees fit. That is all that is done. This is no Quebec question, it is no simple question of one province. The question arises on a piece of legislation which affects the province of Quebec, but it might have arisen on a piece of legislation which affected the province of Manitoba. In fact, not many years ago the same thing did come up in another form with reference to Manitoba, and I myself and others on this side opposed the payment to a judge simply because we thought that, under the circumstances, it was not necessary to appoint a judge. How wrong it is, how incendiary, how entirely away from the merits of the question to attempt to lower this, which is a broad question, into the narrow question of the oppression of one particular province. It is no such question. Every hon. gentleman knows, in his cooler moments, that if this same thing came from any other province, under the same conditions, there would be the very same difference of opinion, and the very same legislation would take place. There has been an attempt made to show that this is an act of oppression by the Senate. Well, the hon. gentleman's campaign against the Senate was not a very fruitful one. He began it and carried it on for a time with great vehemence, but it ultimately fell very flat, and to-day is as dead as Julius Cæsar. But now these gentlemen think there is a chance to make a little capital against the Senate and catch some votes, and so they raise a campaign against that body. But, stripped of all its verbiage, this is simply a question of opinion. As we stated the other day, we believe that there is the power in this parliament over legislation with regard to this matter, and that we have a perfect right to make it effective if we wish. There is not an hon. gentleman opposite who will dare to get up and say that a condition of things might not arise in which this House would, as a unit, refuse to vote salaries for judges under legislation which had been passed by a province. Take an extreme case, and every man on that side would say that if this is proved to have been an intolerable abuse, this House will not submit to it by furnishing the money to carry on the abuse. Grant that, and what do you grant alongside of it? You grant that there may be an honest difference of opinion on any measure that comes up with reference to this matter. There is an honest difference of opinion to-day. I hold the opinion that it is not a question of provincial

autonomy, but quite otherwise, and that it is not the duty of this House to vote the money for extra judges for the province of Quebec under the conditions and the state of things that have been shown to exist in that province. That opinion is a reasonable and honest one. I may be wrong, or I may be right; but no man has the right to get up and say that I am trying to oppress a province because I carry that opinion out, or that I am trying to destroy provincial autonomy because I choose to exercise that opinion on what I think is reasonable ground. If I have that right, so has the Senate, and the Senate has acted within its rights in registering its opinion. That opinion has come here and this House has a perfect right to review it, but for heaven's sake let us review it without reviling the Senate. Any man who, in reply to an opinion on this side, would simply indulge in reviling and abuse, would not be considered as having a strong case. And any man who answers by abuse the recorded opinion of the Senate, has just as equally a weak case. Can we not believe that, so long as we have a Senate and a Commons, each of these has the right to an opinion, and because the opinion of the senators does not agree with ours, are you to stand up and call them the rejected of the people or men who know nothing, or fools or anything else in that line? That never advances a cause and does not advance this cause. Therefore, I say this is not a question of any attack on provincial autonomy. Everybody will agree with Sir John Macdonald in the opinion expressed by him, and which was quoted by the hon. the Solicitor General, that when a provincial legislature declares that it requires additional judges to carry out its judicial system and we are called on to provide for the payment of these judges, under the constitution, the man who undertakes to contravene the wish of the local legislature, assumes the responsibility for what he does. But because he is willing to assume that responsibility, it does not go to prove that he is a lunatic or a fool or a vile man or an oppressor of the poor or the enemy of a province. Certainly not. It simply goes to prove that he is willing to discuss the question and give his vote and take the responsibility, and he would be a coward if he did not. The Senate itself would be coward and not fit to be a constituent part of the government if it refrained from giving its opinion and taking the responsibility, lest some people, who are moved more by impulse than good sense, would stand up in this House and revile it for having dared to do that which it has the constitutional right to do.

I am sorry that this day has been wasted. I am sorry that it has been worse than wasted, because it has been delivered over to the manufacture of campaign literature on a basis which is dangerous to the peace and unity of this country.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The hon. gentleman has just given us an example of the lofty manner in which he can discuss constitutional questions. He opened his remarks by rebuking my hon. friend the Solicitor General for not having risen to the dignity of the occasion, and for having adopted a tone the reverse of judicial. But the hon. gentleman himself gave us an illustration of the very thing he was rebuking. He was anything but judicial in his remarks and even descended to discuss by means of newspaper cartoons the constitutional question before us.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the way the hon. gentleman and his government got into power—by virtue of cartoons.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman had better keep quiet for some time. Nobody interrupted him. If we are to go into newspaper cartoons, and if we are to put on the one side and the other the appeals which may unfortunately be made on some occasions to popular passion, how can *Le Soleil* compare with the *Hamilton Spectator* and the other newspapers which, day after day, are manufacturing, in the most vile fashion, all the possible attacks they can make on the government.

It is not my misfortune, I say it is my pride, that I am of the French race. But that fact is the argument that the hon. gentleman's supporters in the province of Ontario are using against me every day. And, if some of my friends in the province of Quebec sometimes resent it, while I blame them to some extent, I excuse them. The man does not live—certainly not the hon. gentleman—who can stand before me and truly say that under any circumstances in my life, have I ever made the slightest appeal to religious or race passions. I have fought, and I am fighting, an honest battle. I am meeting the hon. gentleman upon his policy; but never in my life did I do anything which could be pointed to as making the slightest appeal to the prejudice or passion of any creed or race.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the right hon. gentleman's (Sir Wilfrid Laurier's) opinion of this that I have read?

The PRIME MINISTER. This is my opinion—if any friend of mine in the columns of any newspaper in the province of Quebec, in *Le Soleil* or *La Patrie*, or any organ of mine—no, not organ, because every newspaper, so far as I am concerned controls its own columns—tries to appeal to the passion of any race or creed, I am not ready to support them. But I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), likewise to impose silence upon the vile sheets, such as the *Hamilton Spectator*, which are to-day attacking me on account of my race and religion.

But that is not the way to discuss this question. Why are we discussing this question to-day? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fos-

ter) says he was quite willing to let this go without discussion. I was not. I thought this was one of the most important questions that could come before this House. I thought there was no more vital question that could be called to the attention of this country, than the question whether or not the provisions of the constitution are to be carried out. That is the question we have to deal with to-day. The question of the salaries of three judges is not a very big question—that is wholly a secondary question. The real question is, whether the principles laid down in the book which sets forth our liberties, provincial as well as federal, shall be observed. The question is whether the administration of justice and the creation of courts, which belong to the legislatures in the several provinces, shall be preserved to them. When the provincial authorities, speaking in their wisdom, have declared that they require so many judges for the administration of justice in a province, I say that it becomes the duty of this House, and of the Senate likewise, to give effect to the decisions so expressed. If the province had the power to appoint these judges, they would appoint them, and there the matter would end. But the power of appointment belongs to the federal authority. Will hon. gentlemen opposite say that when the legislature of Quebec tell us, not once, but repeatedly, that they require so many new judges for the administration of justice, and when their declaration is corroborated by the bar of the province and by the bar of the district of Montreal, which is more particularly affected—will hon. gentlemen say with all this, that we are not to comply with the decision so expressed, but will undertake to teach these men their duty. That is the important question that I submit hon. gentlemen in this House. I submit to those who believe in Liberal principles, but especially, I may say, I submit it to those who were at one time Conservatives of the school of Cartier. It does not rest with this parliament to revise the legislation of any legislature under these circumstances. I make one exception. If it can be shown that a legislature has acted in bad faith, has acted in a manner not defensible, in a manner shocking to the judgment of this House, I say we should not submit. But nothing of the kind is alleged on this occasion. It is not pretended that the legislature of Quebec acted in bad faith or improvidently. But it is said that they did not act wisely. These gentlemen on the other side, coming from the other provinces assume to be superior to the legislature of Quebec. They know better what is necessary for the people of that province than the people of that province themselves. They feel free to tell the people of Quebec that they do not know what they are talking about. They are luminaries. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is one, my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) is another. My hon.

Mr. FOSTER.

friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) also pretends to tell the legislature of Quebec that they do not know what they are talking about, and that the bar of that province is in the same position. We know, say those hon. gentlemen, that they are not in need of so many judges.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I would like to say to the right hon. gentleman, that I did not make use of such an expression as that the legislature of Quebec did not know what they were talking about.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** The hon. gentleman did not say so in so many words. But he did say that there was no need of so many judges in the province of Quebec. That has been the very head and front of his argument, and of the argument of the hon. member for Beauharnois. But what are the facts? The province of Ontario has a population, according to the last census, if I remember well, of 2,115,000. The province of Quebec has a population of 1,500,000. That is a difference of about one-fourth. The province of Ontario has eighty-seven judges to administer justice for the whole province, and the province of Quebec has only forty-one. That is to say, there are two judges in Ontario to one in Quebec. And these gentlemen pretend to tell us that we have too many judges already and ought not to have more. Can there be anything more monstrous? I am ready to appeal to the common sense and justice of the people of Ontario on this question. When the case is presented to the people of Ontario, that in these very estimates that I hold in my hand, we are asking from the parliament of Canada, salaries for eighty-seven judges in the province of Ontario, and only for forty-four—even with the proposed increase—for the province of Quebec, the people of Ontario will not justify the course of hon. gentlemen opposite.

**Mr. HAGGART.** What is the difference in the amount paid for judges in the two provinces?

**The PRIME MINISTER.** I do not know that the difference is very great; but what does it matter?

**The SOLICITOR GENERAL.** The difference is \$60,000.

**The PRIME MINISTER.** The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has his answer. But suppose there was no difference—is not the country wealthy enough to pay the salaries of all the judges needed in any province? Shall we be told that we are to estimate this by the weight of gold, that upon a difference of money shall depend the rights and privileges of the provinces? Sir, I stand upon the broad principle of provincial rights. The Senate had no right—it had the power, but not the right—to reject this legislation. Hon. gentlemen opposite say:

Will you pretend that this parliament is bound to carry out the will of the province of Quebec? Shall we have nothing to say in the matter; shall we have no right to exercise any judgment? I say that in a matter of this kind, our duty is to support the people of the province of Quebec, and their legislation. This is not unexampled under our constitution. The very basis of our constitution is this idea which seems so indefensible to some hon. gentlemen in this House. The parliament of Great Britain is composed of three branches—the Commons, the Lords, and the Queen. When an Act has been passed by the House of Commons and the Lords, will any one say that it does not belong to the Sovereign to exercise her own judgment and decide whether she shall sanction it or not? No Sovereign is bound to give assent to legislation. It is only in exceptional circumstances that she would take such an extraordinary course as to refuse her assent. In the same way I say that under our system, where the fathers of confederation have left the creation of the courts and the number of judges to the legislatures of the provinces, while leaving to this parliament the power of appointing the judges and the duty of paying them—under such circumstances I say, where would we be if this parliament should assume the power to revise the legislation of any province, to substitute our wisdom for their wisdom? Why, we would have a state of anarchy. Suppose that the province of Quebec said to-day: We must have three more judges for the due administration of the law; and suppose this parliament should say, No, you have no right to them, you can do without them, what a condition of things we would have. You would have chaos, you would have anarchy, but you could never have the harmony which ought to exist between the several members of the Canadian family. For that reason I say it was important that we should have this discussion to-day, that we should know where we stand, that we should know whether we have a legislative union in Canada or a federal union; that we should know whether we have parliamentary government with a federal system, or whether we have a tyrannical Senate imposing its will upon the people of Canada.

**Mr. HAGGART.** This has been a question nearly ever since I have been in parliament. The question of the payment of judges in the province of Quebec seems to be a perennial one. I thought the constitutional point had been settled long ago as to the respective powers of the provincial legislature and the federal parliament in reference to the appointment of judges and the rearrangement of judicial districts were in the hands of the Dominion government. Nearly every session we have had a debate on the question as to whether we ought to exercise the right which we undoubtedly have of control over the delimitation and re-

arrangement of these courts. That constitutional authority which is vested in us by the British North America Act I never heard disputed in this House before. It is only a question of expediency. How it affects the autonomy of a province, how that question has been dragged into the debate to-day, I cannot possibly understand; because there is nothing in the action of this House, there was nothing in the action of the Senate, there was nothing in the action of the provincial legislature, to justify the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, especially of the Solicitor General who led off in the discussion of this question. There was difference of opinion between the provincial authorities of Quebec and the Dominion authorities as to the expediency of appointing these judges. The legislation of Quebec showed it. They passed an Act, which was only to take effect upon proclamation by the Lieutenant-Governor. That gave the local authorities for the province of Quebec an opportunity of consulting with the local authorities of the Dominion for the purpose of coming to an agreement upon the subject. I do not know whether they did it or not, I do not know whether the local authorities of the province consulted with the local authorities of the Dominion; if they did so, I did not hear the statement made to-day. The two authorities may have come to an agreement as to what legislation should be taken upon the question. But no matter whether they agreed or not, the provincial authorities adopted the wise and courteous course; they did not delimit the districts of the judges in any manner until, as I assume, they consulted with the Dominion authorities as to whether they should do it or not. Then, because the Dominion authorities chose to accept the dictum of the provincial authorities and take their delimitations in establishing the courts, it is now contended that the Senate is debarred from expressing an opinion upon it. On this side of the House we contend that this was an opportunity for rearranging the districts. It is notorious to any one who has been in the House for a number of years that the consensus of opinion in this country is that there are too many judges in the province of Quebec. It may be said that the province of Ontario has a greater number of judges in proportion to its population than Quebec. We pay the judges of Quebec \$201,000, and as the population of Ontario is so much greater than that of Quebec, the judges of Ontario receive some \$271,000. There has been no attempt at all to attack the provincial autonomy, but we pretend that it is the duty of this House, to whom the people have entrusted the management of the finances of the country, to see that the money of the people is properly applied, and if it can be more economically applied by a different arrangement of the judiciary, then it is our duty to make that a condition of granting the money. If the Minister

Mr. HAGGART.

of Justice does not make that arrangement with the provincial authorities, or if the provincial authorities refuse to change the judicial districts, then I say we ought to know it. I say the House ought to have a statement that the provincial authorities refuse positively to change the delimitations. But the bald statement is made that three judges more are required for the district of Montreal; and it is a notorious fact, if we can believe the gentlemen who speak upon the subject in this House from time to time, that in a great many sections of the province the judges are not overworked. It is charged, I do not know if it is true, that this is a scheme started for political purposes in order to make places for political favourites of the government. I do not suppose that is so. But it is natural for the province, who does not have to furnish the money to pay the salaries, to desire as many judges as it can get, not only for the better administration of justice, but for the purpose of securing appointments for political friends. But it is also the duty of those who have control of the people's money to see that justice is not administered in a lavish manner. The simple question, then, which the Senate had a right to consider, and which this House has a right to consider, is not whether three or more judges are necessary for the district of Montreal, but whether a rearrangement could not be made in that province by which in some country districts where there is a plethora of judges, some of them might not be transferred to the district of Montreal, the same as we do in the province of Ontario; and in that way the money might be saved to the country which would otherwise go for the payment of these extra judges.

No matter what hon. gentlemen may say on the other side of the House about attacks upon provincial autonomy by the Senate, I think the people will look at it in a more practical light and say: Cannot there be a rearrangement in the province of Quebec by which the judges who are at present in that province can fulfil all the judicial duties that are required of them? Surely it is in the province of the Senate to say so. Surely they do not attack in any way provincial autonomy by action in regard to that matter, and surely we are not going to condemn the Senate for exercising an authority which they are perfectly justified in exercising, and raise, from one end of the country to the other, over this little question, which has been threshed out again and again for the last twenty years, on the eve of an election, a charge against the Senate, and a charge against the Conservative party that they have conspired against the political autonomy of the province of Quebec. I do not think it ever entered the mind of any hon. member of this House. I do not suppose that any hon. member of this House took

sufficient interest in the Bill to speak to senators about it. I doubt if any one on this side of the House has exercised a bit of influence for the purpose of having the Bill defeated in the Senate. The Senate have exercised the authority which was vested in them, and they have done it in the best interest of the country. If the Senate have not the right to exercise discretion upon a Bill of this kind, and to reject this amendment to the Act respecting judges of provincial courts, of what use are they at all? What power have they? What kind of legislation are they to exercise their discretion upon? Hon. gentlemen opposite said, during the last election, at least in my county, that the first thing they would do would be to appeal to the Imperial government for a change in the British North America Act, authorizing the abolition of the Senate altogether. But, surely if they have co-equal powers with us, as they have, on almost all subjects, except matters of money, this is something in regard to which they had the right to exercise their discretion, a question which has been threshed out so often, and in regard to which the only question for the exercise of their discretion was as to whether the request of the province of Quebec should be granted or not.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES** (Sir Louis Davies). I desire only to say a few words, and I will not detain the House. No one challenges the right of any individual member of this House, or the Senate to express his opinion on grave constitutional questions that come before the House but it is perfectly obvious that the weight to be attached to the opinion expressed by any hon. gentleman must be proportionate to the knowledge which he possesses on such subjects. This constitutional question has two aspects. The first is whether the Senate of Canada is within its rights in thwarting the constitutional will of a province in a matter that comes within its jurisdiction, and the other is: Has the Senate a right to thwart the action of parliament when it is seeking to carry out the wishes of the province. In regard to the latter I challenge the position taken by the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Haggart). The province of Quebec, as the constitution clearly says, has the right and it is its duty to provide for the organization and constitution of the courts of that province, and it is our right and duty to carry out the measures which they desire, unless, and excepting on one ground, and that is where we are convinced by incontrovertible evidence that the provincial authorities are improvidently exercising their rights. I have not heard it alleged by any person who is either competent or incompetent to judge, that there has been any improvident exercise by the province of Quebec of their rights in this

regard, and if that is so, and if the parliament of this country, which represents the people, have, without a division, endorsed that principle and have provided the salaries of the judges necessary to carry out the wishes of the province of Quebec, I challenge and deny the constitutional position taken by my hon. friend opposite, that it rests with an irresponsible Senate to thwart not only the action taken by the province of Quebec, but the supplementary action taken by this House. The whole will of the people would be set aside, at the whim of an irresponsible body, sitting in the Senate, and it would be so intolerable that we, as a party, never would submit to it. This measure for adding to the judiciary of Quebec which required the assent and consent of both branches of the legislature, was sanctioned and approved by the legislature of that province without division. Party lines, strong as they are there, were invoked but the measure was so good upon its merits that they did not challenge even a division upon it, and in addition to the fact that we have the measure carried by the legislature without a division, as has been stated here to-day, behind the vote of the legislature, there is the approval of the whole bar of the district of Quebec, and of the district of Montreal. In addition to that, when it comes here it receives the support of the government and of the House of Commons, and it is only by a party vote in the Senate, and for party purposes that the wish and action of the people is sought to be defeated.

Mr. A. H. MOORE (Stanstead). Mr. Speaker, I intend to occupy but a very few moments in speaking upon this question. I do not propose to go into a discussion of the constitutional portion of the subject which has been sufficiently dealt with by lawyers, who understand the constitution better than I do. I take it for granted in regard to the Senate that the Senate has a voice in the legislation of this country. They have acted in accordance with what they supposed to be their rights, and they have made their decision. Hon. gentlemen opposite are disputing it in this House. The Senate acted in accordance with what they thought were their rights in regard to the Yukon, and their decision was disputed by hon. gentlemen in this House. They acted in accordance with what they thought to be their rights in regard to the Drummond County Railway, and their decision was objected to by hon. members of this House. But, the people have made up their minds. Public sentiment has been formed in regard to these measures, and the people have come to the conclusion that the Senate are standing up in defence of the rights of the people. I think that when the people are appealed to, the Senate will be amply justified in the action it has taken in regard to this question. I do not rise specially to speak upon this question, but to take ex-

ception to some remarks made by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Stenson). He took occasion to criticise the members from the district of St. Francis for not being here and attending to their duties. I think he mentioned my own name. I will say that I have been here two days to that hon. gentleman's one. It is a strange thing that he should strive to speak upon a constitutional question which he does not know anything about, and leave all the practical questions which come before this House undiscussed. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, if he is here, what difference it would make to the district of St. Francis if this Bill were not to go through. This proposal is to appoint three judges in the Montreal district and the district of St. Francis have their judges, and they will have their judges whether the Bill goes through or not. It does not affect in any way the district of St. Francis. Consequently he travelled out of his way to censure the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McIntosh), and the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Moore). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stenson) had attended to his own business and not be here waiting, as he has been for a long time for that government position which he hopes to be appointed to in Sherbrooke, he would stand better in the eyes of his own constituents than he does to-day. The object of this Bill is to open up three positions for lawyers, favourites of the government, and one of them in the county of Brome. They are all waiting for this opening and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stenson) is waiting for an opening in the district of St. Francis, which I understand he is to have after the session is over. I will not say positively whether that is the case or not, but time will tell. At all events the criticism comes with very bad grace from the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Stenson) who has certainly not attended to the duties of his constituents this session.

House divided on the motion of Mr. Fitzpatrick :

## YEAS :

## Messieurs

Angers,	Hutchison,
Archambault,	Johnston,
Bazinet,	Lang,
Beith,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bernier,	Lavergne,
Blair,	Logan,
Bourassa,	Mackie,
Bourbonnais,	McGugan,
Brodeur,	McHugh,
Brown,	McIsaac,
Burnett,	McLellan (P.E.I.),
Calvert,	McMullen,
Campbell,	Madore,
Casey,	Marcil,
Champagne,	Mignault,
Copp,	Monet,

Mr. MOORE.

Cowan.  
Davies (Sir Louis),  
Desmarais,  
Douglas,  
Dupré,  
Edwards,  
Ellis,  
Fielding,  
Fisher,  
Fortier,  
Fraser (Lambton),  
Frost,  
Gauvreau,  
Geoffrion,  
Gould,  
Graham,  
Harwood,  
Hurley,

Mulock,  
Olivier,  
Parmalee,  
Paterson,  
Pettet,  
Proulx,  
Ratz,  
Richardson,  
Rutherford,  
Savard,  
Semple,  
Sifton,  
Somerville,  
Stenson,  
Talbot,  
Tucker,  
Turcot, and  
Wood.—68.

## NAYS :

## Messieurs

Beattie,  
Bergeron,  
Broder,  
Clancy,  
Clarke,  
Cochrane,  
Craig,  
Davin,  
Foster,  
Gilmour,  
Guillet,  
Haggart,

Henderson,  
Kaulbach,  
Klock,  
LaRivière,  
McAlister,  
Moore,  
Morin,  
Powell,  
Seagram,  
Sproule, and  
Wilson.—23.

## FAIRS :

## Ministerial.

Davis,  
Tolmie,  
Snetsinger,  
Christie,  
Featherston,  
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),  
Gibson,  
Charlton,  
Fitzpatrick,  
Sutherland,  
Lewis,  
MacPherson,  
Macdonell,  
Penny,  
Belecourt,  
Britton,  
Seriver,  
McMillan,  
Russell,  
Flint,  
Bell (Prince),  
Martin,  
Fraser (Guysborough),  
Ethier,  
Dechene,

## Opposition.

Hale,  
Montague,  
Reid,  
Roddick,  
Carscallen,  
Tupper (Sir Charles),  
Corby,  
Tisdale,  
Casgrain,  
Taylor,  
Poupore,  
Rosamond,  
Roche,  
Osler,  
Monk,  
Cargill,  
Blanchard,  
McDougall,  
Borden (Halifax),  
Mills,  
Macdonald (P.E.I.),  
Macdonald (Huron),  
Bell (Pictou),  
Marcotte,  
Dugas.

Motion agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL moved that a message be sent to the Senate acquainting the Senate of the action of this House.

Motion agreed to.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

**AFTER RECESS.  
SUPPLY.**

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Coteau du Lac, Quebec—Wharf on Soulanges Canal ..... \$2,800

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) What is this?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). This is for the construction of a pile wharf 96 feet long, 38 feet wide and 20 feet high.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). What is the object of a wharf there?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is an adjunct of the canal for the landing of freight.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it in the canal?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What on earth is the minister starting in on now—building wharfs inside of canals?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Department of Railways and Canals has the construction of canals to promote traffic; but if there has to be any construction upon a canal for the use of the public, for passengers or for freight, that comes under the Department of Public Works.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman going to take the position that we are to build wharfs on the inland waters of the Dominion wherever people want to put on or put off freight? Surely that is a most dangerous extension. If the ministry commence doing that, there is absolutely no end to it.

Mr. BERGERON. I never heard of this before. There were some wharfs on the Beauharnois Canal, but these were generally built by parties obtaining permission from the department to build them; and besides, they paid the department so much a year for that permission. It has always been a hard thing to obtain permission from the government for the building of a wharf in the canal, because it is an impediment to navigation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am told that there is a thriving village at this place.

Mr. BERGERON. They have a wharf near by, on the river, where the boat stops twice a week.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This wharf is for the accommodation of the trade of that district, and it has to be constructed either by the Department of Public Works or by the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not suppose there is any human probability of getting the attention of the government as a whole to this matter; but, I should like to ask them what their policy is with reference to the disposal of the public moneys of the Dominion for the building of wharfs on inland waters? Have the government made this departure, that they propose, wherever there is a call for it on any of the rivers or canals or other inland waters, to build a wharf at the cost of the Dominion? That is a complete departure from the policy heretofore pursued. We first commenced with the principle that Dominion public works were to be confined to the seaboard and large harbours. We never extended it to the building of little wharfs all along the watercourses of this Dominion, and then the keeping of them up. There is no treasury in the wide world that would stand that tremendous drain. Surely the government could not have canvassed this or understood what was meant by it, or they would not have sanctioned it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend will understand that on the down trip vessels do not use the canal, and there is a wharf available to them; but, on the upward trip they have to use the canal, and does he propose that they shall not be able to transact business on the upward trip? That is the point.

Mr. FOSTER. I might ask my hon. friend what is to become of trade on all the inland waters of our different provinces? Is it the policy from this time on, that wherever vessels come and go, the Dominion treasury is to be drawn upon for the building of wharfs? Heretofore, wharfs on all these inland waters have been built by the people themselves, by the municipalities, by the aid of provincial money in some cases. Until the present time it has never been laid down as a policy that wherever there is trade, the Dominion shall step in and build wharfs and keep them up. I think I can appeal confidently to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who understands well what has been the policy in the past in this respect. Is private enterprise, municipal enterprise, provincial enterprise, to have no chance at all? Is it all to become a matter thrown on the Dominion treasury?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman seeks to lay down a principle for the whole Dominion from a comparatively isolated case, which cannot have general application. The hon. gentleman, I think, is not familiar with the 'locus in quo.' Formerly vessels on the upward trip went by the Beauharnois Canal, on the south side of the river. Now we have the canal on the north side, and vessels of greater draft making the upward trip use that canal. How is the hon. gentleman going to

enable these vessels to discharge their freight and transact business without a wharf?

Mr. FOSTER. How did they do it on the Beauharnois Canal? There are no wharfs there.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There would be no wharf here unless it was required.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). How far from the mouth of the Soulanges Canal is this wharf?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is a swing bridge at the Rivière du Rouge, and it is some distance above that.

Mr. HAGGART. At the entrance of the Soulanges Canal there is a pier at each side, intended to be used as wharfs, and at the lower end of the canal, where it debouches on the lake, there is another. This must be somewhere in the middle.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Those piers are not intended for trade purposes at all. They are guide piers for the purposes of navigation, not for landing or transportation.

Mr. HAGGART. I know the place well and the hon. gentleman is altogether wrong. On each side of the canal there is an entrance and just before the draw-bridge, where the Canada Atlantic passes over, there is a pier on each side. There is a lock in the middle of the canal which could be utilized by the vessels.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are we going to stop with this sort of thing? If we are going to adopt the principle laid down that on every river, canal and watercourse, wherever people want to get off and on, we are going to build a wharf, there will be no end of such expenditure. This thing was never done before outside of tidal waters, and the greater inland waters. We have confined ourselves to tidal waters even in the River St. John. We made an arrangement by which the local legislature contributes half to the cost of every wharf built on the tidal waters from Fredericton down to the mouth of the St. John. The principle has always been recognized that the rivers and small inland waters are not matters for expenditure out of the Dominion treasury. You can go all over Ontario and you will find that these wharfs are built by the village or municipalities or private enterprise.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why, I have a dozen cases in my mind now in Ontario where the total cost of the wharfs in the inland waters was defrayed by the Dominion government—by the hon. gentleman's own government.

Mr. FOSTER. Name one.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Take the village of Beaverton on the east side of

Mr. MULOCK.

Lake Simcoe, entirely inland, a little village, there is a wharf built there entirely at the cost of the Dominion government. When the hon. gentleman cites the River St. John let me tell him that there are wharfs every mile all the way up the river, built by the Dominion government, in the tidal waters and above them too.

Mr. FOSTER. Where?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know how far the tidal waters go, but the hon. gentleman's contention was that on the inland waters in Ontario wharfs were not built by the Dominion government.

Mr. FOSTER. I said in the small inland waters.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The estimates before us contain appropriations for wharfs on inland waters in Ontario, and the hon. gentleman dare not object to them. I challenge him to do it. Whatever is navigable water, whether tidal or inland, is as fit a subject for the erection of wharfs as are tidal waters. If it is right that the Dominion treasury should be taxed to build a wharf in the hon. gentleman's constituency, in tidal waters, it is equally legitimate to construct a wharf on inland waters which are navigable. Why, all the way up from tidal waters to the head of navigation, there are expenditures of public money for the purpose of promoting trade and commerce. If the hon. gentleman's contention is correct as regards wharfs, it is just as applicable to any other improvement to navigation.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course, if it is a question of voting as much as possible from the Dominion treasury, I will not say a word against this, because it is just as well to have the money spent in Quebec as in any other province. But I am opposed to this on principle. We are all here to protect the Dominion treasury. No doubt, in the past, expenditures of that sort have been made. I myself have seen a wharf which cost ten or twelve thousand dollars and had never been used. It was in the province of New Brunswick on a little river, I think of St. Croix.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Whereabouts?

Mr. BERGERON. In the county of Kent, near the parish of St. Louis. It was a little river with hardly any water. A wharf was built there costing, as I say, ten or twelve thousand dollars, and no boat had ever been to it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who built it?

Mr. BERGERON. It was built under the old government. I am talking openly. But money spent in that way is badly spent. We know how it was done, however. The member for the county tells the minister that if he can get a wharf or a bridge constructed,

he will carry the parish or the township ; and it is granted. But let us put a stop to that. The case now before the House is still worse than anything known before, and I call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) to it. This is building a wharf in a canal, a thing I have never heard of before. I know something about the Beauharnois Canal. I have known about that canal for nearly forty years. People used to obtain permission from the Department of Railways and Canals to build little wharfs to load barges with grain. But it was with the greatest difficulty they obtained this permission, and inspections were made by the government engineer, and the most extraordinary precautions taken to avoid impeding navigation. The wharfs soon disappeared, and the government have forbidden any other structures of that kind, as they are objected to by the navigators. No doubt the acting Minister of Public Works is doing this from a good motive. No doubt the member for the county, or a deputation came and said that if you will give us a wharf at the Cedars or at Coteau du Lac, because they are both provided for here, we will carry that whole section. But must we look at it in that way, and not from a national point of view? These canals cost an immense amount of money. The hon. minister says they want the wharfs to unload their freight. But these boats that he refers to, are what we call coasting boats, such as go from Valleyfield to Montreal and back. They are small boats, and there is no danger that they will require the fourteen feet of water which is said to be provided in the canal. Going down, the freights they carry are often heavy—cattle, hay and farm produce of various kinds. But the freights that they bring back are such things as the people have bought in Montreal—light merchandise, most of the packages such as the women carry off under their arms. They can unload all this class of freight that they bring at the bridge, where they can stop ten minutes without impeding navigation, or, better still, at the locks. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), asks if the government have decided upon the policy of building a wharf at everybody's door. If that is to be the principle adopted, I can suggest ten or fifteen wharfs that can be built there. But these wharfs in the canal—I would like to have reminded the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, but he has left the chamber since this discussion began—will be an impediment to navigation, and will be greatly objected to by those using the canal.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). I would like to know the general principle upon which this vote is based. My riding is partly on Lake Ontario and partly on the Bay of Quinté, and I never heard of a government wharf being built there.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This is not the first time the government have built wharfs.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. member for Kent, Ont., (Mr. Campbell) has only to learn that the Conservative government followed a certain course, to believe that must be the right one for this government. But I do not think that is the right way to do business. At Deseronto they do an immense amount of shipping business, and I never heard of their getting even an appropriation to build wharfs. Either there should be some principle in building these wharfs, or it should not be done.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Foster), adopts a principle which I would like him to make good. Is it to be determined that no public money is to be spent for wharfs on inland waters. He has raised that point, and I take issue with him. I do not know of any principle upon which you could exclude those who live on inland waters, from the advantages given to those living on tidal waters. The hon. member takes the position that because they are not in tidal waters there should be no such expenditure. Has that been the rule? The whole history of our expenditure gives instances to the contrary. I have already given the case of Beaverton, a small village on Lake Simcoe, where a wharf was built with Dominion money. It is not even on a through line of traffic like the St. Lawrence. This canal is only a way of getting around an unnavigable section of the St. Lawrence, and, in that way it may fairly be regarded as a branch of the river itself. If the hon. gentleman thinks the erection of wharfs on the River St. Lawrence is a proper work to be carried on by the Dominion, then a mere annex of the river is entitled to equal treatment. The river and the canal are practically one system, the canal is simply a way of getting over the unnavigable section of the river. That being the case, that being a safe principle to follow, I am at a loss to understand how, in view of the practice of hon. gentlemen in the past, they can object to this proposition. The canal may be regarded as practically an artificial branch of the St. Lawrence River, and if you admit that on the down trip it is proper to expend money for wharfs on the St. Lawrence for the purpose of trade, I fail to understand the logic that would prevent the expenditure of money to facilitate the upward trip through the canals. It is the St. Lawrence waters that pass through the canals, and the improvement is for the traffic of the St. Lawrence both up and down.

Mr. HAGGART. The principle adopted by the late government, without an exception, was that it is legitimate to build these wharfs in tidal waters or on the great lakes. The hon. gentleman says the principle was extended to Beaverton. That might be, because Lake Simcoe is a large lake. The same principle is extended to Lake Nipis-

sing. The hon. gentleman asks why we should not do it on the St. Lawrence where this place is? But you don't build them on the St. Lawrence River. Why would you not build a wharf at Kingston on the same principle, at Gananoque, or Brockville? But in these places it is left entirely to private enterprise to build wharfs. But the extraordinary thing about it is that you dig a ditch and make a canal, and then you set to work to build wharfs for the inhabitants on the banks of the canal. Now, at the entrance to this canal there are piers which would work admirably as wharfs. In the centre there is a lock, and they can land on both sides of the lock. If you are going to build landing places on canals for the purpose of accommodating the trade of little villages, which perhaps will never be used, you are going pretty far. The principle on which we granted assistance to wharfs was to confine them to inland waters like Lake Superior, Lake Huron, the Georgian Bay, and Lake Ontario, in some instances—and we extended it to Lake Simcoe, and I believe to Lake Nipissing. Perhaps sometimes the rule was infringed upon to a slight extent; but the general principle was to expend no money on any works of this kind except in tidal waters and on the large lakes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would refer the hon. gentleman to another illustration. I would ask him to transfer his thoughts to Lake Memphremagog in the province of Quebec, a small lake ten or twelve miles in length. I do not know its extent, perhaps the hon. member for Beauharnois does.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a small lake, perhaps ten or twelve miles long and three or four wide. But I am not quite sure. But the reason why a wharf was built there was because the lake is a summer resort. There are vessels of pretty large dimensions plying upon the lake for the advantage of American tourists who come there in large numbers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are some wharfs, I know, on Lake Memphremagog which were built by the Dominion government. However, it is a small body of water, and I suppose that so far as trade and commerce are concerned its importance cannot be compared with the importance of the Soulanges Canal. There is a wharf at Magog, one at Georgeville, and another at Knowlton's Landing, and I am told these wharfs were built by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, why can you not regard the Soulanges Canal as a part of the St. Lawrence River diverted? It is an artificial channel for a part of the St. Lawrence River; and if, as the hon. member for Beauharnois argues, it is proper to spend money on a small lake for the use of American tourists, how can he object to a

grant of money to erect wharfs on this canal for the purpose of trade and commerce between the west and the east of the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. WILSON. Will the Postmaster General tell us how he determines when a wharf should be built by the Dominion government and when it should be built by private enterprise? In our section of the country they are all built by private enterprise.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman asks me upon what principle wharfs should be constructed. All I can say is that since confederation no government has laid down any other doctrine than that we should be guided by the requirements of public interest, and we are being guided, I trust, in all these estimates by a due regard for public interests. There is no hard and fast principle governing the expenditure of public money; the question simply is whether it is a proper expenditure in the public interest, not whether it is on tidal or inland waters. Hon. gentlemen opposite defend the expenditure of money on an inland lake like Lake Memphremagog to meet the requirements of American tourists; and this government, without saying anything about that mode of expenditure, would submit that the construction of a wharf upon the Soulanges, a branch of the St. Lawrence River, is justified by the purpose of developing the trade of Canada. The hon. gentleman may prefer that policy, he voted for that expenditure; others may adopt our method and vote for our proposed expenditure. We must test the scheme upon its own merits.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to say a word in reference to that. When you get down to a simple matter of argument it is very difficult to lay down any general principle which has not its exceptions, but after all you can find the general principles that have governed the expenditure of public money in this respect. To everything you will find an exception. But what startles me to-night is the statement made by the hon. acting Minister of Public Works, that his policy is, and I suppose it is the policy of the government, that no matter whether it is tidal water, or a large river, or a canal which extends a river, or the navigable waters of Canada anywhere in the Dominion, when it is necessary for trade that you shall build a wharf, it is a proper subject with which to come to this parliament and ask for a vote out of the treasury for it. That is a broad principle that the hon. gentleman has laid down here to-night for himself and for the government. That is what startles me. If he had said that this was an exceptional case and defended it upon that ground, there would have been an action which I could have thought fairly commendable. Now, in the first part of the history of this Dominion, you can take

Mr. HAGGART.

the old estimates and you can find that the Dominion started out with the duty outlined before it of expending public money on harbours, breakwaters and the like of that which were for the protection of shipping and trade along the tidal waters the sea-coast particularly. That was the line which was adhered to. Afterwards it was extended on much the same principle to the great lakes, and harbour works were constructed at different points on these great lakes, harbours, breakwaters and those things which were necessary involving large expenditures. For a series of years you can look through the estimates and you will find that these were the kinds of works upon which the Dominion expended its energy. A great deal of pressure was brought by first one, and then another, not only in respect to the large lakes, but in respect to comparatively small lakes, and so you find on Lake Simcoe, Lake Memphremagog, and on Lake St. John examples of the construction of wharfs. This government built wharfs on Lake St. John against the protestations of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. It was done in our time in one or two instances on that lake, and so gradually there has been an extension of the system, but always guarding, as far as possible, the matter so that you might not be launching out on a sea of uncontrollable and incalculable expenditure. Take the St. John River. When first I represented the county of King's, no such thing was thought of as this government being asked for a grant for a wharf along the whole of that river, and it was not until I had represented the county for several years and had become Finance Minister, and I found that on Lake St. John, Lake Simcoe, and on some parts of the St. Lawrence, wharfs were being put down and the pressure was made so strong for me that I had to draw the line at the tidal waters in the River St. John which ran as high as five miles above the city of Fredericton. Then, I did not extend it to the full, but I made an arrangement with the provincial government that whenever any of these necessary wharfs were built the provincial government would furnish one-half of the cost and we would furnish half. A number of wharfs have been built on that principle. Now, what are we face to face with? When I was Minister of Finance I fought against that extension, and I did it on the ground that once you open up inland waters to the building of small wharfs everywhere, you would be practically launching out on an expenditure which would rapidly become uncontrollable. How can you build a little wharf on the Soulanges Canal and refuse a similar demand from Trenton and other places along the lakes, and on every navigable river in the country? That is what startles me. The minister, evidently, with the sanction of the government, starts out on the

principle, which shall rule henceforth, that no matter where it is, wherever there is trade and people who want to get on and off boats, and to take merchandise on and off boats, it is a fair thing for the Dominion government to take money out of the treasury to build a wharf. What will be the consequence?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There are exceptional cases.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not have minded so much if the hon. acting Minister of Public Works had put this as an exceptional case, but he laid down a principle and said that that was to be the rule, that where there was an inland water, large or small where there was traffic or trade, it was a fair thing for the Dominion of Canada to spend money in constructing wharfs. As Minister of Finance in the preceding government, I would shudder to come in with a principle laid down and have to face it in future. There are no revenues which can stand that, and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows it. I do not say that you cannot find exceptions to anything. Cannot we agree that this shall be an exception, and that we must not open up a broad line of expenditure? The money does not come out of my pocket. I am not opposing this because I have to pay for it. I pay my little proportion of taxation; that is all, but I do think that I have some care as to what is to be the future in respect to the expenditure of this country, and dear knows, we have now forms of expenditure enough without overburdening the treasury by expending money in this way. The people of Kingston, Trenton, Cobourg and every town and village along every lake and river in this country, when they know that the Dominion treasury is open for this sort of thing, are not going to put their hands in their pockets. The member who represents the county will come to the ministry and say: You have granted wharfs there. I want you to grant one here. How are you going to refuse him? The voters behind him will say: What is the good of you? Do you not see so-and-so got these little wharfs dotted all along; why do you not get some for us? Therefore, he must get them or know the reason why. You cannot make fish of one and flesh of another. You will have countless numbers of little wharfs costing from \$2,000 to \$5,000 each, and to be kept up after they are built, which is the largest expense. Where are we to land if we are to work on that principle?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) asks why I did not ask the committee to treat this case as an exception. As the discussion was raised by my hon. friend endeavouring to lay down the proposition that no such expenditure as

this should be made except upon tidal waters, I took issue with him upon that point, and that is the point at issue. This may be an exception, if the committee think proper to treat it as an exception, but I could not allow the hon. gentleman's contention to pass unchallenged that there should be no such expenditure as this upon inland waters, and that it should be confined to tidal waters.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman did not say that there should be no such expenditure on inland waters, we are not at issue.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, we are at issue. I did not say that it was not done on inland waters, but I did say that upon all the smaller waters in the inland parts of the country it was not done, and ought not to be done. I know quite well that we have some lakes where it was done occasionally. Lake Simcoe, Lake St. John and the like of that, but I was arguing on the general principle.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am no more desirous than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) of opening the door to unreasonable demands upon the public treasury, but when he says now, after mature reflection—

Mr. FOSTER. Do not put it in that way. I spoke after the necessary deliberation on the question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, I do not want to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, but if that has always been his policy, would he explain to me the case of Lake Megantic, in the county of Beauce, which is twelve miles in length by three or four in width, and upon which lake are many wharfs.

Mr. FOSTER. How many?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Seven.

Mr. FOSTER. When were they built?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They were built by former administrations.

Mr. FOSTER. What years?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Since the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has been in public life.

Mr. FOSTER. What years, I ask?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Since confederation, and by the government which the hon. gentleman supported.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us be precise. The officials are there. In what years were they built?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The officials give me the information that they were built, it is immaterial whether it was

Mr. MULOCK.

the hon. gentleman or his government built them. But, at all events, we can find that out.

Mr. FOSTER. I want the Postmaster General to ask the officials the year in which these wharfs were built.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will get you it precisely later on. You will find seven or eight wharfs built on Lake Megantic by previous governments, and that lake, which I am not acquainted with personally, is entirely inland water. I find from the statutes that as late as 1893—

Mr. FOSTER. What was built then?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) voted money in 1893 to repair the wharfs.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, to repair.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But, it is just as wrong to repair a wharf—

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Postmaster General wants to be fair.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, I do.

Mr. FOSTER. If the wharfs owned by the Dominion were there before I became Finance Minister, was it not a fair thing for me to be asked to keep these Dominion wharfs in repair if they were out of repair? Is there not a difference between doing that and initiating a new expenditure?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not wish to press that argument. I merely compare the practices of to-day with the practices of yesterday. I want the hon. gentleman to understand most distinctly that, so far as I am concerned, I cannot agree to any such proposition as might be construed to have been laid down by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster)—although now he says he did not lay it down—that the districts served by inland waters have not equal claims to the districts served by tidal waters. I understand that the hon. gentleman did not intend to make that contention, but he appears to state that the expenditure on large bodies of inland waters might be justifiable, but not upon small bodies of inland waters. He defends the expenditure of his government upon waters such as the great lakes, and if you call Lake Simcoe an inland lake, he makes the same defence for his government in erecting a wharf there. It is, therefore, purely a question of degree. He defends an expenditure on Lake Simcoe, and in a little while in these estimates, he will have to decide whether he is in favour of an expenditure on Lake Temiscamingue. My hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. Klock) is looking at me. When we come to the expenditure on Lake Temiscamingue, the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) will have to discuss that with the member for Nipissing (Mr. Klock), and I think I will have the

support of my hon. friend (Mr. Klock) as against the member for York (Mr. Foster). Now, when you come to this particular expenditure, you have the St. Lawrence River on its course to the sea navigable and supplied by the Dominion government with wharfage. And, on the north side, the river not being navigable, we propose to make artificial navigation, and establish a wharf on it. Cannot the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) regard this as an exceptional case, and let us pass on with the estimates?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but I want to know where the Postmaster General and his government stand. He twice made the argument that his government proposed to make no distinction between inland and tidal waters, large and small waters, rivers or lakes, but that in every case they will judge according to the circumstances. Is that the position of the hon. gentleman?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have stated that I consider that each item of proposed expenditure should be disposed of on its merits, having regard to the public interests. I do not understand upon what principle we should expend money on the tidal waters for the purpose of trade and commerce and not expend money on the inland waters for the purposes of trade and commerce.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the policy of the government?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am speaking my own views. Large and small bodies of water are relative terms, and the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Foster's) views, as to what is a large body of water or a small body of water, might not be concurred in by others. The question must be determined according to the merits of each case.

Mr. HAGGART. In reference to the particular question under discussion, here is a canal twelve miles long with piers at each end and a lock in the centre suitable for your docks, and you propose to build two wharfs on the same canal. All the way from Lake Ontario to the province line there has never been a Dominion grant for a wharf; and surely the people in that part of the hon. gentleman's own province have had some claims since confederation for wharfage accommodation on account of the development of trade along the River St. Lawrence. But when it comes to the construction of a little canal, or the digging of a ditch for the purpose of dividing the Cedars from the rapids, we have to build wharfs out of the public money. As to the necessities of the case, they are comparative to the necessities of other sections of the country, and I say that no necessity has been proved for the construction of either of these wharfs.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman, I am afraid, has not carried

in his mind the facts connected with many of the wharfs constructed or extended by the government of which he was a member. I understand him to say that for a considerable distance west his government never expended moneys on wharfs.

Mr. HAGGART. Not that I am aware of.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What about the Cobourg wharf and the Port Hope wharf?

Mr. HAGGART. I stated that on the large lakes the same principle was applied as on tidal waters; but on the River St. Lawrence, from where it leaves Lake Ontario down to the province line, I am not aware of any public expenditure for wharfs at Kingston, Gananoque, Brockville, Prescott or Cornwall, except wharfs on the canals for canal purposes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would like to know on what principle the people of Prescott, Gananoque, Kingston and other points should be taxed to build wharfs where the river is enlarged into what is called a lake, as at Cobourg, while the people of Cobourg should not build wharfs on the river itself. The question whether a certain water is a river or a lake is only a question of degree. You have the water beginning at Lake Superior; when it narrows you call it a river, and when it widens it becomes a lake. I am at a loss to understand what principle guides you in proposing that it is sacred to spend money for a wharf on a lake, while it is wrong to do so when that same water narrows to a river.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all clear. The hon. gentleman has been acting Minister of Public Works, and has been wanting to get opportunities to spend public money; and at this moment he has made an appeal to every town and city on the inland waters of this Dominion, come to this government, and it will supply your wants.

Ottawa, March 13, 1900.

My dear Sir,—During Mr. Tarte's absence I have been requested to take charge of his department for him, and it would be of great service in enabling me to take up his work if you would kindly write me at your earliest convenience with reference to the following subjects:

1. For what works in your constituency has there been a parliamentary vote?
2. Have these works been begun? If so, in what state of progress are they?
3. If not begun, what is your advice as to whether or not they should be begun?
4. Are you asking for provision being made in supplementary estimates for:
  - (a) New works;
  - (b) Carrying on or completion of works already authorized or begun?
 If so, what are your views:
  - (a) As to sum required;
  - (b) As to what work should be performed?
5. In case of any work not now under contract, but authorized by vote of parliament,

please state whether you advise its being carried out by contract or by day's labour.

Yours faithfully,

WM. MULOCK.

Mr. CRAIG. I never got one of those.

Mr. FOSTER. No, because you are a Conservative; but there is not a Grit heeler from the head of the great lakes down to the harbour of Cape Breton that has not received one of these invitations to make his raid on the public treasury.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to put myself right with my hon. friend in regard to Lake Memphremagog. The hon. gentleman said there were wharfs built there, and he said the lake was about twelve miles long, and looked to me for my assent. As to the building of wharfs there, I know nothing about it; I simply took my hon. friend's assertion that there were wharfs there, and said that if there were, I supposed they were built to bring people to two or three pleasure resorts which are on the lake. I said this, taking the assertion of my hon. friend that there were wharfs. My hon. friend said that there were about seven wharfs built by the Conservative administration on Lake Megantic. When called on to name them and say where they were and what they cost, he brought in this history of 1893, when some money was voted to repair one of these wharfs. Now, the *tu quoque* argument which we have had is no argument for the people of this country. What a speech we would have from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) if he were sitting on this side of the House and the Conservative government were proposing to build wharfs in the canals. What a night we would have. How is it that the Minister of Railways and Canals allows another department to build wharfs on a canal which is under his direction? If it is necessary to build wharfs in the canal, which I do not believe, would it not be more natural for the work to be done by the minister in charge of the canal? I call his attention again to the fact that in past times the ministers occupying the position he occupies were very reluctant to allow anybody to build a wharf in the canal, and more so to build one themselves.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend would like the particulars of what was done by his government with regard to Lake Megantic, and I will give them to him. The hon. member for York, I believe, was elected a member of parliament in 1882, and has been a member continuously since. His first session was in 1883. I think he entered the government in 1885 as Minister of Marine and Fisheries. During the hon. gentleman's representation of his constituency, and mostly while he was a member of the government, the following wharfs on Lake Megantic were constructed: Under the late government, on Lake Megantic, there were

Mr. FOSTER.

six wharfs erected at different points from 1883 to 1887. Six years in succession, wharfs were built on this little inland lake, twelve miles long and from two to four miles wide. Was this expenditure more justifiable than the construction of a wharf to facilitate the whole upward trade of the River St. Lawrence?

Mr. BERGERON. Is this the whole cost of this work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Cedars—Wharf on Soulanges Canal..... \$2,800

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About three miles away.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman going to build a wharf every three miles?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The canal is only twelve miles long.

Mr. FOSTER. That would only make four wharfs.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not asking for four wharfs this year.

Mr. BERGERON. Will this be built by contract or day work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is a small work, but if it can be done more conveniently by contract, we will do it. The general principle recognized is to let out work by contract, after calling for tenders, wherever that system can be conveniently adopted.

Cornwall Canal—To pay Gilbert Dredging Company, interest ..... \$23,388

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I have the letter here of Mr. Ferguson, and the receipt taken, both of which will be found in *Hansard*, July 4, page 9191. The settlement then made was supposed to have been a full settlement of all the claims of the Gilbert Dredging Company. The chief engineer in his report, dated March 15, 1894, says:

I have the honour to report that Gilbert & Son are the contractors of sections 5, 6, 7 and the adoption of the Sheik's Island dam scheme, 8 of the Cornwall Canal, and that by reason of part of sections 5 and 8 and the whole of sections 6 and 7 are abandoned. The value of the work remaining to be done under this contract, on the abandoned portion of the canal is \$195,362, 15 per cent on which is \$29,350, which, I submit, is a fair consideration for the cancellation of the contract covering these sections of work.

It is absolutely clear that the engineer considered that amount as a complete settlement covering everything.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all.

Mr. CLANCY. Could there be anything more conclusive that this covered every-

thing? We have the hon. gentleman's statement only a few evenings ago, that it was thought at the time, that Gilbert's claim had been completely settled. The receipt does not differ very much from the report. The report puts down the amount as a fair consideration for the cancellation of the contracts covering these abandoned sections. Now, this is not limited, in any sense. Let us take the receipt:

Received from Her Majesty the Queen the sum of \$29,350, in full of all claims in respect of the abandonment of parts of sections 5 and 8 and the whole of sections 6 and 7, and of the abandonment of the aforesaid sections on the Cornwall Canal of the Gilbert Blasting and Dredge Company against Her Majesty the Queen, as per letter of March 12, 1894, of A. Ferguson, Esq., their solicitor, as per order in council of March 28, 1894.

(Sgd.) GILBERT BLASTING AND  
DREDGING CO.  
(Per P. H. Gilbert),

Then Secretary and Treasurer.

Witness, A. Ferguson.

There can be no stronger language to show that this \$29,350 is in full of all claims in respect of that. Before I proceed further, I would like to ask the hon. minister what portion of each of these claims applies to each section. Take, for instance, 'plant lying idle.' does that refer to section 5, section 8, section 6 or section 7, or how much of it to each? And so of the other claims?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I assume this claim, 'plant lying idle,' would arise in respect of all the work that the Gilbert Company were carrying on the different sections. They were delayed and prevented from using their plant. So, a claim arising in respect to that would arise not with respect to any particular contract but with respect to the whole.

Mr. HAGGART. This is a claim of the Gilbert Company for loss or damage supposed to have been sustained as a result of the termination of their contracts or so much of them as we would require to be terminated by the building of the Sheik's Island dam. Let me read from the contract which these parties entered into with the government. I give two clauses:

It is intended that every allowance to which the contractors are fairly entitled will be embraced in the engineer's monthly certificate; but, should the contractor at any time have claims of any description which they consider are not included in the progress certificates, it will be necessary for them to make and repeat such claims in writing to the engineer within fourteen days after each and every certificate in which they allege such claims to have been omitted.

The contractors, in presenting claims of this kind, referred to in the last section, must accompany them with substantial evidence of their accuracy and reasons why they think they should be allowed. Unless such claims are thus made during the progress of the work, within fourteen days, as stated in the preceding clause, and repeated in writing every month until finally adjusted or rejected, it must be clearly under-

stood that they shall be for ever shut out, and the contractors shall have no claim on Her Majesty in respect thereof.

A similar clause is embodied in the contracts with the Gilbert Company. In 1894, the government determined to abandon the construction of a couple of these sections and entered into an arrangement with the Gilbert Company for their abandonment; and in lieu of any damages they might sustain by the cancellation of their contract, although the government were not bound to pay, they entered into an arrangement with the Gilbert Company under which the company were to be paid 15 per cent on \$195,000, the amount of work estimated to be constructed by the company. At the time of the termination of these contracts, there was no claim filed with the government as required under the contract. These claims were an after-thought. Immediately on the receipt of the claims, I forwarded them to the engineer and here is his report upon them:

Superintending Engineer's Office,  
Cornwall, March 6, 1895.

Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 4th inst., covering claims Hutchinson & Co., sub-contractors, and the Gilbert Blasting and Dredging Company, I beg to report that these claims combined, \$57,258.35, correspond very nearly with those of the Gilbert Company of April 24, 1894. With reference to the claim of Hutchinson & Co., in my opinion, none of the items should be considered by the department. It is a matter to be dealt with by their employer, the Gilbert Blasting and Dredging Company. As regards the Gilbert Company's claim, the last item only, namely, repairing banks, \$11,377, appears to be worthy of any consideration. But the company should first be required to furnish particulars, as otherwise it cannot be reported on intelligently.

The engineer in charge of the work reports from time to time to the chief engineer. The Gilbert Company never made any one of these claims before the termination of the contract; and so they never had a moral, much less legal claim. And even when the claim was filed, Mr. Rubidge stated that not a single one of these claims was worth considering, except one. Five years afterwards, in 1899, the minister calls this same Mr. Rubidge and the deputy minister for the purpose of settling these claims. He gets Mr. Rubidge to report favourably on these claims which formerly he had reported were without legal or moral force. He gets the deputy minister to report favourably on these claims, if the engineer in charge of the works would certify to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who gets that?

Mr. HAGGART. The deputy minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Whom does the hon. gentleman mean?

Mr. HAGGART. The four gentlemen that were together at the time, and who consti-

tuted the board of arbitration ; that is himself, the deputy minister, Mr. Rubidge, and Mr. Gilbert. The hon. gentleman says he called them together, and the deputy minister was persuaded by them to report favourably in behalf of that claim. We have the written statement of the deputy minister that he would report favourably on the claim providing the engineer in charge of the work reported in favour of it. There is not a single report in favour of it from the engineer in charge of the work—I may be mistaken—I mean the acting engineer who was immediately in charge of the work, and who gave a certificate to every one of the estimates up to the date when the contract was cancelled. Notwithstanding that they had not the slightest legal claim against the government, these gentlemen sat together and resolved that they were entitled to this claim. Mr. Rubidge swallows his own words, and gives a certificate for work concerning which he states in a letter in reply to me as to the validity of these claims, that they were not worth considering. Mr. Schreiber, of course, on the 26th of August agrees with him, he states that the claims were not worth considering, that he thought they were all settled. So they were all settled, they were settled by the arrangement which I made in 1894. In making an arrangement with these contractors I could only judge by the estimates furnished to my department, I found there was no claim in the department by these people for extra work, and I knew that I was dealing then with only the ordinary estimates of the work under contract, not considering whether they were entitled to it. I thought I had finished the transaction altogether when I recommended an allowance of 15 per cent for the work to be done. It is the most extraordinary transaction that I ever heard of as passed by any department, I never heard before of any minister coming down to the House for the purpose of getting a vote to pay such a claim as this. If it was an honest claim, if it was a moral claim, he could have altered it by order in council saying, Notwithstanding the two clauses in the contract ; and getting permission from the Governor General to submit it to the Exchequer Court, eliminating, if he liked, these two particular clauses. He does not choose to do that ; but without any court finding upon the matter, without any evidence from the engineer who superintended the work, but with the sanction of the deputy minister who could know nothing of it from the parties in charge of the work, he comes down to this House and asks us to pay a large sum of money to these parties who, I state, are not entitled to a single cent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will have to invite the careful consideration of the committee to the ques-

Mr. HAGGART.

tions involved in this matter. I realize that this claim, in common with all unsettled claims of long standing and involving the consideration of a variety of questions, cannot be disposed of off-hand by hon. gentlemen by merely saying that this is the most outrageous thing that has ever been proposed to parliament. This committee must understand, and the hon. gentleman having filled the position of Minister of Railways and Canals ought to be the first to recognize the fact, that whoever fills for the time being the position of head of that department has to deal justly and fairly by the men who have been working under contract with the government, and to examine into their claims and form an opinion upon them. I cannot dismiss every man that comes to me pressing a claim, and say : I will have nothing to do with you. I cannot, in the interest of the country, send every man to the Exchequer Court and say : This claim of yours may have the greatest merit in the world, but I will not consider it ; take it to the court, because if I do consider it and induce my colleagues to consent to putting a vote in the estimates to pay the claim, the gentlemen in opposition will say that I did not know anything about it. Now, I say there is a duty cast upon the minister at the head of that department, a duty that he cannot shirk ; and if he reaches a conclusion in his mind he is bound to act upon it in a way that he considers in the best interests of the country, and that will be at the same time fair to the man who has the transaction with the department. Now, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals would have this committee believe that it was his practice, and the practice of the department, to refuse to recognize any claim that was preferred by any contractor with the government unless that contractor had observed fully the clause in the contract he referred to providing that all these claims must be handed in at the time, and that they must be renewed every month, or else they cannot be legally enforced against the government. Now, the hon. gentleman cannot have forgotten his own experience in that department ; yet he left this committee under the impression that it was his usage and custom invariably to insist upon the observance of that clause. Now, I have the authority of the deputy minister, who was his deputy minister, for saying that he never insisted upon it while he was in the department, and the hon. gentleman will not say that he did ; he will not say that he rejected claims the moment it appeared to him that they had not been regularly handed in month after month in accordance with that clause.

Mr. HAGGART. I tell the hon. gentleman that I never settled any claim of that kind in my life. I never gave a certificate, and never inquired into a claim of that kind, and never settled one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would advise my hon. friend to be economical in the statements he makes, because his memory does not serve him in respect to many of the things that he has stated. He rises in his place with the authority of a gentleman who has been at the head of this department, and he makes statements which ought to have some weight with the committee; but I venture the affirmation that the hon. gentleman is making statements for which he has not the slightest shadow of authority. I say with respect to this very claim that the hon. gentleman led this committee to entertain the opinion that all claims were rejected the moment it appeared that they had not been filed monthly in accordance with this clause, and in that case he would have rejected these, he must necessarily have rejected these. This claim was filed in the month of April or May, 1894, when it came under his notice. What does he do? Does he ask the deputy minister whether these people have regularly and continuously filed their claims in his department? No, he never breathes it. He knew the clause was there, but he knew that it was a dead letter. He knew that Mr. Page never would act upon it, and he knew that the officials of the department did not act upon it. He did not make an appeal to the deputy minister, which I have just asked him if he did make. He did not reject it, he knew that these claims had not been filed in the regular way. Did he reject any? No, he took steps to ascertain how far these claims were well founded, with the view, when he got all information upon them and was satisfied in respect to them, of adjusting them, if they were right, and of rejecting them if on their merits it was right to reject them. That was the action of the hon. gentleman. He knew, as an honest man, and a faithful public administrator, that he could take no other course than that. There is no reason why the hon. gentleman should venture to create as against this government or against me, an unfavourable impression in respect to my action. It was years after the claim was first presented before I came into the department. I found that it was a living claim, a claim which was receiving the consideration of the officers of the department. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said: This claim was settled by me. All claims were settled by me in 1894 with these parties. That was when he authorized the payment of the \$29,000. What was that payment authorized for? That payment was authorized to extinguish the claim that these people made for loss of prospective profits and nothing else. Will the hon. gentleman deny that?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is putting something into my mouth that I never said. I stated that the information they had in the department was that they

were going on with the work regularly, that there were none of these claims in the department in 1894, and that I had settled for the prospective profits of the work which remained to be done, valued at \$195,000, by giving them 15 per cent. Now, the hon. gentleman says that I have settled for extra work in precisely the same manner. He said it most positively. Let him produce the proof. I deny it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman must not attribute to me statements that I did not make.

Mr. HAGGART. You did make the statement that I had settled with them in a similar manner. I deny that I ever did, and you have no proof.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not going into any discussion.

Mr. HAGGART. After you make an assertion in the most positive manner.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not said that the hon. gentleman settled all the claims.

Mr. COCHRANE. Oh.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), who is most judicial and calm when he—

Mr. HAGGART. That statement of yours would frighten any person.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I took down what the hon. gentleman said, and if he says that he did not say what I have quoted, it will answer my purpose quite as well. The hon. gentleman said that these claims, and all claims of the Gilbert Dredging Company were settled by him in 1894, when he paid the \$29,000. It is not necessary that I should elaborate that point. What was settled on that occasion?

Mr. CLANCY. Everything.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy), has the papers in his hands, and yet he persists in saying that. That was settled, and that only which was stated to be settled in the document exchanged between the parties. What was it that was exchanged between the parties? A receipt from the person who received the money from the Crown which contained a reference to a letter, which letter embodied the nature and character of the settlement, and indicated what the settlement was. To show that I am correct in this let me read the receipt again:

Received from Her Majesty the Queen the sum of \$29,350, in full of all claims in respect

of the abandonment of parts of sections 5 and 6, and the whole of sections 6 and 7—

Of the Cornwall Canal. Is that a settlement in respect of work done before that date?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, because there were estimates that were coming in and paid afterwards for work that was done on this canal and which were then due to these people. Then it says:

—as per letter of March 12, 1894, of A. Ferguson, Esq.

In Mr. Ferguson's letter appeared precisely the nature of the claims that were being settled. What does that letter say?

Mr. HAGGART. You stated that there were estimates to come in for that work, the contract for which was cancelled. Are you aware that that work had been abandoned and stopped for months before, and that the estimates were all in before the settlement took place?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not aware of anything except what the deputy minister tells me, and he says that the final estimates were not in at that time.

Mr. HAGGART. There had been no work done on it for months before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has been years since the work was done on the Cornwall Canal, and we have not got the final estimate yet. We are only asking an appropriation this year for the amounts which we judge these final estimates will cover. Now, let me read this letter, which, I suppose, no reasonable person will deny, must be taken as indicating what these people were paid the money for, and what they gave the receipt for:

Sir,—With reference to the several interviews I have had on behalf of the Gilbert Blasting and Dredging Company with you and your deputy minister, on the subject of the claim of the company for loss of anticipated profits—

For loss of anticipated profits.

—on the works of sections 6 and 7 and parts of the works on sections 5 and 8—

For loss of anticipated profits. Does that mean for the payment of damages that had been suffered by reason of any act of the government, or for the non-fulfilling of any contract? The hon. gentleman would not have a moment's standing in any court, if he ventured to enter it and claim anything else than that.

For loss of anticipated profits.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that when that settlement was made that the Gilbert Dredging Company did not search up every particle of work that was to be done, and put it in, for the purpose of showing that that was work

to be done, and that was to be deducted from the whole contract price of the work, that was to have been done in order to bring up what the prospective profits would be? The hon. gentleman must have forgotten that there was a settlement made in regard to that. He will find that there is a statement made in the Auditor General's Report at page Q—157, in regard to the Cornwall Canal, sections 5, 6, 7 and 8, showing the whole of the unfinished work which had been abandoned. Look at the details of the claim and you will find that everything that one could think of has been raked up to show all the work that was done. Look at the claim for the plant that was idle. Does any one in his sober senses think that that was not thought of when the settlement was made. Look at this claim for 'enforcing banks.' Does any sane man think that that was not included in the first settlement? Why the idea is absurd. There is nothing that could have entered the mind of a man with even an inventive genius that was not put in the first claim as work done. Does the minister think that if he had abandoned those sections of the work for ever, that every claim that could have been thought of as prospective profits was not claimed and paid for at the time. The \$48,146 allowed in the first place, covered every item that could in any sense whatever be regarded as prospective profits. But the argument of the minister (Mr. Blair) is always that no one knows anything about these matters but himself. He thinks that he has all the information that is necessary to form a correct idea and that nobody can form a judgment on anything but himself. Well, the hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in that, as the opinion of the House would teach him if he knew it. The reports were clearly and definitely made in 1894, on which the payment was made. There is the certificate of the engineer and there is the letter of Mr. Ferguson which if it means anything at all, means that every claim that could be made was included.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How in the mischief would a settlement made on the first of January, cover work that was to be done on the last of July?

Mr. CLANCY. But everything points towards the conclusion and it appears on the face of the whole thing that this was a final settlement for the abandonment of the work on the sections. Is it a reasonable thing that Mr. Gilbert would have overlooked these items when he was trying to arrive at prospective profits? Not at all. Would not an item for a 'plant standing idle' be a fair claim to put in for prospective profits?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understood that the hon. gen-

Mr. BLAIR.

tleman wished to make a very brief argument.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman wants to make his statement before he leaves for the train.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then I will not have the opportunity of showing the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) that he is wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. You can show the rest of us, we will stay with you.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will not say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has not applied his mind to it, because I have a better opinion of his intellect than to suppose that he would carefully consider the question and arrive at the conclusion he does.

Mr. CLANCY. That is the only argument the minister can ever advance, when we show up the evil of his administration. It would be paying him a poor compliment to say that he cuts a sorry figure in this House because he does not apply himself to his work. It would not be less to the point than is the hon. gentleman's usual answer to criticism on his department. I tell the minister (Mr. Blair) that it is quite apparent to any sensible man that the Gilbert Dredging Company did include all of these items in their first claim and that they were paid for them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Gilbert Dredging Company did not make out for the department the statement as to how much of the work contemplated had been done, so as to ascertain what had remained undone to get at the 15 per cent on the prospective profits. That was done by the officers of the department.

Mr. H. A. POWELL (Westmoreland). Was not the adjustment of the balance of such a nature that it would absolutely involve the preceding statement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. POWELL. I cannot understand that.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the minister mean to say that 'enforcing the banks' escaped Mr. Rubidge's notice at that time? Why it is nonsense to think that. It never occurred to any one that the Gilbert Dredging Company made up the statement with regard to the balance coming to them. Every one knows that that was done by the engineer. And if the engineer was derelict in his duty in including those claims, does any one suppose that the Gilbert Dredging Company would not have reminded him of it. The first settlement was a full settlement for all the claims in connection with the work on the canal, and it was finished and paid for so far as the Gilbert Dredging Company

is concerned. Now, I shall not detain the House longer—

Mr. CAMPBELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) has a record in this House for looking out under his hat and saying something to annoy people.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Go on with your speech and stop scolding.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) might occupy his time better in this House than by interrupting people when they speak. Whenever you hear a discordant note coming from the government benches, if you look under the hon. gentleman's hat you may be sure to find where it comes from. Whatever may occur to the hon. gentleman's mind, no one can prevent the conclusion on the part of the public that the Gilbert Dredging Company knew that that was the final settlement; and in that settlement it is most unlikely that they would have left out a single claim, or that they had any idea of coming back afterwards for another settlement. More than that, the chief engineer and Mr. Rubidge stated that they believed that it was a full settlement. But, the hon. gentleman rakes up a letter four or five years old, and says it would stand another interpretation. The hon. gentleman may put any interpretation he likes on it; but a reasonable public, who do not go beyond the limits of common sense, will come to the conclusion that it is not a difficult thing to master its meaning. I think it is within the capacity of an ordinary mind, even one as narrow as mine, to see that the fact, in a nutshell, is that the Gilbert Dredging Company made a final settlement, and urge every claim that they thought reasonable at that time. The fact that some of the very items included in the present claim were included in the first claim, such as the unwatering of the canal, shows that they were not overlooked at the time of settlement. I have no hesitation in saying, so far as I am able to judge of the subject, that the present claim is entirely an afterthought, and that the public money is taken to pay a claim which is absolutely without foundation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had only advanced a short distance in my statement when the hon. member for Bothwell interposed to give his opinion before he left. I was reading the letter annexed to the receipt and referred to in the receipt. To show the state of mind in which the hon. member for Bothwell approached this question, what does he say in regard to this letter? He says the minister has raked up an old letter four or five years old, as though the age of the letter were something which discredited it, and that it ceased to have any value; although the fact remains that

this letter bears date a few days only before the date of the receipt which passed between the department and the contractors, and states on its face what the reasons and considerations were on which this money was paid. The hon. gentleman sneers at the letter as if I had picked it out of the dust-heap, and as one that ought not to be considered for a moment. But this letter is a part of the transaction—part of what we would call in law the 'res gestae.' It is the most conclusive evidence which it would be possible to offer, and at the time this government paid the money over, they paid it with the knowledge that it was being received by the Gilbert Company simply as a satisfaction for the loss of their anticipated profits on work to be done, not on work that had been done, and that a further claim would, in course of time, be submitted; and this letter is the evidence of the truth of what I say:

The claims, if any, of the company in respect of or arising out of works actually done will, of course, remain to be dealt with apart from this settlement.

With this letter in their hands the government agree to pay and do pay \$29,000 to the Gilbert Company as their right, under a clear understanding as to what their rights were.

Mr. CLANCY. And with that very letter the company understood, and the engineer said, that it was a full settlement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How can the hon. gentleman say, with any approach to fairness, that a settlement is any fuller than it states on its face that it is? How can he say that these documents mean anything more than they express? The language is clear; Mr. Gilbert said, we will take \$29,000 for allowing you to cut this contract off from this day, excluding us from the opportunity of earning profits on what we might have done if the contract were continued. Do they say that they take it in consideration of anything that was done in the past? Not at all. They take it only in respect of the one claim which is referred to in the document.

Mr. CLANCY. The engineer put in every claim they had for the work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend says what the engineer put in, and he implied that the Gilberts must have had a hand in putting it in, which he afterwards said he did not imply. No matter who put in their claim, would the interest of the Gilberts be to make the balance of the work that remained to be done as much as possible or as little as possible? According to the hon. gentleman's argument on the question, the interest of the Gilberts would be to build up the claim for the work done under the contract up to

Mr. BLAIR.

that date, so as to make the amount on the work to be done as little as possible. That would not be in the interest of the Gilberts, because the larger they make the work to be done, the better for themselves. So that my hon. friend's argument is based on an entire misconception of the position of the parties, and he reverses the attitude the Gilberts would naturally take towards the department in the matter. Now, we have got down to the point that in April, 1894, the Crown paid \$29,000 for a specific purpose, which was indicated. Then, the question comes up, was there any bona fide, honest, fair claim which the Gilberts had at that time for anything else? If there was, it has to be disposed of in some way or other. If they have an honest claim, who says they ought not to be paid? It is all very well for political purposes to make a case against the government for maladministration or anything you like; but, it is hardly fair to take out of the pockets even of a government contractor moneys which he is entitled to retain or to deprive him of moneys which are justly his due. I do not care what hon. gentlemen on the other side say, so long as I continue in this department, I am not going to refuse to deal, as I believe, honestly and fairly by any contractor with the government, or reject his claim without consideration, simply because he is a contractor. I think a contractor with the government is entitled to some redress or consideration if he can make out his case, and I am going to allow a fair consideration according to the facts of the case, and the interest of the country, notwithstanding what gentlemen on the other side say. It must be apparent to any member of this House, who has heard the way in which this question has been discussed by the opposition, that they do not concern themselves one bit with the question whether right in this claim at all, but the only question for them is whether they cannot make out some case against the Minister of Railways in this transaction. I say, with as much confidence as I ever made a statement in my life, that there is no fair-minded and partial tribunal that will consider that claim in all its bearings and not conclude that the government had allowed, and only allowed, what was fair and just between the government and the contractors. I am going to take up the time of the committee with this matter, item by item, if the committee will allow me, and see whether the claims are such as ought to be fairly recognized between man and man.

Mr. POWELL. Did this claim, which they were preparing at that time outside the contract for extras or under the contract, come within the estimates made by the engineer or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that a large proportion

of them would not be such as would come within the estimates. Take the plant lying idle.

Mr. HAGGART. If the plant was lying idle the whole time, was not the 15 per cent for the purpose of covering that. If not, what did it cover?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does my hon. friend acknowledge that if it does not cover the idle plant, they ought to have something for the nearly two years during which their plant did lie idle. Does my hon. friend admit this?

Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. POWELL. What were these items?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am going to take the items up one by one. I am not going to allow hon. gentlemen opposite to attack my conduct in connection with this matter without taking the necessary time to put my case before parliament, whether anybody listens to it or not. The plant lay idle two years, all but a month. That is one item. Then there is the reinforcing banks. That item would doubtless be one that might ordinarily come within the estimates, and I have no doubt that if it had been in the estimates it would have covered the full amount that was fairly and properly allowed in respect of that. But it did not come within the estimate, and the reinforcement of the banks was done beyond question. Then here is the loss they sustained in the culverts. That could not be a matter of estimates because that arose by reason of the fact that the canal was not unwatered and the contractors did not have what was pledged to them in the contract. They did not have all that stone that could be removed after the unwatering had been done, and had to get new stone to take the place of the old stone which had been there, and moreover, they would have been allowed a certain sum for the removal of that old stone, which they had not the opportunity of earning. That is a matter of damages.

Mr. POWELL. I am not sure about that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You could hardly expect monthly estimates to establish the amount that was claimed in respect of non-compliance with the contract.

Mr. POWELL. How about the other branch, the prospective profits? They were to have the old culverts.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would not be one of the prospective profits. How could it be?

Mr. POWELL. I understand the circumstances were such—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must ask my hon. friend to kindly allow me to make my statement.

It is not a very simple matter to travel over these things, without having an interrupted opportunity of presenting them to the committee.

Mr. POWELL. This is the first time I knew the hon. gentleman to be so easily disconcerted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not, but it is utterly impossible to present the case in an intelligible form unless I am allowed to proceed without interruption. The question of prospective profits only dealt with what would be earned by the contractor, if his contract had not then been terminated and he had been allowed to go on and complete the work. Any damages he had suffered during the years he had been on the canal would not be prospective profits unquestionably on work which was figured out to amount to \$195,000. Then the question comes up, had these people any claim existing at that time? It is clear, if they had, it was not settled. Now, what was their claim? I will show you their claim and how it was dealt with and how I arrived at the conclusions I did. I may say, in a general way, that it is important to bear in mind that the chief engineer of railways and canals and the superintending engineer of that work were both dead at the time this claim was presented. Mr. Killaly filled the place Mr. Rubidge now holds. Mr. Rubidge came in after a good deal of this work had been done and just before the period when this adjustment of prospective profits took place, so that Mr. Rubidge did not have the personal knowledge which would be necessary in order for him to say off-hand whether this claim or any claim were properly allowable or not. He might express an opinion on some of them, and yet when he came to inform himself with regard to the actual facts and learn just what the claim was in its details, come to a conclusion different from the one he had arrived at in the first instance. We have had some information from Mr. Rubidge with regard to this question. He presented a report to the department, not exactly the report to which the hon. gentleman referred, because it is clear that that report was made without very much knowledge as respects the matter. The report that I allude to, was one dated 5th of August, 1899, and the hon. gentleman referred to the report dated in the year 1895. The letter which Mr. Rubidge wrote to the department in 1895 contained the distinct statement that the claimants were entitled to be paid \$11,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. He said that was the only claim worthy of consideration, and even in that case certain things had to be established.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certain evidence had to be fur-

nished—that is true. This letter of March 6, 1895, was addressed to the chief engineer of the department, and the fact of its being written supports my statement that the claim had not been rejected by the minister, but that he was having his officers look into it. This report of Mr. Rubidge covered a statement furnished to Mr. Rubidge by the Gilbert Company with respect to each of these items or claims, showing the grounds on which they base their claims and information that Mr. Rubidge may know what their contention was. Mr. Rubidge considers these explanations, and he makes a report to the department on them. I have that report before me to read it. It is dated August 5, 1899. He sends with this report on the claim of the Gilbert Dredging and Blasting Company, his report of March 6, 1895, which I have read, and also notes on the claims of Hutchison & Co., and the letter of E. H. Gilbert. Now, we will go over these claims. This report of Mr. Rubidge is in favour of the payment of \$40,588.66. He allows the following different claims :

	Allowed.
Plant idle .....	\$ 7,900
Reinforcing banks .....	11,250
Old stone in culverts .....	10,500
Lost by failure of government to unwater canal .....	11,958
Stone torn .....	1,766
Flooding .....	250
Preparing to start abandoned work....	*
Balance due on unwatering .....	1,000
Filling behind retaining walls.....	420
Wages to yearly employees .....	1,500
Backing to dimension stone used in repairs .....	*
Moving dredges .....	1,020
Working on the road.....	588
	\$48,146

\*Not allowed.

Now, the position is this. That whatever may be anybody's opinion as to the payment of any other sum, there can be no reasonable ground for questioning the payment, at all events, of this amount of \$40,588.66. Mr. Rubidge puts in these items and makes this lengthy statement of the allowance which should be made, and tells why he discredits or refuses others. As to the first item, he gives the opinion of Mr. Robertson the assistant engineer on the work, and refers to the statement of Mr. Paynter in the matter. He says that it is proper to allow a thousand dollars in respect of that plant. On item No. 2 he allows \$11,250. He states here, as hon. gentlemen may see, the grounds upon which he thinks it would be proper to allow these people \$11,250 on that claim. He takes up each of the items which are in this bundle of papers which the hon. gentleman has read over, and which afford the best evidence the committee could desire as to the reasons which caused Mr. Rubidge to come to the conclusion he did up to the amount of \$40,000.

Mr. BLAIR.

Now, there were some amounts in excess of the amounts which were allowed by Mr. Rubidge, and it was at this stage that the question came under my notice. The question was whether Mr. Rubidge had allowed a sufficient sum for the plant lying idle when he allowed \$1,000. For two years the plant was kept unemployed, the men had also to be kept on hand and in their employ in order to take charge of it. He could not send his staff away altogether, he could not send away his secretary, his clerks, his engineer, because they were liable at any day to be called upon at once to resume the work. That was their contract. They proposed to remove this plant and they were refused the privilege of doing so by the department. The department said to them: No, you cannot move this until it is definitely decided whether this work shall be resumed.

Mr. POWELL. There was a final abandonment, and a provisional abandonment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. POWELL. They suspended operations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The department stopped them from working.

Mr. POWELL. How long?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Two years, but they finally abandoned it. But what I say is abundantly established, and it settles the claim entirely, is that when they desired to remove that plant they were forbidden by the department to do so. The department said, No, you must keep that plant there because we may at any moment resume work under this contract. It was, of course, a very unbusinesslike and a very loose and careless piece of administration to leave this thing hanging in that shape for two years. Now, I want to ask the committee to consider the facts as I present them. Would any man say that it is not fair and eminently just that this company, who held \$35,000 worth of plant, plant that was well worth that money, carrying it through their books, plant that was held for two years unemployed, should not be allowed some compensation. I do not think there is one gentleman on the other side of the House who, if he were summoned as a jurymen in such a case, outside altogether of his desire to render a verdict against the department, would not say that it was fair and just to allow these men reasonable compensation for the loss to them for the non-employment of their plant during all that period, and also for the cost to them of the services of the officers and employees that they had to keep upon the work. Now, we had to consider the question whether a thousand dollars was a fair

amount. When we came to consider what was usual and customary between contractors, it became evident that in the first place you would have to allow these people something for depreciation during that period. They have got \$35,000 worth of plant lying there not earning a copper. What would be a fair amount to allow them for being obliged to keep that plant idle during that period? They claimed, of course, a great deal more than they got, but the allowance, when it comes to be figured out, will be found to be a very reasonable one.

Mr. POWELL. They would be idle about two years?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said two years.

Mr. POWELL. They could not work in the winter time.

Mr. HAGGART. The work was closed in February, 1893, and the bargain was made with them in March, 1894, eleven months.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. From April, 1891, until some time in the season of 1893. My impression at this moment is that it was fully one year and eleven months that it remained in that shape. Now, what would anybody say would be a fair allowance for the depreciation and waste to a man's plant kept idle for that period? I do not care whether it was busy every month or not, because men have to buy their plant and make their arrangements.

Mr. COCHRANE. It would be idle in the winter time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would not affect the case, because the business has got to be done, these contracts made, and everything has to be considered in view of the fact that there is not a full twelve months' earnings to be made out of this plant; and when you are carrying in your books the value of your plant and writing off every year an amount for depreciation, you write it off as a year's depreciation, not as a six months' depreciation. The depreciation would not only attach to the season in which work could be profitably employed.

Mr. COCHRANE. There would be a depreciation if it was working.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt, but there would be more depreciation if it was not working, because if the plant was working it would be earning, whereas when it is lying idle there would be a depreciation, some would say, more than when it was working. Then you have to allow some interest upon the capital invested in the plant. We had this thing looked into very carefully, and the valuation placed upon the plant was a little

less than \$35,000. Fifteen per cent of that, any one would say, would be a very small valuation to make to cover the depreciation and interest. We consulted contractors on the subject. I did not jump to any hasty conclusion about this matter. I asked contractors: How much do you yourself charge off in your accounts for depreciation of your plant from year to year? And there was not one of them that told me less than 20 per cent for depreciation in the plant.

Mr. POWELL. Twenty per cent be hang-ed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the statement they made to me. I am not the owner of plant, and I could not say from my own knowledge.

Mr. POWELL. I remember a case where we tried to get as much as we possibly could for depreciation in the running of machinery, and we could not get more than 3 per cent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think if my hon. friend alludes to running machinery which is under cover, which is not exposed to the weather and can be kept oiled, it would be in a different position from plant like this which, they say practically requires to be renewed in five years.

Mr. POWELL. Five years if it is working.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, they will tell you it will go behind in five years as much if it is not working as if it is working.

Mr. GIBSON. A man is very lucky if he has his plant intact at the end of five years.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They charge off 20 per cent every year.

Mr. GIBSON. A man has to keep up his plant, and he has to write off from 10 per cent to 20 per cent for depreciation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You would write off just as much when it is idle as when it is employed. I came to the conclusion, the deputy minister concurred, and the Mr. Rubidge finally came to the same conclusion, when it had been talked over and considered that the allowance he had made in the first place of \$1,000 in respect to this claim was a wholly inadequate allowance and that it would be so held if the claimants had gone to court. I want to know whether, if this case had gone to the Exchequer Court, in respect to the damage on this idle plant, the amount which has been allowed and was recommended for payment would have been exceeded or otherwise. I have no doubt that

the Exchequer Court would have made a more liberal allowance.

Mr. HAGGART. The Exchequer Court would have given them nothing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have had judgments in the Exchequer Court upon various questions and these judgments have been very much in excess of any amounts that the department has been willing to allow. The department, instead of allowing \$9,550, on account of idle plant, allowed \$7,900, or \$6,900 in addition to the sum which Mr. Rubidge had first reported in favour of. This \$7,000 is to be added to the \$40,000 which makes \$47,000 of the mount included in this estimate. You have then within \$1,000 of the amount which we are proposing to pay. The other item consists of \$1,500 for wages of the employees of the contractors during these two years in which they were delayed in their work. They said that the amount of wages they actually had to pay to the people they had employed was \$3,000. We allowed half of that amount. They had their clerk and engineer and we considered that they might properly be allowed for four seasons at \$750 a season, which made \$1,500. We get \$48,000 in that way, and \$48,000 is the amount which we have allowed.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman when this adjustment was made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were prevented from continuing their work in April, 1891, and in April of the season of 1893, they got final notice that the work was not to be continued.

Mr. POWELL. For how long a period do you allow interest?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We allow interest from October 1, 1891, to July 1, 1900.

Mr. POWELL. Here is a claim for idle plant that starts to run in April, 1891, and runs out in February, 1893, when the work is finally abandoned. Their claim is maturing up to that time in the matter of the plant, and yet you go to work and allow interest on this amount from the time the suspension began. Interest is allowed on the amount from the time it commenced to accrue and not from the time it finally accrued.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We only commenced to allow interest on October 1, 1891.

Mr. POWELL. You do not understand me.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do understand you. We might have taken one-half of the \$7,900 from

Mr. BLAIR.

February 1, 1891, and allowed interest on the balance from the very time that the amount was due, but we did not do that. We allowed interest from October 1, 1891. If you figure it up you will find that on the other basis it would come to more than it comes to here.

Mr. HAGGART. I have listened with a good deal of attention to the extraordinary defence of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals of this most extraordinary transaction. He starts out by saying that there was embodied in the contract between the Crown and the Gilbert Dredging Company two clauses by which the contractors would have to furnish to the engineer in charge, a statement of all claims they had against the government in the shape of extras repeated from month to month. The minister (Mr. Blair) said that my practice was to settle claims again and again without consideration of that clause.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said you never acted on it.

Mr. HAGGART. I tell the hon. gentleman that I never meddled with the settlement of any claim in the department. I tell him that the estimates were all prepared by the deputy head of the department and the engineer, and that I had no consultation with the officials for the purpose of allowing claims for the settlement of extras or anything of the kind. If the hon. minister consulted his deputy, his deputy could have told him that his statement was wrong in that regard. The minister asks why I sent the claim to the engineer for the purpose of reporting upon it. I tell him that I never heard of the claim until it was brought up in this House. It was a simple departmental matter and when the extras were allowed beyond a contract, the question might come before me if it were drawn to my attention by the deputy minister, but never otherwise. Let the House not be drawn away from the simple facts of this case. In March, 1894, there was a settlement with Mr. Gilbert. The minister tells us that he did not include the claims which had accrued previously. The work was abandoned in 1893, a year before. Mr. Rubidge furnished the final estimate ten months before the final settlement, and if the contractors had a claim would they not have put it in month after month according to the contract. It appears they carefully kept it back until the settlement was made with them. The minister says they specially excluded these claims under the settlement. He is a lawyer and he knows differently. He knows the meaning of words, and here is what Mr. Ferguson said:

The claim, if any, of the company in respect of or arising out of works actually done.

Does the minister say that 'plant idle' is one of the works actually done? Does he say:

That damages from the failure of the government to unwater the canal,

was one of these. He knows better. He talks of how honourable he would be with contractors. Why, these contractors settled with the government in 1894, and they had their final estimate for this work eleven months previously. They did not except, in the receipt which they gave to the government, any of these claims, and the minister knows that. What procedure did he follow? He summoned the deputy minister, and the engineer, who reported that these claims should not be entertained.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He had reported before that in favour of \$40,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister has in his hands the statement of Mr. Rubidge that there was only one of the items in the claim of Gilbert & Company that was worthy of consideration, and before considering even that he would like to have the details. What I want to draw the attention of the country and parliament to is, that all these things were settled for in March, 1894, and that there was no complaint from the contractor in reference to that settlement. In that settlement the contractor did not reserve these claims and the minister knows it. Look at the extraordinary procedure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) adopted. He asked the deputy head to meet him in consultation with the engineer on the work. The three of them met Mr. Gilbert in the office of the minister, and the minister was not able to get from Mr. Rubidge a certificate at that time that Gilbert was entitled to the money. The minister reverses the whole order of procedure. He first approved, and then the deputy minister certified, provided that Mr. Rubidge would give his certificate afterwards. Why, the poor fellow dare not decide afterwards against the decision of the minister. The decision of the minister is sent to Mr. Rubidge certified by the deputy and then Mr. Rubidge was asked to certify and he did so, and how could he do otherwise. Why did not the minister proceed in the ordinary way? Why did he not get the engineer in charge of the work to certify first and then have the deputy supervise it and then approve of it himself. What business has the minister as political head of the department to meddle in anything of this kind? It is the duty of the deputy head and the engineers in charge of the work to deal with that and it does not come within the province of the minister at all. No other minister ever interfered in the details of such a matter as that. It is only on the interpretation of a contract or on some extraordinary occasion that the minister has to deal with such a matter. I do not know how it ever came to pass that council approved of his action. If the minister thought they had any colour

of right in their claim he could have guarded himself from all suspicion by referring it to the courts. The whole transaction is one of the most monstrous, one of the most indefensible, and one of the nastiest-looking things that ever was transacted in any department of a Canadian government. It was decided upon previously by his predecessor in office, and he should have looked upon his predecessor's decision as somewhat sacred, or at all events he should not have revised it without the fullest consideration and without submitting it to the courts. There is no denying that his predecessor in office decided that this claim was fully paid, and that there was full compensation given for any cancellation of the contract. There is no denying that. Is unwatering or idle plant unperformed work? 'The claims of the company in respect of or arising out of work actually done'—is idle plant or reinforcement of banks work neglected to be done? If Mr. Gilbert had to reinforce the banks, the engineer in charge of the work would have given a certificate of the quantities from day to day, and I will venture to say that he did so, and that he was paid for that work. The hon. gentleman has forgotten that from the 15 per cent allowance for prospective damages, there is to be deducted the \$28,000, and that Mr. Gilbert should have only the 15 per cent on the balance, because the contract is calculated on \$125,000 of unperformed work; but he was paid 15 per cent on that. A more disgraceful transaction I never heard of, and I do not hesitate to say so. The Minister of Railways cannot apologize, he cannot excuse or defend it in any manner whatever. Here is a man who has no claim morally or legally. He has barred his claim by his receipt; and in defiance of everything in the good management of the department, the minister boldly comes down and asks for the payment of a sum of money to which this man is not entitled in the least. How he gets his colleagues to support him in conduct of this kind I cannot understand. How they come to pass a vote in council of \$28,000 for the payment of an old claim of this kind, without any reason being adduced for it, I cannot understand. How did the hon. gentleman get his department to consent to it? When I presided over the department, it would never do such a thing. We have a deputy reporting that the contractor was not entitled to any such amount, the chief engineer in charge reporting that there was only one item worthy of consideration; no certificate from the engineer in charge—he was not consulted at all. These four gentlemen sat in review upon the decision of their predecessors, that this party was settled with in full for the abandonment of his contract, and was given a sum for prospective profits, and coolly decided that he was entitled to \$28,000. This is the same gentleman who has a contract with the department for a

dredge at \$425 a day, for sweeping out the Galops Canal, for which he has been paid \$131,000 for 1,900 square yards, on which he has only received \$8.40 per yard. I stated to the minister the other day that this excavation was costing the country—I was afraid to name the amount—\$45 or \$50 a yard. I said that it was an alarming fact.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The hon. gentleman is wide of the mark.

Mr. **HAGGART**. The amount stated in the papers brought down is \$131,000.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That includes the rock.

Mr. **HAGGART**. It does not include the rock up to date.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. \$109,000 is what the sweeping came to.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Well, take the hon. gentleman's own figures—\$109,000 for removing 1,900 yards of earth. This same man had the contract for deepening the canal, and he was paid in full for that. Mr. Kennedy, of Montreal, was sent up to look over his work, and reported that Mr. Gilbert was entitled to a certain amount when he completed it down to grade, and he was paid in full for that work. Who is this Mr. Gilbert? What claim has he on the country? How is it he has such an extraordinary pull? I do not know the man; I know nothing about him; but I know that this is one of the worst cases ever placed before the parliament of this country.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I suppose the minister for the time being at the head of the Department of Railways and Canals must necessarily submit, with as good grace as possible to all the denunciations which may be heaped upon him by the opposition. Here is a gentleman who has been himself at the head of this department, and who ought to have some experience in these matters, and he tells us that it is no part of the business of a responsible minister to look into claims made on the department, or to supervise and see what is going on in his department, but that he should leave everything to the officials. If anything went astray, the hon. gentleman would be the first man to charge the minister with dereliction of duty and gross incompetency if he would put forward such an excuse. I suppose I shall have to bear with as good grace as possible the denunciations of these hon. gentlemen; but they have no effect upon me, because I am prepared to have this whole transaction, from beginning to end sifted as thoroughly as it is possible to sift it, and I do not fear what the consequences of the investigation will be. I know that it is a fair, square, honest transaction, and, therefore, I do not mind what the hon. gentleman may have to

Mr. **HAGGART**.

say on the subject. The hon. gentleman asked how could there be a claim for unwatering, and would it not be covered by this allowance with respect to prospective profits? I will tell you why that claim should be allowed and why it should not be covered by prospective profits.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I do not want the minister to be stating things which I did not say. I referred to 'the claims of the company in respect of or arising out of work actually done,' and I asked how neglect of unwatering or plant lying idle could be an exception to that.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I can tell the hon. gentleman very readily how it should come under that head, although it need not necessarily come under it, in order to entitle these people to a settlement. If it was right that they should be allowed for this thing, they would not be precluded by the settlement, even though these words in their receipt did not cover it, because all that they were allowed for—I repeat again for the five hundredth time—is the profit they would have made if they had not been stopped from completing their contract. That was estimated at \$195,000. What did this claim of unwatering arise from? It was damages which these people claim, because the terms of the contract which the Crown had entered into with them, pledged the Crown to unwater that canal so that they could do this work dry.

Mr. **E. COCHRANE** (East Northumberland). That was all considered, settled and paid for.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I beg my hon. friend's pardon.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Yes, it was.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That is where I say the hon. gentleman is wrong. You cannot say it was settled and paid for.

Mr. **COCHRANE**. What good is the receipt then?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The receipt does not show it was settled and paid for.

Mr. **COCHRANE**. I would take that receipt before the hon. minister's word, although I have great confidence in him.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I dare say my hon. friend has great confidence in me, but he has not sufficient confidence in anybody, who is not an out and out violent opponent of the government, to believe anything they say.

Mr. **COCHRANE**. I want the hon. minister to take that back.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I was going to add something complimentary to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. COCHRANE. It would be rather a suspicious compliment in my mind. If I were sitting in jury—and I am trying to assume that position in listening to this discussion—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt.

Mr. COCHRANE. I know that men's minds may get biassed and they will judge other men by themselves, and that is not a righteous judgment, if we were to believe the good book. If I were on the jury, I would certainly decide that these gentlemen got paid, and gave a receipt.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are not judging the ex-minister fairly, when you are insinuating that he is judging me by himself.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am sorry if I am not treating the present minister fairly, because I want to do it. I have no prejudice in the matter, but I want to guard the interests of the constituency I represent, and I do not want any contractor, after he has been settled with, and has got what the engineer considers a fair amount for the damage he has suffered through not having been allowed to go on with the contract, and after he has given a receipt—I do not want him to be paid \$28,000 more of the public money. I did not understand the ex-minister (Mr. Haggart) to say that a minister should sit in his chair and let his deputy run his department. What I understood him to say was that when a claim had been settled by a previous minister, it was rather a suspicious circumstance that the acting minister should revive the claim before getting the engineer's certificate, and have his deputy make a report on it, and then decide the case himself. The hon. gentleman evidently took the case in his own hands, and called in his officers after deciding it himself, and ordered them to certify to this, or their heads would come off.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend is now displaying that extraordinary judicial capacity which he claims he is exercising. The hon. gentleman has repeated what was said by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), that no succeeding minister ought to revise, without proper consideration, a decision of his predecessor. I subscribe to that doctrine at once, but the difficulty is that it has not a shadow of application to the present case. It does not happen that I have reversed a settlement made by the previous minister, or a decision arrived at by him. He did not settle this matter, so that I am not disturbing what he settled. He settled one thing, and I am dealing with another. These claims were never passed upon by him at all. What he did, was to send them to his engineer to report upon, and I found them unsettled when I came to the department.

Mr. COCHRANE. What then is the receipt for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would ask the ex-Minister of Railways why, if that receipt was a receipt in full of all claims, why he sent these claims to the superintending engineer, Mr. Rubidge, for him to report upon, and why did he not, when he got the report on March 6, 1895, determine that question, and say: I will allow you \$11,000, or I will allow you something or nothing? These people were there demanding payment month after month, and year after year, why did he not decide their claim? If he had decided it, and that decision had been apparent to me, I would not have reopened it, for certainly I do not want to invite the unnecessary consideration of claims. They are numerous and troublesome enough as it is, and I do not want any more of them than I can help. It was because this was not settled that I had to take it up, and I reached the best conclusion I could, and a conclusion which, I am confident, would be arrived at by ninety-nine out of one hundred fair-minded men.

Let me come to the question of this \$425 per day. The other transaction the hon. gentleman said was the most scandalous, and this one he says is the most atrocious. We have, therefore, two atrocious transactions to deal with. What is the hon. gentleman's complaint? A contract was made with the Gilbert Dredging Company, whereby they were to be paid for a day of twelve hours, \$475, for operating and working a certain plant and machinery, during such number of days as the department might choose to employ them. I found that these gentlemen, when I came to the department had been contractors under the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), and there had been remaining for some little time unsettled, a question as to the clearing up of the rapids, and making a sufficient channel for the purpose of navigation. The hon. gentleman complains that it was unwise policy to do that.

Mr. HAGGART. I never said that it was an unwise policy, but what I said, was that the sum was an enormous sum for the work done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman approve of the policy of clearing out the rapids by means of a dredge and machinery?

Mr. HAGGART. What I said again and again, is that the Gilbert Company had a contract to bring them down to grade line, and that you are giving to these parties \$425 a day for the performing of a work for which they had been paid before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When were they settled, with for doing this work? Before the hon. gentleman came into the department or after?

Mr. HAGGART. After. A good while afterwards. There was a dispute and, if I

remember rightly, it was left to arbitration, to Mr. Kennedy, to decide what the amount should be. On the certificate of Mr. Kennedy, the amount was paid over.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The statement made to me with regard to Mr. Kennedy coming into this matter was that he was sent in 1892 or 1893 to ascertain whether the work was finished. He found there were large boulders in the channel that would have to be removed. He made no estimate of the amount coming to the Gilbert Company by reason of the work they had previously done.

Mr. Haggart. That is not correct whether the minister gets it from his deputy or not; Mr. Kennedy reported as to the amount of work done and to be done.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I will state the facts as they appear in the records of the department and as furnished me by the officers. As early as 1892, the Minister of Railways in his report stated:

It is considered an important matter to ascertain whether the shallow portions of the new channel are occasioned by rock in situ or loose material swept in from the banks and lodging in the irregularities of the bottom. This can only be satisfactorily settled by sending a dredge to make an actual test—doubtless an expensive method, but, in my opinion, fully warranted by the circumstances of the case.

Now, mark how the hon. gentleman subscribed to the statement that it was necessary to send machinery and plant for the purpose of ascertaining the facts—sweeping the channel and relieving the bottom of these obstructions. That was the opinion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) in 1892. It was his opinion also in 1893 and 1894, because precisely the same language is contained in his reports of those years. That pointed to the necessity, notwithstanding what had been done years before by the Gilbert Blasting and Dredging Company in the way of performing their contract, of sending a proper plant to this locality to do this work and to make the channel a suitable one. Prior to 1894, as early as 1892, in the month of October, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) was head of the department, communications passed between the superintending engineer, Mr. Rubidge, and Messrs. E. E. Gilbert & Sons, with reference to maturing a plan proper for this purpose. This is the communication that Mr. Gilbert sent:

The government being desirous of ascertaining whether certain material in the Galops is loose or solid, we make this offer: We will supply the plant at our disposal for \$425 a day, the government to be at liberty to determine the length of time the plant is to be employed. This plan we considered the only feasible plan to determine the nature of the material in the channel.

Yours truly,  
E. E. GILBERT & SONS.

Mr. Haggart.

Mr. Rubidge reported to Mr. Trudeau that he considered the offer made by Messrs. Gilbert & Sons was a favourable offer. They were the only people who had the plant that was necessary, for this was considered a hazardous and difficult place to work, a large amount of plant would be necessary, and nobody else could furnish it. Mr. Rubidge considered this sum, \$425 a day, for the use of plant and the wages of the people employed, was a reasonable amount to say. Mr. Trudeau concurred in that opinion and advised the government to pay \$425 a day to these people to do this work; and it was settled in the department that it should be done. But some difficulty arose—not in respect to this particular contract, but in respect to the relation which the Gilberts bore to the government in connection with the work, and it was suspended and remained postponed for a long period. It was entirely in accordance with the intention and the policy of the department that the contract should be carried on at once if these obstructing circumstances had not occurred. Now, on the 22nd of October, 1892, Mr. Rubidge reported to Mr. Trudeau as follows:

I beg to inclose a letter from Messrs. E. E. Gilbert & Sons, amending their previous offer to furnish necessary plant with which to test the nature of the material in the bottom of the embankment.

And this was the letter of Messrs. Gilbert & Sons referred to:

The government being desirous of ascertaining whether certain material is loose or solid, we beg to make the following offer: We will supply the plant at our disposal, as stated in our letter of 20th ult., for the purpose, for the sum of \$425 a day, the government to be at liberty to determine the length of time the plant is to be employed. This plan we consider the cheapest and only feasible one to determine the nature of the material in the channel.

This is a statement of the plant, and you will see when I read it how complete a misrepresentation of the facts it is for hon. gentlemen who have not read the papers, to get up and say that the government is paying \$425 a day for a dredge. Now we will see:

One large spoon dredge, one large tug, two dump scows, two flat scows, one hauling scow equipped with engines, drums, wire rope, &c., one floating boarding-house, anchors, &c. We to equip said plant with the help necessary for its proper working. The price to be \$425 per day of twelve hours; time to commence when plant is in position designated by engineer in charge.

The government to be at liberty to determine the length of time that the plant is to be so employed, and to have the right to cancel this contract for such survey upon giving us three days' notice of their desire to so terminate the contract.

It will be understood that such chain and wire rope belonging to the government as may be on the ground, which was used in previous operations by us as government contractors at such

work in the Galops Rapids, shall be at our disposal, free of charge.

If it should be required to still further improve the channel by deepening and widening we will do such drilling, blasting and dredging as may be ordered by the engineer in charge, for the sum of \$8.40 per cubic yard for rock necessarily excavated. All possible assistance as regards position of work to be done by us to be afforded by the government engineers. It is further understood that vessel-owners are to be notified by the proper department that access to the channel cannot be obtained during the progress of our operations without such notice as will secure immunity of our plant.

(Sgd.) THE GILBERT BROS. ENGINEERING COMPANY.

That is a statement of the plant which they were required to furnish, and they were required to furnish men to man the plant. Now, is there an hon. gentleman in this House that will say that \$425 a day was not a fair and reasonable price for the use of that plant, the men to work it, all the fuel required, all the material and supplies necessary to operate it? Who is there that knows anything about it that will say it is an exorbitant sum? And yet the hon. member for York does not hesitate to denounce the Minister of Railways and Canals for entering into such a contract because, he says, it is an exorbitant sum. Does he know better than the superintending engineer on the canal? Does he know better than Mr. Trudeau? Does he know better than the chief engineer? He may know better than I do, for I know nothing about it; but these gentlemen are supposed to know, and they have stated that it was a proper arrangement to make. Now, here is what Mr. Rubidge says on June 12, 1897.

Mr. FOSTER. This was taken in 1892, was it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The department first decided to have this channel swept in 1892, and offers were made to the department by these people who possessed this plant, and the offer was accepted and approved by the officers of the department. It went on until 1897, when we decided upon having our canals put in shape, and Mr. Rubidge communicated to the Gilbert Company that the chief engineer of the department—

Mr. FOSTER. The dredge was not at work until 1897.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps 1897. This is the letter which Mr. Rubidge wrote to Mr. Schreiber on June 12, 1897, and I have here Mr. Trudeau's endorsement of the offer of these people. Mr. Rubidge wrote:

The offer of The Gilbert Bros. Engineering Company, of May 31, 1897, to supply all necessary plant for the purposes of surveys, and of removing the alleged obstructions in the channel, is practically a repetition of the offer of October 22, 1892, made at the suggestion of the late chief engineer, Mr. Trudeau, with a view

to act upon my previous reports recommending that a properly equipped dredging and blasting plant should be stationed in the channel, as being, in my opinion, the only means of making a satisfactory test and survey of the bottom, and at the same time of being prepared to remove description of material which might be discovered above the original or contract grade.

The reports also recommend that the south side of the channel should be buoyed, also that in view of the apparent permanent lowering of the water surface and a consequent increase in its slope, that the original grade on Island Shoal and Lower Bar, should be correspondingly lowered. The matter was very carefully considered and previous offers of E. E. Gilbert & Sons amended by that of October 22, 1892—copy herewith.

Referring to the recent offer May 31, 1897, to the hon. the minister, I have to-day had an opportunity of discussing it with Mr. Frank Gilbert, who fully understands the nature and extent of the work required.

Mr. Gilbert has also amended the offer of his company—see copy herewith—by adding the 'torpedo' drill scow to the list of plant to be supplied.

I therefore, in view of the importance of perfecting this channel and bringing it into use, beg to repeat my recommendation that the offer of the Gilbert Bros. to reduce the bottom to the original grade—or any required depth below it—be accepted, and that authority be given me to arrange with them to proceed with the work immediately.

Now, there is Mr. Rubidge's opinion and that opinion was endorsed and approved by the chief engineer of the department. Now, here is what Mr. Kennedy says with regard to this work:

I am in receipt of your telegram of last night asking how best it can be ascertained whether the material above grade on Island Shoal, in the new Galops channel, is loose or solid rock.

Some rough idea may be formed as to the character of the rock on the bottom (as I telegraphed you a few days ago) by means of heavy steel bars forked from a steamer, but the best way of ascertaining, beyond dispute, whether the rock is loose or solid would be to try it with a good powerful dredge. The rock forming the bottom, in its original state, was solid; not only in the sense of being in solid undisturbed beds, but it was so hard in texture as to be practically undredgable, and therefore properly classified as solid rock excavation. Any rock which a dredge can now take up will, therefore, be proved to be loose rock by the fact of its being found dredgeable, and conversely any rock which cannot be dredged will by that be proved to be solid.

In such a trial it would, of course, be essential that only a powerful suitable dredge be employed, and that it be skilfully worked; for there are doubtless blocks of rock which are loose in the sense of not being attached to the bed rock, but which are loose enough or packed closely enough amongst others to appear immovable, and solid, if tried, with an efficient machine or in unskilful hands.

A good dipper dredge would be the most suitable kind.

As to distinguishing between solid and loose rock, just down to grade level and no deeper, the dredge can be made to this also, by taking sufficient care to work the bucket just to grade line depth—such working would, however, be practicable only for investigation purposes. The

blasted bottom cannot be dredged smooth, and if it were desired to make the channel navigable to full grade line depth by leaving no point projecting above that, it would be necessary to put the dredge bucket deeper to an extent depending on the size of the broken rock, the size and kind of bucket and the way in which it is worked.

Yours respectfully,  
(Sgd.) JOHN KENNEDY.

Now, Mr. Kennedy points out the difficulties, the skilfulness required, the strength and character of the plant that was necessary. Mr. Rubidge reports that these people are the proper people to employ, Mr. Trudeau endorses that in strong terms, the chief engineer recommends it and it comes down to me; and because I say that I will not repudiate and reverse the harmonious opinion of all these officers of the department, I am guilty of a transaction which is disgraceful and for which I ought to be condemned. The hon. gentleman laughs. It is a matter of no concern to him that the statement has been published all over the country that a minister has been guilty of disgraceful conduct in his office. That does not appear to the hon. gentleman to be a statement of any gravity at all. But, I ask any hon. gentleman who is present on either side of the House, whether any minister in my position can be fairly condemned for coming to this decision, after having had presented to him such recommendations, such opinions, such advice from the officers of the department. Was anything for me to do but to recommend to council that a settlement be made of the character I have described? There is not a tittle of evidence furnished by these hon. gentlemen to what the value of this plant is. These gentlemen have had these matters before them a long time, because the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals knew all about it. He knew in regard to what the cost of this work was. If the hon. gentleman has so much confidence as he would give us to suppose he has in his ability to make out a case against the department, if he felt that there was any merit in his contention, if he felt that I had been careless or had been acting improvidently in the matter, why did he not bring the case before the Public Accounts and have witnesses summoned to show what would be a fair value to put upon the services that these people had rendered?

Mr. HAGGART. I never heard of it until the supplementary estimates came down. I never knew that the hon. gentleman would present any such claim to the House. How could I know of it before?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where did the hon. gentleman get all his information—out of the supplementary estimates?

Mr. HAGGART. I never suspected that an item of that kind would appear. The first knowledge I had of it was when I

Mr. BLAIR.

saw them in the supplementary estimates. How could I go to the Public Accounts Committee?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman never anticipated that an item of this kind would appear and yet he has been posing before this committee as being possessed with data on all these matters which are matters of engineering skill, as one who had got all the information and now he cannot dream of me doing such a thing. The hon. gentleman had all this material in his possession when he was in the department. He knew that it was recommended by Mr. Rubidge and by Mr. Kennedy, he knew that he had recommended that \$425 a day should be paid for the use of this dredge. He entered into a contract with these people—

Mr. HAGGART. I never would have entered into such contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman could not have done anything else under the circumstances. I repeat that having this information before him, knowing the whole question as to whether I was paying a reasonable or an unreasonable price for the services of this dredge, why did the hon. gentleman not bring it before the Public Accounts Committee, summon expert witnesses to say what the value of this work was, and find out if the minister was guilty of a disgraceful transaction in paying the sum which his officers recommended him to pay. He does not know whether \$400, or \$200, or \$1,000 would be a reasonable price to pay. Why did he not get evidence to show what would be a fair price? That would not answer the hon. gentleman's purpose. All that he desired to do was to make a charge against a political opponent for political purposes.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman asks me why I did not go to the Public Accounts Committee with this transaction which I branded as disgraceful, involving the payment of \$48,000 in settlement of a claim which was already settled. I had no knowledge that any such claim as this would be presented until I saw the supplementary estimates come down? What are referred to the Public Accounts Committee are the public accounts contained in the Auditor General's Report of last year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have been paying for three years on this transaction.

Mr. HAGGART. These payments refer to four or five different transactions.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Mr. HAGGART. The first I saw of this payment to the Gilbert Company on account of dredging was in the Auditor General's

Report of this year. There is an item of \$101,000. What struck me as extraordinary was that the next item in the estimate showed a payment for dredging of \$120 or \$130 a day for services similar to those for which the minister paid \$425 a day. There is no justification at all for the hon. minister in this matter. The hon. minister proceeded to speak about two different things in regard to getting the report of Mr. Kennedy, the engineer, in 1891, recommending that that dredge ought to be employed for the purpose of doing the work. Why did the hon. gentleman not go about it in the ordinary way and call for tenders to do the work? He goes back to the employment of the Gilbert Dredging Company several years before for the purpose of doing work for which they were paid \$425 a day. Mr. Kennedy reported in favour of employing these men for the purposes of surveying the rapids. I ordered Mr. Kennedy to employ them and I understood that the whole time occupied would not be more than six, seven, or eight days. When I found that they had taken twenty days to do it. I was very much annoyed and I ordered the discontinuance of the work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How much did you pay?

Mr. HAGGART. Four hundred and twenty-five dollars a day was the amount they charged, but I refused, in spite of the recommendation of Mr. Rubidge, to employ these men any longer at any such price as that. That might be a reasonable sum to pay for four or five days, but it is not a reasonable sum to pay for two or three years, and to expend \$101,000 in that way is absolutely without any justification whatever. The hon. minister tries to change the charge I made against him from the matter of the \$48,000 to the payment of \$425 a day. The payment of \$425 a day is an extraordinary one, but I do not charge it as disgraceful. I do charge that the other transaction is a disgraceful one. The minister cannot defend it, because there is no defence for it. He forces it on the department, gets a report from the deputy minister, and the report is conditional upon getting a report from the engineer in charge of the work. A more disgraceful transaction was never perpetrated by any minister in this House. The hon. minister gets up and attempts to defend a transaction of that kind when he cannot deny that there was a settlement made by his predecessor. There was a settlement in full made with the Gilbert Company for prospective profits on this work. The final estimate was made eleven months before that. They go before that final estimate in order to trump up a claim against this government and the minister sits in judgment upon it and allows it, thinking we would not point out to the people of the country this disgraceful transaction in all its hideousness. The defence of the hon. minister the other day was that

this was a transaction for which his chief engineer was altogether responsible, that the chief engineer had the settlement of this affair in his own hands, that it was on the report of the chief engineer that he acted. But when we come to learn the facts, we find that the minister settled the matter himself, and that he got the deputy minister's report conditional on getting the certificate of the engineer in charge of the work. Why does he not get the certificate of Mr. Weller, who was in charge of the work? The fact of the matter is there is nothing at all in the claim of the Gilbert Dredging Company. The truth is that the whole thing was settled in 1894 and the reservation in the receipt covers no such thing as 'plant lying idle.' There is no excuse or justification for this payment, and the minister is absolutely unable to defend the transaction. I can understand that the poor engineer in charge of the work, whose livelihood depends upon being submissive to the powers that he would certify, but how the deputy minister ever certified to a transaction of that kind, is more than I can understand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is one thing the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) can rest assured of, and that is that no officer of the department was ever requested by me to certify in any way as to this claim. He can have that evidence on oath, if he wishes.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister first stated that he had considered the claim fully and had come to the conclusion that it ought to be paid. Then the deputy minister was called upon, I suppose, to back up the opinion held by his political head, but I do not think the deputy minister would ever have done any such thing for me when I was minister. The minister (Mr. Blair), talks about my not seeing the estimates that were sent over to the Auditor General, but I venture to say that he never saw one of these estimates himself. The law provides that the payment shall be made on the certificate of the deputy head, and the minister's certificate is not necessary and he never sees them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), is quite positive as to that.

Mr. HAGGART. I am quite positive that in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred, they are never brought to his attention.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is an unimportant matter, but it so happens that although I do not know what the contents of the certificates are, I certify to every estimate that goes to the Auditor General.

Mr. HAGGART. Then that is a new condition of things in the department. If the minister looks at the certificates before him, he will find that never did any Minister of Railways sign these estimates.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), has any spare time on his hands, he might persuade the Auditor General that these estimates should be paid without the signature of the minister.

Mr. **POWELL**. I did not investigate this item previously to its being brought down this afternoon but from what I have heard, my mind is in a considerable state of doubt, to say the least, as respects this transaction. Although I have not gone into it very fully, it is only fair to make the statement before the minister, which I would feel justified in making upon a public platform, and thus giving him an opportunity to answer the statements which I would make in public. I shall very briefly review the salient features of the case as it strikes me. There was a contract for dredging in connection with the Cornwall Canal. In 1891 the work under that contract was suspended. In March, 1893, the work under that contract was totally abandoned. In April, 1894, a settlement was made, at least of some kind, and as to certain matters under the contract. It is claimed by the ex-minister (Mr. Haggart), that at the time that settlement was made, all claims were before him and before the department. The present minister (Mr. Blair), claims that that settlement only was as respects a portion of the matter for which these payments were made.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Not part of these payments at all.

Mr. **POWELL**. Well, as respects what you might call the claims arising out of the contract. I am inclined to agree with him from reading the receipt and the letter from Mr. Ferguson, that, at least, one party to the settlement had the idea that there was something outside which should be a matter of further consideration.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. You can hardly say, that if one party had that view, it would be conclusive upon him that the other party had a different view.

Mr. **POWELL**. Whatever you may deduce from that receipt, here is what it says :

Received from Her Majesty the Queen the sum of \$29,350, in full of all claims in respect of the abandonment of parts of sections 5 and 8 and the whole of sections 6 and 7, and of the abandonment of the aforesaid sections on the Cornwall Canal of the Gilbert Blasting and Dredge Company against Her Majesty the Queen, as per letter of March 12, 1894, of A. Ferguson, Esq., their solicitor, as per order in council of March 28, 1894.

(Sgd.) **GILBERT BLASTING AND DREDGING CO.**,  
(Per P. H. Gilbert),

Then Secretary and Treasurer.

Witness, A. Ferguson.

Read that in connection with Mr. Ferguson's letter? The qualification in Mr. Ferguson's letter is as follows: 'The claims, if any, of the company in respect of or

Mr. **HAGGART**.

arising out of works actually done, will of course remain to be dealt with apart from this settlement.' That language is loose and inexact. I see opportunities there for a fair difference of opinion. Such is the state of the case on April 24, 1894, when amount of \$29,350 mentioned in the receipt from the Gilbert Company was agreed upon for prospective damages or damages for loss of prospective profits at least. It is claimed by the ex-minister that that included something more. A dispute then arises between the parties, and I call the attention of the House and the minister to this fact, that on March 6, 1895, nearly one year afterwards, this dispute culminated in action being taken by the department. That action is to refer the matter to the engineer in charge of the work, Mr. Rubidge, for his report. Mr. Rubidge on that date makes a report. That report states absolutely on the face of it that the Gilberts had no claim whatever, except in respect to the amount of \$11,377.75, and he is not satisfied without further investigation that they have any claim in respect to that. Previous to August 5, 1895, Mr. Rubidge is given instructions by the minister, or by the department, to make a further report. Now, a very essential element in this case is the contents of this letter of instructions; but that letter I do not see among the papers brought down. Its absence is significant, and the inference may fairly be drawn that there was some object in concealing that paper.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. That would not be a fair inference under any circumstances, because the files of the department would not contain a letter-press copy, and the papers which have been brought down are likely communications which are on the files.

Mr. **POWELL**. That letter must be on the files of the department, and there is doubtless a copy of it in the department. The minister's suggestion in that regard would not convince the committee. In accordance with these instructions, Mr. Rubidge makes a report, not in favour of the whole claim, but only \$40,586. On August 26, 1898, twenty-one days afterwards, Mr. Schreiber takes into consideration this report of Mr. Rubidge. He finds fault with what Mr. Rubidge has done, states that he has not acted in accordance with his instructions, and cuts down the amount from \$40,586 to \$26,766. Now, if the Minister of Railways thinks it desirable to act in accordance with the judgment of those gentlemen who are associated with him as officers in his department, in whose technical knowledge he can repose confidence, he should not, I think, have undertaken to overturn the judgment of Mr. Schreiber in respect to that amount.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I did not do it.

Mr. POWELL. The matter rests in the department until January 26, 1900, when the matter is again brought up before Mr. Schreiber. Mr. Schreiber then makes a strange report, a report in which he declines to assume responsibility. The fact of Mr. Schreiber's report is very suggestive in two points of view. In the first place, why does Mr. Schreiber make a second report bringing the amount up to \$48,000, or \$8,000 in excess of the highest estimate that had been made previously, which estimate he had previously condemned? Mr. Schreiber guards himself in respect to his final report. He does not take upon himself the responsibility of certifying it; but he says: 'I will certify this provided the gentleman who had an intimate acquaintance with the matter certifies it;' and that gentleman had not certified it. This is a peculiar state of affairs. The first thing that strikes me about the matter is this. On March 6, 1895, when the matters were fresh in the mind of Mr. Rubidge, who had charge of the work, and who knew whether the claims were well founded or ill-founded, he made a report absolutely condemning the claims as being bad, with one exception, and calling for more light in respect to that claim.

Mr. FOSTER. That was when he was unhampered by his minister.

Mr. POWELL. Yes. When Mr. Gilbert said he had a claim, here was an absolute refusal of it. The matter remained in abeyance during 1895 and down to the time the ex-Minister of Railways vacated the office in July, 1896. Why did not Mr. Gilbert, in the face of this absolute refusal of the department, get a fiat and go into the Exchequer Court?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He never had an absolute refusal of the department.

Mr. POWELL. Does the minister mean to tell me that Mr. Gilbert would not be cognizant of that report, and would not take that as an absolute, flat-footed denial of his claim?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know whether Mr. Gilbert ever saw it or not, but I know that Mr. Gilbert has stated over and over again to me that the department had not determined his case.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman assumed control of the department de facto in September, 1896. He does not settle that claim for nearly four years, and when the settlement is effected, it is rather a shady settlement. I use that language advisedly. In the first place, these claims aggregating upwards of \$48,000 are allowed interest for eight years. The hon. minister was wrong and made an error against himself of a year—I will give him the benefit of that—almost to the extent of a year. The interest did not commence on

the 1st of October, 1891, but some time in the spring of 1892; I reckoned it up, and it is exactly eight years' interest. Now, here are these claims that have been reported against altogether in one case; in the second instance, reported against as respects almost one-half the claim; in another case, reported against to a large extent; yet interest is allowed, and allowed from a day antedating the maturity of many of the claims, even if good. This transaction may be all right, and in a great deal the hon. minister has said about the impropriety of any person, particularly a government acting the part of a shylock and taking advantage of this provision in a contract I entirely agree. I think that the provision requiring the Gilbert Company to submit their claims month by month was for the protection of the department, and as long as the department was satisfied that the claims were bona fide, it would be acting in a most unjust and tyrannical manner if it refused to consider them, even supposing the Gilberts had been guilty of laches.

But there is a phase of their delay that is very important. I do not think that their laches should have prevented Gilbert's claim being considered, but their delay in submitting their claim is a very important factor when we were considering whether it was bona fide or not. If they allowed a couple of years to go by before submitting this claim to the department at all, while I do not say that that delay should have prevented the department from considering it, still it is an important fact when considering whether this claim is bona fide at all. And I must say, although I have not gone into the reports at all but simply speak from what I have heard from previous speakers, that this is not the correct way of administering the affairs of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. There were several things, three at least, that were to be discussed on this same item, and we might as well discuss them now. I do not propose to say anything with reference to the two transactions we have just been discussing except this which I do not think the Minister of Railways made sufficiently clear. He thinks that he has sufficient justification for spending over \$109,000 in keeping a \$425 per day dredge and its appurtenances sweeping the Galops channel because that dredge had been employed previously and payments had been made at that rate by the preceding minister. But the payments were made by the hon. gentleman's predecessor under these conditions. At a certain time in the progress of that work, the department came to the conclusion that it would get Mr. Kennedy, a noted engineer of Montreal, to go and make an examination, and they gave Mr. Kennedy carte blanche to do it. In doing it, he used the Gilbert dredge at the rate of \$425 per day, and when his report was made and the minister found that what was proposed to have been but a six days

job at the rate, had gone on for a longer time at that same rate, the transaction was stopped. The minister himself, working with his officials and with reference to their recommendations, never employed the dredge at that rate at all. Afterwards, in 1897, the present minister took it up, and has spent from that time to this over \$109,000 in that expensive proceeding. What I want the minister to make is a short statement as to what has been the cost of this contract on account of his action with reference to Mr. Archie Stewart's contract in the two regards—one with reference to the quarry which the hon. gentleman attempted to take from him, and the other with reference to the claim which is now before the Exchequer Court for the damages for the cancellation of his contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All I know is this, that when I came into the department the government had before it the question as to the early completion of the canal. We ascertained what progress had been made by the different contractors on the various works in progress, and we came to the conclusion that they were not being prosecuted with vigour, and it was necessary some steps should be taken to urge them on more promptly or else it would be many years before the canal would be fit for the purposes of navigation. In connection with this, naturally the works on the Soulanges came up for consideration. One of the first things I became aware of when I got to the department, was that Mr. Stewart, one of the contractors upon the Soulanges Canal, was being delayed in his work and actually stopped by reason of a dispute between the engineer and himself as to the sufficiency of the stone he was getting out for use. That took some months and led to some delay, and unquestionably put Mr. Stewart to some little disadvantage, and for that he was compensated to an extent regarded as satisfactory by him, and he accepted the amounts and professed to be content. After that he assured the department that he would take the works up and proceed vigorously with them. He was allowed a reasonable opportunity to gather himself together after the delay which had occurred. But he did not appear to at all realize the importance of reorganizing or putting his staff on a stronger basis and pushing the work more than he had been doing. His attention was called to the fact, and he was required to take up the work and prosecute it with vigour. The chief engineer reported from time to time that he was not doing that, and I think two or three notices were given Mr. Stewart that unless he did push the work forward more rapidly it would have to be taken out of his hands.

Mr. FOSTER. About what time was this?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would be early in the

Mr. FOSTER.

season of 1897, or late in the season of 1896. The chief engineer thinks it was in 1896. Mr. Stewart received two or three of those notices and appeared to disregard them all, and later, when he was most earnestly pressed, he gave us to understand that he was not under any compulsion at all to build this work at any time we might require or with any degree of rapidity as he had been authorized to delay in pushing the work forward by the minister of the department, and he had been advised by counsel—Mr. O'Gara, and I think Mr. Osler—that the fact that the department had allowed him to overrun his time, and given him permission to do the work just as he chose, as far as time was concerned, entitled him to disregard any notice that we gave, and we were entirely at his mercy as to when the work should be completed. That was the ground he took, and it was an absolute rebellion against the control of any orders from the department.

Mr. Schrieber gave him final notice that the contract would be taken out of his hands, in accordance with the contract. I saw Mr. Stewart myself, and told him we did not wish to take the work out of his hands, but preferred that he should finish it. I made use of any persuasive powers I had to prevail on him not to allow the extreme step to be taken. But all this was without avail. I gave my sanction, and the final order taking the contract out of his hand was given by Mr. Schreiber. The matter had been previously talked over in council, if I remember well. After having authorized the final step by Mr. Schreiber, I had nothing further personally to do in the matter. All the details were looked after in the customary way, all legal proceedings being taken by the Department of Justice. I took no further part in the matter until I was consulted by the counsel for the Crown looking to the settlement of the suit.

Mr. FOSTER. Was not some action taken by the minister with reference to the quarry?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Action was taken, I believe, by the department—either the Justice Department or the proper officers in my own department in connection with that quarry. When we took the work out of Mr. Stewart's hands we found it necessary that we should get the quarry. A good deal of the stone that we were to put into the work was already cut and the stone for the construction was to be got there, and we were entitled, under the contract as I supposed, and as we were advised by the Justice Department, to take possession of the quarry to enable the new contractor to avail himself of the stone that was cut, and also to have the stone for the continuation of the work. So far as the results go, I believe the final settlement involved the payment to Mr.

Stewart of \$20,000 in respect of damages accruing through the action of the government in taking the quarry. That was one doubt which our council entertained—as to our legal position, and whether, after all, we had been well advised in our proceedings for taking the quarry in the way in which it was taken. The claim for damages for taking the quarry, made by Mr. Stewart, was very large. If my memory serves me right, it is somewhere in the neighbourhood of a million dollars, and perhaps more. Of course, it was an absurdly large claim, but our counsel strongly advised us that we had better settle that claim. Mr. Newcombe, of the Justice Department, the counsel for the Crown, and myself, consulting together, we came to the conclusion that it would be well to recommend a settlement of that portion of the matter in controversy between us on the terms proposed. I sanctioned that, so far as it became my duty to deal with it. There were some \$1,500 of costs in addition.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that all the costs?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No further costs have arisen in connection with it pending the decision of the suit. There still remains to be determined by the court a claim for damages by Mr. Stewart for taking the work out of his hands, and a counter claim by the government against him for damages by reason of his having failed to carry out the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the work finished?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Practically finished—sufficiently for navigation purposes. There is still some dressing up to be done.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not intend, at this late hour, to make very extended remarks, although it is really too bad to have had to go through that immense volume of papers and not be able to give the results of my labour in full. I rather think that I know more about the matter at present than the minister, though I examined the papers somewhat cursorily. But I wish to point the moral of the story that the minister has told us to-night and the results to the country. When I spoke here some time ago in criticism of some of these matters, I said that the minister's management had been costly to the country. This is one of the instances that prove the assertion I made. Mr. Stewart had the contract, but was subject to delays, of course. In 1896, his work was stopped when the new government came in—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was stopped before I came in; I am not responsible for it.

Mr. FOSTER. When I say the minister is responsible, it will be time enough for him to deny the soft impeachment. In 1896, at the beginning of the session, a

dispute arose because Mr. Munro objected to the stone and the work was stopped and the contractor was unable to proceed. That dispute was settled, after some delay, by the chief engineer himself overruling Mr. Munro, and deciding that the stone should be used. On two or three occasions the deputy minister and chief engineer made that apparent to Mr. Munro, and Mr. Stewart was allowed to go on. But, Mr. Stewart ought not to be held responsible for delay which occurred owing to Mr. Munro's dissatisfaction with and interdiction of the stone. When this dispute was settled, it was so late in the season that it was impossible for Mr. Stewart to go on with this work. There is more than this one thing that makes me exceedingly critical of the department—these transactions of Mr. Rubidge, blowing hot and blowing cold, at one time declaring that there was nothing in the claim, and at another time declaring that it was worth \$40,000 or \$50,000, makes one critical of the officer who is implicated in reports and managements of that kind. In the same way with Mr. Munro. During that summer, before the minister, I think, was elected, and when he was running his election contest, this department was presided over by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who took the matter up, and he applied to Mr. Gibson, the member for Lincoln, for some one whom he might send to make an examination of the stone, and Mr. Gibson, willing to oblige the minister, picked out two persons whom he recommended to the minister. These were sent down, and they made a report unfavourable to an expense with reference to this stone. Now, that seemed not quite a fair transaction. Why should the minister apply to one of his own supporters, a member of parliament, to recommend to him impartial persons to go down and make a report? When that member happened to be a contractor, and happened to have interests in quarries as well, it makes the transaction still less advisable. Granted that Mr. Gibson gave a thoroughly competent and honest recommendation of certain men, the fact remains that if you are going to get arbiters to give you a report it is best not to take them from a rival in contracting.

Mr. GIBSON. No rival.

Mr. FOSTER. I mean that he is one of the guild of contractors.

Mr. GIBSON. Every hon. gentleman in this House know that as long as I occupy a position in this House it is practically impossible for me to become a government contractor, so that I was not a rival with Mr. Stewart. Further than that, I refused positively to act myself. The very foreman I recommended was friendly to Mr. Stewart; and the other man was Mr. James Munro, of St. Catharines, a gentleman with whom I have never spoken on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. The only point of my remark was that I did not think it was advisable to ask a member of parliament and a contractor interested in quarry work, to give advice on that subject, and I think subsequent evidence went to show that these gentlemen who were appointed were not the best that might have been sent, at least one of them. However, it was these things that caused delay, and that ought not, I think, be counted against Mr. Stewart. Now, as a result of that action on the part of Mr. Munro, this country was mulcted in the sum of \$17,544, that is the fine it had to pay. Now, that is rather serious. If an officer of the department interferes between a contractor and his work, stops him, and then when it comes to be fought out, is overruled absolutely by the chief engineer, and the chief engineer decides that the stone is good and shall go in, and the contractor is stopped from his work, and Mr. Munro takes it upon himself to run down and see the coming minister and talk the matter over with him, and gets a telegram from him to have the thing stopped until a decision is finally come to—I say that if an officer puts himself in that position and is then proved absolutely in the wrong, and the country has to pay a bill of \$17,544 in order to pay off that piece of bad business, I think it is something that a department should take into account. I think it is very hard that the country should be fined in those sums for incompetence on the part of its officers, and these officers are kept.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you think that action justifies the dismissal of Mr. Munro?

Mr. FOSTER. I say that you have a chief engineer to whom you give the ultimate decision. Mr. Munro shows a strongly antagonistic spirit to the contractor; he condemned his stone, he hung him up, and after the whole thing was gone into, the chief engineer, who is the supreme authority, says, You let that stone go in, I will be responsible for it. Somebody ought to be blamed. I am not blaming the chief engineer, consequently I think that Mr. Munro is subject to criticism.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a serious thing to dismiss an engineer who is in charge of works which have been under contract for a long time, before your contractors are settled with.

Mr. FOSTER. It is equally serious that the country has to pay a large sum of money for these transactions. Some one is wrong, and some one is right, and I am inclined to think the chief engineer is right. Well, after this was decided, it came to be so late that it was impossible for the contractor to go on. The next spring, when the season should have commenced, a change was made in the mode of construction of the locks, and it was not until the 24th of

May, or a month and a half after the season opened and when the contractor should be at work, that he was notified as to this matter, consequently there was a delay of nearly two months in that season. Then occurred the interference of the minister. After talking it all over with the contractor, the latter expressed his willingness to come under contract and to finish the work by 1899. The minister wished it to be finished at the end of 1898. The minister seems to have decided this matter early, for the very notice of cancellation which was forwarded by the chief engineer in November, showed that it was signed by the minister, or authorized by the minister, in June of that year. So the minister had early made up his mind that this should be cancelled, but for some reason it remained over until November, and the chief engineer sent the notice of cancellation in November. He forgot to obliterate the time at which the minister had proposed it should go, which was in June, and both dates appear, the lower one being scratched out. Well, then what took place? This very cancelled contract was given to Ryan & McDonald. For less money? For \$75,000 more, and it will cost more than that before it is finished. But, the minister wanted stone. No, not the minister, but the new contractors wanted stone. They had no quarry; the former contractor had. The minister said to himself: That is easy to arrange. If Ryan & McDonald have no quarry the former contractor has. I will step into the quarry, kick the owner out of it, and put Ryan & McDonald in the quarry to get stone for their contract. And so, the minister stepped into the quarry, kicked the owner out, took possession of it and set Ryan & McDonald at work quarrying in the quarry belonging to Mr. Stewart. He soon found out, to use a western expression that he had bitten off more than he could chew, and in the end he had to give up the quarry.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was because the proceedings were not legally taken not because there was not the right to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, he and his colleagues attempted to put legislation through the House which would have enabled them to have taken hold of that quarry. Fortunately, the Senate stepped in between the minister and this act of spoliation. The legislation was not passed. The minister then entered a suit to expropriate the property or the use of it. He went on to do that with a great flourish of trumpets and his counsel had not got well into the rights of the case before they came about his ears and advised him that he had better settle the suit. Negotiations went on and the minister ultimately paid \$21,500 in settlement for illegally taking possession of this quarry and in settlement of the two years use that he had

had of it. Was that all? The hon. minister would lead us to suppose that that was the total amount of the fine or the costs which had to be paid. But, it was not. Twenty thousand dollars was given to settle the suit; \$1,500 more was given as costs to Mr. Stewart, but there were other costs. Blake and his firm were employed, Mr. Lawlor was employed, valuers were employed, and if these papers show anything at all they show to me that Blake and his firm were paid or are to be paid—I think the payment has been made—\$9,871 as their costs. Mr. Lawlor gets at least \$2,900 as his costs, and as to the valuers I have not got the whole amount which they receive. There was more than one set of valuers, because the minister took hold of Mr. Stewart's machinery, which in the suit was valued, and which stands at a valuation of \$54,000, and this government without doubt will also have to pay for that. The bill of costs and award involved amounts to \$36,771, and that does not carry with it all the costs in the matter, because they have not all been settled. There are first the damages amounting to \$17,544 in consequence of delay caused by his engineer's action. Then the hon. minister came in and took another man's property, careless if the man was willing or not, after which he took his suit in the Exchequer Court, and before he got well under way with it he had to pay \$200,000 and \$1,500 in costs, making \$21,500, and in addition to that he had to pay the difference between \$21,500 and \$36,000 or \$37,000. When the \$36,000 or \$37,000 is added to the \$17,000 it makes \$50,000 and over. These are some of the financial results of the brilliant management of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. The government is responsible in part and they may apportion the blame where they like, but the minister and the minister alone is to blame, that the country will have to pay \$75,000 and more to Ryan & McDonald for doing the work that Mr. Stewart would have done and which he offered to finish in the fall of 1899. The minister wanted it done in 1898. The minister gave the contract to Ryan & McDonald for \$75,000 more. The work has not been done yet, the work will not be done till the snow flies this fall, and a large amount of money will have yet to be spent upon it. It is now 1900, so that the minister paid \$75,000 and \$100,000 more than he would have paid to Mr. Stewart, and the Minister has not got the work done in 1900. If Mr. Stewart had been allowed to have done the work it would have been done in 1899. But there is more. The minister has a suit against him for damages for the cancellation of the contract which is yet unsettled, and which we cannot discuss, but which is liable to result in a still larger sum of money being taken out of the treasury of the country to pay for the damages of cancellation. What more? The minister himself, and

the party declared that the canals had been dilly dallied with, but that now they were going to be finished in 1899. The department got up a tug to go through the canals early to carry out the promise, and they took the tug through, had their picnic, and it was flaunted all over the country that the canals were finished. They were not finished.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman ought to have invited me to that picnic. I never heard of it before.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will not deny that the vessel went through. No doubt it was a good picnic time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I deny the statement which the hon. gentleman made.

Mr. FOSTER. It was a good picnic time, a good opening time. We read the description of it, and it was declared that the canal was opened.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was opened last fall.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not finished, but they got the tug through. In the operation, in order to make a flourish of trumpets and to get the tug through what happened? The water was let in, the water went a little bit too high, it washed off the embankments, and \$100,000 has had to be expended in order to repair the damages which took place.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Revise your information.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be revised, but I will venture to say that revisions will not effect the figures which I have given \$20,000 in the first place, \$1,500, \$9,871, \$2,900 and \$2,500, making \$36,771 as the law costs and the award for illegally taking a man's quarry, \$75,000 extra at least, to the new contractors, who will not finish the work until the end of 1900, and \$100,000 in order to make good the damages resulting from this little picnic. Add to this the suit for damages for cancellation of contract which is now pending. Well, Sir, there was another thing that we are discussing to-night and it is in regard to the cement. I have been looking through these papers very cursorily and what do I find in reference to the cement? I find this is brief: That the present Minister of Railways and Canals made a contract for cement with the Battle people in Thorold. He got it in barrels and he got it in sacks, and the result is seen in the summing up which I shall give. Suffice it to say, that before that, the engineer on the works did not believe in the cement, reported that it was not the right cement to use.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not correct.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, Sir, it was stated on oath by the man himself, before the Public

Accounts Committee. Now, Sir, here is the result of that, as given by the chief engineer. Of the cement used and remaining in the work, there were 3,966 barrels. Of the cement used and afterwards torn down, there were 1,160 barrels. The cement thrown away, as useless, amounted to 16,667 barrels. Making in all thrown away and useless, 17,827 barrels of cement, at a cost of about \$22,462. Who paid the bills? The country paid the bills of course. The minister had the satisfaction of saying 'yes' to some ardent supporter who pressed the cement upon him. He had the satisfaction of pushing it into the work against the wish of the engineer, and afterwards he had the satisfaction of seeing the country paying \$24,462 for cement, the larger part of which was useless and thrown away, and the rest of it built in, proven to be useless and torn down again. You not only lost the cement, but you lost the value of the labour in putting it in, and tearing it down again.

There is another piece of work by this talented business man in a business administration which is going to revolutionise things. I could find more but I do not want to pile it on too much on the minister just now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do not hesitate.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister (Mr. Blair) does not have to pay the bills, and he does not care. These are large transactions you know, and in that generous way which I commended in the minister the other day, he throws on one side and on the other the money of the public. But all the time he is Minister of Railways and Canals, and all the time the poor taxpayer pays the bills.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) in his election manifesto, the other night, started out by affirming that this government was violating all business rules, by letting out contracts without inviting tenders. He told us that the most conspicuous instance of that was that the Minister of Railways bought a worthless cement without a tender. Well, so far as the cement is concerned, this argument does not apply at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I was criticising two things: The business government and their methods of doing business, and the minister (Mr. Blair) immediately mentioned to me that this was done by contract and tender. I took the retraction of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) the very moment he made it, and he ought not to bring it up again.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think the hon. gentleman is correct, but if he states so, I will not contradict him. In this cement matter the department, in the ordinary way, invited tenders for the furnishing of cement,

Mr. FOSTER.

of a certain quality. It was well understood that all cement offered to the government would have to stand a particular test made by the engineer. The Battles amongst others tendered. They offered a cement, at a fair and reasonable price, which was below that of all other tenderers. The chief engineer laid the tenders before me, and he said: I do not consider that the Battle cement is of the best quality, by any means, and I do not believe it will be fit cement for the front work of your walls, but it would do very well for backing. In addition to that I had a strong certificate in its favour from Mr. Thompson, the superintending engineer of the Welland Canal. I had also a certificate from Mr. Thomas Munro, the gentleman who gave the evidence referred to, but who up to that time had not expressed, so far as it had come to my knowledge, any opinion at all upon the quality of this Battle cement other than what I have above referred to. The question arose, whether or not it would be a proper thing for the department to give a small portion of the cement supply to a home industry, or whether we would disregard the offer so received, and take foreign cement. In view of what was set forth in the certificate of Mr. Thompson and of Mr. Munro, in view of the opinion expressed to me by gentlemen who knew its value when used in other canals—amongst others, Mr. Gibson—I came to the opinion that there would be room for the employment of a very considerable amount of this cement in the backing work. I gave the contract to the Battles for that. I can imagine now, that if I had refused to award a portion of the contract to the Battles, how these gentlemen opposite would accuse me of an error of judgment in not giving fair consideration to the claims of the home manufactured article, at all events for a class of work for which it could well have been used. However, we had this additional guarantee behind, that the cement must stand the test; and it was the duty of the superintending engineer on the work to have the cement tested as to its efficiency for the purposes of that construction, as it came from time to time. Under these circumstances a contract was awarded, and these parties made the same cash deposit that was made by the other tenderers, in proportion to the amount that was awarded to them. I did not know the Battles; I had never seen them, I believe, until they were introduced to me on this occasion; I knew nothing about their cement; but it was declared to be useful for the purposes I have mentioned. There was every reason for me to believe that the public interests would be amply protected; and I do not believe that any gentleman in my position would have shut the door in the face of an article that had been used on many of our canals and had a high reputation for certain classes of work. It is true, the cement did not turn out well, and a good deal of it has been lost. But if the duty which de-

volved upon certain officers on the works of exercising care had been performed, and if they had tested it and condemned it, there would have been no great loss suffered by the department; but they did not do that. There was a determination—I did not know it then—on the part of the superintending engineer of the canal to condemn this cement and not give it a fair chance. When it went there, he did not give it proper protection from the weather, with the result that a great deal of it went to waste. I am bound to say that I do not think that the superintending engineer did his duty in the matter. But, as I have said, in managing a department of this kind and having regard to all the conditions, I do not feel that I could undertake to punish with the extremest penalty every failure on the part of an officer, even though it does involve some considerable pecuniary loss to the country. There might be, and would be in many cases, much vaster pecuniary loss entailed on the country by visiting the utmost penalties on officers who may fail to discharge their full duties in these matters. The matter just resolves itself into a case of failure in the article to meet the conditions, and the failure of the superintending engineer to watch it closely; and, as a result, this loss has been sustained. But I cannot myself see that personally or in any official capacity I am open to any very serious criticism. I think that any one who was in my position would have pursued exactly the same course that I did, feeling a desire that if we could fairly and reasonably and safely, as I felt we could, give to our own manufacturers some little consideration in awarding a contract of that kind, we would meet the general desire of the public, and would do no injury to the interests of the public.

With regard to the other question which the hon. gentleman alluded to, the proceedings which were taken in the Stewart matter, it is a great personal satisfaction, no doubt, to the hon. gentleman to discover something for which he can fix some personal or official responsibility on me.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not a personal matter at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I appreciate the hon. gentleman's delight under such circumstances. I know how he rolls the idea as a sweet morsel under his tongue, when he says: Here is a loss to the country, and the Minister of Railways is the man who is responsible for it. Now, let us follow the transaction through. What was the origin of this difficulty? The origin of the whole trouble occasioning all the legal proceedings that ensued, and any losses that may result, was when the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals did as he swore he did, in the testimony he gave in the case of Mr. Stewart—instructed Mr. Stewart to pause in the prosecution of the work. It has transpired,

according to the opinion of the courts, rendered, I think, since that occurrence took place, and not within the knowledge or fully understood by the law officers of the Crown until a more recent period. When the hon. gentleman gave those instructions, and allowed the contract which Mr. Stewart had entered into to complete the work as early as 1894, to be indefinitely postponed, he practically placed the government, as respected the completion of the work, in Mr. Stewart's power. If the hon. gentleman had not done that, if he had insisted that the work should go on, we would probably not have had any difficulty. When the change of government took place, according to the opinion of the officers of the department, whose judgment on the subject I felt myself justified in accepting, this work, at the rate of progress at which it had been going on for the previous two or three years, would not be finished for seventeen years.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman lay the calculations on the Table?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At the end of that short term we would have been able to allow a vessel to run through Mr. Stewart's section of the canal. Does the hon. gentleman imagine that the present Minister of Railways is responsible for the delay in the work? Does he say that the work ought not to have been pushed on, does he say that every reasonable opportunity was not accorded by the department to Mr. Stewart, if he had shaken himself, and got to work to finish it, even if he had taken longer to finish than was required of him at that time? Mr. Stewart was assured by me that we had no wish to treat him harshly or to take this work out of his hands. We infinitely preferred that he should complete it himself, and if he would show that he was in earnest in pushing it forward, we would render him every assistance in our power.

That cannot be denied. Alongside of that assurance I place this fact, that Mr. Stewart made no effort—I do not say that he deliberately refused to make an effort, but would prefer to believe he was unable—to push on the work. He had not the machinery or the men or means to do the work, and it became absolutely necessary to take it out of his hands, if the enlargement of the canal, upon which we had expended many millions of money, were to be made available within any reasonable compass of years.

What is it the hon. gentleman charges me with having or not having done? Was it not sufficient for me to have made every possible effort a human being could make to encourage Mr. Stewart to go on with his work? Was I to stand still and allow the work to be absolutely paralyzed? If I had done that, what would have been the charge against me? If because we had been unwilling or imagined ourselves unable to

grapple with the situation as presented by Mr. Stewart, under the tuition of my hon. friend, and left Mr. Stewart to dilly-dally with the work, what would have been the outcry against me as minister? It would have been, not the cry now raised, but the graver charge, which the people might well take some note of, and which they would have taken note of, that we had shown incapacity and incompetency in allowing these public works to be delayed for an indefinite period. Everything was done to induce Mr. Stewart to go on, and he would not. The department had to act. What was it to do? It had to authorize the necessary steps to be taken in order to bring the contract to an end. But I understand that the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Foster) who had been discussing this question is of opinion that it was my business, not only to come to a conclusion as to the policy to be pursued, but to draw out every paper that had to be drawn out, to be my own lawyer and bailiff and officer, and take all these proceedings myself individually. I should not have utilized the Justice Department or the engineers of the department, but have done these things myself. And because in a question of law the very grave doubt occurred as to whether or not the proper proceedings were taken to carry out our very well considered and properly decided policy, the minister must be condemned forsooth. What have I to do with the legal machinery or the legal proceedings that were taken. I claim that if legal proceedings had been taken in a proper form, Mr. Stewart never would have recovered a dollar against the department.

Mr. HAGGART. Where was the Solicitor General?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think the Solicitor General ever saw the papers or heard anything about the matter. I do not think that the chief engineer consulted with the Solicitor General, but went right over to the Justice Department, and whatever advice was had he got from the officers of that department. I do not think we got it from the Minister of Justice either.

Mr. FOSTER. Did he go over to the Minister of Justice without instructions?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The deputy minister and chief engineer received my authority to authorize all the proceedings that were proper and necessary in order that the condition of things then existing should be put an end to, and the contract taken out of Mr. Stewart's hands and put up to competition, and given to somebody else able and willing to carry it to completion. It is absurd for the hon. gentleman to pretend that the minister of the department had all these details to attend to and follow up minutely and personally, but that is the impression he

Mr. BLAIR.

is trying to create on the public, or at least on those who will be so ill-employed as to read what he has said.

Mr. FOSTER. Am I to understand that the deputy minister burnished up his arms and took possession of that property all by himself?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let the hon. gentleman ask Col. Sherwood, the officer of the police, and he will tell him who took charge.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is such a thing as ministerial responsibility.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am prepared to take the responsibility for the policy which the government adopted and the conclusions arrived at, and for everything that occurred outside of the legal proceedings, and for those I take no responsibility as the head of the Railway Department. I do take the general responsibility that every member of the government must take for what took place in connection with the legal proceedings, but, while I take responsibility for the legitimate business of the Railway Department, I must decline responsibility for the particular legal proceedings taken by another department. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman has made out a very poor case against my department. He has not shown that there was anything we could have done that we did not do. He has not shown that Mr. Stewart was willing and able to prosecute that work. He cannot show that, because it would not be according to the facts. He has not shown that we dealt harshly with Mr. Stewart in any way. He cannot deny that we exhibited a spirit of forbearance and consideration to Mr. Stewart all the way through, and would have been only too happy had he been willing and able to carry the work on to completion. The policy of the government and the way in which it was carried out down to the moment when these proceedings were taken, are matters not at all open to criticism. But, as to errors made in our legal proceedings, I have no special apologies to offer. I suppose that legal uncertainties will arise in respect to all transactions in which differences arise between contending parties. It has happened, so far as the quarry was concerned, that that matter had to be settled at our expense, but I entirely agree with the counsel and assistant counsel and the Deputy Minister of Justice, when they jointly recommended that it would be better to settle that part of the case without any further litigation. I admit the responsibility of settling the matter. As to the outlay which the hon. gentleman has stated, he is entirely wide of the mark in his calculations. Those costs are not applicable only to the proceedings in connection with the quarry. It was all the one suit. There were not two or three different suits.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. minister say?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The quarry question arose in the same suit and the costs paid were not costs applicable to this portion of the suit alone or the quarry question at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid you have not read the papers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not, but I venture to say that I am correct and that there was no division into the case, with regard to the quarry, and the case with regard to the other matter. They were all carried on at one time. Valuers may have been used in connection with the quarry, but they were used also in connection with the other portions. The costs paid and fees paid to counsel for the Crown were on bills that were rendered in connection with the whole suit.

Mr. FOSTER. But all they did was to look into the question of the quarries.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not correct. They took pages of evidence on other points.

Mr. FOSTER. I have read all the papers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) himself has stated that they dealt with a plant that had been used, which was not a question necessarily connected with the quarry. As to the results, I am inclined to think that Mr. Stewart will be much disappointed. I know he has the sympathy of hon. gentlemen opposite. They ought to sympathize with him, seeing that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) went to him and virtually told him not to hurry, that he did not want to press him unduly, and that in so saying, he was speaking in accordance with the wish of the Minister of Finance of that time, who felt that this work would cost less money if it was not hurried.

Mr. WM. GIBSON (Lincoln). The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), cast a slur upon one of the gentlemen I named to go down in place of myself to look at the stone, saying that one of these gentlemen, at all events, was not satisfactory. I suppose I should have suited the hon. gentleman better if I had sent a dry goods merchant, or had consulted with himself as to who should look at the stone. The men who went down at my request, were practical stonemasons, and knew more than the contractor himself. I myself saw the cut stone in the quarry, and afterwards saw the stone in the work. Whether one of the gentlemen whom I sent down was satisfactory or not, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), took care not to say that Mr. Hobson, chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Railway, examined that stone and gave expert evidence as to the quality of the rock, and that Mr. Hanaford, late

chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Railway, was also sent for—

Mr. HAGGART. He was a good authority.

Mr. GIBSON. As good authority as the hon. gentleman who questions his authority. Now, the whole trouble lay in the fact that the contractor was not a practical man. Mr. Archibald Stewart, instead of laying out his work to meet the sizes of the stone in his quarry, instead of cutting the stone two feet and the height of the bed, cut it three feet, where there was a reed of six inches at the bottom and top beds of the stone. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), does not tell the committee that thousands of dollars had to be paid by the new contractors to recut the stone. So little care was taken of it, that it fell in pieces when the hooks were put in it to lift it. The reason I did not go to give my own opinion, was because I knew that some time this matter would come up, and I wanted to be free to deal with the question, and could not be accused of being prejudiced, one way or the other. I examined the stone, and had no fault to find with it, except that the beds were of too great depth, and that the size of stone required, was not considered, that three-foot stone was out of proportion to the work, and that headers could not be got to correspond with the heights of the courses, on account of these reeds. I asked the man there: Why are you leaving the top and bottom beds of the stone? And his answer was: I am told to mind my own business. That was told me by the foreman whom I had recommended to Mr. Stewart, and the fact that I had sent him a foreman, shows that I was not unfriendly to him then, and I am not unfriendly to him now. It is unfair of the hon. member for York to show only one side of the case. He has taken the greatest pains so as to show everything that can be thought to be disadvantageous to the government, but he took good care not to say that Mr. Hobson had examined the stone.

Mr. FOSTER. My statement could only be made from what I found in the papers.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), has been elbow to elbow with Mr. Stewart, as has the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, and he said only this evening, that he knew more about it than the minister does. At all events, he had not a word to say about Mr. Hobson having reported against the stone. Hon. gentlemen could not well do that, because the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), sent Mr. Hobson up to the Sault Canal to examine the masonry and the work in connection with that canal. I do not think that any man who knows anything about it, will be prepared to say that Mr. Hobson is not a judge of stone, both practical and theoretically. And Mr. Hobson condemned the stone in Mr. Stewart's case, for the way it was cut. I know nothing of what took place

between the chief engineer and Mr. Munro, but so far as the stone-cutting was concerned, Mr. Munro was perfectly right. If Mr. Stewart had been a practical man, he would not have tried to have three feet heights of courses in the locks of that canal, particularly in the conditions of his quarry. I never had a word with the men who undertook the contract, and do not know that I should know them if I saw them; but I venture to say that they will agree with me that a practical man would never have cut the stone three feet in height. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals dealt leniently with Mr. Stewart. The fact is that Mr. Stewart got into such a condition, that he had not the money to go on with the work. The stone had to be recut, and the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals knows that tens of thousands of dollars of the peoples' money had to be paid for recutting stone—a work that would have been unnecessary had it been properly done in the first place.

Mr. HAGGART. That is not true.

Mr. GIBSON. Ask the engineers and the present contractors how much the recutting of the stone cost and the difference between the quality of stone cut and that actually used in the work, and you will find the discrepancy. These were things the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) carefully avoided bringing before the House. But if there was any extra cost and expense at all in connection with this work it will be found that it was not caused by the present Minister of Railways and Canals, but was created by the leniency and the friendliness of the ex-minister toward the contractor, allowing him, as it came out in evidence, all the time that he liked, allowing him to be paid for stone after it was condemned by the resident engineer; and after the resident engineer condemned the stone the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals went on and passed estimates and paid Mr. Stewart for quarrying and cutting the stone.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member is stating what is absolutely untrue.

Mr. GIBSON. Was not Mr. Stewart paid month after month?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says that I went on and paid for the stone after the engineer had rejected it; I say the statement is absolutely untrue.

Mr. GIBSON. I have to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, and I accept it fully. I want to say this, however, that I think it will be found on examination that after the report was made by Mr. Munro condemning the stone, estimates were paid for stone cut in the quarries at Rockland. That is the point I want to make clear to the committee, that after the stone was refused by Mr. Munro, it was still sent down upon the works, forced upon the works, and some of it was so rotten that the hooks used

to lift it would not hold. That is one of the reasons that this \$75,000, or whatever the sum was, had to be paid to the contractors who succeeded Mr. Stewart, that is a portion of the cost. The contractors who accepted that work had to make good and replace the stone that Mr. Stewart had been paid for and that had gone to pieces. That is the statement I make, and I think it can be verified on reference to the Department of Railways and Canals. It can be shown that when the last payment was made, when the last progress estimate was made—and the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals dare not deny it—the stone cutting went on, the quarrying went on, after Mr. Munro objected to the stone. Can the hon. gentleman deny it?

Mr. HAGGART. I don't know anything about that.

Mr. GIBSON. Of course, but he allowed it to go on. What I say is that they cut the stone improperly, they cut the stone out of beds where there is a loss of six inches on both beds. The hon. gentleman may laugh but the hon. gentleman never knew anything about his department. I have cross-examined him across the floor of this House time and again, and he always says, I don't know anything about it, I left it to my chief engineer. And all the time he was getting \$8,000 a year for leaving everything in the hands of the officers of his department. The present Minister of Railways and Canals takes pains to acquaint himself personally with the details of his department. He knows more about the Inter-colonial Railway, knows more about the working of it, than did the hon. gentleman who preceded him.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you expect to get for that eulogy?

Mr. GIBSON. I expect nothing. I am not looking for anything. There are higher motives for our action in this House than an expectation of reward. I suppose the hon. gentleman is looking to get back to his old position again, but he is going to be a long time without getting back. It is a long time since he went out of the government, and now he is holding us here five months and a half, and when the House closes the hon. gentleman is out of a job. He has nothing else to do but to remain here. It does not matter to him whether we are five months, or twelve months, or five years. He is simply acting his part here in such a way that he may get back again. It does not lie in the mouth of the hon. gentleman to twit any one in this House with expecting a reward. Everybody has their feelings. If there was ever any gentleman in this House who claimed perfection it is the hon. member for York, and he is about as far from it as the rest of us. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that so far as this work is concerned it will be found that much of the extra cost with

Mr. GIBSON.

regard to the letting of this new contract was largely on account of the condition in which the stone was cut.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Railways and Canals has such a knowledge of everything that when the question of cement to be used in the construction of the locks is to be considered, he does not take the advice of the engineer, but on his own responsibility he orders material, with the result that \$23,000 of the peoples money is being spent for an entirely useless material in the construction of these locks. He states that if it was properly looked after by the engineer in charge of the work, the \$23,000 would not be lost. If he thinks so it is the duty of the ministers to see that that engineer no longer continues in charge of that work. If the engineer in charge of the work is prejudiced against the material so that a loss would accrue to the country of \$23,000 he should not be allowed to continue as the engineer of the work. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) has criticised my management of the work. He speaks of my having overruled the decision of the engineer. I contradict him flatly in that; I did not do anything of the kind. The question of material was left entirely to the deputy. He made inquiries on the subject without being influenced by me at all. I did not care anything about it. It was his business to look after the material used in the construction of the locks and to see that it was proper material. He inquired into the matter in a way that would enable him to get the best information on the subject. He sent for the foreman mason employed on the Intercolonial Railway for the purpose of looking at the quarry and seeing whether the stone was fit for the work or not. He found that it was. Samples of the stone were sent to the mechanical laboratory of McGill University for a report. I had nothing to do with that. As to going into the quarry and seeing whether the stone was the best that could be obtained which the hon. member for Lincoln thinks is part of the duty of the political head of the department, I did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. GIBSON. I never said anything about that.

Mr. HAGGART. That is not part of the minister's duty. He is dependent entirely upon his deputy minister and the engineer in charge of the work. I never interfered directly or indirectly in favour of Mr. Stewart. I treated him the same as every other contractor who had a contract with the department. The hon. Minister of Railways states that I gave exceptional favours to him, that I made a statement to him that debarred the government from compelling him to do the work. The statement made to him was made by the deputy minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, not at all.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, I may have told Mr. Stewart myself. I may have spoken to him in reference to the matter, but the deputy minister had instructions from me. I had instructions from council. The matter was brought up by the Finance Minister in Council. I got instructions and I gave them to the deputy minister in reference to these works.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what we suspected.

Mr. HAGGART. It was under orders from Council. I gave the instructions to the deputy minister. The work was to be gone on with slowly. If I remember correctly the reason was that there was some taxation taken off sugar or something, the finances were not as buoyant as they usually were, and for this reason the Finance Minister asked me to state to the contractors that if they thought it was to their advantage not to proceed expeditiously with their work they could do so. I simply carried out the wish of council and the wish of the Finance Minister.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I want to make a little statement in regard to the stone. I happen to be acting Minister of Railways before my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) took charge of the department, and when I went into the department I found very strong written representations from Mr. Munro, the resident engineer, condemning the stone which Mr. Stewart was supplying from his quarry. Mr. Munro followed up his written representations by a personal visit to the department. I saw him, and he condemned the stone much more strongly than he had done in his written reports. He condemned it so severely that I felt something had to be done. The chief engineer differed from him. The hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) rather intimates that there was some unbusinesslike proceeding in the way in which the department managed this transaction. I wrote to the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies asking each of them if they could furnish me with a first class man who could give me an opinion about the quality of stone supplied for the locks. We got a man from the Grand Trunk Railway, but we did not succeed in getting one from the Canadian Pacific Railway. We got two from the Grand Trunk. Mr. Hobson and Mr. Hannaford. These gentlemen went down, examined the stone, and although they did not condemn it as unreservedly as Mr. Munro had done, they gave an opinion against the stone. I was not disposed to accept even their judgment, but I thought we should get some one else whose thorough knowledge of stone would enable him to pronounce an authoritative opinion upon

it. I thought of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), and I wrote him, telling him the whole circumstances, and asking him whether he could go and examine the stone and give his opinion in order to enable me to form an opinion between the conflicting opinions of Mr. Munro, Mr. Schrieber, Mr. Hobson and Mr. Hannaford. He told me that he did not care to interfere with it at all. Then I asked him if he could give me the names of two of the best qualified men as judges of stone that he knew. He gave me the names of two men and they condemned the stone. I do not know what more I could have done. I do not know that I left anything undone that I should have done, or that I did anything that I should have left undone. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) then came into the department, and I believe he had the benefit of the opinions of the same parties. Eventually part of the stone was accepted, but a great part of it was found bad for the reasons stated by the hon. member for Lincoln, not that the stone was inherently bad, but because of the way in which it was cut. As far as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is concerned, and he has consulted me a good deal, I cannot conceive how a contractor could have been treated more considerately than he has treated Mr. Stewart. His whole object seemed to be to tide Mr. Stewart over the difficulties that he was in. I think that under the circumstances he has treated Mr. Stewart with the utmost consideration and kindness.

Mr. HAGGART. Two of the experts that the hon. gentleman got from the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), Mr. Hobson and Mr. Hannaford, are found to be utterly unreliable, because the stone has been used from that very quarry ever since.

Mr. GIBSON. Were the stone supplied afterwards, three feet high?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know anything about that, their being three feet high, but they were from the same quarry. Mr. Munro reported against the stone and Mr. Hannaford objected to it as not being fit to be used at all. It was not a question of its being 3-feet thick. Besides the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) need not impose his technical knowledge on the committee in reference to all these details. There is another subject which is perhaps as interesting as the others, and in regard to which we would like an explanation from the minister. The Minister of Railways will notice that certain serious statements were made in the Upper House by Senator Ferguson in reference to lubricating oil furnished to the Intercolonial Railway. That matter requires an explanation from the minister.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have a word to say about this cement business. I was at the Public Accounts Committee when this in-

vestigation took place, and I am satisfied in my mind that Mr. Munro was directly responsible for the bad condition of that cement. The cement was under his charge; it was put into a wooden shed, it was subject to damp in the fall and then during winter season it was frozen solid with the result that it set. The best cement in the world would do that if it was treated in the same way. It was the engineer in charge and not the minister that was to blame. Munro should have been dismissed years ago. There were other transactions he was guilty of for which he should have been dismissed, but this one was sufficient. If he knew the first thing about his business, he should have cared for that cement and prevented it from getting damp. He should have put some stoves in the shed to keep the place warm during the winter months. If ministers keep such men in their employment they are responsible to some extent. It was established that this gentleman went almost every day to Montreal and although he had a pass on the Grand Trunk Railway he charged the government the full amount for a single ticket going and coming, although he did not pay a cent and always returned the same day. He should have been dismissed for that. It is all very well to hear the member for York (Mr. Foster) talking about nothing of this kind occurring when he was in power. It is a common occurrence in business as in anything else that the best of men will make mistakes and incur losses and sometimes employ unworthy servants. Ministers of the Crown must have the same experience. Does the member for York remember about the contract for the harbour works in Toronto under his government. It was proved here before a committee of this House that blind bolts were used in that work and that hundreds of thousands of them were driven in with a sledge hammer in place of the whole work being bolted together and filled in with stone. The first storm that came the work was swept away and the country lost over \$22,000. I produced one of these blind bolts at the time in this House and the Minister of Public Works was surprised. There was an investigation held and my charge was proved up to the hilt, although there was an engineer in charge of that work all the time. That occurred in a government of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was a member. I do not believe myself that the minister can, always be held responsible for these things. For the cement business Munro was responsible and he should have been discharged.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS (Russell). Not being familiar with all the ins and outs of this matter I do not wish to take part in this debate further than to say that Mr. Stewart must have suffered considerable loss and he certainly suffered great inconvenience indeed because of the fact that from the

first Mr. Munro condemned this stone in toto. As to the long delay that took place afterwards, and as to the evidence given by the experts I venture no opinion whatever. To a business man or to any one who has any understanding of such matters it would appear perfectly evident that Mr. Stewart must have suffered severely in consequence of Mr. Munro's condemnation of the stone. It proved subsequently that Mr. Munro was wrong because the stone was finally accepted and is in the work to-day. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), inadvertently made a mistake because it is a fact that Mr. Munro's condemnation existed from the first.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not deny that. I think before any of the stone was used in the work Mr. Munro reported against the quarry. But I think the deputy got experts to inquire into it.

Mr. GIBSON. Was no money paid for the stone that was cut in the quarry?

Mr. HAGGART. Not unless on the certificate of Mr. Munro and the deputy minister. I never had anything to do with it. I never talked to the deputy minister about giving a certificate.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Munro refused to certify; and still the money was paid.

Mr. HAGGART. Not that I am aware of.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, that is so; Mr. Munro refused to certify.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Munro refused to certify it, but I do not think the deputy certified until he got Mr. Munro's certificate. Mr. Munro changed his mind after the inquiry by the deputy minister, and when the deputy minister found that it was good, he certified to it. But I had nothing to do with it.

Mr. EDWARDS. Of course, it is very well known that I am a friend of Mr. Stewart's; and as to this whole transaction, I am simply an observer, and I only wish to say that Mr. Stewart must have lost very severely both by loss of time and in consequence of the action taken in regard to the stone.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The ex-Minister of Railways has asked me to make some explanations in regard to certain allegations which have been made by one of the gentlemen of the Senate with regard to what is called the Galena Oil Company's contract. I think it is rather to be regretted that this matter, if gentlemen desired to go into it, was not taken up at an earlier period of the session. At this period I do not think it would be possible to go into it as I would like, because any insinuations or charges which have been made with regard to the bona fides of that transaction can be absolutely dispelled

and disproved. I happen to know about that matter, and I am in a position to state that nothing would have given me more satisfaction than to have had it brought up at a time when we could have had it inquired into by the Public Accounts Committee and all the persons who knew anything about it asked to give their evidence upon it. I explained the transaction somewhat fully the other day when I was speaking generally upon supplies for the Intercolonial Railway, and I do not know that I need now do more than refer to one or two specific things that have since been mentioned. When I first came into the department, I was called upon to deal with the subject of a contract for oil for the Intercolonial Railway. Notice had been sent to the Imperial Oil Company that for the major part of the oil for lubricating purposes the contract would be awarded to it. That was done by the late government; but no contract had been entered into, and it appeared to me that that was not the best arrangement that could have been made. Tenders which were received by the department included, among others, one from a company called the Galena Oil Company, whose works, I believe, are located near the city of Toronto. This company, I may say, has been furnishing oil for lubricating purposes for a number of years to the Canadian Pacific Railway; it also supplied the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canada Atlantic, the Canada Southern, and in point of fact, 95 per cent of all the railways that are operating on the continent of America, because of the way in which it performs the service and the quality of the oil it furnishes. I found among the papers that had been filed with the tender, a list of the companies which at that period were served by the Galena Oil Company, and that company, through its agent, expressed its desire that its statement in that regard should be verified. The various samples of oils that were supplied by the tenderers for analysis were sent to Professor Ruttan, the chemical analyst at McGill, and he made a report upon them. The result of his report was that he did not recommend that the oil of the Imperial Oil Company should be accepted by the government and the contract awarded to it in preference to the others. There was very little difference between its price and that of some of the other tenderers; but the oils of the Galena Oil Company were very much higher than those of the other tenderers. But there was this difference, a substantial and material difference between the tender of the Galena Oil Company and that of the other. The Galena Company guaranteed that if a contract was made with them, they would not only furnish a quality of oil entirely satisfactory to the Railway Department, but that the cost of lubricating oils for the year in which their contract might continue would not be as great per 1,000 miles as it had been for the year preceding, which I believe was an average year. They

said: give us the contract and we will make your oil cost you 10 per cent less than it has been costing you, and the way we will do it is this. We know what kind of oils are better for lubricating than the ordinary producers. We have had the experience with railway companies, we supply 95 per cent of the railway companies and they have confidence in us and the way in which we perform their service, and we will undertake to put men upon your railway, trained experts in the matter of oiling, who will explain to your train hands how to use the oil so as to use it economically, and at all events, whether we succeed in impressing our system on your men or not, we will contract with you that you will not pay us for our oil no matter what quantity you consume, as much by 10 per cent as it cost you last year for your lubricating. That seemed to me a more favourable offer than any of the others. It seemed to guarantee an efficient service, and we had the fact that all the other railways were using it and we were going to get our supply at a 10 per cent reduction.

The question came up and I made a statement of the case in my report to council, and council came to the conclusion that under the circumstances it would be in the public interest to make a contract with the Galena Oil Company in preference to the Imperial Oil Company. The contract has been in operation from that time down to the present. After it had been running a while, on consultation with the mechanical superintendent and the general manager at Moncton, it was decided that the service was very satisfactory and could not be improved upon, but that we would make an effort to have a still further reduction in the cost beyond 10 per cent, and we demanded that 15 per cent reduction should be made in the contract. That was ultimately agreed to, and we went on operating under the 15 per cent for a while. Then, by reason of the instruction which the company gave our employees and the improvements made in the way in which the oil was used, we had such success that the report from the officers of the department show a very much larger reduction in the cost of the oil to the railway itself than the guarantee of the Galena Company provided. The figures which I read in the House the other day, on this subject were to this effect, that whereas prior to the adoption of this contract with the Galena Company it cost us \$3.72 per 1,000 miles for oiling locomotives, under this contract we had succeeded in getting the cost down to \$2.72, effecting thus a saving of a dollar per 1,000 miles. On the passenger service the oiling of the passenger cars has been reduced from 80 cents to 20 cents. On freight cars it has been reduced from 22 to 12 cents, is a much larger percentage than even the 15 per cent at first agreed upon. That is the way the thing stands. It is said, I believe, hon. gentlemen

Mr. BLAIR.

in the Senate, it is stated in the *Montreal Gazette* of to-day, that there is something very suspicious about this whole transaction, because they say the price of this oil is very much higher than the Imperial or the Eastern or any other people are willing to furnish their oil at. That is true, the price is higher, but the question of price is not an important consideration under our contract, and because no matter what the price may be, no matter if it was \$11 per gallon in place of 50 or 60 cents, they could not get beyond the 10 per cent reduction in the first contract and 15 per cent in the second contract—\$2.70 for locomotives, 20 cents for passenger cars and 12 cents for freight cars, no matter how many gallons of oil they used they cannot ask for a nickel more than the figure per 1,000 miles, for each of the different class of cars. The fact that remains is this. The Galena Oil Company charge higher for their oils, but their oils are better quality, and they have given the guarantee, furnishing other railways I mentioned. They have stated to Mr. Pottinger that they supply all the other railways with oil exactly at the same prices charged to us, not one farthing less—no discounts, no reductions. If they do that, as I have reason to believe they do, they appear to be an honourable and self-respecting company. Otherwise they would not have contracts the same as ours with these railways over the whole continent.

Mr. HAGGART. What do you pay per 1,000 miles for the locomotives?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. \$2.72. There is no doubt that before we entered into these contracts at all, the cost to the Intercolonial Railway for oil service was very much greater than upon other railways. Even if we were getting it at 10 per cent less, the cost would be higher than on the Grand Trunk Railway, Canadian Pacific Railway, or Canada Pacific or Canada Southern, or any of these larger roads. And the reason is that these companies exercise a more effective control over their employees in that way, and their employees are more amenable to discipline. You cannot get men to be so circumspect on our road as upon a privately-owned road. I suppose one explanation is that the men feel that if they are chided too severely, political friends will interest themselves in their behalf and prevent punishment from being meted out. I mention this because it is put forward prominently as a ground of condemnation. They say there must be something wrong in the transactions or the government would not undertake to pay the prices in excess of prices that would be furnished by other people. But, it will be seen that the price charged is not the important or controlling element in the situation. The fact is the mileage rate is far below what we have ever before obtained. Another thing is mentioned, and I

am surprised that a paper of such standing as the *Montreal Gazette* should make such insinuations against a minister of the Crown, bringing the evidence of mere supposition to justify those insinuations. This paper says it is a most extraordinary circumstance that when I was seeking election, Mr. Lichtenheim, a gentleman representing the Galena Oil Company was in the county of Queen's, and took an interest in the election; and their getting the contract, therefore, was not surprising. I want to say, most emphatically, that I never heard of Mr. Lichtenheim until after my election took place, and if he was in the county of Queen's during the election, he did not make himself known to me, and I did not know he was there. The contract was made long subsequent to the election. I cannot remember the exact date, but I think it was in October or November. And it was entered into after the fullest consideration by Mr. Pottinger, the general manager, who was of the opinion that it was a favourable arrangement. And certainly, with respect to lubricating our trains, we never had such favourable conditions as to cost.

Mr. HAGGART. What amount does the minister pay for the three years?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The first year it was \$3.72 for locomotives. I do not think there was any reduction in the second year. I think the only reduction that took place would be the 10 per cent below the previous cost per thousand miles.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. gentleman give the cost per car per thousand miles for lubricating?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was 80 cents, as I am advised, before this arrangement was made; and it is now down to 20 cents.

Mr. POWELL. There are some figures I would like the minister to explain as to the cost of lubricating and lighting the railway. I saw in looking after some returns given in the railway reports of the department, that there had been quite a commendable reduction in the cost of lubricating and lighting, but that was all I knew about it at the time the hon. gentleman referred to the oil used up on the Intercolonial Railway. But when the statement was made and figures given the other evening, by the hon. minister, my attention was called to some facts and figures he gave, which I attempted to verify. I think his claim on that occasion was too wide. Either there are some serious defects in the data given in these annual reports, or otherwise the hon. minister is entirely astray in his figures. Every year the department publishes a statement of the cost of lubricating engines and cars, and also from signal and other lamps.

From these tables the following facts are given: In 1896, there was a total engine mileage of 4,714,000, and the cost of lubricating engines was \$28,224. When the present minister came into power, he substituted for the then existing arrangements on the Intercolonial Railway the present arrangement with the Galena Oil Company, and the result was that the next year, 1897, with a mileage of 4,655,000, the cost is \$30,848; in 1898, with a mileage of 4,871,000, the cost was \$31,424; the next year, which is the last year of the published reports, the mileage was 5,974,000, and the cost was \$29,846. This is the statement concerning locomotives. Now, turning to the cost of lubricating cars, I find that in the last year of the ex-minister's management, the total car mileage was 43,005,000, and the cost \$15,098. In 1897 the mileage was 40,823,000; in 1898, 43,189,000; in 1899, 53,422,000; the combined cost of the three last years being \$53,562. The point now arises as to whether there has been a reduction in cost. In 1896, the cost was \$28,224 for 4,714,000 miles of engine mileage. According to that basis, the cost for the three succeeding years should have been \$92,802; as a matter of fact it was \$92,118; so that as given by his reports, the actual cost was \$684 less, as regards engine mileage, than it should be on the basis of 1896. As regards car mileage, the actual cost for the three years, was \$53,562. On the basis of 1896, the cost should have been \$48,256; so that the loss to the country was no less a sum than \$5,306. On the basis of the contract, the hon. gentleman entered into, the two mileages were to form the basis of calculation. From the figures as published, this result follows: There should have been under the contract which provides that the cost is to be in the aggregate ten per cent less than under the last year of Mr. Haggart's administration in 1896, a reduction in respect of engine mileage of \$9,280, as a matter of fact there was only a reduction of \$684. When we look to the car mileage, we find the loss to the country was \$5,300. There should have been a 10 per cent reduction under the terms of the contract, which would have reduced the cost of lubricating the cars by the amount of \$4,825 below \$48,256, which should leave the cost at the rate of 1896. That would make a reduction from the actual figures that were paid on car mileage, of \$10,131. Adding this to the reduction we should have in the case of engines, we find that altogether the country has paid under the contract, \$18,724 more than it should have paid. This is irrespective of the 5 per cent reduction which the hon. gentleman claims for the last year. This extra reduction of 5 per cent would amount to \$7,052. Hence, the cost to the railroad was greater by \$25,779 than under the contract, and subsequent for a further reduction of 5 per cent it should have been.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That cannot be. They cannot be so far astray at Moncton as to have made any such calculation at that.

Mr. POWELL. I am simply giving you the published figures, I do not vouch for their correctness.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is something that is not in the calculation that ought to be there.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman stated also that this contract had reduced the cost of lubricating engines per thousand miles. In the published report of 1896, the cost of lubricating cars per thousand miles is set down, not at \$3.72, which the hon. gentleman says was the cost in 1896, but at \$3.20. Now, these reports for 1897-8-9, give the cost of lubricating engines as follows: 1897, \$4.90 per 1,000 miles; 1898 \$3.50 per 1,000 miles; 1899 \$2.20, making the average for these three years \$3.53½ cents per 1,000 miles. If there was a reduction in the cost per 1,000 miles of 10 per cent instead of being \$3.20, as it was for 1896, the cost would have been 32 cents less, or \$2.88. As a matter of fact, according to his reports, the hon. minister will find that, for these three years, the cost was not \$2.88, but \$3.53½. When you come to cars, according to the figures that are in the hon. gentleman's report, the following results flow: In 1896 the average cost per 1,000 miles for lubricating cars was 30 cents. In 1897 it was 50 cents; in 1898 40 cents, and in 1899, 25 cents. The average cost for the three years, 1897-8-9 was 38½ cents, an increase of 8½ cents instead of a decrease of 3 cents. I think it is due to the hon. gentleman himself to have the mystery connected with this business cleared up. I read the report of the speech that Mr. Ferguson delivered in the Senate. Some of the calculations are not made on exactly the same lines as I have made these, and I do not know where he got some of his figures. They are calculations that he has worked out, and whether they be true or not, I do not know. These results I have obtained from simply taking the hon. gentleman's own figures.

Leaving that I come to a matter which is not one of comparison by mileage at all, but which is a very simple and plain matter, and one that does strike me as a very unjustifiable proceeding on the part of the minister. I refer to one particular kind of oil. The contract that the hon. gentleman entered into with the Galena Oil Company respecting lubricating oils was made on the 17th of September, 1896. Six days afterwards the hon. gentleman entered into another contract with the Galena Oil Company. The second contract was not for lubricating oil, but for signal and lamp oil, as it is called. There appears to be a mystery

Mr. POWELL.

about this contract. In the first place I may say that before that time the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals had called for tenders, and that a tender had been put in for this particular kind of oil by the Imperial Oil Company, for the sum of 37½ cents per gallon, which was accepted. It was not the lowest tender nor was the oil tendered for by this company the very best oil. The lowest tender was that offered by Samuel Rogers & Co., 37 cents per gallon. At the same time there was a tender put in for a peculiar kind of illuminating oil known as 'A' specification of the Intercolonial Railway. 'A' specification is the specification of this contract that was made on the 23rd of September, 1896, and it appears in a return that was brought down in the Senate. It is as follows:

This oil to be of the best quality of double distilled standard white, extra refined petroleum, free from acid, sulphur or other impurities, to weight at 62° Fahr. not less than 7.85 pounds, nor more than 800 pounds per gallon, not less than 90 per cent, to distil between 300° Fahr. and 518° Fahr., to withstand a flash test of 105° Fahr. by the standard pyrometer, and in all other respects to comply with the provisions of the Petroleum Inspection Act, 1880, 43 Vic., cap. 21, and amending Acts. In burning for twelve hours the oil must produce a brilliant and nearly uniform flame, without crusting the wick or discolouring the chimney, and with a loss of not more than 15 per cent in power during that period.

In the contract made on the 23rd of September, 1896, the contract purports to be for signal oil, but this is a portion of the contract:

Such contractor will furnish the said oil in all respects according to the specifications hereto annexed, marked 'A,' and sample submitted, which specification is to be taken and read as forming part of this contract, and will deliver the said oil in good order at Moncton N.B., free from all charges, and duty paid.

Hand lamp and signal oil was tendered for by the Imperial Oil Company at 37½ cents a gallon. That tender was accepted but 'A' specification oil was tendered for at 20½ cents a gallon, and that tender was also accepted. The tender of the Galena Oil Company was 46 2-10 cents a gallon for signal lamp oil. Mr. Ruttan who made the inspection reports gives his analysis as follows:

The sample of signal or hand lamp oil submitted by the Eastern Oil Company, No. 291, possesses such properties and composition as would justify it being placed at the head of the list. It has the best average in all respects. The Samuel Rogers oil gives a bright light, and has the lowest cold test, but contains too much light petroleum, and has too much free fat acid to recommend it as a safe light to use. The signal oil submitted by the Galena Oil Works, Ref. No. 2306, contains a very high percentage of heavy lard oil, giving it a very high cold test for this climate. It also burns with less brilliancy than many of the other

samples, although the light is steady and even. The remaining samples are superior to the two just mentioned, and but slightly inferior to the samples submitted by the Eastern Oil Company, and are about of equal value among themselves.

The Imperial Oil Company's hand lamp and signal oil it will be seen was classed superior to the hand lamp and signal oil of the Galena Oil Company. In fact the other is condemned. This is the peculiarity, that the Imperial Oil Company signal hand lamp oil was offered to the railway, and the offer was accepted at 37½ cents, but that was set aside, and in its room was accepted this oil of the Galena Oil Company, which was condemned by the analyst, at the rate of 46 2-10 cents per gallon, was with tender substituted for it. That is not a question at all that bears on the question of mileage. There is no condition in the contract as to reducing it in any way. It is simply deliberately accepting a poorer oil for 46 2-10 cents per gallon in lieu of a better oil for 37½ cents per gallon. If it be that the contract was not made really for signal oil, but for the 'A' illuminating oil, and this is the legal construction of the contract, then the department deliberately gave to the Galena Company 46 2-10 cents per gallon for an oil that was not as good as was offered by the Imperial Oil Company for 20½ cents and accepted by the railway office at Moncton. In the one case there would be a loss of over 8 cents a gallon, and in the other case there would be a loss of about 26 cents a gallon. These facts appear on the face of a return that has been brought down to the Senate. If the minister (Mr. Blair) has any explanation, I think he had better give it to us before the House closes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The figures which the hon. gentleman has read from the report are not at all within my knowledge. I do not know on what basis they have been prepared, nor do I know as to how far they may be applicable to the calculation which I have recently received. I can understand that it might be for the reason that in the recent statements they have got the cost of the oil for lubricating the railway, within the last nine months would be the low figures I have mentioned, and the years that are there referred to in the report may be years when the rates are up. It is no doubt a fact that the present contract prices that we are getting our oil furnished at, are the results of the most recent operations of the contract upon the line, because for a considerable period after the arrangements we first made there was no evidence that the quantity of oil consumed was very much diminishing. There were a good many complaints made that the employees of the road were not handling the oil with a view to economy, and that went on for a considerable period,

but I have heard lately that the company have been able to introduce a more judicious use of the oil throughout the road. I am quite unable to state anything which is different to what I have already said. I have had these figures presented to me and I gave them to the committee previously. I have stated what these figures show. If they differ from those the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) has made up there must be some mistake somewhere. There cannot be any mistake about this, however: That there has been a saving of 10 per cent when the contract stood at 10 per cent, and there has been a saving of 15 per cent during the period that the 15 per cent reduction was in the contract. I cannot have been misled by the officers of the department in any such way as that they would furnish the oil under the first contract for 10 per cent less than it cost the year preceding the date in which they entered into it.

Mr. FOSTER. They do in 1897 and 1898.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. There are your figures.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot answer for these figures. I do not pay these gentlemen, nor do I adjust their claims. But I feel as morally certain as a man can be, that the accountant in the first place, and the Auditor General in the next place, would not pass accounts unless there was the 10 per cent reduction made according to contract.

Mr. HAGGART. On what basis do you pay the company when you take this oil into store.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the necessity for purchasing two years' supply—nearly \$40,000 worth, and taking it into store at the beginning of the year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that it has been done. I certainly never gave any authority or never was asked, and I cannot say that any such purchase has been made. I have not a particle of doubt in my mind, but that the gentlemen who are responsible for the way in which the payments are made, and the service performed have not allowed the public interests to be sacrificed in the adjustment of the accounts. I will, of course, take immediate means to ascertain what explanations may be given as to that report.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you justify giving 46 2-10 cents to the Galena Oil Com-

pany for oil which is inferior, according to the analyst's report, to the 21-cent oil, and without any 10 per cent reduction ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not recollect the circumstances connected with the other contract. My impression was that there was only one contract.

Mr. **POWELL**. There are two.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I should judge that the oil which they furnished is of a superior character.

Mr. **FOSTER**. But the analyst says it is inferior.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I think you will find that Dr. Ruttan acknowledged that he could not himself form any definite opinion as to the oils. There is no doubt that the signal oil of this company is used very largely by these other railways, is guaranteed to be an article of excellent quality, and is giving very great satisfaction in the department ?

Mr. **HAGGART**. Does the hon. gentleman know the prices the other companies are paying ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I do not. They do not use a large quantity of this oil compared with the lubricating oil, and it might very fairly go with that seeing that the company's conditions for supplying it are so reasonable. We have had the utmost satisfaction with this company in the way in which it has performed the service, and it is the opinion of the general manager and the mechanical superintendent that it is in the interest of the railway service that this company should continue to supply us with these oils. When the manager was last up, I took occasion to ascertain what his officers thought on the subject, and he was decidedly of opinion that it was the best arrangement we could make.

Mr. **HAGGART**. What did it cost in 1897, 1898 and 1899 for lubricating per car mileage ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I told the hon. gentleman that it cost 10 per cent less than \$3.72 during the pendency of the first contract; we reduced that by 5 per cent, which gave us 15 per cent reduction during the pendency of the second contract; and on the present contract we are getting it at a fixed rate of \$2.72, for the locomotives, 20 cents, for passenger cars, and 12 cents for freight cars.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Will the hon. gentleman be astonished to learn that the same gentlemen who have a contract with him for \$2.72 per thousand miles for locomotives, on the Intercolonial, have a contract with the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific Rail-

Mr. **FOSTER**.

way and other railways in Canada to furnish oil for less than \$1.50 per thousand miles for locomotives ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I dare say.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Will he be astonished to learn that for lubricators for which the hon. gentleman has been paying from 80 cents down to 22 cents, they have contracts with nearly every railroad for less than 11 cents ?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. On the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway I think that the passenger car mileage might be reduced one half, and I would not be surprised to learn that on these roads I have named, the car mileage cost per 1,000 miles could be reduced to eight or nine cents. But we cannot and never will be able to do it on the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have been four years getting down to our present figures. The Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway commenced in the neighbourhood of where we were and got down inside of two years to their present basis.

Mr. **FOSTER**. If the hon. minister is willing to let it go at that, I do not think we need stay any longer. Taking the whole matter of this oil business together, it is as bad as the worst kind of oil could possibly be. In the first place, the hon. gentleman entirely repudiated contract and tender. When he came in he found what had been followed always by the Intercolonial Railway—the calling for tenders, the getting of samples, the analyses made by the analyst, and the taking of the best oils at the lowest prices. He found that tenders had been called for and the contracts practically awarded. Did he ask the council anything about that. No, but he swept away all these, and afterwards, when he undertook to make a contract with the Galena Oil Company without calling for tenders, he took the matter to council, and put it through.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Tenders were invited and the Galena Oil Company tendered the same as the Imperial Oil Company did.

Mr. **FOSTER**. That was only in the first instance.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Yes.

Mr. **FOSTER**. But the hon. gentleman in every case took the highest priced oil and gave the contract away from the lowest price tenders, although the analysts reports were against the Galena Oil Company except in one instance.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I got the guarantee of 10 per cent reduction.

Mr. FOSTER. In 1896, what was the standard for the locomotive car mileage? It was \$3.20.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, \$3.72 I am informed.

Mr. FOSTER. Three dollars and twenty cents is given by the hon. gentleman's own return.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As a matter of actual fact, I do not believe it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman may not believe it, but these figures have been taken entirely from his own report given to the House. But supposing it was \$3.72, it was that in 1897, and the contract called for a 10 per cent reduction over rate of 1896.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was \$3.72 in 1896:

Mr. FOSTER. What was it in 1897?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Ten per cent less.

Mr. FOSTER. You got it for \$3.72. That is what you paid in 1897, and the 10 per cent reduction was not taken off.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It must have been taken off. These gentlemen in Moncton knew what the contract was.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman had Dr. Ruttan's analysis on signal oil before him, in which Dr. Ruttan says it is not as good as the sample tendered for at 37½ cents. He gave 46 2-10th cents to the Galena Oil Company, and is buying it at that rate without any 10 per cent reduction. When you tell him this, he says it must be wrong. But, here is the contract, are you to take the contract or simply the supposition of the hon. gentleman? The fact is, that the hon. gentleman's manipulation of the oil business on the Intercolonial Railway is as bad an affair as was ever recorded in the history of any department in the country. He has been weak and tottering in the sham defence he has made to-night. Sometimes he knows everything, but to-night he knows nothing. Why; because he was faced with his own report.

The committee rose and reported progress.

## SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 119) to authorize the granting of subsidies to certain lines of railway herein mentioned (Mr. Blair) read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.35 a.m. (Saturday).

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, July 14, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT—DISMISSED OFFICIALS.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to avail of this, which I hope is the last opportunity of calling attention to the return of dismissed officials by the Department of Railways, so that I might get my errant papers together.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Very well.

HARBOUR WORKS, ST. JOHN, N.B.—TENDERERS' DEPOSITS.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I asked, yesterday morning, for information from the Minister of Finance as to whether the two deposit cheques of the tenderers in connection with this work have been forfeited, and if the proceeds have gone into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The cheques are held by the government, and will be forfeited.

Mr. FOSTER. Will be forfeited?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

IMMIGRATION TO THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I wish to draw attention to an inaccuracy in the report of the Department of the Interior. On page 16 of the report, I find the following:—

The Galicians who have gone into Manitoba and the North-west Territories during the past three years, numbering about 16,000, while attracting a great deal of attention on arrival, have been so well settled—being divided into small colonies—that they have been little heard of since.

The words 'being divided into small colonies' clearly conveys an inaccurate idea, inasmuch as in the colony which exists 35 or 40 miles west of Edmonton, there are half of the whole number of these Galicians, that is to say, about 8,000. I think it is desirable that the House should have a thorough understanding of the facts in such an important matter, and that, so far as this colony is concerned, they are not in a small colony. Further on in the report I read:

They are now considered by the residents a decided advantage to the locality and are making quite as good progress as any other class of settlers in the country. The objection to this nationality which existed in the popular mind a year or two ago and which was the subject of so much newspaper discussion, has quite passed away.

That may be a matter of opinion; but my position, as representative of the district in which a large number of these people are settled, compels me to say that the objection has not passed away. On the contrary, the fact that they are there in such large numbers and increasing so rapidly has increased and intensified the objection hitherto existing there. I read further:

The reason for this appears to be that they are adapting themselves to the conditions of the country and are now looked upon as a part of the great producing class of Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

I would like to say, on behalf of the people of the North-west whom I represent, that they decline to be considered simply in the light of 'producing classes.' They are there for other purposes than merely to be 'producers.' They are citizens of the country; and it strikes me that any report in regard to immigration which considers immigrants simply in the light of 'producing classes,' falls very short of the proper idea of what immigration should be.

Mr. J. V. ELLIS (St. John City). I wish to express my opinion, and that is that the best kind of people we can have in this country are people who are producers.

Mr. FOSTER. If they are good producers.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) has brought up the question of the quality of the immigrants we are getting in this country, I would draw the attention of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of the Interior to a despatch in the *Edinburgh Scotsman*, a marked copy of which I received yesterday. It reads as follows:—

Vienna, June 29.—It appears that a considerable number of the increasing stream of these immigrants from Roumania, which has been passing through the Dual Monarchy for weeks past intend to settle in Canada as labourers.

Further on, I read:

Their poverty is such that they are forced to camp in the open air, being unable to pay for the poorest lodgings.

I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to this statement, and I wish to ascertain from the government if our immigrant agents in Europe are catering to bring out vast numbers of people of this class to settle them in our North-west?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). When the Minister of the Interior is in his seat, I will be able to give an answer to the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke). It is not the policy of the government to bring out paupers, but I know of no restriction against able-bodied men who are willing to work and can work.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) will bring the matter up again, when the Minister of the Interior is here.

Mr. OLIVER.

## BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved second reading of Bill (No. 192)—(from the Senate—to amend the Bank Act Amendment Act. He said: This Bill is designed to meet a case that has arisen since the passing of the Bank Act Amendment. It may be remembered that in that Act we made provision for the purchase of a bank by another bank which desired to take over its business. A case of that kind has arisen under the provisions of the Act, as between the Bank of Commerce and the Bank of British Columbia. The Bank of Commerce has agreed to buy out the Bank of British Columbia. The provisions of the Act are that the purchasing bank must assume responsibility for the note circulation of both banks; a very proper provision. But the power of the purchasing bank, as respects circulation, is limited to its capital under the general provisions of the Bank Act. It is found in this particular case that the united circulation of the two banks will be in excess of the capital stock of the purchasing bank, and, consequently, there will be a difficulty for a time. The purchasing bank is meeting that difficulty by proposing to issue \$2,000,000 of new stock, thus increasing its capital from six to eight millions. However, there will be, in the interval, a period when this circulation would be against the law, and the bank would be liable to a penalty—in fact, it would block the whole transaction. The amendment is to provide that, in a case of that character, the excessive circulation may be met by a cash deposit with the Finance Minister, pending the time that the bank can adjust the difficulty by issuing new stock. It is a very reasonable proposition, and I do not think there can be any objection to it.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee thereon.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). It is provided in subsection *c* of this section that the notes outstanding and in circulation according to the last monthly report of each bank, shall not exceed the paid-up capital of the purchasing bank. It strikes me that this limitation is perhaps more stringent than is necessary. In the event of the consolidation of two banks, by the purchase of one by the other, with perhaps nearly an equal amount of capital, the curtailment of the circulation of notes to the amount of the paid-up capital of the purchasing bank, might work injury to the public interest. I do not see why the provisions which apply to each bank in its separate state should not apply to them when consolidated, so that united they would have the same circulation that they would have in their separate existence.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. If my hon. friend reads the clause through, he will find that we meet that difficulty by providing for a cash deposit; and in the particular case which gave rise to this Bill, the reasonableness of that provision is admitted, and the parties are willing to make the cash deposit. If we can get that additional protection for the note-holder, I think we had better do it.

Mr. **CHARLTON**. This cash deposit will be so much drawn from circulation for the purpose of leaving it with the Finance Minister.

Mr. **FOSTER**. The Finance Minister will not keep it long.

Mr. **CHARLTON**. I do not see any need of curtailing the circulation which each bank in its separate existence would be entitled to issue.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Because when the selling bank goes out of existence, its shareholders are absolved from the double liability. The purchasing bank assumes the notes, and the right of the latter to issue circulation should be limited to the amount of capital which it has in one form or another.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I understand that one bank purchases the other; it is not an amalgamation?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. It is a purchase—the same thing in another form.

Mr. **HAGGART**. It is an entirely different thing, because the stock of the purchase bank is extinguished.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

#### QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL** (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved second reading of Bill (No. 173) 'respecting the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.'

Mr. **BERGERON**. What is it?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. By chapter 48 of the Statutes of 1898, the Quebec Harbour Commissioners were authorized to borrow \$350,000, giving as security a prior lien on the properties it then held in the harbour of Quebec. Last year the Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act was amended to provide that the unexhausted portion of the \$350,000, that is, \$200,000, should be issued carrying with it the prior lien. An Act was also passed ratifying an agreement entered into with the harbour commissioners by the Great Northern Railway Company to build an elevator on the property of the harbour commissioners in the city of Quebec; and it was to secure the payment of the interest on the bonds to be issued to the extent of \$200,000 to enable the elevator to be built, that the provision

I have referred to was made. It was provided in the agreement that the work was to be begun within a certain period and completed within another period. The object of the first part of the amendment now proposed is to extend the terms of that agreement to cover the delay in the completion of the elevator. The second portion is intended to fix definitely the rank of the bonds issued, so as to make it quite clear that the interest on the first issue of \$350,000 shall take precedence over the interest on the \$200,000. There is another modification of the agreement. As it was passed last year, it provided that the harbour commissioners should receive out of the earnings of the elevator a sum sufficient each year to guarantee the payment of the interest, which they guaranteed in their turn, that is, 3 per cent on the \$200,000, or \$6,000 a year. It provided that any sum received by the company in excess of 6 per cent on the \$200,000 would be deposited with the harbour commissioners as a sinking fund to provide for the payment of the \$200,000. It is now proposed that the company instead deposit the sum of \$12,000 a year to the joint credit of the harbour commissioners and the Great Northern Railway Company, and shall maintain that deposit until such time as the security is exhausted, that is to say, for twenty years.

Mr. **BERGERON**. There has been no work done there at all?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. Yes, the elevator is almost completed. It will be finished by September 1.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I understood that the hon. gentleman wanted an extension of time.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. Yes, because under the old agreement it is provided that the works should be begun by the 1st of December last and finished by the 1st of May last. The new guarantee could not be made to apply in this condition of things, because the elevator will not be finished until the 1st of September next, and the intention is to extend the delay.

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

#### RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS** (Mr. Blair) moved third reading of Bill (No. 193) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

Mr. **G. E. FOSTER** (York, N.B.) Before this Bill is read the third time, I want to call the attention of the hon. minister to a fact developed in the papers with reference to the three roads out of the number subsidized, to which payments were made in

excess of \$3,200 per mile. I have gone through all the papers in connection with all of them, and in no single instance is there a voucher or account given by the company to establish in the slightest degree what was the cost of construction. In two cases, the statement was made by the company that they had no vouchers or accounts. In the other case, there seems to have been no demand made for the same. The only thing that results is a hap-hazard estimate by some engineer sent to go over the road after it is finished.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. In all cases where vouchers and papers can be had, the department had adopted the rule, under my instructions, requiring that they should be secured and looked into, for the purpose of ascertaining what the actual cost of the work has been. Of course where a company has not any books or papers,—and that one could imagine would occur at times—you cannot get them. Arrangements may be made by a company with sub-contractors, and the company have nothing to show except its arrangement with the sub-contractor. But that is not a circumstance which at all militates against the government. It would be necessary that these facts should be disclosed some way or other, if the company were asking to be paid or insisting upon being paid a larger sum than the report of the engineers shows the work was worth. But we can rely with confidence that the engineers are not going to make an estimate in excess of the value. A company would be more likely to suffer if not able to furnish evidence to show that the engineer's calculations were favourable to the company and that the work cost more than the engineer's report shows. It is not a difficult matter at all for an engineer to go over a work and establish what it is worth. That is a simple and easy thing. But if, by reason of the fact that, while the work was in progress, expensive portions of the undertaking are covered up and cannot be seen, that circumstance militates against the interest of the company and tends to the reduction of what they claim, because the engineer may report nothing but what he sees on the surface. The question was asked: How could the engineers tell what the work cost? An engineer has no difficulty in giving figures which are a safe valuation, and they know the prices for the different classes of work. One can well understand that the work may have been more expensive than appears on the surface; and the company cannot furnish satisfactory evidence for any additional cost that they may claim. The Crown does not suffer. But we cannot compel them to produce books and papers which they have not got. It does not look very business-like—I am prepared to admit that. But the only thing we can do is to be sure that the value we place on the work is safe and within the mark.

**Mr. FOSTER.**

**Mr. FOSTER.** If the House will allow me a moment—the minister has entirely shifted from the one substantial ground upon which this extra payment was based. It was stated in the first place, and even yesterday before I brought out the information, and the House really thought, that the amount of cost must be made certain by the actual payments that went into the construction of the works. We have nothing to do with the excuse from the minister that they may have difficulty in giving the figures, or with the plea that the company may possibly fare worse if they do not give them. That is not the point; the company were to give the statement. And, if they are told at the outset: You will not get a cent more than \$3,200 per mile, unless you show by your accounts and vouchers just how much has been spent—you will soon find that they will keep their accounts in such form that they can be inspected. Again, I make the statement which the minister denied yesterday, that, though the law expressly states that you shall not include rolling stock in this estimate for the payment of more than \$3,200 a mile, rolling stock was actually included and payment made on basis of it, after being recommended by the minister and passed by the council.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. In what case?

**Mr. FOSTER.** The minister can look at his own papers.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I deny the statement; the hon. gentleman cannot name the instance—

**Mr. FOSTER.** There are not many—only three. The minister denies the statement. I make the statement; let him have recourse to his own papers.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. This is pure evasion on the part of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). I ask him to name the railway that was paid extra subsidy on account of rolling stock.

**Mr. FOSTER.** The hon. minister had better not be too bold. I know what I am stating; I have my responsibility. I refer him to his own papers.

**Mr. JOHN HAGGART** (South Lanark). The papers were returned to the hon. minister. While they were in our hands, I looked over them with the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster). He asked me whether stations were included in road-bed, and I told him they were. Afterwards he called my attention to the fact that rolling stock had been included in that item. The minister stated that there was only one case, when I stated that payments were made otherwise than in the way he had declared they would be made. I stated that in three cases payments were made when there were no vouchers furnished to the government; and, if the hon. minister will consult the

papers, he will find my statement correct. The payments in those cases were made entirely on certificate of his engineer, and in one case rolling stock was included in making up the account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What case?

Mr. HAGGART. I have forgotten the case for the moment; but if the hon. gentleman's deputy were here with the papers, that case would be found.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). It seems to me that the examination by the government engineers of the work would, in any case, be a salutary check upon the representations made by the railway company. While my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) asserts that, in any case, a railway company could give vouchers, I must question the accuracy of his statement. There are cases where extensions of railways are built in a manner that makes it very difficult indeed for the constructor to render separate accounts of the vouchers and the cost. I know one case in which the road had an extension of three and a half miles, which extension was entitled, under the Act, to the bonus of \$3,200 per mile and the extra bonus on cost over \$15,000 per mile. This extension was built by the syndicate owning the road, at prime cost, without the intervention of sub-contractors, and the work was done in conjunction with work upon the portion of the road already constructed. The persons building the road were under the impression that they were to receive a fixed subsidy of \$6,400 a mile, and their accounts were not kept in such shape as to make it possible for them to furnish vouchers for the cost of the three and a half miles separately. In such a case, if the government had taken the stand that they could not pay more than \$3,200 a mile, a great injustice would have been done. The government engineer estimated the cost of the section, and he gave a very moderate estimate. There was upon that section a bridge costing fifty or sixty thousand dollars, \$25,000 of the cost of which was applicable to this little section of three and a half miles. The government engineer estimated that the cost of the road was \$18,277 per mile, including the \$25,000 on account of the bridge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Any rolling stock?

Mr. CHARLTON. No rolling stock was allowed for, nor was the right of way where they passed through a town.

Mr. FOSTER. What road was that?

Mr. CHARLTON. The Tilsonburg, Lake Erie Pacific Railway. The builders said that the estimate was too low and that the road cost them more.

Mr. COCHRANE. How did they know, if they did not keep books?

Mr. CHARLTON. Work on the seventeen miles already constructed went on at the same time with work on the extension, and material was bought for both. It was apparently unnecessary to keep the books separately, because they supposed they would receive a fixed subsidy of \$6,400 a mile. They were placed in such a position that they had to take the government engineer's estimate of the cost, which was \$18,277 a mile. They were able to point out that various items of the estimates were too low. They were able to furnish vouchers for some portions—as, for instance, an interlocking switch—but they were settled with on the basis of the engineer's estimate, which, I am satisfied, did them injustice. But what could the department do? Was the government to take the stand, that this company should not receive a cent in addition to the \$3,200 per mile? If they had taken that stand, I, as representative of the riding in which this road was built, should have taken the ground that the government was guilty of a very serious outrage upon the rights of my constituents. There may be difficulties of that kind, and I know, from the position taken by the government in that respect, that it is a difficult thing to get a matter adjusted without the vouchers are furnished. I know the government take a firm stand upon that matter, and they make no allowance, in the cost of the road, for the cost of the rolling stock, for the cost of terminal charges or terminal privileges, and the cost of right of way within the limits of incorporated villages and towns. I think the course pursued by the government in the matter of the payment of these subsidies, if closely scrutinized, will prove that they have had fair and due regard to public interests in the adjustment of these matters.

Mr. JOHN McALISTER (Restigouche). I know that the first ten miles of the Restigouche and Western that have been constructed have been very difficult indeed. I think the amount expended on it is sufficient to justify their getting more than the \$3,200. I know the locality well, and have been there when they were building the road.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It seems to me that if we propose to give an additional subsidy beyond the \$3,200, that it is a notice to all railroad builders that we will do it only upon certain conditions, namely, that they are able to show, to the satisfaction of the Minister of Railways and Canals, that the railway cost more than \$75,000 per mile. Now, how would any contractor expect to earn additional money, unless he was able to furnish that information? And he could only furnish it by keeping books. The Minister of Railways says they sublet contracts. So they do; but there is no man who sublets a contract but knows what he sublets it for, and if he is a business man, he must keep books

and know where his money is. This is a notice in advance to them, that if they wish for an additional amount of money, they must be prepared to establish what they have expended; therefore, there will be no excuse why they should not be prepared to give that information, and there is no reason why they should ask for an additional subsidy, unless they are prepared to furnish that information,

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I expected the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would tell the House whether he had received a letter from Mr. Armstrong, whose road was mentioned the other day. There was something said against that gentleman, the other day, of a very grave character, and, although I have nothing to do with Mr. Armstrong, I am informed by him that he addressed a letter to the Prime Minister, explaining the matter. If the hon. gentleman has received that letter, I think it would be only an act of justice to Mr. Armstrong that he should read it to the House. Moreover, I believe, from papers I have seen, that the right hon. gentleman had been put, some two or three years ago, in possession of all the facts concerning that transaction, and perhaps the right hon. gentleman may have forgotten that. If he has not got any explanation from Mr. Armstrong, I will ask permisison of the House to put in a statement I have received from him in defence of his character, because it was stated by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that he was a man who, if guilty of what he was accused of should be sent to the penitentiary.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I received a letter from Mr. Armstrong yesterday, denying the statement which I made the other day, which the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals will remember. On receipt of the letter, I immediately put myself in communication with the party from whom I received the information. I telegraphed him yesterday, and I tried to telephone him this morning, and have not been able, up to this moment, to get an answer. But I intend on Monday to make a statement.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the third time and passed.

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Public Works—Harbours and rivers—Maria,  
isolated lock ..... \$6,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). This is on the Baie des Chaleurs, and is to make provision towards the construction of an isolated lock and ballasting crib-work 230 feet by 30 feet, so that steamers plying in the Baie des Chaleurs during the

Mr. SPROULE.

season of navigation may safely land passengers and freight. The total cost of the projected block is \$13,000.

Maria is situated on the northern side of the Baie des Chaleurs and about ten miles to the eastward from Carleton, and is one of the most important parishes in the county of Bonaventure, Quebec. The steamer plying during the season of navigation in the Baie des Chaleurs stops regularly off Maria, landing passengers and freight in boats or barges, which is attended with much loss of time and delay, and at times with much danger, whilst in stormy weather no landing can be effected for want of wharf accommodation. This is very proper and necessary work.

Mr. FOSTER. It will never pass with that explanation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is the hon. gentleman going to threaten the House?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not going to pass with that explanation.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is an important line of steamers plying between Dalhousie and Gaspé. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McAlister) knows that this is the only means of communication that the population on the north shore of the Baie des Chaleurs have with the outside world. That coast from Carleton up to Gaspé is dotted with parishes, all enjoying a relative degree of prosperity. Let us follow the boat, for instance, after it leaves Dalhousie. The boat leaves Dalhousie in the morning, it crosses immediately over to the north shore of Baie des Chaleurs, it stops at Carleton, and then goes to some other place—I cannot follow all the places.

Mr. JOHN McALISTER (Restigouche). Maria is the next place. It anchors out from the shore at that place.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, but that is all. The boat goes to Carleton, where there is a wharf, then to New Richmond, then to New Carlisle, and then it follows the coast—

Mr. McALISTER. It goes to Carleton, Maria, New Richmond and Bonaventure.

The PRIME MINISTER. At all these places touched by the boat, there has been provided by the government of the country wharfs and other accommodations, excepting at Maria.

Mr. McALISTER. There is no wharf between New Carlisle and Harvey.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, there is one at Paspebiac.

Mr. McALISTER. No, there is none at Paspebiac.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. McALISTER. There is no public wharf at Paspebiac.

Mr. TALBOT. There is a wharf.

Mr. McALISTER. There is no public wharf.

The PRIME MINISTER. At all these places there are wharfs which have been put up by the government, not by this government, but by past governments, for the accommodation of the public in that section of the country. But, as I said a moment ago, and it will be borne out by my hon. friend (Mr. McAlister), the people there have no communication with the outside world except through the means of this line of navigation. A railway has been opened, but, unfortunately, it is not running now. The people are left with the same method of sending and receiving their goods as they possessed before. The boat calls at Maria and there is no place at which it can be moored.

Mr. McALISTER. Yes, it always stops there.

The PRIME MINISTER. It moors out in the bay.

Mr. POWELL. It moors to a buoy.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no place at which it can be moored. There is no wharf of any kind. The reason is that the water is so low. The people have been complaining of that condition of things, and they asked the government to build them a wharf, as has been done at some other places. But, upon looking at the matter we came to the conclusion that it would require an expenditure of over \$100,000, and of, perhaps, \$200,000 to build a wharf from the shore to the open sea, or where the boat could find anchor. What was the next best thing to do? We came to the conclusion that we could give them an isolated work, such as we propose here, at a place sufficiently advanced in the bay that the steamer can moor against it.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the depth of the water there?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know the depth of the water, but I know that at the place where this block will be located there will be sufficient water.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Fourteen feet at low water.

The PRIME MINISTER. The boat can moor alongside of it. This is the only accommodation that can be given to that locality.

Mr. BERGERON. It will be the same thing as at Baie St. Paul?

The PRIME MINISTER. The same thing as at Baie St. Paul, and the people will be satisfied with that.

Mr. McALISTER. If the wharf would be any benefit to the people there, I, for one,

would have no opposition to it, because I would be pleased to see the accommodation provided at that place. I see in the estimates that there is a revote of \$6,400 for the extension of the landing pier at Carleton. That is absolutely necessary. The trade at Maria is very small. The revenue of the post office is only about \$100 a year. If you build that wharf away out there, when there is an easterly wind the boat cannot land. There is far greater need of a wharf at New Richmond and Bonaventure than at Maria. There is far more traffic at Bonaventure than at Maria, and if a wharf is to be built at Maria, there is far more reason for building one at Bonaventure. What distance is this wharf to be out from the shore?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Eighteen hundred feet.

Mr. McALISTER. I have been on the boat, and I know that it does not come within three-quarters of a mile from the shore.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When there is a block they will be able to come in much closer than they now do to anchor. The previous government erected a dock at Carleton for the same purpose as the purpose of this block. There are wharfs along that shore, and when the winds are in certain directions the vessels cannot stop at them, but there are times when the vessels can stop. It is proposed, under these circumstances, to have this dock so located that it will meet a portion of the requirements and afford protection between the block and the shore against the prevailing wind. The winds that would chiefly interfere with the landing there would be the south-west winds. This will afford some protection, which pro tanto is of great value. The hon. gentleman says the population of Maria is only about one hundred, but five years ago the village had a population of 2,250.

Mr. McALISTER. There is no village there at all.

Mr. BERGERON. The minister is all wrong.

The PRIME MINISTER. That population includes the whole parish.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no government wharf between Carleton and New Carlisle, a distance of over forty miles, so that this is an absolutely necessary public wharf, and I am surprised to hear the member for York (Mr. Foster) object to it.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister need not put on his heroics.

Mr. BERGERON. The government will have to admit that the opposition saved an immense useless expenditure to the country in connection with this wharf, and I must say to the credit of the Prime Minister that

he had a great deal to do in it in preventing the squandering of that money. The acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Fielding) last year did not know anything about that work which was engineered by the real Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), and through loyalty to his colleague he was willing to rush through a vote for \$60,000. When we were labouring against that item the Prime Minister knowing the locality agreed with the opposition that there was no sense in building a wharf there and he got the item struck out. When the Minister of Finance goes on the hustings and tells the people that we did not object to these appropriations by voting against them, I hope he will give us credit for saving a large sum of money in connection with this work.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was cut down from \$200,000 to \$13,000.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not object to this proposed block although I do not know that it will prove of the benefit that is expected from it. My hon. friend (Mr. McAlister) who knows the place well says that it will be difficult to touch at that wharf when the wind blows in certain directions. Now, let me say this to the Prime Minister and to his government. If the people of Canada are to be led to believe that the government will build for them wharfs, and ice breakers and bridges and anything at all they want, then so far as I am concerned I cannot object to the policy of the government. I do not pay more in taxes than anybody else; probably less. But is it not a most extraordinary thing that the Liberal party should be filling up the estimates with all these expenditures and that the hon. gentleman from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has not yet got a stroke of apoplexy protesting against them. When the Conservatives were in power they never asked a vote for half of these things, and I believe to some degree it was perhaps a bad policy.

The PRIME MINISTER. Are you converted now?

Mr. BERGERON. I never had the ambition to change the whole policy of my party, but I can see now that the government is doing too much in the way of giving public grants. We are taking away personal initiative. Everything comes from the government. My hon. friend knows that there is a good deal of the French paternal government in that. I do not know that it is as good as the British or American way of allowing men to use their intelligence and energies without government aid. For eighteen years the Liberals were clamouring against the Conservatives for constructing such works as these, but when they get into power they go the Conservatives ten better. What will be the end of it? The acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock) sent out a circular inviting his

Mr. BERGERON.

political friends to send in applications for these works, and if there is a man opposite who has not got something for his county he has not done his duty to his people. Here is the government lavish in bridges and wharfs and custom-houses, and any Liberal member who has not obtained one for his constituency will no doubt get the cold shoulder when he returns to his electors. Will the country stand that kind of thing? That is the question. Will the people of Canada say that this is a good policy? I doubt that they will. There is a party opposite us who said that \$40,000,000 was too large an expenditure and that the country was going to ruin and decay. The Prime Minister never had so much eloquence as when he spoke on that subject before the people. But here is to-day expending millions and millions a year more than the Conservatives spent. Here we have this government not only granting everything that is asked for, but actually inviting their friends to ask, sending them a circular which means: Come on, we have our arms in the public chest now; it is at your disposal you good Grits who supported us for eighteen years in opposition, now we are in and let us have a carnival of extravagance. I doubt, Sir, if the people of the country will endorse a policy like that.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister is buying the people with their own money.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is unfair to the memory of your leader that you should quote his sentiment like that. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) that I will not have much trouble in answering to the people for this policy. He has given the answer himself already. After having gone into his fit of eloquence over the expenditure, then he tells us that he himself approves of this appropriation.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, if that is to be your policy.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) commenced by saying that there was a carnival of extravagance, and he wound up by saying that he approved of the vote.

Mr. BERGERON. We saved \$40,000, for the people on it.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) complimented me on striking out this vote last year, and I do not know that I am entitled to that compliment.

Mr. BERGERON. We helped you a great deal.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman will always find us prepared to accept any reasonable representations that are made in this House. We try to inform ourselves as much as we can upon the votes which we ask for, but I do not pre-

tend that we have exact information in every case. Last year the discussion revealed that there was a great deal of shallow water at that point and in looking into the matter we came to the conclusion that this isolated pier would have to answer the purposes. Although the people are disappointed we have to disappoint them, and the best we can do is to give them this isolated pier. The hon. gentleman says that this country is going into too large expenditures. There is some truth in his statement that the government of Canada is perhaps doing more in the way of public works than any other country in the world. But this is not a new system, and I am afraid that whatever government is in power it will have to carry it out for some time to come, and until our country is more thickly populated than it is at the present time. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to lay aside party politics and to give this question their impartial attention. The great difficulty in Canada is that we have an enormous territory, not with a continuous population, but with little settlements here and there. At this point, there is a settlement, a church, and mills, and the people are doing a good deal of business, but they have no wharf accommodation. They see that Carleton on the east and other places on the west have wharf accommodation provided by the government, which afford them facilities for exporting their goods. Is there any reason why we should not give those people the same accommodation that we have given to their neighbours? There is none. Some years ago a railway was built in the Baie des Chaleurs district. Unfortunately this railway is not in operation; but if it were open there would not be the same necessity for this block that there is. I agree with my hon. friend that it is a necessity.

Mr. McALISTER. I do not wish to detract in the least from the importance of Maria, which is in my own neighbourhood. On the contrary, I would support anything for the benefit of that district; but I fail to see how this block is going to be of any benefit, because in certain winds boats cannot land there. Before the money is voted for this block at Maria, I think we should know the exact locality where it is to be placed. If built, it should be built at the place where it will be of most benefit to the whole district.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), expressed regret that this policy has been adopted. But, after a policy has been in existence for a great many years, it is pretty hard to turn round and abandon it altogether. As the First Minister has said; exigencies will arise which require a departure from a well-understood principle in the case of small groups of people, settled in a certain district. We know that hon. gentlemen opposite did a

great deal in this line themselves. They inaugurated this policy. I admit that we found fault with a great many things they did; but you can never lay down a rule without an exception, otherwise it would cease to be a rule, and this may be an exception to that rule. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) took the minister to task last night for erecting wharfs on canals, but that hon. gentleman himself, when he was Finance Minister, got a vote of \$2,500 passed through this House for the erection of a wharf on the Rideau Canal at the Maria Street bridge, right here in the city of Ottawa. If he will turn up the estimates for 1887-8, he will find that vote.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like very much to see the estimate.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will send to the library and get it.

Mr. HAGGART. And I would like you to produce the wharf.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a landing-place there, and if the hon. gentleman sends for the estimates of that year, he will find the vote. With regard to the circular issued by the acting Minister of Public Works, I do not think there is anything wrong in that.

Mr. FOSTER. We did not suppose you would think anything was wrong.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am willing to sit in judgment on the acting Minister of Public Works, or anybody else; but he issued that circular simply for the purpose of gathering information.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was just as good-natured, hearty and generous in his support of the Minister of Public Works last year, when a vote was brought down which would have passed, if we had not organized a contest and fought it here for two or three hours; and the Prime Minister this morning acknowledges that it would have taken \$200,000 to finish the work, and he had absolutely no information on it. But that made no difference to the conscientious member for North Wellington, who was loud in his applause and beautiful in his concurrence.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have the estimates for 1887-8, and I want to read this item:

Wharf accommodation near Maria Street bridge .....	\$2,500
--	---------

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). I want to ask the acting Minister of Public Works if he sent a copy of that circular to the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers). In that constituency there are two communities of people who are more isolated than the people of the Baie des Chaleurs, because they are on islands which constitute municipalities, and on which they have churches

and mills and post offices, but have no means of reaching the outside world except by steamers.

I understand that at Baie des Chaleurs there is a railway, but these people are isolated and have no means of reaching the outside world except by steamer. My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) and the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce know the locality I refer to—the townships of Wolf Island and Howe Island. The township of Howe Island could be connected with the main shore by a bridge not exceeding 150 feet, and applications have come to the government to have that work done. I would like to know if the hon. member for Frontenac sent in an application on behalf of these people, who have erected year after year, at their own expense, wharfs all around Howe Island and Wolf Island without getting a dollar of grant from any Dominion government, while down in the maritime provinces and the province of Quebec, wherever there is a church erected or a little village, or wherever there are a few farmers living along the shore, the government come to their rescue and build a wharf. Why have they not done that for the residents of Wolf Island and Howe Island? A bridge could be erected to connect these islands with the main land at less cost than this wharf down by the Baie des Chaleurs, and which would give connection the whole year round.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not aware that any circular had been sent to my hon. friend from Frontenac, but my hon. friend will not find in the estimates any appropriation for bridges, and especially bridges of the character he refers to, where there is not more than 20 feet of water between the island and the main shore. If he is of the opinion that a bridge should be built by the government on a stretch of water 20 feet wide, I think he is too extravagant for this government, and we could not accept his suggestion.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) cited, as an instance of building wharfs upon a canal, that a vote had been passed in 1887 by the late government for the same purpose. He brought down the sessional papers, in which there is a vote for wharf accommodation on the Rideau Canal near Maria Street bridge. But the Rideau Canal was taken from the Imperial authorities by the Dominion government, the Imperial authorities owned the property in the centre of the town, they owned the wharfs, and these were taken over, subject to the obligation of keeping them in order. There was no new wharf built there. The amount given by this vote was to repair a wharf already existing.

Mr. McMULLEN. Read the item.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. HAGGART. I did read it.

Mr. E. COCHRANE (East Northumberland). I am much obliged to the right hon. Prime Minister for his kindness and graciousness in smiling over at me so benignly, and to you, Mr. Chairman, for recognizing that there are other men in the House besides those behind the ministerial benches. I represent a constituency in Ontario that is now exporting more grain and cheese and farm commodities than the whole of Prince Edward Island, and I want to tell this House that there has never been there never has had a dollar spent on wharfs by any Dominion government.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How long have you represented the county?

Mr. COCHRANE. Longer than you will ever represent a riding, and if I have not represented it with as much intelligence as it is entitled to, I have not at any rate displayed as much brass as the hon. gentleman has. I have never been opposed to the expenditure of money to develop the resources of this country, but when the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals tries to cover up some rather scaly votes, which he is asking for in some remote place that nobody ever heard of before, by making reference to the province of Ontario getting its share, I want to tell him that on Lake Ontario, one of the finest natural harbours there never has had a dollar spent on wharfs in it by a Reform or a Conservative government.

As regards the argument of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), it is his favourite and time-worn one of: 'You are another.' Why, Mr. Chairman, these men got into power through denouncing the extravagance of the Conservative party. They got the votes of the people by misrepresentation, and if they got their money as they got the people's votes, they would be in the penitentiary. I used to listen to the arguments of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) when in opposition, and thought that he was honest. His arguments often made me uneasy in my seat, and almost convinced me that there must have been something wrong. But everything has changed since these gentlemen have got on the Treasury benches. \$30,000,000 expenditures per year was bleeding the people white when they were in opposition, and when the Minister of Trade and Commerce put on his sanctimonious air and declaimed against this expenditure, I felt convinced that he must have been honest in his views. But what a change has come over the spirit of his dream. He never raises his voice now, even in the most feeble protest, when our expenditure has swelled almost to \$80,000,000 per year. Will there be a drop of blood left in the body of the honest farmer when he finds himself bled to the tune of \$80,000,000

more? I believe that the hon. gentleman's excuse is that he is only a looker on and has nothing to say in the affairs of the government, and it seems that he is in this position that his colleagues can say to him: You must sit there and reap the emoluments of office without protest, or you may get out and we will get along without you.

Let me tell the hon. member for Wellington that this reply: 'Oh, you did it too,' will not go down with the people. That hon. gentleman has swallowed every profession he made on the floor of parliament. We could go back to the time when he made some seven hundred speeches in the House of Commons denouncing the extravagance of the Tory party, but he will swallow every one of these votes now submitted without a grimace.

I would ask the right hon. the First Minister if the reply: 'You are another,' is any answer to the criticisms from this side. Why, the right hon. gentleman told the people that he was prepared to run the country on \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 less expenditure. And what is the spectacle we witness to-day? The right hon. gentleman, a knight forsooth, charged with leading the people astray, has only one argument to which he can resort, and that is: You did it too, and are just as bad as we are. But he will find that reply insufficient when he comes to answer for his misdeeds at the next election.

Mr. EDWARDS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) has not had docks built in the constituency in which he lives, his friends when in power were not as good to him as they were to those in other parts of the country. Now, so far as wharf building by the government is concerned, generally speaking, I am opposed to it. In the general way, it is the business of the different localities to build docks for themselves.

Mr. COCHRANE. But you will vote for them.

Mr. EDWARDS. I will undertake to say that I will never vote for as many wharfs to be built under this administration as were voted for by this House during the time I have been here by hon. gentlemen on the other side. But, if people have become accustomed to a certain practice and have learned to regard it as the proper thing, it will take some time to do away with that practice. Last night, there was a discussion on this subject, some features of which amused me—as, for instance, opposition to the building of wharfs by hon. gentlemen in whose constituencies a number of wharfs have already been built at the cost of this country. On the Ottawa River, in the next constituency but one of this, a large expenditure took place on the building of a dock on the river. It was built years ago by hon. gentlemen opposite, and was maintained by them while in power. And as you go further down the river, al-

most all the docks were built at the expense of the federal exchequer. It is simply preposterous for hon. gentlemen opposite to say that this is not their practice.

Mr. COCHRANE. And you condemn it?

Mr. EDWARDS. I say openly and distinctly that, speaking generally, I think docks should be constructed by the people in the locality. There are, perhaps, exceptional cases—but they should be exceptional. But when my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) argues as he did last night that it made a difference whether a wharf was on a lake or on a river, I certainly must take exception to that. The conditions may be just as pressing for a wharf upon a river as upon a lake or upon tidal waters. But I must say that the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite that no docks should be built by the government does not come with good grace from them. The principle that I held to when these docks were being voted under the late government, I hold to to-day. As to the localities in which these docks are being built, I will say, as I said last year, that I am not conversant with all the conditions, and for that reason, am not able to discuss the merits of these wharfs. But I do not believe there is one man in the House who will oppose the construction of a wharf in his own locality, where the conditions are such as to make it desirable that a wharf should be constructed.

Mr. McALISTER. I think we should get some information as to the location of this block. Evidently, a survey has been made. Is the block to be near the buoy where the boat lands now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is to be opposite the church.

Mr. McALISTER. How far is that above the wharf that was proposed to be built before?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are building further out than where it was supposed to be last year.

Mr. McALISTER. When this wharf was up before the House on a previous occasion, complaint was made that it was to be built at the shallowest part of the coast in that locality, and that if it were built a little to the west of this it would be built in a place where the water would be deeper and not only that, but that there was a cape there which would shelter it from westerly winds. Why was not the dock located where it would be of most benefit to the people?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When I stated where it was likely to be built, I gave the information furnished by the chief engineer. The location will be chosen by the chief engineer and he would select the place that is best, without regard to individual interests.

Harbours and Rivers, Quebec—River Saguenay, below Chicoutimi—Dredging (re-vote) ..... \$4,000

Mr. BERGERON. Is that dredging done by contract or by a government dredge ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is intended to be done by the government dredge, worked by men to be hired by the government.

Mr. BERGERON. Are they at work now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Why not ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Because they have not a dredge available at present.

Mr. BERGERON. When will you have it ? I think this vote has been here for some time. It is a standing invitation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The engineer informs me that the only reason dredging has not been done heretofore, is because there has not been a dredge.

Mr. BERGERON. Do you expect to have one soon ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Do you want a big dredge or a small one ? What is the depth of the water there ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. An elevator dredge is the dredge required.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has the contract for the removal of rocks ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The work is done under the supervision of the resident engineer, Mr. Breen, in the city of Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is doing the work ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is done by the foreman. The work of removing rocks is done under the direction of the engineer, Mr. Breen, of Quebec, and under the immediate supervision of a foreman appointed by him.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the name of the foreman ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is done by local men from time to time, whenever the work is to be performed.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a large operation ; \$200 is the total amount. You get an engineer to look after it in the first place and several foremen, and there must be an immense amount spent in this stone-gathering.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The whole time of the engineer is not given to this.

Mr. BERGERON. Does my hon. friend know where the work is being done ?

Mr. MULOCK.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The engineer informs me that this class of work is being performed at a couple of places.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there anything being done at Jersey Cove ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The engineer does not remember.

Mr. BERGERON. There is something being done at Jersey Cove in Gaspé.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is being done there ?

Mr. BERGERON. The government have been paying money to have stone removed, and instead of doing so, a man by the name of Morin has been taking the stone to make roads there. Whenever he could not use it for the road, he threw it down on the shore, and the consequence is that the fishermen cannot pass. He committed a nuisance there instead of doing good, and the government are paying for it.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend perhaps refers to a circumstance that occurred a year or two ago. I know that the account has been in suspense, and that the minister refused to pay it because the money was not expended according to appropriation.

Mr. BERGERON. We are asked to request the government not to pay that man until they are satisfied he is doing the work properly.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries could assist the government, because he has the plaint of the aggrieved parties. I have a copy of the letter here.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never had it called to my attention.

St. Jérôme—Lake St. John wharf ..... \$4,500

Mr. BERGERON. Where is St. Jerome ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is a new parish in the Lake St. John region.

Chicoutimi Wharf—Repairs, painting shed, &c. .... \$1,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is the government building sheds on wharfs, as well as wharfs ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Freight sheds.

Mr. BERGERON. Before we leave Chicoutimi, is there anything more that can be done there ? I see the hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Savard) near the minister. Is there anything he may have forgotten ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, he has not forgotten anything.

Isle Verte—Extension of wharf and new freight shed ..... \$4,500

Mr. FOSTER. Let us have an explanation of that ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. This is for an extension of the wharf and a new freight shed to cost \$4,500.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is this freight shed to cost?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Eight hundred dollars; extension of wharf, \$2,800; repairs to old wharf, \$900, making \$4,500.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Is it possible that we are, on these little wharfs, building sheds at a cost of \$800?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. You could not allow any one else to build upon the wharf.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. You have to build freight sheds on many of these new wharfs. It has been done in many cases.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I never heard of it being done in the maritime provinces.

The **MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES**. Yes. Supposing that a steamer is running to a wharf, carrying perhaps the produce of 200 farmers. When the steamer arrives in the evening these goods have to be put under cover until they can be hauled away; otherwise they would be destroyed. It is a government wharf and you must have a small freight shed.

It being One o'clock, the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Temiscouata Lake—Landing piers ..... \$1,200

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is a new work. There is a great deal of colonization going on along Lake Temiscouata, and these piers are needed for vessels by which the people may have communication with the rest of the world. The lake is about as wide as Lake Megantic. Lumbermen are there in large numbers, and settlers follow the lumbermen.

St. Roch des Aulnaies—Wharf (revote)..... \$3,000

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mulock). This is near Grosse Isle. It is expected to cost \$8,800. The work is now going on.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Is it under contract?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. No. It was considered last session, and there was a vote.

Mr. **HAGGART**. We want now an assurance from the minister that all these works will be let by contract.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Whenever it is reasonably possible, that will be done. Of course, I cannot speak for the real minister, but I think he will read what I say, and I have no doubt will be governed by what I say.

Mr. **HAGGART**. But you should be in a position to make a promise that the law will be carried out.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Certainly.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Whenever it is reasonable to have it done by contract, it will be done so. The engineer tells me that repairs must be excepted.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I mean new works of construction. It may be impossible in many cases to make repairs by contract.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The general principle should be adopted, that the work must be done by tender and contract, and if in any case that principle is not adhered to, it must be, in my judgment, a special case, there must be special conditions that would warrant a departure from the wholesome doctrine of tender and contract.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I take the word of my hon. friend. Last year I took the word of the Minister of Finance. But, of course, as the Minister of Finance said last year, and as the Postmaster General says now, they have only given their own word. Now, the Minister of Public Works will come back here and will not consider himself bound by these promises, as we have seen in the past. It is very awkward not to have the Minister of Public Works here, so that next session we can hold him to his promises.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. There has been no departure from the promises we made here last year.

Rivière du Sud—To complete protection of river banks ..... \$15,000

The **PRIME MINISTER**. This is to complete a work which was undertaken by the late government. It is in the county of Montmagny. The bridge at Montmagny station was alleged to be damaged, and it is to repair that work.

Mr. **HAGGART**. The Prime Minister is astray as to the late government commencing it, it was commenced by his own government. If I remember right, it was in Judge Choquette's county. I went down and looked over the ground, and did not think the government were at all responsible, and refused to undertake the work.

Cap Santé—Wharf (revote, \$2,000) ..... \$3,500

Mr. **BERGERON**. There is going to be an election there. Will that work be done by contract or day's work?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The building is now going on. This is not being done by contract. Cap Santé is a wharf already in existence that the government has purchased and is repairing. Repairs are not being done by contract.

Mr. BERGERON. How much will it cost altogether?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. \$2,000 were paid for the purchase and filling, and it is expected the \$3,500 will complete the work.

Mr. BERGERON. Have you gone into the policy of purchasing wharfs?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some time when a wharf is desired it is better to purchase a dilapidated wharf and rebuild it than to build a new one.

Mr. BERGERON. This will prove an awkward policy. You will be asked to buy all the wharfs in the country, or, at least, to keep them in repair.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is not a new work. The hon. gentlemen opposite introduced the policy at Sault Ste. Marie when Mr. Plummer's wharf was bought for a matter of \$7,000. The reason given was, that part of a wharf was already there, and they simply bought it and added to it, and paid Mr. Plummer \$7,000 for it.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, Mr. Plummer conveyed it over to the government without receiving anything for it whatever.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at all, you had to pay him for it afterwards.

River Batiscan—Dredging channel at mouth ..... \$8,000

The PRIME MINISTER. This is one of the harbours at which the boats of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company call.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is the most important lumber centre, outside of Three Rivers, west of Quebec, in the province of Quebec. It is the place where the two largest mills in the province are situated—those of Price Bros., and those of the St. Maurice Lumber Company; and an American concern is there also. It is one of the great shipping places on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. HAGGART. How far up the River Batiscan are these mills situated?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are about half a mile from the mouth.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the estimated cost of this work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. \$8,000. This will dredge a channel fifty feet wide to a depth of five feet at low water, for a distance of 5,000 feet.

Mr. BERGERON. How is that work being done?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. By a dredge owned by Mr. Malone. He is paid

Mr. MULOCK.

at the rate of \$80 per day of ten hours, and he has to take out 600 cubic yards a day.

Yamaska Lock and Dam—To pay to 'Le Président et les Syndics de la Commune de la Seigneurie d'Yamaska, in full and final settlement of all claims for damages to their lands resulting from the construction of the said works ..... \$3,000

Mr. BERGERON. What is that?

The PRIME MINISTER. In 1885 this government built in the Yamaska River a dam and a lock with the object of improving the navigation above the dam. On the west bank of the river is a large flat area of marsh or meadow land known as La Baie de la Vallière, consisting of several thousand acres. It is owned by the farmers of the neighbourhood in common. There are no fences between them, and they have a kind of organization among themselves by which they use it for pasture. While the dam was being built, and after it was built, they complained that their lands would be flooded.

Mr. BERGERON. Who built the dam?

The PRIME MINISTER. This government, at the time Sir Hector Langevin was Minister of Public Works. The object of the dam was to raise the level of the river so to have navigation as far up the river as St. Hyacinthe. The object was not fully accomplished; but I believe navigation was obtained up to St. Aimé, a distance of eighty miles from the mouth of the river. In 1889 a portion of the dam was washed away, and the complaints of the people were regarded as so well-founded that the government never rebuilt the dam, and it is now in the same damaged condition that it has been in since 1889. The government would not undertake to repair the damage, because it would undoubtedly result in the land being flooded over a very large extent. The owners of that property have been making a constant claim upon the government for the damages they suffered during the years the dam was up. They claimed \$10,000 damages. We sent an engineer to make an inspection, and, as a result, we have agreed to offer them \$3,000 in full settlement of all their demands.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is the president of this syndic de la commune?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know a single one of them.

Mr. BERGERON. Who has been dealing with this matter?

The PRIME MINISTER. The secretary of the syndic. The land is tilled as pasture land in common, under a system which has come down from the French regime. For instance, the land is parcelled out and surveyed, and each farmer is entitled to so many tons of hay and pasture for so many

head of cattle according to the size of his farm.

Mr. BERGERON. How many families are there ?

Mr. R. M. S. MIGNAULT (Yamaska). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, those lands were flooded in 1889. The president of the commune at that time was Mr. Salva. Now it is Mr. Parent who is president of the commune. It is an incorporated commune, with a president and ten syndics.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) How many people or how many families are interested in that commune ?

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) There are 333 people who have rights in that commune. Each of those owners is entitled to so many tons of hay and pasture for so many head of cattle. I could not give the exact number of the head of cattle.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) How have those proprietors acquired those rights ?

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) They were handed over to them by the seignior de Pounancourt.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) So this vote of \$3,000 is going to be distributed among three hundred families ?

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) That sum of money is going to be handed over to the syndics of the commune, who will settle the claims of the interested parties. Those damages were caused by the flooding of the lands in 1889. Every year, since this dam was built, inundations have occurred, but the inundation of 1889 was more considerable than those of the preceding years.

In 1891, the government had a dam built on a small channel which carried the waters into the main dam. Above that latter dam there is a small channel which drains the surrounding lands and carries the water into the Yamaska River. In 1889, a large portion of the waters, instead of flowing into the Yamaska River, passed through that small channel and was thrown over the adjoining lands causing considerable damage to the meadows and pasture lands. Channels were formed which completely destroyed the meadows. The farmers claimed they had lost \$10,000. The farmers not only lost thousands of tons of hay but from 150 200 head of cattle were destroyed by the inundation, and that is the reason why the claimants asked the government a compensation for the damages suffered.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Is the dam still causing damages ?

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) Since that little channel was built the lands have not been flooded and the farmers have suffered no more damages.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Do you know whether the government intend to re-

move the dam in case it should not be rebuilt ?

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) I think my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was mistaken when he stated a little while ago that after the dam was washed away it was never rebuilt. As a matter of fact it was repaired by the government and even after that damages were caused to the lands.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Is the dam up there at present ?

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) Yes, and the level of the Yamaska River, which is raised from four to five feet overflows through a little channel over a large flat area of marsh or meadow land ; and as a matter of fact the land there is so low that I do not think there is more than twenty inches from the level of the lower part of the river to the dam, and the water of the Lake St. Peter flows back as far as that point. The flooding of those lands has caused damages to the meadows and farmers can no longer grow any hay where formerly they used to raise thousands of trusses of hay. There is even a portion of those lands which is no longer fit for pasture purposes, and, moreover, as I said, a large number of head of cattle were destroyed.

Mr. BERGERON. The story of the hon. gentleman from Yamaska (Mr. Mignault) is very interesting, and if what he says is true, as I have no doubt it is, then these people had good claims against the government of Canada in law, and it is most extraordinary that they never applied for a fiat to take proceedings against the government. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mignault) says that in one year alone they suffered over \$10,000 damages and that subsequently 200 head of cattle were destroyed by the inundation, and subsequently they lost thousands of tons of hay. If that is so why did not the government do them justice ? They have certainly claimed they lost \$25,000, but the government now proposes to give them only \$3,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. We intend to offer them that.

Mr. BERGERON. There is nothing paid yet ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. BERGERON. But the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mignault) says they have accepted the \$3,000, and if they have lost \$25,000 through the neglect of the government, surely that is not doing them justice. I presume if they accept this money the government of Canada will for ever get a release of those claims.

The PRIME MINISTER. They must give a release on every claim.

Mr. HAGGART. It is very peculiar that this course should have been adopted without resorting to the ordinary means of expropriation. Has there ever been any

consideration given these people before on account of these claims?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The practical result of the construction of the dam by the government has been to throw a certain quantity of water on these lands which are held in common for pasture purposes.

Mr. HAGGART. The point is whether they have received any remuneration before.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was no remuneration before in any manner whatever.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you a report from any of your officers as to the damage done by this dam?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, we have a report that the damage was caused and that the people claimed \$10,000, but as I have said, nothing was ever paid.

Mr. HAGGART. I have an idea that this claim about the Baie de Vallière was up here before.

Mr. BERGERON. This is for the Petit Chenal?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, I remember there was something about that before.

The PRIME MINISTER. That was in respect to the Petit Chenal which was discussed in the House before in reference to a bar which was placed there to prevent the flow of the water coming in.

Mr. BERGERON. Have you an idea of how much that barrier cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not remember the amount.

Mr. BERGERON. I have somewhat of a grudge against the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock). He has not sent me that circular which he has sent to some of our Liberal friends in the country, and if he had I would ask him for an appropriation something like this for my own county. There is between Valleyfield and the River St. Louis a channel built by the government some years ago and which caused last spring a good deal of damage. The water going through that channel acts as a feeder for the manufactories in Beauharnois, and there is an employee of the government to keep the water in proper level. Last fall when the ice took, this was not properly kept, and the water flowed over the banks and went into the cellars of the farmers and caused a great deal of damage. The government has been asked to compensate for these damages to the extent of \$1,500 or \$1,800, and I do not think that the acting minister even answered their claims, and there is nothing in the estimates to provide for them. I do not see why the people there should not be treated in the same way as

Mr. HAGGART.

our friends in Yamaska. They are the same class of people; good respectable farmers and they deserve some consideration from the Prime Minister, because they supported his government at the last election. I am very sorry that the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock) did not address that circular to me, because I would have advised him as to the wants of these people, and if the government want to do what is fair and just they would have put the sum in the estimates. When the people in my county hear that \$3,000 has been given to some of our friends in Yamaska, and when their claim is exactly the same, they will be surprised that the government should make fish of one and flesh of another. I hope when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) is sending out another circular he will send one to me, because I have many cases to bring to his attention.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I assumed that because of the economical views of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) that if I had addressed that circular to him he would have thrown it into the waste paper basket.

The PRIME MINISTER. He is not an economist for Beauharnois.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am told that the difficulty which the hon. gentleman refers to was not the fault of the government but of Seigneur Ellis of Beauharnois, and there is a question on the part of the people who suffered damage as to whether or not they would proceed by way of petition of right. If my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) proposes to throw aside all his economical views expressed this morning, and wishes to advocate the real substantial wants of his constituents, I will be pleased to learn his views in time for the estimates next session.

Mr. BERGERON. That is very kind of the minister, but I have seen economy practised here so many years by the Conservative government, that I have not yet been able to reconcile myself to the very lavish expenditures made by the Liberal government. If I had received that circular, I would have looked at matters in a different way. The hon. gentleman is badly posted about this ditch. Formerly all that land belonged to the seigniors, and they made a bargain with a man called John Symons, who had a mill on the River St. Louis but could not get all the water he wanted, by which they allowed him to make that ditch from the lake to the river. It was a very shallow thing, about 2 feet of water, and the government some years ago had to deepen it to about 6 feet, so as to carry away more water. The work is a government work. There were some people who claimed to own the whole thing and they were granted a petition of right but never used it. The government own half

an acre on each side, and nobody protested against the government doing work there. The damages that were caused last fall would entitle the people to ask the government to compensate them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why did you not bring it to my attention?

Mr. BERGERON. I was under the impression that we had to deal with a very economical government, but when I see so many grants being given—and in saying this I am not objecting to the present vote—a work of this kind should certainly be provided and I would have been delighted to ask for it.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the dam up there at present?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. The easement will still be exercised?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Is not the embankment that the government put up for the purpose of preventing an overflow of these lands working well?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no such embankment and the dam throws the water over the adjoining lands.

Mr. BERGERON. There is an embankment at the head of the Petit Chenal.

Mr. HAGGART. I have told the First Minister that I remembered something about a vote for this purpose. As I understand this the water came from the Yamaska River and was dammed up by this dam and flowed into a little channel, and thence overflowed the land, and there was a grant given for the purpose of protecting the bridge across this and keeping the water from overflowing.

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) wants to know whether the little channel is still extant. It is still there, and it serves a very useful purpose, as, since it was built, it has kept the water from overflowing.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) This bar is a permanent work, is it not?

Mr. MIGNAULT. (Translation.) Yes.

Richelleu River—Boom east side of entrance to draw-bridge of Central Vermont Railway at St. John..... \$1,500

Mr. HAGGART. Do you charge for the use of these booms?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. HAGGART. On what principle do you build booms down there?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To keep the logs from interfering with navigation and to guide boats through the entrance.

St. Lambert—Cribwork and protection wall ..... \$10,000

Mr. VICTOR GEOFFRION (Chambly and Verchères). Every year the inhabitants occupying the river front at St. Lambert, right opposite Montreal, have been suffering in the spring. When the ice is moved down by the current, it damages the river front, and the inhabitants have petitioned the government to have some protection built there. In the beginning they did not suffer so much, but last year the damage was so great that they had to remove their houses and buildings and their roads about seven feet away. Every year the damage is increasing, and the people think that if ever an appropriation would be warranted by the public interest, it would be in this case. Those who know the locality know that the river front forms a curve on which the ice strikes as it passes down. The preceding government considered the matter and found the claim a just one. If I remember well, Sir Hector Langevin when Minister of Public Works, promised the people of that locality, although they had not suffered so much then as they do now, that he would have some protection work erected, but nothing has yet been done although the people have been suffering more and more every year. It is only reasonable that this work should be done to guard against further damages. My hon. friend need not imagine that there is any political capital in this vote, because my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) knows that the people there are his political friends, and if they ask the government to do this work it is because they are suffering in the way I have stated, and it is only fair that it should be done.

Mr. BERGERON. What would be the whole cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. \$16,000.

Mr. BERGERON. How are you going to build it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. By tender. It is to be cribwork along the road and it will be over 1,500 feet long.

Mr. BERGERON. If you want to do any work that will be permanent and effective, you will have to make it 2,000 or 3,000 feet long.

Mr. FOSTER. It is instructive to see the light and jocose way in which the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock) is dealing with the country's money which has come into his hands for administration to a certain extent. Do we understand the principle upon which we are now going? If we undertake to build cribwork to protect the banks of all the rivers of this country from the corroding effects of the water, we have undertaken a big task. That is

what I understand—the water is eating out the banks, and carrying them away and thus threatening the land adjoining. That is going on in every river from British Columbia to Cape Breton.

Mr. CHARLTON. But this is within the city limits.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see that this makes any difference. Besides, I understand that it is outside the city limits.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The information given to me is that a pier has been constructed from the Victoria bridge down the stream of the St. Lawrence, that is easterly, a distance of nearly 3,000 feet, and approaching St. Helen's Island. The effect of the construction of that pier is to throw to the other side a large volume of water that formerly flowed down the north side.

Mr. HAGGART. What engineer reported that? It is a most extraordinary thing.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It does not require an engineer to understand that. The chief engineer, who is familiar with the works, is of the opinion that it must have that effect. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has only to see the sketch—

Mr. HAGGART. I know; I have been on the pier.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The water cannot go to the north as it formerly did, and it is thrown upon the south shore.

Mr. BERGERON. My impression is that the spending of this money may do good—I hope it will. But I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart), that it would be better to have the written opinion of the engineer. There might be another way to accomplish the object in view. No doubt the throwing of this water to the south has relieved Montreal of danger from spring inundations, but I believe it has done harm on the south. I think I have heard engineers express the opinion that the only way to avoid damage from this water being turned to the south would be to deepen the channel between St. Helen's Island and the south shore.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is rock.

Mr. BERGERON. But you work in rock as well as in other material. I am only throwing out the suggestion. I think before the hon. gentleman involves the country in the expense of this work, he should get the best opinion as to what should be done, so that the money may be spent usefully and not wasted.

Mr. TALBOT. By deepening the channel to the south, would you not deprive the harbour of that much water?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. BERGERON. No, because the danger is from the heavy flow in the spring.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a very important matter, irrespective of any sympathy we may have for a place that is being damaged as this is said to be. This is either one of two things—either the minister is commencing a line of expenditure which will commit this Dominion to expending money for the protection of the banks of every river in Canada, or else the injury complained of is due to some previous work carried on by the Dominion. If the latter be the case, it removes it from the category to which I have objected. But before we undertake in this or in any case the expenditure of a large sum of money to protect the banks of a river, we ought to be perfectly certain that the damage is actually caused by the work precedent built by this government, for which, of course, the people who are being injured are not responsible. Is it not a fact that St. Helen's Island intervenes between the pier that was built and the south shore on which these lands are situated, so as to protect them from the force of the current? In any case, before we undertake such an expenditure, ought we not to have the best engineering report that we can get as to the damages caused, and by what they are caused? It is not quite sufficient for the minister to say that, the pier having been built we must undertake, for all time, the protection of the south bank. A matter of this kind is so important that it ought to be backed up by the written and reasoned report of the engineer, to satisfy us that we ought to undertake the expenditure. When I was in the cabinet, we were petitioned year after year to protect the banks of rivers where there was a sharp turn and the water was eating into the banks, eating away large portions of surrounding lands. We refused to undertake such works, on the ground that if we undertook such works, there would be no end to it, and that it did not fall within our duty, but was a matter for individuals or municipalities, or localities to undertake. If we are not to commit ourselves to expenditures of that kind, we must be certain that the injury is due to something that we have previously done. In such a case there may be reason for our doing perhaps the whole of the work—perhaps assisting the municipality in doing it. But we have no report.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, we have. I can say that personally I was interviewed by the Mayor of St. Lambert and by my hon. friend from Chambly (Mr. Geoffrion), and I have a distinct recollection that the Mayor of St. Lambert showed me a protest which he had filed with the authorities when the work was made in the harbour of Montreal. I think it was addressed to the harbour commissioners, and was a protest against the erection of these works on

the very ground that it would have the effect that has since followed. They feared that the erection of these works would throw the current on the south side and corrode the bank, and do the very damage that has been done.

Mr. HAGGART. How far is the work that it is proposed to erect, from the embankment that was built by the government?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The guard-pier runs parallel to the current of water that flows under the Victoria Bridge, some 3,000 feet down. The ice and water that flow under the bridge spread out, some of it passing alongside the city on the north side of the island, and another part on the south side, both streams running through without doing any harm. The north side has a deep channel and the south side a shallow channel. This pier prevents the water and ice from flowing to the north side, and thus throws a great quantity on the south side, immediately opposite this guard-pier. It is proposed now to construct this protective work at the south side opposite the pier, commencing a short distance below the Victoria Bridge, perhaps one or two hundred feet.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you any reports in the department of the actual rise of water caused by this erection? Have you any actual figures?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The chief engineer informs me that Mr. Fraser, one of the engineers of the department, has reported.

Mr. HAGGART. We would like that report.

Graham Wharf—To complete ..... \$4,000

Mr. BERGERON. Where is this?

Mr. H. S. HARWOOD (Vaudreuil). Graham's wharf is on the Grande Ligne, between Rigaud and Vaudreuil, four miles from Rigaud village, opposite St. Placide, on the Ottawa. It is on the west side of the river.

Mr. BERGERON. Do boats stop there?

Mr. HARWOOD. All the market boats. This is a wharf formerly built by a Mr. Graham, a wood merchant, and up to ten or twelve years ago, he kept up the wharf for his own private business, loading cordwood. When he gave it up, the wharf went to ruin. Seeing the great importance of the wharf, I asked the government to rebuild it. Mr. Graham giving the old wharf, giving the land and the road to go to it, for nothing. The wharf will be a convenience to the parish of St. Marc, five miles away.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there a village near?

Mr. HARWOOD. There is a small settlement, and there is a good country surrounding. This sum will complete the repairs.

Coteau Landing—Dredging (revote) ..... \$2,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the Gauthier contract?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This work is being done by L. Cohen & Son, contractors, Montreal. They have been working there for two years.

Mr. DAVIN. Has Gauthier ceased to work for the department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Has he transferred his contract to anybody else?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have no knowledge of that.

Mr. BERGERON. How much did you pay Gauthier until to-day for dredging at Coteau?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This work has nothing to do with Gauthier. Gauthier has ceased to work for the department.

Mr. BERGERON. Gauthier's dredging took place near the old Canada Atlantic Railway wharf; where is this being done?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This work has been let by tender to Cohen & Son. A. W. Fleck, treasurer of the Canada Atlantic Railway, and secretary of the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway, asked for dredging to be done in connection with the elevator dock at Coteau Landing.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the work Gauthier was doing.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is a continuation of that work, but it has nothing to do with Gauthier. He is away, and we are now carrying out this dredging in a fair and square way.

Mr. DAVIN. When did Gauthier cease to work for the department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He only worked one season, he ceased about two seasons ago.

Mr. BERGERON. How much money was paid to Gauthier?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not the faintest idea. The matter was closed up a year or two ago.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been paid for this work up to date, the work performed at that point, no matter whether by Gauthier or Cohen?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman mean the dredging that has been done at this particular point for an elevator?

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand, dredging has been going on at Coteau Landing for three seasons at least, either at the wharf or the elevator site, or in the vicinity. What has been spent up to date on that work ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The chief engineer informs me that the total expenditure on dredging at this point for the purpose, as I understand, of the Canada Atlantic Railway elevator and wharf, has been \$18,138.16.

Mr. BERGERON. That was the Gauthier contract ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It includes all that has been paid to Mr. Gauthier and to other people who have done any dredging.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are the others ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The engineer cannot recollect whether there was dredging done by others than Mr. Gauthier, but whatever dredging was done by Mr. Gauthier, or anybody else, cost \$18,138.16.

Mr. DAVIN. This is a most extraordinary spectacle. Here is the minister, here is the deputy minister, and here is another officer of the department, and these officials cannot tell him whether any other persons besides Gauthier have been working there. It is a pretty nice state of affairs.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How many years is the hon. gentleman speaking of ?

Mr. DAVIN. Has there been any other dredging other than that done by Gauthier in the last three years ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Why not say so in a straightforward manner, instead of dodging in the manner we have witnessed ?

Mr. BERGERON. Will this \$2,000 complete the work ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is all that it is proposed to expend this year, but the engineer informs me that it will be advantageous to do more dredging, and that it will cost about \$7,000 to complete it.

Mr. BERGERON. I have not the contract for the construction of the Soulanges Canal here, but that contract must have provided for the opening of the Soulanges Canal. I call the attention of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals to this, that the work of opening the Soulanges Canal must have been going on at the place where this dredging is being done. Mr. Macdonald, or whoever was the contractor for the dredging of the opening of the Soulanges Canal, must have been working where this dredging is being done. The contract was given to Gauthier by the hon. Minister of Public

Mr. MULOCK.

Works (Mr. Tarte), or rather the contract was offered to Gauthier. When the minister found out that he could spend some money, he gave a contract to Gauthier to deepen the water at the old Canada Atlantic wharf, so as to facilitate the transshipment of grain from the Canada Atlantic Company's elevators into barges. That was three years ago. The object was to provide 14 feet of water so as to allow barges drawing that depth of water to load grain there and go down to the Soulanges Canal. The contract was given to Gauthier for \$21,000. Gauthier never worked there at all. I do not believe he ever went there at all. He asked Mr. Macdonald, who had barges there, to do that work, and he pocketed the profits. I have tried to get the details of this transaction, but I have not yet succeeded, although I have a pile of papers from the Department of Public Works. But, it has never been denied that Mr. Macdonald did the work for \$5 an hour, while Gauthier was receiving \$8 an hour, or \$30 a day, which he was putting in his pocket. I want to know if this \$2,000 will put a stop to this squandering of money. The country must have paid twice for all that work. The man who had the contract for the opening of the Soulanges Canal must have had the contract for dredging at this very same place, as it is all comprised within the same area. I want to know if the \$2,000 will put an end to this sort of thing ?

Mr. DAVIN. He says it will take \$7,000 more.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This work is called for by the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, public carriers ; it is in their interest and in the interest of the public. I do not think it is squandering money to provide facilities for vessels coming to their elevator. The government do not think so either.

Mr. BERGERON. Do you not think that spending money twice is squandering money ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has been no such transaction as the hon. gentleman mentions. There has been good value received, I am informed by the engineer, for every dollar spent. It is not the slightest consequence who owns the dredge or who gets the money, as long as the public get good value for the money spent. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the question as to who gets the money has anything to do with it. I think when we spend money for the removal of so many cubic yards of earth, the water is just as navigable, no matter who removes the earth or receives the money for it. I am informed by the engineer that a fair market price was paid for the service rendered, and that value was received. If that is the case, there is nothing to discuss as to the past.

As to the \$2,000, I am informed that this is all that it is contemplated spending this year, and that to complete the work will cost about \$7,000 more.

Mr. DAVIN. We are, evidently, in regard to explanations respecting public works and railways and canals, moving in a circle. First, the hon. minister arranges the matter, then he asks the engineer to approve, he gets the engineer to approve, and when we come here and ask him why this was done, he tells us that the engineer has approved of it. What could the engineer do but approve of it? We had the same thing in regard to the Railway Department the other night. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals showed that the hon. Minister of Railways had dictated to the engineer what he should advise, and then he came here and said: I have the sanction of the engineer. This is a beautiful circle in which these hon. gentlemen move.

Mr. FOSTER. And this is a beautiful sentiment that the hon. acting Minister of Public Works has just enunciated. He thinks it is necessary and proper, whenever a public or private corporation want the government to spend money to help them to carry out their enterprises, that the government should step in and make a harbour for every railway company, dig around the wharf of every corporation, and do that with the public money, presumably in the public interest, and without any regard to the private or public enterprise which is being carried on. But, better than that, and more advanced, is the doctrine championed to-day by the hon. gentlemen here in this House to-day, once before by the actual Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), and now by the acting Minister of Public Works, that it makes no matter who does the work provided so much is taken out for so much money. I spoke about the go-between the other day. Here is the champion of the go-between. A man sitting in his office in Montreal, foreign to anything like dredging work, being a relation of the hon. Minister of Public Works, is asked by the minister if he would not like to tender for a contract at Coteau. He takes sixteen days to think it over, then he says he would. In sixteen days he has found that he can get a man who has a tug and dredge at Coteau, and who says: I will do it for half of what you get. Gauthier takes the contract, the work is done while he is sitting in his office, and the public is mulcted by the amount of his commission on that work. The man who does the work and makes the wage gets \$5 a day, while this man gets the overplus. That is the doctrine of the go-between. There is the champion of the go-between.

Rivière Chateauguay—Dredging (revote,  
\$1,500) ..... \$5,000

Mr. BERGERON. Which dredge is working there now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The *Little Giant*.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is she working?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At the mouth of the River Chateauguay.

Mr. BERGERON. How much was done, there last year, how much did it cost, and by what dredge?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Last year there were 7,630 yards consisting of boulders, hard pan and clay. It is navigated by the steamers *Filgate* and *Chateauguay*, which run between Beauharnois and Nun's Island and Lachine and Montreal daily. The work has been continued by the T. F. Moore estate. The vote of \$5,000 was required to continue the dredging which was commenced in 1898, and also certain dredging at certain shoals in the river.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not object to that vote, for I think the money is well spent. The minister is misinformed as to the steamer *Filgate*. She is navigating in some other part of the world, and has not been there for three years. I am told by the pilot of the steamer *Chateauguay*, that there is quicksand there, and that you will have to use piling, for if there is only ordinary dredging it will fill up every year. I would like the minister to consult his engineer about that.

Gatineau River—Protection work on east side of river ..... \$7,300

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The government some years ago diverted the channel of the Gatineau River by dredging at the eastern side, and as the water was thrown to the eastern shore, these protection works are necessary.

Mr. HAGGART. First of all you dredge a channel at the request of the inhabitants and then you have to provide protection works.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The late government did construct protection works there, and these were found inadequate, and it was necessary to continue them.

Hull—Landing pier ..... \$10,000

Mr. HAGGART. What are you building a pier at Hull for?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a pier at the foot of Elizabeth street in Hull, just below the Interprovincial bridge. It is to provide facilities for vessels navigating the Ottawa.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there any vessel landing there?

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright). The vote now submitted by the acting Minister of Public Works is for a landing pier to be constructed at a distance of about 200 feet

from the Interprovincial bridge, now under construction. I do not think that any one will dispute the advisability of this wharf being constructed at this particular point. It will be of considerable benefit not only to the city of Hull, but also to the Gatineau region and to Pontiac County. Every one knows that the transportation of freight by waterway costs a good deal less than by rail, and the freight intended for the extensive region I have referred to, will be landed at that wharf and carried immediately on the Gatineau Railway and on the Pontiac Pacific Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the railway go to this wharf?

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. The intention is to have a siding to the wharf. Every one knows the extensive traffic carried on with the city of Hull, especially in the lumber trade. There is no wharf at Hull with the exception of the ferry landing, and the wharf belonging to private individuals, and these are altogether insufficient for the wants of the trade. It will be readily seen that in the absence of a wharf great inconvenience has been experienced by the people of Hull in getting their freight from Montreal and other points via the Ottawa River. The Ottawa Navigation Company, which plies several steamers, are now obliged to land their freight on the Ottawa side, with the result that the people of the city of Hull are obliged to cart it backwards and forwards four miles each way; in all a distance of eight miles. I submit to hon. gentlemen that this work is an absolute necessity.

Mr. BERGERON. Will that work be done by tender and contract?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will.

Mr. BERGERON. All right.

Greece's Point—Wharf ..... \$3,000

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that?

Mr. HAGGART. Why, this is on the canal. Surely you have wharfage enough on the canal without that.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that on the Grenville Canal?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The accommodation there is inadequate, and the forwarding companies are pressing for this wharf for the accommodation of their trade.

Sorel, P.Q., ice piers ..... \$8,200

Mr. BERGERON. What are these?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are to protect the harbour from ice in the spring. Large numbers of vessels call there, some owned by the government and some by private citizens.

Grand Vallee, pier ..... \$2,000

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that?

Mr. CHAMPAGNE

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is at Grand Vallee des Monts, on the north shore of Gaspé County. It is a shelter for fishing boats, and it is a point which is much exposed to storms.

Depot Harbour, Ontario—Breakwater .... \$50,000

Mr. HAGGART. What will this cost altogether?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About \$150,000. There is an island in the centre of the harbour, and it is proposed to extend a pier from the existing pier to the island, and this will afford complete shelter. Depot Harbour is the terminus of the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway. It is about three miles from Parry Sound, and there is another small village or town springing up there.

Sarnia—Dredging ..... \$11,250

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I would like to call the attention of the acting Minister of Public Works to a petition which was sent to the minister early this session, in regard to the dredging of the Napanee River. The department has had its engineers up there staking out the place where dredging is required, but I do not see any vote in the estimates for doing the work. It is very much needed, and I would like to know what the minister has to say about it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A preliminary survey has been made recently, but the report has not yet been made, and the matter has not yet got to that matured stage to enable the work to be done this year. The hon. gentleman spoke to me about it, and the moment he did so I gave instructions to have a survey made. My recollection is that it was near the close of the session when he spoke to me.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. gentleman's letter to me is dated March 21.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I may say to my hon. friend that a great deal of dredging has to be refused simply because we have not sufficient dredging plant. I am not aware that any dredging plant would be available for that work even if a vote were taken for it this year.

Mr. WILSON. I might call the attention of the hon. gentleman to a letter which I received from Mr. Tarte, dated the 7th of March, in which he says:

In answer to your letter of yesterday, I may say that the department has all the information that is necessary to deal with the matter you speak of when the supplementary estimates come.

I do not think the answer given by the acting minister is sufficient, that the department have not the information, because I have the statement of the minister over his own signature that they had the information. Only a small amount of dredging has to be done. I suppose three or four thou-

sand dollars would be sufficient to make the navigation satisfactory in the Napanee River. I suppose \$3,000 to \$4,000, or less, will do all the work required to make navigation satisfactory. I do urge the minister to have this work done. I had reason to suppose that it would be in the supplementaries from the fact that he had all the information necessary.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When the hon. gentleman brought the matter to my attention, I at once communicated with the chief engineer. I knew nothing about Mr. Tarte having written such a letter, and I am told by the chief engineer that he was in error. When I could not get the information to deal with the matter otherwise, the chief engineer sent Mr. Fraser to Napanee.

Mr. WILSON. How long ago?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is about two or three weeks since he returned.

Mr. WILSON. He must have gone elsewhere and did not come right back.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The chief engineer has the season's work to look after. The order was given to him, but he could not drop every order to proceed to Napanee at once. The hon. gentleman has no ground of complaint against me. I acted with the greatest diligence and in the best faith, and Mr. Tarte was in error. That is all. The report of Mr. Fraser has not yet been made.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the depth of water in the Sarnia ditch?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About four or five feet.

Port Hope Harbour—Dredging, \$5,000; repairs to piers, \$2,000 ..... \$7,000

Mr. CRAIG. I wish to express my approval of this vote. Port Hope is one of the most important harbours on the north shore of Lake Ontario, and it is hoped that at no distant day it will be the harbour where the Trent Valley Canal will enter the lake. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the repairs will go on very soon?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know of no reason why they should not proceed as soon as parliament gives the money.

Lancaster—Wharf ..... \$5,000

Mr. DAVIN. Is this to be done by tender?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Nation River, north branch—Purchase of existing riparian rights and removal of dam, parties interested contributing.... \$2,500

Mr. HAGGART. What is that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The dam had been erected many years ago, and fell into decay, but it had backed up the water

on large quantities of land, and submerged some lands which it is claimed are very valuable. In 1893 parliament voted a sum for the buying out of the ownership in that water privilege, but for some reason or other, the matter was not completed, and the vote lapsed. In 1894-5 the late government repeated the vote, but still allowed it to lapse.

Mr. HAGGART. I thought that that was deepening?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, for acquiring the rights so as to result in the removal of the abandoned dam and allow these lands to be reclaimed.

Mr. HAGGART. This surely is purely a provincial matter. A party has erected a dam, and exercised the right of overflowing the land above it. In order to give the lands back to the individuals, you purchase the dam and remove it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It does seem extraordinary, and I was surprised, when I found that parliament had twice committed itself to the matter. The public are anxious for the removal of the dam, and have been negotiating with the owners and have arrived at a figure.

Mr. HAGGART. There are hundreds of places just the same in Canada.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman put it in his estimates two years. Here is the item as it appears in his estimates:

Nation River, north branch—Purchase of existing riparian rights and removal of dam, parties interested furnishing one-half the amount ..... \$2,500  
Oshawa—Repairs to pier (provided harbour is transferred to town corporation, and that the corporation will agree to maintain it in future) revote, \$8,000..... \$10,000

Mr. HAGGART. Who owns the Oshawa harbour?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know personally. It is owned by private citizens. We have stipulated that the town is to acquire it.

Pickering Harbour—Repairs to breakwaters and dredging ..... \$4,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is for the rebuilding of the upper end of the north and east piers, from low water leveling up, and for dredging between the piers for a short distance up.

Toronto Harbour—Work at eastern entrance, &c. (revote) ..... \$40,000

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain this?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is aware that when the two piers at the eastern gap were constructed, the westerly one of the two was about eight

feet shorter than the other. This westerly one is being extended out 800 feet. That extension will bring it out just as far as the easterly pier, and when it is completed, the process of extending the piers will have to be continued until you get into still water, so as to prevent the washing of the sand. You have got to get beyond the wave line, in fact, to prevent the deposit of sand between the two piers. It is a very necessary work.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the work let by tender ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. It has been let.

Mr. CLARKE. And as to the dredging ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is done at the regular rate by W. E. Phin, who is one of the contractors with Mr. Magann in building the pier. I do not know whether Mr. Magann, is interested in the dredging.

Mr. CLARKE. He gets the work without tender ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At the regular scale of remuneration, \$8 per hour for a minimum of 600 cubic yards per day of ten hours.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister (Mr. Mulock), is aware that this dredging has cost considerably more than according to a statement of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), it previously cost under contract. That being so, it seems manifest that tenders should be called for.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know to what the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. CLARKE. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) in answer to an inquiry gave a statement showing that this work of dredging by Mr. Phin cost more than it had previously cost under contract. I think that will be found in the Auditor General's Report of 1897 or 1898.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The engineer informs me that a contract was let by the late government to Murray & Cleveland, and that of the amount involved in that contract, about \$300,000, a comparative small amount, was for dredging.

Mr. CLARKE. There was an immense quantity of dredging.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Most of the contract, I am told, was for the construction of the piers, but it included dredging, which was to be done at 11 cents. As long as the contractors got a satisfactory result from the whole work, I suppose they did not mind giving a low figure for the dredging. The amount paid to Mr. Quinn is 13 cents a cubic yard.

Mr. COCHRANE. How is it measured ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. By scow measurement.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are there officers there, and do they attend to their business, or are they like the other officers—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Temple is there, a thoroughly reliable and hard-working officer.

Mr. CLARKE. A bid was put in by a Toronto firm to do the work at a much lower price.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The department has not received such an offer. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) give me the name ?

Mr. CLARKE. They were the same firm who, within a year or two supplied Mr. Phin with the apparatus to do the work—Coghill & Company.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Phin has no dredges of his own—he is like Gauthier, is he not ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He has his own dredge.

Mr. DAVIN. I find in the Auditor General's Report for 1898, a sum of \$7,259 paid to Mr. Phin for the work of one dredge, and \$2,721 for the work of another—about \$10,000 paid to Mr. Phin for work given him without tender.

Mr. CLARKE. Let this item stand until I have an opportunity to consult the Auditor General's Report.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Consider it passed ; but if the hon. gentleman wants to discuss it later, he can do so.

Harbours and rivers, Ontario—Toronto harbour—Diversion of Don and dredging in the harbour (revote)..... \$25,000

Mr. CLARKE. Has this work been awarded ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Would the hon. minister explain—I am an Ontario man, though living in the west—the relation of these works, the eastern entrance and the Don. In 1882, I myself proposed a scheme for opening the eastern gap in the harbour, and there was a great deal of interest in the matter. Are these two in any sense the same work ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No; the eastern gap is now used almost solely by vessels passing between Lake Ontario and Toronto Bay. The diversion of the Don is in connection with another scheme altogether.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the work being done on plans approved of ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The city corporation had Mr. Jennings for their engineer, and the department sent Mr. Roy, and the two have been conferring with a view of devising a scheme to work upon—

a general plan, so that the harbour improvements at Toronto shall be carried out otherwise than in a piece-meal fashion. The plan, if carried out, will, doubtless, involve a very considerable expenditure, and it will have to be determined what portion of that expenditure is to be borne by the government and what by the city. Part of the work will be purely local and directly advantageous to the city—reclaiming land, affording extra wharfage, and so on. Part of it may be treated as belonging to navigation. There will have to be an apportionment of the cost. A report upon the scheme has been made, but I have not had time to consider it and bring it to the attention of the government, and until that is done, I doubt that much can be done with this vote.

Harbours and rivers, Ontario—Bronte—  
Harbour improvements ..... \$5,000

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the minister kindly state the nature of these improvements?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This vote is to make provision, in accordance with estimates approved by the chief engineer, for dredging and repairs, and extension in connection with piers built in the mouth of Twelve-Mile Creek, in order to make the harbour available for vessels drawing 8 feet of water. Dredging, \$1,250; sheet piling, \$2,460; extension of piers, \$12,750; add for superintendent, \$540; making a total probable expenditure of \$17,000. This \$5,000 will be on account of that expenditure.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it the intention to proceed with this work at once?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As soon as parliament votes the money the department will proceed to prepare plans and specifications, and put it under tender in the ordinary way. But there is much time involved in the work of preparation, and it takes two or three months to get the plans and specifications ready, and have the advertisements run the proper time, and get the contract signed.

Mr. HENDERSON. I hope that every expedition will be used in order to make this harbour available for the purpose intended as soon as possible.

McGregor's Creek—To compensate Messrs. Taylor & Williams in full of all demands for damages to their warehouse at Chatham, resulting from the subsidence and sliding of portions of the left or south bank of this creek, caused by dredging performed by a government dredge ..... \$ 250  
To pay E. W. Seane in full of his claim for damages caused to property by dredging of creek ..... \$5,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This creek in the town of Chatham runs parallel to one of the leading streets, and only a few

feet back of the main street itself. Some years ago the government dredged that creek for the purpose of facilitating the flow of water and making it navigable for small boats. On the main street the lots are comparatively shallow, and there is a streak of quicksand under the soil, and when the dredging took place there was a subsidence, the dredge removed the lateral support and there was a subsidence in rear of these lots. The government had an examination made and awarded damages to a number of the property owners. These two were left unadjusted. The \$250 claim was considered by Sir Frank Smith when acting Minister of Public Works, and he agreed to pay \$250 and signed the memorandum, and parliament voted the sum. But when it came to be paid, the Auditor General would not allow payment, because the wording did not meet the case. The matter has been revived and brought to my attention, and I find the facts as I have stated them. I consider that Sir Frank Smith having authorized the payment and parliament sanctioned it, we are bound to pay it. Up to the present about \$12,000 has been paid on all these claims.

Port Burwell—Improvement of harbour.. \$30,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is to provide for dredging the basin at Port Burwell to a depth of eighteen feet at low water for the accommodation of steam barges. It is to be used by a new ferry service between Port Burwell and Ashtabula, in Pennsylvania, for the transportation of coal. The total expenditure has been estimated at \$99,890; this will cover the extension and repairs of the westerly and easterly piers. The work has been going on for some time. The money already voted by parliament is \$69,964.

Mr. FOSTER. Has there been any contribution to this by the parties interested?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I think when the work was commenced it was on the distinct basis that they were to provide a certain amount of money, and that this would be supplemented by the government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The chief engineer has no knowledge of that.

Mr. FOSTER. Negotiations began in our time when I was Minister of Finance. The undertaking has merit in it without doubt. There is the opening of a large trade there if anticipations are fulfilled. In considering the matter we made an arrangement with them by which we proposed to give \$25,000, and the company interested was to provide \$25,000. When the hon. gentlemen opposite came into office they eliminated that condition, and the Dominion is now paying the whole cost. Of course, it is an incomplete operation, and the ferry boats not having been put on, I suppose no trade has ac-

crued as yet from the other side across the lakes; but there are prospects of a good trade being opened up when the improvements are made.

Mr. CHARLTON. The government preceding the present one never went so far as to place a sum in the estimates, but did, I believe, promise to the promoters of this enterprise a vote of \$25,000. I do not think, however, that the condition the hon. member for York refers to was made at that time; that condition, as I understand it, was made with the present government.

Mr. FOSTER. I made that condition myself.

Mr. CHARLTON. However, when the project was placed on foot, about the time that the company who proposed to build the road and put on the ferry should have undertaken operations, the chief promoter of this company, Mr. Worthington, of Detroit, died. He was the financial basis of the company, and his death left the company in such circumstances that they were not able to make the expenditure upon the harbour that they proposed. The matter came to a deadlock. I was instrumental in getting from the present government a considerable amount for the purpose of opening this harbour. It was necessary to do this or let the project fall through. The work is one possessing great merit. The harbour of Port Burwell was erected by the government forty or fifty years ago, and was at one time one of the most important harbours on the north shore of Lake Erie. This harbour was allowed to fall into ruins practically, and at the time it was visited by the hon. Minister of Public Works, a year ago last autumn, there was only eight feet of water at the mouth of the harbour. I accompanied the hon. Minister of Public Works upon his visit, and in looking over the works it was assumed that possibly the portion below water of the old piers that had been put in by the government forty years ago could be utilized to build the superstructure upon. The merits of the scheme were so apparent to the minister that he concluded to waive the conditions that had been made in regard to a contribution on the part of the company towards the construction of the harbour, and agree to make the provision necessary for the construction of harbour at this point. The appropriations were made, and work upon the harbour is very well advanced. The present appropriation of \$30,000 will complete the harbour, with a turning basin, or very nearly do so. When the harbour is completed it will be the best harbour, perhaps, on the north shore of Lake Erie, and a harbour whose geographical position makes it an important harbour of refuge, and a harbour which is almost directly opposite the chief American coal ports. It is not more than fifty-eight miles from Erie, Ashtabula, Confeaut and Fair-

Mr. FOSTER.

port. The capacity of the harbour will be ample for all the trade that is likely to centre there, and it will serve the purpose as well for shelter for vessels storm-stressed upon the lake. The purpose of constructing this harbour is to develop the coal trade short line. The railway is about constructed from the harbour of the Michigan Central Railway, and it is proposed to extend it to Ingersoll. It will have a length of thirty-four miles, and will connect with four trunk lines, the Wabash, using the Grand Trunk air line, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Michigan Central Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Arrangements have been made by the company to put on a coal ferry, a vessel capable of carrying twenty-eight loaded cars of a capacity of forty or fifty tons of coal each. The consummation of this project is dependent upon the completion of this harbour. I believe that no public work has been undertaken by the government which has greater merit or will make better returns in the public interest than this one will, and I can most sincerely express the opinion that the policy of the previous government in inaugurating this work, and the policy of the present government in carrying it out to completion, is a good one, and I can also say that it has been necessary to forego the offer made by the company to contribute \$25,000 in order to carry out the work at all.

Port Stanley—Wharf ..... \$8,000

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to draw the attention of the committee again to this question of dredging. I find in the Auditor General's Report for 1898 that the matter is mentioned as far as the contract with Murray & Cleveland is concerned. The cost of dredging under that contract 685,633 cubic yards was 12 cents. In answer to a question. I asked the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), on February 14, 1898, that hon. gentleman said:

The price paid the contractor was at the usual rate paid by the department for work of that kind, namely, \$8 per hour actual working time. The contractor worked from June 29 to November 26 dredging 37,214 cubic yards, the cost per cubic yard being 14½ cents.

Then, he gives the further information that Mr. W. E. Phin, of Brantford, was the contractor. In view of the fact that the department was in possession of the knowledge that the dredging under contract at that time only cost 12 cents per cubic yard, what justification was there for continuing this other contract with Mr. Phin at \$8 per hour? According to the admission of the acting Minister of Public Works, Phin was only supposed to dredge 600 cubic yards per day. That is at the rate of 13½ cents per cubic yard. Why did he pay this amount for doing this work when, in consequence of their having called for tenders this work was done for 12 cents a yard? Why should ten per cent more be paid to Phin for

doing this work than to this other firm of contractors? I am advised that Mr. Coghill, of Toronto, put in a tender to do the work for \$6 an hour, although the hon. minister says that there is no record of any such tender in the department. I think with a work of that magnitude going on in the harbour of Toronto, it is only a business proposition that tenders should have been called for, and that if the experience of the department is that by calling for tenders 10 per cent can be saved, there is no justification for awarding this contract to somebody without tender at a price over and above that for which the work could be done just as well.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Whilst the regular going price may be 12, or 13, or 14 cents per cubic yard from time to time, there is no absolutely fixed price, because the cost of labour varies, and I presume the cost of dredging will vary. Who did dredging at 12 cents a yard and when?

Mr. CLARKE. I was just showing you the record of it in the Auditor General's Report.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Was that dredging done by Murray & Cleveland in connection with the same contract?

Mr. CLARKE. I find the item at page Q-146 of the Auditor General's Report for 1898:

Toronto harbour—Murray & Cleveland, expenditure under contract, dredging 685,633 cubic yards at 12 cents... \$82,275 96

Why is this not done in a businesslike way? Why not call for tenders and ascertain what the work can be done for? When the work was awarded to Phin, he had no dredging apparatus at all, and that he had to lease a dredging apparatus from a person who had one in Toronto.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The department has tried on several occasions to get tenders for dredging. Last year it called for tenders three times for dredging at Coteau Landing, Southampton and Sauguen. The lowest tender in each case was 14 cents per cubic yard. That is the lowest price at which we could get tenders and the officers of the department consider 13 cents a very fair rate. I remember quite well consulting the chief engineer in reference to making a contract with Mr. Phin for dredging this year, and I asked him if that was a fair rate or whether there would be any advantage in calling for tenders. He cited to me the experience of the department recently, and my own impression is, although I may be in error, that I rejected tenders as being greatly in excess of the current-going rate. I refused to allow some work to go on simply because I thought the tenders were excessive. Perhaps that was when I was acting minister last season. So that, there would be no probability of

getting a price lower than 13 cents. The engineer certified to me that that was a fair and reasonable rate, and, under these circumstances, I think I had a right to proceed as I did.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. acting Minister of Public Works seems, by the position he takes on this, to make it very easy for him to go against the principle of tender and contract altogether, and he will positively do away with the necessity of calling for tenders. When he calls for tenders and finds that Phin gives him the lowest tender, then he is perfectly justified. He has done his duty to the public and satisfied his own mind that he is getting the work done at the lowest price. But, he will not do that. He says he is satisfied that he could not get a lower tender. If the hon. minister is going to take that position he will never call for tenders, because he will satisfy himself that he can have the work done just as cheaply without tender. In others of these items, the minister has declared that the policy of the government is, that wherever it can be done it shall be done by tender and by contract, which every one knows is the proper method, but why is it that in a large centre like Toronto that rule cannot be carried out? The experience in Toronto faces the minister in the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. To make his case good the hon. gentleman would have to show that the nature of the dredging was similar. Dredging may range up to thirty cents a yard.

Mr. FOSTER. Every one knows that. If the minister is determined to have an argument against calling for tenders he will have it. You can call for tenders for your particular kind of dredging and you can offer your work for competition and the fact that dredging may cost thirty cents a yard does not interfere with the principle. What objection in the world is there to calling for tenders and awarding the contract to the lowest and best tenderer. This is a new work and one of the easiest things upon which to base a contract by tender. But there is another go-between. At a certain time a strong political friend of the then Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), a strong political friend of the party in power, thought he would like a job, and though he did not own a dredge, and had never been engaged in dredging, he said to the government: I want some contracts if you have any lying around. The accommodating minister said: Yes, we have a large amount of dredging in Toronto harbour, and the political friend replied: Give me a firm offer and I will go out and scurry around and see if I can find a dredge and make my percentage. The accommodating minister said: Yes, we will do that; run out and look for a dredge, and the political friend went out in the street and hired a

dredge, and he figured the terms out with his lead pencil, and he said, this is a good thing. I can make so much per day on it, and he has been making so much per day for three years. It is exactly the system of the go-between; it is a Gauthier business all right. The Postmaster General told us when a man was appointed postmaster, and he farmed it out at 30 per cent; the Postmaster General said: What does it matter so long as the public are served. This dredging business is on the same principle. Carry it through the different departments of government, and what will be the result? Suppose the Minister of the Interior wants a first-class superintendent of agencies, and he says to a political friend: I will give you \$3,000 a year, but you can sit in your house and get another fellow to do the work for \$2,000, and you can rake-off \$1,000, that would just be exactly on a par with what the government is doing here. Why is it that in the broad light of day in the city of Toronto, you cannot call for public tenders for this large amount of dredging, and give it to the lowest and best tenderer?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not rise to say anything about tenders. I simply pointed out to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke), that when he stated a contract was let for dredging in the harbour of Toronto for 12 cents, while this cost 13 cents; I pointed out that it might have been different material that had been dredged, and that wages might have been higher and that other conditions had to be taken into account. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), is inaccurate and unfair, as he was last year in his statements. To say that Mr. Phin is not a contractor is to say what I know is untrue.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say he was not a contractor. I said he had no dredge.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Contractors follow all kinds of work, and Mr. Phin is in that business.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course the minister can find an argument for the go-betweens, if he wants to.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This gentleman is no more a go-between than is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Just the same as Gauthier.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Gauthier sat in his house, but does he mean to say that Mr. Phin sat in his house?

Mr. FOSTER. I mean to say that when Phin got the job from the government, he had no dredging plant, was not in the dredging business, and that when he got what was called a firm offer, he went about the streets until he got a chance to get dredging plant to hire.

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) any proof of that?

Mr. BERGERON. The proof is in the *Hansard* of last year, given by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte).

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) means to say that Mr. Phin took the contract and sat in his office, and did not attend to his work, that he was merely a go-between and pocketed so much money; then I say that all the evidence is against that statement. I know, as a fact, that Mr. Phin has been engaged in giving his personal attention to this work. How does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) know that it can be done cheaper?

Mr. FOSTER. How do you know that it cannot?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I know that the government of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), estimated \$8 an hour as fair wages for dredges, and that they paid it for years and years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They gave more, as a rule.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They did that without doing as we did in the case of Mr. Phin, stipulating that there must be a minimum amount of work. The very fact that we are taking out stuff that was easier, and that it is only one cent a yard cheaper, shows that very great care has been exercised in this matter. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) talks about this man being a go-between and sitting in his house and making so much a day, the hon. gentleman makes a statement that is contrary to the fact. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), say that Mr. Phin paid a certain man so many dollars an hour for doing this dredging work? He says that Mr. Phin hired a dredge at so much a day, how does he know? What did Mr. Phin pay for the dredge, if he hired it? The hon. gentleman ought to know that. Did he pay so much an hour for every hour the dredge worked, or hire it at so much per annum?

Mr. FOSTER. What difference does that make?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Cannot the hon. gentleman see the difference? Suppose there were storms on the lake, and he only worked two days in a week. He is not paid for the time he does not work. He has to take all the chances.

Mr. FOSTER. And suppose it was open to tender.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Now, the hon. gentleman is getting away from the point altogether.

Mr. BERGERON. I will tell the hon. gentleman what we heard in this House

about that from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). When that contract was first discussed, it came out that this man was a barber in the town of Brantford, and had no dredge at all when this work was given to him. There was some remonstrance made in this House, but of course, the vote carried in spite of that. The next year the Minister of Public Works, with a smile, said that Mr. Phin was now the owner of the dredge. That is to say, he had made so much money at \$8 an hour that after one season's work he had been in a position to buy the dredge. That story is in *Hansard*, and has never been denied in this House.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman says this man was a barber, and that has been solemnly stated in this House, although it is an absolute falsehood.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister prove that he is not a barber?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The statement will be laughed at. This man had a large contract on the Grand Trunk tunnel at Sarnia for the same kind of work, and that is his business. But the hon. gentleman comes up with the same tale, and the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) repeats it.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. Minister of Customs tell us what precaution was taken to guard the public interest in connection with this dredging? His colleague the Minister of Public Works did not make answers of the kind the hon. gentleman is making when replying to questions in regard to this contract two years ago. He said then: 'The work was not awarded by public tender.' Does the hon. gentleman think the public interest is being properly guarded when a work of this magnitude is given out without tender at \$8 an hour, although, the minister had information that the same kind of work cost only 12 cents a yard?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to tell him that he will find no contract with Murray & Cleveland at 12 cents a yard as a separate contract. He may find that work was done at less than 13 cents a yard, as part of a larger contract.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman think the government were discharging their duty to the public by bringing a man from Brantford to dredge the eastern harbour at \$8 an hour? The hon. gentleman says that one of the conditions of that contract was that he was to dredge 600 yards a day. I hope he will have no objection to

lay that contract on the Table this evening. There is not a word stated in the Auditor General's Report for 1899, or his report for 1900, as to any such condition. The Auditor General's Report for 1899, on page 161-Q, states: 'W. E. Phin, Brantford, dredging eastern channel, and on bar 400 feet south of east pier, 923 hours 49 minutes, at \$8 an hour, \$7,390.' Not one word is said as to the quantity of material to be dredged per day. Then, in the Auditor General's Report for 1900, at page 183-Q, we find that Mr. Phin was paid for dredging in the eastern channel, at \$8 an hour, \$7,259 in one item, and \$2,712 in another item. There is nothing said as to the quantity to be taken out. But, the Minister of Customs says: 'Oh, but there is dredging and dredging; some may cost 15 or 20 cents a yard, and other dredging may cost 30 cents.' That is quite true; but surely the dredging which Mr. Phin has undertaken to do is not more difficult than that which he did in 1897, because, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman's colleague, one of the stipulations of the contract is that he must dredge 600 yards in ten hours. If the dredging was more difficult, it is not likely that he would be willing to do it at the same price. It must be because the work is of the same character as that which he has been doing during the last three or four years, that the contract price is allowed to remain at the same figure; for if Mr. Phin is an experienced contractor, he would not take the dredging at the same price if the work became more difficult from year to year. Now, I understand that at the time he undertook the work in Toronto harbour Mr. Phin had no dredge. The government never took the slightest precaution to protect the public interest, but allowed him \$8 an hour when he had not a dredging plant at all, but had to rent the outfit to do the work. The firm from whom he rented the plant declared that they had put in a bid for the work at \$6 an hour, but the department say they never received it. I say that it is not in the public interest that a work on which anybody could tender should be continued to be done year after year at \$8 an hour, when, if tenders were invited in all probability it could be done at from 20 to 25 per cent less. According to the statement of the minister on the 14th of February, 1898, the cost of the dredging was 14½ cents a yard, and the arrangement with Mr. Phin has continued from that day to this, although the same kind of work has been done at a cost of only 12 cents a yard. I appeal to the acting minister whether the public interest in a large work of this character would not be better safeguarded by calling for public tenders. When tenders were received, the minister would not be blamed if, other things being equal, he gave the contract to one of his own friends

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am told that the practice of the late government was to make arrangements for dredging by the hour without requiring a minimum amount of work to be done per hour, and the result was that it cost the government much more than the rates now paid, when there is a minimum amount of work exacted they made a loose kind of bargain. The contractor was paid by the hour whether he did more or less.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Was he always paid \$8 an hour?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, whether he did more or less than the average of 60 cubic feet per hour. Under the old regime, a minimum amount of work was not exacted, so I am told by the chief engineer. But when the present administration took office, the Minister of Public Works, in addition to the payment of the old rate, incorporated another condition, namely, that there should be a minimum amount of work done per hour, and the result is that frequently the amount done per day exceeds 600 yards, and then the cost of it is less than 13 cents. At 600 yards precisely per day of 10 hours, the cost would be 13½ cents. If, however, the dredge does more than 600 yards, the cost is less. If any dredging done by Mr. Phin was much less than 13½ cents, it is because he did more than 600 yards per day and the average cost per yard became less. I am told by the chief engineer that the late government never got dredging done at less than \$8 per hour, so that there has been practically a standard price fixed, and the experience I have personally had in two or three cases does not show that the calling for tenders would be any advantage. Unfortunately there are not enough dredges to provide legitimate competition. If you call for tenders, when only one or two dredges are available, you do not gain anything. I do not believe that there are sufficient dredges to create wholesome competition and secure any great advantage from the system of calling for tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman may make what observations and interruptions he chooses. I never yet had him address me in any other than an offensive way.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a chestnut.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is quite true. The hon. gentleman's insulting observations and demeanour are chestnuts. They have become part and parcel of his regular nature.

Mr. CLARKE. I hope that I will address the hon. the Postmaster General with becoming courtesy.

Mr. CLARKE.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was not making any reference to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLARKE. I merely wish to say that notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has just told us as to the average cost of dredging, I find it here stated in *Hansard*, on February 14, 1898, page 482, by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) that the cost per cubic yard, in this very case, was 14½ cents, so that evidently the condition which the hon. gentleman says is inserted in all these contracts, providing for a minimum quantity of 60 cubic yards per hour, per day of 10 hours, was not adhered to. What is the use of the hon. gentleman trying to make us believe something which is directly contradicted by the figures given by the minister for whom he is acting.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The engineer informs me that the rate per hour of \$8 is for ordinary dredges, but that if it should—

Mr. CLARKE. There must be a minimum no matter what occurs.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, for the ordinary dredging, but if the contractors should strike rock or hard-pan, that is not covered by the contract, and no man could dredge rock or hard-pan at any such rate.

Mr. CLARKE. What then becomes of the argument of the Minister of Customs?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister takes no account of the course followed by the government of giving these contracts to parties who are merely agents and who employ the dredges at a lower figure than the government pay. Why should not the government deal direct with the dredge owners and get the advantage of the lowest rate? As to the scarcity of dredges, my information is that since the present government came to power, there were many dredges lying idle at first. The owners of the Owen Sound dredge could not get employment from the government until these dredges were handed over to political friends of the government, and immediately they were employed at \$8 per hour and have been working ever since at that rate. Sometimes there may be a great deal of dredging to be done and the dredges may stand out for a little higher rate, but at other times dredges are lying idle and the owners would be quite willing to accept much lower rates, if tenders were called for and competition thus created. But these hon. gentlemen prefer to pay the full \$8 per hour in order that some friend of theirs, who will hire these dredges at \$5 an hour, may profit by the difference.

Leamington—Pier ..... \$15,000

Mr. HAGGART. Is that a railway pier?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It does not connect with a railway. This is for the construction of a pier some 745 feet long.

Goderich Harbour—Reconstruction of breakwater, &c. (revote) ..... \$20,000

Mr. SPROULE. At what stage is this work, and who is doing it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a revote of \$20,000, together with a vote of \$18,000 in the main estimates, and is required to continue the reconstruction of the breakwater at Goderich. The contract was awarded on August 11, 1898, to F. Smith and D. McGillicuddy, of Goderich.

Mr. BERGERON. A newspaper man.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The contract is for the bulk sum of \$56,700.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the amount of the whole contract?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The total amount of the contract is \$56,700.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the matter with Contractor Madigan?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Madigan's is a sad case. He entered into a contract with the government apparently in perfectly sound mind, it afterwards became manifest that his mind was unbalanced and it was necessary to cancel his contract.

Mr. SPROULE. How much will it cost to complete the work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This \$20,000 completes it.

Mr. SPROULE. You have other items relating to this item, have you not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps, I had better explain all the items relating to this harbour at once. The \$11,000 revote, together with the vote of \$2,000 in the main estimates is required to continue the dredging to twenty feet below low water level, that is about the present level (two feet above zero of gauge), from Lake Huron through channel and up to the new elevator. The estimate of quantity and cost of excavation to make this department are as follows:

Total rock excavation, 9,669 cu. yds. at \$3.	\$29,000
“ hard-pan excavation, 13,852 cu. yds at 45 cents .....	6,233
Total gravel and earth excavation, 81,799 cu. yds at 15 cents .....	12,270
Superintendence, &c. ....	847
<hr/>	
Total .....	\$48,350 00
Deduct expenditures and other estimates .....	\$42,601 72
<hr/>	
Additional amount required.....	\$ 5,748 28

An agreement was entered into with the Morlton Dredging Company, of Goderich, to do the dredging at the regular rate of \$8 per hour, ten hours a day, no time allowed for repairs, &c.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there any provision for a minimum?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no such provision in the contract but it is exacted—600 cubic yards per day of ten hours.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you strike a minimum in these different kinds of dredging?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The government send men to do the blasting, and the removal of the material is done by the dredges. This \$5,039.98 is to pay Contractor Luke Madigan, the amount at his credit at the time of cancellation of his contract. I believe that includes the return of his deposit, and closes with him on account of the contract taken out of his hands. The vote of \$4,700 is for the blasting and removal of a rocky shoal in the vicinity of the Elevator and Transit Company's wharf. The vote of \$2,100 is for repairs to the northern entrance pier of Goderich harbour—ordinary repairs. I am informed that the amount of public money expended on Goderich harbour, I suppose since confederation, is \$626,560.60—up to the 30th of May last.

Mr. SPROULE. How much will it take to complete the work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These balances will complete it.

Mr. SPROULE. The government blasts the material and the dredge removes it. How are they allowed for that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is allowed that 250 cubic yards of broken rock removed is equal to 600 cubic yards of earth.

Mr. SPROULE. And how about the hard-pan?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. According to the nature of the material, from 250 to 400 yards of hard-pan are counted equal to 600 yards of earth.

Mr. SPROULE. Have McGillicuddy and his partner this contract, or is there a separate contract for the dredging, and if so, who are the parties?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Morlton Dredging Company are doing the dredging.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that McGillicuddy?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Who compose that company?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know. I never heard the name until this moment. The officers of the department do not know who compose the company.

Mr. SPROULE. And what is the name of the firm doing the other?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Smith & McGillicuddy.

Mr. SPROULE. I have nothing special to say except that I am told that if this contract were in the hands of people who knew the business, a good deal of money would be made out of it, but even the present contractors are making something out of it. But Mr. McGillicuddy was rather a malcontent some time ago, and intimation was conveyed to him that there was an opportunity of making a little money. His knowledge of printing and newspaper work, of course, suited him admirably for this kind of contracting. I presume by this time he is up to concert pitch and in harmony with the party.

Meaford harbour—Dredging and pile work. \$30,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This vote is to be applied as follows: Construction of a line of pile work, 910 feet in length, on the east side of Meaford harbour; for the extension of the present breakwater to 300 feet in length; dredging and excavation to a depth of 20 feet in low water; removal of 100 feet of the outer end of the present western pier. This work is now under contract, the contract price is \$52,570. Estimate for contingencies, \$3,450. This amount of \$30,000 will need to be supplemented another year by \$36,000. The contract has been awarded to Mr. A. M. Pigott, Hamilton, for \$62,570. Some of the work is required to be done at once to admit the use of the elevator this fall.

Mr. SPROULE. I am sure that the people of Meaford will be grateful for this sum for such a purpose, and the work will be a very valuable one. I noticed some time ago when the minister was up there and being dined—I will not go so far as to say wined, because there was a lot of temperance people there. In an address presented to him I noticed one phrase in it induced him to say that he was glad to know that there was no politics mixed up with the demonstration. I noticed that the entertainment was headed by the gentleman who is supposed to be the coming Reform candidate of that riding, Mr. Hartman. I thought that was a kind of intimation that it was well for them that the gathering was not an exclusively Tory gathering. That conviction was strengthened

Mr. SPROULE.

ed in my mind when I noticed a semi-government organ down here lately drawing attention to the fact that Mr. Hartman had been instrumental in getting this work, and he was going to be the Reform candidate. Of course, I suppose that was inspired from governmental sources here for the purpose, perhaps, of keeping the people mindful of the favour the government was going to do them. I do not think the people will object as long as they get the money spent. Whoever the Conservative candidate will be there, he is going to carry the riding easy enough.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Mr. Hartman to whom the hon. gentleman alludes did press the claims of this town on my attention. I did visit the town, and I formed a very favourable opinion of its prospects, and I regretted the fact that it had not long ago been developed. I think this town on the Georgian Bay may become the centre of an active trade, not only to the advantage of the locality itself, but of the surrounding country, and will also in time be able to establish a good trade with the North Shore. Meaford is naturally well situated for trade, and I look upon this work as inaugurating a new era for it. There is no reason why there should not be good smelters and industries of various kinds established at Meaford, for there are perhaps as good facilities for trade at Meaford as at Midland, Owen Sound or Goderich. I think it is a most justifiable expenditure of public money, no matter whether the hon. gentleman who happens to represent the riding is a Conservative or a Reformer.

It being Six o'clock, the committee took recess.

### AFTER RECESS.

(The House resumed in Committee.)

Collingwood harbour—Improvement (re-  
vote, \$30,000)..... \$50,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) kindly give the explanation of that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This matter was under consideration by the former government, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) will probably remember, and the government made an estimate of \$250,000 for providing a harbour of 20 feet deep with a channel 400 feet wide. There was some engineering mistake and it was a grave one. There was an inaccurate survey of the water, with the result that instead of giving a depth of 20 feet of water the specifications included two feet in the air. The whole specifications had to be recast so as to give 20 feet of water instead of 18 feet of water, and 2 feet of air. The work was under contract to Boon & Arm-

strong, but they did not appear to make a great deal of headway, and this spring we brought the Boon & Armstrong contract to an end. It was in accordance with the specifications prepared by the late administration that the channel should be 400 feet wide. This is wider than is at present necessary, and we recast the specifications so that instead of having a channel 400 feet wide it was reduced to 110 feet in width, with 20 feet depth of water. No doubt another contract will have to be made to make the channel wider as we go on. Then, we made a contract with Boon & Armstrong at \$2.25 per cubic yard for rock work from the centre of the channel to the south shore.

Mr. HAGGART. Was that let by tender and contract?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, for the reason that Boon & Armstrong had this contract. They were dillatory, as they evidently had not the proper experience, but they had their plant and outfit on the ground, and they were ready to go on. I terminated their contract because of the dillatory way in which they had been doing the work. I terminated their contract this spring and gave them in lieu of that contract certain rock work at \$2.25 per cubic yard they agree to abandon their old contract and proceed upon a narrower limit. So that instead of having a channel 400 feet wide according to the specifications prepared in 1896, we propose to have a channel 110 feet wide. We have made it 110 feet because that is exactly two lengths of a dredge, and by moving the dredge once across they cover the width of the channel. We will get a channel of 110 feet wide, and they will move southward as they proceed with their rock work. To the north it is hard-pan, and we have not yet a contract for the hard-pan. Tenders are being invited for the hard-pan on the north side, and if we are successful in getting a contractor, there will be a channel of 110 feet wide by the end of this year.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the town of Collingwood contribute anything?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think they have contributed \$25,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the Grand Trunk not give something?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. SPROULE. The town, I think, gives \$15,000, and the Grand Trunk \$10,000. That is how the \$25,000 is made up.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have only got \$15,000. There was talk of the Grand Trunk giving \$10,000, but it has not come yet.

Mr. SPROULE. They agreed to give it if they got the desired depth of water.

Sault Ste. Marie—Harbour improvements. \$10,000

Mr. HAGGART. What is the explanation of that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is for the reconstruction of the wharf at the Sault.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that where the old wharf was?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This vote is required towards the extension of the old wharf there, known as Plummers' wharf, 100 feet, and for the removal of a shoal.

Little Current—North channel improvements ..... \$1,000

Mr. SPROULE. What is that for?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is for the removal of rocks from the north channel in the Georgian Bay opposite Little Current. The total cost is \$2,500. There has been \$1,500 spent, and this is to complete it.

Port Findlay—Wharf (revote, \$2,500)..... \$5,800

Mr. SPROULE. Where is Port Findlay?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In Algoma. This work is under contract.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The total estimated cost is \$7,300, and this vote of \$5,800 finishes it.

River Ottawa—Dam on main channel above the Long Sault Rapids at the foot of Lake Temiscamingue ..... \$5,600

Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. gentleman kindly say what that will cost, and what the object of the undertaking is?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is to try to raise the water of Lake Temiscamingue. Mr. Lumsden and Mr. Klock have been urging that certain improvements be made, for example, these two wharfs. It is proposed to put in some piers to try and check the flow of water with the view of raising the level, and do away with dredging. We expect to raise the level about 2 feet, and perhaps a little over that, but at any rate it will be over a foot. I would like to state that perhaps this work of constructing the dam will not be let by tender. Mr. Lumsden, who is lumbering there, has seen me on the subject, and he thinks this amount will meet the requirements. There are other people who say it will not. There are reports which say that it will take a great deal of

money to raise the level of the water. But Mr. Lumsden, having a pecuniary interest in the raising of the water, will, if he gets this amount of money, put piers that will to some extent meet the requirements. If he does, I wish the committee to understand that we should be free to get Mr. Lumsden to build these piers for what parliament has voted without having to submit the matter to tender.

Mr. HAGGART. Let me draw the hon. minister's attention to the necessity of a dam at the end of Lake Temiscamingue. I think there could be no more valuable work for this section of the country than to erect a dam at the foot of Lake Temiscamingue for the purpose of retaining the waters which annually come down the Ottawa River, and of distributing their flow over different periods of the year. I do not know whether you would be called upon to pay damages for overflowing farms above it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. HAGGART. If not there is no more necessary work than the erection of a dam at the foot of Lake Temiscamingue for the purpose of reserving the waters of the Ottawa River, so as to have an equitable distribution during the year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The idea at present is to put in these piers at the foot of the lake. They will check the water, and if they do not raise it enough the department can put in more piers and fill in the spaces, and by this process put in a complete dam.

Mr. SPROULE. There is talk about another gentleman who is around there, and they say there is no timber could be injured, or no land that could be flooded.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You are quite right.

South Nation River—Towards the improvement of the pitch-off ..... \$5,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is this making the outlet better as was applied for some years ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is to remove a ledge of rock.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister might as well say at once that the only object is drainage, because there is no navigation there at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The work is to permit of navigation over this rock and also to prevent the water flooding the country.

Lake Manitoba—Opening of additional outlet to prevent overflow of lake, and maintenance of same at proper level for navigation purposes (revote) ..... \$25,000

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What has been done so far with regard to that work?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The work is under contract now and is being pushed forward rapidly.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What work are you doing under the contract?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Dredging the channel so as to give an additional outlet for the water.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. A channel from where?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. From Lake Manitoba into Fairford River.

Lake Manitoba—Dredging small channel at south end ..... \$1,200

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I do not know of any harbour there.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). There is a harbour there, but the sand has been washed up and it forms a bar across the mouth of it and this appropriation is to dredge the bar and allow boats to get into the harbour.

Lake Dauphin—Lowering of..... \$5,000

Mr. LaRIVIERE. How do you intend to lower the level of Lake Dauphin?

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). I am probably better acquainted with that than the minister.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I will wait for the answer of the minister and then it will be all right.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This vote is according to the estimate of the chief engineer, for the removal of boulders in the bed of the river to facilitate the discharge of surplus waters in Lake Dauphin and with a view of preventing the periodical flooding. The total estimated cost is \$9,000.

Fraser River—Improvement of ship channel protection works, &c. .... \$40,000

Mr. SPROULE. What do you propose to do with this large sum of money?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Fraser River gives itself great airs and runs all around the country just as it seems to like. This \$40,000 is to afford protection, &c. It is a very difficult problem to deal with.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you propose to protect the bank?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. By mattresses if possible.

New dredging plant, Ontario and Quebec. \$75,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is this for building new dredging plant?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are engaged in constructing an elevator dredge at Sorel. It will be moved where required.

Des Joachims bridge—Reconstruction (revote) ..... \$14,500

Mr. DAVIN. Will this be let by tender ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Ottawa—Maria Street bridge, over the Rideau Canal—Reconstruction (revote, \$37,000) ..... \$50,000

Mr. DAVIN. Will this be let by tender ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, it is under contract now.

Portage du Fort bridge—Reconstruction (revote) ..... \$19,000

Mr. DAVIN. Is this also under contract by tender ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Battleford—Bridge, to replace old condemned superstructure ..... \$25,000

Mr. DAVIN. Is this a new work ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Have tenders been called for ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not yet. They will be. The old bridge fell down.

Telegraph line on the north shore of St. Lawrence—Extension from Romaine eastward to Belle Island (revote, \$26,000) ..... \$40,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is that being built now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, we expect to have it built by the end of September.

Mr. SPROULE. How are you having it built ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. By contract. We invited tenders from the cable companies in England. There are twenty-three miles of sea cable. This is to provide telegraphic communication between Belle Isle and Canada—a most important public work.

Mr. ELLIS. I was going to ask about the Prince Edward Island telegraph line, but I see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will arrange with the minister that the hon. gentleman may put his question under any item.

Telegraph lines, Ontario—Peelee Islands—Renewal of original portion of cable connecting the island with the mainland. \$6,000

Mr. SPROULE. What do you need down there ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has been a cable there, but it has gone to decay, and we have to repair it.

Telegraph lines, British Columbia—150 Mile House to Quesnelle Forks and Horsefly. \$6,000

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a new line, which connects the old telegraph system of Canada with the Atlin district.

Monument to Hon. Alexander Mackenzie (revote) ..... \$4,000

Mr. DAVIN. When will that be ready ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is thought it will be in shape to be erected next spring.

Mr. DAVIN. Where is it to be placed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think the exact spot is selected yet, but it will be somewhere on our grounds here.

Mr. DAVIN. The erection of a statute to so representative a man as the late Alexander Mackenzie meets with my entire approval; but as the Reform party is supposed to be in power at the present time, I think those in power might have gone further and have erected a statute to the purest and noblest figure in our history whose name is connected with the Reform party, though the Reform party he led would probably not be quite in line with the Reform party of to-day. I mean Robert Baldwin, a man whose character stands out in stainless purity in the history of Canada, and whose efforts to bring about responsible government were untiring and statesmanlike. I hope, if the present government does not, that at an early date some government in Canada will feel a real historical gratitude, and will be led to erect a statute to Robert Baldwin. It is quite right and entirely appropriate that gratitude and loyalty should animate a party in regard to a dead chief; but there is even a nobler loyalty, and that is the loyalty which we can all share towards a man whose name is no longer connected with the strifes of to-day; and of whose claims on national gratitude there can be no doubt. In the same connection I would say that it is a reproach to Canada and to administrations both Liberal and Conservative, that no statute has been raised to D'Arcy McGee. Any one familiar with the history of the years prior to confederation, and the forces that were put into operation to bring confederation about, will know that amid all those men, brilliant and great, who contributed to bring confederation about, there was no man who did more than D'Arcy McGee, because, owing to the peculiar cast of his mind, he was able to present the proposed scheme in an attractive and national light, and, by reason of the intuitive character of his intellect, he was able to anticipate in the midst of a doubting generation, the large expansion and vast proportions of Canada, which we witness to-day. He was the proto-martyr of the Canadian confederacy. He fell a victim to an assassin and died a premature death, because he had so nobly advocated that great forward move-

ment of the Canadian people which culminated in confederation. The reproach is at the door of both Conservatives and Liberals, and I hope that some day not far off the government will see that a suitable memento adorns those grounds of a man who was an ornament to the House of Commons, who contributed, at a time when it was much needed, by his genius and eloquence, to the intellectual life of Canada, and whose name is endeared, not merely to one section, but to the great mass of the people. I think it would be a great mistake to confine such recognitions merely to those who may have climbed to the position of First Minister. It is not done in England, and it would show a regard on the part of the people to what might be called the caprices of fortune, that is unworthy the great motive which should animate us when, after a man has passed away from the strife of the hour, we seek to produce something enduring that will testify to our own time and subsequent generations the estimate we have formed of what the country owed such men.

Mr. SPROULE. Who has the contract for Hon. Alexander Mackenzie's monument?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Felix Hébert.

Portrait of Her Majesty the Queen, including freight charges ..... \$1,000

Mr. SPROULE. What portrait is that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is to be found in Rideau Hall.

Salaries—Chief architect's and chief engineer's staff, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service or any other Act..... \$7,400

Mr. SPROULE. How is this distributed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There have been small increases, but by some ruling of the Auditor General, it seems to be necessary to have a special vote, not merely for the increase, but for all the salaries. It is a revote of the salaries of the staff, and represents about \$1,700 increases distributed among nine officials. They are all old clerks, and this is not included in the main estimates.

Telegraph line—Quesnelle to Atlin, B.C. (revote)..... \$110,000

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman explain this, and state how far built, and the cost per mile?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The distance between Quesnelle and Atlin is about 900 miles, and there you connect with the Quesnelle system. This is required to secure the construction of a telegraph line from Quesnelle to Atlin, 900 to 1,100 miles in length. The appropriation for 1899 was 900 miles at \$250 per mile, \$225,000; and

Mr. DAVIN.

anticipated additional length, 200 miles, \$50,000. Total probable cost, \$275,000. Deduct expenditure to June 30, 1900, \$115,000. Six weeks ago the department received a report showing that 100 miles were constructed westerly from Quesnelle, and 100 miles easterly from Atlin. The whole line will be constructed by October next. The expectation is to have the whole line constructed by October.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it done by tender?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it has been done by the department under the superintendence of Mr. Charleson.

Mr. SPROULE. That is about \$305 a mile?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, \$250. A total of \$275,000 would provide for 1,100 miles, and \$225,000 for 900 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. Why the extra 200 miles?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no real survey, and it is not possible to know but that they may be obliged to go by a circuitous route. General Greeley, who has charge of the American government telegraph service all over the world, was here, and in conversation with me he expressed surprise at the facility with which we built the line and the cheapness of it.

Mr. HAGGART. Cheapness?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, he was amazed at it. And he has been engaged in similar work in Alaska.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the one that Charleson furnished the wire for?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. He has furnished no wire. The wire was furnished by three firms in Montreal, the Lewis, and Kavanagh and Macpherson firms.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you give Charleson a commission on the number of men employed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, he is paid a salary.

Mr. SPROULE. How much?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Four thousand dollars a year.

Mr. SPROULE. And living expenses?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course.

Mr. SPROULE. How many men has he with him on salary?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He has about 100, labourers and all.

Mr. SPROULE. But, how many are employed on salary, and what are their salaries?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. There are four under-managers; and they get about \$1,500 to \$2,000 a year each.

Yukon Territory—Telegraph lines—Dawson to Fort Cudahy or Fifty-Mile River.... \$12,000

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. We are making an arrangement with the United States under which we will have the whole of the business between the United States and Alaska over this line.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Is this to be built by Charleson ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. We have not decided. Probably he will have charge of it. We could not do better.

Yukon District—Trails, roads and bridges (revote) ..... \$50,000

Mr. **HAGGART**. How is this to be expended ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. There is nothing determined as to where these roads shall be built. Last year parliament passed an item for this purpose, and there are some trails and roads constructed. This sum will be available according to the exigencies of the season there. If new discoveries are made and facilities for reaching all claims be deemed necessary, this money may be expended for such purposes. It is simply a precautionary vote to meet what may be a proper demand.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Why was none of the money expended last year ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. A larger sum than this was voted and some of it was spent. It was spent through the Department of the Interior.

Yukon Territory—Public works and buildings—Income, rent, fuel, lighting, &c.. \$19,500

Mr. **SPROULE**. How about the coal up there ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. We have nothing definite.

Mr. **SPROULE**. You still depend on wood ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Yes.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Why do you not build there ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. We are engaged at it now.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What rents do you pay—this seems a large amount ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I believe they calculate to get back the value of a building in two or three years there. This vote, together with one of \$27,000 in

the main estimates is called for by the Department of the Interior. Among the rents to be provided are the following :

Dawson City—Commissioner's office and post office.....	\$14,400
Crown timber and lands registrar's office.....	9,000
Commissioner's house .....	3,000
House for gold commissioner and officials.....	3,000
Cabin—Legal adviser .....	780
Hunker—Land and mining recorder's office .....	300
Sulphur—Mining recorder's office .....	300
Furnishing .....	1,500
Fuel for buildings, 400 cords of wood at \$25 .....	10,000
Light .....	4,000
Incidentals .....	220

Total ..... \$46,500

Mr. **BERGERON**. Do they use the electric light in these buildings ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Electricity is used in Dawson, but we have not the public buildings lighted with it.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Why would not they use an electric light ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The deputy informs me that these buildings are rented, and that as soon as we can get into our own buildings they will be equipped with electric light.

Mr. **SPROULE**. How long are you going to use these before you get your own buildings ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I instructed the engineer, Mr. Fuller, some two months ago to proceed with the work of erecting the buildings.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What is the reason for wood being so high, \$25 a cord ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. The deputy informs me that he has no information upon that point further than that the wood was purchased by Mr. Ogilvie, and accounts were rendered by him.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Are there wooded lands more or less about Dawson ?

Mr. **BERGERON**. Wood is cheap, but the cutting and driving of it is dear, as I learned from an old miner that I met last winter. Day labour is very high.

Mr. **FOSTER**. I want to find out whether the wooded lands in and around Dawson are in the hands of the government, or in the hands of companies and private individuals ?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I am not aware that the government has parted with all its wood lands, but I think the member for Beauharnois has given the explanation. I can recollect having seen an

item in the paper about a man making \$10 in part of a day by sawing wood.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been asserted, and I think there is a great deal of truth in it, that the available timber lands have largely gone into the hands of private holders or companies, and wood being so scarce an article there, they hold it at a very high price. It is the common complaint all through that country, with the miners in particular, that it is getting to be almost impossible for them to get wood for the active operations of their mines.

Mr. SPROULE. I noticed an item in a paper some time ago stating that the wood in the vicinity of Dawson was held by parties who had control over it. Some member of the government ought to know whether that is the case or not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I learned from the Minister of the Interior that there is no corner of any kind upon wood, that the price is now falling, and within the last three or four weeks he is advised that you can get cordwood for \$18. I suppose labour is getting cheaper. But there is an abundance of wood on government lands in the immediate vicinity of Dawson.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the dimensions of that building for which you are paying \$14,400 as rent?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deputy has no information, and it could not be got this side of Dawson City.

Mr. FOSTER. That is rather an astounding statement to make, that you are paying rent for a year and a half at the rate of over \$14,000 a year, and the department has never had the curiosity to ask what kind of a building that was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Ogilvie rented the building. We have to trust somebody, and Mr. Ogilvie is certainly an upright and honourable man, and he is quite familiar with the conditions in Dawson City. When he went there he had to provide proper accommodation, and I think we can depend upon him for making a proper bargain.

Mr. BERGERON. From whom did he lease that building?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. F. C. Lowry.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that satisfactory to the House that is voting money, to say that an official is trustworthy, and consequently we are not going to ask what kind of a house he gets? I may have as much faith as others in Mr. Ogilvie, but he is simply an official, and it is his duty to inform his superiors about these matters; because everybody knows that when you come to

Mr. MULOCK.

vote money you must have more information than a minister saying that he does not know what kind of a house it is. But there is another point. Mr. Ogilvie does not hold himself at all in the proper place of an official towards his minister and towards this parliament. Only this year we had the fact brought out that with reference to a report promised in his last year's report, the acting minister has been unable all this year to get that report from him, and up to the last information which was given to the House, absolutely unable to get even a telegram or an answer from Mr. Ogilvie in answer to his repeated telegrams to know why this information and report had not been sent. That does not seem to me to be the way that an official should act. I have been going through some correspondence in reference to permits in reference to which the hon. Minister of the Interior found that his will and wishes and law had been expressly violated by Mr. Ogilvie. He had to haul him over the coals in a moderate kind of way for having expressly gone against what the minister had ordered. In the course of the whole correspondence I did not see any justification of Mr. Ogilvie's conduct, but when an official in the pay of the government sends out a report and intimates that a supplementary report was soon to follow, when nearly a year goes by and there is no supplementary report, when parliament is in session and wants information, when the hon. acting minister telegraphs and telegraphs when he has to come down to the House and say that he has not had the courtesy of even a reply from Mr. Ogilvie, it shows that the line of communication is cut for some reason or other. Why is it? We are absolutely in the dark in this parliament and although we have arranged telegraphic communication at immense cost we cannot even get a reply from His Excellency to the simplest kind of a telegram.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Is the hon. gentleman referring to Mr. Ogilvie's report for last year?

Mr. FOSTER. I am referring to the supplementary report which was promised by Mr. Ogilvie and for which we have been waiting all this session, and which the hon. acting minister told us in the House that he had three times telegraphed for, after which he had written a sharp letter and at our request telegraphed again. Up to this moment he has not sent the report. I put it to the minister himself; here is one of his officials up there who rents houses and gives a rent of \$1,200 a month. He has made the rent of this building \$14,000 a year, and no department in Ottawa seems to have even a description of the kind of House for which he is paying \$14,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can tell the hon. gentleman something about it

now. My hon. friend for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) has been up in Dawson City and he informs me that this is the finest building in Dawson City and would be a credit to some of the older settled parts of Canada. It is a frame building, two stories, large and commodious. He thinks it could not be built for \$20,000. It affords accommodation not only for the residence of the commissioner but for various offices. The office of the controller, the officer of the court, the registrar, and so on.

Mr. FOSTER. Well it is a great blessing to this parliament that the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) has not gone home before this, or, with the acting Minister of Public Works and the officials of the department, we would have been totally in the dark as to whether it was a corrugated iron building, a log building, or as to anything about the size of it.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to know if the whole building is rented or if the building is divided up amongst different departments.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have it all rented.

Mr. SPROULE. You give \$14,000 for one building and \$9,000 for another. Are these different buildings or are they parts of the same building?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is an additional building.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. acting Minister of the Interior to say that different parts of this building were used for the different offices.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some of the different offices, but it does not contain all our offices.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. acting minister to say that only the gold commissioner was occupying the building for which we pay \$14,400 a year, or are there two or three others in the same building?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There in the office of the controller, the man who has charge of the expenditure, and a part of the building is set apart for the commissioner's residence.

Mr. BERGERON. If the hon. member for New Westminster say that they could not build that building for less than \$20,000 and if we pay \$14,400 a year it will not take many years before the building is all paid for.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He did not say that it could be built for \$20,000. I asked him if it could be built for \$20,000,

and he said that would be the inside figure. He did not tell me what was the outside.

Mr. SPROULE. How many houses and offices are there, and what does each cost?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have read the list already, but I will read it again. The Crown timber office, the land office, and the registrar's office are rented from J. E. Binet. We pay for that building \$9,000 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the size of that house?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the size. The house that the commissioner lives in is rented from Rev. F. Gendreau at \$3,000 a year, the house for the gold commissioner and his officers is rented from the Alaska Commercial Company at \$3,000 a year. Then, there is the office for the legal adviser rented from Mr. de Lobel at \$780 a year. At Hunker Creek there is a mining recorder's office, rent, \$300 a year. At Sulphur Creek there is another mining recorder's office, rent, \$300 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of a building is the one that the registrar is in?

Mr. MORRISON. It is a building very similar to the post office to which the hon. acting minister has referred, excepting that it is smaller. It is something of the same style as the other.

Mr. FOSTER. A two-story building?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. What would be the size?

Mr. MORRISON. It is not much smaller than the other.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the other?

Mr. MORRISON. You are satisfied with the rental of the other building and that would be by inspection, only of course, about 75 x 100 feet. It is a very large building, and the registrar's building is also a very respectable building and one that you would be surprised to find in a town like Dawson. I was very much surprised to see such a commodious and well equipped building.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I have some little knowledge of buildings in Dawson. Of course the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) is criticising something that he knows nothing about. Rents up there are very dear. A little house that I know of and I will give this as an example, about 30 x 40 feet, rented for \$300 a month. That might seem very surprising to hon. members of this House, but it shows what rentals are there. I happen to know this public

building and I do not see anything particularly wrong with the price paid for it. I have no doubt if we went to Apohaqui, where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) lived, that we would not expect such a high rent. It is quite a nice little village, and doing very well since my hon. friend represented it. A little house which you would rent down here for \$20 a month, would cost \$300 or \$400 a month up in the Yukon. Lumber costs \$400 or \$500 a thousand, and land costs from \$10,000 to \$15,000 a lot.

Mr. BERGERON. Does not the land belong to the government?

Mr. DOMVILLE. It did at one time, as did all the rest of the land in Canada, but they parted with it.

Mr. BERGERON. Why did they not hold some of it for their buildings?

Mr. DOMVILLE. If they had the benefit of your wisdom, perhaps they might have done it. The land was parted with there, when the Conservatives were in power.

Mr. BERGERON. We had nothing to do with the Yukon in our day.

Mr. DOMVILLE. I tell you what is the fact, and I am talking about something that I know. I have no doubt that the member for York finds these prices extravagant, and I do not wonder at it, but lots there of fifty feet by one hundred and fifty feet, have been sold for \$50,000, and when you put a building on that, you will see what can be charged. I lived in a little bit of a cottage, not much larger than the Clerk's table there, and we paid \$75 a month for it.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope that next session, we will be able to get information with reference to the size of all these buildings, and what rent we are paying for them.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is an election before then, the government will not have a chance to give the information.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that all the Public Works estimates are now through.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Then I wish to ask the Prime Minister and the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock), if there was not a deputation here from Valleyfield recently, asking for a public building? I want to know from the Prime Minister what that deputation asked, and what was his answer? I want to know why there is not an item in the estimates for that public building which the people of Valleyfield are entitled to get?

The PRIME MINISTER. I received a delegation from Valleyfield some time ago,

Mr. DOMVILLE.

asking, among other things, for a post office. Probably they anticipated the remark that my hon. friend made this morning, when he said of us: Come on, we are now deep in the public treasury

Mr. BERGERON. They heard of Mr. Mulock's circular.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps so. I am sorry to say that the magnitude of the estimates which is so much criticised by my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron), did not permit us to take the matter into consideration this year.

Mr. BERGERON. You are giving them cold justice.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Minister of Public Works goes, I wish to say on behalf of the North-west, and on behalf of all Canada, that these numerous items, these vast amounts which have been voted seem to me to smell of humbug and some of them to smell of something worse. I venture to say that many of these amounts will never be spent, and I wish I could have divided the House on three-fourths of them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would like to hear from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), if he objects to any expenditures in the North-west Territories?

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask the minister for an answer to the question I put yesterday as to the Brockville drill hall—who the tenderers were, the amounts, and the successful tenderer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deputy is leaving to-night and will not be back till Tuesday, so I shall not be able to give the hon. gentleman the information till then. We shall have it here on Monday.

Post office service—Additional amount required ..... \$24,767 84

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Postmaster General will remember that I called attention a short time ago to the dismissal of the postmaster at Carnduff. I think the Postmaster General is aware that the Liberals of that district resent what was done just as much as the Conservatives. There was a numerously-signed petition protesting against it, and if I were to read the names on that petition, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who is acquainted with Carnduff, would see that the majority of the names on that petition are Liberal names. What happened was this. The daughter of the postmaster happened to be in charge, when a gentleman residing there went into the post office and handed her some circulars purporting to be public documents; and this young girl, thinking they were public documents, circulated them; and, because of that, in the face of explanations, she is dismissed, and the man who

pressed the complaint is placed in her position. On the 17th of March Mr. Lesueur wrote to W. W. McLeod, saying :

I am directed to inclose to you herewith copy of a portion of a letter from a Mr. J. H. Taylor, of Carnduff, Assa., charging the postmaster of Carnduff with having distributed, free of postage, through the post office, a certain political pamphlet to persons residing at that place, one copy of which was received by himself; and to request that you will be good enough to inquire into the matter and report the result for the Postmaster General's information.

The letter of Mr. McLeod is as follows :

Post Office Inspector's Office,  
Winnipeg, Man., April 11, 1900.

Sir,—With reference to your letter, No. 91, of the 17th ult., inclosing copy of a portion of a letter from Mr. J. H. Taylor, of Carnduff, Assiniboia, charging the postmaster with having distributed free of postage through the post office a certain political pamphlet to persons residing at that place, and requesting me to inquire into the matter and report the result, I beg to say that on the occasion the pamphlet in question was posted, the postmaster states he was away from home, and the office was in charge of his daughter, a sworn assistant; that Mr. J. W. Connell, M.L.A. for the North-west Territories, handed these pamphlets in, and as they came from Ottawa, and were already done up in wrappers, his assistant did not think it necessary that the postage should be prepaid. The postmaster thinks there were probably about eighty in all posted.

I will call the attention of the Postmaster General to this, for I suppose the merits of this case never really came before him, and that he was pressed by powerful political influences to cut off the head of the postmaster at Carnduff. The assistant postmaster's explanation of the matter is as follows :

I took the papers and distributed them free of charge, as I have distributed papers from editors which were done up in wrappers in same way, so I thought these papers which Mr. J. W. Connell brought in should be distributed in a similar manner. I might also state that I did not know what kind of papers they were. I had no idea whatever that they were political papers. My father and mother did not know that they were political papers either. My father was away from the village altogether when papers were brought to the office and did not return until after I had all the papers which were brought in given out of the general office. I have done very little work in the office, and am indeed sorry for error made and trouble which I have caused. However, I will try and be more careful in the future.

Surely, for a little venial fault like that on the part of a young girl, that is excuse enough. It is evident that she could not have done it from design and knowing the character of these papers. If she knew the character of the papers, she was much too intelligent to circulate them, because she knew very well that that would imperil the position of her father. The purport of the postmaster's explanation was indicated to Mr. Taylor, and his reply

was to the effect that this young girl was a sworn assistant, and he characterized the pamphlet as quite indecent. That is another reason that it is simply impossible that the young girl should have known anything of what she was distributing. Mr. Taylor writes :

Your letter of 27th to hand. With reference to my complaint, I would say that if the postmaster had only franked political pamphlets, I would not have complained.

Mark that, although we know very well that would have been a very grave offence and a most improper thing.

But the abominable stuff that he sent out from his office was not politics, but filth. I have no desire to cause Mr. Carnduff any trouble in the matter, as I think he will be more careful in the future.

So that the man who made the complaint had no desire to have him dismissed.

Although I believe him to be responsible for this, as they refer in their letter to you to the same pamphlets passing through this office under wrapper, they evidently knew what it contained.

Of course that is not so. In the face of the statement of the man who was complaining that he did not want the postmaster to be disturbed, what happened? On May 23, a letter was sent as follows :

Memo. for the post office inspectorship at Winnipeg—Name of office, Carnduff; district, Assiniboia East; cause of vacancy, removal of J. B. Carnduff from postmastership.

And the inspector's report is referred to. There is nothing in the report to account for it. There is nothing in the complainant's letter to account for it, but Mr. Coulter on May 23 writes to J. S. Taylor :

I have the honour to inform you that you have been recommended by the Postmaster General as a fit person to be appointed to the postmastership of Carnduff, in the electoral district of Assiniboia East.

On May 31 Mr. Connell wrote to Mr. McLeod, saying it was rumored that the present postmaster was to be removed, and John Taylor to take his place and informs him that such action will be resented by the people. He said :

A petition is now being signed by the entire community, with scarcely an exception, protesting against such change.

He goes on to say that the building is not sufficiently large, but that Carnduff agreed to build an office of such dimensions as will be necessary to accommodate the public, if given any guarantee that he will be left permanently in charge of the office. He further asks the department to defer further action until they have received the petition or given Mr. Carnduff a hearing which any man is entitled to. Again, on June 4, Mr. Connell wrote to Mr. McLeod, post office inspector, Winnipeg :

Dear Sir,—Inclosed you will please find petition which I have to request you to kindly forward to the Postmaster General at Carnduff.

I may tell you that there is general dissatisfaction throughout the entire district at the action taken in this matter, and the people feel justly indignant at the dismissal of Mr. Carnduff from the post office. He has given the people entire satisfaction for sixteen years, and they feel that the spoils system should not have been applied in this case.

The following is the petition :

Carnduff, Assa., May 31, 1900.

To the Honourable  
the Postmaster General of Canada.

Your petitioners being informed that it is in contemplation to remove Mr. J. P. Carnduff, postmaster of Carnduff, from his position as postmaster, beg respectfully to call your attention to the following facts:

1. That Mr. Carnduff has been for nearly eighteen years a resident in this district, being one of the pioneer settlers.

2. That he has held the post office ever since its establishment, some sixteen years ago.

3. That during that long period he has carried out the duties in a manner which has given complete satisfaction to your petitioners, and, as we have every reason to believe, the public at large throughout the district.

4. That Mr. Carnduff, although known as a Conservative, has never taken, at any time, any active part in politics whatever, much less shown any offensive partisanship.

5. That the business requirements of this rapidly growing town have undoubtedly outgrown the accommodation provided by the existing building, but that Mr. Carnduff is prepared, if given any reasonable guarantee of the permanent tenure of his office, to at once erect a building which will fully meet the needs of the town and district for years to come.

6. That this petition is signed irrespective of party, and because your petitioners believe it to be in the public interest that the present postmaster should be retained.

And your petitioners, therefore, respectfully pray that no change be made, but that the said J. P. Carnduff be permanently retained as postmaster of Carnduff.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

This petition is signed by J. W. Cairns, farmer; Chas. H. Seyper, farmer; and a number of others, covering a page and a half of foolscap. I suppose now that Mr. Taylor has been appointed and there is no hope of the reinstatement of Mr. Carnduff, but I think that the House will see that very harsh treatment has been dealt out to that gentleman, and I would like to hear from the Postmaster General an explanation of his course. We might have thought that at this time, long after the election of 1896, the hatchet would have been hung up, but evidently it is not. I think that this whole matter reflects on the management of my hon. friend.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has read the evidence, which, I understand, shows that mail matter was

Mr. DAVIN.

allowed to be transmitted free through the mails at this point, contrary to law. There are 10,000 postmasters in Canada, and if any laxity of this kind should be allowed in one place, you would very soon find imitation in others, and what would become of the revenue of the country? I think it is a serious offence, and if a postmaster absents himself and allows his place to be taken by some one not competent, whether he be responsible morally or not, he is legally responsible for the act of his agent. In this case he left the office in the hands of some one, who, whether innocently or not, allowed mail matter to be transmitted free. I have had more than one such complaint brought to my attention within the last few years, and while these people very often plead absolute innocence—and I suppose I must accept their word—I think we have to deal with the subject, not merely as to what they intended, but as to whether or not they are competent to protect the revenue. In this case, the revenue may not have suffered to any great extent, but still mail matter was allowed to be transmitted illegally through the mails.

Mr. DAVIN. I will say no more about that except that I do not think that the reply of the hon. gentleman will satisfy the supporters of his party who have signed the petition, and who are indignant at the harsh treatment dealt out to Mr. Carnduff. I have another matter to bring before the hon. gentleman. We heard a great deal in this House and the country about the abuse of the franking privilege. We have had, for instance, criticisms of the Minister of Trade and Commerce for the use of his frank on a certain occasion, and I think the criticisms were just. But occasionally we see in the press absurd criticisms, such as that a member has franked either his own speech or the speech of some other member. I have seen the criticisms of myself, for instance, because I franked to one of my constituents the budget speech of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). I think everybody will admit that it is a very proper use of a frank for a member of parliament, to send the speech of one of the leaders, or the speech of his own or even of any other hon. member. But it must be clear that there is a limit of honour that must be observed. We cannot use the franking privilege to further the commercial interests of ourselves or others. Within a few days I have received a letter from the North-west which brings before me a much more serious breach of the franking privileges than anything that has yet been brought up. In the early part of this session, I had several letters brought before me, on the abuse of the franking privilege, to which I thought to call attention, but I did not think it necessary to bring them before the House, although I thought it was serious enough. For instance, here is a

notice of the *Herald* Publishing Company, as follows :

Montreal, March, 1900.

Dear Sir,—During the past three months we have been sending the 'Herald' to your address daily at the expense of Messrs. Henry Morgan & Co., of this city.

We now find that, owing to a misunderstanding on our part in connection with the excessive postage imposed on papers sent in the interest of advertisers, we are compelled to cancel this contract with Messrs. Morgan & Co.

We are glad to inform you, however, that we have made a new arrangement with Messrs. Morgan & Co. to send you our large Saturday edition for a time, and we hope you will receive it, with the firm's compliments from week to week.

Thinking probably you would like to become a regular subscriber to the 'Herald,' and thus receive the paper daily, we will accept your subscription for a full year for the small sum of \$1.

Bear in mind this is a special price that we quote you in order to get the 'Herald' more widely introduced throughout your district.

Trusting the 'Herald' has been a welcome visitor to your home during the past three months,

We are, yours truly,

THE 'HERALD' PUBLISHING CO.

Now, it will be observed, there are two commercial firms advertised here—Henry Morgan & Co. and the *Herald* Publishing Company. Nevertheless, when that was brought to my attention, I did not bring it before the House, because it related to a newspaper which contained political information, and, by a charitable construction, this might be held to be within the franking privilege, though, when one looks at it, it clearly is not. However, as I say, I did not bring it before the House, because I do not care about that sort of thing. But as it is connected with a very much graver offence against the franking privilege and has again been brought before my attention, I must bring it before the committee. This has been circulated in my own constituency in Alberta and in the Saskatchewan and East Assinibola by the hundreds, franked by the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). But, here is a purely business card :

Hotel Cecil, Ottawa, has now entered on the third month of its existence, and the following are some of our patrons:—

And there is the picture of Hotel Cecil and an alphabetical list of the patrons. This has been circulated, I am told, by tens of thousands all over the west, franked 'T. O. D., M. P.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And by others, also.

Mr. DAVIN. If by others, then so much more reason why I should bring it before parliament. It has only come to my knowledge that the hon. member for Saskatchewan has done it. I will not quote the statements in the letter written to me, because,

after all, they are based on surmise and the writer cannot know whether, or not, the person who has sent this broadcast, has got an equivalent for it. I am not familiar enough with the hon member for Saskatchewan to know whether this address is in his handwriting or not, but the frank is in his writing. If the address is in his writing, this is a very great offence. If it is by the clerk of the hotel, look at the extent to which the post office has been defrauded, supposing that 100,000 or even 500,000 of these have been sent out. But—apart from that, I say that to do a thing like that is a dishonourable thing, unworthy of a member of parliament. I am sorry it came into my hands only within four or five days. Had it come into my hands earlier in the session, I certainly would have made a motion to inquire into it. But here is the hon. member (Mr. Davis) franking an advertisement for the *Herald* Publishing Company and Henry Morgan & Company, and then franking in this business card for an hotel. I will not say that I adopt the criticism of this letter, written to me, that the hon. member has received an equivalent in board, because I have no evidence whatever in the matter. But why should any member of parliament do such a thing as that? What motive can there be? There is no member of the House of Commons so wanting in intelligence as not to know the impropriety of it; and, knowing the impropriety of it, why should it be done? Is it possible, as hinted in this letter inclosing the card and circular, that some consideration is to be given for that? It is quite clear that if 100,000 of these are circulated, it amounts at once to a sum that might face a considerable consideration. I know nothing about that. The impropriety of doing that is clear enough without going on to a suggestion of that sort.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from York, made a suggestion, which I think is a reasonable one, that we should, as far as possible, begin at the beginning.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Postmaster General nothing to say about this matter that has been brought to his attention by the hon. member for West Assinibola? I think it is worthy of very strong remarks.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The statute does not define the kind of mailable matter that may be transmitted under a member's frank; it simply says that letters and other mailable matter may be franked. Each hon. gentleman in the House has to use his own judgment as to what is a proper exercise of that privilege. I would tell my hon. friend (Mr. Davin), that while he singles out the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) for criticism, he is not the only offender, if he is an offender in this respect. I do not think I have any right to sit in judgment on use of the frank by an hon. gen-

tleman if he is within the law; if the law says he may frank any mailable matter, I have no right as a minister to call into judgment the manner in which he may exercise that privilege. I may have my own opinion, but parliament has not given to the Postmaster General the right to say how a member shall exercise his frank. As to the particular case that the hon. gentleman cites, that of the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), I know nothing about it; but I may say that other similar cases have been brought to my attention, not merely this session, but last session, and in connection with that very institution, and I took the liberty of mentioning privately to these gentlemen—they were not confined to one side of the House—that I thought they were exposing themselves to criticism if they ventured to use the frank in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister is perfectly right in saying that under the law he cannot control the manner in which a member during the sitting of the House shall exercise his frank. That was the contention I took when we discussed the matter before. But I do not think the people generally would approve of that kind of extension of the franking privilege, and it might be well for the minister to consider whether the law should not be amended to prevent that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a good idea.

Mr. FOSTER. I think any political matter a member has to send or receive whilst attending the session, should be covered by the frank. Moreover, a man representing a constituency has necessarily to bring a large part of his business with him, and he must do that from the House, and I do not think it is too great an extension of the frank that it should cover his private business. But I think those two things, public documents of a political nature and his own private business, should be the limit to which the frank should apply. It is certainly a terrible abuse when a man constitutes himself the medium for circulating through the mails business advertisements of newspapers or any other business. I dare say we have all offended more or less in that respect.

I want now to call the attention of the minister to the case of the dismissal of a postmaster in the town of Woodstock, N.B., I mean Lieut.-Col. Vince, who was appointed under the regime of the late government. He was a most excellent postmaster, so excellent that I do not think you would find a single political opponent in the whole city of Woodstock or district who would say that in all respects he was not an ideal postmaster. He was a lawyer, and when he undertook the business of the

post office he gave up the practice of law. But there were certain arrears of business which he obtained permission from the department to complete, but that did not bring him into competition with other legal firms of the city, and he carried on no firm business after that. Representations were made that he was interfering, and correspondence took place, and as a result an investigation was ordered, which was undertaken by the post office inspector of the province. The papers brought down show that Mr. Vince devoted his time almost exclusively to the work of the post office; there was no fault found with any service or supervision with which he was charged in connection with the office. He carried on no legal business in competition with any law firm, and with the exception of one or two unimportant things, all he did was just the tag ends of the business which had been begun before he took the position. The report of the inspector, while he does not make any recommendation, is, I think, a complete exculpation. In the first place, his salary was reduced by the rents of the post office boxes having been taken from him. Although that was done, the office was carried on with just the same efficiency as before. There, I think, the matter would have rested, because the postmaster did not interfere with this officer until other pressure was brought. But at last, owing to a promise having been made to a local M.P.P., in the county of Carleton, that he should have the appointment, and after a year of pressure, it came to the point where this gentleman said: Now, I want this promise redeemed, I was promised that place, and I must have it. When it came to that point this letter was written:

Ottawa, August 14, 1899.

Dear Postmaster General,—I beg to bring to your notice that Mr. Vince, postmaster at Woodstock, N.B., still continues to disregard the regulations of your department forbidding officers of his rank to engage in outside business. Mr. Vince carries on openly and notoriously a considerable practice as a lawyer, and his conduct in this regard, after having had numerous warnings, ought not to be longer tolerated. He obviously considers his professional practice of more value than his official position. Might I therefore ask you to take steps to make a change? Kindly have Mr. Vince retired, and appoint Mr. Charles L. Smith, at present member of the legislature for Carleton County, and a resident of Woodstock, postmaster in his place.

Yours faithfully,

ANDREW G. BLAIR.

When that peremptory demand was made upon the Postmaster General he acceded to it, and he dismissed one of the best men that he could possibly have in his whole post office service, a man who subordinated everything to the work of the post office, and who after permission obtained, kept loyally within the lines of that permission,

Mr. MULOCK.

merely finishing up the fag ends of the business. He carried on no firm business whatever, and entered into no competition with the legal firms of the city. I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman would not have dismissed this man were it not for the pressure of his colleague based upon political necessity.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has discussed the matter in a very calm way, and I will endeavour to follow his good example. Not having refreshed my memory as to the facts I can only speak from recollection in reference to what I remember now, going back to the period in the last act in the drama a year and a half ago. I do not understand the hon. gentleman to quarrel with the abstract proposition, that when a person is filling an office such as the postmastership of Woodstock he should not be permitted to carry on some other business in competition with others in that town.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a fair proposition.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was brought to my attention that Col. Vince was engaged in the practice of his profession. When this matter was brought to my attention, I instructed the department to inform him that he would have to make an election between retaining his office and practicing. I was not desirous of dealing in a harsh manner with him, and I gave him authority to manage some little private estate of which he had charge. I endeavoured to give him as much latitude as possible, so long as it did not come in conflict with public opinion and with what I considered my duty towards his competitors. I must say that I think Col. Vince did not altogether live up to the rule that was laid down for his guidance. He may have done so for a while, but I think about the time of the letter that the hon. gentleman has read, he had probably come to the conclusion to practice his profession, and he had practically begun it.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman will find that upon looking up the records in reference to it. What is the date of the letter?

Mr. FOSTER. October.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think there is evidence to show that he had begun the active practice of his profession again. My recollection is that there were newspapers sent to me containing advertisements showing Col. Vince to be acting as solicitor for parties in connection with the disposition of property, acting as solicitor for persons in the management of sales in connection with the winding up

of mortgages. I am of the opinion that in addition to the letter of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) there was evidence furnished showing that while he may for a time have abstained from doing other than looking after these private estates, he subsequently began to act as solicitor for parties to the extent of signing his name to these advertisements, and perhaps otherwise. I may say there was no disposition on the part of the Minister of Railways and Canals to take action except in deference to the view that the hon. member for York thinks is a correct one, which I must agree with.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to enter into a controversy. The hon. Postmaster General is at the disadvantage of not having refreshed his memory of late in reference to the matter. I can assure him that he would find that public opinion in the city of Woodstock is very different from the representation he has just made of it. Of course, Col. Vince does not care now particularly. He did not wish to hold an office where he was not persona grata with the authorities that are. I do not think he harbours any feeling in any way in reference to it, but when there is so good an officer, it hurts the morale of the administration of the post office through and through to find that officials are dealt with simply for political exigencies, as in this case he was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Might it be possible for me to get this item through very soon?

Mr. FOSTER. One or two hon. gentlemen have a few words to say on post office matters, but with the understanding that on Monday they will be allowed to speak on any item, we may allow this to pass.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, on any item.

Post Office Department—Civil Government  
—Forty-eight third-class clerks, \$50 each \$2,400

Mr. FOSTER. Does this include the statutory increases for all those who are eligible?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not every one that would be in law eligible. Everybody under \$600 is included in this.

Mr. FOSTER. There are eighty-six altogether. It must be a pretty large proportion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose it is.

One additional first-class clerkship ..... \$1,400

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to be the additional first-class clerk?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My private secretary, Mr. Laschinger.

Mr. FOSTER. What position has he now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is a second-class clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. When did he come into the service ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With the government.

Mr. FOSTER. In what position ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Twelve hundred dollars a year. This will not add to his salary.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, this gives him \$1,400.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I think there are arrangements made by which the secretaries get \$600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They may get it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I intended that what he got as first-class clerk would be taken off the \$600. I do not intend him by this vote to get any more money than he is getting.

Mr. FOSTER. In 1896 he was made a second-class clerk at \$1,100.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All the private secretaries get \$1,200 a year by a special vote, including the \$600.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but the hon. Postmaster General says that this gentleman came in as a second-class clerk in 1896, that he made his bow in the service as a second-class clerk.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think he came in first as a temporary writer.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to a private secretary having a position given to him, but there is no particular reason why you should make him a first-class clerk.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, he is a very strong man.

Mr. FOSTER. I know, he may be a very strong clerk. My private secretary, in 1885, came in as a second-class clerk, and he only got his first-class clerkship when he had earned it by progression in his increases.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This will not make any difference in his salary. Six hundred dollars, or a variable sum, is attached to the salaries of clerks who are acting as private secretaries. He is getting a certain salary outside of the \$600, being his salary as a second-class clerk. When he gets his increase as a first-class clerk, the amount of that increase will be deducted from the \$600, except any annual increase.

Mr. FOSTER. You make a man a first-class clerk in three years' time. However,

Mr. MULOCK.

I suppose this is provision against the rainy weather.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is a good man.

To increase the salary of Mr. J. F. Everett, superintendent of the money order office \$200, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$200

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is a good increase.

Travelling allowances of judges in the Yukon territory ..... \$1,500

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When Judge McGuire was in the Yukon territory he was obliged to go to Tagish for the purpose of trying the Indian murderers, and this item is simply kept in the estimates for the purpose of meeting such an emergency as that should it arise.

Salary of sheriff, Territorial Court, Yukon. \$2,000

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When the sheriffs in the Yukon were first appointed, they were appointed on the same conditions as existed in the North-west Territories, under which the sheriff received a salary of \$500 and in addition fees. Mr. Constantine, a member of the North-west Mounted Police, was the first sheriff and he received no salary. Subsequently another officer of the North-west Mounted Police was appointed, and as he might incur some personal liability as sheriff he received a salary of \$500 and fees. It was then decided to send a sheriff from the older provinces and Mr. Eilbeck was appointed. It was stipulated that he should receive a salary of \$1,200 and he was requested to make a report as to the amount of fees which he received; the intention being to increase his salary if the fees warranted it. We did receive a statement showing that from the 27th of July, 1899, to January, 1900, about half a year, the fees were \$694.24. It was then decided to increase his salary to \$2,000, from the first of July, inst., the fees to go into the treasury. What I have said of the sheriff applies to the clerk. The clerk received \$500 salary and fees, and it was found that the first clerk, Mr. Schnell, had received out of a gross revenue of about \$8,000 a salary of \$4,000, so that it was decided to abolish the fee system and make his salary \$2,000 a year.

Maintenance of prisoners in the Yukon territory ..... \$15,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is your provision with reference to the prisoners.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The amount paid during the last fiscal year for maintenance at police posts at Dawson and Tagish was \$14,498, and the accounts for May and June are yet to come in. The rate agreed upon being \$1 per diem for each prisoner. This gives a daily average of prisoners of between 47 and 48, which may be further subdivided into 33 at Dawson

and 15 at Tagish. The total for the last year is estimated at about \$17,400.

Dorchester Penitentiary—Further amount required ..... \$4,000

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This item was held over in order that my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) might say something.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the Solicitor General look into the strange meanderings of Mr. Bill, the commissioner, to find out what he was doing at these places for which he charged ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The number of witnesses examined in connection with that inquiry was thirty-seven, and the evidence, I am informed, covers many pages. The charges by the commissioner were for two trips made to Amherst, one to examine Dr. Allison, and the next to examine an ex-guard. The expenses to Halifax, which were accounted for at the time, were for a day in Halifax on his way home.

Mr. FOSTER. I forget the number of days the commissioner spent over this investigation, but it was over half a year, I believe, and from all I can learn the work of the investigation should not certainly have gone over five or six weeks. But the job was nursed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It was 140 days.

Mr. FOSTER. One hundred and forty days, just to look into the affairs of a small penitentiary, the evidence being almost entirely local, and the expenses of the 140 days being, of course, met by the public treasury. I am sorry that when a commission of this kind is appointed, some method is not found of expediting the commissioner. I do not want to pass too strong strictures, as strong as might be passed from all I can learn of what took place; but that circumstance alone is simply absurd.

Charges of management—Office of Assistant Receiver General, St. John ..... \$100

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is owing to the contingent account running very close last year, and we think we need a little more margin.

Department of Justice—Hector Verret to be a second-class clerk, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$1,100

Mr. FOSTER. Why this proviso ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I made inquiry, and I am told that the Auditor General insists upon it, because of some provision contained in the amendment to the Civil Service Act, which was introduced by the Postmaster General. I cannot understand why it should be necessary, because this gentleman is a graduate of the University of Quebec, and I rather assumed that he would not be required to pass the qualifying examination.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you giving him just the regular salary ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, that of a second class clerk.

Governor General's Secretary's Office—Promotion of a second-class clerk to a first-class clerkship ..... \$200

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to be promoted ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Sladen.

Department of the Secretary of State—To provide for an additional first-class clerkship in place of one second-class clerkship at the same salary, which was dropped in the main estimates ..... \$1,400

Mr. FOSTER. Who is to be promoted ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A. M. P. Drouin. He is a skilled engrosser, age 49, appointed in 1885.

To provide for the appointment of A. Brophy as a second-class clerk, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$1,100

Mr. FOSTER. Why is the proviso put in ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Brophy is private secretary to the Secretary of State.

Mr. FOSTER. When did he come in ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think he came in with the minister, as private secretary.

Mr. HAGGART. Does he get \$600 besides this ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I believe not. I think this is not intended to affect his salary, but it gives him the rank in the service.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason you make Mr. Brophy simply a second class clerk, whereas, you make the private secretary to the Postmaster General, who came in at the same time, a first-class clerk ? Both of them came in in 1896. Provided they both are good clerks, why do you discriminate between them ? Is Mr. Brophy so inferior, or the other so superior ? Or is it that the one minister is more insistent than the other ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think in each case, the minister got what he desired.

Department of Printing and Stationery—Statutory increases—One third-class clerk, \$50; one messenger, \$30 ..... \$80

Mr. FOSTER. Who gets the statutory increases ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The clerk is D. Behan, and the messenger H. Allen. Behan was appointed in 1883.

Mr. FOSTER. Have all the clerks in that department received statutory increases ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. I think not. I know that in most of the departments, all did not receive it, and I presume this is not an exception.

Three junior second-class clerks at \$600... \$1,800

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. The three are F. G. Bronskill, T. F. Clancy and G. S. Hutchison. They are all in the service as temporary clerks, receiving respectively \$460, \$400 and \$400. They are all advanced to \$600.

Mr. **FOSTER**. This is the first instalment of the new class ?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Yes.

Department of Indian Affairs—Additional remuneration to the secretary of the department, J. D. McLean, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act..... \$150

Mr. **FOSTER**. Why is this extra salary given to Mr. McLean ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Mr. McLean was appointed secretary of the department in 1897, his salary being fixed at \$2,000. He has proved to be a very efficient officer, and we thought it well to increase his salary by \$150.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What was he before he was made secretary ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. He was a first-class clerk in the department. He had been there a great many years.

Mr. **FOSTER**. What salary ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. \$1,800.

Mr. **FOSTER**. Now he is getting \$2,150 ?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. He had \$1,800 before he was appointed secretary. Then he got \$2,000. He received no increase since then, and now we propose to give him an increase of \$150. That will make his salary \$2,150.

Mr. **FOSTER**. We had a little discussion, when the minister was absent, with reference to the extraordinary increase in the hon. gentleman's department in the case of a few clerks. I do not intend going over that discussion again. The hon. gentleman will find it in *Hansard*. He has seemingly exhausted, by these extraordinary increases given to a few clerks, a large amount of money which prevents his giving the statutory increases to others who are deserving and acknowledged to be deserving, but who are put off with the statement that all of the clerks could not receive their statutory increases. It does seem to be unfair that in order to give increases of \$200, \$400 and \$800 in some cases to a few favoured clerks, the other clerks equally deserving should not receive theirs during all these years. It knocks the ambition and pride out of these clerks entirely to give abnormal increase to certain of his favourites and none

Mr. **FOSTER**.

at all to the other clerks. By this partiality the hon. gentleman has done a decided injustice to numbers of his clerks who admittedly done their work well and have received no statutory increase at all. I do not want to revive the discussion on this matter, but I certainly think that the service does not gain by that kind of favouritism.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I do not want to revive either the discussion which took place some time ago on this question of statutory increases, but I wish to give expression to a similar complaint that has arisen in the Interior Department. I am told that there is considerable heart burning in that department among the typewriters. There are eight or nine ladies, third class clerks, short-hand and type writers, who were made permanent in 1892 at \$400 per annum and, in case of optionals, \$450. Since the coming in of this government, two of these ladies have received exceptional promotion. I wish it to be understood that I am not at all attacking the promotions of these ladies, but what I wish to convey to the minister is the dissatisfaction existing through his not dealing out similar recognition to the others. I have no doubt whatever that the promotions of these ladies were deserved. I am told that Miss May and Miss Barber have been given their increases every year, or at all events they have only missed one year, whilst others have not received any increase, and there is a conviction in the department, especially strong amongst those not recognized in the matter of increases, that neither Miss May nor Miss Barber does better work. It seems, however, that Miss May is with the deputy minister and Miss Barber with Mr. Rothwell, which may account for the fact that they have been promoted. There is a feeling that this is unfair, and that those who had not the good fortune to be typewriters for the deputy minister or Mr. Rothwell, do equally good work, and are equally entitled to their increase. I am assured that officers in the hon. gentleman's department, occupying high positions and having his confidence, appointees of his own, consider that injustice has been done those young ladies, whose grievance I voice on this occasion. I wish to say that not one of these young ladies do I know, and this matter has not been brought to my attention by any of them.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I perfectly understand and appreciate the spirit in which the hon. gentleman has spoken. The two young ladies to whom he refers, Miss May and Miss Barber, are typewriters respectively of the deputy minister and the law clerk. The hon. gentleman will see at once that their work is of a more important character and requires a higher degree of capacity than that of ordinary clerks in the department. That would

account, to some extent, for the slight discrimination in their favour. But I am quite safe in saying that the hon. gentleman is misinformed with regard to the facts, and that there is no one of these clerks to whom he has referred who has not received a statutory increase since the change of government. The facts will bear out my statement that the statutory increases, though not uniformly given every year, have been fairly distributed. It is the first time I have heard of any complaint that favouritism of any kind existed, or that the clerks were not, between themselves, fairly treated. There is, of course, the standing complaint that the clerks do not get their annual increase automatically every year, but that has been already discussed, and I need not go into it now. That has been discussed in the House before, and I need not discuss it again. But this is the first time I have ever heard that there is any complaint that the clerks, as between themselves are not fairly treated and the statutory increases not fairly given. I think I can say with certainty that the hon. gentleman is misinformed on that subject and that a full statement would show that the statutory increases have been fairly distributed. If necessary, on Monday, I will give a statement showing exactly how they have been given.

Mr. FOSTER. On the minister's own statement you would have five or six at the same rate, and two of them given statutory increases every year, and you would have only given the others one statutory increase in the whole time you have been in office. If you have half a dozen young men of about equal ability and equal industry and doing the same class of work, and you give two of them their statutory increases every year and let the others toil along with only one increase in a number of years, that must breed a sense of injustice. If you have not enough to go around, distribute them. Whatever the hon. minister may think about it I think there is no doubt whatever that the other course breeds a dissatisfaction in the service and is a bad thing for the service.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) will bring me the information tomorrow.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Before we leave that item I desire to bring up another matter in connection with the department. While the minister was away we had an item in the estimates to provide for the relief of distressed persons in the North-west Territories, \$10,000, but reduced by the acting minister (Mr. Sutherland) to \$5,000. The information given by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), who took some part in the debate, was that these were dis-

tressed farmers who had lost their crops. He stated, I think, that there were some two hundred of them. I have a letter which I will read to the committee, but without giving the name, as I have not the permission of the writer to give his name. But I will show the letter in confidence to the Minister of the Interior, and he will know the writer as one who is well qualified to speak on this subject. He says:

Five thousand dollars for destitute farmers at Birch River and Cedar Lake; why, there are not more than a dozen families in both places combined, and not a single farmer in the whole of that part of the North-west Territories. Not a bushel of grain was ever sown there, and I do not believe they ever planted a bushel of potatoes even. These people are not destitute. They live by hunting and fishing, and past season has been good for such. I fancy it is an election fund.

When this item was explained it was stated that there was high water in the Saskatchewan last summer which had covered the place where these people had their houses, their property and their crops, and destroyed their crops and they lost everything. Also, I was informed that from 150 to 200 people were suffering—this is what the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland) said—and, after consultation, it was his personal opinion that probably, for the present, \$5,000 would be sufficient. But if the information given by this writer, who certainly is in a position to know the Saskatchewan well, is correct, it would justify moving, on concurrence—I am not saying that I will do it—that the item should not be concurred in. In any case, we want an explanation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Shortly before I went away, this matter was brought to my attention. I had not, at that time, received sufficient information to enable me to make up my mind what course should be adopted. The course subsequently adopted by my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), who acted in my place, was taken upon information which came from the Hudson's Bay Company. The same general course has been followed in this case as has been followed by the department for many years, where persons in the neighbourhood of Hudson's Bay Company posts have been destitute. The Hudson's Bay Company has been given authority to give assistance in absolutely necessary cases. We have in some such cases—with Indians particularly—recouped to the Hudson's Bay Company what they have given in that way. In this particular case the chief commissioner of the Hudson's Bay Company, Mr. Chipman, was requested to instruct his officers at that point to do what was necessary to prevent the people suffering starvation. If there are only a dozen people and only a few who require assistance, the amount disbursed from this vote will be very small. The only use made of the

vote is through the Hudson's Bay Company, and, possibly the officers of the mounted police in the district. Whatever is urgently necessary will be done. I think the hon. gentleman can rely upon it that that is the only use that can be made of it.

Mr. FOSTER. The information we got when that was being voted was largely through the member for Saskatchewan. Very little of the information came through the Hudson's Bay Company, but the representations were made by the member for Saskatchewan on the floor of the House, and he vouched for them, and led us to believe that this was a farming district, that there were from 150 to 200 souls whose crops had been swept away, whose property had been destroyed, and they were in a state of dire starvation. If the statement made in that letter by the gentleman, who is, no doubt, a representative man, is correct, it is a very different version, and it makes one suspicious of these statements that are made.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman will not suggest that the statements of the writer of this letter are to be taken as against statements made by a member of the House, without any further investigation?

Mr. FOSTER. I would just as soon trust the statement of the writer of the letter as the statement of the member for Saskatchewan; but I am bound to take his statement as a member of parliament when he makes it. But, the least that can be said is, that it throws a doubt upon the statement of the member for Saskatchewan, and makes it obligatory upon the minister to make a careful investigation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I agree with that.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another point I wish to mention. I believe a change has been made in the mining regulations as to the area of claims in the placer districts, that these have been enlarged.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No change.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been told that under the new mining regulations the area of the claims in the placer districts have been enlarged, that on Discovery a claim is now 1,500 feet instead of 1,000, and the width has also been increased. Ordinary claims are also enlarged. My informant states that the regulations also provide that claims which have been staked before the present regulations came into force may be increased in size to the present limits, provided it does not interfere with any one else. Now, suppose that the increase verges on the lots that are kept for the government, can the increase take place, will the government hold its title to the alternate lots by

Mr. SIFTON.

so firm a line of delimitation that they will consider that to be an increase or enlargement to the size now made by the regulations?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The reason why I said there had been no change was, that the change was made a good while ago. The writer of the letter is evidently mixing up something else along with the ordinary regulations, when he says that the size of the ordinary claims has been changed. If there is any truth in that it would arise from some changes that were made in regard to the interpretation of the regulations respecting the rear boundary, in regard to which there was great difficulty on account of the question of what rim rock was. Some definition was given to that by the changes that were made. Probably the idea that the size of the ordinary claim was changed has arisen from that.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not quite understand, if the ordinary claim is not enlarged, why he should say:

The regulations also provide that claims which have been staked before the present regulations came into force may be increased in size to the present limits.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That would only refer to specific cases, that is to say, upon a certain creek.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose that in your effort to get it enlarged in that way, increased to the present limits, you find no bar except the reserve claims of the government, is that a bar?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot make a general statement, but I will say what we did. This statement can only be true in some specific cases, which were dealt with by specific orders in council, it is not a general principle, but was done where it appeared to the department that persons staked claims in ignorance of the regulations. I think the particular case so dealt with was upon Dominion Creek, and there the size of the claim was fixed at 250 feet. If, in order to give that width, it was necessary to encroach upon a government claim, then the government would lose, and land to the amount of 250 feet would be given to the claim owner.

Department of Militia and Defence—For increase of salary to the following, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act: Capt. A. Benoit (promoted, chief clerk) ..... \$200

Mr. FOSTER. When this item is up, I want to ask the minister if, in view of the statement made in the House the other day by the Minister of Justice, he proposes to do anything with reference to the Devlin fraud. Is he going to prosecute the man who swindled and committed the fraud, or will he turn the whole matter over to the Minister of Justice in order that the Min-

ister of Justice, as he intimated his readiness to do, may see that justice is carried out.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have not read the statement made by the Minister of Justice. I understand the Minister of Justice stated that he had not consulted me, and I doubt very much if he has very carefully read the case at all. I do not think the hon. gentleman would hardly expect me, on a short notice of this kind, to make a declaration with reference to this matter. However, I have no objection, in fact, I should be very glad to consult the Minister of Justice with reference to the whole matter, and I shall take an early opportunity of discussing it with him.

Department of Railways and Canals—To increase the salary of secretary of department and chief clerk in the office of the deputy minister and chief engineer, L. K. Jones, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$200

Mr. HAGGART. I did not know you had a secretary of the department now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. After the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that there was no necessity for a secretaryship.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman, I think, remembers that my statement was that we would not require any new officer in the department as secretary, that the duties discharged by the secretary previously, might be discharged by the chief clerk, and that it was my intention to appoint the chief clerk as secretary of the department.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. minister be kind enough to tell me what Mr. Jones received in 1896, and what this increase makes his salary now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This makes his salary \$2,400 a year. Mr. Bradley received \$2,800, and Mr. Balderson \$2,300.

Mr. HAGGART. What was the salary Mr. Jones was receiving, when the hon. gentleman entered the department?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I gave him an increase of \$200.

Mr. HAGGART. This is only \$400 of an increase altogether?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Department of Inland Revenue—Chief clerk and accountant, F. R. E. Campeau, from \$2,250 to \$2,400, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$150

Mr. FOSTER. What is that large increase for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will hunt up the explanation.

Auditor General's Office—Three junior second-class clerks at \$600 ..... \$1,800

Mr. HAGGART. There are three more increases in the Auditor General's office.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, we are creating three junior second-class clerks, but this does not add to the number of officers in the department. We are taking men from the temporary service, whom the Auditor General regards as good men. We are not increasing the number of officials, but substituting permanent for temporary officials.

Mr. HAGGART. But there are to be three junior second-class clerks, and they are to get \$1,800.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are not adding to the number of officials at all. We are making three junior second-class clerks, and reducing the number of temporary clerks.

Mr. HAGGART. You take your full estimate for the Auditor General's department, and then you take an estimate for three junior second class clerks at \$1,800.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, but in carrying through the contingencies, I stated that we would reduce the contingent amount given to the Auditor General for clerical services. There are two or three cases in which we will have to make reductions on concurrence.

Department of Agriculture—Increase of salary to W. J. Lynch, chief clerk patent branch, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$100

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) might explain this expenditure.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Mr. Lynch is a chief clerk in charge of the patent branch. He is the junior chief clerk, and has less pay than any of the chief clerks in the department, although he has the largest number of clerks in the department under his control. He is doing the work of his branch very efficiently, and there has been a large increase in the work, in consequence of the large number of patents applied for, and issued.

Promotion of J. W. D. Verner, third-class clerk at \$1,000 in main estimates to second-class clerkship ..... \$100

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. He has been at the head of the third-class clerks for many years.

To provide for three junior second-class clerkships, one at \$638.75 and two at \$600 ..... \$1,838 75

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE** moved :

That the item be reduced by \$38.75.

He said : This adds one clerkship and one clerkship will be taken off the vote for contingencies.

**Mr. HAGGART**. The contingency vote is reduced by this amendment.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Yes, and the next item of \$800 which is put in here, providing for the appointment of an assistant patent examiner, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, will be taken off the contingencies in the main estimates.

**Mr. FOSTER**. We have gone to nearly half-past eleven, and I think we had better stop.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There is the item of the Department of Inland Revenue for which I have been unable to get the explanation.

**Mr. FOSTER**. You can get the explanation on Monday.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Very good. There is the item of the Dominion Police that we may take now. I have had a conversation with the hon. ex-Minister of Finance about this special vote, for the Dominion police.

**Mr. FOSTER**. On the condition that the details of the expenditure shall be submitted to the audit of the Finance Minister, the leader of the opposition and myself, we may let it pass.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. Oh, my hon. friend or any of the leading gentlemen on his side of the House, certainly.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

**Mr. FOSTER**. Before the adjournment, I understood my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) last night to say that no more measures were going to be brought down now.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. No more measures.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

**Mr. FISHER**.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, July 16, 1900.

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

**Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE** (Wright) moved :

That this House doth concur in the 6th report of the select committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates of this House during the present session.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be advisable to concur in this report.

**Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON** (Beauharnois). Mr. Speaker, why should not any reasons be given? Because I have heard the Premier express the view that, unless there are very strong reasons to the contrary, the House should accept the report of the committee, otherwise its action is a reflection on the committee.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. I have not yet heard any reasons in support of it.

**Mr. BERGERON**. I will give my hon. friend some reasons. If my hon. friend (Mr. Champagne) wants to speak, I will give way to him.

**Mr. CHAMPAGNE**. As chairman of the committee, I will give the reasons why, to my mind, this report ought to be adopted by the House. A few days ago, the translators of the Debates presented to the Debates Committee, a petition in which they asked for an increase of salary, in view of the unusual length of the session. They asked for an allowance of \$500 each. After having discussed the matter carefully, and taken into consideration all the facts and reasons for and against the petition, the committee came to the conclusion that it was fair and just to grant the request of these gentlemen to the extent of \$250; and, as chairman of the committee, it is my duty to ask the House to concur in the report which has been laid before it. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has pointed out that in matters of this kind, the reports of committees ought to be adopted by the House, unless exceptional reasons of a very serious character are shown. I submit that this is the right principle to act upon. I am sorry that the right hon. the Prime Minister does not think it advisable to recommend the adoption of the report by the House; but I think the House will be free to accept the principle which was laid down by himself in 1899, when the case of Mr. Pelland's dismissal came before the House. On that occasion the Prime Minister said :

It has been the invariable practice of this House, when questions of this kind have arisen, to sustain the action of the committee, whatever that action was. We must recognize that it is impossible for us, sitting here, to form any conclusions as to the merits of this dismissal. It may be right or it may be wrong. I am assured that it is right, because the members of the committee have come to this conclusion.

As I have said already, unless it can be shown to the House that the report of the committee is altogether wrong, I think it ought to be adopted. Now, it is stated in this report, that on two previous occasions, this House has granted an increase of salary to the translators of the Debates. One precedent is to be found in the year 1885, and the other in the year 1891; and I may say at once, that the present session is likely, when ended, to be the longest session since confederation. In 1885 an extra allowance of \$500 was granted to the translators of the Debates for a session of five months and twenty-one days, when the matter translated covered 6,952 columns. On that occasion, at the end of the session, a report similar to the one now submitted to the House was presented by Mr. White, of Cardwell, who was then the chairman of the Debates Committee. It will be found in the Journals of the House of Commons of 1885, at page 665, as follows:

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell), from the select committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates of the House during the present session, presented to the House the fourth report of the said committee, which was read, as followeth:

The committee would recommend that the following additional allowances be granted for the present session, as owing to the unusual length of the session the work has fully doubled, viz.: To the translators, \$500 each; to the English proofreader and reviser, \$400; to the French proofreader, \$200.

In 1891, a similar demand was made by the translators, with the result that these gentlemen were granted an extra allowance of \$350. The session of 1891 lasted five months and two days, and the matter translated was 6,472 columns, a little less than the translation which had been made during the session of 1885. So the basis taken for the extra allowance was the number of columns translated, the amount having been reduced from \$500 to \$350. I find in the Journals of 1891, at page 518, the following:

Mr. TAYLOR, from the select committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates of this House during the present session, presented to the House the fourth report of the said committee, which was read, as followeth:—

Your committee beg leave to report the following resolution, as a recommendation:—

Resolved, that having regard to the length of the session, the translators and Mr. J. C. Boyce, assistant to the chief reporter, should be paid extra on the same basis as they were paid in 1885, that basis having been a basis of time.

So that in 1885 and in 1891, the rule was admitted and laid down by this House, that

these translators should be paid according to the time during which they would be at work, and according to the amount of work which they would perform. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is far from being an unjust demand on the part of these translators; on the contrary, I think it is a just and fair demand, when we take into consideration the fact that they are paid only \$1,000 for a session, and that they are not placed altogether on the same footing as most of the other employees of this House. We know that the sessional clerks and others are paid by the day, from \$2 to \$3.50 a day, so that these employees are not losing anything by the unusual length of the session, whilst the translators are obliged to work more than they are expected to do under ordinary circumstances. If we take into consideration the good work these translators are doing, especially since certain reforms have been made in the staff, I think at the suggestion of the committee, I think we have every reason to be satisfied with the way they are doing their work. They have translated the debates up to the 7th of July instant, which shows a celerity that is unprecedented. If the French *Hansard* is not more advanced than it is, it is due wholly to the delay caused at the Printing Bureau—for reasons which I have no doubt must be very good—owing to the work coming in every day in immense quantities, especially during the last days of the session. Anyhow, here is the fact, that the translators are at least eight or ten days ahead of the Printing Bureau. Under all circumstances, Mr. Speaker, in view of the precedents established in 1885 and in 1891, the members of the Debates Committee think the House ought to concur in this report, especially in view of the fact that the amount which we recommend is a good deal less than the amounts which were recommended in 1885 and in 1891, while, if we took the basis of the payments then made, the amount would be higher than \$500. I submit the report, and hope that it will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I would like to say a few words about this report, and, in connection with it, on another subject of perhaps equal interest to the other members of this House. I heartily concur in the observations of the hon. gentleman on moving the report. I do think, in view of the increased work which these translators have to do and the increased length of time it will take them to do it, this is not an unreasonable request. The only objection I have to the report is this, that it deals simply with a few hands about the House. This House is now in session 166 days, and it cannot be prorogued for a few days yet. The law provides that, during a session of parliament, a member may draw seven dollars a day during every day of the session until the sessional indemnity of \$1,000 is ex-

hausted. This is always exhausted when 143 days have expired, which, in the present session, expired 23 days ago. I respectfully submit that \$7 a day for a member of parliament, who leaves his business at home and allows it to go to wreck almost entirely for nearly six months in the year, is a very small compensation, and the full amount is drawn at the end of 143 days, after which time a member is obliged to send home for money to pay his board, and work for nothing in the interests of the country. This session is probably a fair average of what sessions will be in the future. All will agree with me that there has been no desire or intention to in any way obstruct the ordinary work of the session, on this side, and yet we have been steadily employed since February 1 doing the work of the country, and we are not quite through. This House for several days past has been very much denuded of its members. Only a fraction are here to-day, because a large number cannot afford to remain here and work for nothing and have nothing to pay their board, when the sessional indemnity is all gone. If this were an exceptional session, and future sessions were not expected to be so long, it might be said that we ought only to deal with the exceptional circumstances at the present. That is what we propose to do with the translators, but I submit that this is not an exceptional session, because for several sessions past we have never been able to get through with our work in less than between five and six months. As the business of the country increases, it may be expected that the length of the session will increase in proportion, and in future we cannot reasonably hope to get through in three months. We should either review the situation and adapt our sessional indemnity to the increased length of the session, or else make some provision that when the sessions become exceptionally long, the members should get some consideration. It may be said that that would tend to lengthen the sessions. In my judgment, it would not likely bring about anything of the kind; but if it did, so long as it could not be shown that the time of the House was wasted, we would be quite justified in making our sessional indemnity bear some proportion to the length of the time we must be here. My objection to the report is, that it only deals with the sessional translators. It ought to deal with every other member connected with the House of Commons and the Senate who is obliged to remain here longer than the usual time to attend to the work of the country, except those paid by the day, and to whom it is, therefore, an advantage to have a long session. But that does not apply to the members of parliament, or the senators, or many of the civil servants connected with the House during the session of parliament, who must be engaged long after the session, finishing up their work, owing to its increased length.

Mr. SPROULE.

It may be said that this would not be endorsed by the country and that this is not the proper time to bring up such a question. I submit that it is the best time to bring it up. We are practically at the end of the parliamentary term; and, if this matter is settled now, the people will have an opportunity, at the forthcoming election, of expressing their views, and it will not be said that at the beginning of a parliament the members voted so much money into their own pockets at a time when the people had not the opportunity of expressing their opinion on the action of their representatives. This, therefore, is the proper time to deal with this question. We must all admit that the sessions are not likely to get shorter. It is unreasonable to suppose that men can leave their business and neglect it during five or six months, when they are doing the work of the country, for an indemnity of \$1,000, and have to bear the great additional expenses incurred in travelling back and forth. If a judge is appointed an arbitrator to arrange a school section, the law allows him \$20 a day, and any man appointed an arbitrator in any ordinary matter, no matter what his ability, gets \$5 a day at the least. But here we are attending to the work of the session and only drawing \$7 a day, and having to bear all the necessary extra expense of donations and subscriptions and all other incidental expenses entailed on us by virtue of our position. And, after the 143 days are up, we are expected to work the rest of the time for nothing and pay our own expenses. This is unreasonable. I do not think that the country expects it, and the government is doing less than its duty when it does not give something that would be a fair compensation.

What must be the result, if this continues? The result will be that you will drive from the House a large number of members who are not moneyed men and cannot afford to be here that length of time without getting fair compensation, and the House would be composed largely of wealthy men, who would not be a fair representation of the various classes and interests of Canada. In my judgment, that is the best House which is composed of men taken from all lines of life, from the poorest as well as the richest—those engaged in large business as well as those engaged in smaller affairs. The result will be, the intelligence of each particular line will give, in the aggregate, the intelligence of the country and bring to bear on the public business the accumulated experience and intelligence drawn from every line and class. But if the present system continues, poor men must be driven from this House, men of moderate means, and only one or two classes will be able to afford to remain, namely, the class who are wealthy, like some of the men we know in this House, and those who have no money and who would come here for the purpose of earning

money they could not possibly do at home. Now, we are sometimes told—

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not like to interrupt my hon. friend's (Mr. Sproule's) argument, but I desire to remind him that he is talking entirely away from the motion.

Mr. SPROULE. As I understand the motion, it is this—that the increase in the length of the session demands an increase of pay for certain persons about this House. I submit that if that applies to any it applies to all, every civil servant in this House. I was about to say—we are sometimes told that the ministers are against this. But compare the ministers and the private members. We are compelled to stay six months of the year here, and we get \$1,000 paying all the extra expenses that must be incurred during a long session here. The minister of the Crown stays the same length of time, and for that length of time he gets \$4,000—that is, he gets \$8,000 a year, and for six months half that amount. It is not justice, therefore, for ministers of the Crown to object to an increase; it is unjust to their own following and to all the members of the House. They are doing less than their duty and less than the country would justify them in doing when they refuse to favour at least some additional indemnity not only to the members of parliament, who have been engaged here so long and must in the future be engaged every year for longer than three months, which was formerly the ordinary length of session, but to every employee about the House of Commons and the Senate whose work is increased by the increased length of the session.

Mr. JAMES McMULLEN (North Wellington). The *Hansard* staff are engaged to do the work of the session, just the same as the members of parliament are engaged to stay here for the session, for \$1,000. Now, we all stand in about the same relation. *Hansard* staff may be kept a few days or few weeks more one session than another. But, to increase the pay of the *Hansard* staff, while members are kept at the same amount as they have been receiving, I consider would be unfair. For my part, I am not prepared to fully endorse the remarks of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). It is well known; it has been my experience—and I have sat in four different parliaments—that the last session of a parliament is always the longest one—

Mr. HENDERSON. Is this the last?

Mr. McMULLEN. It is expected to be. We do not know. But I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite have taken this to be the last session, and have been preparing material against the time when the appeal is made to the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. Last session was about as long.

Mr. McMULLEN. Probably because hon. gentlemen opposite thought that it would be the last session of the parliament. But they have no more right to conclude that this is the last session than they had to conclude that last session was the last. I must say that I agree, to a certain extent, with the remarks of my hon. friend from East Grey. I agree if we are to sit here for five months and receive only \$1,000, it would be no compensation for a man who has any business at all at home. But I am not prepared to sit here and vote money into my own pocket. If the government, after carefully reviewing the business of the country for the last five or ten years, come to the conclusion that the duties performed by the members are increasing and that it is advisable in the interest of the country to recommend an increase or proportionate allowance, that would be an entirely different matter. I am opposed to a vote of that kind until the government concludes it is right. With regard to the *Hansard* staff, notwithstanding the precedents produced by my hon. friend (Mr. Champagne) who presented this report, I will oppose any increase to any person who has agreed to perform the work of the session for a fixed sum, as the *Hansard* staff have done, unless the government assume the responsibility of proposing an increase. I do not think they do more arduous work than the members who sit here all night. As to the remarks dropped by my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) in regard to the discrepancy in the salary of ministers and the allowances to members, I believe that is absolutely ridiculous. I said on one occasion I thought the ministers of the Crown were overpaid. I do not think the First Minister is overpaid, and would not be if he got double what he now receives. But some of the minor ministers are earning, I believe, more than they could in any other way. So far as I am concerned, I shall oppose the adoption of this report until a more general readjustment takes place by the government, who should assume all responsibility.

Mr. J. V. ELLIS. (St. John City). The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) does not use exact terms when he refers to the *Hansard* staff. This report does not refer to the entire *Hansard* staff. As I understand it, the shorthand reporters—and we certainly have excellent reporters, officers of whom the House may well be proud—are paid by the year, but the translators are paid by the session. The reference in the report is entirely to the translators. As a member of the committee, I know that the matter was thoroughly discussed in the committee; and it did seem fair and reasonable to the members of that committee, in view of the length of this session and of the fact that because their work is greatly increased, not only because of the number of days taken up

by this session, but also by the longer hours of these long sittings, these cruelly long sittings, that we have been holding for some weeks past—these men have to do a great deal of extra work. The committee have been very—hard, I was going to say, but that would not be quite correct—on the translators, but they have been very exacting in holding the translators to their duty. The committee have kept the work of translation up better than it has been kept, I believe, in any parliament that has ever sat in Canada. This has been done only by hard, severe work. And, thinking the circumstances exceptional as they may be, though not entirely exceptional, the committee felt that the translators deserved a greater allowance, and I trust that it will be allowed. The amount proposed is a compromise sum, and it is a fair sum under the circumstances.

With regard to the increased indemnity for members, I agree that an increased indemnity should be allowed for this session. Without going over what I have previously said about the hardness and severity of the work, it is undoubtedly a fact that members of the House are at great expense through these long sessions. It is a fair comparison, even though it may be somewhat odious, as all comparisons are said to be, between members of the House and ministers. The tax on private members, during the past session has been very great, and, on account of its length, professional men must see their business going to ruin because of the time they are giving to the public. I cordially support the idea that there should be an allowance to members for the length of the session.

Mr. BERGERON. As a member of the Debates Committee, I desire to say one word in support of the motion of my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Champagne), for the reasons that he gave—and he gave them all.

There is a precedent for this. On two occasions before the translators have been given a bonus. In 1885, they translated probably about half the matter which they have translated this session, and they were given an addition of \$500; in 1891 they were given \$350. Now, it has been remarked that since the indemnity of the members of parliament has not been increased, these gentlemen should have no bonus. I do not think there is any reason in that. We are in a different position entirely, we are members of parliament, and are not supposed to ask for anything; but these are employees of the House, and they have already done double the work for which they had a bonus before. Now, since the Debates Committee have threshed the matter out so thoroughly, and have come to the conclusion to recommend a bonus to the translators, I think we should grant it. I want to say that if there ever was a time—and I say it because I have examined the matter thoroughly—when the translators of the *Hansard* deserved special recognition at the hands of

Mr. ELLIS.

this House, if there ever was a time when they were entitled to congratulation by the House for their work, that time is the present. We have in the past had a good deal of difficulty in the *Hansard* Committee to procure a good translating staff, and I think at last we have probably secured the best staff, one that does the best work and does it the most rapidly, that we have ever had. It is very important for the House of Commons that if the English Debates are to be translated into French, they should be translated into good French; and it is important for the House that they should be translated as quickly as possible after the speeches have been delivered. That has been done this session. For the last two months, since the staff has been renewed, we have had good and quick translation. So I say that these gentlemen are justified in coming before the committee and asking for a bonus, relying upon precedents. The Debates Committee have examined their request and reported in favour of it; and I am surprised that my right hon. friend, without giving any reason for his action, should simply say: This report should not be adopted. Heretofore he has always shown a good deal of consideration for reports of committees for the reason that he regards them as delegations of this House, and to refuse to accept the report of the committee, unless there are strong reasons to the contrary, is a kind of reflection upon the committee.

Now, since I am on my feet, as I do not wish to act the part of a coward, I will say a word on the indemnity question. I am not going to say what I might say, because I am probably the poorest man in this House, but I approve entirely of what has been said by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis). Especially I agree with the hon. member for North Wellington, that it is a disgrace that the members should be speaking about that question in the House. We have a government of Canada controlling affairs, and they should have done what was done in 1885 and in 1891, when the governments of those years did not wait to propose an increase in the indemnity until they were pushed and dragged into it. They simply brought it down in their estimates, everybody understood that it was due to the members, and the people were so well satisfied that we never heard a word of it, either in the House of Commons or anywhere else. As I said before, I am not going to give my own opinion. If I were a rich man I would be able to speak more freely, and I think I would be able to convince this House that the government should have been manly enough to bring down a vote of their own volition. I do not say that the members of Parliament should be treated in a different way from anybody else. The hon. member for St. John, in speaking on the question of the in-

demnity, said what has often occurred to me before. I think there are only two ways of settling this question, and that is either to have an adequate indemnity or to have no indemnity at all, as is the system in England, and then everybody understands that it would be easier to run the elections, and the sessions would be shorter. We would then not be obliged to remain here every day, but we could do like the English members of parliament, come to the House of Commons when there is an important debate and register our vote, and express our opinion, and then go back home and attend to our own business. But where an indemnity is given people think that it is given to pay us for our services, and consequently they expect us to be in attendance upon parliament all the time. As far as I am concerned, an hon. member mentioned the other day that I did not practise in my profession. Well, Mr. Speaker, how can I practise when I am obliged to pass so great a portion of the year in session? When I go to my office even my partners and our clerks scarcely know me. I only mention these things to show that there seems to be a consensus of opinion that this matter ought to be settled in one way or the other. Either let us have no indemnity at all, or if there is to be one, let it be sufficient to indemnify members for the loss of their time.

Mr. G. E. CASEY (West Elgin). The question really before us, I understand, is the increase of pay to the translators. I really cannot see any way before me except to support the report of the committee. These men are not paid by the year, as the reporting staff are paid; their pay is estimated with reference to the ordinary length of the session. When the session becomes double the ordinary length, coupled with, as has been pointed out already, double the ordinary work in each day, there should be some increase in the pay of the translators. I do not say that the committee have hit exactly the right sum to recommend, that is their business; but, I am prepared to say there should be an increase in the pay of these translators. The *Hansard* Committee represents both sides of the House, it has always, in all parliaments, been a very fair committee, and has not been guided by politics in its management of the *Hansard*, to any extent worth noticing. I think it is a fair representation of the good sense of the House on such matters, and that this report is entitled to a good deal of weight. Apart from that report altogether, I would urge the right hon. the Prime Minister not to make this a question on which the government takes an absolute stand, but to take the sense of the House on the matter as a mere question of opinion, and let the sense of the House be carried out.

The discussion has been forced into other lines as well. I cannot help putting in one word in reference to it. My hon. friend from North Wellington has said that we would

look very absurd to be voting money to ourselves as extra pay. Well, if this money is to be given to us we will have to vote it to ourselves, no matter who proposes it. We shall have to take the responsibility of it being done, if it is done, and the responsibility of its being left undone, if it is left undone. I am not trying to force the hand of the government or urging them to reconsider any decision they have come to. They have come to a decision apparently, it is generally supposed they have, from the course the debate has taken; and I am merely discussing this point as a question that must be gone into in the near future. When I first came into this House the indemnity was \$600. During my first session it was raised to \$1,000. At that time the average session was between nine and ten weeks long. If a thousand dollars was a reasonable indemnification for a session of that length, what would be a reasonable indemnification now? That is a question for the House and the country to consider. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), I think, was scarcely fair when he said this government was cowardly on this question, but a former government had boldly taken unsolicited the step of increasing the indemnity. All who were here at that time remember that there was a round robin in order to ascertain, before this thing was done, as it always is ascertained before a thing of that sort is done, that the House would be practically unanimous in supporting the proposition. That is what a round robin means. People do not like the name, but, after all, that is merely the means of ascertaining privately what the feeling of both sides of the House would be on a question of this kind; and, on both former occasions when an increased indemnity was given, it was ascertained, before the government proposed it, that the House was practically agreed that the thing ought to be done.

At the present time the government apparently have what appear to them to be good reasons for not moving in the matter. I am not saying whether they have or not, or whether they intend to move or not, but that seems to be their idea. I must bow to their judgment in this matter, but I cannot admit that there would be anything improper, unfair or indecent, whether this is the last session or the first session in our agreeing to raise the sessional indemnity to a reasonable figure.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I have always adopted the rule and acted upon it that reports of committees ought to be accepted especially when they are presented to the House with adequate reasons. I was taken a little by surprise by this report which asks to do a favour to a certain portion of our employees. After hearing the sense of the House I am quite prepared to move the adjournment of the debate so as to have a word with my

colleagues in council and give an opinion upon it this afternoon. The objection I would have at this moment is that there is some difference between the present proposal and the precedents of 1885 and 1891. In 1885 and in 1891 this recommendation was part of a general plan to increase the indemnity, not only to increase the allowance of certain employees of the House but to increase the indemnity of members as well. There is nothing of that kind on the present occasion while we know that on those two previous occasions, in 1885 and 1891, there was a well understood agreement that such a report came in as part of a general plan. There is no proposal of the kind this year. In regard to the indemnity of members, speaking for myself, because the matter is not one upon which the government is prepared to pronounce an opinion, I am of the opinion that the indemnity of members ought to be increased. The condition of things at the present time is such that I think the people of Canada cannot complain if the men who are sent here receive more than they do at the present time. But, I think it would be objectionable as well as a detriment if we should take any action unless we make a general law. Nothing could be more detrimental to the public interest to have at any time in any session a movement started to increase the indemnity. Members who come here ought to understand that they will receive such an indemnity and no more.

If anything is done to increase the indemnity the plan I would propose would be that the indemnity should be fixed at a certain sum of money not to be increased or decreased should the session be long or short. Members would know that they would get so much, whether it be \$1,500 or \$1,800. It would be to the interest of members, knowing that, to make their speeches short and to expedite matters as much as possible. The plan that I would suggest, would be that the question should be dealt with on general principles. In the meantime I beg to move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Before the motion is carried I would like to say that hon. members who speak of the translation perhaps do not realize, not only the amount of material work, but the amount of superior literary skill that is applied to the work of the translators. Nobody who has not done the actual work of translation can understand the amount of labour and care that are involved. The work done by these gentlemen is not only to be counted by the number of days that they devote to it, but by the number of columns of translation. In 1885 there were some 4,000 columns less than the actual translation done by these translators this session. If we are entitled to a French *Hansard*, what we want is decent translation, not only a literal translation that will oblige us to go to the dictionary and make it out for

ourselves, but a translation that will represent the true sense of the language translated. It has been the effort of the Debates Committee to reform the translation staff so that we shall have proper translation. They have chosen good men; now we have a good staff that is doing good work; and, I think, we should encourage the translators not only to do good work in a material way, but to do good intellectual work. I claim that they are the only staff employed by both Houses of parliament that have such an amount of intellectual work to do. Although the stenographers of this House must have a certain amount of intellectual work to do, it is not to be compared with what is required of the translators who must know, not only the English language, but the French language. This is necessary if the translation is to be perfectly accurate and in the best literary form.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). Mr. Speaker, I was surprised at the principle laid down by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), when he said that the circumstances to-day are not identical with those of 1885 and 1891, because in those days we also increased the indemnity of members as well as of the translators. Well, Sir, I do not see why if we are denied an increased indemnity ourselves, we should do the same thing in regard to the employees of the House, who are entitled to the same privileges that we think we are entitled to ourselves. While the members of the House have nothing to say as to whether their indemnity will be increased, they should have something to say as to whether the salaries of their employees should be increased. The recommendation of the committee which has charge of this part of the business of the House, is simply a recommendation that justice shall be meted out to certain employees who have been overlooked, on account of the length of the session and on account of the matter that has been put into the hands of the translators for translation. While speaking on that I may say that there should be a rearrangement in regard to the translation bureau, and there should be a rearrangement in regard to our staff of reporters as well. There is no class of men, I may say, in the whole country, in the whole of Canada, who, during the time of the session, are more overworked than the reporters of this House, and the translators. I remember on one occasion, that while our translators drew salaries for two sessions in one year, because they are sessional and are paid by the session, our reporters did not receive an increase of pay at all, though they put in two sessions in the year for the same amount of salary, their salary being paid annually. I remember also that in the session of 1896, our reporters had to work night and day for a whole week, consecutively without stopping, and no consideration was given to them. They have not received any compensation for it. When

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

these gentlemen agreed to do the reporting of this House, the sessions were only to last for three months in the year, whereas they are now bound to work for six months for the same amount of money. I believe it is about time that their position in regard to this House should be reconsidered. Of course, at this late hour of the session. I shall not discuss it further because the question has not been put before us, and I may say here, on their behalf, that I have never seen a reporter asking for any extra allowance for his work, and I say that to their credit. But, it is our duty to see that they are well and properly paid. Now, we have only this report in regard to the translators before us. We had a good many complaints in reference to the staff at one time, but I may say, that they have so improved the work that they are now performing it with the greatest celerity, so much so that they are up to date. When we have a staff of men putting forth so much exertion, if they are not rewarded well, we must not expect the same amount of work from them in future, but we must encourage them, because they are doing good work.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (Western Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, you will permit me to say that the committee could not consider the general question, because we have no control over it. All that the committee was able to do, was to consider the question as to whether or not the French translators were entitled to more remuneration, and having decided that they were entitled to more remuneration, we made the recommendation that has been proposed by the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Champagne).

The right hon. gentleman says the indemnity is not adequate, and that it should be raised, his proposition therefore is that as the indemnity is not adequate and therefore unjust, yet he cannot deal with it unless from the point of view of making a permanent increase. And he argues: I cannot agree to pay the translators more unless I give the members of parliament more. Now, I cannot agree with the arguments that because the members of parliament in your opinion are not getting sufficient, and you do not desire to give them sufficient, that that is any reason why certain officers should not get what they are entitled to.

It is a question repellant to me to discuss the indemnity of members. It has been spoken of here as if it were a remuneration; that is not a fact. Why, Sir, if \$1,000 for a session of six months is remuneration, that would be a strange state of things because I could mention one man after another in this House who could in a few minutes if he were drawn away from his business here, make more than the \$7 a day, and often make in a week more than the whole indemnity. To my own knowledge one man here had to give up two cases when he was coming down to parliament. His two clients said: We have

the utmost confidence in you, but we have not the same confidence in your partner, and they asked that a leading man in another firm be brought in. This member of parliament said: Oh, no the gentleman you mention is capable of taking charge of the whole case, and he handed back all the papers. I entirely dissent from regarding the \$1,000 as in any way remuneration. I regard it as an approximate sum to make it less than absolutely cruel to keep members here for six months or five months or four months as the case may be. I will put the idea of the indemnity in this way: It is to make it possible that poor men may be enabled to come to this House and not that men shall be rewarded or receive compensation for their services here. Then again, if it were payment for service, I would not look upon it as a payment of \$7 a day for the session, because there is not a man in this House whose time during the whole of the year is not to some extent taken up with the business of his constituents, and the business of the country. It has been suggested that we might revert to the English system. Well, we cannot revert to the English system in Canada; we have no leisure class here. There was a comparison made between private members and ministers. I cannot agree with even the bare suggestion that ministers of the Crown in this country are overpaid. It is against the interests of the people and against the interests of the country that the ministers should not be paid in a manner bearing an exact proportion almost to the salaries paid to men of similar ability in important civil positions. For the same reason I have always been in favour of increasing the salaries of the judiciary.

Let me deal with an incidental matter. Let me ask what is parliament? Parliament is government by speech and if there be anything that parliament does, that is worth more than another, it is in the criticism of ministers. I venture to say there is not a minister sitting before me who does not believe that in his own department the criticism sometimes from his own side but mainly and necessarily from the opposition has prevented extravagance and excesses in the government, that would otherwise be committed in consequence of forces operating on the department. That every gentleman in this House is aware of. I have no doubt whatever that when the late government was in power and hon. gentleman opposite in opposition many things that would be regrettable were prevented taking place in consequence of the criticism offered. Therefore, this deprecation which we sometimes hear in the House of the opposition for discharging its duties in offering criticism, is a thing which we should not hear. The criticism by the opposition is altogether for the benefit of the people of Canada.

Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to adjourn the debate agreed to.

## POST OFFICE EXPENDITURE.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Does the \$3,592,647.47 shown in Public Accounts, page (1) VIII., column five, as post office expenditure for the year 1894-5, include all sums due for service on post office account up to June 30, 1895 ?

If not, what amount accrued for said services of 1894-5 are not included?

Does the \$3,665,011.30, shown in same column as post office expenditure for 1895-6, include all sums due on post office account for services up to June 30, 1896?

If not, what amount accrued for services of 1895-6 are not included?

And similarly for the \$3,789,478.34, expenditure, 1896-7?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). I answered the whole of the question except the portion having reference to the year 1896-7. I understand that Mr. Foster wishes to know whether the item of \$3,789,478.34 set forth in the public accounts as the expenditure for 1896-7, includes all the moneys owing by the department up to that date, and if not what amount is not so included.

The expenditure for the year ending June 30, 1897, was \$3,789,478.34, which amount includes all sums due by the department up to that date.

## SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—RECRUITING STATIONS, &c.

Mr. GILLIES asked :

1. How many recruiting stations were established in Nova Scotia at which applications were to be received from parties desiring to join the second contingent for service in South Africa?

2. At what points were these recruiting stations?

3. How many assessment boards were appointed in Nova Scotia, and when, to appraise and value the horses for the mounted infantry and artillery that were to be forwarded to South Africa with the second contingent?

4. How many horses, and what price was paid for each, were accepted at the different stations?

5. How many horses, with their prices, were passed over the assessment board at Sydney, Cape Breton, by Dr. Jakeman, the veterinary surgeon representing the department, as being sound and fit for the service?

6. If the horses were not accepted, for what reason were they rejected?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Two. 2. At Canning and Sydney, C.B., being the headquarters of the King's Canadian Hussars and 17th Field Battery respectively. 3. Four, viz.: 1 at Canning, 1 at Sydney, C.B., 2 at Halifax. 4. Canning, 35 horses, viz.: 1 at \$100, 1 at \$112.50, 2 at \$120, 1 at \$125, 1 at \$127.50, 1 at \$130, 5 at \$135, 11 at \$140, 2 at \$145, 10 at \$150. Halifax, 21 horses, viz.: 1 at \$90, 3 at \$135, 3 at \$139, 4 at \$140, 1 at \$144, 3 at \$145, 1 at \$146, 1 at \$147, 1 at \$148, 3 at \$150. 5. No report has been received from the board appointed to act at Sydney, to assess the value of horses offered by men enrolling. The officer commanding 17th

Mr. DAVIN.

Field Battery reported by telegram that but one horse was so offered. Instructions were subsequently issued to the officer commanding the battery to have examined any horses suitable for artillery purposes, and available for purchase if required. He reported that four had been so examined. As they were not required no further action was taken. 6. No horses being accepted for purchase, none of those examined and passed by the veterinary surgeon were afterwards rejected.

## BARRIEFIELD COMMON, KINGSTON.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Sproule) asked :

Has the government sold, leased or given permission to any person or persons to erect cottages on the government land known as Barriefield Common, at Kingston? If so, to whom, and on what terms? Have any cottages been erected on said lands, and by whom?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). No.

## THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PENSIONS FOR VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. OLIVER asked :

Is it the intention to provide pensions for volunteers disabled by wounds or disease in South Africa?

Is it the intention to provide pensions for the dependent relatives of volunteers who have lost their lives in South Africa?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). According to the terms laid down by the Imperial government, and agreed to by this government, in reference to troops from Canada serving in South Africa, they will be treated precisely as Imperial troops, and receive the same pensions and the same gratuities. In reference to any further provision, if any further provision is to be made, the time has not yet arrived for considering that matter.

## JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

House resolved itself into committee to consider the following resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the salary of the senior judge of the Circuit Court of the district of Montreal shall be \$3,600 per annum.

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

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 195) to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

## THE TROUBLES IN CHINA.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Before the Orders of the Day are called, as

we are on the eve of prorogation, I would like to have the opinion of the government on a question of very great importance. Over a month ago, on the 11th of June, the *Herald*, which, as everybody knows, is one of the government organs in Montreal, published an article headed: 'Canada Should Prepare,' in relation to the Chinese war; and after some considerations as to the role to be played by Russia and by England in the east, there was a paragraph which I think is very significant:

Nevertheless there is the possibility of a war in which English civilization will be pitted against a retrogressive despotism. If the struggle comes, it will not be such a walkover as we have witnessed in South Africa. It will be fought on sea as well as on land. If it should come, and if troops should be needed in China, in India, in Persia, or in Africa, there can be no doubt there will be in Canada a repetition of the spectacle which has brought so much comfort to the minds of British statesmen.

And further down:

It is certain that the Canadian people would rise to the occasion, and for one that was willing and anxious to go to South Africa, ten would be ready to serve in the greater trial of strength. It might be well, therefore, for the government to take whatever steps may be necessary to provide against such a contingency.

And a week ago to-day, that is, on Monday last, the *Toronto World* published an article on the same question, from which I read the following paragraph:

While the situation in China is anything but reassuring, we do not think the time has arrived for Canada to proffer any practical assistance. But we cannot tell what a day, or even an hour, may bring forth. . . . When the South African trouble confronted the Empire, the Canadian government laid down the proposition that it could not commit Canada to the sending of a contingent without the sanction of the Dominion parliament. It is, no doubt, better to have the sanction of parliament in cases of this kind, whenever it can be obtained. Parliament is now about to adjourn for seven or eight months, and in the interim events of supreme importance to Canada may transpire. We think that parliament ought to delegate to the government ample power to deal with any situation that may arise between now and its reassembling next winter. The House should not adjourn until it has made a pronouncement on the Chinese question.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to know from the government is this. The reason that was given by the government for not consulting parliament before sending troops to South Africa was that the will of the people was expressed in such an apparent way, in such unmistakable terms, that there was no need for the government to consult parliament; because parliament being only the representation of the people, the government could count upon the support of parliament as far as that was concerned. The present situation is not the same. When parliament prorogued last summer, nobody expected war. In fact, we had passed a motion, the opportuneness of

which I have already discussed, which was intended to help in maintaining peace. Now the situation in China is different. War is declared; at least, if it is not officially declared, there is a state of war in that country, and we see now by the expression of one of the government organs, and by the expression of one of the Tory organs, that it is the wish of some people that Canada should share in that war. Therefore, the reason that existed last session does not exist now; and the only thing I would like to know from the government is, in case the will of the people is expressed with regard to China in the same way as it was expressed in regard to South Africa, whether the government would feel justified in sending a contingent to China without consulting parliament, simply waiting until next session to have their action ratified by parliament; or whether they will follow the constitution and call parliament for a special session before doing anything?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I would deprecate the way in which my hon. friend has spoken of the *Montreal Herald* as being an organ of the government. The government has no organs. There are some papers which are friendly to it, and which support its policy; but my hon. friend would not, I am sure, pretend that the government is responsible for what appears in any paper, however friendly it may be.

Mr. BOURASSA. I did not mean it in that sense, but simply referred to it as coming from one of the closest supporters of the government.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is a friendly paper and a very good one at that, but I would not feel myself bound by anything which appeared, even in such a valuable paper.

As to the question of my hon. friend, he heard me say last Saturday that the government did not intend presenting any new legislation this session, and, therefore, my hon. friend need not anticipate anything in our budget to cover any expenditure connected with the war in China. We do not intend to have any war or to send any contingent to take part in the Chinese war.

I cannot imagine that the occasion will arise in which we will feel called on to take part in that war, because it is not to be supposed that all the allied powers of Europe will not be able to handle that business without our assistance, but should by any possibility, any such occasion arise, and a feeling in behalf of our giving assistance arise in the country that would call for action, the government, if parliament were not in session when it would have the opportunity to pronounce on that question, would consider it its duty to call parliament in order to discuss the advisability of our taking any action.

### THE SCOTT ACT.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call attention to a question affecting the Scott Act. I gave notice last session and this session of some amendments to the Canada Temperance Act, but have not had the opportunity of bringing them before the House, owing to the press of government business. I am, however, encouraged by a resolution which was passed in favour of making some amendments to that Act, which requires perfecting in many matters of detail. It is too late this session to deal with the matter, but I would ask the government whether, in view of that resolution, it would not be prepared to refer any amendments suggested, including those of which I have given notice, to the Department of Justice, and introduce a Bill next session, as a government measure, to supply the deficiencies in the present Act. One reason why I ask this is, even supposing the Bill I have on the Order paper should pass this House, it would have to go to the Senate, where it would have, colloquially speaking, neither father or mother.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is unjust to Senator Vidal, who is one of the oldest and strongest and most intelligent temperance men in the country, and also to the father of the Scott Act, who is now in the Senate.

Mr. FLINT. The Canada Temperance Act is not in force in any district with which Senator Vidal is connected.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not destroy his interest in it.

Mr. FLINT. In any case the point I make is that, if the administration would take hold of this matter and receive suggestions from the various solicitors and prosecutors in those counties where the Act is in force, and refer these suggestions to the Department of Justice, and then embody them in a Bill, and present that Bill to the House as a government measure, which would have the powerful advocacy of the Minister of Justice in the other House, a great deal of time would be saved, and there would be a much better chance of having legislation perfecting the Scott Act adopted.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no hesitation in saying to my hon. friend, that the government would be disposed to perfect the Scott Act, so as to make it more acceptable to those counties which have chosen to adopt it. I must say, however, that my good intentions were not very much responded to on a previous occasion, when a motion recommending the perfecting of the Act passed in this House by barely one of a majority. But if the temperance people choose to make representations to the government and manifest their desire that the Scott Act be perfected, the

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

government would be quite ready to receive their suggestions.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman could not indicate the lines on which he will proceed?

The PRIME MINISTER. I should think that perfection ought to be satisfactory to my hon. friend, but I would add that my hon. friend from Yarmouth was hardly fair to the other branch of the legislature, when he said that nobody in the Senate would feel an interest in such a measure. The father of the Scott Act is at present a very valuable member of the administration, the present Secretary of State, and if any one takes a legitimate pride in his offspring, certainly he would be ready to do everything possible to make it more acceptable.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (Western Assiniboia). I happened to be in Montreal on important business for three or four days, and during that time the motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint) in connection with the Temperance Act came up. I may tell him that the Scott Act is not in force in the Territories, and I think that the people of the North-west Territories have a right to complain of my hon. friend from Yarmouth, in having put this matter so late on the Order paper. As he seems to feel that he has some right to complain of the government, I may say that the people of the North-west Territories—a very large number of whom take great interest in this temperance question—feel that the only measure that will do justice to the needs of the country, is a complete measure of prohibition, and they feel that the government of Canada is not carrying out their pledge that if, when the plebiscite was taken, a majority of the electorate pronounced themselves in favour of prohibition, the government would bring down such legislation, and complain that the government have not kept faith with them in that respect as they have not in so much else. If I had been here I should have voted for absolute prohibition.

### THE GENERAL ELECTIONS.

Mr. G. E. FOSTER (York, N.B.) I would like, at this period of the session, when the belligerent passions on either side have pretty well cooled down, or have been burnt out, and we are all looking forward to a little holiday, to know whether the right hon. gentleman would take the House into his confidence, and tell us how many weeks we may put aside for ourselves for a complete holiday, before being called on to go into the turmoil of an election?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am very glad to say to my hon. friend that I can give him a very satisfactory answer. If he will guide himself by the movements of the Crown, he will be on safe lines.

### LONG SERVICE MEDALS.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) whether it is the intention of the government to recognize long service in the active militia of Canada by granting long-service medals. And, if I am in order, I would ask when may we expect such medals to be issued?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). A question on this subject was put and answered some time ago. The answer was to this effect—that a long-service medal for the colonies had been approved by Her Majesty—a medal similar to that of the British volunteers. Regulations respecting it have been forwarded to the War Office for approval, but have not been received back yet. After they are returned and after we get through with the medals which are now being distributed to those who participated in repelling the Fenian raids this matter will be taken up by the government.

### THE GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY SUBSIDY—ALLEGATION AGAINST MR. C. N. ARMSTRONG.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) the other day asked me if I had received a letter from Mr. C. N. Armstrong with regard to a statement I made when we had under discussion the subsidies to railways. I informed my hon. friend that I had received a letter from Mr. Armstrong, and, on receiving it, had placed myself in communication with my informant. I think it is only fair to Mr. Armstrong and to the party who informed me that I should lay the statement of both parties before the House. This is Mr. Armstrong's letter:

The Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier,  
Premier, Ottawa.

Sir,—In the report in to-day's 'Gazette' of the discussion in the House of Commons last night on the railway subsidy resolutions, I notice certain statements made by you in connection with the Great Eastern Railway.

Although you made these statements on your responsibility as a member of the House, and therefore, it might be considered that you had a personal knowledge of the facts, I cannot but believe that you have been imposed upon by others, and had accepted their statements as worthy of credence.

As the facts being entirely different to the statement made by you, you cannot have had a personal knowledge of them.

In the first place, the government has not paid any subsidy twice on the same rails. The second section was laid with new rails, and the rails laid in the first section are still there, with a slight exception, which I will explain later on.

This is not a new charge. It was first made in 1894, and was immediately met and evidence of its falsity given.

In 1897, La Chambre de Commerce of Montreal, in a memorial to the government on the

extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, inserted a statement prepared by some of its members in which a somewhat similar charge was made. This memorial was sent to the Governor General and the members of the government. Upon obtaining communication of this memorial, I at once instituted actions for libel against those who were responsible for it. La Chambre de Commerce called a special meeting, at which I was asked to be present, and an apology was made to me for the circulation of the statement, and I was requested not to push actions for damage, as the memorial would be withdrawn, and an explanation sent to each person to whom it had been sent.

I also, on the 24th of February, 1897, addressed a letter to His Excellency the Governor General on the subject, which was duly acknowledged, and sent a similar letter to each member of the Privy Council, including one to yourself, which was acknowledged on February 27.

I am forced to believe that lapse of time and your numerous occupations caused you to forget these circumstances.

This story originated through a change of line caused by a change in the location of the bridge across the River St. Francis, which necessitated the rebuilding of about half of a mile of line, and the removal of the rails on that portion. A few of the rails, some twenty-five tons, were temporarily used as a siding to save the trouble of removing a ballast siding, but they are still on the property, and no attempt was made or could have been made, to obtain any subsidy payment on them; this was clearly proved at the time by affidavits of Mr. G. Ball, M.L.A., mayor of Nicolet, and Mr. Phillips, C.E., the engineer in charge of construction, which were furnished to the Railway Department, and is also proved by the reports of the inspecting engineer of the department.

As I quite agree with you and Hon. Mr. Haggart that any one who would do what the Great Eastern Railway Company was charged with doing should be sent to the penitentiary, I trust that you will do justice to that company by withdrawing as publicly as it was made the charge that that company has robbed the people of Canada.

As these charges were so publicly made, I hope that you will not consider me wanting in courtesy if I send a copy of this letter to the press without previously requesting your permission.

I am, yours truly,  
(Sgd.) C. N. ARMSTRONG,  
Managing Director,  
Great Eastern Railway.

P.S.—Should you desire them, I will place at your disposal the correspondence and affidavits above referred to.

On receiving this letter, I searched the records to find the statements which had been sent to me personally. I have it here—a statement by Mr. Allard, M.P.P., as follows:

In 1886 the company—

Meaning the Great Eastern Railway Company—

—constructed a line six miles in length from River Yamaska to St. Francis. That line was in operation during the election of 1887. But as soon as the elections were terminated, the cars disappeared and never were seen again. Afterwards all the rails were removed and some of the sleepers also, and what are left of the sleepers are rotten and of no value. Since 1887 that company has not given the slightest sign of

its existence, and the work which was done is deteriorating every day.

But I was not satisfied, so I telegraphed both to my informants and to Mr. Allard himself at St. Hyacinthe—

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Is that the present member for Yamaska ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. It will be seen that there is a discrepancy on one point. Mr. Armstrong does not deny that a portion of the rails were removed from part of the line, but he implies without stating it absolutely, that the rails so removed were put on another location of the line. He says there was a displacing of the line in order to allow for a new location of the St. Francis bridge, and the rails were put on this new line. That is altogether disposed of by my informant. The telegram I have received from Mr. Allard is in these terms :

Rails were removed by the Armstrong company at St. Francis for a space of about twenty arpents—

That is a little less than a mile—

—and carried to Nicolet, in the spring of 1888 or 1889. No work whatever has been done on the new location of the Armstrong line. The right of way even has neither been bought nor expropriated; and that new location was laid down by the 31st of October, 1889.

The other telegram said :

They removed about a mile of rails between Yamaska and St. François du Lac, not for a change of line but to complete a section between Nicolet and St. Gregoire, where they were short of rails, and was to complete that section. It was the Great Eastern Railway foreman, Joseph Leblanc, that came to St. François du Lac with a tug and barges during the construction of that section between Nicolet and St. Gregoire, and lifted about a mile of rails, not counting the long siding and the 'Y.' and were not put back.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it would only be an act of justice, after what has fallen from my right hon. friend, for me to say a word. If I understood him well he stands in the position which he took at first, notwithstanding Mr. Armstrong's letter—

The PRIME MINISTER. To this extent, yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course, everybody understands how strong an allegation this is against a man occupying the position that Mr. Armstrong does—one who must meet and deal with business men as the head of several enterprises. When this letter was sent by Mr. Armstrong he left it in my hand, in case the Prime Minister should not accept his statement or should receive other information, some documents which I claim the right to put before the House.

Now, I believe my right hon. friend expressed some opinion to which Mr. Armstrong took exception, and the latter addressed to my right hon. friend some papers in February, 1897, which he thought would

be accepted as satisfactory. At that time a letter was also addressed to His Excellency the Governor General by Mr. Armstrong, answering those charges; and I gather by the reply of the Governor General in Council that the explanation of Mr. Armstrong was accepted. Now, the right hon. gentleman admits that the expressions used by Mr. Allard agree pretty well with the explanation he has received from Mr. Armstrong. I may also mention that the Chambre de Commerce de Montreal expressed the same opinion. I do not think there is a man in the country that has been spoken against so harshly as Mr. Armstrong, whether he deserved it or not. I think Mr. Armstrong is a very clever man, and would not allow people to go too far, and the Chambre de Commerce got caught on that occasion. They passed a resolution insinuating, or taking for granted, certain accusations brought against Mr. Armstrong, and he threatened to sue them. They had a meeting, and returned to him this answer on February 22, 1897. It is in French, but I will read it in English :

Montreal, February 22, 1897.

C. N. Armstrong, Esq., Montreal.

Dear Sir,—In reply to a communication of your solicitor, Mr. Morgan, received on Saturday, the 20th, I am instructed to inform you, on the part of the president of the Chambre de Commerce, that the memorandum which you mentioned has been corrected in such a manner as to remove the portion of which you complain, and the copies which were addressed to several persons (about sixty) will be immediately withdrawn from circulation, so as to give you satisfaction.

I remain, sir, your obedient servant.

S. COTE.

Which shows that they did not dare to go any further after receiving a lawyer's letter. A letter was also addressed by Mr. Armstrong to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, and answers were received from the Premier of Canada and from the Governor General. My hon. friend has read a report of Mr. Allard; Mr. Allard is a member of the local House, he is a politician.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Who is the other man who is so distinct in his statements ?

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Beauchemin, who is one of the owners of the South Shore Railway, and is much interested in different railways in the vicinity of Mr. Armstrong's railway, and I do not think there is any love lost between the two. I have here affidavits from two men that my right hon. friend knows. One is from Mr. Phillips, which I will read :

I, William C. E. Phillips, now residing in the town of Iberville, district of St. Johns, civil engineer, do solemnly declare:

That I was, in 1889, engineer in charge of the construction of the Great Eastern Railway between St. Francis and St. Gregoire.

That it is to my personal knowledge that the rails used in the construction of the Nicolet and

St. Gregoire section were new rails not previously used anywhere, and that at the time of the inspection of that section of the line by Mr. Ridout on behalf of the Dominion government no other rails had been laid on this section of the line.

That some time afterwards, to avoid taking up a long siding in the ballast pit, which pit I proposed to use in the construction of the section between Nicolet and St. Francis, I decided to use temporarily some of the rails from St. Francis, where a piece of track some 3,000 feet in length (owing to a change in the line, approved by the government) had to be taken up, to lay a track in Nicolet station yard. These rails were not in use and could be moved in a few hours, and after advising with Mr. Ball, of Nicolet, I took the responsibility of using them temporarily at Nicolet, as the cost of returning them would be trifling.

That, as only some 1,600 feet of track were laid, the remainder of the rails were piled on the company's property, and were there when I left Nicolet the following year.

That some months since I made an inspection of the line between Yamaska and St. Francis for the company, and found all the rails were as originally laid on the whole line, excepting the 3,000 feet above referred to.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and in and by virtue of the provisions of the Evidence Act.

WILLIAM C. E. PHILLIPS.

Then, I have an affidavit from Mr. Ball, the present local member for Nicolet, who, I believe, is one of the proprietors of that road, a shareholder, if not a director. He has some money in it, and has taken an active part in the construction of that line:

I, George Ball, of the town of Nicolet, district of Three Rivers, mill-owner, do solemnly declare that in the year 1889, I made advances to Charles W. Armstrong, contractor, of the city of Montreal, and the Great Eastern Railway Company, in connection with the construction of the Great Eastern Railway between Nicolet and St. Gregoire.

That, as part of these advances, I paid for the rails and fastenings used in the construction of the line between these two points and the freight on them to St. Gregoire Junction on the Grand Trunk Railway.

That I was present when Mr. Ridout inspected the line on behalf of the Dominion government. That the rails there laid on the lines were the rails so paid for by me, and that no subsidy was paid on any other rails.

That it is to my knowledge that a small quantity of rails which, owing to a change of about half a mile of line at St. Francis, had to be taken up, were transferred to Nicolet, and a portion used in laying about a quarter of a mile of track at Nicolet station. That the surplus rails not used in laying this track were loaned temporarily to Messrs. Tourville & Co., and are still in their possession. That no subsidy has been claimed or paid on those rails so removed, nor was there any possibility of its being collected. That Mr. Phillips, the engineer in charge of the work, advised me as to the temporary use of these rails, and that I furnished my boat for their removal.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and in and by virtue of the provisions of the Evidence Act.

GEORGE BALL.

Mr. HAGGART. Were they brought back?

Mr. BERGERON. The gist of the thing is, that the government has not paid two subsidies upon the same rails, as was stated the other day, and which was looked upon as a grave offence. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said the other day that a man who would receive subsidies on the same rails in two different places should be sent to the penitentiary. But, I think it is now established by these affidavits that he did not receive two subsidies upon the same rails. I have brought this matter up simply in justice to Mr. Armstrong, who is a business man, and has had a great deal to do with the business men of Canada, and it would be unjust to suffer an unfounded accusation to go through the country that he had received subsidies twice upon the same rails.

Mr. HAGGART. There seems to be a very serious charge, even after these affidavits have been read to us. He received a subsidy on a certain line of road, he took up one mile of that road and took the rails to another road that he was building, something he had no business to do.

Mr. BERGERON. Only a quarter of a mile.

Mr. HAGGART. He says 3,000 feet—took them over to the other road, and it is not very clear that they were put on to the other line. But, certainly he had received a subsidy for those laid down on one track, and he took them up and took them over to another line of road.

#### SUPPLY—CHARACTER OF DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). I desire to make a few remarks, before that motion is carried.

It being One o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, when one o'clock was called, I was about to rise before the House went into committee to call attention to the degraded spirit that has been introduced within the last four years in the debates of the House. I wish to illustrate it by referring to the degrading tactics that have been adopted in regard to myself. I will take only one illustration out of several that might be taken. Last year the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) in his speech on the address thought fit to discuss my private character, and to discuss my private character in details, having nothing whatever to do with

the issue, and that could not have anything to do with the issue. Private character has nothing whatever to do with the issue that is involved in a man's public character, and for the very first and best of reasons that it is illogical. It diverts the public mind from the real issue, namely, a man's fitness. There are only two cases, there may be two cases, where the private character of a public man can be in issue; one case is where his private conduct infringes on his public efficiency, and the other is where his private conduct is of that notorious character, that, in consequence of a man's public position, it tends to bring discredit on public life and to injure the efficiency of public life. On the 27th of March, 1899, the hon. member for Saskatchewan made statements about my private life referring to incidents that he alleged had occurred in the North-west Territories when this House was not sitting, and the statements were absolutely without foundation. You, Sir, did not call him to order, and the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who has as much responsibility as yourself for the good behaviour of this House sat there and gave him sanction by his silence. Not only that, but the whole—I will not say the whole, but ninety-nine-hundredths of the Liberal party then present, cheered the hon. gentleman while making these statements which were, as I say, utterly unfounded. That, as I stated would justify me, if it were my cue, to take such a course, not only in putting the private character of the hon. member for Saskatchewan in issue, but the private character of every man in the ministerial party who sanctioned him; if I dealt with the hon. member for the Saskatchewan, I should have grounds to go on. I say that within this last session he has been guilty of disgraceful conduct unworthy of a man and a member of parliament as I can prove. He took occasion to insult in me, if I may dare say so, a whole nation in my person, and amid the jeers and laughter of the Liberal party, to imitate my Irish accent, which, of course, has not the high-bred intonation that belongs to the hon. gentleman, and he was vociferously cheered by hon. gentlemen, whose accents, of course, tell that they have been bred in the bowers and boudoirs of Lady Clara Vere de Veres. I am not going to pursue that course, but if I were going to adopt similar tactics, I could show that this very session, as can be proved by members of parliament, if it should be thought necessary at a future session to inquire into the matter, that the hon. gentleman has been guilty of disgraceful conduct unworthy of a member of parliament and unworthy of a gentleman. But, I am not going to pursue that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Order, order. The language of the hon. gentleman is unparliamentary.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. DAVIN. Shall I state what his conduct was?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). No, it is unparliamentary.

Mr. DAVIN. I must not say that he has been guilty of conduct unworthy of a gentleman?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, you must not.

Mr. DAVIN. Then, I will withdraw it, and if I am given a committee, I will prove by the testimony of hon. members of this House that he went to a lodging House in this town with a lady under an assumed name, and tried to pass her off as his wife.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. Nobody but a blackguard would make that statement.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) had better take care, because on his conduct may depend the scope I give to the statement that I make here.

Mr. McMULLEN. Go on as long as you like. Nobody but a blackguard would make that statement.

Mr. DAVIN. What then is to be said of a party that would sanction, on that date, when hon. gentlemen cheered, the making of statements here about my private life without the least foundation, and not one word of order called? I was surprised at the right hon. leader of the House. From him we expected better things. But that same hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) did not only do it in this House, but in another place he referred offensively to slanderous statements that were made about me in a public newspaper, which slanderous statements had to be publicly withdrawn by the man who made them. And then the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) moved that these be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts. The Committee on Public Accounts met, and it was very interesting at the early sittings of that committee to see a number of hon. gentlemen and senators all fleckless, spotless creatures, like Senator Watson and others, coming there, thinking there were going to be revelations which would gratify them in regard to me, and what I had done. Witness after witness was called, and it was shown there was not a tittle of foundation for the suggestions. Well, now, what do I complain of? The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) is chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. What would you expect when two definite matters in regard to a public man and a member of this House are referred to a committee, after the committee

has had evidence placed before it and two ministers of the Crown are present and show by their demeanour that they understood the thing in its true light? What do you think of the chairman of a committee who merely reports the evidence and does not report to this House as he should have done that the committee inquired into these two matters, and that it was found that there was not a tittle of evidence to support the statements made. He does not say anything in this House, but he goes to Toronto, and when he thought he could make a political point for his friends by stating the truth, in Toronto, he makes this statement:

He had been on the Public Accounts Committee for four years, and had been chairman three years. The committee had the full business of the government before them, and there had not been a single charge laid or attempted to be proved that a minister or a member of parliament or head of a department ever took a cent that did not belong to him.

Not a single charge ever even attempted to be proved that a member of parliament had taken a cent that did not belong to him. Now, what is to be said of the manliness in our public life when the chairman of a committee makes a statement like that outside of the House and does not make that statement inside of this House when presenting his report, as he should have done? It shows, of course, that not merely has an ungenerous spirit entered into public life, but a spirit of a character that the place where I am speaking forbids me properly to characterize. Whether we have another session in this term, or whether we are to commence a new term, when another session comes on, I hope we will introduce into our debates a spirit of manliness and a spirit of fair-play, and not a spirit of vile and shameless traduction and moral assassination.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—INDEMNITIES TO FAMILIES.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask in pursuance of a question I have on the Order paper, which I proposed asking the hon. Minister of Militia, what is being done, or what will be done in the case of the wives of men who have lost their lives in South Africa, and what is being done, or what will be done in the case of wives of men who have been disabled in South Africa?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Mr. Speaker, I think that all the cases of that kind are temporarily being looked after by the officers of the Patriotic Fund. There has been a very large fund raised for purposes of that kind. The money is being expended, and all the cases are being looked after. The government is not taking any special action in the matter except as provided for under the Bill passed this session in regard to the

allowance made to the wives of soldiers in South Africa. I think final adjustment of these claims should be left over until a later period. As soon as the session is over I intend to take the matter up, and as far as we have authority now to deal with the individual cases, I propose to do so.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). What about those who are dependent upon soldiers who have gone out. There is the mother of the two Scotts in the North-west and she was dependent upon these two young men. She seems quite at sea as to how she is to get part of their pay. I wish the minister to let us know what she is entitled to and to whom she is to apply.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If the hon. gentleman will address me a letter giving me the particulars I shall be happy to give him the information. All special cases of hardship are being looked after by the patriotic fund. I may say generally that officers of the North-west Mounted Police will be treated in the same way as officers of the permanent force and other officers who have gone out.

Mr. DAVIN. I sent a letter to Col. Irwin, and I am told he is away in England.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is some one acting in his place.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (Three Rivers). The pay of the soldier in South Africa is to be supplemented to the same amount as if he were serving in Canada. I am told that in some cases there is back pay which will revert to the family of the soldier in case of his death. The hon. minister might give us information as to that.

Mr. OLIVER. In case of the death of a married member of the forces in South Africa does the separation allowance to his wife cease at once?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think it would.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the intention?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Balance of expenses in connection with the commission for the investigation of the affairs of St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. \$662

Mr. BERGERON: What did each of these commissioners receive?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Mr. Noxon, \$2,570; Mr. O. K. Fraser, \$2,410; Mr. Lafortune, \$2,340.

Mr. BERGERON. The whole transaction cost about \$15,000, and where is the remaining \$8,000 gone?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I gave all the information on that point when we were on the main estimates. There was clerical assistance, and there were stenographers to be paid for.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are these ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The usual stenographers employed under the order in council; the *Hansard* men.

Mr. BERGERON. Was there not transportation expenses for the commissioners, when they went from one place to another?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It was very natural they should get these disbursements.

Mr. BERGERON. I know they were driving around in fine carriages with two horses.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They were probably looking for the immense quantity of stone that was paid for by the government and never delivered to the penitentiary.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all, they were picnicking. They were driving from St. Vincent de Paul to Montreal in fine carriages with two horses and passing by St. Laurent and boasting that they were having a good time and that the government was paying for it. They were not looking for stone in the county of Laval. How much did that picnicking cost ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I gave all these details on the main item, and they are in *Hansard*. The item stood over and the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Foster) asked for these details which I afterwards gave to him.

Mr. BERGERON. Did the hon. gentleman say it was published in *Hansard* ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, and as the payments were made last year, the hon. gentleman will find all the information in the Auditor General's Report.

To pay P. O'Donnell, late storekeeper, \$2,000, and N. P. Wood, late assistant storekeeper, \$350 gratuities under the authority of 50-51 Vic., cap. 52, sec. 4.... \$2,350

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. On the report made by the commissioners it was found necessary to suspend Mr. O'Donnell, late storekeeper, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Wood, assistant storekeeper. This sum of \$2,000 is intended as a remuneration to Mr. O'Donnell. In view of his forty years service, he would be entitled to receive a gratuity under the Act, of \$3,100. In consequence of the report we did not allow him the full amount but only this \$2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Does he get superannuation ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No. He would have been entitled to receive \$3,100 under

Mr. BERGERON.

what is called a gratuity allowance, but we only recommend that he should receive \$2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I noticed the statement in one of the papers lately that a substantial reduction has been made in the price of binder twine to be sold at this penitentiary, and that this was due to the authorities being able to buy enough raw material at a very much lower price than formerly. Is that a fact, and, if it was, can the hon. gentleman give us the price ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot answer that. The matter has not come to my knowledge at all. I know that a large amount of raw material was purchased, and the House voted, I think, \$30,000 for the purpose of taking advantage of what was thought to be a fall in the market. I cannot go beyond that. I know the penitentiary output of this year has been disposed of at practically retail prices to any of the farmers who wished to apply for it. I am not aware that any change has been made in the figures since this matter was up before.

Mr. SPROULE. The prices are very much lower. They are down to 8½ cents a pound instead of 14 cents. What I wanted to say in connection with the matter was this. When we were discussing the question of the cost of the raw material, especially manila, it was said that owing to the war it was very high in price and almost impossible to be got. The war is not yet over, and the people have not yet gone back to the raising of manila hemp to any extent, so far as is indicated by the returns to the New York market, and it seems strange that at the very time when manila is supposed to be at the highest price owing to its scarcity, the authorities are able to purchase it at so low a price as to sell the binder twine at 8½ cents a pound instead of 14 cents. There must be a nigger in the fence somewhere.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In order if possible to find the nigger, I have sent to the inspector.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is that amount voted as a gratuity or is it voted under the Superannuation Act ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As a gratuity.

Mr. COCHRANE. Was he entitled to anything under the Superannuation Act ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, he was entitled to \$3,100 of superannuation under the Penitentiaries Act.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the report of the commission deprived him of his superannuation, it seems rather difficult to explain how he is entitled to a gratuity. I am merely asking for information.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. A man may be entitled under the Act to a specific

amount, but if it is found that during the time he has served the Crown he has not been a faithful servant, it is possible to make a reduction. After all, this gratuity is a reward for faithful service during a number of years. This man was in the service forty years, and as a result of the investigation it was found necessary to dispense with his services; but at the same time it was felt that something should be given to him for many years of faithful service.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the charge against him?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. At pages 31 and 32 of the commissioner's report, the hon. gentleman will find a reference to the charge. Generally speaking, it was neglect of duty.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If he was in the service forty years and was a faithful servant, and was not found to be unfaithful till forty years had elapsed—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Unfortunately, that was the case in the penitentiaries. Things had been going on for a number of years that were not found out until this commission was appointed.

Expenses of a judicial inquiry into certain election matters, so much thereof as the commissioners may require, to be subject to their order, for the payment of witnesses' fees..... \$20,000

Mr. HAGGART. I understood the Premier the other day to say that if solicitors were wanted for the conduct of the case—there may be two or three—the counsel would be left entirely to select their own solicitors.

The PRIME MINISTER. That I understand from the Minister of Justice.

Mr. HAGGART. Would they be allowed to select, for instance, one or two? The selection is entirely left to them, with the consent of the judges?

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not put that point to the Minister of Justice; but I know that the instructions are that the government does not want to have anything to do with the matter, but wishes to leave it to the judges and the counsel themselves.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to point out, in reference to this matter, though it is a very delicate matter to touch, that one of the judges who is appointed to preside at this inquiry in connection with the election frauds, Mr. Justice Falconbridge, has been appointed to a higher position since he was appointed to this position. It does seem to me to be a very indelicate thing for the government to do, just on the eve of his being put to work on a matter in which the government are very much interested, to practically give him a bonus or a higher salary. If such a

thing were contemplated, it would have come with much better grace after this inquiry than before it. While there may not be anything wrong, and while I do not believe the appointment will influence the judge in any way, because I believe he is a man of very high character, still it does leave an impression on the public mind that will be injurious to the government of the day. Some will have a suspicion that it was done for some other purpose rather than to elevate him to a position which he is better capable of filling than any other capable man.

The PRIME MINISTER. I altogether dissent from the views the hon. gentleman has expressed just now. I believe the general impression on the part of the public will be that the character of Mr. Justice Falconbridge is above the possibility of his being influenced by any consideration of that character. There were two vacancies in the High Court of Justice of Ontario; two chief justices had to be appointed. One of those positions was given to Mr. Justice Armour, against whose appointment I am sure there is not a word to be said; it was approved of by everybody; and I believe the same thing applies to the appointment of Mr. Justice Falconbridge.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not saying a word against Mr. Justice Falconbridge nor against his ability to fill the position. But I say that in the eyes of the public it looks bad and suspicious. I think it looks a good deal worse for the government than for the man. The man may be all right. I do not wish to be understood as casting the slightest reflection upon the government for the appointment, so far as his fitness or unfitness for the position is concerned. As to that, I do not know anything except what is in Mr. Justice Falconbridge's favour; but I say that at the commencement of an inquiry of this kind, in which the government are so directly and vitally interested, there will be a percentage of the public who will come to the conclusion that it was a very indelicate thing to do.

The PRIME MINISTER. I presume nobody will deny that Mr. Justice Falconbridge is fitted for that position. He was the senior judge; he holds a high position in the estimation of the public in the province of Ontario, where he is best known; and it would be most unfortunate, I am sure, if because he was selected to do a work for which he was eminently fitted, that should be a reason against his preferment for another position for which he was also eminently fitted. I did not know that anybody would object to that.

Mr. HAGGART. I believe that the Premier voices the opinion of the whole of Canada, in saying that Mr. Justice Falconbridge is eminently fitted for the position. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will just consider: here is a vacancy in the High

Court of Justice which occurred just after Mr. Justice Falconbridge was appointed on this commission. Surely his appointment to the commission should not prevent him getting his well-deserved promotion.

Mr. DAVIN. There is no doubt whatever that Mr. Justice, now Chief Justice, Falconbridge is a man of the very highest character and legal standing, and I, for my part, have the fullest confidence in him. I think our general system is open to condemnation, judging by what has occurred. We should have the system which prevails in England, and once a man is on the bench there should be no more promotion.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They have promotion in England. Look at the Master of the Rolls.

Mr. DAVIN. The system in England is to recruit the chief justices, not from the ranks of puisne judges, but from the bar.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Where does the present chief justice come from?

Stationery ..... \$5,300

Mr. DAVIN. Does the stationery with which we are supplied come from upstairs?

Mr. SPEAKER. This is applied to the stationery supplied the members.

Mr. BERGERON. How much does the stationery cost this year?

Mr. SPEAKER. \$15,300.

Mr. BERGERON. How much did it cost in 1896?

Mr. SPEAKER. A little larger.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think that is a reduction in the proper direction. Our stationery is very inferior to what it used to be, and if there is a place where the stationary should be first class, it is the House of Commons. There is very little difference between what we are paying to-day and what we paid in 1896, and there is a great difference in the quality of the stationery. We have envelopes we cannot seal and paper that the pen will run through and bad pens.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It seems to me that there is a great difference between the stationery we get here and that which is supplied the Senate.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are very giddy and reckless in that body.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is no reason why we should go to the other extreme. You cannot show me worse paper and envelopes than what are furnished this House. Our stationery is a disgrace to Canada. As to the Senate expenditure, not belonging to that high body, I am not prepared to discuss it, but judging by letters I have received from some members of that House, their stationery is far ahead of ours. Taking

Mr. HAGGART.

the importance of a House like this. I do not see why the government should allow the stationery to be given to us which we receive every day. There is no necessity why there should be any extravagance, but the material ought to be fairly good.

Mr. LARIVIERE. The Printing Committee appointed a sub-committee composed of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) and myself, and we have provided for the stationery for the coming session equal in quality to that furnished the Senate, and that is why this sum is asked.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to make a suggestion to that sub-committee. I do not see why the monograms on the envelopes and the paper of the House of Commons should not be printed in both languages. That would not add to the cost, and would be gratifying to the French members. We used formerly to have the monograms in both languages, but to-day we have none in French at all.

Provincial voters' lists ..... \$8,000

The PRIME MINISTER. This is intended to pay for the lists which we have to receive from the different provincial authorities. Last year this sum was taken out of the appropriation for printing. We had but little printing last year, and could take this sum out of that appropriation, but this year we have had a large number of lists to print, and every penny of this will be required for the printing of the lists.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the sense of paying this when we do not get the lists printed?

The PRIME MINISTER. We will get them printed here.

Mr. SPROULE. They will be a year old when they reach us.

The PRIME MINISTER. They are being printed at this moment.

Mr. SPROULE. For nearly five months we have been told that the lists are being printed, and yet we have seen none of them. Our provincial lists are nearly a year old, and instead of having the latest lists, we will have the old lists.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Printing Bureau is printing the list. These lists come progressively and not altogether.

Mr. SPROULE. We do not see any of them.

The PRIME MINISTER. The printing has been going on since last fall. I will undertake, on concurrence, to have all the information as to the lists.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In that case, I think the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), ought to bring down a list show-

ing which voters' lists are printed, and which are not. For the last five or six months we have been trying to ascertain what was the position of these lists. I know I have put questions more than half a dozen times upon that point, but the invariable answers of the government is that the lists are being prepared. But they cannot be in preparation for ever. Of course, I am against the present system of preparing voting lists for parliamentary elections: but if we are called upon to vote money for the system we ought to be able to get information how the work goes on.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE** (Mr. Fielding). I would call the attention of my hon. friend to a blue-book recently issued by the Secretary of State, which gives most of the information he seeks. I see that the list for Three Rivers for 1899, was not received at the Printing Bureau until December 13: and it was printed. I suppose that the list for this year is not in yet. This blue-book gives a great deal of information, and, if anything further is required, the Prime Minister will supply it.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** But that shows how bad the present system is. The government cannot control the municipal authorities who make up the list. If the municipal authorities were to send a list in September, and we had an election in October, it would follow, that we would be obliged to hold the election on old lists. That goes far to prove that the present system is a vicious system.

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE.** You would not have fresher lists under the old system.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I do not see that that follows. But the point I wish to make is that if hon. gentlemen spend \$30,000 or \$40,000 for printing the lists, and then have to fall back upon a list two years old, the money is wasted and people are disfranchised who should be allowed to vote.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Hear, hear.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** I think that is perfectly plain. You might have one list for the whole life of parliament, holding not only the general election, but by-elections upon it.

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL.** That is what occurred in the last general election—we had lists two or three years old.

**Sir ADOLPHE CARON.** But hon. gentlemen came in to do better than their predecessors: and, if they are going to fall back on a tu quoque argument, the improvement is not very great.

**Mr. BERGERON.** I do not know the provisions of the charter of Three Rivers; but my right hon. friend knows that in our province, the lists are made in the spring—

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Not in Three Rivers.

**Mr. BERGERON.** There may be something special in their charter on that point. I understand in Quebec and Montreal, the lists are only made every two years, and Three Rivers may be in the same case. But I know that in my county the lists are made up in the spring, and they have been two or three months in the Printing Bureau. It may be that there is so much work that they have not been able to get the printing done. But there seems to be a good many in the same position. I suppose the work will be done as soon as possible.

**Mr. E. COCHRANE** (East Northumberland). Does the government have to pay the municipal authorities in each of the provinces for preparing the voters' lists?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** In most of the provinces, the lists are prepared by the municipal authorities, and this money goes to the clerk.

**Mr. COCHRANE.** Then, I understand the clerk of the municipality gets paid for a portion of the voters' lists?

The **PRIME MINISTER.** For the copy he sends.

**Mr. COCHRANE.** I do not think that is proper, so far as Ontario is concerned. I wrote to the judge who revised the lists for East Northumberland to ask who was the custodian of the lists, and he told me it was the clerk of the peace. That is the proper authority from whom to get the list.

The **PRIME MINISTER.** Perhaps so.

**Mr. COCHRANE.** I do not think the government should get the list from the clerk of the municipality. We have no knowledge whether they are tampered with or not. But if they are in charge of the clerk of the peace and the government gets them from that officer, we can have confidence that they are the proper lists. I have never had a list for East Northumberland since the law was changed. Our list was in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on January 8, this year, having been revised about November. If there is an election about the latter part of this year, we shall have to run on a list that is over a year old. Hon. gentlemen opposite used to find fault under the late government, about running elections on old lists; but they have not remedied that at all. Under the old law, if the government intended having an election, say in 1900, we would revise the lists in 1900, and run the election on the new lists. Another point is this—the municipalities do not all have the revision at the same time. I recollect that in my own riding, on one occasion, one municipality did not have the lists revised in time to have the local election. If, for instance the township of Percy did not have their lists printed in time of the election of 1900, what would the government do?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Take the last list in force in the municipality.

Mr. **COCHRANE**. That is you would have a list two years old.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. We cannot help that.

Mr. **COCHRANE**. But there is no economy to the taxpayers. In fact, they are paying now more than they did under the old Franchise Act. You are asking just as much money to print the lists. It is true, it is easier for the member who has to see to the revision of the list. Under the old law, when the lists in my riding were revised, I had to put up money to serve notices, and so on; but now, the money has to be put up by the municipalities in Ontario. But instead of relieving the ratepayers of the province of Ontario, it placed a burden on them that they never had before.

Mr. **BERGERON**. My hon. friend says in Ontario the money will be paid to the clerk of the peace, because he is the custodian of the list; in Quebec it goes to the registrar of the county. What is the scale upon which the government pays for these lists? In Quebec the registrar does five times the amount of work for the same amount of money that the custodian of the list has to do, for instance, in British Columbia. In Quebec the registrar has to have one line for the name, one for the qualification, one for the lot upon which he is qualified, another for the post office address, and so on. It is a pretty heavy list, and that is paid for by so much per name. But in British Columbia there is only the name that has to be written down, and the custodian or whoever he is, gets, I am told, ten cents for writing that name, whereas in the province of Quebec the registrar who has to do five times more work only gets five cents for each name. Now, why should not the government adopt one price for the whole country? Because it is a palpable injustice to pay less in one place than you do in another.

The **PRIME MINISTER**. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, and I will look into it. I think he is in error, but I will ascertain.

Mr. **HAGGART**. I thought this item was a provision for the supplementary provincial lists. This of course does not provide for the voters' lists in cities and towns in the province of Ontario. Have you an item for the purpose of preparing that list?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. There is an item in the main estimates.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I think our Act provides that the registration list, if it is not more than a year old, should be used, and if it is more than a year old, there must be a new registration.

Mr. **COCHRANE**.

Mr. **HAGGART**. It must be a list prepared immediately after the issue of the writ, whether it is a year old or any length of time. I want to be clear upon that point. There is no list for the province of Ontario of a certain class of votes until the writ for the election is issued; then, no matter whether it is a year old or more, there must be a subsidiary list prepared in cities and towns after the writ is issued, otherwise we would have no list.

Mr. **COCHRANE**. What is the law now?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. Where, in the province of Ontario, the lists are made at irregular intervals—and that would apply to manhood suffrage vote in cities and towns—and where the list is more than a year old at the time the election takes place, in that event a new manhood suffrage list must be made up.

Mr. **BERGERON**. How much will this \$8,000 make for this work altogether?

The **MINISTER OF FINANCE**. \$40,000.

Mr. **COCHRANE**. Will the list be sent to us as soon as printed?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. Immediately after they are printed, twenty copies must be sent to the member and to the defeated candidate.

Mr. **DAVID HENDERSON** (Halton). I desire to ask the Solicitor General, as he has the statutes before him, to refer to subsection 10, of section 10, of the Franchise Act. Are we to understand that in the event of the Queen's Printer not having printed the current year list, say the list for 1900, and the election should take place this fall, before these lists have been printed in Ottawa, are we to use the list prepared by the municipal council?

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. Yes. The municipal council prepares a list for provincial purposes, then the custodian or clerk sends a copy of that list to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who causes it to be printed; then that list so printed by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery becomes, for the purposes of our Dominion election, the original list. But if by any accident, either by an omission on the part of the custodian or for any other reason, he does not send the list, then the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is obliged to provide the returning officer with the provincial list which is in the custody of the provincial custodian. So that you have got, for any election that may happen to take place, the last list in force in the province, with the exception of course of the manhood suffrage vote.

Mr. **HENDERSON**. When would the provincial list come in force? Is it immediately after it is revised, or within a certain number of days?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have not got that before me, but I understand that in so far as Ontario is concerned it comes into force within a certain number of days after it is revised, and I think that is the rule all through Canada. I am now dealing with the ordinary list, not the special registration list.

Mr. JAMES GILMOUR (East Middlesex). Suppose that in a portion of the city of London a provincial registration took place in February, would that stand good for a Dominion election that took place in August?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, that would be a list less than a year old.

Mr. GILMOUR. Notwithstanding the fact that the registration took place in the city of London, that portion of the city would be exempt.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, from the obligation to make a new list, that is to say, that would be a list which, within the terms of the statute, would be less than a year old.

Mr. McALISTER. Suppose in the province of New Brunswick an election took place now, before the last lists are printed and distributed, would the election be held on them?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, if they are not printed and distributed, then you simply go to the clerk or whoever the custodian of the provincial lists may be, and you get a copy from him for the returning officers.

Increase in salary of the accountant, deputy sergeant-at-arms and four clerks ..... \$300

Mr. SPEAKER. There is an increase of \$50 each to the accountant, Mr. Chamberlain, and to Mr. Bowie, the assistant sergeant-at-arms, and to four clerks: Mr. Hartney, examiner of private Bills; Mr. W. Todd, clerk of private Bills; Mr. N. Robideau, clerk of railways; Mr. C. H. Jones, third-class clerk.

Mr. BERGERON. Are these statutory increases?

Mr. SPEAKER. These are the usual \$50 increases. They are recommended by the Committee on Internal Economy.

Sessional clerks ..... \$3,120

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say, in respect to these items, that heretofore these estimates have been passed for a session of 100 days, and the House will recall that we had to have a special vote each session. This is for an additional thirty days, so as to avoid the difficulty that has occurred during the last two sessions. We pay out no more money, because they are paid by the day.

French translators ..... \$480

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask His Honour the Speaker to see that there will be a room downstairs placed at the disposal of the French translators next session. Last year and two years ago deputations waited on the Speaker to get a room in the House of Commons for the French translators. They are at present occupying premises outside of this building. I do not know where; in fact, I have never been there. Of course, that costs something as the government is obliged to lease a place for them, but I do not know how much it costs. It has been suggested that the translators should have a room in this building. I believe that downstairs there is a room which, I think, could be put at their disposal. I am not speaking as to the economy that would result from this arrangement, as I do not know whether we are paying a large rent outside or not, but it would be a great deal better for the efficiency of the service if the translators were here. We sometimes have to deal with them, and we either have to send a messenger to them or ask them to come up here. I think if we could have them in this building it would be much better. They would like it better themselves. I would ask His Honour if he would be kind enough to place a room at their disposal, or, if he feels disposed to do so, to consult with the hon. Minister of Public Works and see that a place is put at their disposal by next session.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would be very glad to do it if hon. members would stand between the Speaker and members of this House who are occupants of these rooms. We will have to reduce the accommodation that members of the House use. One of the very first things that I had brought to my attention was a grievance of that kind. As a matter of fact, it is of very long standing.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to say that Mr. Speaker cannot reduce the number of rooms which the members of the opposition occupy.

Mr. J. V. ELLIS (St. John City). This matter can be very easily arranged. After all the members shall have left, whoever is in authority, can put these translators in, and whoever comes back next session will find this room pre-empted.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the hon. member (Mr. Ellis) suggests, this can only be done between two parliaments, and as the hon. gentleman says, they will be in possession when members come back.

Mr. BERGERON. I have called the attention of His Honour to it, so that he can arrange the matter after we are all gone.

Library—Additional to the salaries of Mr. Smith and Mr. Sylvain ..... \$100

Mr. DAVIN. I consider, Sir, that these two gentlemen who are mentioned here are about two of the best officers in the library, and I entirely endorse these increases, which, I suppose, are the annual statutory increases that come to them as a matter of course. But, I have seen no statutory increase for Mr. Casault. Why is it that the name of Mr. Casault is not included? He is absolutely one of the best officers in the employ of the government. He is a most useful officer. Col. Todd is a first-class man. Mr. MacCormac is also a first-class officer in the library. I use the library a good deal, and I think that Mr. Casault does not get what he is entitled to. He has not spoken to me; of course, I know nothing about it; but he is absolutely one of the best officers I ever knew.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that we had a pretty large staff in the library? Do we require two more?

The PRIME MINISTER. This is the same staff.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought we were providing for two new ones?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I entirely agree with what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has just said in regard to Mr. Casault. It seems to me that this is not the only instance, but that in other instances, in which there has been discrimination. Some have been selected for promotion and others, just as well entitled to it, have been put aside. As to these increases, there is no objection, because Mr. Sylvain and Mr. Smith are first-class men. But there is no reason, if you have three good men, why the three good men should not be treated on a plane of equality. If one gets an increase, the others should be treated in the same way.

Mr. BERGERON. To what class does Mr. Casault belong? It may be that he is at the head of his class.

Mr. SPEAKER. He has been a long time in the service.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Casault can hardly be said to be in any class known to the civil service, but this special officer has been there for a long time, he has been a good officer, and I would be very glad to see his name down in the list.

Glasgow Exhibition ..... \$25,000

Mr. DAVIN. Before you proceed with that item, there is a matter that I want to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). The *Canada Lumberman*, published this month in Toronto, the organ of the lumber interest, places before the public a very serious matter which,

Mr. BERGERON.

I think, requires an explanation on the part of the hon. gentleman. It is an article entitled 'The Canadian Exhibit at the Imperial Institute,' and it is as follows:

The Canadian Exhibit at the Imperial Institute.

The resources of Canada, and particularly of the province of Ontario, are by no means properly or creditably represented by the exhibit at the Imperial Institute in London. The visitor would be much more favourably impressed if the exhibits of the various provinces were placed side by side instead of on different floors. The present arrangement does not give the idea that Canada is one Dominion, but rather that it consists of a number of separate provinces, having little or no connection with one another. The exhibit should be arranged in compact form like that of Australia.

As to the character of the exhibit, and more particularly that of the province of Ontario, the richest and most important of the provinces, there is good ground for complaint. One would suppose from the numerous views of Niagara Falls placed about the walls, that this great natural phenomenon was the one distinguishing characteristic of the province of Ontario, while the specimens of Indian work are well calculated to confirm the idea, already too prevalent in the minds of some of the people of Great Britain, that Canada is a wild and uncivilized country.

Ontario is known on this side of the Atlantic as a fruit-growing province, and the quality of its productions in this line is not excelled by those of any other country. In view of this fact, it is extremely humiliating to a Canadian to observe that the jars containing samples of Canadian fruit shown in this exhibit have apparently not been refilled during the last decade. What was once fruit might now, judging from appearances, be almost any other substance under the sun.

There is also displayed a view of the Toronto Industrial Exhibition of date the year 1885, which, of course, conveys a totally inadequate idea of the character and extent of the exhibition of to-day. We would suggest that all relics such as this and the photograph of the ruins of Fort Erie, might well be thrown out of the exhibit, and modern views of our principal cities and industries substituted, so that visitors would be given an approximately fair idea of the kind of country Canada is, the extent of its development, and its advantages as a place of residence and business enterprise. The Canadian Pacific Railway show some excellent views of the harvesting operations in Manitoba. These are well calculated to make a favourable impression upon intending emigrants. There is also an excellent geological map of Ontario, containing a large amount of information with regard to the population and resources of the province. There is a fairly good exhibit of building stones and marbles, also of hardwoods. Other features equally valuable might be added, so as to convey to visitors a proper idea of the country and its resources.

The entire exhibit should either be rearranged, improved, and brought up-to-date, or entirely done away with.

I was requested to bring this matter before the minister, and I hope he will see that our exhibit at the Imperial Institute is rejuvenated.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The Canadian exhibit at the Imperial Institute is managed and provided for by the provinces, and the Domin-

ion government has nothing to do with it. I find from the records, that when the Canadian Institute was established, the late government declined to take up its management, and the duty was relegated to the provinces. I was in the Imperial Institute not very long ago, and I must say that the exhibit of Canada is not very creditable, and not very commensurate with what Canada can produce. The Australian exhibits are looked after by the different colonies of Australasia, and in that respect, are the same as the Canadian exhibits.

**Mr. SPROULE.** What is this Glasgow exhibition?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** It is an international exhibition to be held in Glasgow next year, and a large number of the producers of Canada think it very important that we should exhibit there. The apparent smallness of the vote is accounted for, by the fact, that we expect to be able to take the Canadian exhibit from Paris over to Glasgow. We will only have 8,000 feet of space at Glasgow, whereas we have over 30,000 at Paris.

**Mr. SPROULE.** Who is looking after the work?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** The work will be done when the Paris exhibition is over.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I suppose it will be another job for Tarte. I agree in the desirability of having a proper representation of Canada in Glasgow, and it seems to me that you ought to commence the preparation for the work at once. You cannot prepare for an exhibition in a month or two.

Taking Dominion census..... \$100,000.

**Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher).** In the earlier part of the session I moved for a copy of the forms that were used in the census of 1871, 1881 and 1891, with a view to see what changes had been made in these forms, so as to discover, if possible, why we had such unsatisfactory returns last census as regards the origin of the people. In the census of 1871 and 1881, the form was 'name of the country, or province of birth,' and in the next column, 'origin,' whether they were French Canadians, English Canadians, Irish Canadians, or any other origin. In the census of 1891, this form was changed to 'country or province of birth,' and then a special column for 'French Canadians.' The next column was 'place of birth of father, place of birth of mother.' This was an innovation. My object now is to call the attention of the House to the fact this this appellation of 'French Canadian' as in the form of 1891, led to a great deal of mistakes, so that the returns we have received from that census were very unsatisfactory. The French Canadian population may be divided into two distinct classes.

One: The Canadians of French origin, coming from the province of Quebec, who may properly be called French Canadians. The other: The Acadians, who are also of French origin, and who although they do not style themselves French Canadians, belong to the same family. Then in the Manitoba and the North-west Territories, we have two classes of half-breeds. We have the descendants of the French Canadians, who have settled in the North-west, and we have the descendants of the Scotch people brought in by the Hudson's Bay Company. They are called respectively, French half-breeds and English half-breeds. Though the French half-breeds are the descendants of the Canadians from Lower Canada, who have settled in the North-west, they do not call themselves French Canadians, and they object to being recorded in the census as such. Therefore, while we have a certain number of French Canadians returned under this column, the Acadians and the French half-breeds are excluded, although all three belong to the one family, and should come under the same description if there is only one heading in the form. I would suggest to the minister that he would have a heading for each of these three classes of the French Canadian people, so that they might be returned under their respective headings. I believe that the census should be a complete description of the population, and while I speak especially with regard to French Canadians, I believe the other Canadians, Scotch, English or Irish, should have a column of their own, so that they might be recorded under their respective origins. If we had this designation, then in years to come, we could study the different fluctuations of the population, and ascertain the progress that each nationality is making. In reply to this, I may hear some gentleman tell me that we in Canada should form only one nationality, and that we should all call ourselves 'Canadians.' That is true. We are all Canadians, but at the same time we have a certain affection for our origin, and the Irish Canadians, or Scotch Canadians, or English Canadians should be just as proud of the land that their forefathers came from, as the French Canadians are proud of their origin. I believe that the census should give all these details. We should then have something on record that would be very interesting not only to ourselves, but to future generations. If this whole country is to become one people, then we should follow the progress of the respective nationalities in origin. In the United States they are very much more particular in taking the census, and they give many more details with regard to the people and their respective origins. Why should we not, in the forms that are being distributed, get all the statistics we can? We get descriptions of the private properties of individuals, the animals they are possessed of, and so forth;

but in regard to the origins of the people, which are much more interesting from one standpoint, we are much more neglectful, grouping them all together, so that it is impossible to tell where they come from. I believe a great change should be made in this respect, and the present minister will be deserving of the thanks of the country if he gives us a census which will contain proper statistics with regard to the origins of the people.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I agree with everything which has fallen from the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière). For instance, the student of history or the writer of history, who wants to get such information as my hon. friend has been discussing, ought to be able to find it in the census. We pay a very large amount of money for taking the census, and I think we should make it as complete as possible by giving full information in regard to the different nationalities in the country. The fact of our people all being Canadians does not do away with the historical fact that this part of our continent has been peopled by different races; and it would be very interesting to be able to trace the development of these different races in different parts of the continent. I think we should feel very much indebted to my hon. friend for having brought this matter before parliament; and unless the hon. minister can see insuperable difficulties in the way, I think that information should be added, which would make our census much more interesting, complete and useful, both to the people of this country and to people abroad.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have had this matter brought to my attention personally, before now, by my hon. friend from Provencher and others, and I may say that I quite agree as to the desirability of what he suggests. As to its feasibility, I shall have to consult my officers, and I will certainly do so.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman tell us when the census is to be taken, the system which is to be followed, and who is to be in charge of the work?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have already announced that the system will be the same as before—the de jure system. The census must be taken next year, but no date has yet been fixed, nor has any arrangement been made as to the personnel of those who are to take it.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the census is taken about the same time all over the British Empire, in the month of April. Is it the intention of the department to take it about that time, or to make any departure?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not had anything brought before me yet to induce me to depart from the usual

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

system. The date, however, cannot be fixed until I have gone into the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman say whom he intends to appoint to take charge of the work?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There has been no arrangement made about the personnel. I have just been waiting till the close of the session to go to work at it. If the hon. gentleman will let us away, I will go right at it.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend says the census will be taken on the de jure system?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All the censuses have been taken on that system.

Mr. BERGERON. We heard so many criticisms of the system in 1891 that if my hon. friend adopts it, it may show that it was not so bad a system as was said at the time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose my hon. friend refers to the complaints of the inaccuracies and the padding in that census. I can assure him that I will see that nothing of that kind occurs under my administration.

Cold storage on steamships, on railways, at warehouses, and for expenses in connection with trial at creameries, and for expenses in connection with trial shipments of products and for securing improvement and recognition of the quality of Canadian farm products..... \$30,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is this an additional amount for cold storage?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is to enable us to carry out the arrangements which were provided for in the Bill which passed this House some time ago—to pay for the additional steamships that were required for this season's work.

Mr. SPROULE. That is to cover the enhanced price we have to pay on account of the delay in making your contract.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, nothing of the kind.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to tell us the other night that he would have to pay considerably more now than he would have had to pay if the contract had been made a little earlier.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, the hon. gentleman did not say that at all.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the impression conveyed to the House, whether it was wrong or not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Quite wrong.

Mr. SPROULE. I think *Hansard* will bear me out in saying that that was the impression given.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why does the hon. gentleman say that this is for steamships only, when the vote says that it is also for cold storage on railways, at warehouses and at creameries?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is exactly the same wording as that in the main estimates?

Mr. COCHRANE. If it is not correct, why put it in?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is correct. This is an addition to the vote for cold storage purposes.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. gentleman told us that he was going to ask a certain sum more for cold storage on steamships. Why put in these other items in regard to warehouses and creameries if you want this for cold storage on steamships?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The expenditure for all these items comes out of the one vote, and the difference is simply this, that \$70,000 was asked for in the main estimates and we want \$100,000.

Mr. SPROULE. If I understand it correctly, this goes a good deal further than providing cold storage on steamships. Is it intended out of this vote to select certain trial shipments of products and send them over to be sold? If it is not, I respectfully submit it ought to be changed and let us have the estimates made intelligently. We should know what the money is intended for.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is intended to be used for just the same work as the vote in the main estimates, and is exactly in the same wording, and is an addition to that vote.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this to be used for steamships and railway lines, warehouses, creameries, and for expenses in connection with the shipment of products?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For all these.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the full amount the hon. gentleman intends to use for these purposes?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. \$100,000.

Paris Exhibition ..... \$10,000

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That makes a total of \$285,000. When this question came up before, a good many questions were asked, which I was not then in a position to answer. Now, I would inform the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague)—who, I am sorry, is not here—that his statement that the Canadian build-

ing at the Chicago Fair cost \$4,000 was only incorrect to the extent of \$22,000. It cost \$26,000 instead of \$4,000. In the next place, the World's Fair at Chicago cost this country \$454,801.18.

Mr. CLARKE. What are the particulars?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not all the details:

Dominion government expenditure....	\$252,513 91
Province of Ontario.....	\$84,834 72
“ Manitoba .....	48,828 49
“ Quebec .....	34,407 21
North-west Territories .....	10,600 00
Province of British Columbia	17,956 84
“ Nova Scotia ....	5,057 71
“ Prince Edward Island .....	602 30
	202,287 27

Grand total..... \$454,801 18

A part of that was spent by the provinces, but they undertook the work and prepared the exhibits, which they have not done in the case of the Paris exhibition.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I understand that Manitoba did not exhibit at all on the grounds but had an exhibit outside the grounds?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Manitoba spent \$48,000.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Over \$80,000, but outside the exhibition altogether.

Mr. COCHRANE. What has that got to do with the expenditure of the Dominion?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was part of the whole expenditure of Canada.

Mr. COCHRANE. It was done by the provinces, and not by Canada, and you are bringing that up to cover your own expenditure.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This was a payment by the people of Canada, and if the provinces had taken the same steps to represent themselves at the Paris exhibition, it would not have been necessary for the Dominion to spend so much.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. gentleman give us the particulars of the Dominion expenditure at the Chicago fair?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can give some but not all. I can give, for instance, a list of the employees. Mr. Larke, who was Canadian commissioner at Chicago, cost this country \$11,000. We paid also the following:

W. Saunders.....	\$ 768 15
J. W. Robertson .....	664 10
E. A. Charters.....	2,331 24
W. M. Andrews .....	3,721 14
Miss R. J. Barrett.....	1,803 76
A. M. Chisholm .....	1,038 75
J. Clarke .....	2,801 96

H. C. Cockburn .....	\$ 382 70
W. D. Dimock .....	4,961 17
J. A. G. Goulet.....	2,097 75
W. H. Hay.....	235 68
P. E. Rercheldt.....	358 50
J. B. Samson.....	1,376 60
W. Smith .....	1,000 95
E. S. Stanton .....	1,685 83
M. C. Swanson .....	1,432 08
J. H. Tracey .....	2,326 16
J. O. Turcotte .....	1,378 75
L. Wolverton .....	1,913 45
R. S. Hodgins .....	1,225 20
P. A. Hughes .....	1,544 75
L. H. Lafleur .....	1,448 75
W. B. Larke.....	1,248 20
J. Legge .....	313 00
L. Jones .....	876 65
J. Lobb.....	1,721 40
R. Marion .....	1,293 65
W. Morton.....	2,473 72
G. H. Parsons .....	1,562 11
Brother Plerinus .....	264 00
W. Pennoyer.....	1,405 90
J. P. Redwood .....	1,179 50

I think he was a member of the House at the time.

Mr. BERGERON. No, it was three or four years after.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Altogether thirty-eight employees. There was also the Hon. Joseph Tassé, who was paid \$3,170; E. R. Cockburn, who was a member of the House at the time, \$4,425; Mr. Ewart, \$1,000; Hon. A. R. Angers and Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell, travelling expenses, \$353, making up a total of over \$75,000 for salaries. I have not the details of the other expenditure. The Antwerp and Colonial exhibition cost \$157,617.98, and the Indian and Colonial cost \$154,458.19.

Mr. DAVIN. Is not the hon. gentleman astray in saying that the amount he gave was all for salaries?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Salaries and expenses. The Indian and Colonial exhibition cost about \$160,000. At the Chicago fair, there were some thirty-eight employees on the list, while at Paris, up to the present—not to-day in Paris, by any means—we have only twenty-six.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the total cost of the Dominion with the Chicago fair, leaving out the provincial expenditure?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. \$252,000.

Mr. CLARKE. And how much to date on the Paris exhibition?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the exact details. The amount asked is altogether \$285,000.

Mr. DAVIN. If the number of officers at Paris is fewer now than the number at the Chicago exhibition, the hon. gentleman must be paying them a far larger amount individually.

Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The amount I have given includes freight charges, and about \$125,000 for space, while at Chicago nothing was spent for space, as that was provided by the American people.

Mr. DAVIN. What a monstrous thing to have to spend \$125,000 for space. That will shock the public mind.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, it is a very large expenditure, but it was the rule of the exhibition, and the arrangements made for the British exhibits were made by the Imperial commission, without whose authority we could not have exhibited there at all. Consequently, we had to deal with them and through them for the arrangements for this building. The building has been a very expensive one, and I believe it is not as good as it should have been for the money expended. I have protested, and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has protested, and the bills are not yet settled; and I trust that when we come to settle it, we shall not be obliged to pay the full amount charged. I desire to make it clear that we were allowed to exhibit in Paris only as a portion of the British Empire, that the Exposition commissioners dealt entirely with the British Imperial Commission; that the British Imperial Commission invited us to take part in the exposition as a part of the British Empire, and we accepted that invitation. We are there as part of the British Empire, as one of the colonies of Britain. The British Imperial Commission arranged with the Exposition authorities that the British colonies should have a building to themselves in which to place their exhibits. This was gratifying to us because we thought we could make a better display by having our exhibits all together than if they were scattered in different parts of the exposition. We were informed that the building would cost 10 shillings per square foot of floor space. On that basis we accepted the invitation. The British Imperial Commission afterwards informed us that their calculations had been increased, and the building would cost us more, though they did not give an exact figure. The plans, after considerable discussion and correspondence, had to be submitted to the French commissioners, because only such plans as they approved could be adopted. We found that the plans were going to involve an expenditure of 12s. 6d. or a little over \$3 per square foot. We found also that there were some other expenses, such as fire appliances, which the Paris authorities required to have put in, and lighting. Afterwards we were offered a part of the space which had been set apart for the British exhibits. As we had urgent requests for more space than that available in the colonial building, which was quite inadequate—as a matter of fact we could not even have placed all our exhibits in that

space—and still less make a good show we accepted the offer. That space was charged for, I think at the rate of 6 shillings per square foot. We then found that all the agricultural implements were to be transferred to the park in Vincennes, another part of Paris; and, if they were to be exhibited at all adequately and properly, we had to provide a building in the park in Vincennes. It may be said that we ought not to have agreed to these increased expenditures for buildings and accommodation; but when we found as we did that all the Canadian exhibitors were crying out for more space and declaring that they could not make a proper display in the space allotted—and in fact, we could have filled twice or three times the space placed at our disposal—we decided to undertake the additional expenditure. And I venture to say that the people of Canada would have thought us derelict in our duty had we failed to take the extra space allowed to us. Of course the expenditure for space is very materially increased. I only allude to this to show how unfair it is to make a comparison between this and other exhibitions in which no charge has been made for space. It is the rule of the Paris exhibition to charge for space, and they treat us no differently from the way they treat others. The point is that the building which the Imperial commissioners undertook to put up for the British colonies apparently has not been a success, is not up to the contract and specifications and has been to a certain extent unsatisfactory to Canada. Our commissioners have tried to overcome that at least to some extent by decorating the building inside and out—

Mr. BERGERON. But we are paying all the same.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That remains to be seen. There is still \$16,000 or \$17,000 which, up to the present time I have refused to pay; and I am not going to pay until I have discussed the matter thoroughly, through Lord Strathcona, with the Imperial commission.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister has given us only a part of the information. He says that the Chicago exhibition cost us \$252,000. Will he tell us how many lines were exhibited by us there, what space we had and whether the cost for the different provinces was borne by them, or whether we paid for the employees in connection with their several exhibits.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the details as to space, but, of course, the space we occupied at Chicago was very much larger than at Paris, but the space was free and not so fully occupied. So far as the provincial exhibits are concerned, the provinces spent the amounts I have read here through their own commissioners. But when I gave the

number of employees connected with our exhibits at Chicago I did not include the employees who were sent there by the several provinces.

Mr. BERGERON. Are they paying them out of the provincial exchequer?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They did at Chicago, but they are not doing it at Paris.

Mr. BERGERON. Are we paying for the provincial representatives?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are no provincial employees that I know of, with the exception of one or two honorary commissioners.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Deschenes has gone for Quebec. Is he paid by the Quebec government?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He may be paid by the province. He goes as honorary commissioner, and is doing no work for us at Paris.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It seems to me a poor argument to say that we did so and so because we were asked to do it. If the conditions were not satisfactory, there was no obligations upon the government to pay \$125,000 for space in the Paris exposition. But the point I really wish to discuss was about this building. I have not had an opportunity to visit the exposition, but I have seen quite a number of people who have been there, and they all agree that the Canadian building is no credit to Canada.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, they do not all agree.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have not met one who has been over there who said that the building was at all equal to the buildings of other nations. The Minister of Agriculture did not deny that the building is no credit to Canada. It would have been better for us to pay more for a good building than to put our exhibits into a building which is a discredit to Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend says that everybody who went there has said the same thing. I think he is exaggerating a little. I am willing to admit that the consensus of opinion is that the building is not what it should be for the price we paid, and that a better building ought to have been prepared for the colonial exhibits. I have here a published interview with Mr. Hosmer, a gentleman of Montreal, whom the hon. gentleman knows very well. He is a good judge of such things, and after saying something about the general effect of the exhibition, he is thus reported:

He was aware that the Americans criticized their department, but he was very favourably impressed with Canada's building. It was one of the first objects to catch his eye on entering

the grounds by one of the main entrances, and he thought that, on the whole, it was a good advertisement for the country.

I may say that the Hon. Mr. Tarte has written me over and over again condemning the building and condemning the arrangements made; and in consequence of its inferior character he was obliged to spend a considerable sum of money in decorating it and improving it, and I have no doubt that Mr. Hosmer saw it after Mr. Tarte had made the improvements.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is responsible for that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not quite sure. The colonial committee of the Imperial commission managed the building, and gave the contract, and we paid our proportion. Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania. I think, are represented in the building, and we all pay a certain proportion according to the floor space which each of us occupy.

Mr. BERGERON. I read somewhere that the whole building was supposed to cost \$85,000. Then that would be distributed amongst the different colonies?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Our share is \$85,000.

Mr. BERGERON. I have read several times that a building like that could be built for \$20,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. So far as I can make out from the letters that I have received, the building should have cost about \$70,000 or \$75,000, and I think it did cost a little over \$100,000, of which we pay four-fifths.

Mr. SPROULE. I have information that we had many more lines exhibited in Chicago than we have in Paris. Could the hon. gentleman give us any information in regard to the number of lines that are exhibited in Paris?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got a list of exhibits, of course, but practically every line produced in Canada is exhibited there. We have in the first place the government exhibits; we have the agricultural exhibit, the food produce exhibit, an exhibit including the cold storage arrangements, a forestry exhibit, a fish and game exhibit, a mineral and mining exhibit—all prepared by the officers of the government. We have then exhibits made by a large number of private individuals covering practically every line of the manufactures of Canada outside of those that I have indicated. Among them are exhibits of all kinds of textile fabrics, boots and shoes, leather work, harness and saddlery, and everything of that kind, agricultural implements on a very large scale, heating apparatus, furniture, canoes and boats, wagons and carriages of all kinds, furniture of all kinds, edge tools, metal work

Mr. FISHER.

of various kinds, carpenters' and joiners' work of all kinds—practically every manufacturing industry in Canada is represented. When the hon. gentleman says that in Chicago there was a greater variety exhibited, I think he is in error. There has never been a greater variety sent out of Canada than is found to-day in Paris. It is true, the space in Chicago was very large, consequently a greater number of exhibits could be shown. But we have carefully chosen the exhibits in this case, and induced exhibitors so to arrange their exhibits that specimens are shown of practically everything produced in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. My information is that there was much more variety in Chicago, that there were larger quantities of each line. In fact, the information given to me, is that there were hundreds of articles on exhibition at Chicago, that are not on exhibition at Paris at all.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is talking exaggeratedly, because there are not hundreds of lines at any exhibition. There are hundreds of individual exhibits, but there are not hundreds of lines.

Mr. SPROULE. That shows how little attention the hon. gentleman has given to the matter, because there are hundreds of lines.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Can the hon. gentleman mention them?

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose, if I took the time until ten or eleven o'clock to-night, I might mention the ones I know of, without touching the ones I do not know of. I got this information from a party who was at Chicago for a length of time, and who profess to be somewhat intelligently informed as to what is being done in Paris. While I cannot vouch for it, I think it is approximately correct. In regard to the employees over there, I presume that the hon. minister can give us some information as to what they will cost. While I suppose the hon. gentleman would be able to give us their salaries, he will not be able to know what their expenses will be, until the exhibition is over.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Those who have been sent there are on salary, and they have a certain living allowance per day, which was fixed before they went.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the number of days that they will be there, fixed?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Practically until the exhibition closes.

Mr. SPROULE. And they are engaged for the whole of that time?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not necessarily.

**Mr. SPROULE.** If not necessarily, they must be engaged for some time. I do not understand the object of the minister beating about the bush. He either knows or he does not know. If he does not know, he should not create the impression that they will not be there during the whole time.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** They are engaged for as long as their services were found necessary at the exhibition, or until its close, subject to being sent away whenever their services were no longer needed. Two of the gentlemen sent over have returned already. Mr. Hay, of the experimental farm, went over to put up the agricultural trophies and decorations, and he has returned. One of the men who went over with fruit is returning on August 1. Professor Robertson went over there, spent a week or so, and came back. One officer, I regret to say, was dismissed, on account of his conduct. I, therefore, cannot tell the hon. gentleman exactly how long these gentlemen will be there. They will, in no case, be kept there longer than the exhibition lasts.

**Mr. SPROULE.** That verifies what I say, that it is impossible to tell what the cost will be, unless you know the length of time each one will be there. But the hon. minister said no, because we know the length of time that the exhibition will last. Therefore, we cannot make a correct calculation as to what these officers will cost.

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I have taken a vote of \$285,000, which is all I ask for.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I am inclined to think that it will reach \$300,000. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he can give us any information as to when the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), is coming back?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I cannot say exactly as to when the hon. Minister of Public Works is coming back.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Does he consult with the government at all?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** Yes.

**Mr. BERGERON.** When will the exhibition be over?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** On November 1.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Is my hon. friend aware that the exhibition, as a matter of fact, is not yet prepared, and that it will not be a complete exhibition before September?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I am not prepared to say as to what other countries have done, but the Canadian exhibit has been completed and in efficient operation, and it has absolutely been completed for more than a month back, or about

a month now, with this exception that there are still some small exhibits yet to be sent. We propose to send fruit, for instance, as soon as the fruit gets ripe, and perhaps some grain of the crop of this year.

**Mr. BERGERON.** Can the hon. gentleman speak as to other countries?

**The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** As to other countries, I am not prepared to say. The Canadian exhibit was one of the first prepared for exhibition; in fact, we received many compliments from the press in Paris and elsewhere in regard to it. It will not be out of place for me to say that while we have not received the official declaration from the French authorities, our commissioners have been informed privately by the jury of awards, that Canada has been awarded the highest award in a large number of instances. This is the Grand Prize. I take it that that means the highest class of award. We have been informed privately that the highest award has been given to Canada for the forestry exhibit, the mineral exhibit, the exhibit of agricultural products, the leather exhibit, the furniture exhibit, and the heating apparatus exhibit, and our friends there say that the jury of awards, while not having finished their labours, have spoken most highly of our exhibit of canoes, butter—cheese had not been examined at the time this was written—and our higher educational exhibit. This spring we sent over an exhibit of apples of last season's crop which had been kept in cold storage all winter in Montreal. They were sent away from here on May 24, and they arrived in Paris in first-rate condition, notwithstanding the fact that they had to go from Liverpool to Paris, not in cold storage. They were kept in cold storage here, and sent across the Atlantic in cold storage, but notwithstanding the fact they were sent from Liverpool to Paris by express, they arrived there in good condition, and in time to take part in a competition for prizes. They were exhibited by provinces, and the provinces of Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia took first prizes. The Dominion beat everybody, including the Americans. The province of New Brunswick took second prize and the province of Prince Edward Island took third prize, showing that not only is our fruit of unexceptional quality, but that the arrangements for forwarding it, and our cold storage arrangements for keeping it, turned out to be excellent. I think this is most gratifying, and I hope that when we send forward fruit of this season's crop, the result will be equally satisfactory, as I have no doubt they will be.

**Mr. SPROULE.** I fully appreciate the great importance of sending fresh fruit as soon as it is available, because fruit loses in flavour by being kept. It is affected more in flavour than any other way.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Of course these were the very best keeping varieties.

Mr. **DAVIN**. The hon. gentleman said that there was a specific sum per day for all of the officers at the exhibition. Is the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) limited?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. No.

Mr. **SPROULE**. About the Minister of Public Works, I saw the statement made that he was coming home shortly, but that he was going back again. Does the hon. minister know if that is the case?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. I am not aware of it.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I suppose it would be out of place to ask the right hon. First Minister if the hon. Minister of Public Works is going back again?

The **PRIME MINISTER**. As soon as the hon. Minister of Public Works comes back, he will stay back.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Is the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Agriculture, when the House rises, to pay a visit to the exhibition in Paris?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. I have not made all my plans yet, but I am rather inclined to go, I confess.

Cattle quarantine—To pay North-west Mounted Police, services, &c. .... \$1,500

Mr. **DAVIN**. Have we at the present time a sufficient number of mounted police in the North-west to make the quarantine effective?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. We have not, and that is the reason why I have to ask for this vote. We used to do it by the veterinary surgeons, but in consequence of so many going away, I have been obliged to employ outside veterinary surgeons at higher prices.

Mr. **DAVIN**. But this is to pay the North-west Mounted Police?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Yes, because I asked the North-west Mounted Police to secure the veterinary surgeons, and they do it from outside the force.

Organized districts and public health vote. \$20,000

Mr. **SPROULE**. What is this vote for?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. In consequence of the outbreak of smallpox in the United States I have had to put a number of physicians along the frontier and I find I have to pay them very good prices. Besides, there is smallpox in the Yukon which I may have to attend to.

Mr. **BERGERON**. Is there not a steamer detained now at Gross Isle?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. A steamer arrived at Gross Isle some ten

Mr. **SPROULE**.

days ago with smallpox on board, and the passengers are detained there.

Mr. **SPROULE**. How are these physicians supposed to make their work effective?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. They watch the incoming trains and whenever a passenger comes from a district infected with smallpox, they require that passenger to be vaccinated if he has not been previously vaccinated, and they examine him to see if there is any signs of the disease.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Have you the authority to examine and detain passengers coming from the United States?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Yes, under our Quarantine Act.

Mr. **SPROULE**. That will be news to a good many passengers passing across the line. How many of these physicians have you and how do you pay them.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. There are twenty-two or twenty-three at different points along the frontier. They are selected from the medical men at these different points and as soon as the need for their services passes by we hope to be able to stop the work. They are paid \$100 a month. In 1885 similar work was done by the Dominion government.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I thought the provincial health officers attended to the work then. I think there was some friction between the provincial health officers and the Dominion government in respect to that, because I remember very well that I was consulted about it.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. Dr. Bryce, the chairman of the Ontario Health Board, demanded that I should do this, and the Attorney General of Prince Edward Island pointed out that it was my duty to do this work.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I agree that it is your duty to do it.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE**. The Minister of Justice advised me also that I was bound to do it. The province of British Columbia undertook the work first themselves, but I presume they heard we were doing it in the other provinces and we were obliged to take the work over there.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Under the British North America Act you were of course obliged to look after the quarantine. I would ask the hon. gentleman, for instance, what steps he is taking to prevent smallpox being carried by the Indians who are constantly travelling from the United States into Canada, in Manitoba and the North-west Territories? We know that smallpox is almost always amongst those Indians.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** It would, of course, be practically impossible to watch 3,000 miles of frontier, and what we are doing now is to specially watch the main channel of communication.

Mr. **SPROULE.** I take it that the \$100 covers everything.

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** Yes.

Mr. **SPROULE.** Do these officials give their full time?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** They are obliged to give all the time that is necessary and in some cases it practically takes up all their time and in other cases I presume it would not.

Mr. **SPROULE.** Take the case of Windsor and Detroit. We know that smallpox exists in Detroit and has already been brought into Windsor, and the ferries are constantly passing there every hour in the day. What do your medical men do at such a point as that?

The **MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.** I have left all the details to Dr. Montizambert, the director general of public health.

Mr. **SPROULE.** I am told there is practically no arrangement there and that you can go across the ferry any time without examination. Hundreds of workmen cross there every day, and I am told no precautions are taken to prevent the introduction of smallpox into Canada.

Mr. **CLARKE.** Before that item passes, I wish again to draw the attention of the government to a despatch which is reproduced in the *Edinburgh Scotsman* of Tuesday, July 3. It is a despatch which was sent to the *London Times* from Vienna on June 29. I brought the matter up on Saturday, when the Minister of the Interior was not in his place. It is headed: 'Exodus of Roumanian Jews,' and is as follows:

Vienna, June 29.—It appears that a considerable number of the increasing stream of these immigrants from Roumania, which has been passing through the Dual Monarchy for weeks past intend to settle in Canada as labourers.

I will not read the whole of it. After giving particulars of their condition, it says:

Their poverty is such that they are forced to camp in the open air, being unable to pay for the poorest lodgings.

I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior if settlers of this class are being encouraged to come to Canada by the agents appointed by the government who are touring Europe in the interests of immigration?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** No, the instructions to the agents are not to encourage people of that class. When I was in England the question of a movement of Jews was discussed between myself and Mr. Preston, and I specifically in-

structed him that no encouragement should be given to this particular movement.

Mr. **SPROULE.** I saw a statement in a paper lately that some arrangement was come to between Canada and the United States to enable immigrants to pass through Canada to the United States, and to allow such inspection of them as takes place at Castle Garden, so as to prevent undesirable immigrants reaching that country. Will the minister state what arrangement he has with the United States in this respect, and what will be done with undesirable immigrants after they come here—whether they will be deported, and if so, at whose expense.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** No change has been made in the arrangement that has existed for a considerable number of years before this government took office. Under that arrangement the United States government were allowed to have a commissioner at any landing point where steamships landed immigrants for the purpose of getting information which would enable them to deal with these people upon reaching their country. Up to the present time no proposition has been made for a change. I saw the item to which the hon. gentleman refers, but I have received no official information in regard to it.

Mr. **SPROULE.** Is it the intention to bring in Galicians and Doukhobors as usual and settle them in colonies?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I discussed that point at considerable length upon the general immigration vote, and I thought I made the position of the government on that point very clear. So far as Doukhobors are concerned, we cannot get any more of them, because there are no more. Those who came included all the people of that sect who settled in Russia, so far as I know. Therefore, the question of the Doukhobors need not trouble us in future. As to Galicians, the position I take is exactly what I have explained to the House a number of times. While we cannot offer any special encouragement to those people, we do not object to them coming.

Mr. **SPROULE.** Are you not paying a steamship subsidy for them?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** We pay the steamship companies a bonus for the Galicians just as we do for other persons from the continent of Europe, but we are not giving them any special encouragement as distinguished from other people, and we impose this special restriction upon them, that each head of a family is required to be possessed of a certain amount of money at the time he lands, so that there is no possibility of any of them being objects of charity.

Mr. **SPROULE.** What are you going to do with any that you find without money

after they land? Some of them were objects of charity last year. I notice, in fact, by the hon. gentleman's own report that certain philanthropic gentlemen came from the United States and relieved them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is a fact, and therefore, we require them to have a certain amount of money.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the department give the same encouragement to Galicians and to other people of the continent as is given immigrants from the British Islands?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The continental bonus is larger than the bonus given for immigrants from the British Islands. The reason of that is not to offer a greater inducement to the people from continental Europe, but simply to meet the bonus paid by other countries.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me. Is the same bonus given for the conveyance of continental immigrants as is given for the conveyance of immigrants in the British Islands?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is nothing given for the conveyance of immigrants. The only thing we do in the way of encouragement is to pay a bonus to the steamship agents.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the United States government pay a bonus to the steamship companies?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think the United States government pay any bonus at all, because they do not desire immigrants.

Mr. CLARKE. What other countries have we to compete with?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Queensland and nearly all the Australian colonies, Brazil, Argentina, and I think some others.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman tell us the difference between the continental bonus and that paid for immigrants from the British Islands?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I explained that to the House at least six or seven times. The bonus is the same in the case of English immigrants as it has been for a number of years, a \$1.75 for each adult, and half that amount for each person under twelve years, and therefore not reckoned as an adult. From the continent the bonus is the same, one pound for each adult. The tickets for two persons under twelve are reckoned the same as one adult.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it still the hon. gentleman's intention to settle these Galicians in colonies?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Our intentions respecting them must be re-

Mr. SPROULE.

gulated necessarily, to a considerable extent, by the desires of the people themselves. The idea that the government can send people just wherever they like is entirely a mistake. We have found that to be the case in a number of instances. Persons who came in during the last year from Galicia, came, almost without exception, on account of communications sent them by Galicians already here. They knew exactly where they were going and would not go anywhere else, and would not take advice from the department as to where they should go. They went out among their own people. During the past year we have had practically very little trouble with them because they very largely took care of themselves, owing to that fact. In the future, whatever people of that class come here will probably distribute themselves as they did last year, without much control on the part of the government. Our desire is to separate them and not have them altogether, but it is quite impossible to prevent them colonizing close together. My own impression is that in moderate sized colonies, they would do much better than if scattered around individually.

Mr. SPROULE. According to the hon. gentleman's estimate a Galician over twelve years of age cost us \$4 a head, whereas an Irishman and Englishman or a Scotchman costs \$1.75. I wonder how much the hon. gentleman would be prepared to give for Frenchmen a head?

Mr. DAVIN. Do I understand that none of those Galician Jews referred to in the *Times* despatch from Vienna will come or be encouraged to come here?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. None of them will be encouraged by the government directly or indirectly.

Mr. DAVIN. I may tell the hon. gentleman that while I have a good deal of sympathy for these people, we have to do the best we can for the country, and he is aware that a large number were at one time established along the Souris under the patronage of Baron Hirsch. I have travelled over the whole district set apart for these people, and that district is now desolate. They turned out to be quite unfit for farming, and it would be a perfect waste of money to induce others of that description to settle in the North-west.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice in connection with this immigration that the government had to notify and call in the assistance of American officers to prevent these people leaving this country. He had to invoke the assistance of the Alien Labour law officers of the United States to prevent their going to that country, or we might have had a repetition of the desolate waste along the Saskatchewan. The deputy minister informed us of this in the committee.

**Mr. LaRIVIERE.** I wish to ask my hon. friend if he intends to do something further with regard to the repatriation of French Canadians from the United States. His attention has been called to this on several occasions already. In fact a memorial was sent him last year by Father Morin, who submitted a scheme to that effect, and this year I understand that the congress just held in St. Boniface passed resolutions, and a memorial is to be sent to the hon. gentleman in connection with that movement. I hope that out of this large amount voted for immigration purposes, he will see his way to organize a better system of repatriation than the one followed in the past.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.** I quite appreciate the importance of the subject, and I can say that for the last three years the department has been doing every thing which seemed to be reasonable and likely to bring about the desired result in the direction of repatriating French Canadians. We have given special assistance to the repatriation society and to the late Lake St. John Railway Company which is specially engaged in that work and devote considerable portion of its time and money to it, and we have done in various ways everything possible to encourage that movement. I do not know what more we can do but am quite prepared to consider any suggestion which bears on its face the probability of success.

**Mr. LaRIVIERE.** I had reference particularly to the work that might be done in the eastern states. In the western states a good deal of work has been done, but the French Canadians there have been neglected. That work was done more especially on behalf of the English-speaking population in the United States, and good work has been performed, but I am sorry to say that the general impression of my countrymen is that our section has been neglected in that regard. The hon. minister need only consult the documents put before him on that question and other communications that may be submitted to him, and I have no doubt he will be in a position to do better than he has done in the past.

Militia and Defence—Income—Military properties ..... \$53,200

**Mr. HAGGART.** What is this to be expended for ?

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** Of this, \$30,500 is to be spent on rifle ranges, as follows: Montreal, \$4,500; Quebec, \$10,750; Bedford—that is near Halifax, and is the principal rifle range in Nova Scotia—\$14,750; Victoria, \$500. The putting in of a new wooden block floor in Quebec drill hall is estimated to cost \$7,500; making centre armoury in drill hall, Kentville, N.S., \$1,500. The balance is for heating apparatus in the following buildings: Stanley barracks, Toronto, \$2,200; Fredericton, \$6,700—

at present this building is heated with fire-places and stoves, and a new heating plant will be installed—hospital, St. Johns, Que., \$1,800; new lavatory and heating the same, Royal Military College, \$2,000. Considerable saving will be effected in the expenditure for fuel by these changes. It is estimated that the saving in Stanley barracks will be \$500; Fredericton, \$800; hospital and married quarters, barracks, St. Johns, Que., \$300 a year.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** I put a question on the paper, and I do not know whether it was answered to-day or not. But, I wish to ask the minister to whom he has given permission to erect buildings on the Barriefield common in Kingston? I notice that buildings have been erected there on government property.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** I referred that question to the officers of my department, and received an answer that no permission had been given to any one. Since the hon. gentleman has called attention to the matter—this is the first I have heard of it—I will make immediate inquiry, and if I can get information will let hon. gentlemen have it.

**Mr. TAYLOR.** I was there myself and saw the buildings. I presume that you, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Britton) are well aware of the fact that cottages had been erected on the common east of the hospital. I am satisfied that persons would not put up expensive cottages such as these without coming to some arrangement about the land. I am informed that they have leases for 99 years at a nominal sum. The item had better stand until we get the information.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** It has nothing to do with the subject brought up by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor).

**Mr. TAYLOR.** It has to do with military property, and I am speaking of the military property at Kingston. I had a question on the Order paper for several days and I want the information.

**The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE.** I believe there are properties there belonging to the Interior Department as well as to the Militia Department. I referred the hon. gentleman's question to the proper officers, and I have given the answer as I received it. Since he has made his statement, I will refer that statement at once to the officers of my department and ask for an explanation, and will give him the answer as soon as I get it.

**The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton).** Is the land in the city of Kingston?

**Mr. TAYLOR.** I presume it is within the city limits. I know the property as well as I know where I live myself. It belongs to

the Department of Militia and not to the Department of the Interior. We all know that the military property extends for a mile of two below Kingston, but the spot I speak of is close to the city, just east of the hospital.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). I presume that the Minister of Militia is aware that Lunenburg Rifle Association have abandoned their old range in consequence of the danger caused by rifle firing there, and have selected a new one. The selection was made since I left home, but I can approve of it in every way as free from danger. The association have met and are making a request by letter, which I will send to the minister, for aid for the improvement of the range. I believe they are well entitled to it. We have some excellent shots, and we want to encourage them in every possible way. I would also ask the hon. minister if we can manage to get the new rifle for use in target practice? I think he will have no hesitation in acceding to that request.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think the new rifle has been given out, in limited numbers at any rate, to meet the requirements of the battalions. As soon as the central armoury is established, the hon. gentleman knows, the commanding officer will have charge of the rifles. In the meantime, it is necessary for the care and preservation of the rifles to take them back in store, except a certain number left with each battalion. I will look up the rifle range to which he refers. There is a general vote for rifle ranges, out of which sums can be taken for such purposes as those to which he refers. I will have the matter looked into.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior if he has given any authority to build on the property in Kingston, controlled by his department. I rather thought, from what he said, that he might have given this authority, imagining that the property was under his control?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My only recollection of dealing with any land in Kingston is, that we gave authority to either the city of Kingston or the school board to fence a piece of ordnance land for the purpose of protecting it from trespasses and improving its appearance. We were informed that it would likely become an eyesore if this was not done, and that it would be fenced and used as a park. They were allowed to do this, but they have the property as tenants at will. I would not give that as an official answer, because before that is done the records ought to be searched. When the question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) was put on the paper. I called the attention of the head clerk of the Ordnance branch of it, and he informed me that it must be under the Militia Department. It may be that a more care-

Mr. TAYLOR.

ful search would disclose the fact that he was mistaken, but that can be verified in the morning. I am satisfied, however, that it belongs to the Militia Department.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would call the attention of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), to what the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), has said. It would be well if the whole of that property around Barriefield common were fenced and improved. The river is encroaching on the land, simply for lack of some slight improvements to the property. My hon. friend from Kingston knows just as well as I do that by going out of the city on the steamer, you can glance at the fortifications, and see that they are melting down for want of some little repairs. The frost has got in behind the wall and hove it out. It certainly should have had some repairs within the last two or three years. It is in a very dilapidated state, and a disgrace to the Militia Department of this country.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will look into that.

The PRIME MINISTER. The subject the hon. gentleman has brought up has no connection with the vote that is now before the committee. I understand the minister undertakes to search again and give his answer to-morrow morning.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is a vote for military property.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can say just now that no lease has been given for ninety-nine years, and in any of the leases given by the Militia Department, we specially provided that no building should be constructed, and if buildings have been constructed there on leased ground, the construction is contrary to the terms of the lease.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the hon. member for Kingston aware that buildings are being erected there?

Mr. BRITTON. Yes, I am. Leases have been granted on property below the old hospital property, which I should think any one who knows the property well, would say is an advantage rather than a disadvantage to the properties, both as to the caretaking and as to the appearance of the locality. I know also that persons who have leased, built these cottages at their own risk entirely. The government has a right to take back the property at any time on demand, and all the lessees know perfectly well that they are taking their own chances and building at their own risk. Before the recent leases were made at all, there was a person, whose name I have forgotten, who assigned his lease and it went into the possession of a man named Galloway. That is the first cottage, so far as I know, that was put up on

the ground below the hospital. But since then there have been leases made of pieces of land below that place and below the old hospital, and persons having these leases have taken the risk of putting up inexpensive cottages or buildings, which they occupy for a little while during the hot weather.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could give the information the minister is expected to give as to the leases and the terms?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will get the information tomorrow.

It being Six o'clock, the committee took recess.

### AFTER RECESS.

(The House resumed in committee.)

Gratuity to Mrs. T. J. Benbow, equivalent to two months' wages of her husband..	\$76 25
Gratuity to family of R. Roussell, Quebec, of two months' wages .....	62 00

Mr. BRITTON. In connection with this item I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia if there is any rule in regard to wages where a person dies in the service. Take the case of the engineer of the Royal Military College, who lately died, or any such case as that. Is the payment of his salary only to continue until the end of the month or is there any further pay granted?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Unless they are officials employed in the civil service we have no power except by a vote of parliament to give any gratuity. That is the reason why these amounts are put in here. One of these men was employed at the drill shed in Ottawa and he lost his life through the burning of a hotel in Montreal. The other was the caretaker of the cavalry barracks in Quebec. I do not think the rule would apply to the engineer of the Royal Military College.

Mr. BRITTON. Do I understand that the pay stops on the very day of death?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, at the end of the month.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the government not power to do this without a special vote?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not think so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Only in the case of those who are in the civil service.

Monuments for battlefields .....	\$3,000
----------------------------------	---------

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I move that the word 'revote' be inserted in the item.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HAGGART. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is for monuments at Stoney Creek. It was voted last year.

War in South Africa—Halifax provisional garrison .....	\$350,000
--	-----------

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have already had a vote in the supplementary estimates for last year, which was explained, similar to this, of \$150,000 for the four months to the 30th of June last. This is for the present year, and it is to provide for the maintenance of 1,000 men at Halifax.

Mr. HAGGART. What does it cost a year?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This will be the cost for the year, \$350,000. The cost per man, except for heating and clothing, simply for feeding the men, is 13 8-10 of a cent per day.

Mr. SPROULE. As I understand it, this is for garrisoning Halifax for the next year? Have we not always had to expend something for troops there?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, the hon. gentleman knows that we offered the Imperial authorities to relieve the infantry regiment they had there in order that it might go to South Africa. I do not know how long it will continue.

Bonus to be paid to the following officials on account of extra work in connection with South African contingents: B. Sulte, E. B. Holt, P. Weatherbe, G. Guy, P. Clarke, F. E. Knight, E. E. Lemieux, L. Foley, G. S. Maunsell, F. Beard, S. R. Tooley, \$100 each; F. X. Lambert, W. H. Aumond, T. C. Larose, F. E. P. Aldrich, W. J. Davidson, N. Casault, E. Verrault, J. Courtman, E. A. Waterson, \$50 each. These sums to be chargeable to the fund provided for expenses of troops serving in South Africa.

Mr. HENDERSON. I notice in connection with this vote that there are a number of items for extra services performed by certain officials.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is really not a vote. It is really asking authority to pay gratuities to certain members of the civil service in the Militia Department out of the vote of \$2,000,000. There is no amount carried out there. We were able to pay certain extra amounts to the outside service, but the Auditor General refused to pay any of those in the inside service without a special vote of parliament, so I have asked parliament to vote \$100 to each of a certain number of clerks, and \$50 to certain others on account of extra work which they did, working day and night on holidays and Sundays, in some cases during the time that we were despatching the contingents to South Africa.

Mr. HENDERSON. A question of extra pay came up this morning in regard to certain other officials and I do not see the justice of paying one set of men for extra services

and refusing it to another. I think these men are sufficiently well paid, and if they had a little more work to do in connection with the service they are very well paid without calling on parliament to give them an extra \$50 or \$100 especially when the government are so much opposed to the payment of other men who are serving the country, and who are performing extra services. Either we must have no extras at all, or all cases must be put upon the same basis. I think we had better leave this item over until we learn what the government are going to do in reference to the case we had before us this morning.

Mr. SPROULE. It occurs to me that you should have the words 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act' in this item.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I beg to move that these words be inserted in this item.

Amendment agreed to.

Intercolonial Railway—To increase facilities along the line ..... \$112,800

Mr. SPROULE. I see there are a number of items here. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee long, but I would like to say something on these before they pass. I have watched with a good deal of interest the proposals that have been made from time to time, particularly last year, to expend money upon capital account in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, and it seems to me that they are more than liberal—I was almost going to say that they were extravagant. I find that we voted last year, \$4,421,303 to be spent on capital account in addition to what is spent on revenue account. This year it is proposed to expend \$2,974,249, provided we vote what is proposed here in the estimates, making for the two years \$7,195,552. I would like the people of Ontario especially to take note of this because I am of opinion that they will not endorse it. I think it is a great injustice to them, that in addition to the fair and equitable distribution of any money that is voted for railway subsidies, and we had a pretty large vote last year and a fairly large one this year, amounting to \$3,600,000, which is usually distributed in some kind of ratio between the different provinces, the maritime provinces and the province of Quebec get their share of that vote, but in addition to that we are spending and we spent last year \$7,195,000 in Quebec and the maritime provinces, principally in the maritime provinces. To my mind, this is a distinct injustice to Ontario and the western country where there will not be a dollar of this money spent. It has been said that these are very expensive operations that are being carried on down there. They seem to me to be unusually expensive, because the figures given in regard to the prices of property purchased or

Mr. HENDERSON.

the cost of putting up a building, when we compare them with the cost of property, or of building in our country, or with the same kind of work, they seem to be extravagant. I do not think the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals can go into the province of Ontario and justify it, and I know the people of Ontario will be anything but satisfied when they notice from year to year the very large expenditures that are taking place on the Intercolonial Railway on capital account. This is one of the public works of Canada that is not paying any too well, but notwithstanding that we are putting money into it in large quantities every year. It may be that the hon. minister has been starving it for two or three years and that he has been spending a little extra money this and last year to make up for it and that this is the reason why we have been called upon to provide this very large sum. In my judgment it is an infeasible sum, and I want the people of Ontario, who pay the large share of this money, to understand that this heavy expenditure is going on, that it is out of all proportion to anything that has taken place in their own province, and that notwithstanding this heavy expenditure, the maritime provinces get their proportion as much of any expenditure that is made by the country by way of railway subsidies or public works as any other province gets. This is a special expenditure which takes place in the maritime provinces. The government have been lavish in their expenditures in various lines. The government have been spending money on wharfs by the dozen, and they have commenced public works, that, before they are completed, will mean an expenditure of very many millions of dollars in Canada if they are ever completed. As to the wisdom or unwisdom of commencing these works I am not going to say at the present time. So far as we know many of these public works will be practically money thrown away, and there will be no adequate return to the people for the outlay. But, you are, in addition to that, proposing this very large expenditure which, taking this year and last year together, makes \$7,195,552 to be spent in Quebec and the maritime provinces, the maritime provinces principally, and which is going into capital account on the Intercolonial Railway. I do not think it is justifiable, and I want the people of Canada to know it and to take note of it, so that when the time comes that they may express their opinions, that they may do so in regard to extravagances of this kind, as I think they will do in regard to the extravagances of the government in many other lines.

Mr. McALISTER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) in regard to the expenditures made on the Intercolonial Railway. True, there are very large expenditures made from time to time, but, expenditures judicially made on the

Intercolonial Railway are, perhaps, the best expenditure that can be made by the Dominion of Canada with a view of the development of the whole country. I have heard it stated here that the Intercolonial Railway is managed in the interests of the maritime provinces. I deny that. The Intercolonial Railway is a national highway, managed and operated for the whole people of the Dominion; for the people of the west as well as for the people of the east. No doubt large expenditures are made on the Intercolonial Railway from year to year, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) seems to forget the fact that large expenditures are made on the canals from year to year, and the maritime province members never complain.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not the same thing at all.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no comparison.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is identically the same thing.

Mr. McALISTER. It is exactly on a par, and it is time we should hear the last in this House of such sectional discussions as we sometimes do hear. It does not make any difference whether the money is spent on the Intercolonial Railway or on our canal system, or, whether it is spent in the maritime provinces or in Ontario, so long as it is economically spent, and so long as it is going to be beneficial to the Dominion at large. I would point out to hon. gentlemen that the sooner we stop criticising expenditures that are made in one province, simply because they are made in that province, the better it will be for the interests of the whole Dominion. If you take the *Hansard* and examine it from year to year, you will find that there is scarcely any criticism made by any member from the maritime provinces with regard to the expenditures made on our canals, or in the province of Ontario.

I wish now to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to the present running arrangements on the Intercolonial Railway. When the Intercolonial Railway was extended to Montreal the train left that city in the evening about seven o'clock, and got to Halifax the next night. I never heard any objection to that time schedule, except perhaps it came from the city of Quebec. From the time the Drummond County road opened until last fall, the city of Quebec fought against that running arrangement, and they succeeded in bringing sufficient pressure to bear upon the government to change the time of the trains, and with the result that the present arrangement is about the most unsatisfactory to the Intercolonial Railway at large that could possibly be made. The maritime express now leaves Montreal about twelve o'clock mid-day and gets to Campbellton at 3.20 in the

morning, a most unsatisfactory and inconvenient hour, and arrives at Moncton between eight and nine o'clock. The result is that the very finest scenery along the road cannot be viewed by the tourists. But this is not the only objection. Passengers arriving from the west at Montreal in the evening, rather than wait until twelve o'clock the next day, take the Canadian Pacific Railway short line, and get to Moncton some fourteen or sixteen hours earlier than if they went by the Intercolonial Railway. If you keep your present time table in force, passengers will therefore, not patronize the Intercolonial Railway. From every point of view the old time arrangement was much more beneficial to the road than the present one. There is another objection. A great many of the Toronto papers are taken in the maritime provinces, and under the old arrangement they would arrive there the morning after publication, but under the present arrangement they are a day later, and are practically valueless to the people because daily papers forty eight hours old are seldom read. The evening papers published in Montreal—the *Star*, *Witness* and *Herald*, used under the old arrangement to arrive at their destination the next day after publication, but now they are not distributed in the maritime provinces until twenty-four hours later. From a business point of view, as well as from the point of view of convenience of passengers, the present running time is against the interests of the Intercolonial Railway. Nearly every one now takes a daily paper, merchants, farmers and artisans, and under the present arrangement the papers coming from the west are too old to be of any use to them. I submit that the city of Quebec should not control the running of the Intercolonial Railway. It is a recognized principle that the lesser interest should give way to the greater, but in this case the reverse is the rule. The city of Quebec seems to have brought sufficient pressure to bear upon the government to induce them to change the Intercolonial Railway time against the interests of the whole of the maritime provinces. When this change of train time was made, the town council of the town of Campbellton, passed a resolution protesting against the change, and which was sent to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) on the 14th or 15th of February. He wrote to Mr. Verge, town clerk of the town of Campbellton in answer, as follows:

Dear Mr. Verge,—I have before me your communication of the 13th inst., inclosing a resolution passed at a recent meeting of the town council of Campbellton respecting the change of time for the through express from Montreal. It is always a matter of much difficulty to so arrange a through express as to accommodate all points along the line, and I am well aware that any change is attended with some discouraging consequences; but the present arrangement

is only going to be temporary, and was necessitated by the impossibility to make satisfactory arrangements across the river between Lévis and Quebec. We have quite a considerable business with the city of Quebec, and during part of the winter, especially during January, February and March, the ferries decline to cross after six o'clock, which makes it necessary that all our passengers should leave the city of Quebec before that hour; and remain at Lévis for five or six hours to connect with our eastbound train, while persons who arrived by our westbound train have to remain all night at Lévis before they can make their crossing.

That is inadvertently an error, because the passengers arriving by the westbound train under the old arrangement got to Lévis about twelve o'clock noon, and from that letter it would appear that the city of Quebec was at a disadvantage to connect with trains up and down, whereas the westbound train always got in at the hour I have mentioned, and the passengers did not have to remain at Lévis.

I am afraid it will be impossible to return to the old time-table for a short period, and I would be glad if you would explain to the council the circumstances under which this temporary inconvenience to the citizens of Campbellton has occurred.

Yours faithfully,  
(Sgd.) ANDREW G. BLAIR.

From that it would appear that the present arrangement was only to be temporary, whereas under the new time table, which came into effect about June 23, or 25, the time has continued pretty much as it was before. In fact, it is worse, because under the former arrangement the train going east reached Campbellton at 2.4 a.m., whereas it now reaches it at 3.20, and the train coming up formerly arrived at 3.00, whereas it now arrives at 4.20—a most inconvenient hour. I find by the time table that the scenery from Montreal to Lévis and a short distance below is portrayed in glowing terms. I have nothing to say against that; the scenery is very fine; but nothing is said about the scenery from Bic down to the Lower Restigouche, which is certainly the finest and most picturesque on the Intercolonial Railway. There are many gentlemen here who have travelled over that line, and I think they will agree with me that the finest scenery on the whole Intercolonial Railway is that down through the Metapedia Valley along the Restigouche River and skirting the Bay of Chaleurs until you reach the lower end of the county of Restigouche. That is not all. The county of Restigouche, which I have the honour to represent, is served, so far as train arrangements are concerned, in the very worst possible way. I have referred to the through express going east at 3.20 and coming west at 4.20; but there is a local mixed accommodation train running from Campbellton to Moncton, and from Moncton to Campbellton, that from Campbellton South leaves Campbellton at five o'clock in the morning, a very inconvenient hour. So far as the whole county of Restigouche is con-

Mr. McALISTER.

cerned, this train is of very little service, because it reaches the lower end of the county at too early an hour. Returning from Moncton it reaches Campbellton at 8.20 in the evening and the town of Dalhousie a few minutes earlier. The St. John and Moncton papers all come by that train, and as it arrives after the business places are closed, the postmaster, who has no assistant, has to keep the post office open for the convenience of the people an hour or so after the time for closing. The mails are carried from the station to the post office, a distance of about half a mile, and by the time they reach the office and are sorted it is nine o'clock, if the train is on time. If the train is behind time, as is often the case in winter, there are no mails delivered that night. I am told that the time between Moncton and Campbellton could be made two hours less. The distance is 185 miles, and the time taken by the westbound train is 9 hours and 40 minutes and by the eastbound train 8 hours and 50 minutes, nearly one hour's difference. As that portion of the road is level, I do not know why it should take nearly an hour longer to come up than to go down. If the time is shortened two hours, and I am credibly informed that this could be done, and the train left Campbellton at seven o'clock instead of five o'clock, and arrived on its westward trip at seven o'clock instead of at 8.20, there would be very little complaint. As I said before, it is very unfair to the other sections of the Intercolonial Railway that they should be overlooked for the purpose of accommodating the city of Quebec. If we look at the revenue derived from these different places on the Intercolonial Railway from 1897 to 1899, we find that the trade of the city of Quebec is comparatively small compared with that of other places which I shall mention. I will take first Rimouski South, because it is the first place that is seriously affected by the present arrangement. The revenue derived from these different places in 1897 and 1899 respectively has been as follows:

	1897.	1899.	Increase.
Rimouski.. .. .	\$14,000	\$16,000	\$ 2,000
St. Flavie .. . . .	9,000	13,000	4,000
Little Metis .. . . .	8,100	14,700	3,600
Metapedia .. . . .	9,000	23,350	14,350
Campbellton .. . . .	50,000	57,000	7,000
Newcastle .. . . .	41,000	45,000	4,000
Chatham Junction .. . . .	77,000	96,000	19,000
Kent Junction .. . . .	12,000	18,000	6,000
Quebec .. . . .	22,286	23,123	837

These figures show that the city of Quebec is the last place along the Intercolonial Railway that should find fault or endeavour to get the time changed to suit its convenience. The revenue from the town of Campbellton is more than double what it is from the city of Quebec, and instead of increasing \$837 from 1897 to 1899 it has increased \$7,000. We know very well, as the hon. minister says in his letter, that the Intercolonial Railway

cannot be run so as to suit all localities. Some will be inconvenienced by any arrangement that is made; but the great object should be to so manage the Intercolonial Railway as to accommodate the greatest numbers and the greatest interests involved; and I take it that from a traffic point of view the present arrangement is the most detrimental to the Intercolonial Railway that could possibly be adopted, apart from inconveniencing the larger section of the road. If reports be true the Minister of Railways should take some particular interests in the county of Restigouche and endeavour to accommodate it in some way.

I do not say that the Minister of Railways himself is altogether to blame, but the government has adopted the very worst running time possible for the county of Restigouche. I hope that the hon. gentleman will take this matter into his favourable consideration, and see that some slight change is made by which these complaints may be removed. There is certainly every reason for complaint on the part of the people in this section of the country. I do not bring up this matter at all for the purpose of fault-finding, but because I feel very keenly the injustice done that county which I have the honour to represent, and not only that county but all that section of country, and in addition the whole of the Intercolonial Railway. I hope the hon. minister will take this matter into consideration and have some change made, by which the county of Restigouche will have fair accommodation.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.** I have no fault to find with either the manner or, in a general way, the matter of my hon. friend's criticism. But I can assure him that he is entirely in error in the views he has expressed, that the present time-table on the Intercolonial Railway is due to representations emanating from the city of Quebec. My hon. friend very properly referred to the letter I had written to the municipality of his city, in which I stated that the arrangements made last winter were due to the conditions which prevailed at Lévis in connection with the traffic across to Quebec, and at the same time said that the arrangement would be temporary. That was the view I entertained when that letter was written. It was not because the city or the people of Quebec had called upon us to make the arrangement we did, as to running time that we made that arrangement, but because we were compelled to give them connection, and we could not, except at a very enormous cost, avoid changing the hour of leaving Montreal, and there were considerations at the other end of the line which made it desirable that a change should take place. My hon. friend must not, therefore, infer that we were pressed by the city of Quebec, either to make this change, or to continue it when made. When the time came for considering the

running arrangements for the season opening this spring, the traffic officers of the Intercolonial Railway, one and all, from the general manager down, concurred in the opinion that it would be very much in the interests of the railway service that we should make our hour for leaving Montreal in the morning or before noon, and not revert to the old time table which had governed during the last season. Had we done the latter, one of the results that would have followed would have been this: We would have been compelled to keep the passengers, who in considerable numbers, are using the Intercolonial Railway to reach Cape Breton, at Sydney and North Sydney, at Truro for many hours, and they would have been thrown over so as not to arrive at Sydney and North Sydney to connect with the Newfoundland steamship line until the next day. It is impossible, as the hon. gentleman admits, to make your arrangements for a line of railway, such as the Intercolonial Railway, extending a large territory, when running through trains, so as to convenience intermediate points along the line. Your paramount consideration must be the through traffic, and the convenience of the people at intermediate points must be subordinated to what the traffic officers and general manager of the road conceive to be in its true interest, so far as regard the time of leaving and reaching the terminus of the system. There is no doubt at all in the mind of the officers of the road—those to whom I would have to look for advice—that the service has been very much more profitable, and the results more advantageous, under the present time-table, than they would be if we were to change it. I am told by the general manager, and the reports seem to indicate, that there is a very large amount of through traffic all the way from Montreal to Cape Breton, it cannot be expected that we should sacrifice that through traffic, and throw the system into disorder, for the purpose of having our express train pass local points at hours which would be entirely convenient for the people at those points. We do the best we can with the local service. That brings up the question of the local trade. I know that there is a good deal of complaint on the part of the people of the northern section of New Brunswick, not limited by any means to Campbellton, Restigouche or Dalhousie, but also from Bathurst and Newcastle, against the hours of leaving and arrival of our local trains. I myself have looked into the question with very great care to consider whether better time could not be made, but it has been found wholly impossible to cut short the hours between the terminal points on the local trains with any success. We have to-day to do a certain amount of shunting, to drop and receive a certain amount of light local traffic, freight as well as passengers, and we have to serve the interests of the public in that regard, all of which necessitates delay at these

points, and we cannot give these localities a local train service in any shorter time than we are giving now.

Mr. McALISTER. What is the reason of the fifty minutes difference in the running time coming up and going down?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have to climb one of the longest grades of the whole line, when coming up from Campbellton to St. John, which makes that difference in the time. My hon. friend, of course, naturally and properly looks at this question from the local standpoint, but if he could put himself into the position of viewing it as a whole, he would be overborne by the considerations which have overborne me, and he would find that it will be impossible to do better than we have done. As respects this local train, I have had our general superintendent and general manager and men of the district conferring together. I have talked with them myself and urged them to make that local train faster. But they have assured me and proven to me that it is impossible. The only alternative would be to run another express, and my hon. friend knows the passenger traffic would not justify that. He will find that day after day that train goes out with one or two passengers from Campbellton, drops them along the line, and picks up others and drops them also. That traffic must be carried on by a mixed train under the circumstances, and you cannot make the time on a mixed train that the hon. gentleman thinks should be made. There has been every anxiety to meet the wishes of those who have complained. There is no reason why we should not effect the desired change if it can be done; there is no interest that we would naturally be so glad to serve as that of the travelling public, if it can be done without too serious a burden on the public generally. Such considerations as those the hon. gentleman presents have not been lightly passed over, but every point has been carefully considered. I am sorry that I cannot hold out much prospect, if any—for my part I cannot see any—of improving the local train service in the way he suggests.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a word with regard to the Intercolonial Railway. This road has been a bone of contention ever since I came to parliament. Before the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie went out of power, he closed the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway, which, I think, was a proper thing to do. Unfortunately, hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, and they opened that capital account again, and commenced to charge up such items as snowsheds and that kind of thing. The result has been that we have been adding to this capital account year by year; until, I frankly confess, it is about time some change should be made. I agree with my hon.

Mr. BLAIR.

friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to some extent at least. The people of western Ontario have had to pay for all their accommodation, never receiving a dollar of Dominion money for that purpose in any form. But, in addition to paying for their own railway accommodation, they have to pay their share of the taxes for the construction and maintenance of the Intercolonial Railway, just the same as do those who live near enough to take advantage of the accommodation it affords. I pointed out this fact when I was on the other side of the House. The Minister of Railways says that the canals should be an offset to the Intercolonial Railway. But I do not see that. If the canals ran through the centre of Ontario and gave the same local accommodation to the people there that the Intercolonial Railway gives to the people of the maritime provinces, you might consider the expenditure on the canals an offset to that on the Intercolonial Railway. But the canals run around the border of Ontario, and more than that, they do not give the local accommodation to those who live along their banks that a railway does to the country it serves. The canals are a great transcontinental institution, and are of more advantage to the west and north-west than they are to Ontario. I do not say that the Intercolonial Railway is not, to some extent, an advantage to the western portion of this Dominion. It gives an outlet and convenient connection with the maritime provinces. But, as we have sunk such an enormous amount of money in the road, some steps should be taken to stop further expenditures on capital account. I supported the changes that have recently taken place in the Intercolonial Railway, in the hope that they might bring about a better condition of things in connection with the road than we have experienced in the past. Up to this time the country has lost eight and a half millions in working expenses over revenues and over and above the interest on the money that has been sunk in building the road. It may be said that there are no debentures on the road. That is true, but the country is in debt for the money spent in building the road. That has amounted to \$60,000,000, which, at 3 per cent, would represent nearly two millions of dollars a year, in addition to the running expenses. I do not doubt that the Minister of Railways is doing the best he can. I believe, however, that he is subject to and fettered by political influences. No doubt his experience is that of hon. gentlemen opposite when in power. When I sat on that side of the House, should there be a snowstorm along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of men would want to be sent out to shovel snow and earn a few days' pay. I know that one gentleman, when hon. gentlemen were in power, wanted drains dug along the Intercolonial Railway in order to give some men in his constituency something to do. I hope there

is a better day in store for the Intercolonial Railway. One of the best railroad men in Canada told me, five years ago, sitting in his private car, running between Toronto and Montreal, that Canada was sacrificing more than a million of dollars on the Intercolonial Railway simply because it was subject to political influences. I do not know whether it is the system of the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk to charge to capital such items as we charge to that account, but, if it is so, it only shows that we are doing on the Intercolonial Railway the same as is done on the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk. It makes very little difference, of course, whether sums are charged to capital account or working expenses—it all comes out of the same pocket. But, unfortunately, charging to capital account, we are heaping up an enormous capital in the road that you cannot say is in it. I am glad to know that the Intercolonial Railway is increasing in traffic to such an extent that more rolling stock is wanted. I do hope it has now got over the hill, and that the Intercolonial Railway will show better returns in the future. If it does not, and I am a member of this House, I will strongly urge that it be taken out of the hands of a political majority in parliament and put into the hands of a board who are completely removed from political influence, men in the position of judges or of the Auditor General, who will handle the road in the interest of the country and on business principles and take it from under men who are subject to political influence. We will have to do something with it if, in the near future, it does not show a better return than it has shown in the past. I merely rose to challenge the statement that the canals were a proper offset to the Intercolonial Railway. I contend they are not. I contend that the people of Ontario, for instance, where canals are built get nothing like the local conveniences that the people of the maritime provinces get from the Intercolonial Railway. The canals cost a lot of money. It is true, but they are transcontinental institutions and they do not give anything like the local advantages to the people along their banks that the Intercolonial Railway gives to the people in the lower provinces.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I scarcely believe, although we have just heard presented what has been described as the Ontario view, that there is prevailing in the province of Ontario any such opinion as has been expressed by my hon. friend with regard to the Intercolonial Railway system. I do not believe that any one who thoroughly understands the circumstances under which the Intercolonial Railway was built, and how it came to be a government railway, would for a moment urge that the government of this country ought not to do all that is necessary in order

to maintain that railway in a proper and efficient working condition. I believe that the people of Ontario are broad enough to realize that the Intercolonial Railway was the condition upon which the maritime provinces went into confederation with the older provinces, and rescued the latter from the impossible position in which they found themselves prior to confederation.

Mr. COCHRANE. Oh.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend may say oh. He ought to read the history of his own province, and he will find that there was a complete deadlock between Ontario and Quebec, and it was nothing but the accretion of the maritime provinces that enabled them to overcome the difficulty and launch out upon a career of great prosperity. Now, Sir, I take no pleasure in dwelling upon the sectional phases of the question, I do not think there is any occasion to do so. I believe our public men are broad enough to regard this question as too important to be limited by any narrow sectional views. The maritime provinces are entitled to the fulfilment of the bond that the Intercolonial Railway should be efficiently maintained; and the moment my hon. friend is able to convince the maritime provinces that the great Dominion of Canada cannot carry out its obligations, why, then we will yield, we will submit, we will say we are not going to ask this Dominion to make sacrifices that it cannot bear up under, and therefore, we are not going to insist that the Intercolonial Railway should be maintained as a railway ought to be maintained, and particularly one which belongs to the government of the country. Now, I say it is a reasonable and fair proposition to put the expenditures of construction and maintenance on the one side as compared with the expenditures upon the Intercolonial Railway and its operation upon the other. Even though it were not a part of the solemn engagement that was entered into between the provinces at the time of the union, that this government railway should be constructed and maintained, even outside of that, it is a fair proposition to put the expenditure both for construction and maintenance on the one hand, upon this portion of the country, and the Intercolonial Railway expenditure on the other. I say that in my opinion the province of Ontario gets the best of the bargain by all odds. The province of Ontario came down to the maritime provinces and captured our manufacturing industries, almost the whole of the wholesale import trade of those provinces, as soon as the Intercolonial Railway was in a shape to do the business. We thought we were something of a manufacturing people, but they closed up our manufactures, they took trade away from our wholesale merchants, they sent their runners down there and carried away our business, and the

Intercolonial Railway carried the traffic that they thus obtained. That is a fact, and everybody knows it. But, I am not complaining of that, that is one of the natural consequences of trade; but it is a complete answer to those who say that the Intercolonial Railway is wholly a maritime province institution, and that there are no substantial and important advantages which have been reaped by the upper provinces by reason of the construction of that line. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) laughs at it, but it is a fact all the same. You can appeal, if you like, to statistics, and they will bear out the statement that I make.

Now, I say that the propositions that have been made in the last few years with reference to expenditure upon the Intercolonial Railway have been as moderate and as reasonable as we could make them. We have had no desire to spend one dollar more than was necessary. But the government have been attacked by hon. gentlemen opposite because we had not understood the necessities that have arisen early enough to provide for them, and to provide the necessary improvements upon the line and the necessary increase of equipment. Do they attack us because there was no need of making these improvements upon the Intercolonial Railway? I do not think so; it is because they had a case; it is because there was reason in the ground they had taken that I could not answer them. It was true that we had traffic offering which we could not take, it was true that great industries were springing up which required to be well served by a railway, and we were not able to perform the service. It is because their complaints were well founded that I realized their gravity and was impressed by them, and I have not asked, nor has this government proposed to ask parliament for any larger expenditure than is imperatively necessary in order to put the railway upon a fair and efficient basis by which it will be able to take the business that is offering to it. The business is increasing wonderfully, and I think it will continue to increase, the output seems favourable. But, Sir, it would be a reproach to this country, and my hon. friend would be one of the first men to call attention to it, if, with great industries growing up, there should be no railway to accommodate that business, and if this government should say: We decline to undertake the necessary expenditure because there is a feeling in Ontario against making expenditures upon the Intercolonial Railway, there is a feeling in the country that the capital expenditure should be closed and that we should leave things as they are; you must stand there paralyzed because there is a feeling in one portion of Canada that there ought not to be further expenditure made to meet the demands of a great and prosperous section of the Dominion of Canada. What kind of an answer would

Mr. BLAIR.

that be? How much eclat would that government get by yielding to such a cry and putting it forward as an excuse for doing nothing, for standing by and refusing to move in the direction of developing one of the great properties of the country? Why, we would be held by every right thinking man to be utterly unworthy of the position which we occupy, we would be held to be too cowardly to be entrusted with the responsibilities of the government of this country. That is what would be said about us. Therefore, realizing the necessity of putting our road in the shape in which it can do business we have asked for these appropriations while I am happy to be able to say that I think we are approaching a period when we will not be called upon to ask parliament for any such grants hereafter, and while we have been able to meet what we felt were fair demands of an important section of this country, on the great government railway, we could not have got along with asking for any less sums than we have asked for in such appropriations.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is making an earnest effort to get his estimates through. Whenever there is the slightest criticism upon any particular part of them he gives us a speech. He has just made one of the most wonderful speeches that I have ever had the pleasure of listening to in this House. He actually claims that the maritime provinces have a right to these expenditures in some way or other to counterbalance the deprivation of manufacturing industries which they suffered on account of confederation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) think that is a fair statement?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman gave as one of the reasons why we should not complain of the expenditure down there, that the effect of confederation was that the manufacturing industries were shut out of the maritime provinces and conveyed to Ontario. He speaks as if we were obliged to counterbalance the expenditures for the canals by the expenditures upon the Intercolonial Railway when there is no necessity to counterbalance them at all. The hon. gentleman should justify his expenditures by the needs of the Intercolonial Railway. He has asked this parliament for expenditures on capital account, amounting to \$7,100,000, added to which is the \$1,400,000 that he paid for the Drummond County Railway, making \$8,500,000 charged to capital account in two years. Just fancy any railway on the continent of America which has the amount of traffic that is done on this road with such a capital expenditure as that. The total receipts on the Canadian Pacific Railway are \$30,000,000, while the receipts on the Intercolonial Railway are \$3,500,000. I believe the hon. gentleman says that they will be

increased this year to \$4,000,000 or \$4,500,000. What would the directors or stockholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway think if they were required to expend in two years on that road, for rolling stock and increased accommodation, stations and everything of that kind, an amount equal to \$64,000,000? The thing is perfectly absurd, and I wonder that the hon. gentleman's colleagues in the government have consented to an enormous expenditure of this kind. The people of Canada, by the terms of confederation, agreed to build the Intercolonial Railway. We are not bound by the terms of confederation to agree to the enormous expenditures above the necessities of the road which are being made from year to year. We are willing that there should be no profit to the people of Canada out of the road. It is easy to make \$1,000,000 a year, and to balance receipts and expenditures, but what we object to is that over and above the balance of receipts and expenditures there should be an expenditure out of the principal contributing province of the Dominion of \$4,000,000 a year. There is no justification for it. There is no necessity on the Intercolonial Railway for any such expenditure as that. The rolling stock, and the road-bed on the Intercolonial Railway were of the best possible. They had a lavish amount of locomotives on the Intercolonial Railway, but the hon. minister, when he gets into power, must have a superior kind. The ordinary locomotive is not good enough for the hon. gentleman, but he must have locomotives of the largest size, and he must increase the expenditure for the purpose of building bridges to carry them and to increase the size of tunnels and everything else. The expenditure is entirely unjustifiable, and is out of all proportion to the requirements of the road. There are no people in Canada who begrudge the Intercolonial Railway to the people of the maritime provinces. We do not expect any return from it. We look upon it as a gift to the people of the maritime provinces, but we do not want, besides the gift we have given them, to be mulcted to the extent of \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000 a year for the purpose—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A gift to the people?

Mr. HAGGART. The Intercolonial Railway is a gift by the people of Canada. This expenditure of \$3,500,000 a year is almost useless, and there is no need on the road for it. What the people require from the management of the Intercolonial Railway is that you should put an end to the capital expenditure and see that both ends meet. If there is a small deficit of \$250,000 or \$500,000 a year, adding in capital account, the people of Canada will not begrudge it, but they do begrudge these enormous expenditures which are taking place at present on the road. I wish the

hon. gentleman, upon this item for increased facilities, to give us the particulars. I see by the papers that there is a difficulty in regard to the arrangement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway. I believe that the hon. minister has put the papers on the Table in reference to putting an end to the agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway. I saw it stated from St. John—I do not know as to the truth of it—that the gentleman who is managing the road, or the parties under him, refused to the Canadian Pacific Railway the right of getting freight at the different stations between St. John and the terminus of the road, that the Intercolonial insists that all freight should be booked at its stations along the line of travel which would bring the most return for it. I understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway are likely to put an end to any agreement, and that they are not intending to take any traffic other than local traffic to St. John in future as they have been debarred from the return traffic. I am aware that the traffic they have been taking to St. John is of a kind which did not pay them very well, and that it would have paid them as well to have transferred it to the Grand Trunk Railway and sent it to Portland or to Boston, but the policy of this country was, just as much as possible, to keep the trade of our country for our own ports of St. John, Halifax or Quebec. I believe it is the wish of the people of Canada that the trade should be, if possible, forced to the old country, through our own ports, and it has been the policy of the country to grant favours to the railways which communicate with these ports, and to do everything that we possibly could for the purpose of having the traffic of the country taken from our own ports to the European ports. I would like to know what the arrangement is at present between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, whether the agreement which was in existence in my time has been put an end to, and what are the prospects of a new agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not for a moment challenge the statement that a part of confederation was that the Intercolonial Railway should be built, but it never was part of the confederation that all the branches that have been built should be built. Hon. gentlemen opposite were responsible for all these branches.

Mr. HAGGART. I know it was not, but we have changed since then. We built the Pictou branch, the Oxford and New Glasgow branch, the St. Charles branch and the capital stock in that way was considerably increased. I admit that the extension of the road to the important city of Montreal, was a great advantage, and I congratulate

the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) on moving in the direction of abolishing this system of everlastingly adding to the capital account.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McAlister) told us that the maritime province members never objected to expenditures made in the other provinces. I have a distinct recollection, that when the Canadian Pacific Railway was being built, a very pronounced kick came from the maritime provinces and from Quebec, and that they demanded a quid pro quo for the expenditure on that railway. As a result we gave Quebec a sum equal to \$8,000,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. How?

Mr. SPROULE. We guaranteed the bonds on the North Shore road, and made other expenditures.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. You are altogether wrong.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What did New Brunswick get?

Mr. SPROULE. There was a consideration given to New Brunswick.

Mr. McALISTER. Turn up the *Hansard*, and tell us what member from New Brunswick opposed the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McAlister) was not here at the time.

Mr. McALISTER. But I could read at the time, and I know as much about it as you do.

Mr. SPROULE. I am right in saying there was a vigorous kick from the maritime provinces and from Quebec, and every one of them got compensation. If my memory is right—

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman's memory serve him as respects New Brunswick?

Mr. SPROULE. It does.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What was the consideration there?

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot give it off-hand, but I can very easily turn it up and show the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then your memory is not serving you.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McAlister), says that the canals ought to be taken as an off-set against the Intercolonial Railway. The canals are an international scheme, intended to draw trade from the west, and they do not, to any great extent, benefit the people of Ontario.

Mr. McALISTER. What is the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. SPROULE. The Intercolonial Railway is in every sense of the word a colonization road.

Mr. McALISTER. Not at all.

Mr. SPROULE. It runs through the centre of your country, and your country is not very thickly settled yet. When Sir Leonard Tilley was here, I compared the freight rates on other roads with the freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway, and the Intercolonial rates were such that it was easy to understand why it did not pay. I do not doubt that if the Intercolonial Railway were in the hands of an independent and private company, it might be made self-sustaining. But I regret to say that, in my opinion, it is made a donkey-engine for every party in power in the maritime provinces for the time being. The hon. member (Mr. McAlister) said the Intercolonial Railway was one of the conditions of confederation, but as I understand it, the condition was that the road should be built, and afterwards it was to pay its way out of its earnings, and not be a drain on the country to the tune of \$4,000,000 a year on capital account. I protest in the strongest language on behalf of the people of my province that this large expenditure should be carried on for the benefit of the province of Quebec and the maritime provinces; in addition to the large expenditures they get for harbours and rivers generally. The day must come when we will have to stop this expenditure on capital account. I am far from saying that the Intercolonial road is of no use to us, for I think it is of some little use. It was perhaps more use in the past than it will be in the future, but now we have two other railways to take our freight from the upper provinces to the seaboard. It is true the Intercolonial Railway is a competitor with them, but the Intercolonial Railway does not charge the people of Ontario any less rates than do the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you not think the Canadian Pacific Railway rates would be higher, if the Intercolonial Railway was not in competition with it?

Mr. SPROULE. That may possibly be, but I am not prepared to say.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, I am prepared to say.

Mr. SPROULE. I have not noticed that the freight rates have been changed very much.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What road does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. SPROULE. The Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows the Grand Trunk Railway does not go to the maritime provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. I know it reaches the sea at Portland, but it takes our products out of the country just the same. I believe that if you put the freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway on a paying basis, the road would be self-sustaining, but as the management is now, the Intercolonial Railway is a sink-hole into which we put millions and millions of dollars every year, and without any benefit to the people of the province of Ontario and of the west.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not often that I disagree with my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), but I have to on this occasion. It is too late in the day to discuss the relative position of Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces, in so far as confederation is concerned.

Mr. ELLIS. Hear, hear.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The fathers of confederation in their wisdom pledged themselves to build a railway that would bring the maritime provinces into intimate connection with the other portions of the Dominion, which have been considerably extended since. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) calls the Intercolonial Railway a colonization road, but every road that traverses a section of the country is a colonization road, in the sense that it tends to increase the population. Where does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) find his evidence for the statement, that Quebec got a compensation of \$8,000,000 for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Where does my hon. friend find in the statistical history of this country that Quebec got \$8,000,000 as compensation for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. SPROULE. I tell the hon. gentleman that the bonds of the North Shore Railway were selling at from 20 to 25 cents on the dollar and as soon as this government guaranteed them at 3 or 3½ per cent, they immediately jumped up to 50 cents and we are still paying the interest on these bonds.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I again ask the hon. gentleman to point out to this House when \$8,000,000 were contributed by the government of Canada to the province of Quebec as compensation for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The history of that period is well known to those who happened to be in the House at that time. In anticipation of the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway the provincial government of Quebec put their hands into their pockets and built the line of railway to join the Pacific Railway at Ottawa and when the Pacific Railway was built, the question arose whether the province of Quebec, having expended a large amount of

money in building that road, was going to be left without any compensation; and it was not \$8,000,000 that was paid, but \$4,500,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That was only a part of it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What does the hon. gentleman understand by a part? It is the amount of money Canada paid. The hon. gentleman says that the canal system going through Ontario is of no earthly use to Ontario. It is the great artery which takes the grain from the west to the seaboard.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman misrepresents me. I said that it was of no more use to Ontario than the other provinces.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am so comparatively unaccustomed to public speaking that my hon. friend's interruptions may interfere with my speech. If he will permit me, I state that the canal system of Canada is of great advantage to the whole of Canada, and I say moreover that the Intercolonial Railway is of enormous advantage to Canada. We talk of Imperialism, of uniting this country and making it strong and powerful. Does my hon. friend say for one moment that it would not be a disadvantage to us to have a road like the Intercolonial Railway that carries our goods in winter to Canadian ports instead of letting them go to Portland? My feelings and sympathy for the Grand Trunk Railway are well known. I look on that railway as being the pioneer road of this country, which did more at the time it was built to build up Canada than any other railroad; but I shall never admit that it is not an advantage to the whole of Canada to have a railway that takes our goods in winter to St. John or Halifax. How can the hon. gentleman deny that if it were not for the competition of the Intercolonial Railway, we would be at the mercy of any rates that the other railways might impose? And Sir, it is of no use disguising the fact: the building of the Intercolonial Railway was a part of the confederation; it was one of the conditions on which the maritime provinces came into the union. Of course, I am not discussing the management or the amount of money expended; but I am viewing the question from the historical side, and from the conditions which made the building of that road part and parcel of confederation.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting to the Intercolonial nor to its being part and parcel of confederation. One condition was that that road was to be built. Let it be built to a finality at some time, and then let it be self-sustaining. I object to the bad management which makes it a sink-hole for more money. I am not objecting

to the road nor saying that it is not valuable to the country; but I am objecting to constantly spending four or five hundred thousand dollars a year on capital account to keep up a road which the articles of confederation only bound us to complete once, after which it was to be maintained out of the earnings.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am very sorry this debate has taken the line it has, and I blame the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) for introducing provincial politics into a discussion like this. I can understand the hon. member for North Wellington, because, when he was on this side of the House, he was everlastingly pitching into that road and every other idea advanced by the Conservative party. He has hardly got out of that narrow gauge in which he has been running for a long time. I condemn the Minister of Railways as much as I do him for discussing provincial matters that existed at the time of confederation. He should be a bigger man than that. I represent an Ontario constituency, and I take the ground that as long as the money is properly expended, it is no matter to me where it is expended in this grand Dominion of ours. I am willing to sacrifice a little for the sake of building up a great nationality on this northern half of this continent. That is why I think we should not debate these questions from a provincial point of view. I was very much surprised to find a man who is Minister of Railways and Canals in a government of Canada narrowing his discussion down to ask what New Brunswick got out of this deal. I wonder if that is where the hon. gentleman stands when he is dealing with a large question like this affecting the whole Dominion of Canada. Why, he wants something for New Brunswick or Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was asking the question of the hon. gentleman who said my province had got something.

Mr. COCHRANE. You did get something. Anything that builds up the Dominion of Canada adds to all the provinces.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I agree with that. That is my theory.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then, you did not talk it. That is why I was finding fault with you.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not talk anything else.

Mr. COCHRANE. It appeared to me that you were wanting to make a little political capital in New Brunswick on this question. I can submit to that in the hon. member for North Wellington; but when the Minister of Railways deals with the question in that

spirit, I think it is beneath the dignity of the position he occupies. From my point of view, I do not condemn the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. I know something about the history of that road as well as the hon. gentleman, who told me I did not know what I was talking about; and I have read a little, although I have not dabbled in provincial politics as much as he has. I know something about the history of confederation, and I know that confederation was brought about for a grand purpose outside of anything pertaining to the old provinces of Canada. I believe that the Intercolonial Railway is for the benefit of the whole Dominion. But it is certainly run extravagantly. Had the government kept the rolling stock up as they should have done and charged the ordinary amount necessary to keep it up every year to running expenses, they would have been following a wise and business-like policy which any one could understand, but instead they allowed the rolling stock to run down, and then spent a large amount to renew it and have charged that amount to capital account. By this means they hope to hoodwink the people into believing that they are running the road at a profit. Not only have they bought more engines than are necessary for the proper equipment of the road, but they even went to the United States to get them, although engines better suited to the road could have been had in Canada. Why did they go to the States? There are circumstances in connection with all these things which cause the electorate to look on the course of the Minister of Railways with suspicion. There is only one reason for his going outside this country to buy engines, and that I am not going to repeat.

I am not a railroad man, and do not know as much about railway matters as the hon. minister has said, but I believe that I have brains enough to run the Intercolonial Railway without running it into debt as the hon. gentleman has done. If there is a deficit, the charging of it to capital account will not make it any the less, but of course, the object is to hoodwink the people into believing that there is not a deficit but a surplus. These hon. gentlemen, by charging a large proportion of the annual outlay to capital account instead of to running expenses, think they will get out of the hole they fell into when they took over the Drummond County road, and persuade the people that they have made a good bargain. But the people are not so easily deceived as these hon. gentlemen imagine.

I will never oppose an appropriation for that road when it is reasonable and necessary to keep it in a proper state of repair. As far as our canals are concerned and also the Intercolonial Railway, they are for the development of this great Dominion of ours, and I do not at all agree with those who would like to see our traffic diverted

Mr. SPROULE.

by the Grand Trunk Railway to Boston or any other United States port. On the contrary, I would be willing to sacrifice some thing to keep the trade of the country within our own channels. I do not view our canals in the same light as does the hon. Minister of Railways. The expenditure on these canals has not merely the effect of improving our waterways, but it has also the effect of regulating railway traffic. Were it not for the canals, our railway rates would be a great deal higher, but none the less do I believe that the railways are going to carry the bulk of the grain of this country to the sea. I want our canal system to be kept in proper repair if only for the sake of the effect they have on a railway route. Local politics should not influence a discussion of these large matters affecting the whole Dominion, but they should be viewed from a broad standpoint, and from that standpoint I am prepared to support every legitimate expenditure to keep our railways and canals in proper condition, while at the same time I shall oppose any extravagant outlay, and certainly I shall make every attempt to oppose this means of endeavouring to deceive the people by charging to capital account what should properly go against running expense.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). My hon. friend who has just spoken has very properly said that we should view this question from a Canadian standpoint, but it seems to me he has approached it altogether from the standpoint of a party critic who is bent on fault-finding with the administration. When I heard him speak disparagingly of the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, and express so confidently and with so much modesty his ability to produce better results if he had the management, it seemed to me that he lost sight of the object for which this road was built. As a matter of fact, the circumstances are such that you cannot run that road upon a business basis, because it was not built on business principles. No private corporation would have located that road as it has been. It was built, not as a business project, but as a great national highway, and to-day has realized that project, because it has become an imperial highway, being the only railway we have for the transportation of troops to the west. It was not built as a commercial enterprise to be run on business principles, but was constructed as part and parcel of the great project of confederation. The hon. the Minister of Railways has increased the expenditure in some lines, and I wish to express my approval of the course he has adopted with reference to one class of expenditure. He has increased the wages of a large number of employees, men of different lines of work, such as telegraphers and station agents. He has also increased the wages of the trackmen, and it is with reference

to this particular class that I wish to address the House for a few moments. The trackmen on the Intercolonial Railway were paid from 1880 to 1895 at the rate of \$1.10 per day, and in 1895 their wages were raised to \$1.15. Up to 1895, the foremen trackmen were paid \$1.50, and after that date \$1.60. The increase in the wages of the trackmen in those years was, therefore, equal to  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, and that of the track foremen to  $6\frac{2}{3}$  per cent. But within the past year the hon. minister has increased the wages of the trackmen 5 cents a day, or as large an increase as was made to them in the whole eighteen years during which the Conservatives were in power.

Mr. TAYLOR. Coming on the elections.

Mr. LOGAN. No, the increase was made last year before there were any signs of elections. What I desire to impress on the hon. minister is the desirability of still further increasing the wages of the trackmen.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. LOGAN. I am glad to have the approval of my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. Mullen). Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is a private and soulless corporation, pays its trackmen a minimum wage of \$1.25 per day in the country districts, and in the cities it pays them wages according to the higher cost of living. Whereas on the Intercolonial Railway the minimum wage of the trackmen is \$1.20, and they are paid the same wages whether they live in country districts or in the cities and towns.

Mr. HAGGART. What are the wages paid to trackmen on the St. John division of the Canadian Pacific Railway between St. John and Montreal.

Mr. LOGAN. \$1.25 per day.

Mr. HAGGART. I thought that we were paying as much, if not more.

Mr. LOGAN. No. I find that the Maine Central Railway, which is very near the Intercolonial Railway and which runs through a country where living expenses are about the same, have increased their trackmen's wages, foremen from \$1.50 to \$1.70 a day, and men from \$1.20 to \$1.30 per day.

An hon. MEMBER. How many men to a mile on the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. LOGAN. There are four men to the section—as on all railways, as I understand, in the eastern provinces at any rate. Up to a few years ago the trackmen on the Intercolonial Railway had certain privileges. They could take the hay that grew on the respective sections, but that now goes to the farmers on adjoining land. They were allowed to use the old ties for firewood, but the order now is very strict that these are not to be burned. They were formerly

allowed a day's pay for walking the track on Sunday—

Mr. McALISTER. Are they not allowed something now ?

Mr. LOGAN. They were formerly allowed \$1.10 for walking the track on Sundays. But they get now only 57½ cents, and, as two men generally walk the track, one covering half and the other covering half, that means that these men walk twelve miles on the Sabbath for 57½ cents.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Each man is allowed the amount you name and they only walk six miles each.

Mr. LOGAN. For the twelve miles of walking, only 57½ cents is allowed—this is what I understand from the statement made by the Trackmen's Association, which I have before me. They now get 57½ cents for work for which they were formerly paid \$1.10. The track foremen on the eastern division of the Canadian Pacific Railway are paid \$1.75 per day, whereas our men, as I am instructed, are only paid \$1.60. From 1880 to 1895, track carpenters were paid, foremen, \$2.50, which was cut down to \$2, a decrease of 20 per cent ; and carpenters \$1.60, which was cut down to \$1.20, or a decrease of 25 per cent. The present Minister of Railways, as I say, has given an increase all round. What the trackmen contend is that all permanent employees under a trackmaster shall be granted a raise of 20 per cent on the wages paid when the present minister came into office, that they shall receive a full day's pay for walking the track on Sunday, and that permanent employees should be promoted according to seniority, where merit and other qualifications are equal. That would put the trackmen on the same footing with other permanent employees, which seems to be only fair. At this stage of the session, no one desires long speeches ; but I would like to impress upon the minister that this is a matter of supreme importance. These men are among the hardest-working men in Canada. The hotter the sun, the greater the snowstorm, the more attention must these men devote to the railway. Any man who goes over the Intercolonial Railway and who knows anything about a road-bed is bound to say, as I heard Mr. Hayes, the president of the Grand Trunk, say that the Intercolonial Railway road-bed is in first-class condition. For these reasons I urge that these wages be increased. Why, Sir, in the maritime provinces to-day, with the prosperity which exists in this country, thanks, in a large degree to this government—

Mr. TAYLOR. Providence.

Mr. LOGAN. Well, this government is providential—with the prosperity that exists, nearly every large employing concern has

Mr. LOGAN.

raised wages at least 10 per cent. In the mines of Nova Scotia, wages have been increased 10 per cent within the last two or three months. There is not a manufacturing concern in my own town, or, for that matter, in the three provinces, in which wages are not being increased all along the line. Why should these trackmen be asked to work along the road in stormy weather as well as fine, many of them working on Sunday as well as week days, and sometimes miles from their homes for the paltry, insignificant sum of \$1.15 a day. If private concerns can raise the wages of their employees 10 per cent, the people's railway should increase its wages also. The people of this country are bound to demand that at least as good pay as is given by soulless corporations shall be given by the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. McALISTER. I agree with my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) with regard to the pay of the trackmen on the Intercolonial Railway. I know from personal knowledge the work that the trackmen have to do. As my hon. friend says they have to be out in stormy weather as well as fine and must work Sundays as well as week days. Under the present rate of wages, they are not able to save anything : in fact they cannot support themselves and their families at such wages without close economy. We know that the safety of life and property depends largely on the trackmen. If they are negligent, both life and property are imperilled. The sectionmen on the Intercolonial Railway, as far as I know them, are all faithful, honest men and do their work well. If they were paid adequately for their labour their work would be performed with greater cheerfulness, and, if possible, better than they perform it now. I certainly would support an increase of at least ten cents a day. I am sure that I cannot be charged with taking up time unnecessarily, so I may be allowed a word or two in answer to the Minister of Railways. That hon. gentleman says, in reply to my remarks, that there was not sufficient traffic on the Intercolonial Railway between Moncton and Campbellton to justify putting on another train. I agree with that. But could not the present mixed train be lightened so as to allow it to make better time ? Two regular freights go south from Campbellton and two regular freights come in from the south, in addition to the accommodation and specials. Would it not be possible to lighten the accommodation ? If that were done so as to enable it to make the time in two hours less than at present it would remove the cause of complaint that now exists. I believe that is the only way to get over the difficulty so far as local traffic is concerned. Therefore, it would do away with the necessity of putting on an extra train. That is the only possible way of getting out of the present difficulty and of making that local

service satisfactory to the people. Now, the Minister of Railways and Canals made the remark that the people of Newcastle and Bathurst were complaining of the present time. I do not think they have any cause to complain of the present time so far as the local trains are concerned. The accommodation train going south gets to Newcastle about ten. The train arrives late both up and down, but we do not complain so far as local time is concerned. But any person looking at the time table will see that the county of Restigouche is the worst situated in the point of railway accommodation of any place on the whole Intercolonial Railway. I think by adopting that suggestion the accommodation could be improved to meet all requirements. I am satisfied if the time was reduced two hours each way there would be very little complaint so far as the local service is concerned. Now, as to the through express, may I ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if the down express from Montreal makes sharp connection at Truro with the Cape Breton road?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. The question which the hon. gentleman asks me to consider has been considered, and I will be glad to look into it again and see whether there is any possibility of applying a remedy in the direction he proposes. Let me say one word with regard to the wages of the trackmen on the Intercolonial Railway. My hon. friend has evinced a great deal of interest in the condition of the trackmen and the wages that they are paid, and he is satisfied that they are paid much less wages than the Canadian Pacific Railway Company pay their men in New Brunswick territory. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have this condition of things to face: Through the state of Maine the wages are higher, and for the few miles they run between the boundary and St. John they cannot very well cut down the wages below what they are paying to their sectionmen in the state of Maine. But the hon. gentleman has forgotten this fact, they do not give their section men and their foremen employment all the year round, summer and winter, wet and dry; they drop off a portion of their section force when the summer season is over, and when the repair season has passed, and then they only pick up men as they may require them later, when snowstorms or other contingencies necessitate additional men. So, I think the position of the track men on the Intercolonial Railway is not at all unfavourable as compared with the position of trackmen on the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is another fact the hon. gentleman has forgotten. We are paying as high wages to our men as are being paid by the Grand Trunk Railway. The Grand Trunk Railway comes directly in touch with us, and we pay as good as they do. Of course if we could give additional wages to our men I would

be very glad to do so; and it was without any strenuous pressure from the trackmen on the Intercolonial Railway that this increase was given. I looked into the thing, and I am satisfied that we can give them \$1.20 a day, not in view of the election at all, but because we felt that they were entitled to it, that the improved business justified us in making some addition.

Mr. HAGGART. Now the arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the details in that estimate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may state to the hon. gentleman that we have no written arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway at all. Notices were given to the Canadian Pacific Railway under an agreement entered into with them by the government for the termination of the contract, and when the time came we had a good deal of discussion as to whether we could come to any new arrangement. Conferences between the officers of the two roads extended over a long period; but some times one was away and sometimes another was away. But it did not appear to be possible to come to any common understanding. We took the ground that as respects both the running of the trains between Halifax and St. John and St. John and Halifax, and as respects the transfer of the traffic originating on our road to the Canadian Pacific Railway at St. John, there were two conditions about which we had some reason to complain. We did not strenuously oppose the continuation of the system of passenger train connection with them, but we did feel that the business which grew up upon our own railway, and which the merchants and manufacturers along our line desired to forward to points west, properly to the Intercolonial Railway and did not belong to any other railway. I felt that to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to come into our territory and solicit our merchants to forward their freight to the nearest possible point at which they could get it, and hand it over to another railway to be carried to the terminus of our road, was really a perversion of all sound railway principle. I felt that having 1,400 miles of railway running into the city of Montreal, we should, as a matter of right, say to the people who are situated on our line: We will carry freight to Montreal as cheaply as any other road, but we will carry it over our own road. We are running trains and why should we hurry it on to get it over the Intercolonial Railway as fast as we could and get it into the charge of another railway so that they could bring it to the point which was the terminus of our own line? I could not see any business in that. There has been no disposition on the part of the government to make any change that would be inconvenient to the travelling public. We have offered every facility to the people all

along the line from Halifax to St. John to buy their tickets and to take the route by the Canadian Pacific Railway to St. John if they desired to do so. We have not undertaken to say to the people who want to travel from Montreal; we will prevent you from going by the other railway and insist upon your going by ours. We leave the people to exercise their own discretion in that regard. As to the matter of freight we are perfectly convinced that it is sound policy to retain the custody of our own freight, and to hand it over at the destination whether it be in the city of Montreal, or even to the Canadian Pacific Railway at Ste. Rosalie. We will deliver it at any point to which it may be consigned. We are perfectly willing to give west bound freight to the Canadian Pacific Railway at Montreal or at Ste. Rosalie, or we are perfectly willing to deliver it to the people to whom it is consigned in Montreal. We do not consider that it is sound railway principle or practice for us to be content with 100 or 150, or 200 miles of a haul over our railway and let another railway make the profit of hauling the freight to Montreal when we have a railway which goes right into that city.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. gentleman give an explanation as to how this \$112,800 is to be expended?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The large part of this goes towards providing facilities and acquiring land in Sydney. We have to furnish them with all these requirements. Then we have to provide loading platforms, freight houses and stations, at various points along the line.

Mr. HAGGART. Just read off the cost and the details.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) asked the hon. minister some time ago for some information in regard to railway sidings in Cape Breton. Would he be good enough to give the cost of railway sidings in Cape Breton, if he has it there?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have it, but I do not happen to have it here at this moment. I think it is in my room, and I can send for it. The details of this vote of \$112,800 are:

Freight-house at St. Pierre .....	\$ 400
Ice-house at Mulgrave .....	500
Extension to deep water at Sydney.....	6,213
Shelter building at Taylor's Road.....	150
"    "    Delorme's .....	150
Platform and shelter building at Ferguson's .....	100
Loading platform at Conn's Mills .....	100
Electrical semaphore at Stellarton.....	400
Cattle sheds at Halifax .....	5,000
Shelter shed at St. Chrysostôme.....	150
Well and enlarged freight-house at St. Ignace .....	400
Loading platform at Moffatt's .....	200
Semaphore signal at Mitchell.....	300

Mr. BLAIR.

Freight-house at St. Francois.....	\$ 400
Extend platform at St. John .....	800
Twenty-ton crane at Halifax .....	500
Platform at Armstrong's Brook .....	50
Improving station at Rivière du Loup....	7,500
Storage building for mails, &c., at Halifax	500
Dwelling apartments for agent at Valley..	1,100
Accommodation for Customs Department at Drummondville .....	500
Land at Sydney .....	28,000
Improve station building at Sydney.....	2,300
Loading platform at St. Denis River....	50
Water supply at various stations.....	42,960
Increased accommodation at Sydney .....	11,900
Make changes in erecting shops at Moncton .....	2,000
Increased dwelling accommodation at Jacques River .....	1,000
	<hr/>
	\$112,723

To purchase tools and machinery..... \$66,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to purchase:

Engine and machinery, &c., at Sydney..	\$ 4,000
Small tools for workshops at Moncton, Halifax and Rivière du Loup.....	2,000
Machinery for shops at Moncton.....	60,000

Total .....

\$66,000

Mr. HAGGART. Any particular machines?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. HAGGART. Just general machinery?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

To equip passenger cars with Pintsch's gas apparatus .....

\$4,800

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to equip six sleeping cars on our through passenger trains with Pintsch gas apparatus, at a cost of \$800 each.

To increase accommodation at Lévis ....

\$110,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have already voted for 1899-1900, \$80,000. The supplementary estimates for 1900-1901 amount to \$110,000, making \$190,000. There has been expended up to 31st March, 1900, \$1,027.19, and the estimated expenditure from March 31 to June 30, 1900, is \$79,912.81, making \$80,000, and we will require \$110,000 for this current year.

Mr. HAGGART. How does that compare with the expropriations on the St. Charles branch?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not costing us one-fiftieth part of what it cost on the St. Charles branch.

Additional sidings along the line.....

\$105,500

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The details are as follows:

Sidings at Dartmouth .....	\$ 7,500
Lourdes .....	1,850
St. Wincelias (including station)	2,300
Maddington Falls (including well) .....	2,100
St. Cyrille (including land and freight-house) .....	1,650
St. Germain (including land)..	2,500
Ste. Rosalie Junction .....	2,000
Carmel .....	500
St. Nicholas.. .....	650
St. Apollinaire.....	500
Rivière du Chêne.....	700
Kingsbury Junction.....	2,000
Forestdale .....	700
Aston Junction .....	2,000
Mitchell (including land) .....	2,200
Drummondville (including land)	7,000
Bagot .....	2,000
Cacouna .....	800
St. Arsène .....	800
Isle Verte .....	800
Simon .....	800
Sacre-Cœur .....	2,000
Ste. Flavie .....	3,000
St. Pierre Junction .....	900
Chaudière Junction .....	2,000
St. Jean, Port Joli.....	800
Montmagny .....	1,000
Cap St. Ignace .....	500
L'Islet .....	1,000
Hadlow .....	2,000
St. Valier .....	550
Rivière Ouelle .....	800
Philippe de Neri .....	900
Rivière du Loup .....	5,000
Porcupine .....	2,000
North Sydney Junction .....	17,000
Pirate Harbour.....	5,000
Barnabe River .....	1,000
Ste. Croix.....	2,000
Cape Breton divisions .....	16,500
St. Paschal .....	350
	\$105,500

To provide three travelling steam derricks .....

Mr. HAGGART. What are these for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is proposed to provide one at Truro, one at Moncton, and one at Rivière du Loup.

To provide a new steel bridge at Etchemin—Additional cost.....

Mr. HAGGART. What is the cost of that bridge altogether ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We put the value of the old iron box girder at \$3,000, and we expect to put in a new steel bridge which will cost \$25,000.

To increase accommodation at St. John (revote, \$150,000) .....

Mr. HAGGART. Give us the whole cost of that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot give the hon. gentleman a statement as to what the whole cost will be. I gave that on the main estimates, and I have not the figures here, but I can tell him what these are.

Mr. HAGGART. Try and have them on concurrence. I want to know what the whole cost will be. The hon. minister and myself had a little controversy as to what the total expenditure was. Be sure and have it on concurrence.

To improve ferry service at Strait of Canso .....

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A ferry at the Strait of Canso is really the key to the situation of Cape Breton development.

Mr. HAGGART. Give the details, as we are as anxious to get away as you are.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have no ferry service there at all. We have a barge there, and that barge is pulled over and back by a tug. The barge does not carry passenger trains at all and only four or five cars at a time. It is a very slow business as the barge has to be turned when you go over and when you come back, and it is a very serious impediment in the way of traffic. We are absolutely compelled to have a ferry upon which we can carry trains, go straight out from one slip and run straight into another slip. It is a vital thing and I believe it will provide us with a most excellent steam ferry for the purpose.

Intercolonial Railway—Rolling stock ....

Mr. SPROULE. What is this about ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I gave the details of this and you will find them in the *Hansard*.

Mr. HAGGART. Does that include the amount in the main estimates and all ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I showed the whole statement.

Mr. BERGERON. Where will these cars be built ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will build all we can in Canada. We have always done that.

Mr. BERGERON. We have extensive car works in Canada and they should be patronized.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We certainly are not going outside of Canada for anything we can get here.

Steel rails and fastenings .....

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have provided for 15,000 tons of 80-pound steel rails at \$33 per ton, which was the selling price when we made the estimate.

Mr. HAGGART. Some years ago they were purchased at \$23.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Last year before the rise in steel we bought them delivered at \$20.

Mr. **BERGERON**. We voted in the railway subsidies the other day that all these rails should be bought in Canada. The government should set the good example. Will these rails be bought in Canada?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. Certainly. As soon as there are any to be had in Canada we will buy them by all means.

Mr. **HAGGART**. Is this the total cost?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. This is the balance remaining after we deduct the price we are likely to receive for the old rails.

Mr. **McLELLAN (P.E.I.)**. Is it the intention of the government to lay any steel rails in Prince Edward Island this year. Last year we expected this to be done but we were disappointed.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We hope to put some of the 57-pound rails in Prince Edward Island, which we will replace by the 80-pound rails.

Mr. **McALISTER**. With regard to this vote for railway buildings, I would call the attention of the minister to the railway stations at Nash's Creek and Eel River crossing. I would ask him to improve the stations there so as to make them habitable.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I will take that into consideration.

Mr. **BERGERON**. I notice a lot of revotes here. The government must have expected the elections to come on last year so that when the elections did not come they did not spend the money and so we have to vote it again.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. We made contracts for most of these last year, but the companies were so busy that they could not supply us with material.

Mr. **BERGERON**. It occurs to me that we vote this money too late in the season to have it expended in the fiscal year. If you had voted it two or three months ago it might be properly applied.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. minister (Mr. Blair) to the case of Mr. W. Moon, coal inspector between Halifax and Lévis, who was dismissed in 1896. The member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) also called the minister's attention to this. Mr. Moon got \$80 a month and he was dismissed on the ground that he was not needed, but since then I have been informed that two men have been appointed at \$50 a month each to do Mr. Moon's work. Now, what explanation has the minister for a transaction of that kind?

Mr. **HAGGART**.

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The circumstances are entirely different from what they were then. We were under the impression that we could get along without the services of that inspector. I was advised by the officers that it would be a great advantage to dispense with the inspector, and to have the tank man or the foreman of a section in the neighbourhood keep an eye on the coal as it came to the road, and make a report. It was in the fall of 1896 or early in 1897 when that change took place. That continued for two or three years, until the increased business of the road led to an enormous increase in the coal consumption. This impressed the officers with the importance of having some inspection; and we are now getting a very largely increased quantity inspected for \$100, and better done than it was formerly. From an economical point of view there is no reason to criticise the present arrangement as compared with the previous one.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Would the one man not do it for \$80?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. No, I think not. We are getting coal from Cape Breton and from all the mines in Pictou, as well as from the Cumberland mines.

Mr. **SPROULE**. What did you do with Mr. Moon? Did you give him another position or leave him out in the cold?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. He was there only temporarily.

Mr. **SPROULE**. I think some will be uncharitable enough to believe that it was from a desire to get a place for some one else. Has the hon. minister that answer with regard to sidings?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. The sidings which were put down in Cape Breton as private sidings at the request of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) cost \$2,205. There were laid down private sidings at the request of other parties and at their cost, at Leitche's Creek, Orange Dale, Sydney siding, Leitche's Creek extension, Barrachois and Beaver Cove. These sidings were all put down on the same terms as the sidings for Mr. McDougall, the parties putting up a deposit of the amount required to cover the cost of construction. Then, we put down public sidings at River Denys, George's River, Ball's Creek and Sydney Forks.

Mr. **SPROULE**. Have you the cost of any of these?

The **MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS**. I understood that what the hon. member for Cape Breton wished was the cost of the sidings which he had put down, and also what other sidings had been put

down for private parties ; but I cannot give the details. The amounts deposited were : Leitch's Creek, \$114 ; Orangedale, \$105 ; Sydney Siding, \$200 ; Leitch's Creek extension, \$100 ; Barrachois, \$200 ; Beaver Cove, \$147.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, I understood that there was one put down by private individuals themselves ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think so, because that is hardly usual. It may be so, but I have not any memorandum of such.

Trent Canal—Construction ..... \$300,000

Mr. HAGGART. Where is the construction to be done this year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. \$105,000 of this is required towards the construction of the Kirkfield-Lake Simcoe section, and \$150,000 towards the Trenton-Frankford section. The Kirkfield-Lake Simcoe section is 18 miles in length. It will have four guard gates, five lift-locks, and one hydraulic lift-lock. The estimated cost is \$900,000. The Trenton-Frankford section is 8 miles in length. It will have two guard-gates, seven lift-locks and seven dams.

Rapide Plat Canal—Enlargement ..... \$155,000

Mr. HAGGART. Will that finish it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Farran's Point Canal—Enlargement ..... \$60,000

Mr. HAGGART. Will that finish it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Galops Canal—Enlargement (upper entrance) ..... \$60,000

Mr. HAGGART. Will that finish it ?

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

Sault Ste. Marie Canal—Hugh Ryan & Co., award and interest thereon.... \$283,739 68

Mr. SPROULE. How has this grown to such enormous proportions from what it was when it was presented to this House before ? I have a somewhat distinct recollection of going over that claim in the Public Accounts Committee, and at the figure at which it was then placed, it seemed to me that it was reasonable ; but, still, the parties were asking a good round figure. But this seems to be out of all proportion to what it was then.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This amount is by no means all that was claimed. The claim was referred to Mr. Walter Shanly and the award made by him. This amount comprises the sum which he adjudged was originally due.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When was the award made ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. On April 14, 1899. We brought in a vote last session for the amendment of the award.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not brought down until this year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We brought it down last session but the hon. gentleman opposite asked that it should be allowed to stand.

Mr. HAGGRAT. Of course, at this late stage of the session I am not expected to go into a long argument on this case. I went into it fully last session, and protested against it.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to waste time, but I listened attentively to the examination in the Public Accounts Committee and tried to get at the information from the engineers and contractors. But comparing the work with the amount of the award, it seemed to be unreasonable. What rate of interest was allowed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We allowed the same rate as in all others, six per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. Compound interest ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the papers relating to this should be laid on the table.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were brought down last year. I laid on the table about half a ton of evidence taken before the arbitrator.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Is this the amount of the award ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it arranged when the arbitrator was appointed that his decision was to be accepted without appeal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The arbitrator was appointed under the contract. The contract provided that the chief engineer was to be the sole arbitrator ; but he objected to acting in that capacity, and stated his reasons to Council. He represented that he had been opposing and criticising these claims at every stage, and it did not seem to him reasonable that he should suddenly assume the position of arbitrator. Council regarded his reason as sufficient ; and, in choosing an officer, we decided that there was no man in Canada with the ability and experience to judge of these matters, and whose name would be so complete a guarantee that he would arrive at an honest and correct conclusion, as

Mr. Walter Shanly. We suggested that Mr. Shanly should be appointed and he was accepted by the other parties to the contract.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the award put in writing?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How much did Mr. Ryan claim?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Between four and five hundred thousand dollars.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to income—	
Welland Canal—General repairs .....	\$30,000
Outlet drainage at Port Colborne .....	6,000
To renew entrance piers, Port Colborne (revote) .....	20,000
	\$56,000

What kind of general repairs are these?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The canals generally is in very bad condition, and we must put it into shape. We have been putting it off because we cannot put it off any longer.

Annapolis and Digby Railway—To pay O'Neill & Campbell interest .....

Mr. DAVIN. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is interest on a claim which has been recognized by the courts and judgment recovered for the amount, \$39,559. Up to the time of payment of the judgment under the law, these parties are entitled to 4 per cent, and that is what we are allowing them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What contractors were they?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Contractors on what was called the Western Counties Railway, now the Dominion Atlantic.

Mr. HAGGART. This is interest on an award given them by the courts?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Ottawa River—Survey in view of improvement to navigation .....

Mr. HAGGART. I can only say I am very sorry to see no sum in the estimates for the building of the very important work, the Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal.

Rideau Canal—Salaries and expenses.....

Mr. HAGGART. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That comprises the salary of the overseer, newly appointed, Mr. Daily at \$1,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. The editor of the Kingston Freeman. What are to be his duties.

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is an overseer on every canal. This is a very lengthy canal, and the business is increasing, and it is necessary to have an overseer.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Did he acquire all the necessary experience in a newspaper office?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Newspaper men are very quick to learn.

Mr. HAGGART. This is not using the old staff rightly. If it is necessary to have an overseer, which I doubt, he should have been selected from the staff. There is Mr. Ritchie, the lockmaster at Smith Falls, who is as efficient a man as you could get in the whole Dominion. How will he and the rest of the officers feel when you take a man out of a newspaper office and make him overseer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A newspaper man would be as likely to discharge the duties efficiently as the doctors of medicine, who were appointed superintendents of canals by the late government.

Mr. HAGGART. What doctor of medicine?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Dr. Hickey.

Mr. HAGGART. He was brought up on the canal.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did you ever have an overseer before?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not that I am aware of; but there never has been so much business done as at present.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the canal pay expenses and leave a surplus?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The margin is not very considerable.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister knows there is a very large deficit, and he is loading the canal down with this political appointment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There used to be a superintendent and also an engineer, and now we have a superintending engineer, and also an overseer. We have the same number of officers, but called by different names.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is not Mr. Phillips attending to the duties that Mr. Wise formerly performed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt he is doing all that one person can do, but you cannot expect the one man to be everywhere.

## Welland Canal—

Improvements to Port Colborne entrance (revote) ..... \$300,000

Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount of the expenditure you are going to make at Port Colborne.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. \$1,000,000.

Mr. HAGGART. How much is the Public Works Department going to spend?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As far as I have been able to gather from the engineer in my own department, there would be another \$1,000,000 required for an efficient breakwater at Port Colborne.

Additional for steam communication during the season of 1900, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland ..... \$2,500

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is the usual service between the province of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. Under the terms of union we are obliged to keep up that communication. The subject was discussed on the main estimates, and general approval was expressed of the enlargement of the subsidy by \$2,500. The former subsidy was \$10,000. Tenders were invited, and practically this was the only party that was willing to do the work, and he demanded \$12,500. It is a very important service that keeps up connection between Prince Edward Island and the main land, with our own steamers.

Steam service from Annapolis and Kingsport to London, four trips at \$750 each.. \$3,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a new service to the western part of Nova Scotia on the Bay of Fundy, in the apple region, where, at certain seasons of the year, there is a great deal of business, and people complain of having to ship their apples a long distance. Some parties applied for a new service, and we gave that experimental subsidy of four trips.

Additional for steam service between Port Mulgrave and St. Peter's, extending twice a week to Irish Cove and Marble Mountain ..... \$1,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a section of country which is entirely without railroads, and there is a desire to have boats touch several points along that region. The parties refused to perform the service for the previous sum, and we had to add \$1,000 additional. We are paying \$5,000 for the whole service.

A new lighthouse and fog-alarm building on a pier on Middle Ground, Lake Erie. \$60,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). This is necessary owing to the destruction by fire

this spring of the lighthouse on Pelee Island. As the amount is a large one, I thought it well to bring over a chart of the proposed lighthouse and the location where it is to be placed. The old lighthouse was built before confederation on Pelee Point, and owing to the quicksands and drifts there it was in a very awkward position. In the old times when it was built, as I am instructed by my deputy, the draught of vessels was very light and they could go right in near the lighthouse. The course they took is marked on the chart, the usual course for a dummy light. They had to avoid the shoal by taking a sharp turn. The original lighthouse cost \$65,000, and we have expended on it altogether \$135,000 since it was built. A petition came in from all the captains not to rebuild on the same place, but to build on Middle Ground, and the engineer reports strongly in favour of it.

Legal expenses of arbitration re seizures of sealing vessels by Russian cruisers in the North Pacific Ocean in 1892 (revote). \$8,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is an arbitration which has been pending for some years, and a dispute as to the terms has been carried on. This last week the American government and the British government have succeeded in inducing the Russian government to come to terms; the terms of the arbitration have been agreed upon. This covers all the claims that are in dispute.

Construction of a steamer for fisheries and customs protection, British Columbia... \$50,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For the last ten or twelve years the British Columbia members have been pressing for this steamer. The fisheries along the coast of British Columbia are very valuable, and north away to the straits complaints are being made that American fishermen are encroaching upon our Canadian fishery grounds. Col. Prior has been at me for some time, and four years ago the hon. members for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), and Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Bostock), came to me as a deputation and summed up all the petitions which had been presented to the department for years. I found that it was no use resisting the claims. In addition to the necessity for a vessel for the fishery protection service, there are complaints made that all along the coast there is a great deal of smuggling going on; and although I am made responsible for the expenditure, the Minister of Customs will get the benefit to a large extent, of this protection, because it will be used for fishery protection service and for customs protection.

Erection of two fish hatcheries in British Columbia and a combined salmon and lobster hatchery in Gaspé County..... \$12,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The fish hatchery above

Westminster has worn out and we are building a new one further up the river at Sicamous, on the Fraser River. We are building a second one at the mouth of the Skeena, and another is being built down in Gaspé county near where the old one originally was built, but is worn out.

Mr. SPROULE. Since the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that the inland fisheries belong to the provinces, what do you do with the Ontario hatcheries?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We keep them up. We have not started any more, and as to the question of starting any more, I would like the opinion of the House of Commons. But at present I am not ready to recommend any new ones.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the difference in the case of deep sea fisheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The receipts from British Columbia are many thousands in excess of the expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. That would not alter the principle at all. We either own them or we do not. If we do not own them, I do not see any reason why we should keep up these hatcheries. I can understand the difference between sea fisheries and inland fisheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The receipts from the fisheries in British Columbia come from the salmon fisheries. Gill-net licenses are issued from the mouth of Fraser River as far as twenty miles up. These licenses are issued by us, and the receipts are enormous. The object of these hatcheries in the Skeena and Fraser Rivers is to supplement nature in the supply of the Sockeye salmon which is the most valuable fishery on the Pacific coast.

Mr. SPROULE. If the policy is adopted of keeping up the hatcheries, I would like to inform the hon. minister, that there is an admirable place for a hatchery in Grey County, right close to the Georgian Bay, where there was a most valuable fishing ground, until it was fished out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is that near any town?

Mr. SPROULE. It is near Thornbury on the Beaver River. I think there could not be a better place than that for one.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). The subject of the shore and deep sea fisheries of the maritime provinces, is a matter in which I have, and naturally so, a very deep interest, as the population of the county I have the honour to represent, is largely composed of fishermen, and the sea is the source whence parties residing on the shores of the

Atlantic Coast—Nova Scotia in particular—very largely, and in some cases wholly have hitherto derived their living for themselves and their families. Considering that fishing is their living, it necessarily follows that the primary object and ambition of a fisherman would be that the fishing industry should be made a success, and as a very large amount of money or capital is invested by them in fishing property, it is the natural bent of my inclination, as well as my duty, as the representative of fisherman to watch every interest of theirs in this connection tending to its encouragement and advancement, and to guard, foster and protect their interests here by my expressions in parliament, to make the industry of fishing a success, as far as I am able. This industry I do not despair seeing made a success, if I can only get the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the government to speak and act with me, on the lines I have laid down as shown in letters from me, addressed to the minister, which is nothing more than a course other countries have pursued, and as a result followed with success, so far as the culture of food fishes is concerned.

The sea is the foster mother to the fisherman, as well as the soil is the foster mother to the farmer. The one is synonymous to the other. That is, the fisherman and farmer help to support each other, in short the fisherman gets the cash for his catch, and consequently has the needful wherewith to purchase the products from the farmer, to say nothing of the valuable sea product the farmer received from the sea in sea-weed and kelp, as a fertilizer for his soil. But I regret to say, notwithstanding my many appeals in connection with fish culture, and the scarcity of sea-weed and kelp from our shores, nothing has been done by way of inquiry as to the cause of the lack of crop in the kelp product. I can assure the hon. minister that unless something is done by way of inquiry as to the scarcity of food fishes, and the disappearance of kelp and sea-weed from our shores, the poor fishermen, for the want of a living will, of necessity, be compelled to leave their comfortable little homes, they have built for themselves at no little expense, and seek other channels that will offer more lucrative employment, which will be a serious loss to the place.

The government, through the Department of Agriculture, employed the most skilled minds, with a view of obtaining from the soil the choicest and most abundant crops, any by chemical analysis discovers the description of fertilizer best adapted and most suitable to the soil to which it is to be applied, to produce the richest description of crop, as well as the most abundant. But, is the same care and interest exercised by the Department of Marine and Fisheries as respects the sea, to produce similarly satisfactory results? I certainly have yet to see it. Why not establish a bureau of fisheries, as well as we have a bureau of

agriculture, and court information as respects the advancement of the fisheries, and have committees appointed of members of the Commons, to invite evidence and solicit information from good practical and scientific men, and have the report of such evidence circulated throughout all the fishery districts, for the edification, improvement and practical advantage of fishermen, and the advancement of the fishery industry as a whole?

It is a well-known fact that there is a decrease in the supply of food-fish as the population increases, which is experienced everywhere in all fishing countries, where no effort is made in the direction of the culture of fish by the most improved methods. Hence the greater reason for practical measures being set on foot at once to supply this growing necessity.

We have a first-class scientist in the person of Professor Prince, the commissioner of fisheries. I know of no person better qualified than he, and all I ask is to give him a free hand on the lines I suggest, and as a consequence wonderful results, I feel assured, will follow. At present I am desirous of ascertaining the cause of the disappearance of the small food-fish, and the kelp and sea-weed from our shores, which is a serious loss to both fishermen and farmers, a matter that should be inquired into at the earliest possible moment, for whilst delay offers both fishermen and farmers suffer, and if delayed, or allowed to drift without seeking a remedy, shore fishermen will be driven to surrender their calling, desert their comfortable little cabin homes, upon which they have spent considerable of their hard-earned means, and seek some other more lucrative employment, away, perhaps, from the country. As I have written to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the subject referred to in detail, I will, with his permission, read the letters I have sent him, that they may appear in *Hansard*, with the view of the subject being read and studied over by fishermen and others interested in the subject, so that when an agent or commissioner is sent into the fishing districts by the department—which is greatly desired—to obtain information and evidence, they—the fishermen—will be the better prepared to give their views as to the cause of the disappearance of fish and seaweed, and the means that can be applied to restore this product. The product from the use of fish hatcheries, whether it be from floating incubators, which can be used anywhere on the coast, or stationary one, or the use of natural ponds, formed by the indentations of the coast, all have proved of infinite value in artificial fish culture and the propagation of fish. To illustrate the advantages, take a 12-in. female lobster, which will average by actual count 22,000 eggs, and allow 10 per cent loss in stripping, and another 10 per cent for imperfect eggs, and

you have 18,000 cultivated lobsters from one single lobster. The same can be said of the cod fish in the cultivation of their young. The product really, if properly cared for, is infinitesimal, and I invite the government to give fish culture their very first and heartiest attention and support. Other countries have set an example, such as Norway, Sweden, Scotland, and even little Newfoundland with excellent results. Why should not we follow it up with all seriousness, on similar lines and as an investment the government could not appropriate money to a better purpose than the development of the shore and deep-sea fisheries.

I can recommend places in my county, Lunenburg, for the establishment of hatcheries, and no better can be found on the coast, such as the La Have Islands, at the mouth of the La Have River, Vogler's Cove, Blue and Black Rocks, Chester, and other places between Chester and Hubbert's Cove, all choice places, and well protected from the sea. The hatcheries should be placed at certain intervals all along the coast, and parties paid to care for them, which would be a small income to the parties in charge, and as a result of such methods, an immense return to the fishermen—all of which investments made by the government would be returned by the encouragement given to the fishermen, thus giving employment to them, enriching the waters of the coast, and giving an abundant supply of food product, all of which outlay by the government would be returned to the country in the abundant harvest of fish, when converted into money by the fishermen and spent in Canada—besides giving the fishermen the comforts of life to live from, which at present they are deprived of for the want of a catch, the waters being depleted of the finny and other tribes of food-fish. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, as also that of the minister, I will now read the letters:

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.** The hon. gentleman's letters have not passed unnoticed, and I can assure him that I have referred them expressly to Commissioner Prince to make an investigation this summer, and Commissioner Prince, as soon as parliament is over, will go to the maritime provinces and make investigation into this matter. At this late stage of the session the hon. gentleman could, perhaps, dispense with reading the letters.

**MR. KAULBACH.** I want them to be placed on the *Hansard*, in order that I may be correctly understood by my constituents. The first letter is as follows:

House of Commons,  
Ottawa, March 26, 1900.

Hon. Sir L. H. Davies,  
Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir,—I desire to draw your attention and that of the government as well, to some very important facts respecting the fisheries on certain of our shore in Nova Scotia. Some years ago I

brought to the notice of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the singular disappearance of the kelp and other sea weeds from the rocks and rocky bottoms along our coasts, principally on the southern sea line of the province. But I did not apprehend then the very serious results that have since accrued from the absence of these marine plants in the locality mentioned, and in consequence the absence of fish from our shores, once so plentiful. So marked are they that I no longer delay in making them known to you, in the hope that the matter may receive attention at once at your hands.

The evil—for it is proved such—extends many miles along the shores as well as seawards, and where a vast accumulation of sea plants once flourished in abundance, as a protective shelter and feeding-grounds for young fish, not a vestige is now to be seen; but where it grew the whole bottom is covered completely with a small white or grayish round-shelled mollusc, the technical name of which escapes my memory. Fishermen are unanimous in the belief, or rather the certainty, that fish will not remain where these white shell-fish cover the bottom, that the shore fishing is spoiled, and they suffer accordingly. This white or grayish round shell-fish, commonly called by the fishermen 'horeeggs,' it is conceded by fishermen, was the food of lobsters, that the lobster would crush the shell with her claws, and eat the meat or extract the meat from the aperture in the shell, but now, from the depletion of the lobsters on our shores, from the over-catch or otherwise, the disappearance of the sea weed, and the wonderfully rapid propagation of the referred to 'horeegg,' so-called, covering the rock bottom, both fish and sea plant are all but extinct. Besides this, the broken portions of kelp and bunch sea-weed, that at one time in quantities came ashore after rough weather, furnished a well known and excellent fertilizer for the farm lands lying near the coast. The occupants of these now loudly complain of the want of what was once the natural means of enriching the soil, and they now are powerless to remedy the matter.

With the disappearance of this marine vegetation in the localities I have mentioned, lobsters as well as other fish have been undoubtedly scarce as compared with former days, and I think the reason for it is not far to find. This kelp and sea-weed not only afforded suitable feeding-grounds for young fish, lobsters included, but it also furnished hiding places in which to escape from their enemies, and was also a valuable protection for them in rough weather, just as on land the grass and bushes and the forest furnish food, shelter and protection for the young of wild birds and animals.

In the sea-weed, too, among the crevices in the rocks, the lobster was said to deposit its spawn. Now the rocks are bare and white, and over the barren, shell-covered bottom not a particle of food exists.

The evil complained of has grown so extensive that it appears absolutely necessary a remedy should be sought and decided upon as soon as possible.

I would suggest here—with a view of arriving at the root of the matter—that an efficient officer be sent from your department to visit the coast affected as described, with instructions to obtain all the information possible from practical, intelligent fishermen and others residing there, eliciting from each his actual knowledge of the cause and effect in his own particular district, and such officer to report the same to your department, giving as well his own views on the subject. It appears to me that it is only

Mr. KAULBACH.

by a carefully conducted inquiry of that kind, made during a personal visit by your delegated officer, that we can get at the bottom of the trouble, and discover, if possible, a remedy.

This much is quite certain, the shore fishing industry has suffered, and is still suffering, from the water being depleted of fish. The kelp and sea-weed have gone. Their loss to both fishermen and farmers is so serious that I feel it imperative upon me to ask at your hands attention to the foregoing statements.

The importance of the subject will, I hope, be accepted as my apology for pressing the matter upon you; but at the same time I must request you to have the kindness to give it your best, most serious and earliest consideration.

I have the honour to be, sir,  
Your obedient servant,  
C. E. KAULBACH, M.P.

The second letter with reference to the lobster culture, is as follows:

House of Commons,  
Ottawa, April 20, 1900.

Hon. Sir L. H. Davies,  
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,  
Ottawa.

Sir,—When addressing you by letter some few days ago re the all-but-complete disappearance of fish, kelp and sea-weed from our shores on the Atlantic coast, once so plentiful, I omitted to advance the opinion of others as well as my own, that in order to restock our shores with fish, as referred to, lobsters in particular, that the most convenient, the least expensive, and the most successful method to employ, would be to establish fish hatcheries at short intervals along our shores, and to take advantage of certain indentations of our coast that may present themselves forming natural salt water ponds, with narrow entrances, where the tide ebbs and flows, wherein to deposit all the spawn lobsters when taken in traps by fishermen, where they can be protected, cared for and the spawn deposited by the mother lobster in the natural time.

Such hatcheries or ponds to be protected at the entrance or outlet to the sea by wire netting, in order to prevent fish of prey from entering and interfering with the spawn, and the mother lobster returned to her native element as soon as it would be thought prudent after it had deposited its eggs.

Advantage should be taken to have such fish ponds, or nurseries, as near packing establishments as possible, but in cases where such natural ponds do not exist, then to utilize the improved incubators, and the packers of such canning establishments to receive a benefit for every lobster deposited in them, as well as a certain sum for his attention and care of the same.

In cases where packers are too far removed from such ponds so appropriated, I would suggest a fisherman in the near vicinity to be employed to have charge and receive fish, take account of the number, and care for them, and to be paid a fair compensation for his services. It is generally conceded, and reasonably so, that a mother lobster when taken with eggs or spawn, is not fit for food. Still, nevertheless, such fish are in most cases stripped of their eggs and thrown in for the packers to can, whereby unwholesome food is canned, the unripe eggs destroyed, and worse than that, when thrust on the market, the consumers of such impure food incur the risk of being poisoned when partaking of such diet.

I will go further in expressing my views as respects the use of seed lobsters, that it is a loss to the fishermen when the mother fish is destroyed with the eggs, an injury to the packer so far as his reputation is concerned, and a discredit to Canada and its fair name, when it will permit such imprudence to be practised and does not provide a remedy.

Whereas, to adopt the system as suggested, the fisherman receives his pay for every seed lobster so deposited in such hatcheries, the regulations are not infringed on, the public are relieved of the risk of eating unwholesome food, and still better, the waters are recuperated from the product of such hatcheries, thereby furnishing a supply to the sea at all times equal to the catch, and still better, having the pleasing prospect, at no distant day, of realizing the advantages of such a system by seeing our shores formerly the sporting ground of such fish, restored to their original condition with a rich supply of fish to destroy the 'hore eggs' now covering the bottom, and the rocks, now covered with such objectionable matter, restored with a verdant bed of kelp and sea-weed, the feeding-ground and protection as well as shelter for the fish, thus satisfying the fisherman, having the waters well supplied with fish, and the farmer with a product of kelp and sea-weed, a fertilizer for his farm.

An expenditure in this direction, carried out on those lines, as suggested, means money well, prudently and profitably invested, and will, I feel assured, result in an abundant reward, and meet the favour of fishermen and farmers combined.

I may here suggest that when sending out an agent from your department to visit the coast waters of Nova Scotia to obtain evidence with regard to the disappearance of fish, kelp and sea-weed from our shores—and it is to be hoped you will send one instead of entrusting so important a matter to unskilled resident officials, who in most cases are incapable of eliciting evidence or reporting intelligently—he will be instructed also to make special inquiry as to the practicability of carrying out the suggestions as contained in this letter, and report on this subject as well as the other at the same time, both subjects being synonymous or akin to each other.

As the subject matter of this letter interests every fisherman and farmer of the maritime provinces, I sincerely trust you will concur in my suggestion and give this and the matter referred to in a previous letter, your serious and very earliest attention.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) C. E. KAULBACH, M.P.

The excretion of a saliva character now covering the bottom or feeding grounds for fish, and preventing the growth of sea vegetation, should be carefully inquired into.

Hoping that these letters and my remarks may carry with them the desired effect, I will not occupy the time of the House any longer.

Geological Survey—Boring operations in the North-west Territories ..... \$3,309 51

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
I wish to strike out this item.

Mr. DAVIN. Why is this struck out?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
It is a revote, and there are no operations to be carried on.

Mr. DAVIN. Did the minister intend to carry them on?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
No. This is in connection with the boring for oil. It is a revote of the balance of the appropriation of last year; but the accounts are all paid and there is nothing required.

Mr. DAVIN. When I saw this item, I was in hope that the minister was proposing to sink artesian wells in certain parts of the North-west Territories. I pressed this object many times on the attention of previous ministers. Only one artesian well was sunk, I think, and it was very successful. I am very sorry this is not a vote for that purpose.

Claims of John Harrison, of Owen Sound, for the value of land purchased by him and afterwards cancelled by the Department of Indian Affairs, and the value of his improvements thereon ..... \$1,300

Mr. SPROULE. What is this?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.  
This claim arises in this way. Some years ago the department granted a privilege to a number of parties to cut timber on the Indian reserve on the Saugeen peninsula. This man, John Harrison, was among those who secured that privilege. The government, in compliance with the terms on which the parties were to be allowed to cut timber, cancelled the entries made for settlement claims. By mistake two claims owned by this man, on which settlement duties had been performed and for which he was therefore entitled to his patent, were cancelled along with the others. Upon examination, it did not appear that there was any possible way in which the government could resist his claim.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman sure that is the history of this case? My recollection is that a number of sawmill-owners were in the habit of cutting timber illegally in the Indian lands, and the department had an understanding with these people to charge them double dues. I know that Mr. John Harrison seriously objected to paying this and I was with him at the department one or twice about it, and considerable difference arose between him and the deputy. The land regulations provide for the taking up of homesteads and doing settlement duties, but it was ascertained that the land was so rocky that there would be no object in doing the settlement duty and the timber men and sawmill-owners contended that there was no need of doing the settlement duties. These duties were merely perfunctory operations and the lumbermen bought these claims all over and got up affidavits that the settlement duties were done. That has been going on for many years and I may say that these people claim that these sawmill-owners have been running the thing to suit themselves and to

the disadvantage of the poor Indians. There must be some mistake about this.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. There is no mistake about it. The claim came before me and I could not see that there was any defence. The one who performed the settlement duties was entitled to the patent, and the government, in cancelling all the other entries, cancelled these two by mistake.

Mr. **SPROULE**. How could John Harrison have made a claim for settlement when he was living in Owen Sound and not on the land?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The settlement duties had been performed by the person who lived on the land and John Harrison was a subsequent owner.

Salaries of extra clerks at head office, advertising, &c..... \$3,000

Mr. **DAVIN**. Has the hon. gentleman brought down the information he promised me?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I have the information here:

Ottawa, July 16, 1900.

Memorandum re Salaries of permanent lady clerks (third-class), Department of the Interior.

Since 1896 all the lady officials have received two statutory increases except Miss Barber and Miss May, who have received four.

Both Miss May and Miss Barber have been in the service for many years, Miss May having come in in 1883 and Miss Barber in 1885.

Three, Mrs. Bell, Mrs. Lee and Miss Yielding, have been ill for many months.

Three, Mrs. Ricard, Mrs. Ridley and Miss Shaw, are receiving respectively \$847, \$800 and \$700, hold less important positions than the two clerks who have been granted increases this year, and are not capable of performing the same amount of work.

Two others, Miss Coleman and Miss Ellis, receiving \$750 and \$650, are of more recent appointment, and their work is not so important, and are now proportionately receiving a larger salary than Miss May or Miss Barber.

The following is a statement of the salaries of the permanent lady clerks in the Department of the Interior:

Miss Barber .....	\$800
Miss Coleman .....	750
Miss Ellis .....	650
Miss May .....	850
Miss Ricard .....	847
Mrs. Ridley .....	800
Miss Shaw .....	700
Miss Yielding .....	847

Mrs. Lee is about leaving and Miss Yielding has been many months ill; Mrs. Bell has also been ill.

Mr. **DAVIN**. I would like to say that the complaint was not made to me by any of the young ladies.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I quite understand.

Mr. **SPROULE**.

Mr. **DAVIN**. What is to be done under this item respecting protection of timber lands and tree culture?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Last year we took an appropriation for the purpose of carrying on a system of protecting forests and, to some degree, encouraging forestry in Canada. Of course, the timber lands of the Dominion are not so extensive and important, perhaps, as those of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick or British Columbia. Still, a great deal can be done in Manitoba and the North-west in the preservation of the forest already existing and in encouraging the planting of trees. Hon. members will recollect that an officer was appointed, a considerable discussion having taken place over the appointment last year. That officer has been actively engaged since his appointment in formulating plans for the carrying on of this work. As an initial step he has secured the formation of the Canadian Forestry Association, the first report of which is just now issued. I would commend it to the attention of members of the House. The association has for its object not only to do this work in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, but to encourage the movement for the protection and care of forests in Canada generally. In Manitoba and the North-west Territories and in the railway belt of British Columbia, where the timber was under the jurisdiction of the Dominion, it is our intention under this vote to appoint men whose business it will be to act as fire guardians and forest rangers and also to assist and encourage the planting of trees in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. The number we expect to appoint will be in the neighbourhood of seven or eight, for the purpose of getting the work started. My opinion is that nothing could be done that would be of greater importance to the welfare of Canada than to care for our forests. This is particularly vital in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. If we succeed in doing anything substantial, the money will be well expended.

North-west Mounted Police—Assistant Surgeon W. E. Thompson the difference between \$1,000 and \$1,200 per annum from July 1, 1898, to April 3, 1900. \$351 67

Mr. **DAVIN**. In connection with the North-west Mounted Police, I wish to call attention to a return I moved for early in the session—a return relating to the supplies for the North-west Mounted Police. A great dossier, an immense collection of papers was brought down. I have gone carefully through them, but the letters I wished to have were not there. The orders of the House called for all the correspondence connected with the North-west Mounted Police supplies. The hon. minister (Mr. Sifton) was necessarily very much connected with the North-west, and as an ad-

mitted fact, I believe, he actually managed the North-west Mounted Police—

The **PRIME MINISTER**. Not in the North-west, but in the Yukon.

Mr. **DAVIN**. He had a good deal to do with the North-west Mounted Police too. The correspondence which took place between the Minister of the Interior and the officers of the North-west Mounted Police here do not appear in the correspondence. There was a letter written to the Minister of the Interior on the 22nd of August, 1889, by Mr. Walter Scott, inclosing a letter from Messrs. R. H. Williams & Son, asking that the police should take a quantity of tea that they had on hand. The minister has that letter from Walter Scott in his possession, recommending that this tea should be taken off the hands of Williams & Son and pointing out reasons to the minister why that course should be taken—because Mr. Williams was at that time inclined to join some independent persons in Regina who did not regard the Minister of the Interior with peculiar favour. Probably the hon. minister will be able to let us have that letter of Mr. Scott to-morrow?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. I do not remember anything about the letter. If any letters that passed were not brought down in the return, I presume they were marked 'confidential.' I could not bring down a letter from an outside individual marked 'confidential.'

Mr. **DAVIN**. This letter was inclosed in Mr. Scott's letter:

Glasgow House,  
Regina, Assa., Aug. 21, 1899.

Walter Scott, Esq.,  
Regina, Assa.

Dear Mr. Scott,—On account of your being so connected with the Dominion government from this section of the North-west Territories, I am taking the privilege of addressing you as follows. During the last year and up until last spring, in April, we have been supplying the North-west Mounted Police at this point and some of their other points, with tea. This tea has been pronounced and passed by officers to be the best they have ever had for the money. Now, sir, thinking that they would still continue to use the tea, we placed a very large order for the special brand which they use. The first consignment has just arrived, and the other consignments will still continue to come until our orders are filled. On looking over the schedule calling for tenders for the police supplies, we notice that they are not asking for tenders for their supply of tea this year.

Now, Mr. Scott, unless we can dispose of some of this tea to the police we will be dead stuck, as we have no other channel to place it except through our retail business, and it would take a considerable time to dispose of this quantity of tea that way. If you assist us by placing the matter before the department, or the proper purchaser for the police, you will greatly oblige us.

Yours truly,  
(Sgd.) R. H. WILLIAMS & SON.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. Who is Mr. Williams?

Mr. **DAVIN**. He is a prominent merchant in Regina, very active in the direction not peculiarly pleasant to myself, but, apart from that, a very good fellow. When that letter came into the possession of the Minister of the Interior he wrote a letter or had a letter written to Mr. White, and that letter has not come down.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. If I wrote a letter to Mr. White, I do not remember the circumstances—it must be among the papers. If it is not there, that is pretty good proof that no such letter was ever written.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Did the hon. minister send for Mr. White?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) said I wrote a letter.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Did the hon. minister communicate with Mr. White? He must have communicated with him.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. The hon. gentleman seems to see now that he was incorrect in saying I wrote a letter to Mr. White.

Mr. **DAVIN**. He sent for Mr. White.

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) know what I did. Would the hon. gentleman expect that if I had had a conversation with Mr. White it would be in the return?

Mr. **DAVIN**. No, but I would expect that the hon. gentleman, who is very clever in these matters, would cover his tracks so that they would be very hard to find. What is the result of the negotiations which took place between the hon. gentleman and Mr. White? The result is that this tea was taken off the hands of Williams & Son, and it is palpable under these circumstances that no tenders were called for. The principle that should obtain in these matters was violated, and in fact a job was perpetrated. Will the hon. gentleman bring down to-morrow, before concurrence, Mr. Walter Scott's letter?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR**. If it is not confidential I will bring it down.

Administration of justice in Yukon territory—Witness and jury fees in criminal trials, \$7,000; law books, &c., and freight thereon, \$2,000; living expenses of the sheriff of the Yukon territory and of the clerk of the Yukon territorial court, \$1,200 each; total ..... \$11,400

The **SOLICITOR GENERAL**. It is necessary to provide fees for witnesses, and also for juries in cases in which offences against the laws of Canada are tried. The sheriff and clerk are allowed living expenses with fixed salaries instead of being in possession of the advantages which men enjoy in the North-west Territories. They

are receiving a salary, and the fees, instead of being paid over to them, are put to the credit of the Receiver General.

Expenses in connection with a commission appointed to investigate the Chinese and Japanese question ..... \$10,000

Mr. SPROULE. I always thought that the last commission that sat on that question accumulated about all the information needed. It seems to me the only aim of appointing this commission is to stave off the question and make places for two or three friends for a few months to earn some money.

The PRIME MINISTER. For one matter, without mentioning the Chinese, Japanese immigration is a question which has to be dealt with on altogether different phases, and that alone will justify the commission.

Grant to the Interwestern Exhibition at Calgary ..... \$2,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The people in the neighbourhood of Calgary have organized an association for the purpose of holding an exhibition for the western territories, but open to all parts of the west. In view of the fact that the Territorial government is not able to make a sufficient grant of this kind, the government have thought it would be reasonable to give them a small grant to assist them.

Schools in unorganized districts ..... \$4,500

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The number of schools in the unorganized portions of the Territories is slowly increasing. I have here a list which shows that the total amount that would be required for the year is \$6,200. In addition to the amount we took in the main estimates we require this additional amount. This vote is not under the government of the North-west Territories, but will be administered by the Lieutenant-Governor.

Rocky Mountain Park of Canada ..... \$2,500

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The expenditure that has been incurred amounts to about \$350 for the purchase of a small herd of elk to go into the park. Hon. gentlemen are aware that we are trying to make the park a little more attractive, with considerable success, and the number of visitors indicates that it is growing in favour as a place of resort. We have a herd of buffalo there, and we have purchased a small herd of elk. The amount for the purchase and transportation will be about \$350. Then we require to add to the number of buffalo by getting two or three male buffalos from the north. We have let the contract to a hunter in the north to deliver a couple of them at the park. We do not know exactly how much it will cost, and we could not make an absolute bargain with him. The man is the best we could find for that purpose.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Commission appointed to deal with half-breed claims in the North-west Territories..... \$10,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Two parties are there now who have gone in for the purpose of issuing scrip certificates to the half-breeds. One of these parties went out by way of Alberta and the other through Assiniboia and Saskatchewan, north of the Qu'Appelle. The total expenditure for the year is estimated at \$18,100. We have already estimated in the main and supplementary estimates for last year \$8,100.

Mr. DAVIN. Who are the commissioners?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. McKenna is chairman of one of the bodies. The commissioners are Mr. McKenna, Major Walker, of Calgary, Mr. Cote, of the Department of the Interior, and Mr. Samuel McLeod, of Prince Albert. One of the officers of the department is with each body.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that Mr. McLeod the local member?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think it is.

Mr. DAVIN. That is the entire commission?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. Mr. Cote and Mr. McLeod take one route, and Mr. McKenna and Major Walker the other, because it would be absolutely impossible for one party to cover the whole territory in a season.

Interest on amounts contributed to the Superannuation Fund by E. Kelly, from Dec. 1, 1888, to Dec. 31, 1896, \$47.89; and by J. B. Ryan, from Sept 28, 1886, to Dec. 31, \$75.02 ..... \$122 91

Mr. SPROULE. What is the explanation of this?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These were two officials who were dismissed for political partisanship. When we proposed to give them their superannuation money, with interest, the Auditor General found that they never had any right to be on the superannuation list, and he declined to give them interest. It is only reasonable to give them interest, and I am afraid that from the way the item is drawn they will not be able to get interest up to the time they should get it.

Towards the expenses of visit of American Institute of Mining Engineers to Canada, \$2,000

Mr. DAVIN. When will this take place?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In a month.

To make good to Caleb C. Carleton, of Souris, P.E.I., amount of duties paid by him to United States customs on fish and fish oil, recommended to be paid by commissioner appointed by Dominion government ..... \$208 50

Mr. HAGGART. We voted enough to cover that claim last year

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is a little item due to Mr. Carlton which has been overlooked. Mr. Prowse brought it up in the Senate, and when we looked into the commissioner's report we found that it was due.

Printing plant—Webb perfecting press (revote)..... \$19,000

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether a printing press already in the Bureau had to be discarded and another press substituted?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think we discarded one of the linotype machines, but not a press. This press was ordered last year from the Potter Company, of New York, but they were unable to deliver the press in time, and a revote is necessary.

Consolidation of the Dominion Statutes, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act ..... \$20,000

Mr. SPROULE. When do you expect to have this work completed?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot say, but I apprehend we will be able to get it through within two or three years.

Mr. SPROULE. Who are the parties appointed to do the work?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There are no appointments yet. The last consolidation took six years, beginning in 1881 and ending in 1887.

Mr. COPP. What will be the probable cost of the consolidation of the statutes.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is impossible to say what the cost will be, because it is the intention, so far as possible, to utilize the officials. The last consolidation was so outrageously expensive that we must prevent anything of that kind occurring again. The last consolidation cost \$120,000. This consolidation should not cost more than \$50,000.

Printing Dr. Rand's English-Micmac Dictionary (revote, \$750) ..... \$1,000

Mr. DAVIN. Who is Dr. Rand?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He was a celebrated Micmac missionary in the maritime provinces, who died and left his works in manuscript form.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have been partly printed, and this vote is asked upon the recommendation of the Library Committee.

Expenses under the Conciliation Act, 1900 ..... \$10,000

Mr. DAVIN. We want to know what this is for?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. First of all, there is the editor of the labour

gazette, then, there will be a chief officer in charge of the conciliation board, and there will be some other expenses in connection with the development of the labour board. There is to be a labour board in connection with the department of some of the ministers, and there will be some expenses incurred. I was under the impression that the vote was \$20,000, and I am disappointed that it is not. It is a very sad awakening.

Mr. SPROULE. How many will the labour board consist of?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will have to be developed.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely if the hon. minister has any idea in his head he ought to be able to say what he intends to do.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have given a little idea about what I intend to do.

Mr. SPROULE. The only idea he has given us is, that there is only \$10,000 when he thinks there ought to be \$20,000, and he is going to appoint an editor. Does he propose to buy printing plant for the gazette?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister say how many employees there will be in connection with this vote?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. I think we will begin something like this: You would have a chief officer to take charge of the department, and it would be his duty to be in touch with the conciliation boards. He might require a registrar. There will be a system of registration and some supervision of the establishment of boards throughout the country. In the event of a strike and attempt at conciliation, the chief officer might find it his duty to visit the seat of trouble, and there would be some expenses in connection with that.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. gentleman any idea of the salary he will pay to this officer?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not, I have a fair idea what it will cost for the editor.

Mr. SPROULE. How much?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Between \$1,000 and \$2,000.

Board of Customs—Additional amount required for Dominion appraisers and special officers of customs ..... \$5,000

Mr. DAVIN. Among the list of customs officers given me by the minister, was one William Young, assistant officer at North Portal. May I ask the minister who recommended Young to him?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Young was known to myself to be a good officer. The railway companies require an officer there on account of the amount of

business to look after the manifests and whether Mr. Young will be permanently there or not, I cannot say. This gentleman was living in the North-west or Manitoba at the time.

Mr. DAVIN. He used to be in the hon. gentleman's constituency.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He was in my own constituency and lived there.

Mr. DAVIN. I have here a letter from a former constituent of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson), and he wishes to have it imparted to the House, that the people of the community were very much surprised at learning that this Mr. Young had been appointed customs collector at North Portal.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He is not collector, he is an assistant officer.

Mr. DAVIN. The gentleman to whom I referred, writes me :

The people of this community were more than surprised last week to see a notice that a person named W. D. Young had been appointed a customs collector in Assiniboia. This person was raised in Paris, and was noted only as a useless ne'er-do-well, whom his immediate friends had tried in every way to assist, but all to no avail. He was a tailor, professedly, by trade, but a failure always because of idleness and want of application.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot endorse that.

Mr. DAVIN. I dare say not.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Who says that ?

Mr. DAVIN. I may perhaps give the name to the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I wish you would.

Mr. DAVIN. This letter continues :

At one time his expenses were paid out to British Columbia in the hope that he would there secure employment, but utter lack of ambition and laziness doomed him to failure there also, so he managed in some way to make his way back to Paris, where he was again a burden on his friends.

The only service he has rendered to any one was during the election of 1896, when he in some way became possessed of a copy of an old electioneering brochure which had done duty in North Wellington and other ridings, and with the assistance of two or three others, altered the 'Modern Chronicles' so as to apply to proprietors of the manufacturing establishments in Paris, the men who have brought to the town and retained whatever has been of prosperity and success. The most dastardly innuendoes were by this means directed against every one of these men and their families, the baseness of which can be judged by reading these 'Chronicles,' as you will see them in the 'Star-Transcript' newspaper of June 10 and 17, 1896. This was presumably done in the interest of the Hon. Wm. Paterson, the candidate of the Reform party, and so much indignation was aroused in consequence of the cowardly allusions to the female members of the families of our most respected citizens, that there was little wonder at the result when the state of the poll was announced.

Mr. PATERSON.

I believe the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) was beaten, and the appointment of Young shows his forgiving spirit. Here is a fellow that contrived at the minister's defeat by the way he helped him, and then the minister shows his forgiving spirit by rewarding Young with a job in the public service.

Young was ostracised and refused admission to the society of people who had long respected his family, and so uncomfortable did his residence here become that he was again shipped off, this time to a prairie farm in Manitoba. But as a reward for his supposed services at that election, his friend Bain, private secretary to the Hon. Mr. Paterson, who had himself gained no little notoriety as anonymous scribbler, has used his influence to secure Young a berth which will yield him a living. I can refer you to J. B. Henderson, of the Pennan Manufacturing Company, H. Stroud, manager of the Paris Windmill Company, and all other manufacturers in the town for corroboration.

The publication of the petty, malicious documents was only an evidence of the utter want of judgment and journalistic acumen on the part of the proprietors of the Grit newspaper, but it gave the fellow Young and his envious coadjutors to wound the feelings of a large number of ladies who had no means of protecting themselves from the coarse and cruel innuendoes of the miserable gang who in this cowardly way sought to accomplish their purpose.

It was stated at the time that Bain had signified his intention of using his influence to have Young placed on the government service roll, and it seems he has succeeded, to the chagrin of all who know the despicable character of the man. A glance at the files of the 'Star-Transcript' for June 10 and 17, 1896, will show you the kind of work which secures reward from the hon. Minister of Customs.

Now, that letter is quaint, I grant you. But it shows, and I think the answer of the minister shows, that really this man has been foisted into the public service, because some electioneering work was done in 1896 for the minister. In fact to quote the classical language of my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor), it is another job.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think it is very unfair to the hon. gentleman to put a letter like that upon *Hansard*. May I ask him to give me the name of the writer ?

Mr. DAVIN. Well, I do not think it is necessary to give the name.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You ought to.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think so.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think so. I never heard of the events mentioned in that letter. The writer speaks of my private secretary, John Bain. Ask Mr. Henderson, whose name is mentioned there, about Mr. Bain. He will not thank you for using his name as one who would calumniate Mr. Bain. Mr. Young I do not know personally. I never before heard of the statements mentioned in that letter ; and to spread a document like that on *Hansard* without giving the name of the writer is manifestly unfair. Mr. Bain will see what

is said in *Hansard*, and if the hon. gentleman will not give the name, perhaps we shall be able to discover it in some way. I cannot see what the hon. gentleman is hinting at in the letter about traducing respectable females. I have no remembrance of anything of that kind. I have no remembrance of ever hearing of any unpleasantness. The remarks made with reference to Mr. Bain convince me that whoever has written that has written it in a spirit that is not at all commendable. As I said before, Mr. Bain did speak well of this man to me. He was living in Manitoba or the Territories at the time, and the railway company pressed for additional help at North Portal, and he was asked if he could go there as a temporary officer, and he went, because living near the place he was able to reach there quickly. I would like very much indeed if the hon. gentleman felt himself at liberty to mention the name of the writer, and when he read that letter and placed it on *Hansard*, I think he should have been at liberty to give the name. I think his own sense of fairness would suggest that to him.

Mr. DAVIN. There are two officers in North Portal?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I think there is only one.

Mr. DAVIN. There is A. C. Patterson, sub-collector, and William Young, assistant. Is it necessary to have two officers there?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. North Portal, as the hon. gentleman knows, is a point where there is a good deal of manifesting. Like Emerson, it is on the United States boundary, and it was only on the pressing request of the railway company for an officer in the interest of trade that this officer was sent to assist during the busy season. He may not have to be kept there for a great length of time, and one of the reasons why Mr. Young got the position was that he lived near there.

Mr. DAVIN. What qualification could the work of a tailor give to a man for the position of assistant customs officer?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know whether he was a tailor or what he was. When he took his place I think he was in a newspaper office, and I do not suppose the hon. gentleman will deny that he must have been a man of considerable intelligence.

Mr. DAVIN. I have seen men in newspaper offices who had not much intelligence.

Mr. SPROULE. This only shows the minister's gratitude to those who have been kind to him in election matters, and it seems to be not the only instance, because I have under my hand the name of another man whom he has been good enough, I believe, to appoint in the Customs Department as well. That is the celebrated Tom Lewis, of London, the bartender who managed Mr. Prit-

chett and kept him out of the way during the inquiry into the election frauds, and supplied him with money. He is put into the customs house at London. So it seems that there is a closer connection between these individuals and the minister down here than before. I notice, too, that the celebrated Con. O'Gorman has struck the capital. I am told that he has been brought down here by the Postmaster General to do some secret work.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You are told so? Who told you so?

Mr. SPROULE. It is my business who told me so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You are telling an untruth if you say so. If you make the statement, it is untrue. I never heard of the man in my life.

Mr. SPROULE. I ask, Mr. Chairman, whether the minister is within the rules of order or not?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the expression is in order.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL: If I made an unparliamentary statement, I withdraw it. What is the name—Con. O'Gorman?

Mr. SPROULE. I said Con. O'Gorman.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never heard of such a man in my life, and the hon. gentleman need not stand up there and make any insinuations or slanders.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister may reserve his temper for another time. He is not going to deter me from saying what I want to say nor make me back down. I said I was informed, and I say so still, and I do not allow the Postmaster General nor any other man to make me take back my word.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You are stating what is untrue.

Mr. SPROULE. I said I was told.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Give the name of your author.

Mr. SPROULE. I will not give the name of my author. It is my own business, and not the Postmaster General's; and there is no need of any such display of temper, because I can tell the hon. gentleman a good deal more than he would like to hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Give the name of your author.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quite within my rights in this House and within the rules of debate, and I am not going to be put down by the Postmaster General nor any body else.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You cannot give an authority for your statement.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that if it was so it was in keeping with the recompense that was given to Tom Lewis when he was put into the London custom-house. I said I was informed, and if the Postmaster General had not been quite so impatient he would have heard me out and not let himself into the blunder he has committed by trying to contradict me, and so deliberately and grossly violating the amenities of debate in this House, that he was obliged to take back what he said.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). Perhaps the gentleman who thinks so much of rewarding political supporters for wrong-doing has referred to that matter by reason of a letter which appeared in the *Globe* of Saturday. It is not a nameless letter, either, but a letter signed by a well-known man, J. W. Holmes, M.P.P. for Haldimand County. It is an open letter addressed to Mr. Whitney. In it the writer refers explicitly to some things that were done in 1891; and perhaps it is on account of this letter that we have had this attempt tonight to show that some wrong was done by Liberals in appointing their friends to office. This letter is written in consequence of charges made by Mr. Whitney, when Mr. Holmes was not present, in regard to switching ballots, and matters of that kind, which are the stock-in-trade of the opposition whenever there is a picnic or a political gathering. I will read a small portion of this letter:

Or, if you had looked one half-mile to the north, when you were speaking at Hagersville, and had asked the Hon. Dr. Montague who owned that land, he would have informed you that it was the Indian reserve.

He could further have told you that at the general election held in 1891 Henry J. Ince, a supporter of his, was deputy returning officer in that reserve, and that one Moses, an Indian, poll clerk. By a strange coincidence Henry J. Ince, who lived in Oneida, two or three miles from the reserve polling place, left his home the night previous to the election and went to the polling place, the residence of an Indian, and stayed there all night, apparently to be on hand whenever the poll might open; but by the law it was provided that it should open at nine a.m.

#### Clocks and Watches Gained.

By some strange accident the watch of John Moblo gained an hour. Augustus Almas, of Hagersville, and Joseph McCloy, also supporters of Dr. Montague, were on hand at the poll at eight o'clock a.m. The clock in the polling place mysteriously gained an hour, and through the day the hands pointed an hour ahead of the striking arrangement. For instance, when the clock struck eleven strokes, the hour hand was at twelve.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This discussion is entirely out of order, both what has been said previously and what has now been said, but I suppose the House will allow the hon. gentleman to conclude his remarks.

Mr. MULOCK.

Mr. DAVIN. Do I understand you to rule, Sir, that when your attention has been called to the fact that the hon. member is out of order, and you rule that he is out of order, you will allow him to go on.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) alluded to some one appointed to the customs service, and insinuated that his appointment was due to political purposes. Whether any one of the names the hon. gentleman mentioned is in the service or not, I cannot tell, but no appointment has been made except on the recommendation of those whom any one occupying my position would naturally consult in the matter. My hon. friend from Kingston in reply is reading an article from the *Globe* newspaper to show there are men who secured their position in the Customs Department service for political services rendered Dr. Montague. If the hon. member for East Grey was in order, so was my hon. friend.

Mr. DAVIN. We do not say that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was in order. The Chairman says he was out of order, and that the hon. member for Kingston is also out of order, and I ask him to enforce his ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am bound by the ruling I have just given, though I am somewhat surprised that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who was the one that raised the irregular discussion, should now press his point of order.

Mr. DAVIN. I insist, Sir, upon your ruling being enforced.

Mr. BRITTON. The hon. gentleman read something that purported to be a letter reflecting on the Minister of Customs for some appointment he had made.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have to be guided by the rules of the House, and I have to rule that the discussion is out of order.

Mr. BRITTON. The hon. member for Assiniboia ought to be the last man to raise the point, because ever since this session began he has been continually violating the rules of the House by reading anonymous articles from newspapers, which were irrelevant to the matter in hand, and were purely the fictions of the imaginations of those who wrote them.

The committee rose and reported progress.

#### JUDGES OF THE PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Bill (No. 195) to amend the Act respecting the judges of the provincial courts, read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

## ADJOURNMENT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope the House will agree to sit a little longer that we may make some progress in concurrence. We will reserve any item that any hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. DAVIN. We would rather begin to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid we cannot get through to-morrow.

Mr. HAGGART. We will go on with concurrence to-morrow. We have hurried through these items in order to go home.

## RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved that the House concur in the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 132) to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. HAGGART. What are the amendments?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Striking out the 12th section, that is, with reference to the adoption of the Quebec procedure respecting Dominion railways.

Mr. HENDERSON. What effect would that have?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The striking out of this clause does not affect any other section of the Bill. It was inserted in order to avoid some consequences which, it was thought might result to one or two railways if there was not this power. However, they have chosen to strike it out, and I propose to accept the amendment.

Mr. HAGGART. All right.

Motion agreed to, amendment read the second time and concurred in.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We might take up the unfinished resolution on the paper.

Mr. HAGGART. What is it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That relating to government contracts.

Mr. HAGGART. No; we cannot go on with that to-night. We will get all through to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What will be taken up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This resolution and concurrence.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. (Tuesday.)

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, July 17, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

## THE ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to draw to the attention of the right hon. First Minister and the House the following letter, which I have just received:

Gananoque, Ont., July 16, 1900.

Dear Sir,—The oarsmen of this neighbourhood consider that they have a substantial grievance against the authorities of the country in the non-enforcement of the Alien Labour Law. Instances are occurring here of the bringing in of oarsmen from the American side to row fishing parties who are stopping here and fishing in Canadian waters, the result being that we who have to provide and maintain expensive outfits are left idle, and without the means of earning our livelihood. This is all the more unsatisfactory when we find the American authorities opposite us strictly enforcing the Alien Labour Act on the American side of the line, in the interests of their own citizens. Only last week a number of Queen's College students were sent from the American side, and were not permitted to act as waiters. We would bespeak on our behalf a similar enforcement of the Act, which you were largely instrumental in having introduced, but which, it is to be regretted, is not, at any rate in this locality, attempted to be enforced.

Faithfully yours,

BENJAMIN LONGUEUIL,  
FRANK LATTIMORE.

On behalf of the Gananoque Oarsmen.

## OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright). I see by the Order paper that the motion to resume the adjourned debate on the motion I submitted yesterday, on behalf of the Debates Committee, that this House do concur in the sixth report of the special committee appointed to supervise the official reports of the debates of the House during the present session, is at the end of the Order paper. This is a motion asking for the granting of an additional indemnity to the translators of the debates, and I would like to know from the right hon. Prime Minister whether there is any chance of having this matter brought up again this session for the consideration of the House. I would suggest that, perhaps, it would be better to dispose of it at once. The debate has taken place on the subject, and I think that hon. members have formed their opinion on it. I think it would also be proper for me to ask the right hon. gentleman whether the government has come to any conclusion as to the increase of the sessional indemnity which was discussed on the motion with reference to the French translators?

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With regard to the motion of my hon. friend, I have no objection to ask the House to dispose of it as soon as we have taken concurrence. As regards the question of indemnity, that was settled some time ago, and is no longer before the House.

#### THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata). (Translation). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to call the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), to the treatment members of this House are receiving at the hands of the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, Mr. Schreiber. Not only does that gentleman receive us with scant courtesy, when we call at his office, but he even has the audacity of wilfully deceiving us and, were I not afraid of going against the rules of parliament, I would not hesitate to say that he is an impudent liar.

As representatives of the people in this House, it is high time that we should know whether those public varlets to whom we pay large salaries, are going to be allowed to insult us and tell falsehoods, even in our official relations with them. There are limits to human endurance, and it is high time that the province of Quebec should know whether that state of affairs is going to continue any longer. Mr. Schreiber was to receive on the 13th instant, a telegram in connection with a very important business. I called at his office and inquired from him whether he had received that telegram, and the answer I got from him did not leave room for doubt; he had received nothing. On the 14th of July I called again in the morning, and again at twelve o'clock, and I got a similar answer. But, in the evening, I received a copy of that telegram, and I find that it was sent on the 13th. So, I had been deceived, and the truth had been kept concealed from me. Why? It was, no doubt, in order to favour some of their friends; for, under the new regime, these gentlemen, as in the past, obey their instincts, as I am afraid some of us may know later on from actual experience. I protest against that conduct on the part of some officials, and I hope the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), and the right hon. the Prime Minister, will give a lesson in civility and courteousness to those subalterns who believe they are almighty, and who do not know how to behave towards hon. members of this House who are not of their political stripe.

#### SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

The House proceeded to consider and concur in resolutions adopted in Committee of Supply.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE.

Post Office Department ..... \$202,455

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I desire to refer to the item of \$685,447.85, which has been referred to in debate on the subject of post office expenditure. The Postmaster General, in his explanation, stated this was an item most improperly concealed. Well, Sir, that item was simply the cost of the mail service, and the other items being paid quarterly, only became due on June 30, and was paid out of the appropriation for the fiscal year commencing July 1, that is, out of the appropriation for the year in which the payments were made. The hon. gentleman understands my contention, that amount of \$685,447 is simply the cost of the mail service, and the other items being paid out quarterly, only became due on June 30, and were paid out of an appropriation for the fiscal year commencing on July 1, that is, out of the appropriation for the year in which the payments were made. Now, my contention is, that that rule has been invariably followed, not only when I was Postmaster General, but by Sir Oliver Mowat, the Hon. D. A. McDonald, and the Hon. L. S. Huntington, predecessors of the Postmaster General, who have never taken any exception to this practice. I contend that the practice is correct, that is to say, that a payment should be brought to account during the fiscal year in which the service was rendered. If that were not so, there would be five quarters, the service would be performed only in the year when payment took place. Now, I would like to know from the hon. gentleman how he arranges it, whether he has discontinued the practice which he deemed so irregular, of including payment for mail and other services during the June quarter, in the accounts for the following fiscal year. Does the amount charged for mail service in his report for the year ended June 30, 1897, namely, \$2,218,168.45, include the cost of mail service and other items for the quarter ended June 30, 1897?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It does.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I also wanted to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to another point. So far as my recollection goes, he promised to bring down a list of the contracts which had been cancelled when we were on the main estimates. It may have escaped his memory, but I recollect that he stated he would bring them down. Of course, I think it was a very arbitrary measure to put an end to a contract which had been entered into, according to law, and to refuse to allow the contractors to take an action against the government to find whether the contract had been properly cancelled. That is something that I think these people are entitled to; and if the government consider that they were quite right in cancelling the contracts, there can be no trouble whatever in allowing these people to take out an action and to establish their

rights before the courts of justice of this country. These are the points which I wanted to bring before the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that I probably answered the chief questions that my hon. friend had in his mind, but in case my categorical reply did not quite make it clear what the practice has been, I would say that my instructions to the department are, on the close of the fiscal year, to ascertain all moneys owing for all services rendered up to June 30, and to have the accounts paid in time to have them carried into the expenditure of the department for the year closing on June 30. I understand from the department that my instructions have been fully carried out, and that the items in the public accounts showing the expenditure for each year since I took office, show the total cost of the services for that year.

Mr. HAGGART. That has always been the practice, every expenditure that has been incurred up to June 30, has been included in the accounts of the preceding year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. HAGGART. But the law required it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But it has been ignored.

Mr. HAGGART. Not that I am aware of, as Postmaster General, and from what I have heard since then; every amount, or expenditure, or obligation, of the preceding year, has been included in it. The statute requires it. Our returns were made according to law, and the law is no different now from what it was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The practice is, though.

Mr. HAGGART. It is only a question of payment. The charge against us was that we exceeded the appropriation by paying out of a subsequent year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The law applied in the past, as it does to-day, but in the case of our predecessors, the law was not lived up to, and when I took office, there were debts owing for services rendered up to June 30, amounting to \$685,000, that should have been paid out of the appropriation for the fiscal year terminating June 30, and there should not have been any old accounts outstanding to be paid out of the appropriation for the succeeding year. These debts were accrued, the services rendered, and the money payable on June 30, and should have been paid and included in the expenditure for that fiscal year. That was not done in the case of my predecessors, and it has been done in my case.

Mr. HAGGART. That cannot be.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It has been.

Mr. HAGGART. It was not done before.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will read the evidence confirmatory of my statement. I have here the report of W. H. Cross and W. F. Munro, the two auditors, and here is their statement upon the subject:

(a) At the beginning of the fiscal year 1895-6, as the result of the deficits of the previous years, there were outstanding liabilities of the department, in the shape of unpaid accounts, to the amount of \$616,712.99.

(b) At the close of the fiscal year 1895-6, the liabilities of the department in excess of all parliamentary appropriations applicable thereto amounted to the sum of \$685,447.03.

(c) Thus the liabilities had increased during the year 1895-6 to the extent of \$68,734.04.

There you have the statement of the auditors, and it proves that it was not paid that year.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman says that there is an amount of \$685,447.03 which, as he says, was improperly concealed. Now, my contention is that the amount which was due at the end of June of that year, for the cost of the mail service, and the other items, are paid quarterly, these contracts are made quarterly, and hence they only became due on June 30.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to say that the ex-Minister of Finance himself, discussing this matter with me across the floor of the House, conceded without reservation, that the practice the hon. gentleman alludes to, and which he admitted had become the practice, was not a desirable one, was not a proper one, and he did not defend the practice.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. There is no concealment about it. That is what I am arguing.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It does not appear on the record.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. All these mail contracts are payable quarterly. On June 30, or at the end of the fiscal year, the money was gone and the service had only been rendered in the year after the appropriation for the fiscal year was ended. It was the practice long before my time to pay these amounts out of the amount which was given to us for the next fiscal year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A bad practice, a vicious practice.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It may be a bad practice, but there is no concealment about it. We would have been paying for services which would not have been rendered. The hon. gentleman has not said anything about the practice in regard to flats that I was referring to. I hold that these men are entitled under the law to secure the issue of a fiat to them. It is a matter of opinion which it is quite proper to discuss; but, I

think the law is as I have stated it. The Postmaster General, under certain circumstances, had the right to continue a contract that had been entered into without asking for tenders. The present hon. Postmaster General cancelled a very large number of these contracts. These contractors say that they have the same rights as every other British subject in Canada. They want to see whether, under the law, these contracts have been properly cancelled or not and the hon. gentleman refuses to give them a fiat to allow them to try their case before the courts. I think this is a very improper thing and that it should not be tolerated. Then we were discussing the main estimates. I asked particularly about bringing down the list of these contracts and the hon. gentleman stated that he would do so. That was the reason why we allowed the item to pass. It was understood that we could discuss it now.

**THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I have no recollection about being asked for a list of the contracts, but I would say that there is a very extensive list in the supplementary report. The hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) was not present in the committee when we discussed the very point he now raises. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) brought it up, we discussed it in committee, and I told him that I intended to make a report to the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Mills) setting forth my views on the subject.

**SIR ADOLPHE CARON.** I was absent and it was because of my absence that the request was made that these items should be discussed later.

**MR. HAGGART.** On the question as to whether the book-keeping was properly done or not I cannot get into my head the distinction that the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) tries to draw. At the end of the year everything that was due was entered with the rest of the expenditure of the Post Office Department.

**THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.** No, it was not; that is the trouble.

**MR. HAGGART.** I contend it was, because we fulfilled the requirements of the statute. Every amount that was due was entered in to the expenditure in the Post Office Department.

**THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.** No, it was not.

**MR. HAGGART.** If you will look at the obligations in the statute you will see that they require it.

**THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.** I know they do.

**MR. HAGGART.** I say the statute was fully complied with in every respect. Then, the only question is whether the amount was voted before for the expenditure, or

whether we got a fresh vote. That did not appear in the accounts at all, just the same, for instance, as when the Intercolonial Railway gets a vote of \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 for expenditure on that road. The receipts from the Intercolonial Railway may be such as require a larger expenditure. That does not enter into the book-keeping at all. It makes no difference as to whether the amount is voted previously or voted afterwards. On the question of fiats that matter was threshed out when the Bill was passed, and you will notice that in the speech of Mr. Blake on the subject and in the answers which were given to him by the government the principle was laid down that the mere application by the party who thought he had a claim against the government was sufficient to secure the issue of the fiat as a matter of course. If a man thought he had a claim he had a right to have his claim tried. In England that is the principle which prevails. The answers given by the government when that Bill passed and the opinion of Mr. Blake agreed that every man had the right to have a fiat who had a claim against the Crown the same as he had a right to have a writ issued if he had a claim against an individual, and it was not to lie in the hands of the head of a department, or of the government, to refuse justice to a party who believed he had a right of action against the Crown. The Crown had no option. It was held when the Bill was passed that the option was not vested in the Crown at all of refusing a fiat, but that an application and the performance of the ordinary forms required preceding the issue of a writ were all that were necessary. What a farce it would be otherwise. What was the use of passing or amending the Act in reference to the issue of fiats if a minister may say that a party has no claim, or advises the Crown to issue the fiat?

**MR. SPROULE.** Mr. Speaker, it always seemed to me to be an inherent right that the department, according to my interpretation of the law, could cancel a contract if it, at any time thought it could do so for the betterment of the service, and there is no doubt that on this ground and on this ground simply, if we are to believe the hon. Postmaster General, these contracts were cancelled. That seems to be generally accepted throughout the country, but it has always been a disputed question as to whether the government had or had not legally the right to cancel a contract that it had entered into. That this point should be put beyond doubt it seems to me most desirable for the government to grant a fiat and let these people try their case. It would only be trying one case, for whatever the decision of the court would be in that case, it would be a ruling for all of them, and therefore does not involve a large expenditure of money. But it establishes a precedent that would be a guide in the future. Very many of these people, who are unable

to fight for their rights will believe that they were improperly and illegally dealt with, and I think the government would be consulting its best interests, as well as those of the department and those of the country, by granting this fiat and settling the question once for all. My opinion has always been, and in this I agree with the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart), that the granting of a fiat was a mere matter of form, and that it was distinctly understood that when any one had a claim against the Crown and he wished to try that claim in law, as a matter of course, the government would grant a fiat without any trouble except the asking for it. In regard to the other question I have understood it in this way: Here are accounts coming in at the end of the fiscal year, but these accounts are not adjusted because they cannot be adjusted and paid up to June 30. If they are not paid before June 30, the appropriation lapses.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it does not.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is carried over.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It may be or it may not be.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the general principle with regard to all accounts, that when the fiscal year ends on June 30, then all expenditures to be paid under the appropriation, lapse.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). That is neither the law nor the practice.

Mr. SPROULE. It is done too often in this House for the minister to say it is neither the law nor the practice. We are told time and again by the ministers that the money voted was not paid within the fiscal year and that therefore it has to be revoted. The same principle applies to the Post Office Department. It is true that the appropriation for that purpose may have run out and it may have been necessary to pay these accounts out of the appropriation for the succeeding year, but that has been the custom followed for a long time and it does not seem to me that the practice is different today from what it was years ago.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to direct the attention of the Postmaster General to the post office at Ste. Victoire. I have given the hon. gentleman notice that I would speak about this matter. If the information in my possession is true, that post office is in a bad state and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mullock) will have to watch it very closely. I need not say, of course, that the postmaster there is a man who is looked upon as one of the chiefs of the Liberal party in that parish, and whether it be true or not, people are under the impression that it is on account of his political proclivities and clever-

ness that the department is so very lenient towards him. It seems that letters remain at that office for many days and although they are claimed they are not delivered. As there is no money order office there, the people give to the son of the postmaster, who carries the mails, money letters to be put in the post office at Sorel, but this man does not deliver the letters. He uses the money, and when he feels that he can do so he sends back the money to the party to whom it is addressed. The postmaster does not stamp half the letters that pass through his office. Many letters have been lost at the office and although they have been claimed sometimes it is weeks and months before they have been found. Father Beaudry, the parish priest of Ste. Victoire, has had a long correspondence with Mr. Bain, post office inspector of Montreal, and with the Postmaster General concerning this office at Ste. Victoire. Affidavits were sent to the Postmaster General and an investigation demanded, but instead of trying to find out the truth of these accusations the Postmaster General granted a contract to the postmaster's son for four years to carry the mails at \$270 per annum, when there was an offer made to do the work for \$220, and good securities tendered. In 1898 Father Beaudry, cure of Ste. Victoire, sent the Postmaster General a petition signed by him and a great many parishioners, asking that a daily service be given between Ste. Victoire and Sorel instead of three times a week. In December, 1898, the department called for tenders for the daily service. In April, 1899, the daily service was established, maintained for five or six weeks, and then discontinued. A new demand was made for the daily service by the cure of the parish at Ste. Victoire in November, 1899, and on the 17th of November, 1899, the Postmaster General answered that it was impossible to establish a daily service as the price wanted, namely, \$270 a year, was too high, considering the receipts from the office. Father Beaudry wrote to the minister that he could find a man who would give first-class securities who would carry the mail daily for \$220 per year instead of \$270, which was asked by Mr. Paulhus, the actual postmaster. On the 1st of February, 1900, complaint was made to the inspector of posts as to the manner in which the post office was kept. On the 20th February, 1900, with the idea, as it is hinted here, of blocking the investigation the Postmaster General, although he had said on the 17th of November that he could not establish a daily service because it was too dear; the Postmaster General then established a daily service. He gave to Paulhus fils a contract for four years to carry the mail between Ste. Victoire and Sorel for \$270, notwithstanding that the cure offered him a reliable man to do the work for \$220. A demand was made upon the Postmaster General asking who were the securities for Paulhus and that was refused. The idea there is, that the securities are his son and

his son-in-law, both of whom are insolvent. This is the information which is given to me and which I now bring before the Postmaster General. I have here a copy of a letter which is addressed by Father Beaudry to the post office inspector at Montreal, which I will read :

Sainte Victoire, Feb. 1, 1900.

Mr. James William Bain,  
Post Office Inspector, Montreal.

Sir,—I want to call your attention to the following facts. A letter addressed from St. Hyacinthe, P.Q., on October 18 last to a person residing at Ste. Victoire, county of Richelieu, P.Q., was not delivered until December 3 following. I can see this by the stamps giving the dates of the offices of St. Hyacinthe and Sorel, and I can judge from that that the delay took place in the post office at Ste. Victoire, where the letter remained, as I have the proof, and where it would still be if a person of good will had not taken upon herself to send it back to the person to whom it was addressed. On December 22 a demand was made from St. Hyacinthe by registered letter on the postmaster here, Mr. H. Paulhus, for explanations as regards the delay. He did not give any explanations. On the 9th instant the said party in St. Hyacinthe, being at St. Victoire, where he had gone to see Mr. Paulhus, the latter commenced by saying to him that he had never received any such letter, but he accused everybody of having ill-will against him.

In spite of the complaints which were addressed to Mr. Paulhus—

Mr BRITTON. Tell us what is the grievance.

Mr. BERGERON. Are you tired? You can go out. I have been waiting three weeks to get a chance to bring this matter up, and I notified the Postmaster General that I intended to bring it up. If my hon. friend thinks I am amusing myself, he makes a great mistake. The letter goes on :

In spite of the complaints which were addressed to Mr. Paulhus concerning that letter which was delayed, I have no grudge against him personally; and although he said that he did not fear the post office inspector, I put the whole case before you to let you know: first, that Mr. H. Paulhus keeps in a very bad way the post office at Ste. Victoire; second, that he opens without necessity packages of letters; third, that he does not stamp with the date of the office a great many letters which come to the office; fourth, that many persons in the locality have very serious grievances against Mr. Paulhus.

I take upon me to give, by myself or by others, the proof of these four accusations as stated above, and to furnish you with all the information which you may desire. The person of whom I have spoken above is the Rev. A. M. Daoust, of the bishopric of St. Hyacinthe. This gentleman will give willingly his testimony in case you require it.

Ste. Victoire is one of the rear parishes of the diocese of St. Hyacinthe, I might almost say of the whole postal district of Montreal, which does not possess a daily mail service, and this at least ought to be given to that parish without any inconvenience.

Awaiting your answer, believe me, Mr. Inspector,

Your very devoted servant.

Mr. BERGERON.

This letter is not signed, but I have reason to believe that it was written by Father Beaudry, and my hon. friend must have the original of it. At the bottom is the following :

All the allegations of this letter as far as I am concerned, are perfectly correct. In belief of which, &c.

(Sgd.) A. M. DAOUST,

Assistant Secretary to the Bishop.

St. Hyacinthe, February 1, 1900.

On the 3rd February—and this convinces me that the letter was signed by Father Beaudry—the following letter was written by the post office inspector :

Post Office Inspector's Office,  
Montreal, February 3, 1900.

Rev. J. Beaudry, Curé, Ste. Victoire.

Reverend Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st inst., and to say to you that I will give it my immediate attention.

Your obedient servant,

J. W. BAIN,

Post Office Inspector.

On the 13th of February another letter was written by the post office inspector, as follows :

Post Office Inspector's Office,  
Montreal, February 13, 1900.

Rev. J. Beaudry, Ste. Victoire.

Reverend Mr. Curé,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, and in answer I may say that upon the receipt of your complaint I wrote immediately to the postmaster to call his attention to the irregularities of which you complain, and to put him in a position to give the necessary explanations in the matter. It is impossible for me at present to say exactly when I shall be able to visit Ste. Victoire, but when it shall be possible for me to go, I shall let you know in advance. I hope, in any case, that the admonition given to the postmaster of that place will cause him to give more attention to the duties of his position.

Your obedient servant,

J. W. BAIN,

Post Office Inspector.

I said at the commencement of my remarks that the attention of my hon. friend had been called to this matter long ago. I have a letter from him dated the 17th November, 1899, and addressed to the Rev. Mr. Beaudry, as follows :

Ottawa, November 17, 1899.

My dear Sir,—Permit me to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 13th inst., with reference to the application for the establishment of a daily mail service between Sorel and Ste. Victoire.

This proposed service was strongly pressed upon me by your representative, Mr. Bruneau, and it would have been a very great pleasure for me to have met his wishes, as it would be to accede to yours. You, as a man of experience in affairs of the world, will know that there are generally two sides to every important question, and the present one is no exception. Allow me to say that, with a view to ascertaining whether it would be possible to arrange the daily mail asked for, I directed that tenders be invited for a daily service, in the hope that

the cost would come within reasonable limits, having regard to the revenue derived from the office. The lowest and only tender received was one for \$270. The gross revenue of the Ste. Victoire office amounts to only \$84 a year, out of which the postmaster receives a salary of \$30, leaving a net revenue of \$54. Thus you will see that the expenditure involved would be equal to almost five times the net revenue. The present cost of a tri-weekly service is \$140 a year. I therefore very much regret that after carefully considering all the circumstances, I am unable to comply favourably with your request.

Yours sincerely,  
(Sgd.) W. MULOCK.

Rev. Father J. Beaudry,  
Ste. Victoire, Que.

My hon. friend wrote that letter on the 17th of November; yet when great pressure was brought to bear for an investigation of the office at Ste. Victoire, instead of having an investigation and finding out whether these accusations were true or not, he gave the contract to Mr. Paulhus for \$270 for a daily mail service, although in this letter of the 17th of November he says the revenue would not justify him in doing so. The mail was carried daily for a few weeks and then discontinued; and to-day it is only a tri-weekly service, though the department continues to pay Mr. Paulhus \$270 a year. I hope my hon. friend will give me the explanations, so that they may appear in *Hansard*, and I may send them to these people.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman a few days ago called my attention to the insufficient mail service between Ste. Victoire and Sorel. That was the only thing he alluded to at the time, and I was not then aware, and have not been till this moment, that there was any other ground of complaint than that a daily mail service was paid for and only a tri-weekly service was said to be given.

Mr. BERGERON. I thought the hon. gentleman knew what I meant, because last year the same complaints were brought before him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not know of the complaint with regard to the alleged inefficient management of the post office. There are thousands of communications sent to the Postmaster General which are not brought to his personal attention, but are distributed to the proper officers to be dealt with. I understand my hon. friend's grievances to be divided into two classes: One with reference to the management of the post office, and the other with reference to the mail contract. With reference to the management of the post office, all such complaints are referred to the inspectors to be reported upon. Complaints of this kind are of daily occurrence, referring to letters not being date-stamped, or people fancying that their letters have not been properly despatched, or have not been de-

livered to them when called for. These things will continue as long as there is a post office.

Mr. BERGERON. There are more grave accusations there.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not minimizing them at all. I am only indicating to the hon. gentleman that practically no Postmaster General can possibly receive all the communications and attend to them himself. The machinery of the office does that. A letter only comes to his knowledge when some action has to be taken by the responsible head, such as the dismissal of a postmaster for wrong-doing. I have no recollection of ever having heard till this moment of any irregularities or neglect of duty on the part of the postmaster.

Mr. BERGERON. I think I brought the matter to the attention of my hon. friend in the House last year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think not. I am very methodical in regard to all such matters, and they take their regular routine. Any complaint against the postmaster goes to the inspector, and not to the head of the department, until some official action on his part is necessary. However, I give my version as I recollect the facts, and my hon. friend will observe that there is no connection between the alleged shortcomings of the postmaster as such and the giving of a mail contract to him.

The hon. member for Richelieu was constantly pressing me to establish a daily service, and I resisted his application. He joined forces with the cure, but I resisted, as other Postmasters General have had to do, and will have to do in similar cases. I resisted as long as I could, but finally yielded. It was represented to me that there was no telegraph or telephone or railway system, and that even if the mail service did cost more than it ought, under ordinary circumstances, in consequence of the people not having these conveniences they ought to have an improved mail service, and at last I yielded. As regards the statement that a tri-weekly service only has been rendered, I asked Mr. Smith, of the contract branch, if such was the case, and he said it was not, so far as he knew, and there was nothing in the department to show that there was less than a daily service. If there has been only a tri-weekly service when a daily service was ordered, the officers are responsible for not having brought the matter to my attention. The inspector of the division has certified to the accounts, and they have been paid, and the responsible officer will be called on to ascertain the facts and give an explanation.

Mr. BERGERON. Last year, during the estimates, I spoke on this subject, but, probably, not in so thorough a manner as at

present, but if the hon. gentleman will inquire into the matter, that will be satisfactory. The complaint does not arise in my county, but, of course, we receive many such complaints, right and left.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Quite so, and, as I have said, I will inquire into the subject. With reference to the amount of the contract, my recollection is that, first of all, tenders were invited for the service, beginning at Sorel, and ultimately it was shown to be more convenient to have the contractor begin at Ste. Victoire, and a contract was given beginning at that place, some seven or eight miles from Sorel. It was done in the best of good faith, in order to have the best service. I cannot recollect any offer of \$220, but I am sure that if there were any such offer, it was made in such a way that its acceptance would not have been in the best interests of the community.

Mr. BERGERON. The information I have is, that the cure made an offer at \$220, and gave two securities, and could not get any reply.

I want to ask my hon. friend another question, to which I may not be entitled to a reply to-day, as I did not bring it to his attention previously. I want to find out the number of permanent employees, the number of extra or sessional employees, and the number of first and second class employees in the department. I believe that there are over 270 employees, of whom only about twenty-five are French Canadians. I am informed also, that since this government came into power some of the French Canadians have been superannuated, or have otherwise disappeared from the department, and their places have been filled by English Canadians. I am informed that out of 190 permanent employees, very few are of French origin, and that it is among the sixty-two extra clerks that most of that nationality are to be found. There was a first-class clerk in the department by the name of Octave Fortier, who died and was replaced by an English-speaking Canadian in 1898, although there were some twenty-five or thirty French Canadians in the department in the same class, who had passed all the examinations and were thoroughly competent to perform Mr. Fortier's duties.

I do not want to raise any question of race or nationality, but wish to know, purely and simply, as a matter of administration, if what I have said has actually been done, and if so, what was the reason?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot take exception to the spirit in which my hon. friend has spoken, and will try and meet him in the same spirit. When I took charge of the department, I looked over the staff, and found, without making any comment on the course followed by my predecessor, who can well afford to stand the criticism—that my own fellow-countrymen had been more highly favoured in the department and that there were comparatively

few French Canadians on the staff. Like my hon. friend, I am not anxious to ostentatiously make appointments, on the ground of race, but I desired, when a fair opportunity occurred, to recognize what was due to my friends of French Canadian origin, and from time to time have made appointments of French Canadians. The usual way to enter the Post Office Department was by the third class, and then rise gradually by promotion according to merit. But, when the third class was abolished, the only way to enter the department was by the writers' class, because it is very unfair to those who have been years in the service to put new men into the second class over their heads. That was the principle on which I acted, save in one or two cases, and that was in the case of my own private secretaries.

The private secretary has very onerous work, if he is an efficient man. Owing to the discontinuance of the third class, it is practically impossible for any one to enter the service where there are divisions of classes, first and second, except beginning at the writers' class. To do otherwise would create great disaffection throughout the service. I have respected that position in all I have done, and I have endeavoured, quietly, whenever fair opportunity presented itself, to appoint members of my hon. friend's race. As he does not wish any point made publicly, it is not necessary to press the matter further.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. As to the nationality of those who were appointed, I may explain that of the appointments made when I was head of the department, several were French Canadians. I appointed Mr. Lemay and my own private secretary, who was a French Canadian, and a number of others whom I do not recollect at the moment, but whose names will be found in the civil service list. However, of course, there were very few altogether as the service was already filled.

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). Referring to the subject which occupied the attention of the House during the earlier part of the discussion, I desire to say but a word to express my dissent from the views expressed by the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I believe that a fiat should not issue as a matter of course, that is not the intention and is not the practice; and I should think it is a very bad thing if that were the practice. Before the fiat is issued, there ought to be two things shown—first, that the case is one of a class of cases well known to be within the remedy afforded by the petition of right, and second, that there is a prima facie case for the issue of a fiat. I simply express my dissent from the hon. gentlemen I have referred to and give a reference. I have here 'Clode on Petition of Right,' and at page 50 begins a chapter in which atten-

tion is drawn to certain classes of cases in which it has been held that petition of right will not lie. Discussing that point, at page 52, the author says :

It must not be inferred, however, from the foregoing words, that every violation of right or legal injury for which an action would lie by one subject against another can, if committed by the Crown or its agents against a subject, be the foundation of a petition of right; and that the rights and remedies which a subject has against the Crown by petition are co-extensive with those which he has against his fellow-subjects by action. Such an inference would, as we shall see hereafter, be entirely erroneous. In the first place, it would be wrong to make the rights and remedies which exist between subjects the measure of those which exist between subjects and the Crown, since historically they are unconnected, and have been developed on entirely different principles; and in the second place, there are some acts which are legal injuries when done by a subject, but are not so when done by the Crown.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the date of that book ?

Mr. BRITTON. It is not very recent, still it is not very old—1887.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. member (Mr. Britton) will remember, I was saying that in England the petition of right issued as a matter of course.

Mr. BRITTON. I think not, and I give this authority.

Mr. HAGGART. All that I know, is from the argument that took place in the House when the Bill was passed. I happened to be in the House at that time, and listened to the speeches of Mr. Blake and others. Of course, there are some cases in which it would be inadvisable to grant the petition of right; yet in almost every ordinary case, it ought to be granted. The object of the Bill was to make it as free as possible, and I remember particularly that the argument in the House went to show that when the Bill was passed it was intended that in nearly every case the petition should be granted. I can imagine cases in which it would be inadvisable for the petition to issue, but in nearly every case it should issue.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There ought to be provision or security for costs; otherwise, it would be a serious tax on the exchequer.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. But I would refer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) to the argument of Mr. Blake and other lawyers upon the question.

Arts, agriculture and statistics..... \$492,500

Mr. HAGGART. When are we to get our statistical year books? We want them very badly now.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The statistical year book is in the hands of the printer, and I hope it will be out soon.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the number of copies to be given to each member of the House ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think we shall be able to give about ten copies to each member. I have increased the number as compared with last year.

Department of Indian Affairs—Contingencies ..... \$9,130

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to ask the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland), if he can explain to me why there were two increases granted to the salary of J. D. McLean, secretary of the branch, one in the main estimates of \$50, and another in the supplementaries of \$150, making two increases in one year? Why was it necessary to do that, while many other deserving men in the same department were passed over?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I may say to the hon. gentleman that the intention was that his salary should be increased by \$200. It was increased by \$150, and in addition he got the usual increase along with many others. Mr. McLean holds a position almost equal to that of a deputy minister, although he is receiving a small salary. He has been twenty odd years in the department and it was represented to me by all parties that he had been a most useful public servant, attentive to his duties and most competent to deal with all Indian affairs. As my hon. friend knows, there is no deputy minister at all in the Indian Department, and Mr. McLean fills the deputy's position as far as the administration of the department is concerned.

Mr. SPROULE. He gets the usual statutory increase, when the statutory increase is denied to many others. In addition to this he gets \$150, making three statutory increases in one year. I understand that he is only doing ordinary work—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is the secretary of the department, and he is practically the deputy head of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. He is secretary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is secretary of the department and has very responsible duties, having practically to check up the work of all the other officials of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. There are two objections to this increase. One is the way that a portion of it is put in the main estimates and another in the supplementary estimates. I think that when these increases are given in one year they should be given in one place. It is put in piecemeal in the hope that it may be overlooked by the House

when we are considering these items in the estimates. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) says Mr. McLean is a very useful man. I believe he has been a very useful man to the hon. Minister of the Interior, and I have no doubt that may be one reason why he has got such a large increase while others have been passed over.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether he intends in future to deal out, in case he should have charge of the department, equal justice to all the clerks of his department.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think that I have done any injustice.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like whoever has charge of the railway estimates to bring down this information when they come up for concurrence. The statement was made by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), and confirmed by myself, that in paying extra subsidies to railways last session the locomotives and other materials upon a road were taken into consideration in the estimate for the payment of the subsidy. It was indignantly denied by the hon. Minister of Railways, who said there was no such thing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Could you state on what road?

Mr. HAGGART. There are only three roads altogether, and the one I particularly mentioned was in New Brunswick.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Restigouche and Western Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. I want the papers brought down in reference to it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) stated that it was not correct that the rolling stock had been paid for. What he stated was that in the construction of the railway an engine or two which had been used and which were worn out were taken into consideration as part of the expense of construction.

Mr. HAGGART. In estimating the amount to be paid over, the \$3,200 per mile, the estimate was to be founded on the actual construction of the road independently of the rolling stock. Our statement was that these payments were made without an account being furnished or a book to justify the payment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will have the papers brought down this afternoon.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, as I stated, on one particular road, in order to make out payment, he had to include the rolling stock.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. ex-Minister of Fin-

Mr. SPROULE.

ance (Mr. Foster) stated it, but he refused to state on which road it was.

Mr. HAGGART. I said it was on the Restigouche and Western.

It being One o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

The House resumed at Three o'clock.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before we leave the votes for the Department of Public Works, and with reference to this item for telegraphs, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a company which was chartered last year, namely, the Canadian British Columbian and Dawson City Telegraph Company, Limited. The company obtained from parliament, without objection from the government, a charter to construct a telegraph line to the Yukon district. This necessarily involved considerable expense. The company's correspondence with its solicitor at Ottawa, shows that within two months of the passing of the company's Act of incorporation, he brought the subject of the company's undertaking to the notice of the Minister of Railways who assured him that the government had no intention of undertaking the construction of a telegraph line to the Yukon district. In consequence of this, the provisional directors organized the company and brought out the project in London at great expense. In the month of December, following 1898, the Minister of Public Works was formally advised of the organization of the company, of its having obtained capital in Britain, and of its having entered into a contract for the construction of the work, and the company made an application to him for a lease of the government line from Ascroft to Glenora. He was seen personally on the subject two or three times, but notwithstanding he was aware of the company's operations and expenditure, he concealed the fact that he had a project on foot to build the line for the government, and was then actually carrying out the various preliminaries. Any hon. gentleman who looks at the charter will see that my name appears as one of the directors, and I want to explain the circumstances under which I agreed to join the company. I happened to be in London, when it was represented to me and to the Hon. Mr. Turner, the ex-Premier of the province of British Columbia, who also happened to be in London at the time, that this was an enterprise which Canadians considered to be almost indispensable to that country, as I consider it myself. Two members of the British parliament, among others, became trustees for the company, and English capital was invested in it, for the purpose of building this telegraph line. I had occasion when in London, with the trustees and the bankers of the company, to interview Lord Strathcona, and through him we sent a protest to the Governor in Council here, stating the facts and repre-

senting that it would be detrimental to the best interests of Canada to allow it to go abroad to the public of Great Britain that a charter could receive the sanction of the Canadian government and parliament, and could then be set aside by the government undertaking to build the line themselves. I do not wish to take up the time of the House; but I must state that I know instances where the very circumstances connected with this charter have worked against Canadian enterprise in London. If Canadians go about with a charter and seek to get English capital interested in the development of the resources of Canada or the building of public works of importance, gentlemen may say, 'Well, how can we rely upon your charters, in view of the fact that a charter was given to the Canadian, British Columbia and Dawson City Telegraph Company, Limited, and a few months afterwards, the government, although aware of the expenses which had been incurred by the company in sending an engineer to New York and Chicago for the purpose of entering into contracts to build the line, undertook to do the work themselves?' This certainly is not a means of attracting British capital to Canada. I know the company applied to the government for redress, at least to the extent of being indemnified for the expenses which have been incurred. I had occasion to meet the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) when in London, and I introduced him to these gentlemen. We had interviews with him, but the only explanation we could get from him was, that after granting the charter, the government had decided to build the line themselves. I think this was not a fair recognition of the efforts made by those who undertook to find the capital to build a deserving public work, nor to the company who had invested their funds, and had gone to a great deal of trouble and expense to find the material and to enter into contracts for the construction of the line. I wanted to bring the matter up sooner, but I happened to be away when that part of the estimates of the Public Works Department were taken up. Lord Strathcona himself thought we had a good case for indemnity for the expenses incurred. I think this circumstance has done Canada harm, and is likely to do it more harm still. The government to my mind, did not do what was in the interests of Canada in competing against that company.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Speaker, not being aware of the facts to which my hon. friend alludes, I am not in a position to discuss the merits of the claim which he says has been made to the government for indemnity. I quite endorse all that any member can say as to its being the duty of the government to exercise the best of faith, not only towards those who obtain charters, but towards the public who

may be induced by the government to believe that those charters are outstanding. I understood my hon. friend to state that the foundation of the claim rested on certain representations said to have been made by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), and the Minister of Public Works. How far the utterances of individual ministers would bind the government on questions of policy would be a proper subject for consideration.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. We will not discuss that point; it would mislead the public.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It might mislead the public, and, therefore, no minister can be too cautious in what he does lest even an ill-considered word might be supposed to have more far-reaching consequences and more authority than the facts warranted. However, I can only say, with reference to the memorial which the hon. gentleman says has been presented to the government, that when the Minister of Public Works returns I will bring the matter to his attention, and I have no doubt it will receive every consideration.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would just say, as a supplement to what I have already said, that Mr. Walter O. Clough, a member of the British House of Commons, a man well known in the city of London as a very wealthy man, became a trustee with Alderman Joseph Barker; and the solicitors of the company are Messrs. Gemmell & May, of Ottawa, who had the interviews with the two ministers to whom I have referred.

Militia—Pay and allowances ..... \$381,094

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. During the discussion on the estimates, I had occasion to speak to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, about certain promotions which had been made and certain increases given to some of the officers of the department and refused to others. I refer more particularly to Mr. Holt and to Mr. Lambert, who have been a long time in the department. I had occasion to test the qualifications of both these gentlemen. Mr. Holt came into the service in 1882. His training has fitted him in every way for the position he occupies. He was trained in a commercial house and subsequently in a banking house, and I fear no contradiction, when I say that, as a man thoroughly capable of occupying the very responsible position of accountant in a department like that of militia, he may have his equal, but certainly not his superior. He has been through every examination, he has qualified for every step by submitting to all the examinations he had to undergo. I have never heard during the whole years when I was Minister of Militia, any complaint against him, by any officer in the department. All his superior officers, the deputy and all the others with

whom he was in touch, have always spoken of him as one of the most efficient officers in the civil service. He came into the service in 1882, and in 1894, he became first-class clerk, and received his increase of \$50 every year, until the hon. gentleman took charge of the office in 1897, when the government ceased to give him his annual increase. He is an officer who stands very high and is recommended by the deputy and all those who can appreciate the services he has rendered, and he has refused the increase which is given to others. I have not got a word to say against Mr. Lane or the other gentlemen who have received their increase. They are very good officers, and very useful, but I say the discrimination exercised is one which saps at the very foundation of the civil service of Canada.

Mr. Holt was appointed during my time, and is a very excellent officer, and so is Mr. Larose. But where I claim the injustice is done to Mr. Holt is that he has been refused his increase, and this will interfere with his retiring allowance. It is impossible for me to make out why this discrimination has been made. It is true, Mr. Holt has been given an allowance for extra work in connection with the South African contingents. There is also Mr. Lambert. He is one of the best officers in the department. He does not, nor do his people belong to the political party to which I belong. I am not attempting to depreciate the services rendered by the other gentlemen, but I say that in the cases of Mr. Lambert and Mr. Holt, there is a glaring injustice which should be remedied even at this late hour. Mr. Holt's services are appreciated by all those who know what they have been. During the trouble in the North-west, he was in charge of the books, and he rendered invaluable service. It is very hard indeed that the work of a man who has devoted the best years of his life to the service, should not be recognized and that he should be set aside, while others are promoted and given the increases. I do not know the reason why the minister has taken this course, but it seems to me that injustice has been done in these cases, and I wished to bring them, even though in this brief manner, before parliament, and before the country.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). It is quite true that my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron), has referred to the case of Mr. Holt, in personal conversation, and I endeavoured to explain the matter to him. The question of promotion is not involved; the question is whether the statutory increases, so called, should be given or not. I do not intend to discuss that now, as it has been gone over again and again. But I may say that the present government, on taking office, took the view that we were not bound by the statute to give the so-called statutory increases, unless the minister of the depart-

ment thought the clerk was entitled to it. Under that rule, I selected, with the assistance of the deputy minister, certain clerks—ten, I think out of eighteen—to receive increases. It so happened that Mr. Holt was not one of these. Mr. Holt is in the finance branch of my department and is, as the hon. gentleman states, very efficient indeed. But he is receiving, I think, fairly good remuneration—some \$1,550 a year. For the work he performs, he would not receive that amount in any of our chartered banks—

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He was getting much more when he came in.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then I do not see why he left what he had. In any case, I agree with the hon. gentleman that he is a good man. I do not think the hon. gentleman has a right to say that there has been discrimination. He says that certain clerks junior to these gentlemen have received increases. But the House will readily understand it is necessary, at times, to increase the salaries of men drawing six or seven hundred dollars a year, when it might not be necessary to increase the salary of a man drawing \$1,550. I believe there are many cases of great hardship among the clerks receiving small salaries, and wherever there is such a case, I try to remedy it. In almost every case, except that of Mr. Benoit, who has been promoted, we have given the increase to men whose salaries were below \$1,000. Mr. Holt has not been set aside, or his claim disregarded. He has received one statutory increase since I came in, and, if I remain at the head of the department, he may receive others. But, for this year, he is receiving a bonus of \$100 for the extra work he did for the contingents; and his salary and this bonus together, constitute, I think, a fair reward. As to Mr. Lambert, he is receiving the maximum salary of his class, and we could not give him more, unless we promoted him to a chief clerkship. I think my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron), knowing, as he does, the officers of the department, would not, if he were in my place, recommend that Mr. Lambert should be given a chief clerkship, instead of Mr. Benoit. Mr. Benoit was recommended to the new chief clerkship which has been established, and I believe that was but a just recognition of a most faithful servant. Mr. Lambert is one of the oldest officials in the department, and in the public service. He has been in the public service since 1859, and has earned his full retiring allowance, those being entitled to it, who have served over thirty-five years. Mr. Lambert is now nearly seventy years of age; and I may say to the hon. gentleman that Mr. Lambert is willing, and, I think, desirous of being relieved from his position. I think the last thing in the world that Mr. Lambert contemplates, is asking for promotion.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. On January 1, 1898, Mr. Holt was receiving \$1,550. Since that time, the increase of \$50 has been refused him. Under the system which obtained until the present government came into power, Mr. Holt would have received \$400 more than he has received.

There is where I complain. I am not able to take in the system which is followed. When he came in he came in at the minimum of \$1,400. In these very estimates there are increases of \$200 for some of the officers of the hon. gentleman's department. It seems to me that when these large increases are given, unless it be possible to establish the fact that the ordinary increase is refused because the officer is not deserving, it is an injustice which does a lot of harm in the civil service. When a man does his duty faithfully, and when he sees preferences of that kind, I do not see how he can remain satisfied and contented. If I am in parliament another session I intend to draw the attention of parliament to it in a much more prominent manner, because I think it is doing a great deal of harm and injury to the service.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. I understand that all the charters of steamers for South Africa, with the exception of one, were given to Boston firms. The Minister of Agriculture promised to give some additional information with regard to that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The information that I understood was desired was in connection with the charter of the *Manhanset*, which Messrs. Scammell & Company, of St. John, wrote about. I did not get from my officers details of the other steamers that were chartered. I have here a memorandum from Professor Robertson, which I will read :

I had communication with J. H. Scammell & Co., St. John, N.B. regarding chartering of steamships on account of the War Office for carrying Canadian products to South Africa.

I may say in explanation that this was in consequence of my instructions to Professor Robertson to communicate with various steamship owners and brokers in Canada who might have steamships to offer.

On March 8, Messrs. Scammell & Co. offered the ss. 'Manhanset' at \$27,000. To that I replied: 'Not yet ready charter April sailings, and will not require before April 23.' After that the office agent of the managers of the ss. 'Manhanset,' with Mr. John C. Hall, of Boston, came to Ottawa. It was not suitable to have the 'Manhanset' begin loading before April 25. The point of not beginning to load until April 20 was conceded by the managers direct, through John C. Hall & Co., and could not, as far as I learned, have been obtained in any other way. I could not, as I wanted, have the date when the loading should commence, put to April 28. The demurrage on the steamship was £50 per day, and if the charter party permitted the loading days to count from before the cargo was ready to load, the demurrage would have

to count from before the cargo was ready to load, the demurrage would have been payable for such time. Also, the War Office desired the shipment to be postponed as late as practicable. A telegram has been received at this date, July 11, saying the 'Manhanset' is not yet discharged in South Africa.

The ss. 'Manhanset' was chartered on March 28. I wrote to Messrs. Scammell & Co. a letter on April 6, explaining the facts, as per copy attached hereto.

This is the letter :

I am in receipt of your letter of April 3. The department is desirous of putting this business wholly in the hands of Canadian firms, but has taken the usual business course of accepting the offers of those who were able to offer the best value at the time. We could not use the steamship 'Manhanset' to begin loading until April 20. The agent of the owners of the steamship, together with Mr. Hall, came to Ottawa, and later on they consented to an agreement whereby the lay days would not begin until the date I have mentioned. As far as I could learn, that concession could not have been obtained through any broker except by direct negotiations with the owners of the steamship. At the present moment we have chartered all the tonnage which we require for produce to South Africa.

This shows that when Scammell Bros. made the offer of this steamship it was before we needed her. We then found that we would need a steamer at a certain date. They could not retain the steamer until that date, they only had it up to a certain time. But the owners of the steamer were able to make arrangements through Hall & Company to charter the steamer, but it was really a direct transaction with the owners of the steamer.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell us by to-morrow why the chartering of the steamers was given through a Boston firm. It was thought that we had Canadian firms through whom the business might have been done just as profitable as through a Boston firm.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think the statement is strictly accurate, it was not all done through a Boston firm. I cannot speak positively, but I know there was one steamer owned and managed that was chartered direct from the owners in Canada, and I know there was another steamer chartered through the Thompsons, of St. John, and I think there was another chartered in Canada. But the fact is, as I stated the other day, these gentlemen made us offers much cheaper than anybody else. I gave the Canadian firms a chance, we got offers from a number of people in Canada, and we found they were invariably underbid by this firm, and we felt it to be our duty to take the lowest bid.

Post Office..... \$953 12

Mr. SPROULE. I may as well take the occasion of this item to ask the Postmaster General to inform us how many of the clerks in his department received a statutory in-

crease this year. I do not suppose he could remember the names, but I fancy there were quite a few.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman said he would bring down that list.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am afraid if I said so I have not kept my word. I have not got the list here, but I will send and get it if desired. I should think that 50 per cent, or, perhaps, 55 per cent of those that were eligible received increases.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the hon. minister give the list to the House any time to-night or to-morrow?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That would not be possible, because the names have not passed council. When this vote is passed they will go to council.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. gentleman must have a record of those who would be presented to council for increases. I presume the hon. minister knows those to whom he is going to give increases?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think I can dispose of the matter satisfactorily to the hon. gentleman by saying that in every case both in the inside and outside service where the officer had not a salary of \$600 there is an increase. That represents, I think, the overwhelming number of the employees of the Post Office Department. Most of them are low salaried people. In the last few years there have been no appointments made in the inside service other than those of temporary clerks. I think, and as the higher officers on the list have got pretty well up to the maximum, the withholding of the increase does not numerically affect as many in the Post Office Department as many other cases.

Mr. SPROULE. Those between \$600 and \$1,000, which would be the maximum of the third class would be left out.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, not left out. In addition to those under \$600 getting an increase there is a very large number of permanent clerks who have not been up to the maximum also getting an increase, and I think the hon. gentleman will find, although I do not want to be held literally to this, but I think it is substantially the case, that the increases granted this year will practically apply to every clerk not at his maximum, who has not had an increase in the prior year.

Pay Ralph Jones half interest at 6 per cent on \$38,915.37, amount reported by commissioner on Oxford and New Glasgow Railway claim respecting 'hardpan' of Stewart & Jones' contract, No. 6, made up as follows: On \$38,055.37 from January 7, 1893, date of finding, to September 20, 1893, date of payment, and on \$860 from January 7, 1893, date of finding, to October 9, 1894, date of payment, in all \$1,694.99..... \$347 50

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. HAGGART. I see the representative of justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in his place now. I think when this matter was under consideration, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) stated, that he had referred it to the Department of Justice, and upon their advice this item was put in the estimates. It is one of the most extraordinary interferences of the government in private affairs that I ever knew of. It seems to me that there was a certain sum of money due to Stewart & Jones for contract work down in Nova Scotia, and they were entitled to a certain sum for interest. The government pick out one of the individual members of the firm and say that this money, which is due to the firm, shall be paid to one of the members of the firm. I believe the firm's assets are in the court, and under the direction of the court which makes it still worse. Here is the Railway Department asking the country to vote a sum of money which is due to Jones & Stewart to be paid to Mr. Jones individually, notwithstanding the fact that the amount is due to the firm of Stewart & Jones, and that the assets of the firm are in liquidation, and under the direction of the court.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I presume that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) must have consulted the regular officials of the department. The matter never came to my notice at all. I have not been called upon to express an opinion upon the subject one way or the other.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like the hon. gentleman's opinion of it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It would be necessary for me to give the matter very careful consideration.

Mr. BERGERON. Before we proceed, I would like to refer to a matter we were discussing the other day. Of course, it is very ungrateful to discuss anything now after the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) has gone away, but I want to make one remark about the tolls which have to be paid by the public on the Victoria bridge. I do this in view of the fact that we have granted subsidies this year to the amount of \$230,000, that we voted last year \$270,000, and that we are paying the Grand Trunk Company \$40,000 a year for allowing the trains of the Intercolonial Railway to cross that bridge. We feel that an imposition has been placed upon the public in that they should be called upon to pay tolls when so much money has been contributed towards the construction of that bridge out of the public treasury. I need not remind the House when the Victoria bridge was first built \$5,000,000 of the money of the country was paid towards its construction. The House was under the impression that if we were

able to secure a reduction of the tolls this would be the time to do it, because of the large contributions of public money towards the reconstruction of the bridge. The hon. Minister of Railways promised that he would see to it. What I want to bring before the House now is a sadder case than any of those which have been mentioned in connection with the collection of tolls. The tolls are very high. It costs 5 cents for a man to walk across the bridge when the Grand Trunk Railway Company only charge 5 cents to take a man from the Bonaventure station and land him in St. Lambert. Since this subject was discussed in the House I have received a letter telling me of the case of a man in St. Lambert who had the misfortune to lose his son. He wanted to take the remains to Mount Royal cemetery in Montreal for burial. When the funeral procession crossed the bridge the ordinary toll for the hearse was charged and they charged 5 cents for the body which was in it. That was looked upon as carrying things too far, and I only ask the attention of the House to it to show that unless these gentlemen are remonstrated with they will be allowed to do things which will revolt public opinion. I call the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to it, because the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is far away from here now. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals promised the other day he would see to it. When they are going so far as to charge 5 cents for a corpse crossing the bridge it is carrying things too far altogether.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is aware that by the Bill which has passed this House, and which I hope will receive the Royal Assent tomorrow, we have taken power to regulate the tolls over the bridge. This subject is engaging our attention, and we have already communicated with the Grand Trunk Railway authorities on the subject.

Mr. HAGGART. Before we pass the railway votes, I wish to make a statement. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) and myself stated in the House that some of the railways that earned their subsidies took into consideration the rolling stock. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) denied that in the most positive manner, but the papers are down to-day, and I find it is absolutely correct, that subsidy payments have been made on the rolling stock.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What is the rolling stock?

Mr. HAGGART. The rolling stock is \$10,000 on ten miles of road. The total estimated cost per mile, including that \$10,000, is \$17,985.42.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does the rolling stock include the locomotives?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes. I see a memorandum on the bottom from Mr. Schreiber. The rolling stock referred to is an engine and train of flat cars purchased for construction purposes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is what the Minister of Railways said. It was rolling stock used in construction, but not a portion of the permanent equipment of the road.

Mr. HAGGART. I stated that the rolling stock was taken into consideration in finding out the value of the permanent way.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), and supported by the hon. member (Mr. Foster), left the impression on this committee that this was for the rolling stock on the road. The rolling stock referred to by the Minister of Railways was worn-out rolling stock used in the construction, just the same as an old spade would be.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) looks at the estimate of the cost, he will see at once that that argument will not have the slightest effect. There is an item for close cutting, grubbing, earth excavation, hard-pan and loose rock, solid rock, &c., at the rate of \$1.40 per yard, and that amounted to \$13,133. Then, there are stone drains, rip-rap, timber, lumber in drains, stone filling, public road diversion, ties, rails, fastenings, &c., bringing it up to \$50,000. There is also a steel bridge. All these items cover the cost of construction. It was never contemplated that the rolling stock should be included in the construction. There is no doubt that it was on these figures that the amount was paid. The Act says that for anything over \$15,000 a mile, the road is entitled to 50 per cent of the excess.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I merely point out that the statement of the Minister of Railways was to the effect that the rolling stock was that used up in the construction of the road. Whether it is a proper item to include in the cost of the road is a matter with which I have nothing to do.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman will read the certificates of the engineer he will see there was no mention that this was rolling stock used up in the building of this ten miles of road.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to ask the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) a question. It is understood that Lt.-Col. Sam. Hughes, M.P., has been discharged by Lord Roberts in South Africa. No particulars can be obtained. Might I ask the Minister of Militia or the Prime Minister if they have any information to give on this matter?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Speaking for myself, I have none whatever.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, I can say to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that I have no official information upon the subject.

Mr. SPROULE. The amount expended from year to year during the last few years has been increasing very rapidly, although when hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition they never ceased denouncing the late government for its extravagance in immigration expenditure. In 1894, the late government spent \$202,000 on immigration, and the hon. member for North Wellington declared that if his party held office they would save \$200,000 a year of that expenditure or practically wipe it out altogether. In 1895, the expenditure amounted to \$195,000 and in 1896, to only \$120,000. Then these hon. gentlemen opposite took office, and I find that in 1889 they spent \$387,000, in 1900, \$435,000, and they are asking \$445,000 for 1901. It will thus be seen that the expenditure has more than doubled itself the last three years. It appears to me that the immigration department has been converted into an asylum for defeated Reform candidates and politicians, who are useful no doubt to the party, and are to-day drawing pensions at the expense of the country. Besides the class of immigrants brought in is not a class most desirable for this country. Notwithstanding what may be said to the contrary, I do hold that there is a strong conviction in the North-west that both the Doukhobors and Galicians are undesirable as settlers, and I am told that the unpopularity of the Minister of the Interior to-day in the west is largely due to his immigration policy. The salaries of the agents in Great Britain amount to \$110,000 and we are told by Mr. Preston that the work is not carried on very satisfactorily. He pointed out several directions in which it might be improved. According to the reports from our European and continental agents it appears also that the outlook for immigration is very blue, so that I can see no necessity for this increased expenditure. I therefore move that the item under consideration, item 96, be not concurred, but be referred back to the committee with instructions to reduce it by \$10,000.

Amendment negatived on division.

Contingencies in Canadian, British and foreign agencies and general immigration expenses, including salaries of extra clerks at head office ..... \$283,000

Mr. SPROULE. I beg to move in amendment that this item be not concurred in, but be referred back to the Committee of Supply with instructions to reduce it to the amount of \$200,000.

Amendment negatived on division.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. HAGGART. There was an item with reference to the voters' lists, which came up when the right hon. gentleman was out, and in connection with that item I draw his attention to the fact that the Senate have made a considerable number of amendments to the Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the elections of members to the House of Commons. There are here about 87 amendments. Have the ministers seriously considered the position with regard to this Bill and whether they will go on with it this session?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, I have had a conference with the Minister of Justice to-day on this subject, and he informs me that the amendments, with one single exception—that is, except as relating to one single subject—are verbal and of no consequence, and do not affect the principles of the Bill or its provisions. However, there is a serious alteration in the Bill in regard to the law in Prince Edward Island. Apart from that, there is no difficulty in coming to a conclusion in regard to these amendments. We will take them as soon as we have finished the present order.

Mr. HAGGART. We will take them up the first thing to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, the first thing this evening.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to capital—Cornwall Canal—To pay Gilbert Dredging Company, interest ..... \$22,388

Mr. HAGGART. I move that this item be struck out.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not necessary; it can be expressed by a negative vote.

Amendment negatived on division.

Militia and Defence—Income—Military properties ..... \$53,200

Mr. TAYLOR. I had a question on the Order paper, and I believe that the acting Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sutherland), has the answer. I would like him to give the answer to the question, which is as follows:

Has the government sold, leased or given permission to any person or persons to erect cottages on the government land, known as Barriefield Common, at Kingston? If so, to whom and on what terms? Have any cottages been erected on said lands, and by whom?

Mr. JAMES SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). The following is the answer: The government has not sold or leased to any individuals, land or given permission to erect cottages on the government land, known as Barriefield Common. Leases have been granted to the following parties, of small plots of ground on the shore front of the military reserve, east of Fort Henry: Major J. Galloway, by the year, at an annual rental of \$4.86. No permission granted to erect buildings. J. D. Thompson, for ten years, at a rental of \$4.86. No permission to

erect buildings, and possession resumable by the department at any time, if required. John Carson, same terms. Rental \$4.86. R. H. Abbott, for ten years, at a rental of \$5. Possession resumable by the department when required. Permission to erect buildings granted. No compensation to be allowed at termination of lease.

Penitentiaries—St. Vincent de Paul—Balance of expenses in connection with the commission for the investigation of the affairs of St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary . \$662

Mr. BERGERON. Is that investigation completely finished?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. In both?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In both.

#### OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE moved that the sixth report of the select standing committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House during the present session, be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

#### CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved:

That the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 137) further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, be now considered.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the nature of the amendment?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There were three amendments suggested by the Senate. In reference to the first and fifth we expressed our disagreement. The Senate concurred in the disagreement expressed by us in reference to the first and fifth amendments, but in reference to the third they persisted, and we concur in the amendment made by the Senate?

Mr. BERGERON. What is the third one?

The PRIME MINISTER. The third amendment is an amendment which creates a new offence out of the obtaining of credit under false pretenses. They disagreed to that, and we accept the disagreement. They asked that the law shall remain as it is.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL moved:

That this House doth not insist on its disagreement to the third amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 137) further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, but concurs with the Senate amendment thereto.

Motion agreed to.

#### ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL moved:

That the Senate amendments to Bill (No. 133) to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members of the House of Commons be now considered.

He said: In reference to the first amendment no reason for it is apparent to any one, but as it appears to me to be harmless, I can see no objection to concurring. In reference to the second amendment, I am sorry to say that I think it involves a distinct breach of faith with the representatives of the North-west Territories. It was understood and declared at the unanimous request of all the members of the House from the North-west Territories that this Act would not be made applicable to the North-west Territories. This request was made by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), who sits on the other side of the House as well as by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, but notwithstanding that unanimous request from the members of the North-west Territories, apparently the Senate have thought proper to make some changes, and to make the Act applicable to the North-west Territories. The Senate have not evidently considered the North-west Territories Representation Act, and the Senate have not considered the Bill which we sent to them, because they provide among other things for the North-west Territories, that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall send to the returning officers copies of the election lists when there are no election lists in the North-west Territories. However, I presume, we shall have to submit. The third amendment we agree to; the fourth, also.

Mr. HAGGART. How will you get on if there is an election, if there are no lists, and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is obliged to send the lists?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You will see that it is made applicable as far as possible. It is very curious that they should have specifically inserted that clause which makes it necessary to send copies of the voters' lists. I presume if it is not possible they will not do it. They provide that one whole, clause 6, shall be left out. They evidently made a mistake. It was clause 2 they meant there.

Mr. SPROULE. What is clause 6?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Clause 6 refers to those who are not eligible as candidates, whereas clause 2 says that this Act is not applicable to the North-west Territories, so that it must be clause 2 they had reference to.

Mr. BERGERON. We must be sure about that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There cannot be any doubt about it to any one who understands the Act, because the only clause that has reference to the North-west Territories is clause 2. Clause 6 has reference to an entirely different matter.

Mr. BERGERON. It must be a typographical error.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It must be, I presume.

Mr. HAGGART. Had we not better take one amendment at a time, and see if we can understand it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In reference to the third amendment if my hon. friend will take the statute he will see that the third amendment is intended to substitute the words 'legislature of any province' for 'provincial legislature.' The reason of that amendment is not apparent to the ordinary observer.

Mr. BERGERON. Are there no reasons given?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. None whatever. I cannot see that the difference between 'provincial legislature' and 'legislature of any province' is very clear.

Mr. BERGERON. It might have reference to the North-west Territories.

The PRIME MINISTER. It says 'legislature of any province,' leaving our 'provincial legislature,' and inserting 'legislature of any province.' It cannot mean the North-west Territories there.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The fifth amendment is right. It is 'officer' in the singular, instead of 'officers' in the plural. The sixth amendment being a merely verbal amendment we acquiesce in. The seventh amendment is agreed to, and also the eighth.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the effect of the seventh amendment?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That has reference to the famous clause that we discussed here so much in the House. This provides that the forms of oath shall be prepared beforehand and distributed with the instructions to the returning officers.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, that is all right.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, we agree to that. We agree to the eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. There is no objection as regards amendment No. 16, respecting the stamps to be used on ballots. The 29th is a very important amendment. There is a distinct encroachment upon the principle of provincial franchise. It destroys the principle of manhood suffrage as it exists in Ontario.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the most important clause in the whole Act.

Mr. SPROULE. The general opinion of the House was that there should be not only a provincial, but a county residence in Ontario. You strike at the foundation of the whole thing by that.

Mr. HENDERSON. That applies only to cities, but not to rural districts.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Of course. The amendment is:

29. Page 16, line 50.—After 'contained' insert the following as subsections 6 and 7:

'6. If the name of any person is found on the voters' list to be used at any polling division of an electoral district situate wholly or partly within the limits of a city or incorporated town, and—

if, between the time when such list came into force for the purposes of a Dominion election, and the polling day at such election, such person has changed his residence from one part of such city or town to another part thereof,—

then, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the provincial law as applicable, under the Franchise Act, 1898, or under this Act, to such election, such person shall not be disqualified from voting in such polling division.

7. From any oath which any such person offering his vote at such election may be required to take there shall be omitted any statements as to residence which he cannot, by reason of such change of residence as is mentioned in the next preceding subsection truthfully make, and instead of such statements the following paragraph may be added to such oath:

"That you are now actually a resident of and domiciled in the city (or town) of (insert here the name of the city or town) of which this polling division is a part."

Mr. SPROULE. This is intended simply to meet the case in cities and towns where there is registration. For instance, in Toronto, they might move from one ward to another, and still have the right to vote in the constituency where they moved out of.

Mr. BERGERON. That is our Quebec law. A man may move to a different ward, but he has a right to vote in his old constituency.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If a man's name is on the list in Quebec, the question of residence does not affect him, but it does in Ontario.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, is that amendment correct?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes; at least I submit, in amendment 31, the intention is to broaden to some extent the amendment we introduce here. We applied the franchise to the soldiers in South Africa, but in the Senate they extend it to the soldiers in the Halifax garrison. They do not say how they are to vote or where, but I can see no reason for differing from them.

Mr. HAGGART. Would you let them vote in Halifax?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When they went that length, they could have adopted the English Act. It would have been much more useful than dotting the I's and crossing the T's.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand that you agree to the amendment with reference to the North-west Territories?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, I accept it under protest, because of the guarantees given by the North-west members.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, the only one you disagree to is that relating to Prince Edward Island?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, they are all reduced down to that. I may say shortly that the Prince Edward Island amendment amounts to this. My hon. friends are aware that they have no voters' lists in Prince Edward Island. A man comes up and proves his qualification, and is then entitled to vote. If an objection is made to his vote, notwithstanding the objection his vote is deposited; but the deputy returning officer initials and numbers his ballot, and at the close of the poll, when he adds up the votes, he puts the ballots given by the objected voters in a separate envelope, apart from those admitted. The intention of this amendment is to provide that on a recount, these votes, instead of being counted for the person for whom they are given, are to be subject to what is called a scrutiny; that is to say, the judge on the recount will have the right to examine into the whole question whether or not these voters were entitled to vote. By this proceeding before a county judge will be done what in the other provinces has to be done on a contested election petition. So that you will have this anomaly, that the county court judge will pronounce on these votes one way or the other, with no appeal from his decision; whereas, on a contestation of an election, the whole matter is proceeded with regularly on a petition, before two High Court judges, with an appeal to the Supreme Court. Therefore, this amendment provides for a condition of things which it seems to me is very anomalous. In addition to that, there is no notice given to the man whose vote is attacked. He gets no opportunity to come in and defend his vote. Nor is there any notice given to the opposing candidate as to the votes which are to be attacked. The whole thing is done in a hap-hazard way; and I cannot help putting to myself this question, how comes it to pass that the people of Prince Edward Island have no such proceeding under their local Act? Although their Act has been in operation since confederation, they have never thought it necessary to make this change, and I do not see why we should be asked to import into our election Act such an anomaly as this amendment is.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely it is not the fact that the votes which are objected to are not counted by the deputy returning officer?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are counted, though objected to.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that the rejected votes are counted, and the amendment gives the judge making the scrutiny the power to decide whether they are right or not. That puts the voter in pretty near the same position as the voter in the province of Ontario. In the first count all the votes are counted, because if a man's name is on the list, he votes, whether he is entitled to vote or not; and the only question on the scrutiny would be whether the party who voted was the party whose name was on the list. The question of his qualification could not be entered into.

Mr. BRITTON. In a scrutiny the question of the qualification must be gone into. The hon. gentleman is speaking of a recount, while the Solicitor General is speaking of a scrutiny.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no scrutiny on a recount in Ontario.

Mr. HAGGART. That relieves my mind of the difficulty altogether. If all objected votes are counted, I do not see why power should be given to a judge, whose functions are simply ministerial, to go beyond these ministerial functions.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is exactly the difficulty.

Mr. BERGERON. What I gathered from the discussion in this House, in which my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island occupied the time of the House for about three hours on this point, is that there are no lists in Prince Edward Island. If the man who asks to vote is known by the deputy returning officer, he is allowed to cast his ballot, but if he is not, he gives his name and qualifications and is asked to swear to both, and the deputy takes it upon himself to judge whether he ought to be allowed to vote or not. Then, such ballots are put into a separate envelope, and if there should be a recount, the judge is not given the right to decide whether these votes which were thus put into a special envelope should have been received or not. If you are in the hands of a dishonest deputy returning officer, he can run the poll to suit himself. The people have more confidence in a judge than in a deputy returning officer, and that judge should have the right not only to count the ballots but revise the decision of the deputy returning officer and decide whether those who gave such a vote were entitled to vote or not.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The question is simply whether one judge from a

particular province is going to override all the others.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend admits that there is this special circumstance in Prince Edward Island, that they have no voters' lists there.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Neither have they in the North-west Territories, and why not provide the same process there?

Mr. HAGGART. The difficulty is the form of trial of the person to be summoned.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, it is just an ordinary recount.

Mr. HAGGART. But the party is entitled to prove that he has a right to vote.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. What is it that is proposed by this amendment. The amendment is as follows:

52. Page 26, line 11.—After 'addition' insert the following as subsection (a):

'(a) In the province of Prince Edward Island, at the time and place appointed and before proceeding to recount the votes, the judge may receive an affidavit from the candidate or his agent, against whose return the affidavit mentioned in subsection 1 of this section has been directed, declaring that any other person not qualified to vote has voted, giving the name, designation and residence of such person, and also the name and number of the polling division in which he has voted; provided always that the affidavit authorized by this subsection shall not be received by the judge unless the applicant has deposited with the clerk of the county court in the aforesaid judicial district the sum of \$300, in legal tender or in bills of any chartered bank doing business in Canada, as security for the costs in connection with the recount or final addition, of the candidate appearing by the addition to be elected; and further provided that the affidavit authorized by this subsection shall not be received by the judge except when the recount has been demanded on the fourth ground of application.'

This last provision we had in the old law, but it was struck out when we passed the present Bill the other day. If the deputy returning officer is not an honest man, he may allow people to vote who are not entitled to vote.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is good ground for contesting the election under the Controverted Elections Act.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, but that involves a deposit of \$1,000 and complying with all the procedure of the Controverted Elections Act, while in this province, where the deputy returning officers have special power, they ask that a defeated candidate may be allowed, on depositing \$300 and giving the requisite affidavit, to prove to the satisfaction of the judge charged with the recount that certain ballots were improperly cast.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend must see that he would be thus vesting in

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

the judge, whose duties are simply to make a recount, the power of trying the election.

Mr. BERGERON. That only gives him the power of deciding whether certain votes were properly cast or not.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is equivalent to trying the election.

Mr. BERGERON. No, because there are many other things than that which would void an election.

The PRIME MINISTER. If sufficient votes were contested which, if rejected, would transpose the majority, that would be a proper cause for an appeal under the Controverted Elections Act, but my hon. friend wants, in this particular province, to have an exception made by allowing such an appeal to be brought before a county court judge on the payment of \$300 and filing an affidavit. But the county court judge is simply vested with the ministerial duty of making a recount and determining whether any ballots properly marked were rejected or any improperly marked admitted. Once that is done, his functions cease, and if there were other offences against the election law, which, if proved, would void the election, they must be brought before the court provided under the Controverted Elections Act. My hon. friend, however, would put the county court judge on a par with that court and give him the right of trying the election. The county court judge could reject as many votes as he thought had been improperly given. After his decision, there might be a petition under the Controverted Elections Act to the judge of the Superior Court, and his decision might be different from that of the other judge.

Mr. BERGERON. But, that happens often.

The PRIME MINISTER. But, we should not provide for it except in legitimate cases. The object is to provide for a recount, and it is not necessary, in a recount, to decide these other points. The only object is to admit those ballots that have been properly marked, and to reject those that have not been properly marked. We ought not to put on the judge of the inferior court work which is entrusted to a superior court, that of determining who had and who had not the right to vote in the election. It seems to me it would be a most dangerous proceeding to engraft upon the law such a feature as that.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not understand it as my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) does. Suppose that the election is a very close one—the successful candidate having a majority of only, say, four votes. The unsuccessful candidate demands a recount, and they go before the county judge. His object in claiming a recount is, that he thinks he will be in a position to show that

at least five men had voted who should not have been allowed to vote by the deputy returning officer. He feels that he is elected if only proper votes are counted, and he does not want to disburse \$1,000 and go to all the trouble of a controverted election trial. If he can prove by affidavits that five men had voted against him who should not have voted at all, the election is given in his favour. This is not the law in other parts of the Dominion, but there are special circumstances relating to Prince Edward Island. By depositing \$300 a candidate who, apparently, has received a smaller number of votes, may go before the county court judge. All the people in Prince Edward Island seem to have the most perfect confidence in their judges, which is certainly a very good thing. The affidavits are presented there, and it is like a little trial. It is found—say in the case I have supposed—that five men have voted whose ballots should not have been accepted by the deputy returning officer. These votes are annulled, and the one who asked for a recount is declared elected by one majority. If the man who is then defeated thinks he is entitled to the seat on other considerations, or because he does not agree with the opinion of the judge, and says that in spite of the affidavits these men had a right to vote, he can deposit \$1,000 and go before the controverted elections court. For these reasons, it seems to me that there is something in this proposal.

The PRIME MINISTER. Here is another reason. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) knows that the writ has to be returned within a certain time and that action for a recount has to be taken within a specified time.

Mr. SPROULE. Four days.

The PRIME MINISTER. The application must be made within six days and the report must be made within four days thereafter. But, if you have the county court judges hold a trial, not merely upon one of two but, perhaps, twenty or a hundred cases, you may delay the return of the writ for weeks.

Mr. BERGERON. It would be short.

The PRIME MINISTER. How does my hon. friend know that? The moment you go before a judge, you must take the consequences, and you may have an investigation that will last a long time. It is not a difficult matter to have a recount within four days, because the judge has only to open the envelopes and count the ballots—merely mechanical work. But if you go into the examination of witnesses, first for the plaintiff, and then for the defence, and then in rebuttal—and you may have an investigation that would be protracted for three or four weeks.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. And let me call the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Ber-

geron's) attention to how this would work out in practice. Suppose that a man has the right to go before a judge and ask to have it determined that a certain number of voters have not the right to vote. He has to put in a petition, alleging that certain voters whose ballots were accepted had not the right to vote. It will hardly be said that the other side should be denied the right to attack the qualifications of those who voted for the petitioner. But, before all this can be done, the time for the recount will have expired.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think the second man would have the right to do it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is still worse; that would mean that one side would have the right to ask to have ballots thrown out, while the other side would have no such right. Surely, such an anomaly as that makes it plain that the whole thing is unworkable. The man who drew this, probably never had any experience and was not able to judge that it would be absolutely unworkable.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask that the amendment affecting the North-west should not be gone into until the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is in his place. In the meantime, it is six o'clock.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### AFTER RECESS.

Mr. HAGGART. I wish to make a few remarks on the Prince Edward Island clauses. One of the objections to the form of procedure taken by the Solicitor General and by the right hon. leader of the House, was that in Prince Edward Island, there was no provision for a trial under this clause which gives power to the county court judge, or whoever he may be, not only of making the recount, but also of trying the competency of the person to vote. I see there is a provision in the Bill in the first instance, that where the vote is objected to, the deputy returning officer is obliged to mark the ballot with the number after the name of the person who has voted, so that the ballot can be identified, and that when it comes to trial before the judge on a recount as the competency of the party to vote, it may be in his power to deduct that vote from the number cast, if it is found he had no right to vote. The objection made by the Solicitor General to the amendments made by the Senate were, in the first place, that there was a provision made by which an attack may be made on the candidate who was elected. I find, in looking at the Bill, there is a provision for that. In clause 46:

That in Prince Edward Island any person not qualified to vote in such electoral district has voted, stating the name, designation and residence of such person, and also the name and

number of the polling division in which he has voted.

First of all an affidavit has to be given, setting forth the facts upon which a recount is demanded. Then on page 25, line 23, it is inserted :

Or in Prince Edward Island \$300 if the application is made in relation to the fourth ground of application.

You will see by the Act itself, there is provision made in the first place, that there should be an affidavit attacking the competency of the parties who have voted and giving the grounds. Then the party who complains, must first make a deposit of \$300. The Solicitor General said there was no provision made for an attack upon votes. But I find in section 52, the following :

In the province of Prince Edward Island, at the time and place appointed, and before proceeding to recount the votes, the judge may receive an affidavit from the candidate or his agent against whose return the affidavit mentioned in subsection 1 of this section has been directed, declaring that any other person not qualified to vote has voted, giving the name, designation and residence of such person, and also the name and number of the polling division in which he has voted, provided always that the affidavit authorized by this subsection shall not be received by the judge unless the applicant has deposited with the clerk of the county court in the aforesaid judicial district the sum of \$300 in legal tender in the bills of any chartered bank doing business in Canada, as security for the costs in connection with the recount or final addition of the candidate appearing by the addition to be elected, and further provided, that the affidavit authorized by this subsection shall not be received by the judge except when the recount has been demanded on the fourth ground of application.

So you see it is competent for both parties to make an attack on the competency of the voter who has voted during an election. The right hon. gentleman opposed the Bill on the further ground that there was no time to make a trial of this question. The proceedings for a recount, you must remember, commence seven days after an election, that is on declaration day. Then any day within four days after that, a person may file a petition for the purpose of having a recount, then the judge, after he receives the petition, any time within four days may order the court to be held. I thought from the observations of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, and from the Solicitor General, that the proceedings ended at the end of ten days, but I find by the Act, it is not so. The judge may proceed from day to day until the result of the trial.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The application must be made within six days.

Mr. HAGGART. Within six days after the declaration, after the return.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Within six days after the final revision.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. HAGGART. In Prince Edward Island I notice by the local Act that there was a certain number of days fixed after the election, for declaration day. But, anyway, after declaration day he has six days to file these affidavits and demand a recount by a county judge. Then, after the lapse of four days the judge may fix any time for the purpose of the trial, and the trial may continue on *de die in diem* until it is ended. They have no lists at all in Prince Edward Island. The returning officer has no judicial duty to perform. He has no right to reject a vote. Any person tendering his vote has a right to a ballot and his vote has a right to be counted. Such a proceeding of that kind as might be necessary in Prince Edward Island would not be necessary in other parts of the Dominion, because the qualification of the voter is fixed before the voting day. His name appears on the list of voters and the returning officer's duty is to add up the votes. It is the same with the judge at the recount. The only latitude the judge has is as to whether a vote alleged to have been delivered in favour of a certain candidate has been marked in a proper way. His duty is simply judicial as to the intention of the voter in marking his ballot. I do not know as to the finality of a proceeding. I think the return of the county court judge would be final as to the qualification of the voter and as to the count, and the only questions for the judge would be the ordinary ones as to corrupt practices under the Controverted Elections Act. I was inclined to take the view of the right hon. leader of the House and of the Solicitor General, but on looking it over I think there is a great deal of force in the amendments that have been proposed in the Senate, which are confined entirely to Prince Edward Island. The eighty-two or eighty-three amendments to the Bill I understand were proposed by the government and assented to by the hon. Minister of Justice. They received his sanction and some of them have his imprimatur upon them.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not want to be responsible for putting this clause into the Bill. I cannot accept it.

Mr. DAVIN. In looking over the amendment of the Senate to the Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members of the House of Commons, I find that the Senate seem to have taken note of section 2 of this Bill, which reads as follows :

2. Except as provided by the North-west Territories Representation Act, and to the extent to which certain provisions hereof are incorporated with the said Act by the provisions thereof, this Act shall not apply to the North-west Territories.

Originally, when the Bill came down there were sections applying especially to the North-west Territories, but the government placed this clause in the Bill. Now, Sir, I

find there is an amendment in the Senate which reads as follows :

2. Page 1, line 6.—Leave out the whole of clause 6, and substitute the following :

'2. The following provisions of this Act shall apply to elections in the North-west Territories, so far as the same are applicable and are not inconsistent with the provisions of the North-west Territories Representation Act, as amended, that is to say: Sections 4 to 7, both inclusive; section 9; section 41, paragraphs (c), (d), (e) and (h);—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no such thing as paragraph *h* at all. That shows the care given to this whole matter.

Mr. DAVIN (reading) :

—and subsections 2; sections 43 to 59, both inclusive; sections 62 to 64, both inclusive; sections 69 to 150, both inclusive; and sections 152 to 154, both inclusive; together with the forms mentioned in the said sections and parts of sections; but otherwise, except as provided by the North-west Territories Representation Act, or any amendment thereto, this Act shall not apply to the North-west Territories.'

I may say that this amendment of the Senate is not only unnecessary, but it would make the working of our Act quite cumbersome. It is my opinion that it is in the interest of the efficiency of our North-west Territories Representation Act that this amendment of the Senate should not be agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I concur.

Mr. DAVIN. I move, seconded by the Solicitor General :

That the House do disagree with the second amendment of the Senate in that it is unnecessary, and would render the working of the North-west Territories Representation Act cumbersome.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know anything about this, but I understood that this amendment was made in the Senate at the suggestion of the Minister of Justice. Was the Solicitor General consulted ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not know anything about that. The Bill was introduced after it was examined by the government, and I am responsible for it as it was introduced in this House.

Motion agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL moved :

That the House do disagree to the 46th, 47th, 48th, 49th, 50th, 51st, 52nd and 53rd of the amendments made by the Senate to the said Bill for the following reasons :

1. Because the 'Controverted Elections Act' already makes ample and proper provision for the scrutiny before two judges of the Supreme Court of all objected votes polled in Prince Edward Island under conditions which assure to all interested parties, electors and candidates, the amplest guarantees that the rights of the voters will be examined into and determined on after proper notices given.

2. Because the addition to the powers of the county court judge of holding a scrutiny in conjunction with the recount will prolong the proceedings to an undesirable length, and will raise

serious questions of conflict of jurisdiction between the county court judge under this Act, and the judges of the Supreme Court under the 'Controverted Elections Act.'

3. Because the addition of a scrutiny to a recount is inadvisable and takes away from parties who may consider themselves aggrieved, any right of appeal from the decision of the county court judge.

4. Because the provisions in the amendment for a scrutiny are inadequate and do not provide for the giving of proper notices to parties interested, of the votes to be attacked, and because it is difficult, if not impossible, to make provision within the time in which a recount should be held for the giving of such notices and procuring the necessary evidence against or in support of such votes, and the expenses of such an election scrutiny would be largely in excess of the suggested deposit.

5. Because the acceptance of the amendment leaves it open for the same questions to be adjudicated upon first by the county court judge and afterwards under the 'Controverted Elections Act.'

Mr. HAGGART. I doubt very much that the same subjects would be dealt with by the county court judge and by the judges in a trial under the Controverted Elections Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Every trial under the Controverted Elections Act in Prince Edward Island necessarily implies a scrutiny because there are no lists.

Mr. HAGGART. There is another question I would like the Solicitor General to answer. He has, no doubt whatever, as to the application of the Controverted Elections Act, taken in connection with this Act, to elections in Prince Edward Island ? The impression of some lawyers is that after the passage of this Act, the Controverted Elections Act would not apply to Prince Edward Island.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is absolutely impossible. The trouble about all this is that the gentlemen who dealt with this matter in the Senate, do not appear to have realized that in connection with an election, you have the Franchise Act, which is the basis of all, then you proceed under the Elections Act, which provides the machinery for the election, and then you proceed under the Controverted Elections Act, which provides the machinery necessary for contesting an election. We have not touched the Controverted Elections Act, and you cannot touch this proceeding without amending the Controverted Elections Act. Under the Controverted Elections Act, you must necessarily have a scrutiny in Prince Edward Island. The petitioner cannot satisfactorily claim the seat without having a scrutiny, because otherwise he cannot have the question of the number of votes cast in one way or the other determined.

Mr. SPROULE. In a scrutiny have the judges the right to bring the voter and have him sworn, and put such questions to him

as they desire, in order to ascertain whether or not he had the right to vote ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Undoubtedly. That is the very basis of a scrutiny, that the voters should be brought up for the purpose of being examined. For instance, take an election which is protested on the ground of personation. The petitioner is not going to weary himself with all the expense of establishing bribery and corruption, if he has evidence that two or three persons have been guilty of personating. He limits the trial to that point, and tries to prove that, on ascertaining the true votes cast, the majority will be the other way. But what I have not been able to get those in the other House, with whom I have discussed this matter, to understand, is, that the amendment of the Senate cannot be made operative unless you amend the Controverted Elections Act. I may say that we prepared a Bill to amend the Controverted Elections Act, in order to meet this case, and submitted it to a gentleman of the Senate, and it was refused. I do not know whether I should state that here.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think there is any object in keeping it secret. I heard one of the senators speaking about it, and giving credit to the hon. the Solicitor General for his desire to meet them very fairly. He said no man could have made a stronger effort than the Solicitor General to meet their views and try to reach some satisfactory conclusion, but he thought the Bill as proposed by the government would be entirely unworkable.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The amendment of the Senate would give us two courts to decide the same question. After the county court had given its decision, the whole trial would have to be gone over again under the Controverted Elections Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be something like taking a case from a lower to a higher court.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It would be an absolutely useless proceeding. Why subject a man to the expense of trying the case before a county court judge, and then have to go before another court, which will not take cognizance of what has been done by the county court judge at all ? And besides, there is no procedure provided by the Senate amendment to govern cases going before the county court judge. There is no provision for notices or anything else.

Mr. QUINN. I do not agree with the hon. Solicitor General. I would like him to point out the section in the Controverted Elections Act, which will authorize the contestation of elections on the ground that a certain number of voters, whose votes had been accepted, were not qualified to vote. I do not think that the fact that a person

Mr. SPROULE.

had voted improperly in Prince Edward Island would be a ground for contesting the election, while it ought to be a ground for a recount. The conditions in Prince Edward Island are such that if a man votes who is not qualified, and is satisfied to take the chance of being proceeded against for perjury, there is no way of setting aside the election on the ground that a number of such votes have been given. The fact that a person had been elected by votes cast by a number of persons who had sworn falsely as to their qualifications would not form the basis for an election petition under the Controverted Elections Act, is what made it necessary for the Senate to provide this amendment. I would ask my hon. friend to point out to me the section of the Controverted Elections Act which would allow an election to be contested on the ground that such improper votes had been given.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Does my hon. friend pretend to say that if, for instance, a judge, whose name was on the election list, or any other person not qualified, such votes could not be challenged under the Controverted Elections Act ?

Mr. QUINN. There is no list in Prince Edward Island.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In that case you take the poll book, and if it appears by the poll book that a man has voted who is not qualified, undoubtedly you have the right to establish that fact under the Controverted Elections Act.

Mr. QUINN. On a scrutiny it can be done.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What is a scrutiny ? Let my hon. friend look to the Controverted Elections Act and he will find a scrutiny referred to. It is a necessary and incidental proceeding in all contested elections.

Mr. QUINN. Of course I had no time to look into this question thoroughly, but I looked into it a month or so ago, and the opinion I formed was that the case provided for by the 46th amendment of the Senate, is one that is not covered by the Controverted Elections Act. If a number of persons go into a polling booth in Prince Edward Island and vote, and those men are not qualified electors, there is no means of attacking their votes, except on a recount. This is not a basis for a petition to set aside the election under the Controverted Elections Act. I refer to section 5 of the Controverted Elections Act, which says :

A petition complaining of an undue return, or undue election of a member, or of a double return, or of any unlawful act by any candidate not returned, by which he is alleged to have become disqualified to sit in the House of Commons, at any election, may be presented to the court by any one or more of the following persons:—

No complaint can be made under that of a person, other than the candidate having been guilty of some act which would unseat the member. Other acts under which a petition might be made are provided for specially by the Controverted Elections Act. For instance, there are certain offences under that Act, such as bribing, treating, and so on. But this particular case covered by the amendment of the Senate is not provided for in any way under the Controverted Elections Act. That being so, should it not be provided for under section 90, of the Act before the House—coming in exactly where and as the Senate provides :

If, within four days after that on which the returning officer has made the addition of the votes, for the purpose of declaring the candidate or candidates elected, it is made to appear, on the affidavit of a credible witness, to the judge of the county court of the county or union of counties, or to the judge of the judicial district in which the electoral district or any part thereof is situated, or in the province of Quebec to a judge of the Superior Court ordinarily discharging his duties in the judicial district in which the electoral district or any part thereof is situated, that a deputy returning officer at an election in such electoral district in counting the votes (1) has improperly counted, or (2) has improperly rejected any ballot papers at such election, or (3) has made an incorrect statement of the number of ballot papers cast for any candidate—

Now, why is the act of a deputy returning officer made the subject of a petition to a judge for a recount? For the reason that there is not a line in the Controverted Elections Act which makes the deputy returning officer's conduct the subject of an appeal under that Act. Then it goes on, as relating to Prince Edward Island :

In Prince Edward Island that any person not qualified to vote has voted, stating the name, designation and residence of such persons; or (5) that the returning officer has improperly added up the votes—

—and so on. As I say, the misconduct of a deputy returning officer cannot be made the basis of a petition under the Controverted Elections Act—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How about the other provinces?

Mr. QUINN. The conduct of the deputy returning officers cannot be inquired into on an election petition.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Oh, pshaw!

Mr. QUINN. Then, why is it not here in the Act as I have read it?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Why, you make the deputy returning officer's conduct part of the case.

Mr. QUINN. Undoubtedly, but for what purpose? For the purpose of punishing the deputy returning officer.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. For the purpose of condemning them to costs.

Mr. QUINN. Yes, but not to set aside the election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will not argue that point with you, nor will any other lawyer in the House.

Mr. QUINN. That is a good way to avoid it, but not a good way to answer it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) says the reason why it should not go in, is because it is provided in the Controverted Elections Act. If it can be provided for in that way, why put it in here? He said he would not put in here a provision respecting the conduct of a voter, because it would provide two methods of inquiring into one offence.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. But that is not inquiring into a deputy returning officer's conduct?

Mr. QUINN. Certainly, because the Controverted Elections Act provides against misconduct on the part of deputy returning officers, but not for setting aside the election on that account.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think you need not worry about that.

Mr. QUINN. If section 90 is necessary at all in regard to the misconduct of the deputy returning officer, it is equally necessary with regard to the misconduct of a voter's, as provided under the amendment of the Senate.

Motion (Mr. Fitzpatrick) agreed to on division.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL moved that the remaining amendments made by the Senate in the Bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—CONDITION OF CANADIAN TRADE.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I have no desire to detain the House, nor will I, but I thought this an appropriate occasion to refer to the circumstances of trade in Canada, as we have found them during the past year. At the end of a long and wearisome session, I am sure it will be a source of consolation to the members who have attended so closely to their duties, to know that they have been legislating in the interests of a country that has been making extraordinary progress in all directions. We have not yet received full trade returns from all parts of the Dominion, but we have received sufficient to enable us to deal with approximate figures which I think full returns will prove to be very nearly correct. It must be a source of pleasure, not only to

the members of this House, but to the country at large, to know how great has been the expansion of our trade during the past few years. There has been an increase in the total trade of last year over the preceding year, which was the highest in our history, of something like \$50,000,000. I have here a little table of the goods entered for consumption and of the produce of Canada exported. It deals wholly with the goods we have imported for consumption in this country and the goods we have exported that are the produce of this country, not taking in the total imports and exports. I find that in 1900 our total imports for consumption and total of Canadian produce exported, amounted to \$336,028,190; in the year 1899, the total was \$286,852,855. Hon. gentlemen will see that during the past year there has been an increase of about \$50,000,000 in our trade in the articles that I have mentioned over the preceding year. If we go back four years to 1896, when this government took office, we find the total was \$216,966,232. So there was an increase of something like \$120,000,000 in the past few years. The figures I have given are exclusive of short returns and of coin and bullion exports so it will be seen that they will be very near the correct figures.

I have another table which takes in a larger scope. The total trade on the basis of the total imports for consumption, and total exports exclusive of short returns, are for the following years: In 1900 we had a trade of \$358,866,220; in 1899 the figures were \$308,388,968, or an increase over 1899 of \$50,477,252, or an increase of 16 per cent. In 1896 the figures were \$228,272,279. So that the increase of last year over 1896, four years previous, was \$130,593,941, or an increase of 57 per cent in four years.

But I have also a total of the trade in imports and exports, and while we may say we are more particularly concerned in goods that are entered for consumption and goods the produce of Canada, no one will deny that our total trade in exports, which are not the produce of Canada, and of which we do the handling, from which we reap a great benefit, is of advantage to the country. For the year 1899 the figures for the total trade, imports and exports, were \$321,661,213. For the year 1900 I have made an estimate which I think will be found to be within the mark when the total returns are made, that the total trade in imports and exports of the Dominion of Canada, will be \$372,000,000, an increase of \$50,000,000 over the last year which was the largest by far of any year of Canada's trade, and over the year 1896, which was \$239,025,360, an increase under this table of \$130,000,000 in the four years.

Now, in order to understand the progress that Canada has made during the past four years I will give you the figures for 1878. The total trade of exports and imports amounted to \$172,405,454. There was an

increase then in the eighteen years from 1878 to 1896, of \$66,619,906, or an average annual increase during the eighteen years of about 3½ millions; while in 1900 the increase over the year 1896 has been \$130,000,000, or over \$32,000,000 per year as against \$3,750,000 per year during the previous eighteen years. I say such a result as that must be very gratifying indeed. A large part of the increase has taken place in our imports, and there has also been a large increase in our exports. Taking our exports, the produce of Canada, I find in 1878, the exports of the produce of the mines, fisheries, forests, animals and their products, agricultural products, manufactures and miscellaneous, exclusive of coin and bullion and short returns, amounted to \$65,740,134; in 1896, \$106,378,752; in 1900, \$152,818,917. So that the increase, in the eighteen years, of our exports of the products of Canada was \$40,638,618. In the four years since 1896 the increase has been \$46,440,165, or \$6,000,000 more in the four years than in the eighteen preceding years.

Now, Sir, I do not wish to weary the House by dwelling longer upon these figures, but it seems to me they are appropriate on this occasion when the House is about to vote to Her Majesty the supplies necessary to carry on the government during the coming year. We are told that the amounts asked for are large. Some criticism has been offered by hon. gentlemen opposite to the figures, to the various votes that have been proposed; but they have not so far as I remember challenged those votes except one or two items in committee. It has been said that we are in a very peculiar position inasmuch as it is alleged that certain members of the Liberal party in 1894, and subsequently, when the expenditure was \$38,000,000, said that expenditure was not warranted under the circumstances; and now hon. gentlemen opposite say: You have an expenditure of \$12,000,000 more, and we wonder how you will dare face the electors and what answer you will give them. One hon. gentleman pointed out to us how difficult it would be to meet the electors and he asked: How will you meet them? My answer to that is, that, as far as I am personally concerned, I will meet them with the public accounts of Canada in my hand and I will ask them to turn to the year 1894-5 when the ordinary expenditure of hon. gentlemen was \$38,000,000, excluding capital altogether; I will point out to them that the book shows that in that year there was a total revenue from all sources of not quite \$34,000,000, and that in order to carry on the ordinary affairs of government, they had to borrow and to run the country into debt to the extent of over \$4,000,000. Hon. gentlemen can easily understand, as will the people of this country, that when things are conducted in that way, when, to meet the expenditure on ordinary account, leaving out capital account,

Mr. PATERSON.

they had to run into debt to the extent of \$4,000,000, it was perfectly justifiable on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite in criticising them, and to say that in view of that condition of things there should be an attempt made to bring the expenditure within the revenue. But the hon. gentleman has told us that we have added \$12,000,000 to the expenditure of the country. Does the hon. gentleman think that this is something we should be ashamed of? I say that rather than be ashamed of it, it is something we should be proud of. Suppose, as the hon. gentleman says, that we have this \$12,000,000 of extra expenditure, has it run the country into debt to the extent of a single cent? Not at all. When these figures are applied, according to the hon. Finance Minister, it will be found that the expenditure of last year on ordinary account and the expenditure on capital account, and such expenditure as will have been incurred for the contingents sent to South Africa, will all be paid out of this year's revenue, and leave, as we hope and believe, no debt upon the country at all. Under these circumstances, of what avail is it to talk about the public utterances made in 1894-5, when, with an expenditure of \$38,000,000, we had to borrow and go into debt to the extent of \$4,000,000 to pay the ordinary expenses of the country outside of capital expenditure, and when we added over \$6,000,000, nearly \$7,000,000 to the public debt? Circumstances have changed. Not only are we paying the current expenditures, but we have a surplus, as we have estimated, of \$7,500,000, and we are using that \$7,500,000 to enlarge our canals, to develop our waterways, to improve our railway system, to do as the hon. acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock), is doing from the Atlantic to the Pacific, doing what was neglected for years and years, by hon. gentlemen opposite, putting the harbours, rivers, lighthouses, piers and public buildings of the country in a proper state of repair, and giving facilities to trade and commerce of the country. This is being done and done successfully. I have not the slightest difficulty in reconciling the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite in the year 1894-5, when we had an expenditure of \$38,000,000 with the expenditure which we are called upon to make, exceeding the expenditure of 1894-5, by millions, it is true, but an expenditure not made out of borrowed funds, not running the country into debt, paying not only out of ordinary revenue for the current expenditure, but paying for the capital expenditure as well. But hon. gentlemen say: What about your debt? Well, I have just pointed to the fact that we are not increasing the debt. During these four years, with all the expenditure on capital account, with millions and millions expended in the directions I have pointed out in the public interest, the cheapening transportation to the producers of the country, we have only added less on an average than

\$2,000,000 a year to the net debt of the country, as against \$6,000,000 added every year on the average, by hon. gentlemen opposite. But, hon. gentlemen will say and have said here: You have taken this \$12,000,000 of extra money out of the people by way of taxation. They speak of the volume of taxation as having increased. Yes, it has increased by many millions, but when did the Liberal party ever pledge themselves that the volume of revenue by way of taxation in this country would be less? When did they ever propose that the revenues of the country should be less? What they did pledge themselves to, and what the government are responsible for, was to reduce the rate of taxation, and that they have carried out.

Mr. HENDERSON. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They pledged themselves to reduce the rate of taxation. The parliament of Canada does not make the price at which goods are sold in foreign countries. The parliament of Canada has not dared, nor would it seek to ask any member of this House, or any person in this Dominion, to purchase more or less goods. Every individual can adjust that for himself. But, there is one way and one way alone in which this government do stand between the consumer and the goods he uses, and that is on certain lines of goods they say to him: Before you can acquire these goods to consume them, you must pay a certain number of cents on the dollar into the public treasury, to carry on the government of the country. That is the only way in which the government stand between the people and that which they consume. That is termed the rate of taxation. The government were pledged to reduce the rate of taxation, and they did it. While they reduced the rate of taxation, the volume has swollen, it is true, not swollen by compulsion on the part of the government; for, as I said before, the government do not determine what quantity of goods shall be purchased by any one in this Dominion, nor do they determine the price at which goods are sold in foreign countries. They only determine the number of cents on the dollar that they will take from the consumer to put into the public treasury to carry on the affairs of the Dominion. We were pledged to reduce the rate of taxation, and we have done so. Let me give you now the figures of this and let us remember that all this expenditure which I have mentioned is applied to the public improvements that are being carried on. Let us see how we stand in the way of taxation. If we show the people of this country that we have spent these millions more in the direction that I have indicated, and that while we have done that, we have reduced the rate of taxation, that we have lessened the burdens they were under for years preceding our government coming into power, then, I think the people

will say: You have managed our affairs very well indeed. Now, I have a statement here which I will give as test. I do not give it altogether as an infallible test. I give it to the House as rough test, as a test that was applied by the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Foster) last year. I do not give it as definite test. It is not that, but it will serve a purpose pointing in that direction, and it will not be found very far wrong. Some circumstances come in and it may be varied a little this way or that way, by a larger quantity of goods being charged a higher rate, or the public purchasing more of one line of goods than another, and so on, taking the comparative statement, it is a ready way of arriving at something like the amount of the reduction of taxation that we have affected while we have been in power. In 1900, the goods entered for consumption, dutiable and free, were of the value of \$183,209,273. That was for the year closed June 30. I say these figures may not be absolutely correct, but they are approximately so. As I said before, we have not the full returns, but we have them so full that I do not think when they are completed, the result will make any material difference in the deductions that I draw.

Mr. DAVIN. Would the hon. gentleman state the figures again?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. \$183,209,273, on which we collected duty to the amount of \$28,866,986. That was an average rate of taxation on all the goods imported for consumption, dutiable and free, of 15·76. In 1896, the total value of goods imported was \$110,587,480, on which a duty was collected of \$20,219,037, or a rate of taxation of 18·28, a decrease in the rate of taxation of 2·52, or a reduction in the rate of taxation of nearly 14 per cent.

Mr. DAVIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? What quantity of corn was imported from the United States free, to be exported?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not the returns of the imports of corn this year. We have not the quarterly statements from the outports yet. This statement may be varied a little one way or another by coin and bullion and corn; but I am giving a rough and ready method of judging of the true condition of affairs. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that is not much of a reduction—only 2½ per cent. Remember, however, that it is not 2½ per cent on the 100. It is a reduction of 2·52 from the rate of hon. gentlemen opposite in 1896, which is equal to a reduction in the rate of taxation of 14 per cent. To show what that means to the country, let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if their rate of 18·28 per cent were levied upon the imports for consumption of last year, it would take from the people \$33,490,655, while the duty actually collected was \$28,

866,986, or less by \$4,623,669 than it would have been at the former rate of taxation. With the reduction in the postal rate, which hon. gentlemen opposite said would amount to \$750,000, and with these reductions in the revenue of the country, we find that we have been able to spend millions, which hon. gentlemen opposite lament, we have been able to pay all our ordinary expenditures and we hope all our capital expenditures, and all the expenses of sending our troops to Africa, and come out without adding a dollar to the debt of this country.

Mr. DAVIN. The expenses of the troops were charged to capital.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am explaining that according to the estimate of the Finance Minister, which we think will be realized, not only all the ordinary expenditure of this year, but all the capital expenditure on railways, canals and other objects will be paid out of revenue, and that without adding anything to the burdens of the people at all.

Another point I wish to mention, and it is the last one. Hon. gentlemen say: You pledged yourselves to reduce the public debt. I do not know that we did; but the platform of the Liberal party did recite that we viewed with alarm the great increase of the public debt; and well we might, with deficit after deficit meeting us, and with the debt being added to on the average during the whole eighteen years to the extent of over \$6,000,000 a year. As I have pointed out in the four years in which we have been in power, we have not added to the public debt \$2,000,000 a year; but in my judgment we have virtually reduced the public debt most materially. If—I say, if, because I have not the means of ascertaining the exact fact—if we have added, as I believe we have, half a million people to the population of this country since we came into power, we have virtually decreased the public debt to the people while nominally adding to it \$7,500,000. Why do I judge that we have added half a million people to the population of this country? I ask you, in the first place, to look at the volume of trade. Granted that the people are better off than they were, and no one will deny it; but look at the vast increase in the importations of goods, which means an increased consumption by the people, and that not by displacing goods manufactured in our own country; for every factory, I might say almost without exception from the Atlantic to the Pacific, is busy. The steam whistles all over the country would give the denial to any statement that the production of our home industries is less now than it was before. Everything bears testimony to the fact that there has been an era of great expansion in the manufacturing industries of this country. We find that our home production is greatly enlarged; you read in the papers that there are

Mr. PATERSON.

orders for more goods in many lines than can be got out by the New Year. When we look at our increased importation, at our immigration returns, at the signs of expansion about us in every direction, we must believe that we have added largely to the population of this country, and I think it is not extravagant for me to place that increase at a half a million. If I might use the expressions of hon. gentlemen opposite, I might find confirmation of that belief. I do not wish to distort their remarks, because I know their figures were given in the rough; but more than once the leader of the opposition has spoken of the population of Canada as being now 6,000,000, and the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) last year spoke of Canada as a population of 6,000,000. I do not take so high an estimate; but if when we came into office the population was 5,200,000, and if I put it at 5,700,000 now, I do not think I am out of the way, for the population was 4,800,000, when the census was last taken. I say that the only proper way to measure the debt is at so much per head; and if you take into account half a million people added to the population with the addition of \$7,500,000, to the public debt since we came into power, you will find that we have virtually reduced the public debt of this country by \$3 per head or \$15 per family. Any man knows that if a municipality has a debt of \$200,000, and if you double the population of that municipality, and double its wealth and its assessment, you have virtually cut the debt in two as far as the citizens who were in the municipality when the debt was incurred are concerned. The same will hold with the public debt of Canada; and therefore while there has been a nominal addition to it of \$7,500,000 in the few years, yet by the increase of population there may have been virtually as explained a material reduction in the public debt.

I do not wish to detain the House further. I thought it was not inappropriate, however, when the House is asking for supplies which some gentlemen think extravagant, that I should point out that there is no need for them to feel any apprehension, and I am sure they will agree with me in complimenting the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Mulock) on the fact that he has not confined his attention to one province or one section, but has gone from the Atlantic to the Pacific, wherever the public needs have required it, and has endeavoured to do that which is in the public interest. As I said before, there is only one thing which the people of this country will ask with regard to this extra expenditure of millions of money. When we tell them we have expended it not by increasing taxation, not by borrowing money or running into debt, but while reducing taxation, all they will say will be: 'All right, if you had the money, and if you spent it wisely where the interests of the country require.'

And our answer is that in all the millions and the tens of millions which we have expended, the gentlemen sitting opposite, men skilled in finance, and imbued largely with the spirit of criticism, have not put themselves on record against any item of that expenditure. I do not know that they are on record against any of the expenditure, except, perhaps in committee. There alone did they venture to move reductions, and then only on a very few of the unimportant items. I think we can accept this as evidence that the expenditures made by us in the past, as well as those we are now providing for, will meet with the approval of the country as they have met with almost the unanimous approval of this House.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. gentleman has treated the House to a nice little pyrotechnical display at the end of the session, but very much like all fireworks, it was made up largely of noise and dissolving views. Certainly no one could admire the hon. gentleman for his logic or the depth of his reasoning. He said that the government had practically reduced the public debt. How did he attempt to prove that? By taking the increase in population and because there were increased numbers to pay the debt therefore the debt was decreased. Well, the net debt stood below \$260,000,000 when the present government took office, and it is seven million dollars above to-day, so that the mortgage standing on the farms of this country has been increased to that extent under the regime of the present administration. Let me apply the hon. gentleman's reasoning to a particular case to show its absurdity. Suppose a farmer had mortgaged his farm for \$1,000 when he got married, and then increased it during the next twelve years to \$1,500, and in the meantime had also increased his family to the extent of twelve children. What would the farmer think if the hon. gentleman would apply to his position the same reasoning that he does to the debt of the country, and say to him: You need not worry, you have practically reduced your mortgage, because, whereas when you incurred your mortgage of \$1,000 you were only yourself and your wife, now you are fourteen, including your twelve children, so that your mortgage of \$1,500 means very much less per head than did your mortgage of \$1,000, and you therefore have reduced it. I do not think that kind of reasoning will go down with our intelligent farming community, and it is a very poor compliment to their intelligence for the hon. gentleman to suppose that he can hoodwink them by any such specious and fallacious argument as that. So, with regard to our public debt, the farmer will see that the mortgage which was standing against his farm, when the present government took office, was \$260,-

000,000, whereas to-day it has been increased by \$7,000,000, and will come to the conclusion that instead of that mortgage having been reduced it has been increased, and increased in an exceedingly rapid ratio by these hon. gentlemen.

The hon. gentleman says that he is prepared to go to the country and ask for a favourable verdict and base his case on the Trade and Navigation Returns and the public accounts. He certainly will not go before the people on the platform laid down by his party in 1893, and on the broken pledges which have characterized that party ever since it had the opportunity of putting its promises into effect. The hon. gentleman will try to keep those in the background as much as possible, and seek to delude the public with glittering generalities or anything else that will draw a red herring across the track and divert the attention of the electorate from the many broken promises which stand like mile-stones to mark the ruinous course of the present government.

Let us give another illustration of the fallacies and sophistries of the hon. gentleman, to which he has treated us at this the closing hour of the session. He said: I take the trade of this country during the eighteen years our predecessors were in power, and I find that the average annual increase is of that trade very slight, whereas during the four years we have been in power the average annual increase of our trade has been over \$50,000,000. Let me draw attention to the object lesson which the Finance Minister gave us with regard to the fluctuations of trade, owing to good times and bad times, extending over these eighteen years. In 1878, under the Mackenzie administration, our trade had reached the lowest point it had ever descended to since confederation. The country was in the slough of despond and its trade aggregated only \$150,000,000. During the succeeding years, however, it improved until in 1881 it had reached the highest point it had ever attained in any previous year. Then we had a succession of bad crops, and our trade declined for three or four years in succession and afterwards the reaction set in and it decreased during five or six years. So that during all these eighteen years we have had fluctuations of good and bad times, and in some periods the depression was very low and our export and import trade consequently considerably decreased. And the hon. gentleman takes an average of that eighteen years period of good and bad times and compares it with the average during the past three years, when the crops have been exceptionally good and times have been exceptionally prosperous all over the world. Any one can see at a glance how unfair must be such comparison. In 1896, when these hon. gentlemen took office, the improved condition was apparent especially in the United States where labour and capital were

being employed to a greater extent than they had been before in every line, and in addition Providence had blessed us with a bountiful crop. During that and the succeeding three years, trade therefore ran up rapidly until it reached the highest pitch it has ever reached in this country. But was that due to any good management on the part of this government? We need only look at the increase in growth of our natural products to find out the cause of this prosperity. Year after year for the last three years our farmers have been increasing their exports until last season they exported nearly twice as much to foreign countries as they did the year before. This was owing to good crops and greater yield than for many years previous. To-day we have reached an abnormally inflated period, and the turn may come at any moment. In fact, the signs of the times rather indicate that we must look out for some reaction, but to compare these last four years of inflation with the period of eighteen years preceding must strike everybody as a most unfair comparison. But that is the comparison which the hon. gentleman coolly submits to this House, and he was careful to do so at a moment when he believed that no one would stand up to reply to his argument.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I could not think that while you were here.

Mr. SPROULE. We are approaching the end of the present parliamentary term and no doubt before we meet again, we will have gone to the people for their verdict, and I have no doubt that when the people look over the administration of affairs and carefully analyse the course taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, they will come to the conclusion that if the expenditure has been so much higher than it was under the administration of the late government, as is shown, that it is due to bad management on the part of the present administration and not to any other cause.

The hon. gentleman also endeavoured to show that our taxation was less. How did he endeavour to establish that? By taking into the calculation the 22,000,000 bushels of free corn brought into Canada, a large portion of which went out of the country, and adding that into the free goods to the taxable list for the purpose of striking an average to show the customs taxation rate. Is not that unworthy of an hon. gentleman occupying the position of Minister of Customs? But I think the people of Canada will be inclined to ask: How much more have you taken out of our pockets in taxes than your predecessors took? In 1894-5, the Conservative government took from the people, for customs and excise revenue—and these are the taxes that come out of the country—\$25,000,000. In 1899-1900, the amount taken was \$38,000,000. Yet, the hon. gentleman

dares to tell the people that they took less taxes than their predecessors? The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) told the people of Canada, when the taxes amounted to twenty-five millions, that they were being bled white. If so, they are being bled whiter to-day. But, these gentlemen were fond of declaring to the people of Canada that the expenditure must be cut down. In 1896, the total expenditure under the Conservative government was \$41,000,000, while, under this government it has reached \$53,000,000, an increase of over \$12,000,000. I think the people will say: We do not wish you to go to the Trade and Navigation Returns for figures with which to delude us, when the records of public expenditure show that you have actually spent twelve millions more than your predecessors, instead of reducing the expenditure, as you said you would, by two, or three or even four millions. They will also inquire as to the nature of the expenditure; and I think they will decide that that expenditure has been very improvident looking into it. They will find that unusual lines of expenditure have been opened up. For instance, dozens of public works have been started for which small items are voted to-day. But, these works must all be finished—the country is committed to it—and before they are finished the expenditure for these works will run into millions and millions. We vote \$5,000 to-day; but we are told that this is only the beginning of the work, and that \$50,000, \$80,000 or even \$100,000 will be necessary to complete it. Then, take the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway voted last year for this purpose over \$2,000,000, add that to what we are voting this year and it makes over \$7,000,000 to be expended on capital account. This road was built as one of the terms of confederation; but, the contract was that we were to build it, and then it was supposed to be self-supporting—the people of Canada were not to be taxed to keep it up. But now we find that from year to year our debt is largely added to to keep it up—for instead of its being paid out of revenue as it ought to be, it is charged to capital account. Another pernicious principle is giving subsidies to railways that have to be rebuilt. For instance, we have given \$500,000 to the Grand Trunk to rebuild the Victoria bridge. The Grand Trunk got a large subsidy to build that bridge when it was first constructed, and they have been taking the earnings of that bridge for their own treasury ever since. But, when it is necessary to rebuild, they come to us to get the money. This is a dangerous precedent; I see no reason why, on the same ground, the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway in the country, should not ask for subsidies with which to rebuild their bridges when they are worn out. I want the people to understand that this is a new and unheard of line of expenditure.

and one that may lead us into no end of trouble in the future.

These hon. gentlemen promised us new markets. But, what new markets have they found? Not one. They thought they had one, when they started the negotiations with Trinidad. But it fell through, like their bottle-necked steamers, their preferential trade and other schemes. Who benefits by their system of preferential trade? The English artisan, the English labourer and the English farmer. And not only is Canada injured in a trade point of view, but she is deprived of what might be a means of gaining advantages in outside markets. We want a preferential trade that will be truly preferential that will give an advantage to our side as well as the other. The present government promised to settle our disputes with the United States, and also to secure a reciprocity treaty. Have they done it? They spent \$36,000 wining and dining with the representatives of the United States, but came back with their fingers in their mouths, having presented us with another of their dissolving views. Have they settled the Atlantic shore claims? Have they settled the Behring Sea claims? Have they settled a single dispute with the United States? Not one of them. They have been four years in power and they have not settled one of these disputes, nor have they secured a reciprocity treaty. When they came in they found arrangements completed for a fast Atlantic service, which would be of incalculable benefit to the people. But, with a great flourish of trumpets, they announced they were going to get something better for \$700,000 a year less. But their bottle-necked steamers proved only to be another of those dissolving views. And we are told to-day that we cannot get the fast Atlantic service, unless we pay very much more for it than was called for by the contract that would have been carried out had the Conservatives remained in power.

Then, they said our immigration policy was wrong. The hon. member for North Wellington said, when we proposed to vote \$200,000 for immigration, that it ought to be cut down by \$200,000 and saved to the people. In four years what have they done? This year they have voted \$445,000, and last year they voted \$435,000 for that purpose. The figures have been creeping up every year since they came into power, and still they are not satisfied, because they want more money in order to give them an opportunity to appoint a greater number of their political heelers to these lucrative offices where they become practically pensioners on the country. I want the people of Canada to remember the promises made by these hon. gentlemen, and ask themselves whether they have been fulfilled. They said they would revise the civil service. Have they done so? No, but they have demoralized the civil service

from the highest to the lowest, and have practically starved out some of the best men in the service, refusing to give them annually the \$50 statutory increase to which they were entitled. Then they said they were going to do away with superannuation. Have they done so? Why, Sir, the superannuation list last year reached the highest point it has ever reached, by several thousand dollars. They are superannuating men in the prime of life, men who are walking about the streets of Ottawa and Toronto, drawing large pensions from the country, just as well able to work to-day as they ever were. But they are superannuated, and in my judgment, for no other purpose than that of making places for the political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite.

The Minister of Customs said to-night, Look at what the Postmaster General has done for the people of Canada in the reduction of postage. I am willing to give him credit for everything he did that is right; but I would ask the people to look at. I was going to say, the dishonesty of his policy, but I will say, the three-card monte game that was played on the people of Canada when he got out his Jubilee stamp and took nearly \$400,000 out of their pockets without giving them a dollar in return. Then he went and cancelled a large number of contracts of men who had a legal right to do certain work, ruthlessly cancelled them and expelled them from their positions, without allowing them an opportunity of testing in the courts the legality of the action of the Postmaster General. I say the whole administration has been characterized by incompetence as a party by corruption in their elections, and by jobbery and extravagance of every kind. Look at the deal they made in the Yukon where, if they had not been headed off by the action of the Upper Chamber, they would have given to certain parties \$47,000,000 for the purpose of building a narrow-gauge tramway 150 miles long. Then look at the Crow's Nest Pass Railway out of which a few of their friends that control the organ of the party made about \$3,000,000 out of the people of Canada. When I look over the conduct of these gentlemen I shall be very much mistaken if, when they come to be judged by the people, the verdict will not be: Weighed in the balance and found wanting, and their kingdom will be divided and given to others. When that time comes the people will say to hon. gentlemen opposite, who have been charged for the time being with the control of the destinies of our country: You have violated every pledge you made to the people before you came into power, you have shown your incompetence in every line, you have come short of what we expected of you, you have carried on a game of deceiving the people; and I shall be very much mistaken if the people of Canada do

Mr. SPROULE.

not consign them to the cold shades of opposition for eighteen years to come.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Although I can only remain a few minutes longer in the Chamber, I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without saying a few words in reply to the Minister of Customs. The hon. gentleman started out by telling us how the Liberal party had reduced taxation in face of the fact that they had increased it from 1896 to 1900 to the extent of \$12,000,000. I want especially to draw attention to this fact, that not only have the Liberal party failed to reduce taxation, but they have very largely increased it. It is the declared policy of the Liberal party not to reduce the taxation of the people. That policy has been declared in this House by the Minister of Finance. It is true that in 1897 they did make some changes, they took off a little here and a little there, but whenever they took off a little in some places they put a good deal more on in other places, and that is the policy of the government. They reduced the duty on lawns and muslins, on fine goods worn by fine people; but they were very careful to add more taxes to the coarse goods worn by the labouring classes of this country. The workingman, the toiler, the farmer, the mechanic, who had to wear his tweed and coarse cotton shirt, was taxed an extra 5 per cent by this government who say they have reduced taxation. They were taxed an extra 5 per cent; but the person who could wear fine goods imported from England was allowed to bring them in at a considerable reduction. They have only reduced taxation for one class, not to the people who are entitled to a reduction. Let me give you the words of the Minister of Finance, and I think they will set forth the policy of the government in an authoritative manner. Speaking in this House on the 20th day of June last, the Minister of Finance said:

When we reduced the tariff in 1897 we made a large number of changes, changes which in the main were in the direction of lower taxation. . . . It was of the utmost importance that we should maintain a strong financial position, and in view of the uncertainties as to the amount of revenue that might be produced by this lower rate of taxation, it became necessary that we should take some steps to make good any possible loss that might result.

The intention was that there should be no possible loss resulting from their changes in the tariff. Quoting again from the Minister of Finance:

It was thought that it might fairly be met by providing for the raising of some additional taxation in order to balance or make good the loss occasioned by the reduction of duties.

He says further:

It was necessary to have an increased revenue in certain directions when we were to lose revenue in other directions.

There is the declared policy of the government that is going to the country to tell the people that they have reduced taxation, a party which declares that it is not now, never was and never will be their policy to reduce the taxation of this country. The very fact that they have increased the taxation by \$12,000,000 shows that they are carrying out the policy declared by the Minister of Finance to be the policy of the government, and that was a policy by which, wherever they reduced taxation on one thing, they were to increase it on another to balance up the account. They reduced taxation on certain articles, for instance, that the farmers do not want to use. But, they were very particular to increase taxation on what was absolutely necessary for the farmers use. They added 33½ per cent to the duty on sugar so as to even up what they would lose on some little things they would lose here and there. They added largely to the duty on tobacco, a duty that is paid by about one-fifth of the people of the country, because only about one-fifth of the people consume tobacco. In that way they succeeded in getting over \$1,000,000 to balance up some little reductions they made here and there in their tariff changes. So, I say they have nothing to boast of before the people of this country. They have no right to go before the people of the country and tell them that they have reduced taxation or that they have ever intended to reduce taxation. Their policy is to spend more money simply because they have taken more money in taxes out of the people. Surely the people will have something to say about that. If the hon. gentleman thinks that the people believe that the true policy of the country is simply to pay taxes for the pleasure of seeing the government spend money, the people will have an opportunity of pronouncing on that question, and I believe that when they have that opportunity they will tell the hon. gentlemen that they are tired of seeing their money spent on bridges, and harbours and rivers where there is no water. This is the only item that I feel called upon to refer to. I regret that I am obliged to leave the Chamber; otherwise I would have liked to have taken up many questions to which the hon. gentleman has referred. I think the hon. Minister of Customs would have shown a great deal more common sense had he retained his seat and not made the absurd statements that he did. The statement that the country is satisfied because taxation has been increased by \$12,000,000 is about as absurd as the statement that we are reducing the national debt when we are increasing it.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). I confess that I cannot but agree with the sentiment that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has expressed regarding the speech of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). The hon. Minister of Customs is a man of great

experience. He has been a long time in parliament, he is a man of great ability, he is a powerful man, as we know, on the platform, and he has been accustomed for something like thirty or thirty-five years to deal with public questions. Bearing that in mind, what impression must have been made upon those who listened to the hon. gentleman, and what impression will be made on the people of the country when they read what he has uttered this evening in the press or in *Hansard*? I will just give a resumé of his speech. You have only to do that to see the very ridiculous position in which he is placed for all time. Bearing in mind the history of the last four years, and the utterances of the hon. gentleman, no critic or historian will record what the hon. gentleman has uttered here to-night without asking whether or not some malignant power had not struck the brain-pan of the hon. gentleman for the time being and reduced it below that high level at which it commonly stood. The hon. gentleman went on to say that our imports and exports had increased. He compared the imports and exports at present with the imports and exports in 1896. He went on and said: We are spending \$12,000,000 this year more than our predecessors spent and more than we spent last year. What did he say then? He said: We point with pride to this expenditure. We point with pride to this \$12,000,000 of excessive expenditure. Then he said: Look at the surplus; we have \$7,500,000 of a surplus, and he said that it was a thing whereof to glory. Mr. Speaker, you have been for years a colleague of the hon. gentleman and you know that he has always professed to be a financial critic. He stood up and said: Look at the surplus. Then he went on and talked about taxation. He actually stated that the taxation had been decreased. He stated that for the present year the average taxation on the aggregate imports is 15.76 per cent, but when I asked him whether or not he took into account the large amount of corn that was brought into this country for the purpose of exportation, and which he was counting amongst the imports, he said no, he had not calculated what difference that would make. We know that it would make a difference of about 1.80 per cent in his calculations. I am quite sure that when my hon. friend has, to-morrow morning, gone through his devotions and his mind reverts to what he stated here to-night, namely, that their promise was not to reduce the amount of taxation, but to reduce the rate of taxation, when he remembers that he said that, I think that his reflections will be sicklied o'er with something paler than the cast of thought, and that penitential vows will go up to heaven to the recording angel to beg of him not to make too deep a record of what the hon. gentleman said here to-night. The hon. gentleman surely must remember what was his experience when he went to Winnipeg. He at

Winnipeg rehearsed the audacious attitude that has characterized him here to-night. Did it have any effect on the people of Winnipeg or upon the people of the North-west Territories? No, Sir, although he is one of the foremost orators in the camp of the Liberal party, although he was associated with the minister from the west, and although he had some of the comic talent of the outfit with him, he was not able in many places to get anything like a respectable audience to listen to the extraordinary utterances, a premonition of which had been given in the Winnipeg speech. Mr. Martin, who was an old colleague, and still a Liberal of the Liberals, standing on the same platform, afterwards tore into shreds his attitude and utterances on the tariff, tore into shreds his attitude and utterances in regard to expenditure; and showed in its true light the extraordinary and fatuous audacity of the hon. gentleman on that platform, and the fatuous audacity which has been outdone by him here to-night.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It would have done your heart good to see our meeting at Regina, when you never ventured to come out.

Mr. DAVIN. From what I have heard, I do not think it would have done my heart any harm. I rather think I would have been much pleased, because I heard exactly the way the Regina audience regarded the utterances of my hon. friend and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). Oh, for one hour of blind old Dandolo! Oh, for one hour of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his old form; only to reply to that speech which we have just heard! Let me read an utterance with regard to what the policy of the Liberal party was to be if they got into power in 1889:

We are taking \$6,115,000 more in taxes out of the people than we should, and we spent \$7,571,000 more than we should. An era of economy in expenditure should be at once entered upon.

Who uttered that? The Hon. William Paterson? Does he recognize his language? Or is he like that person mentioned in the epistle of the great apostle who looks in the glass and then goes away and straightway forgets what manner of man he was? Now, Sir, sitting near the hon. gentleman is a leader of the Liberal party, and here is what he said at one time:

For my own part, I do not hesitate to tell him that I consider a yearly expenditure of \$40,000,000 or \$38,000,000 altogether too large for the present resources of Canada. I say that it is a disgrace and a shame to the government who have been entrusted with our affairs that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of \$38,000,000 a year for federal purposes. Sir, the thing is utterly unjustifiable.

That was Sir Richard Cartwright.

Mr. DAVIN.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. With the present resources.

Mr. DAVIN. Are the resources any different?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIN. What the hon. gentleman means by that is this, that the resources of Canada to-day are different from what they were a few years ago, because we happen to have—in consequence mainly of the higher prices—a larger amount paid for imports. Certainly we have not a very much larger amount in the quantity of imports: but we are paying very much more for the imports that are coming in than we did in previous years, and therefore, collecting larger revenue. So that the position of our people is this, that they are paying a larger amount for the goods imported, and, in consequence of paying higher prices, they are paying higher duties on those goods than ever before; and yet the hon. gentleman thinks that because that is the case, our resources are different. Canada was ten years or fifteen years ago what it is to-day, a country of vast resources, whose inchoate wealth is simply incalculable; but, Sir, in these resources Canada is in no different material position to-day than it was when these words were uttered. What has happened is that we have had a period of great prosperity; and what is the attitude taken by the hon. Minister of Customs, who should be a financier, and who is himself a commercial man? What is the attitude taken by the government? Not, I believe, on my honour, with the hearty consent of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I believe if the Minister of Trade and Commerce could have had his way, he would have entered upon a period of economy. We would have used the time of prosperity to cut down the taxation, as has been done in England by great financiers like Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Gladstone. Why, Sir, when you have prosperity, and when you have the consequence of prosperity an abounding income, that is the time not to go into reckless extravagance, not to take Mr. Tarte's view: 'We have spent much, because we have made much.' We have made much—that is the tone of the hon. gentleman, who is evidently taking his inspiration from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). Look, he said, at our surplus of \$7,500,000. It is a burning disgrace to Canada and to the government that they have a surplus of \$7,500,000. Everybody knows that a Finance Minister who cannot adjust taxation so nicely to the needs of the country that income and expenditure will about balance, shows his incapacity. If you want to know what should be thought of a surplus, I will give you the opinion of a man whose opinion you must take. In 1894 a gentleman in this House uttered these words:

Why, Sir, you heard the hon. gentleman driven to the expedient of giving it as an evidence of prosperity—

Just as my hon. friend has done—

—that during the last fifteen years which the country has been under a protective regime, the finances of the country balanced year after year by surpluses which now aggregate to the enormous sum of \$20,000,000. This fact, which I do not hesitate to say to the hon. gentleman, is nothing short of a disgrace and a shame for the administration, was treated by him as a boast.

Who uttered these words? I am quoting from a speech of Mr. Laurier, now Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Prime Minister, delivered in this House in the debate on the address of 1894. But what he was condemning were moderate surpluses aggregating \$20,000,000 over a period of fifteen years. So that an average surplus of something like \$750,000, according to that hon. gentleman, is a disgrace. But the Minister of Customs says, look at our surplus of \$7,500,000. If an average surplus of \$750,000 was in the opinion of the present Prime Minister a disgrace, what would he say if he spoke out his own thoughts of the surplus of the Finance Minister this year, which I say is a burning shame, and a thing which stamps him as utterly unfit, either morally or intellectually, I will not say which, to have charge of the finances of the country. Mr. Laurier went on:

I assert that such a condition of things is a shame and a disgrace to any government. In England the aim and the purpose of the Chancellor of the Exchequer is so to calculate the expense and the expenditure as to make them balance evenly, and the reputation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be lost for ever if, year after year, his calculations were found to be wrong.

Well, Sir, apply that to this government. The only mortal thing they have to boast of is that the country is prosperous. They stand before the country convicted of falsehood to all their pledges. And the hon. gentleman is actually forced to get up here and say that he never promised to reduce the bulk but only the rate. I have quoted his own words and shown that that was not the case.

If, instead of having just the revenue which was wanted to meet the expenditure, it was found that there was such a disparity in his calculations as exists in Canada, the reputation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be lost for ever, unless he was able to show that the discrepancy arose from a sudden disturbance in the condition of business.

That is just what this government cannot say.

I consider that these surpluses represent \$20,000,000 of unjust taxation which has been wrung by the government from the consumers of the country, which should have been left in the pockets of the people for the purposes of their own business, for instance, to be applied to reducing the mortgages with which this country has been plastered during that term of years.

And, Sir, with that seven and a half million dollars of surplus, what have we done? We have voted millions of money to be charged to capital account. One of the items charged to capital account is \$5,000 for a snow fence. You might as well charge to capital account and the future the cost of your pocket-handkerchief. But that is the way that this boasted surplus is made up. But the schoolmaster has been abroad, and the hon. gentleman must not think that the people of Canada are so benighted that the government can go seriously before them, as the friends of free trade and the engineers of great advance and expansion. They stand condemned by the evidence of their own Prime Minister and have heaped on taxes when they should have been reducing them. Let me quote what Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

If we get into power we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie, and I say that although we may not be able to bring the expenditures to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount two, yes, three millions of dollars per year.

Is there any talk about rating in that? Is not that a promise to reduce the bulk of the expenditure? And yet the hon. gentleman will try to impress the people with the view that such a promise was never made.

I want to call attention to the falsification of the promises made by these hon. gentlemen, and which has special interest for that part of the country whence I come. The right hon. the First Minister promised that the protective system would be swept away, and he specifically promised that the duties on agricultural implements would be removed, that we should have cheap coal oil, and that the duties on the cheaper cottons would be removed. But what are the facts to-day? Let me give a few of the items:

	Conservative tariff.	Present tariff.
Farm machinery .....	20 per cent.	20 per cent.
Soft coal .....	60c. per ton	53c. per ton
Burning oil .....	6c. per gal.	5c. per gal.

But they have handed us over body and bones to the Standard Oil Company, and the result is that we are paying more for our coal oil than we ever did.

	Conservative tariff. per cent.	Present tariff. per cent.
Boots and shoes .....	25	25
Manufactures of brass .....	30	30
Carpets .....	25 & 30	35
Gray cottons .....	22½	25
White cottons .....	25	25
Printed cottons .....	30	35
Sewing cottons .....	12½	15
Woollen clothing .....	*25	36

\*And 5 cents per pound.

Here are items that come home to the business men and the farmers of the Northwest Territories, and in regard to which we have specific promises broken, just as was the promise of reduction in expenditure.

and the promise to cut down the upas tree of protection.

Let me compare the expenditure during four years under Liberal-Conservative government and the expenditure of the present government. The expenditure on consolidated revenue, as may be seen by the public accounts of the year 1899, page XV-a, was as follows :

1892-3.....	\$26,814,052
1893-4.....	37,585,025
1894-5.....	38,232,005
1895-6.....	36,949,142

Compare those with the figures under the present administration :

1896-7.....	\$38,349,759
1897-8.....	38,832,525
1898-9.....	41,903,500
1899-1900.....	43,175,000

Take the current fiscal year, we have had a statement made of the expenditure for the eleven months, which shows an increase of \$1,121,630 over the corresponding eleven months of the previous year, and taking the estimates of the Minister of Finance, given in his budget speech—which in the previous years of his administration were below the mark—we have a current expenditure for this year of about forty-three and a half million dollars.

Let me now take capital expenditure. If you will turn to the Public Accounts for 1899, page XV-a, you will find that the capital expenditure for the years of Conservative rule were as follows :

1892-3.....	\$3,088,317
1893-4.....	3,862,969
1894-5.....	3,030,490
1895-6.....	3,781,311

But, Sir, after the change of government we see such an increase in the sums charged to capital account, that there is not a Liberal in the country with any stake in the country, or with any fair sense of what is for the good of the country, who is not shocked at the increase. The following are the figures of capital expenditure under the present administration :

1896-7.....	\$3,523,160
1897-8.....	4,143,503
1898-9.....	5,936,342
1899-1900 (Mr. Fielding's estimate) .....	9,875,000

This last figure is the Finance Minister's own estimate. Fancy, nearly ten million dollars, charged to capital account made up of such items as \$5,000 for a snow fence. With regard to the burden of taxation, on which the hon. gentleman tried, as I say, insincerely, to cover over with a cloak the promises of himself and his government, if you look at the Public Accounts for 1899, page L-1, and the hon. gentleman's own Trade and Navigation Returns for 1899, page 6, you will find that the taxes in the years of Conservative rule, were as follows :

Mr. DAVIN.

#### Liberal-Conservative Taxes.

	Customs.	Excise.	Total.
1893-4 .....	\$19,379,822	\$8,381,088	\$27,760,910
1894-5 .....	17,887,269	7,805,732	25,693,001
1895-6 .....	20,219,037	7,926,005	28,145,042

But, take what we find under the Liberal regime, this regime that was to cut down the expenditure by three millions, and to keep down taxation. We find that the figures were as follows :

Liberal Taxes.			
	Customs.	Excise.	Total.
1896-7 .....	\$19,891,996	\$9,170,378	\$29,072,374
1897-8 .....	22,157,788	7,871,562	30,029,350
1898-9 .....	25,734,228	9,641,227	35,375,455

And the hon. gentleman in his own speech stated the amount that would be received for customs up to the 30th of June last, was between \$28,000,000 and \$29,000,000. And he boasted of it, and seemed to rejoice in it. With his record before him, with his promises and those of his leader and colleagues before him, with sound principles of government and finance before him, he ought to have been ashamed that though a member of this government, he has not been able to effectively protest in council against the course of the Finance Minister; he has not been able to persuade his colleagues to adopt such a wise system of finance and taxation as would enable him to say: The country is prosperous, we have an adequate revenue, and yet I have cut down taxation and reduced the burdens upon the people. Comparing 1896 with 1899, we have the following :

Increase in customs taxes .....	\$5,515,191
“ excise taxes.....	1,715,222
Total increase of taxes .....	7,230,413

The hon. gentleman talked about population, and said that he believed the population had increased considerably. Take his own estimate of the population as found in his own volume, the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1899, page 7, and you find the taxation per head as follows :

	Customs.	Excise.	Total.
1895-6 .....	\$3 94	\$1 54	\$5 48
1896-7 .....	3 83	1 77	5 60
1897-8 .....	4 22	1 50	5 72
1898-9 .....	4 84	1 80	6 64

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What page is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) reading from ?

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman will find this at page 7 of the Trade and Navigation Returns.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is not my own book, that is the Tory campaign book that he is reading from.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, if the Tory campaign book can make a damning arraignment of the present government by quoting from the hon. gentleman's own blue-book, how can the government stand before the coun-

try when they are called to account on platform after platform?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman said he was reading from the Trade and Navigation Returns.

Mr. DAVIN. I told the hon. minister (Mr. Paterson) that what I was reading would be found at page 7 of the Trade and Navigation Returns.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The reference is right.

Mr. DAVIN. Then, what does the hon. gentleman mean?

Mr. TAYLOR. Here is a Grit campaign book. Read the cover.

Mr. DAVIN. It is called 'Political Pointers No. 2.' I have glanced through it. They have no defence for their tergiversations, for their falsehood to their promises, and they go back in the history of this country to try to indict men, some of whom have passed out of public life and some of whom are dead. Actually one of their emissaries was in the library trying to find out whether Sir John A. Macdonald had signed an annexation manifesto some fifty years gone by. Now, here are some more of the achievements of the Liberal government:

They settled the Manitoba school question, which was a subject of so much racial and religious controversy, and which seriously threatened the peace and welfare of the Dominion.

Have they settled it?

They adopted a tariff which materially reduced the rate of taxation, promoted domestic and foreign trade, did no injustice to any class, and has been the means of restoring prosperity to the people.

They 'adopted' a tariff; 'adopted' is the right word. When you adopt a child, for instance, you take him from another family and you call the child your own, and that is what these hon. gentlemen did. Instead of giving a new birth as they promised, instead of giving a tariff for revenue as they promised, they adopted the Tory tariff. But it did not do what it did under those who managed it before. The ex-Minister of Finance knocked off \$3,000,000 at once on sugar. When our friends were in power they tried to adapt the tariff to the conditions of the country, and if the country was prosperous and enabled them to do it, they reduced the taxation. But hon. gentlemen come in and they adopt the tariff, and they do not know how to manage it, and the consequence is we have these riotous surpluses. They have increased the taxes on the cheaper cottons, on tobaccos, on things used by the masses of the people, and they have relieved the rich on some of their luxuries.

They granted imports from Great Britain a substantial preference.

Now, if I had time I could show that that is utterly false, that so far from that being the case every item in this book (the Trade and Navigation Returns) proves that the tariff has been more favourable to the United States than to England; and while imports from England have increased at a certain percentage, imports from the United States have increased still more.

They sent contingents of Canadian volunteers to help the motherland in the Transvaal.

Isn't it beautiful? After dodging it, after trying not to do it, then, when forced to do it by the powerful will of Sir Charles Tupper and the rising tide of public feeling, they turn round and boast of what they have done. You have often heard of the man who was in a shanty with a loft overhead to which a ladder was attached, and when a bear came in he ran up the ladder and drew it after him, but his wife took a broom and beat the bear out. Then he came down and took hold of his wife's hand and said: Didn't we do that well? That is the way they sent soldiers to the Transvaal. On page 6 of this campaign sheet I find:

They gave the people an opportunity to express their minds on the prohibition question.

Why, Sir, I thought the people always had an opportunity of expressing their minds. The hon. gentleman refers to the squandering of a quarter of a million of money on a piece of blatant humbug, for no other reason than to protect the present Prime Minister from the necessity of saying yes or no to a question whether he would give prohibition. When they determined to give a plebiscite it was thought it would fulfil its purpose, because their plan was to go to the country before they could have a session subsequent to the plebiscite being taken. Unfortunately for them the plebiscite being taken showed a clean majority of some 13,000 votes cast for prohibition, for the policy which they promised the people would be carried out. Then, having had a session, they come here and say: The majority is not large enough, we expected you would give a bigger majority than that. Did they hold that out before the people when they said: We will give you a plebiscite? No, Sir, that plebiscite is like the rest of their policy, from the time they entered office to this hour. Take the session of 1896, the session of 1898, the session of 1899, take this session, and take all their utterances, even those that we heard to-night; they have always the same boundless belief in the gullibility of the people, and in humbug. I have more faith in the good sense of the people than hon. gentlemen. I have not so much faith in humbug as hon. gentlemen seem to have, and I do not believe that you can found a policy or a government on diplomatic mendacity, however charmingly it may be put before the people.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS**. That is a good peroration.

**Mr. DAVIN**. I never make perorations. I leave perorations to others. I have made many speeches, but I have never done such a thing as that. When I have finished what I have to say down I sit. I leave these puerilities to my hon. friend and others. I think I have done enough to show to the House and the country that the hon. gentleman would have done well with such a case and at such a time, to have kept silent.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

The following resolutions were adopted:

1. Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending June 30, 1900, the sum of \$2,264,728 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

2. Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending June 30, 1901, the sum of \$36,131,735.03 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

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

### SUPPLY BILL.

The **MINISTER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 196) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending June 30, 1900 and 1901, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

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

### WORKMEN'S WAGES ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Mulock :

'That it be resolved that all government contracts should contain such conditions as will prevent abuses, which may arise from the subletting of such contracts, and that every effort should be made to secure the payment of such wages as are generally accepted as current in each trade for competent workmen in the district where the work is carried out, and that this House cordially concurs in such policy, and deems it the duty of the government to take immediate steps to give effect thereto. It is hereby declared that the work to which the foregoing policy shall apply includes not only work undertaken by the government itself, but also all works aided by grant of Dominion public funds.' The motion of Mr. Clarke in amendment thereto, and the motion of Mr. Campbell in amendment to said amendment.

**Mr. DAVIN**. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the question was raised whether this amend-

**Mr. DAVIN**.

ment of Mr. Campbell was in order ; because it will be seen that what it does is really directly to negative the amendment. I would like to have your decision.

**Mr. SPEAKER**. I cannot say that I see anything in the amendment that is not applicable to the original motion.

**Mr. DAVIN**. Is it in proper form as an amendment ?

**Mr. SPEAKER**. My view, speaking for myself, is that it is in order.

**Mr. TAYLOR**. Now that the Prime Minister is present, I am quite satisfied that the Postmaster General will not insist on going on with this resolution. He cannot insist on it and get it through. The oppositon are few in number, but they are prepared to go on all night, if necessary, and if you introduce a Bill you will not get prorogation to-morrow. The hon. Postmaster General has introduced this resolution to make political capital, and in asking that it should be put through after the Supply Bill has passed, he is trespassing on good nature. We have allowed the Supply Bill to go through, and now it is time that the House should rise.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I am a little surprised at my hon. friend's objection to this policy, for which I expected his co-operation.

**Mr. TAYLOR**. Certainly not.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. I think the country approves of it if the hon. gentleman does not.

**Mr. TAYLOR**. Then, the hon. gentleman ought to have put it through before. It has been on the paper over a month.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. It is only eleven o'clock, we are accustomed to late hours, and this is a subject of great importance.

**Mr. TAYLOR**. You should have put it through a month ago, when we had plenty of time.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. A subject of such importance as this is entitled to be dealt with in a respectful way in this House, and I think we could not more fittingly close this session than by affirming the principle announced in this resolution. I am sure it will commend itself to this House and the country, and be productive of great good, and I fail to understand the reason for any hostility to it. I hope my hon. friend will recede from his attitude, which is a hasty one, and will join with us in unanimously expressing the assent of parliament to this policy.

**Mr. TAYLOR**. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) who has been leading the opposition, left for home a few moments ago with the statement that there

would be nothing further done to-night; and certainly I am not going to take the responsibility in his absence of allowing this measure to be proceeded with.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. Who gave the assurance on behalf of the government that there would be nothing further done to-night? If any one on behalf of the government made any such promise to any member of the House, of course we will observe it.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. He certainly did leave the impression that the hon. Postmaster General if he wanted to do something for the labouring men of this country, would not wait until the dying hours of a session lasting five months and eighteen days.

Mr. **DAVIN**. Do I understand that the hon. Postmaster General means to bring in a Bill if this resolution passes?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. No.

Mr. **DAVIN**. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is, therefore, under a complete misapprehension on that point.

Mr. **TAYLOR**. Then, what is the good of your resolution?

Mr. **DAVIN**. It will be remembered that I myself suggested, when this question was up before, that it should be embodied in a Bill, and then the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) moved his amendment to that effect. If the hon. gentleman introduced a Bill embodying this clause, I would support it; but I do not see the value of a mere resolution. It is only an academic thing, and it can only be hung up for some purpose other than a practical one. If the hon. gentleman is sincere in wishing to put this resolution into practical effect in this country, the proper thing is to bring in a Bill and have it embodied in every contract connected with the railway subsidies we have voted. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) the other night asked the Minister of Railways whether he would embody this resolution in the contracts connected with the railway subsidies which were given to a large number of companies, and the Minister of Railways said he would consider it; but he never gave an answer to my hon. friend from Winnipeg. I think there is a great deal in what the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says, that at this period of the session, when we have gone through all the work, and when there is hardly anybody here, it is not fair nor right for the hon. gentleman to press a motion which will lead to controversy. I could not support the resolution, but I would support a Bill embodying the resolution.

An hon. **MEMBER**. What is the difference?

Mr. **DAVIN**. The difference appears to be this. To pass that resolution does not make

it at all necessary that it shall be embodied in contracts, whereas, if we pass a Bill with one or two clauses in it, providing absolutely that such and such things shall be done, I apprehend that the result would be very different. When my hon. friend put this resolution on the paper, I made a point of inquiring into the way this matter had worked in England, and I brought it to the attention of the House the fact that hundreds and hundreds of contracts were made, and great firms worked out great undertakings, without taking any account of the resolution that had been passed in the English House. I heard the report, which I know the hon. gentleman also read, which was made at the instance of Mr. Buxton, who had a commission of inquiry on the subject.

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL**. A committee of the House?

Mr. **DAVIN**. Well, a committee will do as well. I read the report of the committee and the evidence, and I came to the conclusion that there would have been a very different tale to tell if there had been a Bill making the regulation imperative, and not a mere resolution. Take for instance, Ireland. It was found that the resolution was disregarded entirely in Ireland, and if we are to go into this matter, I must ask the hon. gentleman to allow me to send for the report, for I am sure the House has forgotten what took place in debate on the 22nd March, and would like to know what was reported by that English committee. I do not think, under the circumstances, that it is fair to press the resolution at this time. The hon. minister had plenty of opportunity to press this resolution earlier in the session, when the House was complete, and certainly should not press it now when it is almost denuded of its members. To show the great probability there is of this resolution being utterly disregarded, let me refer to the Alien Labour law, which has been on our statutes some years, and which so far has been a dead letter. If these hon. gentlemen have not been able to enforce one of the laws of this country, how can we expect them to put in force a simple resolution. For my part, I abhor this whole system of promising to the ear and breaking to the fact. It is neither creditable to the government nor conducive to improve the morale of the people. If the government is sincere, why did they not take the hint of the hon. member for Winnipeg and have a resolution to this effect attached as a condition to all their railway grants. We have voted \$3,900,000 in bonuses to railways, and such a resolution as this could easily have been made a condition of each grant. The government cannot say that it was not brought to their attention, because the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) tried to impress the importance of this on the Minister of Railways, and that

hon. gentleman said he would consider, but, as is his habit, utterly failed to keep his promise. If the government would bring in a Bill instead of a resolution, I would support it, and I would ask the hon. minister to confer for a short time with the Solicitor General and bring in a Bill, and we will put it through. But I do not want at the dying hours of the session, to be a party to a thing that is perfectly illusory and calculated to become a dead sea apple in the mouth of the labour of this country.

Amendment (Mr. Campbell) to the amendment (Mr. Clarke), agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is now on the amendment (Mr. Clarke).

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that motion should stand until to-morrow morning when the ex-Minister of Railways will be here. Any person will know that the thing is a piece of buncombe from the start to the finish. It was put on the Order paper months ago, and was taken up in the House on the 22nd of March. Amendments were offered and voted down by the government, amendments intended to put the proposal into shape so that it would be of some benefit to the workingmen. Since then, the railway subsidies have come down and have been voted without these conditions being put in. The government is erecting a building in Vancouver to-day, and I have letters from there that aliens are working on that work while our men are walking the streets there and cannot get a job. This morning, I read a letter from the oarsmen of my own town, Gananoque, saying that they were being driven out of work by alien oarsmen. And yet, on the other hand, when a number of our students from Kingston went across and took employment as waiters in one of the hotels, they were driven back across the line by the officers enforcing the Alien Labour law. Why do not the government enforce our Alien Labour law which is workable except that it depends upon the government itself? The Prime Minister promised that he would give us a law, line for line and word for word the same as the American law; but he has failed to carry out that promise. He has not given us a real effective law, though our workingmen have frequently petitioned for the enforcement of it. Besides the case of the oarsmen, I brought up not long ago the case in Prescott, which was one of the most outlandish cases ever known. The Prime Minister himself said that this case ought to be dealt with, yet nothing has been done. The government want this resolution passed so that these petitions may be put into government contracts. But they have the power to do this without any action on the part of this House. Why do they not put it in the Railway Subsidies Bill? It is simply an attempt to humbug the workingmen of this country, but they are too intelligent

Mr. DAVIN.

to be humbugged in that way. Though this resolution was on the paper on the 22nd of June it is not pressed until now, the 17th of July, after the Supply Bill has been passed and we are only waiting for the Senate to concur in the amendments made in some of the Bills passed in this House and for Black Rod to rap at the door for prorogation. The government tries to humbug the workingmen by saying: Here is what we tried to do for you, but the opposition would not let it pass. Of course the government could force it through if they wish to, but I should think they would yield to the suggestion that they should not force it through until the ex-Minister of Railways, who is leading this side of the House, is present.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). I shall not address myself to the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) that this is a mere sham. The hon. gentlemen are at liberty to have any opinion they like upon that. The propriety of having such a resolution affirmed in the House must be manifest to any person who gives fair consideration to the preparing of contracts for the erection of public buildings. The incorporation of the principle of this resolution in the contracts necessarily means the payment of larger wages to employees, and, therefore, that public works will cost the country something more. It is, therefore, extremely proper that before the principle of this resolution is incorporated in public contracts, as a matter of permanent policy it should receive the sanction of parliament. When it receives the sanction of parliament, it is a mandate and authority to the government to incorporate such a condition in government contracts; and, if this House sanctions the resolution, the principle of it will be lived up to by the government. My hon. friends opposite ask why this provision is not incorporated in the Act, respecting subsidies to railways. If they had been as attentive to find out what is in that Act as to assert what is not in it, they would have found that there is a provision to the effect that the granting of these subsidies shall be upon such conditions as may be set forth in the agreement between the government and the railways respecting such subsidies. If this resolution receives the sanction of the House, it will be the duty of the government and the Minister of Railways, representing the government, to incorporate the provisions of this resolution in the agreements relating to railway subsidies, and it will become one of the conditions regulating the right of railways to receive subsidies. This resolution expressly states that the fair wages principle shall apply to all works aided by subsidies of public money. If hon. gentlemen opposite desire this condition to be incorporated in these subsidies, let this resolution receive their approval and it will become the duty of the government to live up to it in their

dealings with the railways. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has referred to the experience of the Imperial government in connection with a similar resolution. My recollection of that experience is very different from his. In 1891, the Imperial parliament unanimously passed a resolution word for word such as this, except that it did not apply to subsidized works. In 1896-7, that parliament appointed a committee to inquire into the working of the resolution; and the finding of that committee was to the effect that the departments of the Imperial government had very substantially applied it in their government contracts. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) asks for an Act in one breath, and, in the next, says that an Act would not be binding upon us. When this subject was under discussion some months ago, the Prime Minister, dealing with this very proposition about the passing of an Act, pointed out that it was much better to leave it in the form of a resolution, because it afforded more elasticity and would enable the government to meet the various conditions, and not have a cast-iron set of words that would not fit in properly into some contracts. The words may have to be changed, but the principle is applicable to every government contract, and no Act is required in order to give the government a mandate to apply this principle. Already conditions have been drawn and are now in the departments, embodying the principle of the resolution, and current advertisements for public works are subject to the conditions of this resolution. But before we make the country pay more for these public works, as it will be necessary to do from the increase of wages, it is right that the government should have the sanction of this House. Already the principle has been introduced into one public work, involving a considerable expenditure, I refer to the St. Andrew's Rapids in Manitoba. Tenders had been invited without this condition, but the government decided to recall the advertisements, to readvertise for tenders subject to the conditions of this resolution. We have opened the tenders, and they are here to-day, and I want to have that contract executed with the terms of this resolution proposition embodied in it.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the contract given yet?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. I want the authority of parliament before putting the country to the extra expense involved in applying these conditions in that contract. But hon. gentlemen opposite are unwilling to give us their endorsement. I regret it. In England the House unanimously agreed to this principle, and I hope that even yet, my hon. friends will reverse their attitude, and now, at the close of this session, let us agree upon a measure of such

great importance and utility to the working classes. There are now current many other advertisements for public works throughout Canada. All the tenders that have been invited since this resolution was placed upon the Notice paper have been subject to the conditions involved in this fair wages resolution. These contracts are about to be let. Are we to have the authority of parliament to incorporate this fair wages resolution in these contracts? If this resolution passes there will be an obligation upon us, not only in respect to the advertised contracts, but all future contracts, to make them subject to this resolution. Now, on what principle do my hon. friends object? They say no good will come of it. Well, surely no harm can come of it, and if we do not live up to it, what a weapon they will have in their hands against us. I cannot, however, admit their charge of bad faith as having any foundation. The government have taken it up in good faith, with the full purpose of advancing the welfare of the industrial classes of Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the country will be grateful to us for having drawn such a strong and emphatic statement from the Postmaster General, who is the father of this resolution, strongly pledging himself and pledging the government to make this resolution operative. He tells us also that in the Railway Subsidies Bill there is a clause that refers to this matter, and by implication, therefore, he promises that this clause will be embodied in all these railway transactions. He has given us his assurance, and he speaks for the government in the presence of the Premier, that in all future works this clause will be put into operation. I think with an emphatic statement like that we are in almost as good a position as if the hon. gentleman had acted on my suggestion, and given us a Bill. Under these circumstances, I shall not oppose the clause. If the clause is carried out, it will do all that I hoped would be done by an Act of parliament, because we on this side of the House are as anxious as any hon. gentleman opposite to secure to every workingman a fair wage for a fair day's work. The hon. gentleman will remember that on March 22, when I took part in the debate, I pointed out that my object was to have this House take such action as would secure a great boon to the workingmen of Canada, with whom the party with which I act, has always had the strongest sympathy.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT—DEATH OF LIEUT. BORDEN.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I beg to move that the House adjourn. Before this motion is put, I am sure the House will agree that I may properly take

this opportunity of confirming the sad rumour which has been circulated through the corridors of the House this afternoon, to the effect that Lieutenant Borden, son of the Minister of Militia and Defence, met his death yesterday in South Africa. The rumour is unfortunately too true. This afternoon His Excellency received a telegram from Lord Roberts, informing him that yesterday, near Pretoria, Lieutenant Borden was killed in action. Lieutenant Borden was a young man who enlisted recently to fight for the Queen in South Africa. He was only 23 years of age, a young man of great promise, athletic in figure, bright, intelligent, a model boy in every way. He had, as I am informed, already made a mark in his career, attracting the attention of his chiefs by his coolness under fire, by his daring, by his courage, and had won the affections of his comrades by his amiable disposition. This precious life has been cut short by the uncertainties of war. Now, this event, I am sure, will reach the heart of every member of this House. He is the son of a prominent member of this administration, of an old member of this House, and of a popular member, and, as I am reminded, the only son. Whatever bitterness there may be of strife, I am sure that before such a misfortune all such bitterness disappears and that on both sides of the House friends and foes will unite in offering to the bereaved father and to the bereaved mother that sympathy which can be the only solace of such a misfortune on this side of the grave.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). I wish that the hon. leader of the opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) were in his place, in order that he might echo the sentiments which have been so fitly expressed by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). A great statesman, Sir, belonging to Athens said that of great men who died the whole earth seemed to be the mausoleum. I think it may be said, that, of even the humblest hero who under modern conditions dies on the battlefield, the whole earth is his mausoleum, because the civilized world seems to be in attendance and to watch what is going forward, and I am sure there is not a man in Canada, or for that matter, in the British Empire, but will have heard of the death of this young man, just 23 years, with all the budding hopes of youth, and already crowned with valour, whose death is so untimely, and who yet died so grandly, with sympathy for his family, and especially, here in this House, will that sympathy be felt for his distinguished father. I would for my part, personally, as well as, if I may speak for this side of the House, express our great regret, and yet mixed with that regret there is a sort of gratulation and pride that the son of a member of our own body and a

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

member of our government, fighting for the empire, although his family are bereaved and his country has lost his valuable life, yet has won the great prize of death in battle.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 18, 1900.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I beg to inform the House that I have received a letter from His Excellency the Governor General's Secretary, which is as follows:—

Office of the  
Governor General's Secretary,  
Ottawa, July 17, 1900.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber, to prorogue the session of the Dominion parliament, on Wednesday, the 18th instant, at three o'clock.

I have the honour to be, Sir,  
Your obedient servant.

L. G. DRUMMOND, Major,  
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable  
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

CASES OF DUBE AND CAZES.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (Three Rivers). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if we are likely to get the papers in the case of Cazes to-day?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No. The papers are being copied, but will not be ready for some time. The record is very voluminous.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). That is an extraordinary thing. I read that the report of Judge Bossé was printed, and that is the only thing that my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) desires to have. The other papers are not important. It was represented to be entirely different from what had been stated by the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He said that the report of the judge was distinctly more in

favour of commutation in the case of Cazes, and very hard in the case of Dubé. By the account I read, it was the very reverse—that he was more lenient in the case of Dubé than in the case of Cazes. The report is very short, and I am sure it should be brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER. This shows that it is not well to form an opinion on mere fly sheets of that kind. I have been told—I have not seen it myself—that a report purporting to be that of Judge Bossé had been put in *Le Journal*. But, there are two reports in the case of Cazes.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Then, we cannot hope to have the papers here this session?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, but as soon as the return is complete, we may give it to the press.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING—AMENDMENT TO CRIMINAL CODE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There are some little things yet to be done, but I propose that the sitting be suspended until two o'clock.

Mr. NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN (West Assiniboia). Before that motion is put, I would ask the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) whether he received the information that was ordered for me respecting the amendment to the Criminal Code?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I asked the proper official of the department to give my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) the information; and I understood he had done so.

Mr. DAVIN. I have not yet received it.

#### THE LIBRARY.

Mr. DAVIN. I would also like to say, that in making references to the library the other day, I mentioned certain officers as first-rate officers. But, I omitted to mention the name of an officer there whose services are invaluable—Col. Todd.

#### INSPECTION OF APPLES AND PEARS.

Mr. GEORGE GUILLET (West Northumberland). I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) if he has anything to say with reference to the Bill respecting apples and pears, or does he propose to withdraw that Bill?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). We are not prepared to go on with that Bill this session.

The House took recess until Two o'clock.

The House resumed at Two o'clock.

#### CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 197) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act. He said: This Bill is for the purpose of adding certain sections which provide for a scrutiny in the case of the province of Prince Edward Island, that is to say, to bring about what was desired by the amendment suggested in the Senate to the Dominion Elections Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second times, and House resolved itself into committee thereon.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. B. M. BRITTON (Kingston). I want to ask if these amendments are exactly the same as the amendments made by the Senate to the Elections Act?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is not quite the same. This is to provide for a scrutiny in the case of elections in Prince Edward Island, but the provision is for a scrutiny solely, instead of a contestation of the election. It has to be made within twenty days after the publication in the Official Gazette of the election, so as to give an opportunity to contest on any other ground, if it is desired, before the thirty days expire.

Mr. BRITTON. There is a discrimination in favour of Prince Edward Island.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. But there is all the reason in the world for the discrimination. In Prince Edward Island they have no election list as they have in the other provinces, and this is to discriminate in favour of Prince Edward Island, because of the conditions existing in that province.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Do I understand that these clauses which were amended in the Senate give to the county judge the right virtually of trying whether the party was entitled to vote?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Your contention is that that properly ought to be a part of the Controverted Elections Act?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. And you have amended the Act so as to remove all doubts so far as Prince Edward Island are concerned, and to give the judge authority to try these cases.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Exactly, giving that authority to the judge of the High Court, in order that he may dispose of it absolutely as he would of an election petition in the regular courts.

Mr. BRITTON. I understand that the Bill amends the Controverted Elections Act so that there may be a petition on this ground. Do I understand that it may go before the county judge?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, it is not an ordinary petition to contest the election, I suppose it would go before a High Court judge. Then it gives an opportunity of ten days additional to attack on other grounds, if necessary. It must be done within twenty days after the return.

Mr. HAGGART. It does not interfere with the county court judge having the same powers of a recount as in any other part of the Dominion?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He has got absolutely the same powers on a recount.

Bill reported.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I move that the Bill be read the third time.

Mr. HAGGART. What are you going to do with the Act as amended by the Senate?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I understand they are going to withdraw their amendment on our passing this.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We agree to all the amendments proposed by the Senate with the exception of these that are covered by this amendment to the Controverted Elections Act. They are waiting to get this Bill.

Mr. BRITTON. In other words, the Senate has held us up.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think it would be highly improper, after all the labour the House has put upon this Bill when endeavouring to amend the Act, so as to make it impossible for fraud to occur, that our work should all be sacrificed now.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the third time, and passed.

#### JUDGES OF THE PROVINCIAL COURTS.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved that the House take into consideration the Message from the Senate, consisting of amendments made to the Bill (No. 189) to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts.

Motion agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is impossible for us to accept the amendments suggested by the Senate, and we are obliged, in consequence, to allow this important measure to drop entirely, leaving the responsibility for the inconveniences that must necessarily ensue, to rest with the Senate.

Mr. SPEAKER. Dropped.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

#### ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a Message from the Senate acquainting this House that the Senate hath rescinded its proceedings, had this day with respect to the amendments Nos. 46, 47, 48, 49, 52 and 53, made by it to the Bill (No. 133) intituled: 'An Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to the Election of Members to the House of Commons,' and that it doth not insist upon the said amendments, but that it doth insist upon its amendment No. 2 to the said Bill.

#### FORT DUFFERIN WHARF.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

When was the shed upon the government wharf at Port Dufferin or Salmon River, in the county of Halifax, completed?

2. Was this shed built by contract or how otherwise?

3. What amount has been paid on account of the cost of construction of this shed and what bills have been rendered for or on account of the cost of such construction?

4. What wharfage has been collected in respect of the government wharf at Port Dufferin or Salmon River, in the county of Halifax?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mullock). 1. The engineer reports that the work is finished, but he does not give the date. 2. The shed was built by day's labour. 3. The return of expenditure is not yet received by the department. 4. Wharfage is collected by the Marine Department.

#### PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

Mr. Speaker:

His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

#### IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.

An Act to incorporate the South Shore Line Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Copyright Act.

An Act to amend the Civil Service Act.

An Act respecting and restricting Chinese Immigration.

An Act to amend the Pilotage Act.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of J. W. Anderson.

An Act respecting the construction of a branch railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour.

An Act to incorporate the British America Pulp, Paper and Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Central Vermont Railway Company (foreign).

An Act respecting the preservation of Game in the Yukon territory.

An Act to aid in the prevention and settlement of trade disputes and to provide for the publication of statistical industrial information.

An Act to amend the Militia Act.

An Act to amend the Bank Act Amendment Act, 1900.

An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

An Act to amend the Railway Act.

An Act respecting the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

An Act further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.

An Act to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.

An Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to the election of members of the House of Commons.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the fifth session of the eighth parliament of the Dominion with the following

### SPEECH :

*Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

In relieving you from further attendance in parliament, I desire to thank you for the diligent attention which you have given to the labours of an exceptionally protracted session.

When parliament opened in the month of February last, the thoughts of the whole empire were centred on the war which was then raging in South Africa.

The marked successes which have since attended the British arms, and in which our Canadian volunteer soldiers have taken a conspicuous and glorious part, justify the hope that peace will be soon restored in that distant land.

The large number of private Bills with industrial objects considered and passed is a good indication of the great expansion of the business of the country.

I desire to congratulate you on the buoyant state of the revenue. The large receipts have enabled my government to provide liberally for the public service, and to maintain Canada's strong financial position.

A marked feature of the session has been the adoption of many important measures which must beneficially affect the future of the Dominion.

The improvements in the Act relating to banks will tend to perfect a system of banking of which Canada has reason to feel proud.

The extension of the British preference in our tariff will tend to reduce the burden of taxation, and stimulate the growth of our trade with the mother country.

The measure you have passed respecting the admission of Canadian inscribed stock to the list of securities in which trustees in Great Britain may invest, is being followed by similar legislation in the Imperial parliament, which will, in due course, consummate this very important improvement in the financial affairs of the Dominion.

There is reason to believe that the legislation of this session will have important and favourable results. I particularly congratulate you upon the passing of the Conciliation Act, which, it is confidently hoped, will not only improve the condition of the industrial classes, but will also better promote the relations which ought to exist between capital and labour.

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

I thank you for the liberal provision which you have made for the public service.

*Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :*

*Gentlemen of the House of Commons :*

It affords me much pleasure to observe that the prosperity of Canada continues unabated, and I pray that Divine Providence may continue to look with favour upon this Dominion.

# INDEX.

## FIFTH SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT, 1900.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; \*, without remarks or debate; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adj., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y.N., Yeas and Nays; Names in *Italic* and parentheses are those of the mover.

### Angers, Mr. C., *Charlevoix*.

- I.C.R., Passes granted to Judges, Number, &c., (Ques.) 2830 (i).
- South African War, Independence of Parlt. *re* British Institutions, on amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 1860 (i).

### Beattie, Mr. T., *London*.

- Budget, The, 4623 (ii).
- Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 8425; on M. for 2°, 9387.
- Employees, Limitation of Working Hours (B. 56) 1° m., 1109 (i).
- Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2541 (i).
- South African War,—Additional Troops required by Imp. Govt. (remarks) 1208 (i).
- Can. Contingents, in Com. on Res., 1167.
- Hoisting of the Flag on American Bank Note Co.'s Building (remarks) 6994 (iii).
- Postage on Letters (remarks) 650 (i).
- Speech of Mr. Roberts reported in *London Free Press*, 734 (i).
- White, Lt. Col., Retirement, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 3104 (i).

### Belcourt, Mr. N. A., *Ottawa*.

- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7021 (iii).
- Gaspé Election and Customs Official, on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Com. of Sup., 7587 (ii).

### Belcourt, Mr. N. A.—*Con.*

- Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen on amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2494, 2555 (i).
- Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 9137 (iii).
- Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden*, *King's*) in Com., 6478 (ii).
- Orford Copper Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 53) 1°, 1109; on M. for 2°, 1929 (i).
- Ottawa-Hull Fire Relief Fund (B. 175) 1°, 6899.
- Pacific Cable, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7040 (iii).
- South African War, Emergency Rations, First Rep. of Com. (presented) 7646 (iii).
- on M. to print Rep. of Com., 8651 (iii).
- (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 9201.
- Supply B. 147 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4463 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
  - Civil Govt.*: Interior Dept. (salaries) 7822 (iii).
  - Yukon, Administration of, on amt. (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) to Com. of Sup., 8589 (iii).

### Bell, Mr. A. C., *Pictou*.

- Brulé, N. S., Preventive Officer, Name, &c. (Ques.) 4557 (ii).
- Budget, The, 4467, 4479 (ii).
- Centre New Annan P.O., Appmnt. of Postmaster (Ques.) 4557 (ii).
- Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 9393 (iii).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8100 (iii).

**Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.***

- Dorchester Penitentiary Investigation, Payments *re* (Ques.) 778 (i).  
 Eastern Extension Ry., Contract for painting Stations (Ques.) 3038 (i).  
 Fishing Bounty, Claim, &c. (Ques.) 9524 (iii).  
 Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3241 (i).  
 I.C.R. Sand Castings, N.S., Names of Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 9062 (iii).  
 ——— Transportation of Troops, Total Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 9521 (iii).  
 New Glasgow Public Building, Plumbing, &c. (Ques.) 7879 (iii).  
 Paris Exposition—Appnmt. of Min. of Pub. Works (Ques.) 740 (i).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 9018 (iii).  
 Public Health Dept., Establishment of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 8450 (iii).  
 Ry. Mail Service, N.S., Appnmt. of Supt. (Ques.) 2832 (i).  
 Reports, Deptl., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4159 (ii).  
 South African War, Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 546 (i).  
 ——— Transportation of Troops, Freight, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 9722 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

- Canals* (Ottawa River) 8376 (iii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (salaries, &c.) 1705.  
*Militia* (rifle associations, &c.) 8336 ; (warlike stores) 8324 (iii).  
*Railways* : I.C.R. (engine houses) 9435 ; P. E. I. (working expenses) 9505 (iii).  
*Public Works* : Buildings (Ottawa) 7933 ; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (River John wharf) 7941 ; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge N. W. T.) 7838 (iii).

- Tatamagouche Harbour, Survey, &c. (Ques.) 9524 (iii).  
 Tatamagouche Mountain P.O., Appnmt. of Postmaster (Ques.) 4557 (ii).  
 Yukon, Administration of (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 8527 (iii).

**Bell, Mr. J. H., *East Prince, P. E. I.***

- Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5498 (ii).  
 Budget, The, 3555 (ii).  
 Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 3435 (ii).  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 9382 (iii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137, (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on amt. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) to M. for 3°, 6318 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8101 (iii).  
 Fishing Bounties Claims, 1896-99, Amounts paid (Ques.) 2199 (i).

**Bell, Mr. J. H.—*Con.***

- Gordon Point, P. E. I., Wharf, Pets. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 9904 (iii).  
 Govt. System of Telegraph, Establishment B. 85 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 1°, 1722 (i).  
 Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1540 (i).  
 Lighthouses, &c. constructed since 1896 (Ques.) 2199 (i).  
 Lobster Fisheries (M. to adjn.) 4727 (ii).  
 Marconi System of Telegraphing (Ques.) 2199 (i).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4087 (ii), 9024 (iii).  
 Rys. in Can., Number of Miles in Operation, &c. (Ques.) 1884 (i).  
 Representation in the H. of C., B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 1249 ; in Com., 1458 ; on M. for 3°, 1565, (i).  
 South African War, Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 569 (i).  
 Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel Com., 2779 (i).  
 Summerside, P. E. I., Volunteer Organization, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 2179 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Fisheries* (lobster regulations) 5949 (ii).  
*Public Works* : Harbours and Rivers, P. E. I. (Summerside breakwater) 9900 (iii).

**Bell, Mr. J. W., *Addington.***

- Budget, The, 4258 (ii).  
 Militia Drill, Annual Camp (Ques.) 3444 (ii).  
 Post offices, &c., Number established since Jan. 1900 (Ques.) 2464 (i).

**Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.***

- American Vessels and the Coasting Trade (remarks) 7321, 7512, 7650 (iii).  
 ——— (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9149 (iii).  
 Anderson, Patent Relief B. 108 (Mr. *Cargill*) on M. for Com., 5165 (ii).  
 Binder Twine, Sale and Manufacture of, on amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 6239 (ii).  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1052 (i).  
 ——— on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5380 (ii).  
 Budget, The, 4298 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6731 (ii) 7328 ; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 9478 (iii).  
 Export of Logs and Lumber on Indian Reserves, Quantity exported, &c. (Ques.) 150 (i).  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1°, 2358 (i).  
 Gaspé Election and Customs Official, on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Com. of Sup., 7584 (iii).  
 Grain Transportation to the Seaboard (prop. Res.) 442 ; withdn., 3229 (i).  
 ——— between Can. Ports by American Vessels, Quantity carried, Names of Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 431, 739 (i).

**Bennett, Mr. W. H.—Con.**

Grain Transportation in Can. during 1899 (Ques.) 1110 (i).

Hawkestone Dock, Tenders for Construction (Ques.) 3045 (i), 4076 (ii).

Kobold, Gustavus A., Relief (B. 159) 1<sup>o</sup>, 5293 (ii).

Midland Harbour, Range Lights, &c., Erection of (Ques.) 3045 (i).

Orillia Public Building, Caretaker, Name and Salary (Ques.) 286 (i).

Privilege (Ques. of) 5521 (ii).

Personal Explanation *re* Mr. Stubbs, 8525 (iii).

Rama Indian Reserve, Medical Supt. (Ques.) 3043 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1561 (i).

St. Lawrence Canals, Contracts cancelled, Number, &c. (Ques.) 156 (i).

South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1143 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage, &c.) 7627 (iii).

*Militia* (annual drill) 8302 (iii).

Trent Canal, Tenders, *re* Trent-Frankfort section (Ques.) 156 (i).

**Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Beauharnois.**

Abenakis Indians of St. Francis (remarks) 7321.

Anderson, Patent Relief B. 108 (Mr. *Cargill*) on M. for Com., 5165 (ii).

Berthier, Dredging of Channel, &c. (Ques.) 1462.

Berthier en Haut, Name of Dredge, &c. (Ques.) 2171 (i).

Bout de L'Isle and Charlemagne Bridge, Subsidies promised, &c. (Ques.) 5895 (ii).

Budget, The, 3528 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) 3989 (ii).

Charbonneau, Mr. N., Retention by Govt. as Counsel, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 5248 (ii).

Coal Oil, Import Price, &c. (Ques.) 2364 (i).

Companies Clauses Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. 8952 (iii).

Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 89 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 3610 (ii).

Court of Appeals, P. Q. (remarks) 5515 (ii).

*See* 'Judges,' &c.

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5263 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 10453 (iii).

Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 5215, 5223 (ii).

— 6th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 10288-10295 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7323, 8800, 9066, 9070; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 9479; on Sen. Amts., 10455 (iii).

Dube and Cazes, Clemency, &c., Judge's Rep. (remarks) 10504 (iii).

Electoral Lists, Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 169 (i).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 2348 (i).

**Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—Con.**

Franking Privilege, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3636 (ii).

Gaspe Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 3007 (i).

Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, Allegations against Mr. C. N. Armstrong (letters and affidavits read) 10311 (iii).

Hutton, Gen., Successor (remarks) 4258 (ii).

Judges of Court of Appeal, &c., P. Q. Names (Ques.) 3175, 3260 (i).

Judges in Montreal and Quebec since 1880, Names, &c. (Ques.) 4437 (ii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9102; on Sen. Amts., 10051 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners and Conner's Syndicate, Conclusion of arrangements (remarks) 4246 (ii).

— Negotiations *re* (remarks) 5228 (ii).

Motions, Unopposed (remarks) 1009 (i).

Newspaper Postage, Amount collected (Ques.) 3576 (ii).

Perce and Gaspe Wharfs, Construction, &c. 5753 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 246 (i); in Com., 5145 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9698; in Com., 9821, 9835 (iii).

Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *La Patrie*, 2230 (i).

— par. in *Ottawa Citizen re* St. Regis Indians, 7304 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 9003 (iii).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 173 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 10189 (iii).

Railways Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) on prop. Res., 9909, 9937; in Com. on Res., 9954, 9987, 9991; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup> of B., 10195 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 254 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for *re* Mr. *Girouard*, 1724 (i).

Sessional Clerks and Messengers, Payment of, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3636 (ii).

Soulanges and Beauharnois Canals, Opening (remarks) 4559 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Cement Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1478 (i).

— Construction Pay Sheets, Accounts, &c. (M. for copy\*), 2202 (i).

— Cost, &c., Litigation and Claims (Ques.) 1007 (i).

— Stewart's Claim, Papers *re* (remarks) 9799 (iii).

South African War, Pay of Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 705; in Com., 1666, 2005 (i).

— Blankets for, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 292, 440, 1111 (i).

**Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—Con.**

South African War, Emergency Rations, Papers laid on Table (remarks) 7214 (iii).  
 ——— analysis by Dr. Ruttan (remarks) 7988(iii).  
 ——— Flags on Public Buildings (remarks) 1124(i).  
 Superannuation from 1890 to 1896, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 2177 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Administration of Justice*: Exchequer Court (Registrar's salary) 6438 ; (Prince Albert) 6431 ; (Printing, &c. Reports) 6435 ; (Supreme Court) 6433 ; (improvement to library) 6436 (ii).

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Dominion census) 10336 ; (immigration) 7201 ; (Paris Exposition) 7188, 10339 (iii).

*Canals*: Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 9185 ; Soulanges (repairs, &c.) 9496 (iii).

*Govt. of N. W. T.* (clerical assistance), 6685 ; (insane patients) 6683 ; (restoration of public works), 6691 (ii).

*Govt. of the Yukon Territory* (salaries, &c.) 6989 (ii).

*Immigration* (agents', salaries, &c.) 9650 (iii).

*Indian Affairs* (Ont. and Que.) 7281 ; (salaries, &c.) 7281 ; (Land Management fund) 7285 ; (Oka) 7284 ; (St. Regis chiefs, &c.) 7282 ; (St. Regis lockup) 7287 (iii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (French translators) 10330 ; Library (salaries) 10331 ; (stationery) 10323 ; (statutory increases) 10329 ; (voters' lists) 10325 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and G.B.) 9555 ; (Can. and France) 9591 (iii).

*Militia* (arms, ammunitions, &c.) 8360 ; Dom. Rifle Ass'n. (Rockliffe range) 9768 ; (warlike stores) 8316 (iii).

*Penitentiaries*: Kingston, 6440 ; St. Vincent de Paul (electric plant), 6439 (ii) ; (investigation), 10318 ; conc., 10453 (iii).

*Post Offices* (Ste. Victoire) conc., 10429 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings (Valleyfield post office), 10263 ; Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews rapids) 9859 ; Ont. (Goderich breakwater) 10245 ; (Toronto Harbour dredging) 10240 ; Que. (Cap Sante wharf) 10210 ; (Chateauguay River dredging) 10225 ; (Chicoutimi wharf repairs) 10208 ; (Coteau du Lac wharf) 10097 ; (Coteau Landing dredging) 10222 ; (damages at Valleyfield) 10215 ; (Graham wharf) 10221 ; (Greece's Point) 10227 ; (Hull landing pier) 10227 ; (Lévis graving dock) 9859 ; (Maria wharf) 10197 ; (St. Jerome wharf) 10208 ; (St. Lambert protection walls) 10218 ; (St. Roch des Aulnais wharf) 10209 ; (Saguenay River dredging) 10207 ; (Soulanges Canal, wharf) 10097 ; (Yamaska lock, damages) 10212 ; Yukon, Buildings (rents, fuel, &c.) 10257 ; Roads, Trails, &c., 10257 ; Telegraph Lines (Dawson, &c.) 10257 (iii).

*Quarantine* (organized districts) 10347 (iii).

*Railways*: I. C. R. (rolling stock) 10390 ; (steel rails, &c.) 10391 ; (Victoria Bridge tolls) conc., 10448 (iii).

Timber Licenses in Man., on amt. (Mr. Davin) to Com. of Sup., 7249, 7279 (iii).

Toronto Members, Payments to from 1879 to 1897 (remarks) 5888 (ii).

Welland Canal, Dynamite Explosion, on M. (Mr. McCleary) to adjn., 4258 (ii).

**Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—Con.**

Yukon—Charleson, Mr. J. B., Rep. as to Work, &c. (Ques.) 434 (i).

—— Coste's, Rep. *re* Teslin Lake Route, on M. (Mr. Davin) for copy, 609 (i).

—— Girouard, Mr. Jos. Eno, Emplmt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 294 (i).

—— (M. for O.C.\*) 1012 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. *re*, 1381, 1724 (i).

—— La Banque Français du Klondike, par. in *La Presse* (remarks) 9470 (iii).

—— Telegraph Line, Reps., &c., from Mr. Charleson, on M. for Papers, 7206 (iii).

—— Telegraph Supplies, Purchase by Mr. Charleson (remarks) 8284 (iii).

**Bethune, Mr. J. L., Victoria (N.S.)**

Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1713 (i).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 83) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1713 (i).

**Blair, Hon. A. G., Sunbury and Queen's (N.B.)**

Belfast and Murray Harbour Ry. (P.E.I.) Expenditure by Govt. (Ans.) 1741 (i).

Binder Twine, on amt. (Mr. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 6208 (ii).

Brandon and South-western Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 1521, 2409 (i).

B.C. Grievances, on M. (Mr. Prior) to Com. of Sup., 9488 (iii).

Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to adjn., 5742 (ii).

—— on amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 7438 (iii).

Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.' B. 115 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 649<sup>c</sup>, on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 6573, 6586 (ii).

C. P. R., Ouderdonk Award, amounts, &c. (Ans.) 2365 (i).

—— Reduction of Rates, Provisions *re* (Ans.) 2364 (i).

Canals, Amount expended by present Govt. (Ans.) 1897 (i).

Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s B. 171 (Mr. Gibson) in Com., 5397 (iii).

Charlottetown and Murray Harbour Ry. Co.'s (B. 182) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 7647 (iii).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co., &c., Subsidy to (Ans.) 4075 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7035 (iii).

Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 3419 (ii).

Daly, Patrick, Appmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4444 (ii).

Deficits, Ry. Subsidies, &c., (Ans.) 3759 (ii).

Deptl. Reps., on Inquiry for, 817, 868 (i).

Dewar, Robt., Compensation to (Ans.) 6615 (ii).

Dismissals, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 9468, 9798.

Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 9478 (iii).

Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 9 (Mr. Casey) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4781 (ii).

**Blair, Hon. A. G.—Con.**

- Eastern Extension Ry., Cost of painting Stations (Ans.) 3038 (i).  
 Election Frauds, Judicial Inquiry (M. to adjn.) 7092 (iii).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5878 (ii).  
 Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 2999; in Com., 3014 (i).  
 Gilbert Dredging Co., on Inquiry for Papers, 9469 (iii).  
     *See* "Supply," &c.  
 Grain Elevators, Construction at Lévis (Ans.) 5756 (ii).  
 Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2423 (i).  
 G. T. R. Tariff on Oil, Illegality, &c. (Ans.) 298 (i).  
 Hawkesbury and Louisburg Ry. Subsidies, &c. (remarks) 9468 (iii).  
 Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Survey, &c. (Ans.) 1480 (i) 8435 (iii).  
 ——— Protection to Foot Passengers, &c. (Ans.) 9060 (iii).  
 I. C. R., Accommodation at Sydney (Ans.) 297, 3179 (i).  
 ——— Additional Officials since 1896 (Ans.) 3443 (ii).  
 ——— C. P. R. and G. T. R. Shares of Earnings, &c. (Ans.) 3443 (ii).  
 ——— Charges against by C. P. R. and G. T. R. (Ans.) 3771 (ii).  
 ——— Claims for Damages *re* Snow Fences in Bellechasse County (Ans.) 1735 (i).  
 ——— Communications from Sydney Board of Trade (remarks) 4665 (ii).  
 ——— Defective Wheels under Wagner Cars (Ans.) 3445 (ii).  
 ——— Deficits and Surpluses, &c., (Ans.) 9521 (iii).  
 ——— Dismissals, &c., on Inquiry (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) for Ret., 4811 (ii).  
 ——— Earnings, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1555 (i).  
 ——— Extension to Montreal, Claims made on Govt. by G.T.R. for Terminal Improvements (Ans.) 2829 (i).  
 ——— Freight Delays (remarks) 3266 (i).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 3273 (i).  
 ——— Freight brought to Montreal, &c., Quantity (Ans.) 6052 (ii).  
 ——— Freight Rates, and Halifax Board of Trade (remarks) 8120 (iii).  
 ——— G.T.R. Claim for Freight Charges (Ans.) 4915 (ii).  
 ——— Inferior Rails, par. in Cape Breton *Advocate re* (remarks) 5123 (ii).  
 ——— Mileage of Main Line and Branches (Ans.) 2172 (i).  
 ——— Morin, Mr. Geo., Appnmt. as Station Master, &c. (Ans.) 5891 (ii).

**Blair, Hon. A. G.—Con.**

- I. C. R., Passes to Clergymen (Ans.) 4914 (ii).  
 ——— to Judges, &c. (Ans.) 2830 (i).  
 ——— Pichette, Mr., Privileges at Lévis Station (Ans.) 4069 (ii).  
 ——— Receipts at Sydney (Ans.) 9797 (iii).  
 ——— Rivière du Loup, Station Accommodation, &c. (Ans.) 1007 (i).  
 ——— work shops, on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 5521 (ii).  
     *See* "Schreiber," Mr.  
 ——— Ryan, Joseph, Foreman at Lévis (Ans.) 4069 (ii).  
 ——— St. Charles Branch, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1740 (i).  
 ——— Sale of Newspapers, Contract, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 5890 (ii).  
 ——— Sale of Rolling Stock, &c. (Ans.) 4905 (ii).  
 ——— Sand Castings in N. S., Names of Tenderers, &c. (Ans.) 9062 (iii).  
 ——— Shingle Manufacturers Memorial *re* Shipments, &c. (remarks) 10035 (iii).  
 ——— Sidings in Cape Breton (remarks) 9790.  
 ——— Sleepers supplied to Extension from Ste. Rosalie to Chaudière (Ans.) 5246 (ii).  
 ——— Subway in Cumberland Co., Contract, &c. (Ans.) 7880 (iii).  
 ——— Sunday Work (Ans.) 7970 (iii).  
 ——— Sydney and N. Sydney, Traffic and Tickets issued (Ans.) 150 (i).  
 ——— Talbot, Mr. E., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1975 (i), 4917 (ii).  
 ——— Tenders for Fencing (Ans.) 4915 (ii).  
 ——— Time Table, New (remarks) 7513 (iii).  
 ——— Train Accommodation between Montreal and Lower Provs. (remarks) 7421 (iii).  
 ——— Train Service on C. B. Division (remarks) 3073, 3178 (i); 7973, 8077 (iii).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Gillies*) to adjn., 7980 (iii).  
 ——— Transportation of Troops to South Africa, Amount charged, &c. (Ans.) 9520 (iii).  
 ——— Wire Fencing, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3041.  
 Isle Madam. Ry., Subsidy by Govt. (Ans.) 593 (i).  
 Lachine Canal Lockmen, Increase of Pay, &c. (Ans.) 5024 (ii).  
 Lévis Graving Dock, Lengthening (Ans.) 4070 (ii).  
 Long Wharf, St. John, Cost of Removal, &c. (Ans.) 2362 (i).  
 ——— Construction of Warehouse (Ans.) 2403 (i).  
 Money Subsidies to Rys. (Ans.) 1885 (i).  
 New Brunswick Local Elections, Wilson's Beach Breakwater (Ans.) 740 (i).  
 N. S. Rys., Refund of Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 1464.  
 Order, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Unopposed Motions, Procedure, 1905 (i).  
 Orford Copper Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1931 (i).  
 Personal Explanation (Mr. *Powell*) *re* Distribution of Ballots, 7773 (iii).  
 ——— (Mr. *Haggart*) *re* Georgian Bay Canal, 2562.

**Blair, Hon. A. G.—Con.**

- Port Mulgrave and St. Peters Mail Service (remarks) 7422 (iii).
- P. E. I. Ry. Branch Lines, Pets., &c. (Ans.) 9060 (iii).
- Belfast and Murray Harbour Branch, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1741, (i) 4913 (ii); 8434 (iii).
- (Murray Harbour Branch) (B. 182) in Com. 8937 (iii).
- News Agent (Ans.) 4912 (ii).
- Stoppage of Work (remarks) 7419 (iii).
- Straightening Curves at North Wiltshire, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 4443 (ii).
- Procedure in asking Questions, on M. (Mr. *Sproute*) to adjn., 2369 (i).
- Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 112 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 5169 (ii).
- Reps., Deptl., on Inquiry for, 817, 868 (i).
- Ry. Act Amt. (B. 132) 1° m., 3256 (i), 2° m., 4684 (ii), in Com. (amt.) 9342; 3° m., 9365; on Sen. Amts., 10422 (iii).
- Rys. & Canals Rep., Copy sent to Queen's Printer, Date, &c. (Ans.) 4441 (ii).
- Deptl. Rep. (presented) 4436 (ii).
- Rys. in Can., Number of Miles in Operation, &c. (Ans.) 1884 (i).
- Railway Subsidies Authorization (B. 193) prop. Res. 9333; M. for Com. on Res., 9906; in Com. on Res., 9944, 9952-10029; 1°\* of B., 10029; 3° m., 10190 (iii).
- Railway Subsidies bearing Interest. Names, &c., (Ans.) 5752 (ii).
- System of granting, &c. (Ans.) 2171 (i).
- See* "Subsidies."
- Rainy River Ry. Co., Contracts with (Ans.) 4077.
- Restigouche and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (Mr. *McAlister*) on M. for 3°, 3417 (ii).
- Returns, on Inquiry for, 2423 (i), 4663, 4666, 6567, 6784 (ii), 8080 (iii).
- laid on table, 6990 (iii).
- Richelieu Bridge, on Inquiry for Ret., 8934 (iii).
- Roche Fendue and Calumet Dams, Claims (Ans.) 4076 (ii).
- St. Eloi Ballast Ground, Tenure, &c. (Ans.) 7416 (iii).
- St. Lawrence Canals, Contracts cancelled, Number, &c. (Ans.) 156, 2828 (i).
- Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2403 (i).
- 14-ft. Navigation, Completion and Expenditure (Ans.) 739 (i).
- Opening (remarks) 3776 (ii).
- Policy of late Government *re* Completion (Ans.) 2164 (i).
- Schreiber, Mr. C., Use of private Car for Family and Friends (Ans.) 2829 (i).
- Snetsinger, J. G., M.P., Claims for Compensation, &c. (Ans.) 1462, 1738 (i).
- Soulanges and Beauharnois Canals, Opening (remarks) 4559 (ii).

**Blair, Hon. A. G.—Con.**

- Soulanges Canal, Cement Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 1478 (i).
- Cost, &c., Litigation, Claims, &c. (Ans.) 1007 (i).
- Stewart's claim, Papers *re* (remarks) 9799.
- South African War—Emergency Rations—Order, (Ques. of) 6838 (ii).
- Transportation of Supplies, &c., over I.C. R. (Ans.) 9791 (iii).
- Steel Rails, Purchase of by Dept. of Rys. and Canals (Ans.) 2828 (i).
- Contracts for Supplies, on Inquiry for Ret., 2996 (i).
- See* "P.E.I. Ry.," &c.
- Subsidies to Rys., Names, &c. (Ans.) 1885, 2173 (i), 5515 (ii).
- See* "Railways."

**SUPPLY:**

- Canals:* Beauharnois (repairs, &c.) 8931; Chambly (drainage, &c.) 8914; Cornwall (enlargement) 8157; (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 8504, 9185, 9415, 10113-86; Culbute (damages, &c.) 8913; (Farran's Point) 8157; (enlargement) 8880, 10393; Galops (channel) 8157; (dredging) 8504; (enlargement) 8775, 10393; General statement, 8374; Grenville (enlargement) 8157, 8880; (guide piers) 8522; Lachine (construction of lock) 8154; (dredging) 8154; (dredge vessels) 8880; (electrical lighting) 8156; (quadrant pontoon gate) 8155, 8372, 8504; (rebuilding wall) 8522; North Channel (forming) 8881; Rapide du Plat (enlargement) 10393; Rideau (overseer's salary) 10395; St. Francis Lake (protection walls) 8521; St. Lawrence River (gas buoys) 8885, 9426; (surveying, &c.) 8158; St. Louis Lake, 8880; (channel) 8156; St. Ours Lock, 8522; St. Peter's (repairs, &c.) 9499; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 8153; (Ryan & Co.'s award) 10393; Soulanges (construction) 8153, 8888; (repairs, &c.) 9496; (A. Stewart's contract) 8516, 10151; Trent (construction) 8158, 10393; Welland (Port Dalhousie pier) 8521; (Port Colborne entrance) 8520, 10397; (repairs, &c.) 10395 (iii).
- Civil Govt.: Rys. and Canals*—(L. K. Jones) 10285; (salaries, &c.) 8150 (iii).
- Militia* (gratuities) 10357 (iii).
- Public Works:* Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Shippegan harbour) 7946 (iii).
- Railways:* Annapolis and Digby (interest on claims) 10395; (Gov. Gen.'s car) 8916; I.C.R. (additional engine houses) 9432; (additional sidings) 10388; (air brakes) 9456; (Amherst accommodation) 9455; (bridges) 9455; Canso ferry service) 10390; (Cape Breton sidings) 8793; (Christy's Brook) 9454; (draw bars) 9456; (engines, tools, &c.) 10388; Etchemin bridge) 10389; (free passes) 9429; (Galena Oil Co.'s contract) 10173; (gas apparatus) 10388; (General statement) 8374, 8452; (general vote) 8930; (Halifax cotton factory) 9435; (increased accommodation) 8785; (increased facilities) 9459, 10365, 10369, 10386; (increased rates) 8523; (Leper's Brook dyke) 9431; (Lévis accommodation) 10388; (Mulgrave improvements) 9454; (Rockingham station) 9436; (Rocky Lake, bridge) 9431; (rolling stock) 9458, 10390; (St. John accommodation) 10389; (St. John wharf) 8372; (sidings in Cape Breton) 8920; (steam der-

**Blair, Hon. A. G.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

*Railways*—Con.

ricks) 10389; (steel rails, &c.) 10390; Stellarton sidings) 9442; (Sydney accommodation) 9440; (Westville station) 9440; (working expenses) 9503; Miscellaneous (extra clerks) 8522; (salaries, &c.) 8916; (statistics) 8522; (payment to Ralph Jones) 8917; P. E. I. (accommodation, Summerside) 8931; (Hillsboro' bridge) 9461; (working expenses) 9505 (iii).

*Steamship Subsidies* (P. E. I. and mainland) 10397 (iii).

Talbot, Mr. E., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1975.

Trent Valley Canal, Arbitrators on Damages, Names, &c. (Ans) 1896 (i).

—— Cost of Construction (Ans.) 3037 (i).

—— Tenders *re* Trent-Frankfort Section (Ans.) 156 (i).

Welland Canal, Dynamite Explosion (remarks) 4068 (ii).

Western Counties Ry., Refund of Subsidies (Ans.) 1121 (i).

Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn., 971 (i).

Yukon and Edmonton and Pacific Ry. Govt. Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1007 (i).

**Borden, Hon. F. W., King's, N.S.**

Adams Bros., Payments to in 1898-9 (Ans.) 2364.

Barriefield Common, Kingston, Lease by Govt. (Ans.) 10304 (iii).

Bliss, Maj. Foster, Appnmts., &c., by Govt. (Ans.) 2166 (i).

—— Date of Departure from Dawson City (Ans.) 3176 (i).

Cameron, Maj.-Gen., Connection with R. M. C. (Ans.) 2164 (i).

Can. Permanent Corps, Pension System (Ans.) 1115 (i).

Clover Point, B. C. Rifle Range, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 292 (i).

Colonels, Honorary, Recent Appnmts. (remarks) 8282 (iii).

Commissions in Imperial Army, Regulations *re* (remarks) 3283 (i).

*See* "S. A. War," &c.

Côte St. Luc Rifle Range, Closing and purchase of New Site (Ans.) 292 (i).

*See* "Rifle Range."

Courtney, Corporal, "A" Battery, &c. (remarks) 7885, 8282, 8934, 9064 (iii).

—— on Inquiry *re*, 7969, 9685 (iii).

Cove Fields, Quebec, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 7880 (iii).

Dominion of Can. Rifle Association incorp. (B. 169) 1<sup>o</sup>, 5960 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 7135 (iii).

Drysdale, Mr., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4244.

Esquimalt, *See* "S. A. War," "Royal Canadian Infantry."

Fenian Raid Medals, Grants to Widows of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 6915 (ii).

**Borden, Hon. F. W.—Con.**

Fenian Raid Medals, N.B., Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 5023 (ii).

—— Number of Volunteers called out, Deputations, Pets., &c., *re* Recognition of Services (Ans.) 441 (i).

Foyle, Lt., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 9471, 9486, 9683 (iii).

General Service Medals, Conditions, &c., National Colour, &c. (Ans.) 299 (i).

*See* "Medals," &c.

Govt. Contracts containing "sweating" clause, Names, &c. (Ans.) 4558 (ii).

Halifax Garrison, Contract for Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 3775, 4555, 5020 (ii).

*See* "S. A. War."

Hughes, Lt.-Col., Commission in Strathcona's Horse (Ans.) 2750 (i).

—— Letter in *Globe* (remarks) 7207 (iii).

Hutton, Gen., Departure from Can., on M. (Mr. Prior) to adjn., 338 (i).

—— and Lt.-Col. Hughes, Rep. in Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 150 (i).

Imperial and Can. Militia Pay, &c. (Ans.) 2159, 2162 (i).

Kingston Military Camp, Meat Supplies (Ans.) 7969 (iii).

Lee-Enfield Rifle, Charges against Construction by English newspapers (Ques.) 438 (i).

—— issued to Militia Battalions (Ans.) 2157 (i).

Leinster Regiment and Can. Volunteers (remarks) 83 (i).

—— on M. (Mr. McNeill) to adjn., 263 (i).

—— Repatriation of 100th Regiment (Ans.) 171 (i).

*See* "S. A. War."

McGill, Lt.-Col., Royal Military College, Position, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 9905 (iii).

Man. and N.W.T. Defences, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 284 (i).

Markham, Lt.-Col., Retention of Cheque (Ans.) 2834 (i).

Maxwell, Major, Grant to (remarks) 8079 (iii).

Medals, 1866-70, Distribution in 5th and 6th Military Districts (Ans.) 2755 (i).

Medals, Long Service and Active Militia (remarks) 10309 (iii).

*See* "General Service," &c., "Fenian," &c.

Militia Act Amt. (B. 18) in Com., 6453 (ii).

—— B. 61 (Mr. Prior) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 1287 (i).

—— (B. 155) Honorary Colonels, 1<sup>o</sup> m., 5224 (ii); in Com., 9838 (iii).

—— Ambulance Service, &c. (Ans.) 1113 (i).

—— Camps, Transportation of Troops, &c. (Ans.) 9523 (iii).

—— Commanding Officer, Tenure of Command, &c. (Ans.) 1465, 2174 (i), 3773 (ii).

—— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 4333 (ii).

—— copy sent to Bureau, Date (Ans.) 4555 (ii).

—— on Inquiry for (Mr. Prior) 3413, 3990 (ii).

**Borden, Hon. F. W.—Con.**

- Militia Drill, Annual Camp (Ans.) 3444 (ii).  
 — Districts, Service Ammunition stored, Number of Rounds, &c. (Ans.) 5892 (ii).  
 — Issue of Snider Rifles to Rural Corps (Ans.) 2752 (i).  
 — Permanent Corps, Reduction of Pay, &c. (Ans.) 1744, 2164 (i).  
 — Pensions to Permanent Corps, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 1115 (i) 5753 (ii).  
 — Service Limit for Commanding Officers (Ans.) 1465, 2174 (i).  
 — Staff Course, Kingston, on Inquiry for Ret., 2741 (i).  
   *See* "R.M.C."  
 — Stores, Quebec, Supt., Names, &c. (Ans.) 8433 (iii).  
 Miller, Lt. "A" Battery, Status, &c. (Ans.) 9904 (iii).  
 Montreal Rifle Range, Provision by Govt. (Ans.) 440 (i).  
 Oliver Equipment, Purchase, &c. (Ans.) 2364 (i), 9796 (iii).  
 Ottawa and Hull Conflagration, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to adjn., 4332 (ii).  
 Pay, &c. of Militia. *See* "Imperial," &c. "Militia," &c.  
 Prince of Wales Rifles and 6th Fusiliers, Amalgamation, &c. (Ans.) 5022 (ii).  
 — Officers, Names and Rank (Ans.) 5893 (ii).  
 — (remarks) 5251 (ii).  
 Privilege (Ques. of) Lt. Borden, and Press Reports *re* Insubordination, 321 (i).  
 Regimental Bands, Control of (Ans.) 7125 (iii).  
 Returns, on Inquiry for, 4662 (ii), 6785, 7651, 8439 (iii).  
 — Notice to lay on Table, 2742 (i).  
 Rifle Range at Montreal, Purchase (remarks) 4566 (ii).  
   *See* "Cote St. Luc."  
 Royal Canadian Infantry, 'A' Co., Esquimalt, offer for service in China (remarks) 8438 (iii).  
 Royal Military College, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 1735 (i).  
 — Applicants for Staff Course (Ans.) 1110, 2163 (i).  
   *See* "Militia," &c.  
 St. Thomas Drill Shed, Purchase of Parade Ground, &c. (Ans.) 294 (i), 7122 (iii).  
 South African War, Applications from Quebec, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1113, 1723 (i).  
 — Assignment of Soldiers' Pay, &c., 8282 (iii).  
 — Bamford, Private, Telegrams respecting (remarks) 7883 (iii).  
 — Blankets for Troops, Purchase, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 292, 440, 1111 (i).  
 — Can. Contingents, Men left in Halifax to attend to Sick Horses (remarks) 480 (i).  
 — Can. Contingents, on Inquiry (Mr. *Foster*) for Papers, &c., 1211 (i).

**Borden, Hon. F. W.—Con.**

- South African War, Can. Contingents, Rep. *re* Casualties (read) 4554, 4664, 5249 (ii).  
 — numbers, payments, clothing, contributions, &c. (Ans.) 3761-2-3 (ii).  
 — Pay of Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 1157 (i); in Com. on B., 1644, 1692 (i).  
 — residence of Members, provs., &c. (Ans.) 1112 (i).  
 — revolvers purchased, &c. (Ans.) 289 (i).  
 — selection of officers for service (Ans.) 1112 (i).  
 — vacancies, promotion of ex-officers, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (i).  
 — Canadian Gallantry, Telegram read, 9486 (iii).  
 — Chaplains, Appmt. of (Ans.) 7972 (iii).  
 — Commissions, &c., in Can. Contingents (Ans.) 6617 (ii).  
 — Contract for Supplies for Can. Contingents, &c. (Ans.) 4245 (ii), 7971 (iii).  
 — Correctness of Col. Otter's Reps. (remarks) 4560 (ii).  
 — Emergency Food Rations, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 6795 (ii).  
 — on Ques. of Order *re*, 6840 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 7890 (iii).  
 — on Inquiry for Papers *re*, 7120 (iii).  
 — analysis of, on Inquiry for, 7988 (iii).  
 — papers laid on table, 7208, 7317 (iii).  
 — samples analysed, &c. (Ans.) 7417 (iii).  
 — Equipments and Stores furnished Imp. Govt., Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 5243 (ii).  
 — Garrisoning Esquimalt with Can. Troops (remarks) 2148 (i).  
 — Indemnities to Families of Canadian Soldiers (remarks) 10317 (iii).  
 — Insurance of Can. Contingents (remarks) 4248 (ii).  
 — Larue, Private L., Death of (report read) 8314 (iii).  
 — List of Casualties, on Inquiry for, 4566 (ii).  
 — cablegram (read) 4554, 4664, 5249 (ii).  
 — Men of Can. Contingent reported missing (remarks) 4250 (ii).  
 — Number of Volunteers for Active Service (Ans.) 2758 (i).  
 — Ocean Accident & Guarantee Insurance Corporation, Cor. with *re* List of Casualties (remarks) 4560 (ii).  
 — Officers serving as Privates (Ans.) 4240 (ii).  
 — Official Reports (remarks) 3332; Rep. read, 3334 (ii).  
 — Pensions for Volunteers, &c. (Ans.) 10304 (iii).  
 — Punishment of Can. Private (remarks) 4450 (ii).  
 — Purchase of Horses West of Lake Superior (Ans.) 4439 (ii).

**Borden, Hon. F. W.—Con.**

- South African War, Purchase of Saddles &c. (Ans.) 1113, 1464 (i).  
 — Rank of Militia Officers (Ans.) 2752 (i).  
 — Recruiting Stations, N.S., &c. (Ans.) 10303.  
 — Rets., on Inquiry for, 2995 (i)  
 — Strathcona Contingent, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 3775 (ii) 9903 (iii).  
 — loss of horses (Ans.) 3774 (ii).  
 — purchase of horses in N.W.T. (remarks) 481 (i).  
 — Supplies for Can. Contingents, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4558 (ii).  
 — Telegrams *re* Casualties (read) 4664, 5410 (ii), 7894 (iii).  
 — Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid to ss. Lines (Ans.) 5403 (ii).  
 — arrangements, provisioning, &c. (Ans.) 5021 (ii).  
 — Volunteers from Ont., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2181 (i).  
 — Volunteers by Provs., Number, &c. (Ans.) 2182, 2196 (i).  
 Strathcona's Horse, Arrangements of Church Parades (Ans.) 2750 (i).  
 Summerside, P. E. I., Volunteer Organization, Pets *re* (Ans.) 2179 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

- Civil Govt.*: Militia (salaries) 8217 (iii).  
*Militia*: (annual drill) 7201, 8286; (arms, ammunitions) 8344; (clothing, &c.) 8335; (compensation allowances) 9769; (Devlin, Dr., prosecution) 10285; Dom. Rifle Ass'n (Rockcliffe range) 9768; (Esquimalt Defence) 8342; (general statement) 8217; (gratuities) 10357; (Halifax garrison) 10358; (Hughes, Mr. S., dismissal, &c.) 10451; (Lt. Foyle's case) 9769; (medals) 8343; (Messrs. Holt and Lambert) conc., 10443; Military properties (rifle ranges) 10353; (military properties) 8305; (miscellaneous) 8336; (monuments, &c.) 10357; (rifle associations) 8336; (rifle ranges) 8371; (pay, allowance, &c.) 8285; (provisions, &c.) 8335; (salaries, &c.) 8305; S. A. War (Halifax garrison) 9772; (transport, &c.) 8335; (warlike stores) 8306, 8315; (Welland Canal Guard) 9772; Yukon (field force) 9775; (N.W.M.P. supplies) 9774 (iii).  
*Pub. Works*: Buildings (armouries) 9893; Ont. (Brockville drill hall) 9881; (Quebec cartridge factory) 9887 (iii).  
 Sussex, N.B., Armoury for 8th Hussars (Ans.) 1733 (i).  
 Wallace, Gunner, Death of at Kingston (Ans.) 477 (i).  
 Welland Canal, Dynamite Explosion (remarks) 4251 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *McCleary*) to adjn., 4253 (ii).  
 White, Lt.-Col., Retirement, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 3094 (i).  
 Wickwire, Mr., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4244.  
 Work Point Barracks, Pay of Men, &c. (Ans.) 4241 (ii)

**Borden, Hon. F. W.—Con.**

- Yukon Military Barracks, Cost of Erection, &c. (Ans.) 1111 (i).  
 — Militia Force, Number and Distribution (Ans.) 437 (i).  
 — Transport of Troops, Expenditure, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1115 (i).

**Borden, Mr. R. L., Halifax.**

- Admiralty Act Amt. B. 138 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5106 (ii).  
 Arisaig, N.S., Light Keeper, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3262 (i).  
 Bank Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>. 5729; in Com., 6503 (ii).  
 Bicycles obstructing Main Entrance (remarks) 4248 (ii).  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections (M.) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5182; (amt.) 5212 neg. (Y. 43; N. 86) 5697 (ii).  
 — Affidavits of Marshall and Nelson read (M.) to adjn., 5737, 5748 (ii).  
 — Instructions to Commission, 7423; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7437 (iii).  
 — (M. for papers, &c.), 427 (i).  
 — Notice of Motion for Papers, 349, 1010, 1014 (i).  
 — Personal Explanation *re* Quotation, 5229.  
 See "Electoral Frauds," "Privileges and Elections," &c.  
 Broderick, John W., Pet. of Right, Inquiry for Ret., 4811 (ii).  
 Business of the Hse., Unopposed Motions, Procedure, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 1913 (i).  
 Cold Storage on Steamships, in Com. on Res., 4866 (ii).  
 Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5276 (ii).  
 — on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) that Com. rise, 5261 (ii).  
 — (M.) to recom., 6319 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 3259 (i); in Com., 6727 (ii), 7328, 8091 (iii).  
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 1394, 1791 (i).  
 Electoral Frauds Commission (remarks) 6700 (ii).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5137 (ii).  
 Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 3019, 3214 (ii).  
 Halifax Garrison, Supplies for Imp. Forces (remarks) 5250 (ii).  
 Halifax Harbour, Improvement of Approaches (remarks) 6257 (ii).  
 — (remarks) 7771; on M. for Com. of Sup., 7788 (iii).  
 Hatfield, Capt. S. N., Accounts rendered by (M. for copies\*) 2202 (i).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.—Con.**

- House of Commons, Obstruction of Main Entrance (remarks) 4248 (ii).  
 I. C. R., Dismissals, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 4810  
 ——— Freight Rates and Resolution of Halifax Board of Trade, on M. for Com of Sup., 8120.  
 ——— Train Service on C. B. Division, on M. (Mr. *Gillies*) to adjn., 7984 (iii).  
 Land Titles Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 475 (i).  
 ——— B. 139 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 5178 (ii).  
 Mail Bags, Private Delivery of, on M. for Com., of Sup., 8049 (iii).  
 ——— Contracts, Pets., Memorials, &c. (M. for copies\*) 2200 (i).  
 ——— Delivery at Halifax and Dartmouth (remarks) 7990 (iii).  
 Maxwell, Major, Grant to (remarks) 8079 (iii).  
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5074, 5084, 5160 (ii).  
 Postage received by P. O. Dept. for Transmission of Newspapers (M. for Ret.) 2203 (i).  
 Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).  
 Privileges and Election Com., Brockville and West Huron Election, Notice of Motion for Papers, &c., 349, 427 (i).  
     *See* 'Brockville,' &c.  
 Procedure in asking Questions, on Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Taylor*) 2378 (i).  
 Ret. (inquiry) 8080 (iii).  
 ——— I. C. R., Dismissal of P. S. Archibald, 1555 (i).  
 Salmon County, Govt. Wharf and Shed, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 7656 (iii).  
 South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 1183, 1197; in Com. on B., 1649, 1695 (i).  
 ——— Emergency Food, &c., Personal Explanation, 7542 (iii).  
 ——— Men of Can. Contingents reported missing (remarks) 4250 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Administration of Justice* (Exchequer Court) 6437; (Supreme Court) 6434 (ii).  
*Civil Government*: Inland Revenue (contingencies) 6024 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (cold storage) 5977, 6013 (ii).  
*Indians* (St. Regis) 7293 (iii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (tidal surveys) 1701 (i).  
*Public Works*: Buildings (Sarnia post office) 7922; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour breakwater) 7940 (iii).  
 Toronto Hotel Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. *Oster*) in Com., 4964 (ii).  
 Trefry, Norman, L., Shipping Master at Yarmouth, N. S., Salary (Ques.) 2405 (i).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 7134 (iii).  
 Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6414 (ii).

**Borden, Mr. R. L.—Con.**

- Yukon, Court Rules, &c. (Ques.) 739 (i).  
 ——— *John C. Barr*, Undervaluation, &c., on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6668 (iii).  
 ——— Royalties, Charges against Mr. McDonald, on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7689 (iii).  
 ——— Wade, Mr. F. C., Charges against, on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7160 (ii).  
 ——— *Yukoner* ss., Clearance of, on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5006 (ii).  
 ——— on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 5009 (ii).

**Bostock, Mr. H., Yale and Cariboo.**

- B. C. Rep. of Lt.-Gov., Inquiry for, 3478 (ii).  
 Semlin Govt., B. C., Dismissal of, &c. (Ques.) 3039 (i).  
 Yale Mining District Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 123) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2827 (i).

**Bourassa, Mr. H., Labelle.**

- Attack on French Canadians, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 190 (i).  
 Budget, The, 4591 (ii).  
 Chinese War, Action of Can. Govt., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 10304 (iii).  
 Colonial Naval Reserve, Stmt. in Imp. H. of C. (Ques.) 1123, 1473 (i).  
     *See* "Naval," &c.  
 Debates, Official Rep., 6th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 10299 (iii).  
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 1400 (i).  
 Imperial Federation Brochure, Printing, Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 9797 (iii).  
 I. C. R. Freight Delays, on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 3277 (i).  
 Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Sen. Amts., 10074 (iii).  
 Members Sessional Indemnity, Increase, &c. (remarks) 10299 (iii).  
 Montreal Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1342 (i).  
 Naval Reserve, Speech in Imp. H. of C. *re* (remarks) 1123, 1473 (i).  
 Personal Explanation *re* Pub. Accts. Com. 4335.  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 9807 (iii).  
 Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Appnmt. as Govt. Whip, 587 (i).  
 St. Johns Customs Collector, Par. in *Canada Français*, 9851 (iii).  
 South African War—Address to Her Maj., on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6906 (ii).  
 ——— Contingents, Pay of Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 382; in Com. on Res., 1174; in Com. on B., 1658 (i).

**Bourassa, Mr. H.—Con.**

South African War—Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com. (amt.) 9327 (iii).

— Independence of Parlt. *re* British Institutions (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 1793; Neg. (Y. 10; N. 119) 1876 (i).

— (amt.) Notice of (remarks) 1698 (i).

— Intervention of Can. Govt. *re* Settlement (Ques.) 6625 (ii).

— Organization and Maj.-Gen. Hutton's Offer to serve in South Africa, Cor., &c. (M. for copy\*) 166 (i).

— Papers *re* Contingents (remarks) 5 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Public Works*: Buildings, Que. (Hull P. O.) 4345 (ii).

**Britton, Mr. B. M., Kingston.**

Binder Twine, Sale and Manufacture, on amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 6157 (ii).

Brockville and West Huron Elections Investigation, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 1034 (i).

— on amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5357 (ii).

Business, Saturday Sittings, on M., 8652 (iii).

— Unopposed Motions, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 1945 (i).

Canadian Bankers' Association incorp. (B. 55) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1109 (i).

Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s B. 171 (Mr. *Gibson*) in Com., 9403 (iii).

Coasting Laws Abrogation, on amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).

Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 197 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10506 (iii).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. (B. 28) 1<sup>o</sup>, m., 471 (i).

— B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4709, 5266, 5267, 5702, 5704: on amt. (Mr. *Fraser*, *Guysborough*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 6317 (ii).

Dominion Elections Act Amt. (B. 29) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 472 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4793 (ii).

— B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1 3259 (i); on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6717 (ii); in Com., 9702 on Sen. Amts., 10458 (iii).

Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 9 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4785 (ii).

Foreign Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 142 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 4684 (ii).

Gas Inspection Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4671 (ii).

Grain Inspection Act B. 141, (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 5770 (ii).

— Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 466, 496 (i).

Hughes, Lt.-Col., Letter in *Globe* (remarks) 7207.

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9127 (iii).

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 95) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2072 (i).

**Britton, Mr. B. M.—Con.**

Miami Cycle and Manufacturing Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 99) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2147 (i).

Ont. Mutual Life Assurance Co.'s Change of Title (B. 54) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1109 (i).

Parliament, Calling of on a Fixed Date, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 3476 (ii).

Penitentiaries Rep., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4162 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5084 (ii).

Queen's Birthday, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to adjn. (remarks) 5699 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9349 (iii).

Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9974 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 1436 (i).

South African War—Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 9289.

Seed Grain Indebtedness, Govtl. Action, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1784 (i).

— B. 143 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 5040 (ii).  
South Shore Line Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 1<sup>o</sup>, 6914 (ii).

Supply B. 147 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4465 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Canals* (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 8512 (iii).

*Customs* (Dom. appraiser, &c.) 10419 (iii).

*Indians*: B.C. (Squamish school) 8123 (iii).

*Militia* (annual drill) 8300; (Barriefield common) 10356; (compensation allowances) 9769; (gratuities) 10357 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (Can. Law Library, Eng.) 8140.

*Post Office*: conc., 10436 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings, Ont. (Royal Military College) 9888; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Rainy River lock) 7865; (St. Lawrence channel) 7965; Que. (Lévis graving dock) 9865; (Montreal harbour) 9865 (iii).

*Railways*: I.C.R. (free passes) 9429; (payment to Ralph Jones) 8919 (iii).

Timber Licenses in Man., on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 7246, 7277 (iii).

Toronto and Georgian Bay Short Line Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 145) 1<sup>o</sup>, 4436 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4677 (ii).

Winding Up Act, on order for introduction of Bill, 4901 (ii).

Yukon—Administration of, Charges against, on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6403 (ii).

— on amt. (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) to Com. of Sup., 8566 (iii).

**Broder, Mr. A., Dundas.**

Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation P. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5834, 5864 (iii).

O'Reilly, Mr. J. B.. Appmt. as County Judge (Ques.) 479 (i).

South African War, Canadian Contingents, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1072 (i).

**Brown, Mr. J. P., Chateauguay.**

Quebec Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 75) 1<sup>st</sup>,  
1641 (i).

**Burnett, Mr. L., South Ontario.**

Budget, The, 3975 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in Great Britain, Removal  
(remarks) 3988 (ii).

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 82) 1<sup>st</sup>,  
1713 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B.  
127 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5112 (ii).

**Calvert, Mr. W. S., West Middlesex.**

Budget, The, 3723 (ii).

I.C.R. Deficits and Surpluses, &c. (Ques.) 9521.

Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr.  
Blair) in Com. on Res., 9962 (iii).

**Campbell, Mr. A., Kent (Ont.)**

Budget, The, 3796 (ii)

Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.'s (B.  
115) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2827 (i); M. for Com., 6488; in Com.,  
6492; 3<sup>d</sup> m., 6488, 6571 (ii).

— (explanation) 6608 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fielding) in  
Com., 7025 (iii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Carroll) on M.  
for 1<sup>st</sup>, 2353 (i).

Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on  
prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock)—(amt.) 2545 (i).

Grain Inspection B. 141, on amt. (Mr. Davin) to  
M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 6300 (ii).

— Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop.  
Res. (Mr. Bennett) 2811 (i).

Personal Explanation, par. in *Daily Intelligencer*,  
7422 (iii).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Mr.  
Russell) to Com. of Sup., 2123 (i).

Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of Board, on  
prop. Res. (Mr. Davis) 771 (i).

— Subsidies, System of granting, &c. (Ques.)  
2171 (i).

Seed Grain Indebtedness, Govtl. Action, on  
prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) 1778 (i).

South African War—Emergency Rations, on M.  
(Mr. Belcourt) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com.,  
9322 (iii).

Subsidies to Rys., &c., Names and Amounts  
(Ques.) 2173 (i).

Supreme Court Appeal Cases, Sitings, &c.  
(Ques.) 1982 (i).

Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. (B. 30) 1<sup>st</sup>,  
471 (i).

**Cargill, Mr. H., East Bruce.**

Anderson, J. W., Patent Relief (B. 108) 1<sup>st</sup>,  
2560 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fielding) in  
Com., 7020 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fitzpatrick)  
in Com., 6735 (ii), 7334 (iii).

**Cargill, Mr. H.—Con.**

South African War, Volunteers from Ont.,  
Names, &c. (Ques.) 2181-2 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

Customs, Ont. (contingencies and salaries) 6074.

Toronto Hotel Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. Osler) in Com.,  
4966 (ii).

**Caron, Hon. Sir A., K.C.M.G., Three Rivers  
and St. Maurice.**

Atlantic Mail Service, Contract with Beaver SS.  
Line (M. for copy\*) 4078 (ii).

Beaver ss. Contract, &c., Inquiry for Ret.,  
6788 (ii).

Bicycles obstructing Main Entrance (remarks)  
4246 (ii).

Brockville and West Huron Elections, Investiga-  
tion, &c., on M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1031 (i),  
Budget, The, 4601 (ii).

Capital Cases in Quebec, Clemency, &c. (remarks)  
9678 (iii).

Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s B. 171 (Mr. Gibson)  
in Com. 9403 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B.  
180 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 8216 (iii).

Cold Storage on Steamships, in Com on Res.,  
4865 (ii).

Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 35  
(Mr. Morrison) in Com., 3434 (ii).

Cove Fields, Quebec, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 7880 (iii).

Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir Wilfrid  
Laurier) in Com., 5272, 5912; on amt. (Mr.  
Fraser, Guysborough) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 6315 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fitzpatrick)  
on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 6712 (ii), in Com., 8817, 8842 (iii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Sifton) in  
Com., 1390 (i).

Dube and Cazes, Clemency, &c. (remarks) 10504 (iii).  
See "Capital Cases."

Elder-Dempster SS. Contract, Inquiry for Ret.,  
6917 (ii).

Foyle, Lt., Dismissal, on Inquiry for Papers,  
9683 (iii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Carroll) on M.  
for 1<sup>st</sup>, 2351 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B.  
127 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5861 (ii).

Gaspe Short Line Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr.  
Lemieux) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 3414 (ii).

General Officer Commanding, Successor (remarks)  
3576 (ii).

House of Commons, Obstruction of Main En-  
trance (remarks) 4246 (i).

Hutton, Gen., Departure from Can., on M. (Mr.  
Prior) to adjn., 333 (i).

Leinster Regiment and Canadian Volunteers, on  
M. (Mr. McNeill) to adjn., 275 (i).

Mail Bags, Private, Delivery of, on M. for Com.  
of Sup., 8054 (iii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Borden) in Com.,  
9839 (iii).

**Caron, Hon. Sir A.—Con.**

- Ottawa and Hull Conflagration, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to adjn., 4332 (ii).  
 Paper Combine, Proposed Reduction of Duty (remarks) 4807 (ii).  
 Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2°, 6951 (ii).  
 Portage du Fort and French River Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. *Poupore*) on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 4143 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 9694; on M. for Com., 9801; in Com., 9815 (iii).  
 ——— Deptl. Rep. (inquiry) 3331, 3577, 3986, 4068 (ii).  
 Riv. du Loup, Govt. Works, Completion (Ques.) 4076 (ii).  
 Royal Reserve, Announcement of Imp. Govt. *re* (Ques.) 1006 (i).  
 Sessional Clerks, Payment of Salaries (remarks) 5897, 6916 (ii).  
 South African War, Can. Contingents B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 1178; in Com., on B., 1655, 1689, 2001 (i),  
 ——— Closing of Debate (remarks) 1096, 1104 (i).  
 ——— Commissions in Imperial Army, on M. to adjn. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3485 (ii).  
 ——— Equipment and Stores furnished to Imp. Govt., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 5243 (ii).  
 ——— Indemnities to Families of Canadian Soldiers (remarks) 10318 (iii).  
 ——— Official Reports (remarks) 3332 (ii).  
 ——— Punishment of Can. Private, on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4452 (ii).  
 ——— Rank of Militia Officers (Ques.) 2751 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Dominion census) 10335; (Paris Exposition) 10342 (iii).  
*Canals*: Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 9421; Rideau (overseer's salary) 10396; St. Lawrence River (buoys) 8886, 9427; Sault Ste. Marie (Ryan & Co.'s award) 10394; Soulanges (construction) 8895 (iii).  
*Civil Govt.*: Post Office (closing accounts) 6129; (dead letter branch) 6130 (ii); (High Commissioner's Office) 9604 (iii); Post Office (salaries) 6102 (ii).  
*Indians*: Man., and N.W.T. (treaty expenses) 8071; P.E.I. (medical attendance) 8070; Que. (seed grain, &c.) 8069; (St. Regis, litigation, &c.) 8068 (iii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons, Library (salaries) 10331; (stationery) 10323; (voters' lists) 9605, 10324 (iii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Cape Traverse light) 8063 (iii); (salaries, &c.) 1704 (i).  
*Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions* (Can. and France) 9592; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 9597; (G. B. and Can.) 9562, 9582; (Murray Bay and River Ouelle) 9603; (Port Mulgrave and Canoe) 9597; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 9584 (iii).  
*Militia* (annual drill, ammunition, &c.) 8239, 8354; (Messrs. Holt and Lambert) conc., 10442 (iii); (military properties) 8305; (provisions, &c.) 8335; (Royal Military College) 8341; (salaries, &c.) 8305; (transport, &c.) 8335; (warlike stores) 8306 (iii).

**Caron, Hon. Sir A.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

- Miscellaneous*: Interior (seed grain to settlers) 7830 (iii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (Str. *Minto*) 8062 (iii).  
*Penitentiaries*: Kingston (gratuities) 10321 (iii).  
*Post Office* (mail service) 8669, 8695, 8748 (iii); conc., 10424 (iii).  
*Pub. Works*: Buildings, N.S. (Halifax public building) 9873; Ont. (Toronto, automobile cars) 9885; (Toronto junction) 9886; (Ottawa militia stores) 7848; Que. (Buckingham post office) 9876; (Granby post office) 9878; (Quebec cartridge factory) 9877; Coll. of Rev. (slides and booms) 8054; Harbours and Rivers (Lévis graving dock) 9860; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice district) 7837; (Canadian B. C. and Dawson City Tel. Co.) conc., 10440; Telegraph Lines (P. E. I. and mainland) 8056; (Bennet, Dawson and Atlin) 7845; (Yukon and Lewes River improvements) 7842, 8058; Miscellaneous (Can. Bank of Commerce) 9609 (iii).  
*Railways*: Annapolis and Digby (interest on claims) 10395; I.C.R. (engine houses) 9432; (free passes) 9429; (increased facilities) 10375, 10378 (iii).  
*Yukon Territory* (living allowances, &c.) 7834 (iii).  
 Welland Canal, Dynamite Explosion, on M. (Mr. *McCleary*) to adjn., 4256 (ii).  
 Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 994 (i).

**Carroll, Mr. H. G., Kamouraska.**

- Debates, Official, 4th Rep., conc. (M.) 4554 (ii).  
 Franchise Act Amt. (B. 105) 1° m., 2347 (i).  
 Newspaper Postage, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 3263 (i).  
 Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 112) 1°\*, 2827 (i).

**Carscallen, Mr. A. W., North Hastings.**

- Miller, R. W., Postmaster of Actinolite, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1114 (i); (M. for copies) 2201 (i).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir R., G.C.M.G., South Oxford.**

- Address, on The, 124 (i).  
 Adjournment for Ash Wednesday (M.) 1058 (i).  
 Atlantic Mail Service, SS. Sailings (Ans.) 1745.  
 B. C. Miners Labour Troubles and Mr. Clute's Rep. (remarks) 5808 (ii).  
 Budget, The, 2729, 2836 (i).  
 Can. and British West Indies, Transportation Facilities (Ans.) 1883 (i).  
 Can. and Manchester SS. Line, Subsidies paid, &c. (Ans.) 1976 (i).  
 China and Japan. See "Ocean SS. Subsidy."  
 Chinese Immigration, Govt. Policy *re* Poll Tax (Ans.) 589 (i).  
 Cold Storage between P.E.I. and G. B. (remarks) 6253 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7334 (iii).  
 Envelopes supplied to Trade and Commerce Dept., Number, &c. (Ans.) 1119 (i).

**Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—Con.**

Fast Atlantic SS. Service, Negotiations, &c. (Ans.) 2190 (i).

See "Supply, Mail Subsidies," "Atlantic," &c.

Flour Imports into British W. Indies (Ans.) 1881.

Franking Privilege, O. C. Respecting, Violation, &c., on Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 781 (i).

Grand Manan SS. Service, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 596 (i) 9061 (ii).

Magdalen Islands SS. Service (Ans.) 478 (i).

Members Sessional Indemnity, Additional, Par. in *Hamilton Spectator* (remarks) 9669 (iii).

Murray Bay and Riviere Ouelle, Steam Communication (Ans.) 2756 (i).

Ocean SS. Subsidies (B. C., China and Japan) Act Amt. (B. 151) prop. Res., 4333; in Com. on Res., 4811, 1<sup>o</sup> of B., 4812; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 5251 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) 2885 (i).

Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6944 (ii).

Political Pamphlets, Distribution and Printing (Ans.) 171, 475 (i).

Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 2184.

Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9968 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 13, on Ques. of Order (Sir Charles Tupper) 1227 (i).

South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 1690, 2007 (i).

— Emergency Rations, Instructions, &c., on amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).

— Reps. from Col. Otter, on Inquiry for, 4373 (ii).

Subsidy to Musgrave & Co.'s Steamers (Ans.) 4919 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Civil Govt.*: Trade and Commerce (salaries) 9555 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (salaries, &c.) 1709.

*Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions* (Baddeck and East Bay) 9593; (Can. and France) 9591; (Can. and S. Africa) 9590; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 9597; (G. B. and Can.) 9555; (G. B. and St. John) 9577; (Halifax and Porto Rico) 9598; (Halifax, Nfld., and G. B.) 9578; (Halifax, W. Indies and S. America) 9583; (Magdalen Islands) 9583; (Murray Bay and River Ouelle) 9603; (P. E. I. and mainland) 9583; (P. E. I. and G. B.) 9584; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 9597; (Port Mulgrave and Marble Mountain) 9595; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 9584; (Quebec and Manchester) 9588.

*Militia* (arms, ammunition) 8350 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 1700 (i).

Trade and Nav. Returns, on Inquiry for, 868 (i).

Trinidad, Trade Relations with Can. (remarks) 9064 (iii).

Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 10470 (iii).

**Casey, Mr. G. E., West Elgin.**

Brockville and West Huron, Investigation, on M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1020 (i).

**Casey, Mr. G. E.—Con.**

Canadian Mining and Metallurgical Co.'s (Limited)—(B. 172) 1<sup>o</sup>, 5567 (ii).

Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 6574 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt B. 180 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 8203 (iii).

Debates, Official 6th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 10297 (iii).

Drainage across Ry. Lands (B. 9) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 146 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4763; (M.) to ref. to Ry. Com., 4786 (ii).

Eastern Extension Tel. Co., and Imp. Govt., and Australian Govt., Grant of Land, &c. (Ques.) 291 (i).

Eastern Extension Telegraph Co., Concessions granted by Australian Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1752.

Fenian Medals, Number of Volunteers called out, Deputation, Pets., &c. *re* Recognition of Services, (Ques.) 441 (i).

Franking Privileges, O.C. Respecting, Violation, &c., on Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 782 (i).

— on M. (Mr. Donville) to adjn., 789 (i).

French Canadians, Attack, &c., on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn., 201 (i).

Govt. Expropriation of Telegraph Lines (Ques.) 1752 (i).

Govt. System of Telegraph Establishment (B. 85) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 1713 (i).

Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 497 (i).

Herbert, Sir R. G. W., Acting Under Sec. Colonial Office (Ques.) 1117 (i).

Members Sessional Indemnity, Additional, par. in *Hamilton Spectator* (remarks) 9667 (iii).

— Increase, &c. (remarks) 10297 (iii).

Ministerial Resignations, Jan., 1896, Cor. between Gov. Gen. and ex-Ministers (M. for copies) 741.

Montreal Harbour Commissioners and Conner's Syndicate, Cor. with Govt. (M. for copies\*) 3469.

Pacific Cable and Action of Imp. Govt. (M. to adjn.) 1483 (i).

— Concessions to Eastern Extension Co. (M. to adjn.) 2149 (i).

— Inquiry for papers, 865 (i).

— on M. for Com. of Sup., 7044 (ii).

— Par. in *The Outlook* (M. to adjn.) 652 (i).

— Par. in *Toronto Globe* (Ques.) 291 (i).

— *re* Proposal of Eastern Extension Co. (M. to adjn.) 581 (i).

— Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1977 (i).

— See "Eastern Extension Tel. Co."

Parliament, Calling of on a Fixed Date (prop. Res.) 3469 (ii).

Portage du Fort and French River Ry. Co.'s B. 97 (Mr. Poupore) M. to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 4142 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Flint) 4135 (ii).

— on amt. (Mr. Douglas) 9046 (iii).

**Casey, Mr. G. E.—Con.**

Railway Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. 9343 (amt.) 9365; Neg. (Y. 35, N. 65) 9366 (iii).  
Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 250; on M. for 2°, 1243 (i).

— Order (Ques. of) 1238 (i).

St. Thomas Postmaster, Suspension, &c. (Ques.) 6610 (ii).

South African War, Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 556.

## SUPPLY:

*Ottawa and Hull Appropriation* (relief fund) 4341 (ii).

*Public Works*: Buildings, Ont. (St. Thomas drill hall) 9892 (iii).

Telegraph Lines. See "Govt. System."

Tobacco, Abolition of Duties, on amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) to Com. of Sup., 7907 (ii).

Woodbridge Fair, Importation of Posters, &c. (Ques.) 1732 (i).

**Casgrain, Mr. T. C., Montmorency.**

Additional Judges, Prov. of Quebec (Ques.) 1750.

Admiralty Act Amt. B. 133 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5104 (ii).

Atlantic Mail Service, SS. Sailings (Ques.) 1744.

Aud. Gen's Rep., French Translation, &c. (Ques.) 1750 (i).

Beauchemin, Bickerdike, &c., Payments to (Ques.) 3768 (ii).

Bergeronnes, P. Q., Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 1745 (i).

Bilodeau, L. P., Payments to (Ques.) 3766 (i).

Binder Twine, on Ques. of Order, to produce Document quoted from, 6195 (ii).

Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5486.

Budget, The, 3919 (ii).

Cabinet Ministers, Number in 1896 and in 1900 (Ques.) 2744 (i).

— Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2745 (i).

Cable at Pointe aux Outardes, Continuation, &c. (Ques.) 7315 (iii).

Cap aux Corbeaux Pier, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1741 (i).

Cattle Inspection, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 3766.

Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s B., on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to suspend Rule, 6245 (ii).

Charlevoix County, Public Works Expenditures (Ques.) 3036 (i).

Chicoutimi Public Works, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 287 (i).

— Wharf, Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 1745 (i).

Cold Storage on Steamships, in Com. on Res., 4884 (ii).

Consolidated Revenue Fund, Expenditure (Ques.) 2182 (i).

Constantine, Dr., Payments to (Ques.) 3763 (ii).

Debates and Official Papers, French Translation of (remarks) 814 (i).

**Casgrain, Mr. T. C.—Con.**

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6703; in Com., 6725 (ii); (amts.) 7322; 9077 (iii).

Drouin Frères, et Cie, Payments to (Ques.) 3768.

Electoral Lists Prov. of Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 6781.

See "Voters' Lists."

Expenditure on Capital, 1896-99 (Ques.) 2743 (i).

Fast Atlantic SS. Service, Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 2190 (i).

Gaspe Short Line Railway Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 3212 (i).

Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2513, (amt.) 2516; neg. (Y. 40, N. 74) 2545 (i).

— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2479 (i).

Grain Elevators, Construction at Lévis (Ques.) 5756 (ii).

Hotel Rates at Roberval (Ques.) 3767 (ii).

Immigration Expenditure, Amounts, &c., paid (Ques.) 2397 (i).

Imperial Federation Pamphlet, Printing, &c. (remarks) 7884 (iii).

I. C. R., Destruction of Mail Bags at Stations (Ques.) 4741 (ii).

— Freight Service at Quebec (Ques.) 2191 (i).

— Lévis Station, Enlargement, &c. (Ques.) 2192 (i).

— Talbot, Mr. E., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1877, 1975 (i), 4916 (ii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 9083; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 9339 (iii).

Kamouraska Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 9795 (iii).

— and St. Pascal Mail Contract (Ques.) 1749.

See "St. Pascal."

Labrecque, C. O., Payments to (Ques.) 3764 (ii).

Lake St. John, Dredge, Wages, &c. (Ques.) 3765.

Lebel, Wenceslas, Emplmt, &c. (Ques.) 3773 (ii).

Les Boulements, Wharf Accounts (M. for copy\*) 2202 (i).

Mail Service, Kamouraska, &c. (Ques.) 9795 (iii).

See "St. Pascal."

Manitoba School Question, Resolutions, &c. (Ques.) 6915 (ii).

Members of Parliament accepting Offices, Names, &c. (Ques.) 2189 (i).

New Carlisle Wharf, Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 3773.

North Shore Telegraph Line, Amounts paid, Miles Constructed, Appmnt. of Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 1742 (i), 3765, 3769 (ii).

O'Donahue, W. T., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3763-4 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) *re* Franking Privilege, Authorities quoted, 2197 (i).

Peribonka Wharf, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1744 (i), 3765 (ii).

— Pay Sheets *re* Construction (M. for copy\*) 2202 (i).

Perron, P. A., Appmnt. (Ques.) 3768 (ii).

**Casgrain, Mr. T. C.—Con.**

- Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 2°, 5060; in Com., 5081 (ii).  
 Postal Revenue, Reduction on Letters (Ques.) 2190 (i).  
 Potvin, P. A., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3767 (ii).  
 Quebec and Bersimis Mail Service, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 1976 (i).  
 Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Construction, Govt. Action (Ques.) 2192 (i).  
 Quebec and Montreal Ship Channel, Amount expended, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 2190 (i).  
 Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 2188.  
 Returns (inquiry) 1983 (i).  
 Roberval, Dredge, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3764 (ii).  
 Roberval Wharf, Amount Expended, &c. (Ques.) 7416 (iii).  
     *See* "Saguenay." "Lake St. John."  
 St. Alexis Wharf, Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 1745 (i).  
 St. Anne's Wharf, Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 1745 (i).  
 St. Gedeon Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4075, 4741 (ii), 9059 (iii).  
     — Wharf, Payments to S. Desjardins (Ques.) 7416 (iii).  
 St. Jerome Wharf, Payments to Mr. L. Desbiens, &c., Names of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 8838, 8839 (iii).  
 St. Joseph de Lévis Graving Dock, Enlargement, &c. (Ques.) 2191 (i).  
 St. Pascal and Kamouraska Mail Contract (Ques.) 1749 (i), 4741 (ii).  
     *See* "Kamouraska."  
 Saguenay Public Works, Amount Expended, &c. (Ques.) 287 (i).  
 Savard, Ed., Paymaster, Chicoutimi (Ques.) 3767.  
 Sessional Employees, Payment of (remarks) 6061.  
 South African War—Canadian Contingents, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 671.  
     — Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 9274 (iii).  
     — Papers laid on Table (remarks) 7215 (iii).  
 Speeches of Hon. Mr. Tarte at London and Paris, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 3792 (ii).  
 Tadousac Wharf, Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 1745 (i).  
 Talbot, Mr. E., Emplmt by Govt. (Ques.) 1877, 1975 (i), 4916 (ii).  
 Translation. *See* "Debates."  
 Trudel, Mr. Leon, Mail Carrier at Murray Bay, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3037 (i).  
 Voters' Lists, Montmorency (Ques.) 7122 (iii).  
     — Pointe aux Esquimaux (Ques.) 8525 (iii).  
     — P. Q., Number, &c., received by Clerk of the Crown in Chancery (Ques.) 2754, 3038 (i).  
     *See* "Electoral Lists."

**Champagne, Mr. L. N., Wright.**

- Debates, Official, 1st Rep., conc. (M.) 649, 937 (i).  
 — 2nd Rep. conc. (M.) 1206 (i).

**Champagne, Mr. L. N.—Con.**

- Debates, Official, 3rd Rep., conc. (M.) 2907, 2994.  
 — 4th Rep. (presented) 5019 (ii).  
 — 5th Rep. (M.) to conc., 5123, 5213 (ii).  
 — 6th Rep. (M.) to conc., 10030, 10288, 10422.  
 SUPPLY:  
     *Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que.*  
     (Hull landing pier) 10226 (iii).

**Charlton, Mr. J., North Norfolk.**

- Bank Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10188 (iii).  
 Beet Root Sugar, Cor., *re* Bounties, on M. (Mr. *Montague*) for copies, 3188 (i).  
 Budget, The, 3310 (i).  
 Business of the Hse, Unopposed Motions, Procedure, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 1933 (i).  
 Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8191 (iii).  
 Coasting Laws Abrogation, on amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Com. of Sup., 9166, (iii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction Act Amt. B. (17) 1° m., 430 (i).  
     — B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5905.  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1°, 2356 (i).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5140 (ii).  
 Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3225 (i).  
 Grand Valley Ry. Co.'s Change of Title (B. 43) 1°, 649 (i).  
 Imports from U.S., Dutiable Goods, &c. (Ques.) 7315 (iii).  
 Leinster Regiment and Canadian Volunteers, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 267 (i).  
 Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 6459 (ii).  
 Montreal Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1325 (i).  
 Orford Copper Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 1932 (i).  
 Paris Exposition—Can. Exhibits on Sunday, par. in *Toronto Mail* (remarks) 5030 (ii).  
     — Closing on Sundays (remarks) 6252, 6352.  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4119 (ii).  
 Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9954; on M. for 3°, 10193 (iii).  
 South African War—Address to Her Maj., on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6909 (ii).  
     — Canadian Contingents, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 365 (i).  
 Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c. (M.) for Sel. Com., 2763 (i).  
 Supply B. 147 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4460 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
     *Ottawa and Hull Appropriation (relief fund)*  
     4342 (ii).

**Charlton, Mr. J.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

*Pub. Works:* Harbours and Rivers, N. B. (Campbellton, dredging) 9902; Ont. (Port Burwell) 10235; Que. (St. Lambert, protection walls) 10219 (iii).

Timber Licenses in Man., on Ques. of Order, 7267 (iii).

**Chauvin, Mr. L. A., Terrebonne.**

South African War, Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 549 (i).

—— Independence of Parlt. *re* British Institutions, on amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 1872 (i).

Tobacco, Abolition of Duties, on amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) to Com. of Sup., 7905 (iii).

Ville Marie Bank, Pets. *re* Govt. Intervention and Special Grants, on M. for copy (Mr. *Monk*) 3067 (i).

**Christie, Mr. T., Argenteuil.**

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8189 (iii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4102 (ii).

**Clancy, Mr. J., Bothwell.**

Binder Twine, Manufacture, &c. (Ques.) 4920, 5248, 5515, 5889 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Interim Report quoted from, 6194 (ii).

—— Sale and Manufacture of, on amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 6202 (ii).

Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5694 (ii).

Budget, The, 4378 (ii).

Business of the House (remarks) 8012, 8795 (iii).

—— Unopposed Motions, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 1974 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 7006; in Com., 7015, 7031 (iii).

Coasting Laws Abrogation, on amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Com. of Sup., 9183 (iii).

Cold Storage on Steamships, in Com. on Res., 4850 (ii).

Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 89 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 3610 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6736 (ii), 7343, 8092, 8797, 8842 (iii).

Dom. Subsidies to Ont. and Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 155 (i).

Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 9 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 4770 (ii).

Franking Privilege, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3613 (ii).

—— of Provincial Legislatures (Ques.) 3264 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5833, 5837 (ii).

Grain Commission, Rep. (inquiry) 7989 (iii).

**Clancy, Mr. J.—Con.**

Interior Dept., Religion of Clerks (remarks) 3468.

Justice Dept., Rep. of (inquiry) 3986 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) Preferential Trade with G.B., 2235 (i).

Order (Ques. of) 5563 (ii).

Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2°, 6953 (ii).

Phin, W. E., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3770 (ii).

Postal Notes, Regulations respecting (Ques.) 9797 (iii).

Provincial Subsidies paid to Ont. and Que. by Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 155 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9351 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 249; in Com., 1406 (i).

Returns (inquiry) 8837 (iii).

Seed Grain Indebtedness, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1770 (i).

South African War, Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 1199 (i).

—— Meat Supplies for Can. Contingents (Ques.) 7970 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

*Administration of Justice* (P. Mungovan, &c.) 8130 (iii).

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (census) 6343; (cold storage shipment) 7619, 7635; (experimental farms) 6341; (farm bulletins) 6341; (historical data) 6346; (Paris exposition) 6344; (year book) 6340 (ii).

*Canals:* Chambly (drainage, &c.) 8915; Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 9188, 9422, 10112; Galops (dredging, &c.) 8507; (enlargement) 8778; Lachine (construction) 8155; (quadrant pontoon gate) 8155; Soulanges (construction) 8153, 8908; Trent (construction) 8159 (iii).

*Civil Govt.:* Agriculture (salaries) 6337; Aud. Gen.'s office, 7506; Customs (salaries) 6045; Inland Revenue (salaries) 6022; Interior (salaries) 6552; Post Office (salaries) 6106; (contingencies) 6129 (ii).

*Customs* (inspectors' travelling expenses) 6087; (miscellaneous) 6090 (ii).

*Dominion Lands* (salaries, &c.) 7058; (surveys, &c.) 7063 (iii).

*Excise* (methylated spirits) 6030 (ii).

*Fisheries* (cold storage) 5977, 6002 (ii); (C. W. Gauthier, amount due) 8064 (iii); (overseers) 5937 (ii); (salaries and disbursements, &c.) 8066 (iii).

*Govt. of N. W. T.* (insane patients) 6684 (ii).

*Govt. of the Yukon Territory* (salaries, &c.) 6983.

*Immigration* (contingencies, foreign agencies) 9665; (general expenses) 9665; (salaries, agents, &c.) 9654 (iii).

*Indians:* Man. and N. W. T. (general expenses) 8126; (treaty expenses) 8071; (working and destitute Indians) 8124; N. B., 8070; Ont. (medical attendance) 8068 (iii).

*Inland Revenue:* Weights and Measures (salaries) 6033 (ii).

*Inspection of Staples* (Elevator Commission) 7832 (iii); (Hide Inspector) 6043 (ii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (extra salaries) 8063 (iii); (salaries, &c.) 1712 (i).

*Militia* (annual drill, &c.) 8277; (medals) 8344.

**Clancy, Mr. J.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

*Miscellaneous* (distressed settlers, N.W.T.) 7496; (Dankin Act expenses) 8139; Interior (seed grain to settlers) 7829, 8122; Portraits of Hon. Mr. Mackenzie and Sir John Thompson) 8136 (iii).

*Mounted Police* (pay of force) 6098 (ii).

*Ocean and River Service* (Str. *Aberdeen*) 8062; (Str. *Minto*) 8061 (iii); (tidal surveys) 1702 (i).

*Penitentiaries*: Dorchester (investigations) 6969 (ii); Kingston (binder twine) 8132; (investigation stenographers' fees) 8133 (iii); Manitoba, 6975; St. Vincent de Paul (investigations) 6966 (ii).

*Post Office* (dead letter branch) 8770; (mail service) 8731, 8765 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings (experimental farms) 7932; N. S. (Digby post office) 7874; Ont. (Toronto Junction) 9887; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Burlington channel) 7952; (Rainy River lock) 7861; N. S. (Judique wharf) 7836; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 7858; Rideau Hall (remetalling road) 7835; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton, N.W.T.) 7837; Yukon, Buildings (rent, fuel, &c.) 8058; (Lewes and Yukon river) 8058; Telegraph Lines (Bennett and Dawson) 7845 (ii).

*Quarantine* (cattle) 6347; (health regulations) 6348; (salaries and contingencies) 6346 (ii).

*Railways*: I.C.R. (draw-bars) 9457; (increased accommodation) 8792 (iii).

*Yukon District*: Mounted Police, 7078 (iii).

Timber Licenses in Man., on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 7236 (iii).

Tobacco, Abolition of Duties (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7894 (iii).

Toronto Harbour, Dredging Contracts, &c., (Ques.) 1742 (i).

— Engineer's Estimate, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 2202 (i).

Unopposed Motions (remarks) 6062 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4676, 4813; 5974, 6918, 6927 (ii); 7127 (iii).

Yukon—Administration of, on amt. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) to Com. of Sup., 8631 (iii).

— Alternate Sections, Disposal, &c. (Ques.) 155 (i).

— Royalties. Charges against Mr. McDonald, on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7705 (iii).

— Wade, Mr. F. C., Charges against, on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7169 (iii).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F., West Toronto.**

Agricultural Implements exported, 1896-99, Rebate, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 3050 (i).

— Pets. *re* Increase of Duty (Ques.) 1737 (i).

— Rebate on Export from Can. (Ques.) 2750 (i).

Alien Labour Law, Enforcement by U.S. (Ques.) 2465 (i).

— Prosecutions, Payments, &c., (Ques.) 5896, 6612 (ii).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F.—Con.**

American Vessels and the Coasting Trade (remarks) 7320 (iii).

See "Coasting."

Bicycles exported from Can., 1893-99, Rebate (Ques.) 3769 (ii).

Canadian Loan and Investment Co.'s incorp. (B. 76) 1\*, 1641 (i).

Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 6488; in Com. (amt.) 6489, 6499; on M. for 3\* (amt.) 6571; Neg. (Y. 38; N. 49) 6607 (ii).

Coasting Laws Abrogation, on amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Com. of Sup., 9157 (iii).

See "American," &c.

Cold Storage in 1896, Inquiry for Regulations, 4899.

— on Steamships, in Com. on Res., 4892 (ii).

Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2\*, 9369, 9383, 9391; in Com., 9392 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6746 (ii); 9073 (iii).

Doukhobors, Emigration to U.S. (Ques.) 4734 (ii).

Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5117, 5127, 5136, 5860 (ii).

General Service Medals, Conditions, &c., National Colour, &c. (Ques.) 299 (i).

See "Medals."

Govt. Contracts containing "sweating" clause, Names, &c. (Ques.) 4557 (ii).

— Protection to Workmen, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2490 (amt.) 2494; on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2556 (i).

Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2435, 2815 (i).

Halifax Garrison, Contract for Supplies (Ques.) 3775, 4907 (ii).

— Amount from Imp. Contractors, Names, &c. (Ques.) 5020 (ii).

See "S. A. War."

Immigrants from Europe, par. in *Scotsman* (remarks) 10187 (iii).

Indian Corn, Quantity imported and exported (Ques.) 2405 (i).

Joint High Commission, Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 1741 (i).

Medals (1870), Number granted, Names, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 2760 (i).

See "General Service," &c.

Members of the House of Commons, Appnmt. to Offices from 1873 to 1878 (Ques.) 5394 (ii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 6464 (ii).

— Report (Ques.) 3773 (ii).

Milne, James, Patent Relief (B. 102) 1\*, 2345 (i).

Montreal Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1370 (i).

Pacific Cable, par. in *The Outlook*, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to adjn., 657 (i).

**Clarke, Mr. E. F.—Con.**

- Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2°, 6942, 6946 (ii).
- Penetanguishene Reformatory, &c., Number of Reprieves (M. for Ret.°) 2200 (i).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 9815, 9833 (iii).
- Regimental Bands, Control of (Ques.) 7125 (iii).
- Reps., Deptl., Copy sent to Bureau, Date, 4440, 4555, 4734, 4907 (ii).
- Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4156 (ii).
- Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 254; in Com., 1404, 1411, 1456; on M. for 3°, 1632 (i).
- South African War, Can. Contingents, Numbers, Payments, Clothing, &c. (Ques.) 3761-2.
- Contract for Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 4245, 4558 (ii).
- Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 9307 (iii).
- Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 563 (i).
- Purchase of Horses (Ques.) 3769 (ii).
- Transportation of Troops, Amount paid S.S. Lines (Ques.) 5402 (ii).
- arrangements, provisioning, &c. (Ques.) 5021 (ii).

See "Halifax Garrison."

Supply B. 147 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 3°. 4167.

## SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice* (alien labour law) 6430; (Exchequer Court) 6437; (Judges' salaries) 6433; (printing, &c., reports) 6435.
- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Paris exposition) 10338.
- Civil Govt.*: Finance Dept., 6445 (ii).
- Immigration* (pauper immigration) 10349 (iii).
- Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions* (G.B. and Can.) 9560 (iii).
- Penitentiaries*: St. Vincent de Paul (electric plant) 6440; (investigations) 6960 (ii).
- Public Works*: Buildings, Ont. (Brockville drill hall) 9881; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Murray and Cleveland's contract) 10236; (Port Stanley wharf) 10236; (Toronto harbour) 10230, 10236 (iii).
- Quarantine* (organized districts, public health) 10349 (iii).
- Toronto, Dep. Postmaster, Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 3263 (i).
- Drill Hall, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 3036.
- Hotel Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 4963 (ii).
- Wallace, Gunner, Death of at Kingston (Ques.) 477 (i).
- Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4818 (ii).
- Yukon—Bennett and Atlin Tel. Line, Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 289 (i).
- Bennett and Dawson Tel. Amounts paid to J. B. Charleson (Ques.) 288 (i).
- cost of construction, &c. (Ques.) 287 (i).
- Can. Bank of Commerce, Commission, &c. (Ques.) 2750 (i).
- Royalty, Amount collected (Ques.) 2750 (i).

**Cochrane, Mr. E., East Northumberland, (O.)**

- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitpatrick*) in Com., 7332, 8809, 8845, 9069 (iii).
- Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5126, 5128, 5830, 5846 (ii).
- Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 6467 (ii).
- Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9988; on M. for 3°, 10193 (iii).

## SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (cold storage, &c.) 10337; (Paris exposition) 10338 (iii).
- Canals*: Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 10129, 10136 (iii).
- Legislation*: House of Commons (French translators) 10330; (voters' lists) 10326 (iii).
- Penitentiaries*: Kingston (gratuities) 10320 (iii).
- Post Office* (mail service) 8751 (iii).
- Public Works*: Buildings (Rideau Hall) 7937; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Rainy River lock) 7869; (Toronto harbour) 10231; Que. (Maria wharf) (10204 (iii).
- Railways*: I.C.R. (increased facilities) 10379.
- Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 6925, 6932.

**Copp, Mr. A. J. S., Digby.**

Holiness Movement Church in Can. incorp. (B. 51) 1°, 1109 (i).

## SUPPLY:

- Miscellaneous* (consolidation of Dom. Statutes) 10413 (iii).
- Public Works*: Buildings, N.S. (Digby P.O.) 7870 (iii).

**Corby, Mr. H., West Hastings.**

- Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 2412 (i).
- Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2809 (i).
- Ont. Provincial Subsidy due by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3037 (i).
- Picton Postmastership, Vacancy, &c. (Ques.) 1461 (i).
- South African War, Cor. between Govt., Gen. Hutton and Col. Hughes, *re* Contingents, &c. (M. for copies\*) 168 (i).

**Costigan, Hon. J., Victoria (N.B.)**

- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitpatrick*) in Com., 8860 (iii).
- Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B. 65) 1°, 1381 (i).
- Railway Subsidies B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 10011 (iii).
- Restigouche and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (Mr. *McAlister*) on M. for 3°, 3416 (ii).
- Yukon—Administration of, on amt. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) to Com. of Sup., 8565 (iii).

**Cowan, Mr. M. K., South Essex.**

- Budget, The, 4407 (i).  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 5584.  
 — on M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to adjn., 5748 (ii).  
 Can. and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 46) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 649 (i).  
 Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5279 (ii).  
 Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 9 (Mr. Casey) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4772 (ii).  
 Dom. Statutes, Revisions, &c. (Ques). 1886 (i).  
 Franking Privilege, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3624 (ii).  
 Frost & Wood Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 113) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i).  
 Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 2480 (i).  
 Ordnance Lands, Essex Co., Sale of Timber (M. for O. Cs., &c.\*) 3050 (i).  
 Scotsman, SS., Papers *re* Wreck, &c. (remarks) 8656 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c. : Immigration, 7200 (iii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) in Com., 6926 (ii).

**Craig, Mr. T. D., East Durham.**

- Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 5634 (ii).  
 Budget, The, 4346 (ii).  
 Business of the Hse.—Dom. Day Adjnt. (remarks) 8435, 8653 (iii).  
 C. P. R. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Macdonell) on amt. (Mr. Richardson) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2665 (i).  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 8406 (iii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5919 ; on amt. (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 6312 (ii).  
 Franking Privilege, &c., on M. (Mr. Donville) to adjn., 790 (i).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5862, 5876 (ii).  
 Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. Campbell) to prop. Res. (Mr. Mulock) 2549 (i).  
 Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6945 (ii).  
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir Louis Davies) in Com., 5074 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 151 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for Com., 9806 (iii).  
 Preferential Trade with G.B., on amt. (Mr. Russell) to Com. of Sup., 2263 (i).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Flint) 4103 (ii), 8969 (iii).  
 — on amt. (Mr. Douglas) 9049 (iii).

**Craig, Mr. T. D.—Con.**

- Railway Subsidies Authorization. B 193 (Mr. Blair) on prop. Res., 9951 (iii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1613 (i).  
 South African War—Canadian Contingents, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 397.  
 — Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. Monk) to adjn., 6872 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

- Militia (compensation allowances) 9769 (iii).  
 Post Office (mail service) 8713 (iii).  
 Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Rideau Hall fire protection) 9890 ; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Hope harbour) 10229 (iii).  
 Toronto Hotel Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. Osler) in Com., 4958 (ii).  
 Yukon—Administration of, on amt. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) to Com. of Sup., 8594 (iii).

**Davies, Hon. Sir L. H., K. C. M. G., West Queen's (P.E.I.)**

- Aberdeen, SS., Special Trip to Les Eboulements, &c. (Ans.) 8430 (iii).  
 Anderson, J. W., Patent Relief B. 108 (Mr. Cargill) on M. for Com., 5163 ; in Com., 6820.  
 Arbitration, Claims against Dominion (remarks) 10034 (iii).  
 Arisaig, N.S., Light-keeper, Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3262 (i).  
 Bait Freezing Cos., Govt. Assistance, &c. (Ans.) 3176 (i).  
 Bank Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 6627 (ii).  
 Boiler and Machinery Inspectors, B.C., Examination of Candidates, &c. (Ans.) 6779 (ii).  
 — Inspection, Purchase and Sale of old Boilers, &c. (Ans.) 1474 (i).  
 Brace, Mr. R. K., Cor. *re* Dismissal, on M. (Mr. Martin) for Ret., 2203 (i).  
 Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 2407 (i).  
 Brant SS., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 4918 (ii).  
 B. C. Fisheries, Agent's Rep., *re* (Ans.) 3178 (i).  
 — Grievances, on M. for Com. of Sup., 9490.  
 — Hydro-graphical Survey, Govtl. Action *re* (Ans.) 2832 (i).  
 — Tidal Survey (Ans.) 3174 (i).  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections, Instructions, &c., on amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 5293 (ii), 7428 (iii).  
 — on M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to adjn., 5738 (ii).  
 — on Notice of M. (Mr. Borden) 1010, 1019, 1042 (i).  
 Brothies Ledge Beacon, Electric Light, &c. (Ans.) 290 (i).  
 Budget, The, on M. (Mr. McNeill) to adjn. Deb., 4433 (ii).  
 Business of the House, 3757, 4898 (ii).  
 — Unopposed Motions, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 2082 (i).

**Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—Con.**

- Business of the Hse., Procedure, Personal Explanation, &c., 1910 (i).
- Campobello Fish Weirs, Licenses, &c. (Ans.) 594.
- Carmanah Lighthouse, B.C., and Telegraph Communication with Mainland (remarks) 6257.
- Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8186 (iii).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 7005; in Com., 7018, 7031 (iii).
- Companies Clauses Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8952 (iii).
- Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5703, 5710, 5904, 5923 (ii).
- on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) that Cor. rise, 5259 (ii).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6727 (ii); 7329, 7352, 8090, 8798, 8841, 9075 (iii).
- Fisheries Inspector, Man., Name, &c. (Ans.) 6057 (ii).
- Protection Service, B. C., Additional Steamer, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for Cor., *re*, 2762.
- Fish Hatchery at Dunk River, P.E.I., &c. (Ans.) 7656 (iii).
- Hatchery, C. B., Sale, &c. (remarks) 6782.
- Fishing Bounties, &c., Claims (Ans.) 2199 (i), 9524 (iii).
- Bounty Cheques, Distribution (Ans.) 3263.
- Foyle, Lt., Dismissal, on Inquiry for Papers, 9682.
- Franchise Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 2350 (i).
- Franking Privilege, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3617 (ii).
- O. C. Respecting, Violation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Donville*) to adjn., 798 (i).
- Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 3018 (i).
- Glass, James, Fishery Guardian, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 596 (i).
- Gold River and Chester Basin, Buoy Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3875 (ii).
- Govt. System of Telegraph Establishment B. 85 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 1719 (i).
- Halifax Harbour, Improvement of Approaches (remarks) 6258 (ii).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., 7772, 7793 (iii).
- Harris, Geo. A., Investigation, &c. (remarks) 9063 (iii).
- Hillsborough, P. E. I., Bridge Surveys, Amounts Paid (Ans.) 2193 (i).
- I. C. R. Freight Service at Quebec (Ans.) 2191 (i).
- LeBlond, E., Claim for killing Horse (Ans.) 2182 (i).
- Lévis Station, Enlargement, &c., (Ans.) 2192 (i).
- James Beckwith*, Schooner, Payment of Fishing Bounty (Ans.) 6058 (ii).
- (remarks) 6354 (ii).

**Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—Con.**

- Juan de Fuca, Fishing Privileges in Straits (Ans.) 5756 (ii).
- Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9129; on Sen. Amts., 10093 (iii).
- Kendall, A. S., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1120 (i), 4440 (ii).
- Lake Temiscamingue, Survey of (Ans.) 3444 (ii).
- Lakes Winnipegosis and Manitoba, Enforcement of Fishing Regulations (Ans.) 4440 (ii).
- on Inquiry for further papers, 5228 (ii).
- Land Titles Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 5190 (ii).
- Lighthouses, &c. constructed since 1896 (Ans.) 2199 (i).
- Lobster Fisheries, P. E. I., Date of setting Lines, &c. (Ans.) 2759 (i).
- (remarks) 4725 (ii).
- on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Bell, P. E. I.*) 4730 (ii).
- Dates of Close Season (Ans.) 438 (i).
- Fishing in Digby and Annapolis Coves, Regulations (Ans.) 4243 (ii).
- Investigation, Amount expended (Ans.) 2195 (i).
- Marine, Deptl. Report (presented) 1483 (i).
- Marine Hospital, B.C., Use for Barracks (remarks) 3490 (ii).
- Midland Harbour Range Lights, &c., Erection of (Ans.) 3045 (i).
- Money Subsidies to Rys., Rates, &c. (Ans.) 2180.
- Newfoundland and Can., Negotiations, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for copies, 2228 (i).
- North American Transportation Co., Names, &c. (Ans.) 6248 (ii).
- Oak Point Lighthouse, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3444, 3774 (ii).
- Orford Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1727, 1928 (i).
- Parliament, Calling of on a Fixed Date, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 3474 (ii).
- Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6950 (ii).
- Pelee Island, Sale of Life-Saving Station (Ans.) 4559 (ii).
- Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 11) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 243 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 5059, in Com., 5062-98, 5144 (ii), 6995; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 8936.
- Pineau, H. J., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3446 (ii).
- Point aux Trembles Lighthouse, Reconstruction (remarks) 6063 (ii).
- P. E. I. Mail Service, Irregularities of (remarks) 2085 (i).
- (Murray Harbour Branch) Ry. Co.'s B. 182 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 8941 (iii).
- Telegraph Service (Ans.) 4443 (ii).
- Procedure in asking Questions, on M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn., 2369 (i).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 9007 (iii).
- on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 9050 (iii).

**Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—Con.**

Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Construction, Govt. Action (Ans.) 2192 (i).

Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 2187. Repts. Deptl. (remarks) 3990 (ii).

Representation in the H. of C. (Mr. *Mulock*) on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1256; in Com., 1429; on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 1579 (i).

— on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1229 (i).

Returns, Incomplete (remarks) 8440 (iii).

Rets., on Inquiry for (Mr. *Foster*) 2423 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 6138, 6786, 6917 (ii), 6991, 7318 (iii).

Safety of Ships (B. 12) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 246 (i); in Com., 6995 (iii).

St. Gédéon Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 9059 (iii).

Sampson, J., Payment of Fishing Bounty, (Ans.) 8429 (iii).

Sandy Island Lights, Removal, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 440 (i).

Savage Island Spar Lights, Erection and Removal (Ans.) 440 (i).

Sawdust in Rivers, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4556 (ii).

Scotsman, SS., Papers *re* Wreck, &c. (remarks) 8657 (iii).

Seal Cove Life Saving Station, Equipment, &c. (Ans.) 594 (i).

Seed Grain Indebtedness, Govtl. Action, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).

Sheehan, Jacob, Payment of Fishing Bounty (Ans.) 6058 (ii).

South African War, Bloemfontein, Capture of, Raising of Flag on Parl. Buildings (remarks) 1927 (i).

— Canadian Contingents, &c., Closing of Debate (remarks) 1096, 1104 (i).

— Pay of Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fiddling*) in Com. on Res., 1260; in Com. on B., 1653, 1699 (i).

— on amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) Remarks, 1698 (i).

— Emergency Rations, on M (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 6860 (ii).

— analyses, &c., Order (Ques. of) 7888 (iii).

— instructions, &c., on amt. (Mr. *Monk*) to Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).

Stumbles, W. W., Cor. with Marine and Fisheries Dept., on M. for copies (Mr. *Prior*) 4678 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Administration of Justice* (P. Mungovan, &c.) 8128 (iii).

*Canals*: Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 10170; Soulanges (Stewart's claim) 10170 (iii).

*Civil Govt.*: Interior (Messrs. Rothwell and Ryley) 7743, 7748 (iii); (salaries) 6517 (ii); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1699 (i).

*Customs*: N.B. (contingencies and salaries) 6071 (ii).

*Fisheries* (cold storage) 5959, 5976—6021 (ii); (Dom. and Provincial claims) 5927 (ii); (E. W. Gauthier, claim) 8064; (fish hatchery, B. C. and Gaspé) 10398 (iii); (fishing bounties)

**Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.****Fisheries—Con.**

5958 (ii); (Flatheads hatchery) 8067; (H. A. Bruce, claim) 8066 (iii); (hatcheries) 5936; (inspectors, &c.) 5934 (ii); (legal expenses *re* seizures) 10398 (iii); (lobster regulations) 5946; (overseers) 5937; (oyster culture) 5949; (protection service) 5957 (ii); (salaries and disbursements, &c.) 8066; (steamer for B. C. fisheries) 10398 (iii).

*Legislation*: Library of Parl. (sessional messengers) 5924 (ii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (agencies, rents, &c.) 3644; (construction, salaries, &c.) 3663 (ii); (fog alarm, Lake Erie) 10397; (J. W. G. Roberts, salary, &c.) 8063 (iii); (Lurcher Shoul Lightship) 3662, 3672; (maintenance, &c.) 3645 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 1704 (i), 3644 (ii); (Traverse light) 8063 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (G. B. and Can.) 9575, 9582; (P. E. I. and G. B.) 9586 (iii).

*Militia* (arms, ammunition) 8366; (warlike stores) 8317 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (Carleton, Caleb, amount due, &c.) 10413; (Dunkin Act expenses) 8139; (Rand's dictionary) 10413 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (life saving rewards) 1701 (i); (Str. *Aberdeen*) 8063; (Str. *Minto*) 8061 (iii); (tidal services) 1701; (winter mail service) 1704 (i).

*Penitentiaries*: Kingston (binder twine) 8134 (iii).

*Post Office* (mail service) 8747 (iii).

*Pub. Works*: Buildings, N.B. (Marysville post office) 9880; Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I. (Canoe Cove breakwater) 9898; (Summerside breakwater) 9899; Que. (Cap Sante wharf) 10211; (Isle Verte wharf) 10209; (Saguenay River, dredging) 10208 (iii).

*Railways* (locomotives, &c.) conc., 10439 (iii).

*Scientific Institutions* (Meteorological service) 5925 (ii).

Tignish, P.E.I., Customs Duty collected 1898-1900, on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 3469 (ii).

Tobacco, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1502 (i).

Toronto Hotel Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. *Osier*) in Com., 4954, 4964 (ii).

Trefry, Norman L., Shipping Master at Yarmouth, N.S., Salary (Ans.) 2405 (i).

U. S. Steamers, Inspection Exemption, &c. (Ans.) 298 (i).

Vancouver and Nanaimo, Mail Contract (Ans.) 3442 (ii).

Vancouver Drill Hall, Amount expended (Ans.) 2828 (i).

Vroom, G. V., Amount paid by Govt. (Ans.) 2193 (i).

Welland Canal, Number of Employees, &c., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 2181 (i).

West Indies, Trade Relations with (Ans.) 4077

White, Lt.-Col., Retirement, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 3122 (i).

Yukon, Administration of, on amt. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) to Com of Sup., 8619 (iii).

— on Ques. of Order, 8560 (iii).

**Davies, Hon. Sir L. H.—Con.**

- Yukon, Charleson, Mr. J. B., Reps. *re* Telegraph Construction, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) for copies, 7312 (iii).  
 ——— *John C. Barr*, Reps. *re* (Ans.) 6614 (ii).  
 ——— Undervaluation, &c., on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6664 (ii).  
 ——— *Yukoner*, SS., Clearance of, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 5013 (ii).

**Davin, Mr. Nicholas Flood, West Assiniboia.**

- Arbitration, Claims against Dominion, &c., (remarks) 10034 (iii).  
 Binder Twine, &c., on Ques. of Order, on Inquiry for Interim Report, 6195 (ii).  
 ——— on amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 6225 (ii).  
 Borden, Lt., Decease of (remarks) 10503 (iii).  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5532 (ii).  
 Budget, The, 3813 (ii)  
     *See* "Election," &c.  
 Barrows, Mr. T. A., Date of Permit *re* Timber Licenses (Ques.) 6780 (ii).  
     *See* "Timber Licenses, Man".  
 Business of the Hse., Unopposed Motions, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 1937, 2083 (i).  
 Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 6502 (ii).  
 Canada Temperance Act Amts., &c. (remarks) 10368 (iii).  
 C. P. R., Agreement with Govt. *re* Town Sites, Inquiry for papers, 2998 (i).  
 ——— B. 34 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. for Com., 2636; on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 2665 (i).  
 Caruduff, Mr. J. P., Dismissal as Postmaster (Ques.) 7415 (iii).  
 Census, The, (Ques.) 8433 (iii).  
 Chappell, Edgar, Emplymt. by Int. Dept., &c. (Ques.) 778, 2193 (i).  
 ——— and J. G. Turriff (M. to adjn.) 2605 (i).  
     *See* "Sifton, Hon. C.," "Turriff," &c.  
 Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on prop. Res., 8167.  
 Clayton-Bulwer Treaty and Official Cor. with Canada (remarks) 262 (i).  
 Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co's incorp. B. 35 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com. 3438 (ii).  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>st</sup>, 8415; on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 9379 (iii).  
 ——— Order (Ques. of) 8418 (iii).  
 Copeland, Mr. Arthur, Stmnts of (Ques.) 778 (i).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4703, 5264, 5702, 5721, 5897 (ii).  
 ——— Information *re* (remarks) 10505 (iii).  
 Debate in H. of C., Character of, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 10314 (iii).  
 Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 5222 (ii).

**Davin, Mr. N. F.—Con.**

- 6th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 10301.  
 Dep. Returning Officer, Saskatchewan Landing, Payment (Ques.) 3261, 3446 (i).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 6706; in Com., 6731 (ii), 8800; on Sen. Amts., 10464 (iii).  
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1<sup>st</sup>, 431; in Com., 1390-1399; on M. for Com., 1643; in Com., 1790 (i).  
 ——— Man. and N. W. T., Regulations, &c. *re* Licenses (Ques.) 6780 (i).  
 Doukhobors and Galicians, Number settled, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 151, 286 (i).  
 Election Frauds, Judicial Inquiry, on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Blair*) 7115 (iii).  
     *See* "Brockville," &c.  
 Financial Statement of Canadian Trade, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10485 (iii).  
 ——— on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Com. of Sup., 9755 (iii).  
 Franking Privilege, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3616 (ii).  
 ——— O. C. Respecting, Violation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Donville*) to adjn., 806 (i).  
 Fraser, A. J., Removal from Regina Land Office, (Ques.) 740 (i).  
 Garnot, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 295 (i).  
 Gaspé Election and Customs Officials, on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Com. of Sup., 7588 (iii).  
 Gass, C. A., Dismissal (Ques.) 3761, 5241 (ii).  
     *See* "Moosejaw," &c.  
 General Inspection Act (M.) to discharge Order, 4333 (ii).  
 Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2499; (amt.) 2501, 2512; withdn., 2515 (i).  
 ——— on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2551 (i).  
 ——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 10495, 10497.  
 Grain Elevator Commission, Evidence, &c. (Ques.) 437 (i).  
 Grain Inspection B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 5759; in Com., 5763-5805, 5809-5826, 6288; on M. for 3<sup>d</sup> (amt.) 6298, 6300.  
 ——— on M. (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) to ref. back to Com., 6258 (ii).  
 ——— Shipments to G.B., Cor., &c., between Mr. *Ross* and Min. of Agriculture (M. for copies), 157 (i).  
 ——— Transportation, Omissions from Rep. of Royal Commission (remarks) 3225 (i).  
 ——— Royal Commission, O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies) 2200 (i).  
 ——— Inquiry for Ret. *re*, 2998 (i).  
 ——— to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3246 (i).  
 ——— Transit in Man. and N.W.T. Regulation (B. 38) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 577 (i).  
 G.T.R. Tariff on Oil, Illegality, &c. (Ques.) 297.

**Davin, Mr. N. F.—Con.**

- Indian Supplies in Man. and N.W.T., Tenders (Ques.) 4742 (ii).
- Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Sen. Amts., 10068 (iii).
- Judges' Salaries, Resolution respecting (remarks) 7321 (iii).
- Keith, Hilton, Indian Agent at Carlton (Ques.) 1981 (i).
- See* "Privilege."
- Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 31) 1° m., 475 (i); 2° m., 4799 (ii).
- B. 139 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com. 5177 (ii).
- Leinster Regiment and Canadian Volunteers, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 271 (i).
- Library Officials, Efficiency, &c. (remarks) 10505.
- Loucks, Henry Logan and others, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 291 (i).
- Lumsden, N.W.T., Pets. *re* Mail Service (Ques.) 2403 (i).
- Man. and N.W.T. Defences, (prop. Res.) 242, 281.
- Homestead Entries, Abuses in Administration, on M. for Com. of Sup., 9552 (iii).
- Land Grants to Rys., Names and Amounts to Cos. (Ques.) 439 (i).
- O.C. *re* Timber Permits (Ques.) 4743 (ii).
- (M. for copies) 1011 (i).
- Medicine Hat, Public Works (Ques.) 5514 (ii).
- Members Sessional Indemnity, Increase (remarks) 10301 (iii).
- Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden*, *King's*) in Com., 6463 (ii).
- Montreal Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1319 (i).
- Moosejaw, Appnmts. at (remarks) 6963 (ii).
- Collector of Customs, Name, &c. (Ques.) 1465 (i); 5404 (ii).
- Dismissal of Postmaster Chas. A. Gass (Ques.) 5241 (ii).
- (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6323 (ii).
- See* "Gass Privilege," &c.
- Town Site. Exemption of Lots, Memorials, &c. (M. for copy) 2201 (i).
- Moose Mountain Indian Reserve, Sale to U.S. Syndicate (Ques.) 2194 (i).
- Mounted Police Acts, Amt. Bills on Order Paper (remarks) 3331 (ii).
- Pension Act Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 138 (i), 2° m., 4760 (ii).
- Mounted Police Act Amt. (B. 19) 1° m., 431 (i); 2° m., 4787 (ii).
- Cor. *re* letting of Contracts (M. for copies) 161 (i).
- inquiry for Ret. *re*, 3413 (ii).
- Hardware Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 4739, 5244.
- Schedule for Tenders, &c. (M. for Re.. 3213 (ii).
- Supplies, &c., Tenders for Tea (Ques.) 3042.
- Winter Overcoats, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 148.
- See* "Returns," &c.

**Davin, Mr. N. F.—Con.**

- North-west Territories, Amounts paid for Printing, Inquiry for Ret., 3413 (ii).
- Defences (remarks) 263 (i).
- Farmers and Australian Competition, &c. (Ques.) 293 (i).
- Govt. Printing, Amount paid, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 470 (i).
- tenders for 1890-99 (M. for copy) 1011 (i).
- Inquiry for Rets. 19:8 (i), 3413 (ii).
- Land Subsidies to Rys., Names, Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 1117 (i).
- Population, Estimate, &c. (Ques.) 148 (i).
- Rebellion, Land Grants to Militia Force, B. 107 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 2°, 4667 (ii).
- School Lands, Sale of by Govt. (Ques.) 1479
- Subsidy voted to, Cor. between Dom. Govt. and N.W.T. Govt. *re* (M. for copies) 3447 (ii).
- Taxation on Ry. Lands, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 624 (i).
- Tramp Cattle from U.S. (Ques.) 8432 (iii).
- Order (Ques. of) 1934, 1945 (i), 3867 (ii), 10419 (iii).
- Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2°, 6946 (ii).
- Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 2°, 5059 (ii).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2° (amt.) 9694; on M. for Com., 9805; in Com., 9812; M. for 3° (amt.) 9836 (iii).
- Privilege (Ques. of) 4664 (ii).
- Dismissal of Mr. Gass (Quotation from *Hansard*) 5734 (ii).
- Indian Agent Keith, 2072 (i).
- par. in Newspapers *re* Action on Grain Bill, 7121 (iii).
- par. in *Ottawa Citizen*, 1207 (i).
- par. in Newspapers, 1788 (i).
- par. in *Toronto Daily Star re* Attack on Irish Members, 588 (i).
- Procedure in asking Questions, on M. (Mr. *Sprule*) to adjn., 2374 (i).
- Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 9496, 9684 (iii).
- Queen's Birthday Adjournment, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*)—(remarks) 5886 (ii).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 4688 (ii).
- Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 763 (i).
- Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) on prop. Res., 9929 (iii).
- Rebellion of 1885, Scrip for Scouts (remarks) 3467 (ii).
- Regina Leader, Amounts paid by Govt., 1898-9 (Ques.) 592 (i).
- on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn. Deb. (remarks) 3872 (ii).
- Transfer of Town Site to C.P.R., &c. (Ques.) 2759 (i).

**Davin, Mr. N. F.—Con.**

- Returns, Incomplete (remarks) 8281 (iii).  
 — (inquiry) 4447 (ii).  
 — Inquiries for N. W. Mounted Police Supplies, &c., 1555, 1724 (i).  
 Ross, Hon. J. H., Expenses as Indian Commissioner, &c. (Ques.) 148, 297 (i).  
 Scrip, Grant to Half-Breeds (prop. Res.) 305 (i).  
 — to Children, on prop. Res. (Mr. Davis) 644.  
 — to Scouts (prop. Res.) 4744 (ii).  
 Seed Grain Indebtedness B. 143 (Mr. Sutherland) on M. for 2°, 5034; in Com., 5039-5059; on M. for 3° (amt.) neg. (Y. 26: N. 50) 5142, 5143 (ii).  
 — Cor., between Min. of Int. and Homesteaders in Man. and N.W.T. (M. for copies) 158 (i).  
 — inquiry for ret., 2098 (i).  
 — Govtl. Action *re* (prop. Res.) 1757, 1775 (i).  
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3641 (ii).  
 Sifton, Hon. Mr. and Mr. Turriff, Dates of Travelling, &c. (Ques.) 2465 (i).  
 — Speech at Brandon (remarks) 2831 (i).  
   *See* "Chapele, Turriff," &c.  
 Smith, G. F., Dep. Ret. Officer, Payments to (Ques.) 3261, 3446 (ii).  
 South African War, Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. Fielding) on prop. Res., 511; in Com. on Res., 1162, 1171, 1178, 1200; in Com. on B., 1677 (i).  
 — Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. Monk) to adjn., 6867 (ii).  
 — papers laid on Table, 7208 (iii).  
 — Ques. of Order *re* Analyst's Rep., 7541 (iii).  
 — Garrisoning Esquimaux by Can. Troops (remarks) 2148 (i).  
 — Indemnities to Families of Can. Soldiers (remarks) 10318 (iii).  
 — Perry, Supt., and South African Volunteers (Ques.) 297 (i).  
 — Punishment of Can. Private, on M. to adjn. (Mr. Wallace) 4453 (ii).  
 — Recruits for Vacancies, &c. (Ques.) 2404 (i).  
 — Strathcona's Horse, Purchase of Horses in N.W.T. (remarks) 482 (i).  
 Speech of Hon. Mr. Sifton at Brandon *re* Free Lumber (Ques.) 2831 (i).  
 Standard Oil Company, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 5397.

**SUPPLY :**

- Administration of Justice* (Prince Albert) 6431.  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Glasgow exhibition) 10331; (Paris exposition) 7178, 10339 (iii).  
*Canals*: Galops (enlargement) 8777; Welland (docking, &c.) 8521 (iii).  
*Civil Govt.*: Agriculture (salaries) 6337; Customs (contingencies) 6065; Interior (printing law reports) 6513, 6555; (salaries) 6513 (ii), 10280 (iii); Mar. & Fisheries (salaries) 1698 (i); Post Office (salaries) 6130 (ii).  
*Customs*: Man. (contingencies, salaries) 6076; (miscellaneous) 6089 (ii); (N. W. T., Dom. appraisers, &c.) 10414 (iii); (salaries and contingencies) 6084 (ii), 9519; Order (Ques. of) 10419 (iii).

**Davin, Mr. N. F.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con,**

- Dominion Lands* (salaries at head office) 10407; (timber lands protection) 10408 (iii).  
*Fisheries* (cold storage) 5999, 6010 (ii).  
*Geological Survey* (artesian boring, N.W.T.) 10405 (iii).  
*Govt. of N. W. T.* (insane patients) 6683; (restoration of public works) 6691; (schools, clerical assistance) 6684, 6689 (ii).  
*Immigration* (Galician settlers) 10352; (general expenses) 9666; (salaries, agents, &c.) 9633, 9647 (iii).  
*Indian Affairs* (contingencies) conc., 10439; Man., N.W.T. (annuities and commutations) 7295; (industrial schools) 7300 (iii).  
*Interior* (distressed settlers, &c.) 10281 (iii).  
*Legislation*: House of Commons (election frauds commission) 10323; Library (salaries) 10331; (stationery) 10323 (iii).  
*Militia* (annual drill, ammunition, &c.) 8240; (medals) 8343; (warlike stores) 8331 (iii).  
*Miscellaneous* (*Canada Gazette*) 7506; (Conciliation expenses) 10413; (distressed settlers, N. W. T.) 7498; (half-breed commission) 10412; (printing plant, &c.) 10413 (iii).  
*Mounted Police* (pay of force) 6093 (ii); (supplies, cor., &c.) 10408 (iii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 1700 (i).  
*Post Office* (Carnduff postmaster, dismissal, &c.) 10264; (franking business cards, &c.) 10268; (mail service) 8756; (salaries, &c., outside service) 10264 (iii).  
*Pub. Works*: Buildings, N.W.T. (Red Deer court house) 9892; Harbours and Rivers, N. B. (Campbellton dredging) 9902; N. S. (Broad Cove breakwater) 9897; Ont. (Lancaster wharf) 10229; (Toronto harbour) 10232; P. E. I. (Summerside breakwater) 9899; Que. Coteau Landing dredging) 10222; Roads and Bridges (Battleford, N.W.T.) 10253; Miscellaneous (Monument to Mr. Mackenzie) 10254.  
*Quarantine* (cattle) 10347 (iii).  
*Railways*: I. C. R. (water tanks) 8786 (iii).  
 Timber Licenses in Man. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7221 (iii).  
 Tobacco Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Gillies) 4757 (ii).  
 Tramp Cattle from U.S. and Medicine Hat Stock Growers' Ass'n., Cor., &c. (Ques.) 5403 (ii).  
 Transportation Question and St. Lawrence Canal Contracts, Speech of P. M. G. at Collingwood (Ques.) 432 (i).  
 Turriff, J. G., and Chappell, E. A., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2193 (i).  
   *See* 'Chapele,' &c.  
 Vincent, Mr., Surveyor, Emplmt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3043 (i).  
 Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on amt. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 6424 (ii).  
 — on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn., 979 (i).  
 — on amt. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) to Com. of Sup., 8575.  
 — on Ques. of Order, Authorities quoted, 8560 (iii).  
 — Claims, Abandonment by Owners, &c. (Ques.) 5026 (ii).  
 — Coste's Rep. *re* Teslin Lake Route (M. for copy) 605 (i).

**Davin, Mr. N. F.—Con.**

- Yukon, Payment of Dog Drivers, &c. (Ques.) 3262  
 ——— O. C. *re* Claims reserved (Ques.) 4920 (ii).  
 ——— Speech of Senator Kirchhoffer *re* Corruption (Ques.) 3048 (i).

**Davis, Mr. T. O., Saskatchewan.**

- Accident and Guarantee Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 81) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1713 (i).  
 Balgonie and Hedgesford Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1466 (i).  
 Brockville Mail Transfer Service, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1467 (i).  
 Budget, The, 3866, 3882 (ii).  
 Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 6580 (ii).  
 Coasting Laws Abrogation, on amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6755 (ii).  
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 1390 (i).  
 Eastern Harbour and Port Hastings Mail Service (Ques.) 1886 (i).  
 Franking Privilege, &c. (Ques.) 6776 (ii).  
 French Canadians, Attack, &c., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 223 (i).  
 Hockley and Mono Centre Mail Contract (Ques.) 1749, 2742 (i).  
 Land Grants to Rys. in Man., B.C. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 590, 1884 (i).  
 Lunatics from N.W.T. in Man. Asylum, Maintenance (Ques.) 3445 (ii).  
 McNevin, J. C., Claim for Rebellion Losses (M. for cor.) 3463 (ii).  
 Man. and N.W.T. Land Grants to Ry. Co.'s, &c. (Ques.) 590, 1884 (i).  
 Marcotte, Mr. A., Dismissal, &c., Cor., Letters, &c. (M. for copies) 634 (i).  
 Money Subsidies to Rys. (Ques.) 1885 (i).  
 N.W.T. Rebellion Claim of Henry Halero, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 635 (i).  
 ——— Postal Contracts (Ques.) 1745 (i).  
 ——— Taxation of Ry. Lands, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 616 (i).  
 Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Montreal Gazette re* Speech on Ballot Stuffing, &c., 320 (i).  
 Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of Board (prop. Res.) 752 (i).  
 Regina Leader Co., Names of Incorporators, &c. (Ques.) 1464 (i).  
 ——— Amounts paid by Govt. in 1894-5 (M. for Ret. \*) 319 (i).  
 ——— Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 1115, 1116 (i).  
 ——— Ret. *re* ref. to Pub. Accounts Com. (M.) 1786 (i).  
 Returns, Inquiry for *re* Regina Leader, 1209 (i).  
 Scrip for Half-Breed Children (prop. Res.) 640, 646 (i).  
 ——— Grant to Half-Breeds, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 310, 315 (i).

**Davis, Mr. T. O.—Con.**

- Seed Grain Indebtedness, Govtl. Action, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1767 (i).  
 ——— Order. (Ques. of) "Boer" Unparliamentary Language, 1760 (i).  
 Senators, Legal Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 1885.  
 SUPPLY :  
   *Civil Govt.* : Interior (printing law reports) 6520.  
   *Govt. of N.W.T.* (clerical assistance) 6685 ; (insane patients) 6683 (ii).  
   *Miscellaneous* (distressed settlers, N.W.T.) 7490.  
   *Post Office* (mail service) 8708 (iii).  
 Timber Licenses in Man. on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 7237 (iii).  
 ——— Limits, Moore & Macdowall's, Operation, &c. (Ques.) 1898 (i).  
 Whisky, &c., Quantity taken out of bond 1888-99 (Ques.) 2458 (i).

**Dechene, Mr. A. M., L'Islet.**

- Deficits, Ry. Subsidies, &c., Amounts (Ques.) 3758 (ii).  
 I.C.R., Morin, Mr. Geo., Appmt. as Station Master, &c. (Ques.) 5890 (ii).  
 Mileage of Senators and Members (Ques.) 2362 (i).  
 Pelletier, Real, Pay of (Ques.) 8524 (iii).  
 Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, French Translation of M. (remarks) 6384 (ii).

**Desmarais, Mr. O., St. James, Montreal.**

- South African War, Canadian Contingent, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 868 (i).

**Dobell, Hon. R. R., West Quebec.**

- Budget, The, 3391 (ii).  
 Coasting Laws Abrogation, on amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Com. of Sup., 9171 (iii).  
 Cold Storage on Steamships, in Com. on Res. 4866 (ii).  
 Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 468, 484 (i).  
 Halifax Harbour, Approaches, &c. (remarks) 7801 (iii).  
 Imperial Federation Pamphlet, Printing, &c. (remarks) 7885 (iii).  
 South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 1673.  
 ——— Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 6812, 6851 (ii).  
 Travelling Expenses, on Personal Explanation (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3578 (ii).

**Domville, Mr. J., King's (N.B.)**

- Basic Slag Fertilizer (Ques.) 3168 (i) ; 4739, 4908, 5891, 6618, 6777 (ii) ; 8429 (iii).  
 ——— Chemical Works and Chief Analyst of Inland Rev. Dept. (M. for Cor. \*) 4078 (ii).  
 Dominion Dredge, Employees, Names, &c. (Ques.) 5026 (ii).  
 Dom. Voters' Lists, Sheriffs' Fees (Ques.) 4914 (ii).  
 Fertilizers Act Amt. (B. 2) 1<sup>o</sup>, 7 (i).  
 Franking Privilege, O. C. respecting, Violation (M. to adjn.) 787-8 (i).

**Domville, Mr. J.—Con.**

- Hughes, Lt.-Col., and G. O. C., Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 598 (i).
- Hutton, Maj. Gen., and Lt.-Col. Hughes, Rep. in Newspapers (Ques.) 149 (i).
- Departure from Can., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 328 (i).
- Imperial and Canadian Militia Pay, &c. (Ques.) 2159 (i).
- Pension Allowance (Ques.) 2162 (i).
- Liquor Commission, Date of Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 5393 (ii).
- Markham, Lt. Col., Retention of Cheque, &c. (Ques.) 2833 (i).
- Militia Act Amt. (B. 7) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 143 (i).
- (B. 60) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 1286 (i).
- B. 155 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 6474 (ii).
- Annual Drill, 1890-99, Total Number, &c. (Ques.) 1473 (i).
- New Brunswick Voters' Lists, Receival by Govt. (Ques.) 779 (i).
- Northern Commercial Tel. Co., Ltd. (B. 74) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1641 (i).
- Royal Military College, &c., Amounts paid, Expended, &c. (Ques.) 1734 (i).
- St. John's *Sun*, N. B., Payments to by Govt., 1882 to 1896 (Ques.) 1463 (i).
- Sawdust in Rivers. Complaints *re* (Ques.) 4556 (ii).
- Senate and H. of C. Act Amt. (B. 39) M. for leave to introduce B., 510; 1<sup>o</sup> m., 579 (i).
- South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 1654
- Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 6879 (ii).
- Sussex, N. B. Armoury for 8th Hussars (Ques.) 1733 (i).
- SUPPLY:
- Militia* (annual drill, ammunition, &c.) 8248, 8255; 8293, 8357 (iii).
- Public Works*: Yukon, Buildings (rent, fuel, &c.) 10262 (iii).
- Tupper, Sir Charles, &c., Payments to by Govt., (Ques.) 1477, 1755, 1880 (i).
- Voters' Lists for King's, N. B. (Ques.) 1120 (i).
- Yukon—Administration of, on amt. (Mr. *Bell, Pietou*) to Com. of Sup., 8597 (iii).
- Bennett, B. C., and Dawson Telegraph Line, Date of Operation (Ques.) 7316 (iii).

**Douglas, Mr. J. M., East. Assiniboia.**

- Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5607 (ii).
- Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8184 (iii).
- Grain Inspection Act B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 5760; in Com., 5765, 5775, 5794, 5816; on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 6300; on M. (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) to ref. back to Com., 6274 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 8937 (iii).

**Douglas, Mr. J. M.—Con.**

- Grain Trade in Man. and N. W. T. Regulation (B. 14) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 286 (i).
- Inspection, &c. (B. 58) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1207 (i).
- Great North-west Central Ry., Land Grant (Ques.) 2752 (i).
- India Famine, Can. Contributions, &c. (remarks) 3877 (ii).
- N. W. Ters., Taxation on Ry. Lands, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 628 (i).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) amt. 9042 (iii).
- Scrip for Half-breed Children, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 643 (i).
- Seed Grain Indebtedness B. 143 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 5045 (ii).
- Legislation (remarks) 3987 (ii).
- on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1777 (i).
- Settlers in Man. and N.W.T., Grants, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 2760 (i).

**Dugas, Mr. L. E., Montcalm.**

- Choquette, Mr. Justice, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 1979 (i).
- Fenian Raid Medals, Grants to Widows of Officers (Ques.) 6915 (ii).
- Labelle, Mr. L. V., of St. Jacques L'Achigan, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1733 (i).
- Mail Clerks, Montreal and Que. Divisions, Fines (Ques.) 4076 (ii).
- Man. School Ques. (Ques.) 4445, 4915 (ii).
- par in *Mail and Empire re* Action of Winnipeg School Board, 6252 (ii).
- par in *Winnipeg Free Press* (Ques.) 4070
- South African War, Applications from Quebec, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1113, 1728 (i).
- Speech of Prime Minister *re* Man. School Question (Ques.) 3042 (i).
- par in *La Patrie* (Ques.) 2749 (i).
- Vallieres, Philip, Contracts with Pub. Works Dept. (Ques.) 2165 (i).

**Dyment, Mr. A. E., Algoma.**

- Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i).
- Lake Superior and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 124) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i).
- Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 109) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2560 (i).
- Port Arthur Ry. and Terminal Co.'s incorp. (B. 103) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2345 (i).
- Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9963 (ii).

**Edwards, Mr. W. C., Russell.**

- Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on prop. Res., 8166.
- I.C.R. Freight Delays, on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 3282 (i).
- Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 130) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3140 (i).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 9812 (iii).

**Edwards, Mr. W. C.—*Con.***

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 9035 (iii).

Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) on prop. Res., 9927 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

*Canals* : Soulanges (Stewart's claim) 10172 (iii).

*Public Works* : Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Maria wharf) 10205 (iii).

**Ellis, Mr. J. V., *St. John City (N.B.)***

Beet Root Sugar, Cor. *re* Bounties, on M. (Mr. *Montague*) for copies, 3194 (i).

Business of the Hse—Dom. Day Adjournment, &c., 8652 (iii).

C. P. R. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 2656 (i).

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8186, 8203.

Debates, Official, 6th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 10294 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6770 (ii), 7384, 8828, 8853, 8877, 9073, 9079 (iii).

Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3234 (i).

Immigration to N. W. Ters., Class of Settlers, &c. (remarks) 10187 (iii).

Lobster Fisheries, on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Bell, P. E. I.*), 4729 (ii).

Members, Sessional Indemnity, Increase, &c., (remarks) 10294 (iii).

Militia, Ambulance Service, &c. (Ques.) 1113 (i).

Parliament, Calling of on a fixed Date, on prop Res. (Mr. *Caspey*) 3477 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 9808 (iii).

Public Health Dept., Establishment of, on M. for Sup., 8449 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1285.

Servis Railroad Tie Plate Co.'s Patent Relief B. 93 (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 2671 (i).

South African War—Commissions, &c., in Can. Contingents (Ques.) 6617 (ii).

— Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) to conc., in Rep., 9209 (iii).

— Officers serving as Privates (Ques.) 4240

Supply B. 147 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 4466

## SUPPLY :

*Fisheries* (lobster hatcheries) 5956 (ii).

*Legislation* : House of Commons (French translation) 10330 (iii).

*Militia* (annual drill, ammunition, &c.) 8264, 8298 (iii).

*Post Office* (mail service) 8770 (iii).

*Public Works* : Buildings, Que. (post offices) 9880  
Telegraph lines (P. E. I. and mainland) 8054, 10253.

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 6924 (ii) 7135 (iii).

**Erb, Mr. D. K., *South Perth.***

Dom. Elections Act. Amt. (B. 57) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 1109 (i).

— B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7382 (iii).

**Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.***

*Montreal Star*, Copies franked through Mails, Number, &c. (Ques.) 2197, 2401, 2462 (i).

South African War, Canadian Contingent, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 914 (i).

**Featherston, Mr. J., *Peel.***

Cold Storage on Steamships, in Com. on Res., 4849 (ii).

Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5841 (ii).

Toronto Postmaster, Absence from Official Duties (Ques.) 4443 (ii).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S., *Shelburne and Queen's (N.S.)***

Arichat Customs Collector, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 816 (i).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 81, 1057 (i).

Bank Act Amt. B. (No. 163) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 5728; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 5960; in Com., 6502; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 6626, 6628 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 7656 (iii).

— (B. 192) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 9903; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 10188; in Com., 10189 (iii).

Banks, Powers of (Ans.) 2748 (i).

Benevolent Societies, Legislation respecting (remarks) 356 (i).

Binder Twine, Sale and Manufacture of, on amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 6239 (ii).

Budget Speech, Announcement of Delivery, 2345.

— Financial Statement, 2563 (i).

— on M. to adjn. Deb. (Mr. *Monk*) 4049 (ii).

— (remarks) 1010, 1641 (i), 4400, 4403, 4656, 4485 (ii).

Brockville and West Huron Investigation, on Notice of M. (Mr. *Borden*) 1010 (i).

Business of the House (remarks) 4553 (ii), 8072.

— Introduction of Govt. Measures (remarks) 8280 (iii).

Cabinet Ministers, Number, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 2744, 2745 (i).

Canadian Securities (B. 149) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4662; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 5960 (ii).

Canadian Securities in England. *See* "Inscribed Stock."

Canso and St. Peter's Ry. Contracts for Construction (Ans.) 479 (i).

Chartered Banks, List of Shareholders (presented) 4681 (ii).

City and Districts Savings Bank, &c. (B. 177) 1<sup>o</sup>, 6914 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 7221; in Com., 8083 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 156); 1<sup>o</sup> m., 5226 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 6996; in Com., 7014, 7031, 7656; M. for Com., 8160; in Com., 8161 (iii).

— (remarks) 8082 (iii).

Coal Industry of Can., on M. for Com. of Sup., 9717, 9722 (iii).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.—Con.**

- Coasting Laws Abrogation, on amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Com. of Sup., 9154 (iii).
- Commissions *re* Investigations against Govt. Employees, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2398-9 (i).
- Companies Clauses Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. *Gilmour*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4800 (ii).
- (B. 183) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 8082; M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 8935; in Com., 8951 (iii).
- Consolidated Revenue Fund, Expenditure (Ans.) 2182, 2744 (i).
- Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137, (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) that Com. rise, 5260 (iii).
- Customs Act Amt. (B. 184) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 8089 (iii).
- Deficits, Ry. Subsidies, Amounts (Ans.) 3758 (ii).
- Dep. Returning Officer, Saskatchewan Landing, Payment (Ans.) 3261, 3447 (i).
- Dickey, Hon. Arthur, Decease of (remarks) 9056 (iii).
- Dismissals, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 8281 (iii).  
*See* "Employees."
- Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6716 (ii), 7378, 8828, 8874, 9069 (iii).
- Order (Ques. of) 6717 (ii).
- Dom. Subsidies to Ont. and Quebec, &c. (Ans.) 155 (i).
- Eastern Extension Ry. Co.'s Arbitration, &c. (remarks) 10032 (iii).
- Emigration to U. S. (remarks) 3331 (ii).
- Employees of Govt., Dismissal of, &c. (Ans.) 2398-9 (i).
- English Trust Funds, Papers laid on Table, 5122 (ii).
- Estimates, The (remarks) 648 (i).
- (presented) 1057 (i).
- Suppl. ending 1900 (presented) 4338, 5293 5883 (ii).
- Suppl. (1901)—(presented) 8398, 9789 (iii).
- Inquiry for, on M. for Com. of Sup., 8526 (iii).
- on Inquiry for, 8073 (iii).
- Expenditure on Capital, 1896-99 (Ans.) 2182 2744 (i).
- Expropriation Act Amt. (B. 160) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5513; in Com., 5757 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 8083 (iii).
- Fin. Dept., Reps., Copy sent to Queen's Printer (Ans., Date, &c.) 4441 (ii).
- Financial Situation, on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Com. of Sup., 9740 (iii).
- Franking Privilege, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3621 (ii).
- Girouard, Mr., on Inquiry for Papers, 7647 (ii).
- Gov. Gen's Warrants, Total Number issued (Ans.) 1897 (i).
- Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn. Deb., 2559 (i).
- Govt. Life Insurance Annuities, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2755 (i).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.—Con.**

- Grain Inspection B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 5797 (ii).
- G. T. R., Govt. Loan to (Ans.) 4916 (ii).
- Granite Duty, Increase of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 8048 (iii).
- Haley, Mr., late M. P., Decrease of (remarks) 4066 (ii).
- Halifax Harbour, Approaches, &c., on M. to Com. of Sup., 7806 (iii).
- Hay, Removal of Duty (Ans.) 9523 (iii).
- India, Famine, Can. Contributions, &c. (remarks) 3878 (ii).
- Inscribed Stock of Canada in the United Kingdom (B. 149) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4662 (ii).  
*See* "Canadian Securities."
- I. C. R. Freight Rates, Change in Tariff, &c. (remarks) 7606, 7611 (ii).
- Train Service on C. B. Division (remarks) 8078 (iii).
- on M. (Mr. *Gillies*) to adjn., 7982 (iii).
- Interest Act Amt. (B. 161) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 5514; in Com., 5757 (ii); Sen. Amts., conc., 7423 (ii).
- Liquor Traffic, Date of Commission, &c. (Ans.) 5394 (ii).
- Loan Companies Act Amt. (B. 154) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5020; in Com., 5181 (ii).
- Govt. Action *re* Perpetration of Frauds (Ans.) 3040 (i).
- Macaulay Point Claims, Litigation, &c. (Ans.) 1461 (i).
- Meat, Importations of, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3875 (ii).
- Mess. from His Ex.\* (presented) 1057 (i), 4338, 5293, 5883 (ii); 8398, 9789 (iii).
- Militia, Annual Drill, 1890-99, Total Number taking Part (Ans.) 1473 (i).
- Montreal Turnpike Bcnds, Interest due Govt. &c. (Ans.) 2753 (i).
- Newfoundland and Canada, Reciprocity Treaty, Proposals, &c. (Ans.) 290 (i).
- N. W. T., Subsidy voted to, Cor. Between Dom. Govt. and N. W. T. Govt. *re*, on M. for copies (Mr. *Davin*) 3460 (ii).
- Ont. Provincial Subsidy due by Govt. (Ans.) 3037
- Paper Combine, Govt. Legislation *re* Duty (Ans.) 4921 (ii)
- (remarks) 4808 (ii).
- Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6942 (ii).
- Port Mulgrave and St. Peter's Mail Service (remarks) 7422 (iii).
- Preferential Trade, Order (Ques. of) 2038 (i).
- on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2326 (i).
- on Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) *re* Irrelevancy of Deb., 2339 (i).
- Procedure in asking Questions, on Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Taylor*) 2377 (i).  
*See* "Questions."

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.—Con.**

- Prohibition Commission, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1753, 1980, 2180 (i).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8990 (iii).  
 ——— (remarks) 3466 (ii).  
 Provincial Electoral Lists, Expenses of Printing, &c. (Ans.) 2755 (i).  
 Provincial Subsidies paid to Ont. and Quebec by Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 155 (i).  
 Public Accounts Rep. (presented) 10 (i).  
 Public Debt, Additions to since 1894 (Ans.) 1897 (i).  
 Quebec Harbour Commissioners, Amount due Govt. (Ans.) 1461 (i).  
 Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 2183  
*See* "Procedure."  
 Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) on prop. Res. 9940; in Com. on Res., 9858, 10012 (lii).  
 Returns, on Inquiry for, 5409 (ii).  
 Royal Mint for Can., par. in *N. Y. Tribune* (remarks) 5230 (ii).  
 St. John Harbour Works, Forfeited Deposits (remarks) 10186 (iii).  
 St. John's Sun, N. B., Payments to by Govt. from 1882 to 1896 (Ans.) 1463 (i).  
 Savings Banks Act Amt. (B. 177) 1<sup>o</sup>, 6914 (ii).  
*See* "City and District."  
 Sessional Employees, Payment of (remarks) 5897, 6062, 6255, 6355, 6446, 6916 (ii).  
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3636 (ii).  
 Smith, G. F., Dep. Ret. Officer, Payments to (Ans.) 3261, 3447 (ii).  
 South African War, American Bank Note Co., Hoisting of Flag (remarks) 6789, 6993 (ii).  
 ——— Can. Contingent, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 4438 (ii).  
 ——— general composition of, &c. (Ans.) 1474 (i).  
 ——— pay of volunteers (prop. Res.) 261, 350; in Com. on Res., 1156; (B. 59) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1212; in Com. 1646, 1687 (i).  
 ——— Emergency Rations, Analysis, &c. (remarks) 7887 (iii).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn. 6806, 6814 (ii).  
 Standard Oil Co., Prices, &c., (Ans.) 5397 (ii).  
 Superannuations, Amounts granted, and Expediency of Payments (Ans.) 432 (i).  
 ——— from 1890 to 1896, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 2177 (i).  
 Supply (Res. for Com.) 137 (i).  
 ——— (B. 147) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>o</sup>, 4458; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 4466 (ii).  
 ——— (B. 178) 1<sup>o</sup>, 6918 (ii).  
 ——— (B. 179) 1<sup>o</sup>, 7220 (iii).  
 ——— (B. 188) 1<sup>o</sup>, 8796 (iii).  
 ——— M. for Com., 1698 (i), 4338, 6323, 6355 (ii), 8120, 9149 (iii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Administration of Justice* (P. Mungovan, &c.) 8129 (iii).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

- Canals* (Gilbert Dredging Co.), 8513 (iii).  
*Charges of Management* (printing Dom. notes) 6444 (ii), 8121; (receiver general, St. John) 10277 (iii).  
*Civil Govt.*: Auditor General's Office (clerical assistance) 6445 (ii); 7506, 10286 (iii); Finance Dept., 6445 (ii); Gov. Gen's Sec. Office, 7506, 8121, 10278; (High Commissioner's Office), 9604 (iii); Inland Revenue (contingencies) 6025; Interior Dept. (salaries) 6513 (ii); Printing and Stationery Dept. (salaries) 10278; Sec. of State's office, 7506; (clerkships, &c.) 10278 (iii).  
*Customs* (miscellaneous) 6089; N.S. (contingencies) 6068 (i); (Dom. Coal Co's. legislation) 9510; (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 9509 (iii).  
*Govt. of the N. W. T.* (clerical assistance) 6685; (insane patients) 6683; Unorganized Districts (school, &c.) 6689 (ii), 7081 (iii).  
*Immigration* (general expenses) 9666 (iii).  
*Insurance*, 6508 (ii).  
*Legislation—General* (Laws, printing, &c.) 8150 (iii); House of Commons (debates) 5923 (ii); (sessional indemnity) 8135; (voters' lists) 9604, 10325; (Plebiscite vote) 8136 (iii); (stationery) 5924; Library of Parliament (sessional messengers) 5924; Senate (debates) 5923 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 8148 (iii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (maintenance, &c.) 3653 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Annapolis and London) 10397; (G. B. and Can.) 9570; (Halifax, Nfld., and G. B.) 9578; (Port Mulgrave and Marble Head) 10397 (iii).  
*Militia* (annual drill, &c.) 8277; (arms, ammunition) 8353 (iii).  
*Miscellaneous* (American Mining Engineers visit) 10412; (*Canada Gazette*) 7506; (distressed settlers, N.W.T.) 7504; (expenses re counterfeiters) 8143; (half-breed commission) 7073; (printing plant, &c.) 10413; (portraits of Hon. Mr. Mackenzie and Sir John Thompson) 8136; (Queen vs. British American Bank Note Co.) 8142; (Rand's dictionary) 10413; (Superannuation interest to Kelly and Ryan) 10412; (Ville Marie Bank officials) 8145 (iii).  
*Penitentiaries*: Kingston (binder twine) 8133.  
*Post Office* (mail service) 8735 (iii).  
*Public Works*: Buildings, N.S. (Digby post office) 7873; (Halifax public building) 9871; (Liverpool post office) 9875; Ont. (Kingston drill hall) 7916; (Sarnia post office) 7924; Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Shippagan Harbour) 7947; N. S. (dredging at Lunenburg) 7854; (Ecum Secum wharf) 9896; (Porter's Lake dredging) 9896; Telegraph Lines (P.E. I. and Mainland) 8055; Yukon (Yukon and Lewes river improvements) 7843 (iii).  
*Quarantine* (public health regulations) 9200 (iii).  
*Railways*: I. C. R. (facilities, &c.) 9461; (increased accommodation) 8787; (St. John wharf) 8374; (sidings in Cape Breton) 8926 (iii).  
*Unprovided Items*, 8931 (iii).  
*Yukon—Miscellaneous* (Can. Bank of Commerce) 9607 (iii).  
 Timber Licenses in Man., on Ques. of Order, 7263.  
 Tobacco, Abolition of Duties, on amt. (Mr. *Cluney*) to Com. of Sup., 7898 (iii).  
 Toronto Hotel Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 4951 (ii).  
 Trade & Nav. Rets., on Inquiry for, 817 (i).  
 Trinidad Treaty, Trade Relations, &c. (remarks) 3795 (ii).

**Fielding, Hon. W. S.—Con.**

- Tupper, Sir Charles, &c., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 1477, 1880 (i).
- Ville Marie Bank, Pets. *re* Govt. Intervention and Special Grant, on M. for copy (Mr. Monk) 3069 (i).
- Wags and Means* (Res. for Com.) 138 (i).
- The Budget (Financial Stmtnt.) 2563 (i).
- The Tariff (M.) for Com., 8088; in Com., 8088 (iii).
- Weights and Measures, Inspectors Fees, &c. (Ans.) 1554 (i).
- Yukon, Administration of, on amt. (Mr. Bell, *Picton*) to Com. of Sup., 8567 (iii).
- Assay Office (remarks) 9467 (iii).
- Can. Bank of Commerce, Commissions &c. (Ans.) 2751 (i).
- Girouard, Mr., on Inquiry *re*, 7647 (iii).
- Govt. Banking Business, Cor. *re* (M.) to lay on Table, 8082 (iii).
- Postal Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 9793 (iii).
- Royalties. Charges against Mr. McDonald, on amt. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 7716 (iii).
- Telegraph Supplies, Purchase. &c., on Ques. of Order, 8284 (iii).
- *Yukoner* SS., Clearance of, on Ques. of Order (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5005 (ii).

**Fisher, Hon. S. A., Bromc.**

- Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5393 (ii).
- Copy sent to Queen's Printer, Date, &c. (Ans.) 4442 (ii).
- Employees, Number, &c. (Ans.) 2366 (i), 4447 (ii).
- Apples and Pears—Marking of Packages—(B. 127) 1<sup>\*</sup>, 2827 (i).
- See "Fruit," &c.
- Legislation by Govt. (Ans.) 1460 (i).
- Basic Slag Fertilizer (Ans.) 4912, 6621 (ii).
- Bubonic Plague on American Frontier (remarks). 2457 (i).
- Cattle Inspection, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.), 3766 (ii).
- Census, The (Ans.), 8433 (iii).
- Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s B. 171 (Mr. Gibson) in Com., 9398 (iii).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 7002 (iii).
- Cold Storage (B. 152) in Com. on Res., 4822; 1<sup>o</sup> m., 4898 (ii).
- Cold Storage System, Cost, &c. (Ans.), 2366 (i).
- Copyright Act Amt. (B. 167) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 5887; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 6505; ref. to Sel. Com., 6507 (ii); M. for Com., 9148 (iii).
- Copyright Bill, Memo. from Dept. of Jus. (remarks), 6450 (ii).
- Creamery Products, Sale, &c., by Govt. (remarks), 6702 (ii).

**Fisher, Hon. S. A.—Con.**

- Dairy Experts in Man. and N.W.T., Number, &c. (Ans.) 2363, 2458 (i).
- Dent. Maj., Instructions from Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 4443 (ii).
- See "S. A. War."
- Experimental Farm Station Act Amt. (B. 135) 1<sup>\*</sup>, 3478; in Com., 5099 (ii).
- Farm Report (presented) 6138 (ii).
- Foot and Mouth Disease, par. in *Montreal Gazette* (remarks) 3795 (ii).
- Franking Privilege, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3632 (ii).
- Fruit Inspection and Marking Exportation (B. 127) 1<sup>\*</sup>, 2827 (i); in Com., 5107, 5124-40, 5831, 5882 (ii).
- Remarks, 10505 (iii).
- Grosse Isle Quarantine Service (Ans.) 5889, 6350, 6626 (ii).
- See "Kathleen," &c.
- Hay Contracts, on Inquiry for Ret., 7513 (iii).
- See "S. A. War."
- Inspection (Apples and Pears) B. (remarks) 10505 (iii).
- See "Fruit," &c.
- Kathleen Str., Expenditure for Transportation (Ans.) 6350 (ii).
- See "Quarantine."
- Labelle, Mr. L. V., St. Jacques, L'Achigan, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1733 (i).
- Live Stock Associations incorp. (B. 134) 1<sup>\*</sup>, 3478; in Com., 5099 (ii).
- Pan-American Exhibition, Construction of Can. Building (Ans.) 2752 (i).
- Paris Exposition, Closing on Sundays (remarks) 6352 (ii).
- par. in *Toronto Mail re* Exhibits on Sunday (remarks) 5031 (ii).
- Cold Storage for Can. Exhibits (remarks) 5392 (ii).
- Cost of Canadian Buildings (Ans.) 3771 (ii).
- Fisheries Commissioner (Ans.) 1460 (i).
- Map of Can., Boundary Lines, &c. (Ans.) 5891 (ii).
- Officials appointed by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 2400 (i).
- P. E. I. Representation (remarks) 4258 (ii).
- Provincial Representation (remarks) 1642.
- See "Perrault, Mr."
- Patent Act Amt. (B. 168) 1<sup>o</sup>, 5887; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 6933, 6955; (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 6959 (ii).
- Perrault, Mr. J., Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 2831 (i).
- Expenses as Commissioner at Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition (Ans.) 2397 (i).
- See "Paris," &c.
- Political Pamphlets, Printing and Distribution (Ans.) 289 (i).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. Flint) 9026 (iii).

**Fisher, Hon. S. A.—Con.**

- Public Health Dept., Establishment of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 8442 (iii).  
 Quarantine at Grosse Isle, Amount paid to Str. Contest (Ques.) 7314 (iii).  
     *See* "Grosse Isle," &c.  
 — at Victoria, B.C., (remarks) 7304 (iii).  
 Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 10015 (iii).  
 Reports, Deptl., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4165 (ii).  
 Returns, on Inquiry for, 6568, 6916 (ii), 8216 (iii).  
 San José Scale Act Amt. (B. 126) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 3164; in Com., 3166 (i).  
 Small-pox, Outbreak in Winnipeg (remarks) 4456 (ii).  
 Seed Grain Indebtedness, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3644 (ii).  
 South African War, Hay and Oats Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1479 (i).  
 — Hay purchased for Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 4917 (ii), 7315 (iii).  
 — Horses and Hay purchased for Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 6350 (ii).  
 — Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* re Purchase of Can. Horses (remarks) 3779 (ii).  
 — Purchase of Horses (Ans.) 3770, 3774 (ii).  
 — (remarks) 3578 (ii).  
 — Steamers, Charter of, on conc., 10445 (iii).  
 — Transportation of Troops, Freight, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 9725 (iii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (bulletins, printing, &c.) 6341; (census) 6343 (ii), 7642 (iii); (classifying patents) 6342 (ii); (cold storage, &c.) 7619, 10336 (iii); (criminal statistics) 6339 (ii); (Dominion census) 10335 (iii); (experimental farms) 6341 (ii); (Ottawa) 7202; (Glasgow exhibition) 10333 (iii); (historical data) 6344; (Paris exposition) 6344 (ii), 7178, 7186, 10337 (iii); (*Patent Record*) 6339; (year book) 6340 (ii); conc., 10438 (iii).  
*Civil Government* : Agriculture (W. J. Lynch) 10286 (iii); (salaries) 6335 (ii).  
*Public Works* : Building (experimental farms) 7931; Que. (Granby post office) 9878; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour breakwater) 7941 (iii).  
*Quarantine* (cattle) 6347 (ii), 10347 (iii); (health regulations) 6348 (ii), 9197, 9408 (iii); Organized Districts, (public health) 10347; (tuberculosis) 7174 (iii); (salaries and contingencies) 6346; (Tracadie lazaretto) 6347 (ii).  
 Tracadie Lazaretto, Expenses for Transportation (Ans.) 6349 (ii).  
 — Number of Lepers, &c. (Ans.) 5401 (ii).  
 Welland Canal, Dynamite Explosion, on M. (Mr. McCleary) to adjn. 4255 (ii).  
 Year Book, on Inquiry for, 4153 (ii).

**Fitzpatrick, Hon. C., Quebec County.**

- Admiralty Act Amt. B. 138 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5103 (ii).  
 Alien Labour Law, Payments, *re* (Ans.) 6612 (ii).

**Fitzpatrick, Hon. C.—Con.**

- Binder Twine, Kingston Penitentiary, Cost, &c., Name of Purchaser, &c. (Ans.) 170, 778 (i).  
 — Quantity of Fibre received, &c. (Ans.) 5248 (ii).  
 — Quantity of Hemp received (Ans.) 5249.  
 — on amt. (Mr. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 6185 (ii).  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 5470.  
 Central Vermont Ry., Co's B. 171 (Mr. Gibson) in Com., 9686 (iii).  
 Charbonneau, Mr. N., Retention by Govt. as Counsel, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 5248 (ii).  
 Civil Servants, Statutory Increases (remarks) 8439 (iii).  
 Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 197) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 10506; in Com., 10506 (iii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4701, 5263, 5701, 5906, 6322; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 6323 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 10453 (iii).  
 — (remarks) 10505 (iii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 133) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 3258 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 6702, 6712; in Com., 6726 (ii), 7322, 8090, 8797, 8840, 9064; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 9472, 9475; on Sen. Amts., 10453 (iii).  
 Dorchester Penitentiary, Payments *re* (Ans.) 778.  
 Fire Insurance Policies, Uniform Conditions, &c. (remarks) 10035 (iii).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5849 (ii).  
 Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 3213 (i).  
 Judges in Montreal and Quebec since 1880 Names, &c. (Ans.) 4437 (ii).  
 Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. (B. 189) M. for Com. on Res. 8794; 2<sup>o</sup> of Res. 8836; 1<sup>o</sup> of B., 8836; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 9083, 9097; in Com., 9146; 3<sup>o</sup> m. 9338; on Sen. Amts., 10035; withdn., 10507 (iii).  
 — (B. 195) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 10304; (iii).  
 Judges' Salaries, Resolution respecting (remarks) 7321 (iii).  
 Judiciary of Provincial Courts, on Introduction of Bill (remarks) 6692 (ii).  
 Penitentiary Act Amt. (B. 174) 1<sup>o</sup>, 6692 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 8083; in Com., 8083 (iii).  
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir Louis Davies) in Com., 5093, 5159 (ii).  
 Quebec Harbour Commissioners (B. 173) 1<sup>o</sup>, 6692 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 10189 (iii).  
 Restigouche and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (Mr. McAlister) in Com., 3373 (ii).  
 South African War, Canadian Contingents, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 661, 735 (i).  
 — Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. Monk) to adjn., 6827 (ii).  
 — Purchase of Hay, Inquiry for Ret., 8082.

**Fitzpatrick, Hon. C.—Con.**

SUPPLY :

*Administration of Justice (alien labour law)* 6430 (ii) 9776 (iii); (Exchequer Court 6437 (ii) (contingencies, 8131 (iii); (Registrar's salary) 6438, 6888; (Judges' salaries) 6433 (ii); (Man. circuit allowance) 8131; (P. Mungovan, &c.) 8128 (iii); (Prince Albert) 6431; (printing, reports, &c.) 6435; (Supreme Court) 6432, 6434; Library, 6436; (improvements) 6436 (ii).

*Civil Govt.*: Justice (Hector Verrett) 10277 (iii).

*Dominion Police* (retiring allowances, &c.) 8132.

*Legislation*: House of Commons (election frauds commission) 10323; (voters' lists) 10328 (iii).

*Miscellaneous*: (Can. Law Library, England) 8140; (consolidation of Dom. Statutes) 10413; (expenses *re* counterfeiters) 8144; (Henry A. Quinn, rebellion services, &c.) 8136; (Queen *vs.* British American Bank Note Co.) 8140; (Ville Marie Bank officials) 8145; (Wentworth *vs.* Mathieu) 8138 (iii).

*Penitentiaries*: (B. C.) 6976; (Derchester, 10277; (investigations) 6968 (ii); (H. G. Smith) 8135 (iii); Kingston, 6888; (binder twine) 6890 (ii), 8132 (iii); (electric plant) 6440 (ii); (gratuities) 10319; (stenographers fees) 8135 (iii); Manitoba, 6975 (ii), (additional amount) 8134 (iii); St. Vincent de Paul, 6893 (ii), (additional salaries, &c.) 8134 (iii), (electric plant) 6439, (investigations) 6895, 6959 (ii) 10318 (iii), conc. 10453 (iii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (River Batiscan dredging) 10211 (iii).

*Railways* (Ralph Jones, interest, &c.) conc., 10448 (iii).

*Yukon*: Administration of Justice, 9776; (prisoners, &c.) 10276; (Sheriff's salary) 10276; (travelling allowances, &c.) 10276; (witness fees, &c.) 10410 (iii).

Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on amt. (Sir Charles Hilbert Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 6384 (ii).

— Court Rules, &c. (Ans.) 740 (ii).

— Judicial Business, Condition of the Docket of the Court (Ans.) 591 (i).

**Flint, Mr. T. B., Yarmouth.**

Business of the House, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Mondays, 5027 (ii).

— Unopposed Motions, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 2080 (i).

Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6495; on M. for 3<sup>c</sup>, 6571 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 50) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 937 (i).

— (remarks) 10307 (iii).

— Reference *re* (Ques.) 4739 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4704, 5281, 5707, 5899 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9073 (iii).

Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5849 (ii).

Ont. Power Co. of Niagara Falls (B. 121) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i).

Orford Copper Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. Belcourt) M. to adjn. Deb., 1727 (i).

Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 4435 (ii).

**Flint, Mr. T. B.—Con.**

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (prop. Res.) 4079 (ii).

— on M. to adjn. Deb. (Mr. Godbout) 4140 (ii).

— on amt. (Mr. Parmelee) 8953 (iii).

— on amt. (Mr. Douglas) 9047 (iii).

Prohibition Commission, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 1753 (i).

— (remarks) 3466 (ii).

Scott Act. See "Can. Temperance Act."

South African War—Can. Contingent, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 1058.

— Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. Monk) to adjn., 6880 (ii).

SUPPLY :

*Immigration* (salaries, agents, &c.) 9631 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (maintenance, &c.) 3651 (ii).

*Public Works*: Buildings (Ottawa) 7934; Harbours and Rivers (refitting *Eureka*) 7852 (iii).

Yarmouth SS. Co., Ltd. (B. 98) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2147 (i).

— and Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 185 (M.) to suspend Rules, &c., 8278; 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 8280; (M.) to refund fees, 9332 (iii).

Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn., 997 (i).

**Fortier, Mr. E., Lotbinière.**

Lemay, Maxime, Postmaster, Lotbinière. Dismissal and Appnmt. (Ques.) 1728 (i).

**Fortin, Mr. T., Laval.**

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 7337 (iii).

Dorchester Penitentiary, Rep. of Commission (Ques.) 3446 (ii).

Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5851 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Sen. Amts., 10047 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 10014 (iii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Carting of Waste Stone, &c. (M. for cor.\*) 3469 (ii).

— Increase of Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 7878 (iii).

— Regulations *re* Night Duty (Ques.) 2749 (i).

— Cor. *re* Night Duty (M. for copies\*) 3469.

Tobacco manufactured in Can., Number of Pounds, &c. (Ques.) 2178 (i).

**Foster, Hon. G. E., York, (N.B.)**

Adams Bros., Payments to in 1898-99 (Ques.) 2364 (i).

Address, on The, 79, 84 (i).

Adjournment for Ash Wednesday (remarks) 937.

Admiralty Act Amt. B. 138 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5103 (ii).

Agricultural Deptl. Rep., on Inquiry for, 5122 (ii).

Anderson, J. W., Patent Relief B. 108 (Mr. Cargill) on M. for Com., 5165 (ii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 5733 (ii).

Basic Slag Fertilizer (remarks) 5892 (ii).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

- Bathurst Public Building, Refusal of Caretaker to raise Flag (remarks) 6447 (ii).  
*See* "S. A. War."
- Beaumont, Wm., Postmaster at Maple Bay, Claims against Govt. (remarks) 433 (i).
- B. C. Lt.-Governor, Cor. with Sec. of State (remarks) 9523 (iii).
- Inquiry for cor., &c. 9471 (iii).
- Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 5642, 5696 (ii).
- Budget, The (reply) 2674 (i).  
 — Correction in Speech, 2762 (i).  
 — (remarks) 1010, 1641 (i), 3611 (ii).
- Business of the House, Adjournments (remarks) 3611, 3757, 4661, 5897, 6446 (ii), 8073, 8435 (iii).  
 — Ash Wednesday (remarks) 937 (i).  
 — Morning Sittings (remarks) 7772 (iii).  
 — Unopposed Motions (M. to adjn.) 2073 (i).  
 — Procedure (M. to adjn.) 1899 (i).
- Canada Temperance Act, Amendments, &c. (remarks) 10307 (iii).
- Cattle and Cheese Exports to G. B. (Ques.) 1980, 2365 (i).
- Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) 3988 (ii).  
 — Exports to G. B. and U. S. (Ques.) 2365.
- Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s B. 171 (Mr. *Gibson*) in Com., 9398, 9406 (iii).
- Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on prop. Res., 8162; in Com., 8183, 8209 (iii).
- City and Districts Savings Bank B. 177 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8083 (iii).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 6998; in Com., 7007, 7031, 7657; on M. for Com., 8160; in Com., 8161 (iii).
- Civil Service Employees, Number of Dismissals (Ques.) 2196, 2399 (i).  
*See* "Dismissals."
- Clarke, Mr. H. W., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3049.
- Coasting Laws Abrogation, on amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Com. of Sup., 9175 (iii).  
 — Privileges on Great Lakes, Inquiry for Ret., 2421, 2995 (i), 5409 (ii).
- Commissions *re* Investigation against Govt. Employees, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2398 (i).  
 — Names of Commissioners, Allowances, &c. (M. for Stmt. \*) 1012 (i).  
 — (M. for Ret. \*) 2761 (i).
- Companies Clauses Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 8935; in Com., 8951 (iii).
- Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 8401 (iii).  
 — on Ques. of Order, 8420 (iii).
- Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 89 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 3609 (ii).
- Copyright Act Amt. B. 167 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for Com., 9148 (iii).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

- Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5177, 5251 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 8949 (iii).  
 — on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) that Com. rise, 5254 (ii).
- Customs, &c., Revenue, Amount Collected (Ques.) 2179, 2366 (i).
- Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 5222 (ii).  
 — 6th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 10030.
- Dent, Maj., Instructions from Imp. Govt. (remarks) 4444 (ii).  
*See* "S. A. War."
- Deptl. Reps. (inquiries) 816 (i), 3990 (ii).
- Dibblee, Mr., Customs Collector at Woodstock, N. B. (Ques.) 7316 (iii).
- Dickey, Hon. Arthur, Decease of (remarks) 9057.
- Dismissals, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 8280, 9468, 9680, 9798, 10186 (iii).  
*See* "Commissions," "Civil Service" "Employees," &c.
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8796, 8840, 9073; on M. for 3° (amt.) 9480 (iii).
- Dom. Lands Act. Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 1389-99, 1791 (i).
- Domville, Lt.-Col., Retirement of, Reps., &c. (M. for copy\*) 2760 (i).
- Duty, Per Cent of collected, 1890-99 (Ques.) 2367, 2459 (i).
- Eastern Extension Ry. Co.'s Arbitration, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 10031 (iii).
- Electoral Frauds, Judicial Commission (remarks) 9681, 9905 (iii).  
*See* "Brockville," &c.
- Employees of Govt., Dismissal of, &c. (Ques.) 2399 (ii).
- English Trust Funds List, Admission of Can. Securities (M.) to print papers, 5727 (ii).
- Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry for, on M. for Com. of Sup., 8525 (iii).
- Estimates, The (remarks) 648 (i).
- Expenditure on Capital, 1896-99 (remarks) 2744.
- Exports and Imports for July to Jan., 1898-99, and 1899-1900, Value, Duty Collected, &c. (Ques.) 1119 (i).
- Financial Situation (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9729.
- Fire Insurance Policies, Uniform Conditions Bill, on prop. introduction (remarks) 8280 (iii).
- Franking Privilege, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3625 (ii).  
 — on Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 782 (i).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Domville*) to adjn., 782, 792 (i).
- Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5110 (ii).
- Gas Inspection Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2°, 4669; in Com., 4669 (ii).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

Gaspé Election, and Civil Servant (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7573, 7595 (iii).

See "Lemieux, Mr."

Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 2999; in Com., 3004, 3218 (i); on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 3413, 3611 (ii).

General Elections, &c. (remarks) 10308 (iii).

Gilbert Dredging Co., &c., Inquiry for Papers, 9468 (iii).

Girouard, Mr., Inquiry for Papers *re*, 7647 (ii).

Govt. Business, See "Business of the Hse."

Govt. Rys., Steel Rails supplied, Tenders, Quantities and Prices, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 168 (i).

— Inquiry for Ret., 2422, 2996 (i).

See "I.C.R."

Grain Inspection Act B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on Sen. Amts., 8936 (iii).

Harbour Works, St. John, Forfeited Deposits (remarks) 10030, 10186 (iii).

Hay Purchases for Imp. Govt., Inquiry for Ret., 6916 (ii), 7513 (iii).

See "South African War," &c.

Hopewell Cape and Hopewell Mail Service, Contracts, Tenders, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 1012 (i).

Hutton, Gen., Departure from Can. on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 341 (i).

Hutton-Hughes Cor., Inquiry for Ret., 2993 (i).

Indian Treaty, Saskatchewan Indians, Total Cost (Ques.) 2195 (i).

I. C. R., Additional Officials since 1896 (Ques.) 3443 (ii).

— Collections made and accounted for (M. for Ret.\*) 4754 (ii).

— C. P. R. Traffic Arrangements, *Cor. re* (M. for copies\*) 167 (i).

— Inquiry for copies, 2996 (i).

— Defective Car Wheels under Wagner Cars (Ques.) 3445 (ii).

— Dismissal of Mr. Archibald, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 1997 (i).

— G.T.R. Claim of Freight Charges (Ques.) 4915 (ii).

— Sidings in Cape Breton (remarks) 9791.

— Tenders for Fencing (Ques.) 4914 (ii).

See "Govt. Rys."

Interior Dept. Dismissals, &c., Inquiry for Return, 7317 (iii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 9130; in Com., 9146; on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 9340; on Sen. Amts., 10081 (iii).

Labour Commission, B.C., Amount expended (Ques.) 2195 (i).

Labour Troubles, See "Conciliation," &c.

Land Subsidies to Rys., O.C., &c. (Ques.) 2179.

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on Sen. Amts., 8089 (iii).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

Lemieux, Asst. Inspector of Customs, Montreal, and Magdalen Island Elections, Investigation, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 470 (i).

— Inquiry for Rep., 2422, 2996 (i), 3478 (ii).

See "Gaspé."

Liquor in Militia Canteens, Regulations, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 201 (i).

Lobster Investigation, Amount expended (Ques.) 2195 (i).

Long Wharf, St. John, Construction of Warehouse (Ques.) 2403 (i).

— Cost of Removal, &c. (Ques.) 2362 (i).

Mail Mileage in years ending 1890 and 1893 (Ques.) 2169 (i).

See "Ry. Mail," &c.

Members Right to vote, Ruling of Mr. Speaker asked for, 9680 (iii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden*, *King's*) in Com., 6453, 6464 (ii).

— Commanding Officer, Tenure of Command, &c. (Ques.) 2173 (i).

— Service Limit for Commanding Officers (Ques.) 1465 (i).

— Staff Course, Kingston, Inquiry for Ret., 2422, 2740 (i).

See "R.M.C."

Money Subsidies to Rys., Rates, &c. (Ques.) 2180.

Montreal Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1297 (i).

N. W. Rebellion—Land Grants to Militia Force B. 107 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 4668 (ii).

Norton Station, N.B., Postmaster. Dismissal of Mr. McCready (Ques.) 5896 (ii).

Oak Point, N.B., Construction of Lighthouse (Ques.) 3444, 3774 (ii).

Oliver Equipment, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2364 (i).

See "Adams," &c.

Orford Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1728 (i).

Ottawa and Hull Conflagration. See Supply B. 147.

— Relief Fund Vote (remarks) 5807 (ii).

Paris Exposition, Cold Storage for Can. Exhibits (remarks) 5392 (ii).

— Speeches of Hon. Mr. Tarte (remarks) 7511, 8654 (iii).

See "Tarte, Hon. Mr."

Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 6948 (ii).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8083 (iii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5145, 5150 (ii); on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 8936 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 9332; on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 9691; on M. for Com., 9799; in Com., 9817 (iii).

P. O. Dept. (M.) to Print Accounts, 7206 (iii).

— Expenditures, &c. (Ques.), 9795, 10303 (iii).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

- Preferential Trade with G. B. (amt.) to amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2316 (i).  
 ——— Order (Ques. of) Irrelevancy of Deb., 2339 (i).  
 P. E. I. Murray Harbour Branch Ry. B. 182 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 8939 (iii).  
 Procedure in asking Questions (remarks) 2183, 2368 (i).  
 Prohibition Commission, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1980 (i).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 9043, 9051 (iii).  
 ——— on M. to adjn. Deb. (Mr. *Godbout*) 4140.  
 ——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8978 (iii).  
 ——— (remarks) 4101 (ii).  
 ——— Number of Officials, Total Expense, &c. (Ques.) 2180 (i).  
 Public Accounts Com., Meeting, &c. (remarks) 1388, 2741 (i).  
 Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 112 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 5169 (ii).  
 Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 2183, 2368 (i).  
 Railway Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9361 (iii).  
 ——— Mail Service, &c., Additions from 1890 to 1896 (Ques.) 2166 (i).  
     *See* "Mail," &c.  
 Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) on prop. Res. 9910, 9915; in Com. on Res., 9952-10000; on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 10190 (iii).  
 ——— Inquiry for, 8935 (iii).  
 Rainy River Ry. Co., Contracts with (Ques.) 4077 (ii).  
 Repts., Deptl. (inquiry) 816 (i), 3990 (ii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1253 (i), (amt. 6 m. h.) 1255; in Com., 1403 (i).  
 ——— Order (Ques. of) 1251 (i).  
 ——— on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1227, 1557 (i).  
 Restigouche Ry. Co., Rep. of Engineers *re* Cost (M. for Ret. \*) 2201 (i).  
 Returns (inquiries) 1555, 1724, 1876, 2996 (i), 3479, 3639, 4145, 4662, 6567 (ii), 6992, 7120, 7317, 7651, 8216, 8437, 9525 (iii).  
 Returns, Inquiry for, Ministerial Responsibility 6783 (ii).  
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 8526 (iii).  
 ——— M. to print, 6990 (iii).  
 ——— Mr. *Ogilvie's* Report, &c., Inquiry for 8284 (iii).  
 ——— *Richelieu* Bridge, Inquiry for, 8081, 8795, 8933, 9062 (iii).  
*Richelieu* River Bridge, Repts. *re*, on M. for copies, 4753 (ii).  
 Royal Military College, Applicants for Staff Course (Ques.) 2163 (i).  
 ——— Selection of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 1110 (i).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

- Royal Military College (M. for cor., &c.) 1012 (i).  
 ——— *See* "Militia," &c.  
 Round Hill Postmaster, Salary Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 9796 (iii).  
 St. John's Customs Collector, *par.* in *Canada Francais* (remarks) 9853 (iii).  
 St. John, N.B., Harbour Works, Forfeiture of Deposits, &c. (remarks) 10030, 10186 (iii).  
     *See* "Long Wharf."  
 St. Lawrence Canals, Contracts suspended or cancelled, &c. (Ques.) 2823 (i).  
 ——— Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2403 (i).  
 ——— 14-ft. Navigation, Completion and Expenditure (Ques.) 739 (i).  
 Scrap Iron, Quantities sold, Tenders, &c. (M. for Ret.) 2761 (i).  
 Seed Grain Indebtedness B. 143 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 5143 (ii).  
 Silver Lead Ore, Bounty Regulations (M. for Ret.) 1013 (i).  
 Soulanges Canal, Stewart's Claim (inquiry for papers) 9790 (iii).  
 South African War, Bathurst P.O., Hoisting of Flag (remarks) 1124 (i), 6447 (ii), 6994 (iii).  
 ——— Can. Contingents, Inquiry for Papers, &c. 1211 (i).  
 ——— Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers, B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 1155, 1168, 1185; in Com. on B., 1643, 2001 (i).  
 ——— expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4438 (ii).  
 ——— men left at Halifax to care for sick horses (remarks) 489 (i).  
 ——— names of staff officers, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 470 (i).  
 ——— Emergency Rations, Rep. of Analyst, on Ques. of Order, 7541, 7548 (iii).  
 ——— analyses, &c. (remarks) 7885 (iii).  
 ——— appmnt. of day for discussion (remarks) 8934 (iii).  
 ——— customs duty at Montreal (remarks) 7863.  
 ——— inquiry for papers, 7120 (iii).  
 ——— instructions, &c., on amt. (Mr. *Monk*) to Com. of Sup., 7516 (iii).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 6811, 6886 (ii).  
 ——— on M. to print Rep. of Com., 8651 (iii).  
 ——— papers laid on Table (remarks) 7212 (iii).  
 ——— on Ques. of Order, 6839 (ii).  
 ——— on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Monk*) 7306 (iii).  
 ——— Flags on Public Buildings (remarks) 1124 (i), 6447 (ii), 6994 (iii).  
 ——— Hay purchased for Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 7314 (iii).  
 ——— *See* "Hay," &c.  
 ——— Horses and Hay purchased for Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 6350 (ii).  
 ——— Postage on Letters (remarks) 651 (i).  
 Standard Oil Co., Prices, &c. (remarks) 5398 (ii).  
 Steel Rails, Contract for Supplies, Inquiry for Ret. 2996 (i).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.***

Statutory Increases in Civil Service for 1898-1900, Names, &c. (M. for Ret.) 168 (i).

Supply B. 147 (Mr. *Fielding*) in *Com.*, 4458 (ii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Administration of Justice*: (enforcement of alien labour law) 6430 (ii), 9776 (iii); Exchequer Court (Registrar's salary) 6438 (ii); (P. Mungovan, &c.) 8128 (iii); Supreme Court (library improvements) 6436 (ii).

*Agriculture* (census) 7642; (cold storage, &c.) 7619; (*Patent Record*) 7199; (Paris exposition) 7178 (iii).

*Canals*: Chambly (drainage, &c.) 8915; Culbute (damages, &c.) 8913; Farran's Point (enlargement) 8880; Galops (channel) 8157; (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 9187, 9415, 10141, 10150; Grenville (enlargement) 8880; Lachine (dredging) 8154; (dredge vessels) 8880; (electric lighting) 8156; (lock construction) 8154; (quadrant pontoon gate) 8155; Lake St. Louis, 8157, 8879; North Channel (forming) 8881; (repairs, &c.) 9496; St. Lawrence River (gas buoys) 8885, 9426; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 8153; Soulanges (construction) 8153, 8888, 8908; (Stewart's claim) 10150; (repairs, &c.) 9496; Trent (construction) 8158 (iii).

*Civil Govt.*: Aud. Gen.'s Office, 7506; Customs (salaries) 6044 (ii); Geological Survey (salaries) 7303; Gov. Gen.'s Sec's. Office, 7506; (High Commissioner's Office) 9604; Indian Affairs (J. D. McLean) 10279 (iii); Inland Revenue (contingencies) 6022; (salaries) 6021; (absent Minister) 6536; (clerical assistance) 6682; (Mr. Rothwell's salary) 6535, 6553 (ii); (salaries) 7820 (iii); Ques. of order, 6523 (ii); Justice (Hector Verrett) 10277; Militia (Devlin, Dr., prosecution) 10284; Post Office (statutory increases) 10274; Printing and Stationery, 10278; Privy Council Office, 7507; (contingencies) 8147; Public Works (salaries) 7847; Railways and Canals (salaries) 8150; Sec. of State (clerkships, &c.) 10278; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 9555 (iii).

*Culling Timber*, 6031 (ii).

*Customs*: N.S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 9506 (iii).

*Dominion Lands* (inspector's salaries) 7057; (L. E. Fontaine) 7827; (surveys, &c.) 7062 (iii).

*Dominion Police* (retiring allowances, &c.) 8132 (iii).

*Excise* (collectors' allowances) 6029; (methylated spirits) 6030; (preventive service) 6026 (ii).

*Fisheries* (cold storage) 5959, 5978, 6004; (Dom. and Provincial claims) 5926; (hatcheries) 5936; (inspectors, &c.) 5934; (protection service) 5957 (ii).

*Govt. of N.W.T.* (insane patients) 6683; (restoration of public works) 6691; (school grants) 6686; Unorganized Districts (schools, &c.) 6689 (ii).

*Govt. of the Yukon Territory* (salaries, &c.) 6977, 6980 (ii).

*Indians*: B. C. (inspector's salary) 7303; (relief of distress, &c.) 8123; (surveys commission) 7302; Man. and N.W.T. (destitute and working Indians) 8125; (general expenses) 8125; (triennial clothing) 7296 (iii).

*Inland Revenue*: Weights and Measures (salaries) 6032 (ii).

*Inspection of Staples* (elevator commission expenses) 7832 (iii).

*Interior* (distressed settlers) 10283; Grand Falls road) 9777; (mining regulations) 10283.

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*****SUPPLY—*Con.***

*Legislation*: General (law reports printing, &c.) 8149, 8150 (iii); House of Commons (debates) 5923, (ii) 8149; (extra clerks, &c.) 8148; (Plebiscite vote) 8136; (Sergeant-at-Arms) 8149 (iii); (sessional clerks) 5923 (ii); (sessional indemnities) 8136 (iii); (sessional messengers) 5923; (stationery) 5924 (ii); (voters' lists) 9605; Library of Parliament (contingencies) 8150 (iii); (sessional messengers) 5924; Senate (debates) 5923 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 8148 (iii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, salaries, &c.) 3664; (Lurher Shoal Light, construction) 3672; (maintenance, &c.) 3645 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (G. B. and Can.) 9556, 9576; (G. B. and St. John) 9577; (Halifax and Porto Rico) 9598; (Halifax, Nfld. and G. B.) 9578; (Magdalen Islands) 9583 (iii); (Murray Bay and River Ouelle) 9603; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 9597; (Quebec and Manchester) 9588 (iii).

*Militia* (annual drill) 8286; (arms, ammunition, &c.) 8344; (Esquimalt Defences) 8342; (miscellaneous) 8337; (pay, allowance) 8286; South African War (Halifax garrison) 9772; Yukon (field force) 9775; (N. W. M. P. supplies) 9774 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (Banff bridge repairs) 7074, 7831; (B. C. labour troubles) 8146; (boundary surveys, &c.) 7066; (Can. Law Library, Eng.) 8140; (distressed settlers, N.W.T.) 7076, 7490; (expenses re counterfeiter) 8143; (Govt. of Keewatin) 7074; (half-breed commissions) 7066; (Henry A. Quinn, rebellion services, &c.) 8138; Interior (seed grain to settlers) 7828; (portraits of Hon. Messrs. Mackenzie and Thompson) 8136; Queen vs. British American Bank Note Co.) 8140; (roads and bridges at Banff, N. W. T.) 7074, 7831; (Ville Marie Bank officials) 8145; (Wentworth vs. Mathieu) 8138; (Yukon and B.C. survey) 7074 (iii).

*Mounted Police*: Yukon (compensation for mail service) 9779 (iii).

*Ottawa and Hull Appropriation* (relief fund) 4339 (ii).

*Penitentiaries*, Dorchester, 10277 (iii); (investigations) 6968; Kingston, 6440, 6889; (binder twine) 6890 (ii), 8133 (iii); Manitoba, 6975; (St. Vincent de Paul) 6893; (investigations) 6895, 6959 (ii).

*Post Office*: (franking privileges, &c.) 10271; (mail service) 8657, 8683, 8720 (iii); (Woodstock, dismissal of postmaster) 10271 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings (armouries) 9893; (artesian wells) 9892; B. C. (Kamloops, post office) 7927; (Nelson post office) 7927; (New Westminster post office) 7929; (Rossland post office) 7929; Dom. (salaries, &c.) 9893; (water rates) 7939; (experimental farms) 7930; (generally) 7929; Int. Dept. (steel file cases) 9895; N.W.T. (Lt. Gov.'s residence) 7926; N.S. (Digby P.O.) 7870; (Halifax public building) 9871; (Springhill post office) 7877; (Brockville drill hall) 7916, 10264; (Deseronto post office) 9884; (London drill hall) 7916; Ottawa, 7932; (customs offices) 9888; (heating, &c.) 7937; (militia stores) 7847; (Rideau Hall) 7835; (Rideau Hall fire protection) 9889; (steel shelvings) 7939; (Sarnia post office) 7917; (Toronto, automobile cars) 9885; (Toronto junction public building) 9885; (Windsor drill hall) 9889; Que. (Buckingham post office) 9876; (Drummondville post office) 9876; (Granby post office) 9878; Hochelaga post office) 9878 (iii); (Hull

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

*Public Works—Con.*

post office) 4344 (ii); (Victoriaville post office) 9876; (Quebec cartridge factory) 9877; Yukon (rent, fuel, &c.) 7839, 10257; Harbours and Rivers (maintenance of dredges) 7857; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 7848; N.B. (Cape Tormentine breakwater) 7946; (Chance harbour breakwater) 9900; (Dipper harbour) 9900; (Dorchester breakwater) 9901; N.S. (Gabarus breakwater) 9895; (Ingonish breakwater) 7940; (Livingstone's Cove wharf) 9895; (Porter's Lake dredging) 9896; Ont. (Port Burwell) 10234; (Rainy River Lock) 7864; (Toronto harbour works) 10238; P. E. I. (Cance Cove breakwater) 9898; (China Point pier) 7943; Que. (Chicoutimi wharf) 10203; (Coteau du Lac wharf) 10097; (Coteau Landing dredging) 10222; (Isle Verte wharf) 10208; (Magdalen Islands breakwater) 7949; (Maria wharf) 10196; (Newport breakwater) 7949; (Percé wharf) 7950; (removal of rocks, &c.) 7949; (St. Lambert protection walls) 10218; (Saguenay River dredging) 10207; (Soulanges canal wharf) 10097; Quarantine Stations (Str. *Challenge*) 7835 (iii); Roads and Bridges, Ont. (Chaudière Bridge) 4345 (ii); Yukon, Telegraph lines (Bennett, Dawson and Atlin) 7843; (Yukon and Lewes River improvements) 7840 (iii).

*Quarantine* (public health regulations) 9199; *Organized Districts* (tuberculosis) 7174 (iii).

*Railways*: I.C.R., 8374; (air brakes) 9456; (bridges) 9455; (draw-bars) 9456; (engine houses) 9432; (free passes) 9430; (Galena Oil Co.'s contract) 10184; (Halifax cotton factory branch) 9437; (rolling stock) 9458; (sidings in Cape Breton) 8921; (Stellarton sidings) 9447; *Miscellaneous* (salaries, &c.) 8916; P.E.I. (working expenses) 9505 (iii).

*Scientific Institutions* (Meteorological service) 5926 (ii).

*Yukon* (administration of justice) 9777; (living allowances, &c.) 7832; *Miscellaneous* (Can. Bank of Commerce) 9608, 9611; Mounted Police, 7077; (mail service) 9779 (iii).

Supreme Court of the N.W.T. B. 90 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 3607 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. Mr., Proposed Return (remarks) 9681 (iii).

— Speeches of in France (remarks) 8654 (iii).

See "Paris Exposition."

Timber Licenses, &c., on Ques. of Order, 7263-70 (iii).

Toronto Members, Payments to from 1879 to 1897 (remarks) 5888 (ii).

Trade and Commerce, Inquiry for Rep., 1641 (i).

Trade and Nav. Returns, &c. (inquiry) 867, 1009.

Trade Disputes. See "Conciliation," &c.

Trinidad and U. S. Treaty (remarks) 3673 (ii).

Tyrwhitt, Mr., late M. P., Decease of (remarks) 8187 (iii).

U. S. Steamers, Inspection Exemption (remarks) 209 (i).

U. S. Vessels and Coasting Privileges on Can. Lakes, Reps., O. C.'s, &c. (M. for copies\*) 167.

See "Coasting Privileges," &c.

Ville Marie Bank, Monthly Stmnts. from July 1, 1892 (M. for Ret.\*) 1011 (i).

**Foster, Hon. G. E.—Con.**

Welland Canal, Dynamite Explosion (remarks) 4068 (ii).

White, Lt.-Col., Retirement, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 3113 (i).

Yarmouth SS. and Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B., on M. (Mr. *Flint*) to suspend Rules, 8279 (iii).

Yukon—Administration of, on amt. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) to Com. of Sup., 8606 (iii).

— (remarks) 8547 (iii).

— on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 959.

— Order, Ques. of, 8559, 8568 (iii).

— and B. C. Mail Service, Contracts, Routes, Amounts paid, &c., for years 1898, 1899 (M. for Ret.\*) 168 (i).

— Clement, Pattullo and Ridley, Details of Amounts collected (M. for Ret.\*) 2201 (i).

— Council, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 7880, 7968 (iii).

— Dawson City, Population, &c. (Ques.) 591.

— Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co., Govt. Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1007 (i).

— Girouard, Mr., Inquiry for papers *re*, 7647.

— Gold Claims given in Compensation, &c., Cor., &c., with Govt. (M. for Ret.\*) 2201 (i).

— Liquor Permits granted by Govt., &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 168, 2202 (i).

— Mail Contracts now current, Inquiry for Ret., 2996 (i).

— Mail Service—Appropriation Act, 1899 (remarks) 9798 (iii).

— Military Barracks, Cost of Erection, &c. (Ques.) 1111 (i).

— Militia Forces, Number and Distribution (Ques.) 437 (i).

— Mounted Police, Number, Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 591 (i).

— Ogilvie's Rep. (inquiry) 8284 (iii).

— Postal Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 9792 (iii).

— Representation Bill, Cor. *re* (remarks) 3673 (ii).

— Representation in Dom. Parl., on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7779 (iii).

— O. C.'s respecting Living Allowances (M. for Stmnt.\*) 2201 (i).

— Returns, Incomplete (remarks) 7207 (iii).

— Royalties, Charges against Mr. McDonald, on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7709 (iii).

— Telegraph Supplies, &c., Question of Order, 8283 (iii).

— Transfer of Mining Claims (Ques.) 2753 (i).

— Transport of Troops, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1113 (i).

**Fraser, Mr. D. C., Guysborough.**

Anderson, J. W., Patent Relief B. 108 (Mr. *Cargill*) on M. for Com., 5168 (ii).

British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co., Change of Title (B. 20) 1\*, 470 (i).

**Fraser, Mr. D. C.—Con.**

- Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5547 (ii).  
 Budget, The, 4274 (ii).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7036 (iii).  
 Committees, Sittings during Sessions of the Hse. (M.) 8160 (iii).  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 8418 (iii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5702, 5913; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (amt.) 6309 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6730 (ii), 8833 (iii).  
 Dom. Oil Pipe Line and Mfg. Co.'s (B. 37) 1<sup>ca</sup>, 577 (i).  
 Franking Privileges, O. C. Respecting, Violation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Domville*) to adjn., 804 (i).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5135, 5880 (ii).  
 Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2482 (i).  
 Grain Inspection Act B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbiniere*) in Com., 5800 (ii).  
 Holiness Movement Church incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2668 (i).  
 Land Titles Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 475 (i).  
 Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden*, *King's*) in Com., 6457 (ii).  
 Montreal Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1375 (i).  
 Nova Scotia Steel Co.'s (B. 24) 1<sup>ca</sup>, 471 (i).  
 Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6943 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 9820 (iii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 9052 (iii).  
 Pub. Accts. Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 9684. — (M.) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. and Pub. Accts. to Sel. Com., 1108 (i).  
 Restigouche and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (Mr. *McAlister*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 3415 (ii).  
 Servis Railroad Tie-Plate Co. of Can. (Ltd.) Patent Relief (B. 93) 1<sup>ca</sup>, 1975; on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2672 (i).  
 South African War—Emergency Rations, Instructions, &c., on amt. (Mr. *Monk*) to Com. of Sup., 7543 (iii).  
 SUPPLY:  
 Govt. of the Yukon Territory (salaries, &c.) 6984, 6985 (ii).  
 Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Sarnia post office) 7920 (iii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbiniere*) in Com., 7135 (iii).  
 Yukon, Administration of, on amt. (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) to Com. of Sup., 8638 (iii).

**Fraser, Mr. D. C.—Con.**

- Yukon, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 987 (i).  
 — on Ques. of Order, 8561 (iii).  
 — *John C. Barr*, Undervaluation, &c., on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6673 (ii).  
 — Royalties, Charges against Mr. McDonald, on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup. 7695 (iii).  
 — Wade, Mr. F. C., Charges against, on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7141 (iii).

**Fraser, Mr. J., East Lambton.**

- Can. and Manchester S.S. Line, Subsidies paid, &c. (Ques.) 1976 (i).  
 Can. and W. Indies, Transportation Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 1883 (i).  
 C.P.R., Reduction of Rates, Provisions *re* (Ques.) 2363 (i).  
 Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 9 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4784 (ii).  
 Flour Exports from Can. (Ques.) 1882 (i).  
 — Imports into B. West Indies (Ques.) 1881.  
 Homestead Entries, Man. and N.W.T., Number, &c. (Ques.) 2363 (i).  
 I.C.R., Mileage of Main Line and Branches (Ques.) 2172 (i).  
 Land Patents and Mineral Rights (Ques.) 2171.  
 Yukon, Bennett and Dawson Mail Service (Ques.) 2157 (i).

**Frost, Mr. F. T., Leeds and Grenville.**

- Binder Twine, Sale and Manufacture of, on amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 6215 (ii).  
 Cold Storage on Steamships, in Com. on Res., 4862 (ii).  
 Ottawa, Brockville and New York Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 120) 1<sup>ca</sup>, 2827 (i).  
 South African War, Canadian Contingent, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1094 (i).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbiniere*) in Com. (amt.) 6925 (ii).

**Ganong, Mr. G. W., Charlotte.**

- Brown, Bart. and Isaac Dick, Dismissal by Govt. (M. for papers, &c. \*) 1012 (i).  
 Budget, The, 4500 (ii).  
 Campobello Island Fish Weirs, Licenses, &c. (Ques.) 594 (i).  
 See "Frye's Head."  
 Fishing Bounty Cheques, Distribution (Ques.) 3263 (i).  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 2355 (i).  
 Frye's Head, Campobello, Application of Goff & Batson for Weir privileges (M. for Papers, &c. \*) 1012, 2202 (i).  
 See "Campobello."

**Ganong, Mr. G. W.—*Con.***

- Glass, James, Fishery Guardian, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 596 (i).
- Grand Manan and Mainland Steam Service, Names of Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 9061 (iii).
- Lighthouse, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 6788.
- SS. Service, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 596 (i).
- Wharf, Pets., &c., *re* (M. for Copies\*) 1012 (i).
- Mispec River, Construction of Dam, &c. (Ques.) 7122 (iii).
- New Brunswick Local Elections, Letter *re* Wilson's Beach Breakwater (Ques.) 740 (i).
- Paris Exposition, Fisheries Commissioner (Ques.) 1460 (i).
- Officials appointed by Govt. (Ques.) 2400.
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4115 (ii).
- Returns, Inquiry for, 5521, 6788, 6917 (ii).
- Seal Cove, Grand Manan, Erection of Lights, &c. (M. for Rep.\*) 1012 (i).
- Life Saving Station, Equipment, &c. (Ques.) 594 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campobello breakwater) 7945 (iii).
- Ways and Means*, The Tariff, in Com., 8038 (iii).
- Weights and Measures (sale of fish) Act Amt. (B. 64) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 1287 (i).
- Wilson's Beach Breakwater, Repairs and Reps. of Engineers (M. for copies, &c.\*) 1012 (i).

**Gauthier, Mr. J., *L'Assomption.***

- Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co. Subsidy (Ques.) 4075 (ii).

**Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.***

- I.C.R., LeBlond, E., Claim for killing Horse (Ques.) 2182 (i).
- Mail Service below Rivière du Loup (Ques.) 1114 (i).
- Rivière du Loup Station, Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 1006 (i).
- workshops (M. to adjn.) 5516 (ii).
- Sale of Newspapers, Contract, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 5889 (ii).
- St. Eloi Ballast Ground, Tenure, &c. (Ques.) 7416 (iii).
- Schreiber, Mr., Dep. Min. Rys. and Canals, Charges against, 10423 (iii).
- Weights and Measures, Inspectors' Fees, &c. (Ques.) 1553 (i).

**Geoffrion, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.***

- Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 15 (i).
- Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9994 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

- Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (St. Lambert protection walls) 10218 (iii).

**Gibson, Mr. W., *Lincoln and Niagara.***

- Auer Light Patentees, Complaints against *re* excessive Charges (M. for Ret.\*) 2760 (i).
- See "Patent," &c.
- Brandon and South-western Ry. Co's., B. 25 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 2411 (i).
- Budget, The, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn. Deb., 4434 (ii).
- Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 100) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2147 (i).
- Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s (B. 171) 1<sup>st</sup>, 6349 (ii); in Com., 9406, 9687 (iii).
- See "G. T. R. & C. V. R."
- Civil Service Act. Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7027 (iii).
- Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3233 (i).
- G. T. R. and Central Vermont Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to suspend Rule, 6246 (ii).
- Ont. and Rainy Ry. Co's. (B. 136) 1<sup>st</sup>, 3673. (ii).
- Paper Combine, proposed Reduction of Duty (remarks) 4805 (ii).
- Patent Act Amt. B. (106) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2457 (i).
- B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 6938 (ii).
- Patent Act (Auer Light) Amt. B., M. for leave to introduce Bill, 1641 (i).
- Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 5884 (ii).
- Railway Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9363 (iii).
- Railway Subsidies, Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res. 9954, 9996 (iii).
- Representation in the H. of C., B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 1639 (i).
- South African War, Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers, B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 1204 (i).

## SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (historical data) 6346 (ii).
- Canals*: Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 10130, 10154, 10165; Lachine (rebuilding walls) 8522; Soulanges (construction) 8894, 8902, 8923; (Stewart's claim) 10154, 10165; Welland (docking, &c.) 8521 (iii).
- Miscellaneous* (distressed settlers, N. W. T.) 7497; (Dunkin Act expenses) 8139 (iii).
- Ottawa and Hull Appropriation* (relief fund) 4340 (ii).
- Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Rainy River lock) 7862 (iii).
- Welland Canal, Dynamite Explosion (remarks) 4146 (ii).
- Yukon—*John C. Barr*, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to print papers, 4900 (ii).

**Gillies, Mr. J. A., *Richmond (N.S.)***

- Alaska and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1<sup>st</sup>, 649 (i).
- Arichat, Collector of Customs, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 816 (i).
- Brown, late Alfred, Appnmt. of Successor (Ques.) 2836, 3049 (i).
- Canso and St. Peters Ry., Contracts for Construction (Ques.) 479 (i).

**Gillies, Mr. J. A.—Con.**

- Chapel Cove, Breakwater, Erection of by Govt. 1121 (i).
- Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. 5912 (ii).
- Dom Elections Act Amt., B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7331, 8301, 8864; on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 9478 (iii).
- Edwards & Co., Timber Licenses (Ques.) 7121.
- Emigration Agent, Mr. C. A. Devlin, Date of Appmnt., &c. (Ques.) 6776 (ii).
- Fish Hatchery, C. B., Sale, &c. (remarks) 6783 (ii).
- Gaspé Election and Customs Official, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7591 (iii).
- Hawkesbury and Louisburg Ry., Subsidies, &c. (remarks) 9467 (iii).
- Indian Lands, Timber Licenses, Dues, &c. (Ques.) 6777 (ii).
- I. C. R., Accommodation at Sydney, &c. (Ques.) 296 (i).
- Freight Delays, on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 3270 (i).
- Receipts at Sydney (Ques.) 9797 (iii).
- (M. for Ret. \*) 319 (i).
- Train Service on C. B. Division (M.) to adjn., 7975 (iii).
- Sydney and N. Sydney, Tickets issued, &c. (Ques.) 150 (i).
- Sydney Board of Trade, Pets., &c. *re* Train Service (M. for Ret. \*) 1012 (i).
- Isle Madam Ry., Subsidy by Govt. (Ques.) 593.
- James Beckwith*, Schooner. Payment of Fishing Bounty (Ques.) 6058 (ii).
- (remarks) 6353 (ii).
- N. S. Rys., Refund of Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 1464.
- Port Mulgrave and St. Peters Mail Service (remarks) 7421 (iii).
- Public Works in Provs. of Can., Inquiry for Ret. 9684 (iii).
- Returns, (inquiry) 8437 (iii).
- *re* I. C. R. Earnings, &c., 1555 (i).
- Sampson, J. Payment of Fishing Bounty (Ques.) 8429 (iii).
- Sheehan, Jacob, Payment of Fishing Bounty (Ques.) 6058 (ii).
- South African War, Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 1192 (i).
- Recruiting Stations, N.S., &c. (Ques.) 10303 (iii).
- SUPPLY :
- Canals*: St. Peters (repairs, &c.) 9498 (iii).
- Customs*: N. S. (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 9507 (iii).
- Indian Affairs* (schools, Mar. Provs.) 7282 (iii).
- Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Halifax, Nfld. and G. B.) 9581; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 9597; (Port Mulgrave and Marble Mountain) 9595 (iii).
- Miscellaneous* (distressed settlers, N.W.T.) 7505.

**Gillies, Mr. J. A.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

- Public Works*: Buildings, Ont. (Sarnia post office) 7921; Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (New Harbour breakwater) 7941; (River John wharf) 7942 (iii).
- Railways*: I. C. R. (engine houses) 9434; (Halifax cotton factory branch) 9437; Sydney accommodation) 9440 (iii).
- Timber Licenses, Sums paid, &c. (Ques.) 7881.
- Tobacco, Abolition of Duties, on amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) to Com. of Sup., 7910 (iii).
- on Notice of M., 1009 (i).
- Duty, Amount collected in 1899 (Ques.) 3177, 3261 (i).
- Reduction of Duties (prop. Res.) 1499 (i).
- U. S. and G. B., Imports, &c., Amount, &c. (Ques.) 7654 (iii).
- Western Counties Ry., &c., Refund of Subsidies (Ques.) 1121 (i).

**Gilmour, Mr. J., East Middlesex.**

- Can. Permanent Corps, Pension System, &c. (Ques.) 1115 (i).
- See* "Permanent," &c.
- Companies Clauses Act Amt. (B. 32) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 510 (i); 2<sup>d</sup> m., 4799; *ref. to Sel. Com.*, 4800 (ii).
- Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5706 (ii).
- Fire Insurance Policies, Uniform Conditions (remarks) 10035 (iii).
- Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5854, 5876 (ii).
- India, Famine, Can. Contributions, &c. (remarks) 3876 (ii).
- Permanent Corps, Reduction of Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1743, 2164 (i).
- SUPPLY :
- Legislation*: H. of C. (voters' lists) 10329 (iii).
- Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 4674 (ii).

**Gould, Mr. I. J., West Ontario.**

- Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 10 (i).
- SUPPLY :
- Public Works*: Buildings (armouries) 9894 (iii).

**Guillet, Mr. G., West Northumberland (O.)**

- Banks, Powers of (Ques.) 2748 (i).
- Can. National and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 6598 (ii).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8096 (iii).
- Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5117, 5132 (ii).
- (remarks) 10505 (iii).
- Mounted Infantry, Establishment of Units (Ques.) 3040 (i).
- Reports, Deptl., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4166 (ii).
- San José Scale Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 3167 (i).

**Guillet, Mr. G.—Con.**

South African War—Can. Contingent, Inducements to settle in South Africa (Ques.) 5395 (ii).

— Pay to Volunteers, B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 1158, 1178 (i).

**Haggart, Hon. J. G., South Lanark.**

Anderson, J.W. Patent Relief B. 108 (Mr. *Cargill*) on M. for Com., 5166 (ii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 192, (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10189 (iii).

Brandon and Southwestern Railway Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 2413 (i).

Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 1039 (i).

— on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn., 5745 (ii).

Business of the Hse—Unopposed Motions, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 2081 (i).

Can. Govt. Rys., Tenders for Locomotives and Rolling Stock (M. for ret. \*) 4078 (ii).

C. P. R. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Macdonell*) in Com., 2652; on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to M. for 3°, 2657; on amt. (Mr. *Rutherford*) to M. for 3°, 2666 (i).

Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s B. 171 (Mr. *Gibson*) in Com., 9396, 9686 (iii).

See "G. T. R."

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 5227 (ii).

Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 3421 (ii).

Companies Clauses Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8952 (iii).

Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 197 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10506 (iii).

Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 89 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 3610 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4702 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6752 (ii), 8846; Sen. Amts., 10454 (iii).

Foreign Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 142 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2°, 4682 (ii).

Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5128 (ii).

See "General Inspection."

Franchise Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1°, 2355 (i).

Franking Privilege, O. C. Respecting, Violation, on M. (Mr. *Demville*) to adjn., 787 (i).

Gas Inspection Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4670 (ii).

Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 3003; in Com., 3016 (i).

General Inspection (grade for flax seed) Act Amt. B. 79 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4672 (ii).

**Haggart, Hon. J. G.—Con.**

Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 10422 (iii).

Grain Inspection Act B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 6292 (ii).

See "Foreign."

Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 817 (i).

G. T. R. and Central Vermont Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to suspend Rule 6246 (ii).

Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, Allegations against Mr. C. N. Armstrong (remarks) 10312.

Juan de Fuca, Fishing Privileges in Straits (Ques.) 5756 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Sen. Amts., 10090 (iii).

I. C. R. Sale of Rolling Stock, &c. (Ques.) 4905.

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 5177 (ii).

Loan Companies Act Amt. B. 154 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5182 (ii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden*, King's) in Com., 6466, 6481 (ii) 9840 (iii).

Personal Explanation, par in Ottawa Citizen re Georgian Bay Canal, 2561 (i).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5154, 5161 (ii).

Postoffice Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 9819 (iii).

P. E. I. (Murray Harbour Branch) Ry. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. 8942 (iii)

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 4686, 4692 (ii); in Com., 9352; on Sen. Amts. 10422 (iii).

Rys. & Canals Deptl. Rep. (inquiry) 3990 (ii).

Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res. 9963-10028; on M. for 3°, 10192 (iii).

Subsidies bearing Interest (remarks) 5753 (ii).

Safety of Ships B. 12 (Sir *Louis Davies*) M. for 1°, 247 (i).

Seed Grain Indebtedness B. 143 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 5037 (ii).

South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 1652 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

*Administration of Justice* (Supreme Court) 6433 (ii).

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (year book) conc., 10437 (iii).

*Canals*: Beauharnois (repairs, &c.) 8931; (iii) Chambly (drainage &c.) 8914; Cornwall. (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 8504, 9419, 10113, conc., 10452; Culbute, (damages &c.) 8913; Galops (dredging) 8504; (enlargement) 8775; Grenville (guide piers) 8522; Lachine (quadrant pontoon lock) 8504; (quadrant pontoon gate) 8372; (rebuilding wall) 8522; Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 8521; North Channel (forming) 8881; Rideau (overseer's salary) 10395; St. Lawrence River (gas buoys) 8886; (St. Ours lock) 8522; Sault Ste. Marie (Ryan & Co's award) 10394; Soulanges, (construc-

**Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.***SUPPLY—*Con.**Canals—Con.*

tion) 8888, 8905, 8922; (A. Stewart's claim) 8515, 10167; Welland (Port Colborne entrance) 8520, 10397; (Port Dalhousie pier) 8521 (iii).

*Civil Government*: Agriculture (clerkships) 10287; Aud. Gen's office, 10286; Interior (salaries) 6562; Post Office (salaries) 6120; Rys. and Canals (L. K. Jones) 10285; Sec. of State (clerkships, &c.) 10278 (iii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (election frauds, judicial inquiry) 10321; (voters' lists) 10327, conc., 10452 (iii).

*Militia* (gratuities) 10357; (Halifax garrison) 10358; (rifle ranges) 10353 (iii).

*Post Office* (mail service) 8732; Miscellaneous (mail bags, &c.) 8775; Yukon (mail service) 8775; conc., 10425, 10437 (iii).

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Collingwood Harbour) 10248; (Depot Harbour breakwater) 10228; (Leamington pier) 10244; (Nation River dam) 10229; (Port Findlay wharf) 10250; (Sault Ste Marie harbour) 10250; (South Nation River improvements) 10251; Temiscamingue Lake wharfs) 10250; Que. (Cap Sante wharf) 10211; (Coteau du Lac wharf) 10099; (Gatineau River) 10226; (Greece's Point wharf) 10227; (Hull landing pier) 10226; (Maria wharf) 10202; (Richelieu River boom) 10217; (River Batiscan, dredging) 10211; (Rivière du Sud banks) 10210; (St. Lambert protection walls) 10219; (St. Roch des Aulnaies wharf) 10209; (Soulanges Canal wharf) 10099; (Yamaska Lock, damages) 10214; Yukon (roads, trails, &c.) 10257; Telegraphs (Atlin and Quesnelle) 10255 (iii).

*Railways*: Annapolis and Digby (interest on claims) 10395; I. C. R., 8385, 8454, 8471; (Amherst accommodation) 9455; (bridges) 9455; (Canso ferry service) 10390; (draw-bars) 9456; (engine-houses) 9433; (engines, tools, &c.) 10388; (Etchemin bridge) 10389; (Galena Oil Co.'s contract) 10182; (general vote) 8930; (Gov. Gen.'s car) 8916; Halifax cotton factory branch) 9436; (increased accommodation) 8785; (increased facilities) 9460, 10372; (Levis accommodation) 10388; (payment to Ralph Jones) 8917; conc., 10448; (rolling stock) 9459; (rolling stock subsidies) conc., 10449; (St. John wharf) 8372; (St. John accommodation) 10389; (steel rails, &c.) 10390; (Stellarton sidings) 9448; (working expenses) 9503; (locomotives, &c.) conc., 10439; Miscellaneous (extra clerks) 8522; (railway statistics) 8522; (Ottawa River survey) 10395 (iii).

*Unprovided Items*, 8931 (iii).

Welland Canal, Dynamite Explosion (remarks) 4148 (ii).

Yukon—Administration of, on Ques. of Order 8561 (iii).

— Coste's Rep. *re* Teslin Lake Route, on M. (Mr. Davin) for copy, 611 (i).

**Hale, Mr. F. H., *Carleton* (N.B.)**

South African War, Hay and Oats Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1479 (i).

— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* Purchase of Hay (M. for copies\*) 4078 (ii).

Vince, D. McLeod, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor., rep., &c.\*) 4078 (ii).

**Harwood, Mr. H. S., *Vaudreuil*.**

## SUPPLY:

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Graham wharf) 10221 (iii).

**Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton*.**

Agricultural Machinery, Imports, Value, &c. (Ques.) 3046 (i).

Bronte Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 2193 (i).

Budget, The, 3991 (i).

— (explanation) 4178 (ii).

— (M. to adjn. Deb.) 3985 (ii).

Business of the Hse., Dom. Day Adjnt., 8653.

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5922 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick* in Com., 6729 (ii), 7365, 8098, 8874; on Sen. Amts., 10456 (iii).

Farm Wagons, Imports, Value, &c. (Ques.) 3047.

Financial Statement of Canadian Trade, on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 10484 (iii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 2353 (i).

Franking Privilege, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3636 (ii).

French Canadians, Attack, &c., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 233 (i).

Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5107, 5113, 5838, 5889 (ii).

Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2555 (i).

Holiness Movement Church incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2667; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2670 (i).

Interior Dept., Religion of Clerks (remarks) 3467.

La Banque Jacques Cartier, Change of Title B. 67 (Mr. *Brodeur*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1685 (i).

Live Stock Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5101 (ii).

N.W.T., Subsidy voted to, Cor. between Dom. Govt. and N.W.T. Govt. re, on M. for copies (Mr. *Davin*) 3459 (ii).

Paper Combine, Proposed Reduction of Duty (remarks) 4806 (ii).

Preferential Trade with G.B., on amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2113 (i).

Privilege (Ques. of) par in Newspapers *re* Budget Speech, 4067 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4141 (ii).

— on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 9052 (iii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) on Sen. Amts., 10422 (iii).

— Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9465 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1272; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1629 (i).

**Henderson, Mr. D.—Con.**

South African War, Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 1186 ; in Com. on B., 1692 (i).

Sugar, Average Rate of Duty collected in 1899 (Ques.) 3770 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (immigration) 7199 (iii).  
*Legislation* : House of Commons (stationery) 5924 (ii) ; (voters' lists) 10328 (iii).

*Militia* (annual drill) 7202 ; (bonuses to officials) 10358 ; (medals) 8344 (iii).

*Mounted Police* (Yukon mail service) 9788 (iii).

*Penitentiaries* : Kingston (binder twine) 6892 ; St. Vincent de Paul (investigations) 6898 (ii).

*Public Works* : Buildings, Ont. (Sarnia post office) 7917 ; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Bronte harbour) 10233 ; (Collingwood harbour) 7953 (iii).

Tobacco, Abolition of Duties, on amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) to Com. of Sup., 7912 (iii).

— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4758 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2°, 4675 ; in Com., 4680, 4817, 6918, 6928 (ii), 7127 (iii).

**Heyd, Mr. C. B., South Brant.**

Budget, The, 3490 (ii).

Cattle Exports to U.S., 1890-99 (Ques.) 4242 (ii).

Preferential Trade with G.B., en amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 1625 (i).

**Holmes, Mr. R., West Huron.**

Budget, The, 4230 (ii).

Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 3438 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7384, 8829, 8853 (iii).

Fruit Inspection and Marking Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5116 (ii).

Montreal Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1380 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, en prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4109 (ii).

Reports. Deptl., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4158 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

*Legislation* : House of Commons (stationery) 5925 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com. (amt.) 6921.

— (salt packages) Amt. (B. 128) 1°, 2907 (i).

**Hurley, Mr. J. M., East Hastings.**

Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5859 (ii).

Oshawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°, 1877 (ii).

Railway Subsidies B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., on Res., 9972-3 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

*Public Works* : Buildings, Ont. (Deseronto post office) 9884 (iii).

**Ingram, Mr. A. B., East Elgin.**

Anderson, J. W., Patent Relief B. 108 (Mr. *Cargill*) on Sen. Amts., 9689 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. 6504 (ii).

Business of the Hse—Unopposed Motions, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 1960 (i).

Can. Southern Bridge Co.'s (B. 44) 1°, 649 (i).

Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 8426 ; on M. for 2°, 9379, 9390 ; in Com., 9392 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 3) 1°, 7 (i).

— B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6706 ; in Com., 6727 (ii) ; (amt.) 7323 ; in Com., 8091, 8798, 8840, 9071 (iii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 1399 (i).

Electoral Lists, Distribution, &c. (remarks) 169.

— for Ont., Printing, &c. (Ques.) 593 (i).

Franchise Act (1898) Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 143 (i).

— B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1°, 2349 (i).

Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2526, 2547 (i).

I. C. R., Freight Delays, on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 3276 (i).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 22) 1°\* 471 (i).

Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2°, 6954 (ii).

Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 10006 (iii).

Registration in Voters, Govt. Powers *re* (Ques.) 2756 (i).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 1431 (i).

Returns (inquiry) 8077, 8438 (iii).

St. Thomas, Military Parade Ground, &c., Purchase of, &c. (Ques.) 294 (i), 7122 (iii).

— cor. between Govt. and J. H. Wilson, M.D. (M. for copies) 648 (i).

— inquiry for ret., 8077 (iii).

San José Scale Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 3167 (i).

Seed Grain Indebtedness. Govtl. Action, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).

Servis Railroad Tie Plate Co.'s Patent Relief B. 93 (Mr. *Frascr*, *Guysborough*) on M. for 2° 2672 (i).

South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 1661 2005 (i).

— Strathcona's Horse, Telegram received *re* Inquiry for Relatives (remarks) 813 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Post Office* (mail service) 8750 (iii).

*Public Works* : Buildings, Ont. (St. Thomas drill hall) 9890 ; (Toronto, automobile cars) 9886 (iii).

*Railways* : I. C. R., 8385 (iii).

**Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H., K.C.M.G.,  
Portneuf.**

- Apple Barrels, &c., Standard Size, Repeal of Act (Ans.) 2461 (i).  
 Basic Slag Fertilizer (Ans.) 3173 (i), 4741, 5892, 6778 (ii).  
 Brace, R. K., Gas Inspector, P. E. I., Dismissal, &c., (Ans.) 1480 (i), 4918 (ii).  
 ——— Cor. *re* Dismissal, M. for Ret., (Mr. *Martin*) 2204 (i).  
 Customs and Inland Revenue, Amount collected (Ans.) 2180 (i).  
 Fertilizer Act (1892) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Domville*) on M. for 2°, 1974 (i).  
 ——— ref. to Com., on Agriculture and Colonization, 1974 (i).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5829 (ii).  
 Gas Inspector at Charlottetown (Ans.) 4918 (ii).  
 Gas Inspection Act Amt. (B. 78) 1°, 1641 (i); 2° m., 4669, in Com., 4670 (ii).  
 General Inspection Act (flax-seed grades) amt. (B. 79) 1°, 1641 (i); 2° m., 4671; in Com., 4672.  
 Grain Inspection Bill (remarks) 5727 (ii).  
 Grain Inspection Act (B. 141) 1°, 4333; 2° m., 5757; in Com., 5763; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6258, 6269; in Com., 6284; on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for 3°, 6298 (ii).  
 Illicit Stills, Seizure of (Ans.) 7123-4, 7655 (iii).  
 Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 938 (i).  
 Inspection of Foreign Grain (B. 142) 1°, 4333; 2° m., 4681; 3° m., 4684 (ii).  
 Lebel, Wenceslas, Emplmt. &c. (Ans.) 3773 (ii).  
 Liquor License Act (1883) Commissioners' Expenses (Ans.) 2830 (i).  
 Newfoundland and Can., Negotiations, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for copies, 2224 (i).  
 Ottawa and Hull Fire Relief Fund Vote (remarks) 5808 (ii).  
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5148 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Civil Government*: Inland Revenue (contingencies) 6022; (salaries) 6021 (ii).  
*Culling Timber*, 6031 (ii).  
*Excise* (collectors' allowances) 6029; (methylated spirits) 6030; (preventive service) 6026; (technical translation) 6029; (tobacco stamps) 6028 (ii).  
*Inland Revenue*: Inspection of Staples (hide inspector) 6040; (minor revenues) 6043;  
*Weights and Measures* (metric system) 6036; (salaries) 6032 (ii).  
 Tobacco manufactured in Can., Number of Pounds, &c. (Ans.) 2178 (i).  
 ——— Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1509 (i), 4754 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 110) 1°, 2560 (i); 2° m., 4672; in Com., 4675, 4812, 5969, 6918 (ii), 7125, 7422 (iii).  
 Whisky, &c., Quantity taken out of bond 1888-99 (Ans.) 2458 (i).

**Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., Lunenburg.**

- Can. and Porto Rico, Discriminating Duties on Fish, &c. (Ques.) 4240 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6715 (ii); in Com., 9072 (iii).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5131, 5868 (ii).  
 Gold River and Chester Basin, Buoy Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3875.  
 Halifax Harbour, Approaches, &c. on M. for Com of Sup., 7792 (iii).  
 Meat, Importations of, Quantities, &c. (Ques.) 3875 (ii).  
 Medals, Long Service and Active Militia, &c. (remarks) 10309 (iii).  
 Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden*, King's) in Com., 9841 (iii).  
 Newfoundland and Can. Negotiations, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for copies, 2217 (i).  
 ——— Inducements for Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 3875 (ii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 9037 (iii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Customs*: N.S. (contingencies) 6066 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (cold storage) 5959, 5977, 5995 (ii); (deep sea fisheries, N.S.) 10399 (iii); (Dom. and Provincial claims) 5938; (lobster regulations) 5953; (protection service) 5957 (ii).  
*Inland Revenue*: Weights and Measures (metrical instruments) 6040 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Can. and South Africa) 9590; (Halifax and Porto Rico) 9598 (iii).  
*Militia* (annual drill, ammunition, &c.) 8274; (rifle ranges) 10355 (iii).  
*Miscellaneous* (distressed settlers, N.W.T.) 7496 (iii).  
*Public Works*: Buildings (experimental farms) 7931; N.S. (Liverpool post office) 9874; Ont. (Sarnia post office) 7924; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Blue Rock breakwater) 9895; (Broad Cove breakwater) 9897; (Comeauville breakwater) 7836; (dredging at Lunenburg) 7853, 9897; (Ecum Secum wharf) 9896; (Porter's Lake dredging) 9897; (refitting *Eureka*) 7853; Telegraph Lines (P.E.I. and mainland) 8056 (iii).  
 West Indies, Trade Relations with (Ques.) 4077 (ii).

**Klock, Mr. J. B., Nipissing.**

- Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res. 9972 (iii).

**Kloepfer, Mr. C., South Wellington.**

- Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 9 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 4776 (ii).  
 South African War—Canadian Contingent, Pay of Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 1103 (i).  
 ——— Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 6866 (ii).  
 Toronto Hotel Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 4958 (ii).

**Landerkin, Mr. G., South Grey.**

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6757 (ii), 7344 (iii).

G. T. R. and Central Vermont Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to suspend Rule, 6245 (ii).

Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 812, 1108.

— (M.) to reduce time for posting, 6349 (ii).

Schomberg and Aurora Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1975 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Civil Govt.*: Interior (salaries) 6562 (ii).

*Public Works*: Buildings, Ont. (Sarnia post office) 7921 (iii).

Yukon Telegraph Supplies, Purchase by Mr. Charleson (remarks) 8284 (iii).

**LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., Provencher.**

Census of 1871-81-91, Forms Used, &c. (M. for copy\*) 1011 (i).

Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 5123, 5223 (ii).

— 6th Rep of Com., on M. to conc., 10300.

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. 6734 (ii), 9066, 9079 (iii).

Franklin, Man., Indian Reserve, and Res. of Municipality, &c. (Ques.) 5023 (ii).

Grain Commission, Death of Chairman, Delay of Report (Ques.) 289 (i).

— Rep. (M. for copy\*) 2202 (i).

Holiness Movement Church incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 2670 (i).

Mail Service, Man., Pets., &c. (Ques.) 9522 (iii).

Man. Govt., Demands for School Lands (Ques.) 3046 (i).

Man. Homestead Entry, Abuses in Administration, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 9525 (iii).

— Entries, &c. (M. for copies\*) 319 (i).

— Entries of Odd-numbered Sections (M. for Ret. \*) 1012 (i).

— School Question, Memorial of Winnipeg Catholics, &c., 9464 (iii).

Members Sessional Indemnity, Increase, &c. (remarks) 10300 (iii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 6470 (ii).

Orford Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1727 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 9047 (iii).

Provencher Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 6915 (ii).

Seed Grain Indebtedness, Govtl. Action, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1778 (i).

Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 2773 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (census) 10333; (Paris exposition) 10338 (iii).

*Immigration* (French repatriation) 10353 (iii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (stationery) 10323 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (half-breeds commission) 7067.

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Man. (Lake Dauphin) 10252; (Lake Manitoba) 10252 (iii).

**LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—Con.**

Timber Permits issued by Martin Jerome, &c. (M. for stmt. \*) 319 (i).

Voters' Lists, Man., Printing, &c. (Ques.) 3046.

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G., East Quebec.**

Additional Judges, Prov. of Quebec (Ans.) 1751.

Address, on The, 61 (i).

— consdn. (M) 6 (i).

— Precedence (M.) 7 (i).

— to Her Maj. *re* Transvaal Question, Reply (presented) 1206 (i).

— See "S. A. War," &c.

Adjournment for Ash Wednesday (remarks) 937.

— Easter (M.) 3264 (i).

— Queen's Birthday (M.) 5699, 5885 (ii).

See "Business of the House, Govt. Business."

Admiralty Act Amt. (B. 138) 1<sup>st</sup>, 3575; in Com., 5103 (ii).

Alaskan Boundary, Printing of Report *re* (remarks) 8437 (iii).

See "International."

Alien Labour Act, B.C., Enforcement by Govt. (Ans.) 597 (i).

— *re* Deportation of Mr. White (remarks) 5033 (ii).

— Enforcement by U. S., 2465 (i).

— Enforcement at Welland, 8839 (iii).

— Prosecutions, &c. (Ans.) 5896 (ii).

American Vessels and the Coasting Trade (remarks) 7321, 7512 (iii).

— See "Coasting."

Anderson, J. W., Patent Relief B. 108 (Mr. *Cargill*) on Sen. Amts., 9689 (iii).

Anticosti Island. See "Fox Bay."

Armstrong, Mr. C. N., See "Great Eastern Ry."

Arnprior P. O., Contract for Furnishing, and for laying of Asphalt Sidewalk (Ans.) 3035 (i).

Aud. Gen's. Rep., French Translation (Ans.) 1750 (i).

Basic Slag Fertilizer (Ans.) 8430 (iii).

Bertram, Mr., late M. P., Decease of (remarks) 2346 (i).

Binder Twine, Kingston Penitentiary, Advertisements of Sale (Ans.) 1008, 3039 (i).

— Extension of Time for Purchase by Farmers (Ans.) 1118, 2759 (i).

— Manufacture (Ans.) 4920 (ii).

— Price of Raw Material (Ans.) 2747 (i).

— Sales, &c. (Ans.) 2745 (i).

— Sale and Manufacture of, on amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 6238 (ii).

— Schedule of Prices, (Ans.) 1008 (i).

— Tenders (Ans.) 5515 (ii).

Borden, Lt., Decease of (remarks) 10502 (iii).

Bout de L'Isle Bridge, Subsidies promised, &c. (Ans.) 5895 (ii).

B. C. Cabinet Representation (Ans.) 1461 (i).

— Contingent and Govt. Action (remarks) 241, 281 (i).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- B. C. Contingents, *See* "South African War."  
 — County Court Judges, Salaries, on M. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) for cor., 303 (i).  
 — Grievances, on M. (Mr. Prior) to Com. of Sup., 9495 (iii).  
 — Legislature and Action of Lt. Gov., on M. (Mr. Prior) to adjn., 1386 (i).  
 — Lt. Gov. McInnes, Action of the Govt. *re* (remarks) 7882 (iii).  
 — dismissal, cor. with Sec. of State, &c. (Ans.) 9522 (iii).  
 — on Inquiry *re*, 7319, 7989, 9471 (iii).  
 — removal from Office (announcement) 8074.  
 — rep. of Lt. Gov., on Inquiry for (Mr. Bostock) 3478 (ii).  
 — telegram *re* resignation, 6888 (ii).  
 — *See* "Semlin."  
 — Mines and Alien Labour Law, Inquiry for Rep., 1787 (i).  
 — *See* "Slocan."  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections, Investigation, on Notice of M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1011, 1015, 1055 (i).  
 — on amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 5662, 5695 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to adjn., 5740 (ii).  
 — *See* "Electoral," &c.  
 Brown, late Alfred, Appmt. of Successor (Ans.) 3050 (i).  
 Bubonic Plague in B.C. and Quarantine (remarks) 589 (i).  
 Budget Debate, Procedure (remarks) 2741 (i).  
 Business of the Hse. (remarks) 242 (i), 4661, 6243 (ii) 8435 (iii).  
 — Introduction of Govt. Measures (remarks) 8280 (iii).  
 — Morning Sessions (M.) 8073 (iii).  
 — Morning Sittings (remarks) 7772 (iii).  
 — Organization of Coms., 322 (i).  
 — (M.) to take in Mondays, 5027 (ii).  
 — Thursdays, 1013 (i).  
 — Saturday Sittings, 8652 (iii).  
 — Unopposed Motions, Procedure (remarks) 1009, 1898 (i), 6062 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 1912, 2076 (i).  
 — *See* "Adjournments, Govt. Business."  
 Cameron, Maj. Gen., Connection with R.M.C. (remarks) 1978 (i).  
 Can. National and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 3°, 6603 (ii).  
 — (remarks) 6609 (ii).  
 Can. Naval Reserve, Speech in the Imp. H. of C. *re* (remarks) 1123 (i).  
 — *See* "Colonial," "Royal," &c.  
 Canada Temperance Act Amendments, &c. (remarks) 10307 (iii).  
 — Reference *re* (Ans.) 4739 (ii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- Can. and Porto Rico, Discriminating Duties on Fish, &c. (Ans.) 4240 (ii).  
 C. P. R. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Macdonell) on amt. (Mr. Richardson) to M. for 3°, 2663 (i).  
 — Land Grants, Exemption from Taxation (Ans.) 2827 (i).  
 — Taxation of, on amt. (Mr. Richardson) to Com. of Sup., 8019 (iii).  
 Capital Cases in Quebec, Clemency, &c. (remarks) 9679, 10504 (iii).  
 Charlevoix County, Public Works Expenditures (Ans.) 3036 (i).  
 Chinese Immigration, Govt. Action *re* Legislation (remarks) 2617 (i).  
 — on M. for Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).  
 — Immigration Bill (remarks) 7317 (iii).  
 — Restriction (B. 180) 1° m., 7406; (M.) for Com. on prop. Res., 7881; prop. Res., 8162; in Com., 8182, 8207; on Sen. Amts., 9525 (iii).  
 — *See* "Japanese."  
 Chinese War and Action of Can. Govt. (remarks) 10306 (iii).  
 Choquette, Mr. Justice, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 1979 (i).  
 Civil Service Examiners Rep. (presented) 4454 (ii).  
 — List (presented) 286 (i).  
 Clarke, Mr. H. W., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3049 (i).  
 Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Official Cor. with Can. (remarks) 81, 164, 262, 318 (i).  
 Coasting Laws, Suspension, &c. (remarks) 480 (i).  
 — *See* "American," &c.  
 Cold Storage on Steamships (prop. Res.) 4662 (ii).  
 Colonial Naval Reserve, Stmt. in Imp. H. of C. (Ans.) 1473 (i).  
 — *See* "Canadian, Naval," &c.  
 Commissions in Imperial Army, Cor. between Imp. and Can. Govts. (remarks) 3881 (ii).  
 Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Morrison) in Com. 3440 (ii).  
 Companies Clauses Act Amt. B. 32 (Mr. Gilmour) on M. for 2°, 4800 (ii).  
 — B. 183 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8935 (iii).  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. Mulock) on M. for 1°, 8414 (iii).  
 Constituencies, Population of after Redistribution (Ans.) 2173 (i).  
 Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 10507 (iii).  
 Convicts, [Conditional Liberation (B. 89) 1°\*, 1877 (i); 2° m., 3607; 3° m., 4666 (ii).  
 Copyright Bill, Memo. from Dep. Min. of Jus. (remarks) 6448 (ii).  
 Court of Appeals, P. Q. (remarks) 5515 (ii).  
 — *See* "Judges," &c.  
 Courtney, Corporal, 'A' Battery, Charges of Insubordination (remarks) 7771 (iii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. *MacLaren*) on M. for 2°, 4800 (ii).
- (B. 137) 1\*, 3575; in Com., 5251, 5908, 6321; 3° m., 6309; on amt. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) to M. for 3°, 6316 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 8949, 10453 (iii).
- on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) that Com. rise, 5253 (ii).
- Debates, Official, Sel. Com. (M.) 6 (i).
- (M.) to add Name to Sel. Com., 4436 (ii).
- 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 5123, 5214 (ii).
- 6th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 10298, 10423 (iii).
- Translation (remarks) 815 (i), 6995 (iii).
- Deficits, Surpluses and Subsidies, on Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 2835 (i).
- Disbandment of 70th Battalion (Ans.) 3034 (i).
- Dismissals, &c., on Inquiry for Return, 8281, 9681, 9798 (iii).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2° (amt. 6 m. h.) 4797 (ii).
- B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8797; on Sen. Amts., 10455 (iii).
- Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Sifton*) 2° m., 1388; in Com., 1388, 1401; M. for Com., 1643, 1789 (i).
- Dom. Statutes, Consolidation, &c. (Ans.) 593, 886 (i).
- Dorchester Penitentiary, Rep. of Commission (Ans.) 3446 (ii).
- Dube and Cazes, Clemency, &c. (remarks) 9679, 10504 (iii).
- Eastern Extension Ry. Co.'s Arbitration, &c. (remarks) 10032 (iii).
- Eastern Extension Tel. Co. and Australian Grant, &c. (Ans.) 291 (i).
- See 'Pacific Cable.'
- Election Frauds, Judicial Inquiry (remarks) 6059, 6352, 6698, 6916 (ii); 9681, 9905, 10030 (iii).
- on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Blair*) 7107 (iii).
- Opinion of Min. of Justice *re* (read) 7082 (iii).
- O. C. (read) 6569 (ii).
- See "Brockville."
- Electoral Lists, Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 169 (i).
- Famine in India, Dom. Contribution, &c. (remarks) 7771 (iii).
- See "India."
- Foreign Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 142 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2°, 4683 (ii).
- Fox Bay Settlers, on Inquiry (Mr. *Taylor*) for Ret., 1381 (i).
- on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 1994 (i).
- par. in *Montreal Witness re* Trouble with Settlers, 5391 (ii).
- Franchise Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1°, 2347 (i).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- Franchise Act, Suspension, Revision, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1896 (i).
- Franking Privilege, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3619 (ii).
- *Montreal Star* (remarks) 2199 (i).
- O. C. Respecting Violation, on Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 781 (i).
- French Translation of Debates and Official Papers (remarks) 815 (i), 6995 (iii).
- French Canadians, See "Privilege," St. Johns.
- Gaspe Election and Customs Official, on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Com. of Sup., 7580, 7597 (iii).
- Gaspe Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 3004, 3223 (i); on M. for 3°, 3415 (ii).
- General Elections (remarks) 10308 (iii).
- General Officer Commanding, Successor to Genl. Hutton (remarks) 2085, 2563 (i); 3576, 4258 (ii)
- See "Hutton, Gen."
- Geological Survey, Deptl. Rep., Copy sent Bureau, Date (Ans.) 4555 (ii).
- Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays (M. 3072 (i).
- See "Business of the House, Adjournments."
- Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2509, 2514 (i).
- Grain Commission Rep., on Inquiry for, 7989, 8076 (iii).
- Grain Inspection B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) M. to ref. back to Com., 6258; in Com., 6284; (amt.) 6295; 3° m., 6298; on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to M. for 3°, 6305 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 8936 (iii).
- Granite Duty, Increase of (remarks) 7991 (iii).
- Great Eastern Ry. Subsidy, Allegations against Mr. C. N. Armstrong (letter read) 10309 (iii).
- Haley, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4065
- (M. to adjn.) 4066 (ii).
- Halifax Garrison, Applications for Commissions, &c. (Ans.) 3042 (i).
- Contract for Supplies (Ans.) 4907 (ii).
- See 'S. A. War.'
- Harbour, Approaches, &c. (remarks) 7771.
- Hawkestone Dock, Tenders for Construction, &c. (Ans.) 3046 (i).
- Herbert, Sir R. G. W., Acting Under-Sec. Colonial Office (Ans.) 1117 (i).
- House of Commons, Post Office Staff (Ans.) 4444 (ii).
- Hughes, Lt.-Col., and G.O.C., Cor., &c. on M. (Mr. *Domville*) for copies, 605 (i).
- Hutton, Maj. Gen., Cor. *re* Removal, &c., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for copies, 2761 (i).
- Departure from Can., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 326 (i).
- O. C. *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 594 (i).
- Speech at Farewell Dinner, Ottawa (Ans.) 595 (i).
- See "Gen. Officer," &c.

**Laurier. Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- Immigrants from Europe, Govt. Policy *re*, 10187.  
 Imperial Federation Brochure, Printing, Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 9798 (iii).  
 India, Govt. Aid to Famine Fund (Ans.) 3876 (ii).  
     *See* "Famine."  
 Interior Dept., Religion of Clerks (remarks) 3468 (ii).  
 International Commission, Inquiry for Reports, &c. (remarks) 2147 (i).  
     — Negotiations, &c. (Ans.) 1741 (i).  
     — Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2177 (i). **||**  
     *See* "Alaskan."  
 Japanese Immigration, Restriction, &c. (Ans.) 4558 (ii).  
     — par. in *Montreal Gazette* (remarks) 3778.  
     — (remarks) 4667 (ii).  
     *See* "Chinese."  
 Judges of Court of Appeal, &c., P.Q., Names (Ans.) 3175, 3260 (i).  
     *See* "Court," &c.  
 Judges of the Provincial Courts Act B. Amt. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on prop. Res., 7770; on M. for 2', 9110, 9140; in Com., 9147; on amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to M. for 3', 9339; on Sen. Amts., 10087 (iii).  
 Judicial District, Montreal, Removal of certain Judges (Ans.) 290 (i).  
 Justice Dept., Deptl. Rep., Copy sent to Bureau, Date (Ans.) 4555 (ii).  
     — Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 4333 (ii).  
 Labour Commission, B.C., Amount expended (Ans.) 2195 (i).  
 Labour. *See* "Conciliation," &c.  
 Land Titles Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Davin*) in Com., 4799 (ii).  
 Leduc, Mr. Charles, Appmt. of Successor (Ans.) 3044 (i).  
 Leinster Regiment and Canadian Volunteers (remarks) 82, 163, 589 (i).  
     *See* "S. A. War."  
 Library of Parlt., Joint Committee (M.) 137 (i).  
 Lt. Gov. McInnes, and B.C. Elections (remarks) 7319 (iii).  
     *See* "B. C.," &c.  
 Loucks, Henry Logan and others, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 291 (i).  
 Lumsden, N. W. T., Pets. *re* Mail Service (Ans.) 2403 (i).  
 Lunatics from N. W. T. in Man. Asylum, Maintenance (Ans.) 3445 (ii).  
 Man. Govt. Demands for School Lands (Ans.) 3046  
 Man. School Ques. Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 4445, 4916, (ii).  
     — Memorials from Catholics of Winnipeg (remarks) 9466 (iii).  
     — in *Mail and Empire re* Action of Winnipeg School Board, 6253 (ii).  
     — par. in *Winnipeg Free Press* (Ans.) 4074  
     — Resolutions, &c. (Ans.) 6915 (ii).

**Laurier. Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- Marchmont Property, Purchase of (Ans.) 7125 (iii).  
*See* "Plains of Abraham."  
 Members of the House of Commons, Appmt. to Offices, from 1873 to 1878 (Ans.) 5394 (ii).  
     — from 1879 to 1896 (Ans.) 4901 (ii).  
     — accepting Office, Names, &c. (Ans.) 2189.  
     — Mileage, &c. (remarks) 1978 (i).  
     — of Senators and Members (Ans.) 2362 (i).  
     — Sessional Indemnity, Increase, &c. (remarks) 10298 (iii).  
     *See* "Senators."  
 Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden*, *King's*) in Com., 6453, 6465, 6469, (ii).  
 Mint, Establishment by Govt. in Can., on Notice of Motion (Mr. *McInnes*) 1009 (i).  
 Montreal Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1294 (i).  
     — and Victoria Rifles (Ans.) 3036 (i).  
 Montreal Turnpike Trust, Bonds held by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 2402 (i).  
 Moosejaw Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. Gass, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6335 (ii).  
     — (remarks) 6063 (ii).  
 Motions, Unopposed (remarks) 1009, 1898, 1904 (i), 6062 (ii).  
 Mounted Infantry, Establishment of Units (Ans.) 3040 (i).  
 Mount Tolmie P. O., Pets *re* Removal, &c. (Ans.) 2406 (i).  
*Mudlark*, Dredge, Investigation by Resident Engineer (Ans.) 3040 (i).  
 New Brunswick Voters' Lists, Receival by Govt. (Ans.) 779 (i).  
 Newfoundland, Can. Inducements for Confederation (Ans.) 3875 (ii).  
 Newspapers, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 6613  
 N. W. M. P. Pension Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 2', 4761 (ii).  
     — B. 19 (Mr. *Davin* on M. for 2' (amt. 6 m. h.) 4790 (ii).  
     — (on Active Service in South Africa) Pension (B. 80) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 1642 (i) 2<sup>d</sup> m., 3610 (ii).  
     — Hardware Supplies (Ans.) 4839, 5245 (ii).  
     — Police Report (presented) 5122 (ii).  
     — copy sent to Queen's Printer, Date, &c. (Ans.) 4441 (ii).  
     — Supplies, &c. Tenders for Tea (Ans.) 3042.  
     — Winter Overcoats, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 148 (i).  
 N. W. Ters. Defences, &c. (remarks) 263 (i).  
     — Subsidy voted to, Cor. between Dom. Govt. and N. W. T. Govt. *re*, on M. for copies (Mr. *Davin*) 3458 (ii).  
 Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2; *pro forma* (i).  
 Order, (Ques. of) 4926 (ii).  
     — irrelevancy of Deb. (remarks) 4272 (ii).  
     — (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, of Rep. B. 13, 1557 (i).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- Order, References to past debate (Mr. *Davin*) 5734-5 (ii).  
 ——— (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on Unopposed Motions, Procedure, &c., 1904 (i).  
 O'Reilly, Mr. J. R., Appnmt. as County Judge (Ans.) 479 (i).  
 Osborne, J. H., Search of Premises (Ans.) 8431, 8525 (iii).  
 Ottawa and Hull Conflagration (M. to adjn.) 4331 (ii).  
 ——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4337 (ii).  
 ——— Relief Fund Vote (remarks) 5808 (ii).  
 Pacific Cable, on Inquiry (Mr. *Casey*) for papers, 866 (i).  
 ——— par. in Newspapers *re* Question asked in Imp. H. of C. (remarks) 816 (i).  
 ——— par. in *The Outlook*, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to adjn., 657 (i).  
 ——— par. in *Toronto Globe*, (Ans.) 291 (i).  
 ——— *See* "Eastern Telegraph," &c.  
 Paper Combine, Proposed Reduction of Duty (remarks) 4803 (ii).  
 Paris Exposition, Appnmt. of Min. of Pub. Works (Ans.) 740 (i).  
 ——— Arrangements by Govt. respecting (remarks) 1788 (i).  
 ——— Closing on Sundays (remarks) 6252 (ii).  
 ——— Cold Storage for Can. Exhibits (remarks) 5393 (ii).  
 ——— Provincial Representation (remarks) 1643.  
 ——— Speeches of Hon. Mr. *Tarte* (remarks) 7511  
 Perrault, Joseph, on reading of Question (remarks) 2397 (i).  
 Personal Explanation (Mr. *Haggart*) *re* Georgian Bay Canal, 2561 (i).  
 Plains of Abraham, Acquisition by Govt. (Ans.) 2171 (i) 6351, 6617 (ii); 7123, 7125 (iii).  
 Pointe Claire Fire, Relief to Sufferers (remarks) 6137 (ii).  
 Political Pamphlets, Distribution and Printing. (Ans.) 170 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 9696; on M. for Com., 9802 (iii).  
 Post Office Dept., on M. to print Accounts, 7206.  
 Preferential Trade with G.B., on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Foster*) 2341 (i).  
 Prime Minister's Speech at Drummondville, par in *La Patrie* (Ans.) 2749 (i).  
 Printing Committee, Joint (M.) to conc., 261 (i).  
 Private Bills, Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) 5884 (ii).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Flint*) 4436 (ii).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 812 (i).  
 Privilege Ques. of (Sir *Charles Tupper*) *re* Action on Imperial Federation, 6143 (ii).  
 ——— *re* Attack on French Canadians, 166, 171.  
 Procedure in asking Questions (remarks) 2184, 2368 (i).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn., 2372 (i).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (remarks) 3466 (ii).  
 ——— on M. to adjn. Deb. (Mr. *Godbout*) 4141.  
 ——— on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8973 (iii).  
 ——— on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 9043, 9046 (iii).  
 Provincial Subsidies, Increase, &c. (remarks) 10034.  
 Public Accounts Com. Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1388, 2741 (i), 9496 (iii).  
 Queen's Birthday Adjnmt. (M.) 5699, 5885 (ii).  
 Questions answered by Ministers, &c. (remarks) 2184, 2368 (i).  
 Railway Subsidies, on Inquiry for, 8935 (iii).  
 ——— Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) on prop. Res., 9928; in Com. on Res., 9976, 9980, 10013; on M. for 3°, 10195 (iii).  
 Regina Barracks, Outbreak of Diphtheria (statement read) 5701 (ii).  
 ——— *Leader*, Payments to by Govt. (remarks) 1116 (i).  
 Registration of Voters, Govt. Powers *re* (Ans.) 2756 (i).  
 Reports, Deptl., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4151 (ii).  
 ——— Postmaster General's, on Inquiry for, 3986.  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 1586; on amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) to M. for 3°. 1559 (i).  
 ——— on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1557 (i).  
 Returns, on Inquiry for, 1724 (i), 3478, 4145, 4448, 4662, 6568, 6775, 6787 (ii), 6992, 7317, 8081, 8437, 8526 (iii).  
 ——— (Mr. *Davin*) 1725 (i), 3413 (ii).  
 ——— (Mr. *Davis*) 1209 (i).  
 ——— *re* Steamers chartered by Govt., 6257 (ii).  
 ——— Mr. *Ogilvie's* Report, on Inquiry for, 8285.  
 Richelieu River Bridge, Repts. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for copies, 4753 (ii).  
 ——— on Inquiry for Ret. 8795, 8933, 9062 (iii).  
 Roberval Wharf, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 7416 (iii).  
 Royal Reserve, Announcement of Imp. Govt. *re* (Ans.) 1006 (i).  
 ——— *See* "Colonial," &c.  
 St. Gédéon Wharf, Payments to S. Desjardins (Ans.) 7417 (iii).  
 St. Jerome Wharf, Payments to Mr. L. Desbiens, Names of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 8838, 8839 (iii).  
 St. Johns Customs Collector, Utterances *re* French Canadians (remarks) 9849 (iii).  
 St. Patrick's Day Celebration (remarks) 2000 (i).  
 St. Thomas Parade Ground, Cor. between Govt. and J. H. Wilson, M.D., on M. for Cor. (Mr. *Ingram*) 648 (i).  
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Increase of Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 7878 (iii).  
 ——— Regulations *re* Night Duty (Ans.) 2749 (i).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- Scrip, Grant to Half-Breeds, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 315 (i), 4749 (ii).  
 — to Half-Breed Children, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 643 (i).  
 Sec. of State's Deptl. Rep. (presented) 4454 (ii).  
 — Copy sent to Bureau, Date (Ans.) 4555 (ii).  
 Seet Grain Indebtedness, Govtl. Action, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1771 (i).  
 — B. 143 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 5058 (ii).  
 Select Standing Coms. (M.) 6 (i).  
 — Com. to prepare Lists (M.) 137 (i).  
 — Lists (presented) 255 (i).  
 — addition of name (M.) 736 (i).  
 Semlin Govt., B.C., Dismissal of, &c. (Ans.) 3039.  
 See "B.C., Lt.-Gov. McInnes."  
 Senators, Legal Qualifications, &c. (Ans.) 1886 (i).  
 Servis Railroad Tie Plate Co.'s Patent Relief B. 93 (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 2671 (i).  
 Slocan Labour Troubles, Mr. Clute's Report (Ans.) 3944 (i).  
 See "B.C. Mines," &c.  
 Sol. Gen. and Administration of Criminal Justice (Ans.) 5244 (ii).  
 — Ques. out of Order, 5754 (ii).  
 South African War, Additional Troops required by Imp. Govt. (remarks) 1122, 1209 (i).  
 — Address to Her Maj. on Recent Victories (M.) 6899, 6913 (ii).  
 — (M.) to present, 7304 (iii).  
 — Can. Contingent, Pay of Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 1164; in Com. on B., 1674 (i).  
 — Can. Contingent, Inducements to settle in South Africa (Ans.) 5395 (ii).  
 — insurance of (remarks) 4249 (ii), 9524 (iii).  
 — latitude of debate in Com. (remarks) 812.  
 — official cor. (remarks) 5 (i).  
 — papers laid on Table, 7, 80 (i).  
 — vacancies, &c. (remarks) 1211, 1388 (i).  
 — Casualties in Can. Regiment (remarks) 737 (i).  
 — Commissions in Imperial Army (remarks) 3479; on M. to adjn. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3488 (ii).  
 — Emergency Rations, Analyses, &c. (remarks) 7420, 7886 (iii).  
 — on Ques. of Order *re* Rep. of Analyst, 7541, 7549 (ii).  
 — appmnt. of day for discussion (remarks) 8935 (iii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 6790, 6807, 6887 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Sel. Com., 7405, 7514, 7556 (iii).  
 — names, &c., 7572 (iii).  
 — (M.) to substitute name on Com., 7649 (iii).  
 — on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 7646 (iii).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

- South African War, on M. to print Rep. of Com., 8651 (iii).  
 — papers laid on Table (remarks) 7211 (iii).  
 — on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Monk*) 7305 (iii).  
 — Halifax (Garrison (remarks) 589, 649, 1123, 1209 (i).  
 — See "Halifax," "Leinster," &c.  
 — Independence of Parlt. *re* British Institutions, on amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 1837 (i).  
 — on Inquiry for Ret., 2995 (i).  
 — Intervention of Can. Govt. *re* Settlement (Ans.) 6626 (ii).  
 — Leinster Regiment and Can. Volunteers (remarks) 589 (i).  
 — Lord Roberts' Telegram *re* Canadians in Battle (read) 813 (i).  
 — Mess. from Her Majesty and General Roberts (read) 1039 (i).  
 — Monument to Can. Volunteers (Ans.) 1119 (i).  
 — N. W. M. P. Contingent, Pension (B. 80) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 1642 (i).  
 — See "N. W. M. P."  
 — Perry, Supt., and Volunteers (Ans.) 297.  
 — Purchase of Horses (remarks) 3578 (ii).  
 — Relief of Kimberly, Raising of Flag on Parlt. Buildings (remarks) 541 (i).  
 — Reports of Col. Otter (Ans.) 3044, 3049 (i).  
 — Steamers chartered by Govt., on Inquiry for Ret., 6257 (ii).  
 — Strathcona's Horse, Purchase of Horses in N. W. T. (remarks) 482 (i).  
 — telegram received *re* inquiry for relatives (remarks) 814 (i).  
 — Surrender of Gen. Cronje, Telegram (read) 1013 (i).  
 Speech of Prime Minister *re* Man. School Ques. (Ans.) 3042 (i).  
 — of Hon. Mr. Sifton at Brandon *re* Free Lumber (Ans.) 2831 (i).  
 — of Hon. Mr. Tarte at London and Paris, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 3789 (ii).  
 — See "Paris Exposition."  
 SS. *Stanley* and *Minto*, Freight, Amount carried, on M. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) for Ret., 300 (i).  
 Supreme Court Appeal Cases, Sitings, &c. (Ans.) 1982 (i).  
 See "Court," &c.  
 Supreme Court of N. W. T. (B. 90) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 1877 (i), 2<sup>d</sup> m., 3607; in Com., 3607 (ii).  
 Supply B. 147 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4464 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Administration of Justice*: B. C. (Judges salaries) 6438 (ii).  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Paris exposition) 7193, 10347 (iii).  
*Civil Govt.*: Customs (salaries) 6044; Interior (absent minister) 6537, 6541; (Rothwell's salary) 6539; (salaries) 6513; N. W. M. P. (clerical assistance) 6101; (salaries) 6102 (ii);

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.****Civil Govt.—Con.**

Privy Council Office, 7507; (contingencies) 8146, 8147 (iii).

*Fisheries* (cold storage) 6019 (ii).

*Govt. of N. W. T.* (clerical assistance) 6685;

Unorganized Districts (schools, &c.) 6690 (ii).

*Govt. of the Yukon Territory* (salaries, &c.) 6979.

*Indians* (St. Regis lockup) 7291 (iii).

*Inspection of Staples* (hide inspectors) 6042 (ii).

*Legislation*: H. of C. (election frauds commission) 10321; (sessional indemnities) 8136; (voters' lists) 10324; conc., 10452; Library of Parlt. (contingencies) 8150; (salaries) 10331 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (B. C. Labour troubles) 8146; (Chinese and Japanese commission) 10411; (distressed settlers, N. W. T.) 7496; (half-breed commission) 7067, 7071 (iii).

*Mounted Police* (pay of force) 6092.

*Ottawa and Hull Appropriation* (relief fund) 4339 (ii).

*Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 6895 (ii).

*Public Works*: Buildings (Valleyfield Post Office) 10263; Harbours and Rivers, P. E. I. (China Point pier) 7944; Que., 7949; (Maria wharf) 10196; (River Batiscan dredging) 10211; (Rivière du Sud banks) 10210; (St. Jerome wharf) 10208; (St. Lambert protection walls) 10220; (St. Roch des Auhaies wharf) 10210; (Saguenay River dredging) 10208; (Temiscouata landing piers) 10209; (Yamaska Lock, damages) 10212 (iii).

*Railways* (Victoria Bridge tolls) conc., 10449.

*Yukon*: Mounted Police, 7077 (iii).

Talbot, Mr. E., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1878.

Tarte, Hon. Mr., Speeches in France (remarks) 8655 (iii).

— proposed return, 9681 (iii).

— *See* "Speeches, &c."

Timber Licenses in Man., on Ques. of Ordor, 7270 (ii).

Tobacco Duties, on Notice of Motion (Mr. Gillies) 1009 (i).

— on prop. Res. (Mr. Gillies) 4754 (ii).

— on amt. (Mr. Clancy) to Com. of Sup., 7905 (iii).

Toronto Drill Hall, Improvements (Ans.) 3036.

Toronto Members, Payments to (Ans.) 6051 (ii).

— Payments to, from 1879 to 1897 (remarks) 5888 (ii).

Treaty between G. B. and Japan (Ans.) 7970 (iii).

Trinidad and U. S. Treaty (remarks) 3673 (ii).

Trudel, Mr. Leon, Mail Carrier at Murray Bay, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3037 (i).

— Mr. Zono, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3044 (i).

Tupper, Sir Charles, 45th Anniversary of Public Life (remarks) 5806 (ii).

— Payments to as High Commissioner (Ans.) 1756 (i).

Tyrwhitt, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 8188 (iii).

Unopposed Motions (remarks) 1009, 6062 (ii).

*See* "Business," &c.

Vancouver and Victoria, B. C., Electoral Lists, Distributions, &c. (Ans.) 432 (i).

**Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Con.**

Vandal, Release from St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, on M. (Mr. Quinn) for copies of Pets., &c., 300 (i).

Victoria, B. C., Mail Delivery, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3049 (i).

Voters' Lists, Montmorency (Ans.) 7122 (iii).

— for King's, N. B. (Ans.) 1120 (i).

— for Ont., Printing, &c. (Ans.) 593 (i).

— Man., Printing, &c. (Ans.) 3046 (i).

— N. B., Printing and Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 438 (i).

— Printing (remarks) 2673, 2740 (i), 4249 (ii), 7208 (iii).

— P. Q., Number, &c., received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery (Ans.) 2754, 3038 (i), 6781 (ii).

— Sheriff's Fees (Ans.) 4914 (ii).

— Victoria, B. C., Printing, &c. (Ans.) 2402.

— *See* "Electoral."

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4678, 4814.

Welland Canal, Dynamite Explosion (remarks) 4146 (ii).

— on M. (Mr. *McClure*) to adjn., 4258 (ii).

Wellington Bridge, Montreal, par. in *Montreal Witness*, *re* Condition (remarks) 3332 (ii).

White, Lt.-Col., Retirement, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 3074 (i).

Wilson, Mr. S. Childs, Emplmt. (Ans.) 3775.

Winnipeg By-election, Remuneration of Returning Officers (Ans.) 1006 (i).

Woman Suffrage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 9708 (iii).

Yukon, Charges against Min. of Interior *re* Mining Leases (letters read) 8074 (iii).

— Charleson, Mr. J. B., Reprs. *re* Telegraph Construction, on M. Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper* for copies, 7311 (iii).

— (remarks) 7206 (iii).

— Coste's Rep. *re* Teslin Lake Route, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for copy, 609 (i).

— John C. Barr, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to print papers, 4900 (ii).

— on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to print papers, 5020 (ii).

— La Banque Francais du Klondike (remarks) 9470 (iii).

— Ordinances (presented) 4734 (ii).

— Payment of Dog Drivers (Ans.) 3262 (i).

— Permanent Force, Wthdrl., &c. (remarks) 1210 (i).

— Representation Bill, Cor. *re* (remarks) 3673.

— Representation in Parlt. (Ans.) 6615 (ii).

— on prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7648.

— on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7776 (iii).

— Wade, Mr. F. C., Charges against, on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7165 (iii).

**Lavergne, Mr. L., Drummond and Arthabaska.**

Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 6321 (ii).

Drummond and Bagot Electoral Divisions Act Amt. (B. 140) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 4144 (ii).

**Legris, Mr. J. H., Maskinongé.**

Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 104) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2345 (i).

**Lemieux, Mr. R., Gaspé.**

Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s (B. 70) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1459; in Com., 3032, 3210 (i), 3372; 3<sup>d</sup> m., 3413, 3612 (ii).

**Lewis, Mr. W. J., Albert.**

Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co.'s (B. 150) 1<sup>o</sup>\* 4722 (ii).

**Logan, Mr. H. J., Cumberland.**

Budget, The, 4630 (ii).

Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187½ (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9384 (iii).

Dickey, Hon. Arthur, Decease of (remarks) 9058.

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitpatrick*) in Com., 8864 (iii).

Maxwell, Major, Grant to (remarks) 8079 (iii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 9026 (iii).

## SUPPLY:

*Railways*: I. C. R. (Amherst accommodation, 9455; (increased facilities) 10381 (iii).

**Macdonald, Mr. A. C., King's, P.E.I.**

Allerton Harbour, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 6781 (ii).

Cascumpec Harbour Improvements, Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1483 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitpatrick*) in Com., 7327, 8106, 8808, 8847; on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, (amt.) 9482 (iii).

Govt. System of Telegraph Establishment B. 85 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 1723 (i).

Kendall, Mr., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4440.

Lobster Fisheries, on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Bell*, P.E.I.) 4728 (ii).

— P.E.I., Date of setting Lines, &c. (Ques.) 2759 (i).

Magdalen Islands SS. Service (Ques.) 477 (i).

— Number of Trips, &c. (M. for Ret.\*) 319.

Miminegash Harbour, Improvements, &c. by Govt. (Ques.) 1483 (i).

P.E.I. (Murray Harbour Branch) Ry. Co.'s B. 182 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 8947 (iii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 9031 (iii).

— Personal Explanation, 9472 (iii).

St. Peter's P.E.I., Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 3175 (i).

Sandy Island Light, Removal, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 440 (i).

Savage Island Spar Lights, Erection and Removal, &c. (Ques.) 440 (i).

**Macdonald, Mr. A. C.—Con.**

SS. *Stanley* and *Minto*, Freight, Amount carried, &c. (M. for Ret.) 300.

## SUPPLY:

*Fisheries* (fishing bounties) 5958, 5998, 6017; (lobster regulations) 5950 (ii).

*Inland Revenue*: Weights and Measures (metrical system) 6039 (ii).

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (salaries, &c.) 1707 (i).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (P.E.I. and G.B.) 9584 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings, Ont. (Sarnia post office) 7925; Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I., (Campbell's Cove breakwater) 9898; (Summerside breakwater) 9899 (iii).

Tignish Breakwater, P. E. I., Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1482 (i).

Tignish, P.E.I., Amount of Wharfage collected (M. for Ret.\*) 2201 (i).

— Customs Duty collected 1898-1900 (M. for Ret.) 3469 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4679 (ii).

**Macdonald, Mr. P., East Huron.**

Binder Twine, Sale and Manufacture, on amt., (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 6162 (ii).

Budget, The, 4361, 4373 (ii).

Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 6590 (ii).

Constituencies, Population of after Redistribution (Ques.) 2173 (i).

Franking Privilege, O. C. respecting, Violation, on M. (Mr. *Domville*) to adjn., 792 (i).

Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2477 (i).

Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 850 (i).

Postal Notes System, Establishment in Can. (Ques.) 1478 (i).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2233 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of, par. in Ottawa *Citizen* re Dredge, 7418 (iii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4110 (ii), 8965 (iii).

— on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 9044 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1275 (i).

Timber Licenses in Man. on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 7259 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 6922 (ii).

**Macdonell, Mr. J. A., Selkirk.**

C. P. R. Co.'s (B. 34) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 577; in Com., 2638 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Man. (Lake Dauphin) 10252; (Lake Manitoba) 10252 (iii).

**Mackie, Mr. T., North Renfrew.**

Portage du Fort and French River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 97) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2072 (i).

**MacLaren, Mr. A. F., North Perth.**

Budget, The, 3957 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. (B. 62) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 1287 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4800 (ii).

— B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5264, 5713 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 6924 (ii).

**Maclean, Mr. W. F., East York.**

Bankruptcy Court incorp. (B. 4) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 81 (i).

Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 2409 (i); amt., 2617, 2418.

Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 6575, 6583 (ii).

C. P. R. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. for Com., 2626; in Com., 2637, 2646; (amt.) to 3<sup>o</sup>, 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 15; N. 71) 2654; on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2661 (i).

Census, Legislation respecting (remarks) 7786.

Franchise Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Ingram*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 145 (i).

— B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 2347.

Paper Combine, Proposed Reduction of Duty (remarks) 4802 (ii).

Procedure in asking Questions, on M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn., 2371 (i).

South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 2608.

## SUPPLY:

*Ottawa and Hull Appropriation* (relief fund) 4343 (ii).

Welland Canal Dynamite Explosion (remarks) 4149 (ii).

**McAlister, Mr. J., Restigouche.**

Anderson, J. W., Patent Relief B. 108 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for Com., 5162 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 148) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4662 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8109, 8833, 8877 (iii).

Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 2998; in Com., 3025, (amt.) 3029, 3210 (i); in Com., 3372 (ii).

Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 164) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5884 (ii).

I. C. R., Shingle Manufacturers Memorial re Shipments (remarks) 10035 (iii).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s (B. 165) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5884 (ii).

Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 10009; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 10194 (iii).

Restigouche and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 73) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1641 (i); in Com., 3373; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 3415 (ii).

South African War, Volunteers from N. B., Number, &c. (Ques.) 2196 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Customs*: N. B. (salaries) 6074 (ii).

*Fisheries* (Dom. and Provincial claims) 5933 (ii); (Flatheads hatchery) 8067 (iii); (guardians) 5943; (lobster regulations) 5951 (ii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (voters' lists) 10329 (iii).

**McAlister, Mr. J.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Traverse light) 8063 (iii).

*Public Works*: Buildings, N. B. (St. John immigrant building) 9875; Ont. (Sarnia post office) 7926; Harbours and Rivers, N. B. (Campbellton dredging) 9901; (Shippegan harbour) 7946; N. S. (New Harbour) 9896; Que. (Maria wharf) 10196 (iii).

*Railways*: I. C. R. (increased facilities) 10360; (increased rates) 8523; (steel rails, &c.) 10391 (iii).

Telegraph Line, Construction by Govt. to Belle Isle (Ques.) 2462 (i).

**McCarthy, Mr. L. G., North Simcoe.**

British North America Pulp and Paper incorp. (B. 166) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5883 (ii).

Collingwood Harbour Improvements, Appropriations by Govt. (Ques.) 1465 (i).

Copyright Infringement Act Amt. (B. 15) 1<sup>o</sup>, 320 (i).

Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on amt. (Mr. *Fraser*, *Guyborough*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 6321; in Com., 6322 (ii).

Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2801 (i).

G. T. R. and Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s B. (M.) to suspend Rule, 6244 (ii).

Hutton, Gen., Departure from Can., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 336 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9124 (iii).

South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 1176 (i).

## SUPPLY:

*Militia* (annual drill) 8302 (iii).

**McCleary, Mr. W., Welland.**

Currie, Peter, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 3264 (i).

Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2784 (i).

Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. Mr. *Clarke* to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2539 (i).

Hughes, Lt.-Col., and G. O. C., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. *Donville*) for copies, 604 (i).

Niagara Falls Park and Old Fort Erie, Pets. re (Ques.) 2194 (i).

Paper Combine, proposed Reduction of Duty (remarks) 4805 (ii).

Procedure in asking Questions, on M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn., 2371 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 9054 (iii).

South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 1187 (i).

Welland Canal Dynamite Explosion (M. to adjn.) 4252, 4257 (ii).

— (remarks) 4145, 4149 (ii).

**McClure, Mr. F., Colchester.**

- Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 5522.  
 — on M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1043 (i).  
 Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 5920 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8826 (iii).  
 Franking Privilege, O.C. respecting, Violation, &c., on M. (Mr. Donville) to adjn., 810 (i).  
 Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Mr. Russell) to Com. of Sup. 2299 (i).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (amt.) to prop. Res. (Mr. Flint) 4096 (ii).  
 — on amt. (Mr. Parmelee) 9033 (iii).  
 — on amt. (Mr. Douglas) 9053 (iii).  
 South African War—Canadian Contingent, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 1080 (i).  
 SUPPLY :  
*Railways*: I. C. R. (Amherst accommodation) 9455 (iii).  
 Toronto Hotel Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. Oster) in Com., 4962 (ii).

**McCormick, Mr. G., Muskoka and Parry Sound.**  
Osborne, J. H., Search of Premises (Ques.) 8431, 8524 (iii).**McDougall, Mr. H. F., Cape Breton.**

- Budget, The, 4568 (ii).  
 Coal Industry of Can., on M. for Com. of Sup., 9708 (iii).  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. Mulock) in Com., 9393 (iii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup> (amt.) 9481 (iii).  
 Emigration to U.S., par. in Newspaper (remarks) 3330 (ii).  
 Fish Hatchery, C. B., Sale, &c. (remarks) 6782.  
 Foyle, Lt., Dismissal, Inquiry for Papers, 9682.  
 — (remarks) 9471, 9484 (iii).  
 I. C. R., Accommodation at Sydney (Ques.) 3179 (i).  
 — Additional Train Service on C. B. Division (remarks) 3073 (i).  
 — Communications from Sydney Board of Trade (remarks) 4665 (ii).  
 — Complaints *re* Train Service on C. B. Division (Ques.) 3178 (i).  
 — Freight Delays (M. to adjn.) 3267 (i).  
 — Freight Rates. Change in Tariff, &c. (remarks) 7603 (iii).  
 — Sidings in Cape Breton (remarks) 9790 (iii).  
 — Time Table, New (remarks) 7514 (iii).  
 Personal Explanation *re* Mr. Logan's Speech respecting the Dom. Coal Co., 5018 (ii).  
 Port Mulgrave Mail Service (remarks) 7422 (iii).  
 P. E. I. (Murray Harbour Branch) Ry. B. 182 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 8943 (iii).  
 SUPPLY :  
*Agriculture* (cold storage, &c.) 7630 ; (creameries in N. S.) 7631 (iii).

**McDougall, Mr. H. F.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

- Canals*: St. Peters (repairs, &c.) 9503 (iii).  
*Customs*: N. S. (Dom. Coal Co.'s legislation) 9511 ; (salaries, &c.) 9505 (iii).  
*Indians*: N. S. (medical attendance) 7294 ; (Millbrook reserve) 7295 (iii).  
*Legislation*: H. of C. (voters' lists) 9604 (iii).  
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Baddeck and East Bay) 9592 ; (Halifax, Nfld. and G. B.) 9578 ; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 9598 (iii).  
*Militia* (Lt. Foyle's investigation) 9769 (iii).  
*Miscellaneous* (distressed settlers, N. W. T.) 7495. (iii).  
*Post Office* (mail service) 8762, 8774 (iii).  
*Railways*: I. C. R. (Amherst accommodation) 9455 ; (Cape Breton sidings) 8793, 8920 ; (draw-bars) 9457 ; (facilities, &c.) 9459 ; (free passes) 9431 ; (engine houses) 9432 ; (Halifax cotton factory) 9436 ; (increased accommodation) 8790 ; (Stellarton sidings) 9450, 9454 ; (Sydney accommodation) 9440 ; (working expenses) 9504 (iii).  
 Sydney, C. B., P. O. Accommodation (Ques.) 3178 (i).  
 Tobacco Duty, Reduction of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Gillies) 4756 (ii).

**McGregor, Mr. W., North Essex.**

- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8862 (iii).  
 Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 9 (Mr. Cassey) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 4781 (ii).  
 Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s (B. 122) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2827 (i).  
 Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 186) 1<sup>st</sup>, 8524 (iii).  
 SUPPLY :  
*Canals*: St. Lawrence River (gas buoys) 8886.

**McHugh, Mr. G., South Victoria (O.)**

- Budget, The, 4495 (ii).  
 Timagami Ry. Co.'s (B. 118) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2827 (i), on Sen. Amts., 8837 (iii).

**McInerney, Mr. G. V., Kent (N.B.)**

- Brockville and West Huron Elections, on M. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1044 (i).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8807, 8851, 9082 (iii).  
 Electoral Lists, N. B., Printing and Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 438 (i).  
 Lobster Fisheries (remarks) 4723 (ii).  
 — on M. to adjn. (Mr. Bell, P. E. I.) 4730 (ii).  
 — Dates of Opening and Closing Season (Ques.) 438 (i).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. Mulock) on amt. (Mr. Foster) to M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1279 (i).  
 South African War, Can. Contingent, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 535 (i).  
 Steel Rails, Purchase of by Rys. and Canals Dept. (Ques.) 2828 (i).  
 Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on amt. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to Com. of Sup., 6397 (ii).

**McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., Vancouver.**

- Alien Labour Act, B.C., Enforcement by Govt., (Ques.) 597 (i).  
 Beaumont, Wm., Postmaster at Maple Bay, Claims against Govt. (Ques.) 433 (i).  
 Brandon and South-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 471 (i).  
 B. C. Mines and Alien Labour Law, Commissioner Clute's Rep., Inquiry for (remarks) 1787.  
 Chinese Immigration, Govt. Policy *re* Poll Tax (Ques.) 589 (i).  
 Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 3209, 3419 (ii); (amts.) 3426, 3441; Neg. (Y. 21, N. 53) 3441 (ii).  
 Cowichan Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 66) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1381 (i).  
 Franchise Act Amt. (B. 5) 1<sup>o</sup>, 81 (i).  
 Immigration Restriction (B. 27) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 471 (i).  
 Indian Reserves, Govt. Policy *re* Development of Mines (Ques.) 597 (i).  
 Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 471 (i).  
 Labour (Safety) in Mines (B. 47) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 737 (i).  
 Loan Companies, Govt. Action *re* Perpetration of Frauds (Ques.) 3040 (i).  
*Mudlark*, Dredge, Investigation by Resident Engineer (Ques.) 3040 (i).  
 Orford Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. Belcourt) 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1725 (i).  
 Rothwell's Rep. *re* Settler's Claims, Transmission to B. C. Govt. (Ques.) 298 (i).  
 Slocan Labour Troubles, Mr. Clute's Report (Ques.) 3043 (i).  
 Vancouver and Victoria, B. C., Electoral Lists, Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 432 (i).  
 Vancouver and Nanaimo Mail Contract (Ques.) 3442 (ii).

**McIntosh, Mr. J., Sherbrooke.**

- French Canadians, Attack &c., on M. (Sir Charles Tupper) to adjn., 198 (i).  
 Hereford Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 471 (i).

**McIsaac, Mr. C. F., Antigonish.**

- Alaska-Yukon Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 23) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 471 (i).  
 St. Lawrence Terminal and Steamship Co.'s incorp. (B. 157) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5513 (ii).

**McLellan, Mr. B. D., West Prince (P. E. I.)**

- Dunk River Fish Hatchery (Ques.) 7656 (iii).  
 Govt. System of Telegraph Establishment B. 85 (Mr. Casey) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 1717 (i).  
 P. E. I. (Murray Harbour Branch) Ry. B. 182 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 8947 (iii).  
 — Number of Animals killed, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 2202 (i).  
 Souris Breakwater Repairs, Cor. between Govt. and Messrs. Brennan and Ramsay (M. for copies\*) 2202 (i).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Railways*: I. C. R. (steel rails, &c.) 10391 (iii).  
 West Point, P. E. I., Tenders for Wharf Improvements (Ques.) 2164 (i).

**McLennan, Mr. R. R., Glengarry.**

- Binder Twine, Sale and Manufacture of, on amt. (Mr. Taylor) to Com. of Sup., 6193 (ii).  
 Electoral Franchise Bill (remarks) 6244 (ii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on amt. (Mr. Douglas) 9044 (iii).  
 Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9957, 9985 (iii).  
 South African War, Punishment of Can. Private (remarks) 4448 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Public Works*: Buildings (armouries) 9893; (Cornwall armoury) 9883, 9893; (Glengarry post office) 9886 (iii).  
*Canals* (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 8512, 8519 (iii).

**McLennan, Mr. A., Inverness.**

- Coal Industry of Can., on M. for Com. of Sup., 9712 (iii).  
 Foyle, Lt., Dismissal, on M. for Com. of Sup., 9484 (iii).  
 I. C. R., Freight Delays, on M. (Mr. McDougall) to adjn., 3280 (ii).  
 — Train Service on C. B. Division, on M. (Mr. Gillies) to adjn., 7975, 7977 (iii).  
 Lobster Fisheries, on M. to adjn., (Mr. Bell, P. E. I.) 4731 (ii).  
 Mail Service, Inverness County, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6616 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Customs*: N. S. (salaries) 6070 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (cold storage) 5983; (lobster regulations) 5951 (ii).  
*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (Port Mulgrave and Marble Mountain) 9596 (iii).  
*Militia* (Lt. Foyle's case) 9770 (iii).  
*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Margaree harbour) 7964 (iii).  
*Railways*: I. C. R. (sidings, &c.) 8927 (iii).

**McMillan, Mr. J., South Huron.**

- Bacon Exports to G. B. (Ques.) 1879 (i).  
 Binder Twine, Kingston Penitentiary, Purchase by Farmers, Extension of Time (Ques.) 2759 (i).  
 — Price of Raw Material (Ques.) 2747 (i).  
 Budget, The, 3673 (ii).  
 Butter Exports to G. B. (Ques.) 1878 (i).  
 Cattle, Sheep and Horses, Exports to G. B. (Ques.) 2746 (i).  
 Cheese Exports to G. B. (Ques.) 1878 (i).  
 Coasting Laws Abrogation, on amt. (Mr. Bennett) to Com. of Sup., 9173 (iii).  
 Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 9 (Mr. Casey) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4771 (ii).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5139, 5837 (ii).  
 Gas Inspection Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) in Com., 4671 (ii).  
 Grain Exports to G. B. (Ques.) 1879 (i).  
 Order (Ques. of) 3823 (ii).  
 Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Mr. Foster) to amt. (Mr. Russell) to Com. of Sup., 2333.  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Blair) in Com., 9350; (amt.) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 9367 (iii).

**McMillan, Mr. J.—Con.**

Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1283 (i).

St. Thomas Post Office, Suspension of Postmaster (Ques.) 1883 (i).

South African War, Quantity and Value of Exports from Can. to South Africa (Ques.) 3260 (i).

## SUPPLY :

Post Office (mail service) 8723 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 10) 1<sup>st</sup>, 169.

— B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 4673; in Com., 4679, 4818 (amt.) 6920 (ii), 7126 (iii).

**McMullen, Mr. J., North Wellington.**

Agricultural Implements, Duty, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3640 (ii).

Army Postal Cops, Appmnts., &c. (Ques.) 1755

Binder Twine, Kingston Penitentiary, Extension of Time for Purchase by Farmers (Ques.) 1118.

— Price, &c. (Ques.) 778 (i).

Brockville and West Huron Investigation, on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1017, 1026 (i).

Budget, The, 4172 (ii).

Business of the Hse., Unopposed Motions, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 1918 (i).

Cameron, Maj.-Gen., Connection with R.M.C. (Ques.) 1977, 2164 (i).

Can. National Railway and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 6595.

— (explanation) 6607 (ii).

C.P.R., Onderdonk Award, Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 2365 (i).

Canals, Amount expended by present Govt. (Ques.) 1897 (i).

Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>st</sup>, 8408 (iii).

Debates, Official, 6th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 10293 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 1<sup>st</sup>, 474 (i); on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 4795 (ii).

— B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 6722.

Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 9 (Mr. *Cussey*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 4779 (ii).

Franchise Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1<sup>st</sup>, 2354 (i).

Franchise Act, Suspension, Revision, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1896 (i).

Franking Privilege, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3618 (ii).

Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 3001 (i).

Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2497 (i).

— Order (Ques. of) 2554 (i).

Gov. Gen.'s Warrants, Total Number issued (Ques.) 1897 (i).

Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 506 (i).

I. C. R., St. Charles Branch, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1739 (i).

**McMullen, Mr. J.—Con.**

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 9120 (iii).

Liquor License Act (1883) Commissioners Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2830 (i).

Mail Mileage, Yearly, &c., in Can. (Ques.) 1477.

Members of Parlt., Appmnts. to Positions from 1879 to 1896 (Ques.) 4901 (ii).

Members' Sessional Indemnity, Increase, &c. (remarks) 10293 (iii).

Montreal Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1358 (i).

Order (Ques. of) 428 (i), 3838, 4906 (ii).

Paper Combine, Proposed Reduction of Duty (remarks) 4806 (ii).

Paris Exposition, par. in Toronto *Mail re* Exhibits on Sunday (M. to adjn.), 5033 (ii).

Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 6937 (ii).

Postal Army Corps. *See* "Army Postal Corps."

Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 9828 (iii).

Post Offices in Can., Number, &c. (Ques.) 1477.

Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2102 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Bergeron*) par. in *La Patrie*, 2233 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4127 (ii).

— on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 9051 (iii).

Public Debt, Additions to since 1894 (Ques.) 1897 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 4687 (ii); in Com., 9357 (iii).

Railways Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) on prop. Res., 9924; in Com. on Res., 9966 (iii).

Reports, Deptl., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4155 (ii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1223; in Com., 1403; on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 1608 (i).

St. Lawrence Canals and Policy of late Govt. *re* Completion (Ques.) 2164 (i).

Seed Grain Indebtedness B. 143 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 5042, 5049 (ii).

South African War—Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 6875 (ii).

— Order (Ques. of), 6832 (ii).

— Instructions, &c., on amt. (Mr. *Monk*) to Com. of Sup., 7568 (iii).

— Papers laid on Table (remarks) 7216 (iii).

— Par. in Ottawa *Citizen re* Purchase of Canadian Horses (remarks) 3778 (ii).

## SUPPLY :

Canals: Soulanges (Stewart's claim) 10171 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Interior (salaries) 7823 (iii); post office (salaries) 6127 (ii).

Immigration (salaries, agents, &c.) 9646 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (maintenance, &c.) 3653 (ii).

**McMullen, Mr. J.—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

- Militia* (Royal Military College) 8340 (iii).  
*Post Office* (mail service) 8689, 8716 (iii).  
*Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que.*  
 (Maria wharf) 10201 (iii).  
*Railways: I. C. R.* (Amherst accommodation)  
 9455; (increased facilities) 10367; (Stellarton  
 sidings) 9446 (iii).  
 Timber Licenses in Man., Order (Ques. of) 7263.  
 Toronto Members, Payments to (Ques.) 6051 (ii).  
 Trent Valley Canal, Arbitrators on Damages,  
 Names, &c. (Ques.) 1896 (i).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir  
*Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 6927 (ii),  
 7129 (iii).  
 White, Lt.-Col., Retirement, on M. (Mr. *Prior*)  
 to adjn., 3105 (i).

**McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce.**

- Beet Root Sugar, Cor. *re* Bounties, on M. (Mr.  
*Montague*) for copies, 3206 (i).  
 Budget, The. 4573 (ii).  
 — (M.) to adjn. Deb., 4432 (ii).  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections, Investiga-  
 tion, on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1032 (i).  
 See "Election," &c.  
 Civil Servants, Statutory Increases (remarks)  
 8439 (iii).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) in  
 Com., 7012, 7019, 7029, 7658 (iii).  
 Colonels, Honorary, Recent Appmnts. (remarks)  
 8282 (iii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*)  
 in Com., 7326, 8800, 8851, 9066; on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>,  
 9472 (iii).  
 Election Frauds, Judicial Inquiry, on M. to  
 adjn. (Mr. *Blair*) 7117 (iii).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B.  
 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5127 (ii).  
 Hutton, Gen., Departure from Can., on M. (Mr.  
*Prior*) to adjn., 334 (i).  
 Imperial Defence and Preferential Trade (re-  
 marks) 8932 (iii).  
 — par. in *Globe* (remarks) 8836 (iii).  
 Leinster Regiment and Canadian Volunteers (M.  
 to adjn.) 263 (i).  
 — (remarks) 82, 162 (i).  
 — See "South African War."  
 Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in  
 Com., 6463 (ii).  
 Montreal Riots (M. to adjn.) 1288 (i).  
 Pacific Cable, par. in Newspaper, *re* Ques. in  
 Imp. H. of C. (remarks) 815 (i).  
 — par. in *The Outlook*, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to  
 adjn., 656 (i).  
 Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *Toronto Globe*, 1787.  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop.  
 Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 9031 (iii).  
 — on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 9048 (iii).  
 Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (inquiry) 4246 (ii).

**McNeill, Mr. A.—Con.**

- Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>,  
 4689 (ii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13, on amt. (Mr.  
*Foster*) to M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1269; in Com., 1442; on  
 M. for 3<sup>d</sup> (amt.) 1557, 1560; withdn., 1561 (i).  
 — on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Tupper*)  
 1230 (i).  
 South African War, Can. Contingents, Pay to  
 Volunteers, B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on  
 Res., 1160; in Com. on B., 1652, 2001 (i).  
 — Can. Contingents, Vacancies, &c. (remarks)  
 1211, 1388 (i).  
 — Emergency Rations, Analysis, &c. (remarks)  
 7420, 7512 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 6817, 6821 (ii).  
 — on amt. (Mr. *Monk*) to Com. of Sup.  
 7546 (iii).  
 — papers laid on Table (remarks) 7217,  
 7317 (iii).  
 — rep. of Analyst (remarks) 8679 (iii).  
 — ruling of Speaker requested *re* Rep. of  
 Analyst, 7540, 7546 (iii).  
 — Garrison at Halifax (remarks) 937, 1123,  
 1209 (i).  
 — Leinster Regiment and Can. Volunteers  
 (remarks) 589 (i).  
 — See "Leinster," &c.  
 — Postage on Letters (remarks) 652 (i).  
 Supply B. 147 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4464 (ii).
- SUPPLY:  
*Customs: Ont.* (contingencies, salaries) 6074 (ii).  
*Militia* (annual drill) 8302 (iii).  
 Weights and Measures Act. Amt. B. 110 (Sir  
*Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4679,  
 4820 (ii).  
 White, Lt. Col., Retirement, on M. (Mr. *Prior*)  
 to adjn., 3127, 3136 (i).

**Madore, Mr. J. A. C., Hochelaga.**

- Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189  
 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Sen. Amts., 10043 (iii).

**Marcil, Mr. J. E., Bayot.**

- South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay to  
 Volunteers, in Com. on Res., 1168 (i).

**Marcotte, Mr. F. A., Champlain.**

- Aberdeen SS.*, Special Trip to Les Eboulements,  
 &c. (Ques.) 8430 (iii).  
 Budget, The, 4646 (ii).  
 Civil Servants as Insurance Agents (Ques.)  
 5245 (ii).  
 Debates, Translation (remarks) 6994 (iii).  
 Disbandment of 70th Batt. (Ques.) 3034 (i).  
 French Canadians, Attack, &c. on M. (Sir *Charles*  
*Tupper*) to adjn., 237 (i).  
 Gagne, Mr. A., St. Cœur de Marie, Appmnt. as  
 Postmaster (Ques.) 5756 (ii).  
 — See "St. Bruno."  
 Henault, Romuald, Customs Collector, Mas-  
 kinonge (Ques.) 3442 (ii).

**Marcotte, Mr. F. A.—Con.**

- I. C. R., Ouellette, Mr., Report *re* Work performed (Ques.) 4070, 5245 (ii).  
 — Pichette, Mr., Privileges at Lévis Station (Ques.) 4069 (ii).  
 — Ryan, Joseph, Foreman at Lévis (Ques.) 4069 (ii).  
 Illicit Stills, Seizure, &c. (Ques.) 7123-24, 7655 (iii).  
 Lake Temiscamingue, Survey (Ques.) 3444 (ii).  
 Lévis Graving Dock, Lengthening (Ques.) 4070 (ii).  
 Marchmont Property, Purchase of (Ques.) 6617 (ii), 7125 (iii).  
     *See* "Plains," &c.  
 Molocani and Stundists, Immigration, &c. (Ques.) 5244 (ii).  
 Pelessier Post Office. Removal, &c. (Ques.) 7879 (iii).  
 Parent, Mr. Arthur, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 9523 (iii).  
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5069, 5152 (ii).  
 Plains of Abraham, Applications *re* Purchase by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 6351, 6617 (ii), 7123, 7125 (iii).  
 Pontbriand P. O., Pets. *re* Location (Ques.) 1981.  
 St. Bruno and St. Cœur de Marie Post Office, Dismissal of Postmasters (Ques.) 5754 (ii).  
     *See* "Gagne."  
 Savard, Messrs., Appmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5754.  
 — Mr. J., St. Alexis, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5755 (ii).  
 Solicitor General and Administration of Criminal Justice (Ques.) 5244 (ii).  
 South African War, Canadian Contingent, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 933.  
 Superannuations, Amount granted, and Expediency of Payments (Ques.) 432 (i).  
 SUPPLY :  
     *Agriculture* (cold storage) 7629, 7638 (ii).  
     *Public Works*: Yukon (Lewes and Yukon rivers) 8061 (iii).  
 Tremblay, Mr. F., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5755 (ii).  
 — Mr. Hilar, L'Anse St. Jean, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5755 (ii).  
 — Mr. J., St. Bruno, Appmt. as Postmaster (Ques.) 5755 (ii).  
 Yukon—Lands under Licenses, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 5243 (ii).

**Martin, Mr. A., East Queen's (P.E.I.)**

- Alberton and Kildare, P.E.I. Mail Contractor, Name, &c. (Ques.) 1979 (i).  
 Bait Freezing Cos., Govt. Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 3176 (i).  
 Brace, Mr. R. K., Dismissal, Cor. *re* (M. for copy) 2203 (i).  
 — Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1480 (i).  
 — (M. for cor. \*) 2761 (i).  
     *See* "Gass," &c.  
 Brant S.S. Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4918 (ii).

**Martin, Mr. A.—Con.**

- Belfast and Murray Harbour Ry. (P. E. I.) Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 1741 (i).  
     *See* "P. E. I.," &c.  
 Cold Storage between P. E. I. and G. B. (remarks) 6253 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6739 (ii), 7326, 8091, 8818, 8340, on M. for 3<sup>d</sup> (amt.) 9482 (iii).  
 Gas Inspector at Charlottetown (Ques.) 4917 (ii).  
 Govt. System of Telegraph, Establishment B. 85 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 1<sup>d</sup>, 1718 (i).  
 Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Survey, &c. (Ques.) 1480, 2192 (i), 8434, 9059 (iii).  
 — (M. for copies\*) 168.  
 — *See* "P. E. I.," &c.  
 Iris. P.E.I., Pets. *re* Tri-weekly Mail Service (Ques.) 1751 (i).  
 Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 9126 (iii).  
 Judges' Salaries, Resolution respecting (remarks) 7321 (iii).  
 Kendall, A. S., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1119.  
 Murray Harbour Road, P.E.I., Resignation of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 2753 (i).  
 — (M. for cor. \*) 3469 (ii).  
 Newfoundland and Canada, Reciprocity Treaty, Proposals, &c. (Ques.) 290 (i).  
 — Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 2204 (i).  
 Paris Exposition, Provincial Representation (remarks) 1642 (i), 4258 (ii).  
 Pineau, H. J., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3446 (ii).  
 Pinette, P.E.I., Harbour Improvements (Ques.) 2754 (i).  
 P.E.I., and Mainland, Telegraph Service (Ques.) 4443 (ii).  
 — Delegation, *re* Question at Issue with Dom. Govt. (M. for papers\*) 2760 (i).  
 — Belfast and Murray Harbour Branch, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4913 (ii), 8434 (iii).  
 — Specifications, Plans, Tenders, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 168 (i).  
 — Rys. Branch Lines, Pts., &c. (Ques.) 9060 (iii).  
 — Hillsborough River Bridge Traffic, Cor., Telegrams, Memoranda &c. (M. for copies\*) 168 (i).  
 — *See* "Hillsborough."  
 — Mail Service Irregularity of, &c. (remarks) 2085 (i).  
 — (Murray Harbour Branch) Ry. B. 182 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 8940 (iii).  
 — News Agent (Ques.) 4912 (ii).  
 — Stoppage of Work (remarks) 7418 (iii).  
 — Straightening Curves at Colville and Loyalist, Memorials &c. (M. for copies\*) 2201 (i).  
 — Straightening Curves at North Wiltshire, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4443 (ii).

**Martin, Mr. A.—Con.**

Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 1572 (i).

Returns, Incomplete, 8440 (iii).

—— (inquiry) 4665 (ii).

Savage Island Light, Cor. *re* Removal (M. for copies\*) 2202 (i).

**SUPPLY:**

*Fisheries* (cold storage) 5983 (ii); (salaries and disbursements) 8067; (unpaid accounts) 8065; Indians, P. E. I. (medical attendance) 8070. *Inland Revenue*—Weights and Measures (salaries) 6035 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (P. E. I. and G. B.) 9584 (iii).

*Ocean and River Service* (Str. *Minto*) 8062 (iii).

*Public Works*—Dredging (Mar. Provs) 7966; Harbours and Rivers, N. B. (Campobello breakwater) 7945; P. E. I. (Canoe Cove breakwater) 9898; (China Point Pier) 7837, 7943; (Souris Point breakwater) 9899; (Summerside breakwater) 9899; (Wood Island breakwater) 9897 (iii).

*Railways*—P. E. I. (accommodation at Summerside) 8931; (Hillsborough bridge) 9461 (iii).

Tignish and Alberton Ports, Number of Wagons, &c. entered (Ques.) 8839 (iii).

Wagons and Carriages, Number imported into P. E. I. (Ques.) 5402 (ii).

Wood Island (P. E. I.) Breakwater, Pets. *re* Improvements (Ques.) 1737 (i).

**Maxwell, Mr. G. R., Burrard.**

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on prop. Res. 8178; in Com. 8183, 8208 (iii).

Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>st</sup>, 8404 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8827 (iii).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2053 (i).

Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 1000 (i).

—— Telegraph Supplies, Purchase by Mr. Charleson (telegram read) 8282 (iii).

**Mills, Mr. J. B., Annapolis.**

Apple Barrels, &c., Standard Size, &c., Repeal of Act (Ques.) 2459 (i).

Clyde River, N. S., Resignation of Postmaster Geo. Thompson, &c. (Ques.) 5021 (ii).

Dodge, B. H., Customs Officer, Kentville, Amounts paid by Govt. (Ques.) 1118 (i).

—— Seizures made, &c. (Ques.) 1478 (i).

—— Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2465 (i).

Dom. Cotton Mills Co., Ltd. (B. 71) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1553 (i).

Dom. Statutes, Consolidation, &c. (Ques.) 593 (i).

Drysdale, Mr., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4243.

Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5124 (ii).

Kentville P. O. Inspector, Name, &c. (Ques.) 4245 (ii).

Lobster Fishing in Digby and Annapolis Coves, Regulations (Ques.) 4243 (ii).

**Mills, Mr. J. B.—Con.**

Lyons, Catherine Cecilia, Relief (B. 144) 1<sup>st</sup>, 4554 (ii).

Nictaux Falls P. O., Postmaster's Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 2464 (i).

N. S. Govt. Buildings, Hoisting of Flag during Queen's Jubilee (remarks) 6789 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) Business of the Hse., 1946 (i).

Perrault, Joseph, Expenses as Commissioner at Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition (Ques.) 2378 (i).

—— Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 2831 (i).

Porter, Edgar H., Customs Collector, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 2404 (i).

Port George P. O., Issue of Money Orders, &c. (Ques.) 4439 (ii).

Procedure in asking Questions (remarks) 2367 (i).

Returns (inquiry) 6568 (ii).

—— *re* Steamships chartered by Govt. (remarks) 6257 (ii).

St. Johns, P. Q., Postmaster, Defalcations, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 478 (i).

South African War, Bloemfontein, Capture of, Raising of Flag on Parl. Buildings (remarks) 1928 (i).

Subsidy to Musgrave & Co.'s Steamers (Ques.) 4918 (ii).

Vroom, G. V., Amount paid by Govt. (Ques.) 2193 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4676, 4815, 6918 (ii).

Wickwire, Mr., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4244.

**Mignault, Mr. R. M. S., Yamaska.****SUPPLY:**

*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Yamaska lock, damages) 10213 (iii).

**Monet, Mr. D., Laprairie and Napierville.**

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 9338, 9339; on Sen. Amts., 10059 (ii).

Montreal Riots and Victoria Rifles (Ques.) 3036 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 9822 (iii).

St. Johns Customs Collector, par in *Canada Français* (remarks) 9844 (iii).

South African War, Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers, on prop Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 405; in Com. on Res., 1185 (i).

—— Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 9320 (iii).

—— Independence of Parl. *re* British Institutions, on amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com of Sup., 1848 (i).

**Monk, Mr. F. D., Jacques Cartier.**

B. C. Lt.-Governor, Dismissal, &c., Cor. with Sec. of State (Ques.) 9522 (iii).

**Monk, Mr. F. D.—Con.**

- Budget, The, 4049, 4167 (ii).  
 — (M. to adjn. Deb.) 4047 (ii).  
 Cote St. Luc Rifle Range, Closing and Purchase of New Site (Ques.) 292 (i), 4566 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6738 (ii).  
 French Canadians Attacks, &c., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 228 (i).  
 Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 3020 (i).  
 Harris, Geo. A., Investigation into Complaint of &c. (remarks) 9062 (iii).  
 I.C.R. Extension to Montreal, Claims made on Govt. by G. T. R. for Terminal Improvements (Ques.) 2829 (i).  
 Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>e</sup>, 9121 (iii).  
 Lachine Canal, Lockmen, &c., Increase of Pay, &c. (Ques.) 5024 (ii).  
 Medals, 1866-70, Distribution in 5th and 6th Military Districts (Ques.) 2755 (i).  
 Montreal and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1\*, 777 (i).  
 Montreal P.O., Fines, &c. (Ques.) 6057 (ii).  
 — Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1337.  
 — *Star*, Copies franked through Mails (remarks) 2401 (i).  
 — Turnpike Bonds, Interest due Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2402, 2753 (i).  
 Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, O. C. *re* Mr. Walter Shanley (M. for copy\*) 2201 (i).  
 Paris Exposition, Closing on Sundays (remarks) 6353 (ii).  
 Pointe aux Trembles Lighthouse, Reconstruction (remarks) 6062 (ii).  
 Pointe Claire Fire, Relief to Sufferers (remarks) 6135 (ii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 9016 (iii).  
 Provincial Electoral Lists, Expenses of Printing, &c. (Ques.) 2755 (i).  
 Richelieu River, Beloeil, Govt. Works, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2755 (i).  
 Rifle Range at Montreal, Purchase (remarks) 292 (i), 4566 (ii).  
 South African War—Bamford, Private, Telegrams, &c. (remarks) 7882 (iii).  
 — Canadian Contingent, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 907 (i).  
 — Emergency Rations, on amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7527 (iii).  
 — &c., on Ques. of Order, 6831-44 (ii).  
 — (M.) for Com., 7395 (iii).  
 — (M.) to print Rep., 8651 (iii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Balcourt*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com. (Amt.) 9220 (iii).  
 — papers laid on Table (remarks) 7212 (iii).  
 — par. in *Can. Military Gazette* (M.) to adjn., 6790, 6883 (ii).  
 — Personal Explanation. 7536 (iii).

**Monk, Mr. F. D.—Con.**

- South African War—Ques. of Privilege, 7305 (iii).  
 Speeches of Hon. Mr. Tarte at London and Paris (M. to adjn.) 3779 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Administration of Justice* (Judges' salaries) 6431; (Supreme Court, law books) 6436 (ii).  
*Miscellaneous* (distressed settlers, N. W. T.) 7497 (iii).  
*Penitentiaries*: St. Vincent de Paul (electric plant) 6439; (investigations) 6895 (ii).  
 Ville Marie Bank, Cor. between Directors and Govt., and Stmt. of Sums paid, Claims made, &c. (M. for copies\*) 168 (i).  
 — Pets. *re* Govt. Intervention and Special Grant (M. for copy) 3050 (i).

**Montague, Hon. W. H., *Haldimand*.**

- Agriculture Dept., Employees, Number, &c. (Ques.) 2180, 2366 (i).  
 Beet Root Sugar, Cor. *re* Bounties (M. for copies) 3180 (i).  
 Benevolent Societies, Legislation respecting (remarks) 350 (i).  
 Budget, The, 3337, 3374 (ii).  
 Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 6493; on M. for 3<sup>e</sup>, 6601 (ii).  
 C. P. R. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to M. for 3<sup>e</sup>, 2657, 2666 (i).  
 Cattle, &c., Exports to G. B. (remarks) 2746 (i).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2<sup>e</sup>, 6998; in Com., 7023, 7034 (iii).  
 Coasting Laws Abrogation, on amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Com. of Sup., 9158 (iii).  
 Cold Storage on Steamships, in Com. on Res., 4826 (ii).  
 — Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2366 (i).  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>e</sup>, 8424, 8428 (iii).  
 Copyright Act Amt. B. 167 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for Com., 9148 (iii).  
 Cox, Edwin James, Relief (B. 131) 1\*, 3330 (ii).  
 Creamery Products, Sale, &c., by Govt. (remarks) 6701 (ii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5701 (ii).  
 Deficits, Surpluses and Subsidies, on Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 2835 (i).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>e</sup>, 6724 (ii); in Com., 9066, 9071 (iii).  
 Electoral Franchise Bill (remarks) 6244 (ii).  
 — Lists, Distribution, &c. (remarks) 169.  
 Friendly Societies. *See* "Benevolent Societies."  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5835 (ii).  
 Grain Inspection B. (remarks) 5727 (ii).  
 Hutton, Gen., Departure from Can., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 343 (i).  
 — *See* "Par. in *Globe*."  
 I. C. R., Sale of Rolling Stock, &c. (M. to adjn.) 4906 (ii).

**Montague, Hon. W. H.—Con.**

- Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9134; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 9341 (iii).
- Labour Troubles. See "Conciliation." &c.
- Mail Clerks, Examination of (Ques.) 6616 (ii).
- Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 6453, 6460 (ii).
- Militia Staff Course, Kingston, on Inquiry for Ret., 2741 (i).
- Order (Ques. of) Business of the Hse., 1945 (i).
- Irrelevancy of Deb. (remarks) 4271 (ii).
- Orford Copper Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1929 (i).
- Paper Combine, Proposed Reduction of Duty (remarks) 4807 (ii).
- Paris Exposition, Amount spent on buildings (remarks) 7649 (iii).
- Cost of Canadian Buildings (remarks) 3772 (ii).
- Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6911 (ii).
- Personal Explanation, par. in *Toronto Globe*, 2674 (i).
- Par. in *Toronto Globe* re Gen. Hutton (remarks) 480 (i).
- Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 9332 (iii).
- Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2086 (i).
- Provincial Subsidies, &c. (remarks) 10034 (iii).
- Railway Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 9355 (iii).
- Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1589 (i).
- River St. Clair Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 41) 1<sup>o</sup>, 649 (i).
- San José Scale Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 3166 (i).
- Servis Railroad Tie Plate Co.'s Patent Relief B. 93 (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 2671 (i).
- Sessional Clerks, &c., Payment of Salaries (remarks) 6254 (ii).
- Employees, Payment of Salaries, &c. (remarks) 6355 (ii).
- South African War—Address to Her Maj. on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6909 (ii).
- Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Filding*) on prop. Res. 724 (i).
- Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 6853 (ii).
- on Ques. of Order, 6831-44 (ii).
- Papers laid on Table (remarks) 7219 (ii).
- Standard Oil Co.'s Prices (remarks) 5398 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (census) 6343; (classifying patents) 6342; (criminal statistics) 6339; (experimental farms) 6341; (farm bulletins) 6341; (historical data) 6345; (Paris exposition) 6344 (ii), 7184 (iii); (*Patent Record*) 6339 (ii).

**Montague, Hon. W. H.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

- Canals*: Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 9186, 9416; St. Lawrence River (gas buoys) 9427, 9430 (iii).
- Civil Govt.*: Agriculture (salaries) 6335 (ii).
- Customs* (statistical returns) 6243 (ii).
- Interior* (clerical assistance) 6682 (ii).
- Govt. of N. W. T.* (insane patients) 6684, 6689; (school grant) 6686; Unorganized Districts (schools, &c.) 6689 (ii).
- Govt. of the Yukon Territory* (salaries, &c.) 6984.
- Penitentiaries*: Kingston (binder twine) 6891; (St. Vincent de Paul) 6893 (ii).
- Post Office* (mail service) 8677 (iii).
- Quarantine* (health regulations) 6348 (ii), 9197, 9407; Organized Districts (tuberculosis) 7174 (Tracadie Lazaretto) 6347 (ii).
- Railways*: I.C.R. (Stellarton sidings) 9442 (iii).
- Timber Licenses in Man., on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 7245, 7247 (iii).
- Toronto Hotel Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 4965 (ii).
- Trinidad, Trade Relations with Can. (remarks) 9064 (iii).
- Voters' Lists, Printing (remarks) 2673, 2740, 2755 (i), 4249 (ii), 7208 (iii).
- Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4812 (ii).
- Welland Canal, Dynamite Explosion, on M. (Mr. *McCleary*) to adjn., 4257 (ii).
- Number of Employees, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 2181 (i).
- White, Lt.-Col., Retirement, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 3101 (i).
- Yukon—*John C. Barr*, Undervaluation, &c., on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6655 (ii).

**Moore, Mr. A. H., Stanstead.**

- Budget, The, 3565, 3579 (ii).
- Coal Oil Duties (remarks) 8049 (iii).
- Elevator Accommodation, H. of C. (remarks) 1554 (i).
- Granite, Increase of Duty, on M. for Com. of Sup., 8046 (iii).
- (remarks) 7991 (iii).
- Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Sen. Amts., 10094 (iii).
- Montreal, Portland and Boston Ry., Pets. re Subsidy (M. for copy\*) 1012 (i).
- Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6949 (ii).
- Preferential Trade with G.B., on amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2307 (i).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4125 (ii).
- on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 9053 (iii).
- Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 1458 (i).
- Tobacco, Abolition of Duties, on amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) to Com. of Sup., 7902 (iii).
- Woman Suffrage, on M. for Com. of Sup., 9702.
- Year Book (inquiry) 4153 (i).

**Morin, Mr. J. B.,** *Dorchester.*

- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8805 (iii).  
 Emergency Rations, Translation of Evidence, 8935 (iii).  
 G.T.R., Govt. Loan to (Ques.) 4916 (ii).  
 Immigration from Europe to Can., Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2836, 3261 (i).  
 Murray Bay and Rivière Ouelle, Steam Communication (Ques.) 2756 (i).

**Morrison, Mr. A.,** *New Westminster.*

- Arrowhead and Kootenay Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1<sup>st</sup>, 577 (i).  
 Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) in Com., 2406; on amt. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2623 (i).  
 B.C. Lt.-Gov. McInnis, Action of the Govt. *re* (remarks) 7882 (iii).  
 Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on prop. Res., 8164; in Com., 8196 (iii).  
 — Govt. Action *re* Legislation (remarks) 2617 (i).  
 Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1<sup>st</sup>, 577; in Com., 3209 (i), 3418; 3<sup>rd</sup> m., 3441.  
 Homestead Entries, Numbers granted in Ry. Belt, B.C., &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 2760 (i).  
 Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1381.  
 Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8084 (iii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Public Works*: Buildings, Yukon (rent, fuel, &c.) 10262; Harbours and Rivers, B. C. (Fraser River) 7956 (iii).  
 Treaty between G. B. and Japan (Ques.) 7970.

**Mulock, Hon. W.,** *North York (O.)*

- Alberton Harbour, P.E.I., Amount Expended, (Ans.) 6781 (ii).  
 Alberton and Kildare, P.E.I., Mail Contractor, Name, &c. (Ans.) 1979 (i).  
 Army Postal Corps, Appmnts., &c. (Ans.) 1755.  
 Athens P. O., Hours of Closing (Ans.) 7972 (iii).  
 Balgonie and Hednesford Mail Contract (Ans.) 1466 (i).  
 Bathurst Public Building, Refusal of Caretaker to raise Flag (remarks) 6447 (ii), 6994 (iii).  
 See "South African War," &c.  
 Beauchemin, Bickerdike, &c., Payments to (Ans.) 3768 (ii).  
 Beaumont, Wm., Postmaster at Maple Bay, Claim against Govt. (Ans.) 433 (i).  
 Belgrave P. O., Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 2748.  
 Bergeronnes, P. Q., Expenditure by Govt. (Ans.) 1745 (i).  
 Berthier en Haut, Name of Dredge, &c. (Ans.) 2171 (i).  
 Bilodeau, L. P., Payments to (Ans.) 3766 (ii).  
 Brockville Mail Transfer Service, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1472 (i).  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5685.

**Mulock, Hon. W—Con.**

- Broderick, John W., Pet. of Right, on Inquiry (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Ret., 4811 (ii).  
 Bronte Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 2193 (i).  
 Brown, Mr. Alfred, late Supt. Ry. Mail Service, Appmt. of Successor (Ans.) 2832, 2836 (i).  
 Cable at Pointe aux Outardes, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 7316 (iii).  
 Cap aux Corbeaux Pier, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1742.  
 Carnduff, Mr. J. P., Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. 7416 (iii).  
 Centre New Annan P. O., N.S., Appmt. of Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 4557 (ii).  
 Chicoutimi Wharf, Expenditure by Govt. (Ans.) 1745 (i).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7008, 7025 (iii).  
 Clyde River, N.S., Resignation of Postmaster Geo. Thompson (Ans.) 5022 (ii).  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes (B. 187) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 8399; 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 9368; in Com., 9392 (iii).  
 Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 5223 (ii).  
 Dominion, Dredge, Number of Men, Officers, &c. (Ans.) 5026 (ii).  
 Drouin Frères, et Cie, Payments to (Ques.) 3769.  
 Dufferin Port Wharf, &c. (Ans.) 10508 (iii).  
 Eastern Harbour and Port Hastings Mail Service (Ans.) 1895 (i).  
 Eastern Telegraph Co., Concessions granted by Australian Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1752 (i).  
 See "Pacific Cable."  
 Elder-Dempster SS. Contract, on Inquiry for Ret., 6917 (ii).  
 Esquimalt Dry Dock, Pets. *re* Docking Charges (Ans.) 3576 (ii).  
 — Receipts and Expenditures for 1895-6-7-8-9 (Ans.) 5024 (ii).  
 Eurcka, Str., Purchase by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 5752.  
 Franking Privilege, &c. (Ans.) 2459, 2747, 3264, 6777 (ii).  
 — of Provincial Legislatures (Ans.) 3264 (i).  
 — Regulations, O.C. respecting, Violation, &c. (Ans.) 780, 786 (i).  
 See "Montreal Star."  
 Fraser River, B.C., Cost of Improvements, (Ans.) 2833 (i).  
 See "Sumas Bar." &c.  
 Gagné, Mr. A., St. Cœur de Marie, Appmt. as Postmaster (Ans.) 5756 (ii).  
 Gass, Chas. A., Dismissal as Postmaster at Moosejaw (Ans.) 3761, 5241, 5393 (ii).  
 See "Moosejaw."  
 Gordon Point, P.E.I., Wharf, Pets., *re* (Ans.) 9905 (iii).  
 Govt. Contracts containing "sweating" clause, Names, &c. (Ans.) 4557 (ii).  
 — Protection to Workmen, (prop. Res.) 2466 (i); (M.) to resume adjd. deb., 10496 (iii).  
 — (remarks) 10422 (iii).

**Mulock, Hon. W.—Con.**

- Govt. Expropriation of Telegraph Lines (Ans.) 1752 (i).
- Hawkestone Dock, Tenders, &c. 4076 (ii).
- Hockley and Mono Centre Mail Contract (Ans.) 1749, 2743 (i).
- House of Commons, Obstruction of Bicycles in Main Entrance (remarks) 4247 (ii).
- I.C.R., Destruction of Mail Bags at Stations (Ans.) 4742 (ii).
- Mail Service below Riviere du Loup (Ans.) 1114 (i).
- Ouellet, Mr., Mail Clerk at Lévis, Duties (Ans.) 4070, 5246 (ii).
- Iris, P.E.I., Pets. *re* tri-Weekly Mail Service (Ans.) 1752 (i).
- Jones, Mr. E. H., late Postmaster, Kamloops, B.C., Cor. *re* Dismissal, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) for copies, 2762 (i).
- Kamouraska and St. Pascal Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1749 (i), 9795 (iii).
- See* "St. Pascal."
- Kentville P.O., Inspector, Name, &c. (Ans.) 4245.
- Labour Troubles, *See* "Conciliation."
- Lake St. John, Dredge, Wages, &c. (Ans.) 3765.
- See* "Roberval," &c.
- Lemay, Maxime, Postmaster at Lotbinière, Dismissal, &c., (Ans.) 1728 (i).
- Lytton-Lilloet Mail Service, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1979 (i), 3770 (ii).
- Mail Bags, Private Delivery of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 8052 (iii).
- Clerks, Examination of (Ans.) 6616 (ii).
- Montreal and Que. Divisions, Fines (Ans.) 4076 (ii).
- Delivery at Halifax and Dartmouth (remarks) 7990 (iii).
- Mileage, Yearly, &c., in Can. (Ans.) 1477 (i).
- years ending 1890 and 1893 (Ans.) 2169 (i).
- Service, Inverness Co., Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6616 (ii).
- Man., Pets., &c. (Ans.) 9522 (iii).
- See* "Ry. Mail Service."
- Marconi System of Telegraphing (Ans.) 2199 (i).
- Medicine Hat, Public Works (Ans.) 5514 (ii).
- Members' Sessional Indemnity, Additional (remarks) 9672 (iii).
- Miller, R. W., Postmaster at Actinolite, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).
- Mispec River, Construction of Dam, &c. (Ans.) 7122 (iii).
- Montreal Harbour and Connors Syndicate, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 4246, 5228 (ii).
- P.O., Fines, &c. (Ans.) 6057 (ii).
- *Star*, Copies sent through Mails, Number &c. (Ans.) 2463 (i).
- Moose Jaw Postmaster, Dismissal, Rep. of Inspector laid on Table, 5393 (ii).
- See* "Gass, Mr."

**Mulock, Hon. W.—Con.**

- Morrison, Mr. J. C., Collector of Mails at Barrie (Ans.) 2758 (i).
- Murray Harbour Road, P.E.I., Resignation of Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 2754 (i).
- New Carlisle Wharf, Subsidy, &c. (Ans.) 3773 (ii).
- New Glasgow Public Building, Plumbing, &c. (Ans.) 7880 (iii).
- Newmanville-Merrickville Mail Contract, Tenders (Ans.) 7125 (iii).
- Newspaper Postage, Amount collected (Ans.) 3263 (i), 3576 (i).
- New Westminster, B.C., Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ans.) 5896 (ii).
- Nictaux Falls P.O., Postmaster's Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 2464 (i).
- North Shore Telegraph Line, Amounts paid, Miles constructed, Inspector appointed, &c. (Ans.) 1742-3 (i), 3765, 3769 (ii).
- Norton Station, N.B., Dismissal of Mr. McCready (Ans.) 5896 (ii).
- O'Donahue W., T., Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 3763-4 (ii).
- See* "Lake St. John."
- Pacific Cable and Action of Imp. Govt., on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to adjn., 1486 (i).
- Board, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 1977 (i).
- Concessions to Eastern Extension Co., on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to adjn., 2155 (i).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., 7049 (iii).
- Papers, &c., laid on Table, 1554, 1898 (i).
- par. in *Toronto Globe re* Proposal of Eastern Extension Co., on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to adjn., 584 (i).
- par. in *The Outlook*, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to adjn., 656 (i).
- See* "Eastern Telegraph," &c.
- Parent, Mr. Arthur, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 9523 (iii).
- Pelessier Post Office, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 7879.
- Pelletier, Réal, Pay of (Ans.) 8524 (iii).
- Percé and Gaspé Wharfs, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 5753 (ii).
- Peribonka Wharf, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1744 (i), 3766 (ii).
- Perron, P. A., Appnt. (Ans.) 3768 (ii).
- Phin, W. E., Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 3770 (ii).
- Picton Postmastership, Vacancy, &c. (Ans.) 1462.
- Pinette, P.E.I., Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 2754 (i).
- Pontbriand P.O., Pets. *re* Location, &c. (Ans.) 1981.
- Port Dufferin Wharf, Halifax County, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 9904 (iii).
- Port George, N.S., P.O., Issue of Money Orders &c. (Ans.) 4439 (iii).
- Postage on Letters, Insufficient (Ans.) 6625 (ii).
- *See* "S. A. War," &c.
- received by P. O. Dept. for Transmission on Newspapers, on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Ret., 2203 (i).

**Mulock, Hon. W.—Con.**

- Postage, Reduction, Remuneration of Postmasters (Ans.) 2835 (i).
- Postal Contracts, N. W. T. (Ans.) 1748 (i).
- Revenue, Reduction on Letters (Ans.) 2190 (i).
- Notes System, Establishment in Can. (Ans.) 1478 (i).
- Regulations respecting (Ans.) 9797 (iii).
- Postmasters in the Country, Allowances, &c. (Ans.) 598, 1120 (i).
- Post Office Act Amt. (B. 191) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 9332; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 9689; (M.) for Com., 9799; in Com., 9813 (iii).
- Boxes, &c., Rents paid, &c. (Ans.) 1479 (i).
- in Can. Number, &c. (Ans.) 1477, 2464 (i).
- Dept., Clerks, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4446 (ii).
- Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 9795, 10303 (iii).
- offices conducted without assistance of Postmasters, &c. (Ans.) 2757 (i).
- Reps., Copy sent to Queen's Printer, Date, &c. (Ans.) 4442, 4734, 4907 (ii).
- on inquiry for, 3577 (ii).
- Potvin, P. A., Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 3767 (ii).
- Provencher Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 6915 (ii).
- Public Works Dept., Clerks, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4446 (ii).
- Deptl. Rep., on Inquiry for, 4246 (ii).
- Date of Copy sent to Bureau (Ans.) 4734 (ii).
- Maritime Provinces, Minister's Trip, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2179 (i).
- in Provinces of Can., on Inquiry for Ret., 9684 (iii).
- Quebec and Bersimis Mail Service, Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 1976 (i).
- Quebec and Montreal Ship Channel, Amount expended, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 2191 (i).
- Ry. Mail Service, Additional Mileage since 1896 (Ans.) 1754, 2166 (i).
- N. S., Appnmt. of Supt. (Ans.) 2832, 2836 (i).
- Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. Blair) in Com. on Res., 9965 (iii).
- Representation in the H. of C. (B. 13) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 247; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1212; in Com., 1402; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 1556 (i).
- on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 1252 (i).
- Returns, on Inquiry for, 3640, 4664, 5523, 6784 (ii), 8076 (iii).
- Richelieu River, Govt. Works at Belœil, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2756 (i).
- River du Loup, Govt. Works, Completion (Ans.) 4076 (ii).
- Roberval, Dredge, &c., Cost of (Ans.) 3764 (ii).
- See "Lake St. John."
- Roberval, Hotel Rates (Ans.) 3767 (ii).
- Round Hill Postmaster, Salary, Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 9796 (iii).
- Rowan Mills P. O., Postmaster, Name, &c (Ans.) 4742 (ii).

**Mulock, Hon. W.—Con.**

- Roy, Mr., Resident Engineer, B.C., Removal, &c. (Ans.) 2757, 3180 (i).
- St. Alexis Wharf, Expenditure by Govt. (Ans.) 1745 (i).
- St. Anne Wharf, Expenditure by Govt. (Ans.) 1745 (i).
- St. Bruno and St. Cœur de Marie, Dismissal of Postmasters, &c. (Ans.) 5754 (ii).
- St. Gedeon P. O. and Ry. Station, Mail Contract (Ans.) 4075 (ii).
- St. Johns, P. Q. Postmaster, Defalcations, Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 478 (i).
- St. Joseph de Lévis Graving Dock, Enlargement, &c. (Ans.) 2191 (i).
- St. Pascal and Kamouraska Mail Contract (Ans.) 4741 (ii). See "Kamouraska".
- St. Peter's, P. E. I., Harbour Improvements (Ans.) 3175 (i).
- St. Thomas, Postmaster, Suspension, &c. (Ans.) 1883 (i); 6610 (ii).
- Salmon River Govt. Wharf and Shed, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 7656 (iii).
- Savard, Dr. Ed., Paymaster at Chicoutimi (Ques.) 3767 (ii).
- Savard, Messrs. Emplmnt by Govt. (Ans.) 5754 (ii).
- Shrapnel, W., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4556 (ii).
- Soperton Post Office, Establishment, &c. (Ans.) 1735 (i).
- South African War., Bathurst P. O., Hoisting of Flag (remarks), 6447 (ii), 6994 (iii).
- Bloemfontein, Capture of, raising of Flag on Parl. Buildings (remarks) 1927 (i).
- Postage on Letters (remarks) 650 (i).
- Sumas Bar, B.C., Public Works, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 4446 (ii).
- See "Fraser River" &c.

**SUPPLY :**

- Civil Government* Postoffice (closing accounts) 6129; (contingencies) 6129; (dead letter branch) 6129; (salaries) 6102 (ii); statutory increases, &c.) 10274; conc., 10425, 10447; Public Works Dept. (salaries) 7847; (T. F. MacLaughlin's increase) 9858 (iii).
- Customs*: (Dom. appraisers, &c.) 10418 (iii).
- Govt. of N. W. T.*: (insane patients) 6684, 6690.
- Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions*: (G. B. and Can.) 9562 (iii).
- Miscellaneous*: (Conciliation Act) 10413 (iii).
- Post office*: (Carnduff Postmaster, &c.) 10267; (dead letter branch) 8770; (franking privileges) 10270; (general statement) 8661; (mail service) 8661; Miscellaneous (mail bags, &c.) 8775; (Woodstock, dismissal of Postmaster) 10273; Yukon (mail service) 8775 (iii).
- Public Works*: Buildings, B.C. (Kamloops post-office), 7927; (Nelson post office) 7927; (New Westminster post office) 7929; (Rossland post office) 7929; Dom. (rents, &c.) 7938; (salaries, &c.) 9893; (experimental farms) 7930; (generally) 7929; N.B. (St. John immigrant building) 9875; N.W.T. (Regina Govt. Buildings) 9892; (Red Deer court-house) 9892; (Lt. Gov's residence) 7926; N.S. (Digby P. O.

Mulock, Hon. W.—*Con.*SUPPLY—*Con.**Public Works—Con.*

7870; (Liverpool post office) 9874; (public buildings, Halifax) 9872; (Springhill post office) 7878; Ont. (Brockville drill hall) 7916; (Deseronto post office) 9883; (Glengarry post office) 9886; (Kingston drill hall) 7916; (London drill hall) 7916; (Picton post office) 9884; (Rideau Hall fire protection) 9889; (Sarnia post office) 7917, 9884; (Toronto junction) 9886; (Toronto P. O. automobile cars) 9885; (Windsor drill hall) 9889; (Woodstock post office) 7926; Ottawa, 7932; (Customs offices) 9888; (heating, &c.) 7938; (lighting, &c.) 7938; (military stores) 7847, 9858; (Rideau Hall) 7835, 7957; (steel file cases) 9895; (steel shelving) 7939, 9895; (water rates) 7939; Que. (Buckingham post office) 9875; (Chicoutimi post office) 9876; (Drummondville post office) 9876; (Granby post office) 9878; (Hochelaga post office) 9878 (iii); (Hull post office) 4345 (ii); (Quebec cartridge factory) 9877; (Victoriaville post office) 9876; Coll. of Rev. (slides and booms) 8054; Dredging (Mar. Provs.), 7966; (plant new), 10253; Harbours and Rivers, B.C., (Columbia river) 7955; (Fraser river) 7955, 10252; (Victoria harbour) 7964; (Williams Head wharf) 7958; Man. (Lake Dauphin) 10252; (Lake Manitoba) 10252; (St. Andrews rapids) 9859; N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 9901; (Campobello breakwater) 7945; (Cape Tormentine breakwater) 7946; (Chance harbour breakwater) 9900; (Dipper harbour) 9900; (Dorchester breakwater) 9901; (Shippegan harbour) 7916; N. S. (Blue Rock breakwater) 9895; (Broad Cove breakwater) 9897; (Cape Cove breakwater) 7836; (Church Point pier) 7837; (Comeauville breakwater) 7836; (Écum Secum wharf) 9896; (Gabarus breakwater) 9895; (Ingonish breakwater) 7940; (Judique wharf) 7836; (Livingstone's Cove) 9895; (Margaree harbour) 7965; (New Harbour breakwater) 7940; (Porter's Lake dredging) 9896; (River John wharf) 7941; (Winter harbour) 7836; Ont. (Bronte harbour) 10233; (Bruce Mines wharf) 7950; (Collingwood harbour) 7952, 10248; (Depot Harbour breakwater) 10228; (Goderich breakwater) 10245; (Leanington pier) 10245; (Little Current) 10250; (McGregor's Creek) 10233; (Meaford, dredging) 10247; (Nation River dam) 10230; (Pickering breakwater) 10230; (Port Burwell) 10234; (Port Findlay wharf) 10250; (Port Hope harbour) 10229; (Port Stanley wharf) 10236; (Rainy River lock) 7862; (Sault Ste. Marie) 10250; (Sarnia, dredging) 10228; (South Nation river) 10251; (Temiscamingue Lake wharfs) 10250; (Toronto harbour) 10230, 10236; P.E.I. (Annandale pier) 9898; (Canoe Cove breakwater) 9893; (China Point pier) 7943; (Souris Point breakwater) 9899; (Summerside breakwater) 9899; (Wood Island breakwater) 9897; Que. (Cap Sante wharf) 10210; (Chateauguay River, dredging) 10226; (Chicoutimi wharf repairs) 10208; (Coteau du Lac wharf) 10097; (Coteau Landing, dredging) 10222; (Gatineau River improvements) 10226; (Grand Vallee pier) 10228; (Greece's Point) 10227; (Hull landing pier) 10226; (Isle Verte wharf) 10209; (Magdalen Island breakwater) 7949; (Maria wharf) 10195; (Montreal harbour) 9866; (Newport breakwater) 7950; (Perce wharf) 7950; (refitting *Eureka*) 7851; (removal of rocks, &c.) 7949; (Richelieu river

Mulock, Hon. W.—*Con.*SUPPLY—*Con.**Public Works—Con.*

boom) 10217; (St. Lambert protection walls) 10218; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 7848; (St. Roch des Aulnaies wharf) 10209; (Saguenay River, dredging) 10207; (Sorel ice piers) 10227; (Soulanges Canal wharf) 10097; (transportation facilities, Lévis) 9859; (Yamaska lock, damages) 10215; Miscellaneous (Architect's and Engineering staff) 10255; (monument to Mr. Mackenzie) 10254; (portrait of Her Majesty) 10255; Quarantine Stations (Grosse Isle) 7835; Roads and Bridges (Battleford, N.W.T.) 10253 (iii); (Chaudière) 4345 (ii); (Des Joachims) 10253; (Edmonton, N.W.T.) 7837; (Maria Street, Ottawa) 10253; (Portage du Fort) 10253; Rideau Hall (remetelling road) 7835; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice district) 7837; Telegraph Lines (Can. B. C. and Dawson City) conc., 10441; (B.C., Atlin line) 10256; (French Creek extension) 7838; (P.E.I. and mainland) 8054; (Pelee Island) 10253; (St. Lawrence River extension) 10253; (St. Lawrence shores) 7838; Yukon Buildings (rent, fuel, &c.) 7839, 8057, 10257; N. W. M. P. (compensation for mail services) 9779; Telegraph Lines (Atlin and Quesnelle) 10256; (Bennett, Dawson and Atlin) 7844; (Dawson to Fort Cudahy) 10257; (trails, roads, &c.) 10257; (Yukon and Lewes River improvements) 7839, 8058 (iii).

Sydney, C. B., P. O. Accommodation (Ans.) 3178.

Tadouzac Wharf, Expenditure by Govt. (Ans.) 1745 (i).

Tatamagouche Harbour, Survey, &c. (Ans.) 9524.

Tatamagouche Mountain P. O., N. S., Appnmt. of Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 4557 (ii).

Telegraph Line, Construction by Govt. to Belle Isle (Ans.) 2462 (i).

Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners, Expenditure (Ans.) 5515 (ii).

Timber Licenses, &c. (remarks) 7263 (iii).

Toronto Harbour, Amounts paid for Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 1742 (i).

— Postmaster, Absence from Official Duties (Ans.) 4443 (ii).

— Dep. Postmaster, Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 3264 (i).

Trade Disputes. See "Conciliation."

Transportation Question and St. Lawrence Canals Contracts, Speech of P. M. G. at Collingwood (Ans.) 433 (i).

Tremblay, Mr. F., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5755 (ii).

— Mr. Hilas, l'Anse St. Jean, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5755 (ii).

— Mr. J., St. Bruno, Appnmt. as Postmaster (Ans.) 5755 (ii).

Valliers, Philip, Contracts with Pub. Works Dept. (Ans.) 2165 (i).

Vancouver P. O., Letter Carriers, Increase, &c. (Ans.) 1982 (i).

Voters' Lists, Pointe aux Esquimaux (Ans.) 8525.

West Point, P.E.I., Tenders for Wharf Improvements (Ans.) 2164 (i).

**Mulock, Hon. W.—Con.**

- Winnipeg P. O., Number of Letters Annually (Ans.) 4743 (ii).  
 Wood Island (P.E.I.) Pets. *re* Improvements (Ans.) 1737 (i).  
 Yukon—Bennett and Dawson Mail Service (Ans.) 2158 (i).  
 ——— Bennett-Dawson Tel. Line, Charleson Contract for Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 1734 (i).  
 ——— date of operation (Ans.) 7316 (iii).  
 ——— Casca Transportation Co., Claims against Govt. (Ans.) 812 (i).  
 ——— Charleson, Mr., Expenditure per Aud. Gen's. Rep. (Ans.) 2178 (i).  
 ——— Dawson to Circle City, Tel. Line, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 1734 (i).  
 ——— Mail Service, Pets. received by P. M. G., &c. (Ans.) 1482 (i).  
 ——— Postal Receipts and Expenditures (Ant.) 9792 (iii).  
 ——— Tel. Line, Charleson's Rep. (remarks) 7656.  
 ——— Tel. Line, Charges against Mr. Charleson (remarks) 7203 (iii).  
 ——— on Inquiry for Papers, 7514, 7650 (iii).  
 ——— Winter Road, Construction and Expenditure by Govt (Ans.) 1736 (i).

**Oliver, Mr. F., Alberta.**

- C. P. R. Land Grants, Taxation of, on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to Com. of Sup., 8037 (iii).  
 Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt B. 180 (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8295 (iii).  
 Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co's. incorp. B. 35 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 3437 (ii).  
 Grain Inspection Act B. 141 (*Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 5810, 6293; on M. (*Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) to ref. back to Com., 6261; on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 6303 (ii).  
 Hutton, Gen., Departure from Can., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 342 (i).  
 Immigration to N.W. Ters. Inaccuracy of Deptl. Report (remarks) 19186 (iii).  
 Morris and Portage Ry. Co's incorp. (B. 52) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1109 (i).  
 N.W. Ters., Taxation of Ry. Lands (prop. Res.) 611 (i).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4138 (ii).  
 St. Mary's River and Ry. Colonization Co.'s incorp. (B. 88) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1786 (i).  
 South African War, Can. Contingents, B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 530; in Com. on Res., 1159, 1189; in Com. on B., 1665, 1696-1698 (i).  
 ——— Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 9322 (iii).  
 ——— Indemnities to Families of Can. Soldiers (remarks) 10317 (iii).  
 ——— Pensions for Volunteers, &c. (Ques.) 10304.  
 ——— Purchase of Horses for British Army, (Ques.) 3774 (ii).

**Oliver, Mr. F.—Con.**

- South African War—Purchase of Horses West of Lake Superior (Ques.) 4439 (ii).  
 ——— Strathcona's Contingent, Loss of Horses (Ques.) 3774 (ii).  
 ——— pay, &c. (Ques.) 3775 (ii) 9903 (iii).  
 ——— purchase of horses in N.W.T. (remarks) 481 (i).  
 Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 153) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5513 (ii).

**Osler, Mr. E. B., West Toronto.**

- Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5507 (ii).  
 Cold Storage on Steamships, in Com. on Res., 4861 (ii).  
 Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 504 (i).  
 Hutton, Gen., Departure from Can., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 338 (i).  
 Lee-Enfield Rifles issued to Militia Battalions, &c. (Ques.) 2157 (i).  
 Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 6458, 6468 (ii).  
 ——— Issue of Snider Rifles to Rural Corps (Ques.) 2752 (i).  
 Pan-American Exhibition, Construction of Can. Building (Ques.) 2752 (i).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 1624 (i).  
 Supply B. 147 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4462 (i).  
 Toronto Hotel Co's. (B. 114) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2827 (i); in Com., 4952 (ii).

**Parmelee, Mr. C. H., Shefford.**

- Judicial District of Montreal, Removal of certain Judges (Ques.) 290 (i).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4130; (amt.) 4135 (ii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Miscellaneous* (Dunkin Act expenses) 8139 (iii).

**Paterson, Hon. W., North Gren.**

- Agricultural Implements, Imports, Value, &c. (Ans.) 2756, 3034, 3046 (i).  
 ——— Pets. *re* Increase of Duty (Ans.) 1737.  
 ——— Rebate on Export from Can. (Ans.) 2750.  
 American Tugs towing Logs (remarks) 7650 (iii).  
 See "Coasting," &c.  
 Bacon Exports to G. B. (Ans.) 1879 (i).  
 Bicycles exported from Can., 1898-99, Rebate, &c. (Ans.) 3769 (ii).  
 Binder Twine, Quantity and Value imported (Ans.) 5889 (ii).  
 Brule, N.S., Preventive Officer, Name, &c. (Ans.) 4557 (ii).  
 Budget, The, 2940 (i).  
 Butter Exports to G. B. (Ans.) 1878 (i).  
 Cattle and Cheese Exports to G. B. (Ans.) 1980.  
 Cheese Exports to G. B. and U. S. (Ans.) 1878, 2365, 2746 (i), 4242 (ii).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7010 (iii).

**Paterson, Hon. W.—Con.**

- Coal Oil, Import Price, &c. (Ans.) 2364 (i).  
 Coasting Laws Abrogation, on amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Com. of Sup., 9179 (iii).  
*See* "American Tugs."  
 Customs Revenue, Amount collected from 1890 to Date (Ans.) 2366 (i).  
*See* "Exports," &c.  
 Dibblee, Mr., Customs Collector at Woodstock, N.B. (Ans.) 7316 (iii).  
 Dodge, B. H., Customs Officer, Kentville, Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 1118 (i).  
 — Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2465 (i).  
 — Number of Seizures made (Ans.) 1479 (i).  
 Duty, per Cent of collected, 1890-99 (Ans.) 2367, 2459 (i).  
 Exports and Imports, for July to January, 1898-99, 1899-1900, Value, Duty Collected, &c. (Ans.) 1119 (i).  
 — Quantity and Value of Exports from Can. to South Africa (Ans.) 3260 (i).  
*See* "Customs."  
 Farm Wagons, Imports, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3047.  
 Financial Statement *re* Can. Trade, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10470 (iii).  
 Flour Exports from Can. (Ans.) 1882 (i).  
 Gaspé Election and Customs Official, on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Com. of Sup., 7576, 7599 (iii).  
 Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2545, 2554 (i).  
 Grain Deliveries at Collingwood Harbour for 1899 (Ans.) 1466 (i).  
 — Exports to G. B. (Ans.) 1879 (i).  
 — Transportation between Can. Ports and carried by American Vessels (Ans.) 739 (i).  
 — quantity, names of vessels (Ans.) 432 (i).  
 — during 1899 in Can. (Ans.) 1110 (i).  
 Henault, Romuald, Customs Collector, Maskinonge (Ans.) 3442 (ii).  
 Imports from U. S., Dutiable Goods, &c. (Ans.) 7315 (iii).  
 Indian Corn, Quantity imported and exported (Ans.) 2406 (i).  
 John C. Barr, Undervaluation, &c., on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6650 (ii).  
*See* "Yukon," &c.  
 Moosejaw Customs Officer, Name, &c. (Ans.) 1466 (i), 5404 (ii).  
 N.W. Farmers and Australian Competition, &c. (Ans.) 293 (i).  
 — Tramp Cattle from U.S., 8432 (iii).  
 Porter, Edgar H., Customs Collector, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 2404 (i).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 1262; in Com., 1406, 1417; on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 1595 (i).  
 Returns, on Inquiry for, 6789 (ii).

**Paterson, Hon. W.—Con.**

- South African War—Emergency Rations, Analyses, &c. (remarks) 7886 (iii).  
 — customs duties at Montreal (remarks) 7883 (iii).  
 — entries at Montreal (Ans.) 8432 (iii).  
 — papers laid on Table (remarks) 7317 (iii).  
 — Recruits for Vacancies, &c. (Ans.) 2404.  
 Sugar, Average Rate of Duty collected in 1899 (Ans.) 3770 (ii).  
 Supply (B. 196) 1<sup>st</sup>, 10495 (iii).  
 SUPPLY:  
*Agriculture, &c.* (on M. that Com. rise) 7643.  
*Civil Government:* Customs (contingencies) 6064; (salaries) 6043; (statistical returns) 6242 (ii).  
*Customs* (appraisers, Man. and N.W.T.) 10414; B.C. (contingencies, salaries) 6086; (inspectors, travelling expenses) 6088; Man. (contingencies, salaries) 6076; (miscellaneous) 6089; N.B. (contingencies and salaries) 6672; (salaries and contingencies) 6071; N.W.T. (contingencies, salaries) 6084 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 9519 (iii); N.S. (contingencies) 6066 (ii); (salaries, contingencies, &c.) 9506 (iii); Ont. (contingencies, salaries) 6073; (unforeseen expenditure) 6087 (ii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction, salaries, &c.) 3669 (ii).  
*Public Works.* Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Toronto harbour dredging) 10236 (iii).  
 Tignish and Alberton Ports, Number of Wagons, &c., entered (Ans.) 8839 (iii).  
*See* "Wagons."  
 Trade and Nav. Returns (presented) 1057.  
 — on Inquiry for, 1010 (i).  
 Tobacco Duty, Amount collected in 1899 (Ans.) 3177, 3261 (i).  
 Tramp Cattle from U.S. and Medicine Hat Stock Growers Assn., Cor., &c. (Ans.) 5403.  
 U.S. and G.B., Imports, &c. Amount, &c. (Ans.) 7655 (iii).  
 Wagons and Carriages, Number imported into P.E.I. (Ans.) 5402 (ii).  
*See* "Tignish," &c.  
 Woodbridge Fair, Importation of Posters, &c. (Ans.) 1732 (i).  
 Yukon—Administration of, on amt. (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) to Com. of Sup., 8566, 8601 (iii).  
 — *John C. Barr*, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 3761, 6614.  
 — return, on Inquiry (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4810 (ii).  
 — Whiteside, J. E., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6615 (ii).  
 — *Yukoner* SS., Clearance of, &c. (Ans.) 4922, 5396 (ii).  
 — on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 4992 (ii).  
 — on Inquiry for Ret., 6061 (ii).  
 — Opinion of Dept. of Justice (Ans.) 6249 (ii).  
 — Papers laid on Table, 5883 (ii).  
 — Return, on Inquiry (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) for, 6050 (ii).

**Penny, Mr. E. G., St. Lawrence, Montreal.**

- Holiness Movement Church incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2668 (i).  
 La Banque Jacques Cartier, Change of Title (B. 67) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1381 (i).  
 Montreal Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1368 (i).  
 Royal Marine Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 92) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1877 (ii).  
 Toronto Hotel Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. *Oster*) in Com., 4957 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4814 (ii).

**Pettet, Mr. W. V., Prince Edward.**

- Apples, Inspection of, Legislation by Govt. (Ques.) 1460 (i).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5855 (ii).  
 Halifax Garrison, Applications for Commissions, &c. (Ques.) 3041 (i).  
 I.C.R., Wire Fencing, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3041.  
 Rys., Land Grants to (Ques.) 4439 (ii).  
 Schreiber, Mr. C., Use of Private Car for Family and Friends (Ques.) 2829 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Public Works* : Ont. (Picton Post Office) 9884.

**Pope, Mr. R. H., Compton.**

- Leduc, Mr. Charles, Appnmt. of Successor (Ques.) 3044 (i).  
 South African War—Canadian Contingent, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1085 (i).  
 — Purchase of Revolvers, &c. (Ques.) 289 (i).  
 Trudel, Mr. Zono, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3044 (i).  
 Voters' Lists, Free Issues of Copies, O. C.s (M. for O. C.s.) 319 (i).  
 Yukon, Champagne, Mr. Pavinus, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3044 (i).

**Poupore, Mr. W. J., Pontiac.**

- Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 841 (i).  
 Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Surveys, &c. (M. for copies\*) 319 (i).  
 Pontiac, Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1<sup>st</sup>, 649 (i).  
 Roche Fendue and Calumet Dams, Claims (Ques.) 4076 (ii).  
 South African War—Canadian Contingent, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1105 (i).

**Powell, Mr. H. A., Westmoreland.**

- Binder Twine, Sale and Manufacture of, on amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 6219 (ii).  
 Brockville and West Huron Election, on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5333 (ii), 7479 (iii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1047 (i).  
 — See "Election Frauds."

**Powell, Mr. H. A.—Con.**

- C.P.R. Land Grants, Taxation of, on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to Com. of Sup., 8042 (iii).  
 Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s B. 171 (Mr. *Gibson*) in Com., 9402 (iii).  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 9376, 9383 (iii).  
 Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5263, 5703, 5715 (ii), 5917, 6321 ; on amt. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 6312 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7327, 8820, 8846, 8877, 9069 (iii).  
 Election Frauds, Judicial Inquiry, on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Blair*) 7108 (iii).  
 Fenian Raid Medals, N.B. Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 5023 (ii).  
 Franking Privilege, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3620 (ii).  
 Grain Inspection Act B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 5769, 5776, 5799, 5822 (ii) ; amt., 5799 (ii).  
 Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3235 (i).  
 Halifax Garrison, Contract for Meat, Name, &c. (Ques.) 4555 (ii).  
 — Supplies for Imp. Forces (remarks) 5250.  
 — See "S. A. War," &c.  
 I.C.R. and C.P.R., Amounts of freight charges interchanged (M. for Ret.\*) 4754 (ii).  
 — C.P.R. and G.T.R. Shares of Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 2442 (ii).  
 — Charges against, by C.P.R. and G.T.R. (Ques.) 3771 (ii).  
 — Freight brought to Montreal, &c., Quantity (Ques.) 6051 (ii).  
 — Freight Delays (remarks) 3265 (i).  
 — Sleepers supplied to Extension from St. Rosalie to Chaudière (Ques.) 5246 (ii).  
 — Transportation of Troops to South Africa, Amount charged, &c. (Ques.) 9520 (iii).  
 Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., on Res., 8794 (iii).  
 P.E.I. (Murray Harbour Branch) Ry. B. 182 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 8940 (iii).  
 Personal Explanation, par in *Daily Patriot*, re Distribution of Ballots, 7772 (iii).  
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5087 (ii).  
 Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9968, 9998 (iii).  
 South African War, Purchase of Hay by Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 4917 (ii).  
 — Transportation of Supplies, &c. over I.C.R. (Ques.) 9520, 9791 (iii).

## SUPPLY :

*Canals* : Cornwall (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 9190 10121, 10147 ; Farran's Point (enlargement) 8881 ; Lachine (dredge vessels) 8880 ; North Channel (forming) 8881 ; St. Lawrence River (gas buoys) 8886 (iii).

**Powell, Mr. H. A.—Con.**SUPPLY—*Con.*

- Charges of Management* (printing Dom. notes) 6444 (ii).  
*Civil Govt.*: Customs (salaries) 6045 (ii).  
*Customs*: N. B. (contingencies, salaries) 6070.  
*Fisheries* (cold storage) 5991; (Dom. and Provincial claims) 5930; (lobster regulations) 5944; (oyster culture) 5948 (ii).  
*Indian Affairs*: Mar. Provs. (schools) 7282; N. B. (medical attendance) 7295 (iii).  
*Inland Revenue*: Weights and Measures (metrical instruments) 6037 (ii).  
*Interior* (Grand Falls road) 9777 (iii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (maintenance, &c.) 3645 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (Dorchester) 6441, 6443 (ii).  
*Post Office* (mail contracts) 8772 (iii).  
*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, N. B. (Cape Tormentine wharf) 7947; Que. (Maria wharf) 10197 (iii).  
*Quarantine* (public health regulations) 9200.  
*Railways*: I. C. R. (air brakes) 9456; (Amherst accommodation) 9454; (Christy's Brook) 9454; (expenditure, &c.) 8380, 8464, 8483; (Galena oil contract) 10177, 10179; (Halifax cotton factory) 9435; (increased accommodation) 8785; (Rockingham station) 9436; (rolling stock) 9458; (sidings, &c.) 9461; (Stellarton sidings) 9442, 9451; (Westville station) 9440 (iii).

**Prefontaine, Mr. R., *Maisonneuve*.**

- Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 9140 (iii).  
 Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9977 (iii).

**Prior, Hon. E. G., *Victoria, B. C.***

- Anderson, J. W., Patent Relief B. 108 (Mr. *Cargill*) on M. for Com., 5164 (ii).  
 Anti-Chinese Legislation, Cor. between Dom. Govt. and B. C. Govt. (M. for copy\*) 2203 (i).  
 Bailey, W. H., Emplmt. in B. C. Post office (Ques.) 299 (i).  
 B. C. Cabinet Representation (Ques.) 1461 (i).  
 ——— Contingent and Govtl. Action (remarks) 240, 281 (i).  
 ——— returns *re*, Inquiry, 1725 (i).  
 ——— See "S. A. War," &c.  
 ——— County Court Judges, Salaries, &c., on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 304 (i).  
 ——— Fisheries, Agent's Rep. *re* (Ques.) 3177 (i).  
 ——— Grievances, Revenues, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 9486 (iii).  
 ——— Hydrographical Survey, Govtl. Action *re* (Ques.) 2832 (i).  
 ——— Legislature and Action of Lt. Gov. (M. to adjn.) 1382 (i).  
 ——— Lt.-Governorship, Telegrams *re* Resignation, 6887 (ii).  
 ——— Remarks, 7513 (iii).  
 ——— See "McInnes, Lt. Gov."  
 ——— Miners' Labour Troubles and Mr. Clute's Rep. (remarks) 5808 (ii).  
 ——— Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°, 577 (i).  
 ——— Tidal Survey (Ques.) 3174 (i).

**Prior, Hon. E. G.—Con.**

- Boiler and Machinery Inspectors, B. C., Examination of Candidates, &c. (Ques.) 6779 (ii).  
 Brothies Ledge Beacon, Electric Light, &c. (Ques.) 290 (i).  
 Bubonic Plague, Cases reported on American Frontier (remarks) 2457 (i).  
 ——— (remarks) 588 (i).  
 Business of the Hse., Dom. Day Sitting, 8652.  
 Carmanah Lighthouse, B. C., and Telegraph Communication with Mainland (remarks) 6255.  
 Chinese Immigration, Govt. Action *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7052 (iii).  
 ——— Restriction B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on prop. Res., 8171; on M. for 1°, 7412; in Com., 8185, 8209 (iii).  
 Clover Point, B. C., Rifle Range, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 292 (i).  
 ——— Reps., Cor., &c. (M. for copies\*) 2202 (i).  
 Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 3419 (ii).  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 9386 (iii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8819 (iii).  
 Dairy Exports in Man. and N. W. T., Number, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2362, 2458 (i).  
 Egg Island Light, B. C., Omission of lighting (M. for cor.\*) 2761 (i).  
 Esquimalt Dry Dock, Receipts and Expenditures for 1895-6-7-8-9 (Ques.) 5024 (ii).  
 ——— pets. *re* docking charges (Ques.) 3575 (ii).  
 ——— Garrison. See "S. A. War, &c." "Royal Canadian," &c.  
 Fishery Protection Service, B. C., Additional Steamer (M. for cor. *re*) 2762 (i).  
 Fraser River, B. C., Cost of Improvements (Ques.) 2832 (i), 4445 (ii).  
 General Officer Commanding, Successor to General Hutton (remarks) 2085, 2563 (i).  
 Health Dept. See "Public," &c.  
 Hutton, General, Departure from Can. (M. to adjn.) 323, 347 (i).  
 ——— Cor. *re* Removal, O. C.'s, &c. (M. for copies) 2761 (i).  
 ——— O. C. *re* Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 594 (i).  
 ——— Speech at Farewell Dinner, Ottawa (Ques.) 595 (i).  
 Indian Agent, B. C., Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 2402.  
 Japanese Immigration, par. in *Montreal Gazette* (remarks) 3777 (ii).  
 ——— Restriction of, &c. (Ques.) 4558 (ii).  
 Jones, Mr. E. H., late Postmaster, Kamloops, B. C., Dismissal (M. for cor.) 2762 (i).  
 ——— (M. for cor.\*) 3050 (i).  
 ——— (inquiry for Ret.) 4068 (ii).  
 Lee-Enfield Rifle, Charges made *re* Defects, &c. (Ques.) 437 (i).  
 Leinster Regiment, Repatriation of 100th Reg. (Ques.) 171 (i).

Prior, Hon. E. G.—*Con.*

- Leinster Regiment—Papers, &c. (M. for copies\*) 2201 (i).  
 — See "S. A. War," &c.
- Lt.-Governor McInnes' Resignation (remarks) 7513 (iii).  
 — See "B. C.," &c.
- Lytton-Lillooet Mail Service, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1979 (i), 3770 (ii).
- Macaulay Point Claims, Litigation, &c. (Ques.) 1461 (i).
- Marine Hospital, B.C., Use for Barracks (remarks) 3490 (ii).
- McInnes, Lt.-Governor, B.C., and Elections (remarks) 7319 (iii).  
 — See "B. C.," &c.
- Militia Act Am. (B. 61) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 1286 (i).  
 — B. 155 (Mr. Borden, *King's*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 5225 (ii).
- Militia Rep. (inquiry) 3413 (ii).  
 — Stores, Que., Supt. Name, &c. (Ques.) 8433.
- Mount Tolmie P. O., Pets. *re* Removal, &c. (Ques.) 2406 (i).
- Paris Exposition, Map of Can. Boundary Lines, &c. (Ques.) 5891 (ii).
- Pensions to Permanent Corps, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 5753 (ii).
- Postage on Letters, Insufficient (Ques.) 6624 (ii).
- Prince of Wales Fusiliers, &c., Officers, Names and Rank (Ques.) 5893 (ii).  
 — Amalgamation, &c. (Ques.) 5022 (ii).  
 — (remarks) 5250 (ii).
- Public Health Dept., Establishment of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 8447 (iii).
- Quebec Harbour Commissioners, Amount due Govt. (Ques.) 1461 (i).
- Returns, Inquiry for, B. C. Contingent, Cor., &c., 1725 (i).  
 — (inquiry) 4733, 6701 (ii).  
 — *re* White Horse Rapids, Land Grants, &c., 1786 (i).
- Royal Can. Infantry, B. C. Offer of "A" Co. for China (remarks) 8438 (iii).
- Royal Mint for Can., par. in New York *Tribune* (remarks) 5229 (ii).
- Roy, Mr., Resident Engineer, B.C., Removal, &c. (Ques.) 2757 (i).
- Safety of Ships B. 12 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 246 (i).
- Small Pox, par. in Winnipeg *Free Press re* Outbreak (remarks) 4454, 4694 (ii).
- Songhees Indians, B.C., Reserve, Removal of Indians, &c. (Ques.) 1460 (i), 4242 (ii).  
 — Complaints *re* Graveyard (Ques.) 6625 (ii).  
 — Cor. between Govt. and B. C. (M. for copies\*) 2201 (i).
- South African War, B. C. Contingent, Cor. between Dom. and B. C. Govts. (M. for copies\*) 319 (i).  
 — inquiry for papers, 2994 (i), 3638 (ii).

Prior, Hon. E. G.—*Con.*

- South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res.. 657; in Com. on B., 1696 (i).  
 — Commissions in Imperial Army (remarks) 3479 (ii).  
 — Can. Contingents, Insurance, &c. (Ques.) 9524 (iii).  
 — Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 6878 (ii).  
 — papers laid on Table (remarks) 7216 (iii).  
 — samples analysed, &c. (Ques.) 7417 (iii).  
 — Garrisoning of Esquimalt by Can. Troops (remarks) 2148 (i).  
 — Number of Volunteers for Active Service (Ques.) 2757 (i).  
 — Reps. from Col. Otter (inquiry) 4373 (ii).  
 — Residences of Members of Contingents, Provs., &c. (Ques.) 1112 (i).  
 — Selection of Officers for Service (Ques.) 1112 (i).  
 — Vacancies in Can. Contingent, Promotion of ex-Officers (Ques.) 2163 (i).  
 — Volunteers by Provs., Number (remarks) 2182 (i).
- Stumbles, W. W., Cor. with Mar. and Fisheries Dept. (M. for copies) 4078 (ii).  
 — Inquiry for Ret., 6137 (ii).
- Sumas Bar, B.C., Public Works, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2832 (i), 4445 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
- Agriculture* (dairying interests) 9412 (iii).  
*Civil Govt.*: Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1699 (i); Mounted Police (salaries) 6102; (contingencies) 6130; (dead letter branch) 6131; (salaries) 6117 (ii).  
*Govt. of the Yukon Territory* (salaries) 6978 (ii).  
*Indians*: B.C. (medical attendance) 7302; (salaries) 7302; (Squamish school) 8123; (surveys commission) 7303 (ii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (agencies, rents, &c.) 3645; (Brotchie's Ledge light) 1705 (i); 3667; (maintenance, &c.) 3661 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 1705 (i).  
*Miscellaneous* (B. C. labor troubles) 8146 (iii).  
*Militia* (annual drill, ammunition, &c.) 8241, 8260, 8287, 8359; (clothing, &c.) 8335; (miscellaneous) 8336; (rifle associations, &c.) 8336; (rifle ranges) 8370; (warlike stores) 8307, 8325 (iii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (life saving rewards) 1700; (tidal surveys) 1701 (i).  
*Penitentiaries*: B. C., 6975; Kingston (binder twine) 6890 (ii).  
*Post Office* (dead letter branch) 8771; (mail service) 8747 (iii).  
*Public Works*: Buildings (Victoria post office) 7961; (dredging), 7967; Harbours and Rivers, B. C. (Columbia river) 7955; (Fraser river) 7955; (Victoria harbour) 7958; (Williams Head wharf) 7958; Telegraph lines, B. C. (French Creek extension) 7838 (iii).  
*Quarantine*: Organized Districts (tuberculosis) 7174; (public health regulations) 9412; (Tracadie) 6347 (ii).
- Tracadie Lazaretto, Expenses for Transportation (Ques.) 6349 (ii).  
 — Number of Lepers, &c. (Ques.) 5401 (ii)

**Prior, Hon. E. G.—Con.**

- Vancouver Drill Hall, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 2828 (i).  
 — P. O. Letter Carriers, Increase, &c. (Ques.) 1981 (i).  
 Victoria, B. C. Harbour, Amounts voted, &c. (Ques.) 1117 (i).  
 — Mail Delivery, *Pets. re.*, (Ques.) 3049 (i).  
 Voters' Lists, Victoria, B. C., Printing, &c. (Ques.) 2402 (i).  
 White, Lt. Col., Retirement, (M. to adjn.) 3074 (i).  
 Work Point Barracks, B. C., Pay of Men, &c. (Ques.) 4241 (i).  
 Yukon Assay Office (remarks) 9466 (iii).  
 — Bennett and Atlin Tel. Line, Charleson, J. B., Emplmt. of Men, (Ques.) 296 (i).  
 — Bennett-Dawson Tel. line, and Charleson's Contract for Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 1733 (i).  
 — Casca Transportation Co.'s Claim against Govt. (Ques.) 811 (i).  
 — Dawson to Circle City Tel. Line, Construction by Govt (Ques.) 1734 (i).  
 — Game Preservation Act B. 190 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 9059 (iii).  
 — Mail Service, *Pets.* received by P. M. G., &c. (Ques.) 1481 (i).  
 — Quesnelle-Dawson Tel. Line, Purchase of Groceries for Employees (Ques.) 1116 (i).  
 — Royalty on Gold, &c. (remarks) 7613 (ii).  
 — White Horse Rapids, Land and Mineral Grants, Cor. respecting (M. for copies\*) 470 (i).  
 — White Horse Rapids, Land Grants, Boundaries, Conditions, &c (Ques.) 436 (i).  
 — Whiteside, J. E., Emplmt. by Govt., (Ques.) 6615 (ii).  
 — Winter Road, Construction and Expenditure by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1736 (i).

**Puttee, Mr. A. W., Winnipeg.**

- Alien Labour Act, Enforcement at Welland (Ques.) 8839 (iii).  
 Binder Twine, Sale and Manufacture of, on amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 6240 (ii).  
 C. P. R. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. for Com., 2632 (i).  
 — Land Grants, Taxation of, on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to Com. of Sup., 8043 (iii).  
 Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on prop. Res. 8170 ; in Com. 8211 (iii).  
 — (remarks) 7316 (iii).  
 Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 3439 (ii).  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9387 ; in Com., 9393 (iii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5265, 5920 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 49) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 864 (i).  
 — B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 6709 ; in Com., 6740, 6759 (ii), 7344, 8825, 8869 ; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (amt.) 9477 (iii).

**Puttee, Mr. A. W.—Con.**

- Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5111, 5882 (ii).  
 Govt. Contract, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2516 (i).  
 Grain Inspection Act B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 5797 (ii).  
 India, Govt. Aid to Famine Fund (Ques.) 3876 (ii).  
 Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2314 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 9836 (iii).  
 Paper Combine, Govt. Legislation *re* Duty (Ques.) 4921 (ii).  
 Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) on prop. Res., 9937 : in Com. on Res., 10024 (iii).  
 St. Andrew's Lock Contract, Emplmt. of Union Men (Ques.) 598 (i).  
 South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fiddling*) in Com., 1671.  
 Supply B. 147 (Mr. *Fiddling*) in Com., 4461 (ii).  
 SUPPLY :  
   *Customs* : Man. (contingencies, salaries) 6077 6080 (ii).  
   *Fisheries* (hatcheries) 5938 : (overseers) 5939 (ii).  
   *Immigration* (salaries, agents, &c.) 9651 (iii).  
   *Miscellaneous* (B. C. labour troubles) 8147 ; (Printing Bureau plant) 7506 (iii).  
   *Post Office* (dead letter branch) 8771 ; (mail service) 8753 (iii).  
 Winnipeg and Assiniboine River Water Power Authorization (B. 146) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4436 (ii).  
 Winnipeg By-Elections, Remuneration of Dep. Returning Officers (Ques.) 1006 (i).  
 — P. O., Number of Letters annually (Ques.) 4743 (ii).  
 Yukon Representation in Dom. Parl. on amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7785 (iii).

**Quinn, Mr. M. J. F., St. Ann's, Montreal.**

- Admiralty Act Amt. B. 138 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5106 (ii).  
 Brockville and W. Huron Elections on amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 5692 (ii).  
 Caughnawaga Indians, Tribal Govt., *Pets.* (M. for copy\*) 1011 (i).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4712, 5709, 5716 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7372 ; on Sen. Amts., 10467 (iii).  
 Foreign Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 142 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4681 (ii).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5834 (ii).  
 Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 3024 (i).  
 I. C. R. Train Accommodation between Montreal and Lower Ports (remarks) 7421 (iii).  
 Montreal Rifle Range, Provision by Govt. (Ques.) 440 (i).

**Quinn, Mr. M. J. F.—*Con.***

- Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5062, 5071, 5087 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 9809; in Com., 9815, 9824 (iii).  
 Reports, Deptl., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4161 (ii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 1439, 1455 (i).  
 St. Patrick's Day Celebration (remarks) 1998 (i).  
 South African War, Emergency Rations, on amt. (Mr. *Monk*) to Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).  
 — Men of Can. Contingents missing (remarks) 4251 (ii).  
 — Wounded and Sick, Reps. *re*, Inquiry for, 3336 (ii).  
 Vandal, Release from St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Pets. (M. for copies) 299 (i).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4821 (ii).  
 Wellington Bridge, Montreal, par. in Montreal *Witness re* Condition (remarks) 3331 (ii).  
 White, Lt.-Col., Retirement, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 3137 (i).  
*Yukoner* SS. Clearance of, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 4997, 5016 (ii).

**Ratz, Mr. V., *North Middlesex.***

Budget, The, 4321 (ii).

**Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.***

- Freight and Passenger Rates on Rys. Regulation (B. 16) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 429 (i).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5842, 5866 (ii).  
 Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 493 (i).  
 SUPPLY:  
   *Canals* (Galops) 8376 (iii).  
   *Indians* (St. Regis) 7294 (iii).

**Richardson, Mr. R. L., *Lisgar.***

- Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 1511, 1522, 2412; (amts.) 2418, 2419; on amt. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2621 (i).  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5576.  
 Business of the House, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 5029 (ii).  
 Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 6593 (ii).  
 C.P.R. Land Grants in Man., Allotments, &c. (Ques.) 1460 (i).  
 — exemption from taxation (Ques.) 2827 (i).  
 — Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. for Com., 2633; in Com., 2639, 2653; (amt.) to 3<sup>o</sup>, 2655, 2664 (i).  
 — Land Grant (B. 40) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 579 (i).  
 — Land Grants, Taxation of (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7991; (Neg., Y. 6, N. 99) 8045 (iii).  
 — Land Subsidies, Proportion allotted by Govt. (Ques.) 294 (i).

**Richardson, Mr. R. L.—*Con.***

- Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 5220 (ii).  
 Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2542 (i).  
 Grain Inspection Act B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 5761; in Com., 5764, 5772; (amt.) 5783; on M. (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) to ref. back to Com., 6263; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup> (amt.) 6303 (ii).  
 Hay, Removal of Duty, (Ques.) 9523 (iii).  
 N.W. Ters., Taxation of Ry. Lands, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 626 (i).  
 Paper Combine, Proposed Reduction of Duty (remarks) 4803 (ii).  
 Patterson, Gertrude Bessie, Relief (B. 158) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5513 (ii).  
 Postmasters in the Country, Allowances, &c. (Ques.) 598 (i).  
 Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Mennonite Loyalty, 2156.  
 — par. in *Winnipeg Free Press re* representing Railways, 1526 (i).  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 4700 (ii).  
 Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) on prop. Res., 9938; in Com. on Res., 10029 (iii).  
 South African War—Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 9323 (ii).

**Robertson, Mr. J. Ross, *East Toronto.***

- Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co. B. 25 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 1515 (i).  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5446.  
 Govt. Life Insurance Annuities, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 2755 (i).  
 Hughes, Lt.-Col., Commission in Strathcona's Horse (Ques.) 2750 (i).  
 Newspapers, Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 6613.  
 Reports, Deptl., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4156 (ii).  
 South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 529.  
 — Reports of Col. Otter (Ques.) 3044, 3049.

**Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.***

- Binder Twine, Kingston Penitentiary, Advertisements of Sale (Ques.) 3039 (i).  
 — Sale and Manufacture of, on amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 6233 (ii).  
 Bliss, Maj. Foster, Appnmts. by Govt. (Ques.) 2165 (i).  
 — Date of Departure from Dawson City (Ques.) 3176 (i).  
 Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 2406, 2622 (i).  
 Budget, The, 3398 (ii).

**Roche, Mr. W. J.—Con.**

Dauphin Lake, Cor. between G. Hood and Govt.  
(M. for copies) 3469 (ii).

Elkhorn Govt. Building, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 4438.

— Indian Schools, Sale of Printing Plant,  
&c. (Ques.) 2757 (i).

Fisheries Inspector, Man., Name, &c. (Ques.)  
6057 (ii).

Interior Dept., Employees in Man. and Assa. (M.  
for Ret. \*) 2200 (i).

Jerome, Mr. Martin, M.P.P., Emplmt. by  
Govt. (Ques.) 2758 (i).

Lakes Manitoba and Winnipegosis, Cor. *re* Pro-  
hibition of Exportation of Fish (M. for copies \*)  
4078, 5293 (ii).

— inquiry for papers, 5227 (ii).

— Enforcement of Fishing Regulations  
(Ques.) 4440 (ii).

Lake Winnipeg Fisheries, Reps. and Cor. *re*  
(M. for copies \*) 4754 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 87)  
1\* 1786 (i).

South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay of  
Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 1668.

— Purchase of Saddles, &c. (Ques.) 1113,  
1463 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Fisheries* (regulations) 5941 (ii).

*Indians* : Man. (industrial schools) 7296 (iii).

Timber Licenses in Man., on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to  
Com. of Sup., 7253 (iii).

Winnipeg. *See* "Lake."

Yukon—McGregor, Mr. J. D., Appmnt. by  
Govt. (Ques.) 592 (i).

**Roddick, Mr. T. G., St. Antoine, Montreal.**

Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer incorp.  
(B. 77) 1\*, 1641 (i).

Public Health Dept., Establishment of, on M.  
for Com. of Sup., 8440 (iii).

**Rogers, Mr. D. D., Frontenac.**

Binder Twine, Sale and Manufacture of, on amt.  
(Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 6228 (ii).

Budget, The, 4537 (ii).

Business of the Hse.—Unopposed Motions, on M.  
(Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 1973 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*)  
in Com., 6759 (ii).

Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B.  
127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5116, 5852 (ii).

Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on  
amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*)  
2535 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) in  
Com., 9832 (iii).

Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr.  
*Blair*) on prop. Res., 9941 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr.  
*Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 1622 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, Cost of Construction, &c.  
(Ques.) 3037 (i).

**Rogers, Mr. D. D.—Con.**

## SUPPLY :

*Penitentiaries* (binder twine) 6891 (ii).

*Post Office* (mail service) 8764 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir  
*Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 6919 (ii),  
7135 (iii).

**Rosamond, Mr. B., North Lanark.**

Bank Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for  
3°, (amt.) 6626 (ii).

Postage Reduction, Remuneration of Postmasters  
(Ques.) 2835 (i).

## SUPPLY :

*Public Works*: Buildings (Almonte public build-  
ing) 7930 (iii).

**Russell, Mr. B., Halifax.**

Acadia Mortgage Co.'s incorp. (B. 116) 1\*, 2°27.

Anderson, J. W., Patent Relief B. 108 (Mr.  
*Cargill*) on M. for Com., 5167 (ii).

Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt.  
(Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5410  
(ii), 7471 (iii).

Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid*  
*Laurier*) in Com., 5275, 5277, 5713, 5911,  
5921; on amt. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) to  
M. for 3°, 6318 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*)  
in Com., 7347 (iii).

Fraudulent Marking of Merchandise (B. 63) 1°m.,  
1287 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 139 (Mr. *Sutherland*)  
in Com., 5178 (ii).

Merchants Bank of Halifax, Change of Title  
(B. 72) 1\*, 1553 (i).

— (B. 170) M. to suspend Rule, 6247; 1\*,  
6247 (ii).

Preferential Trade with G.B. (amt.) to Com. of  
Sup., 2009 (i).

South African War—Canadian Contingents,  
General Composition of, &c. (Ques.) 1474 (i).

— Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr.  
*Fielding*) 1124 (i).

— Emergency Rations, on M. to conc. in  
First Rep. of Com., 7646 (iii).

— on M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) to conc. in Rep. of  
Sel. Com., 9249 (iii).

Strathcona's Horse, Arrangement of Church  
Parades (Ques.) 2749 (i).

**Rutherford, Mr. J. G., Macdonald.**

Alexander, J. P., Dismissal, Cor. *re* (M. for  
copies\*) 3469 (ii).

Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr.  
*Morrison*) in Com., 2415; (amt.) 2417, 2618,  
2626 (i).

Business of the House (remarks) 8795 (iii).

C.P.R. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. for  
Com., 2631; in Com., 2644; on amt. (Mr.  
*Richardson*) to M. for 3°, 2666; (amt.) 2666 (i).

— Land Grants, Taxation of, on amt. (Mr.  
*Richardson*) to Com. of Sup., 8042 (iii).

**Rutherford, Mr. J. G.—Con.**

- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6733 (ii).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5114 (ii).  
 Govt. System of Telegraphs, Establishment B. 85 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>. 1723 (i).  
 Grain Inspection Act B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 5764, 5769, 5812; on amt (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 6301 (ii).  
 India Famine, Can. Contributions, &c. (remarks) 3881 (ii).  
 Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 6476 (ii).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4121 (ii).  
 Seed Grain Indebtedness B. 143 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 5041, 5051 (ii).  
 South African War, Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 1666 (i).  
 ——— Strathcona's Horse, Purchase of Horses in N. W. T. (remarks) 482 (i).

## SUPPLY:

- Govt. of N. W. T.* (insane patients) 6683 (ii).  
*Immigration* (salaries, agents, &c.) 9642 (iii).  
*Post Office* (mail service) 8768 (iii).

**Savard, Mr. P. V., Chicoutimi and Saguenay.**

- Budget, The, 4652 (ii).

**Semple, Mr. A., Centre Wellington.**

- Budget, The, 4028 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6759 (ii), 7388, 8852 (iii).  
 Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 9 (Mr. *Cusey*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4776 (ii).  
 Members Sessional Indemnity, Additional (remarks) 9675 (iii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1270; in Com., 1434 (i).

**Sifton, Hon. C., Brandon.**

- C P. R. Land Subsidies, Proportion allotted by Govt. (Ans.) 295 (i).  
 Chapele, Edgar, Emplmt. by Int. Dept. (Ans.) 778 (i).  
 Copeland, Arthur, Stmnts. of (Ans.) 779 (i).  
 Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 18) 1<sup>o</sup>m., 430 (i).  
 Doukhobors and Galicians, Number settled, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 151, 286 (i).  
 Eastern Extension Ry. Co.'s Arbitration, &c. (remarks) 10033 (iii).  
 Export of Logs and Lumber, Prohibition, &c. (Ans.) 150 (i).  
 ——— Quantity exported, &c. (Ans.) 150 (i).  
 Fraser, A. J., Removal from Regina Land Office (Ans.) 740 (i).  
 Garnot, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 296 (i).

**Sifton, Hon. C.—Con.**

- Grain Commission, Death of Chairman and Delay of Rep. (Ans.) 290 (i).  
 ——— Evidence, &c. (Ans.) 437 (i).  
 Grain Transit in Man. and N. W. T., Regulation B. 38 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 578 (i).  
 Homestead Entry in Man., Abuses in Administration, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 9546 (iii).  
 Indian Reserves, Govt. Policy *re* Development of Mines (Ans.) 597 (i).  
 Man. and N. W. T. Land Grants to Ry. Cos. &c. (Ans.) 590 (i).  
 N. W. Ters., Population, Estimate, &c. (Ans.) 148 (i).  
 ——— Taxation on Ry. Lands, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 619, 633 (i).  
 Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) on prop. Res., 9942; in Com. on Res., 10007.  
 Regina Leader, Amounts paid by Govt. 1898-9 (Ans.) 593 (i).  
 Ross, Mr. James H., Indian Commissioner, Remuneration, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 149, 297 (i).  
 Rothwell, Mr., Rep. *re* Settlers' Claims, Transmission to B. C. Govt. (Ans.) 298 (i).  
 Scrip, Grant to Half-breeds, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 309 (i).

## SUPPLY:

- Civil Govt.:* Indian Affairs (J. D. McLean) 10279 (iii).  
*Dom. Lands* (timber land protection) 10409 (iii).  
*Geological Survey* (artesian borings, N. W. T.) 10405 (iii).  
*Indian Affairs* (claim of John Harrison) 10406; (contingencies) conc., 10438 (iii).  
*Immigration* (contingencies, foreign agencies) 9664; (French repatriation) 10353; (general expenses) 9567; (Girls' Home, Winnipeg) 9664; (inspection of Immigrants in U.S.) 10350; (paupers from Europe) 10349; (salaries, agents, &c.) 9614; (Women's Protective Society) 9664 (iii).  
*Interior* (distressed settlers) 10282; (Grand Falls road) 9777; (mining regulations) 10284; (ordnance lands) 9778; (salaries at head office) 10407 (iii).  
*Militia* (Barrie field Common) 10354 (iii).  
*Miscellaneous* (Calgary Interwestern exhibition) 10411; (Half-breeds Commission) 10412; (Rocky Mountain Park) 10411; (schools in unorganized districts) 10411 (iii).  
*Mounted Police* (supplies, &c.) 10409 (iii).  
*Public Works:* Yukon Buildings (rent, fuel, &c.) 10260 (iii).  
*Railways* (rolling stock subsidies) conc., 10449.  
 Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 951 (i).  
 ——— Alternate Sections, Disposal, &c. (Ans.) 155 (i).  
 ——— Criminal Proceedings against Officials (Ans.) 153 (i).  
 ——— Dawson City, Population, &c. (Ans.) 591.  
 ——— Extension of Time to Officers *re* Claims (Ans.) 152 (i).  
 ——— Girouard, Mr. Jos. Eno, Emplmt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 294 (i).

**Sifton, Hon. C.—Con.**

- Yukon—McGregor, Mr. J.D., Appmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 592 (i).  
 — Mining Claims and Govt. Policy (Ans.) 151 (i).  
 — Mounted Police, Number and Distribution (Ans.) 592 (i).  
 — Ogilvie, Mr., Rep. and Action taken by Govt. (Ans.) 153, 435 (i).  
 — salary, emoluments, &c. (Ans.) 154 (i).  
 — Rates of Pay to Officers, &c. (Ans.) 152 (i).  
 — Registrar's Fees, &c. (Ans.) 479 (i).  
 — Villeneuve, Levere, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 153 (i).  
 — Water Front Lease and Mr. Wade's Action (Ans.) 152 (i).  
 — White Horse Rapids, Land Grants, Boundaries, Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 436 (i).

**Snetsinger, Mr. J. G., Cornwall and Stormont.**  
Budget, The, 4621 (ii).**Somerville, Mr. J., North Wentworth and Brant.**

- Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 5218 (ii).  
 Ry. Mail Service, Additions to since 1896 (Ques.) 1754 (i).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 1449 (i).

**Speaker (Hon. T. BAIN), South Wentworth.**

- Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from His Ex. (read) 7394, 7409 (iii).  
 — Mess. by Black Rod 3199 (i) : 9480 (iii).  
 Bill (Mr. *Gibson*) ruled out of Order 1642 (i).  
 Binder Twine, Report quoted from, to be laid on Table (ruling) 6194, 6196, 6202 (ii).  
 Brockville and West Huron Election, *re* M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Ruling, 429 (i).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Question of Order (Mr. *Foster*) 1026-31 (i).  
 — on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 1037 (i).  
 — on Ques. of Order (Sir *Louis Davies*)—(ruling) 5737, 5739, 5746 (ii).  
 — Irrelevancy of Debate, 1026, 1053-5 (i); 5589, 5616 (ii).  
 Business of the Hse., Unopposed Motions, Members' remarks checked, 1903 (i).  
 Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.'s Bill (remarks) 6488, 6572; (ruling) 6576 (ii).  
 — Challenge of Votes (ruling) 6608 (ii).  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes B., Ques. of Order (remarks) 8418-22 (iii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133, Order, Ques. of (ruling) 6717, 6718 (ii); Sen. Amts., rescinded, 10508 (iii).  
 — amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) ruled out of order 9480 (iii).  
 Election, Certificate received, 320 (i).  
 See "Members," &c.

**Speaker, Mr.—Con.**

- Franking Privilege—General Ruling on Answering of Question by Ministers 811 (i).  
 — Irrelevancy of Debate, 787, 803 (i).  
 — Member requested not to interrupt, 783 (i).  
 — Member requested to confine remarks to Motion before Hse., 809 (i).  
 — M. (Mr. *Donville*) read, 788 (i).  
 — on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2199 (i).  
 Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) 2516 (i).  
 — on Ques. of Order (Mr. *McMullen*)—(ruling) 2554 (i).  
 I. C. R., Sale of Rolling Stock, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *McMullen*)—(ruling) 4967 (ii).  
 Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 6 (i).  
 Lt. Gov. McInnes and B. C. Elections—Members remarks checked, 7319 (iii).  
 McInnes, W. W. B., Member for Vancouver, Resignation received, 5734 (ii).  
 Markham, Lt. Col., Question remodelled, 2833 (i).  
 Member must accept statement of another member, 9856 (iii).  
 — New, Certificates of Ret. (notification) 81, 320 (i); 9368 (iii).  
 — remarks checked, 701, 1915 (i); 7420, 7512, 7517, 7548, 7887, 8079, 9688, 9748 (iii).  
 Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1057 (i); 5883 (ii); 8398, 9472, 9790 (iii).  
 Montreal Riots, Members interruptions (ruling) 1291, 1310, 1314, 1366 (i).  
 Order (Ques. of) 4926 (ii).  
 — Business of the Hse. (ruling) 1934, 1945 (i).  
 — Member asked to withdraw "infamous," 5734 (ii).  
 — (Mr. *Davin*) Ruling, 3867 (ii).  
 — (Mr. *Talbot*) Ruling, 3839 (ii).  
 — (Mr. *Taylor*) Remarks, 3883 (ii).  
 — (Mr. *Taylor*) on the Budget, 3714 (ii).  
 — Reference to past debate (Mr. *Davin*) Ruling 5735 (ii).  
 — Unparliamentary Language, 6179 (ii).  
 Perrault, Joseph, Expenses, &c., on reading of Question, &c. (ruling) 2397 (i).  
 Portage du Fort and French River Ry. Co.'s B. on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., (ruling) 4144 (ii).  
 Preferential Trade with G.B. Member asked to withdrw. stmnt., 2236 (i).  
 — Ques. of Order, (Mr. *Fielding*) ruling 2038 (i).  
 — (Mr. *Foster*) ruling 2340 (i).  
 Privilege, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Irrelevancy of Debate, 6140 (ii).  
 — (Mr. *Davis*) Member must confine himself Motion before Hse., 321 (i).  
 — (Mr. *Borden*) Member must not prolong discussion, 322 (i).

**Speaker, Mr.—Con.**

- Procedure in asking Questions (ruling) 2370, 2372 2377-78 (i).  
*See* "Questions," &c.  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on amt. (Mr. *Douglas*)—(remarks) 9013 (iii).  
 Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen's. Sec. (Notification) 10504 (iii).  
 — Mess. by Black Rod, 10508 (iii).  
 Questions answered by Ministers (ruling) 2184-5, 2188 (i).  
 — Form of Asking (ruling) 1756 (i).  
 — *See* "Procedure."  
 Representation B. 13, Members remarks checked, 1243 (i).  
 — on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Casey*) 1238 (i).  
 — (Mr. *Foster*) Ruling, 1252 (i).  
 — Member (Mr. *McMullen*) asked to withdraw, stmnt. 1225-31 (i).  
 — (Mr. *Sproule*) 1233 (i).  
 — (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup> (ruling) 1557 (i).  
 Rules of House, Judgment of (remarks) 4451 (ii).  
 — Observance of (remarks) 4733 (i).  
 Seed Grain Indebtedness (remarks) 3987 (i).  
 — Ques. of Order (Mr. *Davis*) Member asked to withdraw, word "boor," 1760 (i).  
 Sen. and H. of C. Act Amt. Bill (ruling) 510 (i).  
 South African War—Address to Her Maj., Mess. from Senate (read) 7303 (ii).  
 — Commissions in Imperial Army, on M. to adjn. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) reading from past Debate (ruling) 3483 (ii).  
 — Emergency Food &c., Ques. of Order *re* Rep. of Analyst (ruling) 7540, 7548 (iii).  
 — Order, Ques. of (ruling) 6831-6844 (ii).  
 — (remarks) 7213, 7216, 7218, 7220 (ii).  
 — on amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) ruling, 9330 (iii).  
 Speech from Throne (rep.) 2 (i).  
 SUPPLY :  
*Legislation House of Commons* (extra clerks &c.) 8148 ; (French translators) 10330 ; (publishing debates) 8149 ; (Sergeant-at-Arms) 8149 (iii) ; (sessional clerks) 5923 (ii) ; 10329 ; (sessional messengers) 5923 ; (stationery) 5924, 10323 ; (statutory increases) 10329 (iii).  
 Timber Licenses, &c. Ques. of Order (ruling) 7262-72 (iii).  
 Vacancies (notification) 1 (i), 5734 (ii), 8074 (iii).  
 Vancouver Electoral Division, Resignation of member (notification) 5734 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Act (remarks) 4675 (ii).  
 Welland Canal, Dynamite Explosion, Member speaking twice on same subject (ruling) 4150 (ii).  
 White, Lt.-Col., Retirement, &c., Member requested not to interrupt, 3102 (i).  
 Yukon, Administration, Charges against, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) "impertinent" ruled out of order, 973 (i).  
 — Charleson, Mr. J. B., Ques. of Order (ruling) 7313 (iii).

**Speaker, Mr.—Con.**

- Yukon—Coste's Rep. *re* Teslin Lake, Members called to Order, 608 (i).  
 — Speech of Senator Kirchhoffer, Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) ruled out of order, 3048 (i).  
 — Telegraph Supplies—Ques. of Order, Member requested to withdraw statement, 8283 ; (ruling) 8284 (iii).  
 — Yukoner. SS., Clearance of, on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) ruling, 5006 (ii).  
**Speaker, Deputy** (Mr. L. P. BRODEUR), *Rouville*.  
 Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 25, in Com., amt. (Mr. *Rutherford*) ruled out of order, 2417 (i).  
 — Unparliamentary Language (ruling) 1517.  
 Brockville and West Huron Investigation, Member called to Order, 1010 (i).  
 Budget, The, on Ques. of Order (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) ruling, 2886 (i).  
 Criminal Code Act Amt. B. in Com., 5906 (ii).  
 — Ques. of Order (ruling) 6322 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8868 (iii).  
 Gaspé Short Line Ry. B. 70, amt. (Mr. *McAlister*) ruled out of order, 3929 (i).  
 Grain Inspection Act B. 141 in Com. (Mr. *Flint*, Chairman) remarks, 5790 (ii).  
 La Banque Jacques Cartier, Change of Title B. 67, 2<sup>d</sup> m., 1685 (i).  
 Order, Ques. of (ruling) 3815, 3823, 4271, 4294 (ii).  
 SUPPLY :  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (Paris exposition) Ques. of Order, 7196 (iii).  
*Civil Govt.* : Interior, Ques. of Order (ruling) 6534 (ii).  
*Customs* : Ques. of (ruling) 10419 (iii).  
*Indians* (St. Regis chiefs, &c.) 7284 (iii).  
 Lighthouse and Coast Service, Members remarks checked, 3648 (ii).  
 Yukon—Administration, &c., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 8561-68 (iii).  
**Sproule, Mr. T. S., East Grey.**  
 Admiralty Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5105 (ii).  
 Agriculture Deptl. Rep. (inquiry) 5122 (ii).  
 — Implements, Imports, Value &c. (Ques.) 2756, 3034 (i).  
 Anderson, J. W., Patent Relief B. 108 (Mr. *Cargill*) on M. for Com., 5166 (ii).  
 Bank Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1<sup>st</sup>, 5730 (ii).  
 Beet Root Sugar, Cor. *re* Bounties, on M. (Mr. *Montague*) for copies, 3192 (i).  
 Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 2408 ; on amt. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2620 (i).  
 Brockville and West Huron, Investigation, on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1016.  
 — Order (Ques. of) 1037 (i) 5588, 5616 (ii).  
 — *See* "Electoral," &c.

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Con.**

- Budget, The, 4203 (ii).  
 Business of the House (remarks) 8072 (iii).  
 — Unopposed Motions, Procedure, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 1921 (i).  
 Can. Nurses Association incorp. (B. 119) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2627 (i).  
 C. P. R. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. for Com., 2635; in Com., 2643; on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2656 (i).  
 Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s B. 171 (Mr. *Gibson*) in Com., 9397, 9687 (iii).  
 Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8194 (iii).  
 Coasting Laws Abrogation, on amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Com. of Sup., 9165 (iii).  
 Cold Storage on Steamships, B. 152 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res. 4823, 4870, 4891; on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 4898 (ii).  
 Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 3422 (ii).  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 8428 (iii).  
 Convicts, Conditional Liberation B. 89 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 3609; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 4667 (ii).  
 Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5914 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 10453 (iii).  
 Debates, Official, 6th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 10290 (iii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4796 (ii).  
 — B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7326, 8096, 8801, 9068; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 9478; on Sen. Amts., 10456 (iii).  
 Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 9 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4783 (ii).  
 Elections Frauds, Judicial Inquiry, on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Blair*) 7113 (iii).  
 Financial Statement *re* Canadian Trade, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10478 (iii).  
 Foot and Mouth Disease, par. in *Montreal Gazette* (remarks) 3795 (ii).  
 Foreign Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 142 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4681 (ii).  
 Foyle, Lt., Dismissal (remarks) 9485 (iii).  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 2350 (i).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5109, 5134, 5827 (ii).  
 Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 3612 (ii).  
 Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2471 (i).  
 Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1527, 2441 (i).  
 Grain Inspection Act B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 5778; (amt.) 5781; 5798; 5805, 5820 (ii).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Con.**

- Holiness Movement Church incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2669 (i).  
 Hutton, General, Departure from Can., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 332 (i).  
 India Famine. Can. Contributions, &c. (remarks) 3880 (ii).  
 Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9117; in Com., 9147; on Sen. Amts., 10079 (iii).  
 Lavelle, Pets. *re* Establishment of P. O. (M. for Ret. \*) 3050 (i).  
 Live Stock Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5100 (ii).  
 McNab, Lake, Name of, &c. (Ques.) 8433 (iii).  
 Members Sessional Indemnity, Increase, &c. (remarks) 10290 (iii).  
 Montreal Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1362 (i).  
 National Sanitarium Association incorp. (B. 117) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (ii).  
 Newfoundland and Can., Negotiations, &c. Cor., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for copies, 2214 (i).  
 Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 101) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2345 (i).  
 N. W. Ters., Taxation on Ry. Lands, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 618, 634 (i).  
 Order (Ques. of) Timber Licenses, &c., 7262 (iii).  
 Orford Copper Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 1930 (i).  
 Parliament, Calling of on a Fixed Date, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 3473 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 9700; on M. for Com., 9811, 9830 (iii).  
 — offices conducted without assistance of Postmaster &c. (Ques.) 2757 (i).  
 Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2130 (i).  
 Private Bills, Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. *Flint*) 4436 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) 5885 (ii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) *re* Dredge (remarks) 7418 (iii).  
 Procedure in asking Questions (M. to adjn.) 2369 (i).  
 Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 112 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 5176 (ii).  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4686 (ii); in Com., 9348 (iii).  
 — Ry. Commissioners, Establishment of Board, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 766 (i).  
 — Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9976; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 10194 (iii).  
 Reports, Deptl., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4163 (ii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 1413 (i).  
 — Order of Ques., 1232 (i).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Con.**

San José Scale Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 3166 (i).

Servis Railroad Tie Plate Co.'s Patent Relief B. 93 (Mr. *Fraser*, *Guyborough*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 2672 (i).

South African War—Canadian Contingents, Pay to Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 1096; in Com., 1664, 1697; in Com., 2007.

— Emergency Rations, &c., on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 7894 (iii).

— Postage on Letters (remarks) 651 (i).

— Purchase of Horses, par. in *Montreal Gazette*, 3578 (ii).

— Strathcona's Horse—Purchase of Horses in N. W. T. (remarks) 482.

Speeches of Members, Limitation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) for Sel. Com., 2782 (i).

Supply B. 147 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4461 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

*Administration of Justice*: Exchequer Court (contingencies) 8131; (P. Mungovan, &c.) 8127 (iii).

*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (chartered steamers, &c.) conc., 10445; (cold storage, &c.) 10336; (Dominion census) 10335; (Glasgow exhibition) 10333; (immigration) 7200; (Paris exposition) 7179, 10341 (iii).

*Canals*: Sault Ste. Marie (Ryan & Co.'s award) 10393; Soulanges (construction) 8908 (iii).

*Civil Government*: Interior Dept. (salaries) 7823; Railways and Canals (salaries) 8152 (iii).

*Customs* (Dom. appraisers, &c.) 10418 (iii).

*Dominion Police* (retiring allowances, &c.) 8132.

*Fisheries* (fish hatchery at B. C. and Gaspé) 16399; (Noble Bros.) 8066 (iii).

*Immigration* (contingencies, foreign agencies) 9664; (inspection, &c.) 10350; (salaries, agents, &c.) 9638; conc., 10451 (iii).

*Indian Affairs* (contingencies) conc., 10438; (John Harrison's claim) 10406; B. C. (Inspector's salary) 7303; (industrial schools) 7299; (Land Management fund) 7285; Man. and N. W. T. (general expenses) 8126; Ont. (medical attendance) 8069; (St. Regis) 7294 (iii).

*Interior* (ordnance lands) 9778 (iii).

*Legislation*: House of Commons (election frauds commission) 10321; Library (salaries) 10331; (voters' lists) 9605, 10324 (iii).

*Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions* (G. B. and Can.) 9555, 9559 (iii).

*Militia* (annual drill, ammunition, &c.) 8252, 8291, 8357; (Barriefield Common) 10355; (Halifax garrison) 9772, 10358; (Hughes, Lt.-Col., return, &c.) conc., 10450; (medals) 8343; (military properties) 8306, 10355; (provisions, &c.) 8335; (salaries, &c.) 8304; (war-like stores) 8311 (iii).

*Miscellaneous* (Chinese and Japanese commission) 10411; (Conciliation Act) 10414; (Consolidation of Dom. Statutes) 10413; (distressed settlers, N. W. T.) 7495; (expenses *re* counterfeiters) 8144; Interior (seed grain to settlers) 7831 (iii).

*Mounted Police* (compensation for mail service) 9779, 9788 (iii).

*Penitentiaries*: Kingston (binder twine) 8132; (gratuities) 10319 (iii).

*Post Office* (mail service) 8749; (statutory increases) conc., 10428, 10446 (iii).

**Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

*Pub. Works*: Buildings, B. C. (Nelson post office) 7927; (New Westminster post office) 7929; (Rossland post office) 7929; (experimental farms) 7931; N. W. T. (Lt. Gov.'s residence) 7927; N. S. (Digby P. O.) 7870; Ont. (London drill hall) 7917; (Toronto, automobile cars) 9885; Ottawa, 7933; (heating, &c.) 7938; (lighting, &c.) 7938; (rents, &c.) 7938; (Rideau Hall) 7937; (steel shelving, &c.) 7939; Dredging (plant, new) 10252; Harbours and Rivers, B. C. (Fraser River) 10252; Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 9859; N. S. (Winter Harbour) 7836; N. B. (Cape Tormentine harbour) 7948; Ont. (Bruce Mines wharf) 7950; (Collingwood harbour) 7952, 10249; (Goderich breakwater) 10245; (Meaford dredging) 10247; (Temiscamingue Lake wharfs) 10251; (Toronto harbour dredging) 10244; (Rainy River lock) 7862; (Sarnia dredging) 10228; (Sault Ste. Marie) 10250; (South Nation River) 10251; Que. (Lévis graving dock) 9860; (Montreal harbour) 9866; Miscellaneous (monument to Mr. Mackenzie) 10255; (remetalling road at Rideau Hall) 7835; Telegraph Lines (Peele Island) 10253; (St. Lawrence extension) 10253; Yukon Buildings (rent, fuel, &c.) 10257; Telegraph Lines (Atlin and Quesnelle) 10256; (Bennett and Dawson) 7847; (Yukon and Lewes River improvements) 7842 (iii).

*Quarantine*: Organized Districts (public health) 9410, 10347; (tuberculosis) 7175, 7199 (iii).

*Railways*: I. C. R. (increased facilities) 10359; (steel rails, &c.) 10391 (iii).

*Yukon* (administration of justice) 9777; Miscellaneous (Can. Bank of Commerce) 9609; (living allowances) 7833 (iii).

Timber Licenses in Man., on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 7245, 7273 (iii).

Tobacco, Abolition of Duties, on amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) to Com. of Sup., 7904 (iii).

Toronto Hotel Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. *Oster*) in Com., 4956, 4961 (ii).

Tyrwhitt, Mr., late M. P., Decease of (remarks) 8188 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4820 (ii), 7127 (iii).

Yukon—Administration of, on amt. (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) to Com. of Sup., 8566 (iii).

— Wade, Mr. F. C., Charges against, on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7155 (iii).

**Stenson, Mr. M. T., Richmond and Wolfe.**

Judges of the Provincial Courts B. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Sen. Amts., 10078 (iii).

South African War—Can. Contingents, Pay of Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 532 (i).

**Stubbs, Mr. W., Cardwell.**

Personal Explanation *re* Attendance at Grit Caucuses, 8439 (iii).

**Sutherland, Hon. J., North Oxford.**

Abenakis Indians of St. Francis (remarks) 7321 (iii).

Agriculture Dept., Number of Permanent Employees, &c. (Ans.) 2180 (i).

**Sutherland, Hon. J.—Con.**

- Bilodeau, L. P., Payments to (Ans.) 3766 (ii).  
 Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Morrison) in Com., 2408; on amt. (Mr. Rutherford) 2619 (i).  
 Burrows, Mr. T. A., Date of Permit *re* Timber Licenses (Ans.) 6780 (ii).  
     *See* "Yukon," &c.  
 Business of the House (remarks) 8072 (iii).  
 Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 6575 (ii).  
 C. P. R. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Macdonell); in Com., on amt. (Mr. Richardson) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 2657, 2665.  
 ——— Order (Ques. of) 2631 (i).  
 ——— Land Grants to Man., Allotments, &c. (Ans.) 1460 (i).  
 Cattle Embargo in B. C., Removal (remarks) 3988 (ii).  
 Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s B. 171 (Mr. Gibson) in Com., 9405 (iii).  
 Chappell, Edgar, and J. G. Turriff, on M. Mr. Darin) to adjn., 2616 (i).  
     *See* "Turriff, J. G."  
 Civil Servants as Insurance Agents (Ans.) 5245 (ii).  
 ——— Employees, Number of Dismissals (Ans.) 2196 (i).  
 Companies Clauses Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 8935 (iii).  
 Constantine, Dr., Payments to (Ans.) 3764 (ii).  
 Currie, Peter, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 3264 (i).  
 Devlin, C. A., Date of Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 6776 (ii).  
 Dom. Creek, on Inquiry for Ret., 6702 (ii).  
     *See* "Yukon."  
 Dom. Lands, Man. and N. W. T., Regulations *re* Timber Licenses, &c. (Ans.) 6780 (ii).  
 Dredging Leases published in *Canada Gazette* (Ans.) 7315 (iii).  
     *See* "Yukon."  
 Doukhobors, Emigration to U. S. (Ans.) 4734 (ii).  
 Edwards & Co., Timber Licenses (Ans.) 7121 (iii).  
 Elkhorn Indian Schools, Sale of Printing Plant, &c. (Ans.) 2758 (i).  
 ——— Public Buildings, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 4439 (ii).  
 Franklin Indian Reserve, Man., and Res. of Municipal Council (Ans.) 5023 (ii).  
 Free Passes to Immigrants, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1118 (i).  
 Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Com., 3002 (i).  
 Girouard, Mr., on Inquiry for Papers, 7647 (iii).  
     *See* "Yukon." &c.  
 Grain Inspection Act B 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 5773 (ii).  
 Grain Transportation, Rep. of Royal Commission laid on Table, 3224 (i).  
 ——— (M. to print) 3255 (i).  
 Great North-west Central Ry., Land Grant (Ans.) 2752 (i).

**Sutherland, Hon. J.—Con.**

- Homestead Entries, Man. and N. W. T., Number, &c. (Ans.) 2363 (i).  
 Hutton, Gen., Departure from Can., on M. (Mr. Prior) to adjn., 346 (i).  
 Immigration from Europe to Can., Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2836, 3261 (i).  
 Immigration Expenditure, Amounts, &c. paid (Ans.) 2398 (i).  
 Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep (presented) 2759 (i).  
 ——— Agent, B. C., Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 2402.  
 ——— Lands, Timber Licenses, Fees, &c. (Ans.) 6777 (iii).  
 ——— Supplies in Man. and N. W. T., Tenders (Ans.) 4742 (ii).  
 ——— Treaty, Saskatchewan, Total Cost (Ans.) 2195 (i).  
 Interior Dept., Number Clerks, &c. (Ans.) 4446.  
 ——— Rep. on Inquiry for, 3986 (ii).  
 ——— (presented) 4333 (ii).  
 ——— copy sent to Queen's Printer, Date, &c. (Ans.) 4442 (ii).  
 Jerome, Mr. Martin, M. P. P., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2758 (i).  
 Keith, Hilton, Indian Agent at Carlton (Ans.) 1981 (i).  
 Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) withdn., 3255 (i).  
 Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 95) withdn., 3255 (i).  
 Labrecque, C. O., Payments to (Ans.) 3764 (ii).  
 Land Grants to Rys. in Man., B. C., and N. W. T. (Ans.) 1885 (i), 4439 (ii).  
 ——— O. C.'s, &c. (Ans.) 2179 (i).  
 Land Patents and Mineral Rights (Ans.) 2172 (i).  
 Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. (B. 139) 1<sup>st</sup>, 3758; in Com., 5177 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 8089 (iii).  
 Man. and N. W. T., O. C. *re* Timber Permits (Ans.) 4743 (ii).  
 Militia Force N. W. T. Land Grants (B. 107) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2457 (i).  
 Molocani and Stundists, Immigration, &c. (Ans.) 5244 (ii).  
 Morgan, R. W., Residence, &c. (Ans.) 5247 (ii).  
 Moore & Macdowall's Timber Limits, Operation, &c. (Ans.) 1898 (i).  
 Moose Mountain Indian Reserve, Sale to U. S. Syndicate (Ans.) 2194 (i).  
 McNab Lake, Sale of (Ans.) 8433 (iii).  
 Niagara Falls Park and Old Fort Erie, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 2194 (i).  
 N. W. Rebellion, Land Grants to Militia Force (B. 107) 2<sup>d</sup> m., 4667; 3<sup>d</sup> m., 4811 (ii).  
 N. W. T., Land Subsidies to Rys., Names, Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 1117 (i).  
 ——— School Lands, Sale of by Govt. (Ans.) 1479 (i).  
 O'Donahue, W. T., Payments to (Ans.) 3763 (ii).  
 Portage du Fort and French River Ry. Co. B. 97 (Mr. Poupore) withdn., 4332 (ii).

**Sutherland, Hon. J.—Con.**

- Procedure in asking Questions, on M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn., 2373 (i).  
 Rys., Land Grants to (Ans.) 4439 (ii).  
 Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 10007 (iii).  
 Rama Indian Reserve, Medical Supt. (Ans.) 3043 (ii).  
 Regina *Leader Co.*, Names of Incorporators, &c. (Ans.) 1464 (i).  
 ——— Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 1115, 1116 (i).  
 Regina, Transfer of Town Site to C. P. R., &c. (Ans.) 2759 (i).  
 Returns, on Inquiry for, 4448 (ii), 6992, 7121, 7318 (iii).  
 ——— on Inquiry for (Mr. *Prior*) 4811 (ii).  
 ——— laid on Table, 3264 (i), 6990 (iii).  
 Seed Grain Indebtedness Act Amt. (B 143) 1° m., 433; 2° m., 5034; in Com., 5037-5059; 3° m., 5142 (ii).  
 ——— Legislation (remarks) 3987 (ii).  
 Sifton, Hon. Mr., and Mr. *Turriff*, Dates of Travelling, &c. (Ans.) 2465 (i).  
 See "Chapelle," "Turriff," &c.  
 Songhees Indian Reserve, Complaints *re* Graveyard (Ans.) 6625 (ii).  
 ——— Removal of Indians, &c. (Ans.) 1461 (i), 4242 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Arts, &c.* (immigration) 7199 (iii).  
*Civil Govt.* : Geological Survey (salaries) 7303; Indian Affairs (clerical assistance) 8123; (salaries, &c.) 7281; (contingencies) conc., 10438; Interior (contingencies) 7826 (iii); (clerical assistance) 6682; (salaries) 6512, 6536 (ii), 7820 (iii); (Messrs. Rothwell and Ryley's salaries) 6512, 6542 (ii), 7729, 7813 (iii).  
*Dom. Lands* (Inspector's salaries) 7058; salaries (L. E. Fontaine) 7827; (surveys, &c.) 7062.  
*Govt. of N. W. T.* (clerical assistance) 6685; (insane patients) 6683; (restoration of public works) 6691; Unorganized Districts (schools, &c.) 6690 (ii).  
*Govt. of the Yukon Territory* (salaries, &c.) 6977.  
*Indian Affairs* : B. C. (inspector's salary) 7303; (medical attendance) 7302; (relief of distressed) 8123; (salaries) 7302; (surveys commission) 7302; (Squamish school) 8223; (Land Management Fund) 7285; Man. and N. W. T. (annuities and commutations) 7295; (destitute and working Indians) 8124; (general expenses) 8125; (treaty expenses) 8071; N. B. (medical attendance) 7295; N. S. (medical attendance) 7295, 8070; Millbrook reserve) 7295; (schools) 7282; (Ont. and Que.) 7282; (St. Regis chiefs, &c.) 7282; (lockup) 7287; (litigation) 8068; (Oka) 7285; (medical attendance) 8069; (seed grain, &c.) 8069; (triennial clothing) 7296; P. E. I. (medical attendance) 8070 (iii).  
*Inspection of Staples* (elevator commission) 7832.  
*Militia* (Barriemfield Common) conc., 10452 (iii).  
*Miscellaneous* (boundary surveys) 7066; (distressed settlers, N. W. T.) 7490; (Govt. of Keewatin) 7074; (half-breeds commission) 7066; Interior (seed grain to settlers) 7828; (roads and bridges at Banff, N. W. T.) 7074; (relief to distressed settlers) 7075; (repairs to Banff bridge) 7831; (seed grain to settlers) 8121; (Yukon and B. C. survey) 7074 (iii).

**Sutherland, Hon. J.—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

- Quarantine* (public health regulations) 9200.  
*Yukon Territory* (living allowances, &c.) 7833.  
 Timagami Ry. on M. to strike out Name from Charter, 8837 (iii).  
 Timber Licenses, Man., on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. of Sup., 7232 (iii).  
 ——— Licenses, Sums Paid, &c. (Ans.) 7881 (iii).  
 Turriff, J. G., and Chappelle, E. A., Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2194 (i).  
 See "Chapelle, Sifton, Hon. Mr.," &c.  
 Vincent, Mr., Surveyor, Emplmt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 3043 (i).  
 White, Lt.-Col., Retirement, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 3129, 3132 (i).  
 Administration of the Yukon (remarks) 6508 (ii).  
 ——— Charges Against, on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6422 (ii).  
 ——— *An English Expert on the Klondike*, Purchase of Copies (Ans.) 6612 (ii).  
 ——— Applications for Coal Areas (Ans.) 8432.  
 ——— Applications for Land, &c. (Ans.) 5405 (ii).  
 ——— Bonanza Creek Lease, Mr. A. E. Philp's Application (Ans.) 5025 (ii).  
 ——— report, &c., *re* (Ans.) 5894 (ii).  
 ——— Champagne, Mr. Pavinus, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3044 (i).  
 ——— Claims, Abandonment by Owners (Ans.) 5026 (ii).  
 ——— Claims reserved, Disposal (Ans.) 5406 (ii).  
 ——— Communications with Mr. Ogilvie (Ans.) 4738 (ii).  
 ——— Council, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 7880, 7968 (iii).  
 ——— Dredging Leases, Applications of Mr. Philp, &c. (Ans.) 5247, 5399 (ii).  
 ——— cancelled or forfeited (Ans.) 5893 (ii).  
 ——— transference to Mr. Philp and others (Ans.) 5248 (ii).  
 ——— Game Preservation Act (B. 190) 1° m., 9059 (iii).  
 ——— Girouard, J. E., Advances to (Ans.) 5408.  
 ——— inquiry for papers *re*, 7647 (iii).  
 ——— Hydraulic Leases to Robt. Anderson (Ans.) 6054 (ii).  
 ——— Instructions to W. H. Lynch (Ans.) 6351.  
 ——— Land under License, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 5243 (ii).  
 ——— Liquor Permits, on Inquiry (Mr. *Foster*) for copies, list, &c., 2997 (i).  
 ——— Ogilvie, Mr., Rep. of Yukon Territory (Ans.) 5025 (ii).  
 ——— answer to telegram, *re* (Ans.) 5895 (ii).  
 ——— on Inquiry for 4559, 4738, 6600, (ii), 7915 (iii).  
 ——— salary (Ans.) 4735 (ii).  
 ——— Options Granted, Date, &c. (Ans.) 5894 (ii).  
 ——— Option Holders, Names, &c. (Ans.) 5895.  
 ——— Payments to Mr. Clements (Ans.) 4736 (ii).  
 ——— Royal Commission *re* Investigation (Ans.) 4738, 5233, 5237, 5241 (ii).

**Sutherland, Hon. J.—*Con.***

- Yukon—Royalty, Amount collected (Ans.) 2750.  
 — Royalties, Charges against Mr. McDonald on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7681 (iii).  
 — Royalty of Alex. McDonald, Rep., &c. (Ans.) 5895 (ii).  
 — Teslin Lake Dredging Licenses (Ans.) 5242 (ii).  
 — Theft from Gold Commissioner's Office (Ans.) 5406 (ii).  
 — Timber Licenses, Names, &c. (Ans.) 5408.  
 — Transfer of Mining Claims (Ans.) 2753 (i).  
 — Wade, Mr. F. C., Charges against, on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 7150 (ii).  
 — Water Front at Dawson, Lease, &c. (Ans.) 7654 (iii).  
 — *Yukoner* SS., Clearance of, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 5017 (ii).

**Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.***

- Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5915 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7338 (iii).  
 Grosse Isle Quarantine, Steamer Service, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 5888, 6350, 6626 (ii), 7314 (iii).  
 I. C. R. Claims for Damages *re* Snow Fences in Bellechasse County (Ques.) 1735 (i).  
 — Freight Delays, on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 3283 (i).  
*Kathleen* Str., Expenditure for Quarantine Service (Ques.) 6350 (ii).  
 Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 6459 (ii).  
 Order (Ques. of) 3837 (ii).  
 Pilots, Montreal and Kingston, Cor. *re* Incorporation (M. for copy, &c.\*) 2203 (i).  
 Quarantine at Grosse Isle, Amounts paid to Str. Contest (Ques.) 7314 (ii).  
 Quebec Bridge Co.'s (B. 96) 1<sup>st</sup>\*, 2072 (i).  
 Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res. 10010 (iii).  
 Reports, Deptl., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4165 (ii).  
 South African War—Emergency Rations, Entry at Montreal (Ques.) 8432 (iii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Public Works* : Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Maria wharf) 10197; (St. Lambert protection walls) 10219 (iii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (maintenance, &c.) 3654 (ii).

Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, French Translation of M. (remarks) 6385 (ii).

**Tarte, Hon. J. I., *St. John and Iberville.***

- Bailey, W. H., Emplmt. in B. C. Post Office (Ans.) 299 (i).  
 Berthier, Dredging of Channel, &c. (Ans.) 1462.  
 Cascumpec Harbour Improvements, Govtl. Action (Ans.) 1483 (i).

**Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.***

- Chapel Cove, Breakwater, Erection of by Govt. (Ans.) 1121 (i).  
 Chicoutimi Public Works, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 287 (i).  
 Collingwood Harbour Improvements, Appropriations by Govt. (Ans.) 1465 (i).  
 Elevator Accomodation, H. of C. (remarks) 1554.  
 Fox Bay Settlers, and Statement of Hon. Min. of Pub. Works (Ans.) 293 (i).  
 Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 455 (i).  
 Miminegash Harbour, Improvements, &c. by Govt. (Ans.) 1483 (i).  
 Montreal Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1307 (i).  
 Orillia Public Building, Caretaker, Name and Salary (Ans.) 286 (i).  
 Pacific Cable, par. in *The Outlook*, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to adjn., 655 (i).  
 St. Andrews Lock, Emplmt. of Union Men (Ans.) 598 (i).  
 Saugenay Public Works, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 287 (i).  
 South African War—Canadian Contingents, Pay to Volunteers, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 682.  
 — Flags on Public Buildings (remarks) 1124.  
 Tignish Breakwater, P.E.I., Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 1482 (i).  
 Victoria, B.C., Harbour, Amounts voted, &c. (Ans.) 1117 (i).  
 Yukon—Bennett and Atlin Tel. Line, Charleson, Mr., and Emplmt. of Men, Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 288, 296 (i).  
 — Bennett to Atlin Tel. Line, Cost of Construction, &c. (Ans.) 289 (i).  
 — Bennett and Dawson Tel. Line, Cost of Construction, Number of Employees, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 288 (i).  
 — Charleson, Mr. J. B., Rep. as to Work, &c. (Ans.) 435 (i).  
 — Coste's Rep. *re* Teslin Lake Route, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for copy, 605 (i).  
 — Quesnelle-Dawson Tel. Line, Purchase of Groceries for Employees (Ans.) 1116 (i).

**Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.***

- Alien Labour Law Enforcement, par in Prescott Paper *re* Deportation of Mr. White (remarks) 5032 (ii).  
 — Letter from Gananoque Oarsmen (read) 10422 (iii).  
 Arnprior P.O., Contract for furnishing and for Laying of Asphalt Sidewalk (Ques.) 3035 (i).  
 Anticosti, See "Fox Bay Settlers."  
 Athens, P.O., Hours of Closing (Ques.) 7972 (iii).  
 Barriefield Common, Kingston, Lease or Sale by Govt. (Ques.) 10304 (iii).  
 Belgrave P.O., Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 2747.

**Taylor, Mr. G.—Con.**

- Binder Twine, Sales, &c. (Ques.) 2745 (i).  
 — Advertisements by Govt. (Ques.) 1008 (i).  
 — (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6146, 6238 (ii).  
 — Cost, &c., Name of Purchaser, &c. (Ques.) 169 (i).  
 — Quantity of Hemp received (Ques.) 5249.  
 — Schedule of Prices (Ques.) 1008 (i).  
 Boiler Inspection, Purchase and Sale of old Boilers, &c. (Ques.) 1474 (i).  
 Budget, The, 3709 (ii).  
 Business of the Hse., Unopposed Motions, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to adjn., 1971 (i).  
 Can. National and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*)—(M.) to have Clerk read names, 6607 (ii).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7021 (iii).  
 Cold Storage on Steamships, in Com. on Res. 4832, 4856 (ii).  
 Courtney, Corporal, in "A" Battery, Charges of Insubordination, &c. (remarks) 7771, 7885, 7989, 8282, 8934, 9063 (iii).  
 — Inquiry for Papers, 9685 (iii).  
 Daly, Patrick, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4444.  
 Dufferin Port, Halifax County wharf, construction, &c. (Ques.) 9904; 10508 (iii).  
 Election Pamphlets, Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 170, 171, 289, 475 (i).  
 Envelopes supplied to Trade and Commerce Dept., Number, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).  
 — (M. for Ret.\*) 2201 (i).  
 Eureka Str., Purchase by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 5751.  
 Foreign Grain, Inspection of, Act Amt. B. 142 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 3°, 4684 (ii).  
 Fox Bay Settlers, Cor. between Govt. and Methodist Conference (M. for copy\*) 649 (i).  
 — (M. to adjn.) 1984 (i).  
 — par. in *Montreal Witness* re Trouble with Settlers, 5390 (ii).  
 — Inquiry for Ret., 1381, 1787 (i).  
 — Statement of Hon. Min. of Pub. Works, (Ques.) 292 (i).  
 Franking Privilege, Abuse of by Member (Ques.) 2747 (i).  
 — M. (Mr. *Domville*) to adjn., Seconded, 788 (ii).  
 — Infringement of P. O. Act (Ques.) 2458.  
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3618.  
 — O.C. respecting, Violation, &c. (Ques.) 779.  
 Free Passes to Immigrants, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1117 (i).  
 French Canadians, Attack, &c., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 235 (i).  
 Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5115, 5139, 5850, 5865.  
 — on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 10496, 10499.

**Taylor, Mr. G.—Con.**

- Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) to prop., Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) M. to adjn. deb., 2559 (i).  
 — (remarks) 10496 (iii).  
 Grain Transportation to the Seaboard, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3232 (i).  
 Holiness Movement Church incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2669 (i).  
 House of Commons, Post Office Staff (Ques.) 4444 (ii).  
 I. C. R., Passes to Clergymen (Ques.) 4913 (ii).  
 International Commission, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2175 (i).  
 Kingston Military Camp, Meat Supplies (Ques.) 7969 (iii).  
 Mann, G. O., Release from Kingston Penitentiary, Rep. of Min. of Jus., &c. (M. for copies) 1013 (i).  
 McGill, Lt.-Col., Royal Mil. College, Position, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 9905 (iii).  
 Militia Camps, Transportation, &c. (Ques.) 9523.  
 Miller, Lt. "A" Battery, Status, &c. (Ques.) 9904 (iii).  
 Newmanville-Merrickville Mail Contract, Tenders (Ques.) 7124 (iii).  
 North American Transportation Company, Names, &c. (Ques.) 6248 (ii).  
 Orford Copper Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1931 (i).  
 Order (Ques. of) 3883 (ii).  
 Pelee Island, Sale of Life-saving Station (Ques.) 4559 (ii).  
 Plains of Abraham, Acquisition by Govt. (Ques.) 2171 (i).  
 Political Pamphlets, Printing and Distribution (Ques.) 170, 171, 289, 475 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 9822 (iii).  
 Preferential Trade with G. B., Explanation of Interview with A. Saunders, 2342 (i).  
 Privilege (Ques. of) Indebtedness for Speeches, 483 (i).  
 — (Mr. *Bergeron*) par. in *La Patrie*, 2232 (i).  
 Procedure in asking Questions, Order (Ques. of) 2377 (i).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4112 (ii).  
 Public Works, Maritime Provinces, Minister's Trip, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2179 (i).  
 Returns, Inquiry for, 1381, 1787 (i).  
 St. Lawrence Canals, Opening, (remarks) 3775.  
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal. Res. of Town Council, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 9727 (iii).  
 Soperton Post Office, Establishment, &c. (Ques.) 1735 (i).  
 Snetsinger, J. G., Claim for Compensation, &c. (Ques.) 1462, 1737 (i).

**Taylor, Mr. G.—Con.**

- South African War, American Bank Note Co.'s Building, Hoisting of Flag (remarks) 6789 (ii); 6993 (iii).  
 — Assignment of Soldiers' Pay, Letter read, 8281 (iii).  
 — Bloemfontein, Capture of, Raising of Flag on Parliament Buildings, 1927 (i).  
 — Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers, B. 59 (Mr. *Fiddling*) in Com. on Res., 1203; in Com. on B., 1672, 1694 (i).  
 — Flag on Bank Note Buildings (remarks) 6789 (ii); 6993 (iii).  
 — Monument to Can. Volunteers (Ques.) 1119 (i).  
 — Relief of Kimberly, Raising of Flag on Parliament Building (remarks) 541 (i).

**SUPPLY :**

- Canals*: Rideau (overseer's salary) 10395 (iii).  
*Civil Govt.* (High Commissioner's Office) 9604 (iii); Inland Revenue (salaries) 6021 (ii).  
*Customs* (miscellaneous expenses) 6089 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (close season) 5941; (cold storage) 5989, 5999 (ii); (C. W. Gauthier, claim) 8065 (iii).  
*Immigration* (salaries, agents, &c.) 9631 (iii).  
*Inland Revenue*: Weights and Measures (salaries) 6034 (ii).  
*Inspection of Staples* (hide inspector) 6940 (ii).  
*Legislation*: H. of C. (printing and binding) 5925 (ii).  
*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (construction salaries, &c.) 3664; (maintenance, &c.) 3646 (ii); (salaries, &c.) 1706 (i).  
*Militia* (annual drill) 8296; (Barriefield common) 10354; conc., 10452; (warlike stores) 8323 (iii).  
*Mounted Police* (pay of force) 6099 (ii).  
*Penitentiaries* (binder twine) 6892; St. Vincent de Paul, 6896; (investigations) 6960, 6974 (ii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (maintenance) 1700 (i).  
*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Maria wharf) 10199, 10202; (refitting *Eureka*) 7850; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 7850 (iii).  
 Thousand Island Ry. Co.'s. (B. 86) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1786 (i).  
 Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners, Expenditure, (Ques.) 5514 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 5972, 6929 (ii); 7131 (iii).  
 Wilson, Mr. S. Childs, Emplmt. (Ques.) 3775 (ii).  
 Yukon, Charleson, J. B., Expenditure per Aud. Gen's. Rep. (Ques.) 2178 (i).

**Tisdale, Hon. D., South Norfolk.**

- Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 2408; on amt. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2624 (i).  
 Budget, The, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn. Deb., 4433 (ii).  
 C. P. R. Co's. B. 34 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on M. for Com., 2630; on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 2659 (i).  
 Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s B. 171 (Mr. *Gibson*) in Com. 9400 (iii).

**Tisdale, Hon. D.—Con.**

- Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4701, 5902 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6744 (ii), 7324, 8090 (iii).  
 Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Lemicux*) in Com., 3012 (i).  
 Hall, Henry, Dismissal by Govt, Papers, &c. (M. for copies) 470 (i).  
 — inquiry for Ret. 6788 (ii).  
 Hutton, Gen., Departure from Can., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 326 (i).  
 Militia, Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 9840 (iii).  
 Private Bills, Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) 5884 (ii).  
 Queen's Birthday Adjournment, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5885 (ii).  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4687 4697 (ii); in Com., 9356 (iii).  
 — Subsidies, Authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 9964 (iii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1<sup>o</sup>, 254; on M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, 1638 (i).  
 Rowan Mills P. O., Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ques.) 4742 (ii).  
 St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co's. (B. 111) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i).  
 South African War, Can. Contingents, in Com. on Res., 1169, 1180, 1196 (i).  
 — Emergency Rations, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 6844 (ii).  
 — Papers laid on Table (remarks) 7216 (iii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 4675; in Com., 4676 (ii).  
 Welland Canal, Dynamite Explosion (remarks) 4150 (ii).  
 White, Lt.-Col., Retirement, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 3103, 3106 (i).

**Tucker, Mr. J. J., St. John City & County.**

- Fruit Inspection and Marking, Exportation B. 127 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5859 (ii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart., Cape Breton.**

- Address, on The, 20 (i).  
 Banking and Commerce Com., Substitution of Name (M.) 6135 (ii).  
 Bertram, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2346 (i).  
 Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., on amt. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2623 (i).  
 B.C. Lt.-Gov., Inquiry re, 7989 (iii).  
 — Removal from Office (remarks) 8074 (iii).  
 Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5672, 5695 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1014, 1055 (i).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—Con.**

- Brockville and West Huron Elections (remarks) 5476 (ii).  
 ——— Telegram from Mr. McPherson (read) 5700 (ii).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. Borden, *Halifax*) to adjn., 5739 (ii).  
 ——— Procedure (remarks) 2741 (i).  
 ——— See "Election Frauds," &c.  
 Budget, The, 2880, 2907; (amt.) 2940 (i).  
 ——— Procedure (remarks) 2741 (i).  
 Business of the House, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 5027 (ii).  
 ——— Organization of Com. (remarks) 322 (i).  
 ——— Unopposed Motions, Procedure (remarks) 1898 (i).  
 ——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 2079 (i).  
 ——— (remarks) 156 (i).  
 Cameron, Maj. Gen., Connection with R.M.C. (remarks) 1977 (i).  
 Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 3°, 6577 (ii).  
 ——— Challenging of Members' Votes, 6607 (ii).  
 C.P.R. Land Grants, Taxation of, on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to Com. of Sup., 8027 (iii).  
 Canadian Securities in the United Kingdom B. 149 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°. 5966 (ii).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 5227 (ii); on M. for 2°. 6996 (iii).  
 Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Official Cor. with Can. (remarks) 80, 82, 163, 318 (i).  
 Coasting Laws, Suspension (remarks) 480 (i).  
 Cold Storage on Steamships, in Com. on Res., 4837 (ii).  
 Commissions in Imperial Army, Cor. between Imp. and Can. Govts. (remarks) 3881 (ii).  
 See "S. A. War."  
 Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 8409 (iii).  
 ——— on Ques. of Order, 8419 (iii).  
 Copyright Bill, Memo. from Dep. of Jus. (remarks) 6447 (ii).  
 Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5251 (ii).  
 ——— on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) that Com. rise, 5261 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6709 (ii); in Com., 8090 (iii).  
 Election Frauds, Judicial Inquiry (remarks) 6059, 6352, 6569, 6693, 6916 (ii), 7084 (iii).  
 See "Brockville," &c.  
 Estimates, Suppl. (1900)—(remarks) 5293 (ii).  
 Famine in India, Contribution from Dom. &c., (remarks), 3879 (ii); 7119, 7770 (iii).  
 Fish Hatchery, Sydney, C.B., Sale, &c. (remarks) 6781 (ii).  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1°, 2347 (i).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—Con.**

- Franking Privilege, O. C. respecting, &c., on M. (Mr. *Domville*) to adjn., 800 (i).  
 ——— on Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 781 (i).  
 ——— Order (Ques. of) Personal Violence to Member, 808 (i).  
 ——— Speaker's Ruling *re* Ministerial Answers (remarks) 811 (i).  
 Grain Inspection Act B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 5764; on M. (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) to refer back to Com., 6281 (ii).  
 G.T.R. and Central Vermont Ry. Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. *McCarthy*) to suspend Rule, 6245 (ii).  
 Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to sit in Mornings, 8073 (iii).  
 Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2501, 2514-15 (i).  
 Haley, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 4065 (ii).  
 Halifax Harbour, Approaches, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 7803 (iii).  
 High Commissioner, Payments, &c., on Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) Objection, 1755 (i).  
 Hutton, Gen., Departure from Canada, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 326 (i).  
 Imperial and Can. Pension Allowance (remarks) 2162 (i).  
 India Famine, Can. Contributions, &c. (remarks) 3879 (ii); 7119, 7770 (iii).  
 I. C. R., Cumberland Co. Subway, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 7880 (iii).  
 ——— Freight Delays, on M. (Mr. *McDougall*) to adjn., 3277 (i).  
 ——— Par. in Cape Breton *Advocate re* Inferior Rails (remarks) 5123 (ii).  
 ——— Sale of Rolling Stock, &c. (remarks) 4906.  
 ——— Train Service on C. B. Division (remarks) 7972, 8077 (iii).  
 International Commission, Inquiry for Report, &c. (remarks) 2147 (i).  
 Leinster Regiment and Canadian Volunteers (remarks) 163 (i).  
 Members of Parlt., Appnmts. to Positions (remarks) 4904 (ii).  
 ——— Mileage, &c., Objection to Ques., 1978 (i).  
 Merchants Bank of Halifax, Change of Title Bill, on M. (Mr. *Russell*) to suspend Rule, 6247 (ii).  
 Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Borden, *King's*) on M. for 1°, 5224; in Com., 6456, 6465, 6472 (ii).  
 Newfoundland and Can., Negotiations, &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for copies, 2221 (i).  
 Order, Ques. of (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4926 (ii).  
 ——— Representation B. 13 on M. for 3°, 1556 (i).  
 ——— Unopposed Motions, Procedure, 1903.  
 ——— Ques. of (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) referring to past debate, 5735 (ii).  
 Ottawa and Hull Conflagration, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4338 (ii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—Con.**

- Pacific Cable, Cor. with Imp. Govt. and Colonies, &c. (M. for copies\*) 1011 (i).  
 — on M. for Com. of Sup., 7048 (iii).  
 — Par. in Toronto *Globe* re Proposal of Eastern Extension Co., on M. (Mr. *Casey*) to adjn., 583 (i).  
 Paris Exposition, Officials appointed by Govt., &c. (remarks) 2399 (i).  
 — Arrangements by Govt. respecting (remarks) 1788 (i).  
 — Provincial Representation (remarks) 1642.  
 Perrault, Joseph, on reading of Question (remarks) 2397 (i).  
 Personal Explanation, Travelling Expenses, 3577, 4334 (ii).  
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. 11 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 2°, 5059 ; in Com., 5161 (ii).  
 Proposed Reduction of Postage (remarks) 4801.  
 Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2035, 2240 (i).  
 Privilege (Ques. of) Cor. in London *Times* re Action on Imperial Federation, 6138, 6144 (ii).  
 — in Winnipeg *Free Press* re Attack on French Canadians (remarks) 165 (i).  
 — (M. to adjn.) 172 (i).  
 Procedure in asking Questions, on M. (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn., 2370 (i).  
 Public Health, Dept., Establishment of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 8445 (iii).  
 Queen's Birthday, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to adjn. (remarks) 5700 (ii).  
 Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 2183, 2370 (i).  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 3257 (i).  
 Regina *Leader*, Payments to by Govt. (remarks) 1116 (i).  
 Reports, Deptl., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4150 (ii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 1216, on amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) to M. for 3°, 1560 ; on M. for 3°, 1582 (amt.) 1586.  
 — Order (Ques. of) 1225 (i).  
 Returns (inquiry), 8436 (iii).  
 Rifle Clubs, Establishment of (remarks) 7119 (iii).  
 Royal Mint for Can., Par. in N. Y. *Tribune* (remarks) 5230 (ii).  
 Seed Grain Indebtedness B. 143 (Mr. *Sutherland*) in Com., 5038, 5046, 5057 (ii), on M. for 3°, 5143 (ii).  
 Sel. Standing Com., on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to prepare Lists (remarks) 137 (i).  
 South African War, Additional Troops required by Imp. Govt. (remarks) 1122 (i).  
 — Address to Her Maj. on Recent Victories (seconded) 6901 (ii).  
 — Canadian Contingents, Pay to Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 351 ; in Com. on B., 1647, 2004 (i).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, Bart.—Con.**

- South African War—Latitude of debate in Com. (remarks) 812.  
 — Casualties in Canadian Regiment (remarks) 738 (i).  
 — Commissions in Imperial Army (M. to adj.) 3480 (ii).  
 — (remarks) 3881 (ii).  
 — Emergency Rations, Analyses, &c. (remarks) 7886 (iii).  
 — Order (Ques. of), 6831 (ii).  
 — on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to adjn., 6804 (ii).  
 — on M. to conc. in First Rep. of Com., 7646 (iii).  
 — Flags on Public Buildings (remarks) 1124 .  
 — Inquiry for Complete List of Casualties (remarks) 4563 (ii).  
 — Insurance of Canadian Contingent, Par. in Ottawa *Free Press*, 866 (i).  
 — Insurance of Can. Contingents (remarks) 4248 (ii).  
 — explanation, 1926 (i).  
 — telegrams from Company (read) 1122 (i).  
 — Ocean Accident and Guarantee Insurance Corporation, Cor. with re List of Casualties (remarks) 4563 (ii).  
 — Official Rep. (remarks) 3333 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Customs* : N S. (salaries) 6070 (ii).  
*Fisheries* (cold storage) 5987, 5996 (ii).  
*Militia* (arms, ammunition) 8366 ; (Esquimalt) 8343 ; (Royal Military College) 8337 ; (warlike stores) 8310, 8314 (iii).  
 Toronto Hotel Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. *Oster*) in Com., 4966 (ii).  
 Tupper, Sir Charles, 45th Anniversary of Public Life (remarks) 5805 (ii).  
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 8088 (i).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4820, 5969 (ii).  
 Welland Canal, Dynamite Explosion (remarks) 4148 (ii).  
 Yukon, Administration of, Charges against (M. to adjn.) 938 (i).  
 — Coste's Rep. re Teslin Lake Route, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for copy, 606 (i).  
 — *John C. Barr* (M.) to print Return, 5019.  
 — reps., re register, &c. (Ques.) 3761 (ii).  
 — Permanent Force in the Yukon, withdr., &c. (remarks) 1209 (i).  
 — Representation in Dom. Parl. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7773 (iii).  
 — (prop. Res.) 7647 (iii).  
 — *Yukoner* Str., Clearance, &c. (Ques.) 6248.

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert,****K.C.M.G., Pictou.**

- Bank Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6503 (ii).  
 B.C. County Court Judges, Salaries, &c. (M. for Cor., &c.) 300 (i).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert—Con.**

Brockville and West Huron Elections, on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 5446-5447 (ii), 7456 (iii).

— (remarks) 5480, 5621, 5691 (ii).

— on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn., 5744.

— See "Election Frauds," &c.

Business of the House (remarks) 242 (i).

Can. and U.S. Coasting Laws on Pacific Coast, (M. for O. C.'s\*) 319 (i).

Copyright Bill, Memo. from Dep. Min. of Jus. (remarks) 6448 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4700, 5716 (ii).

— (M.) that Com. rise, 5252 (ii).

Dewar, Robt., Compensation to (Ques.) 6615 (ii).

Election Frauds, Judicial Inquiry, on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Blair*) 7096 (iii).

Gas Inspection Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4670 (ii).

Gaspé Elections and Custom Official, on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Com. of Sup., 7578, 7601 (iii).

Gass, Mr., See "Moosejaw."

Grain Inspection Act B. 141 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2°, 5762 (ii).

I. C. R., Sunday Work (Ques.) 7969 (iii).

Judges of Provincial Courts, on Order for 1° of B., 6692 (ii).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 31 (Mr. *Davin*) in Com., 4799 (ii).

Militia Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Borden, King's*) in Com., 6480 (ii).

Moosejaw Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. Gass, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6335 (ii).

Morgan, R. W., Residence, &c. (Ques.) 5247 (ii).

New Westminster, B. C., Postmaster, Name (Ques.) 5896 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, Irrelevancy of Deb. (remarks) 4272 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 4699 (ii).

Returns (inquiry) 4723 (ii).

Richelieu River Bridge, Repts. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Foster*) for copies, 4753 (ii).

Shrapnel, W., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4555 (ii).

South African War—Emergency Rations, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Monk*) 7305 (iii).

**SUPPLY:**

*Administration of Justice* (B. C. Judges' salaries) 6438; (Exchequer Court) 6437; (Registrar's salary) 6438; (Supreme Court) 6432, 6435 (ii).

*Arts, &c.* (historical data) 6345 (ii).

*Civil Govt.*: Customs (contingencies) 6064; (statistical returns) 6242; Interior (Messrs. Rothwell and Ryley's salaries) 6508, 6542 (ii), 7729, 7734, 7807, 7818 (iii); (salaries) 6508; Post Office (salaries) 6103 (ii).

*Customs*: B. C. (contingencies, salaries) 6086; (inspector's travelling expenses) 6088; (unforeseen expenditure) 6087 (ii).

*Fisheries* (C. W. Gauthier, claim) 8064; (H. H. A. Bruce, claims, &c.) 8066 (iii).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.**

*Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Traverse light) 8063 (iii).

*Mounted Police* (pay of force) 6100 (ii).

*Penitentiaries*, 6438; (inspector's rep.) 6441 (ii).

*Public Works*: Yukon, Buildings (rent, fuel, &c.) 8058; Harbours and Rivers, B. C. (Fraser River) 7956; N. S. (River John wharf) 7941; Ont. (Burlington channel) 7951; (Collingwood harbour) 7952; P. E. I. (China Point pier) 7944 (iii).

United States Steamers, Inspection Exemption (remarks) 299 (i).

Wilson, J., Services in Connection with Egg Island Lighthouse, B. C. (M. for cor, \*) 2760 (i).

Yukon, Administration of, Charges against, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6356 (amt.) 6374, Neg. (Y. 38; N. 74) 6428 (ii).

— (remarks) 6507 (ii).

— Applications for Coal Areas (Ques.) 8431.

— Applications for Land, &c. (Ques.) 5404 (ii).

— Application, Grants, &c., for certain areas mentioned in Ret. 85 (1898) M. for Ret. \*, 167

— Applications, Records, &c., *re* Claims Nos. 18, 26 and 16, Records of all Royalties due and collected (1897-8) &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 167 (i).

— Bonanza Creek Lease, Rep., &c. (Ques.) 5894 (ii).

— application of Mr. A. E. Philp (Ques.) 5025 (ii).

— Charleson, Mr. J. B., Repts. *re* Telegraph Construction, &c. (M. for copies) 7310 (iii).

— inquiry for papers, 7514 (iii).

— See "Telegraph," &c.

— Claims reserved, Disposal (Ques.) 5406 (ii).

— Communications with Mr. Ogilvie (Ques.) 4738 (ii).

— Criminal Proceedings against Officials (Ques.) 153 (i).

— Dominion Creek, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 157 (i).

— inquiry for Ret., 6702 (ii).

— Dredging Leases, Cancelled or Forfeited, &c. (Ques.) 5893 (ii).

— Dredging Leases, Teslin Lake, Applications of Messrs. Philp and others (Ques.) 5398, 5246, 5247 (ii).

— transference to Mr. Philp and others (Ques.) 5247 (ii).

— published in *Canada Gazette* (Ques.) 7315.

— *An English Expert on the Klondike*, Purchase of Copies (Ques.) 6612 (ii).

— Extension of Time to Officers *re* Claims (Ques.) 152 (i).

— Girouard, J. E., Advances to (Ques.) 5407.

— Hydraulic Leases to Robt. Anderson (Ques.) 6052 (ii).

— Instructions to W. H. Lynch (Ques.) 6351.

— Investigation by Mr. Ogilvie, Action *re* by Govt. (Ques.) 153 (i).

**Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert—Con.**

- Yukon—*John C. Barr*, Ret. (inquiry) 4722, 4809, 5227, 6049 (ii).  
 — registration, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 319 (i).  
 — reps. *re* (Ques.) 6614 (ii).  
 — return (M.) to print papers, 4899 (ii).  
 — undervaluation, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6633 (ii).  
 — Judicial Business, Condition of the Docket of Court (Ques.) 590 (i).  
 — Mining Claims and Govt. Policy (Ques.) 151 (i).  
 — Ogilvie's Rep., Answer to Telegram (Ques.) 5895 (ii).  
 — rep. and Action taken by Govt. (Ques.) 435 (i), 4738 (ii).  
 — (inquiry) 4559 (ii), 7915 (iii).  
 — Rep. of Yukon Ter. (Ques.) 5625 (ii).  
 — salary, emoluments, &c. (Ques.) 154 (i), 4735 (ii).  
 — Option Holders, Names, &c. (Ques.) 5894.  
 — Options granted, Date, &c. (Ques.) 5894.  
 — Payments to Mr. Clements (Ques.) 4735.  
 — Rates of Pay to Officers, &c. (Ques.) 152.  
 — Registrar's Fees, &c. (Ques.) 479 (i).  
 — Representation in Parlt. (Ques.) 6615 (ii).  
 — Royal Commission, &c. (Ques.) 4736 (ii).  
 — Royal Commission *re* Investigation (Ques.) 5231, 5233, 5238 (ii).  
 — Royal Commission, Reps. respecting, Limitation of Scope, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 167 (i).  
 — Royalty to Alex. McDonald, Rep., &c. (Ques.) 5895 (ii).  
 — (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7658 (iii).  
 — Teslin Lake Dredging Licenses (Ques.) 5242 (ii).  
 — Theft from Gold Commissioner's Office (Ques.) 5406 (ii).  
 — Timber Licenses, Names, &c. (Ques.) 5408.  
 — Telegraph Line, Mr. Charleson's Rep., &c.: M. for Papers, 7203 (iii).  
 — Inquiry for Papers, 7649 (iii).  
 — *See* "Charleson."  
 — Villeneuve, Levere, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 153 (i).  
 — Wade, Mr. F. C., Charges against, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7136 (iii).  
 — Wade, Mr. F. C., Instructions, &c. not already produced, Tenders, Papers, &c. (M. for Ret. \*) 167 (i).  
 — Walsh-Carbonneau Agreement (remarks) 6243 (ii).  
 — Water Front at Dawson, Lease, &c. (Ques.) 7652 (iii).  
 — and Mr. Wade's Action (Ques.) 151 (i).  
 — Yukoner S.S., Clearance of (Ques.) 4921, 5395 (ii).  
 — (M. to adjn.) 4926, 4967 (ii).  
 — incomplete Ret. (remarks) 6059 (ii).  
 — (M.) to print cor. *re*, 6567 (ii).  
 — Ques. of Order, 5003 (ii).

**Turcot Mr. G., *Mégantic*.**

- Budget, The, 3947 (ii).  
 Kinnear's Mills P.O., Inquiry *re* Registered Letter, 8076 (iii).

**Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe*.**

- Commissions in Imperial Army, Regulations *re* (remarks) 3283 (i).  
 Morrison, Mr. J. C., Collector of Mails at Barrie (Ques.) 2758 (i).  
 South African War, Punishment of Can. Private, on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Wallace*) 4453 (ii).  
 — Official Reports, Inquiry for, 3332 (ii).  
 White, Lt.-Col., Retirement, on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 3111 (i).

**Wallace, Hon. N. Clarke, *West York*.**

- Bank Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 3°, 6629 (ii).  
 Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 1516, 2410 (i).  
 Brockville and West Huron Investigation, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 1023 (i).  
 — on amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to Com. of Sup., 5565 (ii).  
 Budget, The, 3140, 3284 (i).  
 — on M. to adjn. Deb. (Mr. *Monk*) 4049 (ii).  
 Can. National Ry. and Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 3°, 6587 (ii).  
 C.P.R. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. *Macdonell*) on amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to M. for 3°, 2662 (i).  
 Cattle Embargo on Can. Cattle (remarks) 3988 (ii).  
 Chinese Immigration Restriction B. 180 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 7413 (iii).  
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 6997 (ii).  
 Customs, Deptl. Rep. (inquiry) 285 (i).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for 2°, 4793 (ii).  
 — B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6720 (ii); in Com., 8814, 8852 (iii).  
 Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 9 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 4777 (ii).  
 Experimental Farm Stations Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5099 (ii).  
 Franchise Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Ingram*) on M. for 1°, 145 (i).  
 — B. 105 (Mr. *Carroll*) on M. for 1°, 2351 (i).  
 French Canadians, Attack, &c., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 206 (i).  
 Govt. Contracts, Protection to Workmen, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2472 (i).  
 Grain Inspection Act B. 141 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) on M. for 2°, 5758 (ii).  
 Hutton, Gen., Departure from Can., on M. (Mr. *Prior*) to adjn., 348 (i).  
 I.C.R., Train Service on C.B. Division, on M. (Mr. *Gillies*) to adjn., 7986 (iii).  
 Live Stock Associations incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5099 (ii).

**Wallace, Hon. N. Clarke—Con.**

- McInnes, Lt.-Gov., and B.C. Elections (remarks) 7319 (iii).  
 Military Districts, Service Ammunition, Number of Rounds stored, &c. (Ques.) 5892 (ii).  
 Montreal Riots, on M. (Mr. *McNeill*) to adjn., 1349 (i).  
 Newfoundland and Can., Negotiations, Cors., &c., on M. (Mr. *Martin*) for copies, 2224 (i).  
 N.W. Ters., Taxation of Ry. Lands, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 629 (i).  
 Paris Exhibition, Officials appointed by Govt., &c. (remarks) 2401 (i).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 9699 (iii).  
 P.E.I. (Murray Harbour Branch) Ry. B. 182 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 8948 (iii).  
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Bergeron*) par. in *La Patrie*, 2232 (i).  
 — (Mr. *Borden*, *King's*) Lt. Borden and Press. Reps. re Insubordination (remarks) 321 (i).  
 — (Mr. *Bourassa*) re Appnmt. as Govt. Whip, 588 (i).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 8959 (iii).  
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 4686 (ii).  
 Reps. Deptl. (inquiry) 3989 (ii).  
 — Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4154 (ii).  
 Representation in the H. of C. B. 13 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 249; on M. for 2°, 1237; in Com., 1401; on M. for 3°, 1601 (i).  
 — on Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1226.  
 St. Johns Customs Collector, par. in *Canada Francais* (remarks) 9855 (iii).  
 Seed Grain Indebtedness B. 143 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 3°, 5143 (ii).  
 South African War, Can. Contingents, Pay to Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 541; in Com. on Res., 1191; in Com. on B., 1649, 1686 (i).  
 — Chaplains, Appnmt. of (Ques.) 7971 (iii).  
 — Emergency Rations, Analyses, &c. (remarks) 7887 (iii).  
 — M. to adjn., 7890 (iii).  
 — instructions, &c., on amt. (Mr. *Monk*) to Com. of Sup., 7562 (iii).  
 — papers laid on Table (remarks) 7217 (iii).  
 — List of Casualties (inquiry) 4566 (ii).  
 — Oliver Equipment, Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 9796 (iii).  
 — Punishment of Can. Private (M. to adjn.) 4451 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Civil Govt.* : Customs (contingencies) 6064; Post Office (contingencies) 6132; (salaries) 6113, 6122 (ii).  
*Customs* : N. B. (contingencies and salaries) 6072 (ii); N. W. T. (salaries, &c.) 9519 (iii); N. S. (contingencies) 6066 (ii); salaries, contingencies, &c.) 9508 (iii); Man. (contingencies, salaries) 6076; Ont. (contingencies

**Wallace, Hon. N. Clarke—Con.****SUPPLY—Con.****Customs—Con.**

- and salaries) 6073; Que. (contingencies and salaries) 6072 (ii).  
*Militia* : South African War (Halifax garrison) 9772; (warlike stores) 8320 (iii).  
*Ocean and River Service* (tidal surveys) 1702; (winter mail service) 1704 (i).  
*Railways* : I. C. R., 8462 (iii).  
 Tobacco Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Gillies*) M. to adjn. deb., 4760 (ii).  
 Trade and Nav. Rets., Inquiry for, 817 (i).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4680, 4812, 6920 (ii).  
 Wood, Mr., See "St. Johns," &c.  
 Yukon—*John C. Barr*, Undervaluation, &c., on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., 6675 (ii).  
 — *Yukoner* SS., Clearance of, on M. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to adjn., 5000 (ii).

**Wilson Uriah, Lennox.**

- Budget, The, 3734 (ii).  
 Clerks in Depts., Number, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 4446 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7383 (ii).  
 Holiness Movement Church incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2667 (i).  
 Interior Dept., Religion of Clerks (remarks) 3468 (ii).  
 — Deptl. Rep. (inquiry) 3986 (ii).  
 Orford Copper Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 1932 (i).  
 Paris Exposition, Cost of Canadian Buildings (Ques.) 3771 (ii).  
 Parliament, Calling of on a Fixed Date, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 3477 (ii).  
 Postmasters' Allowances since Reduction of Postage, &c. (Ques.) 1120 (i).  
 Post Office Boxes, Rents paid, &c. (Ques.) 1479 (i).  
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (remarks) 3466 (ii).  
 Railway Subsidies bearing Interest, Names, &c. (Ques.) 5515, 5752 (ii).  
 — Subsidies authorization B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res. 9966 (iii).  
 Reports, Deptl., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 4160 (ii).  
 Rideau Hall, &c., Expenses, &c., July, 1892, June, 1899, (M. for stmnt. \*) 4079 (ii).  
 Subsidies to Rys., Names (Ques.) 5515 (ii).

**SUPPLY :**

- Administration of Justice* : Exchequer Court (contingencies) 8131; (P. Mungovan, &c.) 8129 (iii).  
*Arts, Agriculture, &c.* (immigration) 7201; (Paris exposition) 7183 (iii).  
*Canals* : Soulanges (construction) 8912 (iii).  
*Charges of Management* (printing Dom. Notes) 6445 (ii).

**Wilson, Uriah—Con.**

## SUPPLY—Con.

- Fisheries* (cold storage) 5991 (ii); (C. W. Gauthier, claim) 8064; (hatcheries, &c.) 8067 (iii).  
*Immigration* (contingencies, foreign agencies) 9664; (salaries, agencies, &c.) 9614 (iii).  
*Indians*: Man. and N.W.T. (general expenses) 8127 (iii).  
*Miscellaneous* (seed grain to settlers) 8122 (iii).  
*Legislation*: H. of C. (voters' lists) 9606 (iii).  
*Penitentiaries*, 8135 (iii); Kingston, 6440; St. Vincent de Paul (electric plant) 6440 (ii).  
*Public Works*: Dom. (water rates) 7939; buildings, N.W.T. (Govt. Buildings) 9893; Ont. (Deseronto post office) 9883; (Picton post office) 9884, Rideau Hall, 7937; (fire protection) 9890; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Sarnia, dredging) 10228; P.E.I. (China Point pier) 7944; Que. (Soulanges canal wharf) 10101; Yukon, Buildings (rent, fuel, &c.) 8058 (iii).  
 U. S. Steamers, Inspection) Exemption, &c. (Ques.) 298 (i).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 5975 (ii).

**Wood, A. T., Hamilton.**

- Binder Twine, on amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Com. of Sup., 6152, 6207 (ii).  
 Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. 25. (Mr. *McInnes*) in Com., 1520 (i).  
 ——— (Ques. of Order) 1517 (i).  
 Can. National Transport Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 6599 (ii).  
 ——— (explanation) 6608 (ii).

**Wood, Mr. A. T.—Con.**

- Canadian Steel Co.'s incorp. (B. 129) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2994 (i).  
 Cold Storage on Steamships, in Com. on Res., 4848 (ii).  
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7341, 8826, 9065 (iii).  
 Gaspé Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 2999 (i).  
 Nickel Steel Co.'s (B. 68) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1381 (i).  
 Orford Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. 53 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, amt. 1725 (i).  
 Patent Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2<sup>d</sup>, 6941 (ii).  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. 191 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 9829 (iii).  
 Preferential Trade with G.B., on amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com., of Sup. (explanation) 2042 (i).  
 Restigouche and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 73 (Mr. *McAlister*) on M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, 3415 (ii).  
 South African War—Can. Contingents—Pay to Volunteers B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 1689.  
 SUPPLY:  
*Customs*: Man. (contingencies, salaries) 6077.  
*Militia* (warlike stores) 8323 (iii).  
*Public Works*: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Burlington channel) 7951 (iii).  
*Quarantine* (public health regulations) 9410.  
 Toronto Hotel Co.'s B. 114 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 4963 (ii).  
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 110 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) in Com., 4817 (ii).

# INDEX--PART II

## SUBJECTS

- ABENAKIS INDIANS OF ST. FRANCIS: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 7321 (iii).
- "ABERDEEN" STR., ALTERATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8062 (iii).
- SPECIAL TRIP TO LES EBOULEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 8430 (iii).
- Acadia Mortgage Co.'s B. No. 116** (Mr. Russell) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 4479; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6820 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 86.)
- Accident and Guarantee Co. of Canada incorp. B. No. 81** (Mr. Penny) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1713; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2156 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5751 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 87.)
- ACCOMMODATION AT SYDNEY, I. C. R., DISSATISFACTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 296 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3179 (i).
- See "I. C. R.," &c.
- ADAMS BROS., PAYMENTS TO IN 1898-99: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2364 (i).
- ADDITIONAL JUDGES, PROV. OF QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1750 (i).
- See "Judges."
- ADDITIONAL OFFICIALS ON I. C. R., SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3443 (ii).
- SIDINGS, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 10388 (iii).
- TRAIN SERVICE ON C. B. DIVISION: Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 3073 (i).
- See "I. C. R.," &c.
- TROOPS REQUIRED BY IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1122 (i).
- Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1209 (i).
- ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX'S. SPEECH: condsn. M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
- moved (Mr. Gould) 10; seconded (Mr. Geoffrion) 15 (i).
- Deb.: (Sir Charles Tupper) 20; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 61; (Mr. Foster) 79, 84; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 124 (i).
- PRECEDENCE: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
- TO HER MAJESTY *re* RECENT VICTORIES: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6899, 6913 (ii).
- MESS. FROM SENATE: read (Mr. Speaker) 7303.
- *re* TRANSVAAL QUESTION, REPLY: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1206 (i).
- ADJOURNMENTS:
- ASH WEDNESDAY: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1058 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Foster) 937 (i).
- BUSINESS OF THE HSE.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8073 (iii).
- DOM. DAY: Remarks (Mr. Craig) 8435.
- Remarks (Mr. Prior) 8652 (iii).
- EASTER: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3264.
- OTTAWA AND HULL CONFLAGRATION: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4331 (ii).
- See "Supply Bill," 147.
- QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5699, 5885 (ii).
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 6430, 6888 (ii); 8172, 9776 (iii).
- ADMINISTRATION OF YUKON: amt. to Com. of Sup., (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 8527; neg. (Y. 34; N. 70) 8648 (iii).
- Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 8559 (ii).
- Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 8561-68 (ii).
- amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 6356, 6374; neg. (Y. 38; N. 74) 6428 (ii).
- M. to adjn. (Sir Charles Tupper) 938 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 9766, 10276 (iii).
- Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 6507.
- TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10276 (iii).
- See "Yukon," &c.
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2; *pro forma*.
- Admiralty Act Amt. B. No. 138** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3575; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5103; in Com., 5103; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5144 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 45.)
- AGENTS REP., *re* B.C. FISHERIES: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3177 (i).
- See "B.C.," &c.
- AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:
- AGRICULTURE DEPT., EMPLOYEES, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Montagne) 2180, 2366 (i).
- DEPTL. REP.: Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 5122 (iii).
- presented (Mr. Fisher) 5393 (ii).
- DEPTL. VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 6335 (ii); 7619, 9412, 10286 (iii).
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6342 (ii); 7619, 10331 (iii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

- BUBONIC PLAGUE IN B.C. AND QUARANTINE: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 588 (i).  
 — REPORTED CASES ON AMERICAN FRONTIER: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 3457 (i).  
 BULLETINS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 6341 (ii).  
 CATTLE EMBARGO IN G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Burnett*) 3988 (ii).  
 — INSPECTION, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3766 (ii).  
 — QUARANTINE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 10347 (iii).  
 — SHEEP AND HORSES, EXPORTS TO G.B.: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2746 (i).  
 CENSUS OF 1871-81-91, FORMS USED, &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 1011 (i).  
 — LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 7786 (iii).  
 — TAKING OF: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 8433 (iii).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 6343 (ii), 7642 (iii).  
 COLD STORAGE BETWEEN P. E. I. AND G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 6253 (ii).  
 — ON STEAMSHIPS: Prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4662; in Com. on Res., 4822 (ii), 7619.  
 — IN 1896: Inquiry for Regulations (Mr. *Clarke*) 4899 (ii).  
 — SYSTEM, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 2366 (i).  
 COPYRIGHT BILL, OPINION OF DEPT. OF JUS.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6447 (ii).  
 CREAMERIES, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7631 (iii).  
 CREAMERY PRODUCE, SALE, &c. BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 6701 (ii).  
 CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 6339 (ii).  
 DAIRY EXPORTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T., COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2362, 2458 (i).  
 DAIRYING INTERESTS: in Com. of Sup., 9412 (iii).  
 DENT, MAJ., INSTRUCTIONS FROM IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4443 (ii).  
 See "South African War," &c.  
 EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 6341 (ii).  
 — BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 7930 (iii).  
 — OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 7202 (iii).  
 FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE, PAR. IN MONTREAL GAZETTE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 3795 (ii).  
 GRAIN SHIPMENTS TO G.B., COR. BETWEEN MR. ROSS AND MIN. OF AGR.: M. for copy (Mr. *Davin*) 157 (i).  
 GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 7835 (iii).  
 — STEAMER SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 5888, 6626 (ii).  
 HEALTH REGULATIONS ON PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 9197, 9407 (iii).  
 IMPLEMENTS, DUTY ON: ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3640 (ii).  
 — EXPORTED, 1896-99, REBATE, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Clarke*) 3050 (i).  
 — IMPORTS, &c., VALUE: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2756, 3034 (i).  
 — PETS. *re* INCREASE OF DUTY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1737.  
 — REBATE ON EXPORTS FROM CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2750 (i).  
 INSPECTION (APPLES AND PEARS) BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Guillet*) 10505 (iii).  
 MACHINERY, IMPORTS, VALUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 3046 (i).  
 PAN-AMERICAN EXHIBITION, CONSTRUCTION OF CAN. BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Oster*) 2752 (i).  
 PARIS EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 6344 (ii) 7173.  
 — AMOUNT SPENT ON BUILDINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 7649 (iii).  
 — APPNT. OF MIN. OF PUB. WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) 740 (i).  
 — ARRANGEMENTS BY GOVT., RESPECTING: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1788 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

- PARIS EXPOSITION: CLOSING ON SUNDAYS: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 6252, 6352 (ii).  
 — COLD STORAGE FOR CAN. EXHIBITS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 5392 (ii).  
 — COST OF CAN. BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 3771 (ii).  
 — FISHERIES COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1460 (i).  
 — MAP OF CAN., BOUNDARY LINE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5891 (ii).  
 — OFFICIALS APPOINTED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 2460 (i).  
 — PAR. IN TORONTO "MAIL" *re* EXHIBITS ON SUNDAY: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 5030 (ii).  
 — P. E. I. REPRESENTATION: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 4258 (ii).  
 — PROVINCIAL REPRESENTATION: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 1642 (i).  
 — SPEECHES OF HON. MR. TARTE: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7511 (iii).  
 PATENT ACT (AUER LIGHT) AMT. BILL (Mr. *Gibson*): Ruled out of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1642 (i).  
 PATENTS, CLASSIFYING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6342.  
 "PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 6339 (ii), 7199 (iii).  
 PINEAU, H. J., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3446 (ii).  
 QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 6346 (ii); 9197, 9407 (iii).  
 — AT GROSSE ISLE, AMOUNTS PAID TO STR. "CONTEST": Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 7314 (iii).  
 — HEALTH REGULATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6348 (ii).  
 — ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iii).  
 — VICTORIA, B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Fisher*) 7304 (iii).  
 SMALL-POX, REPORTED OUTBREAK: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 4454, 4694 (ii).  
 STATISTICAL RETURNS: in Com. of Sup., 6242 (ii).  
 STATISTICAL YEAR BOOK: in Com. of Sup., 6340 (ii); conc., 10437 (iii).  
 — Inquiry (Mr. *Moore*) 4153 (ii).  
 STEEL SHELVING: in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iii).  
 TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 6347 (ii).  
 — EXPENSES FOR TRANSPORTATION QUES.: (Mr. *Prior*) 6349 (ii).  
 — NUMBER OF LEPERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5401 (ii).  
 TRAMP CATTLE FROM U.S. AND MEDICINE HAT STOCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION, COR., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5403 (ii), 8432 (iii).  
 TUBERCULOSIS: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iii).  
 WILLIAM'S HEAD QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 7958 (iii).  
 AIR BRAKES, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 9456 (iii).  
 ALASKA AND B.C. SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 7066.  
 ALASKAN BOUNDARY, PRINTING OF REP.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8437 (iii).  
 Alaska and North-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 42 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 649; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1005 (i).  
 Alaska-Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 23 (Mr. *Logan*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 471; 2<sup>o</sup>, 589 (i).  
 ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10007 (iii).  
 ALBERTON AND KILDARE, P. E. I. MAIL CONTRACTORS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1979 (i).  
 ALBERTON HARBOUR, P. E. I., AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.; Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, *King's*) 6781 (ii).  
 See "P. E. I.," &c.

- ALEXANDER, J. P., DISMISSAL, COR. *re*: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Rutherford*) 3469 (ii).
- Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 125** (Mr. *Dyment*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i) 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3373; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5922 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- ALGOMA CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9963 (iii).
- ALIEN LABOUR ACT, B.C., ENFORCEMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 597 (i).
- ENFORCEMENT AT WELAND: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 8839 (iii).
- ENFORCEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6430 (ii), 9776 (iii).
- ENFORCEMENT BY U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2465 (i).
- PAR. IN PRESCOTT PAPER *re* DEPORTATION OF MR. WHITE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5032 (ii).
- LETTER FROM GANANOQUE OARSMEN: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 10422 (iii).
- PAYMENTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6612 (ii).
- PROSECUTIONS UNDER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5896 (ii).
- ALLOWANCE, PAY TO MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 8285.
- ALLOWANCES TO OFFICIALS, YUKON TERRITORY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7832 (iii).
- ALLOWANCE TO EXCISE COLLECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (ii).
- AMBULANCE SERVICE, MILITIA, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 1113 (i).
- AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO.'S BUILDING, HOISTING OF FLAG: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 6789 (iii).
- LETTER READ (Mr. *Fielding*) 6993 (iii).
- See "S. A. War," &c.
- AMERICAN MINING ENGINEERS, VISIT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10412 (iii).
- AMERICAN TUGS AND COASTING TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 7650, 7512 (iii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 7320 (iii).
- AMHERST RY. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 9454 (iii).
- See "I.C.R.," &c.
- AMMUNITION &c., ANNUAL DRILL: in Com. of Sup., 7201, 8239, 8286, 8344 (iii).
- AMOUNTS PAID FOR PRINTING, N.W.T.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 3413 (ii).
- Anderson, J. W., Patent Relief B. No. 108** (Mr. *Cargill*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2560; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2783 (i); M. for Com., 5162; *ref.* to Sel. Com., 5168; in Com., 6820; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6821 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9689 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- "AN ENGLISH EXPERT ON THE KLONDIKE," PURCHASE OF COPIES: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6612 (ii).
- ANIMALS, NUMBER KILLED, &c., P. E. I. RY.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *McLellan*, P.E.I.) 2202 (i).
- ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY. CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10395 (iii).
- ANNAPOLIS AND G.B., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (iii).
- ANNANDALE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 9898 (iii).
- ANNUAL DRILL: in Com. of Sup., 7201, 8239, 8286 (iii).
- See "Militia," &c.
- Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Addington) 3444 (ii).
- ANTI-CHINESE LEGISLATION, COR. BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND B.C. GOVT.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Prior*) 2203 (i).
- ANTICOSI See "Fox Bay Settlers."
- ALTERNATE SECTIONS IN YUKON, DISPOSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 155 (i).
- Apples and Pears Inspection.** See "Fruit Inspection."
- APPLES BARRELS, &c., STANDARD SIZE, &c., REPEAL OF ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 2459 (i).
- APPLES, INSPECTION OF, LEGISLATION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Pettet*) 1460 (i).
- APPLICATION, GRANTS, &c., FOR CERTAIN AREAS IN YUKON MENTIONED IN RET. 83 (1898): M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 167 (i).
- FOR COAL AREAS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 8431 (iii).
- FOR LAND, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5404 (ii).
- RECORDS, &c., *re* CLAIMS 18, 26 AND 16, RECORD OF ALL ROYALTIES DUE AND COLLECTED (1897-98) &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 167 (i).
- ARBITRATION CLAIMS AGAINST DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10031 (iii).
- ARICHAT, COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, APPOINT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 816 (i).
- ARCHIBALD, P. S., DISMISSAL OF: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 1555 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1997 (i).
- ARCHITECT AND ENGINEERING STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 10256 (iii).
- See "Public Works," &c.
- ARISAIG, N.S., LIGHTKEEPER, NAME, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 3262 (i).
- ARMS, AMMUNITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8344 (iii).
- ARMOURIES: in Com. of Sup., 9893 (iii).
- See "Militia," &c.
- ARMSTRONG, MR. C. N.: See "Great Eastern Ry."
- ARMY POSTAL CORPS, APPOINTMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1755 (i).
- See "S. A. War," &c.
- ARNPRIOR P. O., CONTRACT FOR FURNISHING AND LAYING ASPHALT SIDEWALK: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3035 (i).
- Arrowhead and Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 36** (Mr. *Morrison*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 577; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 777; *withdn.*, 1975 (i).
- ARTESIAN BORINGS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 10405.
- WELLS, PRINCE ALBERT: in Com. of Sup., 9892 (iii).
- ARTHABASKA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10015 (iii).
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6342 (i), 7619, 10331 (iii).

- ASH WEDNESDAY, ADJOURNMENT FOR: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1058 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 937 (i).
- ASSAY OFFICE, YUKON TERRITORY: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 9466 (iii).
- ASSENT: See "Bills."
- ASSIGNMENT OF SOLDIERS PAY: Letter read (Mr. *Taylor*) 8281 (iii).
- ATHENS P. O., HOURS OF CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7972 (iii).
- Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 148** (Mr. *McAlister*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 4662; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4734 (ii).
- ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT WITH BEAVER SS. LINE: M. for copy\* (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4078 (ii).  
 — SAILINGS OF STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1744 (i).  
 — See "Beaver," &c.
- ATLIN AND BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 10254 (iii).
- ATLIN AND QUESNELLE TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 10255 (iii).  
 See "Yukon," &c.
- AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6445 (ii), 7506, 10286 (iii).  
 — REPORT, FRENCH TRANSLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1750 (i).  
 — Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 81, 1057 (i).
- AUER LIGHT PATENTEES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST *re* EXCESSIVE CHARGES: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Gibson*) 2760 (i).
- AUSTRALIAN COMPETITION AND N. W. FARMERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 293 (i).
- AUTOMOBILE CARS, TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 9885 (iii).  
 See "Post Offices," &c.
- BACON, EXPORTS TO G. B.: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1879 (i).
- BADDECK AND EAST BAY SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 9592 (iii).
- BAILEY, W. H., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 299 (i).
- BAIT FREEZING COS., GOVT. ASSISTANCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3176 (i).
- BALGONIE AND HEDNESFORD MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1466 (i).
- BALLOT STUFFING, &c., PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE": Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Davis*) 320 (i).
- BAMFORD, PRIVATE, TELEGRAMS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7882 (ii).
- BANFF, N.W.T., ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 7074, 7831 (iii).
- Bank Act Amt. B. No. 163** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 5728; 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 5960; in Com., 6502; 3<sup>rd</sup> m., 6626 (ii), Sen. Amts., 7656 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 26.)  
 — **B. No. 192** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 9903; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 10188; in Com., 10188, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 10189 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 27.)
- BANKING AND COMMERCE COM., SUBSTITUTION OF NAME: M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6135 (ii).
- Bankruptcy Court Establishment B. No. 4** (Mr. *Maclean*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 81 (i).
- BANKS, POWERS OF: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 2748 (i).
- Banque Provinciale du Canada B. No. 67** (Mr. *Penny*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1381; 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 1685; in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2948 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 102.)
- BARRIEFIELD COMMON, KINGSTON: in Com. of Sup., 10354; conc., 10452 (iii).  
 — LEASE AND SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 10304 (iii).
- BASIC SLAG, PHOSPHATE POWDER AND GOVT. ANALYSES: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 3168 (i), 4739, 4908, 5891, 6618, 6777 (ii), 8429 (iii).  
 See "Chemical," &c.
- BATHURST, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING, REFUSAL OF CARETAKER TO RAISE FLAG: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6447 (ii), 6994 (iii).
- BATISCAN RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10211.
- BATTLEFORD, N.W.T., BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 10253 (iii).
- Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s B. No. 84** (Mr. *Hurley*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1713; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1933 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3373 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BEAUCHEMIN, BICKERDIKE, &c., PAYMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3768 (ii).
- BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8931 (iii).  
 See "Soulanges," &c.
- BEAUMONT, WM., POSTMASTER AT MAPLE BAY, B.C., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 433.
- BEAVER SS. CONTRACT: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 6788 (ii).  
 See "Atlantic," &c.
- BEET ROOT SUGAR, COR. *re* BOUNTIES: M. for copies (Mr. *Montague*) 3180, 3199 (i).
- BELFAST AND MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH, P. E. I. RY., CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4913 (ii), 8434 (iii).  
 — EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1741 (i).  
 — SPECIFICATION, PLANS, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Martin*) 168 (i).  
 — See "P. E. I.," &c.
- BELGRAVE P. O., MAIL CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2747 (i).
- BENNETT AND ATLIN TEL. LINE, CHARLESON, J. B., EMPLOYT. OF MEN, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 296.  
 — COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 289 (i).
- BENNETT AND DAWSON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser, Lambton*) 2157 (i).  
 — TEL. LINE, DATE OF OPERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 7316 (iii).  
 — AMOUNT PAID TO J. B. CHARLESON: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 288 (i).  
 — COST OF CONSTRUCTION, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, TENDERERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 287 (i).  
 — CONSTRUCTION, &c., CHARLESON'S SUPPLIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1733 (i).  
 — See "Yukon," &c.

- BENNETT, DAWSON AND ATLIN TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iii).
- BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 350 (i).
- BERGERONNES, P. Q., EXPENDITURE ON PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1745 (i).
- BERNIER, HON. M. E., Introduced, 9469 (iii).
- BERTHIER, DREDGING OF CHANNEL, & C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1462 (i).
- BERTHIER EN HAUT, NAME OF DREDGE, & C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2171 (i).
- BERTRAM, MR., LATE M. P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2346 (i).
- BICYCLES EXPORTED FROM CAN. (1898-9) REBATE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3760 (ii).
- BILLS: ROYAL ASSENT: (Mr. *Speaker*) 3199 (i), 7394, 7409, 9480 (iii).
- BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*)  
1°\*, 2; *pro forma*.
- BILL (No. 2) To amend the Fertilizers Act, 1890.—(Mr. *Domville*)  
1°\*, 7; 2° m., 1974 (ii).
- BILL (No. 3) Further to amend the Dominion Election Act.—(Mr. *Ingram*)  
1°, 7 (i).
- BILL (No. 4) To establish a Bankruptcy Court.—(Mr. *Maclean*)  
1°\*, 81 (i).
- BILL (No. 5) To amend the Franchise Act, 1898.—(Mr. *McInnes*)  
1°, 81 (i).
- BILL (No. 6) To amend the Mounted Police Pension Act.—(Mr. *Davin*)  
1°, 138 (i); 2° m., 4760 (ii).
- BILL (No. 7) To amend the Militia Act.—(Mr. *Domville*)  
1°, 143 (i).
- BILL (No. 8) To amend the Franchise Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Ingram*)  
1°, 143 (i).
- BILL (No. 9) Respecting Drainage on and across the property of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Casey*)  
1°, 146 (i); 2° m., 4763 (ii).
- BILL (No. 10) In further amendment of the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *McMillan*)  
1°\*, 169 (i).
- BILL (No. 11) To amend the Pilotage Act.—(Sir *Louis Davies*)  
1°, 243 (i); 2° m., 5059; in Com., 5061, 5144 (ii); 6995; 3° m., 8936 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 12) To amend the Act respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Sir *Louis Davies*)  
1°, 246 (i); 2°, and in Com., 6995; 3°\*, 6996 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- BILL (No. 13) Respecting representation in the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Mulock*)  
1°, 247; 2° m., 1212; in Com., 1401; 3° m., 1556, agreed to (Y. 91; N. 45) 1640 (i).
- BILL (No. 14) To regulate the grain trade in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Douglas*)  
1°\*, 286 (i).
- BILL (No. 15) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *McCarthy*)  
1°, 320 (i).
- BILL (No. 16) To regulate Freight and Passenger Rates on Railways.—(Mr. *Reid*)  
1°, 429 (i).
- BILL (No. 17) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Charlton*)  
1°, 430 (i).
- BILL (No. 18) Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Sifton*)  
1°, 430; 2° m., 1388; in Com., 1388; M. for Com., 1643; in Com., 1789; 3°\*, 1792 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 19) To amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Davin*)  
1°, 430 (i); 2° m., 4787; amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 m. h., 4790 (ii).
- BILL (No. 20) Respecting the British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company, and to change its name to "The British Yukon Railway Company."—(Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough.)  
1°\*, 470; 2°\*, 589 (i); in Com., and 3°\*, 5922 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 21) Respecting the Hereford Railway Company.—(Mr. *McIntosh*)  
1°\*, 471; 2°\*, 589; in Com., and 3°\*, 1511 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 22) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Ingram*)  
1°\*, 471; 2°\*, 589; in Com., and 3°\*, 1511 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 108.)
- BILL (No. 23) To incorporate the Alaska-Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Logan*)  
1°\*, 471; 2°\* 589 (i).
- BILL (No. 24) Respecting the Nova Scotia Steel Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough.)  
1°\*, 471; 2°\*, 589; in Com., and 3°\*, 2670 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 111.)
- BILL (No. 25) Respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*)  
1°\*, 471; 2°\*, 589; in Com., 1511, 2406, 2617; 3°\*, 2783 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 26) Respecting the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bostock*)  
1°\*, 471; 2°\*, 589; in Com., and 3°\*, 1725 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- BILL (No. 27) To impose certain restrictions on Immigration.—(Mr. *McInnes*)  
1°\*, 471 (i).
- BILL (No. 28) Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Britton*)  
1°, 471 (i).
- BILL (No. 28) Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Britton*)  
1°, 471 (i).

- BILL (No. 29) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Britton*.)  
1° 472 (i); 2° m., 4793; amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*)  
6 m. h., 4797 (ii).
- BILL (No. 30) In further amendment of the Trade Mark and Design Act.—(Mr. *Campbell*.)  
1°\*, 471 (i).
- BILL (No. 31) To amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—  
(Mr. *Davin*.)  
1°, 475 (i); 2° m., 4799; in Com., and 3°, 4799
- BILL (No. 32) To amend the Companies Clauses Act —  
(Mr. *Gilmour*.)  
1°, 510 (i); 2° m., 4799; ref. to Com., 4800 (ii).
- BILL (No. 33) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Prior*.)  
1°\*, 577; 2°\*, 777; in Com., and 3°\*, 1725 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 52.)
- BILL (No. 34) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macdonell*.)  
1°\*, 577; 2°\*, 777; in Com., 2626; 3° m., 2654, agreed to, 2667 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Comox and Cape Scott Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)  
1°\*, 577; 2°\* 1005; in Com., 3209 (i), 3418; 3° m., 3441 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- BILL (No. 36) Respecting the Arrowhead and Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)  
1°\*, 577; 2°\*, 777; withdn., 1975 (i).
- BILL (No. 37) Respecting the Dominion Oil Pipe Line and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. *Fraser*, *Guysborough*.)  
1°\*, 577; 2°\*, 1005 (i).
- BILL (No. 38) To regulate the trade in grain in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Davin*.)  
1°, 577 (i).
- BILL (No. 39) To amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Domville*.)  
1°, 579 (i).
- BILL (No. 40) Respecting the land grant of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Richardson*.)  
1°, 579 (i).
- BILL (No. 41) Respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Montague*.)  
1°\*, 649; 2°\*, 1005; in Com., 1685; 3°\*, 1725 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 117.)
- BILL (No. 42) To incorporate the Alaska and North-western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)  
1°\*, 649; 2°\*, 1005 (i).
- BILL (No. 43) Respecting the Grand Valley Railway Company, and to change its name to the Port Dover, Brantford, Berlin and Goderich Railway Company.—(Mr. *Charlton*.)  
1°\*, 649; 2°\*, 1246; in Com., and 3°\*, 2670 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 44) Respecting the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Ingram*.)  
1°\*, 649; 2°\*, 1005; in Com., and 3°\*, 1685 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 91.)
- BILL (No. 45) Respecting the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Poupore*.)  
1°\*, 649; 2°\*, 1005; in Com., and 3°\*, 2670 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 46) Respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Cowan*.)  
1°\*, 649; 2°\*, 1005; in Com., and 3°\*, 1685 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 47) Respecting Labour in Mines.—(Mr. *McInnes*.)  
1°, 737 (i).
- BILL (No. 48) Respecting the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Monk*.)  
1°\*, 777; 2°\*, 1005; in Com., and 3°\*, 1725 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 49) To amend "The Dominion Elections Act."—(Mr. *Puttice*.)  
1° m., 864 (i).
- BILL (No. 50) Further to amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Flint*.)  
1° m., 937 (i).
- BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Holiness Movement (or Church) in Canada.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)  
1°\*, 1109; 2°\*, 1686; in Com., 2667; 3° m., 2670; 3°\*, 2783 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 101.)
- BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Morris and Portage Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macdonnell*.)  
1°\*, 1109; 2°\*, 1686; in Com., and 3°\*, 2783 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- BILL (No. 53) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Orford Copper Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)  
1°\*, 1109; 2° m., 1725, 1728 (i).
- BILL (No. 54) Respecting the Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company, and to change its name to "The Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada."—(Mr. *Britton*.)  
1°\*, 1109; 2°\*, 1686 (i); in Com., and 3°\*, 4478 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 112.)
- BILL (No. 55) To incorporate the Canadian Bankers Association.—(Mr. *Britton*.)  
1°\*, 1109; 2°\*, 1728 (i); in Com., and 3°\*, 5751 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
- BILL (No. 56) To determine the length of the working day for workmen and labourers.—(Mr. *Beattie*.)  
1° m., 1109 (i).
- BILL (No. 57) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Erb*.)  
1° m., 1109 (i).
- BILL (No. 58) To supervise and control the warehousing, inspection and weighing of grain in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Douglas*.)  
1°\*, 1207 (i).
- BILL (No. 59) To provide for the Expenses of the Canadian Volunteers serving Her Majesty in South Africa.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)  
Prop. Res., 261; M. for Com. on Res., 350, 657, 868, 1058, 1124; in Com. on Res., 1155; 1°\*, 1212; 2°, and in Com., 1643, 1686, 2000; 3°\*, 2009 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 6.)

- BILL (No. 60) To amend the Militia Act.—(Mr. *Domville.*)  
1° m., 1286 (i).
- BILL (No. 61) To amend the Militia Act.—(Mr. *Prior.*)  
1° m., 1286 (i).
- BILL (No. 62) To amend "The Criminal Code, 1892." (Mr. *MacLaren.*)  
1° m., 1287 (i); 2° m., 4800 (ii).
- BILL (No. 63) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, as to marks on merchandise.—(Mr. *Russell.*)  
1° m., 1287 (i).
- BILL (No. 64) To amend the Weights and Measures Act as respects the sale of fish.—(Mr. *Ganong.*)  
1° m., 1287 (i).
- BILL (No. 65) To incorporate the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)  
1°\*, 1381; 2°\*, 1686; in Com., and 3°\*, 2783 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 66) Respecting the Cowichan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *McInnes.*)  
1°\*, 1381; 2°\*, 1728; in Com., and 3°\*, 2783 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- BILL (No. 67) Respecting La Banque Jacques Cartier, and to change its name to Banque Provinciale du Canada.—(Mr. *Penny.*)  
1°\*, 1381; 2° m., 1685; in Com., and 3°\*, 2948 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 102.)
- BILL (No. 68)—Respecting the Nickel Steel Company of Canada.—(Mr. *MacPherson.*)  
1°\*, 1381; 2°\*, 1686 (i); in Com., and 3°\*, 5922 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 109.)
- BILL (No. 69) To incorporate the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bostock.*)  
1°\*, 1381; 2°\*, 1686 (i); withdn., 3255 (i).
- BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Gaspé Short Line Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lemieux.*)  
1°\*, 1459; 2°\*, 1686; M. for Com., 2998; in Com., 3003; 3210 (i), 3372; 3° m., 3413, 3611 (ii).
- BILL (No. 71) Respecting the Dominion Cotton Mills Company.—(Mr. *Quinn.*)  
1°\*, 1553; 2°\*, 2109; in Com., and 3°\*, 4479 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- BILL (No. 72) Respecting the Merchants Bank of Halifax, and to change its name to "The Royal Bank of Canada."—(Mr. *Russell.*)  
1°\*, 1553; 2°\*, 1933; in Com., and 3°\*, 2948 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 103.)
- BILL (No. 73) Respecting the Restigouche and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *McAlister.*)  
1°\*, 1641; 2°\*, 1933 (i); in Com., 3372; 3° m., 3415 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- BILL (No. 74) Respecting the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Domville.*)  
1°\*, 1641; 2°\*, 1933; in Com. and 3°\*, 2783 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 110.)
- BILL (No. 75) To incorporate the Quebec Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bernier.*)  
1°\*, 1641; 2°\*, 2109 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 4479 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- BILL (No. 76) To incorporate the Canadian Loan and Investment Company.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)  
1°\*, 1641; 2°\*, 1933; in Com. and 3°\*, 2948 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 77) To incorporate the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer.—(Mr. *Quinn.*)  
1°\*, 1641; 2°\*, 1933; in Com. and 3°\*, 2670 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- BILL (No. 78) To amend the Gas Inspection Act.—(Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière.*)  
1°\*, 1641 (i); 2° m., 4669; in Com., 4669; 3°\*, 4671 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 79) To amend the General Inspection Act, so as to provide a grade for Flax Seed.—(Sir *Henry Joly de Lotbinière.*)  
1°\*, 1641 (i); 2° m., 4671; in Com., 4672; 3°\*, 4672 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- BILL (No. 80) Respecting the members of the Northwest Mounted Police Force on active service in South Africa.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)  
1° m., 1642 (i); 2° m., 3610; in Com. and 3°\*, 3611 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 81) To incorporate the Accident and Guarantee Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Penny.*)  
1°\*, 1713; 2°\*, 2156 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 5751 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 82) To incorporate the Crown Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)  
1°\*, 1713; 2°\*, 2157; in Com. and 3°\*, 2948 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- BILL (No. 83) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Haley.*)  
1°\*, 1713; 2°\*, 2783 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 5162 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. *Hurley.*)  
1°\*, 1713; 2°\*, 1933 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 3373 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BILL (No. 85) To provide for the establishment of a Government system of Telegraphs.—(Mr. *Cusey.*)  
1° m., 1713 (i).
- BILL (No. 86) Respecting the Thousand Island Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)  
1°\*, 1786; 2°\*, 2109 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 4022 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 87) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Roche.*)  
1°\*, 1786; 2°\*, 2109 (i).
- BILL (No. 88) To incorporate the Ste. Mary's River Railway and Colonization Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)  
1°\*, 1786; 2°\*, 2109 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 3373 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- BILL (No. 89, from the Senate) to amend an Act to provide for the Conditional Liberation of Penitentiary Convicts.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)  
1°\*, 1877 (i); 2° m., 3607; in Com., 3610; 3° m. 4666 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 48.)

- BILL (No. 90, from the Senate) Respecting the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*.)  
1°\*, 1877 (i); 2° m., 3607; in Com., 3607; 3°\*, 3607 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 91) Respecting the Oshawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Burnett*.)  
1°\*, 1877; 2°\*, 2109 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 3373 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 92) To incorporate the Royal Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Penny*.)  
1°\*, 1877; 2°\*, 2109 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 4478 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 118.)
- BILL (No. 93) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Servis Railroad Tie Plate Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. *Fraser*, Guysborough.)  
1°\*, 1975; 2° m., 2670 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 8709 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 121.)
- BILL (No. 94) Respecting the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company.—(Mr. *Landerkin*.)  
1°\*, 1975; 2°\*, 2673 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 7652 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- BILL (No. 95) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Britton*.)  
1°\*, 2072; 2°\*, 2157; withdn., 3255 (i).
- BILL (No. 96) Respecting the Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Talbot*.)  
1°\*, 2072; 2°\*, 2673 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 3373 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 116.)
- BILL (No. 97) To incorporate the Portage du Fort and French River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mackie*.)  
1°\*, 2072; 2°\*, 2673 (i); ref. to Sel. Com., 4142, withdn., 4332 (ii).
- BILL (No. 98) Respecting the Yarmouth Steamship Company, Limited. (Mr. *Fliné*.)  
1°\*, 2147; 2°\*, 2673 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 4479 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 124.)
- BILL (No. 99) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Miami Cycle and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. *Britton*.)  
1°\*, 2147; 2°\*, 2673 (i).
- BILL (No. 100) Respecting the Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gibson*.)  
1°\*, 2147; 2°\*, 2673 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 5751 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 101) Respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Klock*.)  
1°\*, 2345; 2°\*, 2673 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 5162 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 102) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of James Milne.—(Mr. *Clarke*.)  
1°\*, 2345; 2°\*, 2673 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 4950 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 105.)
- BILL (No. 103) To incorporate the Port Arthur Railway and Terminals Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)  
1°\*, 2345; 2°\*, 2673 (i); withdn., 4554 (ii).
- BILL (No. 104) Respecting the Montfort and Gati-neau Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bourassa*.)  
1°\*, 2345; 2°\*, 2673 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 3373 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- BILL (No. 105) To amend the Franchise Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Carroll*.)  
1° m., 2347 (i).
- BILL (No. 106) To amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. *Gibson*.) 1°\*, 2457 (i).
- BILL (No. 107) To make further provision respecting grants of land to Members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-west.—(Mr. *Sutherland*.)  
1°\*, 2457 (i); 2° m., 4667; in Com., 4669; 3° m., 4811 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 108) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of J. W. Anderson.—(Mr. *Cargill*.)  
1°\*, 2560; 2°\*, 2783 (i); M. for Com., 5162; ref. to Sel. Com., 5168; in Com., 6920; 3°\*, 6821 (ii); Sen. Amts., 9689 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 109) To incorporate the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)  
1°\*, 2560; 2°\*, 2673 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 5162 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 110) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*.)  
1°\*, 2560 (i); 2° m., 4672; in Com., 4675, 4812, 5969, 6918 (ii); 7125, 7422; 3°\*, 7423 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 111) Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. *Fisdale*.)  
1°\*, 2827; 2°\*, 3033 (i); in Com. and 3°\*, 4069 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 119.)
- BILL (No. 112) To incorporate the Quebec and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)  
1°\*, 2827; 2°\*, 3033 (i); in Com., 5169, 3°\*, 5230 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
- BILL (No. 113) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Frost and Wood Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Cowan*.)  
1°\*, 2827 (i); 2°\*, 3373; in Com. and 3°\*, 4950 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 100.)
- BILL (No. 114) Respecting the Toronto Hotel Company.—(Mr. *Oaler*.)  
1°\*, 2827 (i); 2°\*, 3373; in Com., 4951; 3°\*, 5162 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 122.)
- BILL (No. 115) To incorporate the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.—(Mr. *Campbell*.)  
1°\*, 2827 (i); 2°\*, 3373; in Com., 6489; 3° m., 6571; agreed to (Y., 59; N., 37) 6607 (ii).
- BILL (No. 116) To incorporate the Acadia Mortgage Company.—(Mr. *Russell*.)  
1°\*, 2827 (i); 2°\*, 4479; in Com. and 3°\*, 6820 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 117) Respecting the National Sanitarium Association.—(Mr. *Maclean*.)  
1°\*, 2827 (i); 2°\*, 3373; in Com. and 3°\*, 4069 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 107.)

- BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Timagami Railway Company.—(Mr. *McHugh*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3033 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 7552; Sen. Amts., 8837 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 84.)
- BILL (No. 119) To incorporate the Canadian Nurses Association.—(Mr. *Roddick*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3033 (i); withdn., 4554 (ii).
- BILL (No. 120) To incorporate the Ottawa, Brockville and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. *Frost*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3373 (ii); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 7031 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 121) Respecting the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls.—(Mr. *Flint*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3033 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4069 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 113.)
- BILL (No. 122) Respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *McGregor*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3033 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4069 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 123) To incorporate the Yale Mining District Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bostock*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3373 (ii).
- BILL (No. 124) To incorporate the Lake Superior and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3373 (ii); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 7552 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 125) Respecting the Algoma Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3373; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5922 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 126) To amend the San José Scale Act.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 3164; in Com., 3166; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3168 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 127) to provide for the marking and inspection of packages containing Apples and Pears for export.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5107; in Com., 5107, 5124, 5827.
- BILL (No. 128) To amend the Weights and Measures Act as respects the contents of packages of Salt.—(Mr. *Holmes*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2907 (i.)
- BILL (No. 129, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canadian Steel Company.—(Mr. *Calvert*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2994 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3373; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4069 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 130, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. *Edwards*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3140 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3373; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4479 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- BILL (No. 131, from the Senate) For the Relief of Edwin James Cox.—(Mr. *Montague*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3330; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 4069; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4950 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 125.)
- BILL (No. 132) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Blair*.)  
1<sup>o</sup> m., 3256; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4684, 4695 (ii); in Com., 9342; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 9365; Sen. Amt., 10421 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 133) To consolidate and amend the law relating to the Election of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)  
1<sup>o</sup> m., 3258 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 6702; in Com., 6725 (ii); 7322, 8090, 8796, 8840, 9064; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 9472; Sen. Amts., 10454, 10508 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 134) Respecting the incorporation of Live Stock Associations.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3478; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5099; in Com., 5099; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5124 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 135) To amend the Experimental Farm Station Act.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3478; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5099; in Com., 5099; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5124 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 136, from the Senate) Respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gibson*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3673; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3804; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4479 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- BILL (No. 137, from the Senate) Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3575; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 4700; in Com., 4700, 5176, 5251, 5701, 5922, 6063; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 6309; recom., 6321; 3<sup>o</sup>, 6323 (ii); Sen. Amts., 8949, 10453 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 138, from the Senate) To amend "The Admiralty Act, 1891."—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3575; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5103; in Com., 5103; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5144 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- BILL (No. 139) To amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Sutherland*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 3758; 2<sup>o</sup>, and in Com., 5177; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5181 (ii); Sen. Amts., 8089 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 140) Respecting the Parishes of St. Eugène de Grantham, in the County of Drummond and St. Nazaire d'Acton, in the County of Bagot.—(Mr. *Lavergne*.)  
1<sup>o</sup> m., 4144 (ii.)
- BILL (No. 141) Respecting the grain trade in the Inspection District of Manitoba.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4333; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 5757; in Com., 5763, 5809; M. to ref. back to Com., 6258; in Com., 6284; 3<sup>o</sup> M., 6298 (ii); Sen. Amts., 8936 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 142) Respecting the Inspection of Foreign Grain.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4333; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4681; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 4684 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 143) To amend the Act respecting Securities for Seed Grain indebtedness.—(Mr. *Sutherland*.)  
1<sup>o</sup> m., 4333; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 5034; in Com., 5037; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 5142; agreed to (Y. 50; N. 26) 5143 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 144, from the Senate) For the Relief of Catherine Cecilia Lyons.—(Mr. *Mills*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4554; 2<sup>o</sup>, 4695; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5922 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 128.)

- BILL (No. 145) To incorporate the Toronto and Georgian Bay Short Line Railway Company.—(Mr. *Britton*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4436; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 4695 (ii).
- BILL (No. 146) To enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water power.—(Mr. *Puttee*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4436; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 4695; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6276 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 123.)
- BILL (No. 147) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending June 30, 1900.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)  
Prop. Res., 4338, 4458; 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 4458; in Com., 4458; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 4466 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- BILL (No. 148, from the Senate) Respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—(Mr. *McAlister*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4662; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 4734 (ii).
- BILL (No. 149) Respecting Inscribed Stock of Canada in the United Kingdom.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4662; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 5960; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5969 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 150) Respecting the Salisbury and Harvey Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lewis*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4722; 2<sup>o</sup>\* 5230; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5922 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 151) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)  
Prop. Res., 4333, 4811; 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4812; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 5251; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5251 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 152) To authorize contracts with certain Steamship Companies for Cold Storage accommodation.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)  
Prop. Res., 4662, 4822; 1<sup>o</sup> m., 4898; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5827 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 153, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Richardson*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5513; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5751; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6276 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- BILL (No. 154, from the Senate) To amend the Loan Companies Act, Canada, 1899.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5020; 2<sup>o</sup>, and in Com., 5181; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5182 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 155) To amend the Militia Act.—(Mr. *Borden*, King's.)  
1<sup>o</sup> m., 5224; 2<sup>o</sup>, and in Com., 6453 (ii), 9838; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 9844 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 156) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)  
1<sup>o</sup> m., 5226 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 6996; in Com., 7007, 7031, 7656, 8160; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 8161 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 157, from the Senate) To incorporate the St. Lawrence and Terminal Steamship Company.—(Mr. *McIsaac*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5513; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5922; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6488 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 120.)
- BILL (No. 158, from the Senate) For the relief of Gertrude Bessie Patterson.—(Mr. *Richardson*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5513; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5922; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6820 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 129.)
- BILL (No. 159, from the Senate) For the relief of Gustavus Adolphus Kobold.—(Mr. *Bennett*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5293; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5446; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5922 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 127.)
- BILL (No. 160) To amend the Expropriation Act.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5513; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5757; in Com., 5757; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5757 (ii). Sen. Amts., 8083 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 161) To amend the Acts respecting Interest.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)  
1<sup>o</sup> m., 5514; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5756; in Com., 5757; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5757 (ii); Sen. Amts., 7423 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 162, from the Senate) Respecting Money Lenders.  
This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.
- BILL (No. 163) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)  
1<sup>o</sup> m., 5728; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 5960; in Com., 6502; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 6626 (ii); Sen. Amts., 7656 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 164, from the Senate) Respecting the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *McAlister*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5884; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5999 (ii).
- BILL (No. 165, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. *McAlister*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5884; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5999 (ii).
- BILL (No. 166, from the Senate) To incorporate the British North America Pulp and Paper Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5883; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 6502 (ii); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 8471 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 167) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)  
1<sup>o</sup> m., 5887; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 6506 (ii); in Com., 9148; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 9149 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 168) To amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)  
1<sup>o</sup> m., 5887; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 6933 (ii).
- BILL (No. 169) To incorporate the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association.—(Mr. *Borden*, King's.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5960 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 7135; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 7136 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 99.)
- BILL (No. 170) To amend the Act respecting the Merchants Bank of Halifax, and to change its name to the Royal Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Russell*.)  
M. to introduce B., 6247; 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 6247; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6488 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 104.)
- BILL (No. 171) Respecting the Central Vermont Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gibson*.)  
M. to present Pet., 6244; 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 6349; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 6502 (ii); in Com., 9396, 9686; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 9688 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 172) Respecting the Canada Mining and Metallurgical Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Penny*.)  
1<sup>o</sup>\*, 6567 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 7091; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 8103 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 92.)

- BILL (No. 173) Respecting the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup>, 6692 (ii); 2°<sup>a</sup> m., 10189; in Com., and 3°<sup>a</sup>, 10190 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 116.)
- BILL (No. 174) To amend the Penitentiary Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup>, 6692 (ii); 2°<sup>a</sup>, 8083; in Com., 8083; 3°<sup>a</sup>, 8088 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 175) To incorporate the Ottawa and Hull Fire Relief Fund.—(Mr. Belcourt.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup>, 2°<sup>a</sup>, 6899 (ii); in Com., and 3°<sup>a</sup>, 7652 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 114.)
- BILL (No. 176) To incorporate the South Shore Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Flint.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup>, 6914 (ii); 2°<sup>a</sup>, 7341; in Com., and 3°<sup>a</sup>, 8837 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 177) To amend Chapter 32 of the Statutes of 1890, respecting certain Savings Banks in the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup> m., 6914 (ii), 2°<sup>a</sup> m., 7221; in Com., 8082; 3°<sup>a</sup>, 8083 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 178) For granting to Her Majesty, certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1900.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup>, 2°<sup>a</sup>; in Com., and 3°<sup>a</sup>, 6918 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 179) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th of June, 1900.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup>, 2°<sup>a</sup> and in Com., and 3°<sup>a</sup>, 7220 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 180) Respecting and Restricting Chinese immigration.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup> m., 7406; 2°<sup>a</sup>, 8162; in Com., 8182, 8189; 3°<sup>a</sup>, 8285; Sen. Amts., 9525 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 181, from the Senate) For the relief of William Henry Featherstonhaugh.—(Mr. Gibson.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup>, 7511; 2°<sup>a</sup>, 7652; in Com., and 3°<sup>a</sup>, 8103 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 126.)
- BILL (No. 182) Respecting the construction of a branch railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour.—(Mr. Blair.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup> m., 7647; 2°<sup>a</sup> and in Com., 8937; 3°<sup>a</sup>, 8949 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 7.)
- BILL (No. 183 from the Senate) To amend the Companies Clauses Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup>, 8062; M. for 2°, 8935; 2° and in Com., 8951; 3°<sup>a</sup>, 8952 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 42.)
- BILL (No. 184) To amend the Tariff of Customs, 1897.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup>, 2°<sup>a</sup>, and in Com., 8089; 3°<sup>a</sup>, 8160 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 185) To authorize the sale of the Yarmouth Steamship Company property to the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company's.—(Mr. Flint.)**  
M. to receive Pat., 8278; 1°<sup>a</sup>, 2°<sup>a</sup>, 8280; in Com., and 3°<sup>a</sup>, 8709; withdn., 8332 (iii).
- BILL (No. 186, from the Senate) Respecting the Red Deer River Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Semple.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup>, 8524; 2°<sup>a</sup>, in Com., and 3°<sup>a</sup>, 9396 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 187) To aid in the prevention and settlement of trade disputes and the publication of statistical and industrial information.—(Mr. Mulock.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup> m., 8399; 2°<sup>a</sup> m., 9368; in Com., 9392; 3°<sup>a</sup>, 939 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 188) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1900.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup>; 2°<sup>a</sup>; in Com., and 3°<sup>a</sup>, 8796 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 189) To amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)**  
Prop. Res., 8794; 2° of Res., 8836; 1°<sup>a</sup> of B., 8836; 2° m., 9083; in Com., 9146; 3° m., 9338; Sen. Amts., 10035, 10507 (iii).
- BILL (No. 190) Respecting the preservation of Game in the Yukon Territory.—(Mr. Sutherland.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup> m., 9059; 2°<sup>a</sup>; in Com., and 3°<sup>a</sup>, 9494 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 191) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Mulock.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup> m., 9332; 2°<sup>a</sup> m., 9689; agreed to (Y. 79; N. 27) 9701; M. for Com., 9799; in Com., 9812; 3°<sup>a</sup> m., 9836; 3°<sup>a</sup>, 9838 (iii).
- BILL (No. 192, from the Senate) To amend the Bank Act Amendment Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup>, 9903; 2°, 10188; in Com., 10188; 3°<sup>a</sup>, 10189 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 27.)
- BILL (No. 193) To authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway and other works therein mentioned.—(Mr. Blair.)**  
Prop. Res., 9333; M. for Com. on Res., 9906; in Com. on Res., 9960; 1°<sup>a</sup> of B., 10029; 2°<sup>a</sup>, and in Com., 10185; 3°<sup>a</sup> m., 10190 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 8.)
- BILL (195) Further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)**  
Prop. Res., 10304; 1°<sup>a</sup> of B., 10304; 2°<sup>a</sup>, in Com., and 3°<sup>a</sup>, 10420 (iii).
- BILL (No. 196) For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1900, and the 30th June, 1901, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. Paterson.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup>, 2°<sup>a</sup>, in Com., and 3°<sup>a</sup>, 10495 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 197) To amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)**  
1°<sup>a</sup> m., 10506; 2°, and in Com., 10506; 3°<sup>a</sup> m., 10507 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 13.)
- BILODEAU, L. P., PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain)**  
3766 (ii).

- BINDER TWINE : in Com. of Sup., 6890 (ii), 8132 (iii).  
 — ADVERTISEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1008.  
 — Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3039 (i).  
 — EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PURCHASE BY FARMERS :  
 Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1118 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 2759 (i).  
 — MANUFACTURE : Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 4920 (ii).  
 — NAME OF PURCHASER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Taylor)  
 169 (i).  
 — PRICE OF RAW MATERIALS : Ques. (Mr.  
 McMillan) 2746 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 778 (i).  
 — PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS QUOTED FROM :—  
 Order (Ques. of) Mr. Clancy, 6194 (ii).  
 — QUANTITY AND VALUE IMPORTED : Ques. (Mr.  
 Clancy) 5889 (ii).  
 — QUANTITY OF FIBRE RECEIVED, SHIPPED, &c. :  
 Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 5248 (ii).  
 — QUANTITY OF HEMP RECEIVED : Ques. (Mr.  
 Taylor) 5249 (ii).  
 — SALE, &c. : amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Taylor)  
 6146, 6238 ; Neg. (Y. 38 ; N. 71) 6241 (ii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2745 (i).  
 — SCHEDULE OF PRICES : Ques. (Mr. Taylor)  
 1008 (i).  
 — TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 5515 (ii).
- BLANKETS FOR TROOPS, PURCHASE, COST, &c. : Ques.  
 (Mr. Bergeron) 292, 440 (i).  
 See "S. A. War," &c.
- BLISS, MAJ., APPOINTMENTS BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Roche)  
 2165 (i).  
 — DATE OF DEPARTURE FROM DAWSON CITY :  
 Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3176 (i).
- BLOEMFONTEIN, CAPTURE OF, RAISING OF FLAG ON  
 PARLT. BUILDINGS (Mr. Taylor) 1927 (i).  
 See "S. A. War," &c.
- BLUE ROCK BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 9895 (iii).
- BOILER AND MACHINERY INSPECTORS, B.C., EXAMINA-  
 TION OF CANDIDATES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior)  
 6779 (ii).
- BOILER INSPECTION, PURCHASE AND SALE OF OLD  
 BOILERS, &c. : (Mr. Taylor) 1474 (i).
- BONANZA CREEK LEASE, APPLICATIONS OF MR. A. E.  
 PHILP : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5025.  
 — LEASE, REP., &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Hiboert  
 Tupper) 5894 (ii).  
 — See "Yukon."
- BONUSES, &c. TO OFFICIALS IN MILITIA DEPT. : in  
 Com. of Sup., 10358 (iii).
- BOOKS, PURCHASE OF : in Com. of Sup., 6022 (ii).
- BORDEN, LT., DECREASE OF : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid  
 Laurier) 10502 (iii).  
 — INSUBORDINATION PRESS REPS. : Ques. of  
 Privilege (Mr. Borden, Kings) 321 (i).
- BOUNDARY SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 7066 (iii).
- BOUT DE L'ISLE BRIDGE, SUBSIDIES PROMISED : Ques.  
 (Mr. Bergeron) 5895 (ii).
- BRACE, MR. R. K., GAS INSPECTOR OF P.E.I., DIS-  
 MISSAL : M. for cor.\* (Mr. Martin) 2203, 2761 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1480 (i).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 6035 (ii).  
 — See "P. E., I. &c."
- BRANCH LINES, P. E. I. RAILWAY, PETS., &c. : (Mr.  
 Martin) 9060 (iii).  
 See "P. E. I.," &c.
- Brandon and South-western Railway  
 Co.'s B. No. 25 (Mr. Morrison) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 471 ; 2<sup>o</sup>\*,  
 589 ; in Com., 1511, 2406, 2617 ; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2783 (i).  
 (63-64 Vic., c. 51.)
- "BRANT" SS., CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Mar-  
 tin) 4918 (ii).  
 — MAINTENANCE, &c. : in Com., 3645 (ii).
- BRIDGES, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 9455 (iii).
- British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B.  
 No. 33 (Mr. Prior) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 577 ; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 777 ; in Com.,  
 and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 1725 (i). (63-64 Vic., c. 52.)
- British North America Pulp and Paper  
 Co.'s B. No. 166 (Mr. McCarthy) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 5883 ;  
 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 6502 (ii) in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 8471 (iii). (63-64  
 Vic., c. 89.)
- British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 20 (Mr.  
 Fraser, Guysborough) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 470 ; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 589 (i) in  
 Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5922 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 53.)
- BRITISH COLUMBIA :
- ALASKA AND B.C. SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup.,  
 7066 (iii).
- ALIEN LABOUR ACT, B.C., ENFORCEMENT BY  
 GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 597 (i).  
 See "Labour," &c.
- BAILEY, W. H., EMPLOYT. IN B.C. POST OFFICE :  
 Ques. (Mr. Prior) 299 (i).
- BEAUMONT, WM., POSTMASTER AT MAPLE BAY,  
 B.C., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Mc-  
 Innes) 433 (i).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA AND ATLIN TEL. LINE : in  
 Com. of Sup., 10254 (iii).
- BROTCHIE'S LEDGE BEACON, ELECTRIC LIGHT, &c. :  
 Ques. (Mr. Prior) 290 (i).  
 — LIGHT-SHIP : in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i)  
 3667 (ii).
- BOILER AND MACHINERY INSPECTORS, B.C., EX-  
 AMINATION OF CANDIDATES, &c. : Ques. (Mr.  
 Prior) 6779 (ii).
- BUBONIC PLAGUE IN B.C. AND QUARANTINE :  
 Remarks (Mr. Prior) 588, 2457 (i).
- BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 7927 (iii).
- CABINET REPRESENTATION : Ques. (Mr. Prior)  
 1461 (i).  
 See "B.C. Grievances," &c.
- CANADIAN, BRITISH COLUMBIA AND DAWSON CITY  
 TEL. CO. : conc., 10440 (iii).
- CARMANAH LIGHTHOUSE AND TELEGRAPH COM-  
 MUNICATION WITH MAINLAND : Remarks (Mr.  
 Prior) 6255 (ii).
- CLOVER POINT RIFLE RANGE, AMOUNT EXPENDED,  
 &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 292 (i).  
 — REPS., COR., &c. : M. for copy\* (Mr. Prior)  
 2202 (i).
- COLUMBIA RIVER, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of  
 Sup., 7955 (iii).
- COUNTY COURT JUDGES, SALARIES, &c. : M. for  
 Cor., &c. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 300 (i).  
 See "Judges," &c.
- CUSTOMS : in Com. of Sup., 6086 (ii).
- DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 7967 (iii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

- EGG ISLAND LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).  
 — OMISSION OF LIGHTING : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Prior) 2761 (i).  
 ESQUIMALT DEFENCES : in Com. of Sup., 8342 (iii).  
 — GARRISONING BY CAN. TROOPS : Remarks (Mr. Prior) 2148 (i).  
 — DRY DOCK, PETS. *re* DOCKING CHARGES : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3575 (ii).  
 — RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR 1895-6-7-8-9 : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5024 (ii).  
 FISHERIES, AGENT'S REP., *re* : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3177 (i).  
 FISH HATCHERIES, B.C. AND GASPÉ : in Com. of Sup., 10399 (iii).  
 FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE, B.C., ADDITIONAL STEAMER : M. for Cor. *re* (Mr. Prior) 2762 (i).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 10398 (iii).  
 FRASER RIVER, COST OF IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2832 (i).  
 — IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7955, 10252 (iii).  
 FRENCH CREEK TELEGRAPH : in Com. of Sup., 7838 (iii).  
 GRIEVANCES OF B.C., REVENUES, &c. : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Prior) 9486 (iii).  
 HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 7955, 10252 (iii).  
 HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, NUMBERS GRANTED IN RY. BELT, B.C. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Morrison) 2760.  
 HYDROGRAPHICAL SURVEY, GOVTL. ACTION *re* : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2832 (i).  
 INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 7302 (iii).  
 — AGENT, APPNMT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2402 (i).  
 — RELIEF OF DISTRESSED : in Com. of Sup., 8123 (iii).  
 — RESERVES, GOVT. POLICY *re* DEVELOPMENT OF MINES, Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 597 (i).  
 JONES, MR. E. H., LATE POSTMASTER KAMLOOPS, B.C., DISMISSAL : M. for Cor. (Mr. Prior) 2762.  
 — M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Prior) 3050 (i).  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 4068 (ii).  
 JUAN DE FUCA, FISHING PRIVILEGES IN STRAITS : Ques. (Mr. Haggart) 5756 (ii).  
 JUDGES SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6438.  
 KASLO AND LARDO-DUNCAN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 10007 (iii).  
 KAMLOOPS POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 8927.  
 LABOUR COMMISSION, AMOUNT EXPENDED : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2195 (i).  
 — LABOUR TROUBLES : in Com. of Sup., 8146.  
 See "B. C. Miners."  
 LEGISLATURE AND ACTION OF LT. GOV. : M. to adjn. (Mr. Prior) 1382 (i).  
 — ACTION OF THE GOVT. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Morrison) 7882 (iii).  
 — COR. WITH SEC. OF STATE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9522 (iii).  
 — ELECTIONS AND LT.-GOV. : Remarks (Mr. Prior) 7319 (iii).  
 — Inquiry for Rep. of (Mr. Bostock) 3478 (ii).  
 — INQUIRY FOR COR, &c. : (Mr. Foster) 9471.  
 — (Sir Charles Tupper) 7989 (iii).  
 — REMOVAL FROM OFFICE : Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 8074 (iii).  
 — RESIGNATION, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Prior) 7513 (iii).  
 — TELEGRAM *re* RESIGNATION : Read (Mr. Prior) 6887 (ii).  
 LYTTON-LILLOOET MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, CONTRACTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1979 (i) 3770 (ii).  
 MACAULAY POINT CLAIMS, LITIGATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1461 (i).  
 MARINE HOSPITAL, B.C., USE OF FOR BARRACKS : Remarks (Mr. Prior) 3490 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

- MINERS LABOUR TROUBLES AND MR. CLUTE'S REP. : Remarks (Mr. Prior) 5808 (ii).  
 — Inquiry for (Mr. McInnes) 1787 (i).  
 See "B. C. Labour," &c.  
 MOUNT TOLMIE P.O., PETS. *re* REMOVAL : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2406 (i).  
 "MUDLARK" DREDGE, INVESTIGATION BY RESIDENT ENGINEER : Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3040 (ii).  
 NELSON POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7927.  
 NEW WESTMINSTER POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7929 (iii).  
 — POSTMASTER, NAME : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5896 (ii).  
 PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 6975 (ii).  
 QUARANTINE, VICTORIA : Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 7304 (iii).  
 ROSSLAND POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7929.  
 ROY, MR., RESIDENT ENGINEER, REMOVAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2757, 3180 (i).  
 SEMLIN GOVT., B.C., DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bostock) 3039 (i).  
 SHRAPNEL, W., DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4555 (ii).  
 SLOCAN LABOUR TROUBLES, MR. CLUTE'S REP. : Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3043 (i).  
 SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE, REMOVAL OF INDIANS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1460 (i) 4242.  
 — COMPLAINTS *re* GRAVEYARD : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 6625 (ii).  
 — COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND B.C. : M. for copy\* (Mr. Prior) 2201 (i).  
 SOUTH AFRICAN WAR, B.C. CONTINGENTS, COR. BETWEEN DOM. AND B.C. GOVTS. : M. for copies\* (Mr. Prior) 319 (i).  
 — Inquiry for Returns (Mr. Prior) 1725, 2994 (i) 3638 (ii).  
 — GOVTL. INTENTION *re* : Remarks (Mr. Prior) 240, 281 (i).  
 SQUAMISH SCHOOL, in Com. of Sup., 8123 (iii).  
 STUMBLES, W. W., COR. WITH MAR. AND FISHERIES DEPT. : M. for copies (Mr. Prior) 4078 (ii).  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 6137 (ii).  
 SUMAS BAR, PUBLIC WORKS, COST, &c. : (Ques.) (Mr. Prior) 4445 (ii).  
 SURVEYS AND RESERVE COMMISSION : in Com. of Sup., 7302 (iii).  
 TIDAL SURVEY : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3174 (i).  
 VANCOUVER DRILL HALL, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2828 (i).  
 — ELECTORAL DIVISION, RESIGNATION OF MEMBER : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5734 (ii).  
 — P. O., LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1981 (i).  
 VANCOUVER AND NANAIMO MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3442 (ii).  
 VANCOUVER AND VICTORIA, B.C., ELECTORAL LISTS, DISTRIBUTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 432 (i).  
 VICTORIA HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7958 (iii).  
 — AMOUNTS VOTED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1117  
 — MAIL DELIVERY, PETS. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3049 (i).  
 — POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7961 (iii).  
 VOTERS' LISTS, PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2402 (i).  
 WILLIAMS' HEAD QUARANTINE STATION : in Com. of Sup., 7958 (iii).  
 WILSON, J., SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH EGG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, B.C. : M. for cor.\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2760 (i).  
 WORK POINT BARRACKS, PAY OF MEN, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 4241 (ii).  
 YUKON AND B. C. MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, ROUTES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c. FOR YEAR 1898-99 : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

- YUKON AND B. C. SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 7074 (iii).
- BROAD COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9897 (iii).
- BROCKVILLE AND WEST HURON ELECTIONS, INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSIONERS: amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Borden, *Halifax*) 7423, 7437. Neg. (Y. 32; N. 50) 7488 (iii).
- M. to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5182 (amt.) 5212; (ii). Neg. (Y. 43, N. 86) 5697 (ii).
- Deb. (Sir *Louis Davies*) 5293; (Mr. *Powell*) 5333; (Mr. *Britton*) 5357; (Mr. *Bennett*) 5380; (Mr. *Russell*) 5410; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5446, 5447; (Mr. *Boss-Robertson*) 5447; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 5470; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 5486; (Mr. *Bell, P.E.I.*) 5498; (Mr. *Osler*) 5507; (Mr. *McClure*) 5522; (Mr. *Davin*) 5532; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) 5547; (Mr. *Wallace*) 5565; (Mr. *Richardson*) 5576; (Mr. *Cowan*) 5584; (Mr. *Douglas*) 5607; (Mr. *Craig*) 5634; (Mr. *Foster*) 5643, 5696; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5662, 5695; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5672, 5695; (Mr. *Mulock*) 5685; (Mr. *Quinn*) 5692; (Mr. *Clancy*) 5694 (ii).
- AFFIDAVITS OF MARSHALL AND NELSON READ: M. to adjn. (Mr. Borden, *Halifax*) 5737, 5748 (ii).
- Member called to order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1010 (i).
- M. (Mr. Borden, *Halifax*) 1014 (i).
- Notice of Motion for Papers (Mr. Borden, *Halifax*) 349 (i).
- M. for Papers, &c., 427 (i).
- &c.: Notice of Motion on Order Paper: Remarks (Mr. Borden, *Halifax*) 1010, 1014 (i).
- Personal Explanation *re* Quotation (Mr. Borden, *Halifax*) 5229 (ii).
- on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Foster*): Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1026-31 1053-55 (i).
- Ques. of Order: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 5563, 5589, 5616 (ii).
- Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 1037 (i).
- Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5476 (ii).
- Telegram of Mr. MacPherson: read (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5700 (ii).
- BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7916, 9881, 10264 (iii).
- MAIL TRANSFER SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1467 (i).
- BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9973 (iii).
- BRODERICK, JOHN W., PET. OF RIGHT: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Borden, *Halifax*) 4811 (ii).
- BRONTE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 10233 (iii).
- IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2193.
- BROTCHIES LEDGE BRACON, ELECTRIC LIGHT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 290 (i).
- LIGHT-SHIP: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i), 3667.
- BROWN, MR. AND ISAAC DICK, DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: M. for papers &c.\* (Mr. *Ganong*) 1012 (i).
- BROWN, LATE ALFRED, APPOINT. OF SUCCESSOR: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2836, 3049 (i).
- BRUCE, H. A., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8066.
- BRUCE MINES WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iii).
- BRULÉ, N. S., PREVENTIVE OFFICER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 4557 (ii).
- BUBONIC PLAGUE IN B.C. AND QUARANTINE: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 588, 2457 (i).
- REPORTED CASES ON AMERICAN FRONTIER: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2457 (i).
- BUCKINGHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9875.
- BUDGET, THE, ANNOUNCEMENT OF DELIVERY (Mr. *Fielding*) 2345 (i).
- CORRECTION IN SPEECH (Mr. *Foster*) 2762 (i).
- FINANCIAL STATEMENT (Mr. *Fielding*) 2563 (i).
- REPLY (Mr. *Foster*) 2674 (i).
- Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2729, 2836; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2880, 2907 (amt.) 2940; (Mr. *Patterson*) 2940; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3140, 3284; (Mr. *Charlton*) 3310 (i); (Mr. *Montague*) 3337, 3374; (Mr. *Dobell*) 3391; (Mr. *Roche*) 3398; (Mr. *Heyd*) 3490; (Mr. *Begeron*) 3528; (Mr. *Bell, P.E.I.*) 3555; (Mr. *Moore*) 3565, 3579; (Mr. *McMillan*) 3673; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3709; (Mr. *Calvert*) 3723; (Mr. *Wilson*) 3734; (Mr. *Campbell*) 3796; (Mr. *Davin*) 3813; (Mr. *Davis*) 3866, 3882; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3919; (Mr. *Turcot*) 3947; (Mr. *MacLaren*) 3957; (Mr. *Burnett*) 3975; (Mr. *Henderson*) 3985, 3991; (Mr. *Scemple*) 4028; (Mr. *Monk*) 4049, 4047, 4167; (Mr. *McMullen*) 4172; (Mr. *Henderson*) 4178; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4203; (Mr. *Holmes*) 4230; (Mr. *Bell, Addington*) 4258; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) 4274; (Mr. *Bennett*) 4298; (Mr. *Ratz*) 4321; (Mr. *Craig*) 4346; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 4361, 4373; (Mr. *Clancy*) 4378; (Mr. *Cowan*) 4407; (Mr. *McNeill*) 4432, 4443, 4573; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 4467, 4479; (Mr. *McHugh*) 4495; (Mr. *Ganong*) 4500; (Mr. *Rogers*) 4537; (Mr. *McDougall*) 4568; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4591; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4601; (Mr. *Snetsinger*) 4621; (Mr. *Beattie*) 4623; (Mr. *Logan*) 4630; (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4646; (Mr. *Savard*) 4652; (Mr. *Fielding*) 4656; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 88) 4660 (ii).
- PROCEDURE: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2741 (i).
- Ques. of Order (Sir *Richard Cartwright*); Ruling (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 2886 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1010, 1641 (i).
- BUFFALO RY. CO.'S B. NO. 100 (Mr. *Gibson*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2147; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2673 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5751 (ii). (63-64 *Vic., c. 54.*)
- BUILDINGS, PUBLIC: in Com. of Sup., 7929, 9858 (iii).
- B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7927 (iii).
- N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 9875 (iii).
- N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7926, 9892 (iii).
- N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7870, 9871 (iii).
- ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 7916, 9881, 10264 (iii).
- QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 9875, 10264 (iii).
- YUKON, RENTS, FUEL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7839, 8057, 10258 (iii).
- BULLETINS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 6341 (ii).
- BURLINGTON CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7951 (iii).
- BURREWS, MR. T. A., DATE OF PERMIT *re* TIMBER LICENSE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 6780 (ii).
- See "Timber Licenses, Man."
- BUSINESS OF THE HSE., ADJOURNMENTS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 8073 (iii).
- INTRODUCTION OF GOVT. MEASURES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 8280 (iii).

- BUSINESS OF THE HSE., MORNING SESSIONS: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8073 (iii).**  
 — Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7772 (iii).  
 — M. to take in Mondays (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5027 (ii).  
 — ORGANIZATION OF COMMITTEES: Remarks 322.  
 — Remarks (Mr. Clancy) 8795 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Sir Louis Davies) 4898 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 4553 (ii), 8072 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3611, 3757, 4661, 5897, 6446 (ii), 8435 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6243 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 156, 242 (i).  
 — SATURDAY SESSIONS: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8652 (iii).  
 — UNOPPOSED MOTIONS, PROCEDURE, &c.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1898 (i).  
 — M. to adjn. (Mr. Foster) 1899, 2073 (i).  
 — Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1903, 1934, 1945 (i).  
 — See "Govt. Business."
- BUTTER EXPORTS TO G.B.: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 1878 (i).**
- CABINET MINISTERS, NUMBER IN 1896 AND 1900: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2744 (i).**  
 — TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2745 (i).  
 — REPRESENTATION, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1461 (i).
- CABLE AT POINTE AUX OUTARDES, CONTINUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 7315 (iii).**
- CALGARY INTERWESTERN EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 10411 (iii).**
- CAMERON, MAJ. GEN., CONNECTION WITH R.M.C.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1977, 2164 (i).**
- CAMPBELL'S COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9898 (iii).**
- CAMPBELLTON CUSTOMS OFFICER: in Com. of Sup., 6074 (ii).**  
 — WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 9901 (iii).
- CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7945.**  
 — ISLAND FISH WEIRS, LICENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 594 (i).  
 — See "Grand Manan."
- CANADA AND FRANCE, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 9591 (iii).**  
 — AND GREAT BRITAIN, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 9555, 9576 (iii).  
 — MANCHESTER SS. LINE, SUBSIDIES PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) 1976 (i).
- Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. Cowan) 1<sup>st</sup>, 649; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1005; in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1685 (i). (63-64 Vic., c. 90.)**
- Canada Mining and Metallurgical Co.'s B. No 172 (Mr. Penny) 1<sup>st</sup>, 6557 (ii); 2<sup>nd</sup>, 7031; in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 8163 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 92.)**
- Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.'s Bill No. 115 (Mr. Campbell) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2827 (i); 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3373; in Com., 6489; 3<sup>rd</sup> m., 6571; agreed to (Y. 50; N. 37), 6607 (ii).**
- CAN. AND PORTO RICO, DISCRIMINATING DUTIES ON FISH, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 4240 (ii).**  
 — AND SOUTH AFRICA, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 9590 (iii).
- Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. No. 44 (Mr. Ingram) 1<sup>st</sup>, 649; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1005; in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1685 (i). (63-64 Vic., c. 91.)**
- Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 50 (Mr. Flint) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 937 (i).**
- CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Flint) 10307 (iii).**  
 — REF. re: Ques. (Mr. Flint) 4739 (ii).
- CANADA AND U. S., COASTING LAWS ON PACIFIC COAST: M. for O.C.'s\* (Sir Charles H. Tupper) 319 (i).**  
 — W. INDIES TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) 1883 (i).
- Canadian Bankers' Association Co.'s B. No. 55 (Mr. Britton) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1109; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1728 (i) in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5751 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 93.)**
- CANADIAN BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 9607 (iii).**  
 — COMMISSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2750 (i).
- CANADIAN, BRITISH COLUMBIA AND DAWSON CITY TEL. Co.: conc., 10440 (iii).**
- CANADIAN CONTINGENTS, &c.: Notice of amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 1698 (i).**  
 — BLANKETS, PURCHASE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1111 (i).  
 — B.C. CONTINGENT AND GOVTL. INTENTIONS: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 240, 281 (i).  
 — COR. BETWEEN DOM. AND B.C. GOVTS.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Prior) 319 (i).  
 — OFFER, &c.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Prior) 1725, 2994 (i); 3638 (ii).  
 — CONTRACT FOR SUPPLIES FOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4245 (ii).  
 — COR. BETWEEN GEN. HUTTON AND COL. HUGHES: M. for copies\* (Mr. Corby) 168 (i).  
 — EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4438.  
 — GALLANTRY: Telegram read (Mr. Borden, Kings) 9486 (iii).  
 — GENERAL COMPOSITION OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Russell) 1474 (i).  
 — INDUCEMENTS TO SETTLE IN SOUTH AFRICA: Ques. (Mr. Guillet) 5395 (ii).  
 — INQUIRY FOR PAPERS (Mr. Foster) 1211 (i).  
 — INSURANCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 9524 (iii).  
 — KILLED AND WOUNDED: Rep. read (Mr. Borden, King's) 4554 (ii).  
 — LATITUDE OF DEBATE IN COM.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 812 (i).  
 — MEN LEFT AT HALIFAX TO CARE FOR SICK HORSES: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 480 (i).  
 — MEN MISSING: Remarks (Mr. Quinn) 4250 (ii).  
 — NAMES OF STAFF OFFICERS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 470 (i).  
 — NUMBERS, PAYMENTS, CLOTHING, CONTRIBUTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3761, 3762 (ii).  
 — OFFICIAL COR.: laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7, 80 (i).

- CANADIAN CONTINGENTS, &C., ORGANIZATION AND MAJ.-GEN. HUTTON'S OFFER TO SERVE IN SOUTH AFRICA, COR, &C.: M. for copy\* (Mr. Bourassa) 166 (i).
- PAPERS *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 5 (i).
- PAY OF VOLUNTEERS: prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 261, 350 (i).
- See "Can. Volunteers Bill."
- PURCHASE OF REVOLVERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Pope) 289 (i).
- VACANCIES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 1211, 1388 (i).
- See "South African War, &c."
- "CANADA GAZETTE": in Com. of Sup., 7506 (iii).
- CANADIAN GOVT. RYS., TENDERS FOR LOCOMOTIVES AND ROLLING STOCK: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Haggart) 4078 (ii).
- LAW LIBRARY, ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 8140 (iii).
- Canadian Loan and Investment Co.'s B. No. 76.** (Mr. Clarke) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1641; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1933; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2948 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 95.)
- CANADIAN NAVAL RESERVE, SPEECH IN IMP. H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 1123 (i).
- See "Colonial," &c.
- NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10005 (iii).
- Canadian Nurses Association incorp. B. No. 119** (Mr. Roddick) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3033 (i); withdn., 4554 (ii).
- C. P. R. AGREEMENT WITH GOVT., *re* TOWN SITES: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Davin) 2998 (i).
- AND BRISTOL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10012 (iii).
- AND DYMENT RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9975 (iii).
- AND I. C. R., AMOUNTS OF FREIGHT CHARGES INTERCHANGED: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Powell) 4754.
- AND I. C. R., COLLECTIONS MADE AND ACCOUNTED FOR: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 4754 (ii).
- I. C. R. AND G. T. R., SHARES OF EARNINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 3442 (ii).
- AND WASKADA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10005 (iii).
- Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34** (Mr. Macdonell) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 577; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 777; in Com., 2626; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 2654, agreed to, 2667 (i). (63-64 Vic., c. 55.)
- **Land Grant B. No. 40** (Mr. Richardson) 1<sup>o</sup>, 579 (i).
- C. P. R. LAND GRANT, EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. Richardson) 2827 (i).
- LAND GRANTS TO MAN., ALLOTMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Richardson) 1460 (i).
- LAND GRANTS, TAXATION OF: amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Richardson) 7991; Neg. (Y. 6, N. 99) 8045 (iii).
- LAND SUBSIDIES, PROPORTION ALLOTTED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Richardson) 294 (i).
- ONDERDONK AWARDS, AMOUNTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2365 (i).
- C. P. R., REDUCTION OF RATES, PROVISIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) 2363 (i).
- CAN. PERMANENT CORPS, PENSION SYSTEM, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Gilmour) 1115 (i).
- Canadian Steel Co.'s incorp. B. No. 129** (Mr. Calvert) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2994 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3373; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4069 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 94.)
- Canadian Stock Inscribed in United Kingdom B. No. 149** (Mr. Fielding) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4662; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 5960; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5969 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 11.)
- Canadian Volunteers (South Africa) Expenses, Provision B. No. 59** (Mr. Fielding) prop. Res., 261; M. for Com. on Res., 350, 657, 868, 1058, 1124; in Com. on Res., 1155; 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1212; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, and in Com., 1643, 1686, 2000; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2009 (i). (63-64 Vic., c. 6.)
- FOR DEBATE: See "S. A. War," &c.
- CANALS:
- BEAUHARNOIS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8931 (iii).
- BERTHIER, DREDGING OF CHANNEL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1462 (i).
- BURLINGTON CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7951 (iii).
- CHAMBLY, DRAINAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8914.
- CORNWALL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 8157, 9185, 10112; conc., 10452 (iii).
- CULBUTE, LAND DAMAGES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8913 (iii).
- CURRIE, PETER, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 3264 (i).
- DALY, PATRICK, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4444 (ii).
- FARRANS POINT, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 8157, 8880, 10393 (iii).
- GALOPS CHANNEL, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8157, 8504, 8775, 10393 (iii).
- GILBERT DREDGING CO.: in Com. of Sup., 8504, 9185, 9415, 10112; conc., 10452 (iii).
- Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 9468 (iii).
- GRENVILLE, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 8157, 8522, 8880 (iii).
- LACHINE, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 8154.
- DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8880 (iii).
- ELECTRIC LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 8156 (iii).
- LOCKMEN, &C., INCREASE OF PAY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5024 (ii).
- QUADRANT PONTOON GATE: in Com. of Sup., 8155, 8372, 8504 (iii).
- REBUILDING WALL: in Com. of Sup., 8522 (iii).
- LAKE ST. LOUIS CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8156 (iii).
- LÉVIS, TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 9859 (iii).
- MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, REP. OF SURVEYS, &C.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Poupore) 219 (i).
- O. C. *re* MR. WALTER SHANLEY: M. for copy\* (Mr. Monk) 2201 (i).
- NORTH CHANNEL, FORMING: in Com. of Sup., 8881 (iii).
- OTTAWA RIVER CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 8376.
- PERSONAL EXPLANATION, PAR. IN OTTAWA "CITIZEN" *re* GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: (Mr. Haggart) 2561 (i).
- PORT BURWELL: in Com. of Sup., 10234 (iii).
- PORT COLBORNE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 8520, 10397 (iii).
- PORT DALHOUSIE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 8521.

CANALS—*Con.*

- QUEBEC AND MONTREAL SHIP CHANNEL, AMOUNT EXPENDED, COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2190 (i).
- RAINY RIVER LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 7861 (iii).
- RAPIDE PLAT, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 10393 (iii).
- RIDEAU CANAL, OVERSEER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 10395 (iii).
- RYAN & Co.'s AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 10393.
- ST. ANDREW'S LOCKS, EMPLOYMENT OF UNION MEN: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 598 (i).
- ST. FRANCIS LAKE, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 8521 (iii).
- STRAIGHTENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8157 (iii).
- ST. LAWRENCE CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 8885, 9427 (iii).
- ST. LAWRENCE CANALS AND POLICY OF LATE GOVT. *re* COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2164 (i).
- CHANNEL, KINGSTON: in Com. of Sup., 7965 (iii).
- 14-FT. NAVIGATION, COMPLETION AND EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 739 (i).
- CONTRACTS CANCELLED, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 156 (i).
- CONTRACTS SUSPENDED OR CANCELLED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2828 (ii).
- EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2403 (i).
- OPENING: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 3775 (ii).
- REMOVAL OF ROCKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iii).
- SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7848 (iii).
- SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 8158 (iii).
- ST. LOUIS LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 8879 (iii).
- ST. OURS LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8522 (ii).
- ST. PETERS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9498 (iii).
- SAULT STE. MARIE, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 8153, 10393 (iii).
- RES. OF TOWN COUNCIL, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9727 (iii).
- SAULT STE. MARIE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 10250 (iii).
- SNETSINGER, J. G., M.P., CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1462 (i).
- OPINION OF MIN. OF JUS.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1737 (i).
- SOULANGES AND BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, OPENING: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4559 (ii).
- SOULANGES CANAL, CEMENT TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1478 (i).
- CEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8894 (iii).
- CONSTRUCTION PAY SHEETS, ACCOUNTS, &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2202 (i).
- COST, LITIGATION AND CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1007 (i).
- CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 8153, 8515, 8888, 10150 (iii).
- REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9496 (iii).
- WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10097 (iii).
- STEWART'S CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 8515, 10150 (iii).
- Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Foster*) 9799 (iii)
- TRANSPORTATION QUESTION AND ST. LAWRENCE CANAL CONTRACTS, SPEECH OF P.M.G. AT COLINGWOOD: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 432 (i).
- TRENT VALLEY, ARBITRATION ON DAMAGES, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1896 (i).
- COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Rogers*) 3037 (i).
- CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 8153, 10393 (iii).
- TENDERS *re* TRENT-FRANKFORT SECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 156 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*

- WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 8520, 10395.
- DYNAMITE EXPLOSION: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4068 (ii).
- (Mr. *McCleary*) 4145, 4149 (ii).
- (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 4251 (ii).
- M. to adjn. (Mr. *McCleary*) 4252, 4257 (ii).
- MILITIA GUARD: in Com. of Sup., 9772.
- NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 2181 (i).
- CANALS, AMOUNT EXPENDED BY PRESENT GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1897 (i).
- CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 8153, 8372, 8775, 8879, 9185, 9496, 10393 (iii).
- GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 8374.
- CANOE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9898.
- CANSO FERRY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 10390 (iii).
- CANSO AND ST. PETERS RY., CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 479 (i).
- CAP AUX CORBEAUX PIER, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1741 (i).
- CAPE BRETON SIDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 8793, 8920.
- See "I.C.R.," &c.
- CAPE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7836 (iii).
- CAP SANTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10210 (iii).
- CAPE TORMENTINE AND NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1704 (i).
- HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7946 (iii).
- CAPE TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup. 8063.
- CARLETON, CALEB, AMOUNT DUE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10413 (iii).
- CARMANAH LIGHTHOUSE, B.C. AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 6255 (ii).
- CARNDUFF, MR. J. P., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 7415 (iii).
- DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10264 (iii).
- CASCA TRANSPORTATION CO.'S CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 811 (i).
- See "Yukon," &c.
- CASCUMPEC HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, GOVT. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 1483 (i).
- CASUALTIES LIST, CABLEGRAM READ (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 5249 (ii).
- DEATH OF PRIVATE LARUE: Report read (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 8314 (iii).
- RECEIPT OF REP. OF COL. OTTER, *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3049 (i).
- Inquiry for (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4563 (ii).
- IN CAN. REGIMENT: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 737 (i).
- LORD ROBERTS TELEGRAM *re* CANADIANS IN BATTLE: read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 813 (i).
- TELEGRAMS READ (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 5410 (ii), 7894 (iii).
- See "South African War," &c.
- CATTLE AND CHEESE EXPORTS TO G. B.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1980 (i).
- CATTLE EMBARGO IN G. B.: Remarks (Mr. *Burnett*) 3988 (ii).

- CATTLE EXPORTS TO G. B. AND U. S. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2365 (i).  
 — TO U. S., 1890-99: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 4242 (ii).  
 — INSPECTION, AMOUNTS PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3766 (ii).  
 — QUARANTINE, N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 10347 (iii).
- CATTLE, SHEEP AND HORSES, EXPORTS TO G. B. : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2746 (i).
- CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS, TRIBAL GOVT., PETS., &c. : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Quinn*) 1011 (i).
- CENSUS : in Com. of Sup., 6343 (ii) ; 7642, 10333 (iii).  
 — OF 1871-81-91, FORMS USED, &c. : M. for copy\* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1011 (i).  
 — LEGISLATION RESPECTING : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 7786 (iii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 8433 (iii).
- CENTRAL ONTARIO RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 9968 (iii).
- Central Vermont Railway Co.'s B. N. 171** (Mr. *Gibson*) M. to present Pet., 6244 ; 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 6349 ; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 6502 (ii) ; in Com., 9396, 9686 ; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 9688 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 56).
- CENTRE NEW ANNAN P. O., APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 4557 (ii).
- "CHALLENGE" STR., QUARANTINE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 7835 (iii).
- CHAMBLY CANAL, DRAINAGE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8914 (iii).
- CHAMPAGNE, MR. PAVINUS, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 3044 (i).
- CHANCE HARBOUR, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 9900 (iii).
- CHAPEL COVE, BREAKWATER, ERECTION OF BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1121 (i).
- CHAPLAINS, APPOINTMENT OF : Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 7971 (iii).
- CHAPPEL, EDGAR, AND J. G. TURRIFF : M. to adjn. (Mr. *Davin*) 2605 (i).  
 — EMPLOYMENT BY INT. DEPT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 778 (i).  
 — See "Turriff," &c.
- CHARBONNEAU, MR. N., RETENTION BY GOVT. AS COUNSEL, REMUNERATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5248 (ii).
- CHARGES AGAINST I. C. R. BY C. P. R. AND G. T. R. : Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 3771 (ii).  
 — See "I.C.R."
- CHARGES AGAINST MIN. OF THE INT. *re* MINING LEASES, LETTERS READ (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8074 (iii).
- CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 6444 (ii) ; 8121, 10277 (iii).
- CHARLESON, J. B., EXPENDITURE PER AUD. GEN.'S REP. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2178 (i).  
 — Inquiry for Papers (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 7514 (iii).  
 — Ques. of Order, Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7313 (iii).  
 — REP. AS TO WORK, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 434 (i).
- CHARLESON, J. B. : REPS. *re* TELEGRAPH CONSTRUCTION, &c. : M. for copies (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 7310 (iii).  
 — See "Yukon," &c.
- CHARLEVOIX COUNTY, PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3036 (i).
- Charlottetown and Murray Harbour Ry. B. No. 182** (Mr. *Blair*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 7647 ; 2<sup>o</sup>, and in Com., 8937 ; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 8949 (iii.) (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 7).
- CHARTERED BANKS, LIST OF SHAREHOLDERS : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 4681 (ii).
- CHARTERED STEAMERS, SOUTH AFRICAN WAR, &c. : conc., 10446 (iii).
- CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 10013 (iii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 4075 (ii).
- CHATEAUGUAY RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 10225 (iii).
- CHAUDIÈRE BRIDGES, REBUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4345 (ii).
- CHEESE EXPORTS TO G. B. : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1878.
- CHEMICAL WORKS AND CHIEF ANALYST OF INLAND REV. DEPT. : M. for cor.\* (Mr. *Domville*) 4078 (ii).  
 — See "Basic Slag."
- CHICOUTIMI POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup. 9876 (iii).  
 — PUBLIC WORKS, AMOUNT EXPENDED : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 287 (i).  
 — WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10208 (iii).  
 — EXPENDITURE BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1745 (i).
- CHINA AND JAPAN SUBSIDIES : prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4333 (ii).
- CHINA POINT PIER, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 7837, 7943 (iii).
- CHINESE AND JAPANESE COMMISSION : in Com. of Sup., 10411 (iii).
- Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. No. 180** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 7406 ; M. for Com. on Prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7881, 8162 ; 2<sup>o</sup>, 8162 ; in Com., 8182, 8189 ; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 8285 ; Sen. Amts., 9525 (iii.) (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 32).  
 — See "Immigration."
- CHINESE IMMIGRATION BILL : Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) 7316 (iii).  
 — GOVT. ACTION *re* LEGISLATION : Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 2617 (i).  
 — GOVT. ACTION *re* : ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP., 7052 (iii).  
 — GOVT. POLICY *re* POLL TAX : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 589 (i).  
 — WAR, AND ACTION OF DOM. GOVT. : par. in Montreal "Herald" (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10304 (iii).
- CHOQUETTE, MR. JUSTICE, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1979 (i).
- CHRISTY'S BROOK, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9454 (iii).
- CHURCH POINT PIER : in Com. of Sup., 7836 (iii).
- CIVIL SERVANTS AS INSURANCE AGENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5245 (ii).

- CIVIL SERVANTS, STATUTORY INCREASES: Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 8439 (iii).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 156** (Mr. Fielding) 1° m., 5226 (ii); 2° m., 6996; in Com., 7007, 7031, 7656, 8160; 3°, 8161 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 14.)
- CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES, NUMBER OF DISMISSALS: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2196 (i).
- LIST: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 286 (i); 4454 (ii).
- CLAIMS IN YUKON, ABANDONMENT BY OWNERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 5026 (ii).
- See "Yukon," &c.
- CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* SNOW FENCES IN BELLE-CHASSE CO., I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 1735 (i).
- CLAIMS RESERVED, DISPOSAL, &c., YUKON: Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 5406 (ii).
- CLARKE, MR. H. W., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3049 (i).
- CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, OFFICIAL COR. WITH CAN.: remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 80, 82, 163, 318 (i).
- Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 262, 318 (i).
- CLEMENT, PATTULLO AND RIDLEY, DETAILS OF AMOUNT COLLECTED: M. for Ret\*. (Mr. Foster) 2201 (i).
- PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4735 (ii).
- CLERKS IN DEPTS., NUMBER, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 4446 (ii).
- CLOVER POINT, B.C., RIFLE RANGE, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 292 (i).
- M. for copy\* (Mr. Prior) 2202 (i).
- CLYDE RIVER, N.S., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER GEO. THOMPSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 5021 (ii).
- COAL AREAS IN YUKON. See "Applications."
- COAL INDUSTRY OF CANADA: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. McDougall) 9708 (iii).
- COAL OIL DUTIES, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Moore) 8049 (iii).
- IMPORT PRICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2364 (i).
- COASTING LAWS, ABROGATION OF BY GOVT.: amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bennett) 9149; Neg. (Y. 32; N. 51) 9184 (iii).
- LAWS, SUSPENSION: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 480 (i).
- OF U. S. VESSELS ON GREAT LAKES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2421, 2995 (i); 5409 (ii).
- See "American," &c.
- Cold Storage Accommodation Authorization B. No. 152** (Mr. Fisher) prop. Res., 4662, 4822; 1°, 4898; 2°, in Com., and 3°, 5827 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 10).
- COLD STORAGE BETWEEN P.E.I. AND G.B.: Remarks (Mr. Martin) 6253 (ii).
- FOR FISH BAIT: in Com. of Sup., 5953, 5998, 6017 (ii).
- IN 1896: Inquiry for Regulations (Mr. Clarke) 4899 (ii).
- ON STEAMSHIPS: prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4662; in Com. on Res., 4822 (ii).
- COLD STORAGE, SS. AND RYS., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7619, 10336 (iii).
- SYSTEM, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Montague) 2366.
- COLDWELL, MR., CUSTOMS OFFICER: in Com. of Sup., 6066 (ii).
- COLLECTION OF REVENUES: in Com. of Sup., 8054 (iii).
- COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, APPROPRIATIONS BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1465 (i).
- COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7952, 10248 (iii).
- COLONELS, HONORARY, RECENT APPOINTMENTS: Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 8282 (iii).
- COLONIAL NAVAL RESERVE, STMT. IN IMP. H. OF. C.: Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 1473 (i).
- See "Can. Naval, &c."
- COLUMBIA RIVER, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7955 (iii).
- COMEAUVILLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7836 (iii).
- COMMISSIONS &c. IN CAN. CONTINGENTS: Ques. (Mr. Ellis) 6617 (ii).
- See "South African War," &c.
- IN IMP. ARMY, COR. BETWEEN IMP. AND CAN. GOVT.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 3381.
- M. to adjn. (Sir Charles Tupper) 3480 (ii).
- Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3483 (ii).
- REGULATIONS *re*: Remarks (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 3283 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Prior) 3479 (ii).
- COMMISSIONS ON STAMPS FOR CAN. TOBACCO: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (ii).
- COMMISSIONS *re* INVESTIGATIONS AGAINST GOVT. EMPLOYEES, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2398 (i).
- M. for stmnt.\* (Mr. Foster) 1012, 2761 (i).
- inquiry for Ret., 9680 (ii).
- COMMITTEES:
- BANKING AND COMMERCE, SUBSTITUTION OF NAME: M. (Sir Charles Tupper) 6135 (ii).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL, 1ST REP. CONC.: M. (Mr. Champagne) 649, 937 (i).
- 2ND REP., CONC.: M. (Mr. Champagne) 1206 (i).
- 3RD REP.: M. (Mr. Champagne) 2907, 2994.
- 4TH REP. CONC.: M. (Mr. Carroll) 4554 (ii).
- 5TH REP.: Presented (Mr. Champagne) 5019 (ii).
- M. to conc., 5123, 5213 (ii).
- 6TH REP. OF COM.: M. to conc. (Mr. Champagne) 10030, 10288, 10422, 10453 (iii).
- M. to add Name (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4436 (ii).
- PRINTING COMMITTEE, JOINT: M. to conc. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 261 (i).
- SEL. STANDING COM., ADDITION OF MR. PUTTEE'S NAME: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 736 (i).
- COMS.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).
- COM. TO PREPARE LISTS: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 137 (i).
- Lists presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 255.
- PUB. ACCOUNTS, AUD. GEN.'S REP. AND PUB. ACCTS.: M. to ref. to Sel. Com. (Mr. Fraser, Guysborough) 1108 (i).
- MEETINGS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 9496, 9684 (iii).
- Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1388, 2741 (i).

- COMMUNICATIONS FROM SYDNEY BOARD OF TRADE :  
Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 466<sup>s</sup> (ii).  
See "I. C. R."
- COMMUNICATIONS WITH MR. OGILVIE : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4738 (ii).
- Comox and Cape Scott Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 577; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1005; in Com., 3209 (i), 3418; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 3441 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 57.)
- Companies Clauses Act Amt. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Gilmour*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 510 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4799; ref. to Com., 4800 (ii).  
— B. No. 183 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 8082; M. for 2<sup>o</sup>, 8935; 2<sup>o</sup>, and in Com., 8951; 3<sup>o</sup>, 8952 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
- COMPENSATION ALLOWANCES, MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 9769 (iii).
- COMPLAINTS *re* TRAIN SERVICE ON C. B. DIVISION : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3178 (i).  
— See "I. C. R.," &c.
- Conciliation of Trade Disputes B. No. 187 (Mr. *Mulock*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 8399; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 9368; in Com., 9392; 3<sup>o</sup>, 9396 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 24.)  
— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Davin*) 8418 (iii).  
— Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 8418-22.
- CONCILIATION ACT, EXPENSES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10413 (iii).
- Conditional Liberation of Convicts Act Amt. B. No. 89 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1877 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 3607; in Com., 3610; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 4666 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 48.)
- Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer incorp. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Quinn*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1641; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1933; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 2670 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 96.)
- CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND, EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2182 (i).
- CONSOLIDATION OF DOM. STATUTES : in Com. of Sup., 10413 (iii).
- CONSTANTINE, DR., PAYMENTS TO : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3763 (ii).
- CONSTITUENCIES, POPULATION OF AFTER REDISTRIBUTION : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2173 (i).
- COPELAND, MR. ARTHUR, STMENTS. OF : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 778 (i).
- Copyright Act Amt. B. No. 167 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 5887; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 6505 (ii); in Com., 9148; 3<sup>o</sup>, 9149 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
- COPYRIGHT BILL, MEMO. OF DEPT. OF JUS. : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6447 (ii).
- Convicts. See "Conditional."
- CORNWALL ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 9883, 9893 (iii).  
— CANAL, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 8157, 9185, 10112; conc., 10452 (iii).
- COSTE, MR., REP. *re* TESLIN LAKE ROUTE : M. for copy (Mr. *Davin*) 605 (i).
- COTEAU DU LAC WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10097 (iii).
- COTEAU LANDING DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 10222.
- CÔTE ST. LUC RIFLE RANGE, CLOSING AND PURCHASE OF SITE : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 292 (i).  
See "Militia," &c.
- COUNCIL, YUKON, NAMES, SALARIES, &c. OF MEMBERS : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7880, 7968 (iii).
- COUNTERFEITERS, LITIGATION EXPENSES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8143 (iii).
- COUNTY COURT JUDGES, B.C., SALARIES, &c. : M. for cor., &c. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 300 (i).
- COURTNEY, CORPORAL IN "A" BATTERY, CHARGES OF INSUBORDINATION, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 7771, 7885, 8282, 8933, 9063 (iii).  
— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Taylor*) 7989, 9685 (iii).
- COURT OF APPEALS, PROV. OF QUEBEC : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5515 (ii).  
— See "Judges," &c.
- COVE FIELDS, QUEBEC, SALE, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 7880 (iii).  
— See "Plains," &c.
- Cowichan Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 66 (Mr. *McInnes*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1381; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1728; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup> 2783 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- Cox, J. E., See "Divorce."
- CREAMERIES, N.S. : in Com. of S-p., 7631 (iii).
- CREAMERY PRODUCT SALES, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 6701 (ii).
- Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. No. 15 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 320 (i).  
— B. No. 17 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 430 (i).  
— B. No. 28 (Mr. *Britton*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 471 (i).  
— B. No. 62 (Mr. *MacLaren*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 1287 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4800 (ii).  
— (Merchandise Marking) Amt. B. No. 63 (Mr. *Russell*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 1287 (i).  
— B. No. 137 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3575; 2<sup>o</sup>, and in Com., 4700, 5176, 5251, 5701, 5922, 6063; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 6309; recom., 6321; 3<sup>o</sup>, 6323 (ii); Sen. Amts., 8949, 10453 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 46).  
— M. that Com. Rise (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5251 (ii).
- CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST OFFICIALS : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 153 (i).
- CRIMINAL STATISTICS : in Com. of Sup., 6339 (ii).
- Crown Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 82 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1713; 2<sup>o</sup> 2157; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 2948 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- CULBUTE CANAL, LAND DAMAGES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8913 (iii).
- CULLING TIMBER : in Com., of Sup., 6031 (ii).
- CUMBERLAND CO., SUBWAY (I.C.R.) CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7880 (iii).
- CURRIE, PETER, APPNMT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 3264 (i).
- Customs Act Amt. B. No. 184 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>o</sup>, and in Com., 8089; 3<sup>o</sup>, 8160 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 15.)
- CUSTOMS :  
AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, DUTY ON, M. FOR COM. OF SUP. : Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3640 (ii).  
— EXPORTED (1896-9), REBATE, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Clarke*) 3050 (i).  
— IMPORTS, VALUE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2756, 3034 (i).  
— Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 3046 (ii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

- AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS : PETS. *re* INCREASE OF DUTY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 1737 (i).  
 — REBATE ON EXPORTS FROM CAN.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2750 (i).  
 AMERICAN VESSELS AND THE COASTING TRADE : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 7512, 7650 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 7320 (iii).  
 — amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bennett) 9149 ; Neg. (Y. 32 ; N. 51) 9184 (iii).  
 APPRAISERS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 10414 (iii).  
 ARICHAH, COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, APPOINT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 816 (i).  
 BACON EXPORTS TO G.B.: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 1879 (i).  
 B.C., CUSTOMS : in Com. of Sup., 6086 (ii).  
 BEET ROOT SUGAR, COR. *re* BOUNTIES : M. for copies (Mr. Montague) 3180, 3199 (i).  
 BICYCLES EXPORTED FROM CAN. (1898-9) REBATE : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3769 (ii).  
 BRULE, N.S., PREVENTIVE OFFICER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 4557 (ii).  
 BUTTER EXPORTS TO G. B.: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 1878 (i).  
 CAMPBELLTON CUSTOMS OFFICER : in Com. of Sup., 6074 (ii).  
 CAN. AND PORTO RICO, DISCRIMINATION DUTIES ON FISH, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 4240 (ii).  
 CAN. AND U. S. COASTING LAWS ON PACIFIC COAST : M. for O. C.'s\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 319 (i).  
 CATTLE AND CHEESE EXPORTS TO G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1980 (i).  
 CATTLE EXPORTS TO G. B. AND U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2365 (i).  
 — TO U. S., 1890-9 : Ques. (Mr. Heyd) 4242.  
 CHEESE EXPORTS TO G. B.: Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 1878 (i).  
 COASTING LAWS, ABROGATION OF BY GOVT.: amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bennett) 9149 ; neg. (Y. 32 ; N. 51) 9184 (iii).  
 — SUSPENSION : Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 480 (i).  
 COASTING PRIVILEGES, U. S. VESSELS ON CAN. LAKES : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2421, 2995 (i), 5409 (ii).  
 — See "U.S.," &c.  
 COLDWELL, MR., CUSTOMS OFFICER : in Com. of Sup., 6066 (ii).  
 CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE, AMOUNT COLLECTED : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2179 (i).  
 — DEPTL. VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 6043, 6064, 6242 (ii).  
 — REP.: Inquiry for (Mr. Wallace) 285 (i).  
 DIBBLEE, MR. CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WOODSTOCK, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7316 (iii).  
 DODGE, B. H., CUSTOMS OFFICER, KENTVILLE, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 1118 (i).  
 — SEIZURES MADE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 1478, 2465 (i).  
 DUTY, PER CENT OF COLLECTED, 1890-99 : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2367, 2459 (i).  
 EXPORTS AND IMPORTS FOR JULY TO JAN., 1898-9, 1899-1900, VALUE, DUTY COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1119 (i).  
 EXPORT OF LOGS AND LUMBER FROM INDIAN RESERVES, QUANTITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 150 (i).  
 FARM WAGONS, IMPORTS, &c., VALUE : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3047 (i).  
 FINANCIAL STATEMENT *re* CANADIAN TRADE : on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Paterson) 10470 (iii).  
 FLOUR EXPORTS FROM CAN.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) 1882 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

- FLOUR IMPORTS TO BRITISH W. INDIES : Ques. (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) 1881 (i).  
 GASPE ELECTIONS AND CUSTOMS OFFICIAL : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Foster) 7573, 7595 ; amt. (Mr. Gillies) 7591 ; neg. (Y. 21 ; N. 34) 7602 (iii).  
 — See "LEMIEUX, MR."  
 GRAIN EXPORTS TO G. B. (Mr. McMillan) 1879.  
 HAY, REMOVAL OF DUTY : Ques. (Mr. Richardson) 9523 (iii).  
 HENAUT, ROMUALD, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT MASKINONGÉ (Mr. Marcotte) 3442 (ii).  
 IMPORTS FROM U. S., DUTIABLE GOODS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 7315 (iii).  
 INDIAN CORN, QUANTITY IMPORTED AND EXPORTED : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2405 (i).  
 INLAND REVENUE AND CUSTOMS, AMOUNT COLLECTED : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2179 (i).  
 LEMIEUX, ASSISTANT INSPECTOR OF CUSTOMS, MONTREAL AND MAGDALEN ISLAND ELECTIONS, INVESTIGATION, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 470 (i).  
 — See "GASPE," &c.  
 MCNAMARA, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WALKERTON : in Com. of Sup., 6074 (ii).  
 MAN. CUSTOMS : in Com. of Sup., 6076 (ii).  
 MEAT, IMPORTATIONS : Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 3875.  
 MOOSEJAW COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1465 (i), 5404 (ii).  
 — SUB-COLLECTOR : in Com. of Sup., 6084 (ii).  
 N. B. CUSTOMS : in Com. of Sup., 6070 (ii).  
 N. W. T. CUSTOMS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6084 (ii), 9519 (iii).  
 N. W. FARMERS AND AUSTRALIAN COMPETITION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 293 (i).  
 N. S. CUSTOMS : in Com. of Sup., 6066 (ii), 9505 (iii).  
 PAPER COMBINE, GOVT. LEGISLATION *re* DUTY : Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 4921 (ii).  
 — PROPOSED REDUCTION OF DUTY : Remarks (Mr. Maclean) 4802 (ii).  
 PHILLIPS, MR., APPRAISER AT WINNIPEG : in Com. of Sup., 6080 (ii).  
 PORTER, EDGAR H., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, INVESTIGATION *re* : Ques. (Mr. Mills) 2404 (i).  
 PRESCOTT, MR., COLLECTOR AT BAIE VERTE : in Com. of Sup., 6071 (ii).  
 QUEBEC CUSTOMS : in Com. of Sup., 6072 (ii).  
 REPORT OF CUSTOMS DEPT.: Inquiry for (Mr. Wallace) 285 (i).  
 REVENUE, AMOUNT COLLECTED FROM 1890 TO DATE : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2366 (i).  
 SALARIES, CUSTOMS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6073 (ii).  
 SUGAR, AVERAGE RATE OF DUTY COLLECTED, 1899 : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3770 (ii).  
 SYDNEY CUSTOMS REVENUE : in Com. of Sup., 6069 (ii).  
 TIGNISH AND ALBERTON PORTS, NUMBER OF WAGONS, &c., ENTERED : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 8739 (iii).  
 TIGNISH, P. E. I., CUSTOMS DUTY COLLECTED 1898-1900 : M. for Ret. (Mr. Macdonald, P. E. I.) 3469 (ii).  
 UNIFORMS FOR CUSTOMS OFFICERS : in Com. of Sup., 6090 (ii).  
 U. S. AND G. B. IMPORTS, &c., AMOUNTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 7654 (iii).  
 U. S. VESSELS AND COASTING PRIVILEGES ON CAN. LAKES, REPS., O. C.'s, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Foster) 167 (i).  
 — See "Coasting."  
 WAGONS AND CARRIAGES, NUMBER IMPORTED IN P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 5402 (ii).  
 WINNIPEG CUSTOMS : in Com. of Sup., 6077 (ii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

- WOODBRIDGE FAIR, IMPORTATION OF POSTERS, &c.: (Mr. *Casey*) 1732 (i).
- WOOD, MR., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT ST. JOHN, Remarks (Mr. *Monet*) 9844 (iii).
- WOODSTOCK CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, &c.: (Mr. *Foster*) 7316 (iii).
- YOUNG, MR., DOM. OFFICER AT NORTH PORTAL: in Com. of Sup., 10414 (iii).
- DAIRY EXPERTS IN MAN. AND N.W.T., COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2362 (i).
- NUMBER, &c. (Mr. *Prior*) 2458 (i).
- DAIRYING INTERESTS: in Com. of Sup., 9412 (iii).
- DALY, PATRICK, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4444 (ii).
- DAUPHIN LAKE, COR. BETWEEN GEO. HOOD AND GOVT.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Roche*) 3469 (ii).
- DAWSON AND FORT CUDAHAY TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 10257 (iii).
- DAWSON CITY, POPULATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 591 (i).
- DAWSON TO CIRCLE CITY TEL. LINE, CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1734 (i).
- See "Yukon."
- DEAD LETTER BRANCH, P.O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6129 (ii).
- DEBATES AND OFFICIAL PAPERS, FRENCH TRANSLATION OF: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 814 (i).
- DEBATE IN HOUSE OF COMMONS, CHARACTER, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 10314 (iii).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL: in Com. of Sup., 5923 (ii), 8149.
- M. for Sel. Com. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).
- 1ST REP. OF COM., CONC.: M. (Mr. *Champagne*) 649, 937 (i).
- 2ND REP., CONC.: M. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1206 (i).
- 3RD REP.: M. (Mr. *Champagne*) 2907, 2994 (i).
- 4TH REP. CONC.: M. (Mr. *Carroll*) 4554 (ii).
- 5TH REP.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 5019; M. to conc., 5123, 5213 (ii).
- 6TH REP. OF COM.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 10288, 10030, 10422; conc., 10453 (iii).
- M. to add Name (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4436 (ii).
- TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Marcotte*) 6994.
- DEEP SEA FISHERIES, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 10399.
- DEFECTIVE WHEELS UNDER WAGNER CARS, I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3445 (ii).
- DEFENCES, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Res. prop. (Mr. *Davin*) 242, 281 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 263 (i).
- DEFICITS AND SURPLUSES, I. C. R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 9521 (iii).
- DEFICITS, RY. SUBSIDIES, &c., AMOUNTS: (Ques.) (Mr. *Dechene*) 2835 (i); 3758 (ii).
- DELEGATION FROM P. E. I. GOVT., REPS. *re*: M. for papers (Mr. *Martin*) 2760 (i).
- DENT, MAJ., INSTRUCTIONS FROM IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4443 (N).
- DEPTL. REPORTS, INQUIRY FOR: (Mr. *Foster*) 816, 867 (i).
- DEPOT HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10228 (iii).

- DESERONTO POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9883 (iii).
- DES JOACHIMS BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 10253 (iii).
- DESTRUCTION OF MAIL BAGS AT STATION ON I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4741 (ii).
- DEVLIN, DR., PROSECUTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10284 (iii).
- See "South African War," &c.
- DEVLIN, MR. C. A., DATE OF APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 6776 (ii).
- DEWAR, ROBT., COMPENSATION TO: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6615 (ii).
- DIBBLEE, MR., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WOODSTOCK, N. B.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7316 (iii).
- DICKEY, HON. ARTHUR, DECEASE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 9056 (iii).
- DIGBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7870 (iii).
- DIPPER HARBOUR, N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 9900 (iii).
- DISBANDMENT OF 70TH BATTALION: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3034 (i).
- DISMISSALS FROM DEPTL. SERVICES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 9680 (iii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10183 (iii).
- I. C. R., &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4810 (ii).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 7317, 8280, 9468, 9798 (iii).
- See "Commissions, &c."
- DISTRESSED SETTLERS IN SASKATCHEWAN: in Com. of Sup., 7490 (iii).
- LIARD AND DEASE RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 7075 (iii).
- DIVISIONS:
- BINDER TWINE, SALE AND MANUFACTURE OF: amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) neg. (Y. 38; N. 71) 6241 (ii).
- BROCKVILLE AND WEST HURON ELECTIONS: on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup.; neg. (Y. 43; N. 86) 5697 (ii).
- INSTRUCTION, &c.: on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) neg. (Y. 32; N. 50) 7488 (iii).
- BUDGET, THE: amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) neg. (Y. 48; N. 88) 4660 (ii).
- CAN. NATIONAL RY. CO.'S B. 115 (Mr. *Campbell*) on amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3<sup>d</sup>, neg. (Y. 38; N. 49) 6607 (ii).
- C. P. R. CO.'S B. 34 (Mr. *Macdonell*) amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) neg. (Y. 15; N. 71) 2654 (i).
- amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) neg. (Y. 21; N. 68) 2664 (i).
- LAND GRANTS, TAXATION OF: amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 6; N. 99) 8045 (iii).
- CAPE SCOTT AND COMOX RY. CO.'S B. 35 (Mr. *Morrison*) amt. (Mr. *McInnes*) neg. (Y. 21; N. 53) 3441 (ii).
- COASTING LAWS ABOGATION: amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) neg. (Y. 32; N. 51) 9184 (iii).
- FINANCIAL SITUATION: amt. (Mr. *Foster*) neg. (Y. 44; N. 86) 9767 (iii).
- GASPE ELECTIONS AND CUSTOMS OFFICIAL: amt. (Mr. *Foster*) neg. (Y. 21; N. 34) 7602 (iii).
- GOVT. CONTRACTS, PROTECTION TO WORKMEN: amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) neg. (Y. 40; N. 74) 2545 (ii).
- GRAIN INSPECTION B. 141: amt. (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) agreed to (Y. 93; N. 10) 6283.

DIVISIONS—*Con.*

- INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT *re* BRITISH INSTITUTIONS: amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bourassa*) neg. (Y. 10; N. 119) 1875 (i).
- JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS B. 189 (M.) to dissent from Sen. Amts., agreed to (Y. 68; N. 23) 10095 (iii).
- PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH G. B.: amt. (Mr. *Russell*) agreed to (Y. 91; N. 46) 2343 (ii).
- PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) agreed to (Y. 65; N. 64) 9055.
- amt. (Mr. *Parmelee*) agreed to (Y. 98; N. 41) 9041 (iii).
- POST OFFICE ACT AMT. B. 191: amts. (Mr. *Davin*) neg. (Y. 27; N. 79) 9701; (Y. 36; N. 79) 9836 (iii).
- RAILWAY ACT AMT. B. 132: amt. (Mr. *Casey*) neg. (Y. 35; N. 65) 9366 (iii).
- amt. (Mr. *McMillan*) neg. (Y. 30; N. 78) 9367 (iii).
- REPRESENTATION B. 13: 3<sup>o</sup>, amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) neg. (Y. 45; N. 91) 1640 (i).
- SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS SECURITIES B. 143 (Mr. *Sutherland*) amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for 3<sup>o</sup>, neg. (Y. 26; N. 50) 5142 (ii).
- SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—EMERGENCY RATIONS, INSTRUCTIONS: amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) neg. (Y. 30; N. 46) 7570 (iii).
- amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) agreed to (Y. 47; N. 30) 7572 (iii).
- M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com.; amt. (Mr. *Monk*) neg. (Y. 50; N. 73) 9326 (i).
- M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) agreed to (Y. 66; N. 52) 9330 (iii).
- TIMBER LICENSES IN MAN.: amt. (Mr. *Davin*) neg. (Y. 37; N. 72) 7280 (iii).
- TOBACCO, ABOLITION OF DUTIES: amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 38; N. 68) 7914 (iii).
- YUKON, ADMINISTRATION OF, CHARGES AGAINST: amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 38; N. 74) 6428 (ii).
- amt. (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) neg. (Y. 34; N. 70) 8648 (iii).
- "JOHN C. BARR," UNDERVALUATION, &c.: on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 22; N. 43) 6681 (ii).
- amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) neg. (Y. 46; N. 72) 7786 (iii).
- ROYALTIES, CHARGES AGAINST MR. McDONALD: on amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 33; N. 63) 7727 (iii).
- WADE, MR. F. C., CHARGES AGAINST: amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 26; N. 51) 7172 (iii).
- Divorce, Cox, Edwin James, Relief B. No. 131** (Mr. *Montague*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3330; 2<sup>o</sup>, 4069; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 4950 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 125.)
- **Featherstonhaugh, Wm. Henry, Relief B. No. 181** (Mr. *Gibson*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 7511; 2<sup>o</sup>, 7652; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 8103 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 126.)
- **Kobold, Gustavus Adolphus, Relief B. No. 159** (Mr. *Bennett*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 5293; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5446; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 5922 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 127.)
- **Lyons, Catherine Cecilia, Relief B. No. 144** (Mr. *Mills*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 4554; 2<sup>o</sup>, 4695; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 5922 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 128.)
- **Patterson, Gertrude Bessie, Relief B. No. 158** (Mr. *Richardson*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 5513; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5922; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 6820 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 129.)
- DODGE, B. H., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, KENTVILLE, N.S., SEIZURES MADE, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1478, 2465 (ii).
- AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1118 (i).
- Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 83** (Mr. *Haley*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1713; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2783 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 5162 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- See "Yarmouth SS. Co."
- Dom. of Canada Rifle Association incorp. B. No. 169** (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 5960 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 7135; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 7136 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 99.)
- Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 197** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 10506; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 10506; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 10507 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- Dom. Cotton Mills Co.'s B. No. 71** (Mr. *Quinn*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1553; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2109 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 4479 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 98.)
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 3** (Mr. *Ingram*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 7 (i).
- **B. No. 29** (Mr. *Britton*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 472 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4793; amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 m. h., 4797 (ii).
- **B. No. 49** (Mr. *Puttee*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 864 (i).
- **B. No. 57** (Mr. *Erb*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 1109 (i).
- **B. No. 133** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 3258 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 6702; in Com., 6725 (ii), 7322, 8090, 8796, 8840, 9064; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 9472; Sen. Amts., 10454, 10508 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- Ques. of Order, Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 6717-8 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 6244 (ii).
- Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 18** (Mr. *Sifton*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 430; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 1388; in Com., 1388; M. for Com., 1643; in Com., 1789; 3<sup>o</sup>, 1792 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 20.)
- Dom. Oil Pipe Line and Mfg. Co.'s B. No. 37** (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 577; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1005.
- DOM. BUILDINGS, RENT, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 7938, 9893 (iii).
- DOM. CENSUS:** in Com. of Sup., 10333 (iii).
- DOM. COAL COS., LEGISLATION, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 9510 (iii).
- DOM. CREEK, COR., &c.:** M. for copies (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 157 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6702 (ii).
- DOM. DAY, ADJOURNMENT:** Remarks (Mr. *Craig*) 8435.
- Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 8652 (iii).
- 'DOMINION' DREDGE, EMPLOYEES, NAMES, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 5026 (ii).
- DOM. LANDS:** in Com. of Sup., 7058, 7827 (iii).
- **MAN. AND N.W.T., REGULATIONS *re* TIMBER LIMITS:** Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 6780 (ii).
- **SALARIES, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 10407 (iii).
- DOM. NOTES, PRINTING, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 6444 (ii).
- DOM. POLICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 8132 (iii).
- DOM. RIFLE ASSOCIATION:** in Com. of Sup., 9768 (iii).

- DOM. STATUTES, CONSOLIDATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 593 (i).  
 — REVISIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 1886 (i).  
 DOM. SUBSIDIES TO ONT. AND QUE.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 155 (i).  
 DOMVILLE, LT.-COL., RETIREMENT OF, REPS. &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2760 (i).  
 DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 6441, 6443, 6959, 6968 (ii) 9901, 10277 (iii).  
 — INVESTIGATION, PAYMENTS, *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 778 (i).  
 — REP. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 3446.  
 DOUKOHOBORS AND GALICIANS, NUMBER AND SETTLEMENT IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 151, 286 (i).  
 — EMIGRATION TO U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4734.  
 Drainage across Railway Lands B. No. 9 (Mr. *Casey*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 146 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4763 (ii).  
 DRAW BARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 9456 (iii).  
 DREDGES, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7857.  
 DREDGING, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7967 (iii).  
 DREDGING LEASES, APPLICATION OF MR. PHILP: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5246, 5247 (ii).  
 — CANCELLED OR FORFEITED, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5893 (ii).  
 — PUBLISHED IN "CANADA GAZETTE": Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 7315 (iii).  
 — TESLIN LAKE, APPLICATIONS OF MESSRS. PHILP AND OTHERS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5398 (ii).  
 — TRANSFERENCE TO MR. PHILP AND OTHERS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5247 (ii).  
 — See "Yukon," &c.  
 DREDGING MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).  
 — PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 10252 (iii).  
 DROUIN FRERES ET CIE., PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3768 (ii).  
 DRUMMONDVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9876.  
 DRYSDALE, MR., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4243 (ii).  
 DUBE AND CAZES, CAPITAL CASES, CLEMENCY, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 9678, 10504 (iii).  
 DUFFERIN PORT, HALIFAX COUNTY, WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9904, 10508 (iii).  
 DUNK RIVER HATCHERY, REBUILDING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McLellan*) 7656 (iii).  
 DUTY, PER CENT OF COLLECTED 1890-9: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2367, 2459 (i).  
 EARNINGS, I.C.R., &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1555 (i).  
 EASTER ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3264.  
 EASTERN EXTENSION RY. CO.'S ARBITRATION: *par.* in Newspapers (Mr. *Foster*) 10031 (iii).  
 — CONTRACT FOR PAINTING STATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3038 (i).  
 EASTERN EXTENSION TEL. CO. AND IMP. GOVT. AND AUSTRALIAN GOVT. GRANT OF LAND, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 291 (i).  
 — CONCESSIONS GRANTED BY AUSTRALIAN GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1752 (i).  
 EASTERN HARBOUR AND PORT HASTINGS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1886 (i).  
 ECUM SECUM WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 9896 (iii).  
 EDMONTON BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (iii).  
 EDWARDS & CO., TIMBER LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 7121 (iii).  
 EGG ISLAND LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).  
 — OMISSION OF LIGHTING: M. for cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 2761 (i).  
 ELDER-DEMPSTER SS. CONTRACT: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 6917 (ii).  
 — See "Atlantic," "Beaver," &c.  
 ELECTION CERTIFICATES: Received (Mr. *Speaker*) 320.  
 ELECTION PAMPHLETS, DISTRIBUTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 475 (i).  
 ELECTION FRAUDS COMMISSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10321 (iii).  
 — JUDICIAL INQUIRY O. C.: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6569 (ii).  
 — OPINION OF MIN. OF JUS.: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7082 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 9681, 9905, 10030 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6059, 6693 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6352, 6916 (ii).  
 — See "Brockville," &c.  
 ELECTORAL FRANCHISE BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 6244 (ii).  
 ELECTORAL LISTS, DISTRIBUTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 169 (i).  
 — See "Voters' Lists."  
 — FOR ONT., PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 593 (i).  
 — N.B., PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 438 (i).  
 — P.Q., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 6781 (ii).  
 ELEVATOR ACCOMMODATION, H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Moore*) 1554 (i).  
 ELEVATOR COMMISSION EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7832 (iii).  
 ELKHORN, GOVT. BUILDINGS, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4438 (ii).  
 — SALE OF PRINTING PLANT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2758 (i).  
 — PRINTING PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7296.  
 EMERGENCY RATIONS, ANALYSIS OF DR. RUTTAN: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7988 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 7420, 7512, 8079 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7885 (iii).  
 — APPNMT. OF DAY FOR DISCUSSION: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 8934 (iii).  
 — CHARGES AGAINST MILITIA DEPT.: M. (Mr. *Monk*) 7395, 7514 (iii).  
 — CUSTOMS DUTY AT MONTREAL: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7883 (iii).  
 — ENTRY AT MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 8432.  
 — FIRST REP. OF SEL. COM.: Presented (Mr. *Belcourt*) 7646 (iii).  
 — M. to substitute name on Committee (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7649 (iii).  
 — M. to print Rep. of Com. (Mr. *Monk*) 8651.

- EMERGENCY RATIONS**: Ques. of Order, *re* Documents laid on Table, Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 6831-6844 (ii).  
 — amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) agreed to (Y. 47; N. 30) 7572 (iii).  
 — Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7540, 7548 (iii).  
 — Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (iii).  
 — Papers laid on Table (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 7208 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 7317 (iii).  
 — PAR. IN "CAN. MILITARY GAZETTE": M. to adjn. (Mr. *Monk*) 6790, 6883 (ii).  
 — Personal Explanation (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7542 (iii).  
 — Ques. of Order (Sir *Louis Davies*) 7888 (iii).  
 — Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Monk*) 7305 (iii).  
 — SAMPLES ANALYSED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 7417 (iii).  
 — TRANSLATION OF EVIDENCE (Mr. *Morin*) 8935.  
 — See "S. A. War."
- EMIGRANTS FROM EUROPE (1897-9), NUMBER, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2836 (i).
- EMIGRATION AGENT, MR. C. A. DEVLIN, DATE OF APPOINTMENT:** Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 6776 (ii).
- EMIGRATION TO U.S., PAR. IN NEWSPAPER:** Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3330 (ii).
- EMPLOYEES, INTERIOR DEPT., IN MAN. AND ASSA.:** M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Roche*) 2200 (i).
- EMPLOYEES OF GOVT., DISMISSAL OF, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2399 (i).  
 — See "Dismissals," &c.
- ENGINE HOUSES, ADDITIONAL, I. C. R.:** in Com. of Sup., 9432 (iii).
- ENGLISH TRUST FUNDS, ADMISSION OF CAN. SECURITIES:** M. to print papers (Mr. *Foster*) 5727 (ii).  
 — Papers laid on Table (Mr. *Fielding*) 5122 (ii).
- ENVELOPES SUPPLIED TO TRADE AND COMMERCE DEPT., NUMBER, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1118.  
 — M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Taylor*) 2201 (i).
- EQUIPMENT AND STORES FURNISHED TO IMP. GOVT. TENDER, &c.:** Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 5243 (ii).
- ESQUIMALT DEFENCES:** in Com. of Sup., 8342 (iii).  
 — GARRISONING BY CAN. TROOPS: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2148 (i).  
 — DRY DOCK, PETS. *re* DOCKING CHARGES: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3575 (ii).  
 — RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR 1895-6-7-8-9: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5024 (ii).
- ESTIMATES, THE:** Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1057 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 648 (i).  
 — (1900): Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 4338, 5293, 5883 (ii).  
 — (1901) Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 8338, 9790 (iii).  
 — SUPPL.: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 8693 (iii).  
 — Inquiry for (Mr. *Foster*) 8525 (iii).
- ETCHEMIN BRIDGE, I. C. R.:** in Com. of Sup., 10389.  
 "EUREKA," STR., PURCHASE BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5751 (ii).  
 — REFITTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7850 (iii).
- EXCHEQUER COURT:** in Com. of Sup., 6437 (ii), 8131.  
 — REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6888.
- EXCISE:** in Com. of Sup., 6026 (ii).
- EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL, 1896-99:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2743 (i).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARMS:** in Com. of Sup., 6341 (ii).  
 — BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 7930 (iii).  
 — OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 7202 (iii).  
 — FARM REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 6138.
- Experimental Farm Stations Act Amt. B. 135** (Mr. *Fisher*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 3478; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5099; in Com., 5099; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5124 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS FOR JULY TO JAN., 1898-9, 1899-1900, VALUE, DUTY COLLECTED, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1119 (i).
- EXPORT OF LOGS AND LUMBER FROM INDIAN RESERVES, QUANTITY, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 150 (i).
- EXPORTS TO SOUTH AFRICA, QUANTITY AND VALUE FROM CAN.:** Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 3260 (i).
- Expropriation Act Amt. B. No. 160** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5513; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5757; in Com., 5751; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5757 (ii); Sen. Amts., 8083 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- EXTENSION OF TIME TO OFFICERS *re* CLAIMS IN YUKON:** Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 152 (i).
- EXTENSION TO MONTREAL I. C. R., CLAIMS MADE ON GOVT. BY G. T. R. *re* TERMINAL IMPROVEMENTS:** Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2829 (i).  
 — See "I. C. R."
- FACILITIES, I. C. R.:** in Com. of Sup., 9459 (iii).
- FAMINE IN INDIA, CONTRIBUTION FROM DOM. GOVT., &c.:** Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7119, 7770 (iii).  
 — See "India," "Finance," &c.
- FARM WAGONS, IMPORTS, &c., VALUE:** Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 3047 (i).
- FARNHAM AND FRELIGHSBURG RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY:** in Com. on Res., 10015 (iii).
- FARRAN'S POINT CANAL:** in Com. of Sup., 8157, 10393.  
 — ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 8880 (iii).
- FAST ATLANTIC SS. SERVICE, NEGOTIATIONS, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2190 (i).
- Featherstonhaugh, W. H.** See "Divorce."
- FENIAN RAID MEDALS, GRANTS TO WIDOWS OF OFFICERS:** Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 6915 (ii).  
 — N. B., DISTRIBUTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 5023 (ii).  
 — NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS CALLED OUT, DEPUTATIONS, PETS, &c. *re* RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Casby*) 441 (i).
- Fertilizers Act (1890) Amt. B. No. 2** (Mr. *Domville*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 7; 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 1974 (i).
- FINANCIAL SITUATION:** amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Foster*) 9729 (iii); Neg. (Y. 44, N. 86) 9767 (iii).  
 — *re* CANADIAN TRADE: on M. for Com. of Ways and Means (Mr. *Paterson*) 10470 (iii).
- FINANCE:**  
 ARBITRATION CLAIMS AGAINST DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10031 (iii).  
 AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6445 (ii), 7506 (iii).  
 BANKS, POWERS OF: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 2748 (i).  
 CANADIAN BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 9607 (iii).

FINANCE—*Con.*

- CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 6444 (ii), 8121, 10277 (iii).
- COMMISSIONS *re* INVESTIGATION AGAINST GOVT. EMPLOYEES, COMMISSIONER'S EXPENSES AND SERVICES RENDERED GOVT.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 1012, 2761 (i).
- inquiry for Ret., 9680 (iii).
- CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2182 (i).
- COUNTERFEITERS, LITIGATION EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8143 (iii).
- DOM. NOTES, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6444 (ii), 8121 (iii).
- DOM. SUBSIDIES TO ONT. AND QUEBEC: Ques (Mr. Clancy) 155 (i).
- ENGLISH TRUST FUNDS, ADMISSION OF CAN. SECURITIES: M. to print papers (Mr. Foster) 5727 (ii).
- Papers laid on Table (Mr. Fielding) 5122.
- EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL, 1896-99: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2743 (i).
- FAMINE IN INDIA, CONTRIBUTION FROM DOM. GOVT., &c.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 7770 (iii).
- CONTRIBUTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Gilmour) 3876 (ii).
- GRANT OF GOVT.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 7119 (iii).
- GOVT. AID TO FAMINE FUND: Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 3876 (ii).
- FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6445 (ii).
- FIRE INSURANCE POLICIES, UNIFORM CONDITIONS BILL: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8280 (iii).
- Remarks (Mr. Gilmour) 10035 (iii).
- GOVT. LIFE INSURANCE ANNUITIES, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ross-Robertson) 2755 (i).
- GOV. GEN.'S WARRANTS, TOTAL AMOUNT ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1897 (i).
- INSURANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6508 (ii).
- LIQUOR COMMISSION, DATE OF APPOINTMENT: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 5394 (ii).
- LOAN COMPANIES, GOVT. ACTION *re* PERPETRATION OF FRAUDS: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3040 (i).
- MINT, ESTABLISHMENT BY GOVT. IN CAN.: Notice of Motion (Mr. McInnes) 1009 (i).
- See "Royal," &c.
- MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1885 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2180 (i).
- MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST, BONDS HELD BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2402, 2753 (i).
- N.W.T., SUBSIDY VOTED TO, COR. BETWEEN DOM. AND N.W.T. GOVTS., *re*: M. for copies (Mr. Davin) 3447 (ii).
- ONTARIO PROVINCIAL SUBSIDY DUE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Corby) 3037 (i).
- OTTAWA AND HULL CONFLAGRATION: Prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 4338 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 4339 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5807 (ii).
- PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH G.B.: amt. (Mr. Russell) to Com. of Sup., 2009 (i).
- Order, Ques. of (Mr. Clancy) 2236 (i).
- PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES PAID TO ONT. AND QUEBEC BY DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 155 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Montague) 10034 (iii).
- PUBLIC DEBT, ADDITIONS TO SINCE 1894: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1897 (i).
- QUEEN VS. BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO.: in Com. of Sup., 8140 (iii).
- RECEIVER GENERAL, ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 10277 (iii).
- ROYAL MINT FOR CAN., PAR. IN N. Y. "TRIBUNE": Remarks (Mr. Prior) 5229 (ii).
- SUPERANNUATIONS, AMOUNT GRANTED AND EXPENDIENCY OF PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 432 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*

- SUPERANNUATIONS FROM 1890 TO 1896, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2177 (i).
- THREE RIVERS HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5514 (iii).
- UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 8931 (iii).
- VILLE MARIE BANK, COR. BETWEEN DIRECTORS AND GOVT. AND STMT. OF SUMS PAID, CLAIMS MADE, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Monk) 168 (i).
- MONTHLY STMTS. FROM JULY, 1892: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 1011 (i).
- PETS. *re* GOVT. INTERVENTION AND SPECIAL GRANT: M. for copy (Mr. Monk) 3050 (i).
- OFFICIALS: in Com. of Sup., 8145 (iii).
- WINDING UP ACT, ON ORDER FOR INTRODUCTION OF BILL: Remarks (Mr. Britton) 4901 (ii).
- UNIFORM CONDITIONS BILL: prop. (Mr. Fitzpatrick); Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8280 (iii).
- UNIFORM CONDITIONS: Remarks (Mr. Gilmour) 10035 (iii).

## FISHERIES:

- BAIT FREEZING COS., GOVT. ASSISTANCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 3176 (i).
- BAIT: See "Cold Storage."
- B. C. FISHERIES, AGENTS' REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3177 (i).
- STEAMER FOR FISHERIES PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 10398 (iii).
- See "Stumbles, Mr."
- BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN: in Com. of Sup., 5958.
- CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 9524 (iii).
- 1896-9: AMOUNTS PAID: Ques. (Mr. Bell, P. E. I.) 2199 (i).
- CHEQUES, DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 3263 (i).
- CAMPOBELLO ISLAND FISH WEIRS, LICENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 594 (i).
- COLD STORAGE FOR FISH BAIT: in Com. of Sup., 5958, 5998, 6017 (ii).
- DEEP SEA FISHERIES, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 10399 (iii).
- DOM. AND PROVINCIAL CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (ii).
- DUNK RIVER HATCHERY, REBUILDING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McLellan) 7656 (iii).
- HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 5936 (ii).
- B. C. AND GASPÉ: in Com. of Sup., 10399.
- SYDNEY, C. B., SALE, &c.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 6781 (ii).
- INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 5934 (ii), 8064 (iii).
- LEGAL EXPENSES *re* SEIZURES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10398 (iii).
- MAN, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 6057.
- N.S., DEEP SEA: in Com. of Sup., 10399.
- OVERSEERS: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (ii).
- PROTECTION SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5957 (ii).
- PROTECTION SERVICE, B.C., ADDITIONAL STEAMER: M. for copy *re* (Mr. Prior) 2762 (i).
- FLATHEADS HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 8067 (iii).
- FRIE'S HEAD CAMPOBELLO, APPLICATION OF GOFF & BATSON FOR WEIR PRIVILEGES: M. for papers, &c.\* (Mr. Ganong) 1012, 2202 (i).
- GLASS, JAMES, FISHERY GUARDIAN, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 596 (i).
- JUAN DE FUCA, FISHING PRIVILEGES IN STRAITS: Ques. (Mr. Haggart) 5756 (ii).
- KENDALL, MR., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1119 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, P. E. I.) 4440 (ii).
- LAKE WINNIPEG FISHERIES, REPS. AND COR. *re*: M. for copies (Mr. Roche) 4754 (ii).
- LAKES WINNIPEGOSIS AND MANITOBA ENFORCEMENT OF FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 4440 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

- LAKES WINNIPEGOSIS AND MANITOBA, COR. *re* PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF FISH: M. for copies\* (Mr. Roche) 4078, 5293.  
 — Inquiry for further papers (Mr. Roche) 5227 (ii).
- LOBSTER FISHING, DATES OF CLOSE SEASON: Ques. (Mr. McInerney) 438 (i).  
 — IN DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS COVES, REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 4243 (ii).  
 — P. E. I., DATE OF SETTING LINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 2759 (i).  
 — FISHERIES: Remarks (Mr. McInerney) 4725 (ii).  
 — M. to adjn. (Mr. Bell, P.E.I.) 4727 (ii).  
 — FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 5944 (ii).  
 — INVESTIGATIONS, AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2195 (i).
- NOBLE BROS., CLAIM, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8066 (iii).
- OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 5948 (ii).
- SAMPSON, J., PAYMENT OF FISHING BOUNTY: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 8429 (iii).
- SHEEHAN, JACOB, FISHING BOUNTY PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 6058 (ii).
- STUMBLES, MR., VISIT TO B.C. *re* FISHERIES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 6137 (ii).  
 — See "B.C. Fisheries."
- FLAGS ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1124 (i).  
 — See "South African War," &c.
- FLATHEADS HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 8067 (iii).
- FLOUR EXPORTS FROM CAN.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) 1882 (i).  
 — IMPORTS TO BRITISH W. INDIES: Ques. (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) 1881 (i).
- FOG ALARMS ON LAKE ERIE: in Com. of Sup., 10397.
- FONTAINE, MR. L. E., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7827 (iii).
- FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE, PAR IN "MONTREAL GAZETTE": Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3795 (ii).
- Foreign Grain Inspection B. No. 142 (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4333; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4681; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 4684 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 40).
- FOX BAY SETTLERS, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND METHODIST CONFERENCE: M. for copy\* (Mr. Taylor) 649 (i).  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1381, 1787 (i).  
 — M. to adjn. (Mr. Taylor) 1984 (i).  
 — PAR IN "MONTREAL WITNESS" *re* TROUBLE WITH SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5391 (ii).  
 — STMT. OF HON. MIN. OF PUB. WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 292 (i).
- FOYLE, LT., RETIREMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9769.  
 — Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 9471, 9484, 9682.
- Franchise Act (1898) Amt. B. No. 5 (Mr. McInnes) 1<sup>o</sup>, 81 (i).  
 — B. No. 8 (Mr. Ingram) 1<sup>o</sup>, 143 (i).  
 — B. No. 105 (Mr. Carroll) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 2347 (i).
- FRANCHISE ACT, SUSPENSION, REVISION, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1896 (i).
- FRANKING BUSINESS ADVERTISEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10268 (iii).  
 — PRIVILEGE: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Clancy) 3613 (ii).

- FRANKING PRIVILEGE, ABUSE OF BY MEMBERS: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2747 (i).  
 — INFRINGEMENT OF P. O. ACT: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2458 (i).  
 — O. C. RESPECTING VIOLATIONS: M. to adjn. (Mr. Domville) 787-8 (i).  
 — REGULATIONS, O. C. RESPECTING, VIOLATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 779 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. Davis) 6776 (ii).  
 — PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 3264 (i).  
 — MONTREAL "STAR": Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 2197.  
 — MONTREAL "STAR": Order, Ques. of, Authorities quoted (Mr. Casgrain) 2197 (i).  
 — See "Montreal Star."
- FRANKLIN, MAN., INDIAN RESERVE AND RES. OF MUNICIPALITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 5023.
- FRASER, A. J., REMOVAL FROM REGINA LAND OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 740 (i).
- FRASER, B. H., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1698.
- FRASER RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 7955 (iii).  
 — PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10252 (iii).  
 — COST OF IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2832 (i).
- FRECHETTE, L. A., TECHNICAL TRANSLATION: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (ii).
- FREE PASSES TO IMMIGRANTS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1117 (i).
- FREE PASSES. I.C.R., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9429 (iii).
- Freight and Passenger Railway Rates Regulation B. No. 16 (Mr. Reid) 1<sup>o</sup>, 429 (i).
- FREIGHT DELAYS, I.C.R.: M. to adjn. (Mr. McDougall) 3257 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Powell) 3265 (i).  
 — CHANGE IN TARIFF, &c.: Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 7603 (iii).  
 — SERVICE AT QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2191 (i).
- FRENCH CANADIANS, ATTACK, &c., PAR. IN WINNIPEG "FREE PRESS": Ques. of Privilege (Sir Chas. Tupper) 165 (i).  
 — M. to adjn. (Sir Charles Tupper) 172 (i).
- FRENCH CREEK, B.C., TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 7838 (iii).
- FRENCH REPATRIATION, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 10353 (iii).
- FRENCH TRANSLATORS, ROOMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1033) (iii).
- FRIENDLY SOCIETIES. See "BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES."
- Frost and Wood Co.'s Patent Relief Bill No. 113 (Mr. Cowan) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i) 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3373; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4950 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 100).
- Fruit Inspection and Marking for Exportation B. 127 (Mr. Fisher) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827 (i), 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5107; in Com., 5107, 5124, 5827 (ii).
- FRYE'S HEAD CAMPOBELLO; APPLICATION OF GOFF & BATSON FOR WEIR PRIVILEGES, &c.: M. for papers, &c.\* (Mr. Ganong) 1012, 2202 (i).
- GABARUS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9895 (iii).

- GAGNE, MR., ST. COEUR DE MARIE, APPNMT. AS POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5756 (ii).
- GALENA OIL CO.'S CONTRACT, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 10173 (iii).
- GALICIAN SETTLERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 10352 (iii).
- GALOPS CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 8376, 8504, 8775, 10393 (iii).
- DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8157 (iii).
- Game Preservation.** See "YUKON."
- GARNOT, MR., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 295 (i).
- GARRISON AT HALIFAX : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 649 (i).
- See "Halifax," &c.
- GAS APPARATUS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 10389 (iii).
- GAS BUOYS, ST. LAWRENCE RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 8885, 9426 (iii).
- Gas Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 78** (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1641 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4669; in Com., 4669: 3<sup>o</sup>, 4671 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- GAS INSPECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4917 (ii).
- GASPE AND DALHOUSIE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (iii).
- GASPE ELECTIONS AND CUSTOMS OFFICIAL : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Foster*) 7573, 7595; amt. (Mr. *Gillies*) 7591, Neg. (Y. 21; N. 34) 7602 (iii).
- Gaspe Short Line Ry. Co.'s B. No. 70** (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1459; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1686; M. for Com., 2998; in Com., 3003, 3210 (ii) 3372; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 3413, 3611.
- GASS, CHAS. A., POSTMASTER AT MOOSEJAW, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3761, 5241 (ii).
- Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Davin*) 5734 (ii).
- See "Moosejaw."
- GATINEAU RIVER DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 10226.
- GENERAL ELECTIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10308 (iii).
- General Inspection (Flax Seed) Act Amt. B. No. 79** (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1641 (i) 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4671; in Com., 4672: 3<sup>o</sup>, 4672 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- GENERAL OFFICER COMMANDING, SUCCESSOR, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2085, 2563 (i).
- Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 3576 (ii).
- See "Hutton, Gen."
- GENERAL SERVICE MEDALS : in Com. of Sup., 8343.
- CONDITIONS, &C., NATIONAL COLOUR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 299 (i).
- GENERAL STATEMENT, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8374, 8452 (iii).
- VOTE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8930 (iii).
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iii).
- GILBERT DREDGING CO.: in Com. of Sup., 8504, 9185, 9415, 10112 (iii); conc., 10452 (iii).
- Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Foster*) 9468 (iii).
- GIRLS HOME OF WELCOME, WINNIPEG : in Com. of Sup., 9664 (iii).
- GIROUARD, J. E., APPNMT. AS REGISTRAR : M. for O. Ca.\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1012 (i).
- ADVANCES TO : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5407 (ii).
- EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 294 (i).
- Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Foster*) 7647 (iii).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1381, 1724 (i).
- GLASGOW EXHIBITION : in Com. of Sup., 10331 (iii).
- GLASS, JAMES, FISHERY GUARDIAN, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 596 (i).
- GLENGARRY POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup. 9886 (iii).
- GODERICH BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 10245 (iii).
- GOLD CLAIMS IN YUKON GIVEN IN COMPENSATION, &C., COR. &C. WITH GOVT.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2201 (i).
- See "Yukon."
- GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, THEFT, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5406 (ii).
- GOLD RIVER AND CHESTER BASIN, BUOY SERVICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3875 (ii).
- GORDON POINT, P.E.I., WHARF, PETS., *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, P.E.I.*) 9904 (iii).
- GOVT. BANKING BUSINESS, COR. *re* : M. to lay on Table (Mr. *Fielding*) 8082 (iii).
- GOVT. BUSINESS, PRECEDENCE ON WEDNESDAYS : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3072 (i).
- THURSDAYS : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1013.
- See "Business of the House."
- GOVT. CONTRACTS CONTAINING "SWEATING CLAUSE," NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 4557 (ii).
- GOVT. CONTRACTS, PROTECTION TO WORKMEN : prop. Res. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2466 (i).
- Deb. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2471; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2472; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2477; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2479; (Mr. *Cocun*) 2480; (Mr. *Fraser, Guusborough*) 2482; (Mr. *Clarke*) 2490, (amt.) 2494, 2556; (Mr. *Belcourt*) 2494, 2555; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2497; (Mr. *Davin*) 2499 (i) 10497 (iii); (amt.) 2501, 2512, withdn., 2515; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2501, 2514-15; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2509, 2514; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2513, (amt.) 2516, neg. (Y. 40; N. 74) 2545; (Mr. *Puttee*) 2516; (Mr. *Ingram*) 2526, 2547; (Mr. *Rogers*) 2535; (Mr. *McCleary*) 2539; (Mr. *Beattie*) 2541; (Mr. *Richardson*) 2542; (Mr. *Campbell*)—(amt.) 2545; (Mr. *Pater-son*) 2545, 2554; (Mr. *Craig*) 2549; (Mr. *Davin*) 2551; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2554; (Mr. *Henderson*) 2555; (Mr. *Taylor*) 2559 (i) 10496 (iii); (Mr. *Fielding*) 2559 (i).
- ON QUES. OF ORDER (Mr. *McMullen*) : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2554 (i).
- M. to res. adjdn. deh. (Mr. *Mulock*) 10495.
- Remarks (Mr. *Mulock*) 10422 (iii).
- GOVT. EXPROPRIATION OF TELEGRAPH LINES : Ques. (Mr. *Casby*) 1752 (i).
- GOVT. HOUSE, REGINA : in Com. of Sup., 7926 (iii).
- GOVT. OF N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup. 6683 (ii).
- YUKON TERRITORY : in Com. of Sup., 6377 (ii).
- GOVT. LIFE INSURANCE ANNUITIES, LEGISLATION *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 2755 (i).
- GOVT. PRINTING, N.W.T., AMOUNT PAID, &C.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Davin*) 470 (i).

- GOVT. PRINTING, N.W.T., TENDERS FOR 1890-9 :  
M. for copy\* (Mr. *Davin*) 1011 (i).
- GOVT. RYS., STEEL RAILS SUPPLIED, TENDERS, QUANTITIES AND PRICES, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 168 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2422 (i).
- Govt. Telegraph System Establishment  
B. No. 85 (Mr. *Casey*) 1° m., 1713 (i).
- GOVT. TELEGRAPH LINES, CONSTRUCTION TO BELLE ISLE : Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 2462 (i).
- GOVERNOR GENERAL'S CAR, ELECTRIC LIGHTING : in Com. of Sup., 8916 (iii).
- SECRETARY'S OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7506, 8121, 10278 (iii).
- WARRANTS, TOTAL AMOUNT ISSUED : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1897 (i).
- GRAHAM WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10221 (iii).
- GRAIN COMMISSION, DECEASE OF CHAIRMAN, DELAY IN REP. : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 289 (i).
- Inquiry for (Mr. *Clancy*) 7939 (iii).
- M. for copy\* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2202 (i).
- Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8076 (iii).
- GRAIN DELIVERIES AT COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR FOR 1899 : Ans. (Mr. *Paterson*) 1466 (i).
- GRAIN ELEVATOR COMMISSION, EVIDENCE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 437 (i).
- See "Elevators," &c.
- GRAIN ELEVATORS, CONSTRUCTION AT LÉVIS : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 5756 (ii).
- GRAIN EXPORTS TO G. B. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1879 (i).
- Grain Inspection and Weighing in Man. and N. W. T. Supervision B. No. 58 (Mr. *Douglas*) 1°\*, 1207 (i).
- GRAIN SHIPMENTS TO G. B., COR. BETWEEN MR. ROSS AND MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE : M. for copy (Mr. *Davin*) 157 (i).
- Grain Trade in the Inspection District of Man. B. 141 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1°, 4333 ; 2° m., 5757 ; in Com., 5763, 5809 ; M. to ref. back to Com., 6258 ; in Com., 6284 ; 3° m., 6298 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 8936 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
- Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 5727 (ii).
- Grain Trade in Man. and N. W. T. Regulation B. No. 14 (Mr. *Douglas*) 1°\*, 286 (i).
- B. No. 38 (Mr. *Davin*) 1°, 577 (i).
- Grain. See "Foreign," "Seed Grain."
- GRAIN TRANSPORTATION BETWEEN CAN. PORTS BY AMERICAN VESSELS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 431, 739 (ii).
- IN CANADA DURING 1899 : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1110 (i).
- REP OF ROYAL COMMISSION : laid on Table (Mr. *Sutherland*) 3224 (i).
- (M.) to print Rep. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 3255 (i).
- M. for copy of O. C. (Mr. *Davin*) 2998 (i).
- O.C.'s, &c. : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Davin*) 2200.
- GRAIN TRANSPORTATION TO THE SEABOARD : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 442 ; withdn., 3229 (i).
- Deb. (Mr. *Tarte*) 455 ; (Mr. *Britton*) 466, 496 ; (Mr. *Dobell*) 468, 484 ; (Mr. *Reid*) 493 ; (Mr. *Casey*) 497 ; (Mr. *Osler*) 504 ; (Mr. *McMullen*) 506 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 817 ; (Mr. *Poupore*) 841 ; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 850 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1527 ; (Mr. *Bell, P.E.I.*) 1540 ; (Mr. *Blair*) 2423 ; (Mr. *Clarke*) 2435 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2441 ; (Mr. *McCleary*) 2784 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2801 ; (Mr. *Corby*) 2809 ; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2811 ; (Mr. *Clarke*) 2815 ; (Mr. *Charlton*) 3225 ; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3232 ; (Mr. *Gibson*) 3233 ; (Mr. *Ellis*) 3234 ; (Mr. *Powell*) 3235 ; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3241 ; (Mr. *Davin*) 3246 (i).
- GRANBY POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9878 (iii).
- GRAND FALLS, N.B., MAINTENANCE OF ROAD, &c. : 9777 (iii).
- GRAND MANAN LIGHTHOUSE, &c. : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Ganong*) 6788 (ii).
- SS. SERVICE, CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 596 (i), 9061 (iii).
- WHARF, PETS., &c., *re* : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Ganong*) 1012 (i).
- G. T. R. AND VICTORIA BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 9976 (iii).
- CLAIM FOR FREIGHT CHARGES ON I. C. R. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4915 (ii).
- GOVT. LOAN : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 4916 (ii).
- TARIFF ON OIL, ILLEGALITY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 297 (i).
- GRAND VALLEE PIER : in Com. of Sup., 10227 (iii).
- Grand Valley Ry. Co. See "Port Dover."
- GRANITE, INCREASE OF DUTY : Remarks (Mr. *Moore*) 7991 (iii).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., 8046 (iii).
- GREAT EASTERN RY., ALLEGATIONS AGAINST MR. C. N. ARMSTRONG : Letters read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10309 (iii).
- Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 164 (Mr. *McAlister*) 1°\*, 5884 ; 2°\*, 5999 (ii).
- GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res. 10015 (iii).
- GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., LAND GRANT : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2752 (i).
- GREECE'S POINT WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10227 (iii).
- GRENVILLE CANAL, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 8157, 8522, 8880 (iii).
- GRIEVANCES, B.C., REVENUES, &c. : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Prior*) 9486 (iii).
- GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 5888, 6350, 6626 (ii), 7314 (iii).
- STATION : in Com. of Sup., 7835 (iii).
- HALEY, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4065 (ii).
- M. to adjn. Hse. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4066 (ii).
- HALF-BREEDS COMMISSION, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7066, 10412 (iii).
- HALIBURTON AND WHITNEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 9971 (iii).
- HALIFAX COTTON FACTORY SIDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 9435 (iii).

- HALIFAX GARRISON** : in Com. of Sup., 9772, 10358 (iii).  
 — APPLICATIONS FOR COMMISSIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Pettet*) 3041 (i).  
 — CONTRACT FOR SUPPLIES : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3775, 4907, 5020 (ii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 4555 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 937, 1123, 1209 (i).  
 — SUPPLIES FOR IMP. FORCES : Remarks (Mr. *Powell*) 5250 (ii).  
 — See "Garrison," &c.  
 — GOVT. BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 9871 (iii).  
 — HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT OF APPROACHES : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6257 (ii).  
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7771, 7788 (iii).  
 — Nfld. and G. B., MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (iii).  
 — AND PORTO RICO, SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (iii).  
 — WEST INDIES AND SOUTH AMERICA, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9583 (iii).
- HALL, HENRY, DISMISSAL BY GOVT., PAPERS, &c.** : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Tisdale*) 470 (i).  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6788 (ii).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS** : in Com. of Sup., 7848 (iii).  
 — B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 7955, 10252 (iii).  
 — MAN. : in Com. of Sup., 9859, 10252 (iii).  
 — N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 7945, 9900 (iii).  
 — N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 7836, 7940, 9895 (iii).  
 — ONT. : in Com. of Sup., 7950, 10228 (iii).  
 — P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 7837, 7943, 9897 (iii).  
 — QUE. : in Com. of Sup., 7949, 10097, 10195 (iii).  
 — ST. JOHN, FORFEITED DEPOSITS : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10186 (iii).
- HARDWARE SUPPLIES, N.W.M.P.** : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4739, 5244 (ii).
- HARRISS, GEO. A., INVESTIGATION re** : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 9062 (iii).
- HARRISON, JOHN, CLAIMS, &c.** : in Com. of Sup., 10406 (iii).
- HATCHERIES, FISHERY** : in Com. of Sup., 5936 (ii).  
 — FISH, B.C. AND GASPÉ : in Com. of Sup., 10399 (iii).
- HATFIELD, CAPT. S. N., ACCOUNTS RENDERED BY** : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2202 (i).
- HAWKESBURY AND LOUISBURG RY. SUBSIDIES** : Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 9467 (iii).
- HAWKESTONE DOCK, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION** : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3045 (i), 4076 (ii).
- HAY, COR. WITH IMP. GOVT. re PURCHASE OF** : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Hale*) 4078 (ii).  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 6916 (ii), 7513.  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7314 (iii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 4917 (ii).  
 — REMOVAL OF DUTY : Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 9523 (ii).  
 — AND OATS CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 1479.  
 — See "S. A War," &c.
- HEALTH REGULATIONS ON PUBLIC WORKS** : in Com. of Sup., 9197, 9407 (iii).
- HENAULT, ROMUALD, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT MASHKINONGÉ (Mr. *Marcotte*)** 3442 (ii).
- HERBERT, SIR R. G. W., ACTING UNDER-SEC. COLONIAL OFFICE** : Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1117 (i).
- Hereford Railway Co's B. No 21 (Mr. *McIntosh*)** 1<sup>st</sup>, 471 ; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 589 ; in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1511 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 60.)
- HIDE INSPECTOR** : in Com. of Sup., 6040 (ii).
- HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, SALARIES, &c.** : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (iii).
- HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE** : in Com. of Sup., 9461 (iii).  
 — CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 8434.  
 — P.E.I., COR., TELEGRAMS, MEMORANDA, &c. : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Martin*) 168 (i).  
 — SURVEY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1480, 2192 (i), 9059 (iii).
- HISTORICAL DATA** : in Com. of Sup., 6344 (ii).
- HOCHELAGA POST OFFICE** : in Com. of Sup., 9878.
- HOCKLEY AND MONO CENTRE, MAIL CONTRACT** ; Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1749, 2742 (i).
- Holiness Movement (Church) in Canada incorp. B. No. 51 (Mr. *Belcourt*)** 1<sup>st</sup>, 1109 ; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1686 ; in Com., 2667 ; 3<sup>rd</sup> m., 2670 ; 3<sup>rd</sup> 2783 (i). (63-64 Vic., c. 101.)
- HOLT AND LAMBERT, MESSRS., BONUSES, &c.** : conc., 10442 (iii).
- HOMESTEADS ENTRIES, MAN., &c.** : M. for copies\* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 319 (i).  
 — ABUSES IN ADMINISTRATION, &c. : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 9525 (iii).  
 — MAN. AND N.W.T., NUMBER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser, Lambton*) 2363 (i).  
 — NUMBERS GRANTED IN RY. BELT, B.C. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Morrison*) 2760 (i).  
 — See "Manitoba," &c.
- HONORARY COLONELS, RECENT APPOINTMENTS** : Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 8282 (iii).  
 — See "Militia B. 155."
- HOPEWELL CAPE AND HOPEWELL MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, TENDERS, &c.** : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1012 (i).
- HORSES AND HAY PURCHASED FOR IMP. GOVT.** : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 6350 (ii).
- HORSES.** See "Purchase."
- HOTEL RATES AT ROBERVAL** : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3767 (ii).
- HOUSE OF COMMONS** :  
 — BERTRAM, MR. LATE M.P., DECEASE OF : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2346 (i).  
 — BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT : Mess. by Black Rod (Mr. *Speaker*) 3199 (i).  
 — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, MORNING SESSIONS : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8073 (iii).  
 — M. to take in Mondays (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5027 (ii).  
 — UNOPPOSED MOTIONS, PROCEDURE, &c. : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1898 (i).  
 — Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1934, 1945 (i).  
 — M. to adjn. (Mr. *Foster*) 1899, 2073 (i).  
 — DEBATE IN HOUSE OF COMMONS, CHARACTER, &c. : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 10314 (iii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

- DEBATES AND OFFICIAL PAPERS, FRENCH TRANSLATION OF : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 814 (i).
- OFFICIAL TRANSLATION : Remarks (Mr. *Marcotte*) 6994 (iii).
- OFFICIAL : in Com. of Sup., 5923 (ii), 8149 (iii).
- ELECTION CERTIFICATES RECEIVED (Mr. *Speaker*) 320 (i).
- FRAUDS, COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6352 (ii).
- JUDICIAL INQUIRY *re* ELECTION FRAUDS : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6059, 6693 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 9681, 9905, 10030.
- O. C. read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6569 (ii).
- OPINION OF MIN. OF JUS. : Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7082 (ii).
- Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6916 (ii).
- ELEVATOR ACCOMMODATION H. OF C. : Remarks (Mr. *Moore*) 1554 (i).
- FRANKING BUSINESS ADVERTISEMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10268 (iii).
- FRANKING PRIVILEGES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 6776 (ii).
- OF PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE : Ques. Mr. *Clancy* 3264 (i).
- See "Montreal Star."
- FRECHETTE, L. A., TECHNICAL TRANSLATION : in Com. of Sup., 6029 (ii).
- GENERAL ELECTIONS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10308 (iii).
- HALEY, MR., LATE, M.P., DECEASE OF : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4065 (ii).
- M. to adjn. Hse. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4066 (ii).
- HOUSE OF COMMONS : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (iii).
- LEGISLATION : in Com. of Sup., 8135, 9604 (iii).
- LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 8150 (iii).
- EFFICIENCY, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 10505 (iii).
- MEMBERS, NEW, CERTIFICATES OF RET. : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2, 7 (i).
- ACCEPTING OFFICE, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2189 (i).
- APPOINTED TO OFFICES FROM 1873 TO 1878 : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5394 (ii).
- APPNTS. TO POSITIONS FROM 1879 TO 1896 : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 4901 (ii).
- MILEAGE, &c. : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1977 (i).
- RIGHT TO VOTE ON BILLS : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 9680, 9688 (iii).
- SESSIONAL INDEMNITY, ADDITIONAL : par. in Hamilton "Spectator" (Mr. *Casey*) 9667 (iii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 10290 (iii).
- MINISTERS ABSENT FROM SITTINGS OF THE HSE. : in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Foster*) 6535, 6553 (ii).
- MOTIONS, UNOPPOSED : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1009 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 6062 (ii).
- See "Business of the House."
- OBSTRUCTION OF MAIN ENTRANCE : Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4246 (ii).
- PARLIAMENT, CALLING OF ON A FIXED DATE : prop. Res. (Mr. *Casey*) 3469 (ii).
- POST OFFICE STAFF : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4444 (ii).
- PRINTING AND BINDING, H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 5925 (ii).
- PRIVATE BILLS, EXTENSION OF TIME : M. (Mr. *Flint*) 4435 (ii).
- M. (Mr. *Gibson*) 5884 (ii).
- M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 812 (i).
- M. to reduce time for posting (Mr. *Landerkin*) 6349 (ii).
- PROCEDURE IN ASKING QUESTIONS : M. to adjn. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2369 (i).
- Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2370, 2372, 2377-78 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

- PROROGATION, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC. : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 10504, 10508 (iii).
- QUESTIONS ANSWERED BY MINISTERS : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2184-5, 2188 (i).
- FORM OF ASKING : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1756 (i).
- REGISTRATION OF VOTERS, GOVT. POWERS, *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 2756 (i).
- RULES OF HOUSE, INFRINGEMENT OF : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 4451 (ii).
- OBSERVANCE OF : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 4733 (ii).
- SERGEANT-AT-ARMS, SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).
- SESSIONAL CLERKS : in Com. of Sup., 5923 (ii), 8148 (iii).
- AND MESSENGERS, PAYMENT OF : on M. for Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3636.
- PAYMENT OF SALARIES : Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 5897, 6916 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 6061 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 6254, 6355, 6446.
- SESSIONAL INDEMNITY TO SENATORS AND MEMBERS : in Com. of Sup., 8135 (iii).
- MESSENGERS : in Com. of Sup., 5923 (ii).
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE : Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
- SPEECHES OF MEMBERS, LIMITATION, &c. : M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2763 (i).
- STATIONERY, H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 5924 (ii).
- STATUTORY INCREASES : in Com. of Sup., 10329.
- TYRWHITT, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 8187 (iii).
- VACANCIES : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i), 5734 (ii), 8074 (iii).
- VANCOUVER ELECTORAL DIVISION, RESIGNATION OF MEMBER : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 5734 (ii).
- VOTERS' LISTS, B.C., PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2402 (i).
- VANCOUVER AND VICTORIA, DISTRIBUTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 432 (i).
- VOTERS' LISTS, FREE ISSUE OF COPIES, O. C.'S : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Pope*) 319 (i).
- MAN., PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *La-Rivière*) 3046 (i).
- MONTMORENCY : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7122.
- N.B., PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 438 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1120 (i).
- RECEIVED BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 779 (i).
- PRINTING : Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 2673, 2740 (i), 4249 (ii), 7208 (iii).
- POINTE AUX ESQUIMAUX : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 8525 (iii).
- P.Q., NUMBER RECEIVED BY CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2754, 3038 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 9604 ; conc., 19452 (iii).
- HUGHES, LT.-COL., COMMISSION IN STRATHCONA'S HORSE : Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2750 (i).
- AND G.O.C., COR., &c. : M. for copies (Mr. *Domville*) 598 (i).
- LETTER IN "GLOBE" : Remarks (Mr. *Britton*) 7207 (iii).
- RETURN : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 10450 (iii).
- See "Hutton, Major-Gen.," &c.
- HUGHES, MR. R. A., SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 6033 (ii).
- HULL LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 10226 (iii).
- P.O. REBUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4344 (ii).

- HUTTON, MAJ.-GEN., APPOINTMENT OF SUCCESSOR : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 4258 (ii).  
 — COR. *re* REMOVAL, O.C.'s, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Prior) 2761 (i).  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2993 (i).  
 — M. to adjn. (Mr. Prior) 323, 347 (i).  
 — AND LT.-COL. HUGHES, REP. IN NEWSPAPERS : Ques. (Mr. Domville) 149 (i).  
 — O.C. *re* DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 594 (i).  
 — SPEECH AT FAREWELL DINNER, OTTAWA : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 595 (i).  
 HYDROGRAPHICAL SURVEY, B.C., GOVTL. ACTION *re* : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2832 (i).  
 HYDRAULIC LEASES IN YUKON TO ROBERT ANDERSON : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 6052 (ii).  
 ILLICIT STILLS, SEIZURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 7123-24, 7655 (iii).  
 Immigration Restriction B. No. 27 (Mr. McInnes) 1<sup>st</sup>, 471 (i).  
 — See "Chinese Immigration."  
 IMMIGRATION :  
 ANTI-CHINESE LEGISLATION, COR. BETWEEN DOM. GOVT. AND B. C. GOVT. : M. for copy\* (Mr. Prior) 2203 (i).  
 CHINESE IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION ACT AMT. B. : M. for Com. on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7881, 8162 (iii).  
 CHINESE IMMIGRATION BILL : Remarks (Mr. Puttee) 7316 (iii).  
 — GOVT. ACTION *re* LEGISLATION : Remarks (Mr. Morrison) 2617 (ii).  
 — on M. for Com. of Sup., 7052 (iii).  
 — GOVT. POLICY *re* POLL TAX : Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 589 (i).  
 DEVLIN, MR. C. A., DATE OF APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 6776 (ii).  
 DOUKHOBORS AND GALICIANS, NUMBER SETTLED, COST PER HEAD, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 151, 286 (i).  
 DOUKHOBORS, EMIGRATION TO U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4734 (ii).  
 EMIGRANTS FROM EUROPE, (1897-99) NUMBER, &c.: (Mr. Morin) 2836, 3261 (i).  
 EMIGRATION AGENT, MR. C. A. DEVLIN, DATE OF APPOINTMENT : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 6776 (ii).  
 EMIGRATION TO U. S., PAR IN NEWSPAPER : Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 3330 (ii).  
 — EXPENDITURE, AMOUNTS, &c. PAID : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2306 (i).  
 FREE PASSES TO IMMIGRANTS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1117 (i).  
 FRENCH REPATRIATION, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 10353 (iii).  
 GIRLS HOME OF WELCOME, WINNIPEG : in Com. of Sup., 9664 (iii).  
 IMMIGRATION FROM ROUMANIA, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10349 (iii).  
 — PAR IN "SCOTSMAN": Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 10187 (iii).  
 — TO N. W. TERS., INACCURACIES IN DEPTL. REP. : Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 10186 (iii).  
 IMMIGRATION : in Com. of Sup., 7199 (iii).  
 — AGENTS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7199, 9614 ; conc., 10451 (iii).  
 — INSPECTION IN U. S. : in Com. of Sup., 10350 (iii).  
 JAPANESE IMMIGRATION : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4067 (ii).  
 — RESTRICTION OF &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 4558 (ii).
- IMMIGRATION—*Con.*  
 MOLOCANI AND STUNDISTS, IMMIGRATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 5244 (ii).  
 PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF *re* MENNONITE LOYALTY : (Mr. Richardson) 2156 (i).  
 ROUMANIAN JEWS, PAR. IN "SCOTSMAN" : Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 10187 (iii).  
 ST. JOHN IMMIGRANT BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 9875 (iii).  
 WOMEN'S PROTECTIVE SOCIETY : in Com. of Sup., 9664 (iii).  
 IMPERIAL AND CANADIAN MILITIA PAY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 2159 (i).  
 — PENSION ALLOWANCE : Ques. (Mr. Domville) 2162 (i).  
 IMPERIAL DEFENCES AND PREFERENTIAL TRADE : Remarks (Mr. McNeill) 8932 (iii).  
 — PAR IN "GLOBE" (Mr. McNeill) 8836 (iii).  
 — BROCHURE, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 9797 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Casgrain) 7884 (iii).  
 IMPORTS FROM U. S., DUTIABLE GOODS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 7315 (iii).  
 INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R. : in Com. of Sup., 8785 (iii).  
 — FACILITIES, I. C. R., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10359 (iii).  
 — See "I. C. R."  
 INCOMPLETE RETURN : (Mr. Foster) 7207 (iii).  
 — See "Returns," &c.  
 INDEMNITIES TO FAMILIES OF CAN. SOLDIERS : Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 10317 (iii).  
 — See "S. A. War."  
 INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. *re* BRITISH INSTITUTIONS : amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Com. of Sup., 1793 ; Neg. (Y. 10, N. 119) 1876 (i).  
 INDIA FAMINE, CAN. CONTRIBUTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Gilmour) 3876 (ii).  
 — GOVT. AID TO FAMINE FUND : Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 3876 (ii).  
 INDIANS :  
 ABENAKIS INDIANS OF ST. FRANCIS : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 7321 (iii).  
 CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS, TRIBAL GOVT., PETS., &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. Quinn) 1011 (i).  
 ELKHORN GOVT. BUILDINGS, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 4438 (ii).  
 — SCHOOLS, SALE OF PRINTING PLANT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 2758 (i).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 7296 (iii).  
 FRANKLIN, MAN., INDIAN RESERVE, AND RES. OF MUNICIPALITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 5023 (ii).  
 INDIAN AFFAIRS CONTINGENCIES : conc., 10438.  
 — AGENCIES, INSPECTOR, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iii).  
 — B. C., APPOINTMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2402 (i).  
 — B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 7302 (iii).  
 — DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. Sutherland) 2759 (i).  
 — DEPTL. VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 7281, 8123, 10279 (iii).  
 — RELIEF OF DISTRESSED : in Com. of Sup., 8123 (iii).  
 INDIAN CORN, QUANTITY IMPORTED AND EXPORTED : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2405 (i).  
 INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 8068 (iii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

- INDIAN LAND MANAGEMENT FUND : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iii).
- INDIAN LANDS, TIMBER LICENSES, DUES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 6777 (ii).
- INDIANS, MAN., AND N. W. T. ANNUITIES AND COMMUTATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 7295 (iii).
- TREATY EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 8071.
- N. B. : in Com. of Sup., 8070 (iii).
- MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 7295 (iii).
- N. S., MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 7294, 8070 (iii).
- ONT. AND QUE. : in Com. of Sup., 7281.
- MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 8068 (iii).
- P. E. I., MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 8070 (iii).
- QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 8069 (iii).
- SEED GRAIN DISTRIBUTION : in Com. of Sup., 8069 (iii).
- RESERVES, GOVT. POLICY *re* DEVELOPMENT OF MINES : Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 597 (i).
- SCHOOLS : in Com. of Sup., 7282, 7296 (iii).
- SUPPLIES IN MAN. AND N. W. T. : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 4742 (ii).
- TREATY, SASKATCHEWAN INDIANS, TOTAL COST : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2195 (i).
- TRIENNIAL CLOTHING : in Com., 7296 (iii).
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS FOR INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 7282, 7296 (iii).
- KEITH, HILTON, INDIAN AGENT AT CARLTON : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1981 (i).
- MILLBROOK INDIAN RESERVE : in Com. of Sup., 7295 (iii).
- MOOSE MOUNTAIN INDIAN RESERVE, SALE TO U. S. SYNDICATE : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2194 (i).
- OKA INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 7284 (iii).
- PRINTING PLANT AT ELKHORN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL : in Com. of Sup., 7296 (iii).
- RAMA INDIAN RESERVE, MEDICAL SUPT. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3043 (i).
- RAND'S MICMAC DICTIONARY : in Com. of Sup., 10413 (iii).
- ROSS, MR. J. H., INDIAN COMMISSIONER, REMUNERATION, EXPENSES, &C. BY DOM. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 148, 297 (i).
- ST. REGIS INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 7282 (iii).
- LITIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 8068 (iii).
- LOCK-UP : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iii).
- QUES. OF PRIVILEGE : par. in Ottawa "Citizen" (Mr. Bergeron) 7504 (iii).
- SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE, COMPLAINTS *re* GRAVEYARD : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 6625 (ii).
- COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND B. C. : M. for copy\* (Mr. Prior) 2201 (i).
- REMOVAL OF INDIANS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1460 (i), 4242 (ii).
- SQUAMISH SCHOOL, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 8123.
- SUPPLIES IN MAN. AND N. W. T. : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 4742 (ii).
- TIMBER LICENSES, DUES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 6777 (ii).
- TREATY, SASKATCHEWAN INDIANS, TOTAL COST : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2195 (i).
- TRIENNIAL CLOTHING : in Com. of Sup., 7296 (iii).
- WORKING AND DESTITUTE INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 8124 (iii).
- INGONISH BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 7940 (iii).
- INLAND REVENUE :**
- ALLOWANCE TO EXCISE COLLECTORS : in Com. of Sup., 6029 (ii).
- APPLE BARRELS, &C., STANDARD SIZE, &C., REPEAL OF ACT : Ques. (Mr. Mills) 2459 (i).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*

- APPLES, INSPECTION OF, LEGISLATION BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Pettet) 1460 (i).
- BASIC SLAG, GOVT. ANALYSES : Ques. (Mr. Domville) 3168 (i), 4739, 4908, 5891, 6618, 6777 (ii), 8429 (iii).
- BRACE, MR. R. K., GAS INSPECTOR OF P.E.I., DISMISSAL : M. for cor.\* (Mr. Martin) 2761 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1480 (i), 4917 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 6035 (ii).
- CHEMICAL WORKS AND CHIEF ANALYST OF INLAND REV. DEPT. : M. for cor.\* (Mr. Domville) 4078 (ii).
- COLLECTION OF REVENUES : in Com. of Sup., 8054 (iii).
- COMMISSIONS ON STAMPS FOR CAN. TOBACCO : in Com. of Sup., 6028, 6029 (ii).
- CULLING TIMBER : in Com. of Sup., 6031 (ii).
- ELEVATOR COMMISSION EXPENSES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 7832 (iii).
- EXCISE : in Com. of Sup., 6026 (ii).
- GAS INSPECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1480 (i), 4917 (ii).
- GRAIN DELIVERIES AT COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR FOR 1899 : Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 1466 (i).
- GRAIN ELEVATORS, CONSTRUCTION AT LÉVIS : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 5756 (ii).
- GRAIN ELEVATOR ROYAL COMMISSION, EVIDENCE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 437 (i).
- DECEASE OF CHAIRMAN, DELAY IN REP. : Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 289 (i).
- O. C.'s &C. : M. for copies\* (Mr. Davin) 2200, 2998 (i).
- REPORT : M. for copy\* (Mr. LaRivière) 2202 (i).
- GRAIN INSPECTION BILL : Remarks (Mr. Montague) 5727 (ii).
- HIDE INSPECTOR : in Com. of Sup., 6040 (ii).
- ILLICIT STILLS, SEIZURES, &C. IN ST. ROCHS : Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 7123-4, 7655 (iii).
- INLAND REVENUE, CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 6022 (ii).
- DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) 938 (i).
- DEPTL. SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 6021.
- INSPECTION OF STAPLES : in Com. of Sup., 6040 (ii), 7832 (iii).
- INSPECTORS OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES : in Com. of Sup., 6032 (ii).
- METHYLATED SPIRITS : in Com. of Sup., 6030 (ii).
- METRICAL SYSTEM : in Com. of Sup., 6036 (ii).
- PREVENTIVE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 6026 (ii).
- TOBACCO DUTY, AMOUNT COLLECTED, 1899 : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 3177, 3261 (ii).
- Notice of Motion (Mr. Gillies) 1009 (i).
- prop. Res. (Mr. Gillies) 1499 (i); 4754, M. to adjn. deb., 4760 (ii).
- TOBACCO MANUFACTURED IN CAN., NUMBER OF POUNDS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. Fortin) 2178 (i).
- TOBACCO STAMPS, IMPORTED : in Com. of Sup., 6028, 6029 (ii).
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT : Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4675 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 6032 (ii).
- INSPECTOR'S FEES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1553 (i).
- WHISKEY, &C., QUANTITY TAKEN OUT OF BOND, 1888-99 : Ques. (Mr. Davis), 2458 (i).
- INSANE PATIENTS IN N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 6683.
- Inscribed Stock.** See "Canadian."
- Inspection of Apples and Pears.** See "Fruit Inspection."
- INSPECTION (APPLES AND PEARS) BILL :** Remarks (Mr. Guillet) 10505 (iii).
- Inspection.** See "Grain."

- INSPECTORS OF DOM. LANDS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).
- INSPECTION OF STAPLES : in Com. of Sup., 6040 (i), 7832 (iii).
- INSPECTORS OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES : in Com. of Sup., 6032 (ii).
- INSTRUCTIONS TO W. H. LYNCH : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 6351 (ii).
- INSURANCE, &c., COR. *re* LIST OF CASUALTIES : Remarks (Mr. Borden, King's) 4560 (ii).  
 — Explanation (Sir Charles Tupper) 1926 (i).  
 — PAR IN OTTAWA "FREE PRESS" (Sir Charles Tupper) 866 (i).  
 — Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 4248 (ii).  
 — TELS. FROM COMPANY : Read (Sir Charles Tupper) 1122 (i).
- INSURANCE : in Com. of Sup., 6508 (ii).
- INTERCOLONIAL RY.:
- ACCOMMODATION AT SYDNEY, DISSATISFACTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 296 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3179 (i).
- ADDITIONAL OFFICIALS SINCE 1896 : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3443 (ii).  
 — SIDINGS, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 10388.  
 — TRAIN SERVICE ON C. B. DIVISION : Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 3073 (i).
- AIR BRAKES : in Com. of Sup., 9456 (iii).
- BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 9455 (iii).
- C. P. R., AMOUNTS OF FREIGHT CHARGES INTERCHANGED : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Powell) 4754 (ii).  
 — COLLECTIONS MADE AND ACCOUNTED FOR : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 4754 (ii).
- C.P.R. AND G.T.R. SHARES OF EARNINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 3442, 3771 (ii).
- CAPE BRETON SIDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 8793, 8920 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 9790 (iii).
- CHARGES AGAINST BY C.P.R. AND G.T.R.: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 3442, 3771 (ii).
- CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* SNOW FENCES IN BELLECHASSE COUNTY : Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 1735 (i).
- CANSO FERRY SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 10390.
- COMMUNICATIONS FROM SYDNEY BOARD OF TRADE : Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 4665 (ii).
- COMPLAINTS *re* TRAIN SERVICE ON C. B. DIVISION : Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3178 (i).
- CUMBERLAND COUNTY, SUBWAY, CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 7880 (iii).
- DEFECTIVE WHEELS UNDER WAGNER CARS : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3445 (ii).
- DEFICITS AND SURPLUSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Calvert) 9521 (iii).
- DESTRUCTION OF MAIL BAGS AT STATION : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 4741 (ii).
- DISMISSAL OF P. S. ARCHIBALD : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 1555 (i), 4810 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1997 (i).
- DRAW BARS : in Com. of Sup., 9456 (iii).
- EARNINGS, &c. : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Gillies) 1555 (i).
- ENGINE HOUSES, ADDITIONAL, : in Com. of Sup., 9432 (iii).
- ETCHEMIN BRIDGE, : in Com. of Sup., 10389.
- EXTENSION TO MONTREAL, CLAIMS MADE ON GOVT. BY G.T.R. *re* TERMINAL IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2829 (i).
- FACILITIES, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 9459 (iii).
- FREE PASSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9429 (iii).
- INTERCOLONIAL RY.—*Con.*
- FREIGHT DELAYS : M. to adjn. (Mr. McDougall) 3267 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Powell) 3265 (i).
- FREIGHT RATES, CHANGE IN TARIFF, &c.: Remarks (Mr. McDougall) 7603 (iii).  
 — DISCRIMINATION AGAINST HALIFAX : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 8129 (iii).
- FREIGHT SERVICE AT QUE.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2191 (i).
- G.T.R. CLAIM FOR FREIGHT CHARGES : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4915 (ii).
- GENERAL STATEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 8374, 8452 (iii).
- GENERAL VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 8930 (iii).
- HALIFAX COTTON FACTORY SIDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 9435 (iii).
- INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 8785 (iii).
- INCREASED RATES : in Com. of Sup., 8523 (iii).
- JONES, RALPH, PAYMENT TO : in Com. of Sup., 8917 (iii).
- LABELLE, MR. L. V., OF ST. JACQUES L'ACHIGAN, EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1733.
- LE BLONDE, CLAIM FOR KILLING HORSE : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 2182 (i).
- LÉVIS ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 10388.  
 — STATION, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2192 (i).
- LOCOMOTIVES, &c.: conc., 10439 (iii).
- LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, CONSTRUCTION OF WAREHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2403 (i).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 8572 (iii).
- MAIL SERVICE BELOW RIVIÈRE DU LOUP : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1114 (i).
- MILEAGE OF MAIN LINES AND BRANCHES : Ques. (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) 2172 (i).
- MORIN, MR. GEO., APPOINT. AS STATION MASTER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dechene) 5890 (ii).
- NEWSPAPERS, SALE OF, CONTRACTS, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5890 (iii).
- OUELLET, MR., MAIL CLERK AT LÉVIS, DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 4070, 5245 (ii).
- PAR. IN CAPE BRETON "ADVOCATE" *re* INFERIOR RAILS : Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 5123 (ii).
- PASSES GRANTED TO JUDGES, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Angers) 2830 (i).  
 — TO CLERGYMEN : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4913.  
 — See "Free Passes."
- PICHETTE, MR., PRIVILEGES AT LÉVIS STATION : Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 4069 (ii).
- RECEIPTS AT SYDNEY : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 9797.
- RIVIÈRE DU LOUP STATION, ACCOMMODATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1006 (i).  
 — WORKS, COMPLETION : Ques. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 4076 (ii).  
 — : M. to adjn. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5516 (ii).
- ROCKY LAKE BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 9431 (iii).
- ROLLING STOCK : in Com. of Sup., 9458, 10390.  
 — SALE OF : Ques. (Mr. Haggart) 4905 (ii).  
 — M. to adjn. (Mr. Montague) 4906 (ii).
- RYAN, JOSEPH, FOREMAN AT LÉVIS : Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 4069 (ii).
- ST. CHARLES BRANCH, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1739 (i).
- ST. JOHN'S WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 8372 (iii).
- SAND CASTINGS IN N. S., NAMES OF TENDERERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 9062 (iii).
- SAVARD, ED., PAYMASTER, CHICOUTIMI : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3767 (ii).
- SCRAP IRON, QUANTITY SOLD, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 2761 (i).
- SCHREIBER, MR., DEP. MIN. OF RYS. AND CANALS, COMPLAINT AGAINST : (Mr. Gauvreau) 10423.  
 — USE OF PRIVATE CAR FOR FAMILY AND FRIENDS : Ques. (Mr. Pettet) 2839 (i).
- SHINGLE MANUFACTURERS' MEMORIAL, *re* SHIPMENTS : Remarks (Mr. McAllister) 10035 (iii).

INTERCOLONIAL RY.—*Con.*

- SIDINGS IN CAPE BRETON : Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 9790 (iii).  
 — in Com of Sup., 8793, 8920 (iii).  
 SLEEPERS SUPPLIED EXTENSION FROM ST. ROSALIE AND CHAUDIÈRE : Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 5246 (ii).  
 STEAM DERRICKS, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 10389 (iii).  
 STELLARTON RY. SIDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 9442.  
 STEEL RAILS, CONTRACTS FOR SUPPLIES : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2996 (i).  
 STEEL RAILS, FASTENINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10390 (iii).  
 SUNDAY WORK : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 7969 (iii).  
 SYDNEY RY. ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 9440 (iii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 296 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3179 (i).  
 SYDNEY AND N. SYDNEY, TRAFFIC AND TICKETS ISSUED : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 150 (i), 9797 (iii).  
 SYDNEY BOARD OF TRADE, PETS., &c. *re* TRAIN SERVICE : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Gillies*) 1012 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 4665 (ii).  
 — See "Accommodation."  
 TENDERS FOR FENCING : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4914.  
 TIME TABLE, NEW : Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 7514 (iii).  
 TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS, COR. *re* : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Foster*) 167 (i).  
 TRAFFIC BETWEEN SYDNEY AND N. SYDNEY, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Gillies*) 319 (i).  
 TRAIN ACCOMMODATION BETWEEN MONTREAL AND LOWER PORTS : Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 7421 (iii).  
 TRAIN SERVICE ON C. B. DIVISION : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7972, 8077 (iii).  
 — M. to adjn. (Mr. *Gillies*) 7975 (iii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3178 (i).  
 TRANSPORTATION OF TROOPS, TOTAL EARNINGS : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) 9521 (iii).  
 — TO SOUTH AFRICA, AMOUNT CHARGED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 9520 (iii).  
 WATER TANKS : in Com of Sup., 8786 (iii).  
 WESTVILLE STATION : in Com. of Sup., 9440 (iii).  
 WIRE FENCING, CONTRACTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Pettet*) 3041 (i).  
 WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 9503 (iii).  
 Interest Act Amt. B. No. 161 (Mr. *Fielding*)  
 1° m., 5514 ; 2°, 5756 ; in Com., 5757 ; 3°, 5757 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 7423 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 29.)

## INTERIOR :

- ALASKA AND B. C. SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 7066 (ii).  
 ARTESIAN BORINGS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 10405 (iii).  
 ARTESIAN WELLS, PRINCE ALBERT : in Com. of Sup., 9892 (iii).  
 BANFF BRIDGE, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7831 (iii).  
 — ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 7074 (iii).  
 BOUNDARY SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 7066 (iii).  
 BURROWS, MR. T. A., DATE OF PERMIT *re* TIMBER LICENSE : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 6780 (ii).  
 CALGARY INTERWESTERN EXHIBITION : in Com. of Sup., 10411 (iii).  
 CHAPPELLE, EDGAR, AND J. G. TURBIFF : M. to adjn. (Mr. *Davin*) 2605 (i).  
 — EMPLOYT. BY INT. DEPT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 778 (i).  
 CLERICAL ASSISTANCE : in Com. of Sup., 6508, 6682 (ii).  
 DAUPHIN LAKE, COR. BETWEEN GEO. HOOD AND GOVT.: M. for Copy\* (Mr. *Roche*) 3469 (ii).  
 DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7729, 7807, 7818, 7820, 10281 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

- DISTRESSED SETTLERS IN SASKATCHEWAN : in Com. of Sup., 7490, 10281 (iii).  
 — LIARD AND DEASE RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 7075 (iii).  
 DOM. LANDS, MAN. AND N.W.T., REGULATIONS *re* TIMBER LIMITS : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 6780 (ii).  
 — SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7058, 7827, 10407 (iii).  
 EDWARDS & CO., TIMBER LICENSES : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 7121 (iii).  
 FRASER, A. J., REMOVAL FROM REGINA LAND OFFICE : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 740 (i).  
 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iii).  
 GRAIN TRANSPORTATION, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION : Laid on Table (Mr. *Sutherland*) 3224.  
 — M. to print Rep. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 3255.  
 HALF-BREEDS COMMISSION, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7066, 10412 (iii).  
 HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, MAN. AND N.W.T., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*, *Lambton*) 2363 (i).  
 — NUMBERS GRANTED IN RY. BELT, B.C. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Morrison*) 2760 (i).  
 INSANE PATIENTS, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6683 (ii).  
 INSPECTORS OF DOM. LANDS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).  
 INTERIOR DEPT., EMPLOYEES IN MAN. AND ASSA. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Roche*) 2200 (i).  
 — CLERICAL ASSISTANCE : in Com. of Sup., 6508, 6682 (ii).  
 — REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*) 4333 (ii).  
 — Inquiry for (Mr. *Wilson*) 3986 (ii).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 6508 (ii), 7729, 7807, 7818, 7820, 10281 (iii).  
 — RELIGION OF CLERKS : Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 3467 (ii).  
 KEEWATIN GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 7074 (iii).  
 LAND PATENTS AND MINERAL RIGHTS : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser*, *Lambton*) 2171 (i).  
 LAIRD AND DEASE RIVERS, RELIEF TO SETTLERS : in Com. of Sup., 7075 (iii).  
 LOUCKS, HENRY LOGAN AND OTHERS, EMPLOYT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 291 (i).  
 LUNATICS FROM N.W.T. IN MAN. ASYLUMS, MAINTENANCE : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 3445 (i).  
 MAN. AND N.W.T., LAND GRANTS TO RY. COS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 590 (i).  
 — O.C. *re* TIMBER PERMITS : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4743 (ii).  
 MAN. GOVT., DEMANDS FOR SCHOOL LANDS : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3046 (i).  
 MAN. HOMESTEADS, ENTRIES, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 319 (i).  
 — HOMESTEAD ENTRIES OF ODD-NUMBERED SECTIONS : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1012.  
 — See "Homestead."  
 — TIMBER PERMITS ON DOM. LANDS, O.C.'s &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Davin*) 1011 (i).  
 MOOSEJAW TOWNSITE, EXEMPTION OF LOTS, MEMORIALS, &c. *re* : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Davin*) 2201 (i).  
 N. W. TER., GOVT. PRINTING, TENDERS FOR 1890-99 : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Davin*) 1011 (i).  
 — LAND SUBSIDIES TO RYS., NAMES, ACCOUNTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1117 (i).  
 — SCHOOL LANDS, SALE OF, BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Davin*) 1479 (i).  
 ORDINANCE LANDS, ESSEX COUNTY, SALE OF TIMBER : M. for O.C.'s\* (Mr. *Cowan*) 3050 (i).  
 ORDINANCE LANDS : in Com., 9778 (iii).  
 REBELLION (1885) SCRIP FOR SCOUTS : Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 3467 (ii).  
 REGINA, TRANSFER OF TOWN SITE TO C. P. R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2759 (i).  
 ROTHWELL AND RYLEY, MESSRS., STATUTORY INCREASES : in Com. of Sup., 6508, 6542 (ii), 7729, 7807, 7818 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

ROTHWELL'S REP. *re* SETTLERS' CLAIMS, TRANSMISSION TO B. C. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 298 (i).

SASKATCHEWAN SETTLERS, RELIEF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7490, 10281 (iii).

SIRIP TO HALF-BREEDS, GRANT, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 305 (i).

— FOR HALF-BREED CHILDREN: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 640, 646 (i).

— TO HALF-BREED SCOUTS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 4744 (ii).

SCHOOLS IN N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 6684, 6689 (ii).

— IN UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 6689 (ii), 10411 (iii).

SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS, GOVTL. ACTION *re*: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1757, 1775 (i).

— IN MAN. AND N. W. T., COR. BETWEEN MIN. OF INT., AND HOMESTEADERS: M. for copy (Mr. *Davin*) 158, 2993 (i).

— LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Douglas*) 3987 (ii).

— TO SETTLERS IN N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 7828, 8121 (iii).

SETTLERS IN MAN. AND N. W. T., GRANTS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Douglas*) 2760 (i).

SIFTON, HON. MR. AND MR. TURRIFF, DATES OF TRAVELLING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2465 (i).

— See "Chappelle," "Turriff, Mr.," &c.

SILVER LEAD ORE BOUNTY REGULATIONS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1013 (i).

STEEL FILE CASES: in Com. of Sup., 9895 (iii).

SURVEYS AND RESERVE COMMISSION, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 7302 (ii).

SURVEYS, DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 7062.

TIMBER LANDS, MAN., PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10407 (iii).

TIMBER LICENSES, MANITOBA: Admt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 7221 (iii).

— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 7262; ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7262 (ii).

— LICENSES, SUMS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 7881 (iii).

— LIMITS, MOORE & MACDOWALL'S, OPERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1898 (i).

— PERMITS ISSUED BY MARTIN JEROME, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 319 (i).

TURRIFF, J. G., AND CHAPPELL, E. A., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2193 (i).

— See "Chappelle," "Sifton, Hon. Mr."

UNORGANIZED DISTRICT SCHOOL GRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 6689 (ii).

VINCENT, MR., SURVEYOR, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3043 (i).

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION: Inquiry for Rep. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2147 (i).

— TOTAL EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2175 (i).

INTERVENTION OF CAN. GOVT. *re* SETTLEMENT OF S. A. WAR: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 6625 (ii).

INVESTIGATION BY MR. OGILVIE, ACTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 153 (i).

IRISH MEMBERS, ATTACK ON, PAR. IN TORONTO "DAILY STAR": Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Davin*) 588 (i).

IRIS (P.E.I.), PETS. *re* TRI-WEEKLY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1751 (i).

IEONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9960 (iii).

ISLE MADAM, SUBSIDY BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 593 (i).

ISLE VERTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10208 (iii).

"JAMES BECKWITH," SCHOONER, PAYMENT OF FISHING BOUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 6058, 6353 (ii).

— See "Fisheries."

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4067 (ii).

— RESTRICTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4558 (ii).

JEROME, MR. MARTIN, M.P.P., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2758 (i).

"JOHN C. BARR": Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4722, 4809, 6049 (ii).

— Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5227 (ii).

— M. to print papers (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5019.

— M. to print papers (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4899 (ii).

— REPS. *re*: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6614 (ii).

— REGISTRATION, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 319 (i).

— REPS. *re* REGISTER, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3761 (ii).

— UNDERVALUATION, &c.: amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6633, neg. (Y. 22; N. 43) 6681 (ii).

— See "Yukon."

JOINT HIGH COMMISSION, NEGOTIATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1741 (i).

JONES, MR. E. H., LATE POSTMASTER, KAMLOOPS, B.C., DISMISSAL: M. for cor. (Mr. *Prior*) 2762 (i).

— M. for cor.\* (Mr. *Prior*) 3050 (i).

— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Prior*) 4068 (ii).

JONES, RALPH, PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 8917; conc., 10447 (iii).

JONES, L. K., STATUTORY INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., 10285 (iii).

JUAN DE FUCA, FISHING PRIVILEGES IN STRAITS: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 5756 (ii).

JUDGES, B.C., SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6438.

— IN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC SINCE 1880, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4437 (ii).

— OF COURT OF APPEAL, &c., P.Q., NAMES: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3175, 3260 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. No. 189 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) prop. Res., 8794; 2<sup>d</sup> of Res., 8836; 1<sup>st</sup> of B., 8836; 2<sup>d</sup> m., 9083; in Com., 9146; 3<sup>d</sup> m., 9338; Sen. Amts., 10035, 10507 (iii).

— B. No. 195 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) prop. Res., 10304; 1<sup>st</sup> of B., 10304; 2<sup>nd</sup>, in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 10420 (iii).

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7770.

— ON ORDER FOR FIRST READING OF BILL: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6692 (ii).

JUDGES SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6431 (ii).

— RESOLUTIONS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7321 (iii).

JUDICIAL BUSINESS, YUKON, CONDITION OF THE DOCKET OF THE COURT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 590 (i).

JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF MONTREAL, REMOVAL OF CERTAIN JUDGES : Ques. (Mr. *Parmelee*) 290 (i).

JUDIQUE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 7836 (iii).

JUSTICE :

ADDITIONAL JUDGES, PROV. OF QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1750 (i).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE : in Com. of Sup., 6430, 6888 (ii), 8127, 9776 (iii).

ALIEN LABOUR ACT, B. C., ENFORCEMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 597 (i).

— ENFORCEMENT AT WELLAND : Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 8839 (iii).

— ENFORCEMENT BY U.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2465 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 6430 (ii), 9776 (iii).

— PAR. IN PRESCOTT PAPER *re* DEPORTATION OF MR. WHITE : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5032.

— LETTER FROM GANANOQUE OARSMEN : Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 10422 (iii).

— PAYMENTS *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6612 (ii).

— PROSECUTIONS UNDER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5896 (ii).

BINDER TWINE, KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, ADVERTISEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1008 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3039 (i).

— EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PURCHASE BY FARMERS : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1118 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2759 (i).

— MANUFACTURE : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 4920.

— NAME OF PURCHASER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 169 (i).

— PRICE OF RAW MATERIAL : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2747 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 778 (i).

— Production of documents quoted from : Ques. of Order (Mr. *Clancy*) 6194 (ii).

— QUANTITY AND VALUE IMPORTED : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 5889 (ii).

— QUANTITY OF FIBRE RECEIVED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 5248 (ii).

— QUANTITY OF HEMP RECEIVED : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5249 (ii).

— SALES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2745 (i).

— SALES : Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Taylor*) 6146, 6238 ; neg. (Y. 38 ; N. 71) 6241 (ii).

— SCHEDULE OF PRICES : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1008 (i).

— TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 5515 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 6890 (ii), 8132 (iii).

B.C. COUNTY COURT JUDGES, SALARIES, &c. : M. for Cor., &c. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 300 (i).

B.C. MINES AND ALIEN LABOUR LAW, COMMISSIONER CLUTE'S REP. : Inquiry for (Mr. *McInnes*) 1787 (i).

B.C. MINERS LABOUR TROUBLES AND MR. CLUTE'S REP. : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5808 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 8146 (iii).

— See "Labour Commission," "Slocan," &c.

B.C. PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 6975 (ii).

CANADIAN LAW LIBRARY, ENGLAND : in Com. of Sup., 8140 (iii).

CHEQUETTE, MR. JUSTICE, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1979 (i).

COURT OF APPEALS, PROV. OF QUEBEC : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5515 (ii).

DOMINION POLICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8132 (iii).

DOM. STATUTES, CONSOLIDATION OF : in Com. of Sup., 10413 (iii).

— CONSOLIDATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 593 (i).

— REVISIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 1886.

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 6441, 6443, 6959, 6968 (ii), 10277 (iii).

— INVESTIGATION, PAYMENTS, *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 778 (i).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY : REP. OF COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 3446 (ii).

DUBÉ AND CAZES, CAPITAL CASES, CLEMENCY, &c. : Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 9678, 10504.

EXCHEQUER COURT, REGISTRAR'S SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 6888 (ii).

— SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6437 (ii), 8131 (iii).

JUDGES, B.C., SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6438 (ii).

— IN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC SINCE 1880, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4437 (ii).

— OF COURT OF APPEAL, &c., P.Q., NAMES : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3175, 3260 (i).

— OF PROVINCIAL COURTS, INCREASE OF SALARIES : prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7770 (iii).

— ON ORDER FOR FIRST READING OF BILL : Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6692 (ii).

— SALARIES, RESOLUTIONS RESPECTING : Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7321 (iii).

— in Com. on Sup., 6431 (ii).

— REMOVAL OF CERTAIN JUDGES : Ques. (Mr. *Parmelee*) 290 (i).

JUSTICE DEPT., SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 10277.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 6888.

— ELECTRIC PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 6440.

— GRATUITIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10319.

— INVESTIGATION : in Com. of Sup., 8135.

LABOUR COMMISSION, B.C., AMOUNT EXPENDED : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2195 (i).

— See "B.C. Mines," &c.

LAW BOOKS, SUPREME COURT LIBRARY : in Com. of Sup., 6436 (ii).

MAN. CIRCUIT ALLOWANCE TO JUDGES : in Com. or Sup., 8131 (iii).

MANITOBA PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 6975 (ii), 8134 (iii).

MANN, G. O., RELEASE FROM KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, REP. OF MIN. OF JUS., &c. : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Taylor*) 1013 (i).

MUNGOVAN, P., PAYMENTS TO : in Com. of Sup., 8128 (iii).

O'REILLY, MR. J. B., APPOINT. AS COUNTY JUDGE : Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 479 (i).

PENITENTIARY REFORMATORY, &c., NUMBER OF REPRIEVES : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Clarke*) 2200.

PENITENTIARIES : in Com. of Sup., 6438, 6888, 10277 (iii).

— INSPECTOR'S REP. : in Com. of Sup., 6441.

— INVESTIGATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 6895, 6959 (ii).

— REPORT : Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4333 (ii).

— inquiry for (Mr. *Clancy*) 3986 (ii).

PRINCE ALBERT JUDICIAL COURT : in Com. of Sup., 6431 (ii).

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 6893 (ii), 8134, 10453 (iii).

— CARTING OF WASTE STONE, &c. : M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Fortin*) 3469 (ii).

— COR. *re* NIGHT DUTY : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Fortin*) 3469 (ii).

— ELECTRIC PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 6439.

— INCREASE OF SALARIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 7878 (iii).

— INVESTIGATION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10318 (iii).

— REGULATIONS *re* NIGHT DUTY : Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2749 (i).

SLOCAN LABOUR TROUBLES, MR. CLUTE'S REP. : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3043 (i).

— See "B.C. Mines," "Labour Commission," &c.

SMITH, H. GILBERT, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 8135 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

- SOLICITOR GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5244.  
 — Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5754 (ii).  
 SUPREME COURT APPEAL CASES, SITTINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 1982 (i).  
 — LIBRARY, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6436 (ii).  
 — SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6432 (ii).  
 VANDAL, RELEASE FROM ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Quinn*) 299 (i).  
 VERRETT, HECTOR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 10277 (iii).  
 WENTWORTH VS. MATHIEU: in Com. of Sup., 8138 (iii).
- KAMLOOPS POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 8927 (iii).  
 KAMOURASKA AND ST. PASCAL MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1749 (i), 9795 (iii).
- Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co.'s B. No. 26** (Mr. *Bostock*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 471; 2<sup>o</sup>, 589; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 1725 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- KASLO AND LARDO-DUNCAN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10007 (iii).  
 "KATHLEEN," STR., EXPENDITURE FOR QUARANTINE SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 6350 (ii).
- KEEWATIN GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 7074 (iii).  
 KEITH, HILTON, INDIAN AGENT AT CARLTON: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1981 (i).  
 KELLY AND RYAN, SUPERANNUATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10412 (iii).  
 KELLY, EDWARD, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6024 (ii).  
 KENDALL, A. S., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1119 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P. E. I.) 4440 (ii).  
 KENTVILLE P. O., INSPECTOR, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4245 (ii).
- Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 69** (Mr. *Bostock*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1381; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1686; withdn., 3255.
- Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 95** (Mr. *Britton*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2072; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2151; withdn., 3255 (i).
- KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9972 (iii).  
 KINGSTON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7916 (iii).  
 KINGSTON MILITARY CAMP, MEAT SUPPLIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7969 (iii).  
 KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 6888 (ii).  
 — ELECTRIC PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 6440 (ii).  
 — GRATUITIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10319 (iii).  
 — INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 8135 (iii).
- KINNEAR MILLS P. O., INQUIRY *re* REGISTERED LETTER: (Mr. *Turcotte*) 8076 (iii).  
 Kobold, G. A. See "Divorce."  
 LA BANQUE FRANCAISE DU KLONDIKE: Par. in "La Presse" (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9470 (iii).  
 La Banque Jacques Cartier. See "Banque Provinciale."  
 Labourers Working Day, Length B. No. 56 (Mr. *Beattie*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 1109 (i).  
 Labour. See "Mines, &c."
- LABOUR TROUBLES, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 8146 (iii).  
 — COMMISSION, B. C., AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2195 (i).  
 Labour Troubles. See "Conciliation."  
 LABRECQUE, C. O., PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3764 (ii).  
 LABELLE, MR. L. V., ST. JACQUES L'ACHIGAN, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1733 (i).  
 LAVELLR, PETS. *re* ESTABLISHMENT OF P. O.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Sproule*) 3050 (i).  
 LACHINE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 8154 (iii).  
 — DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 8880 (iii).  
 — ELECTRIC LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 8156 (iii).  
 — LOCKMEN, &c., INCREASE OF PAY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 5024 (ii).  
 — QUADRANT PONTOON GATE: in Com. of Sup., 8155, 8372, 8504 (iii).  
 — REBUILDING WALL: in Com. of Sup., 8522 (iii).  
 LAKE DAUPHIN: in Com. of Sup., 10252 (iii).  
**Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 122** (Mr. *McGregor*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2827; 2<sup>o</sup>, 3033 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 4069 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 62.)  
 LAKE MANITOBA, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10252.  
 — See "Lake Winnipegosis."  
 LAKE ST. JOHN, DREDGE, &c., COST OF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3765 (ii).  
 LAKE ST. LOUIS CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8156 (iii).  
**Lake Superior and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 124** (Mr. *Dyment*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2827 (i); 2<sup>o</sup>, 3373 (ii); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 7552 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 63.)  
 LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE, SURVEY OF: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3444 (ii).  
 LAKE WINNIPEG FISHERIES, REPS. AND COR. *re*: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Roche*) 4754 (ii).  
 LAKES WINNIPEGOSIS AND MAN., ENFORCEMENT OF FISHING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4440.  
 — COR. *re* PROHIBITION OF EXPORTATION OF FISH: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Roche*) 4078, 5293 (ii).  
 — Inquiry for further papers (Mr. *Roche*) 5227 (ii).  
 LANCASTER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10229 (iii).  
**Land Grants to Militia Force (N.W.T.) Provision B. No. 107** (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2457; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4667; in Com., 4669; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 4811 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 17.)  
 LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 4439.  
 — IN MAN., B. C. AND N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1894 (i).  
 — SUBSIDIES TO RYS., NAMES, AMOUNTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1117 (i).  
 — O. C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2179 (i).  
**Land Titles Act Amt. B. No. 31** (Mr. *Davin*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 475 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 4799; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 4799 (ii).  
 — B. No. 139 (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3758; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 5177; 3<sup>o</sup>, 5181 (ii); Sen. Amts., 8069 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 21.)  
 LANDS UNDER LICENSES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5243 (ii).

- LAND PATENTS AND MINERAL RIGHTS : Ques. (Mr. *Frazer, Lambton*) 2171 (i).
- LAW BOOKS, SUPREME COURT LIBRARY : in Com. of Sup., 6436 (ii).
- N.W.T., PRINTING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6513.
- SUPREME COURT, PRINTING : in Com. of Sup., 6435 (ii).
- LAWS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8150 (iii).
- “LEADER” CO., AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT. IN 1894-5 : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Davis*) 319 (i).
- AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT., 1898-9 : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 592 (i).
- LEAMINGTON PIER : in Com. of Sup., 10244 (iii).
- LEBEL, WENCESLAS, EMPLOYT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3773 (ii).
- LE BLONDE, CLAIM FOR KILLING HORSE ON I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2182 (i).
- LEDUC, MR. CHARLES, APPNMT. OF SUCCESSOR : Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 3044 (i).
- LEE-ENFIELD RIFLE, CHARGES *re* DEFECTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 437 (i).
- ISSUED TO MILITIA BATTALIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Oster*) 2157 (i).
- LEGAL EXPENSES *re* FISHERIES SEIZURES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10398 (iii).
- LEGISLATION—HOUSE OF COMMONS : in Com. of Sup., 9604, 10321 (iii).
- LEINSTER REGIMENT AND CANADIAN VOLUNTEERS : Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 82, 162, 589 (i).
- Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 163 (i).
- M. to adjn. (Mr. *McNeill*) 263 (i).
- REPATRIATION OF 100TH REGIMENT : Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 171 (i).
- See Halifax “Garrison.”
- LEMAY, MAXIME, POSTMASTER AT LOTBINIÈRE, DISMISSAL AND APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Fortier*) 1728 (i).
- LEMIEUX, MR., ASST. INSPECTOR OF CUSTOMS, MONTREAL, AND MAGDALEN ISLAND ELECTIONS, INVESTIGATION, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 470 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2422, 2996 (i), 3478 (ii).
- See “Gaspé.”
- LEPER’S BROOK DYKE : in Com. of Sup., 9431 (iii).
- LES EBOULEMENTS WHARF, ACCOUNTS : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2202 (i).
- LÉVIS ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 10388 (iii).
- GRAVING DOCK : in Com. of Sup., 9859 (iii).
- LENGTHENING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4070.
- STATION, ENLARGEMENT, I.C.R., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2192 (i).
- TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES : in Com. of Sup., 9859 (iii).
- LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 7839, 8058 (iii).
- See “Yukon,” &c.
- LIARD AND DEASE RIVERS, RELIEF TO SETTLERS : in Com. of Sup., 7075 (iii).
- LIBRARY OF PARLT., JOINT REP : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
- COM. : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 137 (i).
- CONTINGENCIES : in Com. on Sup., 8150 (iii).
- OFFICIALS, EFFICIENCY, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 10505 (iii).
- SALARIES &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10331 (iii).
- LT. GOVERNOR McINNIS, B.C., ACTION OF THE GOVT. *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 7882 (iii).
- B. C. LEGISLATURE AND ACTION OF LIEUT. GOV : M. to Adjn. (Mr. *Prior*) 1382 (i).
- COR. WITH SEC. OF STATE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9522 (iii).
- AND ELECTIONS : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 7319.
- INQUIRY FOR COR., &c. : (Mr. *Foster*) 9471.
- INQUIRY *re* (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7989 (iii).
- REMOVAL FROM OFFICE ; Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 8074 (iii).
- INQUIRY FOR REP. OF (Mr. *Bostock*) 3478 (ii).
- RESIGNATION, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 7513 (iii).
- TELEGRAM *re* RESIGNATION : Read (Mr. *Prior*) 6887 (ii).
- See “B.C.,” &c.
- LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 1704 (i), 8063, 10397 (iii).
- LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup. 3663 (ii).
- CONSTRUCTED SINCE 1896 : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, P.E.I.*) 2199 (i).
- SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1704 (i).
- LILLOGET AND LYTTON MAIL SERVICE, ESTABLISHMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1979 (i), 3770 (ii).
- LIQUOR COMMISSION, DATE OF APPNMT : Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 5394 (ii).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT (1883), COMMISSIONERS’ EXPENSES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2830 (i).
- LIQUOR IN MILITIA CANTEENS, REGULATIONS, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2201 (i).
- PERMITS GRANTED BY GOVT., &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 168, 2202 (i).
- on Inquiry (Mr. *Foster*) for copies, &c. 2997 (i).
- See “YUKON,” &c.
- LITTLE CURRENT WHARF : in Com. on Sup., 10250 (iii).
- LIVERPOOL POST OFFICE : in Com. on Sup., 9874 (iii).
- LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATIONS INCORP. B. No. 134 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 3478 ; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 5099 ; in Com. 5099 ; 3<sup>rd</sup> 5124 (ii), (63-64 Vic., c. 33).
- LIVING ALLOWANCES IN YUKON : M. for stmnt.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2201 (i).
- LIVINGSTONE’S COVE : in Com. on Sup., 9895 (iii).
- Loan Companies Act Amt. B. No. 154 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 5020 ; 2<sup>nd</sup>, and in Com., 5181 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5182 (ii), (63-64 Vic., c. 48).
- LOAN COMPANIES, GOVT. ACTION *re* PERPETRATION OF FRAUDS : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3040 (i).
- LOBSTER FISHERIES : in Com. of Sup., 5944 (ii).
- DATES OF CLOSE SEASON : Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 438 (i).

- LOBSTER FISHERIES P.E.I., DATE OF SETTING LINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 2759 (i).  
 ——— Remarks (Mr. *McInerney*) 4723 (ii).  
 ——— M. to adjn. (Mr. *Bell, P.E.I.*) 4727 (ii).  
 ——— FISHING IN DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS COVES, REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4243 (ii).  
 ——— INVESTIGATIONS, AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2195 (i).
- LOCAL ELECTIONS, N. B., LETTER *re* WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 740 (i).
- LOCKEPORT AND SABLE RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com on Res., 19012 (iii).
- LOCOMOTIVES, &c.: conc., 10439 (iii).  
 ——— See "I. C. R.," &c.
- LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, COST OF REMOVAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2362 (i).  
 ——— CONSTRUCTION OF WAREHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2403 (i).
- LONDON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7916 (iii).
- LOUCKS, HENRY LOGAN AND OTHERS, EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 291 (i).
- LUMSDEN, N.W.T., PETS. *re* MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2403 (i).
- LUNATICS FROM N.W.T. IN MAN. ASYLUMS, MAINTENANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 3445 (ii).
- LUNENBURG HARBOR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 7853, 9897 (iii).
- LURCHER SHOAL LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 3662, 3672 (ii).
- LYNCH, W. J., INCREASE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10286 (iii).
- LYONS, C. C. See "Divorce."
- LYTTON-LILLOOET MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1979 (i) 3770 (ii).
- MACAULAY POINT CLAIMS, LITIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1461 (i).
- MACKENZIE, HON. MR., MONUMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 10254 (iii).
- MCGILL, LT. COL., ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, POSITION, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9905.
- MCGREGOR'S CREEK: in Com. of Sup., 10233 (iii).
- MCGREGOR, MR. J. D., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 592 (i).
- MCLEAN, J. D., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10279.
- MENAB LAKE, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8433.
- MENAMARA, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WALKERTON: in Com. of Sup., 6074 (ii).
- MENEVIN, J. C., CLAIM FOR REBELLION LOSSES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Davis*) 3463 (ii).
- MAGDALEN ISLANDS SS. SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 477 (i).  
 ——— BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iii).  
 ——— MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 9583 (iii).  
 ——— NUMBER OF TRIPS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Macdonald*) 319 (i).
- MAIL BAGS, PRIVATE DELIVERY: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 8049 (iii).  
 ——— CLERKS, EXAMINATION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 6616 (ii).  
 ——— MONTREAL AND QUEBEC DIVISION, FINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 4076 (ii).
- MAIL CONTRACTS IN YUKON NOW CURRENT: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2996 (i).  
 ——— PETS., MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2200 (i).  
 ——— DELIVERY AT HALIFAX AND DARTMOUTH: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7990 (ii).  
 ——— MILEAGE, YEARLY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1477 (i).  
 ——— IN YEARS ENDING 1890 AND 1893: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2169 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE, B. C. AND YUKON, CONTRACTS, ROUTES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c. FOR YEARS 1898-99: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 168 (i).  
 ——— SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 8657, 8708 (iii).  
 ——— BELOW RIVIÈRE DU LOUP: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1114 (i).  
 ——— INVERNESS COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 6616 (ii).  
 ——— MAN., PETS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 9522.  
 ——— P.E.I., IRREGULARITY, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 2085 (i).  
 ——— RAILWAY, &c. ADDITIONS FROM 1890 TO 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2166 (i).  
 ——— YUKON, APPROPRIATION ACT, 1899: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 9798 (iii).  
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 9779 (iii).  
 ——— PETS. RECEIVED BY P.M.G., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1481 (i).
- MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 9555 (iii).  
 ——— P.E.I. AND G.B.: in Com. of Sup., 9584 (iii).  
 ——— P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: in Com. of Sup., 9583, 10398 (iii).  
 ——— TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION: in Com. of Sup., 8054 (iii).
- MAN. AND N.W.T., LAND GRANTS TO RYS., NAMES AND AMOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 439, 590 (i).
- Manitoba and North-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 87 (Mr. *Roche*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1786; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2109 (i).
- MANITOBA:
- APPRAISERS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 10414 (iii).
- C.P.R. LAND GRANTS IN MAN., ALLOTMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1460 (i).  
 ——— EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 2827 (i).  
 ——— PROPORTION ALLOTTED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 294 (i).
- CIRCUIT ALLOWANCE TO JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 8131 (iii).
- DAIRY EXPORTS FROM MAN. AND N.W.T., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2362, 2458 (i).
- ELKHORN GOVT. BUILDINGS, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4438 (ii).  
 ——— PRINTING PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7296 (iii).  
 ——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2758 (ii).
- FISHERIES INSPECTOR, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 6057 (ii).
- FRANKLIN, INDIAN RESERVE AND RES. OF MUNICIPALITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5023 (ii).
- FRENCH REPATRIATION: in Com. of Sup., 10353 (iii).
- GIRLS' HOME OF WELCOME, WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 9664 (iii).

MANITOBA—*Con.*

- GRAIN COMMISSIONERS' REPORT : on Inquiry for (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8076 (iii).
- GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., LAND GRANT : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2752 (i).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 9859, 10252 (iii).
- HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, ABUSES IN ADMINISTRATION, &c. : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 9825 (iii).
- MAN. AND N. W. T., NUMBER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser, Lambton*) 2363 (i).
- M. for copies\* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 319 (i).
- OF ODD-NUMBERED SECTIONS : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1012 (i).
- INDIANS, MAN. AND N. W. T. ANNUITIES AND COMMUTATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 7295 (iii).
- SUPPLIES IN MAN. AND N. W. T. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4742 (ii).
- INTERIOR DEPT., EMPLOYES IN MAN. AND ASBA. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Roche*) 2200 (i).
- JEROME, MR. MARTIN, M.P.P., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2758 (i).
- LAKE DAUPHIN : in Com. of Sup., 10252 (iii).
- COR. BETWEEN GEO. HOOD AND GOVT. : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Roche*) 3469 (ii).
- LAKE MANITOBA, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 10252 (iii).
- LAKE WINNIPEG FISHERIES, REPS. AND COR. *re* : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Roche*) 4754 (ii).
- ENFORCEMENT OF FISHING REGULATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4440 (ii).
- PROHIBITION OF FISH, REPS. *re* : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Roche*) 5293 (ii).
- Inquiry for further papers (Mr. *Roche*) 5227 (ii).
- MAN. AND N. W. T., LAND GRANTS TO RYS., NAMES AND AMOUNTS : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 439 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 590 (i).
- MAN. GOVT., DEMANDS FOR SCHOOL LANDS : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3046 (i).
- PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 6975 (ii), 8134 (iii).
- SCHOOL QUESTION, MEMORIAL FROM WINNIPEG CATHOLICS : Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 9464 (iii).
- PAR IN "MAIL AND EMPIRE" *re* ACTION OF WINNIPEG SCHOOL BOARD (Mr. *Dugas*) 6252 (ii).
- PAR IN "WINNIPEG FREE PRESS" : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 4070 (ii).
- RESOLUTIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 6915 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 4070, 4445, 4915 (ii).
- PHILLIPS, MR., APPRAISER AT WINNIPEG : in Com. of Sup., 6080 (ii).
- PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, PAR IN "WINNIPEG FREE PRESS" *re* REPRESENTING RYS. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1526 (i).
- *re* MENNONITE LOYALTY (Mr. *Richardson*) 2156 (i).
- PROVENCHE MAIL SERVICE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6915 (ii).
- ST. ANDREW'S LOCKS, EMPLOYT. OF UNION MEN : Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 598 (i).
- RAPIDS : in Com. of Sup., 9059 (iii).
- SETTLERS IN MAN. AND N. W. T., GRANTS, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Douglas*) 2760 (i).
- SPEECH OF HON. MR. SIFTON AT BRANDON *re* FREE LUMBER : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2831 (i).
- TIMBER LANDS, MAN., PROTECTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10407 (iii).
- LICENSES MANITOBA : amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 7221 (iii).
- O.C., *re* PERMITS : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4743.
- PERMITS ISSUED BY MARTIN JEROME, &c. : M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 319 (i).

MANITOBA—*Con.*

- TIMBER PERMITS ON DOM. LANDS, O.C.'s, &c. : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Davin*) 1011 (i).
- VOTERS' LISTS, MAN., PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3046 (i).
- WINNIPEG BY-ELECTIONS, REMUNERATION OF DEP. RETURNING OFFICERS : Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 1006.
- CUSTOMS : in Com. of Sup., 6077 (ii).
- P. O., NUMBER OF LETTERS, ANNUALLY : Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 4743 (ii).
- WINNIPEG LAKE : See "Lake Winnipeg."
- Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 109 (Mr. *Dumont*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2560 ; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2673 (i) ; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5162 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 9970 (iii).
- MANN, G. O., RELEASE FROM KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, REP. OF MIN. OF JUS., &c. : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Taylor*) 1013 (i).
- MARCHMONT PROPERTY, PURCHASE OF : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 7125 (iii).
- See "Plains of Abraham," &c.
- MARCONI SYSTEM OF TELEGRAPHING : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, P.E.I.*), 2199 (i).
- MARCOTTE, MR. A., DISMISSAL, COR., &c. *re* : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 634 (i).
- MARGAREE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 7965 (iii).
- MARIA STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 10253 (iii).
- MARIA WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10195 (iii).
- MARKHAM, LT.-COL., RETENTION OF CHEQUE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2833 (i).
- MARINE :
- "ABERDEEN" STR., FITTING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8062 (iii).
- SPECIAL TRIP TO LES EMBOULEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 8430 (iii).
- ARISAIG, N. S., LIGHTKEEPER, NAME, SALARY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3262 (i).
- BERTHIER EN HAUT, NAME OF DREDGE : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2171 (i).
- BOILER AND MACHINERY INSPECTORS, B.C., EXAMINATION OF CANDIDATES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 6779 (ii).
- BOILER INSPECTION, PURCHASE AND SALE OF OLD BOILERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1474 (i).
- "BRANT," SS., CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4918 (ii).
- MAINTENANCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3645 (ii).
- BROTCHIE'S LEDGE BEACON, ELECTRIC LIGHT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 290 (i).
- LIGHTSHIP : in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i), 3667 (ii).
- CAPE TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 8063 (iii).
- CARMANAH LIGHTHOUSE, B.C., AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 6255 (ii).
- "CHALLENGE," STR., QUARANTINE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 7835 (iii).
- "DOMINION" DREDGE, EMPLOYEES, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 5026 (ii).
- EGG ISLAND LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).
- OMISSION OF LIGHTING : M. for cor.\* (Mr. *Prior*) 2761 (i).
- ESQUIMALT DRY DOCK, PETS. *re* DOCKING CHARGES : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8575 (ii).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR 1895-9 : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5024 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

“EUREKA” STR., PURCHASE BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5751 (ii).  
 — REFITTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7850 (iii).  
 FOG ALARMS ON LAKE ERIE: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (iii).  
 FRASER RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 7955 (iii).  
 GAS BUOYS, ST. LAWRENCE RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 8885, 9426 (iii).  
 GOLD RIVER AND CHESTER BASIN, BUOY SERVICE TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 3875 (ii).  
 GRAND MANAN LIGHTHOUSE, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ganong) 6788 (ii).  
 — See “Seal Cove.”  
 HOSPITAL, B.C. USED FOR BARRACKS: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 3490 (ii).  
 HYDROGRAPHICAL SURVEY, B.C., GOVT. ACTION *re*: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2832 (i).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 1698 (i).  
 “JAMES BECKWITH” SCHOONER, PAYMENT OF FISHING BOUNTY: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 6058, 6353 (ii).  
 “KATHLEEN” STR., EXPENDITURE FOR QUARANTINE SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 6350 (ii).  
 LAKE ST. JOHN, DREDGE, &c., COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3765 (ii).  
 LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1704 (i); 3644 (ii), 8063, 10397 (iii).  
 LIGHTHOUSES, &c. CONSTRUCTED SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. Bell, P.E.I.) 2199 (i).  
 LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1704 (i), 3663 (ii).  
 — SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1704 (i).  
 LURCHER SHOAL LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 3662 (ii).  
 MACAULAY POINT CLAIMS, LITIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1461 (i).  
 MARCONI SYSTEM OF TELEGRAPHING: Ques. (Mr. Bell, P.E.I.) 2199 (i).  
 MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 1698 (i).  
 — REPORT: Presented (Sir Louis Davies) 1483.  
 MARINE HOSPITAL, B.C., USED FOR BARRACKS: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 3490 (ii).  
 METEOROLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 5925.  
 MIDLAND HARBOUR RANGE LIGHTS, &c., ERECTION OF: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3045 (i).  
 “MINTO” STR., FITTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8061 (iii).  
 “MUDLARK” DREDGE, INVESTIGATION BY RESIDENT ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 3040 (i).  
 MURRAY BAY AND RIVIÈRE OUELLE, STEAM COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 2756 (i).  
 OAK POINT, N.B., CONSTRUCTION OF LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3444 (ii).  
 — TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3774 (ii).  
 OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i), 8061 (iii).  
 PELKE ISLAND, SALE OF LIFE-SAVING STATION: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4559 (ii).  
 PILOTS, MONTREAL AND KINGSTON, COR. *re* INCORPORATION: M. for copy, &c.\* (Mr. Talbot) 2203 (i).  
 POINTE AUX TREMBLES LIGHTHOUSE, RECONSTRUCTION: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6062 (ii).  
 REWARDS FOR SAVING LIFE: in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).  
 SANDY ISLAND LIGHT, REMOVAL, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 440 (i).  
 — COR. *re* REMOVAL: M. for copy\* (Mr. Martin) 2202 (i).  
 — SPAR LIGHTS, ERECTION AND REMOVAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 440 (i).  
 SAWDUST IN RIVERS, COMPLAINTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 4556 (ii).  
 “SCOTSMAN” SS., PAPERS *re* WRECK: Remarks (Mr. Cowan) 8656 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*

SEAL COVE, GRAND MANAN, ERECTION OF LIGHTS, &c.: M. for Rep.\* (Mr. Ganong) 1012 (i).  
 — inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ganong) 6788 (ii).  
 — LIFE SAVING STATION, EQUIPMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 594 (i).  
 SS. “STANLEY” AND “MINTO,” FREIGHT CARRIED, AMOUNT, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 300 (i).  
 STUMBLES, W. W., COR. WITH MAR. AND FISHERIES DEPT.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Prior) 4078 (ii).  
 TIDAL SURVEYS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1701 (i).  
 TIDAL SURVEY, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3174 (i).  
 TIGNISH, P.E.I., AMOUNT OF WHARFAGE COLLECTED: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 2201 (i).  
 TREFRY, NORMAN L., SHIPPING MASTER AT YARMOUTH, N.S., SALARY: Ques. (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 2405 (i).  
 U.S. STEAMERS, INSPECTION EXEMPTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 298 (i).  
 WILSON, J., SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH EGG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, B.C.: M. for Cor.\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2760 (i).  
 MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS’ TRIP, MAR. PROVS., EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2179 (i).  
 MARYSVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9880 (iii).  
 MAXWELL, MAJOR, GRANT TO: Remarks (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 8079 (iii).  
 MEAFORD, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10247 (iii).  
 MEAT, IMPORTATIONS OF: Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 3875.  
 — SUPPLIES FOR CAN. CONTINGENTS: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 7970 (iii).  
 MEDALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8343 (iii).  
 — LONG SERVICE AND ACTIVE MILITIA, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Kaulbach) 10309 (iii).  
 — (1870) NUMBER GRANTED, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Clarke) 2760 (i).  
 — DISTRIBUTION IN 5TH AND 6TH MILITARY DISTRICTS: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2755 (i).  
 MEDICINE HAT PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 5514 (ii).  
 MEMBER INTRODUCED, 9368 (iii).  
 — ACCEPTING OFFICE, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2189 (i).  
 — APPOINTED TO OFFICES FROM 1873 TO 1878: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 5394 (ii).  
 — FROM 1879 TO 1896: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 4901 (ii).  
 — MILEAGE, &c.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1977 (i).  
 — NEW, CERTIFICATES OF RET.: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2, 7, 81 (i).  
 — REMARKS CHECKED: (Mr. Speaker) 787, 803 (i), 7319, 7421, 7512, 7516, 8079, 9748 (iii).  
 — RIGHT TO VOTE ON BILLS: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 9680, 9688 (iii).  
 — SESSIONAL INDEMNITY, ADDITIONAL: *par* in Hamilton “Spectator” (Mr. Casey) 9667 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10290 (iii).  
 — See “House of Commons.”  
 MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:  
 MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1057 (i), 5293 (ii).

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—*Con.*

MESS. Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 4338, 5883 (ii), 8398, 9472, 9790 (iii).

— FROM HER MAJ. AND LORD ROBERTS :  
Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1039, 1057 (i), 5293.

**Merchants Bank of Halifax B. No. 72** (Mr. *Russell*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1553; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1933; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 2948 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 103.)

— **B. No. 170** (Mr. *Russell*) M. to introduce B., 6247; 1<sup>o</sup>, 2<sup>o</sup>, 6247; in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>, 6488 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 104.)

METEOROLOGICAL SURVEY : in Com. of Sup., 5925 (ii).

METHYLATED SPIRITS : in Com. of Sup., 6030 (ii).

METRIC SYSTEM : in Com. of Sup., 6036 (ii).

**Miami Cycle and Manufacturing Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 99** (Mr. *Britton*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2147; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2673 (i).

MIDLAND HARBOUR RANGE LIGHTS, &c.: Erection of Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3045 (i).

MILEAGE OF MAIN LINES AND BRANCHES OF I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fraser, Lambton*) 2172 (i).

MILEAGE OF SENATORS AND MEMBERS : Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 2362 (i).

**Militia Act Amt. B. No. 7** (Mr. *Domville*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 143 (i).

— **B. No. 60** (Mr. *Domville*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 1286 (i).

— **B. No. 61** (Mr. *Prior*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 1286 (i).

— **B. No. 155** (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 1<sup>o</sup> m. 5224; 2<sup>o</sup> and in Com., 6453 (ii), 9838; 3<sup>o</sup>, 9844 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 18.)

## MILITIA :

ALLOWANCE, PAY TO MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 8285, 9769 (iii).

— See "Imperial," "Can. Permanent Corps," "Pensions," &c.

AMBULANCE SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 1113.

ANNUAL DRILL : in Com. of Sup., 7201, 8239, 8286 (iii).

— 1890-99, TOTAL NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1473 (i).

ARMOURIES : in Com. of Sup., 9893 (iii).

ARMS, AMMUNITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8344.

ARMY POSTAL CORPS, APPNMTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1753 (i).

BARRACKS IN YUKON, COST OF ERECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1111 (i).

— LEASE AND SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 10304 (iii).

BARRIEFIELD COMMON, KINGSTON : in Com. of Sup., 10354; conc., 10452 (iii).

BLISS, MAJ. FOSTER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2165 (i).

BORDEN, LT., INSUBORDINATION, PRESS REPS.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 321 (i).

— DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10503 (iii).

BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7916.

CAMERON, MAJ. GEN., CONNECTION WITH R. M. C.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1977, 2164 (i).

CAMPS, TRANSPORTATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9523 (iii).

CANADIAN NAVAL RESERVE, SPEECH IN IMP. H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1123, 1473 (i).

CAN. PERMANENT CORPS, PENSION SYSTEM, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 1115 (i).

CLOTHING : in Com. of Sup., 8335 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

CLOVER POINT, B. C., RIFLE RANGE, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 292 (i).

— REPS., COR., &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Prior*) 2202 (i).

COLONELS, HONORARY, RECENT APPNMTS.: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 8282 (iii).

COMMISSIONS IN IMP. ARMY, COR. BETWEEN IMP. AND CAN. GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3881 (ii).

— REGULATIONS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 3283 (i).

COMPENSATION ALLOWANCES, MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 9769 (iii).

CORNWALL ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 9883, 9893 (iii).

COTÉ ST. LUC RIFLE RANGE, CLOSING AND PURCHASE OF NEW SITE : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 292 (i), 4566 (ii).

COURTNEY, CORPORAL IN "A" BATTERY, CHARGES OF INSUBORDINATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 7771, 7885, 7989, 8282, 8933, 9063, 9685.

DEPTL. VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 7201, 8217, 9768, 10284, 10353 (iii).

DISBANDMENT OF 70TH BATTALION : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3034 (i).

DISTRICTS, SERVICE AMMUNITION, NUMBER OF ROUNDS STORED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 5892.

DOMINION RIFLE ASSOCIATION: in Com. of Sup., 9768 (iii).

DOMVILLE, LT.-COL., RETIREMENT OF, REPS., &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2760 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 8342 (iii).

FENIAN MEDALS, NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS CALLED OUT, DEPUTATIONS, PETS., &c., *re* RECOGNITION OF SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 441 (i).

— GRANTS TO WIDOWS OF OFFICERS : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 6915 (ii).

— N. B. DISTRIBUTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 5023 (ii).

— "Militia Medals," &c.

FOYLE, LT., RETIREMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9769 (iii).

— Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 9471, 9484 (iii).

GENERAL OFFICER COMMANDING, SUCCESSOR TO GEN. HUTTON : Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2085, 2563 (i).

— Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 3576 (ii).

— TENURE OF COMMAND : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1465, 2173 (i).

GENERAL SERVICE MEDALS: in Com. of Sup., 8343 (iii).

— CONDITIONS, &c., NATIONAL COLOUR, &c.: (Mr. *Clarke*) 299 (i).

GENERAL STATEMENT *re* MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 8217 (iii).

GRATUITIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10357 (iii).

HALIFAX GARRISON : in Com. of Sup., 9772, 10358 (iii).

— APPLICATIONS FOR COMMISSIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pettet*) 3041 (ii).

— SUPPLIES, &c., AMOUNT FROM IMP. CONTRACTORS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5020 (ii).

— Remarks (Mr. *Powell*) 5250 (ii).

— CONTRACT FOR MEAT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 4555 (ii).

— CONTRACT FOR SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3775, 4907 (ii).

HATFIELD, CAPT. S. N., ACCOUNTS RENDERED BY: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2202 (i).

HOLT AND LAMBERT, MESSRS., BONUSES, &c.: conc., 10442 (iii).

HONORARY COLONELS, RECENT APPNMTS.: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 8282 (iii).

## MILITIA—Con.

- HUGHES, LT.-COL. AND G.O.C., COR., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Domville*) 598 (i).  
 — COMMISSION IN STRATHCONA'S HORSE: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 2750 (i).  
 HUGHES, LT.-COL., LETTER IN "GLOBE": Remarks (Mr. *Britton*) 7207 (iii).  
 — Return, &c. (remarks) 10450 (iii).  
 HUTTON, MAJ.-GEN. AND LT.-COL. HUGHES, REP. IN NEWSPAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 149 (i).  
 — APPNMT. OF SUCCESSOR: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4258 (ii).  
 — COR. *re* REMOVAL: O. Cs., &c., M. for copies (Mr. *Prior*) 2761 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 594 (i).  
 — DEPARTURE FROM CAN.: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Prior*) 323, 347 (i).  
 — SPEECH AT FAREWELL DINNER, OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 595 (i).  
 IMPERIAL DEFENCES AND PREFERENTIAL TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 8932 (iii).  
 IMPERIAL DEFENCES, PAR. IN "GLOBE": Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 8836 (iii).  
 IMPERIAL AND CANADIAN MILITIA PAY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2159 (i).  
 — PENSION ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2162 (i).  
 ISSUE OF SNIDER RIFLES TO RURAL CORPS: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 2752 (i).  
 KINGSTON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7916.  
 — MILITARY CAMP, MEAT SUPPLIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7969 (iii).  
 LEE-ENFIELD RIFLE, CHARGES *re* DEFECTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 437 (i).  
 — ISSUED TO MILITIA BATTALIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 2157 (i).  
 LEINSTER REGIMENT AND CAN. VOLUNTEERS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 163 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 82, 162 (i).  
 — M. to adjn. (Mr. *McNeill*) 263 (i).  
 — REPATRIATION OF 100TH REGIMENT: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 171 (i).  
 — See "Halifax Garrison."  
 LIQUOR IN MILITIA CANTEENS, REGULATIONS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2201 (i).  
 LONDON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7916 (iii).  
 MCGILL, LT.-COL., ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, POSITION, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9905 (iii).  
 MAN. AND N.W.T. DEFENCES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 242, 281 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 263 (i).  
 MARKHAM, LT.-COL., RETENTION OF CHEQUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2833 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 2833 (i).  
 MAXWELL, MAJOR, GRANT TO: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 8079 (iii).  
 MEDALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8343 (iii).  
 — 1866-70, DISTRIBUTION IN 5TH AND 6TH MILITARY DISTRICTS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2755.  
 — LONG SERVICE AND ACTIVE MILITIA, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 10309 (iii).  
 — (1870) NUMBER GRANTED, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Clarke*) 2760 (i).  
 MILITIA CAMPS, TRANSPORTATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9523 (iii).  
 — DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7201, 8217, 9768, 10284, 10353 (iii).  
 — DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Borden, Kings*) 4333 (iii).  
 — Report, inquiry for (Mr. *Clarke*) 3773 (ii).  
 — (Mr. *Prior*) 3413 (ii).  
 — DISTRICTS, SERVICE AMMUNITION, NUMBER OF ROUNDS STORED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 5892 (ii).  
 — DRILL, ANNUAL CAMP: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Addington*) 3444 (ii).

## MILITIA—Con.

- MILITIA, GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 8217 (iii).  
 — PERMANENT CORPS, REDUCTION OF PAY: Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 1743 (i).  
 — PROPERTIES: in Com. of Sup., 8305, 10353 (iii).  
 — PROVISIONS: in Com. of Sup., 8335 (iii).  
 — OFFICERS, RANK OF: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2751 (i).  
 — SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8304 (iii).  
 — STAFF COURSE, R.M.C.: Inquiry for Ret\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2422 (i).  
 — STORES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 7847, 9858 (iii).  
 — STORES, QUEBEC, SUPT., NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8433 (iii).  
 — SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 8335 (iii).  
 — TRANSPORT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8335.  
 MILLER, LT., "A" BATTERY, STATUS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9904 (iii).  
 MOUNTED INFANTRY, ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITS: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 3040 (i).  
 MONTREAL RIFLE RANGE, PROVISION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 440 (i).  
 MONTREAL RIOTS AND VICTORIA RIFLES: Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3036 (i).  
 N. W. REBELLION, CLAIMS OF HENRY HALCRO, COR., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Davis*) 835 (i).  
 OLIVER EQUIPMENT, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2364 (i).  
 — PURCHASE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 9796 (iii).  
 OTTAWA MILITIA STORES BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 7847, 9858 (iii).  
 PERMANENT CORPS, REDUCTION OF PAY, O.C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 1115, 1743, 2164 (i).  
 PENSIONS TO PERMANENT CORPS, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5753 (ii).  
 PERSONAL EXPLANATION PAR. TORONTO "GLOBE" *re* GENL. HUTTON: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 480 (i).  
 PRINCE OF WALES RIFLE AND 6TH FUSILIERS, AMALGAMATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5022.  
 — NAMES AND RANK: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5893 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5250 (ii).  
 QUEBEC CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 9877 (iii).  
 REGIMENTAL BANDS, CONTROL OF: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7125 (iii).  
 REGINA BARRACKS, OUTBREAK OF DYPHTHERIA: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5701 (ii).  
 REPATRIATION OF THE 100TH REG., PAPERS, REPS., &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Prior*) 2201 (i).  
 RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8336 (iii).  
 RIFLE CLUBS, ESTABLISHMENT OF: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7119 (iii).  
 RIFLE RANGE AT MONTREAL, PURCHASE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 292 (i) 4566 (ii).  
 RIFLE RANGES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8370 (iii).  
 — ROCKLIFFE: in Com. of Sup., 9768 (iii).  
 ROYAL CANADIAN INFANTRY, B.C., OFFER OF "A" CO. FOR CHINA: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 8438 (iii).  
 ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 6337 (iii).  
 — ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION: in Com., of Sup., 9888 (iii).  
 — AMOUNTS PAID, EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1734 (i).  
 — APPLICANTS FOR STAFF COURSE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1110, 2163 (i).  
 — SELECTION OF OFFICERS, &c.: M. for cor. (Mr. *Foster*) 1012 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

- ST. THOMAS DRILL SHED, PURCHASE OF PARADE GROUND, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 294 (i) 7122.  
 — COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND J. H. WILSON, M.D. : M. for copies (Mr. Ingram) 648 (i).  
 SERVICE LIMIT FOR COMMANDING OFFICERS : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1465, 2173 (i).  
 SNIDER RIFLES, ISSUE OF TO RURAL CORPS : Ques. (Mr. Osler) 2752 (i).  
 SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I., VOLUNTEER ORGANIZATION, PETS., *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bell, P.E.I.) 2179 (i).  
 SUSSEX, N.B., ARMOURY FOR 8TH HUSSARS : QUES. (Mr. Domville) 1733 (i).  
 TORONTO DRILL HALL, IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 3036 (i).  
 WALLACE, GUNNER, DEATH AT KINGSTON : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 477 (i).  
 WARLIKE STORES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8306.  
 WHITE, LT.-COL., RETIREMENT OF : M. to adjn. (Mr. Prior) 3074 (i).  
 WORK POINT BARRACKS, B.C., PAY OF MEN, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 4241 (ii).  
 YUKON MILITIA FORCE, PAY, SUPPLIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9774 (iii).  
 — NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 437 (i).
- MILLBROOK INDIAN RESERVE : in Com. of Sup. 7295 (iii).
- MILLER, LT., "A" BATTERY, STATUS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 9904 (iii).
- MILLER, R. W., POSTMASTER OF ACTINOLITE, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Carscallen) 1114 (i).  
 — COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND OTHERS *re* DISMISSAL : M. for copy\* (Mr. Carscallen) 2201 (i).
- Milne, James, Patent Relief B. No. 102 (Mr. Clarke) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2345 ; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2673 (i) in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 4950 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 105).
- MIMINEGASH HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 1483 (i).
- Mines Labour B. No. 47 (Mr. McInnes) 1<sup>o</sup>, 737 (i).
- MINES AND ALIEN LABOUR LAW, B.C., COMMISSIONER CLUTE'S REP. : Inquiry for (Mr. McInnes) 1787 (i).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Prior) 5808 (ii).
- MINING CLAIMS IN YUKON AND GOVT. POLICY : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 151 (i).
- MINING REGULATIONS IN YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 10283 (iii).
- MINISTERS ABSENT FROM SITTINGS OF THE HSE. : in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Foster) 6535, 6553 (ii).
- MINISTERIAL RESIGNATIONS, JAN., 1896, COR. BETWEEN GOV.-GEN. AND EX-MINS. : M. for copies\* (Mr. Casey) 741 (i).  
 — RESPONSIBILITY, PREPARING RETURNS : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6783 (ii).
- MINT, ESTABLISHMENT BY GOVT. IN CAN. : Notice of Motion (Mr. McInnes) 1009 (i).
- "MINTO" STR., FITTING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8061.
- MISCELLANEOUS : in Com. of Sup., 10254, 10411 (iii).
- MISPEC RIVER, CONSTRUCTION OF DAM, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7122 (iii).
- MOLOCANI AND STUNDISTS, IMMIGRATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 5244 (ii).
- MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS : Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1885 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2180 (i).
- Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Ry. Co.'s B. No. 104 (Mr. Bourassa) 1<sup>o</sup>, 2345 ; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2673 (i) ; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3373 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- Montreal and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 48 (Mr. Monk) 1<sup>o</sup>, 777 ; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1005 ; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 1725 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. No. 165 (Mr. McAlister) 1<sup>o</sup>, 5884 ; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5999 (ii).
- MONTREAL HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 9865 (iii).  
 — AND CONNERS SYNDICATE, NEGOTIATIONS *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 4246, 5228 (ii).  
 — COR. WITH GOVT. : M. for copy\* (Mr. Casey) 3469 (ii).
- Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. No. 130 (Mr. Edwards) 1<sup>o</sup>, 3140 (i) ; 2<sup>o</sup>, 3373 ; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 4479 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, REP. OF SURVEYS, &c. : M. for copies\* (Mr. Poupore) 319 (i).
- MONTREAL, PORTLAND AND BOSTON RY., PETS. *re* SUBSIDY : M. for copy\* (Mr. Moore) 1012 (i).
- MONTREAL P.O. FINES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6057.  
 — RIFLE RANGE, PROVISIONS BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Quinn) 440 (i).  
 — RIOTS AND VICTORIA RIFLES : Ques. (Mr. Monet) 3036 (i).  
 — M. to adjn. (Mr. McNeill) 1288 (i).  
 — Members interrupting : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1291, 1310, 1314, 1366 (i).
- MONTREAL "STAR," COPIES FRANKED THROUGH MAILS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 2401, 2462 (i).
- MONTREAL TURNPIKE BONDS, INTEREST DUE GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2402, 2753 (i).
- MONUMENTS, BATTLEFIELDS, &c. : in Com. of Sup. 10357 (iii).  
 — TO CAN. VOLUNTEERS IN SOUTH AFRICA : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1119 (i).
- MOOSE JAW APPOINTMENTS : Remarks (Mr. Davin) 6063 (ii).  
 — COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, NAME, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 1465 (i), 5404 (ii).  
 — DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER CHAS. A. GASS : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 5241 (ii).  
 — amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Davin) 6323 (ii).  
 — DISMISSAL, REP. OF INSPECTOR: LAID ON TABLE (Mr. Mulock) 5393 (ii).  
 — SUB-COLLECTOR : in Com. of Sup., 6084 (ii).
- MOOSE JAW TOWN SITE, EXEMPTION OF LOTS, MEMORIALS, &c. : M. for copy\* (Mr. Davin) 2201.
- MOOSE MOUNTAIN INDIAN RESERVE, SALE TO U.S. SYNDICATE : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2194 (i).
- MORGAN, R. W., CORRECT INITIALS AND RESIDENCE : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5247 (ii).
- MORIN, MR. GEO., APPOINT. AS STATION MASTER, I.C.R., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Dechene) 5890 (ii).
- Morris and Portage Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 52 (Mr. Macdonnell) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1109 ; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1686 ; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 2783 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 67.)

MORRISON, MR. J. C., COLLECTOR OF MAILS AT BARRIE : Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2758 (i).  
 MOTIONS UNOPOSED : Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 6062.  
 ——— Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1009 (i).  
 ——— See "Business of the House."  
 MOUNTED INFANTRY, ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITS : Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 3040 (i).  
**Mounted Police Act (1894) Amt. B. No. 19** (Mr. *Davin*) 1°, 431 (i); 2° m., 4787; amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 m. h., 4790 (ii).  
 ——— **Pension Act Amt. B. No. 6** (Mr. *Davin*) 1°, 138 (i); 2° m., 4760 (ii).  
 MOUNTED POLICE ACTS, AMT. BILLS ON ORDER PAPER : Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 3330 (ii).  
 ——— HARDWARE SUPPLIES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5244 (ii).  
 ——— SUPPLIES, &c., TENDERS FOR TEA : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3042 (i).  
 ——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 3413 (ii).  
 ——— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 7077 (iii).  
 ——— NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 591 (i).  
 MOUNT TOLMIE P. O., PETS. *re* REMOVAL : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2406 (i).  
 "MUDLARK" DREDGE, INVESTIGATION BY RESIDENT ENGINEER : Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3040 (i).  
 MULGRAVE, PORT, RY. IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 9454 (iii).  
 MUNGOVAN, P., PAYMENTS TO : in Com. of Sup., 8128 (iii).  
 MURRAY AND CLEVELAND CONTRACTS : in Com. of Sup., 10237 (iii).  
 MURRAY BAY AND RIVER OUELLE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 9603 (iii).  
 ——— STEAM COMMUNICATION : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2756 (i).  
 MURRAY HARBOUR ROAD, P. E. I., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2754 (i).  
 ——— M. FOR COR.\* (Mr. *Martin*) 3469 (ii).  
**Mutual Life Assurance Co. of Canada B. No. 54** (Mr. *Britton*) 1°, 1109; 2°, 1686 (i) in Com., and 3°, 4478 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 11.)  
**National Sanitarium Association Co.'s B. No. 117** (Mr. *Maclean*) 1°, 2827 (i) 2°, 3373; in Com., and 3°, 4069 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 107.)  
 NATION RIVER DAM : in Com. of Sup., 10229 (iii).  
 ——— See "SOUTH NATION".  
 NELSON POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7927 (iii).  
**NEW BRUNSWICK :**  
 BATHURST, N. B., HOISTING OF FLAG, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6447 (ii); 6994 (iii).  
 ——— See "SOUTH AFRICAN WAR," &c.  
 BROWN, BART., AND ISAAC DICK, DISMISSAL BY GOVT. : M. for papers, &c.\* (Mr. *Ganong*) 1012 (i).  
 BUILDINGS, N. B. : in Com. of Sup., 9875 (iii).  
 CAMPBELLTON CUSTOMS OFFICER : in Com. of Sup., 6074 (ii).  
 ——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 9901 (iii).  
 CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iii).  
 ——— ISLAND FISH WEIRS, LICENSES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 594 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 7946 (iii).  
 CAPE TORMENTINE AND NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 1704.  
 CHANCE HARBOUR BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 9900 (iii).  
 CUSTOMS, N. B. : in Com. of Sup., 6070 (ii).  
 DIBBLEE, MR., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WOODSTOCK : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7316 (iii).  
 ——— See "WOODSTOCK".  
 DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 6441, 6443, 6959, 6968 (ii); 9901, 10277 (iii).  
 ——— INVESTIGATION, PAYMENTS, *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, *Pictou*) 778 (i).  
 ——— REP. OF COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 3446 (ii).  
 ELECTORAL LISTS, N. B., PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 438 (i).  
 FENIAN RAID MEDALS, N. B., DISTRIBUTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 5023 (ii).  
 FRYES HEAD CAMPOBELLO, APPLICATION OF GOFF & BATSON FOR WEIR PRIVILEGES : M. for papers, &c.\* (Mr. *Ganong*) 1012, 2202 (i).  
 GLASS, JAMES, FISHERY GUARDIAN, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 596 (i).  
 GRAND FALLS, N. B., MAINTENANCE OF ROAD, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9777 (iii).  
 GRAND MANAN LIGHTHOUSE, &c. : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Ganong*) 6788 (ii).  
 ——— SS. SERVICE, CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 596 (i), 9061 (iii).  
 ——— WHARF, PETS., &c. *re* : M. for copies,\* (Mr. *Ganong*) 1012 (i).  
 HARBOURS AND RIVERS, N. B. : in Com. of Sup., 7945, 9900 (iii).  
 HARBOUR WORKS, ST. JOHN, FORFEITED DEPOSITS : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10186 (iii).  
 ——— See "ST. JOHN, HARBOUR WORKS."  
 HOPEWELL CAPE AND HOPEWELL MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, TENDERS, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1012 (i).  
 INDIANS, N. B. : in Com. of Sup., 8070 (iii).  
 ——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 7295 (iii).  
 LOCAL ELECTIONS, N. B., LETTER *re* WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 740.  
 LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN : in Com. of Sup., 8372.  
 ——— COST OF REMOVAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2362 (i).  
 ——— CONSTRUCTION OF WAREHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2403 (i).  
 LURCHER SHOAL LIGHTSHIP : in Com. of Sup., 3662 (ii).  
 MARYSVILLE POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9880.  
 MISPEC RIVER, CONSTRUCTION OF DAM, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 7122 (iii).  
 NORTON STATION, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF MR. MCCREADY : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 5896 (ii).  
 OAK POINT LIGHTHOUSE, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3444, 3774 (ii).  
 RECEIVER GENERAL, ST. JOHN : in Com. of Sup., 10277 (iii).  
 RESTIGOUCHE RY. CO., REP. OF ENGINEERS *re* COST : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2201 (i).  
 RESTIGOUCHE AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 10009 (iii).  
 ROUND HILL POSTMASTER, SALARY, ALLOWANCES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 9796 (iii).  
 ST. JOHN'S HARBOUR WORKS, FORFEITURE OF DEPOSITS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10030, 10186.  
 ——— AND G. B., MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9577 (iii).  
 ——— IMMIGRANT BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 9875 (iii).  
 ——— "SUN," PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT. 1882 TO 1896 : Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1463 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

- SEAL COVE LIFE SAVING STATION, EQUIPMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 594 (i).  
 — ERECTION OF LIGHTS, &c.: M. for Rep.\* (Mr. *Ganong*) 1012 (i).  
 SHEDIAC AND SHEMOGUE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10012 (iii).  
 SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7946 (iii).  
 SUSSEX, N. B., ARMOURY FOR 8TH HUSSARS: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1733 (i).  
 TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 6347 (ii).  
 — EXPENSES FOR TRANSPORTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 6349 (ii).  
 — NUMBER OF LEPERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5401 (ii).  
 VINCE, D. McLEOD, DISMISSAL &c.: M. for Cor., Repts., &c.\* (Mr. *Hale*) 4078 (ii).  
 — See "SOUTH AFRICAN WAR," &c.  
 VOLUNTEERS FROM N. B., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 2196 (i).  
 VOTERS' LISTS FOR KING'S, N. B.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1120 (i).  
 — RECEIVED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 779 (i).  
 WILSON'S BRACH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS AND REPS. OF ENGINEERS: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Ganong*) 1012 (i).  
 — See "Local Elections."  
 WOODSTOCK CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7316 (iii).  
 — POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10271 (iii).
- NEW CARLISLE WHARF, SUBSIDY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3773 (ii).
- NEWFOUNDLAND AND CAN. RECIPROCITY TREATY, PROPOSALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 290 (i).  
 — COR., &c.: M. for copy (Mr. *Martin*) 2204 (i).  
 — INDUCEMENTS FOR CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3875 (ii).
- NEW GLASGOW PUBLIC BUILDING, PLUMBING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 7879 (iii).
- NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7940, 9896 (iii).
- NEWMANVILLE-MERRICKVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7124 (iii).
- NEWPORT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iii).
- NEWS AGENT, P. E. I. RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4912.
- NEWSPAPERS, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 6613 (ii).  
 — POSTAGE, AMOUNTS COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 3263 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3576 (ii).  
 — WRAPPERS: in Com. of Sup., 6089 (ii).
- NEW WESTMINSTER POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7929 (iii).  
 — POSTMASTER, NAME: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5896 (ii).
- NIAGARA FALLS PARK AND OLD FORT ERIE, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2194 (i).
- Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. *Ingram*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 471; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 589; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1511 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 108.)
- Nickel Steel Co. of Canada B. No. 68 (Mr. *MacPherson*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1381; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1686 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5922 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 109.)
- NICOLET RIVER RY. BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10021 (iii).

- NICTAUX FALLS, P. O., POSTMASTER'S RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 2464 (i).
- Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 101 (Mr. *Klock*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2345; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2673 (i) in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5162 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- NOBLE BROS., CLAIM, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8066 (iii).
- NORTH AMERICAN TRANSPORTATION CO., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 6248 (ii).
- NORTH CHANNEL, FORMING: in Com. of Sup., 8881.
- Northern Commercial Telegraph Co.'s B. No. 74 (Mr. *Domville*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1641; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1933; in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2783 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 110.)
- NORTH SHORE TEL. LINE, AMOUNTS PAID, MILES CONSTRUCTED, APPNT. OF INSPECTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1742 (i) 3765, 3769 (ii).
- North-west Mounted Police (South Africa) Provision B. No. 80 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 1642 (i) 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 3610; in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3611 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 19).
- N. W. MOUNTED POLICE FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (ii).  
 — COR. *re* SUPPLIES &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10408.  
 — MAIL SERVICE IN THE YUKON, COMPENSATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9779 (iii).  
 — POLICE REPORT: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5122 (ii).  
 — SUPPLIES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1555, 1724 (i).
- NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:
- ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10007 (iii).
- ARTESIAN BORINGS: in Com. of Sup., 10405 (iii).  
 — WELLS, PRINCE ALBERT: in Com. of Sup., 9892 (iii).  
 — BALGONIE AND HEDNESFORD MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1466 (i).  
 BANFF, ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 7074 (ii).  
 BATTLEFORD, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 10253 (iii).  
 BUILDINGS, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 7926, 9892 (ii).  
 CALGARY INTERWESTERN EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 10411 (iii).  
 CARNDUFF POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10264 (iii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 7415 (iii).  
 CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 10347 (iii).  
 COPELAND, MR. ARTHUR, STMTS. OF: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 778 (i).  
 CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 6084 (ii).  
 — SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9519 (iii).  
 DEP. RETURNING OFFICER, SASKATCHEWAN LAND-ING, PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3261 (i).  
 DISTRESSED SETTLERS, LIARD AND DEASE RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 7075 (iii).  
 — IN SASKATCHEWAN: in Com. of Sup., 7490.  
 DOM. LANDS, MAN. AND N. W. T., REGULATIONS *re* TIMBER LIMITS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 6780.  
 DOUKHOBORS AND GALICIANS, NUMBER AND SETTLEMENT IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 286 (i).  
 EDMONTON BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (iii).  
 FRASER, A. J., REMOVAL FROM REGINA LAND OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 740 (i).  
 GASS, C. A., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3761, 5241 (ii).  
 — Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Davin*) 5734 (ii).  
 — See "MOOSEJAW," &c.  
 GOVT. HOUSE, REGINA: in Com. of Sup., 7926.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

- GOVT. OF N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 6683 (ii).  
 HALF-BREEDS COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 10412 (iii).  
 IMMIGRATION TO N. W. TERS., INACCURACIES IN DEPTL. REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 10186 (iii).  
 INDIANS, MAN. AND N. W. T., TREATY EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 8071 (iii).  
 ——— TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2195 (i).  
 INSANE PATIENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6683 (ii).  
 KEEWATIN GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 7074 (iii).  
 KEITH, HILTON, INDIAN AGENT AT CARLTON: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1981 (i).  
 See "Privilege."  
 LAW REPORT, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6513 (ii).  
 LAND GRANTS TO RYS. IN MAN., B. C. AND N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1884 (i).  
 ——— SUBSIDIES TO RYS., NAMES, AMOUNTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1117 (i).  
 LIARD AND DEASE RIVERS, RELIEF TO SETTLERS: in Com. of Sup., 7075 (iii).  
 LUMSDEN, PETS. *re* MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2403 (i).  
 LUNATICS FROM N. W. T., IN MAN. ASYLUMS, MAINTENANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 3445 (ii).  
 MAN. AND N. W. T. DEFENCES: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 242, 281 (i).  
 ——— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 263 (i).  
 MEDICINE HAT, PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5514 (ii).  
 MOOSEJAW APPOINTMENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6063 (ii).  
 ——— COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1465 (i), 5404 (ii).  
 ——— DISMISSAL OF MR. GASS: amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 6323 (ii).  
 ——— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3761, 5241 (ii).  
 ——— REP. OF INSPECTOR: laid on Table (Mr. *Mulock*) 5393 (ii).  
 ——— SUB-COLLECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6084.  
 ——— TOWNSITE, EXEMPTION OF LOTS, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Davin*) 2201 (i).  
 MOOSE MOUNTAIN INDIAN RESERVE, SALE TO U.S. SYNDICATE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2194 (i).  
 N. W. FARMERS AND AUSTRALIAN COMPETITION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 293 (i).  
 N. W. MOUNTED POLICE FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (ii).  
 ——— HARDWARE SUPPLIES, AMOUNTS PAID &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4739, 5244 (ii).  
 ——— COR. *re* CONTRACTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Davin*) 161 (i).  
 ——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1555, 1724 (i), 3413 (ii), 10408 (iii).  
 ——— SCHEDULE FOR TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Davin*) 5213 (ii).  
 ——— SUPPLIES, &c., TENDERS FOR TEA: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3042 (i).  
 ——— WINTER OVERCOATS, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 148 (i).  
 N. W. TERS. POPULATION, ESTIMATE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 148 (i).  
 ——— SUBSIDY VOTED TO, COR. BETWEEN DOM. AND N. W. T. GOVTS. *re*: M. for copies (Mr. *Davin*) 3447 (ii).  
 N. W. TERS. PRINTING, TENDERS, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Davin*) 470, 1011 (i).  
 ——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1998 (i), 3413 (ii).  
 POSTAL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1745 (i).  
 PRINCE ALBERT JUDICIAL COURT: in Com. of Sup., 6431 (ii).  
 PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, INDIAN AGENT KEITH: (Mr. *Davin*) 2072 (i).  
 PUBLIC WORKS DESTROYED BY FLOODS: in Com. of Sup., 6691 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

- RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8929-  
 REGINA BARRACKS, OUTBREAK OF DIPHTHERIA: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5701 (ii).  
 ——— GOVT. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 9892.  
 ——— "LEADER" CO., AMOUNTS RECEIVED: on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn. deb: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 3872 (ii).  
 ——— TRANSFER OF TOWN SITE TO C.P.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2759 (i).  
 ROCKY MOUNTAIN PARK: in Com. of Sup., 10411.  
 ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (iii).  
 SASKATCHEWAN SETTLERS, RELIEF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7075, 7490, 10281 (iii).  
 SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 6684, 6689 (ii).  
 ——— LANDS, SALES OF BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1479 (i).  
 SEED GRAIN TO SETTLERS: in Com. of Sup., 7828.  
 ——— COR. BETWEEN INT. DEPT. AND PERSONS IN N. W. T.: M. for copies (Mr. *Davin*) 158 (i).  
 ——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 2998 (i).  
 TAXATION OF RY. LANDS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 611 (i).  
 TRAMP CATTLE FROM U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 8432 (iii).  
 ——— AND MEDICINE HAT STOCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION COR., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5403 (ii).  
 YOUNG, MR., DOM. OFFICER AT NORTH PORTAL: in Com. of Sup., 10414 (iii).  
 NORTON STATION, N.B., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF MR. MCCREADY: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 5896 (ii).  
 Nova Scotia Steel Co.'s B. No. 24 (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 471; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 589; in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2670 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 111.)  
 NOVA SCOTIA:  
 AMHERST, ACCOMODATION: in Com. of Sup. 9454.  
 ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY. CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10395 (iii).  
 ——— G. B., SS. SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (iii).  
 ARCHAT, COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: (Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 816 (i).  
 ARISAIG, LIGHTKEEPER, NAME, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3262 (i).  
 BADDECK AND EAST BAY SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 9592 (iii).  
 BLUE ROCK BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9895 (iii).  
 BROAD COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9897 (iii).  
 BROWN, LATE ALFRED, APPNMT. OF SUCCESSOR: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3049 (i).  
 BRULE, PREVENTIVE OFFICE, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 4557 (ii).  
 BUILDINGS, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7870, 9871.  
 CANSO FERRY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 10390.  
 CANSO AND ST. PETERS RY. CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 479 (i).  
 CAPE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7836.  
 CENTRE NEW ANNAN, P.O., APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 4557 (ii).  
 CHAPEL COVE, BREAKWATER, ERECTION OF BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1121 (i).  
 CHRISTY'S BROOK: in Com. of Sup., 9454 (iii).  
 CLYDE RIVER, RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER GEO. THOMPSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 5021.  
 COMEAUVILLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7836 (iii).  
 CREAMERIES: in Com. of Sup., 7631 (iii).  
 CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 6066 (ii) 9805 (iii).  
 DEEP SEA FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 10399.  
 DIGBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7870 (iii).  
 DIPPER HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 9900 (iii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

- DODGE, B. H., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, KENTVILLE: SEIZURES MADE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1118, 1478 (i).
- DREDGING, MARITIME PROVINCES: in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).
- DUFFERIN, PORT, HALIFAX COUNTY, WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9904, 10508 (iii).
- EASTERN EXTENSION RY. CO., ARBITRATION, PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10031.
- CONTRACT FOR PAINTING STATIONS: Ques. Mr. *Bell, Pictou* 3038 (i).
- EASTERN HARBOUR AND PORT HASTINGS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1886 (i).
- ETCHEMIN BRIDGE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 10389 (iii).
- ECUM SECUM WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 9896 (iii).
- FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 10399 (iii).
- HATCHERY, SYDNEY, C.B., SALE, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6781 (ii).
- GABARUS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9895.
- GOLD RIVER AND CHESTER BASIN, BUOY SERVICE TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 3875 (ii).
- HALIFAX COTTON FACTORY SIDINGS: in Com. on Sup., 9435 (iii).
- GOVT. BUILDING: in Com. on Sup., 9871.
- GARRISON: in Com. on Sup., 9772, 10358.
- APPLICATIONS FOR COMMISSIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pettet*) 3041 (i).
- CONTRACT FOR MEAT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 4555 (ii).
- CONTRACT FOR SUPPLIES: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3775, 4907, 5020 (ii).
- SUPPLIES FOR IMPERIAL FORCES: Remarks (Mr. *Powell*) 5250 (ii).
- remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 1123, 1209 (i).
- remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 649 (i).
- HARBOUR APPROACHES, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7771, 7788.
- IMPROVEMENT OF APPROACHES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6257 (ii).
- HALIFAX, NFLD. AND G. B., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (iii).
- AND PORTO RICO, SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 9598 (iii).
- WEST INDIES AND SOUTH AMERICA, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 9583 (iii).
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 7836, 7940, 9895 (iii).
- HAWKESBURY AND LOUISBURG RY. SUBSIDIES: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 9467 (iii).
- INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 7294, 8070 (iii).
- INGONISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7940.
- I.C.R., CAPE BRETON SIDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 8793, 8920 (iii).
- COMPLAINTS *re* TRAIN SERVICE ON C. B. DIVISION: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3178 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 3073 (i), 9790.
- Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7922, 8077.
- M. to adjn. (Mr. *Gillies*) 7975 (iii).
- CUMBERLAND COUNTY, SUBWAY, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7880 (iii).
- FREIGHT RATES, DISCRIMINATION AGAINST HALIFAX: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 8120 (iii).
- SAND CASTINGS IN N. S., NAMES OF TENDERERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 9062 (iii).
- "JAMES BECKWITH," SCHR., PAYMENT OF FISHING BOUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 6058, 6353 (ii).
- JUDIQUÉ WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7836 (iii).
- KENTVILLE, P. O. INSPECTOR, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4245 (ii).
- LEPER'S BROOK DYKE: in Com. of Sup., 9431 (iii).
- LIVERPOOL P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 9874 (iii).
- LIVINGSTONE'S COVE: in Com. of Sup., 9895 (iii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

- LOBSTER FISHING IN DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS COVES, REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4243.
- LOCKEPORT AND SABLE RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10012 (iii).
- LUNENBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7853, 9897 (iii).
- MAIL DELIVERY AT HALIFAX AND DARTMOUTH: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7990 (iii).
- SERVICE, INVERNESS COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 6616 (ii).
- MARGAREE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7965 (iii).
- MILLBROOK INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 7295 (iii).
- MULGRAVE, PORT, RY. IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 9454 (iii).
- NEW GLASGOW, PUBLIC BUILDING, PLUMBING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 7879 (iii).
- NEW HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7940, 98.6 (iii).
- NICTAUX FALLS P. O., POSTMASTER'S RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 2464 (i).
- NOVA SCOTIA RY., REFUND OF SUBSIDIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1464 (i).
- PORTER'S LAKE, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 9896 (iii).
- PORT GEORGE P. O., ISSUE OF MONEY ORDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4439 (ii).
- PORT MULGRAVE AND CANSO, SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 9597 (iii).
- PORT MULGRAVE AND MARBLE HEAD SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 9595, 10397 (iii).
- AND ST. PETER'S MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 7421 (iii).
- RY. ON ISLE MADAM, SUBSIDY BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 593 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE, N. S., APPNMT. OF SUPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2832 (i).
- RIVER JOHN WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7941 (iii).
- ROCKINGHAM STATION: in Com. of Sup., 9436.
- ROCKY LAKE BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 9431 (iii).
- ST. PETER'S CANAL, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9498 (iii).
- SALMON COUNTY, GOVT. WHARF AND SHED, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7656 (iii).
- SHEEHAN, JACOB, FISHING BOUNTY PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 6058 (ii).
- SPRINGHILL P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 7877 (iii).
- STELLARTON RY. SIDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 9442.
- SUBSIDY TO MUSGRAVE & CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4918 (ii).
- SYDNEY, CUSTOMS REVENUE: in Com. of Sup., 6069 (ii).
- P. O. ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3178 (i).
- RY. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 9440 (iii).
- Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3179 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 296 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 4665 (ii).
- RECEIPTS AT SYDNEY: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 9797 (iii).
- TRAFFIC AND TICKETS ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 150 (i).
- M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Gillies*) 319 (i).
- PETS., &c. *re* TRAIN SERVICE: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Gillies*) 1012 (i).
- TATAMAGOUCHE HARBOUR, SURVEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 9524 (iii).
- TATAMAGOUCHE MOUNTAIN P. O., APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 4557.
- THOMPSON, GEO., POSTMASTER AT CLYDE RIVER, N. S., RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 5021 (ii).
- TREFFRY, NORMAN L., SHIPPING MASTER AT YARMOUTH, SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2405 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

- WESTERN COUNTIES RY., & C., REFUND OF SUBSIDIES : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1121 (i).  
 WESTVILLE STATION : in Com. of Sup., 9440 (iii).  
 WINTER HARBOUR, REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 7836 (iii).  
 YARMOUTH STEAMSHIP CO. AND DOM. ATLANTIC RY. CO.'S BILL : M. to suspend Rules, &c. (Mr. *Flint*) 8278 (iii).  
 ——— M. to refund Fees (Mr. *Flint*) 9332 (iii).  
 NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS FOR ACTIVE SERVICE, S. A. WAR : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2757 (i).  
 OAK POINT LIGHTHOUSE, TENDERS, & C. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3444, 3774 (ii).  
 OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i), 8061 (iii).  
 Ocean Steamship Subsidies Act Amt. B. No. 151 (Mr. *Fisher*) prop. Res., 4333, 4811 ; 1\*, 4812 ; 2\* m., 5251 ; in Com., and 3\*, 5251 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 9.)  
 O'DONAHUE, W. T., LUMBER CONTRACT, & C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3764 (ii).  
 ——— PAYMENTS TO : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3763 (ii).  
 OFFICERS SERVING AS PRIVATES IN S. A. : Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 4240 (ii).  
 OFFICIAL REPS. OF COL. OTTER *re* CONTINGENTS : Read (Mr. *Borden*, *King's*) 3334 (ii).  
 ——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 3332 (ii).  
 ——— See "S. A. War," &c.  
 OGIIVIE, MR., REP. AND ACTION TAKEN BY GOVT. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 435 (i).  
 ——— ANSWER TO TELEGRAM : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5895 (ii).  
 ——— Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 7915 (iii).  
 ——— REP. OF YUKON TER. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5025 (ii).  
 ——— Remarks (Mr. *Sutherland*) 6060 (ii).  
 ——— SALARY, EMOLUMENTS, & C. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 154 (i), 4735 (ii).  
 OJA INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 7284 (iii).  
 OLIVER EQUIPMENT, COST, & C. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2364 (i).  
 ——— Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 9796 (iii).  
 ——— See "S. A. War," &c.  
 Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 136 (Mr. *Gibson*) 1\*, 3673 ; 2\*, 3804 ; in Com., and 3\*, 4479 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 69.)  
 Ontario Power Co. of Niagara Falls Co.'s B. No. 121 (Mr. *Flint*) 1\*, 2827 ; 2\*, 3033 (i) ; in Com., and 3\*, 4069 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 113.)  
 ONTARIO :  
 ALEXANDRIA P.O. : in Com. of Sup., 9886 (iii).  
 ALGOMA CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 9963 (iii).  
 ALIEN LABOUR ACT, ENFORCEMENT AT WELAND : Ques. (Mr. *Puitee*) 8839 (iii).  
 ARNPRIOR P.O., CONTRACT FOR FURNISHING AND LAYING ASPHALT SIDEWALKS : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3035 (i).  
 ATHENS POST OFFICE, HOURS OF CLOSING : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7972 (iii).  
 AUTOMOBILE CARS, TORONTO POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9885 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

- BARRIEFIELD COMMONS, KINGSTON : in Com. of Sup., 10354 ; conc., 10452 (iii).  
 ——— LEASE AND SALE, & C. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 10304 (iii).  
 BELGRAVE P.O., MAIL CONTRACTS, & C. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2747 (i).  
 BINDER TWINE : in Com. of Sup., 6890 (ii), 8132.  
 ——— ADVERTISEMENT OF SALE : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3039 (i).  
 ——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1008 (i).  
 ——— EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PURCHASE : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2759 (i).  
 ——— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1118 (i).  
 ——— NAME OF PURCHASER, & C. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 169 (i).  
 ——— PRICE OF RAW MATERIAL : Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 2747 (i).  
 ——— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 778 (i).  
 ——— QUANTITY OF FIBRE RECEIVED, & C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 5248 (ii).  
 ——— QUANTITY OF HEMP RECEIVED : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5249 (ii).  
 ——— SALE, & C. : amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Taylor*) 6146, 6238 ; neg. (Y. 38 ; N. 71) 6241 (ii).  
 ——— Production of Documents quoted from : Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Clancy*) 6194 (ii).  
 ——— SCHEDULE OF PRICES : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1008 (i).  
 ——— TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 5515 (ii).  
 BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 7916, 9881, 10264 (iii).  
 ——— MAIL TRANSFER SERVICE, CONTRACTS, & C. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1467 (i).  
 ——— WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 9973 (iii).  
 BRONTE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 10233 (iii).  
 ——— IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2193 (i).  
 BRUCE MINES WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iii).  
 BUILDINGS, ONT. : in Com. of Sup., 7916, 9881, 10264 (iii).  
 BURLINGTON CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 7951  
 C. P. R. AND DYMENT RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 9975 (iii).  
 COASTING LAWS, SUSPENSION : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 480 (i).  
 ——— M. for copies\* (Mr. *Foster*) 167 (i).  
 ——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2421, 2995 (i) 5409 (ii).  
 ——— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 7512, 7650 (iii).  
 CENTRAL ONTARIO RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 9968 (iii).  
 COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 7952, 10248 (iii).  
 ——— IMPROVEMENTS, APPROPRIATIONS BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1465 (i).  
 CORNWALL ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 9883, 9893 (iii).  
 ——— CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 8157, 9185, 10112 ; conc., 10452 (iii).  
 CUSTOMS, SALARIES. : in Com. of Sup., 6073 (ii).  
 DEPOT HARBOUR BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 10228 (iii).  
 DESERONTO POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9883.  
 DES JOACHIMS BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 10253.  
 ELECTORAL LISTS FOR ONT., PRINTING, & C. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 593 (i).  
 EXPORT OF LOGS AND LUMBER FROM INDIAN RESERVES, QUANTITY, & C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 150 (i).  
 FARRAN'S POINT CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 8157, 8880, 10393, 10397 (iii).  
 GALOPES CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 8376, 8504 (iii)  
 ——— CHANNEL, DREDGING, & C. : in Com. of Sup., 8157 (iii).  
 ——— ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 8775, 10393

ONTARIO—*Con.*

GAS BUOYS, ST. LAWRENCE RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 8885 (iii).  
 GILBERT DREDGING CO.: in Com. of Sup., 10112; conc., 10452 (iii).  
 GLENGARRY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9886.  
 GODÉRICH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10245.  
 GRAIN DELIVERIES AT COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR FOR 1899: Ans. (Mr. Paterson) 1466 (i).  
 HALIBURTON AND WHITNEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9971 (iii).  
 HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 7950, 10228 (iii).  
 HAWKESTONE DOCK, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3045, 4076 (ii).  
 HOCKLEY AND MONO CENTER, MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1749, 2742 (i).  
 INDIANS, ONT. AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 7281 (iii).  
 — MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 8068 (iii).  
 IRONDALE, BANCROFT AND OTTAWA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9960 (iii).  
 KINGSTON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7916.  
 — MILITARY CAMP, MEAT SUPPLIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 7969 (iii).  
 — AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9972 (iii).  
 — PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 6888 (ii) 8135 (iii).  
 — ELECTRIC PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 6440.  
 — GRATUITIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10319.  
 LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE, SURVEY OF: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 3444 (ii).  
 LAVELLE, PETS. *re* ESTABLISHMENT OF P. O.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Sproule) 3050 (i).  
 LANCASTER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10229 (iii).  
 LEAMINGTON PIER: in Com. of Sup., 10244 (iii).  
 LITTLE CURRENT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10250.  
 LONDON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7916 (iii).  
 MCGREGOR'S CREEK: in Com. of Sup., 10233 (iii).  
 McNAB LAKE, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 8433 (ii).  
 McNAMARA, MR., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WALKERTON: in Com. of Sup., 6074 (ii).  
 MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9970 (iii).  
 MANN, G. O., RELEASE FROM KINGSTON PENITENTIARY, REP. OF MIN OF JUS., &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. Taylor) 1013 (i).  
 MEAFORD, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10247 (iii).  
 MIDLAND HARBOUR RANGE LIGHTS, &c.: ERECTION OF: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3045 (i).  
 MILITIA STAFF COURSE KINGSTON: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2422, 2740 (i).  
 — See "R. M. C.", &c.  
 MILLER, R. W., POSTMASTER OF ACTINOLITE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Carscallen) 1114 (i).  
 MORRISON, MR. J. C., COLLECTOR OF MAILS AT BARRIE: Ques. (Mr. Tyrwhitt) 2758 (i).  
 MURRAY AND CLEVELAND'S CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 10236 (iii).  
 NORTH RIVER, DAM: in Com. of Sup., 10229, 10251 (iii).  
 NEWMANVILLE-MERRICKVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 7124 (iii).  
 NIAGARA FALLS PABE AND OLD FORT ERIE, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCleary) 2194 (i).  
 NORTH CHANNEL, FORMING: in Com. of Sup., 8881 (iii).  
 ORDNANCE LANDS, ESSEX COUNTY, SALE OF TIMBER: M. for O. C.'s\* (Mr. Cowan) 3000 (i).  
 O'REILLY, MR. J. B., APPOINT. AS COUNTY JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 479 (i).  
 ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER, NAME AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 286 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

OTTAWA, BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 7932 (iii).  
 — CHAUDIERE BRIDGES, REBUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4345 (ii).  
 — CUSTOMS OFFICES: in Com. of Sup., 9688.  
 — HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7937 (iii).  
 — LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7938 (iii).  
 — MARIA STREET BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 10253 (iii).  
 — MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 7847, 9858 (iii).  
 OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, O. C. *re* MR. WALTER SHANLEY: M. for copy\* (Mr. Monk) 2201 (i).  
 OTTAWA AND HULL CONFLAGRATION: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to adjn. Hse., 4331 (ii).  
 — See "Supply B. 147."  
 — Prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 4338 (ii).  
 — RELIEF FUND: in Com. of Sup., 4339 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5807 (ii).  
 OTTAWA AND NEW YORK RY. CO.'S BRIDGE SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9975 (iii).  
 OTTAWA RIVER SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 10395.  
 PARRY SOUND AND FRENCH RIVER RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9971 (iii).  
 PELEE ISLAND, SALE OF LIFE-SAVING STATION: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4559 (ii).  
 — TELEGRAPHS: in Com. of Sup., 10254 (iii).  
 PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9963 (iii).  
 PENETANGUSHENE REFORMATORY, &c., NUMBER OF REPRIEVES: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Clarke) 2200.  
 PHIN, W. E., CONTRACTS *re* DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10236 (iii).  
 PICKERING BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10230.  
 PICTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9884 (iii).  
 — POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Corby) 1461 (i).  
 PORT BURWELL: in Com. of Sup., 10234 (iii).  
 PORT COLBORNE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 8520, 10397 (iii).  
 PORT DALHOUSIE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 8521.  
 PORT FINDLAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10250.  
 PORT HOPE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 10229.  
 PORT STANLEY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10236.  
 RAINY RIVER RY. CO., CONTRACTS WITH: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4074 (ii).  
 — LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 7861 (iii).  
 RAMA INDIAN RESERVE, MEDICAL SUPT.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3043 (i).  
 RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 10393 (iii).  
 RIDEAU CANAL, OVERSEER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 10395 (iii).  
 ROCKLIFFE RANGE: in Com. of Sup., 9768 (iii).  
 ROWAN MILLS P. O., POSTMASTER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tisdale) 4742 (ii).  
 ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, AMOUNTS EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1734 (i).  
 — STAFF COURSE, SELECTION OF OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1110, 2163 (i).  
 — M. for cor.\* (Mr. Foster) 1012 (i).  
 — inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2422, 2740 (i).  
 ST. THOMAS DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9890.  
 — PURCHASE OF PARADE GROUND, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 294 (i) 7122 (iii).  
 — COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND J. H. WILSON, M. D.: M. for copies (Mr. Ingram) 648 (i).  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ingram) 8077 (iii).  
 — POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 6610 (ii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. McMillan) 1883 (i).  
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 8885, 9427 (iii).  
 — CHANNEL, KINGSTON: in Com. of Sup., 7965 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER CANALS : CONTRACTS CANCELLED, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 156.  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2825 (i).  
 — EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2403 (i).  
 — OPENING : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 3775 (ii).  
 — POLICY OF LATE GOVT. *re* COMPLETION : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2164 (i).  
 — 14-FT NAVIGATION, COMPLETION AND EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 739 (i).  
 — REMOVAL OF ROCKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iii).  
 — SURVEYS : in Com. of Sup., 8158 (iii).  
 SARNIA, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10228 (iii).  
 — POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7917, 9884.  
 SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 10393 (iii).  
 — HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 10250 (iii).  
 — CANAL, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 8153 (iii).  
 — RES. OF TOWN COUNCIL, &c. : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9727 (iii).  
 SCHOMBURG AND AURORA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. of Res., 9975 (iii).  
 SNETSINGER, J. G., M.P., CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1462, 1737 (i).  
 SOPERTON POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1735 (i).  
 SOUTH NATION RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 10229, 10251 (iii).  
 STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 9962 (iii).  
 SUBSIDIES TO ONT. AND QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 155 (i).  
 — SUBSIDY DUE BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Corby*) 3037 (i).  
 TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 10250 (iii).  
 THOUSAND ISLANDS RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 9972 (iii).  
 TORONTO DRILL HALL, IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3036 (i).  
 — HARBOUR, AMOUNTS PAID FOR DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1742 (i).  
 — DREDGING CONTRACT : in Com. of Sup., 10230, 10236 (iii).  
 — ENGINEERS ESTIMATE, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2202 (i).  
 — MEMBERS, PAYMENTS TO : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 6051 (ii).  
 — PAYMENTS TO FROM 1879 TO 1897 : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5888 (ii).  
 — POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9885 (ii).  
 — POSTMASTER, ABSENCE FROM OFFICIAL DUTIES : (Mr. *Featherston*) 4443 (ii).  
 — DEP. POSTMASTER, SUPERANNUATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3263 (ii).  
 TRANSPORTATION QUESTION AND ST. LAWRENCE CANAL CONTRACTS, SPEECH OF P.M.G. AT COLLINGWOOD : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 432 (i).  
 TRENT VALLEY CANAL, ARBITRATION ON DAMAGES, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1896 (i).  
 — CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 8158, 10393 (iii).  
 — COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Rogers*) 3037 (i).  
 — TENDERS *re* TRENT-FRANKFORD SECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 156 (i).  
 VOLUNTEERS FROM ONT. FOR SOUTH AFRICA, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Cargill*) 2181 (i).  
 WALLACE, GUNNER, DEATH AT KINGSTON : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 477 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

- WELLAND CANAL, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8520 (iii).  
 — DYNAMITE EXPLOSION : M. to adjn. (Mr. *McCleary*) 4252, 4257 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 4251 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *McCleary*) 4145, 4149 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4068 (ii).  
 — MILITIA GUARD : in Com. of Sup., 9772.  
 — NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 2181 (i).  
 — REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10395 (iii).  
 WINDSOR DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 9889.  
 WOODBRIDGE FAIR, IMPORTATION OF POSTERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 1732 (i).  
 WOODSTOCK POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7926.  
 OPTIONS GRANTED IN YUKON, DATE, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5894 (ii).  
 — NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5894 (ii).  
 — See "Yukon," &c.  
 ORDER, QUES. OF, BROCKVILLE AND HURON ELECTIONS : on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*). Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 429 (i).  
 — Member called to order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1010.  
 — BUDGET, THE (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) : Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 2886 (i).  
 — CHARLESON, MR. J. B. : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7313 (iii).  
 — CONCILIATION OF TRADE DISPUTES BILL (Mr. *Davin*) 8418 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 8418-22 (iii).  
 — Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 8418 (iii).  
 — CUSTOMS OFFICERS : in Com. of Sup., 10421 (iii).  
 — DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT. BILL 133 : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 6717-8 (ii).  
 — EMERGENCY RATIONS, *re* DOCUMENTS LAID ON TABLE : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 6831-6844 (ii).  
 — FRANKING PRIVILEGE, &c. : Personal Violence to Member (Mr. *Speaker*) 809, 811 (i).  
 — IRRELEVANCY OF DEBATE : Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 4271, 4294, 6140, 6194, 6202 (ii).  
 — Member asked to withdraw "infamous" (Mr. *Speaker*) 5734 (ii).  
 — Member asked to withdraw word "boor" (Mr. *Speaker*) 1760 (i).  
 — Member (Mr. *Davis*) must confine himself to motion before House (Mr. *Speaker*) 321 (i).  
 — Members remarks checked (Mr. *Speaker*) 701.  
 — REPRESENTATION BILL : Ques. of Order (Sir *Charles Tupper*) ; ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1557 (i).  
 — (Mr. *Davin*) : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3867 (ii).  
 — (Mr. *McMullen*) : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3823, 3838 (iii).  
 — (Mr. *McMullen*) 4906 : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 4907 (ii).  
 — Member (Mr. *McMullen*) asked to withdraw stmt. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1225-31 (i).  
 — (Mr. *Speaker*) 4926 (ii).  
 — Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 3815 (ii).  
 — (Mr. *Talbot*) : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3839 (iii).  
 — (Mr. *Taylor*) : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 3883 (ii).  
 — RIGHT TO VOTE ON BILLS : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 9680, 9688 (iii).

- ORDER, Ques. of, N.W.T. LAW REPORTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6534 (ii).  
 ——— PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH G. B., ORDER: Ques. of (Mr. Foster) 2339; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2340 (i).  
 ——— REFERRING TO PAST DEBATE: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5735 (ii).  
 ——— SENATE AND H. OF C. ACT AMT. BILL (Mr. Domville): Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 510 (i).  
 ——— UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE (Mr. Speaker) 6179.  
 ——— "YUKONER" SS., CLEARANCE: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5006 (ii).  
 ——— Yukon, Rep. of Mr. Coste *re* Teslin Lake Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 608 (ii).  
 ——— YUKON TELEGRAPH SUPPLIES, PURCHASE BY MR. CHARLESON: Telegram read (Mr. Maxwell) 8282 (iii).  
 ——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 8283 (iii).  
 ——— Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 8284 (iii).
- ORDINANCES, YUKON TERRITORY: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4734 (ii).
- ORDNANCE LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 9778 (iii).  
 ——— ESSEX COUNTY, SALE OF TIMBER: M. for O. C.'s.\* (Mr. Cowan) 3050 (i).
- O'REILLY, MR. J. B., APPNMT. AS COUNTY JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 479 (i).
- Oxford Copper Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 53 (Mr. Belcourt) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1109; 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 1725, 1928 (i).
- ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER, NAME AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 286 (i).
- OSBORNE, J. H., SEARCH OF PREMISES: Ques. Mr. McCormick) 8431, 8524 (iii).
- Oshawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 91 (Mr. Burnett) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1877; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2109 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3373 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 70).
- Ottawa Brockville and New York Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 120 (Mr. Frost) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2827 (i); 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3373 (ii); in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 7031 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 71).
- OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, O. C. *re* MR. WALTER SHANLEY: M. for copy\* (Mr. Monk) 2201.
- Ottawa and Hull Fire Relief Fund Co.'s B. No. 175 (Mr. Belcourt) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 6899 (ii); in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 7652 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 114).  
 ——— See "Supply B. 147."
- OTTAWA AND HULL APPROPRIATION (RELIEF FUND): prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 4338 (ii).  
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 4339 (ii).  
 ——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5807 (ii).  
 ——— CONFLAGRATION: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to adjn. Hse., 4331 (ii).
- OTTAWA AND NEPEAN POINT BRIDGE Co.'s BRIDGE SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10002 (iii).
- OTTAWA AND NEW YORK RY. Co.'s BRIDGE SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9975 (iii).
- OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 7932 (iii).  
 ——— HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7937 (iii).  
 ——— LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7938 (iii).  
 ——— CUSTOMS OFFICES: in Com. of Sup., 9888 (iii).  
 ——— MILITIA STORES: in Com. of Sup., 7847 (iii).
- OTTAWA RIVER CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 8376 (iii).  
 ——— RIVER SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 10395 (iii).
- OTTER'S, COL., CORRECTNESS OF REPS. *re* South African War: Remarks (Mr. Borden, King's) 4560.  
 ——— Inquiry (Mr. Prior) 4373 (ii).  
 ——— Ques. (Mr. Ross-Robertson) 3044 (i).  
 ——— See "South African War," &c.
- OUELLETTE, MR. A., DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 5245 (ii).  
 ——— MAIL CLERK AT LÉVIS, DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 4070 (ii).
- OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 5948 (ii).
- PACIFIC CABLE: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Belcourt) 7040 (iii).  
 ——— ACTION OF IMP. GOVT.: M. to adjn. (Mr. Casey) 1483 (i).  
 ——— CONCESSIONS TO EASTERN EXTENSION Co.: M. to adjn. (Mr. Casey) 2149 (i).  
 ——— COR. WITH IMP. GOVT. AND COLONIES, &c.: M. for copies\* (Sir Charles Tupper) 1011 (i).  
 ——— Inquiry for papers (Mr. Casey) 865 (i).  
 ——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Mulock) 1554, 1898.  
 ——— PAR IN NEWSPAPERS *re* QUES. IN IMP. H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. McNeil) 815 (i).  
 ——— PAR IN "THE OUTLOOK": M. to adjn. (Mr. Casey) 652 (i).  
 ——— PAR IN "TORONTO GLOBE": Ques. (Mr. Casey) 291 (i).  
 ——— PAR IN "TORONTO GLOBE" *re* PROPOSAL OF EASTERN EXTENSION Co.: M. to adjn. (Mr. Casey) 581 (i).  
 ——— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1977 (i).  
 ——— See "Eastern Extension."
- PAN-AMERICAN EXHIBITION, CONSTRUCTION OF CAN. BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. Oster) 2752 (i).
- PAPER COMBINE, GOVT. LEGISLATION *re* DUTY: Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 4921 (ii).  
 ——— PROPOSED REDUCTION OF DUTY: Remarks (Mr. Maclean) 4802 (ii).  
 ——— PROPOSED REDUCTION OF POSTAGE: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 4801 (ii).
- PARENT, MR. ARTHUR, EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 9523 (iii).
- PARIS EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 6344 (ii), 10337.  
 ——— AMOUNT SPENT ON BUILDINGS: Remarks (Mr. Montague) 7649 (iii).  
 ——— APPNMT. OF MIN. OF PUB. WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 740 (i).  
 ——— ARRANGEMENTS BY GOVT., RESPECTING: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1788 (i).  
 ——— CLOSING ON SUNDAYS: Remarks (Mr. Charlton) 5030, 6252, 6352 (ii).  
 ——— COLD STORAGE FOR CAN. EXHIBITS: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5392 (ii).  
 ——— COST OF CAN. BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 3771 (ii).  
 ——— FISHERIES COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1460 (i).  
 ——— MAP OF CAN., BOUNDARY LINE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5891 (ii).

- PARIS EXPOSITION : OFFICIALS APPOINTED BY GOVT.:  
 Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 2400 (i).  
 — PAR IN "TORONTO MAIL" *re* EXHIBITS ON  
 SUNDAY: Remarks (Mr. Charlton) 5030 (ii).  
 — P. E. I. REPRESENTATION: Remarks (Mr.  
 Martin) 4258 (ii).  
 — PROVINCIAL REPRESENTATION: Remarks (Mr.  
 Martin) 1642 (i).  
 — SPEECHES OF HON. MR. TARTE: Remarks  
 (Mr. Foster) 7511 (iii).  
 — STAFF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iii).  
 PARLIAMENT, CALLING OF ON A FIXED DATE: prop.  
 Res. (Mr. Casey) 3469 (ii).  
 PASSES TO CLERGYMEN ON I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr.  
 Taylor) 4913 (ii).  
 — JUDGES, I. C. R., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr.  
 Angers) 2830 (i).  
 PARRY SOUND AND FRENCH RIVER RY. Co.'s SUB-  
 SIDY: in Com. on Res., 9971 (iii).  
 Patent Act Amt. B. No. 106 (Mr. Gibson)  
 1<sup>o</sup>, 2457 (i).  
 — B. No. 168 (Mr. Fisher) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 5887; 2<sup>o</sup> m.,  
 6933 (ii).  
 PATENT ACT (AUER LIGHT) AMT. BILL (Mr. Gibson):  
 ruled out of Order (Mr. Speaker) 1642 (i).  
 PATENTS, CLASSIFYING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6342.  
 "PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 6339 (ii),  
 7199 (iii).  
 Patents. See "Andrew, J. W.," "Frost and  
 Wood," "Miami Cycle Co.," "Milne, James,"  
 "Orford Copper Co.," "Servis Railroad Tie  
 Plate."  
 Patterson. See "Divorce."  
 PAYMENT TO DOG DRIVER IN YUKON, &c.: Ques. (Mr.  
 Davin) 3262 (i).  
 PELEE ISLAND, SALE OF LIFE-SAVING STATION: Ques.  
 (Mr. Taylor) 4559 (ii).  
 — TELEGRAPHS: in Com. of Sup., 10254 (iii).  
 PELESSIER P. O., REMOVAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte)  
 7879 (iii).  
 PELLETIER, REAL, PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. Dechene)  
 8524 (iii).  
 PEMBROKE SOUTHERN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: in Com. on  
 Res., 9963 (iii).  
 PENETANGUISHENE REFORMATORY, &c., NUMBER OF  
 REPRIEVES: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Clarke) 2200 (i).  
 Penitentiary Act Amt. B. No. 174 (Mr.  
 Fitzpatrick) 1<sup>o</sup>, 6692 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup>, 8088; in Com.,  
 8083; 3<sup>o</sup>, 8088 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 47.)  
 PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6438, 6888 (ii),  
 10277, 10318 (iii).  
 — B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 6975 (ii).  
 — INSPECTOR'S REP.: in Com. of Sup., 6441 (ii).  
 — INVESTIGATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6895, 6959.  
 — KINGSTON, BINDER TWINE: in Com. of Sup.,  
 8132 (iii).  
 PENSIONS TO PERMANENT CORPS, LEGISLATION RES-  
 PECTING: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 5753 (ii).  
 — FOR VOLUNTEERS, SOUTH AFRICAN WAR, &c.:  
 Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 10304 (iii).  
 — See "Militia," &c.
- PERCE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iii).  
 — AND GASPE WHARFS, CONSTRUCTION, &c.:  
 Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 5753 (ii).  
 PERIBONKA WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. Mr.  
 Casgrain) 1744 (i), 3765 (ii).  
 — PAY SHEETS *re* CONSTRUCTION: M. for copy\*  
 (Mr. Casgrain) 2202 (i).  
 PERMANENT CORPS, REDUCTION OF PAY, O. C., &c.:  
 Ques. (Mr. Gilmour) 2164 (i).  
 — YUKON FORCE, WITHDRL., &c.: Remarks (Sir  
 Charles Tupper) 1209 (i).  
 PERRAULT, JOS., EXPENSES AS COMMISSIONER AT CEN-  
 TENNIAL EXHIBITION: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 2378 (i).  
 — ON READING OF QUESTION: Ruling (Mr.  
 Speaker) 2397 (i).  
 — INQUIRY *re*: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 2831 (i).  
 PERRON, P. A., APPOINT.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3768.  
 PERRY, SUPT., AND VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. Davin)  
 297 (i).  
 PERSONAL EXPLANATION *re* ATTENDANCE AT CAUCUSES  
 (Mr. Stubbs) 8439 (iii).  
 — EMERGENCY (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 7542 (iii).  
 — *re* MR. LOGAN'S SPEECH IN *re* DOM. COAL CO.  
 (Mr. McDougall) 5018 (ii).  
 — *re* MR. STUBBS (Mr. Bennett) 8525 (iii).  
 — PAR. IN BELLEVILLE "DAILY INTELLIGENCER"  
 (Mr. Campbell) 7422 (iii).  
 — PAR. IN "DAILY PATRIOT" *re* DISTRIBUTION  
 OF BALLOTS (Mr. Powell) 7772 (iii).  
 — PAR. IN OTTAWA "CITIZEN" *re* GEORGIAN BAY  
 CANAL (Mr. Haggart) 2561 (i).  
 — PAR. IN TORONTO "GLOBE" (Mr. Montague)  
 2674 (i).  
 — PAR. IN TORONTO "GLOBE" *re* GEN. HUTTON:  
 Remarks (Mr. Montague) 480 (i).  
 — PROHIBITION, &c. (Mr. Macdonald, P. E. I.)  
 9472 (iii).  
 — *re* PUB. ACCTS. COM. (Mr. Bourassa) 4385 (ii).  
 — TRAVELLING EXPENSES (Sir Charles Tupper)  
 3577, 4334 (ii).  
 PHILLIPS, MR., APPRAISER AT WINNIPEG: in Com.  
 of Sup., 6080 (ii).  
 PHIN, W. E., CONTRACTS *re* DREDGING, &c.: in Com.  
 of Sup., 10236 (iii).  
 — PAYMENTS TO, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 3770.  
 PICHETTE, MR., PRIVILEGES AT LEVIS STATION,  
 I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 4069 (ii).  
 PICKERING BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10230 (iii).  
 PICTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9884 (iii).  
 — POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &c.: Ques. (Mr.  
 Corby) 1461 (i).  
 Pilotage Act Amt. B. No. 11 (Sir Louis Davies)  
 1<sup>o</sup>, 243 (i); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 5059; in Com., 5061, 5144 (ii)  
 6995; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 8936 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 36.)  
 PILOTS, MONTREAL AND KINGSTON, COR. *re* INCOR-  
 PORATION: M. for copy\* (Mr. Talbot) 2203 (i).  
 PINEAU, H. J., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr.  
 Martin) 3446 (ii).  
 PINETTE HARBOUR (P. E. I.) IMPROVEMENTS: Ques.  
 (Mr. Martin) 2754 (i).

PLAINS OF ABRAHAM, PURCHASE OF: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 6351, 6617 (ii), 7123 (iii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2171 (i).  
 PLEBISCITE VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 8136 (iii).  
 POINTE CLAIRE FIRE, RELIEF TO SUFFERERS: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6135 (ii).  
 POINTE AUX OUTARDES CABLE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 7315 (iii).  
 POINT AUX TREMBLES LIGHTHOUSE, RECONSTRUCTION: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6062 (ii).  
 POLITICAL PAMPHLETS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 170, 289 (i).  
 PONTBRIAND P. O., PETS. *re* LOCATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 1981 (i).  
 Pontiac Pacific Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 45 (Mr. Pourore) 1<sup>st</sup>, 649; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1005; in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2670 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 72.)  
 POPULATION OF N. W. TERS., ESTIMATE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 148 (i).  
 PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 10253.  
 Portage du Fort and French River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 97 (Mr. Mackie) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2072; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2673 (i) *ref. to Sel. Com.*, 4142, *withdn.*, 4332 (ii).  
 Port Arthur Ry. and Terminals Co.'s B. No. 103 (Mr. Dymont) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2345; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2673 (i) *withdn.*, 4554 (ii).  
 PORT BURWELL, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10234.  
 PORT COLBORNE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 8520, 10397 (iii).  
 PORT DALHOUSIE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 8521 (iii).  
 Port Dover, Brantford, Berlin and Gode- rich Ry. Co.'s B. No. 43 (Mr. Charlton) 1<sup>st</sup>, 649; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1246; in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2670 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 73.)  
 PORTER, EDGAR H., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, INVESTIGATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 2404 (i).  
 PORTER'S LAKE, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9896.  
 PORT FINDLAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10250 (iii).  
 PORT GEORGE P. O., ISSUE OF MONEY ORDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 4439 (ii).  
 PORT HOPE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 10229 (iii).  
 PORT MULGRAVE AND CANSO, SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 9597 (iii).  
 — AND MARBLE MOUNTAIN, SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 9595, 10397 (iii).  
 — AND ST. PETER'S MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. Gillies) 7421 (iii).  
 PORTRAIT OF HER MAJESTY: in Com. of Sup., 10255.  
 — OF HON. MR. MACKENZIE AND SIR JOHN THOMPSON: in Com. of Sup., 8136 (iii).  
 PORT STANLEY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10236 (iii).  
 POSTAGE ON NEWSPAPERS: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 4801 (ii).  
 POSTAL ARMY CORPS: *See* "Army Postal Corps."  
 Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 191 (Mr. Mulock) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 9332; 2<sup>nd</sup> m., 9689; agreed to (Y. 78; N. 27) 9701; M. for Com., 9799; in Com., 9812; 3<sup>rd</sup> m., 9836; Amt. (Mr. Davin) *neg.* (Y. 36; N. 79) 9837; 3<sup>rd</sup>, 9838 (iii).

## POST OFFICE:

ALBERTON AND KILDARE, P.E.I., MAIL CONTRACTORS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1979 (i).  
 ARNPRIOR P. O., CONTRACT FOR FURNISHING, AND LAYING ASPHALT SIDEWALK: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3035 (i).  
 ATHENS POST OFFICE, HOURS OF CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 7972 (iii).  
 AUTOMOBILE CARS, TORONTO POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9885 (iii).  
 BAILEY, W. H., EMPLOYMT. IN B. C. POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 299 (i).  
 BALGONIE AND HEDNESFORD MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1466 (i).  
 BEAUMONT, WM., POSTMASTER AT MAPLE BAY, B.C., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 433 (i).  
 BELGRAVE P. O., MAIL CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2747 (i).  
 BROCKVILLE MAIL TRANSFER SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1467 (i).  
 CAPE TORMENTINE AND NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1704.  
 CARNDUFF POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10264 (iii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. Davin) 7415 (iii).  
 CENTRE NEW ANNAN P. O., APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 4557 (ii).  
 CLYDE RIVER, N.S., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER GEO. THOMPSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 5021 (ii).  
 DEAD LETTER BRANCH, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6129 (ii).  
 EASTERN HARBOUR AND PORT HASTINGS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1886 (i).  
 FRANKING PRIVILEGE, ABUSE OF BY MEMBERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2458, 2747 (i).  
 — M. to *adjn.* (Mr. Domville) 787-8 (i).  
 — Order, Ques. of (Mr. Speaker) 809 (i).  
 — O. C. RESPECTING, VIOLATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 779 (i).  
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Clancy) 3613.  
 GAGNE, MR., APPNMT. AS POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 5756, 5754 (ii).  
 GASS, CHAS. A., POSTMASTER AT MOOSEJAW, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 3761, 5241.  
 — Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Davin) 5734 (ii).  
 — *See* "Moosejaw," &c.  
 HOCKLEY AND MONO CENTER, MAIL CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1749, 2742 (i).  
 HOPEWELL CAPE AND HOPEWELL MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 1012 (i).  
 IRIS (P.E.I.), PETS. *re* TRI-WEEKLY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1751 (i).  
 JONES, MR. E. H., LATE POSTMASTER, KAMLOOPS, B.C., DISMISSAL: M. for cor. (Mr. Prior) 2762, 3050 (i).  
 — inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 4068 (ii).  
 KAMOURASKA MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 9795 (iii).  
 — AND ST. PASCAL MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1749 (i); 4741 (ii).  
 KENTVILLE P. O., INSPECTOR, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 4245 (ii).  
 KINNEAR MILLS P. O., INQUIRY *re* REGISTERED LETTER (Mr. Turcott) 8076 (iii).  
 LAVELLE, PETS. *re* ESTABLISHMENT OF P. O.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Sproule) 3050 (i).  
 LEMAY, MAXIME, POSTMASTER AT LOTBINERE, DISMISSAL AND APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. Fortier) 1728 (i).  
 LILLOOET AND LYTTON MAIL SERVICE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1979 (i) 3770 (ii).  
 LUMSDEN, N.W.T., PETS. *re* MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2403 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

- MAIL BAGS, PRIVATE DELIVERY : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 8049 (iii).  
 — CLERKS, EXAMINATION OF : Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 6616 (ii).  
 — CONTRACTS, PETS., MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2200 (i).  
 — MONTREAL AND QUEBEC DIVISION, FINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 4076 (ii).  
 — DELIVERY AT HALIFAX AND DARTMOUTH : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7990 (iii).  
 — MILEAGE, YEARLY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1477 (i).  
 — IN YEARS ENDING 1890 AND 1893 : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2169 (i).  
 MAIL SERVICE : in Com of Sup., 8657, 8708 (iii).  
 — INVERNESS CO. : Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 6616 (ii).  
 — MAN., PETS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 9522 (iii).  
 — YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 9779 (iii).  
 MILLER, R. W., POSTMASTER OF ACTINOLITE, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 1114.  
 MONTREAL P. O. FINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6057 (ii).  
 MONTREAL "STAR," COPIES SENT THROUGH MAIL, NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ethier*) 2462 (i).  
 MOOSEJAW APPOINTMENTS : Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6063 (ii).  
 — DISMISSAL OF MR. GASS : amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 6323 (ii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5241 (ii).  
 — REP. OF INSPECTOR : laid on Table (Mr. *Mulock*) 5393 (ii).  
 MORRISON, MR. J. C., COLLECTOR OF MAILS AT BARRIE : Ques. (Mr. *Tyrchitt*) 2758 (i).  
 MOUNT TOLMIE P. O., PETS. *re* REMOVAL : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2406 (i).  
 MURRAY HARBOUR ROAD, P. E. I., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2753.  
 — M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Martin*) 3469 (ii).  
 NEWMANVILLE-MERRICKVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, TENDERS : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7124 (iii).  
 NEWSPAPER POSTAGE, AMOUNTS COLLECTED : Ques. (Mr. *Carroll*) 3263 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3576 (ii).  
 — PROP. REDUCTION : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4801 (ii).  
 NEW WESTMINSTER POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7929 (iii).  
 — POSTMASTER, NAME : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5896 (ii).  
 NICTAUX FALLS P. O., POSTMASTER'S RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 2464 (i).  
 NORTON STATION, N. B., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF MR. MCCREADY : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 5896.  
 PAPER COMBINE, PROP. REDUCTION OF POSTAGE : Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4801 (ii).  
 PELESSIER POST OFFICE, REMOVAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Murcotte*) 7879 (iii).  
 PICTON POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Corby*) 1461 (i).  
 PONTBRIAND P. O., PETS. *re* LOCATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1981 (i).  
 PORT GEORGE P. O., ISSUE OF MONEY ORDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4439 (ii).  
 POSTAGE ON LETTERS, INSUFFICIENT : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 6624 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Beattie*) 650 (i).  
 — RECEIVED BY P. O. DEPT., FOR TRANSMISSION OF NEWSPAPERS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2203 (i).  
 — See "Newspapers," &c.  
 — REDUCTION, REMUNERATION OF POSTMASTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 2835 (i).  
 POSTAL CONTRACTS, N. W. TERS.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1745 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

- POSTAL NOTES, REGULATIONS RESPECTING : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 9797 (iii).  
 — NOTE SYSTEM, ESTABLISHMENT IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1478 (i).  
 — RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES IN YUKON : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 9792 (iii).  
 — REVENUE, REDUCTION ON LETTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2190 (i).  
 POSTMASTERS ALLOWANCES SINCE REDUCTION OF POSTAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1120 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 598 (i).  
 POST OFFICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (ii) 8657, 8681, 8708 ; conc., 10424, 10446 (iii).  
 — ACCOUNTS : M. to print (Mr. *Foster*) 7206.  
 — BOXES, RENTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1479 (i).  
 — Inquiry for (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 3330, 3577, 4068 (ii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4442, 4734, 4907 (ii).  
 — EXPENDITURES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 9795, 10303 (iii).  
 — GENERAL STATEMENT (Mr. *Mulock*) : in Com. of Sup., 8661 (iii).  
 — OFFICES CONDUCTED WITHOUT ASSISTANCE OF POSTMASTER'S, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2757.  
 — IN CAN., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1477 (i).  
 — NUMBER ESTABLISHED SINCE JAN. 1900 : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Addington*) 2464 (i).  
 — OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10254, 10264 (iii).  
 P. E. I. MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY OF, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 2085 (i).  
 PROVENCHER MAIL SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6915 (ii).  
 QUEBEC AND BERSIMIS MAIL SERVICE, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1976 (i).  
 RY. MAIL SERVICE, ADDITIONS SINCE 1896 : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 1754 (i).  
 — N. S., APPNMT. OF SUPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell Pictou*) 2832 (i).  
 ROUND HILL POSTMASTER, SALARY, ALLOWANCES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 9796 (iii).  
 ROWAN MILLS P. O., POSTMASTER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 4742 (ii).  
 ST. BRUNO AND ST. COEUR DE MARIE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5754, 5756 (ii).  
 ST. GEDEON MAIL CONTRACT, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 9059 (iii).  
 — AND RY. STATION, MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4075 (ii).  
 ST. JOHN'S, P. Q., POSTMASTER, DEFALCATIONS, INVESTIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 476 (i).  
 ST. PASCAL AND KARMOURASKA MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1749 (i) 4741 (ii).  
 — See "KAMOURASKA," &c.  
 ST. THOMAS POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 6610 (ii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1883 (i).  
 SOPERTON POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1735 (i).  
 SYDNEY, C. B., P. O. ACCOMMODATION : Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3178 (i).  
 TATAMAGOUCHE MOUNTAIN, P. O., APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 4557 (ii).  
 THOMPSON, GEO., POSTMASTER AT CLYDE RIVER, N. S., RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 5021 (ii).  
 TORONTO POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9885 (iii).  
 — AUTOMOBILE CARS : in Com. of Sup., 9885.  
 — POSTMASTER, ABSENCE FROM OFFICIAL DUTIES : Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 4443 (ii).  
 — DEP. POSTMASTER, SUPERANUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3263 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

- TRUDEL, MR. LEON, MAIL CARRIER AT MURRAY BAY, SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3037 (i).  
 VANCOUVER AND NANAIMO MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3442 (ii).  
 VANCOUVER P.O., LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1981 (i).  
 VICTORIA B.C., MAIL DELIVERY, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3049 (i).  
 WINNIPEG P.O., NUMBER OF LETTERS ANNUALLY: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 4743 (ii).  
 WINTER MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1704 (i).  
 WOOD ISLAND, P.E.I., PETS. *re* IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1737 (i).  
 WOODSTOCK, N.B., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7926, 10271 (iii).  
 POTVIN, P.A., PAYMENTS TO, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3767 (ii).  
 PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH G. B.: amt. (Mr. *Russell*) to Com. of Sup., 2009 (i).  
 Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2035; (Mr. *Wood*) 2042; (Mr. *Maxwell*) 2053; (Mr. *Montague*) 2086; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2102; (Mr. *Henderson*) 2113; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2123; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2130; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2233; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2240; (Mr. *Craig*) 2263; (Mr. *Heyd*) 2280; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2291; (Mr. *McClure*) 2299; (Mr. *Moore*) 2307; (Mr. *Puttee*) 2314; (Mr. *Foster*) 2316 (amt.) 2326; (Mr. *Fielding*) 2326; (Mr. *McMillan*) 2333 (i).  
 — ORDER, QUES. OF: Ruling (Mr. *Speuker*) 2038.  
 — Order, Ques., of (Mr. *Clancy*) 2236 (i).  
 — Order, Ques., of (Mr. *Foster*) 2339; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2440 (i).  
 PRESCOTT, MR., COLLECTOR AT BAIE VERTE: in Com. of Sup., 6071 (ii).  
 PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (ii).  
 PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH *re* MAN. SCHOOL QUESTION: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 3042 (i).  
 — SPEECH AT DRUMMONDVILLE, PAR. IN "LA PATRIE": Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 2749 (i).  
 PRINCE ALBERT JUDICIAL COURT: in Com. of Sup., 6431 (ii).  
 PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.  
 ALBERTON HARBOUR, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 6781 (ii).  
 ALBERTON AND KILDARE, MAIL CONTRACTORS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1979 (i).  
 — See "Tignish," &c.  
 ANNANDALE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 9898 (iii).  
 — BELFAST AND MURRAY HARBOUR RY., CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1741 (i) 4913 (ii) 8434 (iii).  
 — PLANS, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Martin*) 168 (i).  
 BRACE, MR., INSPECTOR OF GAS, CHARLOTTETOWN: in Com. of Sup., 6035 (ii).  
 — COR., *re*: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Martin*) 2203, 2761 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1480 (i), 4917 (ii).  
 CAMPBELL'S COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9898 (iii).  
 CANOE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9898 (iii).  
 CAPE TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8063 (iii).  
 CASCUMPEC HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 1483.  
 CHINA POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 7837, 7943.  
 CHURCH POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 7836 (iii).  
 COLD STORAGE BETWEEN P.E.I. AND G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 6253 (ii).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

- DELEGATION FROM P.E.I. GOVT., RRPS. *re*: M. for papers\* (Mr. *Martin*) 2760 (i).  
 DUNK RIVER HATCHERY, REBUILDING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McLellan*) 7656 (iii).  
 GORDON POINT, WHARF, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, P.E.I.*) 9904 (iii).  
 HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 7837, 7943, 9897 (iii).  
 HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 9461.  
 — CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 8434 (iii).  
 — COR. TELEGRAMS, MEMORANDA, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Martin*) 168 (i).  
 — PROTECTION TO FOOT PASSENGERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 9059 (iii).  
 — SURVEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1480, 2192 (i).  
 INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 8070 (iii).  
 IRIS, PETS. *re* TRI-WEEKLY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1751 (i).  
 KENDALL, MR., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 4440 (ii).  
 LOBSTER FISHERIES, DATE OF SETTING LINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 2759 (i).  
 MIMINGASH HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS, &c. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 1483 (i).  
 MURRAY HARBOUR ROAD, P.E.I., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2753.  
 — M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Martin*) 3469 (ii).  
 PARIS EXPOSITION, P. E. I. REPRESENTATION: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 4258 (ii).  
 PINEAU, H. J., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3446 (ii).  
 PINETTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2754 (i).  
 P.E.I. AND G.B., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 9584 (iii).  
 — AND MAINLAND SS. SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 9583, 10398 (iii).  
 — MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY OF, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 2085 (i).  
 — RAILWAYS: in Com. of Sup., 8931, 9461, 9505 (iii).  
 — BRANCH LINES, PETS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 9060 (iii).  
 — NEWS AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4912.  
 — NUMBER OF ANIMALS, KILLED, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *McLellan, P.E.I.*) 2202 (i).  
 — STOPPAGE OF WORK: Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 7418 (iii).  
 — STRAIGHTENING CURVES AT NORTH WILTSHIRE, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4443 (ii).  
 — STRAIGHTENING CURVES, COLVILLE AND LOYALIST, MEMORIALS: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Martin*) 2201 (i).  
 — SUMMERSIDE ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 8931 (iii).  
 — TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION: in Com. of Sup., 8054 (iii).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4443 (ii).  
 ST. PETER'S, P.E.I., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 3175 (i).  
 SANDY ISLAND LIGHT, REMOVAL, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 440 (i).  
 SAVAGE ISLAND SPAR LIGHTS, ERECTION AND REMOVAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 440 (i).  
 — COR. *re* REMOVAL: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Martin*) 2202 (i).  
 SS. "STANLEY" AND "MINTO," FREIGHT CARRIED, AMOUNT, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 300 (i).  
 SOURIS BREAKWATER REPAIRS, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND MESSRS. BRENNAN AND RAMSAY: M. for Copy\* (Mr. *McLellan, P.E.I.*) 2202 (i).  
 SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT: in Com. of Sup., 9899.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

- STRAIGHTENING CURVES AT COLVILLE AND LOYALIST, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Martin*) 2201 (i).
- SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9899 (iii).
- VOLUNTEER ORGANIZATION, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, P.E.I.*) 2179 (i).
- TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 10253 (iii).
- TIGNISH AND ALBERTON PORTS, NUMBER OF WAGONS, &c. ENTERED: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 5402 (ii) 8739 (iii).
- TIGNISH, P.E.I., AMOUNT OF WHARFAGE COLLECTED: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 2201 (i).
- BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 1482 (i).
- CUSTOMS DUTY COLLECTED 1898-1900: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 3469 (ii).
- WAGONS AND CARRIAGES, NUMBER IMPORTED IN P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 5402 (ii) 8739 (iii).
- WEST POINT, P.E.I., TENDERS FOR WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *McLellan*) 2164 (i).
- WOOD ISLAND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9897 (iii).
- PETS. *re* IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1737 (i).
- PRINCE OF WALES RIFLES AND 6TH FUSILIERS, AMALGAMATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5022 (ii).
- OFFICERS, NAMES AND RANK: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5893 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 5250 (ii).
- PRINTING AND BINDING, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 5925 (ii).
- PRINTING BUREAU PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (iii).
- PRINTING COMMITTEE, JOINT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 281 (i).
- PRINTING DOM. NOTES: in Com. of Sup., 8121 (iii).
- PRINTING, &c., N.W. TERS.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 1998 (i).
- See "N.W.T.", &c.
- PRINTING PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10413 (iii).
- AT ELKHORN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 7296 (iii).
- PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 10278 (iii).
- PRISONERS, YUKON, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10276 (iii).
- PRIVATE BILLS, EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Flint*) 4435 (ii).
- M. (Mr. *Gibson*) 5884 (ii).
- M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 812, 1108 (i).
- M. to reduce time for Posting (Mr. *Landerkin*) 6349 (ii).
- PROVINCIAL SUBSIDY DUE ONTARIO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Orby*) 3037 (i).
- PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF (Mr. *Bennett*) 5521 (ii).
- (Mr. *Davin*) 4664 (ii).
- *re* APPNMT. AS GOVT. WHIP (Mr. *Bourassa*) 587 (i).
- COR. IN "LONDON TIMES" *re* ACTION ON IMP. FEDERATION (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6138, 6144 (ii).
- INDEBTEDNESS FOR SPEECHES (Mr. *Taylor*) 483.
- INDIAN AGENT KEITH (Mr. *Davin*) 2072 (i).
- MENNONITE LOYALTY (Mr. *Richardson*) 2156.
- PAR. IN "LA PATRIE" (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2230 (i).

- PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS *re* ACTION ON GRAIN BILL (Mr. *Davin*) 7121 (iii).
- PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS *re* BUDGET SPEECH (Mr. *Henderson*) 4067 (ii).
- PAR. IN "OTTAWA CITIZEN" (Mr. *Davin*) 1207.
- PAR. IN "OTTAWA CITIZEN" *re* DREDGE (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 7418 (iii).
- PAR. IN "TORONTO GLOBE" (Mr. *McNeill*) 1787 (i).
- PAR. IN "WINNIPEG FREE PRESS" *re* REPRESENTING RYS. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1526 (i).
- See "Personal Explanation."
- PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7507 (iii).
- CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 8146 (iii).
- PROCEDURE IN ASKING QUESTIONS: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Sproule*) 2369 (i).
- Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2370, 2372, 2377-78 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Mills*) 2367 (i).
- See "Questions," &c.
- PROHIBITION COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 1753 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1980, 2180 (i).
- PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Flint*) 4079 (ii) 8952 (iii).
- Deb. (Mr. *Bel, P.E.I.*) 4087; (Mr. *McClure*)—(amt.) 4101 (ii) 9053 (iii); (Mr. *Christie*) 4102; (Mr. *Craig*) 4103; (Mr. *Holmes*) 4109; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 4110; (Mr. *Taylor*) 4112; (Mr. *Ganong*) 4115; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4119; (Mr. *Rutherford*) 4121; (Mr. *Moore*) 4125; (Mr. *McMullen*) 4127; (Mr. *Parnellee*) 4130 (amt.) 4135; (Mr. *Casey*) 4135; (Mr. *Oliver*) 4138 (ii) 9044; (Mr. *Wallace*) 8959; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 8965; (Mr. *Craig*) 8969; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8973; (Mr. *Foster*) 8978; (Mr. *Fielding*) 8990; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 9003; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 9007; (Mr. *Monk*) 9016; (Mr. *Bell, Picton*) 9018; (Mr. *Bell, P.E.I.*) 9024; (Mr. *Logan*) 9026; (Mr. *Fisher*) 9026; (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 9031; (Mr. *McNeill*) 9031; (Mr. *McClure*) 9633; (Mr. *Edwards*) 9035; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 9037; Amt. (Mr. *Parnellee*) agreed to (Y. 98; N. 41) 9041 (iii).
- Amt. (Mr. *Douglas*) 9042 (iii).
- Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 9043, 9051; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9043, 9046; (Mr. *Speaker*) 9043; (Mr. *McLennan, Glengarry*) 9044; (Mr. *Casey*) 9046; (Mr. *LaRivière*) 9047; (Mr. *Flint*) 9047; (Mr. *McNeill*) 9048; (Mr. *Craig*) 9049; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 9050; (Mr. *McMullen*) 9051; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) 9052; (Mr. *Henderson*) 9052; (Mr. *Moore*) 9053; (Mr. *McCleary*) 9054; agreed to (Y. 65; N. 64) 9055 (iii).
- PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: Remarks (Mr. *Flint*) 3466 (ii).
- VOTE: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 9472 (iii).
- PROROGATION, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 10504, 10508 (iii).
- PROTECTION SERVICE, FISHERY: in Com. of Sup., 5957 (ii).
- B.C., ADDITIONAL STEAMER: M. for Cor. *re* (Mr. *Prior*) 2762 (i).
- PROVENCHER MAIL SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6915 (ii).
- PROVINCIAL ELECTORAL LISTS, EXPENSES OF PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2755 (i).

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 10034 (iii).

— PAID TO ONT. AND QUEBEC BY DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 155 (i).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 10 (i).

PUB. ACCOUNTS COM., AUD. GEN.'S REP. AND PUB. ACCTS.: M. to ref. to Sel. Com. (Mr. *Frascr, Guysborough*) 1108 (i).

— MEETINGS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 9496, 9684 (iii).

— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1388, 2741 (i).

PUBLIC DEBT., ADDITIONS TO SINCE 1894: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1897 (i).

PUBLIC HEALTH DNPT., ESTABLISHMENT OF: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Roddick*) 8440 (iii).

ORGANIZED DISTRICT QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 10347 (iii).

#### PUBLIC WORKS:

ALBERTON HARBOUR, P. E. I., AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 6781 (ii).

ALEXANDRIA P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 9886 (iii).

ANNANDALE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 9898 (iii).

ARCHITECT AND ENGINEERING STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 10256 (iii).

BATISCAN RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10211 (iii).

BATTLEFORD, N. W. T., BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 10253 (iii).

BERGERONNES, P. Q., EXPENDITURE ON PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1745 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA AND ATLIN TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 10254 (iii).

BLUE ROCK BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9895 (iii).

BROAD COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9897 (iii).

BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9881, 10264 (iii).

BRONTE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 10233 (iii).

— IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2193 (i).

BRUCE MINES WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7950.

BUCKINGHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9875 (iii).

BUILDINGS, GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 7929, 9858 (iii).

— B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 7927 (iii).

— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 9875 (iii).

— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7870, 9871 (iii).

— N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 7826, 9892 (iii).

— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 7916, 9881, 10264.

— QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 9875, 10264 (iii).

CABLE AT POINTE AUX OUTARDES, CONTINUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7315 (iii).

CAMPBELL'S COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9898 (iii).

CAMPBELLTON WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 9901.

CAMBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7945 (iii).

CANADIAN, BRITISH COLUMBIA AND DAWSON CITY TEL. CO.: conc., 10446 (iii).

CANOE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9898 (iii).

CAP AUX CORBEAUX PIER, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1741 (ii).

CAPE COVE BREATWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7836 (iii).

CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7946 (iii).

CAP SANTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10210 (iii).

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS, GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P. E. I.*) 1483.

#### PUBLIC WORKS—Con.

CHANCE HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9900 (iii).

CHAPEL COVE BREAKWATER, ERECTION OF BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1121 (i).

CHARLEVOIX COUNTY, PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3036 (i).

CHATEAUGUAY RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10225 (iii).

CHAUDIÈRE BRIDGES, REBUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4345 (ii).

CHICOUTIMI POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9876 (iii).

— PUBLIC WORKS, AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 287 (i).

— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10208 (iii).

— EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1745 (i).

CHINA POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 7837, 7943 (iii).

CHURCH POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 7836 (iii).

CHRISTY'S BROOK, N. S., SUBWAY: in Com. of Sup., 9454 (iii).

COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 10248.

COLUMBIA RIVER, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7955 (iii).

COMEAUVILLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7836 (iii).

COTEAU DU LAC WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10097 (iii).

COTEAU LANDING, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10222 (iii).

DEPOT HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10228 (iii).

DES JOACHIMS BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 10253.

DESERONTO POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9883 (iii).

DIGBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7870 (iii).

DIPPER HARBOUR, N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 9900.

DOMINION BUILDINGS, RENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7938, 9893 (iii).

DORCHESTER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9901 (iii).

DREDGES, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7857 (iii).

DREDGING, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 7967 (iii).

— MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 7966 (iii).

— PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 10253 (iii).

DRUMMONDVILLE P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 9876.

DUFFERIN PORT, HALIFAX COUNTY, WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9904, 10508 (iii).

ECUM SECUM WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 9896 (iii).

EDMONTON BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (iii).

FRASER RIVER, B. C., COST OF IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2832 (i).

— PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10252.

GABARUS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9895.

GATINEAU RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10226 (iii).

GODERICH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10245.

GORDON POINT, P. E. I., WHARF, PETS. re: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, P. E. I.*) 9904 (iii).

GOVT. HOUSE, REGINA: in Com. of Sup., 7926.

GRAHAM WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10221 (iii).

GRANBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9878 (iii).

GRAND FALLS, N. B., MAINTENANCE OF ROAD, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9777 (iii).

GRAND MANAN WHARF, PETS., &c. re: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Ganony*) 1012 (i).

GRAND VALLEE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 10228.

GREECE'S POINT: in Com. of Sup., 10227 (iii).

HALIFAX HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT OF APPROACHES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6257 (ii).

— GOVT. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 9871.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 7848.

— B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 7955, 10252 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

- HARBOURS AND RIVERS : MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 9859, 10252 (iii).  
 — N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 7945, 9900 (iii).  
 — N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7940, 9895 (iii).  
 — ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 7950, 10228 (iii).  
 — P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7837, 7943, 9897.  
 — QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 7949, 10097, 10195 (iii).  
 HARBOUR WORKS, ST. JOHN, FORFEITED DEPOSITS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10030, 10186 (iii).  
 HAWKENTONE DOCK, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: (Mr. *Bennett*) 3045 (i).  
 HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 9461.  
 — CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 8434 (iii).  
 HOHELAGA POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9878.  
 HULL LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 10226.  
 — P.O., REBUILDING: in Com. of Sup. 4344.  
 INGNISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7940.  
 ISLE VERTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10208 (iii).  
 JUDIQUE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7836 (iii).  
 KAMLOOPS POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 8927.  
 LAKE DAUPHIN: in Com. of Sup., 10252 (iii).  
 LAKE MANITOBA, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10252 (iii).  
 LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE, SURVEY OF: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3444 (ii).  
 LANCASTER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10229 (iii).  
 LEAMINGTON PIER: in Com. of Sup., 10244 (iii).  
 LEPERS BROOK DYKE: in Com. of Sup., 9431.  
 LES EBOULEMENTS WHARF, ACCOUNTS: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2202 (i).  
 LEVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 9859.  
 — LENGTHENING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4070 (ii).  
 LITTLE CURRENT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10250.  
 LIVERPOOL POSTOFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9874.  
 LIVINGSTONES COVE: in Com. of Sup., 9895 (iii).  
 LUNENBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7853, 9897 (iii).  
 MCGREGORS CREEK: in Com. of Sup., 10233 (iii).  
 MAGDALEN ISLAND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iii).  
 MARGAREE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7965 (iii).  
 MARIA STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup. 10253 (iii).  
 MARIA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10195 (iii).  
 MARYSVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9880.  
 MEAFORD, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10247.  
 MEDICINE HAT PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5514 (ii).  
 MIMINEGASH HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS, &c. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 1483 (i).  
 MONTREAL HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 9865 (iii).  
 MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS AND CONNORS SYNDICATE, COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Casey*) 3469 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4245 (ii).  
 — NEGOTIATIONS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5228 (ii).  
 MURRAY AND CLEVELAND'S CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 10236 (iii).  
 NATION RIVER DAM: in Com. of Sup., 10229, 10251 (iii).  
 NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7927 (iii).  
 NEW GLASGOW PUBLIC BUILDING, PLUMBING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 7879 (iii).  
 NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7940, 9896 (iii).  
 NEWPORT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7950.  
 NORTH SHORE TELEGRAPH LINE, MILES CONSTRUCTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3765, 3769 (ii).  
 ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER, NAME AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 286 (i).  
 OTTAWA CITY, CHAUDIERE BRIDGES, REBUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4345 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

- OTTAWA BUILDINGS, HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7932, 7937 (iii).  
 — LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7938 (iii).  
 — CUSTOMS OFFICES: in Com. of Sup., 9888.  
 — MARIA ST. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 10253 (iii).  
 — RIVER SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 10395  
 PELEE ISLAND TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 10254 (iii).  
 PERCE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iii).  
 PERCE AND GASPE WHARFS, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5753 (ii).  
 PERIBONKA WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1744 (i); 3765 (ii).  
 — PAY SHEETS *re* CONSTRUCTION: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2202 (i).  
 PHIN, W. E., CONTRACTS *re* DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10236 (iii).  
 — PAYMENTS TO, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 3770 (ii).  
 PICKERING BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 10230 (iii).  
 PICTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9884 (iii).  
 PINETTE HARBOUR (P.E.I.), IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2754 (i).  
 POINTE AUX OUTARDES CABLE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7315 (iii).  
 PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 10253 (iii).  
 PORTERS LAKE, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9896 (iii).  
 PORT FINDLAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10250.  
 PORT HOPE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 10229.  
 PORT STANLEY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10236.  
 P.E.I. TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 10254.  
 PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 7835, 10195.  
 — ARCHITECT AND ENGINEERING STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 10256 (iii).  
 — CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 7847, 9858.  
 — DEPTL. REP., DATE OF COPY SENT TO BUREAU: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4734 (ii).  
 — MAR. PROV'S., MINISTER'S TRIP, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2179 (i).  
 — N.W.T., DESTROYED BY FLOODS: in Com. of Sup., 6691 (ii).  
 — PROV. OF QUEBEC: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 9684 (iii).  
 — SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7847 (iii).  
 RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 9892.  
 REGINA GOVT. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 9892.  
 RICHELIEU RIVER BRIDGE: on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 4753 (ii).  
 — BOOM: in Com. of Sup., 10217 (iii).  
 — GOVT. WORKS AT BELOEIL, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2755 (i).  
 RIDEAU HALL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7937.  
 — FIRE PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9889 (iii).  
 — NEW WING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7838.  
 — REMETALLING ROAD, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7835 (ii).  
 RIVIERE DU SUD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10210.  
 RIVER JOHN WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7941 (iii).  
 ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 10253.  
 — N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (iii).  
 ROBERVAL, DREDGE, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3764 (ii).  
 — WHARF, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7416 (iii).  
 ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 4076 (ii).  
 ROCKINGHAM STATION: in Com. of Sup., 9436.  
 ROCKY MOUNTAIN PARK: in Com. of Sup., 10411.  
 ROSSLAND POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7929.  
 ROY, MR., RESIDENT ENGINEER, B.C., REMOVAL OF: Ans. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3180 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

- ST. ALEXIS WHARF, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1745 (i).  
 ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 9859 (iii).  
 ST. ANNE WHARF, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1745 (i).  
 ST. GEDEON WHARF, PAYMENTS TO S. DESJARDINS : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7416 (iii).  
 ST. JOHN'S HARBOUR WORKS, FORFEITURE OF DEPOSITS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10030, 10186 (iii).  
 ST. JÉRÔME WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10208 (iii).  
 ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2191 (i).  
 ST. LAMBERT PROTECTION WALLS : in Com. of Sup., 10218 (iii).  
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER RY. BRIDGE, CHAUDIÈRE JUNCTION SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 10022 (iii).  
 — TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 7838, 10253 (iii).  
 ST. PETER'S, P.E.I., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 3175 (i).  
 ST. ROCH DES AULNAIES WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10209 (iii).  
 ST. THOMAS DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 9890.  
 STE. VICTOIRE POST OFFICE : conc., 10429 (iii).  
 SAGUENAY RIVER DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 10207 (iii).  
 — PUBLIC WORKS, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 287 (i).  
 SALMON COUNTY, GOVT. WHARF AND SHED. COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 7656 (iii).  
 SARNIA, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10228.  
 — POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7917, 9884 (ii).  
 SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 7946 (iii).  
 SOREL ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 10227 (iii).  
 SOURIS BREAKWATER REPAIRS, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND MESSRS. BRENNAN AND RAMSAY : M. for copy\* (Mr. *McLellan*, P.E.I.) 2202 (i).  
 — KNIGHT'S POINT : in Com. of Sup., 9899.  
 SOUTH NATION RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 10229, 10251 (iii).  
 SPRINGHILL POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7877.  
 SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 9899 (iii).  
 TADOUSAC WHARF, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1745 (i).  
 TATAMAGOUCHE HARBOUR, SURVEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, *Picton*) 9524 (iii).  
 TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 7838 (iii).  
 TÉMISCAMINGUE LAKE WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 10250 (ii).  
 — See "Lake Temiscamingue."  
 TÉMISCOUATA LANDING : in Com. of Sup., 10209.  
 TIGNISH BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, P.E.I.) 1482 (i).  
 TORONTO HARBOUR, AMOUNTS PAID FOR DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1742 (i).  
 — DREDGING CONTRACT : in Com. of Sup., 10230, 10236 (iii).  
 — ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2202 (i).  
 VALLEYFIELD, DAMAGES BY FLOODS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10114 (iii).  
 — POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 10264 (iii).  
 VALLIERS, PHILLIP, CONTRACTS WITH PUB. WORKS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 2165 (i).  
 VANCOUVER DRILL HALL, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2828 (i).  
 VICTORIA HARBOUR, AMOUNTS VOTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1117 (i).  
 — DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7958 (iii).  
 — POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7961 (iii).  
 VICTORIAVILLE POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9876 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

- WEST POINT, P.E.I., TENDERS FOR WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *McLellan*) 2164 (i).  
 WINDSOR DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 9889 (iii).  
 WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS AND REPS. OF ENGINEERS : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Ganong*) 1013 (i).  
 WINTER HARBOUR, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7836.  
 WOOD ISLAND BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 9897 (iii).  
 WOODSTOCK POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7926.  
 YAMASKA LOCK, DAMAGES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10212 (iii).  
 PUNISHMENT OF CAN. SOLDIER IN SOUTH AFRICA : Remarks (Mr. *McLennan*, *Glengarry*) 4448 (ii).  
 PURCHASE OF HAY : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 8082 (iii).  
 — OF HORSES : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3769 (ii).  
 — OF HORSES FOR BRITISH ARMY : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3774 (ii).  
 — PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE" (Mr. *Sproule*) 3578 (ii).  
 — PAR. IN OTTAWA "CITIZEN" re PURCHASE OF CAN. HORSES : Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) 3778 (ii).  
 — PURCHASE OF HORSES WEST OF LAKE SUPERIOR : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4439 (ii).  
 QUARANTINE : in Com. of Sup., 6346 (ii), 9197, 9407.  
 — AT GROSSE ISLE, AMOUNTS PAID TO STR. "CONTEST" : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 7314 (iii).  
 — See "Grosse Isle," &c.  
 — CATTLE : in Com. of Sup., 10347 (iii).  
 — HEALTH REGULATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 6348.  
 — ORGANIZED DISTRICTS : in Com. of Sup., 7174.  
 — STEAMERS : in Com. of Sup., 7835 (iii).  
 — VICTORIA, B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Fisher*) 7304.  
 Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. No. 96 (Mr. *Talbot*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2072; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2673 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3373 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 116.)  
 Quebec Harbour Commissioners' B. No. 173 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 6692 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 10189; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 10190 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 116.)  
 Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 112 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3033 (i); in Com., \* 5169; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5230 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 74.)  
 Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65 (Mr. *Costigan*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1381; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1686; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 2783 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 75.)  
 Quebec Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 75 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1641; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2109 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4479 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 76.)  
 QUEBEC :  
 ABENAKIS INDIANS OF ST. FRANCIS : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7321 (iii).  
 "ABERDEEN," STR., SPECIAL TRIP TO LES EBOULEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 8430 (iii).  
 ANTICOSTI : See "Fox Bay Settlers."  
 ARTHABASKA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 10015 (iii).  
 BATISCAN RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 10211 (iii).  
 BEAUCHEMIN, BICKERDIKE, &c., PAYMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3768 (ii).  
 BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8931 (iii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- BERGERONNES, EXPENDITURE ON PUBLIC WORKS : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1745 (i).
- BERTHIER, DREDGING OF CHANNEL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1462 (i).
- BERTHIER EN HAUT, NAME OF DREDGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2171 (i).
- BILODEAU, L. P., PAYMENTS TO : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3766 (ii).
- BOUT DE L'ISLE BRIDGE, SUBSIDIES PROMISED : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5895 (ii).
- BUCKINGHAM POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9875 (iii).
- BUILDINGS, QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 9875, 10264 (iii).
- CABLE AT POINTE AUX OUTARDES, CONTINUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7315 (iii).
- CAP AUX CORBEAUX PIER, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1741 (i).
- CAP SANTE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10210 (iii).
- CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS, TRIBAL GOVT., PETS., &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Quinn*) 1011 (i).
- CHAMBLAY CANAL, DRAINAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8914 (iii).
- CHARLEVOIX COUNTY, PUBLIC WORKS, EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3036 (i).
- CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 10013 (iii).
- SUBSIDY TO : Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 4075.
- CHATEAUGUAY RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 10225 (iii).
- CHICOUTIMI POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9876.
- PUBLIC WORKS, AMOUNT EXPENDED : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 287 (i).
- WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10208 (iii).
- WHARF, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1745 (i).
- CHOQUETTE, MR. JUSTICE, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1979 (i).
- CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* SNOW FENCES IN BELLE-CHASSE CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 1735 (i).
- CONSTANTINE, DR., PAYMENTS TO : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3763 (ii).
- COTEAU DU LAC WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10097.
- COTEAU LANDING DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 10222 (ii).
- COTE ST. LUC RIFLE RANGE, CLOSING AND PURCHASE OF NEW SITE : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 292 (i).
- See "Montreal," &c.
- COURT OF APPEALS, PROV. OF QUE.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5515 (ii).
- See "Judges."
- COVE FIELDS, QUEBEC, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 7880 (iii).
- See "Plains of Abraham."
- CULBUTE CANAL, LAND DAMAGES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8913 (iii).
- CUSTOMS, QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 6072 (ii).
- DISBANDMENT OF 70TH BATTALION : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3034 (i).
- DROUIN FRERES ET CIE., PAYMENTS TO : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3768 (ii).
- DRUMMONDVILLE POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9876 (iii).
- DUBE AND CAZES, CAPITAL CASES, CLEMENCY, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 9678 (iii).
- See "Justice," &c.
- ELECTORAL LISTS, PROV. OF QUEBEC, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 6781 (ii).
- See "Voters' Lists."
- "EUREKA," STR., REFITTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7850 (iii).
- FARNHAM AND FRELIGHSBURG RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 10015 (iii).
- FOX BAY SETTLERS, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND METHODIST CONFERENCE : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Taylor*) 649 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- FOX BAY SETTLERS : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1381, 1787 (i).
- M. to adjn. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1984 (i).
- PAR. IN MONTREAL "WITNESS" *re* TROUBLE WITH SETTLERS : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5391.
- STMT. OF HON. MIN. OF PUB. WORKS : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 292 (i).
- FRANKING PRIVILEGE, MONTREAL "STAR" : Order, Ques. of, Authorities quoted (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2197 (i).
- See "Montreal Star."
- GAGNE, MR., APPOINT. AS POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5756 (ii).
- GASPÉ AND DALHOUSIE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (i i).
- GASPÉ ELECTIONS AND CUSTOMS OFFICIAL : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Poster*) 7573, 7595 ; aut. (Mr. *Gillies*) 7591 ; neg. (Y. 21 ; N. 34) 7602 (iii).
- See "Lemieux, Mr."
- GATINEAU RIVER DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 10226 (iii).
- GOVT. TELEGRAPH LINES, CONSTRUCTION TO BELLE ISLE : Ques. (Mr. *McAister*) 2462 (i).
- GRAHAM WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10221 (iii).
- GRANBY POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (iii).
- GRAND VALLEE PIER : in Com. of Sup., 10228 (iii).
- GREAT NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 10015 (iii).
- GREECE'S POINT : in Com. of Sup., 10227 (iii).
- G. T. R. AND VICTORIA BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 9976 (iii).
- GRENVILLE CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 8522 (ii).
- ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 8157, 8880 (iii).
- GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION : in Com. of Sup., 7835 (iii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 6626 (ii).
- STEAMER SERVICE, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 5888 (ii).
- See "Kathleen, Str.," "Quarantine," &c.
- HARBOURS AND RIVERS, QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 7949, 10097, 10195 (iii).
- HENAULT, ROMUALD, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT MASKINONGE : (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3442 (ii).
- HOCHELAGA POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9878.
- HOTEL RATES AT ROBERVAL : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3767 (ii).
- HULL LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 10226.
- P. O., REBUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4344.
- ILLICIT STILLS, SEIZURE, &c., Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 7123 24, 7655 (iii).
- INDIANS, QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 8069 (iii).
- SEED GRAIN DISTRIBUTION : in Com. of Sup., 8069 (iii).
- I. C. R., FREIGHT SERVICE AT QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2191 (i).
- RIVIERE DU LOUP STATION, ACCOMMODATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1006 (i).
- ST. CHARLES BRANCH, CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1739 (i).
- TRAIN ACCOMMODATION BETWEEN MONTREAL AND LOWER PORTS : Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 7421 (iii).
- ISLE VERTE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10208.
- JUDGES, ADDITIONAL IN PROV. OF QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1750 (i).
- P. Q., NAMES : Ques. (Mr. *Bergcron*) 3175, 3260 (i).
- IN MONTREAL AND QUEBEC SINCE 1880, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4437 (ii).
- JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF MONTREAL, REMOVAL OF CERTAIN JUDGES : Ques. (Mr. *Parmelee*) 290.
- See "Court of Appeals."

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- KAMOURASKA MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 9795 (iii).  
 KAMOURASKA AND ST. PASCAL MAIL CONTRACE : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1749 (i), 4741 (ii).  
 — See "St. Pascal," &c  
 KATHLEEN, STR., EXPENDITURE FOR QUARANTINE SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 6350 (ii).  
 — See "Grosse Isle."  
 KINNEAR MILLS P. O., LOSS OF REGISTERED LETTER : Remarks (Mr. *Turcot*) 8076 (iii).  
 LABELLE, MR. L. V., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1733 (i).  
 LABRECQUE, C. O., PAYMENTS TO : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3764 (ii).  
 LACHINE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 8154 (iii).  
 — DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 8880 (iii).  
 — ELECTRIC LIGHTING : in Com. of Sup., 8156 (ii).  
 — LOCKMEN, &C., INCREASE OF PAY : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 5024 (ii).  
 — QUADRANT PONTOON GATE : in Com. of Sup., 8155, 8372, 8504 (iii).  
 — REBUILDING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 8522 (iii).  
 LAKE ST. JOHN DREDGE, COST, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3765 (ii).  
 LAKE ST. LOUIS CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 8156 (ii).  
 LABEL, WENCESLAS, EMPLOYT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3773 (ii).  
 LEMAY, MAXIME, POSTMASTER AT LOTBINIÈRE, DISMISSAL AND APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Fortier*) 1723 (i).  
 LEMIEUX, MR., ASST. INSPECTOR OF CUSTOMS, MONTREAL, AND MAGDALEN ISLAND ELECTIONS, INVESTIGATION, &C. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 470 (i).  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2422, 2996 (i), 3478 (ii).  
 — See "Gaspé."  
 LES EBOULEMENTS WHARF, ACCOUNTS : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2202 (i).  
 LÉVIS ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R. : in Com. of Sup., 10388 (iii).  
 LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK : in Com. of Sup., 9859.  
 — LENGTHENING, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4070 (ii).  
 — STATION, ENLARGEMENT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2192 (i).  
 — STATION, I. C. R., PICHETTE, MR., PRIVILEGES AT : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4069 (ii).  
 — TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES : in Com. of Sup., 9859 (iii).  
 MAGDALEN ISLAND BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iii).  
 — ELECTIONS. See "Gaspé," &c.  
 — MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9583 (iii).  
 — SS. SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*, *P. E. I.*) 477 (i).  
 — M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Macdonald*, *P. E. I.*) 319.  
 MAIL CLERKS, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC DIVISION, FINES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 4076 (ii).  
 — SERVICE BELOW RIVIERE DU LOUP : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1114 (i).  
 MARCHMONT PROPERTY, PURCHASE OF : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 7125 (iii).  
 — See "Plains of Abraham."  
 MARIA WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 10195 (iii).  
 MILITIA STORES, QUEBEC, SUPT., NAME, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 8433 (iii).  
 MONTREAL HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 9865.  
 — COMMISSIONERS AND CONNORS SYNDICATE, COR. WITH GOVT. : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Casey*) 3469 (ii).  
 — NEGOTIATIONS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4246, 5228 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- MONTREAL : PORTLAND AND BOSTON RY., PETS. *re* SUBSIDY : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Moore*) 1012 (i).  
 — P. O., FINES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6057.  
 — RIFLE RANGE, PROVISION BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 440 (i).  
 — RIOTS AND VICTORIA RIFLES : Ques. (Mr. *Monet*) 3036 (i).  
 — M. to adjn. (Mr. *McNeill*) 1288 (i).  
 — MEMBERS INTERRUPTING : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 1291, 1310, 1314, 1366 (i).  
 — "STAR," COPIES FRANKED THROUGH MAILS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Ethier*) 2401, 2462 (i).  
 — See "Franking Privilege."  
 — TURNPIKE TRUST, BONDS HELD BY GOVT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2402, 2753 (i).  
 MURRAY BAY AND RIVER OUELLE, STEAM COMMUNICATION : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2756 (i).  
 — SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 9603.  
 NEW CARLISLE WHARF, SUBSIDY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3773 (ii).  
 NEWPORT BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 7950.  
 NICOLET RIVER RY. BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 10021 (iii).  
 NORTH SHORE TELEGRAPH LINE, CONSTRUCTION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1742 (i) 3765, 3769.  
 O'DONAHUE, W. T., PAYMENTS TO : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3763-4 (ii).  
 OKA INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 7284 (iii).  
 OTTAWA RIVER CANALS : in Com. of Sup., 8376.  
 OUELLET, MR., MAIL CLERK AT LÉVIS, DUTIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4070 (ii).  
 PARENT, MR. ARTHUR, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 9523 (iii).  
 PELESSIER POST OFFICE, REMOVAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 7879 (iii).  
 PERCE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 7950 (iii).  
 — AND GASPÉ WHARFS, CONSTRUCTION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5753 (ii).  
 PERIBONKA WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1744 (i) 3765 (ii).  
 — PAY SHEETS *re* CONSTRUCTION : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2202 (i).  
 PERRON, P. A., APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3768 (ii).  
 PILOTS, MONTREAL AND KINGSTON, COR. *re* INCORPORATION : M. for copy,\* &C. (Mr. *Talbot*) 2203 (i).  
 PLAINS OF ABRAHAM, PURCHASE OF : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 6351, 6617 (ii) 7123-5 (iii).  
 — ACQUISITION BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2171 (i).  
 — See "Cove," &c.  
 POINTE CLAIRE FIRE, RELIEF TO SUFFERERS : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 6135 (ii).  
 — AUX OUTARDES CABLE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 735 (iii).  
 — AUX TREMBLES LIGHTHOUSE, RECONSTRUCTION : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 6062 (ii).  
 PONTBRIAND P. O., PETS. *re* LOCATION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1981 (i).  
 PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 10253 (iii).  
 POTVIN, P. A., PAYMENTS TO, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3767 (ii).  
 PRESCOTT, MR., COLLECTOR AT BAIE VERTE : in Com. of Sup., 6071 (ii).  
 PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH AT DRUMMONDVILLE, PAR. IN "LA PATRIE" : Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 2749.  
 PRINCE OF WALES RIFLES AND 6TH FUSILIERS, AMALGAMATION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5022.  
 — See "Militia," &  
 PUBLIC WORKS, PROV. OF QUEBEC : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Gillics*) 9684 (iii).  
 QUARANTINE AT GROSSE ISLE, AMOUNTS PAID TO STR. "CONTEST" : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 7314 (iii).  
 — See "Grosse Isle."

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- QUEBEC AND BERSIMIS MAIL SERVICE, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1976 (i).  
 — BRIDGE SUBSIDY, CONSTRUCTION, GOVT. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2192 (i).  
 — CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 9877 (iii).  
 — AND GASPE BASIN MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 9584 (iii).  
 — HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNT DUE GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1461 (i).  
 — AND MANCHESTER, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 9588 (iii).  
 — AND MONTREAL SHIP CHANNEL, AMOUNT EXPENDED, COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2190 (i).  
 RICHELIEU RIVER BOOM: in Com. of Sup., 10217.  
 — GOVT. WORKS AT BELCEIL, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2755 (i).  
 — BRIDGE: on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 4753.  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 8081, 8795, 8933, 9062 (iii).  
 RIFLE RANGE AT MONTREAL, PURCHASE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 4566 (ii).  
 RIVER DU LOUP GOVT. WORKS, COMPLETION: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4076 (ii).  
 — WORKSHOPS: M. to adjn. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 5516 (ii).  
 RIVIÈRE DU SUD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10210.  
 ROBERVAL, DREDGE, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3764 (ii).  
 — WHARF, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7416 (iii).  
 ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 4076 (ii).  
 ST. ALEXIS WHARF, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1745 (i).  
 ST. ANNE WHARF, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1745 (i).  
 ST. BRUNO AND ST. CŒUR DE MARIE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5734 (ii).  
 ST. ELOI BALLAST GROUND, TENURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 7416 (iii).  
 ST. FRANCIS LAKE, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 8521 (iii).  
 — STRAIGHTENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8157 (iii).  
 — ST. FRANCIS RIVER BRIDGE CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10016 (iii).  
 ST. GEDEON MAIL CONTRACT, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 9059 (iii).  
 — P.O. AND RY. STATION, MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4075 (ii).  
 — WHARF, PAYMENTS TO S. DESJARDINS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7416 (iii).  
 ST. JEROME WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10208 (iii).  
 — PAYMENTS TO AND NAMES OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 8838 (iii).  
 ST. JOHNS, P.O., POSTMASTER, DEFALCATIONS, INVESTIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 478 (i).  
 ST. JOHNS CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, PAR. IN "CANADA FRANCAIS": on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monet*) 9844 (iii).  
 — See "Wood, Mr."  
 ST. JOSEPH DE LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2191 (i).  
 ST. LAMBERT PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 10218 (iii).  
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER RY. BRIDGE SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10022 (iii).  
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 7838, 10253 (iii).  
 — SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7848.  
 ST. LOUIS LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 8879 (iii).  
 ST. MAURICE SLIDE: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (iii).  
 ST. OURS LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8522 (iii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- ST. PASCAL AND KAMOURASKA MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1749 (i) 4741 (ii).  
 — See "Kamouraska."  
 ST. REGIS INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 7282 (iii).  
 — LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 8068 (iii).  
 — LOCK-UP: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iii).  
 — QUES. OF PRIVILEGE: par. in "Ottawa Citizen" (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7304 (iii).  
 ST. ROCH DES AULNAIES WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10209 (iii).  
 STE. VICTORIE POST OFFICE: conc., 10429 (iii).  
 ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 6893 (ii) 8134; conc., 10453 (iii).  
 — CARTING OF WASTE STONE, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. *Fortin*) 3469 (ii).  
 — ELECTRIC PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 6439.  
 — INCREASE OF SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 7878 (iii).  
 — INVESTIGATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10318 (iii).  
 — REGULATIONS *re* NIGHT DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2749 (i).  
 — M. for copy\* (Mr. *Fortin*) 3469 (ii).  
 SAGUENAY PUBLIC WORKS, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 287 (i).  
 — RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 10207.  
 SAVARD, ED., PAYMASTER AT CHICOUTIMI: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3767 (ii).  
 SAVARD, MESSRS., APPNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5754 (ii).  
 SOREL ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 10227 (iii).  
 SOULANGES AND BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, OPENING: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4559 (ii).  
 SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 8515, 10097, 10150 (iii).  
 — CEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8894 (iii).  
 — CEMENT TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1478 (i).  
 — CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 8153, 8888 (iii).  
 — CONSTRUCTION PAY SHEETS, ACCOUNTS, &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2202 (i).  
 — COST, &c., LITIGATION AND CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1007 (i).  
 — CONTRACTS, &c.: Inquiry for papers (Mr. *Foster*) 9799 (iii).  
 — REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9496 (iii).  
 SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res. 10019 (iii).  
 TADOUSAC WHARF, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1745 (i).  
 TALBOT, MR. E., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1877, 1975 (i).  
 TEMISCOUATA LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 10209.  
 THREE RIVERS HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5514 (ii).  
 TREMBLAY, MESSRS., APPNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5755 (ii).  
 TRUDEL, MR. LEON, MAIL CARRIER AT MURRAY BAY, SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3037 (i).  
 — MR. ZONO, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 3044 (i).  
 VALLEYFIELD, DAMAGES BY FLOODS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10114 (iii).  
 — POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 10264 (iii).  
 VALLIERS, PHILIP, CONTRACTS WITH PUB. WORKS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 2165 (i).  
 VANDAL, RELEASE FROM ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: M. for Pets. (Mr. *Quinn*) 299.  
 VICTORIA BRIDGE SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9976 (iii).  
 — TOLLS: conc., 10448 (iii).  
 VICTORIAVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 9876 (iii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

- VILLE MARIE BANK OFFICIALS: in Com. of Sup., 8145 (iii).
- COR. BETWEEN DIRECTORS AND GOVT. AND STMT. OF SUMS PAID, CLAIMS MADE, &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Monk) 168 (i).
- MONTHLY STMTS. FROM JULY 1892: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 1011 (i).
- PETS. *re* GOVT. INTERVENTION AND SPECIAL GRANT: M. for copy (Mr. Monk) 3050 (i).
- VOLUNTEERS FROM QUEBEC FOR SERVICE IN SOUTH AFRICA, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 1113, 1728 (i).
- *See* "SOUTH AFRICAN WAR," &c.
- VOTERS LISTS, MONTMORENCY: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 7122 (iii).
- P. Q., NUMBER RECEIVED BY CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2754, 3038 (i).
- POINTE AUX ESQUIMAUX: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 8525 (iii).
- *See* "ELECTORAL LISTS."
- WELLINGTON BRIDGE, MONTREAL, PAR. IN "DAILY WITNESS" *re* CONDITION: (Mr. Quinn) 3331 (ii).
- WOOD, MR., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT ST. JOHN, UTTERANCES *re* FRENCH PATRIOTS: Remarks (Mr. Monct) 9844 (iii).
- *See* "ST. JOHN'S P. Q."
- YAMASKA LOCK, DAMAGES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10212 (iii).
- QUESNELLE-DAWSON TEL. LINE, PURCHASE OF GROCERIES FOR EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1116 (i).
- QUESTIONS ANSWERED BY MINISTERS: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2183 (i).
- Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2184-5, 2188 (i).
- *See* "Procedure," &c.
- FORM OF ASKING: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1756.
- QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: M. to adjn. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5699, 5885 (ii).
- QUEEN VS. BRITISH AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO.: in Com. of Sup., 8140 (iii).
- QUINN, HENRY A., SERVICES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8136 (iii).
- Railway Act Amt. B. 132** (Mr. Blair) 1° m., 3256 (i) 2° m., 4684, 4695 (ii) in Com., 9342; 3° m., 9365; Sen. Amts., 10421 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 23.)
- Railways Subsidies Authorization B. No. 193** (Mr. Blair) Prop. Res. 9333; M. for Com. on Res., 9906, 9944; in Com., on Res., 9960; 1\* of B., 10029; 2\* and in Com., 10185, 3° m., 10190 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 8.)
- Deb. on M. for Com. on Res.: (Mr. Bergeron) 9909, 9937; (Mr. Foster) 9910, 9915; (Mr. McMullen) 9924; (Mr. Edwards) 9927; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9928; (Mr. Davin) 9929; (Mr. Puttee) 9937; (Mr. Richardson) 9938; (Mr. Fielding) 9940; (Mr. Rogers) 9941; (Mr. Sifton) 9942; (Mr. Craig) 9951.
- In Com. on Res. (Mr. Blair) 9952-10029 (iii).
- Deb. (Mr. Bergeron) 9954, 9987, 9991; (Mr. Gibson) 9954; (Mr. Charlton) 9954; (Mr. McLennan, Glenagarry) 9957, 9985; (Mr. Fielding) 9958, 10012; (Mr. Calvert) 9962; (Mr. Haggart) 9963-10028; (Mr. Dymont) 9963; (Mr. Tisdale) 9964; (Mr. Henderson) 9965; (Mr. Mulock) 9965; (Mr. Wilson) 9966; (Mr. McMullen) 9966; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 9968; (Mr. Powell) 9968, 9998; (Mr. Klock) 9972; (Mr. Hurley) 9972;

Railways Subsidies B.—*Con.*

- (Mr. Britton) 9974; (Mr. Sproule) 9976; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9976, 10013; (Mr. Prefontaine) 9977; (Mr. Cochrane) 9988; (Mr. Geoffrion) 9994; (Mr. Gibson) 9996; (Mr. Ingram) 10006; (Mr. Sutherland) 10007; (Mr. Sifton) 10007; (Mr. McAlister) 10009; (Mr. Talbot) 10010; (Mr. Costigan) 10011; (Mr. Fortin) 10014; (Mr. Fisher) 10015; (Mr. Puttee) 10024; (Mr. Richardson) 10029 (iii).
- 3° m. (Mr. Blair) 10190 (iii).
- Deb. on 3°, (Mr. Foster) 10190; (Mr. Haggart) 10192; (Mr. Charlton) 10193; (Mr. Cochrane) 10193; (Mr. McAlister) 10194; (Mr. Sproule) 10193; (Mr. Bergeron) 10195 (iii).
- RAILS, INFERIOR I.C.R., PAR. IN CAPE BRETON "ADVOCATE" *re*: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 5123 (ii).
- RAILWAYS:**
- AMHERST RY. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 9454 (iii).
- ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY RY. CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10395 (iii).
- BELFAST AND MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 4913 (ii) 8434.
- EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1741 (i).
- SPECIFICATION, PLANS, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Martin) 168 (i).
- CAN. GOVT. RYS., TENDERS FOR LOCOMOTIVES AND ROLLING STOCK: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Haggart) 4078 (ii).
- C.P.R., AGREEMENT WITH GOVT. *re* TOWN SITES: Inquiry for papers (Mr. Davin) 2998 (i).
- LAND GRANTS TO IN MAN., ALLOTMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Richardson) 1460 (i).
- EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. Richardson) 2827 (i).
- SUBSIDIES, PROPORTION ALLOTTED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Richardson) 294 (i).
- ONDERDONK AWARDS, AMOUNTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2365 (i).
- REDUCTION OF RATES, PROVISIONS, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser Lambton) 2363 (i).
- CANSO AND ST. PETER'S RY., CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 479 (i).
- CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY. CO., &c., SUBSIDY TO: Ques. (Mr. Gauthier) 4075 (ii).
- DEFICITS, RY. SUBSIDIES, &c., AMOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. Dechene) 2835 (i) 3758 (ii).
- EASTERN EXTENSION RY. CO.'S ARBITRATION: par. in Newspapers (Mr. Foster) 10031 (iii).
- CONTRACT FOR PAINTING STATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 3038 (i).
- GALENA OIL CO.'S CONTRACT, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 10173 (iii).
- G.T.R. AND CENTRAL VERMONT RY. CO.: M. to suspend Rule (Mr. McCarthy) 6244 (ii).
- G.T.R. TARIFF ON OIL, ILLEGALITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 297 (i).
- GREAT EASTERN RY., ALLEGATIONS AGAINST MR. C. N. ARMSTRONG: Letters read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10309 (iii).
- GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., LAND GRANT: Ques. (Mr. Douglas) 2752 (i).
- GOVERNOR GENERALS CAR, ELECTRIC LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 8916 (iii).
- GOVT. RYS., STEEL RAILS SUPPLIED, TENDERS, QUANTITIES AND PRICES, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
- Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2422 (i).
- HAWKESBURY AND LOUISBURG RY. SUBSIDIES: Remarks (Mr. Gillies) 9467 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

- HILLSBOROUGH RIVER BRIDGE TRAFFIC, COR., TELEGRAMS, MEMORANDA, &c. : M. for copies\* (Mr. *Martin*) 168 (i).
- PROTECTION TO FOOT PASSENGERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 9059 (iii).
- SURVEY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1480, 2192 (i).
- JONES, RALPH, PAYMENT TO : conc., 10447 (iii).
- LAND GRANTS TO RYS. IN MAN., B.C. AND N. W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1884 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Lavin*) 439 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Puttice*) 4439 (ii).
- SUBSIDIES TO RYS., O. C., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2179 (i).
- LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, COST OF REMOVAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2362 (i).
- MONTREAL, PORTLAND AND BOSTON RY., PETS. *re* SUBSIDY : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Moore*) 1012.
- N. W. T. TAXATION OF RY. LANDS : prop. Res. (Mr. *Oliver*) 611 (i).
- NOVA SCOTIA RY., REFUND OF SUBSIDIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1464 (i).
- PORT MULGRAVE, RY. IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 9454 (iii).
- P.E.I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 8931, 9461 (iii).
- BRANCH LINES, PETS., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 9060 (iii).
- EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 9505 (iii).
- NEWS AGENT : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4912.
- NUMBER OF ANIMALS KILLED, &c. : M. for Ret\* (Mr. *McLellan*) 2202 (i).
- STRAIGHTENING CURVES AT COLVILLE AND LOYALIST, MEMORIALS, &c. : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Martin*) 2201 (i).
- NORTH WILTSHIRE, COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4443 (ii).
- STOPPAGE OF WORK : Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 7418 (iii).
- SUMMERSIDE, ACCOMMODATION : in Com. — See "Belfast," &c. of Sup., 8931 (iii).
- QUEBEC BRIDGE SUBSIDY, CONSTRUCTION, GOVT. ACTION : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2192 (i).
- RAILWAYS AND CANALS : in Com. of Sup., 8150, 8785, 9429, 10285, 10359 (iii).
- DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 4436.
- Inquiry for (Mr. *Haggart*) 3990 (ii).
- ESTABLISHMENT OF BOARD : prop. Res. Mr. *Davis* 752 (i).
- EXTRA CLERKS : in Com. of Sup., 8522.
- GENERAL STATEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 3374, 8452 (iii).
- I. C. R., INCREASED RATES : in Com. of Sup., 8523 (iii).
- NUMBER OF MILES IN CAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, P. E. I.) 1884 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE, &c., ADDITIONS FROM 1890 TO 1896 : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2166 (i).
- ADDITIONS SINCE 1896 : Ques. (Mr. *Somer-ville*) 1754 (i).
- APPOINT. OF SUPT., N.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*, Pictou) 2832 (i).
- RAILWAYS, MISCELLANEOUS VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 8916 (iii).
- RAILWAY ON ISLE MADAM, SUBSIDY BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 593 (i).
- RAILWAY STATISTICS : in Com. of Sup., 8522 (iii).
- SUBSIDIES AUTHORIZATION B. 193 (Mr. *Blair*) prop. Res., 9333 (iii).
- See "Rys. Subsidies B."
- SUBSIDIES BEARING INTEREST, Names, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5752 (iii).
- SUBSIDIES : Inquiry for (Mr. *Foster*) 8935.
- SYSTEM OF GRANTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2171 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

- RESTIGOUCHE RY. CO., REP. OF ENGINEERS *re* COST : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2201 (i).
- ST. ELOI BALLAST GROUND, TENURE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 7416 (iii).
- STEEL RAFTS, PURCHASE OF BY RYS. AND CANALS, DEPT. : Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 2828 (i).
- See "I. C. R., Govt. Rys.," &c.
- SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS, NAMES AND AMOUNTS : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2173 (i).
- NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5515 (ii).
- SUMMERSIDE, P. E. I., RY. ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 8931 (iii).
- TIMAGAMI RY. CO. : M. to strike out clause in Sen. Amts. (Mr. *McHugh*) 8-37 (iii).
- VICTORIA BRIDGE TOLLS : conc., 10448 (iii).
- WESTERN COUNTIES RY., &c., REFUND OF SUBSIDIES : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1121 (i).
- YARMOUTH STEAMSHIP CO. AND DOM. ATLANTIC RY. CO.'S BILL : M. to refund fees (Mr. *Flint*) 9332 (iii).
- See "Yarmouth SS. Bill."
- RAINY RIVER RY. CO., CONTRACTS : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4074 (ii).
- LOCK : in Com. of Sup., 7861 (iii).
- RAMA INDIAN RESERVE, MEDICAL SUPT. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3043 (i).
- RAND'S MICMAC DICTIONARY : in Com. of Sup., 10413.
- RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 10393 (iii).
- RATES OF PAY TO OFFICIALS IN YUKON, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 152 (i).
- REBELLION, N. W., CLAIM OF HENRY HALCRO, COR. &c. : M. for copies (Mr. *Davis*) 635 (ii).
- SCRIP FOR SCOUTS : Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 3467 (ii).
- RECEIPTS AT SYDNEY : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 9797 (iii).
- See "Railways," &c.
- RECEIVER GENERAL, ST. JOHN : in Com. of Sup., 10277 (iii).
- RECRUITS FOR VACANCIES IN SOUTH AFRICA, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2404 (i).
- RECRUITING STATIONS, N.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 10303 (iii).
- RED DEER COURT HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 9892 (iii).
- Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 186 (Mr. *Scemple*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 8524 : 2<sup>o</sup>, in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 9396 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- REFUND OF SUBSIDIES, NOVA SCOTIA RY. &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1464 (i).
- REGIMENTAL BANDS, CONTROL OF : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7125 (iii).
- REGISTRATION OF VOTERS, GOVT. POWERS, *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 2756 (i).
- REGISTRAR'S FEES IN YUKON, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 479 (i).
- REGINA BARRACKS, OUTBREAK OF DIPHTHERIA : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5701 (ii).
- GOVT. BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 9892 (iii).
- "LEADER" CO., AMOUNTS RECEIVED : on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn. deb. ; remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 3872 (ii).
- NAMES OF INCORPORATORS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1464 (i).

REGINA "LEADER" Co.: Inquiry for Ret. *re* (Mr. Davis) 1209 (i).

— PAYMENT TO BY GOVT.: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 1116 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. Davis) 1115, 1116 (i).

— M. to ref. Ret. to Pub. Accts. Com. (Mr. Davis) 1786 (i).

— TRANSFER OF TOWN SITE TO C.P.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2759 (i).

RELIEF OF KIMBERLEY, RAISING OF FLAG ON PARLT. BUILDINGS: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 541 (i).

REPATRIATION OF THE 100TH REGT., PAPERS, REPS., &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Prior) 2201 (i).

— See "South African War," "Halifax Garrison," "Leinster," &c.

REPORTS, DEPTL., DATE OF COPY SENT TO BUREAU: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 4440, 4555, 4737 (ii).

— DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 4150, 4246 (ii).

— Inquiry for (Sir Adolphe Caron) 3985 (ii).

— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3990 (ii).

— Inquiry for (Mr. Wallace) 3989 (ii).

REPORTS PRESENTED:

AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher) 5393 (ii).

AUD. GENERAL'S (Mr. Fielding) 51, 1057 (i).

CHARTERED BANKS, LIST OF SHAREHOLDERS (Mr. Fielding) 4681 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE LIST, &c. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 286, (i), 4454 (ii).

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (Mr. Fisher) 6138 (ii).

INDIAN AFFAIRS (Mr. Sutherland) 2759 (i).

INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joy de Lotbinière) 938 (i).

INTERIOR (Mr. Sutherland) 4333 (ii).

LIBRARY OF PARLT. (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).

MARINE (Sir Louis Davies) 1483 (i).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden, King's) 4333.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5122 (ii).

PENITENTIARIES (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4333 (ii).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Mr. Fielding) 10 (i).

RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) 4436 (ii).

SEC. OF STATE (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4454 (ii).

TRADE AND NAV. RETURNS (Mr. Paterson) 1057.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF YUKON: Inquiry (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4559 (ii).

— See "Yukon," &c.

**Representation in the House of Commons B, No. 13** (Mr. Mulock) 1<sup>o</sup>, 247; 2<sup>o</sup> m, 1212; in Com., 1401; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 1556; agreed to (Y. 91; N. 45) 1640 (i).

1<sup>o</sup> m. (Mr. Mulock) 247.

Deb. (Mr. Clancy) 249; (Mr. Wallace) 219; (Mr. Casey) 250; (Mr. Clarke) 254; (Mr. Tisdale) 254; (Mr. Bergeron) 254 (i).

2<sup>o</sup> m. (Mr. Mulock) 1212 (i).

Deb. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1216; (Mr. McMullen) 1223; (Mr. Wallace) 1237; (Mr. Casey) 1243; (Mr. Bell, P.E.I.), 1249; (Mr. Foster) 1253 (amt. 6 m. h.) 1255; (Sir Louis Davies) 1256; (Mr. Paterson) 1262; (Mr. McNeill) 1269; (Mr. Semple) 1270; (Mr. Henderson) 1272; (Mr. Macdonald Huron) 1275; (Mr. McInerney) 1279; (Mr. McMillan) 1283; (Mr. Ellis) 1285.

In Com., 1401 (i).

Deb. (Mr. Wallace) 1401; (Mr. Mulock) 1402; (Mr. Foster) 1403; (Mr. McMullen) 1403; (Mr. Clarke) 1404, 1411, 1456; (Mr. Clancy) 1406; (Mr. Paterson) 1406, 1417; (Mr. Sproule) 1413; (Sir. Louis Davies) 1429; (Mr. Ingram) 1431;

### Representation in the House of Commons B.—*Con.*

(Mr. Semple) 1434; (Mr. Britton) 1436; (Mr. Quinn) 1439, 1455; (Mr. McNeill) 1442; (Mr. Somerville) 1449; (Mr. Moore) 1458; (Mr. Bell, P. E. I.) 1458 (i).

3<sup>o</sup> m. (Mr. Mulock) 1556 (i).

Deb. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1556; (Mr. Foster) 1557; (Mr. McNeill) 1557; (amt.) 1560; withdn. 1561; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1559; (Sir Charles Tupper) 1560; (Mr. Bennett) 1561; (Mr. Bell, P.E.I.), 1565; (Mr. Martin) 1572; (Sir Louis Davies) 1579; (Sir Charles Tupper) 1582 (amt.) 1586; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1586; (Mr. Montague) 1589; (Mr. Paterson) 1595; (Mr. Wallace) 1601; (Mr. McMullen) 1608; (Mr. Craig) 1613; (Mr. Rogers) 1622; (Mr. Osler) 1624; (Mr. Heyd) 1625; (Mr. Henderson) 1629; (Mr. Clarke) 1632; (Mr. Tisdale) 1638; (Mr. Gibson) 1639 (i).

REPRESENTATION BILL: Ques. of Order (Sir Charles Tupper) 1225, 1556 (i).

— Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1557 (i).

REPRESENTATION OF YUKON IN DOM. PARLIAMENT: Prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 7647 (iii).

— Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 6615 (ii).

RESIDENCES OF MEMBERS OF CAN. CONTINGENT, PROVS., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1112 (i).

— See "Can. Contingents," &c.

**Restigouche and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 73** (Mr. McAlister) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1641; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 1933 (i); in Com., 3372; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 3415 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 78.)

RESTIGOUCHE AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10009 (iii).

RESTIGOUCHE RY. CO., REP. OF ENGINEERS *re* COST: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 2201 (i).

RETURNS, INCOMPLETE: Remarks (Mr. Davin) 8281.

— (Mr. Borden, Halifax) 8080 (iii).

— (Mr. Casgrain) 1983 (i).

— (Mr. Clancy) 8837 (iii).

— (Mr. Davin) 4447 (ii).

— (Mr. Foster) 1555, 1724, 1876 (i), 3479, 3639, 4145, 4662, 6567 (ii), 7120, 7317, 7651, 8216, 8526, 9525 (iii).

— (Mr. Ganong) 5521 (ii).

— (Mr. Ingram) 8438 (iii).

— (Mr. Martin) 4665 (ii), 8440 (iii).

— (Mr. Mulock) 8076 (iii).

— (Mr. Prior) 4733, 4811, 6701 (ii).

— (Sir Charles Tupper) 8436 (iii).

— (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4723 (ii).

RETURNS LAID ON TABLE (Mr. Sutherland) 3264, 6989.

— (Mr. Blair) 6990 (iii).

— MR. OGILVIE'S REPORT: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 8284 (iii).

— ORDERED: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6775 (ii).

— *re* STEAMSHIPS CHARTERED BY GOVT. (Mr. Mills) 6257 (ii).

REWARDS FOR SAVING LIFE: in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).

RICHELIEU RIVER BRIDGE: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 8081, 8795, 8933, 9062 (iii).

— BOOM: in Com. of Sup., 10217 (iii).

— GOVT. WORKS AT BELOEIL, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2755 (i).

- RIDEAU HALL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7937 (iii).  
 — EXPENSES, &c., JULY, 1892, TO JUNE, 1899: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Wilson) 4079 (ii).  
 — FIRE PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9889.  
 — NEW WING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7835 (iii).  
 — REMETALLING ROAD, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7835 (iii).  
 RIDEAU CANAL, OVERSEER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 10395 (iii).  
 RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8336 (iii).  
 — CLUBS, ESTABLISHMENT OF: Remarks (Sir Charles Tupper) 7119 (iii).  
 RIFLE RANGES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8370, 10353 (iii).  
 — MONTREAL, PURCHASE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4566 (ii).  
 RIVIÈRE DU LOUP STATION, I.C.R., ACCOMMODATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1006 (i).  
 — GOVT. WORKS, COMPLETION: Ques. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 4076 (ii).  
 — WORKSHOPS: M. to adjn. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5516.  
 — See "I. C. R.," &c.  
 RIVER JOHN WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7941 (iii).  
 RIVIÈRE DU SUD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10210 (iii).  
 ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 10253 (iii).  
 — N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (iii).  
 — YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 10257 (iii).  
 ROBERTS, J. W. G., SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8063 (iii).  
 ROBERVAL, DREDGE AT, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3764 (ii).  
 — WHARF, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 7416 (iii).  
 ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Poupore) 4076 (ii).  
 ROCKINGHAM STATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 9436.  
 ROCKLIFFE RANGE: in Com. of Sup., 9768 (iii).  
 ROCKY LAKE BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 9431 (iii).  
 ROCKY MOUNTAIN PARK: in Com. of Sup., 10411 (iii).  
 ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 9458, 10390 (iii).  
 — SUBSIDIES, &c.: conc., 10449 (iii).  
 — See "I. C. R.," "Sale," &c.  
 ROSS, MR. J. H., INDIAN COMMISSIONER, REMUNERATION, EXPENSES, &c., BY DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 148, 297 (i).  
 ROSSLAND POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7929 (iii).  
 ROTHWELL AND RYLEY, MESSRS., SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6508, 6542 (ii) 7729, 7807, 7818.  
 ROTHWELL, MR., REP. *re* SETTLERS CLAIMS, TRANSMISSION TO B.C. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 298.  
 ROUND HILL POSTMASTER, SALARY, ALLOWANCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9796 (iii).  
 ROUMANIAN JEWS, IMMIGRANTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10349 (iii).  
 — PAR. IN "SCOTSMAN": Remarks (Mr. Clarke) 10187 (iii).  
 ROWAN MILLS P.O., POSTMASTER, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tisdale) 4742 (ii).  
 ROYAL ASSENT. See "Bills."
- ROYAL CANADIAN INFANTRY, B.C., OFFER OF "A" CO. FOR CHINA: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 8438 (iii).  
 — See "S. A. War."  
 ROYAL COMMISSION *re* INVESTIGATION IN YUKON: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4736, 5231, 5233, 5238 (ii).  
 — M. for Ret.\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 167.  
 — See "Yukon," &c.  
 Royal Marine Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 92 (Mr. Penny) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1877; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2109 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4478 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 118.)  
 ROYALTIES IN YUKON, AMOUNT COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2750 (i).  
 — CHARGES AGAINST MR. McDONALD: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 7658; neg. (Y. 33; N. 63) 7727 (iii).  
 — ROYALTY TO ALEX. McDONALD, REP., &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5895 (ii).  
 — ON GOLD OUTPUT: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 7613.  
 ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, in Com. of Sup., 8337 (iii).  
 — ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 9888 (iii).  
 — APPLICANTS FOR STAFF COURSE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1110, 2163 (i).  
 — EXPENSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1734 (i).  
 — SELECTION OF OFFICERS, &c.: M. for Cor.\* (Mr. Foster) 1012 (i).  
 — See "Militia," &c.  
 ROYAL MINT FOR CANADA, PAR. IN "N.Y. TRIBUNE": Remarks (Mr. Prior) 5229 (ii).  
 ROYAL RESERVE, ANNOUNCEMENT OF IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Sir Adolphe Caron) 1006 (i).  
 ROY, MR., RESIDENT ENGINEER, B.C., REMOVAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2757, 3180 (i).  
 RULES OF HOUSE, INFRINGEMENT OF: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4451 (ii).  
 — OBSERVANCE OF: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4733.  
 RYAN, MR. J. B., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6024 (ii).  
 RYAN & Co.'s AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 10393 (iii).  
 RYAN, JOSEPH, FOREMAN AT LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 4069 (ii).  
 ST. ALEXIS WHARF, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1745 (i).  
 ST. ANDREWS LOCKS, EMPLOYT. OF UNION MEN Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 598 (i).  
 — RAPIDS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 9859 (iii).  
 ST. ANNE WHARF, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1745 (i).  
 ST. BRUNO AND ST. CŒUR DE MARIE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 5754.  
 — See "Gagne, Mr." &c.  
 ST. CHARLES BRANCH I.C.R., CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1739 (i).  
 ST. CHARLES JUNCTION AND I.C.R. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 10010 (iii).  
 St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. No. 111 (Mr. Tisdale) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 3033 (i) in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 4069 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 119.)

- St. Clair River Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 41** (Mr. *Montague*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 649; 2<sup>o</sup>, 1005; in Com., 1685; 3<sup>o</sup>, 1725 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 117.)
- St. Eloi Ballast Ground, Tenure, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 7416 (iii).
- St. Eugene de Grantham, &c., Parish B. No. 140** (Mr. *Lavergne*) 1<sup>o</sup> in., 4144 (ii).
- St. Francis Lake, Protection Walls:** in Com. of Sup., 8521 (iii).
- **STRAIGHTENING CHANNEL:** in Com. of Sup., 8157 (iii).
- St. Francis River Bridge Co.'s Subsidy:** in Com. on Res., 10016 (iii).
- St. Gedeon Mail Contract, Amount Paid, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 9059 (iii).
- **P.O. AND RY. STATION, MAIL CONTRACT:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4075 (ii).
- **WHARE, PAYMENTS TO S. DESJARDINS:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7416 (iii).
- St. Jerome Wharf:** in Com. of Sup., 10208 (iii).
- **PAYMENTS TO AND NAMES OF EMPLOYEES:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 8838 (iii).
- St. John, N.B., and G.B., Mail Subsidy:** in Com. of Sup., 9577 (iii).
- **HARBOUR WORKS, FORFEITED DEPOSITS:** Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 10030, 10186 (iii).
- **IMMIGRANT BUILDING:** in Com. of Sup., 9875.
- **"SUN," N.B., PAYMENTS TO, BY GOVT., 1882 TO 1896:** Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1463 (i).
- **WHARF:** in Com. of Sup., 8372 (iii).
- St. John's, P.Q., Customs Collector, Par. in "Canada Francais":** on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monet*) 9844 (iii).
- **POSTMASTER, DEFALCATIONS, INVESTIGATION, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 478 (i).
- St. Joseph de Lévis Graving Dock, Enlargement, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2191 (i).
- St. Lambert Protection Walls:** in Com. of Sup., 10218 (iii).
- St. Lawrence and Terminal S.S. Co.'s B. No. 157** (Mr. *McIsaac*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 5513; 2<sup>o</sup>, 5922; in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 6488 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 120.)
- St. Lawrence River Canals:** in Com. of Sup., 8885, 9427 (iii).
- **CONTRACTS CANCELLED, NUMBER, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 156 (i).
- **SUSPENDED OR CANCELLED, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2828 (i).
- **EXPENDITURE, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2403 (i).
- **OPENING:** Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 3775 (ii).
- **CHANNEL, KINGSTON:** in Com. of Sup., 7965.
- **POLICY OF LATE GOVT. re COMPLETION:** Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2164 (i).
- **REMOVAL OF ROCKS, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 7949 (iii).
- **14-FT. NAVIGATIONS, COMPLETION AND EXPENDITURE:** Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 739 (i).
- **RIVER RY. BRIDGE, QUEBEC, SUBSIDY:** in Com. on Res., 10022 (iii).
- St. Lawrence Ship Channel:** in Com. of Sup., 7848.
- **SHORE TELEGRAPH, MARGAREE AND MABOU:** in Com. of Sup., 7838 (iii).
- **SURVEYS:** in Com. of Sup., 8158 (iii).
- **TELEGRAPH LINES:** in Com. of Sup., 10253.
- St. Louis Lake:** in Com. of Sup., 8879 (iii).
- Ste. Mary's River Ry. and Colonization Co.'s incorp. B. No. 88** (Mr. *Oliver*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 1796; 2<sup>o</sup>, 2109 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>, 3373 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 79).
- St. Maurice Slides:** in Com. of Sup., 7837 (iii).
- St. Ours Lock:** in Com. of Sup., 8522 (iii).
- St. Pascal and Kamouraska Mail Contract:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4741 (ii).
- See "Kamouraska."
- St. Patrick's Day Celebration:** Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 1998 (i).
- St. Peters Canal, Repairs, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 9498 (iii).
- St. Peters, P.E.I., Harbour Improvements:** Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P. E. I.*) 3175 (i).
- St. Regis Indians:** in Com. of Sup., 7282 (iii).
- **LITIGATION EXPENSES:** in Com. of Sup., 8068.
- **QUES. OF PRIVILEGE: par in Ottawa "Citizen"** (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7304 (iii).
- **LOCK-UP:** in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iii).
- **St. Roch des Aulnaies Wharf:** in Com. of Sup., 10209 (iii).
- St. Thomas Drill Hall:** in Com. of Sup., 9890.
- **PURCHASE OF PARADE GROUND, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 294 (i) 7122 (iii).
- **COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND J. H. WILSON:** M. for copies (Mr. *Ingram*) 548 (i).
- **Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Ingram*)** 8077 (iii).
- **POSTMASTER, SUSPENSION, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 6610 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1883 (i).
- St. Victoire Post Office:** conc., 10429 (iii).
- St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary:** in Com. of Sup., 6893 (ii) 8134; conc., 10453 (iii).
- **CARTING OF WASTE STONE, &c., M. for Cor.\*** (Mr. *Fortin*) 3469 (ii).
- **ELECTRIC PLANT:** in Com. of Sup., 6439 (ii).
- **INCREASE OF SALARIES, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 7878 (iii).
- **INVESTIGATION, &c.:** in Com. of Sup., 10318.
- **REGULATIONS, &c. re NIGHT DUTY:** Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2749 (i).
- **M. for copy\* (Mr. *Fortin*)** 3469 (ii).
- SADDLES FOR SOUTH AFRICA PURCHASED BY GOVT., NUMBER, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 1113, 1463 (i).
- See "South African War." &c.
- Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. No. 12** (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 246 (i) 2<sup>o</sup>, and in Com., 6995; 3<sup>o</sup>, 6996 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 35.)
- Saugenay River, Dredging:** in Com. of Sup., 10207.
- **PUBLIC WORKS, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 287 (i).
- Sales of Newspapers, I.C.R., Contracts, Amounts Paid, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 5890 (ii).

- SALE OF ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R., &c., Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 4905 (ii).  
 — M. to adjn. (Mr. *Montague*) 4906 (ii).  
**Salisbury and Harvey Ry. Co.'s B. No. 150** (Mr. *Lewis*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 4722; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 5230, in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 5922 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 80.)  
 SALMON COUNTY, GOVT. WHARF AND SHED, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7656 (iii).  
 SAMPSON, J., PAYMENT OF FISHING BOUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 8429 (iii).  
 SAND CASTINGS IN N.S., NAMES OF TENDERERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 9062 (iii).  
 SANDY ISLAND LIGHT, REMOVAL, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 440 (i).  
**San José Scale Act Amt. B. 126** (Mr. *Fisher*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2827; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 3164; in Com., 3166; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 3168 (i). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 31.)  
 SARNIA, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10228 (iii).  
 — POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7917, 9884 (iii).  
 SASKATCHEWAN LANDING, DEP. RETURNING OFFICER, PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3261 (i).  
 — SETTLERS, RELIEF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7490, 10281 (iii).  
 SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 8153, 10393 (iii).  
 — HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 10250 (iii).  
 — RES. OF TOWN COUNCIL, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9727 (iii).  
 SAVAGE ISLAND SPAR LIGHTS, ERECTION AND REMOVAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 440.  
 — COR. *re* REMOVAL: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Martin*) 2202 (i).  
 SAVARD, ED., PAYMASTER, CHICOUTIMI: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3767 (ii).  
 SAVARD, MESSRS., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5754 (ii).  
**Savings Banks Act Amt. B. No. 177** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 6914 (ii); 2<sup>o</sup> m., 7221; in Com., 8082; 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 8083 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 28.)  
 SAWDUST IN RIVERS, COMPLAINTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 4556 (ii).  
**Schomberg and Aurora Ry. Co.'s B. No. 94** (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1975; 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 2673 (i); in Com. and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 7652 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 81.)  
 SCHOMBURG AND AURORA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 9975 (iii).  
 SCHOOLS IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6684, 6689 (ii).  
 SCHOOL LANDS, N.W.T., SALE BY GOVT. (Mr. *Davin*) 1479 (i).  
 SCHOOLS IN UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 10411 (iii).  
 SCHREIBER, MR., DEP. MIN. OF RYS. AND CANALS, COMPLAINT AGAINST (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 10423 (iii).  
 — USE OF PRIVATE CAR FOR FAMILY AND FRIENDS: Ques. (Mr. *Pettet*) 2829 (i).  
 "SCOTSMAN," SS. PAPERS, *re* WRECK: Remarks (Mr. *Cowan*) 8656 (iii).  
 SCOTT ACT. See "CAN. TEMP. ACT."  
 SCRAP IRON, QUANTITY SOLD, TENDERS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2761 (i).  
 — See "I.C.R.," &c.
- SCRIP TO HALF-BREEDS, GRANT, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 305 (i); 4744 (ii).  
 — TO HALF-BREED CHILDREN: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davis*) 640, 646 (i).  
 SEAL COVE, GRAND MANAN, ERECTION OF LIGHTS, &c.: M. for Rep.\* (Mr. *Ganong*) 1012 (i).  
 — LIFE SAVING STATION, EQUIPMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 594 (i).  
**SECRETARY OF STATE:**  
 "CANADA GAZETTE" in Com. of Sup., 7506 (iii).  
 PRINTING BUREAU, PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 7506, 10413 (iii).  
 PROVINCIAL ELECTORAL LISTS, EXPENSES OF PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2755 (i).  
 SEC. OF STATE'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7506.  
 — DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4454 (ii).  
 VOTERS' LISTS. See "GENERAL HEADING."
- SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS, ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP.:  
 Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 3641 (ii).  
 — IN MAN. AND N.W.T., COR. BETWEEN MIN. OF INT. AND HOMESTEADERS: M. for copies (Mr. *Davin*) 158 (i).  
 — COR. BETWEEN INT. DEPT. AND PERSONS IN N.W.T.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 2998 (i).  
 — GOVTL. ACTION *re*: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1757, 1775 (i).  
 — LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Douglas*) 3987.
- Seed Grain Indebtedness Securities B. No. 143** (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1<sup>o</sup> m., 4333; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 5034; in Com., 5037; 3<sup>o</sup> m., 5142; agreed to (Y. 50; N. 26) 5143 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 16.)  
 SEED GRAIN TO SETTLERS: in Com. of Sup., 7828, 8121 (iii).  
 SELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR SERVICE IN SOUTH AFRICA: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1112 (i).  
 SEL. STANDING COM., ADDITION OF MR. PUTTEE'S NAME: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 736 (i).  
 SEMLIN GOVT., B.C., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bostock*) 3039 (i).  
**Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. No. 39** (Mr. *Domville*) 1<sup>o</sup>, 579 (i).  
 — Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 510 (i).  
 SENATE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 8148 (iii).  
 See "Supply," &c.  
 SENATORS, LEGAL QUALIFICATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1885 (i).  
 SERGEANT-AT-ARMS, SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES in Com. of Sup., 8149 (iii).  
 SERVICE LIMIT FOR COMMANDING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1465 (i).
- Servis Railroad Tie Plate Co. of Canada, Patent Relief B. No. 93** (Mr. *Fraser, Guyborough*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 1975; 2<sup>o</sup> m., 2670 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 8709 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 121.)  
 SESSIONAL CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 5923 (ii).  
 — PAYMENT OF SALARIES: Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 5897, 6916 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 6254 (ii).  
 — ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeon*) 3636 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 6061.

- SESSIONAL CLERKS: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 6355, 6446 (ii).
- INDEMNITY TO SENATORS AND MEMBERS: in Com. of Sup., 8135 (iii).
- MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 5923 (ii).
- SETTLERS IN MAN. AND N.W.T., GRANTS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Douglas*) 2760 (i).
- SHEDIAC AND SHEMOGUE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com., on Res., 10012 (iii).
- SHEEHAN, JACOB, FISHING BOUNTY, PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 6058 (ii).
- SHERIFF'S FEES, YUKON, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10276 (iii).
- SHINGLE MANUFACTURERS MEMORIAL *re* SHIPMENTS, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *McAlister*) 10035 (iii).
- SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7946 (iii).
- SHRAPNEL, W., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4555 (ii).
- SIDINGS IN CAPE BRETON: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 9790 (iii).
- See "I.C.R., &c."
- SIFTON, HON. MR. AND MR. TURRIFF, DATES OF TRAVELLING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2465 (i).
- See "Turriff, Mr."
- SILVER LEAD ORE BOUNTY REGULATIONS: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 1013 (i).
- SLEEPERS SUPPLIED TO I.C.R., EXTENSION FROM ST. ROSALIE TO CHAUDIÈRE: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 5246 (ii).
- SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 7837 8054 (iii).
- SLOCAN LABOUR TROUBLES, MR. CLUTE'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3043 (i).
- See "B.C.," &c.
- SMALL-POX, REPORTED, OUTBREAK: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 4454, 4694 (ii).
- SMITH, G. F., DEP. RET. OFFICER, PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3446 (ii).
- SMITH, H. GILBERT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 8135.
- SNETSINGER, J. G., M.P., CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1462, 1737 (i).
- SOLICITOR GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5244 (ii).
- Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5754 (ii).
- SONGHEES INDIAN RESERVE, COMPLAINTS *re* GRAVEYARD: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 6625 (ii).
- REMOVAL FROM RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1460 (i), 4242 (ii).
- COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND B.C.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Prior*) 2201 (i).
- SOPERTON POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1735 (i).
- SOREL ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 10227 (iii).
- SOULANGES AND BEAUHARNOIS CANALS, OPENING: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4559 (ii).
- SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 8515, 10150 (iii).
- CEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8894 (iii).
- CEMENT TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1478 (i).
- CONSTRUCTION, PAY SHEETS, ACCOUNTS, &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2202 (ii).
- CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 8153, 8888.
- SOULANGES CANAL: CONTRACTS, &c.: Inquiry for papers (Mr. *Foster*) 9799 (iii).
- COST, &c., LITIGATION AND CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1007 (i).
- REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9496 (iii).
- WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 10097 (iii).
- SOURIS KNIGHTS POINT: in Com. of Sup., 9899 (iii).
- SOURIS BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND MESSRS. BRENNAN AND RAMSAY: M. for copy\* (Mr. *McLellan, P.E.I.*) 202 (i).
- SOUTH AFRICAN WAR:
- ADAMS BROS., PAYMENT TO IN 1898-99: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2364 (i).
- See "Oliver Equipment."
- ADDITIONAL TROOPS REQUIRED BY IMPERIAL GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1122 (i).
- Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1209 (i).
- ADDRESS TO HER MAJ., MESS. FROM SENATE: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 7303 (iii).
- *re* RECENT VICTORIES: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6899, 6913 (ii).
- TRANSVAAL QUESTION, REPLY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1206 (i).
- AMERICAN BANK NOTE CO.'S BUILDING, HOISTING OF FLAG: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 6789 (ii).
- Letter read (Mr. *Fielding*) 6993 (iii).
- APPLICATIONS FROM QUEBEC, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1113 (i).
- ASSIGNMENT OF SOLDIERS' PAY: Letter read (Mr. *Taylor*) 8281 (iii).
- BAMFORD, PRIVATE, TELEGRAMS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7882 (iii).
- BATHURST, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING REFUSAL OF CARETAKER TO RAISE FLAG: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6447 (ii), 6994 (iii).
- BLANKETS FOR TROOPS, PURCHASE, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 292, 440, 1111 (i).
- BLOEMFONTEIN, CAPTURE OF, RAISING OF FLAG ON PARTL. BUILDING (Mr. *Taylor*) 1927 (i).
- B.C. CONTINGENT AND GOVTL. INTENTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 240, 281 (i).
- COR. BETWEEN DOM. AND B.C. GOVTS.: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Prior*) 319 (i).
- OFFER, &c.: Inquiry for papers (Mr. *Prior*) 2994 (i); 3638 (ii).
- CANADIAN CONTINGENTS, COR. BETWEEN GEN. HUTTON AND COL. HUGHES: M. for copies\* (Mr. *Corby*) 163 (i).
- EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4438 (ii).
- GALLANTRY: Telegram read (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 9486 (iii).
- GENERAL COMPOSITION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 1474 (i).
- INDUCEMENTS TO SETTLE IN SOUTH AFRICA: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 5395 (ii).
- INSURANCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 9524.
- INQUIRY FOR PAPERS (Mr. *Foster*) 1211 (i).
- LATITUDE OF DEBATE IN COM.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 812 (i).
- MEN LEFT AT HALIFAX TO CARE FOR SICK HORSES: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 480 (i).
- MISSING: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 4250 (ii).
- NAMES OF STAFF OFFICERS, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 470 (i).
- OFFICIAL COR.: Laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7, 80 (i).
- ORGANIZATION AND MAJ.-GEN. HUTTON'S OFFER TO SERVE IN SOUTH AFRICA, COR., &c.: M. for copy\* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 166 (i).
- PAPERS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5 (i).
- NUMBERS, PAYMENTS, CLOTHING CONTRIBUTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3761-2 (ii).

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—*Con.*

CANADIAN CONTINGENTS, PAY OF VOLUNTEERS: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 231, 350 (i).  
 Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 351; (Mr. *Charlton*) 365; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 382; (Mr. *Craig*) 397; (Mr. *Monet*) 465; (Mr. *Davin*) 511; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 529; (Mr. *Oliver*) 530; (Mr. *Stenson*) 532; (Mr. *McInerney*) 535; (Mr. *Taylor*) 541; (Mr. *Wallace*) 541; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 546; (Mr. *Chauvin*) 549; (Mr. *Casey*) 563; (Mr. *Clarke*) 563; (Mr. *Bell, P.E.I.*) 569; (Mr. *Prior*) 657; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 661, 735; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 671; (Mr. *Tarte*) 682; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 705; (Mr. *Montague*) 724; (Mr. *Beattie*) 734; (Mr. *Desmarais*) 868; (Mr. *Monk*) 907; (Mr. *Ethier*) 914; (Mr. *Marcotte*) 933; (Mr. *Flint*) 1058; (Mr. *Broder*) 1072; (Mr. *McClure*) 1080; (Mr. *Pope*) 1085; (Mr. *Frost*) 1094; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1096; (Mr. *Kloepfer*) 1103; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1096, 1104; (Mr. *Poupore*) 1105; (Mr. *Russell*) 1124; (Mr. *Bennett*) 1143 (i).  
 In Com. on Res., 1155 (i).  
 Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 1155, 1168, 1185; (Mr. *Fielding*) 1156; (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 1157; (Mr. *Guillet*) 1158, 1178; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1159, 1189; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1160; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1160; (Mr. *Davin*) 1162, 1171, 1178, 1200; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1164; (Mr. *Beattie*) 1167; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1169, 1180, 1196; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1174; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1176; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1178; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1183, 1197; (Mr. *Monet*) 1185; (Mr. *Henderson*) 1186; (Mr. *McCleary*) 1187; (Mr. *Marcil*) 1188; (Mr. *Wallace*) 1191; (Mr. *Gillies*) 1192; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1199; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1203; Mr. *Gibson*) 1204.  
 1\* of B. 59 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1212 (i).  
 2° m. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1643.  
 In Com., 1643 (i).  
 Deb. (Mr. *Fielding*) 1646, 1687, 2000; (Mr. *Foster*) 1643, 2001; (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 1644, 1692; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1647, 2004, 2035; (Mr. *Wallace*) 1649, 1686; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1649; 1696; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1652; (Mr. *McNeill*) 1652, 2001; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1653, 1690; (Mr. *Domville*) 1654; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 1655, 1699, 2001; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1658; (Mr. *Ingram*) 1661, 2005; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1664, 1697, 2007; Mr. *Oliver*) 1665, 1696-8; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1666, 2005; (Mr. *Rutherford*) 1666; (Mr. *Roche*) 1668; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1672, 1694; (Mr. *Puttee*) 1671; (Mr. *Dobell*) 1673; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1674; (Mr. *Montague*) 1675; (Mr. *Davin*) 1677; (Mr. *Wood*) 1689; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1690, 2007; (Mr. *Henderson*) 1692; (Mr. *Prior*) 1696; (Mr. *Macleam*) 2008 (i).  
 — CASUALTIES, LIST OF: Inquiry for (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4563 (i).  
 — DEATH OF PRIVATE LABUE: Report read (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 8314 (iii).  
 — KILLED AND WOUNDED: Rep. read (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 4554 (ii).  
 — PURCHASE OF REVOLVERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 289 (i).  
 — RECEIPT OF REP. OF COL. OTTER, *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Ross-Robertson*) 3049 (i).  
 — Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 737 (i).  
 — TELEGRAM *re* CANADIANS IN BATTLE, LORD ROBERTS: READ (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 813 (i).  
 — (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 5249, 5410 (ii) 7894.  
 — CHAPLAINS, APPNMT. OF: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 7971 (iii).  
 — CHARTERED STEAMERS, &c.: conc., 10446.  
 — COMMISSIONS, &c. IN CAN. CONTINGENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 6617 (ii).  
 — IMPERIAL ARMY: M. to adjn. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3480 (ii).

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—*Con.*

COMMISSIONS IN IMPERIAL ARMY: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 3479 (ii).  
 EMERGENCY RATIONS, CHARGES AGAINST MILITIA DEPT.: M. (Mr. *Monk*) 7395, 7514 (iii).  
 — M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Com. 7395 (iii).  
 Deb. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7405, 7414, 7541, 7549; (Mr. *Foster*) 7516, 7541, 7548; (Mr. *Speaker*) 7517, 7540, 7541; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 7524; (Mr. *Monk*) 7527; Personal Explanation, 7536; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 7529; (Mr. *Quinn*) 7536; (Mr. *McNeill*) 7540, 7546; (Mr. *Davin*) 7541; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7542; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough*) 7543; (Mr. *Wallace*) 7546; (Mr. *McMullen*) 7568; Amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) agreed to (Y. 47; N. 30) 7572 (iii).  
 — FIRST REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Belcourt*) 7646 (iii).  
 Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7646; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7646; (Mr. *Russell*) 7646 (iii).  
 — M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) to conc. in Rep. of Sel. Com., 9201 (iii).  
 Deb. (Mr. *Ellis*) 9209; (Mr. *Monk*) amt. 9220; (Mr. *Russell*) 9249; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 9274; (Mr. *Britton*) 9289; (Mr. *Clarke*) 9307; (Mr. *Monet*) 9320; (Mr. *Campbell*) 9322; (Mr. *Oliver*) 9322; (Mr. *Richardson*) 9323; M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) agreed to (Y. 66; N. 52) 9330; Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 9327; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ruling 9330 (iii).  
 EMERGENCY RATIONS, ANALYSES, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7885 (iii).  
 — (Mr. *McNeill*) 7317, 7420, 7512, 8079. (iii).  
 — ANALYSIS OF DR. RUTTAN: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7988 (iii).  
 — APPNMT. OF DAY FOR DISCUSSION: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 8934 (iii).  
 — Inquiry for papers (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (iii).  
 — M. to print Rep. of Com. (Mr. *Monk*) 8651.  
 — M. to substitute name on Committee (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7649 (iii).  
 — papers laid on Table (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 7208 (iii).  
 — CUSTOMS DUTY AT MONTREAL: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7883 (iii).  
 — ENTRY AT MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 8432 (iii).  
 — PAR. IN "CAN. MILITARY GAZETTE": M. to adjn. (Mr. *Monk*) 6790, 6883 (ii).  
 Deb. (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 6795; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6804; (Mr. *Fielding*) 6806, 6814; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6790, 6807, 6887; (Mr. *Foster*) 6811, 6886; (Mr. *Dobell*) 6812, 6851; (Mr. *McNeill*) 6817, 6821; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 6827; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 6844; (Mr. *Montague*) 6883; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 6860; (Mr. *Kloepfer*) 6866; (Mr. *Davin*) 6867; (Mr. *Domville*) 6870; (Mr. *Craig*) 6872; (Mr. *McMullen*) 6875; (Mr. *Prior*) 6878; (Mr. *Flint*) 6880 (ii).  
 — M. (Mr. *Borden, King's*) to lay Papers on Table, 7208 (iii).  
 Deb. (Mr. *Davin*) 7208; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7211; (Mr. *Foster*) 7212; (Mr. *Monk*) 7212; (Mr. *Speaker*) 7213, 7216, 7218, 7220; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7214; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7215; (Mr. *Prior*) 7216; (Mr. *McMullen*) 7216; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 7216; (Mr. *McNeill*) 7217; (Mr. *Wallace*) 7217; (Mr. *Montague*) 7219 (iii).  
 — personal explanation (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7542 (iii).  
 — ques. of order, *re* documents laid on Table Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 6831-6844 (ii).  
 — Ques. of Order (Sir *Louis Davies*) 7888 (iii).  
 — Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Monk*) 7305 (iii).  
 — ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7540, 7548 (iii).  
 EMERGENCY RATIONS, SAMPLES ANALYSED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 7417 (iii).

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—*Con.*

- EMERGENCY RATIONS, TRANSLATION OF EVIDENCE :  
Remarks (Mr. *Morin*) 8935 (iii).
- EQUIPMENT AND STORES FURNISHED TO IMP. GOVT.,  
TENDER, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 5243.
- ESQUIMALT GARRISONING BY CAN. TROOPS: Re-  
marks (Mr. *Prior*) 2148 (i).
- EXPORTS, QUANTITY AND VALUE OF FROM CAN. TO  
SOUTH AFRICA: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 3260.
- FLAGS ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks (Mr.  
*Foster*) 1124 (i).
- FRENCH CANADIANS, ATTACK *re*, PAR. IN WIN-  
NIPEG FREE PRESS: Ques. of Privilege (Sir  
*Charles Tupper*) 165 (i).
- HALIFAX GARRISON: in Com. of Sup., 9772, 10358.  
— CANADIAN OFFER: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*)  
937, 1123 (i).  
— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 649 (i).  
— See "Leinster."
- HAY AND OATS CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 1479.  
— COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.: M. for copies\*  
(Mr. *Hale*) 4078 (ii).  
— inquiry for ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 7513, 8082 (iii).  
— FOR IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 6350,  
6916 (ii) 7314 (iii).  
— Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 4917 (ii).
- INDEMNITIES TO FAMILIES OF CAN. SOLDIERS: Re-  
marks (Mr. *Oliver*) 10317 (iii).
- INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. *re* BRITISH INSTITU-  
TIONS: amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup.,  
1793; Neg. (Y. 10: N. 119) 1875 (i).  
— Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1698 (i).
- INSURANCE, &c., COR. *re* LIST OF CASUALTIES :  
Remarks (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 4560 (ii).  
— Explanation (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1926 (i).  
— PAR. IN OTTAWA "FREE PRESS" (Sir  
*Charles Tupper*) 866 (i).  
— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4248 (ii).  
— TELEGRAMS FROM COMPANY: Read (Sir  
*Charles Tupper*) 1122 (i).
- INTERVENTION OF CAN. GOVT. *re* SETTLEMENT :  
Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 6625 (ii).
- LEINSTER REGIMENT AND CAN. VOLUNTEERS :  
Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 589 (i).  
— See "Halifax Garrison"
- LETTERS, POSTAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Beattie*) 650 (i).
- MEAT SUPPLIES FOR CAN. CONTINGENTS: Ques.  
(Mr. *Clancy*) 7970 (iii).
- MESS. FROM HER MAJ. AND LORD ROBERTS :  
Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1039 (i).
- MILITIA OFFICERS, RANK, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe*  
*Caron*) 2751 (i).
- MONTREAL RIOTS: M. to adjn. (Mr. *McNeill*)  
1288 (i).  
— MEMBERS INTERRUPTING: Ruling (Mr.  
*Speaker*) 1291, 1310, 1314, 1366 (i).
- MONUMENT TO CAN. VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr.  
*Taylor*) 1119 (i).
- NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS FOR ACTIVE SERVICE :  
Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2757 (i).
- OFFICERS SERVING AS PRIVATES: Ques. (Mr.  
*Ellis*) 4240 (ii).
- OFFICIAL REPS.: Inquiry for (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 3332.
- ORDER, QUES. OF, MEMBERS REMARKS CHECKED  
(Mr. *Speaker*) 701 (i).
- OTTER, COL., REPS.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden,*  
*King's*) 4560 (ii).  
— Inquiry (Mr. *Prior*) 4373 (ii).  
— Ques. (Mr. *Boss Robertson*) 3044 (i).  
— Read (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 3334 (ii).
- PENSIONS FOR VOLUNTEERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr.  
*Oliver*) 10304 (iii).
- PERRY, SUPT., AND VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr.  
*Davin*) 297 (i).
- PUNISHMENT OF CAN. SOLDIER: Remarks (Mr.  
*McLennan, Glengarry*) 4448 (ii).

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—*Con.*

- PURCHASE OF HORSES FOR BRITISH ARMY: Ques.  
(Mr. *Oliver*) 3774 (ii).  
— PAR. IN MONTREAL "GAZETTE": Remarks  
(Mr. *Sproule*) 3578 (ii).  
— PAR. IN OTTAWA "CITIZEN" *re*: Remarks  
(Mr. *McMullen*) 3778 (ii).  
— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3769 (ii).  
— WEST OF LAKE SUPERIOR: Ques. (Mr.  
*Oliver*) 4439 (ii).
- QUEBEC, APPLICANTS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr.  
*Dugas*) 1728 (i).
- RECRUITING STATIONS, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*)  
10363 (iii).
- RECRUITS FOR VACANCIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*)  
2404 (i).
- RELIEF OF KIMBERLEY, RAISING OF FLAG ON  
PARLT. BUILDINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 541.
- RESIDENCES OF MEMBERS OF CONTINGENT, PROVS.,  
&c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1112 (i).
- ST. JOHNS CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, PAR. in "CANADA  
FRANÇAIS": Remarks (Mr. *Monet*) 9844 (iii).
- SADDLES PURCHASED BY GOVT., NUMBER, &c.:  
Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 1113, 1463 (i).
- SELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR SERVICE: Ques. (Mr.  
*Prior*) 1112 (i).
- SPEECH OF MR. ROBERTS REPORTED IN LONDON  
"FREE PRESS" (Mr. *Beattie*) 734 (i).
- STRATHCONA'S HORSE, ARRANGEMENTS OF CHURCH  
PARADES: Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 2749 (i).  
— PAY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3775 (ii),  
9903 (iii).  
— PURCHASE OF HORSES IN N.W.T.: Re-  
marks (Mr. *Oliver*) 481 (i).  
— LOSS OF HORSES: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3774.  
— See "Purchase," &c.  
— TELEGRAM RECEIVED *re* INQUIRY FOR  
RELATIVES: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 813 (i).
- SUPPLIES FOR CAN. CONTINGENTS, CONTRACT, &c.:  
Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4245 (ii).  
— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4558 (ii).
- SURRENDER OF GEN. CRONJE: Telegram read  
(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1013 (i).
- TELEGRAMS *re* CASUALTIES: Read (Mr. *Borden,*  
*King's*) 4664 (iii).
- TRANSPORTATION OF SUPPLIES OVER I.C.R.: Ques.  
(Mr. *Powell*) 9791 (iii).  
— AMOUNT PAID SS. LINES: Ques. (Mr.  
*Clarke*) 5402 (ii).  
— ARRANGEMENTS, PROVISIONING, &c.: Ques.  
(Mr. *Clarke*) 5021 (ii).  
— FREIGHT, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr.  
*Bell, Pictou*) 9722 (iii).
- VACANCIES IN CAN. CONTINGENTS, PROMOTIONS  
OF EX-OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2163 (i).  
— Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 1211, 1388 (i).
- VOLUNTEERS BY PROVS., NUMBER, &c.: Ques.  
(Mr. *Cargill*) 2182 (i).  
— Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 2182 (i).  
— FROM N.B., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr.  
*McAlister*) 2196 (i).  
— ONT, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Cargill*)  
2181 (i).  
— WOUNDED AND SICK CANADIANS, REP. *re*:  
Inquiry for (Mr. *Quinn*) 3336 (ii).
- SOUTH NATION RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 10251 (iii).
- South Shore Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No.  
176 (Mr. *Flint*) 1<sup>st</sup>, 6914 (ii); 2<sup>nd</sup>, 7341; in Com.  
and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 8837 (iii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- SOUTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res.,  
10019 (iii).
- SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
- SPEECH OF SENATOR KIRCHHOFFER *re* YUKON COR-  
RUPTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3048 (i).
- SPEECHES OF MEMBERS, LIMITATION, &c.: M. for Sel.  
Com. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2763 (i).

- SPEECH OF MR. ROBERTS REPORTED IN LONDON "FREE PRESS" (Mr. *Beattie*) 734 (i).
- SPEECH OF HON. MR. SIFTON AT BRANDON *re* FREE LUMBER : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2831 (i).
- OF HON. MR. TARTE AT LONDON AND PARIS : M. to adjn., (Mr. *Monk*) 3779 (ii).
- SPRINGHILL P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 7877 (iii).
- SQUAMISH SCHOOL, B. C. : in Com. of Sup., 8123 (iii).
- STAFF COURSE, KINGSTON : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2740 (i).
- See "Militia," &c.
- STANDARD OIL COMPANY, PRICES REGULATED BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5397 (ii).
- STATIONERY, H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 5924 (ii), 10323 (iii).
- STATISTICAL RETURNS : in Com. of Sup., 6242 (ii).
- STATISTICAL YEAR BOOK : conc., 10437 (iii).
- Inquiry (Mr. *Moore*) 4153 (ii).
- STATUTORY INCREASES IN CIVIL SERVICE FOR 1899-1900, NAMES, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 168 (i).
- STEAM DERRICKS, I. C. R. : in Com. of Sup., 10389.
- STEAMER FOR FISHERIES PROTECTION, B. C. : in Com. of Sup., 10398 (iii).
- STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES : in Com. of Sup., 10397 (iii).
- STEEL FILE CASES : in Com. of Sup., 9895 (iii).
- STEEL RAILS, CONTRACT FOR SUPPLIES. : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2996 (i).
- FASTENINGS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10390 (iii).
- PURCHASE OF BY RYS. AND CANALS DEPT. : \* Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 2828 (i).
- See "I. C. R.," &c.
- STEEL SHELVING, DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE : in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iii).
- STELLARTON, RY. SIDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 9442 (iii).
- STEWART, MR. ARCHIE'S CONTRACT : in Com. of Sup., 8515, 10150 (iii).
- Inquiry for papers (Mr. *Foster*) 9799 (iii).
- STEWART, J. W., SALARY, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1698.
- SS. "STANLEY" AND "MINTO," FREIGHT CARRIED, AMOUNT, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 300 (i).
- SS. SUBSIDY TO MUSGRAVE & Co. : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4918 (ii).
- Stock.** See "Canadian."
- STRAIGHTENING CURVES AT COLVILLE AND LOYALIST, P. E. I. RY., MEMORIALS, &c. : M. for copy\* (Mr. *Martin*) 2201 (i).
- AT NORTH WILTSHIRE, COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 4443 (ii).
- STRATHCONA'S HORSE, ARRANGEMENT OF CHURCH PARADES : Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 2749 (i).
- LOSS OF HORSES : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3774 (ii).
- PAY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 3775 (ii), 9903.
- PURCHASE OF HORSES IN N. W. T. : Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 481 (i).
- TELEGRAM RECEIVED *re* INQUIRY FOR RELATIVES : Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 813 (i).
- See "South African War," &c.
- STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 9962 (iii).
- STUMBLES, W. W., COR. WITH MAR. AND FISHERIES DEPT. : M. for copies (Mr. *Prior*) 4078 (ii).
- VISIT TO B. C. *re* FISHERIES : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Prior*) 6137 (ii).
- SUBSIDY VOTED TO N. W. T., COR. BETWEEN DOM. AND N.W.T. GOVTS. *re* : M. for copies (Mr. *Davin*) 3447 (ii).
- SUBSIDIES TO RYS., NAMES AND AMOUNTS : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2173 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5515, 5752 (ii).
- SYSTEM OF GRANTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Campbell*) 2171 (i).
- SUBSIDIES : See
- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.
  - Algoma Central Ry. Co.
  - Arthabaska Ry. Co.
  - Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.
  - Canadian Northern Ry. Co.
  - C. P. R. and Bristol Ry. Co.
  - C. P. R. and Dymont Ry. Co.
  - C. P. R. and Waskada Ry. Co.
  - Central Ontario Ry. Co.
  - Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.
  - Farnham and Frelighsburg Ry. Co.
  - G. T. R. and Victoria Bridge Co.
  - Great Northern Ry. Co.
  - Haliburton and Whitney Ry. Co.
  - Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.
  - Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co.
  - Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.
  - Lockeport and Sable River Ry. Co.
  - Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.
  - Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Co.
  - Ottawa and Nepean Point Bridge Co.
  - Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.
  - Parry Sound and French River Ry. Co.
  - Pembroke Southern Ry. Co.
  - Restigouche and Western Ry. Co.
  - St. Charles Junction and I. C. R. Co.
  - St. Francis River Bridge Co.
  - Schomburg and Aurora Ry. Co.
  - Shediac and Shemogue Ry. Co.
  - South Shore Ry. Co.
  - Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Co.
  - Thousand Islands Ry. Co.
  - Victoria Bridge Subsidy.
- SUGAR, AVERAGE RATE OF DUTY COLLECTED 1899 : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 3770 (ii).
- SUMAS BAR, B. C., PUBLIC WORKS, COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 4445 (ii).
- See "Fraser River."
- SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 9899.
- RY. ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 8931.
- VOLUNTEER ORGANIZATIONS, PETS. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Bell, P.E.I.*) 2179 (i).
- SUNDAY WORK, I. C. R. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 7969 (iii).
- SUPERANNUATION FROM 1890 TO 1896, AMOUNTS PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2177 (i).
- AMOUNT GRANTED AND EXPEDIENCY OF PAYMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 432 (i).
- SUPPLIES FOR CAN. CONTINGENTS, TENDERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4558 (ii).
- N. W. MOUNTED POLICE, COR. *re* CONTRACTS : M. for copies (Mr. *Davin*) 161 (i).
- SCHEDULE FOR TENDERS, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 5213 (ii).

**Supply (Ottawa and Hull Fire) B. No. 147**

(Mr. *Fielding*) Prop. Res., 4338, 4458; 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\*, 4458: in Com., 4458; 3<sup>o</sup>m., 4466 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 1).

— **No. 178** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 6918 (ii). (63-64 Vic. c. 2).

— **No. 179** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 7220 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 3).

— **No. 188** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 8796 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 4).

— **No. 196** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1<sup>o</sup>\*, 2<sup>o</sup>\*, in Com., and 3<sup>o</sup>\*, 10495 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 5).

**SUPPLY:**

(Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.)

**AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM:** Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) S. A. War, Independence of Canada, 1793; neg. (Y. 10; N. 119) 1875; Amt. (Mr. *Russell*) Preferential Trade with Great Britain, 2009, 2086, 2236; agreed to (Y. 91; N. 46) 2343 (i); Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) Franking Privilege &c., 3613; Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) B. C. Contingent, Offer, &c., 3638; Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) Seed Grain Indebtedness, 3641; Remarks (Mr. *McMullen*) Agricultural Implements, Duty on, 3641; Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Brockville and West Huron Elections 5182, 5293, 5410, 5522; neg. (Y. 43; N. 86) 5698; Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) Moose Jaw Appointments, 6063, Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) Binder Twine, Sale, &c., 6146; neg. (Y. 38; N. 71) 6241; Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) Dismissal of Mr. Gass, 6323; Amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Yukon Administration, 6355, neg. (Y. 38; N. 74) 6428; Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Yukon Administration, 6507; Amt. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) "John C. Barr," 6633, neg. (Y. 22; N. 43) 6681; Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) Lt. Governor of British Columbia, 6887, (ii); Remarks (Mr. *Belcourt*) Pacific Cable, 7040; Amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Yukon Administration, 7136; neg. (Y. 26. N. 51) 7172; Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) Timber Licenses in Man., 7221; neg. (Y. 37; N. 72) 7280; Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Brockville and West Huron Elections, 7423; neg. (Y. 32; N. 50) 7488; Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) Gaspé Elections, 7573; Amt. (Mr. *Gillies*) 7594; (neg. (Y. 21; N. 34) 7602; Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) I. C. R. Freight Rates, &c., 7603; Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) Royalty on Gold Output, 7613; Amt. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) Royalties in Yukon, 7658; neg. (Y. 33; N. 63) 7727; Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Representation in the Yukon, 7773; neg. (Y. 46; N. 72) 7787; Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Halifax Harbour Approaches, 7788; Amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) Reduction of Tobacco Duties, 7894; neg. (Y. 38; N. 68) 7914; Amt. (Mr. *Richardson*) C. P. R. Land Taxation, 7991; neg. (Y. 6; N. 99) 8045; Remarks (Mr. *Moore*) Granite Industry, 8046; Remarks, (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) I. C. R. Freight Rates, 8120; Remarks (Mr. *Roddick*) Public Health Dept., 8440; Amt. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) Yukon Administration, 8527; neg. (Y. 34; N. 70) 8648; Amt. (Mr. *Bennett*) Coasting Laws, Abrogation, &c., 9149; neg. (Y. 32; N. 51) 9184; Remarks (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) Dismissal of Lt. Foyle, 9484; Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) B. C. Grievances, 9486; Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) Homestead Entries, Man., 9525; Remarks (Mr. *Moore*) Woman Suffrage, 9702; Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) Coal Industry of Canada, 9708; Remarks (Mr. *Bell,*

**SUPPLY—Con.****AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.—Con.**

*Pictou*) South African War, Transportation, &c., 9722; Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) Financial Situation, 9729; neg. (Y. 44; N. 86) 9767; Remarks (Mr. *Monet*) St. John's Custom Collector, 9844; Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) Character of Debate in House of Commons, 10314; Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) Indemnities to Families of Soldiers, 10318 (iii).

**MESS. FROM HIS EX.:** Transmitting Estimates for 1900-1901, 1057 (i); Suppl., 4338, 5293, 5883 (ii); further Suppl., 8398, 9789 (iii).

**Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com.,** 137, 1698, 1793, 2009, (i), 3613, 4338, 5182, 5923, 5976, 6063, 6146, 6323, 6355, 6507, 6633, 6887, 6959 (ii), 7040, 7136, 7221, 7423, 7573, 7658, 7773, 7894, 7991, 8120, 8217, 8285, 8440, 8527, 8657, 8879, 9149, 9407, 9184, 9525, 9702, 9844, 10097, 10195, 10314 (iii).

**IN COM.:** 1698 (i), 3644, 4339, 5923, 5976, 6064, 6335, 6428, 6508, 6682, 6888, 6959 (ii), 7057, 7174, 7281, 7490, 7619, 7729, 7807, 7916, 8054, 8121, 8217, 8285, 8452, 8648, 8657, 8879, 9184, 9407, 9496, 9555, 9768, 9858, 10097, 10195, 10318 (iii).

**COMMITTEE:**

*Administration of Justice.* See "Justice."

**Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:**

Bulletins and Reports, Distribution, 6341 (iii).

Census, 6343 (i), 10333 (iii).

Cold Storage, 7619, 10336 (iii).

Criminal Statistics, 6339 (ii).

Experimental Farms, 6341 (ii).

General Vote, 6339 (ii).

Glasgow Exhibition, 10331 (iii).

Paris Exposition, 6344 (ii), 7178, 10337 (ii).

Patents, Classifying Canadian, 6342 (iii).

"Patent Record," 7199 (iii).

Statistical Year-Book, 6340 (ii).

**Charges of Management, 6444 (ii).**

Dominion Notes, Printing, &c., 8121 (iii).

Office of Assistant Receiver General, St. John, 10277 (iii).

**Civil Government:**

Agriculture, 6535 (ii), 10286-7 (iii).

Auditor General, 7506, 10286 (iii).

**Contingencies:**

Auditor General, 6445 (ii).

Customs, 6064 (ii).

Governor General's Office, 8121 (iii).

High Commissioner's Office, 9604 (iii).

Indian Dept., 8123 (iii).

Inland Revenue, 6022 (ii).

Interior, 6682 (ii), 7826 (iii).

Mounted Police, 6101 (ii).

Post Office, 6129 (ii).

Privy Council Office, 8146-7 (iii).

Customs, 6043 (ii).

Finance, 6445 (ii).

Geological Survey, 7303 (iii).

Governor General's Secretary's Office, 7506, 10278 (iii).

Indian Dept., 7281, 8123, 10279 (iii).

Inland Revenue, 6021 (ii), 10286 (iii).

Interior, 6508 (ii), 7729, 7807 (iii).

Justice, 10277 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries, 1698 (i).

Militia and Defence, 8217, 10284 (iii).

Mounted Police, 6102 (ii).

Post Office Dept., 6102 (ii), 8770, 10274-6 (iii).

Balancing Depositors' Accounts, 6129 (ii).

Privy Council Office, 7507 (iii).

Public Printing and Stationery, 10278-9 (iii).

Public Works, 7847, 9353 (iii).

Railways and Canals, 8150, 10285 (iii).

Secretary of State, 7506, 10278 (iii).

Trade and Commerce, 9555 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Collection of Revenues :*

Culling Timber, 6031 (ii).

## Customs :

B. C., 6086 (ii).

Dominion Appraisers, &amp;c., 10414 (iii).

Manitoba, 6076 (ii).

Minor Revenues, 6043 (ii).

Miscellaneous, 6089 (ii).

New Brunswick, 6070 (ii).

N. W. T., 6084 (ii).

Nova Scotia, 6066 (ii), 9505 (iii).

Ontario, 6073 (ii).

Quebec, 6072 (ii).

Salaries, Contingencies, 9506 (iii).

Salaries, &amp;c., 6087 (ii).

Unforeseen Expenses, 6087 (ii).

## Excise :

Collectors' Allowance and Duties collected, 6029 (ii).

General Vote, 6026 (ii).

Purchase of Methylated Spirits, 6029 (ii).

Sale of Stamps for Canadian Tobacco, Commissions, 6029 (ii).

Stamps for Canadian and Imported Tobacco, 6028 (ii).

To pay L. A. Frechette for Special Translation, 6029 (ii).

## Post Office, Outside Service :

Additional Amount required, 10264 (iii).

Mail Service, 8657 (iii).

## Public Works :

Slides and Booms, Salaries, &amp;c., 8054 (iii).

Telegraph between P. E. I. and Mainland, 8054 (iii).

## Weights and Measures, Gas, &amp;c.:

Salaries of Officers, Inspectors, &amp;c., 6032 (ii).

*Dominion Lands—Capital :*

General Vote, 7062 (ii).

To pay L. E. Fontaine, 7827 (iii).

*Dominion Lands—Income :*

General Vote, 7057 (iii).

Inspector's Expenses, Travelling Expenses, &amp;c., 7061 (iii).

Salaries, Extra Clerks, &amp;c., 7061, 10407 (iii).

*Dominion Police :*

Special Services, 8131 (iii).

*Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."**Fisheries :*

Bruce, H. H. A., Claim of, 8066 (iii).

Building Fisheries and Clearing Rivers, 5958.

Cold Storage for Bait for Deep-Sea Fishermen, 5959, 5976, 5999 (ii).

Expenses *re* Seizures by Russian Cruisers, 10398 (iii).

Fisheries Protection Service, 5957 (ii).

Construction of Steamer for B. C., 10398 (iii).

General Vote, 5926 (ii).

Gauthier, C. W., Claim of, 8063 (iii).

New Hatcheries in B. C. and Gaspé, 10398 (ii).

New Hatchery at Flatheads, 8067 (iii).

Oyster Culture, 5958 (ii).

Salaries, &amp;c. of Fishery Officers, 8066 (iii).

To pay for Distribution of Fishing Bounty, 5958 (ii).

*Geological Survey :*

Boring Operations in N. W. T., 10405 (iii).

*Govt. of North-west Territories :*

Grant for Damage by Floods, 6691 (ii).

Grant for Schools, &amp;c., 6684 (ii).

Insane Patients, 6683 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Govt. of the Yukon Provisional District :*

Salaries and Expenses of Administration, 6977 (ii) 7832 (iii).

[See "Yukon Provisional District."]

*Immigration :*

Agents' Salaries, Can., G. B., and Foreign Countries, 9614 (iii).

Contingencies, Agencies, &amp;c., 9664 (iii).

General Expenses, 7199, 9664 (iii).

Girls' Home of Welcome, Winnipeg, 9664 (iii).

Women's Protective Immigration Society, 9664.

*Indians :*

Addition to Millbrook Reserve, 7295 (iii).

British Columbia, Inspector's Salary, 7303 (iii).

Medical Attendance, 7302, 8123 (iii).

Salaries, 7302 (iii).

Surveys and Reserve Commission, 7302 (iii).

## Manitoba and N. W. T.:

Annuities and Commutations, 7295 (iii).

Day, Boarding and Industrial Schools, 7296 (iii).

General Expenses, 8071, 8125 (iii).

Supplies for Destitute Indians, 8124 (iii).

Triennial Clothing, 7296 (iii).

## Land Management Fund, 7285 (iii).

New Brunswick, Medical Attendance, 7295.

Nova Scotia, Medical Attendance, 7294, 8070.

Oka Indians, Removal, 7284 (iii).

Ontario and Quebec, 7281 (iii).

Claim of John Harrison, 10406 (iii).

Medical Attendance, 8068 (iii).

Ontario and Quebec and Maritime Provinces, Schools, 7282 (iii).

Relief of Distress, 8069 (iii).

P. E. I., Medical Attendance, 8070 (iii).

St. Regis, Salaries, &amp;c., 7282 (iii).

Cost of Defence, 8068 (iii).

Lock-up, 7287 (iii).

*Inspection of Staples :*

Expenses of Grain Commission, 7832 (iii).

Purchase and Distribution of Grain Standards, 6040 (ii).

*Insurance :*

General Vote, 6508 (ii).

*Justice, Administration of :*

Circuit Allowances, Manitoba, 8131 (iii).

Enforcement of Alien Labour Law, 6430 (ii), 9776 (iii).

## Exchequer Court :

Audette, L. A., Additional Allowances, 6438, 6888 (ii).

Clerk in Registrar's Office, 6434 (ii).

Messenger, 6437 (ii).

Office for the Clerk of the Court, &amp;c., Prince

Albert, 6431 (ii).

One first class Clerk, 6437 (ii).

One third class Clerk, 6435 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, &amp;c., 6437 (ii), 8137 (iii).

Supreme Court, Reporter, 6432 (ii).

Improvements to Library, 6436 (ii).

Printing, Binding and Distributing Reports, 6435 (ii).

Purchase of Law Books for Library, 6436.

To pay P. Mungovan, 8127 (iii).

[See "Govt. of Yukon," "Yukon District, &amp;c."]

*Legislation :*

General: Printing, Printing Paper and Binding, 5924 (ii).

## House of Commons :

Committees, Sessional Clerks, &amp;c., 8148 (iii).

Estimate of Sergeant-at-Arms, 5923 (ii), 8149.

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEES—*Con.**Legislation—Con.*House of Commons—*Con.*

Expenses of Judicial Inquiry *re* Elections, 10321 (iii).

Expenses of Plebiscite Vote, 8136 (iii).

French Translators, 10330 (iii).

Printing Generally, 8150 (iii).

Publishing Debates, 5923 (ii), 8149 (iii).

Salaries to certain officers, 10329 (iii).

Sessional Clerks, 5923 (ii), 8148, 10329 (iii).

Sessional Indemnities of Absent Members, &c., 8136 (iii):

Stationery, 10323 (iii).†

Voters' Lists, 9604, 10324 (iii).

## Library :

Contingencies, 8150 (iii).

Salaries, 10331 (iii).

Sessional Messengers, 5924 (ii).

## Senate :

Publishing Debates, 5923 (ii).

Salaries, &c., 8148 (iii).

Sessional Indemnity, Senator Sullivan, 8135.

*Lighthouse and Coast Service :*

Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 3644 (ii).

Construction of Lighthouses (salaries of temporary officers, &c.), 3663 (ii).

Construction of Steel Light Ship, Lurcher Shoal, 3672 (ii).

Maintenance and Repairs to Lighthouses, 3645.

Middle Ground, Lighthouse, &c., 10397 (iii).

Roberts, J. W. G., Salary, 8063 (iii).

Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 1704 (i), 3644 (ii).

Traverse Light, Protection to Pier, 8063 (iii).

Wages and Maintenance of Lurcher Shoal Lightship, 3662 (ii).

*Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions :*

Annapolis and Kingsport to London, 10397 (iii).

Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, 9592 (iii).

Canada and Great Britain, 9555 (iii).

Canada and South Africa, 9590 (iii).

Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 9596 (iii).

Great Britain and P.E.I., 9584 (iii).

Halifax and Porto Rico, 9598 (iii).

Halifax, St. John's, Nfld. and Liverpool, 9578.

Magdalen Islands and Mainland, 9583 (iii).

Manchester and Canada, 9588 (iii).

Murray Bay and River Ouelle, 9603 (iii).

Port Mulgrave, Arichat and Canso, &c., 9597.

Port Mulgrave and St. Peters, &c., 10397 (iii).

P. E. I. and Mainland, 9583, 10397 (iii).

Quebec and Gaspé Basin, 9584 (iii).

St. John and Liverpool, 9577 (iii).

St. John, &c., West Indies and South America, 9583 (iii).

St. Peters and Port Mulgrave, 9595 (iii).

*Militia :*

Annual Drill, 7201, 8286 (iii).

Arms, Ammunition, &c., 8344 (iii).

Bonuses to Officials *re* Extra Work, 10358 (iii).

Clothing, &c., 8335 (iii).

Compensation to E. W. Armstrong, 9769 (iii).

Esquimalt Defences, 8342 (iii).

General Service Medals, 8343 (iii).

Gratuities, 10357 (iii).

Guard at Welland Canal, 9772 (iii).

Halifax Garrison, 9772, 10358 (iii).

Military College, Kingston, 8337 (iii).

Military Properties, 8305, 10353 (iii).

Miscellaneous and Unforeseen, 8336 (iii).

Monuments for Battlefields, 10357 (iii).

Pay, Allowances, &c., 8285 (iii).

Provisions and Supplies, 8335 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Militia—Con.*

Purchase of Land for Rifle Ranges, 8370 (iii).

Rifle Associations, 8336 (iii).

Rockliffe Rifle Range, Building, 9768 (iii).

Salaries, &c., 8305 (iii).

Transport, &c., 8335 (iii).

Warlike and Other Stores, 8306 (iii).

*Minor Revenues :*

Grand Falls, Improvement of Road, 9777 (iii).

Ordnance Lands, 9778 (iii).

*Miscellaneous :*

Amount *re* British American Bank Note Co., 8140 (iii).

Amount *re* Wentworth *vs.* Mathieu, 8138 (iii).

Astronomical Work of Interior Dept., 7066 (iii).

Calgary Exhibition, 10411 (iii).

"Canada Gazette," 7506 (iii).

Canadian Law Library, London, Eng., 8140.

Conciliation Act, Expenses, 10413 (iii).

Consolidation of Dominion Statutes, 10413 (iii).

Expenses *re* Chinese, &c. Commission, 10411.

— B.C. Labour Troubles, 8146 (iii).

— Trial of Counterfeiters, 8143 (iii).

Half-Breeds Claims Commission, Expenses, &c., 7066, 10412 (iii).

Keewatin District, Expenses of Govt., 7074.

Maintenance of Roads, &c., Banff, 7074 (iii).

Repairs to Bridge between Banff and Anthracite, 7831 (iii).

Monument of late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, 10254 (iii).

Payments to C. Kelly, &c., 10412 (iii).

— C. C. Carleton, 10412 (iii).

Portraits, 8136, 10255 (iii).

Printing Bureau Plant, 7506, 10413 (iii).

Printing Dr. Rand's Dictionary, 10413 (iii).

Quinn, Henry A., Services in Rebellion, 8136.

Relief to Distressed Persons on Liard and Dease Rivers, 7075 (iii).

Relief to Distressed Persons in N.W.T., &c., 7075, 7490, 8121 (iii).

Rocky Mountain Park, 10411 (iii).

Schools in Unorganized Districts, 10411 (iii).

Survey of Boundary between B.C. and Yukon Territory, 7074 (iii).

Ville Marie Bank Trial, &c., 8144 (iii).

Visit of American Mining Engineers, 10412

*Mounted Police :*

Compensation for Yukon Mail Service, 9779.

General Service, 6092 (ii).

*Ocean and River Service :*

"Aberdeen," SS., Alterations, 8062 (iii).

General Vote, 1700 (i).

"Minto," SS., Outfit, Stores, 8061 (iii).

Rewards for Saving Life, 1700 (i).

Tidal Services, &c., 1701 (i).

Winter Mail Service, 1704 (i).

*Penitentiaries :*

British Columbia, 6975 (ii).

Dorchester, 6959 (ii), 10277 (iii).

General Vote, 6438 (ii).

Investigations, 8135 (iii).

Kingston, 6440, 6888 (ii).

Gratuities, 10319 (iii).

Further Amount for Binder Twine, 8132 (iii).

Manitoba, 6975 (ii), 8134 (iii).

St. Vincent de Paul, 6893 (ii), 8134, 10318 (iii).

To pay H. Gilbert Smith, 8135 (iii).

*Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."**Public Works—Capital :*

## Buildings :

Ottawa Militia Stores, 7847, 9858 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Public Works—Capital—Con.*

## Harbours and Rivers :

- Rainy River, Lock and Dam, 7861 (iii).
- St. Andrew's Rapids, 9859 (iii).
- St. Lawrence River Ship Channel 7848 (iii).
- Transportation Facilities, 9859 (iii).

*Public Works—Income :*

## Buildings, Generally, 7929 (iii).

- Construction of Armouries, 9893 (iii).
- Dom. Public Buildings, Salaries to Clerks, &c. 9893 (iii).
- Experimental Farms, Generally, 7930 (iii).

## British Columbia :

- Kamloops, Post Office, 7927 (iii).
- Nelson, Public Building 7927 (iii).
- New Westminster, Public Building 7929.
- Rosland, Public Building, 7929 (iii).

## New Brunswick :

- St. John Inmigrant Building, 9875 (iii).

## North-west Territories :

- Court-house, 9892 (iii).
- Lieut. Governor's Residence, &c., 7926 (iii).
- Regina, Refund to N.W.T. Govt., 9892 (iii).
- Prince Albert, Artesian Well, 9892 (iii).

## Nova Scotia :

- Digby, Post Office, &c., 7870 (iii).
- Halifax, Public Building, 9871 (iii).
- Liverpool, Public Building, 9874 (iii).
- Springhill, Public Building, 7877 (iii).

## Ontario :

- Brockville, Drill Hall, 7916, 9881 (iii).
- Deseronto, Public Building, 9883 (iii).
- Kingston, Drill Hall, 7916 (iii).
- Military College, 9888 (iii).
- London, Drill Hall, &c., 7916 (iii).
- Ottawa, Experimental Farm Buildings, 7202 (iii).
- Customs Offices, 9888 (iii).
- Rideau Hall, Repairs, &c., 9889 (iii).
- Picton, Public Building, 9884 (iii).
- St. Thomas, Drill Hall, 9890 (iii).
- Sarnia, Public Building, 7917, 9884 (iii).
- Toronto P. O., Purchase of Automobiles, 9885 (iii).
- Toronto, Custom-house, 9888 (iii).
- Junction, Public Building, 9886.
- Windsor, Drill Hall, 9889 (iii).
- Woodstock, Post Office, 7926 (iii).

## Quebec :

- Buckingham, Public Buildings, 9875 (iii).
- Chicoutimi, Public Building, 9876 (iii).
- Drummondville, Public Building, 9876 (iii).
- Granby, Public Building, 9878 (iii).
- Hochelaga, Post Office, 9878 (iii).
- Hull, Public Buildings, 4344 (ii).
- Quebec, Cartridge Factory, 9877 (iii).
- Victoriaville, Public Building, 9876 (iii).

## Rents, repairs, &amp;c. :

- Dom. Buildings, Ottawa, 7932 (iii).
- Heating, &c., 7937 (iii).
- Lighting, &c., 7938 (iii).
- Steel Shelving, Agriculture Dept., 7939.
- Interior Dept., 9895 (iii).
- Water, 7939 (iii).

## Quarantine, Repairs to SS. "Challenger," 7835 (iii).

## Rents of Buildings, 7938 (iii).

## Rideau Hall, Furniture and New Wing, 7835 (iii).

## Remetalling Drive, 7835 (iii).

## Dredging :

- Maritime Provinces, 7966 (iii).
- New Plant, Ont. and Que., 10252 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Public Works—Income—Con.*

## Harbours and Rivers, generally, 7958 (iii).

## British Columbia :

- Columbia River, Improvements, 7955 (iii).
- Fraser River, Improvements, 7955, 10252.
- William's Head, Quarantine Wharf, 7958.

## Manitoba :

- Lake Dauphin, Lowering, 10252 (iii).
- Lake Manitoba, Outlets, 10251 (iii).
- Dredging, 10252 (iii).

## New Brunswick :

- Campbellton, Dredging, Wharf Extension, 9901 (iii).
- Campobello, Breakwater, 7945 (iii).
- Cape Tormentine, Breakwater, 7946 (iii).
- Chance Harbour, Breakwater, 9900 (iii).
- Dipper Harbour, Breakwater, 9900 (iii).
- Dorchester, Breakwater, 9901 (iii).
- Shippegan, Repairs, &c., 7946 (iii).

## Nova Scotia :

- Blue Rock, Breakwater, 9895 (iii).
- Broad Cove, Breakwater, 9897 (iii).
- Cape Cove, Breakwater, 7836 (iii).
- Church Point Pier, 7836 (iii).
- Comeauville Breakwater, 7836 (iii).
- Ecum Secum, Wharf, 9896 (iii).
- Gabarus, Breakwater, 9895 (iii).
- Ingonish, Breakwater, 7940 (iii).
- Judique, 7836 (iii).
- Livingstone Cove, Wharf, 9895 (iii).
- Lunenburg, Dredging Harbour, 9897 (iii).
- New Harbour, Breakwater, 7940, 9896 (iii).
- Porter's Lake, Dredging, 9896 (iii).
- River John, Wharf, 7941 (iii).
- Winter Harbour, 7836 (iii).

## Ontario :

- Bronte, Harbour Improvements, 10233 (iii).
- Bruce Mines, Wharf, 7950 (iii).
- Burlington Channel, 7951 (iii).
- Collingwood, Harbour, 7952, 10248 (iii).
- Depot Harbour, Breakwater, 10228 (iii).
- Goderich, Breakwater, 10245 (iii).
- Lancaster, Wharf, 10229 (iii).
- Leamington Pier, 10244 (iii).
- Little Current, North Channel, 10250 (iii).
- McGregor's Creek, 10233 (iii).
- Meaford, Dredging, 10247 (iii).
- Nation River, Removal of Dam, &c., 10229 10251 (iii).
- Oshawa, Pier, 10230 (iii).
- Pickering, Repairs and Dredging, 10230.
- Port Burwell, Harbour, 10234 (iii).
- Port Findlay, Wharf, 10250 (iii).
- Port Hope, Dredging, 10229 (iii).
- Port Stanley, Wharf, 10236 (iii).
- River Ottawa, Lake Temiscamingue Dam, 10250 (iii).
- Sarnia, Dredging, 10228 (iii).
- Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour, 10250 (iii).
- To pay E. W. Seane, for Land Damages, 10233 (iii).
- Toronto Harbour, Dredging, &c., 10230, 10232 (iii).
- Murray and Cleveland's, Dredging Contract, 10237 (iii).

## Prince Edward Island :

- Annandale, Pier, 9898 (iii).
- Canal Cove, Breakwater, 9898 (iii).
- China Point, Pier, 7837, 7943 (iii).
- Pinette, Pier, 9897 (iii).
- Souris Knight Point, Breakwater, 9899 (iii).
- Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 9899.
- Wood Island, Breakwater, 9897 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Public Works—Income—Con.*Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

## Quebec :

- Cap Sante, Wharf, 10210 (iii).
- Cedars, Wharf, 10112 (iii).
- Chicoutimi, Wharf, 10208 (iii).
- Coteau du Lac, Wharf, 10097 (iii).
- Coteau Landing, Dredging, 10222 (iii).
- Gatineau River, Protection Works, 10226.
- Graham's Wharf, 10221 (iii).
- Grand Vallée, Pier, 10227 (iii).
- Greece's Point, Wharf, 10227 (iii).
- Hull, Landing Pier, 10226 (iii).
- Isle Verte, Wharf Extension, 10208 (iii).
- Lower St. Lawrence, Removal of Rocks, 7949 (iii).
- Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, 7949 (iii).
- Maria, Isolated Block, 10195 (iii).
- Newport, Breakwater, 7949 (iii).
- Percé (North Cove) Wharf, 7950 (iii).
- Richelieu River, Boom, 10217 (iii).
- River Batiscan, Dredging, 10211 (iii).
- Rivière Chateauguay, Dredging, 10225 (iii).
- Rivière du Sud, Protection Works, 10210.
- St. Jerome, Wharf, 7950, 10208 (iii).
- St. Lambert, Protection Works, 10218 (iii).
- St. Roch des Aulnaies, Wharf, 10209 (iii).
- Saguenay River, Dredging, 10207 (iii).
- Sorel, Ice Piers, 10227 (iii).
- Temiscouata Lake, Landing Piers, 10209.
- Yamaska Dam, Land Damages, 10212 (iii).

## Miscellaneous :

- Monument of late Hon. Alexander Mac-kenzie, 10254 (iii).
- Portrait of Her Majesty the Queen, 10255.
- Salaries of Chief Engineer's Staff, &c., 10255.

## Roads and Bridges :

- Battleford, Bridge, 10253 (iii).
- Chaudiere, Reconstruction of Bridge, 4345.
- Des Joachims, Reconstruction of Bridge, 10253 (iii).
- Edmonton Bridge, 7837 (iii).
- Ottawa, Maria Street Bridge, 10253 (iii).
- Portage du Fort, Reconstruction of Bridge, 10253 (iii).

## Slides and Booms :

- St. Maurice River, 7837 (iii).

## Telegraph Lines :

- British Columbia, 10254 (iii).
- Cape Beale and Carmanah, 7838 (iii).
- Margaree and Mabou, &c., 7838 (iii).
- Pelee Islands, Cable, 10253 (iii).
- Romaine and Belle Island, 10253 (iii).

## Quarantine :

- Carrying out Regulations concerning Health of Employees on Public Works, 6348 (ii), 9197, 9407 (iii).
- Cattle Quarantine, 6347 (ii).
- Services of Mounted Police, 10347 (iii).
- Public Health, &c., 10347 (iii).
- Salaries and Contingencies of Organized Districts, 6346 (ii).
- Tracadie Lazaretto, 6347 (ii).
- Tuberculosis, Prevention, 7174 (iii).

*Railways and Canals :*

## Canals :

- Beauharnois, 8931 (iii).
- Carillon and Grenville, Guide Piers, 8522.
- Chambly, 8914 (iii).
- Cornwall, Enlargement, 8157, 9185 (iii).
- To pay Gilbert Dredging Co., 8157, 9185, 9415, 10112 (iii).
- Culbute, 8913 (iii).
- Farran's Point, 8157, 8880, 10393 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.**Railways and Canals—Con.*Canals—*Con.*

- Galops Canal, Enlargement, 8775, 10393 (iii).
- Galops Rapids, Forming Channel, 8157 (iii).
- Grenville, Enlargement, 8157, 8880 (iii).
- Lachine, Lock, 8154 (iii).
- Building Slope Walls, 8154 (iii).
- Building Wall of Basin (2) 8522 (iii).
- Dredges, 8880, 8930 (iii).
- Dredging between Locks, 2 and 3, &c., 8154 (iii).
- Installation of Electric Light, 8156 (iii).
- Pontoon Gate, 8155, 8372, 3504 (iii).
- Lake St. Francis Removing Shoal, 8157 (iii).
- Protection Walls, 8521 (iii).
- Lake St. Louis, Forming Channel, 8156, 8879.
- North Channel, 8157, 8880 (iii).
- Ottawa River, Survey, 10395 (iii).
- Rapide Plat, 10393 (iii).
- Repairs, Operating Expenses, 9496 (iii).
- Rideau, 8930, 10395 (iii).
- St. Lawrence River, Gas Buoys, 8885, 9426.
- St. Lawrence River Reaches, Surveying, &c., 8158, 9426 (iii).
- St. Ours Lock and Dam, 8522 (iii).
- Sault Ste. Marie, 8153, 1393 (iii).
- Soulanges, 8153, 8888 (iii).
- Trent, Construction, 8158, 10393 (iii).
- Welland, 8520, 8521, 10395, 10397 (iii).

## Railways :

- Annapolis and Digby, 10395 (iii).
- Intercolonial Ry.:
- Additional Round-houses, 9432 (iii).
- Sidings, 10388 (iii).
- Amherst Accommodation, 9454 (iii).
- Subway at Christy's Brook, 9454 (iii).
- Car Couplings, 9456 (iii).
- Etchemin, Steel Bridge, 10389 (iii).
- Ferry Service at Strait of Canso, 10390.
- General Vote, 8452, 8930, 9503 (iii).
- Halifax Accommodation, 8785 (iii).
- Cotton Factory Branch, 9435-6 (iii).
- Increased Accommodation at Lévis, 10388.
- at St. John, 10389 (iii).
- Facilities, &c. along Ry., 9459, 10359 (iii).
- Lepers Brook, Dyke Extension, 9431 (iii).
- Lighting Cars with Pintsch Gas, 10388.
- Machinery and Tools, 10388 (iii).
- Mulgrave, Improvements, 9454, 10390 (iii).
- Rockingham, Station Improvements, 9436.
- Rocky Lake, Iron Highway Bridge, 9431.
- Rolling Stock, 9458, 10390 (iii).
- Steel Rails, 10390 (iii).
- Stellarton Sidings, 9442 (iii).
- Strengthening Bridges, 9455 (iii).
- Sydney Accommodation, 9440 (iii).
- To pay Ralph Jones, 8917 (iii).
- Travelling Steam Derricks, 10389 (iii).
- Westville, Station Accommodation, 9440 (iii).
- Prince Edward Island Ry.:
- General Vote, 8503, 8931, 9505 (iii).
- Murray Harbour Branch, 9461 (iii).
- Miscellaneous :
- Railway Statistics, 8522 (iii).
- Repairs to Gov. Gen's Car, "Victoria," 8916 (iii).
- Salaries of Extra Clerks, &c., 8522, 8916.

*Scientific Institutions.*

- Meteorological Service, 5925 (ii).

*Unprovided Items, 8931 (iii).*

SUPPLY—*Con.*COMMITTEE—*Con.*

## Yukon Provisional District :

Administration of Justice, 9776, 10410 (iii).

Maintenance of Prisoners, 10276 (iii).

Sheriff's Salary, 10276 (iii).

Dawson to Fort Cudahy Telegraph Line, 10257.

Further Sum required, 9774 (iii).

Lewes and Yukon Rivers, Improvements, 7839, 8058 (iii).

Mail Service, 8775 (iii).

Maintenance of Mounted Police Force, 7077, 9774 (iii).

Militia Field Force, 9775 (iii).

Payments to Can. Bank of Commerce, 9606.

Public Buildings, Rent, &amp;c., 7839, 8057, 10257.

Quesnelle and Atlin Telegraph Line, 10255 (iii).

Salary to W. E. Thompson, 10408 (iii).

Telegraph Lines, Working Expenses, 7843 (iii).

Trails, Roads and Bridges, 10257 (iii).

## CONCURRENCE :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, 10437 (iii).

Indian Dept., 10438 (iii).

Militia and Defence, Military Properties, 10452.

— Pay, &amp;c., 10442 (iii).

Post Office, 10424, 10446 (iii).

Railways and Canals :

— Gilbert Dredging Co., Interest, 10452.

— Ralph Jones, Interest, 10447 (iii).

St. Vincent de Paul Expenses of Commission, 10453 (iii).

Salaries of Immigration Agents, 10451 (iii).

SUPREME COURT APPEAL CASES, SITTINGS, &amp;c. : Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1982 (i).

— LIBRARY, IMPROVEMENTS, &amp;c. : in Com. of Sup., 6436 (ii).

Supreme Court (N. W. T.) B. No. 90 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1877 (i); 2<sup>d</sup> m., 3607; in Com., 3607; 3<sup>d</sup>, 3607 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 44.)

SUPREME COURT SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 6432 (ii).

SURRENDER OF GEN. CRONJE : Telegram read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1013 (i).

SURVEYS, DOM. LANDS : in Com. of Sup., 7062 (iii).

— AND RESERVE COMMISSION, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 7302 (iii).

— YUKON AND B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 7074 (iii).

SUSSEX, N.B., ARMOURY FOR 8TH HUSSARS : Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1733 (i).

SYDNEY BOARD OF TRADE, PETS., &amp;c., re TRAIN SERVICE : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Gillies) 1012 (i).

— RY. ACCOMMODATION ; in Com. of Sup., 9440.

— N. SYDNEY, TRAFFIC AND TICKETS ISSUED : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 150 (i).

— See "I.C.R." &amp;c.

— CUSTOMS REVENUE : in Com. of Sup., 6069 (ii).

— P.O. ACCOMMODATION : Ques. (Mr. McDougall) 3178 (i).

TADOUSAC WHARF, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1745 (i).

TALBOT, MR. E., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 1877, 1975 (i), 4916 (ii).

TARTE, HON. MR., SPEECHES IN FRANCE : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8654 (iii).

— PROPOSED RETURN : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9681 (iii).

— See "Speeches," &amp;c.

TATAMAGOUCHE HARBOUR SURVEY, &amp;c. : Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 9524 (iii).

— MOUNTAIN P.O., APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 4557 (ii).

TAXATION OF RY. LANDS, N.W.T. : prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 611 (i).

TELEGRAMS re CASUALTIES : Read (Mr. Borden, King's) 4664 (ii).

— See "South African War," &amp;c.

TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 7838, 8054, 10253 (iii).

— P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 10254 (iii).

— AND MAINLAND : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 4443 (ii).

— YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iii).

— M. for Papers (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 7203 (iii).

— MR. J. B. CHARLESON'S REP. : Inquiry for papers (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 7649, 7656 (iii).

— SUPPLIES, PURCHASE BY MR. CHARLESON : Telegram read (Mr. Maxwell) 8282 (iii).

— Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 8283 (iii).

— Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 8284 (iii).

— See "Yukon," &amp;c.

TÉMISCAMINGUE LAKE WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 10250 (iii).

TÉMISCOUATA LANDING : in Com. of Sup., 10209 (iii).

TENDERS FOR FENCING, I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4914 (ii).

TESLIN LAKE DREDGING LICENSES : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5242 (ii).

— See "Yukon," &amp;c.

The Royal Bank of Canada. See "Merchants' Bank."

THOMPSON, GEO., POSTMASTER AT CLYDE RIVER, N.S., RESIGNATION, &amp;c. : Ques. (Mr. Mills) 5021 (ii).

Thousand Islands Ry. Co.'s B. No. 86 (Mr. Taylor) 1<sup>st</sup>, 1786; 2<sup>d</sup>, 2109 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>d</sup>, 4022 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 83.)

THOUSAND ISLANDS RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 9972 (iii).

THREE RIVERS HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, EXPENDITURE : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5514 (ii).

TIDAL SURVEY, B.C. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 3174 (i).

— SALARIES, &amp;c. : in Com. of Sup., 1701 (i).

TIGNISH AND ALBERTON PORTS, NUMBER OF WAGONS, &amp;c. ENTERED : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 8739 (iii).

TIGNISH, P.E.I., AMOUNT OF WHARFAGE COLLECTED : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 2201 (i).

— BREAKWATER, P.E.I., CONTRACTS, &amp;c. : Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 1482 (i).

— CUSTOMS DUTY COLLECTED, 1898-1900 : M. for Ret. (Mr. Macdonald, P.E.I.) 3469 (ii).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. McHugh) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2827; 2<sup>d</sup>, 3033 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>d</sup>, 7552; Sen. Amts., 8837 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 84.)

TIMBER LANDS, MAN., PROTECTION, &amp;c. : in Com. of Sup., 10407 (iii).

— LICENSES, SUMS PAID, &amp;c. : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 7881 (iii).

TIMBER LICENSES, MANITOBA : amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 7221 (iii).  
 — Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 7262 ; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7262 (iii).  
 — LICENSES IN YUKON, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5408 (ii).  
 — LIMITS, MOORE & MACDOWALL'S OPERATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1898 (i).  
 — PERMITS, MAN. AND N.W.T., O.C. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4743 (ii).  
 — ISSUED BY MARTIN JERÔME, &c. : M. for stinmt.\* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 319 (i).  
 TIME TABLE, NEW, I.C.R. : Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 7514 (iii).  
 TOBACCO, ABOLITION OF DUTIES : amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clancy*) 7894 ; neg. (Y. 48 ; N. 68) 7914.  
 — AMOUNT COLLECTED IN 1899 : Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3177, 3261 (i).  
 — prop. Res. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1499 (i), 4754 (ii) ; M. to adjn. deb., 4760 (ii).  
 — Notice of Motion (Mr. *Gillies*) 1009 (i).  
 — MANUFACTURED IN CAN., NUMBER OF POUNDS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fortin*) 2178 (i).  
 — STAMPS, IMPORTED : in Com. of Sup., 6028 (ii).  
 Toronto and Georgian Bay Short Line Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 145 (Mr. *Britton*) 1\*, 4436 ; 2\*, 4695 (ii).  
 Toronto Hotel Co.'s B. No. 114 (Mr. *Oster*) 1\*, 2827 (i) 2\*, 3373 ; in Com., 4951 ; 3\*, 5162 (ii). (63-64 *Vic.*, c. 122.)  
 TORONTO DRILL HALL, IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3036 (i).  
 — HARBOUR, AMOUNTS PAID FOR DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1742 (i).  
 — DREDGING CONTRACT : in Com. of Sup., 10230, 10236 (iii).  
 — ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Clancy*) 2202 (i).  
 — MEMBERS, PAYMENTS TO : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 6051 (ii).  
 — PAYMENTS TO FROM 1879 TO 1897 : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5888 (ii).  
 — POSTMASTER, ABSENCE FROM OFFICIAL DUTIES : Ques. (Mr. *Featherston*) 4443 (ii).  
 — DEP. POSTMASTER, SUPERANNUATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3263 (i).  
 — POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9885 (iii).  
 TRACADIE LAZARETTO : in Com. of Sup., 6347 (ii).  
 — NUMBER OF LEPERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 5401 (ii).  
 — EXPENSES FOR TRANSPORTATION : Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 6349 (ii).

Trade Disputes. See "Conciliation."

Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. B. No. 30 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1\*, 471 (i).

#### TRADE AND COMMERCE :

ANNAPOLIS AND G. B., SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 10397 (iii).  
 BADDECK AND EAST BAY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (iii).

#### TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*

CANADA AND FRANCE, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (iii).  
 — AND GREAT BRITAIN, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9555, 9576 (iii).  
 — AND MANCHESTER SS. LINE, SUBSIDIES PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser, Lambton*) 1976.  
 — AND SOUTH AFRICA SS. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9590 (iii).  
 — AND WEST INDIES TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fraser, Lambton*) 1883.  
 CHINA AND JAPAN SUBSIDIES : prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4333 (ii).  
 ENVELOPES SUPPLIED TO TRADE AND COMMERCE DEPT., NUMBER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1118.  
 — M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Taylor*) 2201 (i).  
 FAST ATLANTIC SS. SERVICE, NEGOTIATIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2190 (i).  
 GASPE AND DALHOUSIE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (iii).  
 GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND STEAM SERVICE, NAMES OF TENDERERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 9061 (iii).  
 GRAND MANAN SS. SERVICE, CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 596 (i).  
 HALIFAX AND PORTO RICO, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (iii).  
 HALIFAX, NFLD., AND G. B., MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (iii).  
 — W. INDIES AND S. AMERICA, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9583 (iii).  
 MAGDALEN ISLANDS, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9583 (iii).  
 — SS. SERVICE, NUMBER OF TRIPS, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Mr. *Macdonald*) 319 (i).  
 — Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 477 (i).  
 MAIL SUBSIDIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9555, 10397 (iii).  
 MURRAY BAY AND RIVER OUELLE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 9603 (iii).  
 MUSGRAVE & CO., SS. SUBSIDY TO : Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4918 (ii).  
 NEWFOUNDLAND AND CAN. RECIPROCITY TREATY, PROPOSALS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 290 (i).  
 — COR., &c. : M. for copy (Mr. *Martin*) 2204.  
 P. E. I. AND G. B., MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9584 (iii).  
 — AND MAINLAND, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9583, 10398 (iii).  
 PORT MULGRAVE AND CANSO, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (iii).  
 — AND MARBLE MOUNTAIN, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 9595 (iii).  
 — AND ST. PETER'S MAIL SERVICE : Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 7421 (iii).  
 QUEBEC AND GASPE BASIN, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9584 (iii).  
 — AND MANCHESTER, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9588 (iii).  
 ST. JOHN AND G. B., MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 9577 (iii).  
 STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES : in Com. of Sup., 10397.  
 TRADE AND COMMERCE, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9555 (iii).  
 — REP. : Inquiry for (Mr. *Foster*) 1641 (i).  
 TRADE AND NAV. RETS. : Inquiry for (Mr. *Foster*) 1009 (i).  
 — (Mr. *Wallace*) 817 (i).  
 — Presented (Mr. *Paterson*) 1057 (i).  
 TRINIDAD AND U. S. TREATY : Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 3673 (ii).  
 — TRADE RELATIONS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 3795 (ii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 9064 (iii).  
 WEST INDIES, TRADE RELATIONS WITH : Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 4077 (ii).

- TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS, I. C. R. AND C. P. R., COR.  
re : M. for copies\* (Mr. Foster) 167 (i).
- TRAFFIC BETWEEN SYDNEY AND N. SYDNEY, &c.: M.  
for Ret.\* (Mr. Gillies) 319 (i).
- TRAIN ACCOMMODATION BETWEEN MONTREAL AND  
LOWER PORTS : Remarks (Mr. Quinn) 7421 (iii).  
— See "I. C. R.," &c.
- TRAIN SERVICE ON C. B. DIVISION : Remarks (Sir  
Charles Tupper) 7922, 8077 (iii).  
— M. to adjn. (Mr. Gillies) 7975 (iii).  
— See "I. C. R.," &c.
- TRAMP CATTLE FROM U. S. AND MEDICINE HAT STOCK  
GROWERS ASSOCIATION, COR., &c.: Ques. (Mr.  
Davin) 5403 (ii).
- TRANSFER OF MINING CLAIMS : Ques. (Mr. Foster)  
2753 (i).  
— See "Yukon," &c.
- TRANSPORTATION QUESTION AND ST. LAWRENCE CANAL  
CONTRACTS, SPEECH OF P. M. G. AT COLLINGWOOD :  
Ques. (Mr. Davin) 432 (i).
- TRANSPORTATION OF SUPPLIES OVER I. C. R.: Ques.  
(Mr. Powell) 9791 (iii).  
— TROOPS TO SOUTH AFRICA, AMOUNT CHARGED,  
&c.: Ques. (Mr. Powell) 9520 (iii).  
— AMOUNT PAID SS. LINES : Ques. (Mr. Clarke)  
5402 (ii).  
— ARRANGEMENTS, PROVISIONING, &c. : Ques.  
(Mr. Clarke) 5021 (ii).  
— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bell, Pictou)  
9722 (iii).  
— TOTAL EARNINGS, I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Bell,  
Pictou) 9521 (iii).  
— YUKON, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster)  
1113 (i).
- TREATY BETWEEN G. B. AND JAPAN : Ques. (Mr.  
Morrison) 7970 (iii).
- TREFRY, NORMAN L., SHIPPING MASTER AT YAR-  
MOUTH, N. S., SALARY : Ques. (Mr. Borden, Hali-  
fax) 2405 (i).
- TREMBLAY, MESSRS., APPOINT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr.  
Marcotte) 5755 (ii).
- TRENT CANAL, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 8158,  
10393 (iii).  
— ARBITRATORS ON DAMAGES, NAMES, &c.: Ques.  
(Mr. McMullen) 1896 (i).  
— COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rogers)  
3037 (i).  
— TENDERS re TRENT-FRANKFORT SECTION : Ques.  
(Mr. Bennett) 156 (i).
- TRINIDAD TREATY, TRADE RELATIONS, &c.: Remarks  
(Mr. Fielding) 3795 (ii).  
— Remarks (Mr. Montague) 9064 (iii).  
— AND U. S. TREATY : Remarks (Mr. Foster)  
3673 (ii).
- TRUDEL, MR. LEON, MAIL CARRIER AT MURRAY BAY,  
SALARY : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 3037 (i).  
— MR. ZONO, SALARY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Pope)  
3044 (i).
- TUBERCULOSIS : in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iii).
- TUPPER, SIR CHARLES, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques.  
(Mr. Domville) 1477, 1755, 1880 (i).  
— 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF PUBLIC LIFE : Remarks  
(Sir Charles Tupper) 5805 (ii).
- TURRIFF, J. G., AND CHAPPELL, E. A., EMPLOYT. BY  
GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 2193 (i).  
— See "Chappelle" &c.
- TYRWHITT, MR. LATE M. P., DECEASE OF : Remarks  
(Mr. Foster) 8187 (iii).
- UNIFORMS FOR CUSTOMS OFFICERS : in Com. of Sup.,  
6090 (ii).
- UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS, SCHOOL GRANTS : in Com.  
of Sup., 6689 (ii), 7081 (iii).
- UNPROVIDED ITEMS : in Com. of Sup., 8931 (iii).
- U. S. AND G. B. IMPORTS, AMOUNTS, &c.: Ques.  
(Mr. Gillies) 7654 (iii).
- U. S. STEAMERS INSPECTION, EXEMPTION, &c.: Ques.  
(Mr. Wilson) 298 (i).  
— COASTING PRIVILEGES ON CAN. LAKES, REPS.,  
O. C's., &c.: M. for copies\* (Mr. Foster) 167 (i).
- VACANCIES IN CAN. CONTINGENTS, PROMOTIONS OF EX-  
OFFICERS : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2163 (i).  
— Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i), 5734 (ii), 8074.
- VALLEYFIELD, DAMAGES BY FLOODS, &c.: in Com. of  
Sup., 10215 (iii).  
— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 10263 (iii).
- VALLIERS, PHILLIP, CONTRACTS WITH PUB. WORKS  
DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 2165 (i).
- VANCOUVER DRILL HALL, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.:  
Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2828 (i).  
— ELECTORAL DIVISION, RESIGNATION OF MEM-  
BER : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5734 (ii).  
— P. O., LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE, &c.: Ques.  
(Mr. Prior) 1981 (i).  
— AND NANAIMO MAIL CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr.  
McInnes) 3442 (ii).  
— AND VICTORIA, B. C. ELECTORAL LISTS, DIS-  
TRIBUTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McInnes) 432 (i).
- VANDAL, RELEASE FROM ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENI-  
TENTIARY : M. for copies of Pets. (Mr. Quinn)  
299 (i).
- VERRETT, HECTOR, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 10277.
- VICTORIA BRIDGE SUBSIDY : in Com. Res., 9976 ;  
conc., 10448 (iii).
- VICTORIA, B. C. HARBOUR, AMOUNTS VOTED, &c.:  
Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1117 (i).  
— DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7958 (iii).  
— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 7961 (iii).  
— MAIL DELIVERY, PETS. re : Ques. (Mr. Prior)  
3049 (i).
- VICTORIALVILLE, POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 9876.
- VILLE MARIE BANK OFFICIALS : in Com. of Sup.,  
8145 (iii).  
— COR. BETWEEN DIRECTORS AND GOVT. AND  
STMT. OF SUMS PAID, CLAIMS MADE, &c.: M. for  
copies\* (Mr. Monk) 168 (i).  
— MONTHLY STMTS. FROM JULY, 1892 : M. for  
Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 1011 (i).  
— PETS. re GOVT. INTERVENTION AND SPECIAL  
GRANT : M. for copy (Mr. Monk) 3050 (i).

- VILLENEUVE, LEVERE, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 153 (i).
- VINCE, D. McLEOD, DISMISSAL, &c. : M. for Cor., Reps., &c.\* (Mr. Hale) 4078 (ii).
- VINCENT, MR., SURVEYOR, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 3043 (i).
- VOLUNTEERS FROM N. B. FOR SOUTH AFRICA, NUMBER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. McAlister) 2196 (i).
- ONT., NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Cargill) 2181.
- PROVS., NUMBER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Cargill) 2182 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Prior) 2182 (i).
- VOTERS' LISTS : in Com. of Sup., 9604, 10324 ; conc., 10452 (iii).
- B. C., PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2402.
- FREE ISSUES OF COPIES, O. C.'s : M. for copies\* (Mr. Pope) 319 (i).
- FOR KING'S, N.B. : Ques. (Mr. Domville) 1120.
- MAN., PRINTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. LaRivière) 3046
- MONTMORENCY : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 7122 (iii).
- NEW BRUNSWICK, RECEIVED BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Domville) 779 (i).
- P.Q., NUMBER RECEIVED BY CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2754, 3038 (i).
- POINTE AUX ESQUIMAUX : Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 8525 (iii).
- PRINTING, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Montague) 2673, 2740 (i), 4249 (ii), 7208 (iii).
- VROOME, G. V., AMOUNT PAID TO BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Mills) 2193 (i).
- WADE, MR. F. C., CHARGES AGAINST : amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 7136 (iii).
- amt. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to Com. of Sup. ; neg. (Y. 26 ; N. 51) 7172 (iii).
- TENDERS, PAPERS, &c. : M. for Ret.\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 167 (i).
- See "Yukon," &c
- WAGONS AND CARRIAGES, NUMBER IMPORTED IN P.E.I. : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 5402 (ii).
- WALLACE, GUNNER, DEATH AT KINGSTON : Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 477 (i).
- WALSH-CARBONNEAU AGREEMENT : Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 6243 (ii).
- See "Yukon," &c.
- WABLIKE STORES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8306 (iii).
- WATER FRONT AT DAWSON, LEASE, &c. : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 7652 (iii).
- MR. WADE'S ACTION : Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 151 (i).
- WATER RATES, DOM. BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 7939 (iii).
- WATER TANKS, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 8786 (iii).
- WAYS AND MEANS : M. for Com. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 10470 ; in Com., 10495 (iii).
- Res. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 138 (i).
- THE BUDGET—FINANCIAL STATEMENT (Mr. Fielding) 2563 (i).
- Reply (Mr. Foster) 2674 (i).
- See "Budget, The."
- THE TARIFF : M. for Com., 8068 (iii).
- Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. No. 10 (Mr. McMillan) 1°, 169 (i).
- (Sale of Fish) Act Amt. B. No. 64 (Mr. Ganong) 1° m., 1287 (i).
- B. No. 110 (Sir Henry Joly de Lotbinière) 1°\* ; 2560 (i) ; 2° m, 4672 ; in Com., 4675, 4812, 5969, 6918 (ii) 7125, 7422 ; 3°\* , 7423 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 37.)
- (Salt) Act Amt. B. No. 128 (Mr. Holmes) 1°\* , 2907 (i).
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT : Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4675 (ii).
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES : in Com. of Sup., 6032 (ii).
- INSPECTORS' FEES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1553 (i).
- WELLAND CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 8520 (iii).
- DYNAMITE EXPLOSION : M. to adjn. (Mr. McCleary) 4252, 4257 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. Borden, King's) 4251 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4068 (ii).
- Remarks (Mr. McCleary) 4145, 4149 (ii).
- MILITIA GUARD : in Com. of Sup., 9772 (iii).
- NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Montague) 2181 (i).
- REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 10395 (iii).
- WELLINGTON BRIDGE, MONTREAL, PAR. IN "DAILY WITNESS" re CONDITION (Mr. Quinn) 3331 (ii).
- WENTWORTH VS. MATHIEU : in Com. of Sup., 8138.
- Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 153 (Mr. Richardson) 1°\* , 5513 ; 2°\* , 5751 ; in Com., and 3°\* , 6276 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 85.)
- WESTERN COUNTIES RY., &c., REFUND OF SUBSIDIES : Ques. (Mr. Gillies) 1121 (i).
- WEST INDIES, TRADE RELATIONS WITH : Ques. (Mr. Kaulbach) 4077 (ii).
- WEST POINT, P.E.I., TENDERS FOR WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. McLellan) 2164 (i).
- WESTVILLE STATION : in Com. of Sup., 9440 (iii).
- WHISKY, &c., QUANTITY TAKEN OUT OF BOND, 1888-99 : Ques. (Mr. Davis) 2458 (i).
- WHITE HORSE RAPIDS : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Prior) 1786 (i).
- LAND AND MINERAL GRANT, COR. RESPECTING : M. for copies\* (Mr. Prior) 470 (i).
- LAND GRANTS, BOUNDARIES, CONDITIONS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 436 (i).
- See "Yukon," &c.
- WHITE, LT.-COL., RETIREMENT OF : M. to adjn. (Mr. Prior) 3074 (i).
- WHITESIDE, J. E., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Prior) 6615 (ii).
- WICKWIRE, MR., EMPLOYT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. Mills) 4244 (ii).
- WILLIAMS HEAD QUARANTINE STATION : in Com. of Sup., 7958 (iii).
- WILSON, J., SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH EGG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, B.C. : M. for cor.\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 2760 (i).
- WILSON, MR. S. CHILDS, EMPLOYT. : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3775 (ii).

- WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER, REPAIRS AND REPS. OF ENGINEERS: M. for copies\* (Mr. Ganong) 1012 (i).
- WINDING-UP ACT, ON ORDER FOR INTRODUCTION OF BILL: Remarks (Mr. Britton) 4901 (ii).
- WINDSOR DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 9889 (iii).
- Winnipeg and Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. No. 146 (Mr. Puttee) 1<sup>st</sup>, 4436; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4695; in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 6276 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 123.)
- WINNIPEG BY-ELECTIONS, REMUNERATION OF DEP. RETURNING OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 1006 (i).
- CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 6077 (ii).
- P.O., NUMBER OF LETTERS ANNUALLY: Ques. (Mr. Puttee) 4743 (ii).
- WINNIPEG LAKE. See "Lake Winnipeg."
- WINTER HARBOUR, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7836 (iii).
- MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1704 (i).
- OVERCOATS, N. W. MOUNTED POLICE, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 148 (i).
- ROAD TO YUKON, CONSTRUCTION AND EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1736 (i).
- WIRE FENCING, CONTRACTS, I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pettet) 3041 (i).
- WITNESS FEES, YUKON, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10410.
- WOMEN'S PROTECTIVE SOCIETY: in Com. of Sup., 9664 (iii).
- WOMAN SUFFRAGE: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. Moore) 9702 (iii).
- WOODBRIDGE FAIR, IMPORTATION OF POSTERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 1732 (i).
- WOOD ISLAND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 9897.
- PETS. *re* IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 1737 (i).
- WOOD, MR., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT ST. JOHN'S, UTTERANCES *re* FRENCH PATRIOTS: Remarks (Mr. Monet) 9844 (iii).
- See "St. John's," &c.
- WOODSTOCK, N.B., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7316 (iii).
- POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10271 (iii).
- POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 7926 (iii).
- WORKING AND DESTITUTE INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 8124 (iii).
- WORKING EXPENSES, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 9503.
- P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 9505 (iii).
- Workmen.** See "Labourers."
- WORK POINT BARRACKS, B.C., PAY OF MEN, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 4241 (ii).
- WORK, STOPPAGE OF, P.E.I. Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Martin) 7418 (iii).
- See "P.E.I." &c.
- WOUNDED AND SICK CANADIANS, REP., *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Quinn) 3336 (ii).
- Yale Mining District Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No 123 (Mr. Bostock) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2827 (i); 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3373 (ii).
- YAMASKA LOCK DAMAGES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10212 (iii).
- Yarmouth Steamship Co.'s B. No. 98 (Mr. Flint) 1<sup>st</sup>, 2147; 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2673 (i); in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4479 (ii). (63-64 Vic., c. 124.)
- No. 185 (Mr. Flint) M. to receive Pet., 8278; 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 8280; in Com. and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 8709; withdn., 9332 (iii).
- YARMOUTH STEAMSHIP CO. AND DOM. ATLANTIC RY. CO.'S BILL: M. to suspend Rules, &c. (Mr. Flint) 8278 (iii).
- M. to refund fees (Mr. Flint) 9332 (iii).
- YEAR BOOK, STATISTICAL: in Com. of Sup., 6340 (ii).
- YOUNG, MR., DOM. OFFICER AT NORTH PORTAL: in Com. of Sup., 10414 (iii).
- Yukon Game Preservation B. No. 190 (Mr. Sutherland) 1<sup>st</sup> m., 9059; 2<sup>nd</sup>, in Com., and 3<sup>rd</sup>, 9484 (iii). (63-64 Vic., c. 34.)
- YUKON:
- ADMINISTRATION OF, CHARGES AGAINST: amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 6356, 6374; neg. (Y. 38; N. 74) 6428 (ii).
- M. to adjn. (Sir Charles Tupper) 938 (i).
- amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bell, Pictou) 8527 (iii).
- Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 8559 (iii).
- ruling (Mr. Speaker) 8561-68 (iii).
- Remarks (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 6507.
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 9776, 10276 (iii).
- ALLOWANCES TO OFFICIALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7832, 10276 (iii).
- ALTERNATE SECTIONS, DISPOSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clancy) 155 (i).
- "AN ENGLISH EXPERT ON THE KLONDIKE," PURCHASE OF COPIES: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 6612 (ii).
- APPLICATIONS FOR COAL AREAS: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 8431 (iii).
- GRANTS, &c. FOR CERTAIN AREAS MENTIONED IN RET. 83 (1898) M. for Ret.\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 167 (i).
- LAND, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5404 (ii).
- RECORDS, &c., *re* CLAIMS 18, 26 AND 16, RECORD OF ALL ROYALTIES DUE AND COLLECTED (1897-8) &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 167 (i).
- ASSAY OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. Prior) 9466 (iii).
- ATLIN AND QUESNELLE TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 10256 (iii).
- BENNETT AND ATLIN TEL. LINE, CHARLESON, J. B., EMPLOYT. OF MEN: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 296 (i).
- COST OF CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 289 (i).
- AMOUNT PAID TO J. B. CHARLESON: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 288 (i).
- CONSTRUCTION, &c., MR. CHARLESON'S SUPPLIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1733 (i).
- COST OF CONSTRUCTION, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, TENDERERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 287 (i).
- DATE OF OPERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Donville) 7316 (iii).
- in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iii).
- MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Fraser, Lambton) 2157 (i).
- See "Charleson, Mr.," "Telegraph Lines," &c.
- BLISS, MAJ., DATE OF DEPARTURE FROM DAWSON CITY: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3176 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

- BONANZA CREEK LEASE, APPLICATIONS OF MR. A. E. PHILP: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5025 (ii).  
 — REP., &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5894 (ii).  
 B. C. MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACTS, ROUTES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c. FOR YEARS 1898-99: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).  
 BUILDINGS, RENTS, FUEL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7839, 8057, 10258 (iii).  
 CANADIAN BANK OF COMMERCE, COMMISSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 2750 (i).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 9607 (iii).  
 CASCA TRANSPORTATION CO.'S CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 811 (i).  
 CHAMPAGNE, MR. PAVINUS, EMPLOYT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Pope) 3044 (i).  
 CHARGES AGAINST MIN. OF THE INT. *re* MINING LEASES: Letters read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8074 (iii).  
 CHARLESON, J. B., EXPENDITURE PER AUD. GEN.'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2178 (i).  
 — inquiry for papers (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 7514 (iii).  
 — REPS. *re* TEL. CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. for copies (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 7310 (iii).  
 — Ques. of Order: ruling (Mr. Speaker) 7313.  
 — REP. AS TO WORK, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 434 (i).  
 — See "Bennett," "Telegraph Lines," &c.  
 CLAIMS, ABANDONMENT BY OWNERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Davin) 5026 (ii).  
 — RESERVED, DISPOSAL, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5406 (ii).  
 CLEMENT, PATTULO AND RIDLEY, DETAILS OF AMOUNT COLLECTED: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 2201 (i).  
 COMMUNICATIONS WITH MR. OGILVIE: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4738 (ii).  
 COSTE, MR., REP. *re* TESLIN LAKE ROUTE: M. for copy (Mr. Davin) 605 (i).  
 — ORDER, QUES. OF (Mr. Speaker) 608 (i).  
 COUNCIL, NAMES, SALARIES, &c. OF MEMBERS: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7880, 7968 (iii).  
 CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AGAINST OFFICIALS: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 153 (i).  
 DAWSON AND FORT CUDAHY TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 10257 (iii).  
 DAWSON CITY, POPULATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 591 (i).  
 DAWSON TO CIRCLE CITY TEL. LINE, CONSTRUCTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1734 (i).  
 DREDGING LEASES, APPLICATION OF MR. PHILP: DOM. CREEK, COR., &c.: M. for copies (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 157 (i).  
 — INQUIRY FOR RET. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 6702 (ii).  
 Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5246, 5247.  
 — CANCELLED OR FORFEITED, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5893 (ii).  
 — PUBLISHED IN "CANADA GAZETTE": Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 7315 (iii).  
 — TESLIN LAKE, APPLICATIONS OF MESSRS. PHILP AND OTHERS: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5398 (ii).  
 — TRANSFERENCE TO MR. PHILP AND OTHERS: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5247 (ii).  
 EXTENSION OF TIME TO OFFICERS *re* CLAIMS: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 152 (i).  
 GIROUARD, J. E., ADVANCES TO: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5407 (ii).  
 — APPNMT. AS REGISTRAR: M. for O. C.'s\* (Mr. Bergeron) 1012 (i).  
 — SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 294.  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 1381, 1724.

YUKON—*Con.*

- GOLD CLAIMS GIVEN IN COMPENSATION, &c., COR., &c., WITH GOVT.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 2201 (i).  
 — COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, THEFT OF, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5406 (ii).  
 GOVT. BANKING BUSINESS, COR. *re*: M. to lay cor. on Table (Mr. Fielding) 8082 (iii).  
 — in Com. of Sup., 6977 (ii).  
 HYDRAULIC LEASES TO ROBT. ANDERSON: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 6052 (ii).  
 INCOMPLETE RETURNS (Mr. Foster) 7207 (iii).  
 INSTRUCTIONS TO W. H. LYNCH: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 6351 (ii).  
 INVESTIGATION BY MR. OGILVIE, ACTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 153 (i).  
 "JOHN C. BARR," REGISTRATION, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 319 (i).  
 — Inquiry for Ret. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4722, 4809, 5527, 6049 (ii).  
 — M. to print Papers (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4899, 5019 (ii).  
 — REPS. *re* REGISTER, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 3761, 6614 (ii).  
 — UNDERVALUATION, &c.: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 6633 (ii).  
 JUDICIAL BUSINESS, CONDITION OF THE DOCKET OF THE COURT: (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 590 (i).  
 LA BANQUE FRANCAIS DU KLONDIKE, PAR. IN "LA PRESSE": Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 9470.  
 LANDS UNDER LICENSES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marcotte) 5243 (ii).  
 LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 7839, 8058 (iii).  
 LIQUOR PERMITS GRANTED BY GOVT., &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Mr. Foster) 2202 (i).  
 — NAMES, POST OFFICE ADDRESSES, NUMBER OF GALLONS, &c.: M. for Stmt.\* (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).  
 — on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for copies, &c. (Mr. Sutherland) 2997 (i).  
 MCGREGOR, MR. J. D., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 592 (i).  
 MAIL CONTRACTS NOW CURRENT: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2996 (i).  
 — SERVICE, APPROPRIATION ACT, 1899: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9798 (iii).  
 — PETS. RECEIVED BY P.M.G., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 1481 (i).  
 MILITARY BARRACKS, COST OF ERECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1111 (i).  
 MILITIA FORCES, NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 437 (i).  
 — SUPPLIES, PAY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9774.  
 MINING CLAIMS AND GOVT. POLICY: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 151 (i).  
 MORGAN, R. W., CORRECT INITIALS AND RESIDENCE: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5247 (ii).  
 MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 7077 (iii).  
 — NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 591 (i).  
 — MAIL SERVICE IN THE YUKON, COMPENSATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9779 (iii).  
 NORTH AMERICAN TRANSPORTATION CO., NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6248 (ii).  
 OGILVIE, MR., REP. AND ACTION TAKEN BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir Charles Tupper) 435 (i).  
 — ANSWER TO TELEGRAM: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 5025, 5895 (ii).  
 — Inquiry (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 4559 (ii) 7915 (iii).  
 — Remarks (Mr. Sutherland) 6060 (ii).  
 — SALARY, EMOLUMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) 154 (i) 4735 (ii).

YUKON—*Con.*

- OPTIONS GRANTED, DATE, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5894 (ii).  
 ——— HOLDERS, NAMES, &c.: (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5894 (ii).  
 O. C. *re* CLAIMS RESERVED: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4920 (ii).  
 ——— *re* LIVING ALLOWANCES: M. for Stmtnt.\* (Mr. *Foster*) 2201 (i).  
 ORDINANCES: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4734 (ii).  
 PAYMENT TO DOG DRIVER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3262 (i).  
 PAYMENT TO MR. CLEMENT: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4735 (ii).  
 PERMANENT FORCE, WITHDR., &c.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1209 (i).  
 POSTAL RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 9792 (iii).  
 PRISONERS, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10276 (iii).  
 QUESNELLE AND ATLIN TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 10256 (iii).  
 QUESNELLE-DAWSON TEL. LINE, PURCHASE OF GROCERIES FOR EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1116 (i).  
 RATES OF PAY TO OFFICIALS, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 152 (i).  
 REGISTRAR'S FEES, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 479 (i).  
 REPRESENTATION IN DOM. PARLT.: amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7773 (iii).  
 ——— COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 3673 (ii).  
 ——— prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7647 (iii).  
 ——— Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6615.  
 ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 10257.  
 ROYAL COMMISSION, REP., LIMITATION OF SCOPE, &c.: M. for Ret.\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 157 (i).  
 ——— *re* INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4736, 5231, 5233, 5238 (ii).  
 ROYALTIES, AMOUNT COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2750 (i).  
 ——— ALEX. McDONALD, REP., &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5895 (ii).  
 ——— CHARGES AGAINST MR. McDONALD: amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 7658; neg. (Y. 33; N. 63) 7727 (iii).  
 ——— GOLD OUTPUT: Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 7613 (iii).  
 SHERIFF'S FEES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10276 (iii).  
 SPEECH OF SENATOR KIRCHHOFFER *re* CORRUPTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3048 (i).  
 TELEGRAPH LINES: M. for papers (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 7203 (iii).  
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 7843 (iii).  
 ——— MR. J. B. CHARLESON'S REP., &c.: Inquiry for papers (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 49, 7656 (iii).

YUKON—*Con.*

- TELEGRAPH LINES, SUPPLIES PURCHASED BY MR. CHARLESON: Telegram read (Mr. *Maxwell*) 8282 (iii).  
 ——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Foster*) 8282 (iii).  
 ——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 8284 (iii).  
 TERRITORY ACT, COURT RULES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 739 (i).  
 TESLIN LAKE DREDGING LICENSES: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5242 (ii).  
 TIMBER LICENSES, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 5408 (ii).  
 TRANSFER OF MINING CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2753 (i).  
 TRANSPORT OF TROOPS, EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1113 (i).  
 VILLENEUVE, LEVERE, EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 153 (i).  
 WADE, MR. F. C., CHARGES AGAINST: amt. to Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 7136; neg. (Y. 26; N. 51) 7172 (iii).  
 ——— TENDERS, PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies\* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 167 (i).  
 WALSH-CHARBONNEAU AGREEMENT: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6243 (ii).  
 WATER FRONT AT DAWSON, LEASE, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 7652 (iii).  
 ——— LEASE AND MR. WADE'S ACTION: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 151 (i).  
 WHITE HORSE RAPIDS, LAND GRANTS, BOUNDARIES, CONDITIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 436 (i).  
 ——— COR. RESPECTING; M. for copies\* (Mr. *Prior*) 470 (i).  
 ——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Prior*) 1786 (i).  
 WHITESIDE, J. E., EMPLOYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 6615 (ii).  
 WINTER ROAD, CONSTRUCTION AND EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1736 (i).  
 WITNESS FEES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10410 (iii).  
 YUKON, EDMONTON AND PACIFIC RAILWAY CO., GOVT. CONTRACTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1007 (i).  
 "YUKONER," STR., INCOMPLETE RET: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6059 (ii).  
 ——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. *Paterson*) 5883.  
 ——— CLEARANCE, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4921, 5395, 6248 (ii).  
 ——— M. to adjn. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 4926, 4967 (ii).  
 ——— Deb. (Mr. *Paterson*) 4992; (Mr. *Quinn*) 4997, 5016; (Mr. *Wallace*) 5000; (Mr. *Fielding*) 5005; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5006, 5009; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 5013; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 5017 (ii).  
 ——— M. to print cor. *re* (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 6567 (ii).